

**EAWOP Small Group Meeting**  
**Hybrid work environments**

**Call for Papers**

9<sup>th</sup> – 10<sup>th</sup> January 2025

Berlin, Germany

Organizers: Alexandra Michel, Janne Kaltiainen, and Annkatrin Hoppe

**Conference Theme**

**Improving and understanding hybrid work environments**

The workplace of the future will be characterised by a much higher proportion of hybrid working. Hybrid work is characterized by dynamic switches between various work modes related to *where*, *how*, and *when* people work. Following Lauring and Jonasson (2024) recent conceptualization of hybrid work, these various work modes refer first to the location (e.g. switching between working on-site in the office, in a co-working space, or remotely at home), second, to the modality (e.g., switching between meeting with colleagues face-to-face and virtually), and third, temporality (e.g., working together synchronously vs asynchronously).

Hybrid working has several advantages for organisations, including the possibility of substantial cost-savings (e.g., lower cost of office space) and for employees, including greater flexibility, autonomy, and reduced commuting times (e.g., Aksoy et al. 2022; Delanoëje & Verbruggen, 2020; De Vincenzi et al. 2022). Moreover, the reduction in commuting and the ability to work from home away from major cities holds appeal for governments as they attempt to manage the twin transition (digital and green transitions). However, hybrid workers can also experience a sense of loneliness and isolation due to reduced social interaction and support (Papandrea et al., 2020; Leka, 2021) and blurred boundaries between work and personal life (De Vincenzi et al., 2022). Generally, the adverse effects of working from home are more pronounced among women, younger workers, those with lower incomes, and those with caretaking responsibilities who face additional burdens of juggling care and work responsibilities (Sostero et al., 2020). Evidence remains inconclusive not only regarding the association between hybrid working and employee mental health, well-being, and performance but also on team processes (e.g., participation, communication), team cohesion, and effective leadership (e.g., Allen et al., 2024; Arena et al., 2023). Researchers and practitioners need to attend to both the short- and long-term effects of hybrid work as they unfold, as they may differ. For instance, WFH may promote individual task performance in the short term, while in the long term may harm creativity, social connectedness, and learning in organizations.

Hybrid working environments, comprising different forms and types of alternative work arrangements are not homogeneous and can vary in terms of the pattern of hybrid working, the ratio of remote to in-office working (ranging from those who work only in the office, work only remotely or work some days in the office and some days remotely), and the autonomy with which workers can choose when and where to work, amongst others. Also, the mode of working may vary greatly regarding the level of virtuality. These

hybrid work arrangements present new challenges and the need to upskill organisational decision-makers, such as leaders, managers, and HR professionals.

We are interested in receiving submissions representing high quality research with rigorous designs using longitudinal, diary, qualitative, and/or intervention designs and approaches aiming to understand and improve hybrid work and its consequences for workers, teams, and organizations. When considering hybrid work, its antecedents, and consequences not only at the individual but also at the team or organizational level as well as intervention approaches, questions such as the following are raised:

- How does hybrid work impact different outcomes at the individual (e.g., health, wellbeing, performance, creativity, work-family interface), team (e.g., collaboration, psychological safety, team climate) or organizational level (e.g., productivity, commitment)?
- Which are the characteristics of ‘good’ hybrid work? Where, when and how to work in hybrid work settings? How can hybrid work characteristics be assessed and differentiated? Under which boundary conditions can the negative impacts of hybrid work be alleviated, and positive ones boosted?
- How can workplaces and co-working spaces (e.g., office design) be made more attractive for hybrid workers? How should hybrid work be designed and crafted?
- How can leaders address the challenges of leading with less face-to-face interaction with employees? What are effective (virtual) leadership practices in hybrid working environments?
- Which interventions at the organizational, team, leadership and individual level are effective in improving hybrid work and its consequences?

