



Hybrid Work Culture and its Impact on Employee Well-Being: A Conceptual Analysis

Cahyaning Haswari^{1*}, Gusti Ayu Desy Dwi Cahyani², Ni Luh Putu Widyani Puspitawat³, Santi Nururly⁴
University of Mataram

Corresponding Author: Cahyaning Haswari cahyaninghaswari@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Kata Kunci: Hybrid Work Culture, Employee Well-Being, Work Flexibility, HRM, Work-Life Balance

Received : 20, October
Revised : 22, November
Accepted: 24, December

©2025 Haswari, Cahyani, Puspitawat, Nururly): This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).



ABSTRAK

Technological developments and changes in post-pandemic work patterns have encouraged organizations to adopt a hybrid work culture that combines remote and in-office work. This article is a conceptual analysis that aims to explain how a hybrid work culture affects employee well-being through the integration of various theoretical foundations, such as Job Demands-Resources Theory, Work-Life Balance Theory, Boundary Theory, and Organizational Support Theory. Findings from various studies indicate that a hybrid work culture provides benefits in the form of flexibility, autonomy, reduced commuting time, and increased work-family integration. However, this work model also presents challenges such as technostress, social isolation, role boundary blurring, and workload intensification. This article synthesizes Q1-Q4 journals to develop a conceptual understanding of the mechanisms by which hybrid work influences psychological, social, and occupational well-being. This analysis identifies three main pathways: (1) the dynamics of job demands and job resources, (2) the interaction of the Work-Life Balance and Boundary Management Pathway, and (3) the Organizational Support Pathway. The article concludes with theoretical implications, practical implications, and a future research agenda.

INTRODUCTION

The development of digital technology, organizational transformation, and changing employee expectations have driven a fundamental shift in modern work patterns. Since the COVID-19 pandemic, companies around the world have accelerated the adoption of flexible work models that allow employees to work remotely, in hybrid formats, or with a combination of both. Although the pandemic emergency has passed, many organizations choose to maintain hybrid work models because they are considered to support flexibility, increase efficiency, and provide a better balance between work and personal life (Carnevale & Hatak, 2020; Wang et al., 2021). The hybrid work culture has evolved not only as a situational response but as a new paradigm in human resource management.

Hybrid work culture is defined as a work pattern that integrates physical interaction in the office and virtual work activities as a unified system. This model requires adaptation in terms of coordination, communication, the use of digital technology, as well as patterns of control and supervision. When implemented appropriately, hybrid work offers several advantages, such as increased autonomy, work flexibility, reduced commuting stress, and time efficiency, which ultimately contribute to improved employee well-being (Ipshita et al., 2023; Putnam et al., 2022). However, if not managed properly, hybrid work can lead to negative consequences, such as technostress, work intensification, digital fatigue, and social isolation (Galanti et al., 2021; Molino, Ingusci, Signore, & others, 2020).

Employee well-being itself is a multidimensional aspect that includes psychological, emotional, social, and physical conditions of individuals in the work context. Organizations need to pay serious attention to employee well-being because various studies show that employee well-being is closely related to productivity, commitment, job satisfaction, turnover intention, and performance quality (Rudolph, Allan, Hertel, et al., 2021; Sander et al., 2023). In the context of hybrid work, well-being dynamics become increasingly complex as they are influenced by work design, the quality of organizational support, boundary management capability, and the level of digital workload.

Several previous studies indicate that the increased flexibility offered by hybrid work can improve work-life balance, which in turn positively affects well-being (Chandra, 2023; Darouei & Pluut, 2021). However, other literature highlights ambivalent effects. For instance, excessive flexibility may cause blurred boundaries between work and personal life, thereby increasing the risk of stress and burnout (Palumbo, 2020; Toscano & Zappalà, 2020). Thus, the impact of hybrid work on well-being is not linear but is influenced by organizational conditions, job design, management support, and personal preferences.

Although literature on remote working and flexible work arrangements has grown rapidly, these studies are mostly empirical and focused on outcome analysis, while conceptual studies that deeply explore mechanisms, major theories, and models of hybrid work's influence on well-being remain relatively limited (Kniffin & others, 2021). This creates a theoretical gap, particularly in

understanding how hybrid work culture as a new phenomenon shapes employee behavior, perceptions, and psychological conditions in a sustainable manner.

In addition, hybrid work models require the management of organizational culture that differs from traditional work models. Changes in communication structures, collaboration patterns, and technology use encourage organizations to develop a more adaptive, digital, and trust-based work culture. An organizational culture that supports autonomy, balance, and emotional sustainability becomes a crucial determinant of whether hybrid work produces positive or negative outcomes (Kossek & Lautsch, 2018; Soga & others, 2022).

This situation underscores the need for a conceptual analysis capable of integrating various relevant theories, including Job Demands–Resources Theory, Work–Life Balance Theory, Boundary Theory, Work Design Theory, and Organizational Support Theory, to build a systematic understanding of how hybrid work culture affects the three main dimensions of well-being, namely psychological well-being, work-related well-being, and social well-being. Therefore, this study aims to analyze hybrid work culture as a contemporary work phenomenon, examine its mechanisms and pathways of influence on employee well-being based on major theories, identify factors that strengthen or weaken its impact, and offer an integrative conceptual model that can serve as a foundation for empirical research or organizational policy formulation. By presenting a comprehensive theoretical synthesis and conceptual framework, this article provides significant academic contributions to human resource management literature, particularly in understanding work transformation and employee well-being in the digital era.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Concept of Hybrid Work Culture

Hybrid work culture is a form of flexible work arrangement that combines physical work activities in the office with remote work activities. This model has evolved as a result of digital transformation and global experiences during the COVID-19 pandemic. Hybrid work is not merely the combination of work locations, but a new cultural pattern that governs norms, values, and modern work practices (Chandra, 2023). In a hybrid culture, key elements such as flexibility, autonomy, digitalization capability, and trust-based management play significant roles in determining the success of its implementation.

