

Employee Engagement in Hybrid Work Environments: A Systematic Literature Review

¹Dr. Priyanka Gehlot, ²Dr. Suresh Saini, ³Dr. Himanshu Kataria, ⁴Dr. Shivani Wadhwa

¹Assistant Professor, Jagannath University, Jaipur

²Assistant Professor, Jagannath University, Jaipur

³Assistant Professor, Jagannath University, Bahadurgarh

⁴Assistant Professor, Jagan Institute of Management Studies

Abstract

The speed of the adoption of hybrid working has also affected the way employee engagement is developed, sustained and lived in organisations. There has been extensive research regarding engagement in traditional and fully-remote learning environments, but the evidence is fragmented and incongruent when looking at hybrid learning environments. This study provides a systematic literature review that brings together the current literature around the employees' engagement in a hybrid working situation. The review systematically synthesizes peer-reviewed research from the last 10 years using theories on engagement (Kahn, 1990), on job demands–resources (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007), and on flexible work (Allen et al., 2015). The review process was conducted in a transparent way, across major academic databases, and key factors, mechanisms and outcomes of engagement in hybrid contexts were identified. The results reveal that the decision to work flexibly involves a complex interplay between autonomy, leadership practices, digital work design and organizational support systems, and not only location flexibility. Moderating effects of hybrid intensity and contextual factors, including culture and role interdependence (Wang et al., 2021), are also highlighted in the synthesis. This review connects the dots of what we know about engagement and organizes it around a theme, making the insights more granular, while also adding to the theory of engagement in the context of hybrid work, with implications for organizations that want to build viable hybrid working models. The paper ends with discussion of the most important research gaps and directions for future research.

Keywords: employee engagement, hybrid work, flexible work arrangements, systematic literature review, digital work design

1. Introduction

Employee engagement has long been known to be an important factor in organizational performance, employee health and wellbeing, and sustainable competitive advantage. As such, employee engagement is a key construct in human resource management and organizational behavior literature, with engaged employees exhibiting increased discretionary effort, organizational commitment, and job performance (Kahn, 1990; Saks, 2006). Historically, engagement studies have focused on workplaces that were physically co-located, and where social interaction, managerial control, and organizational culture were in the same place. But many of these assumptions have been thrown out the window with the recent surge in hybrid working. Work done at a mix of home and workplace, referred to as hybrid work, is becoming a more common and expected experience for many contemporary workplaces (Allen et al., 2015; Eurofound, 2022). New digital collaboration tools, changing employee expectations and considerations of costs within the organization have also pushed this change. Although the hybrid model has the potential to provide flexibility and autonomy, it does present new challenges in terms of coordination, visibility, social connectivity and equitable access to resources (Wang et al., 2021). These tensions prompt questions regarding the process of and surrounding employee engagement in a distributed physical and virtual environment.

Current studies on employee engagement in flexible and remote work environments offer some insight, but there is limited agreement on the evidence regarding flexible work and hybrid environments. However, hybrid work is not just an extension of telework, but has unique features that are not often included in many studies, including

the alternation of place of work, different levels of in-person interaction, and the need to manage both modes of work concurrently (Charalampous et al., 2019). Furthermore, empirical evidence is scattered, in some cases under multidisciplinary names, such as management, psychology, information systems, etc. and in some cases is measured and analyzed from various perspectives. A lack of conceptual integration prevents the accumulation of knowledge, and it contributes to the challenge of getting clear advice based on evidence from organizations. In this background, there is a need for a systematic review of the literature to bring together the current state of knowledge regarding employee engagement in hybrid working. Research to date has largely examined remote working, telecommuting, or flexible working in general (Allen et al., 2015; Bailey & Kurland, 2002), with little attention given to hybrid working as a unique organizational phenomenon. The purpose of this gap can be filled by conducting a systematic literature review, which involves critically analysing existing research to uncover the common frequencies of themes, theory and method, and to identify gaps in the evidence. The aim of this paper is, thus, to review and synthesize academic research of employee engagement in the context of hybrid working. The review aims to address several key questions: (1) What drives worker engagement in hybrid working environments? (2) How is worker engagement theorized and empirically studied in hybrid environments? (3) What are the impacts of worker engagement in hybrid settings, and what are the research gaps? Answering these questions, the paper helps fill a gap in the theory on engagement by building on the concepts of engagement in the context of changing work arrangements, and provides practical guidance to organizations developing and implementing hybrid work systems.

