

Bibliometric dan Systematic Literature Review (SLR): Employee Engagement pada Era Hybrid Working

Eneng Iviq Hairo Rahayu¹, Zahra², Fara Mutia³, Lilik Yuliawati⁴, Iwan Asmadi⁵

^{1,2,3,4,5} Universitas Bina Sarana Informatika, Jakarta, Indonesia

* Correspondence e-mail; eneng.eor@bsi.ac.id

Article history

Submitted: 2026/05/01; Revised: 2026/06/11; Accepted: 2026/07/17

Abstract

This study aims to analyze the development of research on employee engagement in the context of hybrid working through bibliometric analysis and a Systematic Literature Review (SLR) approach. The study employed a mixed-methods design by integrating bibliometric analysis using VOSviewer software and literature synthesis based on the PRISMA protocol. Data were collected from Scopus, Web of Science, and Google Scholar databases covering publications from 2019 to 2024. The literature selection process resulted in 87 articles that met the inclusion criteria. The bibliometric findings indicate that publications related to employee engagement in the era of hybrid working increased significantly after the COVID-19 pandemic, with major themes focusing on psychological aspects, digital technology, leadership, work-life balance, and organizational culture. The SLR results reveal that work flexibility and transformational leadership are the most dominant factors in enhancing employee engagement. In addition, digital technology plays a crucial role in facilitating communication and collaboration among employees. However, hybrid working also presents challenges, including increased work stress and blurred boundaries between personal and professional life. This study contributes theoretically through the development of an integrative model of employee engagement within the hybrid working context and provides practical implications for organizations in designing adaptive and sustainable human resource management strategies in the modern workplace era.

Keywords

Bibliometric Analysis, Employee Engagement, Hybrid Working, Systematic Literature Review, Work-Life Balance.



© 2026 by the authors. This is an open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY SA) license, <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>.

INTRODUCTION

This research employed a descriptive qualitative approach with a content analysis research design. Content analysis was used to identify, classify, and interpret linguistic elements contained in song lyrics, particularly stylistic elements and meaning. This approach was chosen because the research focused on examining the

textual content of song lyrics as literary documents containing aesthetic, moral, social, and religious messages. According to (Moleong, 2021), qualitative research aims to understand phenomena in depth through descriptive data in the form of words, while stylistic analysis is used to uncover the use of language as a means of creating aesthetic effects in literary works (Al-Ma'ruf & Nugrahani, 2021).

The object of this research is the lyrics of the songs "Begadang," "Keramat," and "Judi" by Rhoma Irama. The song "Begadang" was released on the album "Soneta Volume 1: Begadang" in 1975. "Keramat" was a popular song in the 1980s, conveying religious values and respect for parents (Kurniawan et al., 2023), while "Judi" was released on the album "Soneta Volume 14: Judi" in 1988. These three songs were chosen because they share diverse stylistic characteristics and convey meaning relevant to social life.

The research data consisted of words, phrases, clauses, sentences, and stanzas containing stylistic and meaningful meanings. The data source was the lyrics of Rhoma Irama's songs "Begadang," "Keramat," and "Judi," obtained through documentation from sources containing the complete lyrics.

The data collection technique was a documentation method using listening and note-taking techniques. The researcher read and listened to the song lyrics repeatedly, then noted sections containing stylistic and meaningful meanings. The obtained data were then classified based on stylistic categories according to (Keraf, 2019) and types of meaning, including denotative and connotative meanings, as proposed by (Hanifah, 2023) and (Nasution & et al., 2024).

The primary research instrument was the researcher (human instrument) assisted by data cards and classification tables. The researcher played a role in determining the data, grouping it based on analytical categories, and interpreting the meaning contained in the song lyrics.

The data analysis technique used a content analysis model, which was carried out in several stages: (1) collecting data in the form of song lyrics; (2) reading and understanding the text thoroughly; (3) identifying data containing stylistic and meaning content; (4) classifying data based on stylistic and meaning types; (5) interpreting the function of stylistic and meaning in song lyrics; (6) analyzing the relevance of the findings to Indonesian language learning; and (7) drawing conclusions.

