

Remote Work, Hybrid Work Models, and Employee Well-being: A Review of Human Resource Management Practices

Dr. Ritu Chandna

Associate Professor in Commerce

Sant Mohan Singh Khalsa Labana Girls College, Barara (Ambala)

Abstract

Remote and hybrid work arrangements have moved from a peripheral, occasionally offered employment benefit to a mainstream feature of organisational life, a shift accelerated dramatically by the COVID-19 pandemic and sustained, in modified form, well beyond it. This paper reviews the academic literature examining remote work, hybrid work models, and employee well-being, with particular attention to the human resource management practices that shape how these arrangements are experienced by employees. The review traces the evolution of remote work research from its pre-pandemic origins, through the pandemic-era surge in mandatory remote working, to the more deliberate and structured hybrid work models that have since emerged. The review is organised around four themes: pre-pandemic and early evidence on remote work and well-being, pandemic-era evidence on well-being, productivity, and stress, hybrid work models and associated human resource management practices, and the role of leadership and organisational support in shaping the well-being-productivity relationship. The findings indicate that remote and hybrid work arrangements are associated with a complex, double-edged pattern of well-being outcomes: greater autonomy, flexibility, and reduced commuting burden on one hand, alongside risks of social isolation, blurred work-life boundaries, and technology-related strain on the other, with the balance between these outcomes substantially shaped by organisational support, leadership behaviour, and the specific human resource management practices an organisation adopts. A structured literature-review methodology underpins the analysis. The paper concludes by synthesising practical implications for human resource management and by outlining directions for future research.

Keywords: remote work, hybrid work, employee well-being, human resource management, telecommuting, work-life balance

1. Introduction

1.1 Background of the Study

Remote work, in various forms, has existed as an organisational practice for several decades, but it remained a comparatively marginal arrangement, typically offered selectively to specific roles or employees, until the COVID-19 pandemic forced a sudden, near-universal shift to remote working across large segments of the global workforce in 2020. This abrupt transition compressed what might otherwise have been a gradual, decade-long evolution in workplace practice into a matter of weeks, generating an unprecedented volume of academic and practitioner research examining how employees experienced this shift, and with what consequences for their well-being, productivity, and engagement. As pandemic-related restrictions eased, many organisations did not simply revert to fully on-site work but instead adopted hybrid work models combining remote and in-office work in varying proportions, reflecting both employee preferences revealed during the pandemic and organisations' own emerging views on the productivity and cultural

implications of different work arrangements. This review synthesises the resulting body of research, with particular attention to its implications for human resource management practice.

1.2 Remote Work and Hybrid Work Models: Concept and Evolution

Remote work, or telework, refers to work arrangements in which employees perform their job duties away from a traditional, employer-provided office location, typically from home, using digital communication and collaboration technologies to remain connected to colleagues and organisational systems. Hybrid work models represent a more recent evolution of this concept, combining remote and on-site work within a single, typically employer-defined or employee-negotiated schedule, rather than treating remote work and office-based work as mutually exclusive alternatives. Prior to the pandemic, remote work research tended to focus on individual-level psychological and practical factors shaping remote workers' effectiveness and well-being, often examining a relatively self-selected population of employees who had actively chosen or negotiated remote arrangements. The pandemic fundamentally altered this research context by making remote work compulsory, rather than voluntary, for a much broader and more heterogeneous population of employees, many of whom had neither chosen nor been specifically prepared for remote working, a distinction that later hybrid work research has had to carefully account for when interpreting findings generated under pandemic conditions.

1.3 Employee Well-being in Changing Work Arrangements

Employee well-being, as examined in this literature, is generally understood as a multidimensional construct encompassing psychological well-being, such as stress, anxiety, and life satisfaction, alongside more work-specific dimensions such as job satisfaction, work engagement, and work-life balance. Remote and hybrid work arrangements are theorised to influence well-being through several, sometimes opposing, mechanisms: increased autonomy and reduced commuting time are generally associated with improved well-being, while social isolation, blurred boundaries between work and personal life, and increased reliance on digital communication technologies are associated with elevated stress, burnout, and a phenomenon increasingly described in the literature as digital or technology-related fatigue. The relative balance of these positive and negative mechanisms appears to depend substantially on factors outside the individual employee's direct control, including the quality of organisational communication, the adequacy of technological infrastructure, and the extent to which organisations have adapted their human resource management practices to genuinely support, rather than merely permit, remote and hybrid working.

