

# HYBRID OR REMOTE? THE IMPORTANCE OF WORK FORM IN SHAPING ENGAGEMENT TO WORK IN A POST-PANDEMIC REALITY

## Introduction

As a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, a number of changes were made in the sphere of labor organization. These changes primarily affected the way work was delivered to ensure that ongoing tasks were carried out. While in the first stage of the pandemic, remote work, exclusively from home, dominated in most organizations, later a hybrid model of work began to prevail. Today, many organizations have decided to stay with such a work model, treating it as the so-called new normal [Abdel Hadi, Bakker, Häusser, 2021], and in the future, it is expected to become the dominant model of employing employees in organization [Naqshbandi et al., 2023; Moglia, Hopkins, Bardoel, 2021].

Working in a hybrid model has disrupted the previous state of organizational balance. While earlier, in the 1990s, this work was treated as an attractive benefit offered by organizations to a few employees [Unda-Lopez et al., 2023; Naqshbandi et al., 2023; Parent-Lamarche 2022; Wontorczyk, Roźnowski 2022, Gomez-Salgado et al., 2021], the increase in the scope of hybrid work was particularly influenced by the operating conditions caused by the COVID-19 pandemic. At the beginning of 2022, as many as 35% of employees were working remotely or in a hybrid model, and 9 out of 10 people did not want to return to the traditional stationary work model [PAP Local Government Service]. And now, as indicated by the Labor Force

---

\* Izabela Bednarska-Wnuk, Ph.D., Assistant Professor – University of Lodz. ORCID: 0000-0003-0206-4633.

Survey (LFS), as many as 7.1% of the total workforce worked remotely in Q1 2023 [GUS]. Thus, the COVID-19 pandemic has changed the way organizations operate. In the area of human capital management, the most important manifestation of this change has been the spread of remote and hybrid work [Sidor-Rządkowska, 2022]. Remote work is identified in this article as work that is performed exclusively from any location chosen by the employee (but not from the organization), while hybrid work involves performing work duties both from home and from the organization [Radziukiewicz, 2021].

The hybrid model of work has also caused the emergence of a variety of problems in the areas such as shaping employee motivation, building teams, and measuring job performance [Naqshbandi et al., 2023]. These changes have also affected employee satisfaction and engagement, which resulting in challenges related to employee retention and psychosocial aspects. However, some employees do not want to return to the office [Singh, Sant, 2023], appreciating remote work exclusively from home.

The topic of employee engagement seems particularly relevant. This is due to the lack of direct contact with employees and the requirement for self-discipline in time management. Flexible work can lead to employees losing their sense of purpose faster and their motivation decreasing. Significantly, even before the pandemic, the Gallup Institute indicated in 2017 that 67% of employees are not engaged in their work, merely “showing up” at work, while only 15% are actually engaged [State of the Global Workplace]. The problem of engagement affects employees regardless of the form of flexible work [Sardeshmukh, Sharma, Golden, 2022; Colley, Williamson, 2020]. Meanwhile, as the CBRE report indicates, employees would ultimately prefer to work in a hybrid model with a preference for working in the office [The Global Live-Work-Shop Report] rather than at home. Moreover, today, the main strategic task of an organization is its ability to retain and engage employees, which can be achieved by developing favorable work arrangements, including making them more flexible [Parent-Lamarche, 2022].

Additionally, this topic in the post-pandemic reality, which began on May 5, 2023, when the World Health Organization declared the end of the COVID-19 pandemic [<https://serwiszoz.pl/aktualnosci-prawne/who-oglaszamy-koniec-pandemii-covid19-7636.html>], is relatively new and has not yet received extensive research attention. Based on a review of the literature and current research in the theoretical part related to the issue at hand, it was noted that it is insufficiently described and studied. Most of the works and studies conducted are related to the period 2020–2022, during which workers operated under increased sanitary-epidemiological regimes [Saurage-Altenloh et al., 2023; Unda-Lopez et al., 2023; Naqshbandi et al., 2023; Parent-Lamarche, 2022; Wontorczyk, Roźnowski, 2022; Gomez-Salgado et al. 2021]. On the other hand, there are few works that simultaneously explain work engagement, intention to quit the organization, and take into account two forms of work: remote

work and hybrid work, as well as current research related to the issue addressed in this article. Hence, there is now a need for research on engagement in companies using the hybrid work organization model and those whose employees work exclusively remotely.

In the context of the noticeable increase in the role of flexible forms of work (remote work and hybrid work), it seems important to know the level and structure of involvement in work, taking into account the above-mentioned forms, and to verify it in the context of employees' intention to quit the organization in the new "post-pandemic" reality. The results presented in the paper are an attempt to fill the research gap in the field of individual factors related to hybrid and remote work. To achieve this goal, the paper first reviews the literature and the results of research by various authors. Then, it presents the results of our own research conducted in the post-pandemic reality in 2023 among employees working in the hybrid model and exclusively remote work. The conclusion formulates insights for economic theory and practice.