Data validity was achieved through increased observational rigor and theoretical triangulation by comparing analysis results based on stylistic theory (Al-Ma'ruf & Nugrahani, 2021), stylistic theory (Keraf, 2019), and theories of meaning used in

previous studies. The analysis results were then presented descriptively to provide a comprehensive overview of stylistic style, meaning, and its relevance as Indonesian language learning materials.

METHODS

This research uses a mixed-methods approach that sequentially integrates two complementary methods: (1) bibliometric analysis as a quantitative approach to objectively map the knowledge landscape, and (2) a Systematic Literature Review (SLR) as a qualitative approach to in-depth synthesize empirical findings. This integration follows the recommendation of Donthu et al. (2021), who assert that the combination of bibliometrics and SLR yields a more comprehensive understanding of a research field than either method alone.

The research design is retrospective-systematic, meaning this study reviews existing literature (rather than collecting new primary data), with the unit of analysis focused on scholarly articles on employee engagement in the context of hybrid working indexed in reputable international databases. The justification for choosing this design is based on the need to fill the literature gap identified by Paramita et al. (2025) and Shankar et al. (2026) regarding the lack of integrated studies that place hybrid working as the primary context for employee engagement.

A literature search in the Scopus and Web of Science (WoS) databases was conducted using structured Boolean operators to ensure search sensitivity and specificity. The search string formula applied was as follows: ("employee engagement" OR "work engagement") AND ("hybrid work*" OR "hybrid organization*" OR "remote work*" OR "flexible work arrangement*") The search was limited to document types (Article and Review), using English and Indonesian, with a publication period of 2019 to 2024.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Interpretation of Bibliometric Trends

The significant surge in publications in 2020-2021 reflects the academic response to the disruption of the COVID-19 pandemic, which forced millions of employees worldwide to adapt to remote work models quickly. This phenomenon created a unique and valuable "natural experiment" for researchers to examine the impact of radical changes in work arrangements on various aspects of organizational behavior, particularly employee engagement (Bailey et al., 2022).

The dominance of psychological thematic clusters in the keyword co-occurrence network indicates that the academic community increasingly recognizes the affective and

cognitive dimensions as core to the engagement construct. This is consistent with the theoretical framework developed by Kahn (1990), which defines engagement as employees' physical, cognitive, and emotional self-expression in their work roles. In the context of hybrid working, the expression of these three dimensions faces new challenges due to the reduction in in-person interactions, traditionally the primary medium for transmitting engagement (Rich et al., 2010).

Discussion of Main Themes

Flexibility as a Leverage Point for Engagement

The findings regarding the central role of flexibility align with Self-Determination Theory (SDT) developed by Deci and Ryan (1985), which identifies autonomy as one of the basic psychological needs of humans. When employees have control over when and where they work, the need for autonomy is met, which in turn drives intrinsic motivation and deeper engagement with work (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Van den Broeck et al., 2016).

However, this study also found that poorly managed flexibility can create role ambiguity and perceptions of inequity among employees. For example, differences in access to flexibility between knowledge workers and frontline workers create a potential engagement gap that HRM practitioners need to address (Kelliher & Anderson, 2010; Beauregard et al., 2019).

Technology-Mediated Engagement: Opportunities and Risks

The literature reveals a complex relationship between technology and engagement in the context of hybrid working. On the one hand, digital collaboration platforms have proven effective in maintaining team connectivity and facilitating efficient communication. A 2022 study by Microsoft, involving over 31,000 respondents from 31 countries, found that effective use of digital collaboration tools is positively correlated with productivity and job satisfaction.

On the other hand, the phenomenon of "Zoom fatigue," or exhaustion resulting from excessive use of video conferencing platforms, is a serious concern. Research by Bailenson (2021) from Stanford University identified four psychological mechanisms underlying this fatigue, including excessive eye contact and constant self-consciousness. These findings imply that organizations need to design protocols for judicious technology use and consider the sustainability of employees' psychological energy.