According to Wang et al. (2021), hybrid work should be understood as a work design that positions technology as a connector between individual work and collaborative work. Hybrid work culture also requires a shift in managerial paradigm from presence-based supervision toward output-based and trust-based control. This is reinforced by Carnevale and Hatak (2020), who identify that hybrid work demands organizational cultural adaptation to support employee well-being, innovation, and productivity in a balanced manner.

Furthermore, hybrid work cannot be separated from the dynamics of an outcome-based working environment. Studies by Galanti et al. (2021) emphasize that the success of hybrid culture is influenced by the organization's ability to

create psychological safety, provide adequate technological support, and facilitate cross-location coordination. Thus, hybrid work is not only a structural change but also a cultural transformation that affects interaction, communication patterns, and work relationships within an organization.

Employee Well-Being in the Context of Modern Work

Employee well-being is a multidimensional concept encompassing physical, psychological, social, and professional conditions experienced by individuals in the workplace. Several theories define well-being as an indicator of balance between job demands and an individual's psychological capacity to manage stress adaptively (Sander et al., 2023). Modern well-being models highlight three major dimensions:

1. **Psychological well-being**, related to positive emotions, psychological resilience, life satisfaction, and a sense of meaning in work (Rudolph, Allan, & others, 2021).
2. **Work-related well-being**, which includes work motivation, engagement, burnout, and job pressure (Ipsen et al., 2021).
3. **Social well-being**, which covers the quality of interpersonal relationships, social support, and a sense of connectedness within teams (Putnam et al., 2022).

In the context of hybrid work, achieving well-being becomes more complex due to dispersed work environments, increased digital intensity, and shifting boundaries between work and personal life (Toscano & Zappalà, 2020). Research indicates that hybrid work may enhance well-being through greater flexibility, but it can also worsen psychological conditions if organizations do not provide adequate support mechanisms (Palumbo, 2020).

Key Theories Related to Hybrid Work and Well-Being

1. Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) Theory

The Job Demands–Resources Theory is a framework that explains how job characteristics influence employee well-being and organizational performance. Initially introduced as a model in 2001 and later developed into a comprehensive theory (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017), its core proposition is that job characteristics fall into two major categories: job demands and job resources (Tummers & Bakker, 2021).

Job demands are aspects of work that require sustained effort and are therefore associated with psychological and physiological costs, such as high workload or role conflict (Tummers & Bakker, 2021). Conversely, job resources refer to aspects that help employees achieve work goals, reduce job demands and associated costs, and stimulate personal growth and development—such as social support from colleagues or job autonomy (Tummers & Bakker, 2021).

The JD-R model proposes two primary processes: the health impairment process and the motivational process (Demerouti, 2025; Gómez-Figueroa et al., 2025). The health impairment process occurs when high job demands, unbalanced by sufficient job resources, lead to exhaustion, stress, and eventually health problems. For example, excessive workload without adequate managerial support can trigger burnout (Bakker & Demerouti, 2016). The motivational process, on the other hand, occurs when abundant job resources

foster work engagement, job satisfaction, and higher performance because employees feel supported and have the tools to achieve their goals (Gómez-Figueroa et al., 2025).

The JD-R theory has evolved with the addition of concepts such as personal resources and recognition of reciprocal relationships among variables (Schaufeli, 2017; Tummers & Bakker, 2021). It has been widely applied in thousands of organizations and has inspired hundreds of empirical studies, reinforcing its relevance in research on job stress and motivation (Bakker & Demerouti, 2016; Schaufeli, 2017). Providing a flexible framework for different work contexts, JD-R theory guides research and practice in creating healthier, more engaging, and more productive work environments.

2. Boundary Theory

Boundary Theory explains how individuals create, maintain, and adjust boundaries between different life domains – particularly work and family (or non-work) domains (Bhat et al., 2022; Clark, 2000). The theory posits that boundaries are conceptual demarcation lines that define where behaviors relevant to one domain start or end (Adisa et al., 2017). These boundaries may be physical, emotional, temporal, cognitive, and/or relational, functioning as “mental fences” that simplify one’s environment and separate one domain from another (Adisa et al., 2017; Bhat et al., 2022).

The theory focuses on how individuals manage the integration or segmentation of these domains (Clark, 2000; Cobb et al., 2022). **Segmentation** refers to efforts to keep domains separate, whereas **integration** involves blending or overlapping roles between domains. Preferences for segmentation or integration are influenced by individual tendencies, social norms, and work and family demands. For example, a segmentation-oriented individual may avoid responding to work emails after office hours, while an integrator may feel comfortable completing work tasks at home (Bhat et al., 2022).

Clark’s Work/Family Border Theory is an important extension of Boundary Theory, which views individuals as daily “border crossers” between work and family domains. This theory discusses how integration and segmentation, boundary formation and management, border-crossing participation, and interactions with others at work and home affect work–family balance (Clark, 2000). Research shows that effective boundary management is essential for achieving positive work–life balance and reducing role conflict (Adisa et al., 2017; Cobb et al., 2022).

3. Work–Life Balance Theory

Work–Life Balance (WLB) Theory addresses how individuals balance demands and roles in work and non-work domains, such as family life, social activities, and personal time (Amiruddin & Monil, 2022; Joshi, 2024). Historically, WLB research was conflict-oriented, focusing on how demands from one domain hinder effective functioning in another (Amiruddin & Monil, 2022; Bhat et al., 2022). Such conflicts may manifest as time-based, strain-based, or behavior-based conflicts, each of which can negatively influence job satisfaction, commitment, and overall well-being (Amiruddin & Monil, 2022).

However, modern perspectives on WLB go beyond conflict, acknowledging the potential for symbiotic relationships between work and non-work domains (Bhat et al., 2022; Naz et al., 2021). Integrated conceptualizations of WLB suggest that balance involves not only minimizing conflict but also achieving positive engagement in work and non-work roles with minimal social role conflict (Naz et al., 2021). This includes the concept of enrichment, where experiences and resources from one role enhance quality of life in another – such as work-to-family or family-to-work enrichment (Bhat et al., 2022).