## 1. Literature review

Issues of employee engagement have been a subject of consideration for many years, both in theory and in business practice [Wefald et al., 2012; Juchnowicz, 2012; Kahn, 1990]. However, the term "organizational commitment" itself can refer to various areas and approaches [Wefald et al., 2012]. Boshoff and Mels [2000], on the other hand, emphasize that organizational commitment can be framed as employees' identification with the organization's mission, shared values, goals, and objectives; engagement in their work; engagement in their profession; and engagement in the social environment. Engagement is also associated with satisfaction, a sense of greater importance in the organization, and a willingness to expend effort in completing tasks [Lewicka, Szeliga, 2016]. Bakker, Albrecht, and Leiter [2011], on the other hand, state that engagement is a combination of willingness and ability to work. According to Juchnowicz [2012] organizational engagement manifests itself in behavior accompanied by a willingness to prioritize the goals of the organization or professional activity over personal goals, along with readiness to take responsibility under conditions of independent action. It is also a positive state of mind characterized by a high level of energy, passion, dedication, and full concentration on work, sometimes making it difficult to detach from it [Schaufeli et al., 2002].

Similarly, Wojtczuk-Turek defines engagement as an energetic state associated with work activity, health and psychological well-being [2016]. This is known as work engagement, a distinct construct, separate from organizational commitment [Saks, 2006]. This type of engagement consists of three components: vigor, dedication, and

absorption [Schaufeli et al., 2002]. Vigor is understood and measured as the level of energy and mental resilience during the work performed. Dedication stems from pride in one's work and a willingness to identify with it. Absorption, refers to full concentration, focus on the work, and the difficulty of detaching from it [Schaufeli et al., 2002]. An engaged employee is highly motivated to achieve the organization's goals and objectives and shows special determination and dedication in performing professional duties. Such an employee also displays a proactive attitude, contributing to the organization's efficiency, innovation, and performance. There is also ample evidence pointing to the relationship between work engagement and customer satisfaction, turnover rates, business performance [Harter, Schmidt, Hayes, 2002], job resources [Bakker et al., 2007] workaholism [Clark et al., 20014], work life balance [Shimazu et al., 2010], or the intention to quit the organization [Alfes et al., 2013]. Engagement is also influenced by work organization that provides employees with autonomy of location and time [Gerards, de Grip, Baudewijns, 2018].

During the pandemic, the problem of labor engagement become a priority for organizations operating under a changed model of labor provision, the so-called hybrid labor model. Although this way of providing work is not yet fully defined and stable, it represents a kind of innovation, whose arrangement of interrelated and market-conditioning elements remains unexplored from a scientific point of view [Tabor-Blazewicz, Rachon, 2022]. The hybrid model of work was first defined by Halford [2005]. It refers to the division of work time and location of work between working at home and working in a traditional office [O'Rourke, 2021: 560]. The popularity of the term and form of work have gained prominence, especially during COVID-19 pandemic. However, the use of flexible work arrangements has been gaining popularity since the 1970 s due to the development of information technology. It was then that the term "telework" [Nilles, 1976] was first introduced, which is often used interchangeably with such terms as remote work or work from home (WFH). However, it cannot be unequivocally stated that they are the same, as they can be distinguished by the criteria of regularity and repetitiveness of work [Dolot, 2020]. In addition, remote work is defined as work done at any distance from where the results of that work are expected [Zalega, 2003]. A characteristic feature of remote work is that its most popular form is work performed exclusively at the home of an employee using information technology. Such work can take the form of a so-called home office [Dolot, 2020]. Thus, this article assumes that remote work is work done exclusively from home.

On the other hand, in the hybrid work model, the combination of remote work and telecommuting is one of its fundamental elements. Their integration is an example of a hybrid enterprise [Choudhury, Foroughi, Larson, 2021]. Although these forms are fairly well researched [Palumbo et al., 2021; de Menezes, Kelliher, 2013] they remain an ongoing area of academic reflection [Sampat et al., 2022].

A systematic review of the literature available in international databases was conducted to identify academic papers on hybrid work, remote work, and work engagement. The databases used were Ebsco, Scopus, and Web of Science. The following keywords were used in the search: hybrid work, remote work, and work engagement. The result was a total of more than 370,000 publications. Subsequently, the following restrictions were applied to the identified articles: full-text, peer-reviewed publications with keywords in title or abstract. Duplicate publications, reviews, books, chapters in books, dissertations, and post-conference materials were eliminated, resulting in 46 publications. The abstracts of these selected articles were analyzed to identify those of an empirical nature. Analysis of the content of the articles showed that more than 85% of the publications on hybrid or remote work engagement are empirical in nature. In the papers analyzed, the work environment (hybrid vs. remote) was mainly the dependent variable. In three publications, hybrid vs. remote work was used as a mediating variable, a moderator for variables such as productivity, work engagement, organizational affiliation, and intention to quit the organization.

Previous research has established the relationship between hybrid work organization and productivity, with work engagement as a mediator [Naqshbandi et al., 2023]. Interestingly, telework, as one of the elements of hybrid work organization, positively affects work engagement [Naqshbandi et al., 2023; Gerards, de Grip, Baudewijns, 2018] and negatively impacts the employee's intention to quit the organization [Sardeshmukh, Sharma, Golden, 2012; Alfes et al., 2013]. The positive impact of flexible work arrangements on work engagement ultimately leads to a lower intention to quit the organization [Parent-Lamarche, 2022].

This suggests that work engagement is more likely to occur with the provision of flexible work arrangements [Naqshbandi et al., 2023]. Therefore, the following hypotheses can be made.