Leadership Evolution in a Hybrid Ecosystem

The shift from a supervision-based leadership model to a trust-based leadership model is one of the most consistent findings in the reviewed literature. In a hybrid environment, a leader's ability to lead at a distance becomes a critical competency for team success (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004).

The Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) model developed by Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995) provides a useful framework for understanding these dynamics. The quality of the exchange relationship between leaders and team members has been shown to retain its significance even in technology-mediated environments, with leaders who proactively build personal relationships through one-on-one virtual check-ins demonstrating higher levels of team engagement (Kniffin et al., 2021; Bailey et al., 2022).

Organizational Culture as a Critical Moderator

The findings regarding the role of organizational culture confirm the perspective proposed by Gratton (2021) in his influential book, "The Hybrid Future." Organizations that successfully maintain or even increase employee engagement in the transition to a hybrid model are those that proactively manage what Gratton calls "signpost moments"—the key moments that define the organization's identity and values.

Comparative analysis shows that organizations with high-trust and outcome-oriented cultures are more successful in maintaining engagement than those with bureaucratic and process-oriented cultures. This implies that the transformation to hybrid working requires a deeper cultural transformation (Vyas & Butakhieo, 2021; Spreitzer et al., 2017).

Integrative Model of Employee Engagement in Hybrid Working

Based on the synthesis of SLR findings and bibliometric analysis, this study proposes an integrative model that illustrates the interaction between various factors that influence employee engagement in the context of hybrid working. This model positions employee engagement as a dependent variable influenced by four clusters of factors: (1) individual factors (self-efficacy, boundary management skills, preferences for autonomy); (2) interpersonal factors (leader-subordinate relationship quality, team cohesion, coworker support); (3) organizational factors (flexibility policies, technological infrastructure, organizational culture); and (4) contextual factors (sociocultural norms, economic conditions, employment regulations).

This model integrates and expands the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) framework introduced by Bakker and Demerouti (2007, 2017), by adding a spatial dimension (work location) as a moderating variable for the effects of various job resources on engagement. In a hybrid context, some traditional job resources (such as physical proximity to colleagues and direct access to managers) undergo transformation, necessitating technology-based functional replacements (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017).

Research Gaps and Future Research Agenda

Despite the rapidly expanding literature, this review identifies several significant research gaps. First, the majority of studies (78%) were conducted in developed countries with established digital infrastructure, thus limiting the generalizability of the findings to developing countries like Indonesia, which face greater infrastructure disparities (Bailey et al., 2022).

Second, most studies are cross-sectional, so the causal relationship between hybrid working and employee engagement still requires confirmation through longitudinal studies. Third, the perspectives of employees from vulnerable groups—including employees with disabilities, single parents, and the sandwich generation—remain underrepresented in the literature, even though these groups may experience different impacts from hybrid arrangements (Kossek et al., 2015; Page et al., 2021).

When analyzed through the lens of organizational sociology, the massive loss of daily physical interaction in hybrid work models has the potential to weaken the "organic

solidarity"—borrowing Émile Durkheim's term—that binds different functions within a company's social system. Face-to-face interaction is the primary medium through which cultural values and organizational rituals are naturally transmitted. When these interactions are replaced by rigid, scheduled digital screens, the social fabric of an organization becomes depersonalized. Relationships between employees tend to shift from emotionally comprehensive social connections to purely task-oriented, transactional ones. As a result, the social capital (such as mutual trust and norms of reciprocity) that typically thrive in physical communities is eroded. Organizations with a low-trust culture experience social anomie, where employees feel alienated from the company's collective vision, which directly undermines the dedication and absorption pillars of employee engagement.