Achieving work–life balance is crucial for well-being, job performance, the ability to maintain healthy relationships, and societal well-being (Amiruddin & Monil, 2022). Factors such as family-friendly policies, organizational and family support, and individuals' ability to modify boundaries play important roles in achieving effective WLB (Atiq & Iqbal, 2018). Research continues to integrate concepts, theories, and influencing factors to understand and promote WLB across diverse contexts (Joshi, 2024).

4. Organizational Support Theory

Organizational Support Theory proposes that employees develop a general perception of the extent to which the organization they work for values their contributions and cares about their well-being (Eisenberger et al., 2019; Kurtessis et al., 2015). This perception is known as Perceived Organizational Support (POS) (Dolma & Dolma, 2018). Employees tend to interpret caring or uncaring treatment as an indication of whether the organization likes or dislikes them (Vardaman et al., 2016). OST, rooted in the norm of reciprocity, suggests that employees will reciprocate the POS they receive by becoming more committed to the organization and continuing to engage in it (Vardaman et al., 2016).

The key factors shaping POS include fairness, leader support, human resource practices, and working conditions (Dolma & Dolma, 2018; Eisenberger et al., 2019). Fair treatment, managerial support, favorable organizational rewards, and good working conditions significantly contribute to forming high POS (Eisenberger & Rhoades, 2001). It is important to note that employees perceive such treatment as discretionary organizational choices, meaning that the organization chooses to show care and appreciation rather than doing so out of obligation (Eisenberger et al., 2019). When organizations demonstrate support, employees feel valued and acknowledged.

POS has wide-ranging effects on various employee attitudes and behaviors, as well as organizational outcomes. High POS has been associated with increased affective commitment, job satisfaction, positive mood, organizational citizenship behavior, and employee performance (Eisenberger et al., 2019; Mitchell et al., 2011; Sun, 2019). Conversely, low POS can lead to higher turnover intention and work-related stress (Mitchell et al., 2011). By fulfilling employees' socio-emotional needs, POS fosters self-enhancement processes that contribute to improved subjective well-being (Viot & Benraiss-Noailles, 2024). Therefore, organizational support is a strategic lever for enhancing employee outcomes and creating a positive and productive work environment.

Research Gaps from Previous Literature

Based on reviews of Q1–Q4 indexed journals:

1. There is a lack of conceptual studies that formulate a comprehensive theoretical model (Wang et al., 2021).
2. Many studies focus on the pandemic period and have not examined hybrid work as a permanent organizational culture (Kniffin et al., 2021).
3. Internal mechanism variables such as boundary control and digital fatigue are rarely integrated within a single theoretical framework.
4. Contexts of developing countries remain understudied, particularly Indonesia.
5. There is still limited research integrating JD-R, Boundary Theory, and Organizational Support in explaining employee well-being.

These gaps are addressed in this article through a conceptual analytical approach.

METHODOLOGY

This study employs a conceptual analysis approach, which aims to construct a deep and integrated theoretical understanding of the relationship between hybrid work culture and employee well-being (Jabareen, 2009; Kivunja, 2018). This approach is commonly used in studies oriented toward theory development, structural mapping of literature, and the integration of conceptual constellations without relying on empirical data collection (Jabareen, 2009). The use of a conceptual method is considered appropriate given that hybrid work is a contemporary and evolving phenomenon characterized by complex dynamics, thereby requiring a strong theoretical foundation before being evaluated through empirical approaches (Richter & Richter, 2024). In this context, conceptual analysis enables the identification of relational patterns among variables, synthesis of multiple theoretical perspectives, and the formulation of a coherent analytical model that may serve as a reference for future research (Nagori & Lawton, 2024; Vartiainen & Vanharanta, 2024).

Methodologically, this study is designed as a conceptual article with three primary objectives:

- (1) identifying core concepts and major theories related to hybrid work and employee well-being,
- (2) synthesizing literature findings into a systematic and consistent framework of thought, and
- (3) constructing a conceptual model that elaborates the mechanisms through which hybrid work culture influences various dimensions of well-being (Beckel & Fisher, 2022; Nagori & Lawton, 2024; Vartiainen & Vanharanta, 2024).

The theoretical argumentation is developed by prioritizing logical consistency, conceptual accuracy, and phenomenological relevance, supported by empirical and conceptual findings from previous studies to produce a robust and scientifically reliable theoretical structure (Kivunja, 2018).

The literature sources used in this study include reputable international journals ranked Q1–Q4, such as *Applied Psychology*, *Journal of Business Research*, *Work & Stress*, *Human Relations*, and the *International Journal of Environmental*

Research and Public Health; scholarly books and classical theories such as the Job Demands–Resources Theory (Demerouti, 2025), Work–Life Balance Theory, and Organizational Support Theory; as well as conceptual articles and empirical reviews related to hybrid work, flexible work arrangements, and employee well-being (Eng et al., 2024; Hasyim & Bakri, 2024; Nagori & Lawton, 2024; Bath & Markulin, 2024). The literature was selected based on thematic relevance, theoretical contribution, publication reputation, and publication range within the last ten years (except for foundational theories) (Nagori & Lawton, 2024). This selection ensures that the developed conceptual construction possesses sufficient intellectual depth and academic validity.

The analysis was conducted through three systematic stages. First, *Concept Identification*, focused on identifying and clarifying central concepts—such as hybrid work, flexibility, digital work design, organizational support, technostress, work–life balance, and employee well-being—which were subsequently categorized into major conceptual themes (Eng et al., 2024; Griva et al., 2024; Klaser et al., 2023; Marsh et al., 2024; Vartiainen & Vanharanta, 2024; Bath & Markulin, 2024).

Second, *Theoretical Mapping*, involved mapping relevant theories and linking them with the phenomenological characteristics of hybrid work, including the Job Demands–Resources Theory, Work–Life Balance Theory, and Organizational Support Theory (Demerouti, 2025; Eng et al., 2024; Grobelny, 2023; Klaser et al., 2023; Bath & Markulin, 2024). This mapping enabled the identification of influence pathways explaining how hybrid work culture affects employee well-being.

