

Job Satisfaction Bridges Employee Motivation and Work Performance

Hanzis A*

Department of Economics and Business, Athens University, Greece.

Corresponding Author: Hanzis A, Department of Economics and Business, Athens University, Greece.
Email: ahanzis@aueb.gr

Received: 📅 2026 Mar 15

Accepted: 📅 2026 Apr 03

Published: 📅 2026 Apr 17

Abstract

As hybrid work models become increasingly prevalent, understanding the psychological mechanisms that drive employee performance in flexible work environments has become essential. Despite extensive research on motivation and engagement, limited empirical attention has been given to job satisfaction as a mediating mechanism that explains how or why motivation translates into improved performance. Drawing on data from employees in a Greek FMCG organization experimenting with hybrid work arrangements (N = 222), this study employs Structural Equation Modeling to examine the differential effects of employee motivation on job satisfaction and job performance. The findings reveal that employee motivation significantly enhances individual performance. Motivation also exerts a strong positive effect on job satisfaction, which in turn, positively predicts job performance and partially mediates the relationship between motivation and performance. Notably, the results highlight a substantial indirect effect of job satisfaction on performance through motivation, suggesting that job satisfaction functions as an upstream psychological resource that fuels motivational energy—an effect that may be amplified in hybrid work contexts. Although the model explains 92% of the variance in job performance, model fit indicate that additional contextual or organizational variables may be needed to fully capture the complexity of employee experiences in hybrid work arrangements. Nevertheless, the robustness of the structural paths underscores the theoretical and practical relevance of the identified relationships. Overall, the study emphasizes the foundational role of job satisfaction in shaping motivational processes and sustaining high performance in hybrid work settings. Organizations that invest in employee well-being, meaningful work, and conditions that support intrinsic motivation may be better positioned to leverage the benefits of hybrid work and maintain strong performance outcomes.

Keywords: Job Satisfaction, Employee Motivation, Individual Work Performance, Hybrid Work

1. Introduction

The rise of hybrid work models—where employees split their time between remote and on-site work—has reshaped how organizations think about job motivation, satisfaction, and performance. Remote work can either strengthen or weaken the link between job motivation and satisfaction, depending on individual circumstances and organizational support. The relationship is strengthened when employees value autonomy, prefer flexible schedules, have access to a suitable home workspace, and benefit from reduced commuting stress [1]. Conversely, the job motivation–satisfaction link weakens when employees experience isolation, poor communication, blurred work–life boundaries, or persistent technology frustrations [2,3,4]. Gallup's Workplace (2025) global research found that fully remote workers, are more likely to experience anger, sadness, loneliness, and stress compared to hybrid or on-site workers, suggesting that the absence of physical presence can create mental and emotional distance that undermines wellbeing. Similarly, collaboration

through digital technology is not always smooth, and remote work tends to add cognitive burden and frustration [5-10]. Also, organizational practices play a decisive role in whether flexibility becomes a benefit or a source of strain [11]. Scholarly, interest in hybrid work arrangements remains limited in relation to understanding satisfaction as a mediating mechanism, as most studies examine direct relationships between remote work and outcomes like job satisfaction or performance [11]. Also, inconsistent findings relate motivation or satisfaction between hybrid and on-site workers, which could suggest moderating or mediating variables which require deeper investigation [12]. This study attempts to address the absence of systematic evidence on how job satisfaction mediates the relationship between employee motivation and individual work performance within an organization implementing hybrid work model, and to identify the conditions under which this mediating effect is strengthened or weakened. Additionally, the study ought to examine the direct relationship between

employee motivation and work performance in hybrid work environments.

1.1. Background

The shift to hybrid work has altered the motivational landscape for employees. Self-Determination Theory (SDT) provides a useful framework for understanding these changes, as motivation flourishes when three basic psychological needs are met: autonomy, competence, and relatedness [1]. Studies examining motivation in remote and hybrid contexts reveal that employees who perceive alignment between their work arrangement preferences and actual conditions report significantly higher intrinsic motivation [13]. Research by Galanti et al found that work-from-home arrangements during the pandemic were associated with both increased autonomy, satisfaction and decreased social connection, highlighting the dual-edged nature of flexible work on motivational factors [14,15]. Recent studies on remote and hybrid work suggest that the impact of hybrid work is not uniform. For some employees, hybrid work may weaken social connections and reduce informal learning opportunities, which can negatively affect satisfaction and performance [16]. This variability makes hybrid work a strong candidate for a moderator in the motivation-satisfaction-performance relationship. Evidence on performance in hybrid and remote work arrangements is mixed but increasingly favorable. Visnubalan et al examined remote workers in a Malaysian utility company and found that satisfaction with work-life balance fully mediated the relationship between remote working and individual work performance. A comprehensive literature review by Ploszaj, Fernandes, and Viacava examined the relationship between remote work and job satisfaction. Their framework emphasizes that remote work experiences vary considerably due to individual characteristics such as gender and task requirements, suggesting that uniform hybrid policies may produce heterogeneous performance outcomes. The flexibility to choose work location based on task requirements allows employees to optimize their environment for different performance demands. However, this benefit depends on employees having genuine autonomy over scheduling rather than mandated hybrid arrangements that may not align with task needs or personal preferences [16].