1.4 Rationale and Objectives of the Review

The rapid, pandemic-driven expansion of remote and hybrid work research has produced a large and still-growing body of literature, but one that spans several distinct phases — pre-pandemic voluntary remote work, pandemic-era mandatory remote work, and post-pandemic hybrid arrangements — each generating findings that are not always directly comparable to one another. This makes a structured synthesis of the existing evidence particularly valuable, both to clarify what is reasonably well established across these different phases and to identify where human resource management practice most urgently needs further evidence-based guidance. Remote work, hybrid work models, and employee well-being. The specific objectives of this review are: (a) to trace the evolution of remote and hybrid work research from its pre-pandemic origins through the pandemic and into the emerging hybrid work era; (b) to synthesise evidence on the well-being consequences of these arrangements, including both positive and negative mechanisms; (c) to examine the specific human resource management practices associated with more positive well-being outcomes in hybrid work contexts; and (d) to assess the role of leadership

and organisational support in shaping the relationship between remote or hybrid work and employee well-being.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Remote Work and Employee Well-being: Pre-Pandemic and Early Evidence

Research conducted prior to the COVID-19 pandemic generally examined remote work as a voluntary or selectively offered arrangement, providing an important, if now somewhat dated, baseline against which pandemic-era findings can be compared. Grant, Wallace, and Spurgeon (2013) examined the psychological factors affecting remote e-workers' job effectiveness, well-being, and work-life balance, finding that autonomy and effective self-management were significant positive predictors of remote worker well-being, while professional isolation emerged as a significant risk factor, particularly among employees who worked remotely on a full-time rather than partial basis. Bloom, Liang, Roberts, and Ying (2015), in a widely cited randomised experiment conducted within a Chinese firm, found that employees who worked from home experienced a significant increase in productivity alongside improved job satisfaction and reduced attrition, though the study also noted that a substantial proportion of employees, when later given the choice, preferred to return to the office at least part of the time, citing concerns about professional isolation and career visibility. Allen, Golden, and Shockley (2015) conducted a comprehensive review of telecommuting research and concluded that the relationship between telecommuting and various well-being and performance outcomes was generally positive but highly dependent on moderating factors, including the extent of telecommuting, job characteristics, and individual differences in self-regulation and social needs, cautioning against treating telecommuting's effects as uniform across employees or contexts. Gajendran, Harrison, and Delaney-Klinger (2015) similarly examined telecommuting's effects on employee performance and found that telecommuting could enhance perceived autonomy and access to valued organisational resources, though excessive telecommuting intensity risked weakening employees' relationships with supervisors and colleagues, suggesting a curvilinear rather than simply linear relationship between the extent of remote work and its well-being and performance consequences. Tavares (2017) reviewed the health effects of telework specifically and found generally positive associations with physical and psychological health outcomes, while similarly cautioning that social isolation and the blurring of work-home boundaries represented consistent risk factors requiring active management. Table 1 summarises key findings from this stream of the literature.

Table 1: Selected Pre-Pandemic and Early Studies on Remote Work and Employee Well-being

Author(s) / Year	Focus	Key Findings
Grant, Wallace, & Spurgeon (2013)	Psychological factors in remote e-work	Autonomy and self-management supported well-being; professional isolation was a key risk.
Bloom, Liang, Roberts, & Ying (2015)	Randomised work-from-home experiment (China)	Productivity and job satisfaction improved, but many employees later preferred hybrid arrangements.

Author(s) / Year	Focus	Key Findings
Allen, Golden, & Shockley (2015)	Comprehensive review of telecommuting research	Effects generally positive but highly dependent on moderating job and individual factors.
Gajendran, Harrison, & Delaney-Klinger (2015)	Telecommuting and job performance	Moderate telecommuting beneficial; excessive intensity weakened workplace relationships.
Tavares (2017)	Health effects of telework	Generally positive health associations, tempered by isolation and boundary-blurring risks.