CONCLUSION

This study presents a comprehensive bibliometric analysis and systematic literature review of 87 scholarly articles discussing employee engagement in the context of hybrid working from 2019 to 2024. Several key conclusions can be drawn from this study: 1) *Bibliometric Trends*: Academic interest in the topic of employee engagement in hybrid working has accelerated significantly since 2020, fueled by the COVID-19 pandemic, which catalyzed the transformation of work models globally. The body of knowledge in this field is divided into four main interconnected thematic clusters: psychological, technological, managerial, and employee well-being. 2) *Critical Engagement Factors*: Five key factors that consistently influence employee engagement in hybrid working are: flexibility and autonomy, quality of technology infrastructure, leadership style, work-life balance, and organizational culture. Flexibility and effective leadership emerged as the factors with the greatest and most consistent impact in the literature. 3) *Paradox and Complexity*: The relationship between hybrid working and employee engagement is complex and non-linear. A work-life balance paradox exists where hybrid flexibility can simultaneously be a source of engagement and burnout, depending on individual, interpersonal, and organizational contextual factors. 4) *Practical Implications*: The research findings imply the need for a holistic and contextual approach to designing hybrid working policies. Organizations are advised to (a) implement clear yet adaptive flexibility policies, (b) invest in digital leadership training, (c) develop inclusive technology infrastructure, (d) build integrated employee wellness programs, and (e) proactively manage organizational culture to ensure an equitable experience for all employees. 5) *Integrative Model*: This research produces an integrative model of employee engagement in hybrid working that extends and updates the JD-R framework by adding a spatial dimension as a moderator. This model provides a conceptual

foundation for further empirical research, particularly longitudinal and cross-cultural research. 6) Research Agenda: The identified research gaps open up extensive research opportunities, particularly longitudinal studies examining engagement dynamics over time, research in developing country contexts, and studies examining the experiences of vulnerable groups in hybrid working ecosystems.

REFERENCES

- Aksoy, C. G., Barrero, J. M., Bloom, N., Davis, S. J., Dolls, M., & Zarate, P. (2023). Working from home around the world. *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, 2022(2), 281–360. <https://doi.org/10.1353/eca.2023.a907517>
- Ashforth, B. E., Kreiner, G. E., & Fugate, M. (2000). All in a day's work: Boundaries and micro role transitions. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(3), 472–491. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2000.3363315>
- Bailenson, J. N. (2021). Nonverbal overload: A theoretical argument for the causes of Zoom fatigue. *Technology, Mind, and Behavior*, 2(1). <https://doi.org/10.1037/tmb0000030>
- Bailey, C., Madden, A., Alfes, K., & Fletcher, L. (2022). The meaning, antecedents and outcomes of employee engagement: A narrative synthesis. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 19(1), 31–53. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12077>
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands-resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(3), 309–328. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940710733115>
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). Job demands-resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 22(3), 273–285. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000056>
- Barrero, J. M., Bloom, N., & Davis, S. J. (2021). Why working from home will stick (NBER Working Paper No. 28731). National Bureau of Economic Research. <https://doi.org/10.3386/w28731>
- Beauregard, T. A., Basile, K. A., & Canonico, E. (2019). Home is where the work is: A new study of homeworking in Acas—and beyond. *Acas Research Papers*.
- Bloom, N., Han, R., & Liang, J. (2024). Hybrid working from home improves retention without damaging performance. *Nature*, 630(8018), 920–925. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-024-07500-2>
- Bloom, N., Han, R., & Liang, J. (2024). Hybrid working from home improves retention without damaging performance. *Nature*, 630(8018), 920–925. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-024-07500-2>
- 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>
- Choudhury, P., Foroughi, C., & Larson, B. (2021). Work-from-anywhere: The productivity effects of geographic flexibility. *Strategic Management Journal*, 42(4), 655-683. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.3251>
- Clark, S. C. (2000). Work/family border theory: A new theory of work/family balance. *Human Relations*, 53(6), 747-770. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726700536001>
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. Plenum Press.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), 227-268. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1104_01
- Donthu, N., Kumar, S., Mukherjee, D., Pandey, N., & Lim, W. M. (2021). How to conduct a bibliometric analysis: An overview and guidelines. *Journal of Business Research*, 133, 285–296. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2021.04.070>
- Donthu, N., Kumar, S., Mukherjee, D., Pandey, N., & Lim, W. M. (2021). How to conduct a bibliometric analysis: An overview and guidelines. *Journal of Business Research*, 133, 285–296. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2021.04.070>
- Facilities Dive. (2024, July 1). Hybrid employees show higher rates of workplace engagement: Gallup. <https://www.facilitiesdive.com/news/gallup-workplace-sentiment-engagement-hybrid-work-models/720317/>
- 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(6), 1524-1541. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.6.1524>
- Gallup. (2024). State of the global workplace: 2024 report. <https://www.gallup.com/workplace/349484/state-of-the-global-workplace.aspx>
- Gallup. (2025, April 23). Global employee engagement drops for only the second time in 12 years, costing the world's economy US\$438 billion [Press release]. <https://www.prnewswire.com/news-releases/global-employee-engagement-drops-for-only-the-second-time-in-12-years-costing-the-worlds-economy-us438-billion-302434901.html>
- Global Workplace Analytics. (2022). Remote/hybrid work/in-office trends and forecast. <https://globalworkplaceanalytics.com/work-at-home-after-covid-19-our-forecast>
- Graen, G. B., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25

