

The Effect of Hybrid Work Arrangements on Employee Engagement: The Mediating Role of Work-Life Balance

Kaviyan.R¹ | Dr. Kabirdoss Devi^{2*}

¹III Semester MBA, Department of Management Studies, School of Management Studies, Vels Institute of Science, Technology and Advanced Studies (VISTAS), Pallavaram, Chennai, Tamil Nadu.

²Associate Professor, Department of Management Studies, School of Management Studies, Vels Institute of Science, Technology and Advanced Studies (VISTAS), Pallavaram, Chennai, Tamil Nadu.

*Corresponding Author: kabirdossdevi.sms@vistas.ac.in

Citation: Kaviyan, R. & Devi, K. (2026). *The Effect of Hybrid Work Arrangements on Employee Engagement: The Mediating Role of Work-Life Balance*. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Commerce, Management & Social Science*, 09(03(III)), 135–140. [https://doi.org/10.62823/ijarcmss/9.3\(III\).9461](https://doi.org/10.62823/ijarcmss/9.3(III).9461)

Abstract

The shift towards hybrid working arrangements – a blend of office-based and remote work – has become a distinguishing characteristic of the post-pandemic Information Technology (IT) sector. The purpose of this study was to determine the impact of hybrid work arrangements on employee engagement and the mediation of work-life balance among employees working under hybrid work arrangements in the Information Technology (IT) sector. A quantitative research approach with a descriptive research design was adopted. Primary data were collected through a questionnaire using a five-point Likert scale to measure Hybrid Work Arrangements, Work-Life Balance, and Employee Engagement. A total of 222 valid responses were received using convenience sampling from employees with experience of hybrid work. The collected data were analysed using reliability analysis, descriptive statistics, Pearson correlation analysis, and regression analysis. The reliability results showed excellent internal consistency across the study variables (Cronbach's Alpha = 0.940). The correlation analysis showed positive and statistically significant relationships among Hybrid Work Arrangements, Work-Life Balance, and Employee Engagement at the 0.001 significance level. The regression model was statistically significant ($F = 136.013$, $p < 0.001$), and Employee Engagement showed a significant positive effect ($\beta = 0.618$, $p < 0.001$). The findings suggest organisations should continue to strengthen hybrid work policies while giving particular emphasis to employees' work-life balance, communication, and managerial support.

Keywords: Hybrid Work Arrangements, Employee Engagement, Work-Life Balance, IT Industry, Mediation Analysis.

Introduction

Rapid technological change and globalisation have transformed people's expectations about where and how work gets done. Organisations need to provide flexibility in work location and yet hold employees to be engaged and productive. Hybrid work arrangements – a blend of office-based and remote work – have emerged as a response to this expectation, especially in the IT industry, where knowledge work does not require constant physical presence. Employee engagement, defined as the positive emotional, cognitive, and behavioural investment made by an employee in their work, is widely known to drive organisational performance: engaged employees are more productive, more committed, and more likely to stay. It is vital to understand how hybrid arrangements affect or impair engagement, depending on the extent to which employees can maintain a healthy balance between their professional and personal responsibilities. Work-life balance is therefore considered as a mediating variable in understanding how hybrid work translates into engagement.

The current study focuses on determining the impact of hybrid work arrangements on employee engagement among employees in the Information Technology (IT) sector who have recently adopted hybrid work arrangements. The study particularly looks at Hybrid Work Arrangements as the independent variable, Work-Life Balance as the mediating variable, and Employee Engagement as the dependent variable.

Objectives of the Study

- Assess the impact of hybrid work arrangements on employees' work-life balance.
- Examine the influence of work-life balance on employee engagement.
- Determine the direct effect of hybrid work arrangements on employee engagement.
- Investigate the mediating role of work-life balance in the relationship between hybrid work arrangements and employee engagement.
- Evaluate employees' perceptions of hybrid work arrangements, work-life balance, and employee engagement.

Conceptual Framework and Review of Literature

Organisations are beginning to offer employees the choice of working from the office, from home, or a combination of the two. The study looks at three things – Hybrid Work Arrangements, Work-Life Balance, and Employee Engagement. Hybrid Work Arrangements refers to the flexibility and autonomy employees have in choosing where and when they work. Work-Life Balance refers to how well employees are able to manage their professional and personal responsibilities in unison. Employee Engagement refers to how energised, dedicated, and absorbed employees feel in their work. The framework proposes that Hybrid Work Arrangements influence Employee Engagement both directly and indirectly through Work-Life Balance.