2.2 The COVID-19 Pandemic as an Accelerant: Evidence on Well-being, Productivity, and Stress

The COVID-19 pandemic transformed remote work research almost overnight, generating a large volume of studies examining the well-being consequences of sudden, mandatory, and often poorly prepared-for remote working. Kniffin et al. (2021), in a wide-ranging synthesis authored by a large group of organisational scholars, examined the workplace implications of COVID-19 broadly and identified employee well-being, virtual teamwork, and leadership adaptation as central themes requiring urgent further research, while cautioning that many pandemic-era findings reflected crisis conditions rather than the more considered, voluntary remote work arrangements studied previously. Carnevale and Hatak (2020) examined employee adjustment during the early pandemic period and found that human resource management practices emphasising clear communication, flexibility, and perceived organisational support significantly buffered the negative well-being consequences that might otherwise have resulted from the abrupt shift to remote work. Waizenegger, McKenna, Cai, and Bendz (2020) examined team collaboration under enforced work-from-home conditions and found that teams were often required to improvise new collaborative practices rapidly, with teams that successfully developed new digital collaboration norms reporting better-sustained performance and well-being than teams that simply attempted to replicate in-person practices through video calls. Galanti, Guidetti, Mazzei, Zappalà, and Toscano (2021) examined the impact of pandemic-era work-from-home arrangements on productivity, engagement, and stress, finding that self-leadership and social support from supervisors and colleagues were significant positive predictors of both productivity and well-being, while work overload and technology-related difficulties were significant negative predictors of well-being specifically. Molino et al. (2020) examined the well-being costs of increased technology use during pandemic remote working and found that higher levels of perceived technostress were associated with poorer well-being outcomes, though this relationship was weaker among employees who reported higher levels of digital competence, suggesting that technology-related well-being risks are at least partly manageable through adequate digital skills training. Table 2 summarises key findings from this stream of the literature.

Table 2: Selected Pandemic-Era Studies on Remote Work, Well-being, and Stress

Author(s) / Year	Focus	Key Findings
Kniffin et al. (2021)	Broad synthesis of COVID-19 workplace implications	Well-being, virtual teamwork, and leadership adaptation identified as central emerging themes.
Carnevale & Hatak (2020)	Employee adjustment during early pandemic	Supportive HRM practices (communication, flexibility) buffered negative well-being effects.
Waizenegger, McKenna, Cai, & Bendz (2020)	Team collaboration under enforced remote work	Teams developing new digital collaboration norms sustained performance and well-being better.
Galanti, Guidetti, Mazzei, Zappalà, & Toscano (2021)	Productivity, engagement, and stress during WFH	Self-leadership and social support positively predicted well-being; overload and tech issues harmed it.
Molino et al. (2020)	Technostress during pandemic remote work	Technostress harmed well-being; effect weaker among digitally competent employees.

2.3 Hybrid Work Models and Human Resource Management Practices

As pandemic restrictions eased, research attention shifted toward the more deliberate, structured hybrid work models many organisations subsequently adopted, along with the human resource management practices needed to support them effectively. Choudhury, Foroughi, and Larson (2021) examined the productivity effects of geographic work flexibility and found that employees given greater flexibility over where they worked demonstrated increased productivity, attributed partly to better alignment between individual work preferences and actual working conditions, though the study also noted that this flexibility required deliberate organisational support to translate into sustained productivity gains rather than simply increased autonomy in isolation. Wang, Liu, Qian, and Parker (2021) examined effective remote working during the pandemic from a work design perspective and identified specific job redesign practices, including clearer task structuring and deliberate boundary-setting between work and personal time, as significant contributors to more positive remote working outcomes, offering practical guidance directly relevant to the design of hybrid work arrangements. Carillo, Cachat-Rosset, Marsan, Saba, and Klarsfeld (2021) examined teleworkers' experiences specifically within the French context and found that organisational and managerial support, rather than employees' individual characteristics alone, was the most significant predictor of successful adjustment to enforced telework, reinforcing the broader pattern identified across this review that organisational practices, not simply the remote or hybrid nature of work itself, substantially determine well-being outcomes. Appel-Meulenbroek, Kemperman, van de Water, Weijs-Perrée, and Verhaegh (2022) examined employees' hybrid working preferences using a stated-choice methodology and found that employees generally preferred a mix of remote and office-based work rather than either extreme, with office attendance valued specifically for social interaction and collaborative tasks rather than

for individual, focused work, offering useful guidance for organisations designing hybrid work policies around specific task types rather than uniform attendance requirements. Arunprasad, Dey, Jebli, Manimuthu, and El Hathat (2022) proposed a conceptual model integrating technology orientation, leadership, human resource management practices, and organisational culture as jointly necessary conditions for effective remote and hybrid work outcomes, arguing that piecemeal adoption of only some of these elements is unlikely to produce sustained positive results. Table 3 summarises key findings from this stream of the literature.