2. Review Methodology

This study uses a Systematic Literature Review to synthesize and critically analyze the previous research in the area of employee engagement of hybrid work. Applying this approach is suitable due to the scattered and multidisciplinary sources of existing literature and the requirement to have a transparent and replicable review process in management research (Tranfield et al., 2003; Snyder, 2019). Instead of statistical aggregation, the review highlights conceptual integration and thematic synthesis, giving the opportunity to bring together the knowledge and findings from various theoretical and methodological approaches. Literature search was carried out in the three major academic databases namely Scopus, Web of Science and ABI/INFORM. These databases have been chosen due to their robust coverage of high-quality journals in the area of organizational behavior, human resource management, and related areas. Combination of the keywords “employee engagement”, “hybrid work”, “blended work”, “flexible work” and “remote and on-site work” were used to create a structured search strategy using Boolean operators to improve precision as well as to increase breadth. Only articles published from 2013 to 2024 were included in the search because the hybrid model has gained significant traction in work settings and organisations since this time (Allen et al., 2015; Wang et al., 2021).

Inclusion/exclusion criteria were used to select papers in order to ensure relevance and quality. Peer-reviewed journal articles which explicitly explored employee engagement or related constructs in hybrid or blended work environments were included. Empirical and conceptual studies were both taken into account to provide both theory and insights. Only studies that did not include any blended instruction and conference papers, practitioner reports and publications in languages other than English were excluded. This enabled a more targeted and rigorous sample. The screening process had several stages. Duplicates were removed, and titles and abstracts were examined and studies that were clearly out of scope were discarded. Full text was subsequently screened to ensure that they met the inclusion criteria. The sequential method minimized the selection bias and increased the validity of the review process (Petticrew & Roberts, 2006). Studies were included in the synthesis only if they addressed engagement in hybrid work or in similar work contexts. Data extraction was systematically done to record the salient features of each study, such as publication year, theory, research design, sample context, and main findings on employee engagement. Recurring patterns and relationships between studies were found using thematic synthesis (analyzing the extracted data) (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Studies were not formally evaluated on the basis of a quality scoring tool, but rather based on conceptual clarity, methodological transparency and relevance to hybrid work contexts. This balanced approach has led to an evidence-based review process that is also sensitive to the current research and practice of hybrid work.

3. Descriptive Analysis of the Literature

Over the last few years, research on employee engagement in the context of hybrid work has increased significantly, and the institutionalization of hybrid working has spread to different sectors. However, there is a spike in publications post-2020, which aligns with the organizational trial of working in a hybrid fashion since the COVID-19 pandemic. Previous research generally focused on engagement in the context of flexible or telework, while more recent research explicitly defined hybrid work as a new way of working that involves remote and in-person attendance (Charalampous et al., 2019; Wang et al., 2021). It represents a growing shift in conceptualization of hybrid work as a more than transitional or simply crisis-driven option. It can be seen from the disciplinary point of view that literature is spread out in management, organizational psychology, human resource management and information systems journals. Empirical contributions tend to be management and HR oriented, focusing on leadership practices, HR policies and support mechanisms in the organisations. Psychology-based research, on the other hand, tends to be more on the individual level, for example, the effects on well-being, motivation, and boundaries between work and life, whereas information systems research emphasizes the significance of digital collaboration instruments and processes in work mediated by technology (Carillo et al., 2021). This disciplinary fragmentation is a factor that leads to different definitions and different ways of measuring engagement across studies, and makes cross-study comparisons difficult.

In terms of method, quantitative research designs are most common and surveys are the most common form of data collection. Cross sectional designs with validated measurement instruments for engagement (e.g. Utrecht Work Engagement Scale) have been used in many studies in the context of flexible or hybrid work (Schaufeli et al., 2006). Qualitative and mixed-methods studies are comparatively less common but provide more in-depth insights into employee experiences, including their sense of social connectedness, identity and fairness of hybrid working (Felstead & Reuschke, 2020). Longitudinal designs are less common, limiting insight into the dynamics of engagement over time in the context of growing maturity of hybrid working practices. Geographically, the focus is on North America and on Western Europe, with a relatively small presence of emerging economies. This imbalance poses questions about the generalizability of the findings in the context, as cultural norms, labor laws and technological systems may have a significant impact on hybrid working experiences and the outcomes of engagement (Eurofound, 2022). Most of the studies reported focus on knowledge-intensive sectors, mainly IT, professional services and higher education, and frontline, manufacturing and public sector sectors are under-researched. Overall, the descriptive analysis shows a rapidly expanding, although uneven literature. Interest in hybrid work and engagement is growing, but the evidence base is still very unevenly distributed by region, sector and methodology. The communicative patterns highlight the requirements of integrative synthesis and further of diversified empirical procedures that form the basis of the thematic analysis which follows.

