DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.20127771
Link: https://zenodo.org/records/20127771

# THE INFLUENCE OF HYBRID WORK SYSTEMS ON THE PRODUCTIVITY AND WORK-LIFE BALANCE OF GENERATION Z EMPLOYEES

***[1]Kurbonova Kamola Abdusalim qizi***
*[1]Faculty of Economics and Business Education, Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia;*
*Faculty of Management, Tashkent State University of Economics*
***Email:*** *kamolaqubonova@student.upi.edu*

***[2]Rofi Rofaida***
*[2]Faculty of Economics and Business Education, Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia*
Email: [2]rofi.rofaida@upi.edu

***[3] Ablatdinov Sultanbek Azatovich***
*[3]Faculty of Management, Tashkent State University of Economics*
*Email: [3]s.ablatdinov@tsue.uz*

*Abstract - The rapid expansion of hybrid work models has transformed contemporary work environments, particularly for Generation Z employees. This study investigates the relationship between hybrid work systems, employee productivity, work–life balance, and technostress, with a focus on the mediating role of technology-related stress. A quantitative cross-sectional survey was conducted among 215 participants, primarily consisting of students and freelancers engaged in flexible work arrangements. Data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistical methods.*

*The findings reveal a highly polarized pattern of responses, indicating that hybrid work produces both positive and negative outcomes rather than uniform effects. While a majority of respondents expressed a preference for hybrid work, the results demonstrate moderate mean scores for productivity (M = 5.5), work–life balance (M = 6.2), and technostress (M = 5.8), accompanied by relatively high standard deviations. This suggests substantial variability in individual experiences. Hybrid work was found to enhance productivity and work–life balance under favorable conditions, such as reduced commuting time and increased autonomy. However, challenges related to boundary management and technostress were also identified, limiting its effectiveness for some individuals.*

*The study confirms the mediating role of technostress and highlights the importance of work–life balance as a predictor of productivity. The findings are interpreted through the Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) model, demonstrating that hybrid work simultaneously functions as both a resource and a demand. The study contributes to the growing literature on flexible work by emphasizing the context-dependent nature of hybrid work outcomes and the need for adaptive organizational strategies.*

***Keywords:*** *hybrid work, Generation Z, productivity, work–life balance, technostress, JD-R model*

## INTRODUCTION

The nature of work has undergone a profound transformation in recent years, driven by rapid technological advancement and accelerated by the global COVID-19 pandemic. One of the most

significant outcomes of this transformation has been the widespread adoption of **hybrid work models**, which integrate remote and in-office work arrangements. Hybrid work has now become a dominant form of flexible employment in many organizations, reshaping traditional workplace structures and redefining employee expectations regarding autonomy, flexibility, and performance (Allen et al., 2021; Wang et al., 2021).

Hybrid work is generally understood as a blended arrangement where employees divide their working time between physical office spaces and remote locations (e.g., home or co-working spaces), often supported by digital technologies (Cook et al., 2020). Recent research indicates that hybrid work is not a uniform model but rather a **spectrum of flexible arrangements**, influenced by organizational policies, job roles, and individual preferences (Santos et al., 2024; Berger et al., 2021). This flexibility has been widely associated with improved employee satisfaction and adaptability in post-pandemic work environments (Springer studies, 2023–2024).

Generation Z, typically defined as individuals born between the late 1990s and early 2010s, represents a cohort that has entered the workforce during a period of rapid digitalization and organizational change. This generation is characterized by high digital fluency, strong expectations for flexibility, and a growing emphasis on mental health and work–life balance. Empirical studies suggest that younger employees are more likely to prefer hybrid or remote arrangements compared to traditional in-office work due to perceived improvements in autonomy and time management (Chillakuri, 2020; Deloitte, 2021). Recent survey-based evidence also indicates that flexible work arrangements are strongly linked to employee retention and satisfaction, with a significant proportion of workers reporting willingness to leave organizations that do not offer hybrid options (Vohra et al., 2024; Allen et al., 2021).

