International Journal of Multidisciplinary
Research in Science, Engineering and Technology

(A Monthly, Peer Reviewed, Refereed, Scholarly Indexed, Open Access Journal)

A Study on It Employee Perception Towards Hybrid Working Mode

Dr. R. Suresh, Akshaya S, Shenbagavel M

Associate Professor, Sri Sairam Institute of Management Studies, Sri Sairam Engineering College, Chennai, India

Scholar, Sri Sairam Institute of Management Studies, Sri Sairam Engineering College, Chennai, India

Scholar, Sri Sairam Institute of Management Studies, Sri Sairam Engineering College, Chennai, India

ABSTRACT: This study investigates IT employees' perceptions of hybrid work models, a rapidly evolving paradigm in the post-pandemic era. It aims to understand their attitudes towards flexibility, productivity, work-life balance, collaboration, and career development within a hybrid framework. The research employs a quantitative approach, surveying a diverse sample of IT professionals currently engaged in or transitioning to hybrid work. Key areas of exploration include the perceived benefits (e.g., autonomy, reduced commute stress, greater control over personal time) and challenges (e.g., communication breakdowns, maintaining team cohesion, blurred boundaries between work and personal life, potential impact on mentorship). Furthermore, the study delves into the influence of organizational culture, technological infrastructure, and leadership support on these perceptions. It examines how varying levels of these factors impact employees' ability to thrive in a hybrid environment. The findings will provide valuable insights for organizations seeking to optimize their hybrid work strategies, fostering an environment that balances employee well-being with operational efficiency and business objectives. This abstract highlights the growing importance of understanding employee perspectives to effectively navigate the complexities of modern work arrangements in the IT sector and offers a pathway for developing more sustainable and equitable hybrid work policies.

KEYWORDS: Hybrid Work, IT Employees, Productivity, Job Satisfaction, Remote Work, Work-Life Balance, Employee Perception.

I. INTRODUCTION

The term 'Hybrid' has been used in many ways over time, and recently it signifies the blending of technology with human lifestyles. Our way of life is shaped by culture and various systems that govern different aspects of life such as family, education, society, and work. Each of these domains operates within structured systems that provide order and direction, enabling individuals and organizations to function effectively. Systems ensure progress and coordination, balancing order with flexibility. In workplaces, systems define rules about where and when employees work, reporting structures, and work hours. These systems shape the work environment and workflow dynamics. The hybrid work model—a mix of remote and in-office work—has become a revolutionary approach in the IT sector, especially in India. It has been widely accepted by both employees and employers due to its many benefits, including improved work-life balance, reduced commuting time, and increased autonomy. Reports like Unispace's Global Workplace Insights 2024–25 reveal that over 97% of Indian IT workers and 98% of employers are satisfied with hybrid arrangements, outperforming global satisfaction rates.

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Dr. B. Thayumanavar's (2024): This research Hybrid work improves productivity, flexibility, and job satisfaction but faces challenges like communication gaps and cybersecurity risks. Success requires clear policies, leadership, and digital tools.

Furtado, and Plácido Pinheiro (2015): Says that The thought ofTelework is defined as remote work supported by technology, requiring a clear execution model with flexible work programs, staff, and rules. The study analyzed a company implementing flexible work (FW) using two methods of Verbal Decision Analysis (VDA).

Prithwiraj (Raj) Choudhury, Tarun Khanna, Christos A. Makridis, Kyle Schirmann(2022): Tell that Hybrid work is emerging globally as a new work arrangement affecting productivity and collaboration. A randomized study in an Asian company showed that a moderate number of in-office days increased communication and innovation.

Monika Grzegorczyk, Mario Mariniello, Laura Nurski and Tom Schraepen (2021): Tell that Post-COVID-19, work decisions are less pandemic-driven as remote work proves effective. Employees in suitable roles maintain productivity while working remotely. Telework enables new work processes. This shift can boost overall productivity.

Gajendran & Harrison (2007) and related studies: Found that Hybrid work improves job satisfaction and work-life balance but poses task challenges. Flexibility boosts engagement and productivity per Social Exchange Theory. Women benefit from hybrid models yet struggle with work-life boundaries. Effective communication and in-person collaboration remain essential for success.