4. Thematic Synthesis of Employee Engagement in Hybrid Work Environments

The thematic synthesis shows that a set of interrelated factors at individual, job, leadership, technological, and organizational levels affects employee engagement in hybrid work. In hybrid environments, engagement is not just about being physically present in a workplace, but also about creating a dynamic balance of flexibility, connectivity, and control. In all of the studies examined, there were some recurring themes that account for the ease or difficulty of engagement in hybrid work arrangements. An individual level, autonomy and self-regulation become salient factors in engagement. The flexibility of timing and location of work in hybrid work has been linked to positive psychological outcomes such as psychological empowerment and intrinsic motivation (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Wang et al., 2021). But this freedom can come with a foggy work-life separation, information overload, and the pressure to monitor one's own performance. Research suggests that having good boundary management skills and increased self-efficacy is associated with continued engagement in hybrid work arrangements and that there is a relationship between role ambiguity and constant connectivity and employee disengagement (Charalampous et al., 2019).

Person-to-job and job-to-task features also are important. Role clarity, manageable workloads and interdependencies of tasks are important factors for engagement in hybrid working. High clarity and coordination in job design are associated with greater vigor and dedication (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007) when working away from the company and on-site. However, poorly structured hybrid jobs can worsen cognitive workload and decrease engagement, especially if there is a lack of consistency between the job's performance measures and

outcome-based assessment (Carillo et al., 2021). Another key theme is leadership and managerial practices. High engagement in hybrid teams has been consistently linked to trust-based leadership, frequent and effective communication and inclusive managerial practices. Leaders that focus on the outcomes and not the visible presence of their team members who are working remotely, as well as those who intentionally create inclusion between the remote and on-site teams, are effective in reducing distance and inequality perceptions (Contreras et al., 2020). Conversely, when managers are based on a norm of presenteeism or do not adjust leadership to the hybrid context, engagement tends to drop.

Technology and digital infrastructure are key enablers to engagement in hybrid work. Coordination and social connection is achieved through reliable collaboration mechanisms, clear communication channels and a conducive digital culture. But technology can be a double-edged sword as well. A lack of restraint around virtual meetings and constant notifications, as well as digital surveillance, have been correlated with fatigue and/or disengagement (Felstead & Reuschke, 2020). When technology is used purposefully, supportively and with task demands in mind, engagement is highest when not used for control. At the organizational level, culture and HR practices influence employee's experience and interpretation of hybrid work. Perceived organizational support (POS) and fairness in flexibility access are strongly associated with engagement outcomes (Saks, 2006). Predictability and support are provided in the workplace through formalization of hybrid work arrangements in policies, training and performance systems, leading to continued engagement. However, sporadic or inconsistent use of hybrid practices can worsen feelings of disenfranchisement and inequity. Taken together, these themes indicate that flexibility alone is not likely to be a direct driver of employee engagement in hybrid working arrangements – it is the design, management, and implementation of flexibility as a part of organizational systems that does. The synthesis illustrates a multi-level and relational nature of engagement in hybrid contexts, which underpins the discussion of moderators, mediators and contextual influences to be explored in the next section.

5. Moderators, Mediators, and Contextual Influences

In addition to direct antecedents, several factors in the literature were identified as moderating, mediating, and contextual in hybrid work experiences. This is why there is no universal formula for engagement in similar hybrid models from one person, team or organisation to another. Hybrid work does not work in isolation, but rather collaborates with the organizational structure, the person and the broader context to shape engagement dynamics. Organizational support is always found as a significant mediator between hybrid work practices and employee engagement. Support, as demonstrated in the provision of resources as well as the responsiveness of management, and the fairness with which policies are implemented, aid the process of making flexibility work in terms of engagement outcomes (Saks, 2006). The reciprocal commitment and trust that occurs when employees feel that hybrid options are being provided as a valid mode of support rather than a cost-cutting strategy can enhance employee engagement. However, there are also negative consequences that result from weak support structures, such as disengagement and withdrawal behaviors.