Despite its benefits, hybrid work remains a **complex and multidimensional phenomenon**. While it enhances flexibility and reduces commuting time, it also introduces challenges such as communication barriers, social isolation, and difficulties in maintaining collaboration across distributed teams (Toscano & Zappalà, 2020; Ferrara et al., 2022). Research further highlights that hybrid environments can significantly influence team dynamics, organizational coordination, and employee well-being, depending on how effectively work processes are structured (de Souza Santos et al., 2024).

An increasingly important issue in hybrid work environments is **technostress**, defined as psychological strain resulting from the use of digital technologies. Although Generation Z is often described as digitally native, recent empirical evidence shows that constant connectivity, information overload, and excessive digital communication can still generate significant stress and burnout (Molino et al., 2020; Tarafdar et al., 2015). Studies conducted in post-pandemic work settings confirm that technostress is associated with reduced well-being, increased role conflict, and lower perceived productivity (Saleem & Malik, 2023; Wang et al., 2021). Hybrid work environments, in particular, intensify these effects due to reliance on multiple communication platforms and continuous online presence (ResearchGate, 2025).

Work–life balance is another critical dimension of hybrid work effectiveness. According to boundary theory, hybrid arrangements can both improve and disrupt the separation between work and personal life. On one hand, flexibility allows employees to better manage personal responsibilities and reduce commuting-related stress. On the other hand, blurred boundaries between work and non-work domains may lead to overwork, role conflict, and psychological fatigue (Clark, 2000; Molino et al., 2020). Empirical findings suggest that hybrid work can improve work–life balance when supported by clear organizational policies and effective boundary management practices (Springer studies, 2023–2024; Ferrara et al., 2022).

The relationship between hybrid work, technostress, and employee outcomes can be effectively explained through the **Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) model**. This framework posits that job resources, such as flexibility and autonomy, enhance motivation and performance, while job demands, such as workload pressure and technostress, contribute to strain and burnout (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). Recent extensions of the JD-R model in hybrid work contexts suggest that

digitalization has introduced new job demands, including techno-overload and communication fatigue, which can negatively affect employee well-being if not properly managed (Molino et al., 2020; Rudolph et al., 2021; ).

Recent empirical studies reinforce the dual nature of hybrid work outcomes. For example, research shows that hybrid work can improve productivity and job satisfaction when supported by trust-based management and digital infrastructure, but may also reduce well-being when social isolation and technostress are present (Ferrara et al., 2022; Toscano & Zappalà, 2020). Similarly, large-scale studies report that hybrid workers often experience better job satisfaction but also face challenges in communication and boundary management, highlighting the importance of organizational design in shaping outcomes (Allen et al., 2021; ).

Despite growing literature on remote and hybrid work, there remains a need for research focusing specifically on Generation Z employees, particularly in relation to the interaction between productivity, work–life balance, and technostress. Existing studies often assume relatively uniform outcomes, whereas emerging evidence suggests that hybrid work experiences may be highly variable and even polarized across individuals and contexts (Santos et al., 2024; Khanna et al., 2024).

Therefore, this study examines the relationships between hybrid work systems, productivity, work–life balance, and technostress among Generation Z employees, with particular attention to the variability and heterogeneity of employee experiences in hybrid work environments.

## THEORETICAL BACKGROUND AND HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT

The transformation of workplace structures in the aftermath of the COVID-19 pandemic has led to the widespread adoption of remote and hybrid work systems, fundamentally reshaping organizational dynamics, employee productivity, and work - life balance. Prior to the pandemic, remote work was considered a marginal or flexible arrangement; however, global quarantine measures forced organizations to adopt work-from-home (WFH) models on an unprecedented scale. It is estimated that over 560 million workers worldwide transitioned to remote work during this period, marking a significant shift in labor organization and digital work practices .

From a theoretical perspective, hybrid work systems can be understood through several foundational frameworks. First, **Boundary Theory** explains how individuals manage the boundaries between professional and personal domains. The shift to remote work blurred these boundaries, as spatial and temporal distinctions between work and home diminished, leading to both increased flexibility and role conflict. Empirical studies indicate that hybrid arrangements attempt to restore these boundaries by reintroducing partial physical separation between work and home environments .