Third, *Conceptual Integration*, synthesized all concepts and theories into a comprehensive analytical framework, including the formulation of intervariable relationships, influence mechanisms, and potential mediators and moderators (Grobelny, 2023; Vartiainen & Vanharanta, 2024).

Table 1. Literature Mapping and Theoretical Basis for Developing the Hybrid Work–Well-Being Conceptual Model

No	Author(s) (Year)	Journal (SJR/SINTA Rank)	Context, Method	Variable Focus	Key Findings & Implications
1	Mitchell et al. (2012)	<i>Computers in Human Behavior</i> (Q1)	Survey of 699 hospital employees on new IT adoption	Perceived organizational support (POS), distributive justice, intrinsic/identified motivation	POS & distributive justice relate to intrinsic/identified motivation; POS uniquely predicts enjoyment & IT acceptance; intrinsic motivation mediates POS effects.
2	Kurtessis et al. (2017)	<i>Journal of Management</i> (Q1)	Meta-analysis of 558 studies	POS, social exchange constructs (LMX, affective commitment)	Strong support for Organizational Support Theory; POS strongly related to affective commitment,

No	Author(s) (Year)	Journal (SJR/SINTA Rank)	Context, Method	Variable Focus	Key Findings & Implications
					performance, and reduced turnover.
3	Bakker & Demerouti (2017)	<i>Organizational Dynamics</i> (Q1)	Conceptual review of JD-R model	Job demands (workload, emotional demands), job resources (autonomy, support)	JD-R framework shows high demands → burnout; high resources → engagement; recommends psychosocial monitoring to reduce burnout.
4	Dolma & Dolma (2018)	<i>Journal of Internet Applications & Management</i> (Q4)	Multi-group confirmatory factor analysis	Survey of SPOS items	Demonstrated configural, metric & scalar invariance between online and paper SPOS administration.
5	Eisenberger et al. (2019)	<i>Journal of Applied Psychology</i> (Q1)	Temporal meta-analysis (317-383 samples over 30 years)	POS, LMX, affective commitment; justice & performance	POS mean level slightly increased over time; LMX & commitment stable; strong relationships with justice & extra-role performance.
6	Dwivedi et al. (2020)	<i>International Journal of Information Management</i> (Q1)	Expert opinion article	Digital transformation, online learning, cybersecurity, remote work	Highlights organizational challenges/opportunities in digital transition; emphasizes digital strategy, cybersecurity, and infrastructure.
7	Molino et al. (2020)	<i>Sustainability</i> (Q1)	Cross-sectional surveys among Italian remote workers	Technostress, workload, work-family conflict, strain	Technostress & workload increase work-family conflict & behavioral strain; mandatory remote work worsens technostress.
8	Oakman et al. (2020)	<i>BMC Public Health</i> (Q1)	Rapid review of 23 WFH studies	Health outcomes (pain, well-being, stress, depression, fatigue)	WFH effects vary; influenced by organizational support, social connection & boundary control; women benefit less.

No	Author(s) (Year)	Journal (SJR/SINTA Rank)	Context, Method	Variable Focus	Key Findings & Implications
9	Chafi et al. (2021)	<i>Sustainability</i> (Q1)	Two qualitative studies (53 Swedish public employees)	Remote vs. hybrid work experiences	Hybrid work blends flexibility, autonomy & social benefits; remote work enhances WLB but causes isolation.
10	Ipsen et al. (2021)	<i>IJERPH</i> (Q2)	Survey of 5,748 knowledge workers (29 European countries)	WFH benefits & drawbacks	Six factors identified: WLB, efficiency, control; home limitations, job uncertainty, inadequate tools.
11	Rudolph & Zacher (2024)	<i>Human Resource Development Quarterly</i> (Q1)	32-wave monthly panel (n=994)	% WFH, professional isolation, satisfaction, self-efficacy, performance	Nonlinear (inverted-U) relationships; prior experience & proper resources reduce negative impacts.
12	Santarpia et al. (2021)	<i>IJERPH</i> (Q2)	Multi-group SEM (968 telecom employees)	Autonomy, goal-oriented leadership, personal initiative, cross-role interference, WFC	Autonomy increases cross-role interference; leadership reduces nonwork→work interference; interference predicts WFC.
13	Wang et al. (2021)	<i>Applied Psychology</i> (Q1)	Mixed methods (interviews & survey of 522 Chinese employees)	Work-home interference, communication difficulties, procrastination, loneliness; virtual work characteristics	Social support reduces all WFH challenges; autonomy reduces loneliness; workload & monitoring worsen interference; self-discipline moderates relationships.
14	Weitzer et al. (2021)	<i>Int. Archives of Occupational & Environmental Health</i> (Q1)	Cross-sectional survey of 1,010 Austrians	Self-reported changes in life quality & productivity	WFH improves quality of life but lowers productivity; effects vary by gender, age & education.
15	Boccoli et al. (2022)	<i>Sinergie</i> (Q3)	Survey of 1,550 workers; SEM	Autonomy, temporal flexibility, WLB, engagement, satisfaction	Autonomy & flexibility improve WLB; WLB mediates positive effects on engagement & satisfaction.

No	Author(s) (Year)	Journal (SJR/SINTA Rank)	Context, Method	Variable Focus	Key Findings & Implications
16	Cobb et al. (2022)	<i>Community, Work & Family</i> (Q1)	Mixed methods	Family- supportive supervisor behaviors (FSSB)	FSSB applies to remote work but expressed differently; influences satisfaction & WLB.
17	Bloom, Han & Liang (2024)	<i>Nature</i> (Q1)	Randomize d controlled trial (1,612 tech employees)	Hybrid schedule, job satisfaction, turnover, working hours, communication	Hybrid work reduces turnover by ~33%, increases job satisfaction; shifts daily work patterns; managers less enthusiastic than employees.
18	Singh et al. (2022)	<i>Journal of Business Research</i> (Q1)	Survey of 306 forced remote workers	Technostress, techno-fatigue, subjective well- being, resilience	Digital platforms cause technostress → techno- fatigue → lower well- being; prior experience reduces technostress.
19	Kim & Park (2025)	<i>Employee Relations</i> (Q2)	Survey of 317 full- time employees (Korea); SEM	POS, flexible remote work, WLB	POS increases meaningful work, use of flexible remote work, and WLB; meaningful work & flexibility mediate POS effects; supportive climates enhance well-being & performance.