### **Contribution of the Small Group Meeting**

In sum, this SGM represents a unique opportunity for researchers, practitioners and policymakers to come together to advance the conceptual understanding of hybrid work environments along with proposing approaches for designing hybrid work and suggestions for policy implications. It aims to provide a forum for a researcher-practitioner-policy-maker dialogue to discuss challenges, best practices and new avenues that contribute to the understand and design of hybrid work arrangements.

### **Outcomes of the Small Group Meeting**

The anticipated outcomes of the SGM are as follows:

1. An agenda for future research to advance research and practice on designing and improving hybrid work environments.
2. A better understanding of relevant issues for practitioners to contribute to the evidence-base for practitioners and policy makers.
3. An opportunity to develop a series of papers for submission to a special issue to a journal such as EJWOP.

### **Key Dates**

Deadline for submission of abstracts: 10<sup>th</sup> of December 2024

Acceptance letters for participants: by 12<sup>th</sup> of December 2024

Small Group Meeting: 9<sup>th</sup> -10<sup>th</sup> of January 2025

### **Venue of the Meeting**

Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Germany

Rudower Chaussee 18

12489 Berlin - Adlershof

The psychology department of Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin is located in Berlin-Adlershof, Germany's largest science and technology park located 20 min from Berlin (BER) airport. Public transportation from Berlin main station takes approximately 45 minutes.

The SGM will be held in a newly designed co-working site "STEAM": <https://www.wista.de/en/real-estate/working-environments>, offering a hybrid work environment for startups and smaller companies.

### **Nature of the conference**

This EAWOP Small Group Meeting is a workshop over three days with approximately 4 keynote speakers, 20 paper presentations, and a focus on providing time for discussions and ideas for the future of the field, both research and practitioner-focused. There will be no registration fee and costs for meals during the day will be covered.

### **Submission of Abstracts**

Paper abstracts (up to 500 words) should be submitted by 10<sup>th</sup> December 2024 to [michel.alexandra@baua.bund.de](mailto:michel.alexandra@baua.bund.de). Participants will be notified about the acceptance of their paper by December 10th, 2024.

### **Publication of papers**

We are planning to publish a selection of the papers in a special issue of EJWOP. This will be discussed in more detail at the SGM.

## References

- Aksoy, C. G., Barrero, J. M., Bloom, N., Davis, S. J., Dolls, M., & Zarate, P. (2022). Working from Home Around the World. *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, 2022(2), 281–360. <https://doi.org/10.1353/eca.2022.a901274>
- Arena, M., Hines, S., & Golden, J. (2023). The three Cs for cultivating organizational culture in a hybrid world. *Organizational Dynamics*, 52(1), 100958. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2023.100958>
- Bakker, A.B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The Job Demands-Resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22, 309-328.
- Briner, R. B. & Reynolds, S. (1999). The costs, benefits and limitations of organizational level stress interventions. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20, 647-664.
- Cox, T., Karanika, M., Griffiths, A. & Houdmont, J. (2007). Evaluating organizational-level work-stress interventions: Beyond traditional methods. *Work & Stress*, 21(4), 348-362.
- De Vincenzi, C., Pansini, M., Ferrara, B., Buonomo, I., & Benevene, P. (2022). Consequences of COVID-19 on Employees in Remote Working: Challenges, Risks and Opportunities An Evidence-Based Literature Review. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(18), 11672. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph191811672>
- DeJoy, D. M., Wilson, M. G., Vandenberg, R. J., McGrath-Higgins, A. L. & Griffin-Blake, C. S. (2010). Assessing the impact of healthy work organization intervention. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 83, 139-165.
- Delanoëije, J., & Verbruggen, M. (2020). Between-person and within-person effects of telework: A quasi-field experiment. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 29(6), 795–808. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2020.1774557>
- DeLongis, A., Folkman, S. & Lazarus, R. S. (1988). The impact of daily stress on health and mood: Psychological and social resources as mediators. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54(3), 486-495.
- Demerouti, E., Eeuwijk, E. van, Snelder, M. & Wild, U. (2011). Assessing the effects of a "personal effectiveness" training on psychological capital, assertiveness and self-awareness using self-other agreement. *Career Development International*, 16(1), 60-81.
- Emmons, R. A. & McCullough, M. E. (2003). Counting blessings versus burdens: An experimental investigation of gratitude and subjective well-being in daily life. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84(2), 377-389.
- Ferrara, B., Pansini, M., De Vincenzi, C., Buonomo, I., & Benevene, P. (2022). Investigating the Role of Remote Working on Employees' Performance and Well-Being: An Evidence-Based Systematic Review. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(19), 12373. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph191912373>
- Hakanen, J. J., Perhoniemi, R., Toppinen-Tanner, S (2008). Positive gain spirals at work: From job resources to work engagement, personal imitative and work-unit innovativeness, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 73, 78-91.
- Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist*, 44(3), 513-524.
- Ilies, R., Keeney, J. & Scott, B. A. (2011). Work-family interpersonal capitalization: Sharing positive work events at home. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 114(2), 115-126.