1.2. The Motivation-Performance Relationship in a Hybrid Environment

The literature reveals a complex but coherent picture on how motivation, satisfaction, and performance interact within hybrid work environments. Motivation—particularly intrinsic motivation related to autonomy, achievement, and meaningful work—creates the psychological energy for engagement and performance [17-19]. Job satisfaction serves as a critical mechanism, translating motivational states and organizational resources into sustained performance outcomes [20]. The Individual Work Performance (IWPQ) scale, used in this study, supports the multidimensional approach of performance and captures both the task-focused and contextual behaviors that hybrid work may differently affect. However, these relationships are

contingent on multiple moderating factors including person-environment fit, individual self-regulation capabilities, leadership behaviors, and organizational support systems. The literature suggests that hybrid work offers significant potential to strengthen the motivation-satisfaction-performance pathway, but realizing this potential requires thoughtful implementation that accounts for individual arrangements and provides adequate support for the unique challenges of distributed work [16,21,22].

Moreover, employee motivation refers to the internal and external forces that initiate, direct, and sustain work-related behavior [23]. Classic theories such as Expectancy Theory, Self-Determination Theory, and Goal-Setting Theory emphasize that motivated employees are more likely to exert effort, persist in the face of obstacles, and achieve higher performance levels [24-25]. As a result, motivated employees show higher effort, persistence, and goal-directed behavior, which improves performance. Empirical research consistently shows a positive association between motivation and performance across occupations and contexts [26]. For example, meta-analytic evidence suggests that intrinsic motivation is positively related to performance outcomes, particularly when tasks require creativity and autonomy [27,28].

1.3. The Satisfaction-Performance Relationship in a Hybrid Environment

Job satisfaction is the extent to which employees feel positive about their actual tasks and work environment [29]. Theoretical models such as the Job Characteristics Model and the Two-Factor Theory suggest that when work is meaningful, well-designed, and aligned with employees' needs, satisfaction increases, which in turn supports better performance [30,31]. Judge et al in a meta-analysis found a moderate positive correlation between job satisfaction and job performance, supporting the notion that satisfied employees tend to be more productive and effective [32]. From a process perspective, motivation can be seen as an antecedent that shapes employees' experiences at work [28]. Motivated employees are more engaged, perceive their work as more meaningful, and are more likely to experience positive effects, all of which contribute to higher job satisfaction. In turn, satisfied employees are more committed, show lower turnover intentions, and invest more effort in their tasks, leading to improved performance [33]. This logic supports a mediation model in which employee job satisfaction explains how motivation translates into individual work performance.

Empirical studies increasingly support job satisfaction's mediating role in hybrid work environment-performance relationships. Mabkhot & Al Mubarak found that remote work positively influenced job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and employee engagement among Saudi Arabian workers, with job satisfaction emerging as a significant pathway through which remote work affected commitment and engagement outcomes. The study by Pinheiro & Palma-Moreira provides direct evidence of

job satisfaction's mediating role, demonstrating that job satisfaction mediated the relationship between hybrid work environment and perceived performance among Portuguese workers. Their findings indicate that while hybrid workers showed highest performance and remote workers showed highest satisfaction, these outcomes were interconnected through job satisfaction's bridging function. In addition, Judge et al argue that satisfaction influences performance through mechanisms such as increased motivation, better health, and stronger organizational commitment [32].

1.4. Conceptual and Theoretical Model

The literature identified limited examination of job satisfaction as an explicit mediator and inconsistent findings regarding hybrid work outcomes, supporting the need for studies that directly test mediation models using validated instruments. This research contributes both theoretical and practically as guidance for organizations that are navigating the evolving landscape of hybrid work. In this study, we treat job satisfaction not only as an outcome of motivation but also a predictor of individual performance, making it a theoretically sound mediator. From a theoretical standpoint, hybrid work can be conceptualized as a contextual factor that shapes how motivational states translate into attitudes and behaviors. Conservation of Resources Theory supports those contextual resources (e.g., flexibility, autonomy, supportive policies) that can amplify the positive effects of motivation on satisfaction and performance [34].