Source: Selected literature from international journals Q1-Q4.

Although this study does not utilize quantitative data, this conceptual research requires strong argumentative validity, which is achieved through logical coherence, conceptual consistency, literature triangulation, and alignment with the latest global developments on hybrid work. This validity ensures that the conceptual model developed has a solid theoretical foundation and is ready to serve as a basis for subsequent empirical research.

RESEARCH FINDINGS

Synthesis Results: Conceptual Model of the Influence of Hybrid Work on Well-Being

Based on the synthesis of theories and literature, this study identifies three key pathways that explain how hybrid work culture affects employee well-being:

(1) Job Demands–Job Resources (JD–R) Pathway

Within the Job Demands–Resources (JD–R) framework, hybrid work culture influences employee well-being through the balance between job demands and job resources. The core of the JD–R model is that employee well-being and performance depend on the extent to which available resources can compensate

for and restructure the impact of job demands (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017). In the context of hybrid work, these demands include not only workload and time pressure but also technostress, information overload, and role ambiguity arising from dispersed coordination and communication across physical and digital workspaces (Molino, Ingusci, Signore, Manuti, et al., 2020; Shukla & Singh, 2022).

Hybrid work tends to increase employees' exposure to digital demands, such as the obligation to remain responsive across multiple communication channels, frequent virtual meetings, and the need to navigate complex organizational digital systems. These conditions may lead to techno-overload, techno-invasion, and techno-complexity, contributing to emotional exhaustion and reduced cognitive capacity (Molino et al., 2020; Mazzei et al., 2023). When these demands exceed the resources available—such as limited technological support, unclear role expectations, or insufficient social support—risks include increased burnout, digital fatigue, chronic stress, and declines in work-related well-being (Oakman et al., 2020; Rudolph, Allan, Hertel, et al., 2021). In other words, a hybrid culture without adequate work design may amplify “energy drain” on the demands side.

On the other hand, the JD-R model emphasizes that hybrid work can provide strong job resources, particularly autonomy, flexibility, social and organizational support, and technology adequacy. Autonomy in determining the timing, location, and method of work allows employees to regulate their work rhythm according to their personal conditions and preferences, enhancing psychological well-being, intrinsic motivation, and work engagement (Bloom, 2021; Wang et al., 2021). With strong technological infrastructure and clear organizational policies, flexibility becomes a key job resource that protects employees from the adverse effects of high job demands (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017; Ipsen et al., 2021). Additionally, perceived organizational support and organizational care toward employee needs in hybrid arrangements strengthen feelings of being valued and contribute to improved psychological and social well-being (Eisenberger et al., 2019; Viot & Benraiss-Noailles, 2024).

Thus, the JD-R pathway in the context of hybrid work can be understood as a balancing mechanism between new digital and distributed demands and redesigned hybrid resources. When organizations strengthen resources such as autonomy, role clarity, technological support, and social/organizational support, hybrid work can enrich employee well-being across psychological, work-related, and social dimensions (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017; Sander et al., 2023). Conversely, when digital demands remain high and resources insufficient, hybrid work acts as a “risk amplifier,” increasing technostress, fatigue, and long-term well-being deterioration (Molino et al., 2020; Rudolph et al., 2021). In this perspective, technology in hybrid work plays a dual function: as a mediator enabling communication, coordination, and work delegation, and simultaneously as a potential source of demands that must be regulated through well-being-oriented work design and policies.

(2) Work–Life Balance and Boundary Management Pathway

Within the Work–Life Balance Theory and Boundary Theory, hybrid work influences employee well-being through boundary management mechanisms between work and personal domains. Hybrid work creates more fluid, flexible, and often ambiguous boundary structures, making the quality of integration and segmentation crucial to the maintenance of employee well-being (Clark, 2000; Cobb et al., 2022). When work–family boundaries are well managed, hybrid work enables employees to align their work rhythms with personal needs, reduce role conflict, and foster enrichment between work and family domains (Aprilina & Martdianty, 2023; Abildgaard et al., 2024).

The flexibility inherent in hybrid work allows employees to attend to household responsibilities or family needs without fully abandoning their professional duties. This contributes to more harmonious role integration, increased job satisfaction, and improved psychological well-being (Aprilina & Martdianty, 2023; Al, 2025). Studies show that hybrid workers—especially those with children—report higher work–family enrichment, lower stress levels, and better work performance than on-site workers (Abildgaard et al., 2024). In this context, flexibility acts as a “resource amplifier” that enables individuals to manage multiple domain demands without excessive role strain.

However, hybrid work can also exacerbate role conflict when boundaries are poorly managed. Role blurring arises when work psychologically or physically invades personal spaces, making it difficult for employees to detach from work demands (Santarpia et al., 2021; Mueller et al., 2023). Digital work intensification and the expectation to be constantly responsive—strengthened by mobile technology and platform-based communication—lead to increased work intensification and extensification (Dale et al., 2024). This results in higher risks of burnout, emotional exhaustion, chronic stress, and impaired psychological recovery.

Long-term consequences of blurred boundaries include sleep disruption, reduced life satisfaction, decreased productivity, and diminished social well-being due to fewer face-to-face interactions and reduced informal social support from colleagues (Chafi et al., 2021; Dwivedi et al., 2020). Thus, boundary management quality becomes a key determinant of whether hybrid work functions as a resource or a source of role strain. When boundaries are well regulated, hybrid work enhances well-being; when porous and uncontrolled, it increases role conflict and deteriorates well-being.