H1 A higher level of work engagement in flexible work arrangements promotes a lower level of intention to quit the organization.

H2 The form of work performed (remote work, hybrid work) differentiates the level of work engagement.

Additionally, it was examined whether the form of work performed (hybrid vs. remote work) differentiates the level of employee work engagement by gender and by age.

## 2. Materials and methods

### 2.1. Data collection and sample

The survey included 402 employees of organizations declaring a form of hybrid and remote work organization, of which 51.2% were women and 49% were men. There is a clear downward trend in the various age groups. Respondents from the age group up to 25 years (29.1%) dominated. Respondents from the 26–35 age group accounted for 26.9%, from the 36–45 age group (23.4%), and from the 46–55 range (17.9%). Respondents from the 56+ age group accounted for the least, at only 2.7%. The majority of workers (25.1%) were characterized by seniority in the range of 3 to 5 years. Of comparable proportion are respondents with seniority of more than 20 years (15.90%) and seniority of 16 to 20 years (15.2%). The least numerous group are respondents with seniority of up to 6 months (4.5%), from 7 to 12 months (6.5%) and with seniority of 1 to 2 years (9.5%). Among all respondents, 61.7% were employees working in a hybrid work organization, and only 38.3% were employees working exclusively remotely.

The CAWI [Computer Assisted Web Interview] technique was used in the study. This method was chosen because the online questionnaire survey (CAWI) is becoming more and more popular due to faster access to respondents, ensuring anonymity, and faster data collection.

The survey was conducted in 2023 among two categories of employees: those working exclusively remotely and those working in a hybrid work organization model. The sampling for the study was purposive, convenience sampling. The survey was anonymous. Most respondents gave their consent to participate in the study. While 480 surveys were sent, 402 surveys were received. The response rate was therefore 83.75%.

The empirical material obtained was then subjected to statistical analysis using IBM SPSS Statistics 28.0.

### 2.2. Measures

#### 2.2.1. Work engagement

Work engagement was measured using a 17-item version of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES-17) [Schaufeli, Bakker, 2003]. This tool examines three dimensions of work engagement: Vigor (6 items), Dedication to Work (5 items), and Absorption (6 items). Responses are given on a 7-point Likert scale, indicating how often they feel a certain way about their work (from 0 – never to 6 – always, every day). Respondents had to indicate how often they experienced each of the feelings

described on the seven-point scale from “never” to “always.” Sample items included “When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work” and “I am enthusiastic about my work”. Cronbach’s alpha reliability was obtained for the following dimensions: Vigor (0.77), Dedication to work (0.85), Absorption (0.76) and for the entire UWES tool scale  $\alpha = 0.96$ .

### 2.2.2. Intention to quit

“Intention to Quit” was measured using a tool [Lance et al., 1989] consisting of three questions: “I often think about leaving my job,” “I intend to quit the organization,” and “I intend to make a real effort to find another job in the next few months”. Respondents answered on a 5-point Likert scale regarding from “Strongly disagree” to “Strongly agree”. The reliability of this measure, as indicated by Cronbach’s Alpha, was  $\alpha=0.86$ .

### 2.2.3. Form of work

Form of work – hybrid vs. remote – was measured by one item. It was coded as 1 for hybrid work and 2 for remote work.

### 2.2.4. Control variables

Two individual control variables – gender and age – were included in the analyses. Previous studies have shown that these variables can differentiate the level of work engagement [Douglas, Roberts, 2020].

## 3. Results

The surveyed respondents made a relatively low assessment of the intention to quit the organization ( $M=7.1294$ ,  $Me=6$ ,  $SD=3.87758$ ). On the other hand, in terms of engagement to work, average scores were obtained, indicating that respondents do not fully devote themselves to their work and do not feel fully emotionally attached to their professional role ( $M=65.1045$ ,  $Me=67$ ,  $SD=16.5186$ ). In the factor structure of work engagement, as indicated by the analysis of the empirical material, the highest level was recorded for the dimension of vigor ( $M=24.2388$ ,  $SD=5.85976$ ). Respondents showed less engagement in the dimension of dedication ( $M=18.3756$ ,  $SD=6.20399$ ). Table 1 presents the results of descriptive statistics of the variables used in the study.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics of variables used in the study (N=402)

Variable	M	Me	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis
Vigor	24.23	25	5.859	-0.886	1.270
Dedication	18.37	19	6.203	-0.480	-0.358
Absorption	22.49	23	6.443	-0.730	0.829
Work engagement- general	65.10	67	16.518	-0.629	0.333
Intention to quit	7.12	6	3.877	0.642	-0.780

Source: own study.

The analyses conducted confirmed the correlation between job engagement and employees' intention to leave the organization ( $r=-0.175$ ,  $p<0.001$ ). There was a negative correlation between the studied variables, with the relationship being significant but weak in terms of strength, as  $r \leq 0.2$ .