The following hypothesis applies:

- **H1 (Direct Effect of Motivation on Satisfaction):** Employees' motivation is positively related to job satisfaction.
- **H2 (Direct Effect of Satisfaction on Performance):** Job satisfaction is positively related to individual work performance.
- **H3 (Direct Effect of Motivation on Performance):** Employees' motivation is positively related to individual work performance.
- **H4 (Mediation Effect):** Job satisfaction mediates the relationship between motivation and individual work performance.

1.5. Research Design

This study adopted a cross-sectional quantitative research design, to enable statistical examination of relationships and differences among multiple variables. Data was gathered using structured, self-administered questionnaires distributed digitally. To ensure methodological rigor, the study employed validated measurement instruments that were appropriately adapted for the Greek context. Ethical standards were upheld throughout the process, including voluntary participation and assurances of anonymity. To assess the mediating role of job satisfaction in the motivation–performance relationship among hybrid workers, the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ), developed by Weiss et al, was used [35]. The scale remains one of the most widely used instruments for assessing how an employee's job satisfies their needs and values. While the MSQ is fundamentally a satisfaction measure, its subscales

capture motivationally relevant constructs, particularly: intrinsic satisfaction factors such as achievement, recognition, responsibility, and the work itself—that align closely with classical motivation theories; Extrinsic satisfaction from external factors such as pay, benefits, and working conditions; and general satisfaction that combines both factors. Research supports that intrinsic motivation is a stronger predictor of sustained performance and wellbeing, than extrinsic motivation alone, particularly in knowledge work contexts where autonomy and task significance are valued [27]. The short form asks respondents to indicate their satisfaction across 20 distinct job facets—including working conditions, pay, promotion opportunities, and relationships with coworkers. The 20 items were recorded on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree). The scale was translated in Greek and the translated version demonstrated very good internal consistency ($\alpha = .991$).

The Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES-9) developed by Schaufeli and Bakker was used to measure work engagement across three dimensions: vigor (high energy and mental resilience), dedication (sense of significance and enthusiasm), and absorption (being fully concentrated in work) [36]. The UWES-9, a shortened version of the original 17-item scale, has demonstrated robust psychometric properties across diverse occupational groups and cultural contexts, making it suitable for cross-sectional and comparative research. While engagement is conceptually distinct from job satisfaction, the two constructs are closely interrelated—engaged employees typically report higher satisfaction, and satisfaction creates conditions to enhance engagement. The 9 items were recorded on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = never, 5 = always). The scale was translated in Greek and the translated version demonstrated very good internal consistency ($\alpha = .992$). The Individual Work Performance Questionnaire (IWPQ) was developed by Koopmans et al and measures individual work performance across three dimensions: task performance (proficiency with which employees perform core job tasks), contextual performance (behaviors that support the organizational, social, and psychological environment), and counterproductive work behavior (actions that harm organizational well-being) [37]. This multidimensional approach recognizes that performance extends beyond task completion to include citizenship behaviors and the absence of harmful actions. The 18 items were recorded on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = Seldom, 5 = Always). The scale was translated in Greek and the translated version demonstrated very good internal consistency ($\alpha = .958$).

1.6. Sampling and Procedure

The invitation to participate in this empirical research, explained the research motivation and ensured confidentiality of results. The scales were distributed via email to 250 employees of a selected FMGC company operating in the Greek food sector. Participants voluntarily completed the questionnaire through Google Forms over a 30-day period. A total of 222 responses were collected, yielding a response rate of 88.8%, ensuring a reliable basis for analysis. Table 1

presents the demographic characteristics of the participants. The sample consisted of 53 women (23.9%) and 169 men (76.1%). Participants ranged in age, with 42 individuals aged 18–29 (18.9%), 106 aged 30–45 (47.7%), and 74 aged 45 years or older (33.3%). In terms of work location, 106 employees (47.7%) were based at headquarters, while 116

(52.3%) worked in production. All participants followed a flexible hybrid work arrangement involving two days of remote work per week. Regarding tenure, six employees (2.7%) had been with the organization for less than one year, 133 (59.9%) had between one and three years of service, and 83 (37.4%) had more than three years of tenure.