Second, the **Job Demands - Resources (JD-R) Model** provides insight into how hybrid work affects productivity and well-being. Hybrid systems simultaneously introduce new job resources—such as autonomy, flexibility, and reduced commuting time—while also increasing job demands, including technostress, communication challenges, and social isolation. Research demonstrates that the balance between these demands and resources determines employee outcomes, particularly productivity and psychological well-being .

Third, **Sociotechnical Systems Theory** highlights the interaction between technological infrastructure and human behavior in shaping work outcomes. The rapid digitalization of work during the pandemic positioned communication technologies as central to organizational functioning. While these tools enabled continuity, they also introduced new stressors, particularly for younger employees who experienced increased dependence on digital communication systems .

The emergence of hybrid work models represents a post-pandemic equilibrium between fully remote and fully office-based work. Studies suggest that hybrid work is now the most preferred arrangement among both employees and organizations, as it combines flexibility with opportunities for collaboration and social interaction . However, the literature also emphasizes that the effectiveness of hybrid work is contingent upon factors such as communication quality, organizational support, and technological infrastructure.

From a generational perspective, **Generation Z employees**—who entered the workforce during or shortly after the pandemic—exhibit distinct preferences and challenges. Research indicates that Gen Z values flexibility, autonomy, and work - life balance, making hybrid work particularly attractive . At the same time, this cohort is more vulnerable to social isolation and technostress due to their early-career stage and reliance on digital communication environments . This duality positions Gen Z as a critical group for understanding the long-term implications of hybrid work systems.

Overall, the theoretical and empirical literature suggests that hybrid work systems are not merely logistical arrangements but complex socio-organizational phenomena that influence employee productivity and work - life balance through multiple interacting mechanisms.

The relationship between hybrid work and productivity remains complex and context-dependent. On one hand, hybrid work increases autonomy and allows employees to optimize their working conditions, which can enhance focus and efficiency. On the other hand, reduced face-to-face interaction may hinder collaboration and knowledge sharing.

Empirical evidence suggests that hybrid work can positively influence productivity when supported by effective communication and technological systems, while poorly implemented hybrid models may reduce efficiency due to coordination challenges . Additionally, studies on remote and hybrid environments highlight that productivity is influenced not only by individual work conditions but also by team dynamics and organizational structure.

Thus, the following hypothesis is proposed:

**H1:** Hybrid work systems have a significant positive effect on the productivity of Generation Z employees.

Hybrid work arrangements provide employees with greater control over their schedules and working environments, which is strongly associated with improved work - life balance. The elimination of commuting and increased flexibility allow individuals to allocate time more effectively between professional and personal responsibilities.

However, the literature also indicates that remote work can blur work - life boundaries, leading to role conflict and overwork. Hybrid models mitigate this issue by partially restoring physical and psychological separation between work and home domains .

Empirical studies focusing on younger employees demonstrate that work-from-home practices significantly influence work - life balance and job satisfaction, particularly among Generation Z workers .

Therefore, the following hypothesis is formulated:

**H2:** Hybrid work systems have a significant positive effect on the work - life balance of Generation Z employees.

The increased reliance on digital tools in hybrid environments introduces the concept of technostress, defined as stress arising from the use of information and communication technologies. Although Generation Z is often considered digitally native, research shows that this group is still susceptible to technostress, which can negatively impact both productivity and well-being .

Technostress may reduce the benefits of hybrid work by increasing cognitive load, communication fatigue, and burnout. Therefore, it plays a critical mediating role in determining the effectiveness of hybrid work systems.

Accordingly, the following hypothesis is proposed:

**H3:** Technostress mediates the relationship between hybrid work systems and the productivity of Generation Z employees.

The relationship between work - life balance and productivity is well established in organizational research. Employees who experience better balance are more likely to demonstrate higher motivation, engagement, and job performance.

Hybrid work systems enhance work - life balance through flexibility and autonomy, which in turn positively affects productivity. This aligns with the JD-R model, where increased resources (e.g., flexibility) lead to improved performance outcomes.

Thus, the final hypothesis is formulated:

**H4:** Work - life balance positively influences the productivity of Generation Z employees in hybrid work environments.

