

Hybrid Work Models in Higher Education: Implications for Faculty Well-being and Productivity

Falgni Y. Makwana¹

Abstract:

Hybrid work models have gained prominence in Indian higher education institutions as digital technologies enable flexible work arrangements. In the context of India's vision for Viksit Bharat 2047, higher education institutions play a critical role in fostering human capital and institutional effectiveness. This study examines the impact of hybrid work models on faculty well-being, with a particular focus on work-life balance, and explores its implications for productivity in academic settings.

A quantitative research design was adopted using primary data collected from 55 faculty members in higher education institutions. A structured questionnaire based on a five-point Likert scale was used, and data were analysed using reliability analysis, descriptive statistics, correlation, and regression techniques. The findings reveal a significant positive relationship between hybrid work models and faculty work-life balance, indicating that flexibility and autonomy enhance the ability to manage professional and personal responsibilities.

Drawing on the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) framework, the study conceptualizes hybrid work as a job resource that supports faculty well-being. While productivity was not directly measured as a separate construct, the findings suggest that improved work-life balance may create favourable conditions for enhanced productivity. The study highlights the importance of institutional support and structured policies for the effective implementation of hybrid work models.

The study offers important implications for higher education institutions in designing flexible and sustainable work practices aligned with the goals of Viksit Bharat 2047.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The nature of work in higher education institutions has undergone significant transformation in recent years, driven by advances in digital technologies and evolving workplace practices. The increasing adoption of hybrid work models, which combine on-campus and remote work, has reshaped how faculty members perform teaching, research, and administrative responsibilities. These developments have encouraged institutions to reconsider traditional work structures and explore more flexible and adaptive work arrangements.

In the context of India's vision for Viksit Bharat 2047, higher education institutions play a crucial role in developing human capital, fostering innovation, and enhancing institutional effectiveness. The integration of digital technologies and flexible work practices is central to this transformation. Hybrid work models, therefore, represent not only a shift in work arrangements but also a strategic approach to improving faculty well-being and productivity in academic settings.

Work-life balance is a critical aspect of faculty well-being, particularly in academic professions where individuals manage multiple responsibilities, including teaching, research, student mentoring, and administrative duties. While hybrid work arrangements offer flexibility and autonomy, they may also blur the boundaries between work and personal life, creating both opportunities and challenges for faculty members.

From a theoretical perspective, the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) framework suggests that job resources such as flexibility, autonomy, and supportive work environments can help individuals manage job demands and enhance well-being. Hybrid work arrangements may function as an important job resource by enabling faculty members to better organise their work and personal responsibilities.

Despite the growing adoption of hybrid work models, limited empirical research has examined their implications for faculty well-being, productivity, and institutional effectiveness in higher education institutions. This study seeks to address this gap by examining the impact of hybrid work models on faculty

¹Department of Management, Jankidevi Bajaj Institute of Management Studies, SNDT Women's University, Mumbai, India, Email: falgniymakwana@gmail.com

work–life balance, well-being, and productivity, and by highlighting their implications for institutional practices.

2.0 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1. To explore how hybrid work models influence faculty work–life balance and overall well-being in higher education institutions.
2. To examine the effect of hybrid work arrangements on faculty productivity in academic settings.
3. To understand faculty perceptions regarding institutional support for hybrid work practices.
4. To suggest policy measures for the effective and sustainable implementation of hybrid work models in higher education institutions.

3.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

Hybrid Work Models in Higher Education

Hybrid work models refer to flexible work arrangements where employees divide their time between on-site and remote work environments. In higher education, such models have gained prominence due to advancements in digital technologies and online learning platforms. Faculty members increasingly engage in teaching, research, and administrative tasks through a combination of physical and virtual modes.

Recent studies suggest that hybrid work enhances flexibility, autonomy, and job satisfaction among employees (Allen et al., 2015). In academic settings, hybrid models enable faculty to manage time more efficiently and reduce commuting constraints, thereby improving overall work experiences. However, the effectiveness of hybrid work depends on institutional readiness, digital infrastructure, and organizational support.

Work–Life Balance in Academic Context

Work–life balance is a critical determinant of employee well-being and organizational performance. In higher education, faculty members often perform multiple roles, including teaching, research, mentoring, and administrative duties, which may lead to role overload and work–life conflict.