Table 3: Selected Studies on Hybrid Work Models and HRM Practices

Author(s) / Year	Focus	Key Findings
Choudhury, Foroughi, & Larson (2021)	Geographic flexibility and productivity	Flexibility improved productivity, but required organisational support to be sustained.
Wang, Liu, Qian, & Parker (2021)	Work design for effective remote working	Task structuring and boundary-setting practices significantly improved remote work outcomes.
Carillo, Cachat-Rosset, Marsan, Saba, & Klarsfeld (2021)	Teleworker adjustment in France	Organisational and managerial support was the strongest predictor of successful adjustment.
Appel-Meulenbroek, Kemperman, van de Water, Weijs-Perrée, & Verhaegh (2022)	Hybrid working preferences (stated-choice study)	Employees preferred a mix of remote and office work, valuing office time for social interaction.
Arunprasad, Dey, Jebli, Manimuthu, & El Hathat (2022)	Integrated model of remote work success factors	Technology, leadership, HRM practices, and culture jointly necessary for effective outcomes.

2.4 Leadership, Organisational Support, and the Well-being-Productivity Relationship

A final theme running throughout this literature concerns the specific role of leadership behaviour and organisational support in shaping whether remote and hybrid work arrangements produce positive or negative well-being outcomes. Bartsch, Weber, Büttgen, and Huber (2021) examined leadership during the pandemic-induced shift to digital service delivery and found that leaders who provided clear communication, emotional support, and structured guidance were significantly more effective at maintaining employee well-being and service quality than leaders who simply replicated pre-pandemic management practices within a remote context. Yang, Kim, and Hong (2022) examined the role of technology readiness in shaping working-from-home outcomes and found that both individual technology readiness and organisational support for technology use significantly predicted well-being, with organisational support found to be particularly important for employees with lower individual technology readiness, suggesting that organisational investment in support and training can help offset individual-level digital skill gaps. Kowalski, Arul doss, Gurus murthy, and Parayitam (2022) examined the relationship between work-from-

home arrangements, productivity, and job satisfaction, finding that this relationship was mediated by work-life balance and moderated by the extent of organisational support provided, reinforcing the view that remote and hybrid work's well-being consequences are not fixed but are substantially shaped by deliberate organisational choices. Lund et al. (2021), in a widely cited industry analysis, projected that hybrid work arrangements were likely to persist as a long-term feature of post-pandemic work across many industries and occupations, while cautioning that the distribution of hybrid work opportunities was likely to remain uneven across occupational categories and income levels, raising broader questions of workplace equity that extend beyond well-being narrowly defined. Taken together, this body of research indicates that leadership behaviour and organisational support function as critical moderating variables throughout the relationship between remote or hybrid work arrangements and employee well-being, a conclusion with direct and significant implications for human resource management practice.

3. Research Methodology

This paper adopts a narrative literature-review methodology rather than a primary empirical survey, since its purpose is to synthesise and critically organise existing research on remote work, hybrid work models, and employee well-being. The review process followed several structured steps. First, a search was conducted across academic databases and repositories commonly used in organisational behaviour and human resource management research, including Google Scholar, PsycINFO, ScienceDirect, Emerald Insight, and SAGE Journals. Search terms included combinations of keywords such as 'remote work', 'telework', 'telecommuting', 'hybrid work', 'employee well-being', 'work-life balance', and 'human resource management practices'.

Second, inclusion criteria were applied to select relevant studies: publications had to be peer-reviewed journal articles or widely cited industry research reports; a period chosen to capture both pre-pandemic baseline research and the substantial body of pandemic- and post-pandemic-era research on hybrid work; and substantively concerned with the relationship between remote or hybrid work arrangements and employee well-being, productivity, or related human resource management practices. Studies focused primarily on unrelated aspects of digital technology or organisational behaviour, without a specific remote or hybrid work focus, were excluded, as were studies published outside the specified date range unless required for essential conceptual background.