Statistical significance was obtained for the correlation between work engagement and intention to quit ( $p<0.05$ ). The effect of health evaluation on the explanatory variable was positive. There were significant differences in the individual dimensions of job engagement and employees' intention to quit the organization. Specifically, the dimensions of vigor and dedication to work, showed a negative correlation with intention to quit ( $r=-0.186$ ,  $p<0.001$  and  $r=-0.202$ ,  $p<0.001$ , respectively). On the other hand, no significant relationship was noted between absorption and the employee's intention to quit the organization ( $r=-0.085$ ,  $p=0.089$ ). However, the results indicate that there is a statistically significant correlation between the studied dimensions of job engagement. The strongest correlation ( $r = 0.752$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) links dedication to work with vigor. The weakest correlations are between absorption and dedication to work ( $r = 0.633$ ,  $p<0.001$ ). These values were in line with those reported by Schaufeli and Salanova [2007], at around 0.65. (Table 2).

Table 2. Correlation for components of work engagement and intention to quit the organization

Variable	Dedication	Absorption	intention to quit the organization
Vigor	0.752**	0.633**	-0.186**
Dedication		0.701**	-0.202**
Absorption			-0.085
Intention to quit the organization			

\*\* Correlation significant at the 0.01 level (two-sided)

Source: own study.

The type of relationship between work engagement and an employee's intention to quit was determined by regression analysis. The dependent variable was intention



to quit, while the independent variable was job engagement. The results of the regression analysis are shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Results of regression analysis – work engagement vs. intention to quit

Variable	Intention to quit				
	B	SE	B	t	p
Model					
Constant	9.805	0.776		12.633	<0.001
Engagement to work	-0.041	0.012	-0.175	-3.556	<0.001
$R^2=0.031$ $F(1, 400)=12.646$ ; $p<0.001$					

\*  $p < 0.001$ .

Source: own study.

Regression analysis indicated a negative effect of work engagement on employee's intention to quit the organization ( $p < 0.05$ ). The more engaged employees are in their work, the less likely they are to quit the organization.

It was important to know whether the form of work performed (remote vs. hybrid) differentiates respondents' work engagement. Comparing the form of work performed vs. overall work engagement of employees using the Mann-Whitney U-test, it was found that it did not significantly differentiate the studied variable ( $U=21413.000$ ,  $p=0.083$ ). However, differences were seen in two dimensions of work engagement – vigor and work absorption. Employees who work exclusively in a remote form exhibit significantly higher levels of vigor ( $M_{rank}=216.55$ ,  $U=21413$   $p=0.040$ ) and absorption ( $M_{rank}=218.99$ ,  $U=21790$   $p=0.017$ ) than employees who provide work in a hybrid model (for vigor  $M_{rank}=192.16$ ,  $p=0.040$  and absorption  $M_{rank}=190.64$ ,  $p=0.017$ , respectively).

Interestingly, taking into account the form of work performed vs. work engagement, there were no significant differences for gender (remote form  $U=3473$ ,  $p=0.059$ , hybrid form  $U=7282$ ,  $p=0.472$ ), including in individual dimensions. However, in the case of age, the Kruskal-Wallis test showed significant differences between the study variables ( $H=7.385$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), particularly among those working in the hybrid form. When analyzing multiple comparisons (post-hoc), the Bonferroni method's correction for significance proved too sensitive and did not reveal significant differences between specific groups. Without applying the correction, the differences were noticeable between the following groups: respondents up to 25 years old ( $M_{rank}=98.6$ ) and 46–55 years old ( $M_{rank}=130.73$ ) with a difference of  $D=-32.666$ ,  $p=0.027$ ; respondents up to 25 years old ( $M_{rank}=98.6$ ) and 26–35 years old ( $M_{rank}=131.15$ ) with a difference of  $D=-33.086$ ,  $p=0.017$ ; respondents up to 25 years old ( $M_{rank}=98.6$ ) and 36–45 years old ( $M_{rank}=132.4$ ) with a difference of  $D=-33.982$ ,  $p=0.016$ .

On the other hand, evaluation of the relationship between gender and intention to quit demonstrated that gender significantly differentiates intention to quit

$U=22845.000$ ;  $p=0.021$ . Men showed significantly higher levels of intention to quit ( $M_{rank}=215.06$ ) than women ( $M_{rank}=188.60$ ). Considering the form of work, gender significantly differentiated the level of intention to quit only in the hybrid form,  $U=9075.000$ ;  $p=0.013$ . The Mann-Whitney U-test showed that men ( $M_{rank}=135.09$ ) had significantly higher levels of intention to quit than women ( $M_{rank}=113.31$ ). In contrast, for respondents working remotely, there was no relationship between intention to quit and gender ( $U=3134.000$ ;  $p>0.005$ ).

In addition, an attempt was made to assess the relationship between intention to quit and the age of employees. The Kruskal-Wallis H-test showed no significant differences between age and employees' intention to quit the organization, either for those working in hybrid ( $H=6.054$ ;  $p>0.05$ ) or in a remote form ( $H=8.905$ ;  $p>0.05$ ).

## 4. Discussion of research results

The obtained research results confirmed Hypothesis 1. Employees who have a high level of work engagement are characterized by a low level of intention to quit the organization. However, the findings are inconsistent with the research of Saurage-Altenloh et. al. [2023], which showed that the more engaged employees were while working remotely, the greater the likelihood that they intended to quit the organization.