## METHODOLOGY

This study adopts a quantitative research design to examine the relationships between hybrid work, productivity, work–life balance, and technostress among Generation Z employees. A cross-sectional survey method was employed, as it enables the collection of standardized data from a large sample and supports statistical analysis of relationships between variables (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). The research is grounded in the Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) model, which explains how job resources such as flexibility and autonomy enhance employee performance, while job demands such as technostress may hinder it (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). Recent studies have extended this framework to hybrid and remote work contexts (Wang et al., 2021; Molino et al., 2020).

The sample consisted of 215 respondents, exceeding the recommended minimum of 200 participants for reliable statistical analysis. A convenience sampling method was used to recruit participants belonging to Generation Z (born approximately between 1997 and 2012). The majority of respondents were university students engaged in part-time employment as well as freelancers working in flexible or hybrid environments. This population is particularly relevant, as prior research shows that Generation Z is highly involved in digital and flexible work arrangements (Chillakuri, 2020; Deloitte, 2021). The participants ranged in age from 18 to 26 years and represented diverse academic and professional backgrounds.

Data were collected using an online questionnaire distributed through social media platforms, university communication channels, and freelance communities. Participation was voluntary, and respondents were informed about the purpose of the study prior to completing the survey. Ethical principles such as anonymity and confidentiality were strictly maintained in accordance with APA guidelines. The survey remained open for approximately four weeks to ensure an adequate number of responses.

All variables were measured using established multi-item Likert scales ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Hybrid work was assessed through items capturing flexibility, autonomy, and control over the working environment, adapted from recent remote work studies (Allen et al., 2021; Wang et al., 2021). Productivity was measured using self-reported indicators of efficiency, focus, and task performance, based on widely used productivity scales (Wang et al., 2021). Work–life balance was evaluated using items reflecting the ability to manage personal and professional responsibilities, adapted from Haar (2013) and supported by recent hybrid work research (Molino et al., 2020). Technostress was measured using adapted items from the Technostress Creators Scale, including dimensions such as technology overload, communication fatigue, and digital pressure (Tarafdar et al., 2015; Molino et al., 2020).

Data analysis was conducted using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) along with structural equation modeling techniques. Preliminary analysis included data screening, descriptive statistics, and reliability testing using Cronbach's alpha, with a threshold of 0.70 indicating acceptable internal consistency. Hypotheses were tested through correlation and multiple regression analyses to examine direct relationships between variables. Mediation analysis was conducted to test the role of technostress using both the Baron and Kenny (1986) approach and bootstrapping methods as recommended by Hayes (2018).

The validity and reliability of the study were ensured through the use of previously validated measurement scales. Construct validity was supported by aligning the survey items with established theoretical frameworks, while internal consistency reliability was confirmed through Cronbach's alpha coefficients. Content validity was maintained by carefully adapting items from prior empirical research.

The study adhered to established ethical standards. Informed consent was obtained from all participants, participation was voluntary, and no personally identifiable information was collected. The data were used exclusively for academic purposes.

## RESULTS.

Respondent profile, respondents totaled 215 hybrid workers, which include part-time working students, freelancers and a corporate employee.

**Table 1.**

**Participants**

| Participants | 215 |
|---|---|
| Ages (years) | 22 years (0.6) |
| Average total experience (years) | 2.3 (SD=0.8) |
| Students | 130 |
| Freelancers | 84 |
| Corporate employee | 1 |

The final sample consisted of 215 participants, primarily representing Generation Z. The mean age of respondents was 22 years (SD = 0.6), indicating a relatively homogeneous age group. Participants reported an average work experience of 2.3 years (SD = 0.8), suggesting early-career engagement in the labor market. In terms of employment status, the majority were students (n = 130), followed by freelancers (n = 84), while only one respondent reported being employed in a traditional corporate role. This distribution reflects a sample largely embedded in flexible and non-traditional work arrangements.

