

Key Factors of Remote and Hybrid Work Model – what have we learned after COVID-19?

Nika Marković

Center for Cognitive Science
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences
and Faculty of Computing and Electrical
Engineering, University of Zagreb
ORCID: 0009-0000-0331-904X

Abstract

This paper explores the key factors of remote and hybrid work models following the COVID-19 pandemic. It analyzes the remote work model and factors that influence the experience, and with a focus on productivity and satisfaction of the employees, it provides a comprehensive overview of the current workplace status. In a post-pandemic world, evaluating the remote model and considering possibilities for combining remote and in-office working are crucial for creating guidelines for the future. It also explores the potential psychological effects of working from home and hybrid work arrangements. Key factors that influence the remote experience include job structure, prior experience with remote work, the size of an organization, working in a team, and the amount of time spent working remotely. Productivity and job satisfaction are considered important outcomes of working remotely. Productivity is increased during remote work in some situations. Job satisfaction is positively related to remote work. In consideration of the advantages and disadvantages of remote and office work, a balance of both could be the solution to optimizing productivity, satisfaction, and overall work experience. In conclusion, this paper aims to understand how remote and hybrid work affect people and companies, stressing the need to consider various factors necessary for adapting to the new ways of working in the future.

Keywords: hybrid work, job satisfaction, key factors, productivity, remote work

Introduction

In 2020, the world faced the COVID-19 pandemic. Faced with the risks of coming into contact with other people, daily lives had to be drastically readjusted. The workplace was no exception, and employers who could, given their line of work, shifted to working from home. Since then, the pandemic has ended, but remote and hybrid work models remain in use. Mentions of the remote work model

date to 1974, when Jack Nilles first used the term “telecommuting” while stuck in traffic in Los Angeles (Kurland & Bailey, 1999). Telework, now more commonly referred to as remote work, is a “work arrangement in which employees perform their regular work at a site other than the ordinary workplace, supported by technological connections” (Fitzer, 1997, p. 65). This concept gained traction in the United States in the early 2000s, with estimates of three to nine million telecommuters (Kurland & Bailey, 1999), but it became widespread globally in the COVID-19 pandemic.

Switching to remote work during the pandemic was inevitable for everyone who had the opportunity, and working from home showed to be very valuable to people concerned about COVID-19 (Galanti et al., 2021). George et al. (2021) have found that 56% out of their 278 respondents think that remote work is a positive transformation, and 61% of them stated they would prefer this work model after the pandemic. The respondents also reported less overall life stress while working remotely, greater freedom or creativity (71%), more opportunities to innovate and improve work (66%), and greater work-life balance (59%). Unfortunately, reports about remote work are not all positive. General deterioration in health is one of them. Respondents reported the biggest problems with eating (no appetite or overeating), sleeping issues, and a general poor mood (Afonso et al., 2022; George et al., 2021). Also, Guler et al. (2021) found that their respondents reported a significant rise in back pain experienced whilst working from home, related to the use of inappropriate chairs and inadequate computer setups, as well as weight gain, related to less activity and consumption of more junk food.

Once the pandemic had ended, a question arose for both employers and employees. What is next: do we stay remote, does everything go back to the way it used to be, or is the combination of both models inevitable? It seems that the combination, or hybrid work model, is becoming more and more popular. The hybrid work model is a combination of working in the office and working remotely (Teevan, 2021). This August, Gallup (2023a) reported that Meta and Zoom announced that their employees would be returning to the office, but in a hybrid way – Meta employees must be at the office three days a week and Zoom employees two. They also report that 80% of employees who can work remotely expect that their work arrangement is hybrid or remote.

Employees’ preferences for work environments vary, with some who favor home for focused tasks and others who prefer the office. An office is a place for socializing and culture building, but remote work enables more autonomy

and well-being (Gallup, 2023b). A Gallup (2023b) survey shows that over 50% of workers both expect the possibility of hybrid work and prefer it. Data from a survey conducted by Barrero et al. (2021) on more than 30,000 Americans shows that remote work can remain an option for about half of the employees and that employers' plans typically consist of two days of remote work a week.

Understanding how these new work models affect both employees and employers is an important subject in 21st century organizations. In this paper, the key factors of working remotely will be explored, with a comprehensive overview at the productivity and satisfaction of the employees. Is the hybrid work model, as the combination of working remotely and in the office, the best option for a modern workplace?