Differences were also noticed in the detailed analyzes of the dimensions of involvement obtained. In only two dimensions of work engagement (vigor and dedication to work), the higher the level, the lower the level of the employee's intention to quit the organization. Feeling pride in one's work, identifying with it and experiencing an energetic state in relation to the performance of one's job duties result in a fuller identification with one's work, which influences less activity among employees to seek alternative ways of providing work. For organizations, this means the need to take care of employees in terms of shaping the essence, content, and conditions of work offered. These activities can lead to a stronger identification of the employee with the organization and full dedication to work. Interestingly, the level of preoccupation with work versus its relationship with the intention of employees to quit the organization did not receive empirical support. There was a lack of correlation. A high level of preoccupation with work, i.e. full concentration on the tasks at hand, does not determine the intention to quit the organization. Managers, therefore, wishing to retain employees in the organization providing flexible work and avoid their departure from the organization, should first of all pay more attention to vigor and dedication to work especially since an engaged employee is of great value to the organization [Harter, Schmidt, Hayes, 2002].

This also means orienting modern organizations to shape working conditions that support the employee's mental and physical resilience and enable them to carry

out tasks that have important and proudful meaning. In addition, all three types of work engagement are positively correlated with each other, meaning that when the level of one dimension rises, we also note an upward value in another. The results of the study are also consistent with the findings of other researchers that allowing employees to choose when and how much to work enables them to demonstrate high levels of energy and feel enthusiasm about their work [Schaufeli et al., 2002].

However, regarding Hypothesis 2, it was only partially confirmed. The form of work performed (hybrid vs. remote) does not differentiate the level of work engagement overall. Interestingly, previous research is inconclusive in this regard. Both a negative impact of remote/hybrid work [Sardeshmukh et al., 2012] and a positive impact [de Menezes, Kelliher, 2011] are indicated. It is seen, however, there are differences within the three dimensions of work engagement. Importantly, employees who work exclusively from home, so-called remote work, have significantly higher levels of vigor and absorption than those who work in a hybrid model. Similar conclusions were also obtained by Uru, Gozukara, Tezcan [2022]. It seems that the result obtained applies primarily to those whose home space and the way it is used by other household members enable the employee to perform work duties, as well as those who are able to set clear boundaries between work and personal life [Syper-Jędrzejak, 2021]. However, the obtained result is contrary to the research results of Singh and Sant [2023], who showed that employee engagement is higher among employees performing hybrid work than remote work.

Surprisingly, it may seem that gender, in relation to the form of work performed does not differentiate work engagement. The lack of clear differences between men and women may be related to the diminishing disparities in behaviors over the years, as indicated by researchers [Wojciszke, 2009]. In addition, the current spread of remote and hybrid work seems to have developed a so-called “new normal,” in which certain behaviors in the organization adopt a certain gender unification.

Interestingly, other studies point to differences between men and women in their engagement to work. Numerous studies show that women are more engaged and productive when working from home [Awada et al., 2021]. This is likely due to the greater number of organizational and social roles performed and the opportunity to integrate them while working from home.

In addition, based on the data collected, there were differences between an employee's age and his level of engagement, but only for hybrid work arrangements. In the case of working exclusively from home, age does not differentiate the level of engagement. This is probably due to constantly being in a homogeneous work environment, where the stage of the employee's career does not matter. In everyone's case, engagement in work is at a similar level. In the case of a hybrid work organization, it is noted that the older the employee, the higher his level of engagement. Presumably, greater time flexibility allows for greater task flexibility, encompassing

both professional and family spheres. In addition, older workers tend to be more connected to their teams, have close working relationships, identify more with their work, and are also more available and show greater engagement than their younger counterparts. Douglas and Roberts [2020] point to similar results among private sector employees. They used the same survey instrument (UWES) and showed that employees aged 50 and older have statistically significantly higher rates of work engagement than employees under 50. However, it is important to keep in mind the aging of this group, which leads to a decrease in work engagement [Bayl-Smith, Griffin, 2014], making it crucial for an organization to implement various programs like age management or diversity management.

## 5. Theoretical and practical implications

The study conducted has several implications for theory and practice. From a theoretical point of view, the UWES survey tool used [Schaufeli, Bakker, 2003] was applied to a specific environment, namely the flexible work model. The survey was conducted among employees working exclusively from home as well as those in a hybrid work model. To date, most results from studies have not accounted for the distinction between these two forms of work, focusing predominantly on remote work [Sardeshmukh et al., 2012] or hybrid work [Naqshbandi et al., 2023; Sampat et al., 2022]. Thus, this study achieves one of its main goals: to expand the growing body of knowledge since the pandemic about remote work and hybrid work. The framework of this research also helps us understand whether the form of work performance is conducive to achieving high levels of work engagement and influences employees' intention to quit the organization.

The study also has various practical implications for organizational management. First and foremost, those organizations that allow employees to work flexibly, regardless of the form of work, help foster engagement at work. The issues raised in this study are important, first of all, for those organizations that want to retain employees and at the same time expect a high level of employee engagement. The organization should be aware that the very fact of doing flexible work promotes positive attitudes toward work.

## 6. Limitations and future research

However, the survey has several limitations. First, the survey only obtained responses from employees doing only remote work (from home) and hybrid work. It is recommended that the survey be expanded to learn more about the opinions

of employees doing traditional work and to make comparisons among these three groups about the level of work engagement in conjunction with their intention to quit the organization.