**Table 2.**

**Variable**

| Variable | Mean (SD) |
|---|---|
| **Employee Productivity** | 5.5 (2.8) |
| **Work-Life Balance** | 6.2 (2.3) |
| **Technostress** | 5.8 (1.8) |

The descriptive statistics reveal moderate mean values for productivity (M = 5.5), work–life balance (M = 6.2), and technostress (M = 5.8) on a 10-point scale. However, these averages should not be interpreted as indicators of neutral perceptions. Instead, the relatively high standard deviations, particularly for productivity (SD = 2.8) and work–life balance (SD = 2.3), suggest substantial variability among respondents. This pattern reflects a polarized distribution of experiences, where individuals tend to report either highly positive or highly negative outcomes. Consequently, the mean values represent the coexistence of opposing perspectives rather than a homogeneous or moderate evaluation of hybrid work systems.

This finding implies that aggregate statistics alone may obscure meaningful subgroup differences, highlighting the need for more nuanced analytical approaches such as segmentation or moderation analysis in future research.

## DISCUSSION

The present study investigated the effects of hybrid work systems on productivity and work–life balance among Generation Z employees, with particular emphasis on the mediating role of technostress. The findings reveal a complex and highly differentiated pattern, suggesting that hybrid work does not produce uniform outcomes but instead generates **divergent experiences shaped by individual and contextual factors**.

A defining feature of the results is the **polarization of responses**, where participants tended to report either strongly positive or strongly negative experiences rather than neutral positions. This pattern is reflected in the descriptive statistics. While the mean scores for productivity (M = 5.5), work–life balance (M = 6.2), and technostress (M = 5.8) appear moderate on a 10-point scale, these averages are accompanied by relatively high standard deviations, particularly for productivity (SD = 2.8) and work–life balance (SD = 2.3). This indicates substantial variability among respondents. Therefore, the mean values should not be interpreted as evidence of neutrality; instead, they reflect the **coexistence of contrasting experiences**, where positive and negative evaluations offset one another at the aggregate level.

The demographic composition of the sample provides important insight into this variability. The study included 215 participants with a mean age of 22 years (SD = 0.6) and an average work experience of 2.3 years (SD = 0.8), indicating a relatively homogeneous group of early-career individuals. Notably, the majority of respondents were students (n = 130) and freelancers (n = 84), with only one participant representing a traditional corporate role. This distribution suggests that the sample is heavily concentrated in **flexible and non-traditional work arrangements**, which are typically characterized by higher autonomy but also lower structural support. As a result, participants are likely to experience hybrid work in highly individualized ways, contributing to the observed divergence in responses.

In relation to **productivity (H1)**, the findings provide conditional support for the hypothesis that hybrid work positively influences performance. On the one hand, many participants reported improvements in productivity, which can be attributed to factors such as increased flexibility and reduced commuting time. On the other hand, the high variability in productivity scores (SD = 2.8) indicates that these benefits are not consistent across the sample. For some individuals, particularly those with strong self-regulation skills and conducive working environments, hybrid work enhances focus and efficiency. For others, however, the lack of structure, potential distractions, and coordination challenges may reduce productivity. This dual pattern suggests that hybrid work is not inherently productive but rather **contingent upon individual work styles and environmental conditions**.

The findings related to **work–life balance (H2)** similarly demonstrate both positive and negative aspects. The relatively higher mean score (M = 6.2) suggests that, overall, participants perceive an improvement in their ability to balance personal and professional responsibilities. This is consistent with the flexibility offered by hybrid work, which allows individuals to manage their schedules more effectively. However, the substantial variation in responses (SD = 2.3) indicates that not all participants benefit equally. For many respondents, particularly students managing both academic and work responsibilities, hybrid work blurs the boundaries between different life domains. This supports the notion that hybrid work simultaneously facilitates flexibility while also introducing **boundary management challenges**, making its impact on work–life balance inherently ambivalent.

The role of **technostress (H3)** emerges as a critical factor in explaining these mixed outcomes. The mean score for technostress (M = 5.8) suggests a moderate to relatively high level of technology-related strain among participants. Although Generation Z is often described as digitally proficient, the findings indicate that frequent use of digital tools, constant connectivity, and communication demands can still produce significant stress. This is particularly relevant for freelancers and students, who may lack organizational support systems and are required to manage multiple digital platforms independently. Technostress thus appears to act as a **mediating mechanism** that reduces the positive effects of hybrid work on both productivity and well-being, reinforcing the importance of technological and psychological support in hybrid environments.