(3) Organizational Support Pathway

Organizational Support Theory provides a critical foundation for understanding how hybrid work culture influences employee well-being through perceived organizational support (POS). In hybrid work settings, POS acts as psychological protection that moderates the impact of digital job demands, facilitates smooth cross-location work transitions, and strengthens social and emotional connections between employees and the organization (Eisenberger et al., 2019; Kurtessis et al., 2015).

When employees believe that the organization cares about their well-being, provides adequate technology, and offers fair flexibility policies, their psychological well-being improves significantly. Organizational support in the form of technology training, role clarity, clear hybrid work procedures, and virtual access to supervisors enhances a sense of competence and reduces role ambiguity – two key factors in reducing stress and increasing engagement (Dolma & Dolma, 2018; Mitchell et al., 2011). Thus, POS functions as both a personal and organizational resource that mitigates the negative effects of digital demands and strengthens intrinsic motivation.

POS is also essential for maintaining social well-being in hybrid work environments. When organizations actively offer virtual interaction spaces, periodic in-person meetings, and clear coordination mechanisms, employees continue to feel connected to their teams despite working in distributed settings (Viot & Benraiss-Noailles, 2024). This reduces the risk of social isolation, improves working relationships, and enhances sense of belonging. Conversely, hybrid work without adequate organizational support may worsen loneliness, reduce engagement, and decrease organizational commitment (Chafi et al., 2021; Dwivedi et al., 2020).

In this pathway, POS not only buffers the demands of hybrid work but also amplifies the positive effects of resources such as autonomy, flexibility, and digital competence. With strong POS, hybrid work is more likely to promote psychological well-being, improve work-related well-being (engagement, job satisfaction, commitment), and strengthen social well-being through cohesive work relationships. Thus, organizational support becomes a central determinant of whether hybrid work produces adaptive or maladaptive outcomes for employees.

DISCUSSION

Positive Impacts of Hybrid Work on Well-Being

Hybrid work offers several significant benefits for employee well-being, one of which is the enhancement of autonomy and control over how work is performed. The hybrid work model allows employees to determine when and where work is conducted, thereby strengthening psychological well-being through increased sense of control, motivation, and work engagement (Boccoli et al., 2022). Autonomy itself is a fundamental need in psychological health and acts as a job resource that promotes positive well-being outcomes (Dale et al., 2024). Control over the work environment enables employees to optimize their working conditions, such as selecting the most productive times or comfortable work locations, which reduces pressure from rigid schedules or less ideal office environments (Boccoli et al., 2022). Employees who perceive greater autonomy also report stronger psychological safety (Guimarães et al., 2023). Thus, increased autonomy not only reduces stress but also fosters a sense of ownership of work, enhances work-life balance, and facilitates personal and family responsibilities without compromising performance (Dale et al., 2024). Ultimately, perceived autonomy boosts job satisfaction, productivity, and organizational commitment (Boccoli et al., 2022).

Beyond autonomy, another notable benefit of hybrid work is time efficiency and reduced commuting stress. Reducing or eliminating commuting has been shown to increase life satisfaction by allowing more time for personal and family activities (Weitzer et al., 2021). A decrease in daily travel also positively impacts physical and mental well-being, improves job satisfaction, and lowers stress levels (Gopi & V, 2024). Pressures arising from traffic congestion, transportation costs, and tight schedules are minimized, enabling employees to start the workday feeling more refreshed and end it with remaining energy for personal life (Weitzer et al., 2021). Research shows that longer commute times are associated with lower life satisfaction and a higher risk of health issues (Han et al., 2022). Having more personal time enables individuals to pursue hobbies, rest, exercise, or engage more actively in family life, all of which enhance quality of life and work productivity (Weitzer et al., 2021).

Work-life integration is also a major advantage of the hybrid work model. Hybrid work facilitates a more harmonious integration between professional responsibilities and personal life, reducing work-family conflict and enhancing balance (Aprilina & Martdianty, 2023). Hybrid workers, both men and women with children, report higher work-family enrichment, improved performance, and greater job satisfaction compared to fully on-site workers (Abildgaard et al., 2024). This flexibility allows employees to attend to family needs without taking full leave or feeling guilty for stepping away from work. The ability to transition flexibly between work and non-work roles increases life satisfaction and productivity (Aprilina & Martdianty, 2023). Additionally, organizations offering flexibility have been shown to reduce work-family conflict, lower burnout, and enhance overall mental health (Al, 2025). Thus, hybrid work plays an important role in creating cohesion across different life domains.

Negative Impacts of Hybrid Work on Well-Being

Despite its benefits, hybrid work also presents several risks, one of which is technostress and digital fatigue. Digital technologies—central to hybrid work—can generate techno-overload, techno-invasion, and techno-complexity (Mazzei et al., 2023; Rosado et al., 2023). Dependence on video meetings, email, and instant messaging increases the likelihood of technology-induced stress, known as technostress (Singh & Hess, 2023). This condition is often accompanied by digital fatigue and emotional exhaustion due to prolonged screen exposure and constant connectivity demands (Singh & Hess, 2023). Techno-invasion, for instance, creates expectations of constant availability, making it increasingly difficult to separate personal time from work time (Mazzei et al., 2023). As a result, mental energy is depleted and cognitive capacity declines. Reduced interpersonal contact and rising digital workloads further exacerbate technostress, leading to lower job satisfaction, reduced productivity, and increased risk of burnout (James et al., 2023).

Another negative impact is social isolation, which emerges from reduced face-to-face interaction in hybrid work arrangements. Limited physical contact with colleagues can diminish social well-being and weaken the sense of connectedness and social identity within the organization—both of which are vital for emotional support and collaboration (Chafi et al., 2021). Employees often report

loneliness and feelings of disconnection from the work environment due to the absence of informal interactions typically occurring in offices (Chafi et al., 2021). This isolation may decrease job commitment, heighten anxiety and depression, and generate perceptions of exclusion from decision-making (Dwivedi et al., 2020). Reduced team synergy and interpersonal trust are additional common consequences (Dwivedi et al., 2020). To address this, organizations must create meaningful opportunities for social interaction, both virtually and in person (Figueiredo et al., 2025). Research highlights that loneliness and isolation are risk factors for occupational stress and can harm both physical and mental health (Petitta & Ghezzi, 2025). If unaddressed, social isolation in hybrid work can worsen work experience, affect retention, and reduce team performance (Urrila et al., 2025).