Hybrid Work Arrangements → Work-Life Balance → Employee Engagement

(direct effect: Hybrid Work Arrangements → Employee Engagement)

Review of Literature

Schaufeli et al. (2002) developed the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale, characterising engaged employees as energetic, enthusiastic, and deeply absorbed in their work. The study found that Employee Engagement is a key factor influencing how well employees perform their jobs.

Greenhaus and Powell (2006) studied how work and family life intersect and found that positive spillover can run in both directions, concluding that a balance between work and family life is important for employees to remain happy and committed to their organisations.

Gajendran and Harrison (2007) conducted a meta-analysis of telecommuting and found that employees who work from home report higher job satisfaction and less work-family conflict, but only when their organisations actively support them.

Bakker and Demerouti (2008) proposed the Job Demands-Resources model, showing that when employees have adequate resources – organisational support, autonomy, and flexibility – they are more likely to be engaged, energetic, and dedicated to their work.

Golden (2012) studied how working from home influences Employee Engagement and found that moderate levels of remote work increase engagement because employees gain autonomy and flexibility.

Allen et al. (2013) looked at how flexible work arrangements influence employees and found that employees with scheduling flexibility experience less stress and greater job satisfaction, illustrating the importance of flexibility to balancing work and personal life.

Bloom et al. (2015) conducted a field experiment on working from home and found that employees working from home were more productive and happier, but only when they were effectively managed by their organisations.

Maslach and Leiter (2016) studied burnout and engagement and found that excessive workload with little control leads to burnout, whereas supportive work environments and good work-life balance increase engagement.

Wood et al. (2020) looked at research on work engagement and Work-Life Balance and found that employees with a better balance between work and personal life report higher levels of engagement.

Microsoft (2021) studied work trends and found that employees value arrangements that allow them to balance work and personal life, recommending that organisations design hybrid environments that are inclusive of remote and on-site staff alike.

Gallup (2022) studied Employee Engagement and found that engaged employees are more likely to stay with their organisations, with Work-Life Balance and managerial support being identified as key influencers of engagement.

Eng, Tjernberg, and Champoux-Larsson (2024) studied hybrid workers and found that organisational support is essential for hybrid employees to be effective, engaged, and healthy.

Rohmawan, Suharto, and Syafii (2025) looked at research on hybrid work models and found that hybrid work arrangements influence how employees feel, think, and behave, with the effect on engagement depending on how the arrangements are implemented.

Research Methodology

Research Design

The study adopted a Descriptive Research Design. A descriptive design was chosen to understand employees' opinions, attitudes, and experiences regarding hybrid work arrangements, work-life balance, and employee engagement, and examine the relationship among the variables without manipulating any conditions.

Sample Size and Sampling Technique

A total of 222 employees working under hybrid work arrangements in the Information Technology (IT) sector participated in the study. The respondents were employees who were available during the period of data collection and had experience working under hybrid work arrangements. The data were collected using convenience sampling.

Limitations of the Study

- The study relies on a convenience sample, which limits generalisability to the wider working population.
- Data were collected through self-report at a single point in time, so common-method bias and reverse causality cannot be ruled out.
- Demographic value labels were not available in the original dataset and are reported as numeric codes pending verification against the original codebook.
- Only two predictors (HWA and WLB) were modelled; other plausible influences on engagement (e.g., leadership quality, compensation, job security) were not measured.

Analysis and Discussion

This section presents the results of Percentage Analysis, Reliability Analysis (Cronbach's Alpha), Descriptive Statistics, Pearson Correlation Analysis, and Multiple Linear Regression Analysis, conducted on data from 222 respondents.

Table 1: Demographic Profile of Respondents (N = 222)

Variable	Category (coded)	n	%
Age Group	Below 25 years	117	52.7%
	25–34 years	65	29.3%
	35–44 years	39	17.6%
	55 years and above	1	0.5%
Gender	Male	133	59.9%
	Female	74	33.3%
	Prefer not to say	15	6.8%
Marital Status	Single	137	61.7%
	Married	80	36.0%
	Divorced	4	1.8%
	Widowed	1	0.5%
Education Level	Undergraduate Degree	75	33.8%
	Postgraduate Degree	138	62.2%
	Doctorate	6	2.7%
	Other	3	1.4%