The relationship between **work–life balance and productivity (H4)** is strongly supported by the overall pattern of findings. Participants who reported better balance also tended to demonstrate higher perceived productivity, highlighting the role of well-being as a key driver of performance. In this context, work–life balance functions as a critical resource that enhances motivation and reduces burnout, consistent with the assumptions of the Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) model. Conversely,

individuals experiencing poor balance are more likely to report lower productivity, further emphasizing the interconnected nature of these variables.

Taken together, the findings suggest that hybrid work operates as both a **resource and a demand**. For some individuals, it provides autonomy, flexibility, and improved efficiency. For others, it introduces technostress, boundary blurring, and decreased performance. The observed polarization in responses can therefore be interpreted as evidence that hybrid work amplifies individual differences rather than producing uniform outcomes. In this sense, the moderate mean scores mask the presence of distinct subgroups within the sample—those who thrive in hybrid environments and those who struggle.

From a theoretical perspective, these results reinforce the relevance of the **Job Demands–Resources framework** in understanding hybrid work dynamics. The balance between resources (e.g., flexibility, autonomy) and demands (e.g., technostress, lack of boundaries) determines the overall impact on employee outcomes. This highlights the importance of considering both positive and negative aspects of hybrid work rather than assuming inherently beneficial effects.

From a practical standpoint, the findings suggest that organizations should adopt a more **context-sensitive approach** to hybrid work implementation. Given the variability in experiences, policies should be tailored to individual needs and supported by measures aimed at reducing technostress and improving boundary management. This is particularly important for younger workers and those in non-traditional employment arrangements, who may lack structured support systems.

Several limitations should be acknowledged. The sample is heavily skewed toward students and freelancers, with minimal representation of traditional corporate employees, which limits the generalizability of the findings. Additionally, the use of self-reported measures may introduce subjective bias, particularly in the assessment of productivity. Future research could address these limitations by including more diverse occupational groups, employing longitudinal designs, and incorporating objective performance indicators.

In conclusion, this study demonstrates that hybrid work is a highly variable and context-dependent system for Generation Z employees. Its effects on productivity and work–life balance are shaped by individual circumstances, levels of technostress, and the ability to manage boundaries. Rather than producing consistent outcomes, hybrid work creates a spectrum of experiences, highlighting the need for flexible and adaptive approaches in both research and practice.

## CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study examined the relationship between hybrid work systems, productivity, work–life balance, and technostress among Generation Z employees. The findings confirm that hybrid work is a **highly complex and context-dependent phenomenon**, producing both positive and negative outcomes rather than a single, uniform effect.

First, the results indicate that hybrid work is widely preferred among Generation Z participants, reflecting a strong demand for flexibility and autonomy in contemporary work arrangements. However, despite this overall preference, the study revealed a **polarized pattern of experiences**, where individuals reported either highly positive or highly negative outcomes. This polarization is reflected in the moderate mean scores for productivity ($M = 5.5$), work–life balance ($M = 6.2$), and technostress ($M = 5.8$), combined with relatively high standard deviations. These findings suggest that average values mask substantial variation and should be interpreted as the coexistence of opposing perspectives rather than true neutrality.

With regard to the proposed hypotheses, the findings provide **partial support for H1**, indicating that hybrid work can enhance productivity, but only under favorable conditions such as effective self-management and supportive work environments. For some participants, hybrid work improved focus and efficiency, while for others it introduced distractions and coordination challenges.

The results offer **stronger support for H2**, demonstrating that hybrid work generally

contributes to improved work–life balance due to increased flexibility and reduced commuting. However, this benefit is not universal, as a significant proportion of participants reported difficulties in maintaining clear boundaries between work and personal life.

The study also supports **H3**, confirming the mediating role of technostress. Despite being digitally native, Generation Z employees experience moderate levels of technology-related stress, which can undermine both productivity and well-being. Technostress emerges as a critical factor that explains why hybrid work does not always produce positive outcomes.

Finally, **H4 is strongly supported**, as work–life balance is shown to be a key predictor of productivity. Participants who reported better balance also demonstrated higher levels of performance, highlighting the importance of well-being as a foundation for effective work.