Research indicates that flexible work arrangements can significantly improve work–life balance by allowing employees to better manage competing demands (Hill et al., 2010). In academic environments, hybrid work models may reduce time pressures and enhance personal well-being. However, blurred boundaries between work and personal life may also create challenges such as extended working hours and digital fatigue.

Hybrid Work and Faculty Productivity

Faculty productivity is typically reflected in teaching effectiveness, research output, and administrative efficiency. Flexible work arrangements, including hybrid models, may positively influence productivity by providing autonomy and enabling focused work environments.

Studies have shown that reduced commuting time and flexible scheduling can enhance employee efficiency and task performance (Kossek & Lautsch, 2018). In higher education, hybrid work may support better time allocation across academic responsibilities. However, productivity outcomes may vary depending on individual work styles and institutional support systems.

Theoretical Framework: Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) Theory

The Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) theory provides a comprehensive framework for understanding how work environments influence employee well-being and performance (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). According to this theory, job demands require sustained effort and may lead to stress, while job resources help individuals manage these demands and enhance motivation.

Hybrid work models can be conceptualized as a job resource, as they provide flexibility, autonomy, and control over work processes. These resources can reduce work–life conflict and support faculty well-being. In academic contexts, hybrid work arrangements may enable faculty members to better manage multiple responsibilities, thereby contributing to improved work–life balance and productivity.

3.1 Research Gap

Despite the growing adoption of hybrid work arrangements across sectors, limited empirical research has specifically examined their impact on faculty work–life balance within higher education institutions,

particularly in the Indian context. Existing studies have largely focused on employee productivity, job satisfaction, and organizational performance, with comparatively less attention given to faculty well-being and the unique work dynamics of academic professions.

Furthermore, prior research has not sufficiently explored how hybrid work models function as a job resource within the framework of the Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) theory in academic settings. There is also a lack of integrated analysis linking hybrid work practices with both individual outcomes, such as work–life balance and well-being, and broader institutional implications.

Therefore, this study seeks to address these gaps by examining the relationship between hybrid work models and faculty work–life balance, while also considering implications for productivity and institutional effectiveness in higher education institutions.

3.2 Hypothesis Development

Hybrid work arrangements have become increasingly prevalent in higher education institutions as digital technologies enable faculty members to perform academic tasks across both physical and virtual environments. These models provide flexibility in terms of work location and scheduling, allowing faculty members to manage teaching, research, and administrative responsibilities more effectively.

Work–life balance is a critical dimension of faculty well-being, particularly in academic professions characterized by multiple and often overlapping roles. Faculty members frequently engage in teaching, research, student mentoring, and administrative activities, many of which extend beyond conventional working hours. As a result, maintaining a balance between professional and personal responsibilities can be challenging. Hybrid work arrangements, by offering greater flexibility and autonomy, may enable faculty members to better manage these competing demands.

From a theoretical perspective, the Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) framework provides a useful lens to understand this relationship. According to the JD-R theory, job resources such as flexibility, autonomy, and supportive work arrangements play a crucial role in helping employees manage job demands and enhance well-being. Hybrid work models can be conceptualized as a job resource, as they allow faculty members to organize their work schedules more efficiently and reduce work–life conflict. Therefore, hybrid work arrangements are expected to positively influence faculty work–life balance.

In addition to well-being, productivity is an important outcome in academic settings. Faculty productivity encompasses teaching effectiveness, research output, and administrative efficiency. Hybrid work arrangements may enhance productivity by allowing faculty members to work in environments that suit their tasks, reduce commuting time, and provide greater control over work schedules. Increased autonomy and flexibility may contribute to improved focus and efficiency, thereby positively influencing perceived productivity.

Furthermore, the effectiveness of hybrid work models is likely to depend on the level of institutional support. Institutional support includes access to digital infrastructure, clear work policies, administrative guidance, and technical resources. Higher education institutions that provide structured support systems can facilitate smoother implementation of hybrid work arrangements, enabling faculty members to fully utilize the benefits of flexibility while minimizing potential challenges such as role ambiguity and work fragmentation.

Based on these arguments, the following hypothesis is proposed:

H1: Hybrid work models have a significant positive impact on faculty work–life balance in higher education institutions.

4.0 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study adopted a quantitative, descriptive, and correlational research design to examine the relationship between hybrid work models and faculty work–life balance in higher education institutions. The study also discusses the implications of hybrid work practices for faculty productivity based on the empirical findings and existing literature.