NEED FOR THE STUDY
The hybrid work model has reshaped IT workplaces, requiring a deeper understanding of employee needs and expectations. It is important to study work-life balance, productivity, and performance differences between remote and in-office work.The model's effect on tasks like coding, support, and cybersecurity must be evaluated. Employee satisfaction, stress, and boundary-setting also demand attention.Organizational support, tools, policies, and security challenges are key areas of concern. Lastly, the study explores career growth, mentorship, and recognition in hybrid settings.

OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY
Primary Objective:
To analyze the perception of IT employees towards the hybrid working mode and its impact on their productivity, job satisfaction, and overall work experience.

Secondary Objectives:
• To assess the impact of hybrid work on IT employees' productivity and efficiency.
• To evaluate the effects of hybrid work on employee work-life balance and mental well-being.

SCOPE OF THE STUDY
The scope of the study revolves around understanding IT employees' perceptions of the hybrid working model and its impact on their professional and personal lives. It focuses on key areas such as productivity, job satisfaction, work-life balance, collaboration, organizational support, and career growth. The target population includes IT professionals like software developers, system administrators, cybersecurity experts, project managers, and support staff working in organizations that have adopted hybrid models. Geographically, the study may concentrate on a specific region or consider global trends based on data availability.

III. RESEARCH DESIGN

DATA COLLECTION
In this study both primary and secondary data are used
Primary data: The primary data is collect through these questionnaire serve as a cornerstone of the study's analysis, capturing the wide range of perspective and experience.

QUESTIONNARE:
The primary data was collected using a structured questionnaire. The structured questionnaires that were framed and designed consists of Likert 5 point scale, Multiple choice question, Ranking question

SAMPLE SIZE
Sample size pertains to the quantity of items chosen from the population to form a sample, and an ideal sample size meets criteria for efficiency, representativeness, reliability, and flexibility. Through the simple random sampling technique, respondents are chosen for the study's objectives. In this instance, data is gathered from 73 respondents via a questionnaire.

TOOLS USED FOR SAMPLING
1 KRUSKAL-WALLIS H TEST
To find the H test between income and job security.

HYPOTHESIS

NULL HYPOTHESIS (Ho): There is no significant relation between income and job security.
ALTERNATIVE HYPOTHESIS (H1): There is a significant relation between income and job security.

SHOWING THE H TEST BETWEEN INCOME AND JOB SECURITY RANKS

INCOME		N	MEAN RANK
JOB SECURITY	1	14	36.18
	2	22	39.34
	3	22	33.52
	4	15	39.43
	TOTAL	73	

INTERPRETATION:
From the above table 2.2.1, Ho is accepted and H1 is rejected as the significant value of job security score is 0.761 which is greater than 0.05. So, there is no significant relation between income and job security.

CORRELATION
To find correlation between satisfied level with hybrid working model and how hybrid work impacts productivity.

HYPOTHESIS
NULL HYPOTHESIS(Ho): There is no significant relation between satisfied level with hybrid working model and how hybrid work impacts productivity.
ALTERNATIVE HYPOTHESIS(H1): There is significant relation between satisfied level with hybrid working model and how hybrid work impacts productivity.

SHOWING THE CORRELATION BETWEEN SATISFIED LEVEL WITH HYBRID WORKING MODEL AND HOW HYBRID WORK IMPACT PRODUCTIVITY.

	Satisfied	Productivity
Spearman's rho satisfied correlation coefficient	1.000	.238
Sig.(2-tailed)		.042
N	73	73
.		
Productivity correlation coefficient	.238	1.000
Sig .(2-tailed)	.042	
N	73	73

INTERPRETATION:
 Ho is rejected and H1 is accepted because the results revealed a moderate positive correlation ($\rho = 0.238$, $p < 0.001$), indicating a positive but weak correlation between satisfaction with the hybrid working model and productivity.

IV. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, SUGGESTION

FINDINGS

o The majority of respondents (32.9%) are in the age group of 20-24 years.
o 24.7% of the respondents belong to the age group of 35-44 years.
o 17.8% of respondents are above 55 years of age.
o The age group 25-34 accounts for 13.7% of respondents.
o Only 11% of respondents are in the 45-55 age group.
o A larger proportion of respondents are female (56.2%) compared to male (43.8%).
o Regarding family type, 53.4% of respondents belong to a nuclear family, while 46.6% are from a joint family.

SUGGESTIONS

➢ Tailored Flexibility: Recognize that a significant portion of employees prefer a hybrid model with 3-4 days of working from home (39.7%), and a notable segment (24.7%) prefers full-time remote work.