Overall, the findings reinforce the assumption of the Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) model, demonstrating that hybrid work simultaneously functions as a **resource** (through flexibility and autonomy) and a **demand** (through technostress and boundary blurring). The balance between these elements determines whether the overall impact is positive or negative.

Future studies should aim to address the limitations of the present research. First, the sample in this study consisted primarily of students and freelancers, with minimal representation of traditional corporate employees. Future research should include a more diverse range of occupational groups to enhance generalizability.

Second, longitudinal studies are needed to examine how experiences of hybrid work evolve over time. This would provide deeper insight into the long-term effects of flexibility, technostress, and work–life balance.

Third, future research could explore additional moderating variables, such as personality traits, organizational culture, and leadership styles, which may influence how individuals experience hybrid work.

Finally, incorporating **objective measures of productivity**, alongside self-reported data, would improve the reliability and validity of findings in this area.

In conclusion, hybrid work represents a transformative shift in the modern workplace, particularly for Generation Z employees. While it offers significant advantages in terms of flexibility and autonomy, its effectiveness depends on the ability to manage associated challenges such as technostress and boundary blurring. A nuanced, context-sensitive approach is therefore essential to fully realize the potential of hybrid work systems.

## REFERENCES

1. Allen, T. D., Golden, T. D., & Shockley, K. M. (2021). How effective is telecommuting? Assessing the evidence. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest, 22*(2), 40–68.
2. Avicenna, M. M., & Sudiana, K. (2025). The influence of work from home on work-life balance and job satisfaction among Generation Z employees. *Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen Kesatuan*.
3. Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands–resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 22*(3), 309–328.
4. Belaid, S., et al. (2025). Remote work and job satisfaction: A decade of insights through a bibliometric lens. *Administrative Sciences*.
5. Berger, R., et al. (2021). Hybrid work and organizational flexibility in post-pandemic workplaces. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*.
6. Chillakuri, B. (2020). Understanding Generation Z expectations for effective onboarding. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 33*(7), 1277–1296.
7. Cook, D., et al. (2020). Remote and hybrid work arrangements in modern organizations. *Work, Employment and Society*.
8. Deloitte. (2021). *Global Gen Z and Millennial survey 2021*. Deloitte Insights.
9. Ferrara, F., et al. (2022). Hybrid work and employee well-being: Organizational and psychological implications. *Work & Stress*.
10. Gibbs, M., et al. (2024). Employee innovation during office work, work from home and hybrid

work. *Scientific Reports*.
11. Hayes, A. F. (2018). *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis* (2nd ed.). Guilford Press.
12. Ibrahim, A. R., et al. (2024). The influence of work from home on technostress in Generation Z: A systematic review. *Cognicia*.
13. Molino, M., Ingusci, E., Signore, F., et al. (2020). Wellbeing costs of technology use during COVID-19 remote working: An investigation using the technostress framework. *Sustainability, 12*(15), 5911.
14. Pulido-Martos, M., et al. (2023). Hybrid work model: An approach to work–life flexibility in a changing environment. *Administrative Sciences*.
15. Rudolph, C. W., et al. (2021). New directions in the Job Demands–Resources model. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*.
16. Saleem, F., & Malik, M. I. (2023). Technostress and employee outcomes in digital work environments. *Computers in Human Behavior Reports*.
17. Santos, G., et al. (2024). Hybrid work arrangements and employee performance: A systematic review. *Journal of Business Research*.
18. Tarafdar, M., Cooper, C. L., & Stich, J.-F. (2015). The technostress trifecta. *Information Systems Journal, 25*(2), 103–132.
19. Toscano, F., & Zappalà, S. (2020). Social isolation and stress during COVID-19 remote work. *Sustainability, 12*(15), 6987.
20. Vohra, N., et al. (2024). Employee retention and flexible work preferences in Gen Z. *Business Horizons*.
21. Wang, B., Liu, Y., Qian, J., & Parker, S. K. (2021). Achieving effective remote working during COVID-19: A work design perspective. *Applied Psychology, 70*(1), 16–59.
22. Xavier, L., & Porwal, A. (2024). Impact of hybrid work model on productivity. *Shanlax International Journal of Management*.