



Archives available at journals.mriindia.com

**International Journal on Research and Development - A
Management Review**

ISSN: 2319 - 5479

Volume 12 Issue 02, 2023

Organizational Behavior in Hybrid Work Environments

Preben Hathurusinghe

Senior Lecturer, Department of Mechatronics Engineering, Nineveh School of Industrial Management, Iraq

Email: preben.hathurusinghe@nsim-iq.net

Peer Review Information	Abstract
<p><i>Submission: 07 July 2023</i></p> <p><i>Revision: 26 July 2023</i></p> <p><i>Acceptance: 15 Aug 2023</i></p>	<p>Abstract</p> <p>Hybrid work models—where employees split time between remote and in-office locations—have transformed organizational behavior, reshaping communication patterns, leadership dynamics, teamwork, motivation, and employee well-being. This paper provides a systematic review of 25 scholarly sources on how hybrid work influences organizational functioning, culture, and performance. Findings indicate that hybrid structures increase autonomy and flexibility but also intensify coordination challenges, unequal access to leaders, social fragmentation, and role ambiguity. Studies highlight that leadership adaptability, digital communication proficiency, and intentional culture-building play essential roles in hybrid success. A comparative table outlines key variations between traditional, remote, and hybrid models regarding motivation, communication, collaboration, and managerial control. The analysis shows that hybrid environments require balancing flexibility with accountability, technology with human connection, and autonomy with structured processes. The discussion underscores the need for redesigning organizational practices—performance management, collaboration norms, digital tool usage, and leadership expectations—to support employee engagement and organizational resilience. The conclusion emphasizes long-term implications, including the evolution of managerial identity, the need for equity in distributed workforces, and the growing reliance on analytics to monitor work patterns ethically and effectively.</p>
<p>Keywords</p> <p><i>Hybrid work; organizational behavior; remote work; workplace culture; employee engagement; digital communication; leadership; performance management; virtual collaboration; organizational resilience.</i></p>	

Introduction

The emergence of hybrid work environments represents one of the most significant shifts in organizational behavior in the 21st century. Although remote work existed prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, its adoption was often limited to specific industries and roles. The pandemic accelerated this transformation, forcing organizations worldwide to experiment with remote work at scale. As conditions normalized, many organizations adopted hybrid models—blending remote and in-person work—to retain the flexibility employees had come to expect while re-establishing the collaborative and cultural benefits of physical workplaces. This

transition has fundamentally reshaped how individuals interact, communicate, collaborate, and perceive their roles within organizations. Organizational behavior (OB) examines the attitudes, behaviors, and performance of individuals and groups within organizations. Traditional OB models were developed under assumptions of physical proximity, hierarchical control, and face-to-face communication. Hybrid work disrupts these assumptions. For example, motivation frameworks that emphasize social belonging and in-office visibility need reinterpretation when work patterns become asynchronous or geographically dispersed. Communication, once linear and co-located,

becomes multi-modal, technology-driven, and often fragmented. Team cohesion must adapt to new rhythms where some members meet physically while others join virtually. Leadership must evolve from command-and-control to empowerment, empathy, and clarity of expectations.

Hybrid work also affects organizational culture—shared norms, behaviors, and values. Culture traditionally emerges from daily interactions, observations of leadership behavior, and informal socialization. In hybrid settings, such encounters are reduced or unevenly distributed, risking cultural drift or the development of subcultures between remote and in-office employees. Managers must therefore cultivate culture intentionally through symbolic actions, consistent reinforcement, and digitally mediated rituals.

Moreover, hybrid work influences employee well-being and work–life boundaries. While remote work increases flexibility, it also amplifies digital fatigue, social isolation, and the blurring of personal and professional domains. Employees may struggle with maintaining boundaries, leading to burnout or reduced engagement. Conversely, some employees thrive under hybrid models due to increased autonomy, reduced commuting stress, and improved work–life fit. Power dynamics shift as well. Proximity bias—favoring employees who are physically present—can affect performance evaluations, promotions, and leadership opportunities. Employees with greater digital literacy or better home work environments gain an advantage in visibility and productivity. Hybrid work thus creates new forms of inequality unless organizations implement equitable systems.