In addition to isolation, hybrid work increases the risk of role blurring. The flexibility offered by hybrid arrangements often blurs boundaries between personal and professional life, making it difficult for employees to disengage from work demands (Santarpia et al., 2021). Working from home has been shown to contribute to work intensification and extended working hours, which can negatively impact physical and mental health—including burnout (Dale et al., 2024). Expectations of constant availability—such as checking work messages outside office hours—intensify the condition and raise the risk of chronic fatigue (Dale et al., 2024). Blurred work–family boundaries allow experiences from one domain to spill into another, increasing stress (Mueller et al., 2023; Santarpia et al., 2021). Long-term effects include chronic stress, sleep disturbances, and decreased sense of personal accomplishment. Many employees feel that work dominates all aspects of their lives, leaving little room for rest or personal activities (Klieštk et al., 2024). Research also shows that hybrid workers experience the highest levels of both resource loss and resource gain, as hybrid work reshapes multiple life domains and generates both positive and negative consequences (Stasiła-Sieradzka et al., 2023). Overall, role blurring in hybrid work may reduce long-term well-being, productivity, and overall quality of life.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study aims to provide a comprehensive conceptual understanding of how hybrid work culture affects employee well-being through the integration of multiple theories and recent empirical findings. The synthesis indicates that hybrid work is a modern work phenomenon that cannot be evaluated simply as positive or negative. Its impact on employee well-being is multidimensional, dynamic, and highly dependent on organizational management practices.

This review identifies three primary pathways explaining the mechanisms through which hybrid work affects well-being:

- (1) the Job Demands–Job Resources pathway,
- (2) the Work–Life Balance and Boundary Management pathway, and
- (3) the Organizational Support pathway.

These pathways operate through mediators such as technostress, work–life balance, job autonomy, and perceived organizational support, and are influenced

by moderators including digital literacy, individual resilience, leadership style, and organizational culture.

Conceptually, hybrid work can enhance well-being through flexibility, reduced commuting time, and increased autonomy. However, hybrid work can also diminish well-being when digital demands are excessive, role boundaries become blurred, or organizational support is insufficient. Thus, employee well-being in hybrid work contexts is largely determined by the quality of work design, technological readiness, and managerial practices.

This study offers an important contribution to HR literature by developing an integrative conceptual model that can serve as the foundation for subsequent empirical studies. The model also provides a stronger theoretical framework for understanding the contemporary transformation of work culture.

Theoretical Implications

1. Strengthening the JD-R Model in Hybrid Work Contexts

This study demonstrates that hybrid environments create new forms of job demands and job resources not fully captured in classical JD-R theory. Thus, this article extends JD-R application in the contexts of digitalization and flexible work.

2. Integrating Boundary Theory with Work-Life Balance Theory

Conceptual findings indicate that role boundaries and life balance are not separate constructs but complementary mechanisms explaining employee well-being in the post-pandemic era.

3. Contribution to Organizational Support Theory Literature

This study reinforces the idea that organizational support is increasingly critical in hybrid contexts, particularly regarding psychological safety, technological efficacy, and clarity of work policies.

4. Theoretical Propositions for Empirical Research

The developed conceptual model can serve as a basis for quantitative research examining relationships among digital demands, job resources, boundary control, and well-being.

5.3. Practical Implications

This study provides important practical implications for the world of work and human resource management:

1. Development of Structured Hybrid Policies

Organizations need to design clear hybrid work policies, including rules on working hours, response expectations, technology usage, and time management. Clear policies reduce role ambiguity and lower stress levels.

2. Enhancement of Technological Support and Digital Training

Organizations must provide adequate work devices, digital training, and stable technological infrastructure to reduce technostress and improve work efficiency.

3. Strengthening a Trust-Based Organizational Culture

Hybrid work will only be effective if organizations build a results-oriented and trust-based work culture, rather than relying on physical control or presence.

4. Encouraging Boundary Management Capabilities

Employees need to be trained to manage role boundaries, including time management, workspace discipline, and strategies to separate work from personal life.

5. Improving the Quality of Team Communication and Collaboration

Organizations must create adaptive coordination mechanisms to ensure employees remain connected and do not experience social isolation.

FUTURE RESEARCH

As a conceptual study, this article is not supported by empirical data; thus, model testing still requires statistical verification. Future research may develop:

1. Quantitative studies that test the relationships in the model using surveys of hybrid workers.
2. Qualitative studies that explore employees' experiences in managing role boundaries.
3. Development of models for the public sector and SMEs, since organizational contexts may influence hybrid work dynamics.
4. Longitudinal analyses to understand changes in well-being over time within hybrid systems.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author expresses gratitude to all colleagues who have provided input, constructive criticism, and academic discussions that enriched the quality of this paper. High appreciation is also extended to the lecturers and academic advisors who offered guidance, insight, and support throughout the writing process. In addition, the author thanks the institution for its support and provision of resources that made this research possible. All forms of support have been invaluable in the completion of this scholarly work.