Psychological Effects of Remote and Hybrid Work

Drawing on job demands-resources theory and self-determination theory, this chapter explores the potential psychological effects of working from home and hybrid work arrangements. Job demands-resources theory was first introduced by Demerouti et al. (2001) and suggests that the work environment can be seen as a balance between challenges, or demands, and support, or resources, which have different effects on employees. Job demands are defined as "physical, social, or organizational aspects of the job that require sustained physical or mental effort and are therefore associated with certain physiological and psychological costs (e.g., exhaustion)," and job resources as "physical, psychological, social, or organizational aspects of the job that may do any of the following: (a) be functional in achieving work goals; (b) reduce job demands at the associated physiological and psychological costs; (c) stimulate personal growth and development" (Demerouti et al., 2001, p. 501). Feeling overwhelmed by work (high demands) leads to burnout, specifically feeling exhausted. On the other hand, lacking the tools and support needed (low resources) makes employees feel disconnected and unmotivated, or, more simply put, leads to disengagement. Demerouti and Bakker (2023) expand this theory in the light of a crisis, based on COVID-19 studies and also prior literature. They propose an extension of the model, factoring in regulation. Regulation has an impact on the influence of job demands and resources on energy/health, and motivation, as well as directly on energy/health, motivation, and the outcome. Regulation consists of an individual, their family, leadership, organizational and work group strategies, all of which interact with each other. These help in balancing the

demands of remote work. Remote work can blur the boundaries between work and personal life, increasing stress. Family and friends play a crucial role as potential stressors or sources of support during crises (Gabriel and Aguinis, 2022, according to Demerouti and Bakker, 2023). Remote work, especially when combined with childcare responsibilities, can negatively affect women's well-being and performance. Egalitarian approaches to childcare (sharing responsibilities) benefit both partners. The study also points out that successful remote work leaders demonstrate both task-oriented (clear communication, project management) and relationship-oriented (support, empathy) behaviors. Individuals can proactively optimize their work environment to stay motivated during remote work challenges (Kniffin et al., 2021; Wang et al., 2021, according to Demerouti and Bakker, 2023). This complements top-down approaches, like redesigning remote work arrangements.

According to the self-determination theory (Gagné and Deci, 2005), the fulfillment of three psychological needs (competence, autonomy, and relatedness) impacts work motivation, consequently affecting outcomes. Internalized and intrinsic motivations tend to generate more favorable results compared to extrinsic and less internalized motivations. The evolving nature of work, marked by heightened uncertainty and interdependence, may influence these needs and motivations. Gagné et al. (2022) explore the potential consequences of remote work arrangements on worker satisfaction and motivation through the lens of self-determination theory and how technology shapes work design. Virtual work can present challenges. For example, virtual interactions can lack workplace cues that can lead to confusion about roles and hinder smooth interactions; virtual meetings can be tiring and less effective; close monitoring of managers can undermine the feeling of autonomy, and virtual work can also lead to feelings of isolation and exclusion from colleagues. Simple strategies like virtual coffee breaks or buddy systems can help foster connection in remote settings. Virtual work can also satisfy needs in terms of competence; for example, access to information and training opportunities through ICT can enhance knowledge and skills. The trend towards hybrid work arrangements is likely to continue, and designing them to meet autonomy, competence, and relatedness will be crucial for long-term success. Finding the optimal balance between remote work and in-office interaction will likely vary depending on individual preferences, job roles, and personality traits. By understanding the impact on worker needs, organizations can design work environments that promote satisfaction, motivation, and well-being.

Key Factors in Remote and Hybrid Work Experience

Remote work comes with a lot of benefits and challenges. To differentiate between them and influence them, it is crucial to understand the underlying factors that shape the work experience. Key factors that will be considered are structural factors, experience with remote work, the size of an organization, working in a team, and the amount of time spent working remotely.

The first set of factors that need to be analyzed are structural factors. Knowing exactly what to do and how to seek support or help is important in perceiving remote work. Van Zoonen et al. (2021) showed that employees who knew what their expectations were and who could do their tasks individually adjusted more easily to remote work. Concretely, clearly provided goals, objectives, and task independence are beneficial. Adjustment to remote work was measured using a five-item scale which measured satisfaction with remote work, perceived performance in a remote work setting, and balance between work and personal life. Both work independence and job clarity show strong support for the hypothesis that these structural factors positively influence adjustment to remote work. Structural stability is also important for good adjustment to remote work; the less the work practices change, the better the reported employee adjustment (van Zoonen et al., 2021). It is important to note that this research has been conducted on a non-random sample and that the sample is quite homogenous, so the generalizability of these findings is limited. It was also conducted in the early stages of the pandemic and in Finland, whose citizens were not as affected by the pandemic as those in other countries. Other research has shown that having training, help, and technical support also helps with better adjustment (Donati et al., 2021).