Hybrid work has been found to be a key moderating factor, with its intensity and design. Research shows that engagement can differ based on the mix of remote versus traditional work and the consistency of work locations. Staff with well-established hybrid work arrangements who have stable routines and defined expectations have higher engagement scores than staff operating under ad hoc or constantly changing arrangements (Wang et al., 2021). The effects of autonomy and social connection are further tempered by hybrid intensity, where an increased amount of in-person requirements can reduce perceived flexibility, and an increase of remote work can increase isolation. The effects of individual differences are also moderated in hybrid contexts. Employees' ability to adjust to hybrid working needs is based on their career stage, job role and digital competence. Engagement is typically lower for early in their career employees, and those with highly interdependent roles, because they have less informal learning, and less social interaction, than experienced employees who benefit more from autonomy and flexibility (Charalampous et al., 2019). The hybrid nature of hybrid work experiences is also evident in personal preferences for structure, social interaction and boundary management which influence engagement trajectories.

Another very important context can be national and cultural factors. Expectations of visibility, communication and availability in the hybrid working context are influenced by cultural norms related to power distance, collectivism, and work centrality. Some of the engagement outcomes found in Western cultures may not apply in countries where there are more greater norms of physical presence or hierarchical supervision (Eurofound, 2022).

Attitudes towards flexible working, infrastructure quality, and labour law also impact the notion of a hybrid model. Lastly, task and team context moderate engagement in hybrid environments. The salience of coordination and communication processes is affected by high task interdependence and the need for virtual collaboration processes and by team dispersion. Higher engagement is reported in hybrid teams that develop common ground rules, a clear coordination process, and inclusive practices that connect remote and on-site colleagues (Contreras et al., 2020). In sum, the two findings support the notion that employee engagement is dependent on a multi-layered series of moderating and mediating factors, not just place of work.

6. Outcomes of Employee Engagement in Hybrid Work Contexts

Research on the topic consistently relates employee engagement in hybrid work to a variety of individual and organizational outcomes. But these outcomes are influenced by the unique characteristics of hybrid working, including the coexistence of physical and virtual forms of work. Engagement in this context is more than just the traditional measures of engagement and includes well-being, sustainability of work practices and employment relationships that last into the future. In the individual level analysis, positive relationships are found with task performance, discretionary effort and innovative behavior for high engagement in hybrid working arrangements. A well-engaged workforce knows how to adjust to change and operate proactively in the face of challenges, particularly when working across locations, as is the case in a hybrid workplace (Bakker & Albrecht, 2018). Research further indicates that the negative impacts of role ambiguity and digital demands can be mitigated by engagement, which allows workers to stay productive in the face of greater digital complexity and role ambiguity (Wang et al., 2021).

Well-being for employees is a closely related outcome that emerges. Participating in hybrid working has been associated with reduced emotional exhaustion and burnout when there is sufficient provision, autonomy, and support. However, negative well-being effects are stronger when the engagement is hindered by too much digital connectedness, social isolation, or vague expectations (Charalampous et al., 2019). This two-sidedness is a key element in understanding how hybrid working can, over time, have both positive and negative impacts on employee wellbeing. The organizational level: Engaged employees in the hybrid contexts lead to higher organizational commitment and lower turnover intentions. Engagement makes employees feel like they belong, even if they are not physically present, and helps them stay with the company in today's more flexible workforce (Saks, 2006). There is also some evidence that engagement is linked to positive citizenship behaviours (e.g., knowledge sharing and peer support), which have been shown to be crucial for team cohesion and performance in hybrid arrangements. The literature also indicates that the relationship between hybrid work practices and work outcomes is mediated by engagement. No clear evidence of better performance as a result of a well-designed and supported hybrid work arrangement, but rather better employee engagement. However, when engagement is low, the reward of flexibility and efficiency that hybrid work can bring is unlikely to be fulfilled and may even lead to a decrease in performance and morale (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007).