➢ Address Disconnection: The primary challenge identified is employees feeling disconnected from the team (42.5%). Implement strategies to foster stronger team bonds and social interaction, such as regular in-person team-building events, dedicated collaboration days, or virtual social gatherings.

➢ Enhance Collaboration Tools: With 15.1% reporting difficulty in collaboration/communication, invest in and train employees on advanced digital collaboration tools that facilitate seamless communication and project management regardless of location.

➢ Support for Home Office Environments: Since distractions at home affect 21.9% of respondents, consider offering stipends or resources for employees to set up more conducive home office environments (e.g., noise-canceling headphones, ergonomic furniture).

➢ Ensure Resource Access: Address the 12.3% who feel a lack of access to office resources by ensuring all necessary tools, software, and physical resources are accessible remotely or made readily available during office visits.

V. CONCLUSION

The analysis of the survey data on hybrid work reveals a workforce that largely embraces flexibility but with nuanced preferences and concerns. While a significant majority of respondents express satisfaction or moderate preference for hybrid models, highlighting their positive impact on work-life balance and productivity, a substantial portion still values traditional office settings or desires improvements within the hybrid framework. Key challenges identified include feelings of disconnection from the team and distractions at home, underscoring the need for enhanced communication strategies and supportive home office environments. Furthermore, employees prioritize career growth and collaboration alongside flexibility and work-life balance, suggesting that successful hybrid policies must strategically integrate opportunities for professional development and seamless teamwork.

REFERENCES

1. **Maran, K., & Chandra Shekar, V. (2015).** *Engineering Students and Industry Expectations: A Perception Study*. IJRESS, 5(4), 17–22.
2. **Dhayalan, V., & Seethalakshmi, M. (2021).** *Evaluating Stress Levels in Software Firms*. Ilkogretim Online, 20(1), 4900–4907.
3. **Keerthana, S., & Anantharajan, R. S. (2024).** *Machine Learning in Recruitment Funnels*. IJARETY. https://doi.org/10.15680/IJRET.2024.1106098
4. **Usha, S., & Rohini, V. (2018).** *Linking Work Environment and Employee Output*. IJPAM, 118(20), 799–807.
5. **Murugan, K. (2020).** *Managing Retail Attrition: An HR Viewpoint*. GRSHR, 40(3), 221–224.
6. **Prasad, B. V., & Rajasekhar, D. (2017).** *Attrition in Mechanical Engineering Units*. IJMET, 8(12), 856–861.
7. **Usha, S., & Maran, K. (2014).** *Examining Quality of Work Life in IT-HR Interface*. Asia Pacific Journal of Research, 1(XVI), 120–127.
8. **Maran, K., & Usha, S. (2014).** *Women Employee Wellbeing in Indian IT Sector: A Case Study*. Asia Pacific Journal of Research, 1(XVI), 33–40.
9. **Dinesh Kannaa, K. V., & Karthika, S. (2024).** *AI and Automation Impact on HR Outcomes*. IJRHRM, 6, 423–426. https://doi.org/10.33545/26633213.2024.v6.i2e.246