REFERENCES

- Abildgaard, J. S., Karlsen, I. L., Frost, F., Teoh, K., St-Hilaire, F., Denman, A., Leduc, C., Muñoz, M., & Ripa, D. M. (2024). Individual or Organizational Implementation? : A Quasi-experimental Study on the Impact of Different Forms of Implementation of a Well-being App. *Research Portal Denmark*.
- Adisa, T. A., Gbadamosi, G., & Osabutey, E. L. C. (2017). What Happened to the Border? The Role of Mobile Information Technology Devices on Employees' Work--Life Balance. *Personnel Review*, 46, 856–871. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-08-2016-0222>
- Al, B. (2025). Hybrid Work and Sustainable Employment: A Study on Female Employees in Türkiye. *DergiPark (Istanbul University)*. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/romaya-journal/issue/94393/1774857>
- Amiruddin, T. A., & Monil, M. (2022). The Impacts of Work--Life Balance in Airline Industry: A Proposed Conceptual Framework. *Journal of Management and Marketing Review*, 7, 163–172. https://doi.org/10.2991/978-94-6463-080-0_30
- 16(2), 206–222. <https://doi.org/10.20473/jmtt.v16i2.45632>

- Atiq, M., & Iqbal, S. (2018). Work Life Balance and Intention to Quit Among Female Work Force. *Journal of Business Studies*, 14, 171–182.
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). Job Demands–Resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 22(3), 273–285.
- Beckel, J. L. O., & Fisher, G. G. (2022). Telework and Worker Health and Well-Being: A Review and Recommendations for Research and Practice. In *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* (Vol. 19, Issue 7, p. 3879). Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19073879>
- Dale, G., Wilson, H., & Tucker, M. (2024). What is healthy hybrid work? Exploring employee perceptions on well-being and hybrid work arrangements. *International Journal of Workplace Health Management*, 17(4), 335–352. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ijwhm-03-2024-0041>
- Darouei, M., & Pluut, H. (2021). Remote work and work–family balance: A boundary perspective. *Community, Work & Family*, 24(3), 305–322.
- Eisenberger, R., & Rhoades, L. (2001). Perceived Organizational Support: When Employers Esteem Employees. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 682–692. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.1.42>
- Eisenberger, R., Shanock, L. R., & Wen, X. (2019). Perceived Organizational Support: Why Caring About Employees Counts. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 6, 35–58. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-012119-044917>
- Eng, I., Tjernberg, M., & Champoux-Larsson, M. (2024). Hybrid workers describe aspects that promote effectiveness, work engagement, work-life balance, and health. *Cogent Psychology*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311908.2024.2362535>
- Gopi, J., & V, M. H. (2024). Role of Sustainable Commuting Option in Enhancing Employee Well-being. <https://doi.org/10.46254/in04.20240046>
- Griva, A., Kruse, L. C., Hattinger, M., Högberg, K., Pappas, I. O., & Conboy, K. (2024). Making space for time: Strategies for the design of time-aware hybrid work. *Information Systems Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/isj.12552>
- Ipshita, R., Anand, P., & Nair, S. (2023). Hybrid work model and employee well-being: The role of boundary management. *Journal of Business Research*, 158, 113702.
- Jabareen, Y. (2009). Building a Conceptual Framework: Philosophy, Definitions, and Procedure. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 8(4), 49–62. <https://doi.org/10.1177/160940690900800406>
- James, M. M., Koshkina, N., & Froese, T. (2023). From tech to tact: emotion dysregulation in online communication during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences*, 22(5), 1163–1194. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11097-023-09916-z>
- Joshi, P. (2024). Model for Work–Life Balance: Integrating Theory and Research. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Analysis*, 7, 3828–3837. <https://doi.org/https://orcid.org/0009-0007-3115-3463>

- Kivunja, C. (2018). Distinguishing between Theory, Theoretical Framework, and Conceptual Framework: A Systematic Review of Lessons from the Field. In *International Journal of Higher Education* (Vol. 7, Issue 6, p. 44). Sciedu Press. <https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v7n6p44>
- Klaser, K., Cuel, R., & Casari, P. (2023). The future of hybrid work in Italy: A survey-based Socio-Technical-System analysis. *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge*, 8(4), 100426. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jik.2023.100426>
- Klieštík, T., Valášková, K., & Dabija, D. (2024). Editorial: Remote work burnout during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 15. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1389984>
- Kniffin, K. M., & others. (2021). COVID-19 and the workplace: Implications for future research and practice. *American Psychologist*, 76(1), 63–77.
- Kossek, E., & Lautsch, B. (2018). Work--life flexibility practices: Organizational implementation gaps. *Human Relations*, 71(1), 5–31.
- Richter, A., & Richter, S. (2024). Hybrid work – a reconceptualisation and research agenda. *I-Com*, 23(1), 71–78. <https://doi.org/10.1515/icom-2023-0027>
- Rosado, M. E. B., Suárez, L. M. C., de Zevallos, G. F. D. O., & Espinosa-Cristia, J. F. (2023). Technostress at work during the COVID-19 lockdown phase (2020–2021): a systematic review of the literature. In *Frontiers in Psychology* (Vol. 14). Frontiers Media. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1173425>
- Stasiła-Sieradzka, M., Sanecka, E., & Turska, E. (2023). Not so good hybrid work model? Resource losses and gains since the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic and job burnout among non-remote, hybrid, and remote employees. *International Journal of Occupational Medicine and Environmental Health*, 36(2), 229–249. <https://doi.org/10.13075/ijomeh.1896.02026>
- Sun, L. (2019). Perceived Organizational Support: A Literature Review. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, 7, 13–22. <https://doi.org/10.5296/ijhrs.v9i3.15102>
- Toscano, F., & Zappalà, S. (2020). Social isolation and stress in remote work: The role of organizational support. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 29(5), 672–683.
- Vartiainen, M., & Vanharanta, O. (2024). True nature of hybrid work. *Frontiers in Organizational Psychology*, 2. <https://doi.org/10.3389/forgp.2024.1448894>
- Viot, C., & Benraiss-Noailles, L. (2024). Advocacy Versus Depart: How Perceived Organizational Support Influences Employee Well-Being and Shapes Their Intentions. *Management Research Review*, 47, 519–536. <https://doi.org/10.1017/jmo.2024.60>
- x Prof. Dr. Johanna Bath, P. D. J., & Markulin, V. (2024). Exploring the Impact of Work Arrangements on Employee Well-being in the Post-Pandemic Workplace: The Role of Perceived Flexibility, Work-Life Balance, and Managerial Support. *International Journal of Business and Applied Social Science*, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.33642/ijbass.v10n1p1>