In conclusion, the evidence cumulative so far suggests that employee engagement is a key outcome and explanatory mechanism in hybrid working. It has a positive impact on performance, well-being, and retention, making it evident that design for engagement is crucial when implementing hybrid working. These results also highlight a need for additional long term and/or organization-level research, discussed below under research gaps and future directions.

7. Gaps, Limitations, and Directions for Future Research

Although there has been a significant amount of research in recent years examining employee engagement in the context of the hybrid workplace, the literature reviewed reveals some recurring research gaps and limitations that hinder the development of theory and its practical use. A significant one is around conceptual clarity. Often, studies are conducted on the basis of very general and unclear definitions of hybrid work and engagement, which are transferred from the traditional or fully remote working context without proper contextualisation. This restricts the amount of detail that can be extracted and compared between studies on engagement dynamics that are specific to hybrid working. There are methodological limitations as well. Many of the dominant cross-sectional survey designs limit the ability to make causal inferences and mask processes of engagement development as workers and employers learn about working from home. The majority of cross-sectional survey designs have limited ability

to make causal inferences and mask engagement development as workers and employers gain experience of hybrid working. There are limited longitudinal studies to explore how engagement changes over time and at various phases of hybrid working implementation. In addition, although the qualitative and mixed method approaches can provide a rich account of experiences of identity, inclusion and informal social processes in hybrid settings, they are underutilised (Charalampous et al., 2019).

Despite a number of theoretical models, from a theoretical perspective, engagement research in hybrid contexts still largely follows the existing approaches, like the Job Demands–Resources model and Social Exchange Theory. These perspectives provide rich insights, but may not capture current challenges like digital surveillance, algorithmic management, and power and visibility shifts in hybrid working systems. Future studies could benefit from combining the theories of sociotechnical systems, boundary theory and institutional theory to better understand the complexity of hybrid working arrangements (Wang et al., 2021). Moreover, there are context restrictions that cause further limitations on generalizability. Empirical evidence is also disproportionately focused on the knowledge industries and on the Western world, and under-represented in emerging markets and manufacturing organizations, as well as in the public sector. Hybrid working practices and the outcomes of hybrid working are likely to be influenced by cultural, regulatory and infrastructural differences, but these differences have not been well studied. Comparative and cross-national research might be able to contribute to this imbalance and to add to the contextual understanding. Lastly, there are some substantive research directions that are suggested by the review. Future research should explore the difference in engagement experiences of various sub-populations, career phases, and job functions to further understand equity and inclusion in hybrid work. There is also a need for increased focus on team and organisational level outcomes, and the longer-term effects of hybrid working on career progression and organisational culture. Closing these gaps will be crucial to gaining a deeper understanding of employee engagement in the hybrid workplace of the future.

8. Practical Implications

The results of this systematic review provide a number of practical suggestions for organisations wanting to engage employees in the hybrid working environment. First, the notion of engagement should be considered as a design goal and not the automatic result of providing flexibility. The shift toward symbolic adoption of hybrid work and a more intentional design of work that creates a balance between autonomy and structure is crucial for organisations. Establishing agreed-upon standards for performance, when and where it will occur, and how it will be measured decreases ambiguity and promotes continued engagement. Leadership practice is an important component to influence engagement within hybrid arrangements. Managers need to shift from supervisory management to one that is based on trust and focuses on results. It is key to have regular and meaningful communication, equal access to information and to involve remote and on-site staff in decision-making processes. Leadership development programs should thus encompass the skills and attributes related to the hybrid environment, such as managing distributed teams and identifying disengagement in less obvious environments and situations, and virtual communication.

Human resource policies and systems should also be aligned with hybrid work as well. When hybrid working is part of formal HR practices, engagement is further reinforced when it's not seen as a privilege. This means that there is genuine flexibility in policies, there is consistency in how they are applied to all roles and performance management systems are not based on physical presence but on outcomes and cooperation. Digital skills, boundary management and self-regulation are areas of training that can further support employee engagement. Technology use should be based on principles of enablement, not control. Organizations need to invest in secure digital collaboration tools, while at the same time setting out guidelines for lessening the excessive meeting, continuous connectivity and digital fatigue. Establishing communication agreements and expectations and defining the appropriate use of monitoring technologies can help maintain trust and engagement. Last but not least, organisations should be aware that hybrid working experiences are varied. There are a number of differences among people in terms of their job roles, career stages, and personal situations that may need to be taken into account when developing engagement strategies. Engagement surveys, as well as structured check-ins, are just some of the types of regular feedback mechanisms that may be used to track engagement levels and adjust hybrid practices over time. A comprehensive and flexible strategy can help organizations use a hybrid work model to boost employee engagement and organizational productivity.