When it comes to the size of an organization, the literature does not offer a unanimous finding regarding its influence. While some reports suggest that smaller organizations foster better remote work environments with a more people-oriented culture (Sarbu, 2018), bigger companies have more resources available to make the best out of the remote arrangement (Illegems et al., 2001). Thinking about this in the context of lockdown, Donati et al. (2021) suggest that bigger companies had more resources to implement work-from-home practices in a timely manner. Their research has found that a cluster of employees who worked for big companies held the most positive beliefs about remote work. However, Donati et al. (2021) surveyed a relatively small sample ($N=163$) through an online survey and used snowball sampling, so the generalizability

of this finding is very limited. While the size of an organization might have been an important factor in the early phases of the lockdown, eventually all companies, regardless of their size, had to implement remote work practices to stay in business. Smaller companies could have made up for better platforms and more resources in departments of the organization, which are characteristic of bigger companies, with easier communication and better cohesiveness. Now that remote and hybrid work has become so common, a better culture in the company may have more influence on work experience than its infrastructure.

Another factor that should be mentioned is previous experience. Employees who had already been used to working remotely before the pandemic adjusted better to the new situation (van Zoonen et al., 2021). Pre-COVID-19 research also showed that knowing how remote work operates fosters positive attitudes towards it (Silva Cortès et al., 2019). A study (van Zoonen et al., 2021) found that employees who experienced a bigger change in location of work had a harder time adjusting to remote work; it was easier to adapt for employees whose number of days working remotely went from three to five than for those whose remote work days went from one to five. Guler et al. (2021) also found that those employees who were unprepared for remote work reported frequent lower back pain because they used dining chairs instead of ergonomic ones, and they used computers in an inappropriate way (screen too close, screen below eye level). However, this study has collected data about pain in the form of self-reports, and it is hard to be certain about how different participants experience pain, what pain tolerance they have, and what levels of pain prior to remote work they are comparing it to. It would be interesting to conduct this study in an experimental way, where physical check-ups would be done with all participants, and then some of them would work in an ergonomically designed remote work setting, and others would work remotely with no interventions to their usual set-up.

Teamwork is also a factor worth looking into. Effective communication and trust play crucial roles in the success of collaborative efforts within virtual teams (Yusuf, 2012). Donati et al. (2021) found that respondents who worked in teams had a more positive attitude towards remote work and better coping strategies than those who performed their work tasks individually. They point out that social support inherent to teamwork is positively correlated with well-being. Bloom et al. (2022) found that while working from home, employees showed an increase in messaging with each other while working remotely and in the office once they started the hybrid program. Van Zoonen et al. (2021) found that a trusting relationship between employees and managers is correlated with making adjustments to remote working more difficult. This correlation was

relatively small, but statistically significant. The researchers offer a possible explanation: individuals who trust their co-workers less prefer remote work because it reduces contact and confrontation with people they do not trust. This study also found that the perception of social isolation had a negative impact on the perception of remote work experiences. When considering teamwork, collaboration and communication always come to mind. Yang et al. (2022) analyzed anonymized individual-level data on the communication practices of 61,182 US Microsoft employees from December 2019 to June 2020 all of whom switched to remote work due to the pandemic in March and April 2020. They have found that implementing remote work across the entire firm resulted in a collaboration network that was more rigid and compartmentalized, with fewer connections linking various sections of the organization. Also, the switch to remote work led to a decline in real-time communication and an increase in communication that occurred at different times, contributing to an asynchronous communication pattern. The findings suggested that remote work led to a decreased interconnectivity among business groups and a decrease in the number of connections bridging gaps in the informal collaboration network. It is important to note that only one IT company was studied, some employees were excluded due to the confidentiality of their work, and it was conducted during the most uncertain period of the pandemic, and that there was no time to adjust to remote work during just three months. While the authors note that employees might be using collaboration networks established while working in person, it is inconclusive whether different networks would be established in the online environment over a longer period of time. It should be highlighted that the researchers treat collaboration networks and communication media usage as separate, not considering their possible interaction.