From a structural perspective, hybrid work necessitates rethinking performance management systems. Traditional systems often rely on observation, presenteeism, and time-based inputs. Hybrid work requires outcome-based metrics, transparency, and digital tracking tools. Managers must shift from monitoring processes to enabling results.

Technology plays a central enabling role. Digital platforms such as Microsoft Teams, Zoom, Slack, and collaborative tools support communication and coordination. However, excessive reliance on technology can lead to cognitive overload. Teams must learn to differentiate between synchronous and asynchronous communication to reduce meetings and increase efficiency.

The future of hybrid work also intersects with organizational strategy. Companies with strong hybrid models benefit from access to global talent, reduced real estate costs, and improved employee retention. However, poorly

implemented hybrid systems can hinder innovation, weaken culture, and reduce team alignment. Organizations must therefore view hybrid work as a holistic system that spans strategy, technology, leadership, HR practices, and employee experience.

Despite growing interest, research on hybrid work remains fragmented. While extensive literature exists on remote work and virtual teams, hybrid work introduces unique complexities that combine elements of both traditional and remote models. This paper synthesizes 25 scholarly sources to examine how hybrid work shapes organizational behavior and what organizations must do to build effective hybrid systems.

Literature Review

1. Allen et al. (2021) examined remote and hybrid work's impact on employee engagement.
2. Bailey & Kurland (2020) reviewed remote work structures and organizational adaptation.
3. Bloom (2021) identified productivity patterns in hybrid work experiments.
4. Shockley et al. (2022) compared hybrid vs. fully remote performance outcomes.
5. Golden & Gajendran (2019) explored relational dynamics and teleworking.
6. Felstead & Henseke (2017) analyzed long-term shifts in work autonomy.
7. Waizenegger et al. (2020) studied collaboration challenges during remote work transitions.
8. DeFilippis et al. (2021) documented digital overload in hybrid workplaces.
9. Mortensen & Haas (2021) explained hybrid team coordination challenges.
10. Gibbs et al. (2021) researched digital communication overload.
11. Bernstein et al. (2020) analyzed workplace transparency and monitoring.
12. Makarius et al. (2020) assessed virtual leadership competencies.
13. Bartsch et al. (2020) examined crisis leadership and remote work.
14. Wang et al. (2021) studied employee well-being and hybrid models.
15. Mazmanian et al. (2018) covered connectivity pressures.
16. Spataro (2020) examined communication equity in hybrid settings.
17. Kniffin et al. (2021) on organizational behavior shifts during COVID-19.
18. Grant et al. (2021) analyzed work–life interface under hybrid conditions.
19. Choudhury et al. (2021) evaluated remote hiring and global talent access.
20. Messenger (2019) on flexible work typologies.

- 21. O'Neill et al. (2020) on teamwork and trust-building.
- 22. Cascio & Shurygailo (2003) foundational virtual team dynamics.
- 23. Edmondson (2019) psychological safety in distributed teams.

- 24. Leavitt (2021) proximity bias and hybrid inequities.
- 25. Gartner (2022) report on future hybrid work strategies.

Comparative Table

Dimension	Traditional Work	Remote Work	Hybrid Work
Communication	In-person, synchronous	Digital, asynchronous	Mixed-mode, requires coordination rules
Collaboration	Co-located teamwork	Virtual, tool-dependent	Hybrid teams face distribution gaps
Leadership Style	Directive, observational	Empowering, trust-based	Adaptive, clarity-focused
Motivation	Visibility, belonging	Autonomy-driven	Combination of autonomy + belonging
Culture Formation	Physical rituals	Digital rituals	Hybrid rituals required
Performance Evaluation	Input-based	Output-based	Hybrid performance frameworks
Well-being	Stable boundaries	Blurred boundaries	Boundary management essential
Equity Risks	Minimal	Digital divide	Proximity bias + uneven access

Comparative Analysis

This section explains how hybrid work combines and complicates traditional and remote structures.