Third, the shortlisted studies were read in full and organised thematically, reflecting the natural chronological and conceptual progression of this literature from pre-pandemic voluntary remote work research, through pandemic-era mandatory remote work research, to post-pandemic hybrid work and leadership-focused research. Four themes were identified inductively from repeated patterns across the literature: pre-pandemic and early evidence; pandemic-era evidence on well-being, productivity, and stress; hybrid work models and associated human resource management practices; and the role of leadership and organisational support. Findings from each study were extracted and tabulated to allow side-by-side comparison, as reflected in Tables 1 through 3. Finally, the synthesised findings were used to develop the conclusions and future research directions presented in the sections that follow. As with any narrative review, this approach does not claim the exhaustive coverage of a formal systematic review or meta-analysis, but rather aims to provide a coherent, thematically organised synthesis of a rapidly evolved and still-developing research area.

4. Conclusion

This review has synthesised recent academic literature on remote work, hybrid work models, and employee well-being, drawing on studies published between 2013 and 2022 that collectively span pre-pandemic voluntary remote work research, pandemic-era mandatory remote work research, and the emerging body of research on structured hybrid work models. Across the four themes examined, a consistent and important pattern emerges: remote and hybrid work arrangements are associated with a genuinely double-edged set of well-being consequences, offering benefits including greater autonomy, flexibility, and reduced commuting burden, while simultaneously carrying risks of social isolation, blurred work-life boundaries, and technology-related strain. Crucially, the balance between these positive and negative outcomes does not appear to be fixed or inherent to remote or hybrid work as such, but is substantially shaped by organisational choices — including the quality of leadership communication, the adequacy of technological support and training, and the specific human resource management practices an organisation adopts around task design, boundary-setting, and social connection.

These findings carry direct implications for human resource management practice. First, the consistent finding that organisational and managerial support outweighs individual employee characteristics as a predictor of successful adjustment to remote and hybrid work suggests that human resource management functions should invest deliberately in manager training and support structures, rather than assuming that remote and hybrid work arrangements will succeed simply because appropriate technology has been provided. Second, the finding that employees generally prefer a mix of remote and office-based work, valuing office time specifically for social interaction and collaborative tasks, suggests that hybrid work policies are likely to be more effective when designed around specific task types and team needs, rather than applied as a uniform attendance requirement across all roles and functions. Third, the identified risks of technology-related strain and blurred work-life boundaries suggest that human resource management practices should extend beyond simply enabling remote work technologically, to actively supporting employees' digital skills development and encouraging deliberate boundary-setting practices between work and personal time.

5. Future Work

Several directions for future research emerge from the gaps identified in this review. First, much of the pandemic-era research reviewed in this paper was conducted under crisis conditions that may not generalise well to more considered, voluntary hybrid work arrangements; future research should distinguish more carefully between findings generated under acute crisis conditions and those generated under more stable, deliberately designed hybrid work policies, to avoid over-generalising from pandemic-specific circumstances. Second, longitudinal research designs are needed to examine whether the well-being benefits and risks associated with hybrid work arrangements persist, strengthen, or diminish over extended periods, particularly as organisations continue to refine their hybrid work policies well beyond the initial post-pandemic transition period.

Third, the reviewed literature reveals a relative scarcity of research examining equity implications of hybrid work arrangements across different occupational categories, income levels, and caregiving responsibilities, an important gap given industry analyses suggesting that access to hybrid work opportunities remains unevenly distributed; future research explicitly designed to examine these equity dimensions would strengthen the field's ability to inform genuinely inclusive human resource management policy. Fourth, given the consistent finding that leadership behaviour significantly moderates well-being outcomes in remote and hybrid contexts, future research should

examine which specific leadership training interventions most effectively build the communication, emotional support, and structured guidance capabilities identified as important across the studies reviewed in this paper, moving from descriptive findings about what effective remote leadership looks like toward more prescriptive, tested guidance for developing it.