The amount of time spent working remotely is also one of the factors of remote work. Golden and Veiga (2005) have shown that job satisfaction rises with the number of hours spent working remotely, until the threshold of around 15 hours a week, when it starts stagnating. Hoornweg et al. (2016) also found that productivity rises before hitting the mark of eight work hours a week, after which it starts declining. Newer research has also shown that working from home several days a week has a positive impact on the perception of remote work (Donati et al., 2021). It is important to note that the studies conducted by Golden and Veiga (2005) and Hoornweg et al. (2016) were conducted before the COVID-19 pandemic, so their findings might not be as relevant now that remote work became more common. Golden and Veiga (2005) used a sample of people who had been working remotely for four or more years on average. A more recent study from Donati et al. (2021) also shows that remote work had

a positive impact. In the post-pandemic world, access to exploring the hybrid work model in real life can provide us with more cohesive insight into how time spent working remotely influences work experience. Choudhury et al. (2024) investigate the impact of hybrid work on work outcomes, particularly focusing on communication and work novelty, through a field experiment conducted in collaboration with BRAC, a large non-governmental organization. 130 workers from the human resources department in Dhaka, Bangladesh, were randomized to work different days from the office over nine weeks. Daily lotteries determined office or remote work, and data for 108 employees was analyzed. Workers were categorized into high (0-23% days in office), intermediate (23-40%), and low (more than 40%) working from home (WFH) groups. Workers in the intermediate-WFH group express higher satisfaction with remote work, perceive a better work-life balance, and experience less isolation compared to both high- and low-WFH categories. Findings also indicate that intermediate levels of remote work are associated with the highest volume of emails sent, the greatest number of email recipients, more positive sentiment in emails, and increased novelty in work output. Again, it is important to note the limitations of this study. It is based on a single organization in Bangladesh, limiting generalizability; the sample size was restricted to 108 HR employees, which may limit statistical power; and it was focused on only one department. The study period was limited to nine weeks, possibly not capturing the long-term effects, and the outcomes were focused on email communication and work novelty, potentially not capturing all aspects of work outcomes.

In shaping a post-pandemic workplace, companies should aim to understand structural elements, the temporal aspects of remote work, individual experiences, and the dynamics of teamwork to provide their employees with the best possible work experience in order to enhance their motivation, productivity, satisfaction, and well-being. Taking care of communication and collaboration practices in the company could also prove vital for the productivity and innovation of the employees. Hybrid work arrangements may offer advantages of flexibility and ease the feelings of isolation, potentially making them the optimal balance between remote and in-office work dynamics.

Productivity

It is important to understand what the underlying factors of success are in working from home, but it is also important to take into consideration the outcomes of the remote work model. Offering remote work to employees

provides many benefits, including employee flexibility, talent attraction, and alignment with employee demands and the labor market (Błaszczuk et al., 2023). The productivity of the employees is important to the employer and the key to shaping the post-pandemic workplace.

While Guler et al. (2021) reported their participants have had health consequences like increased back pain and weight gain, they also reported that participants felt their productivity has increased. George et al. (2021) reported that more than half of their respondents experienced a positive impact on productivity and creativity, and also experienced more opportunities to learn how to be more productive (56% of respondents). They also report that more than 70% of respondents gained more freedom and creativity in how they do their job, and 46% feel using Zoom, Skype, or other online platforms improved productivity. According to the same research, having a higher purpose, individual values, social support, personal fortitude, and an increase in work all enhance productivity, as does having clear boundaries between work and personal life. Job security and whether there are other people at home did not correlate with changes in productivity (George et al., 2021). While this research found that 50% of their participants felt more productive working from home, there was also a slightly negative side to this: 27% of them strongly disagreed and 23% didn't see a difference. This research was conducted on 278 U.S. workers who worked at least 50% of their time remotely via an online survey. The data collected is descriptive, but they also interviewed 8 individuals, which helped researchers have a broader understanding of the transition to remote work.

Galanti et al. (2021) have found that high job demands have a negative correlation with productivity and the promotion of stress, as well as social isolation and work-family conflict, while autonomy and self-leadership have a positive correlation with productivity. This research has also found that employees of older age perceived they had lower productivity, encountering technological challenges and adaptability issues, which is in line with findings from Sharit et al. (2009), which explained that these difficulties arise through problems with technology and a lesser ability to adapt to change. The research Galanti et al. (2021) conducted was on a quite small sample ($N=209$) of only Italian citizens; they used convenience sampling and an online survey, so the generalizability of this finding is very limited. Hoornweg et al. (2016) conducted research that found that productivity peaked at eight hours of remote work a week, after which it started declining. The authors suggest that the reason behind this might be a better quality of socialization when working at the office and the fact that extensive remote work can lead to isolation, blurring of work-life boundaries,

and longer working hours, which can have a negative impact in the long run. This suggests that a day a week at home could be good for getting tasks done without distractions. While the findings of this study are very interesting, it should be considered that the sample size is relatively small ($N=111$), non-remote workers are not included, and the study was conducted in a bank. Also, it is worth mentioning that the authors themselves highlighted that estimates from remote workers could be biased and that there is no way to differentiate hourly and total productivity from their research. The research has found a curvilinear relationship between the number of hours spent working remotely and productivity, with a non-significant rise in the low number of hours of remote work and a significant negative relationship for a high number of remote work hours.