Population and Sample

The target population comprised faculty members employed in higher education institutions who had experience with hybrid work arrangements. Primary data were collected through an online survey using a convenience sampling technique. A total of 55 valid responses from faculty members in higher education institutions in Mumbai were included in the final analysis.

Research Instrument

Primary data were collected using a structured questionnaire developed after an extensive review of the literature on hybrid work models and work–life balance. The questionnaire consisted of two sections. The first section collected demographic information, including designation, type of institution, and teaching experience. The second section measured the study constructs using a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree).

The Hybrid Work Model construct was measured using four items, while Work–Life Balance was measured using three items. For each construct, a composite score was computed by averaging the responses to the respective items. These composite scores were used as the variables for correlation and regression analyses.

Variables of the Study

The study examined the following variables:

- Independent Variable: Hybrid Work Model (4 items)
- Dependent Variable: Work–Life Balance (3 items)

The implications of hybrid work models for faculty productivity were interpreted based on the relationship between hybrid work models and work–life balance and supported through the existing literature.

Reliability of the Instrument

The internal consistency of the measurement scales was assessed using Cronbach's Alpha. The Hybrid Work Model scale recorded a Cronbach's Alpha value of 0.858, while the Work–Life Balance scale recorded 0.830, indicating satisfactory reliability for both constructs.

Data Collection Procedure

The questionnaire was administered online through Google Forms. Participation was voluntary, and respondents were informed about the purpose of the study. Confidentiality and anonymity were maintained, and the responses were used solely for academic research.

Data Analysis

The collected data were analysed using descriptive and inferential statistical techniques. Descriptive statistics, including frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations, were used to summarise the demographic characteristics of the respondents and the study variables.

Pearson's correlation analysis was conducted using the composite scores of the Hybrid Work Model and Work–Life Balance constructs to examine the relationship between the two variables. Regression analysis was subsequently performed to determine the influence of hybrid work models on faculty work–life balance. The findings were then interpreted to discuss their implications for faculty productivity and institutional practices in higher education.

Ethical Considerations

Participation in the study was voluntary, and respondents were informed about the purpose of the research. Anonymity and confidentiality of responses were ensured, and the data were used solely for academic purposes.

4.1 Results and Analysis

Reliability Analysis

Reliability analysis was conducted to assess the internal consistency of the measurement scales used in the study. Cronbach's alpha values were calculated for the constructs of hybrid work models and work–life balance.

The results indicate that the Cronbach's alpha values for hybrid work models (0.858) and work-life balance (0.830) exceed the recommended threshold of 0.70, demonstrating satisfactory internal consistency and reliability of the measurement scales.

Table 1: Reliability Analysis

Variable	Number of Items	Cronbach's Alpha
Hybrid Work Models	4	0.858
Work-Life Balance	3	0.830

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics were used to understand the central tendency and variability of the variables.

The mean score for hybrid work models ($M = 3.491$) suggests that faculty members have moderately positive perceptions of hybrid work arrangements. The mean value for work-life balance ($M = 3.794$) indicates that respondents generally perceive hybrid work as supportive in managing professional and personal responsibilities.

These findings suggest that hybrid work environments are viewed favourably by faculty and may contribute to improved well-being and effective management of academic responsibilities.

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation
Hybrid Work Models	3.491	1.114
Work-Life Balance	3.794	1.005

Note: $N = 55$

Correlation Analysis

Correlation analysis was conducted to examine the relationship between hybrid work models and work-life balance.

The results reveal a moderate positive correlation ($r = 0.616$, $p < 0.01$) between hybrid work models and work-life balance. This indicates that increased flexibility and autonomy associated with hybrid work arrangements are significantly associated with better work-life balance among faculty members.

Table 3: Correlation Matrix

Variables	Hybrid Work Models	Work-Life Balance
Hybrid Work Models	1	
Work-Life Balance	0.616*	1

Note: $N = 55$, $p < 0.01$

Regression Analysis

Regression analysis was performed to assess the impact of hybrid work models on work-life balance.

The results show that hybrid work models have a significant positive effect on work-life balance ($\beta = 0.616$, $t = 5.69$, $p < 0.001$). This indicates that hybrid work arrangements significantly predict faculty members' ability to manage professional and personal responsibilities.

The findings support the proposed hypothesis (H1), confirming that hybrid work models function as an important job resource that enhances faculty well-being.