The survey should also be expanded to include other variables moderating the form of work performance versus engagement, such as employee productivity, performance, or job satisfaction. The inclusion of multiple variables would enable a multidimensional research perspective and, as a result, an in-depth analysis of the problem studied in this article. There are also limitations at the methodological level. The survey is limited only to respondents doing flexible work, without taking into account the type of organization, type of work (physical vs. white-collar) or employee category (specialist, manager, director).

## Conclusion

In summary, it is not possible to say unequivocally which model of work provision is more conducive to work engagement. Both forms of work have their advantages as well as disadvantages. Undoubtedly, just as in the traditional form of work, in the case of remote vs. hybrid work, a high level of engagement translates into a low level of intention to quit the organization by employees. It therefore seems important for employees to strive to develop and maintain a high level of vigor, to find a sense of meaning in work, and to use methods that support full concentration on work and focus. These can include: relaxation exercises to increase concentration or mindfulness training (mindfulness).

The manager, recognizing that a flexible work environment is conducive to high engagement, should prioritize building employee engagement and fostering a sense of belonging among the team and the organization. This is especially important for employees who work exclusively from home and have no direct contact with their work team, as opposed to those who provide work in a hybrid model. The manager should also support the individual development of employees and take care of their physical, mental, and social well-being. In addition, employees considering the increasing flexibility of the professional sphere, should take care not only of work-life balance, but should now strive for work-life integration, i.e. the combination of the private and professional spheres, which would take into account the possibility of the emergence of work overload. Such organization of work and life will promote greater satisfaction, reduce stress, prevent burnout, and increase the level of overall engagement to work.

Furthermore, today's managers should target re-engagement, i.e., rebuilding existing modes of engagement in favor of those that actually influence employee behavior. This is particularly important in the context of retaining key employees who are strategically important to the organization.

## References

- [1] Abdel Hadi S.A., Bakker A.B., Häusser J.A. [2021], The role of leisure crafting for emotional exhaustion in telework during the COVID-19 pandemic, *Anxiety, Stress and Coping* 34(5): 530–554.
- [2] Alfes K., Shantz A.D., Truss C., Soane E.C. [2013], The link between perceived human resource management practices, engagement and employee behaviour: A moderated mediation model, *International Journal Human. Resources Management* 24: 330–351.
- [3] Awada M., Lucas G., Becerik-Gerber B., Roll S. [2021], Working from home during the COVID-19 pandemic: Impact on office worker productivity and work experience, *Work* 69(4): 1171–1189.
- [4] Bakker A.B., Albrecht S.L., Leiter M.P. [2011], Work engagement: Further reflections on the state of play, *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology* 20: 74–88.
- [5] Bakker A.B., Hakanen J.J., Demerouti E., Xanthopoulou D. [2007], Job resources boost work engagement, particularly when job demands are high, *Journal of Educational Psychology* 99(2): 274–284.
- [6] Bayl-Smith P.H., Griffin B. [2014], Age discrimination in the workplace: Identifying as a late-career worker and its relationship with engagement and intended retirement age, *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 44(9): 588–599.
- [7] Boshoff Ch., Mels G. [2000], The impact of multiple engagements on intentions to resign: An empirical assessment, *British Journal of Management* 11(3): 255–272.
- [8] Choudhury P., Foroughi C., Larson B. [2021], Work-from-anywhere: The productivity effects of geographic flexibility, *Strategic Management Journal* 42(4): 655–683.
- [9] Clark M.A., Michel J.S., Stevens G.W., Howell J.W., Scruggs, R.S. [2014], Workaholism, work engagement and work-home outcomes: Exploring the mediating role of positive and negative emotions, *Stress and Health* 30(4): 287–300.
- [10] de Menezes L.M., Kelliher C. [2011], Flexible working and performance: A systematic review of the evidence for a business case, *International Journal of Management Reviews* 13(4): 452–474.
- [11] Demerouti E., Derks D., Ten Brummelhuis L.L., Bakker A.B. [2014], *The impact of ICT on quality of working life*, in: Korunka C., Hoonakker P. (eds.), *New ways of working: impact on working conditions, work-family balance, and well-being*, Springer: 123–141.
- [12] Dolot A. [2020], Wpływ pandemii COVID-19 na pracę zdalną – perspektywa pracownika, *E-mentor* 1(83): 35–43.
- [13] Douglas S., Roberts R. [2020], Employee age and the impact on work engagement, *Strategic HR Review* 19(5): 209–213.
- [14] Gerards R., de Grip A., Baudewijns C. [2018], Do new ways of working increase work engagement? *Personnel Review* 47(2), 517–534.