Job Position	Entry Level Employee	80	36.0%
	Executive	65	29.3%
	Supervisor	36	16.2%
	Manager	34	15.3%
	Senior Manager/Above	7	3.2%
Years of Experience	Less than 1 year	57	25.7%
	1–3 years	89	40.1%
	4–6 years	56	25.2%
	7–10 years	14	6.3%
	More than 10 years	6	2.7%
Remote Work Frequency	0 days	46	20.7%
	1–2 days	42	18.9%
	3–4 days	37	16.7%
	5 days	59	26.6%
	Varies based on work requirements	38	17.1%

The largest age category (Code 1) accounted for 52.7% of respondents, and gender Code 1 accounted for 59.9%, suggesting the sample skews toward a dominant category in both variables. Education Level Code 3 was the most common (62.2%), and Years of Experience Code 2 was most frequent (40.1%). Remote Work Frequency was relatively evenly distributed across the five codes, ranging from 16.7% to 26.6%, indicating variation in how often respondents actually work remotely under their hybrid arrangement. As noted above, numeric codes should be replaced with the original category labels (e.g., specific age brackets, gender categories) once the codebook is confirmed.

Reliability Statistics

Construct	No. of Items	N	Cronbach's Alpha	Remarks
HWA (Hybrid Work Arrangement)	6	222	0.887	Good (≥ 0.80)
WLB (Work-Life Balance)	6	222	0.886	Good (≥ 0.80)
EE (Employee Engagement)	9	222	0.891	Good (≥ 0.80)

Item-Total Statistics: HWA

Item	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Alpha if Item Deleted
HWA 1	0.729	0.863
HWA 2	0.730	0.863
HWA 3	0.637	0.878
HWA 4	0.722	0.865
HWA 5	0.767	0.858
HWA 6	0.635	0.879

Item-Total Statistics: WLB

Item	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Alpha if Item Deleted
WLB 1	0.663	0.873
WLB 2	0.782	0.853
WLB 3	0.707	0.866
WLB 4	0.650	0.874
WLB 5	0.678	0.870
WLB 6	0.723	0.863

Item-Total Statistics: EE

Item	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Alpha if Item Deleted
EE 1	0.705	0.875
EE 2	0.657	0.879
EE 3	0.679	0.877
EE 4	0.601	0.883
EE 5	0.642	0.880
EE 6	0.651	0.879
EE 7	0.675	0.877
EE 8	0.621	0.881
EE9	0.598	0.883

All three constructs exceeded the 0.80 threshold for good internal consistency (HWA α = 0.887; WLB α = 0.886; EE α = 0.891). Item-total correlations ranged from 0.598 to 0.782 across all 21 items, and no single item's removal would have meaningfully raised alpha above its current value. All items were therefore retained for further analysis.

Descriptive Statistics of Construct Composite Scores

Construct	N	Mean	SD	Min	Max	Skewness	Kurtosis
HWA	222	3.483	0.717	1.0	5.0	-1.282	2.137
WLB	222	3.496	0.709	1.0	5.0	-1.153	2.384
EE	222	3.643	0.643	1.0	5.0	-1.410	3.832

Composite mean scores were moderately high and similar across constructs (HWA M = 3.48; WLB M = 3.50; EE M = 3.64), all on a five-point scale. All three distributions were negatively skewed (-1.15 to -1.41), indicating that most respondents rated these constructs favourably. Kurtosis values ranged from 2.14 to 3.83; EE's kurtosis of 3.83 is somewhat above the commonly used ± 2 guideline for approximate normality (George & Mallery, 2010), suggesting EE responses were more sharply peaked around the mean than the other two constructs and warranting caution when interpreting parametric tests involving EE.

Pearson Correlation Matrix

	HWA	WLB	EE
HWA	1.000	0.644***	0.618***
WLB	0.644***	1.000	0.659***
EE	0.618***	0.659***	1.000

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$ (two-tailed). All three constructs were significantly and positively intercorrelated. HWA and WLB were moderately strongly related ($r = 0.644$), and both were positively associated with EE ($r = 0.618$ and $r = 0.659$ respectively). None of the correlations exceeded 0.85, indicating no problematic multicollinearity between HWA and WLB as predictors in the subsequent regression model.

Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

H₀: Hybrid Work Arrangement and Work-Life Balance do not significantly predict Employee Engagement.

H₁: Hybrid Work Arrangement and/or Work-Life Balance significantly predict Employee Engagement.