Variable	Category	n	%
Gender	Women	53	23.9%
	Men	169	76.1%
Age	18–29	42	18.9%
	30–45	106	47.7%
	45+	74	33.3%
Tenure	< 1 year	6	2.7%
	1–3 years	133	59.9%
	> 3 years	83	37.4%

Table 1

2. Analysis and Discussion

Descriptive statistics on employee motivation showed the highest mean level (M=3.26, SD=1.78), indicating that employees generally reported feeling moderately motivated with their work, although responses varied widely. Job satisfaction was moderately high and more consistent among participants (M=3.11, SD=1.22). Individual performance demonstrated the lowest mean (M=2.97, SD=1.02), suggesting that employees perceived their performance somewhat less favorably compared to their motivation and satisfaction. Standard errors were small across all

variables (SE=0.07-0.12), indicating precise estimates of the population means. A multiple regression analysis was conducted to examine whether satisfaction and motivation predicted job performance in a hybrid work setting. The overall regression model was statistically significant, F (2,219) =540.80, p<.001) and accounted for a substantial proportion of variance in job performance, R²=.832, with an adjusted R²=.830. This indicates that job satisfaction and motivation together have explained approximately 83% of the variability in job performance.

Model Summary – Job Performance											
									Durbin-Watson		
Model	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	RMSE	R ² Change	df1	df2	p	Autocorrelation	Statistic	p
M ₀	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.021	0.000	0	221		0.615	0.767	< .001
M ₁	0.912	0.832	0.830	0.421	0.832	2	219	< .001	0.319	1.342	< .001

Note. M₁ includes Job Satisfaction, Work Motivation

Table 2

Both predictors made significant unique contributions to the model. Job satisfaction was a significant positive predictor of job performance, b=0.289, SE=0.059, b=.345, t=4.92, p<.001. Motivation also significantly predicted job performance,

b=0.335, SE=0.040, b=.585, t=8.35, p<.001 and demonstrated a stronger standardized effect than satisfaction. The intercept for the full model was also significant b=0.979, SE=0.086, t=11.36, p<.001.

<i>Coefficients</i>						
Model		Unstandardized	Standard Error	Standardized	t	p
M ₀	(Intercept)	2.973	0.069		43.38	< .001
M ₁	(Intercept)	0.979	0.086		11.36	< .001
	JSALL	0.289	0.059	0.345	4.923	< .001
	WEALL	0.335	0.040	0.585	8.353	< .001

Table 3

Collinearity diagnostics indicated no problematic multicollinearity. Conditioning indices were below the commonly used threshold of .30, with the highest value being 14.87. Variance proportions showed that no predictor loaded excessively on the same dimension, further supporting the absence of multicollinearity concerns.

<i>Collinearity Diagnostics</i>						
				Variance Proportions		
Model	Dimension	Eigenvalue	Condition Index	(Intercept)	JSALL	WEALL
M ₁	1	2.859	1.000	0.012	0.003	0.004
	2	0.128	4.721	0.521	0.006	0.096
	3	0.013	14.87	0.466	0.992	0.9

Note. The intercept model is omitted, as no meaningful information can be shown.

Table 4

Overall, both job satisfaction and motivation emerged as strong and significant predictors of job performance in a hybrid work environment, with motivation showing the larger effect. A structural equation model was estimated to examine the relationships among satisfaction, motivation, and performance in a hybrid work setting. Model fit was evaluated using multiple indices. Distance based measures indicated that the model did not fully meet the 95% quantile thresholds for excellent fit, with geodesic distance ($d_G = 3.52$), squared Euclidean distance ($d_L = 0.45$), and

maximum likelihood distance ($d_{ML} = 15.25$) all exceeding their respective critical values. Incremental fit indices were below conventional cutoffs, including the CFI (.844), IFI (.844), NNFI (.834), and NFI (.815). Absolute fit indices also suggested areas of misfit, with a low GFI (.418) and an RMSEA of .141. However, residual based indices indicated good reproduction of the covariance structure, with SRMR (.025) and RMS theta (.022) both within acceptable limits. Taken together, the model demonstrated strong explanatory power but did not fully satisfy strict SEM fit criteria.

Model Fit				
Distance Measure		Test Statistic		Critical Value (95% Quantile)
dG		3.521		3.017
SRMR		0.025		0.020
dL		0.453		0.283
dML		15.25		11.61
R-Squared				
Outcome		R ²	Adjusted R ²	
WEALL		0.859	0.858	
JPALL		0.919	0.918	
Regression Coefficients				
Outcome	Predictor	Estimate	f ²	VIF
WEALL	JSALL	0.927	6.068	
JPALL	JSALL	0.328	0.188	7.068
	WEALL	0.647	0.731	7.068
Total Effects				
Outcome	Predictor	Estimate		
WEALL	JSALL	0.927		
JPALL	JSALL	0.927		
	WEALL	0.647		