Researching the opinions and attitudes of employees is very convenient, but there are also other measures to take into consideration – for instance, measures of increased productivity, profit, how managers see the performance of employees, etc. Bloom et al. (2015) found in a Chinese call center company that the implementation of remote work has shown an increase in performance of 13%. This research has been conducted on a 16,000-employee company for the duration of nine months. In the beginning, all the employees were working in person, and volunteers who were eligible for remote work were selected. This finding has led the company to allow all employees to have the option to work from home, which half of them took. This also allowed employees who worked from home in the first part of the research to return to the office if they wanted to, which allowed those who were uncomfortable at home to return and those who thrived to stay at home. After the change, they noted an even bigger increase of 22% in performance. This company has also reported that by working from home, they are cutting their costs by around 2,000 dollars per employee per year, of which about 230 dollars came from the performance of the employee. Supervisors have reported a more positive impact on productivity than employees in other positions (George et al., 2021). From a manager's perspective, when asked about rating their employees' level of productivity, reports indicate that almost a quarter of them couldn't compare work from home and in the office; 31% think it was significantly or moderately higher when in-office, while 45% believe that it was significantly or moderately higher when working remotely (Błaszczuk et al., 2023).

Künn et al. (2020) have conducted interesting research on chess players who had to resort to online tournaments during the pandemic. Using artificial intelligence, they compared player performance in an online tournament to

previous editions of world championships in rapid chess. This research aimed to evaluate how moving tasks to an online environment impacted cognitive performance. It was found that the size of errors in the online environment was 16.8% higher than in person, while they didn't find a statistically significant increase in the probability of making an error. While the finding that cognitive performance is poorer in an online setting is very interesting, this research is limited by the precise data set they collected, during a period of just two weeks and on 123 games, and by the effects of distress that the pandemic had caused. This research would be interesting to conduct in a non-pandemic environment.

While there are positive and negative reports of productivity in remote work settings, it is important to look at them through the prism of some of this data being collected during the pandemic, when switching to work from home was a necessity to keep safe from COVID-19 and the times were challenging and unsure. Now that remote work isn't followed by the threat of the pandemic, with the development of many platforms and tools to enhance the experience, companies have the freedom to see how a mix of working remotely and from the office works out. With that, researchers have many exciting opportunities to tackle the limitations of previous research and find conclusive findings on what practices of remote work boost productivity. Taking into consideration pre-pandemic research and hopefully soon with many new finds, productivity can be enhanced through remote work, with careful consideration of the job description and organization.

Job Satisfaction

The satisfaction of the employees is the factor that could easily be the most important to them. When considering overall satisfaction, there are some key facilitators. As previously stated, research conducted by Golden and Veiga (2005) has shown a curvilinear effect of remote work: job satisfaction increases up until the point of working around two and a half days a week remotely, after which it stagnates with a slight fall. Participants in their study were all working remotely for four years on average and are all technologically savvy, so generalization of the results is limited. Gajendran and Harrison (2007) conducted a meta-analysis that showed a positive relationship between job satisfaction and remote work. While the size of the effect was moderate, the meta-analysis was concluded primarily based on studies that were conducted in a natural setting. Their reports also show that remote workers report less work-life conflict, which Fonner and Roloff (2010) also showed in their research. They have also found

that work-life conflict is a mediator of job satisfaction and remote work in two ways: firstly, by providing more flexibility and helping balance personal and professional roles, and secondly, more complexly, that remote work provides less frequent information exchange, leading to lower stress. Schall (2019) found a positive and linear correlation between remote work and job satisfaction. This research consisted of primarily low-intensity remote workers, with the average number of hours worked from home being 13.70 hours a week (around 35%). A mediating effect of perceived autonomy and work-life conflict with remote work was also found in this research. Higher perceived autonomy in remote work led to better job satisfaction, as did less work-life conflict. An interesting finding from Fonner and Roloff's (2010) research is that being away from workplace politics while working remotely is another factor in higher job satisfaction. Perceived workplace politics were measured with a scale that included "global politics" items (i.e. "Favoritism rather than merit determines who gets ahead around here.", "People here usually don't speak up for fear of retaliation by others.") and "going along to get ahead" items. (i.e., "There is no place for yes-men around here; good ideas are desired even when it means disagreeing with superiors."). They conclude that remote workers are more satisfied than workers who work in person most of the time. Research by Bloom et al. (2015), which showed an increase in productivity with remote work, also found that the remote workers showed higher satisfaction levels than the ones working from the office.