9. Conclusion

The aim of this systematic literature review was to summarise current studies on employee engagement in the context of hybrid working, which has become a pivotal factor in modern working life. The review illustrates the relational and multi-faceted nature of engagement in the hybrid context, where individual autonomy, job design, leadership practices, technological infrastructure, and organizational support play a role. Engagement is not a purely flexible arrangement; it relies on the way hybrid working is designed, directed and integrated in to organisational arrangements. A cross-disciplinary approach to evidence integration expands traditional engagement theories to hybrid work contexts, and reveals limitations in adapting models for co-located or fully-remote work settings. The results highlight the need to consider hybrid work as a new way of working, with different engagement patterns and dynamics, moderators and outcomes. The review helps conceptual clarity and provides a unified framework to be used for future empirical studies.

On a practical level, it is important to remember that engagement in the hybrid context must be driven by commitment, consistent HR policies and careful application of technology. Companies that invest in and support hybrid work as a business strategy and an institutional process are more likely to achieve the benefits of hybrid working in terms of performance, health and employee retention. On the other hand, suboptimal hybrid settings can lead to loss of engagement and impact on organizational cohesion. Although this review is valuable, the scope and nature of the literature is restricted and remains fragmented by region, sector and methodology. Longitudinal, multi-level, and context-based studies are needed in the future to delve deeper into engagement over time as hybrid work develops. Overall, this review offers a stepping-stone in the scholarly and organizational research of employee engagement in a hybrid working environment.

References

- [1] Allen, T. D., Golden, T. D., & Shockley, K. M. (2015). How effective is telecommuting? Assessing the status of our scientific findings. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 29(2), 276–294. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amp.2015.0142>
- [2] Bailey, D. E., & Kurland, N. B. (2002). A review of telework research: Findings, new directions, and lessons for the study of modern work. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23(4), 383–400. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-6486.00333>
- [3] Bakker, A. B., & Albrecht, S. L. (2018). Work engagement: Current trends. *Career Development International*, 23(1), 4–11. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12164>
- [4] Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The Job Demands–Resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 70(2), 309–328. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2006.11.007>
- [5] Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- [6] Carillo, K., Cachat-Rosset, G., Marsan, J., Saba, T., & Klarsfeld, A. (2021). Adjusting to epidemic-induced telework: Empirical insights from teleworkers in France. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 33(1), 69–88. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JWL-07-2020-0123>
- [7] Charalampous, M., Grant, C. A., Tramontano, C., & Michailidis, E. (2019). Systematically reviewing remote e-workers' well-being at work: A multidimensional approach. *Applied Psychology*, 68(1), 51–86. <https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12201>
- [8] Contreras, F., Baykal, E., & Abid, G. (2020). E-leadership and teleworking in times of COVID-19 and beyond: What we know and where do we go. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 41(8), 871–878. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2442>
- [9] Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The “what” and “why” of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 11(4), 227–268. <https://doi.org/10.1006/obhd.2000.2736>
- [10] Felstead, A., & Reuschke, D. (2020). Homeworking in the UK: Before and during the 2020 lockdown. *Human Relations*, 73(12), 1611–1637. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726720905480>
- [11] Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(4), 692–724. <https://doi.org/10.2307/258726>

- [12] Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21(7), 600–619. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2006.00050.x>
- [13] Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., & Salanova, M. (2006). The measurement of work engagement with a short questionnaire: A cross-national study. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 91(2), 300–324. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.2.300>
- [14] Snyder, H. (2019). Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines. *Journal of Business Research*, 104, 333–339. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428118824059>
- [15] Tranfield, D., Denyer, D., & Smart, P. (2003). Towards a methodology for developing evidence-informed management knowledge by means of systematic review. *British Journal of Management*, 14(3), 207–222. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-6486.00375>
- [16] Wang, B., Liu, Y., Qian, J., & Parker, S. K. (2021). Achieving effective remote working during the COVID-19 pandemic: A work design perspective. *Academy of Management Annals*, 15(1), 16–59. <https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2021.0058>