- [15] GUS – Główny Urząd Statystyczny, <https://stat.gov.pl/> (accessed: 23.11.2023).
- [16] Gomez-Salgado J., Dominguez-Salas S., Romero-Martin M., Romero A., Coronado-Vazquez V., Ruiz-Frutos C. [2021], Work engagement and psychological distress of health professionals during the COVID-19 pandemic, *Journal Nurse Management* 29: 1016.
- [17] Halford S. [2005], Hybrid workspace: Re-spatialisations of work, organization and management, *New Technology, Work and Employment* 20(1): 19–33.
- [18] Harter J.K., Schmidt F.L., Hayes T.L. [2002], Business unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: A meta-analysis, *Journal of Applied Psychology* 87(2): 268–279.
- [19] Aktualności prawne [rok], <https://serwiszoz.pl/aktualnosci-prawne/who-oglaszamy-koniec-pandemii-covid19-7636.html> (accessed: 20.11.2023).
- [20] Juchnowicz M., Kinowska H. [2022], Komponenty dobrostanu pracowników w warunkach pracy hybrydowej, in: Tabor-Błażewicz J., Rachoń H. (eds.), *Wyzwania kierowania ludźmi w systemie hybrydowej organizacji pracy*, SGH Publishing House, Warsaw: 33–46.
- [21] Juchnowicz M. [2012], *Zaangażowanie pracowników sposoby oceny i motywowania*, Polskie Wydawnictwo Ekonomiczne, Warsaw.
- [22] Kahn W.A. [1990], Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work, *The Academy of Management Journal* 33(4): 692–724.
- [23] Kossek E.E., Lautsch B.A. [2018], Work-life flexibility for whom? Occupational status and work-life inequality in upper, middle, and lower level jobs, *The Academy of Management Annals* 12(1): 5–36.
- [24] Lance C.E., Lautenschlager G.T., Sloan, C.E., Varca, P.E. [1989], A comparison between bottom-up, top-down and bi-directional models of relationships between global and life facet satisfaction, *Journal of Personality* 57(3): 601–624.
- [25] Lewicka D., Szeliga M. [2016], Zaufanie wertykalne a zaangażowanie organizacyjne na przykładzie podmiotu leczniczego, *Zeszyty Naukowe Wyższej Szkoły Humanitas. Zarządzanie* 1: 205–224.
- [26] Moglia M., Hopkins J., Bardoe A. [2021], Telerwork, hybrid work and the United Nation's sustainable development goals: Towards policy coherence, *Sustainability* 13(16): 9222.
- [27] Naqshbandi M.M., Kabir I., Ishak N.A., Islam M.Z. [2023], The future of work: Work engagement and job performance in the hybrid workplace, *The Learning Organization*. Vol. ahead-of-print No. ahead-of-print.
- [28] Nilles J. [1976], *The telecommunications – transportation trade off: Options for tomorrow*. Wiley, Washington DC.
- [29] O'Rourke G.A. [2021], Workplace strategy: A new workplace model, *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources* 59(4): 554–566.
- [30] Palumbo R., Manna R, Cavallone M. [2021], Beware of side effects on quality! Investigating the implications of home working on work-life balance in educational services”, *The TQM Journal* 33(4): 915–929.

- [31] PAP Local Government Service, <https://samorzad.pap.pl/kategoria/aktualnosci/raport-juz-35-proc-polakow-pracuje-zdalnie-lub-hybrydowo> (accessed: 22.11.2023).
- [32] Parent-Lamarche A. [2022], Teleworking, work engagement, and intention to quit during the COVID-19 pandemic: Same storm, different boats? *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 19(3): 1267.
- [33] Radziukiewicz M. [2021], Praca zdalna w Polsce i jej perspektywy, *Economic and Regional Studies* 14(4): 409–427.
- [34] Russell J.A. [2003], Core affect and the psychological construction of emotion, *Psychological Review* 110: 145–172.
- [35] Saks A.M. [2006], Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement, *Journal of Managerial Psychology* 21: 600–619.
- [36] Sampat B., Raj S., Behl A., Schöbel S. [2022], An empirical analysis of facilitators and barriers to the hybrid work model: A cross-cultural and multi-theoretical approach”, *Personnel Review* 51(8): 1990–2020.
- [37] Sardeshmukh S.R., Sharma D., Golden T.D. [2012], Impact of telework on exhaustion and job engagement a job demands and job resources model, *New Technology, Work and Employment* 27(3): 193–207.
- [38] Schaufeli W.B., Bakker A.B. [2003], *UWES – Utrecht Work Engagement Scale: Test manual* [Unpublished Manuscript]. Publisher: Department of Psychology, Utrecht University.
- [39] Schaufeli W.B., Salanova M. [2007], Work engagement: An emerging psychological concept and its implications for organizations, in: Gilliland S.W., Steiner D.D., Skarlicki D.P. (Eds.), *Research in social issues in management (Vol. 5): Managing social and ethical issues in organizations*, Publisher Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishers: 135–177.
- [40] Schaufeli W.B., Salanova M., González-Romá V., Bakker A.B. [2002], The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach, *Journal of Happiness Studies* 3(1): 1–92.
- [41] Shimazu A., Bakker A.B., Demerouti E., Peeters M.C.W. [2010], Work-family conflict in Japan: How job and home demands affect psychological distress, *Industrial Health* 48, 766–774.
- [42] Sidor-Rządkowska M., [2022], Praca zdalna i hybrydowa a budowanie wizerunku pracodawcy w czasach postpandemicznych, *Marketing i Rynek* 29(12): 28–37.
- [43] Singh S., Sant S. [2023], The moderating role of workplace (hybrid/remote) on employee, Engagement and employe turnover intention, *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, November.
- [44] State of the global workplace – Gallup report, <https://www.slideshare.net/adrianboucek/state-of-the-global-workplace-gallup-report-2017> (3.05.2023).
- [45] Syper-Jędrzejak M. [2021], Praca zdalna a wypalenie zawodowe, in: Mendryk I., *Zarządzanie zasobami ludzkimi w nowej przestrzeni fizycznej i społecznej*, Difin, Warsaw: 221–238.