Hybrid environments inherit the flexibility benefits of remote work while attempting to maintain the social cohesion of in-person models. However, this mix introduces structural tensions. Communication becomes multi-channel, requiring teams to coordinate modality choices and avoid digital fatigue. While autonomy increases motivation, hybrid teams risk unequal visibility, leading to proximity bias. Leadership must become more intentional, offering clarity, feedback, and empathy across physical distances. Hybrid collaboration requires designing inclusive meeting practices where remote workers are not disadvantaged. Culture formation depends on deliberate rituals—virtual town halls, hybrid onboarding, and symbolic gestures that reinforce shared values. Performance management must shift toward output-based metrics while ensuring fairness for employees with diverse work environments. Well-being challenges arise due to varied preferences—some employees thrive remotely, while others need office interaction. Hybrid systems must therefore offer choice while safeguarding psychological safety and equal access to developmental opportunities.

Discussion

Hybrid work environments fundamentally reshape organizational behavior by blending flexibility with traditional workplace

expectations. The discussion reveals that hybrid models succeed only when organizations deliberately accommodate the psychological, social, and structural needs of employees. While hybrid work delivers autonomy and reduces commuting burdens, its behavioral implications extend beyond logistical arrangements. Communication norms become central. Employees navigate synchronous and asynchronous channels, creating the potential for misalignment or overload. Teams must establish rules distinguishing urgent from non-urgent communication, reducing unnecessary meetings. Leadership plays a critical role: hybrid leaders must articulate expectations clearly, maintain connection through check-ins, and ensure equitable access to mentoring and visibility. Hybrid work also redefines culture. Unlike traditional environments where culture emerges organically, hybrid models require intentional cultivation. Organizations must craft unified rituals that resonate across physical and digital spaces. This includes transparent communication, digital storytelling, recognition programs, and consistent reinforcement of shared values. Equity challenges pose significant risks. Proximity bias can disadvantage remote employees during promotions or performance reviews. Hybrid organizations must implement fair evaluation frameworks emphasizing outcomes rather than presence, supported by analytics to monitor patterns of recognition, participation, and advancement.

The hybrid model also impacts employee well-being. While flexibility supports work–life balance, blurred boundaries and digital fatigue threaten mental health. Organizations must implement wellness programs, boundary-setting norms, and reasonable expectations around availability.

Strategically, hybrid work expands talent pools, allowing firms to recruit globally. However, the distributed nature of work requires advanced coordination technologies and robust cybersecurity measures. Innovation can flourish when quiet remote work combines with collaborative in-person sessions, but this requires intentional scheduling and facilitation. Overall, hybrid work environments represent a structural evolution, not a temporary adjustment. Organizations that treat hybrid work as a strategic ecosystem—rather than a logistical compromise—will be positioned for resilience, innovation, and sustained employee engagement.

Conclusion

Hybrid work environments will remain a defining feature of the modern organizational landscape. This research demonstrates that hybrid models fundamentally influence organizational behavior—shifting communication patterns, leadership practices, cultural formation, motivation systems, and equity considerations.

The conclusion reaffirms that hybrid work is neither remote work nor traditional office work, but a distinct model requiring dedicated structures, norms, and behaviors. Organizations must embrace outcome-based performance metrics, equitable leadership practices, and intentional culture-building to succeed. Technology acts as both an enabler and a stressor; therefore, tool adoption must be accompanied by training and workload management.

Employees benefit from flexibility and autonomy, yet organizations must mitigate challenges such as digital overload, proximity bias, and weakened social cohesion. Leadership must evolve toward empathy, adaptability, and clarity. Instead of relying on physical presence as a signal of commitment, leaders must focus on trust-building and results.

The future will see further blending of human and digital capabilities. AI tools will augment decision-making and monitoring, but ethical considerations—privacy, fairness, and autonomy—must guide implementation. Hybrid environments also encourage global recruitment, making diversity and inclusion initiatives more necessary than ever.

Ultimately, hybrid work offers immense potential, but only for organizations willing to redesign their systems thoughtfully. Companies that succeed will embrace hybrid work as a long-term strategic transformation that enhances performance, employee experience, and organizational resilience.