- Jain, A., Hassard, J., Leka, S., Di Tecco, C., & Iavicoli, S. (2021). The Role of Occupational Health Services in Psychosocial Risk Management and the Promotion of Mental Health and Well-Being at Work. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(7), 3632. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18073632>
- Lauring, J., & Jonasson, C. (2024). What is hybrid work? Towards greater conceptual clarity of a common term and understanding its consequences. *Human Resource Management Review*, 101044. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2024.101044>
- Luthans, F., Avolio, B., Avey, J. & Norman, S. (2007). Positive Psychological Capital: Measurement and Relationship with Performance and Satisfaction, *Personnel Psychology*, 60, 541-572.
- Mohr, C., Hammer, L., Dimoff, J., Allen, S., Lee, J., Arpin, S., McCabe, S., Brockwood, K., Bodner, T., Mahoney, L., Dretsch, M., & Britt, T. (2024). Supportive-leadership training to improve social connection: A cluster-randomized trial demonstrating efficacy in a high-risk occupational context. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000384>
- Muraven, M., Tice, D. M. & Baumeister, R. F. (1998). Self-control as limited resource: Regulatory depletion patterns. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74(3), 774-789.
- Nielsen, K., Randall, R., Holten, A. L. & Gonzalez, E. R. (2010). Conducting organizational-level occupational health interventions: What works? *Work & Stress*, 24(3), 234-259.
- Nielsen, K., Taris, T. W. & Cox, T. (2010). The future of organizational interventions: Addressing the challenges of today's organizations. *Work & Stress*, 24(3), 219-233.
- Papandrea, D. (2020). In the face of a pandemic: Ensuring safety and health at work. Geneva: ILO.
- Ryan, R. M. & Frederick, C. (1997). In energy, personality and health: Subjective vitality as a dynamic reflection of well-being. *Journal of Personality*, 65(3), 529-565.
- Schaufeli, W. B. & Bakker, A. B. (2004). Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25, 293-315.
- Sin, N. L. & Lyubormirsky, S. (2009). Enhancing well-being and alleviating depressive symptoms with positive psychology interventions: A practice friendly meta-analysis. *Journal of Clinical Psychology: In Session*, 65(5), 467-487.
- Sonnentag, S., Binnewies, C., and Mojza, E. J. 2008. "Did you have a nice evening?" A day-level study on recovery experiences, sleep, and affect. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(3), 674-684.
- Sostero, M., Milasi, S., Hurley, J., Fernandez-Macías, E., & Bisello, M. (2020). Teleworkability and the COVID-19 crisis: A new digital divide? JRC working papers series on labour, education and technology.
- Vischer, J. C. (2007). The effects of the physical environment on job performance: Towards a theoretical model of workspace stress. *Stress and Health*, 23, 175-184.