- [46] Tabor-Błazewicz J., Rachoń, H. [2022], *Wyzwania kierowania ludźmi w systemie hybrydowej organizacji pracy*, SGH Publishing House, Warsaw.
- [47] The global live-work-shop report, <https://www.cbre.com/insights/books/the-global-live-work-shop-report> (accessed: 25.05.2023).
- [48] Unda-Lopez A., Paz C., Hidalgo-Andrade P., Hermosa-Bosano C. [2023], Variations of work engagement and psychological distress based on three working modalities during the COVID-19 pandemic, *Front. Public Health*, 1–7.
- [49] Uru F.O., Gozukara E., Tezcan L. [2022], The moderating roles of remote, hybrid, and onsite working on the relationship between work engagement and organizational identification during the COVID-19 pandemic, *Sustainability* 14(24).
- [50] Wontorczyk, A., Rożnowski, B. [2022], Remote, hybrid, and on-site work during the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic and the consequences for stress and work engagement, *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 19(4), 2400.
- [51] Wefald A.J., Mills M.J., Smith M.R., Downey R.G. [2012], A comparison of three job engagement measures: Examining their factorial and criterion-related validity, *Applied Psychology Health Well Being* 4(1): 67–90.
- [52] Wojciszke B. [2009], *Człowiek wśród ludzi. Zarys psychologii społecznej*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar, Warsaw.
- [53] Wojtczuk-Turek A. [2016], *Wspieranie produktywności pracowników wiedzy. Rola zarządzania zasobami ludzkimi i dopasowania człowiek-organizacja*, Wydawnictwo PWN, Warsaw.
- [54] Zalega T. [2003], Praca zdalna – obraz przemian w Polsce i wybranych krajach Unii Europejskiej, *Master of Business Administration* 17(4): 35–45.

---

## HYBRID OR REMOTE? THE IMPORTANCE OF WORK FORM IN SHAPING WORK ENGAGEMENT IN A POST-PANDEMIC REALITY

### Abstract

As a result of the changes brought about by COVID-19, not only the model of work has changed, but also the idea of it. In the initial phase, most employees were forced to work exclusively from home. This solution quickly gained popularity over time and many organizations, incorporated it into their so-called hybrid work model. Since today the ability to retain employees through work engagement is now becoming a major strategic issue, it seems important to know the level and structure of work engagement taking into account the

form of work performance (remote vs. hybrid) and its verification in the context of employees' intention to quit the organization. The characteristics of the forms of commitment from the work performed were examined among 402 employees using the tool -UWES-17. The results indicate that employees who have a high level of commitment are characterized by a low level of intention to quit the organization. The form of work performed does not differentiate work commitment in general, differences were noticed in two dimensions of work commitment – vigor and work absorption.

The study presented here is an attempt to fill the research gap on individual factors related to hybrid and remote work.

**KEYWORDS: WORK ENGAGEMENT, REMOTE WORK, HYBRID WORK, INTENTION TO QUIT.**

**JEL CLASSIFICATION CODE: M12**

---

## HYBRYDOWA CZY ZDALNA? ZNACZENIE FORMY PRACY W KSZTAŁTOWANIU ZAANGAŻOWANIA W PRACĘ

### Streszczenie

W wyniku zmian spowodowanych pandemią COVID-19 uległ zmianie nie tylko model pracy, ale i wyobrażenie o niej. W początkowej fazie większość pracowników zmuszona była pracować wyłącznie z domu. Rozwiązanie to z czasem zyskało na popularności i wiele organizacji włączyło je do swojego modelu pracy, tzw. hybrydowego. Ponieważ zdolność do zatrzymania pracowników poprzez zaangażowanie w pracę staje się obecnie głównym problemem strategicznym, istotne wydaje się poznanie poziomu i struktury zaangażowania w pracę, uwzględniając formę wykonywania pracy (zdalna vs hybrydowa) oraz jej weryfikację w kontekście zamiaru odejścia pracowników z organizacji. Charakterystykę poziomu zaangażowania w zależności od formy wykonywania pracy zbadano wśród 402 pracowników za pomocą narzędzia -UWES-17. Wyniki wskazują, że pracownicy, którzy mają wysoki poziom zaangażowania, charakteryzują się niskim poziomem intencji zamiaru opuszczenia organizacji. Forma wykonywanej pracy nie różnicuje zaangażowania w pracę w ujęciu ogólnym, dostrzeżono różnice w dwóch wymiarach zaangażowania w pracę – w wigorze i absorpcji pracą. Zaprezentowane opracowanie jest próbą wypełnienia luki badawczej w zakresie indywidualnych czynników związanych z pracą hybrydową i pracą zdalną.

**SŁOWA KLUCZOWE: ZAANGAŻOWANIE W PRACĘ, PRACA ZDALNA, PRACA HYBRYDOWA, INTENCJA O ODEJŚCIU Z PRACY**

**KODY KLASYFIKACJI JEL: M12**