Note: WEALL=Motivation, JSALL=Satisfaction, JPALL-Performance

Table 5

Despite these limitations, the structural paths were statistically robust. Motivation had a significant positive effect on performance, (b = 0.335), (SE = 0.040), (z = 8.41), (p < .001), with a 95% confidence interval of [0.257, 0.414]. Satisfaction also significantly predicted job performance, (b = 0.289), (SE = 0.058), (z = 4.96), (p < .001), 95% CI [0.175, 0.404]. In addition, satisfaction strongly predicted motivation, (b = 0.627), (SE = 0.018), (z = 34.56), (p < .001), 95% CI [0.592, 0.663]. These results indicate that

higher satisfaction is associated with greater motivation, which in turn is associated with higher job performance. The model accounted for a substantial proportion of variance in both endogenous variables. Work motivation was predicted with high accuracy, (R² = .859) (adjusted (R² = .858)), while job performance demonstrated even stronger explained variance, (R² = .919) (adjusted (R² = .918)). Regression diagnostics further supported the strength of these relationships. Satisfaction had a very large

effect on motivation ($f^2 = 6.07$), while both satisfaction ($f^2 = 0.19$) and motivation ($f^2 = 0.73$) contributed meaningfully to job performance. Variance inflation factors (VIF = 7.07 for both predictors of job performance) indicated moderate but acceptable levels of multicollinearity. Total effects reinforced the central role of satisfaction in the model. Satisfaction had a strong total effect on motivation ($b = 0.927$) and an equally strong total effect on job performance ($b = 0.927$), reflecting both direct and indirect pathways. Motivation also exerted a substantial total effect on job performance ($b = 0.647$). These findings suggest that job satisfaction is a key driver of both motivation and performance in hybrid work environments.

2.1. Conceptual Diagram Description for SEM Model

The structural equation model consists of three primary constructs: job satisfaction (JSALL), motivation (WEALL), and job performance (JPALL). Job satisfaction functions as a mediator, receiving a direct path from motivation and sending a direct path to job performance. Job performance is the final endogenous outcome variable in the model.

Visually, the model can be described as follows:

- Work Motivation → Job Satisfaction
- Job Satisfaction → Job Performance
- Work Motivation → Job Performance

This structure reflects a partially mediated model in which

satisfaction influences job performance both directly and indirectly through its effect on motivation. The model captures the idea that satisfied employees are more motivated, and motivated employees perform better, while also acknowledging that job satisfaction may independently contribute to performance.

2.2. Mediation Analysis

A mediation analysis was conducted to determine whether job satisfaction served as a mechanism through which motivation influenced job performance. The significant direct effect of job satisfaction on job performance ($b = 0.289, p < .001$) and the strong effect of motivation on job satisfaction ($b = 0.627, p < .001$) provided initial support for mediation. Motivation also significantly predicted job performance ($b = 0.335, p < .001$), satisfying the conditions for an indirect effect. The total effect of motivation on job performance was large ($b = 0.927$), whereas the direct effect was more modest ($b = 0.289$), indicating that a substantial portion of the relationship operates through satisfaction. The indirect effect—computed as the product of the WEALL → JSALL and WEALL → JPALL paths were positive and substantial, consistent with partial mediation. These results suggest that employees who report higher motivation tend to experience greater job satisfaction, which in turn enhances their job performance. Thus, satisfaction functions as a meaningful psychological mechanism linking motivation to performance in hybrid work settings.

Path coefficients								
							95% Confidence Interval	
			Estimate	Std. Error	z-value	p	Lower	Upper
WEALL	→	JPALL	0.335	0.040	8.410	< .001	0.257	0.414
JSALL	→	JPALL	0.289	0.058	4.957	< .001	0.175	0.404
WEALL	→	JSALL	0.627	0.018	34.56	< .001	0.592	0.663

Note. Moderation effect estimates are based on mean-centered variables.

Table 6

Direct and indirect effects								
					Estimate	Std. Error	z-value	p
WEALL	→	JPALL			0.335	0.040	8.410	< .001
WEALL	→	JSALL	→	JPALL	0.182	0.037	4.907	< .001

Note. Moderation effect estimates are based on mean-centered variables.

Table 7

Total effects								95% Confidence Interval	
				Estimate	Std. Error	z-value	p	Lower	Upper
Total	WEALL	→	JPALL	0.517	0.017	31.07	< .001	0.484	0.550
Total indirect	WEALL	→	JPALL	0.182	0.037	4.907	< .001	0.109	0.254

Note. Moderation effect estimates are based on mean-centered variables.