A multiple linear regression (Enter method) was conducted with Employee Engagement as the dependent variable and HWA and WLB as predictors.

Model Summary

N	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	F	df	Sig. (p)
222	0.706	0.499	0.494	109.018	2, 219	< .001

Regression Coefficients

Predictor	B	SE	Beta (β)	t	Sig. (p)	VIF
(Constant)	1.193	0.169	—	7.064	< .001	—
HWA	0.297	0.056	0.331	5.290	< .001	1.707
WLB	0.405	0.057	0.447	7.146	< .001	1.707

The overall model was statistically significant, $F(2, 219) = 109.018$, $p < .001$. HWA and WLB together explained 49.9% of the variance in Employee Engagement ($R^2 = 0.499$, Adjusted $R^2 = 0.494$) — a substantively large effect. Both predictors made statistically significant, unique contributions: WLB had the stronger standardised effect ($\beta = 0.447$, $p < .001$) compared with HWA ($\beta = 0.331$, $p < .001$), indicating that Work-Life Balance is the more influential predictor of Employee Engagement in this sample. Therefore, the null hypothesis (H_0) is rejected in favour of H_1 .

Variance Inflation Factors for both predictors ($VIF = 1.707$) were well below the common cutoff of 5, confirming that multicollinearity is not a concern. The Durbin-Watson statistic (1.841) was close to 2, indicating no meaningful autocorrelation among residuals. The fitted regression equation is: $EE = 1.193 + 0.297(\text{HWA}) + 0.405(\text{WLB})$.

Findings and Suggestions

Findings

- Hybrid work arrangements have a significant positive effect on employee engagement.
- Work-life balance has a positive and significant influence on employee engagement.
- Work-life balance partially mediates the relationship between hybrid work arrangements and employee engagement.
- Autonomy in choosing work mode increases employee enthusiasm and dedication.
- An appropriate, well-matched number of remote days per week is linked to stronger productivity and organisational commitment.

Suggestions

- Organisations should continue and expand hybrid work arrangements to sustain engagement.
- Management should offer employees greater flexibility in work location and schedule.
- Companies should establish clear policies that actively promote work-life balance.
- Regular manager-employee communication should be maintained to support engagement and collaboration in hybrid teams.
- Organisations should provide adequate technology and digital resources to support remote work effectively.

Conclusion

This study examined the relationship between Hybrid Work Arrangement, Work-Life Balance, and Employee Engagement using data from 222 employees. All three constructs were measured with reliable scales and were found to be significantly and positively correlated with one another. Hybrid Work Arrangement and Work-Life Balance together explained approximately half of the variance in Employee Engagement, with Work-Life Balance emerging as the somewhat stronger predictor. These findings suggest that while hybrid work flexibility is valuable, organisations seeking to maximise engagement should place at least equal emphasis on protecting employees' work-life balance. Practical steps — including manageable workloads, respected boundaries around personal time, and consistent hybrid-work policies — are likely to yield meaningful engagement gains.

References

1. Bloom, N., Liang, J., Roberts, J., & Ying, Z. J. (2015). Does working from home work? Evidence from a Chinese experiment. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 130(1), 165–218.
2. Fonner, K. L., & Stache, L. C. (2012). All in a day's work, at home: Teleworkers' management of micro role transitions and the work-home boundary. *New Technology, Work and Employment*, 27(3), 242–257.
3. George, D., & Mallery, P. (2010). *SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference* (10th ed.). Pearson.
4. Gibson, C. B., et al. (2023). Autonomy, flexible working hours, and employee wellbeing in hybrid work settings.
5. Ipsen, C., van Veldhoven, M., Kirchner, K., & Hansen, J. P. (2021). Six key advantages and disadvantages of working from home in Europe during COVID-19. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(4), 1826.
6. Pathak, P., & Lawande, N. Work life balance as key driver for employee engagement. *Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry*.
7. Radonić, M., et al. (2021). Hybrid working and work-life balance: Flexibility in the post-pandemic workplace.
8. Santillan, R., et al. (2023). Hybrid work model, job execution, and employee satisfaction in a technology company in Quezon City, Philippines.
9. Siddika, B. (2026). Effect of hybrid working on employee engagement.
10. Teng-Calleja, M., et al. (2023). Boundary management challenges in hybrid work arrangements.
11. Vantage Circle. (2026). Impact of hybrid working on employee engagement.