Research from van Zoonen et al. (2021) found that employees with more job autonomy have shown higher levels of job satisfaction than those with less job autonomy. Bloom et al. (2022) conducted newer research as well, on a company with around 1600 employees, which once again showed that employees working from home scored significantly higher on survey measures regarding work satisfaction, life satisfaction, and work-life balance. This research also showed, interestingly, that non-managers working from home showed a 38% reduction in quit rates, while managers showed a 55% increase, which suggests that they experienced difficulties in managing remotely.

Before the pandemic, research suggested a positive relationship between remote work and job satisfaction, with benefits like increased autonomy, reduced work-life conflict, and avoidance of office politics, which more recent studies conducted during or after the pandemic seem to confirm. Remote workers report higher satisfaction with work, life, and work-life balance compared to their in-office counterparts. However, there's a need for further research to understand the impact across various job types and individual preferences. Additionally, the role of factors like perceived autonomy and work-life balance

in mediating job satisfaction with remote work suggests that successful remote work arrangements might require tailoring to individual needs and preferences.

Conclusion

The COVID-19 pandemic forced a rapid shift to remote work for many organizations, offering a real-world experiment on a massive scale. While pre-pandemic research suggested the potential benefits of remote work, the pandemic provided unique insights. Both remote and in-person work models have their advantages and disadvantages. Key factors that make remote work a better experience for the employees include structured assignments and job description, prior experience with remote work, a bigger organization with greater resources, working in a team, and the amount of time spent working remotely, which is around half of the work week remotely and half in the office. Research shows that productivity can be increased while working remotely. It is important to take into consideration multiple factors, such as the nature and requirements of the job, the age and personality traits of the employee, and time spent working remotely. When implemented well, remote work can enhance productivity. The hybrid work model is to be taken into consideration to balance the benefits of both work models. Job satisfaction is shown to be positively related to remote work in multiple papers. Some report a curvilinear relationship, while others report a positive linear relationship. In both cases, flexibility and the possibilities of work-life balance are what make remote work compelling.

Looking at all the research analyzed in this paper, some of the most common limitations of these studies are the fact that some were conducted during the pandemic, which surely had an impact on all participants and clouded what the impact of the pandemic was and what the impact of remote work was. It is also important to consider the limitations that come from samples. Most of the samples were convenience samples, which always limits the generalizability of the results. Some of the papers mentioned were conducted only on remote workers, without a control sample of those working in the office, and some samples were quite small. A big limitation that should also be pointed out is the fact that a lot of the researchers have opted for online surveys in combination with convenience sampling, which could suggest that people who have participated were already more tech-savvy and in a position to favor remote work. This limitation could be overcome by conducting company-wide research and including all the employees, regardless of their age and technological proficiency. It should also be pointed out that a lot of research is focused on specific companies or

industries, while research based on different companies and industries could give more generalizable results. In this scope, a lot of studies focus on only one country. Given that online surveys are the most common choice, it would be great to see international collaboration and collect and analyze data from multiple countries and cultures.

Future research could provide many interesting insights into how remote working impacts humans and all areas of their lives. Interesting areas to research would be to see how remote work impacts other household members and their daily lives and the impact of having the same living and working space. Also, future research can address how remote work impacts cognitive abilities, especially in long-term remote work. Experiments with multi-national companies could also provide valuable data and further insight into remote work experiences and their impact on employees and employers. An interesting focus point could be in discovering and constructing tools, programmes, and resources to enhance well-being and productivity. Further research on the design and implementation of hybrid work models is essential. Identifying optimally balanced schedules, effective communication strategies for hybrid teams, and tools to promote a sense of belonging among remote workers are all crucial areas of research. Ultimately, this deeper understanding will guide the development of tools and resources to enhance well-being, productivity, and a sense of community in the post-pandemic workplace.

Delving into the depths of underlying factors and understanding the impact of remote work on productivity and job satisfaction among employees is the key to the organization of modern workplaces. Taking into consideration all the research, the logical step moving forward seems to be implementing a hybrid work model. By providing the best of both worlds, the future of the office seems to be hybrid; we just must discover which hybrid setting works best for both the company and the employee.