Table 4: Regression Results

Predictor	Beta (β)	t-value	p-value
Hybrid Work Models	0.616	5.69	< 0.001

Interpretation of Findings

Overall, the results suggest that hybrid work models contribute positively to faculty well-being by improving work–life balance. The flexibility and autonomy associated with hybrid work arrangements enable faculty members to manage multiple academic responsibilities more effectively.

While productivity was not directly measured as a separate construct, the positive relationship between hybrid work and work–life balance indicates favourable conditions for improved efficiency and academic performance. The findings also imply that institutional support and structured implementation of hybrid work models can further enhance their effectiveness in higher education settings.

5.0 DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to examine the impact of hybrid work models on faculty work–life balance, well-being, and productivity in higher education institutions. The findings provide empirical evidence that hybrid work arrangements are positively associated with faculty work–life balance. Faculty members who experience greater flexibility and autonomy in hybrid work environments report improved ability to manage professional and personal responsibilities.

The significant positive relationship identified between hybrid work models and work–life balance highlights the role of flexibility as a critical job resource. In line with the Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) framework, hybrid work arrangements enable faculty members to better manage job demands by offering control over work schedules and work environments. This contributes to enhanced well-being and reduced work–life conflict.

Beyond work–life balance, the findings also suggest important implications for faculty productivity. The flexibility associated with hybrid work allows faculty members to allocate time more efficiently across teaching, research, and administrative tasks. Reduced commuting time and greater autonomy may contribute to improved focus and task completion. Although productivity was not directly measured as a separate construct, the positive association between flexibility and work–life balance indicates favourable conditions for enhanced academic performance.

The study further underscores the importance of institutional effectiveness in the successful implementation of hybrid work models. Higher education institutions play a critical role in providing the necessary support systems, including digital infrastructure, clear policy frameworks, and administrative guidance. Institutional support ensures that hybrid work arrangements are implemented in a structured and equitable manner, thereby maximizing their benefits for faculty members.

These findings are consistent with prior research on flexible work practices, which emphasizes the role of autonomy and flexibility in enhancing employee well-being and performance. In the context of higher education, hybrid work models can be viewed as a strategic tool for improving both faculty well-being and institutional outcomes.

6.0 CONCLUSION

This study examined the impact of hybrid work models on faculty work–life balance, well-being, and productivity in higher education institutions. The findings demonstrate that hybrid work arrangements function as an important job resource by providing flexibility and autonomy, which contribute positively to faculty well-being and their ability to manage professional and personal responsibilities.

In the context of India’s vision for Viksit Bharat 2047, higher education institutions play a pivotal role in developing human capital and fostering institutional resilience. The adoption of hybrid work models represents a significant step towards creating flexible, inclusive, and sustainable academic work environments.

The study highlights that while hybrid work enhances work–life balance, its effectiveness depends on the presence of strong institutional support systems. Universities and colleges must develop structured policies, invest in digital infrastructure, and implement faculty support mechanisms to ensure the successful integration of hybrid work practices.

Overall, hybrid work models offer significant potential for improving faculty well-being, supporting productivity, and strengthening institutional effectiveness. By aligning work practices with evolving digital and societal needs, higher education institutions can contribute meaningfully to the broader goals of sustainable development and Viksit Bharat 2047.

7.0 REFERENCES

- 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.
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). *The job demands–resources model: State of the art*. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(3), 309–328.
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). *Job demands–resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward*. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 22(3), 273–285.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Hill, E. J., Erickson, J. J., Holmes, E. K., & Ferris, M. (2010). *Workplace flexibility, work hours, and work–life conflict*. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 24(3), 349–358.
- Kossek, E. E., & Lautsch, B. A. (2018). *Work–life flexibility for whom?* *Academy of Management Annals*, 12(1), 5–36.
- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). *The job demands–resources model of burnout*. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 499–512.

Table 1: Reliability Analysis

Variable	Number of Items	Cronbach's Alpha
Hybrid Work Models	4	0.858
Work–Life Balance	3	0.830

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation
Hybrid Work Models	3.491	1.114
Work–Life Balance	3.794	1.005

Note: $N = 55$

Table 3: Correlation Matrix

Variables	Hybrid Work Models	Work–Life Balance
Hybrid Work Models	1	
Work–Life Balance	0.616*	1

Note: $N = 55$, $p < 0.01$



Table 4: Regression Results

Predictor	Beta (β)	t-value	p-value
Hybrid Work Models	0.616	5.69	< 0.001