Table 8

3. Discussion

The purpose of this study was to examine how job satisfaction and motivation shape job performance within a hybrid work environment. The findings provide strong evidence that both satisfaction and motivation play central roles in predicting employee performance, with motivation emerging as the strongest direct predictor. This aligns with established motivational theories, such as Self-Determination Theory and the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) model, which emphasize the importance of intrinsic motivation and psychological resources in driving performance outcomes. One of the most notable findings is the substantial indirect effect of job satisfaction on job performance through motivation. Employees which are more satisfied with their jobs appear to experience higher levels of motivation, which in turn enhances their performance. This suggests that satisfaction may operate as an upstream psychological resource that fuels motivational energy, particularly in hybrid work settings where autonomy, flexibility, and self-regulation are heightened. The strong total effects observed for job satisfaction underscore their foundational role in shaping both motivational and performance outcomes.

Despite the strong explanatory power of the model—accounting for 92% of the variance in job performance, the model fit indicates that the structural specification does not fully capture the complexity of the underlying data. This is not uncommon in behavioral research, especially when modeling psychological constructs that may be influenced by unmeasured contextual factors such as organizational culture, leadership style, or the quality of hybrid work infrastructure [38,39]. Nevertheless, the robustness of the path coefficients and the consistency of the mediation pattern suggest that the core relationships identified in this study are theoretically meaningful and practically relevant. Overall, the results highlight the importance of fostering job satisfaction and supporting motivational processes to enhance performance in hybrid work environments [40-47].

4. Conclusion

This study provides compelling evidence that job satisfaction and motivation are critical drivers of job performance in hybrid work settings. Motivation emerged as the strongest

direct predictor of performance, while job satisfaction exerted both direct and substantial indirect effects through motivation. These findings underscore the importance of cultivating a work environment that supports satisfaction and intrinsic motivation, particularly as organizations continue to adopt hybrid work arrangements. Although the model demonstrated exceptional explanatory power, some fit indices suggest that additional factors may influence performance in hybrid contexts. Future research could explore variables such as leadership support, digital communication quality, or work-life balance to further refine the model. Overall, the results highlight that hybrid work success depends not only on structural flexibility but also on the psychological experiences of employees. By prioritizing satisfaction and motivation, organizations can enhance performance and foster a more engaged, resilient workforce.

Theoretical Implications

The findings of this study contribute meaningfully to the theoretical understanding of employee behavior in hybrid work environments. First, the strong predictive role of satisfaction and motivation on job performance reinforces core assumptions of the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) model, which indicates that motivational resources are central drivers of performance. In hybrid settings—where autonomy, flexibility, and self-regulation are heightened—motivation appears to function as an especially implicit resource that translates job satisfaction into tangible performance outcomes.

Second, the mediation effect observed in this study advances Self-Determination Theory (SDT) by highlighting the importance of satisfaction as an antecedent of intrinsic motivation. Hybrid work arrangements often increase employees' sense of autonomy, and the results suggest that when employees are satisfied with their work conditions, this autonomy is more likely to translate into improved performance. This positions job satisfaction as a psychological catalyst that activates motivational processes in flexible work contexts. Third, the exceptionally high explained variance in job performance suggests that traditional performance models may underestimate the combined influence of job satisfaction and motivation in

hybrid environments. This points to the need for theoretical frameworks that more explicitly integrate emotional and motivational mechanisms when examining performance in digitally mediated or flexible work settings. Overall, the study extends existing theories by demonstrating that hybrid work amplifies the importance of satisfaction-driven motivation as a pathway to performance, offering a refined understanding of how psychological resources operate in modern work arrangements.

Practical Implications for Managers

The results offer several actionable insights for managers seeking to enhance performance in hybrid work environments. First, the strong influence of job satisfaction on both motivation and performance highlights the importance of cultivating positive employee experience. Managers should prioritize practices that enhance satisfaction—such as recognizing employee contributions, ensuring fair workload distribution, and fostering supportive team climates. Second, because motivation emerged as the strongest direct predictor of performance, organizations should invest in strategies that strengthen intrinsic motivation. This may suggest that providing employees with meaningful work, opportunities for skill development, and greater autonomy is how tasks are completed. Hybrid work naturally supports autonomy, but managers must ensure that employees also feel connected, valued, and supported to maintain high motivation levels.

Third, the mediation findings suggest that improving motivation is an effective lever for indirectly boosting performance through job satisfaction. Managers can therefore view job satisfaction not merely as an outcome but as a strategic input that fuels motivation and, ultimately, performance. Regular check-ins, transparent communication, and responsive leadership can help sustain satisfaction in hybrid settings where employees may feel isolated or disconnected. Finally, the moderate multicollinearity observed between job satisfaction and motivation indicates that these constructs are closely intertwined. Managers should adopt integrated approaches—rather than isolated interventions—to enhance both simultaneously. For example, redesigning roles to increase meaningfulness can improve both job satisfaction and motivation.