Literature

Afonso, P., Fonseca, M., & Teodoro, T. (2022). Evaluation of anxiety, depression, and sleep quality in full-time teleworkers. *Journal of public health (Oxford, England)*, *44*(4), 797–804. <https://doi.org/10.1093/pubmed/fdab164>

Barrero, J. M., Bloom, N., & Davis, S. J. (2021). *Why working from home will stick*. National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper 28731.

- Błaszczuk, M., Popovic, M., Zajdel, K., & Zajdel, R.** (2023). Implications of the COVID-19 Pandemic on the Organization of Remote Work in IT Companies: The Managers Perspective. *Sustainability*, 15. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su151512049>.
- Bloom, N., Liang, J., Roberts, J., & Ying, Z. J.** (2015). Does Working from Home Work? Evidence from a Chinese Experiment, *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 130(1), 165–218. <https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qju032>
- Bloom, N., Han, R., & Liang, J.** (2022). *How Hybrid Working From Home Works Out*. National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper 30292.
- Choudhury, P., Khanna, T., Makridis, C. A., & Schirmann, K.** (2024). Is hybrid work the best of both worlds? Evidence from a field experiment. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 1-24.
- Demerouti, E., & Bakker, A. B.** (2023). Job demands-resources theory in times of crises: New propositions. *Organizational Psychology Review*, 13(3), 209-236.
- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B.** (2001). The job demands-resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 499–512. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.499>
- Donati, S., Viola, G., Toscano, F., & Zappalà, S.** (2021). Not All Remote Workers Are Similar: Technology Acceptance, Remote Work Beliefs, and Wellbeing of Remote Workers during the Second Wave of the COVID-19 Pandemic. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 18(22), 12095. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph182212095>
- Fitzer, M. M.** (1997). Managing from Afar: Performance and Rewards in a Telecommuting Environment. *Compensation & Benefits Review*, 29(1), 65–73. <https://doi.org/10.1177/088636879702900110>
- Fonner, K. L., & Roloff, M. E.** (2010). Why teleworkers are more satisfied with their jobs than are office-based workers: When less contact is beneficial. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 38(4), 336–361. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00909882.2010.513998>
- Gagné, M., & Deci, E.** (2005). Self-determination theory and work motivation. *Journal Of Organizational Behavior*, 26(4), 331-362.
- Gagné, M., Parker, S.K., Griffin, M.A., Dunlop, P.D., Knight, C., Klonek, F.E., & Parent-Rocheleau, X.** (2022). Understanding and shaping the future of work with self-determination theory. *Nature Reviews Psychology*, 1(7), 378-392.
- Gajendran, R. S., & Harrison, D.A.** (2007). The good, the bad, and the unknown about telecommuting: Meta-analysis of psychological mediators and individual consequences. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 1524-1521. [10.1037/0021-9010.92.6.1524](https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.6.1524)
- Galanti, T., Guidetti, G., Mazzei, E., Zappalà, S., & Toscano, F.** (2021). Work From Home During the COVID-19 Outbreak: The Impact on Employees' Remote Work Productivity, Engagement, and Stress. *Journal of Occupational and environmental medicine*, 63(7), e426–e432. <https://doi.org/10.1097/JOM.0000000000002236>
- Gallup** (2023, October 9). *The Future of the Office Has Arrived: It's Hybrid*. <https://www.gallup.com/workplace/511994/future-office-arrived-hybrid.aspx>