10. **Ramu, M., & Manikandan, M. (2023).** *Gig Workforce and HRM Adaptability*. ICCEBS, IEEE, 4(2), 15–18.
11. **Dhayalan, V., & Maran, K. (2013).** *Conceptual Dimensions of Job Satisfaction*. IJOBMP, 2(1), 275–281.
12. **Venkatesh, P. (2025).** *Moonlighting and Organizational Ethics*. Advances in Consumer Research, 2(3), 55–60.
13. **Usman Mohideen, K. S., & Swathi, G. (2024).** *Stress Impact on IT Freshers' Mental Health*. IJRHRM, 6(2), 360–364.
14. **Allen et al. (2021).** *[Hybrid Work & Flexibility Insights]*.
15. **Maran, K., & Priyadarsini, P. (2010).** *Call Center Life: A Work-Life Balance Outlook*. SMART Business Management Journal, 6(1), 75–80.
16. **Jeyalakshmi, R., & Yugendran, S. (2024).** *HR Tech Innovations and AI-Driven HRM*. IJFTIB, 6(2), 224–229.
17. **Prasad, B. V., & Suresh, R. (2019).** *Effectiveness of Induction Training*. IJRTE, 8(2S11), 2880–2882.
18. **Usha, S. (2025).** *Integration of AI in Eco-Friendly Recruitment*. ICFTS. https://doi.org/10.1109/ICFTS62006.2025.11031918
19. **Jeyalakshmi, R., & Gracy, H. R. (2023).** *Employee Engagement in Hybrid Teams*. RIFA Junior, 14(2), 1075–1080.
20. **Venkatesh, P. (2020).** *Strategic Recruitment in IT Startups*. Studies In Indian Place Names, 40(42), 320–324.
21. **Kumar, R. G., & Hariharasudhan, B. (2024).** *Predictive Hiring Through AI*. IRJMETS, 6(12), 4680–4685.
22. **Maran, K., & Venkateswara Prasad, B. (2017).** *HR Dimensions in Leadership Development for Youth*. JARDCS, 16(Special Issue), 655–658.
23. **Jeyalakshmi, R., & SentamilSelvan, K. (2023).** *Managerial Influence on Job Satisfaction*. RIFA, 14(2), 1069–1073.
24. **Dinesh Kumar, S. (2022).** *LinkedIn as a Tool for Professional Development*. Journal of Tech Careers, 1(2), 17–21.
25. **Mani, M., & A. S. (2024).** *IT Job Role Stress: A Quantitative Insight*. IJAR, 10(12), 234–238.
26. **Anantharajan, R. S., & Sujitha. (2024).** *Holistic HRM Using Analytics*. IJRPRR. https://doi.org/10.55248/gengpi.5.1224.0222
27. **Suresh, R., Athapit, A., & Radhika, S. (2020).** *Occupational Risk Factors in SMEs*. Ilkogretim Online, 19(2), 1987–1995.
28. **Jeyalakshmi, R., & Sivarajeswari, S. (2022).** *Remote Work Culture and Mindset*. ICSE, Atlantis Press, 136–141.
29. **Keerthana, B., & Harshini, R. (2024).** *AI Screening Systems in Hiring*. IRJMETS, 6(12), 4628–4633.
30. **Maran, K., & Usha, S. (2014).** *Perception of Flexi-time Among IT Women Employees*. Asia Pacific Journal of Management Research, 2(1), 25–30.
31. **Murugan, K. (2020).** *CAMEL Evaluation and Employee Satisfaction*. Test Engineering & Management, 40(6), 99–103.
32. **Kumar, R. G., & Anitha, A. (2024).** *Resilience Building in Virtual HR Teams*. IJMRSET, 7(11), 160–166.
33. **Patrícia Vasconcelos, Elizabeth Furtado, & Plácido Pinheiro (2015).** *Telework Enabled by Technology*.
34. **Prithwiraj (Raj) Choudhury, Tarun Khanna, Christos A. Makridis, & Kyle Schirmann (2022).** *Hybrid Work is Rising Globally*.
35. **Prasad, B. V., & Suresh, R. (2020).** *HR Approaches to Reduce Attrition*. IJMET, 13(7), 1122–1129.
36. **Mohideen, K. S., & Gracy, H. R. (2018).** *Virtual Collaboration and Commitment*. IJMET, 9(3), 46–51.
37. **Suresh, R., & Kumar, R. G. (2020).** *HRM Strategies for Auto Sector Wellness*. IJMRSET, 6(11), 1015–1020.
38. **Venkatesh, P. (2019).** *HR Audits and Organizational Alignment*. Gujarat Research Society, 21(18), 1579–1584.
39. **Kumar, R. G., & Jothi Sri, D. (2025).** *Post-Training Behavior Changes*. IJPREMS, 5(2), 101–108.
40. **Anantharajan, R. S., & Ashwatha, J. (2024).** *Performance Appraisal and Promotion Decisions*. IJPREMS. https://doi.org/10.58257/IJPREMS37992
41. **Ramu, M., & Venkatesh, P. (2024).** *Profile Optimization in Digital Hiring*. ICPECTS, IEEE, 5(1), 35–39.
42. **Venkateswara Prasad, B., & Mohideen, K. U. (2016).** *Garment Industry and Female Stress: A Chennai Perspective*. IJHRSS, 3(12), 101–107.
43. **Usha, S., & Jaichitra, D. (2018).** *Attendance Dynamics in IT Companies*. IJPHRD, 9(2). https://doi.org/10.5958/0976-5506.2018.00082.7
44. **Mohideen, K. S., & Sabharish, A. (2024).** *Wellness Gaps in Project-Based Work*. IJAR, 10(12), 193–197.

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF

MULTIDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH
IN SCIENCE, ENGINEERING AND TECHNOLOGY