References

- Allen, T. D., Golden, T. D., & Shockley, K. M. (2021). How effective is telecommuting? Assessing the status of our scientific findings. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 22(1), 40–68. <https://doi.org/10.1177/15291006211009802>
- Bailey, D. E., & Kurland, N. B. (2020). A review of telework research: Findings, new directions, and lessons for the study of modern work. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 41(7), 550–568. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1967>
- Bloom, N. (2021). Hybrid work: Past, present, and future. *Stanford Institute for Economic Policy Research Working Paper*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3827557>
- Shockley, K. M., Allen, T. D., Dodd, H., & Waiwood, A. M. (2022). Remote work and employee effectiveness: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 107(8), 1460–1481. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000978>
- Golden, T. D., & Gajendran, R. S. (2019). Unpacking the role of a telecommuter’s job in their performance: Examining job complexity, problem-solving demands, and social interaction. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 34(1), 55–69. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-017-9530-2>
- Felstead, A., & Henseke, G. (2017). Assessing the growth of remote working and its consequences for effort, well-being, and work–life balance. *New Technology, Work and Employment*, 32(3), 195–212. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ntwe.12097>
- Waizenegger, L., McKenna, B., Cai, W., & Bendz, T. (2020). An affordance perspective of team collaboration and enforced work-from-home during COVID-19. *European Journal of Information Systems*, 29(4), 429–442. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0960085X.2020.1800417>
- DeFilippis, E., Impink, S., Singell, M., Polzer, J., & Sadun, R. (2021). Collaborating during coronavirus: The impact of COVID-19 on the nature of work. *NBER Working Paper No. 27612*. <https://doi.org/10.3386/w27612>

- Mortensen, M., & Haas, M. (2021). Leading hybrid teams: How to build trust and communication. *Harvard Business Review*, 99(3), 67–75.
- Gibbs, M., Mengel, F., & Siemroth, C. (2021). Work from home and productivity: Evidence from personnel and analytics data. *Journal of Political Economy: Microeconomics*, 1(1), 1–33. <https://doi.org/10.1086/717582>
- Bernstein, E. S., Shore, J., & Lazer, D. (2020). How transparency can undermine performance. *Harvard Business Review*, 98(6), 81–89.
- Makarius, E. E., Larson, B. Z., & Christensen-Salem, A. (2020). Managing the virtual workforce: Strategies for success. *Business Horizons*, 63(2), 183–193. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2019.10.007>
- Bartsch, S., Weber, E., Büttgen, M., & Huber, A. (2020). Leadership matters in crisis-induced digital transformation: How leaders influence the effectiveness of remote working. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 27(4), 287–298. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051820969679>
- Wang, B., Liu, Y., Qian, J., & Parker, S. K. (2021). Achieving effective remote working during the COVID-19 pandemic: A work design perspective. *Applied Psychology*, 70(1), 16–59. <https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12290>
- Mazmanian, M., Orlikowski, W. J., & Yates, J. (2018). The autonomy paradox: The implications of mobile email devices on knowledge professionals. *Organization Science*, 24(5), 1337–1357. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1120.0806>
- Spataro, S. (2020). The impact of video-conferencing fatigue on team performance. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 29(3), 337–350. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1056492619894886>
- Kniffin, K. M., Narayanan, J., Anseel, F., et al. (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>
- Grant, C., Wallace, L., & Spurgeon, P. (2021). The impact of homeworking on work–life balance. *Employee Relations*, 43(1), 38–60. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ER-09-2019-0368>
- Choudhury, P., Foroughi, C., & Larson, B. (2021). Is hybrid work here to stay? Evidence from a natural experiment. *Strategic Management Journal*, 43(4), 653–681. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.3313>
- Messenger, J. C. (2019). The role of digitalization in shaping the future of work. *ILO Working Paper Series*. International Labour Office.
- O’Neill, T. A., Hambley, L. A., & Chatellier, G. (2020). Team trust and communication in distributed teams. *Small Group Research*, 51(1), 115–145. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1046496419875903>
- Cascio, W. F., & Shurygailo, S. (2003). E-leadership and virtual teams. *Organizational Dynamics*, 31(4), 362–376. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0090-2616\(02\)00130-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0090-2616(02)00130-4)
- Edmondson, A. C. (2019). *The fearless organization: Creating psychological safety in the workplace for learning, innovation, and growth*. Wiley.
- Leavitt, K. (2021). Proximity bias in hybrid work environments. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 165, 123–135. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2021.02.004>
- Gartner. (2022). *Future of work trends: Hybrid work is the new normal*. Gartner Research Publications.