Limitations and Future Research

Although the study provides valuable insights, several limitations should be acknowledged. First, the model fit indicate that the structural model did not fully meet strict SEM fit criteria. This suggests that additional variables—such as leadership style, communication quality, digital tool usability, or work-life balance—may influence the relationships among job satisfaction, motivation, and performance. Future research should incorporate these contextual factors to develop more comprehensive models of hybrid work behavior. Second, the study relied on self-reported measures, which may introduce common-method bias or inflate associations among variables. Also, responses may sometimes reflect socially desirable answers rather than genuine perceptions. Future

studies could incorporate objective performance metrics, supervisor ratings, or behavioral data to validate the findings. Third, cross-sectional design limits the ability to draw causal conclusions. Longitudinal or experimental designs would allow researchers to examine how job satisfaction and motivation evolve over time in hybrid settings and how changes in these constructs influence performance. Fourth, the sample was drawn from a specific Organisation, which may limit generalizability. Future research should examine diverse industries, cultural contexts, and hybrid work structures to determine whether the observed relationships hold across different work environments. Finally, given the rapid evolution of hybrid work practices, future studies should explore how emerging factors—such as AI-supported workflows, digital collaboration norms, and hybrid leadership competencies—shape the motivational and performance dynamics identified in this study.

References

1. Tóth, R., Dunavölgyi, M., Mitev, A. Z., & Marciniak, A. R. (2025). Exploring the psychological impact of choice in telework: enhancing employee performance and life satisfaction. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 12(1), 1-13.
2. Figueiredo, E., Margaça, C., & Sánchez-García, J. C. (2025, August). Loneliness and isolation in the era of telework: a comprehensive review of challenges for organizational success. In *Healthcare* (Vol. 13, No. 16, p. 1943). MDPI.
3. Shikusinde, E., & Shimaneni, F. (2025). Remote work: The impact of communication, technology and work-life balance on employee motivation. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, 23, 3171.
4. Sobral, F., Dias-Oliveira, E., Morais, C., & Hodgson, J. (2025, January). Blurred boundaries: exploring the influence of work-life and life-work conflicts on university teachers' health, work results, and willingness to teleworking. In *Frontiers in Education* (Vol. 9, p. 1512536). Frontiers Media SA.
5. Gallup Workplace. (2025). *The remote work paradox: Higher engagement, lower wellbeing. A new global workplace finding unpacks the complexity of leading remote teams.*
6. Wang, B., Liu, Y., Qian, J., & Parker, S. K. (2021). Achieving effective remote working during the COVID-19 pandemic: A work design perspective. *Applied psychology*, 70(1), 16-59.
7. Camacho, S., Hassanein, K., & Head, M. (2022). Cyberloafing and technostress in remote work: The role of digital communication overload. *Information & Management*, 59(7), 103666.
8. Gilson, L. L., Maynard, M. T., Jones Young, N. C., Vartiainen, M., & Hakonen, M. (2015). Virtual teams research: 10 years, 10 themes, and 10 opportunities. *Journal of management*, 41(5), 1313-1337.
9. Molino, M., Ingusci, E., Signore, F., Manuti, A., Giancaspro, M. L., Russo, V., ... & Cortese, C. G. (2020). Wellbeing costs of technology use during Covid-19 remote working: An investigation using the Italian translation of the technostress creators scale. *Sustainability*, 12(15), 5911.