- years: Applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 6(2), 219-247. [https://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843\(95\)90036-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843(95)90036-5)
- Gratton, L. (2021). How to do hybrid right. *Harvard Business Review*, 99(3), 66-74.
- HR Dive. (2025, September 8). Gallup: Hybrid work rates have stabilized — and flexibility is key. <https://www.hrdive.com/news/gallup-hybrid-work-stabilized-flexibility-key-rto-remote/759477/>
- Judijanto, L. (2025). Evolution of employee engagement research in digital era: Bibliometric study. *West Science Business and Management*, 3(01), 149–157. <https://doi.org/10.58812/wsbm.v3i01.1796>
- Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(4), 692-724. <https://doi.org/10.5465/256287>
- Kelliher, C., & Anderson, D. (2010). Doing more with less? Flexible working practices and the intensification of work. *Human Relations*, 63(1), 83-106. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726709349199>
- Kim, H. S., Waight, J., Xu, X., & Yoon, S. W. (2025). Navigating leadership in hybrid or remote workplaces: A systematic review of employee engagement strategies. *Human Resource Development Review*, 25(2), 183–211. <https://doi.org/10.1177/15344843251381386>
- Kim, H. S., Waight, J., Xu, X., & Yoon, S. W. (2025). Navigating leadership in hybrid or remote workplaces: A systematic review of employee engagement strategies. *Human Resource Development Review*, 25(2), 183–211. <https://doi.org/10.1177/15344843251381386>
- Kniffin, K. M., Narayanan, J., Anseel, F., Antonakis, J., Ashford, S. P., Bakker, A. B., Bamberger, P., Bapuji, H., Bhawe, D. P., Choi, V. K., Creary, S. J., Demerouti, E., Flynn, F. J., Gelfand, M. J., Greer, L. L., Johns, G., Kesebir, S., Klein, P. G., Lee, S. Y., ... Vugt, M. V. (2021). COVID-19 and the workplace: Implications, issues, and insights for future research and action. *American Psychologist*, 76(1), 63-77. <https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000716>
- Kossek, E. E., Hammer, L. B., Thompson, R. J., & Burke, L. B. (2014). Leveraging workplace flexibility for engagement and productivity. SHRM Foundation's Effective Practice Guidelines Series.
- Kossek, E. E., Ruderman, M. N., Braddy, P. W., & Hannum, K. M. (2012). Work–nonwork boundary management profiles: A person-centered approach. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 81(1), 112-128. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2012.04.003>
- Microsoft. (2022). 2022 Work Trend Index: Annual report. Microsoft Corporation.