- Gallup** (2023, December). *State of the American workplace*. <https://www.gallup.com/workplace/349484/state-of-the-global-workplace.aspx>
- George, T. J., Atwater, L. E., Maneethai, D., & Madera, J. M.** (2021). Supporting the productivity and wellbeing of remote workers. *Organizational Dynamics*, 100869. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2021.100869>
- Golden, T. D., & Veiga, J. F.** (2005). The Impact of Extent of Telecommuting on Job Satisfaction: *Resolving Inconsistent Findings*. *Journal of Management*, 31(2), 301–318. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206304271768>
- Guler, M. A., Guler, K., Guneser Gulec, M., & Ozdoglar, E.** (2021). Working From Home During a Pandemic: Investigation of the Impact of COVID-19 on Employee Health and Productivity. *Journal of occupational and environmental medicine*, 63(9), 731–741. <https://doi.org/10.1097/JOM.0000000000002277>
- Hoorweg, N., Peters, P. & van der Heijden, B.** (2016). Finding the Optimal Mix between Telework and Office Hours to Enhance Employee Productivity: A Study into the Relationship between Telework Intensity and Individual Productivity, with Mediation of Intrinsic Motivation and Moderation of Office Hours. *New Ways of Working Practices*, 16, 1-28. <https://doi.org/10.1108/S1877-636120160000016002>
- Illegems, V., Verbeke, A., & S'Jegers, R.** (2001). The organizational context of teleworking implementation. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 68, 275–291.
- Künn, S., Seel, C., and Zegners, D.** (2020). *Cognitive performance in the home office – evidence from professional chess*. IZA Discussion Paper No. 13491.
- Kurland, N. B., & Bailey, D. E.** (1999). Telework: The advantages and challenges of working here, there, anywhere, and anytime. *Organizational Dynamics*, 28(2), 53–68. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0090-2616\(00\)80016-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0090-2616(00)80016-9)
- Sarbu, M.** (2018). The role of telecommuting for work-family conflict among German employees. *Research in Transportation Economics*, 70, 37–51. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.retrec.2018.07.009>
- Schall, M. A.** (2019). *The Relationship Between Remote Work and Job Satisfaction: The Mediating Roles of Perceived Autonomy, Work-Family Conflict, and Telecommuting Intensity*. Master's Theses. 5017. <https://doi.org/10.31979/etd.2x82-58pg>
- Sharit, J., Czaja, S. J., Hernandez, M. A., & Nair, S. N.** (2009). The Employability of Older Workers as Teleworkers: An Appraisal of Issues and an Empirical Study. *Human factors and ergonomics in manufacturing*, 19(5), 457–477. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hfm.20138>
- Silva Cortès, A., Montoya Restrepo, I.A., & Valencia Arias, J.A** (2019). The attitude of managers toward telework, why is it so difficult to adopt it in organizations? *Technology in Society*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2019.04.009>
- Teevan, J.** (2021). The new future of work: Research from Microsoft into the Pandemic's Impact on Work Practices. *Microsoft*.
- Yang, L., Holtz, D., Jaffe, S., Suri, S., Sinha, S., Weston, J., Joyce, C., Shah, N., Sherman, K., Hecht, B., & Teevan, J.** (2022). The effects of remote work on collaboration among information workers. *Nature human behaviour*, 6(1), 43–54. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-021-01196-4>

Yusuf, B. N. M. (2012). Communications and trust is a key factor to success in virtual teams collaborations. *International Journal of Business and Technopreneurship*, 2(3), pp. 399-413.

van Zoonen, W., Sivunen, A., Blomqvist, K., Olsson, T., Ropponen, A., Henttonen, K., & Vartiainen, M. (2021). Factors Influencing Adjustment to Remote Work: Employees' Initial Responses to the COVID-19 Pandemic. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 18(13), 6966. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18136966>

Sažetak

Ovaj rad istražuje ključne faktore modela rada na daljinu i hibridnih modela rada nakon pandemije COVID-19. Kroz istraživanje prije pandemije i COVID-19, analiza modela rada na daljinu, čimbenika koji utječu na iskustvo i fokus na produktivnost i zadovoljstvo zaposlenika, daje široki pogled na status na radnom mjestu. U svijetu nakon pandemije, evaluacija modela na daljinu i mogućnosti kombiniranja rada na daljinu i rada u uredu ključna je za kreiranje smjernica za budućnost. Rad također istražuje moguće psihološke učinke rada na daljinu i hibridnih radnih aranžmana. Ključni čimbenici koji utječu na kvalitetu i doživljaj rada na daljinu uključuju strukturu posla, iskustvo rada na daljinu, veličinu organizacije, rad u timu i količinu vremena provedenog radeći na daljinu. Produktivnost i zadovoljstvo poslom smatraju se važnim ishodima rada na daljinu. U nekim situacijama, produktivnost se povećava radom na daljinu. Zadovoljstvo poslom pozitivno je povezano s radom na daljinu. Uzimajući u obzir prednosti i nedostatke rada na daljinu i rada iz ureda, ravnoteža oba bi mogla biti rješenje za postizanje veće produktivnosti, zadovoljstva i ukupnog radnog iskustva. Zaključno, cilj je razumjeti kako rad na daljinu i hibridni rad utječu na ljude i tvrtke, naglašavajući potrebu razmatranja različitih čimbenika za prilagodbu novim načinima rada u budućnosti.

Ključne riječi: hibridni rad, ključni faktori, produktivnost, rad od kuće, zadovoljstvo poslom