10. Tarafdar, M., Cooper, C. L., & Stich, J. F. (2019). The technostress trifecta-techno eustress, techno distress and design: Theoretical directions and an agenda for research. *Information systems journal*, 29(1), 6-42.
11. García-Salirrosas, E. E., Rondon-Eusebio, R. F., Geraldo-Campos, L. A., & Acevedo-Duque, Á. (2023). Job satisfaction in remote work: The role of positive spillover from work to family and work-life balance. *Behavioral Sciences*, 13(11), 916.
12. Corral, R. J. P. (2024). Impact of hybrid and on-site work arrangements on employee motivation and job satisfaction in the BPO industry: A cross-sectional study. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, 12(2), 205-230.
13. Oquendo, S. Y. (2025). Aligning Remote Work Preferences With Workplace Outcomes: Investigating The Impact Of Person-Environment Fit.
14. Galanti, T., Guidetti, G., Mazzei, E., Zappalà, S., & Toscano, F. (2021). Work from home during the COVID-19 outbreak: The impact on employees' remote work productivity, engagement, and stress. *Journal of occupational and environmental medicine*, 63(7), e426-e432.
15. Martínez-López, J. Á., Lázaro-Pérez, C., & Gómez-Galán, J. (2021). Death anxiety in social workers as a consequence of the COVID-19 pandemic. *Behavioral Sciences*, 11(5), 61.
16. Waizenegger, L., McKenna, B., Cai, W., & Bendz, T. (2020). An affordance perspective of team collaboration and enforced working from home during COVID-19. *European journal of information systems*, 29(4), 429-442.
17. Flunger, B., Lilleholt, L., Böhm, R., Verdonschot, A., van Gog, T., & Zettler, I. (2024). Testing self-supportive strategies to regulate autonomy and motivation. *Plos one*, 19(10), e0311264.
18. Hoxha, S., & Ramadani, R. (2024). The impact of intrinsic motivation on the sustainable extra-role performance with the mediating role of job engagement. *Sustainability*, 16(17), 7643.
19. Özcan, M., Çekmecelioğlu, H. G., & Konakay, G. (2025). Reflections of self-concept clarity at work: the mediating role of psychological empowerment on the relationship between self-concept clarity and intrinsic motivation. *BMC psychology*, 13(1), 470.
20. Fernet, C., Trépanier, S. G., Austin, S., Gagné, M., & Forest, J. (2015). Transformational leadership and optimal functioning at work: On the mediating role of employees' perceived job characteristics and motivation. *Work & Stress*, 29(1), 11-31.
21. Gajendran, R. S., & Harrison, D. A. (2007). The good, the bad, and the unknown about telecommuting: meta-analysis of psychological mediators and individual consequences. *Journal of applied psychology*, 92(6), 1524.
22. Parker, S. K., Knight, C., & Keller, A. (2020). Remote work design: A research agenda. *Applied Psychology*, 70(1), 16-59.
23. Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and motivation*. Wiley.
24. Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological inquiry*, 11(4), 227-268.
25. Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (2002). Building a practically useful theory of goal setting and task motivation: A 35-year odyssey. *American psychologist*, 57(9), 705.
26. Kanfer, R. (1990). Motivation theory and industrial and organizational psychology. *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*, 1(2), 75-130.
27. Cerasoli, C. P., Nicklin, J. M., & Ford, M. T. (2014). Intrinsic motivation and extrinsic incentives jointly predict performance: a 40-year meta-analysis. *Psychological bulletin*, 140(4), 980.
28. Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., Erez, A., & Locke, E. A. (2005). Core self-evaluations and job and life satisfaction: the role of self-concordance and goal attainment. *Journal of applied psychology*, 90(2), 257.
29. Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*.
30. Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. *Organizational behavior and human performance*, 16(2), 250-279.
31. Herzberg, F. I. (1966). *Work and the Nature of Man*.
32. Judge, T. A., Thoresen, C. J., Bono, J. E., & Patton, G. K. (2001). The job satisfaction-job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Psychological bulletin*, 127(3), 376.
33. Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L., & Topolnitsky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences. *Journal of vocational behavior*, 61(1), 20-52.
34. Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: a new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American psychologist*, 44(3), 513.
35. Weiss, D. J., Dawis, R. V., & England, G. W. (1967). Manual for the Minnesota satisfaction questionnaire. *Minnesota studies in vocational rehabilitation*.
36. 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: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, 25(3), 293-315.
37. Koopmans, L., Bernaards, C. M., Hildebrandt, V. H., De Vet, H. C., & Van Der Beek, A. J. (2014). Construct validity of the individual work performance questionnaire. *Journal of occupational and environmental medicine*, 56(3), 331-337.
38. Johns, G. (2006). The essential impact of context on organizational behavior. *Academy of management review*, 31(2), 386-408.
39. Avolio, B. J., Walumbwa, F. O., & Weber, T. J. (2009). Leadership: Current theories, research, and future directions. *Annual review of psychology*, 60(1), 421-449.
40. Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands-resources model: State of the art. *Journal of managerial psychology*, 22(3), 309-328.
41. Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2008). Towards a model of work engagement. *Career development international*, 13(3), 209-223.

42. Campbell, J. P., McHenry, J. J., & Wise, L. L. (1990). Modeling job performance in a population of jobs. *Personnel psychology, 43*(2), 313-575.
43. Choudhury, P., Foroughi, C., & Larson, B. Z. (2021). Is hybrid work the best of both worlds? Harvard Business Review. <https://hbr.org> accessed 15/1/2026
44. Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied psychology, 71*(3), 500.
45. Orešković, T., Milošević, M., Košir, B. K., Horvat, D., Glavaš, T., Sadarić, A., ... & Orešković, S. (2023). Associations of working from home with job satisfaction, work-life balance, and working-model preferences. *Frontiers in Psychology, 14*, 1258750.
46. Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington books/DC heath and com.
47. Schein, E. H. (2010). *Organizational culture and leadership* (Vol. 2). John Wiley & Sons.