- <https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/worklab/work-trend-index>
- Nippert-Eng, C. E. (1996). *Home and work: Negotiating boundaries through everyday life*. University of Chicago Press.
- Page, M. J., McKenzie, J. E., Bossuyt, P. M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T. C., Mulrow, C. D., Shamseer, L., Tetzlaff, J. M., Akl, E. A., Brennan, S. E., Chou, R., Glanville, J., Grimshaw, J. M., Hróbjartsson, A., Lalu, M. M., Li, T., Loder, E. W., Mayo-Wilson, E., McDonald, S., ... Moher, D. (2021). The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*, 372, n71. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71>
- Paramita, A., Irhandayaningsih, A., & Zaidah, I. (2025). Trends and insights in work engagement research: A bibliometric analysis. *Banking & Management Review*. <https://ojs.ekuitas.ac.id/index.php/bmr/article/view/931>
- Rich, B. L., Lepine, J. A., & Crawford, E. R. (2010). Job engagement: Antecedents and effects on job performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(3), 617-635. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2010.51468988>
- Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2004). Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25(3), 293-315. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.248>
- Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., & Salanova, M. (2006). The measurement of work engagement with a short questionnaire: A cross-national study. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 66(4), 701-716. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164405282471>
- Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., & Salanova, M. (2006). The measurement of work engagement with a short questionnaire: A cross-national study. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 66(4), 701-716. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164405282471>
- Shankar, R., Jaiswal, D., & Lall, M. (2026). Mapping the landscape of work engagement research. *IIM Ranchi Journal of Management Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IRJMS-01-2025-0010>
- Shankar, R., Jaiswal, D., & Lall, M. (2026). Mapping the landscape of work engagement research. *IIM Ranchi Journal of Management Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IRJMS-01-2025-0010>
- Siddika, A. (2025). Effect of hybrid working on employee engagement. *International Journal of Management and Commerce Innovations*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/393457119_Effect_of_hybrid_working_on_employee_engagement

- Sökmen, A., Cansız, G., & Bıyık, Y. (2023). Bibliometric analysis and visualization of global research on employee engagement. *Sustainability*, 15(13), Article 10196. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15131019610196>
- Spreitzer, G., Bacevice, P., & Garrett, L. (2015). Why people thrive in coworking spaces. *Harvard Business Review*, 93(7-8), 28-30.
- Spreitzer, G., Cameron, L., & Garrett, L. (2017). Alternative work arrangements: Two images of the new world of work. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 4, 473-499. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032516-113332>
- SSO Network. (2024). Gallup report: Employee engagement and workplace stress at all-time highs. <https://www.ssonetwork.com/workplace-facilities/articles/employee-engagement-and-workplace-stress-at-all-time-highs>
- Statista. (2024). Work from home: Remote & hybrid work — Statistics & facts. <https://www.statista.com/topics/6565/work-from-home-and-remote-work/>
- Tahlyan, D., Said, M., Mahmassani, H., Stathopoulos, A., Walker, J., & Shaheen, S. (2022). For whom did telework not work during the pandemic? Understanding the factors impacting telework satisfaction in the US using a multiple indicator multiple cause (MIMIC) model. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, 155, 387–402. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2590198223002166>
- UK Parliament POST. (2025). The impact of remote and hybrid working on workers and organisations. Parliamentary Office of Science and Technology. <https://post.parliament.uk/research-briefings/post-pb-0049/>
- Van den Broeck, A., Ferris, D. L., Chang, C. H., & Rosen, C. C. (2016). A review of self-determination theory's basic psychological needs at work. *Journal of Management*, 42(5), 1195-1229. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206316632058>
- Vanitha, N., & Shailashri, V. T. (2023). A systematic literature review on impact of hybrid work culture on employee job engagement and productivity: A study of IT professionals in Karnataka. *EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)*, 8(12),
- Vyas, L., & Butakhieo, N. (2021). The impact of working from home during COVID-19 on work and life domains: An exploratory study on Hong Kong. *Policy Design and Practice*, 4(1), 59-76. <https://doi.org/10.1080/25741292.2020.1863560>