Finally, as hybrid work models continue to mature, future research should examine more directly how emerging workplace technologies, including collaborative virtual and augmented reality tools, are likely to reshape the well-being consequences of remote and hybrid work identified in this review, since much of the existing evidence base was generated using more conventional video-conferencing and messaging technologies that may not fully represent the digital collaboration environments organisations are likely to adopt going forward. Addressing these directions would strengthen the evidence base available to human resource management practitioners navigating what appears likely to remain a durable, rather than temporary, feature of contemporary organisational life.

References

1. Allen, T. D., Golden, T. D., & Shockley, K. M. (2015). How effective is telecommuting? Assessing the status of our scientific findings. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 16(2), 40–68.
2. Appel-Meulenbroek, R., Kemperman, A., van de Water, A., Weijs-Perrée, M., & Verhaegh, J. (2022). How to attract employees back to the office? A stated choice study on hybrid working preferences. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 81, 101784.
3. Arunprasad, P., Dey, C., Jebli, F., Manimuthu, A., & El Hathat, Z. (2022). Exploring the remote work challenges in the era of COVID-19 pandemic: Review and application model. *Benchmarking: An International Journal*, 29(10), 3333–3355.
4. Bartsch, S., Weber, E., Büttgen, M., & Huber, A. (2021). Leadership matters in crisis-induced digital transformation: How to lead service employees effectively during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of Service Management*, 32(1), 71–85.
5. 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.
6. Carillo, K., Cachat-Rosset, G., Marsan, J., Saba, T., & Klarsfeld, A. (2021). Adjusting to epidemic-induced telework: Empirical insights from teleworkers in France. *European Journal of Information Systems*, 30(1), 69–88.
7. Carnevale, J. B., & Hatak, I. (2020). Employee adjustment and well-being in the era of COVID-19: Implications for human resource management. *Journal of Business Research*, 116, 183–187.
8. Charalampous, M., Grant, C. A., Tramontano, C., & Michailidis, E. (2019). Systematically reviewing remote e-workers' well-being at work: A multidimensional approach. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 28(1), 51–73.
9. Choudhury, P., Foroughi, C., & Larson, B. (2021). Work-from-anywhere: The productivity effects of geographic flexibility. *Strategic Management Journal*, 42(4), 655–683.
10. Gajendran, R. S., Harrison, D. A., & Delaney-Klinger, K. (2015). Are telecommuters remotely good citizens? Unpacking telecommuting's effects on performance via i-deals and job resources. *Personnel Psychology*, 68(2), 353–393.

11. Galanti, T., Guidetti, G., Mazzei, E., Zappalà, S., & Toscano, F. (2021). Work from home during the COVID-19 outbreak: The impact on employees' remote work productivity, engagement, and stress. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 63(7), e426–e432.
12. Grant, C. A., Wallace, L. M., & Spurgeon, P. C. (2013). An exploration of the psychological factors affecting remote e-worker's job effectiveness, well-being and work-life balance. *Employee Relations*, 35(5), 527–546.
13. Kniffin, K. M., Narayanan, J., Anseel, F. (2021). COVID-19 and the workplace: Implications, issues, and insights for future research and action. *American Psychologist*, 76(1), 63–77.
14. Kowalski, K. B., Aruldoss, A., Gurumurthy, B., & Parayitam, S. (2022). Work-from-home productivity and job satisfaction: A double mediation model. *Journal of Risk and Financial Management*, 15(9), 401.
15. Lund, S., Madgavkar, A., Manyika, J., Smit, S., Ellingrud, K., Meaney, M., & Robinson, O. (2021). The future of work after COVID-19. McKinsey Global Institute.
16. Molino, M., Ingusci, E., Signore, F., Manuti, A., Giancaspro, M. L., Russo, V., Zito, M., & Cortese, C. G. (2020). Wellbeing costs of technology use during Covid-19 remote working: An investigation using the Italian translation of the technostress creators scale. *Sustainability*, 12(15), 5911.
17. Tavares, A. I. (2017). Telework and health effects review. *International Journal of Healthcare*, 3(2), 30–36.
18. Waizenegger, L., McKenna, B., Cai, W., & Bendz, T. (2020). An affordance perspective of team collaboration and enforced working from home during COVID-19. *European Journal of Information Systems*, 29(4), 429–442.
19. 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.
20. Yang, E., Kim, Y., & Hong, S. (2022). Does working from home work? Exploring the role of technology readiness and well-being. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 174, 121271.