

Evaluation of the Remote Working Model from the Employees’ Perspective: Qualitative Research

Onur OKTAYSOY¹
M. Akif YENİKAYA²

Received: 15.03.2026, Accepted:06.05.2026
DOI Number: 10.5281/zenodo.20563234

Abstract

This study aims to examine how the remote work model is experienced by employees and its effects on work outcomes, motivation, work-life balance, organizational commitment, and social relationships from the employees’ perspective. The study was designed using a phenomenological design within the framework of a qualitative research approach. The data required for the research were obtained from 56 employees with remote work experience, working in different sectors, through semi-structured interview forms. The data obtained were analyzed using thematic analysis. The findings reveal that remote work offers important advantages for employees, such as time and location flexibility, autonomy, work-life balance, and individual productivity. However, the findings also reveal that the remote work model can lead to significant negative consequences such as social isolation, weakened organizational belonging, communication and coordination difficulties, digital fatigue, and blurred work-life boundaries. The research results show that remote work does not have a one-sided effect on employees; rather, it is experienced in different ways depending on individual characteristics, the nature of the work, and the level of organizational support.

Key words: Work Models, Remote Work, Hybrid Work, Human Resources Management, Organizational Transformation.

JEL Code: J28, M12, M54

¹ Assist. Prof., Kafkas University, Türkiye, onuroktaysoy@kafkas.edu.tr, <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-8623-614X>

² Assist. Prof., Kafkas University, Türkiye, akif.yenikaya@kafkas.edu.tr, <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-3624-722X>

1. Introduction

The acceleration of digitalization and the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic have led to a fundamental transformation in working life over the past decade, overturning long-established practices. Traditional office-based working models are increasingly being replaced by remote working, hybrid working, and flexible working models. This shift has also created a new paradigm in terms of organizational behavior, leadership styles, job satisfaction, and employee engagement. Indeed, according to data from the International Labour Organization (ILO), approximately 260 million people, or about 7-8% of global employment, worked from home before the pandemic. In 2020, this number reached over half a billion people due to the pandemic, marking a historic increase (ILO, 2023). Similarly, according to data from the US Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), approximately 50% of the workforce worked remotely at some point in 2021, and this rate exceeded 70% in sectors such as information technology, finance, and professional services (BLS, 2022). A similar trend has been observed in Türkiye. According to the Turkish Statistical Institute's (Turkstat) Household Labor Force Survey, the rate of working from home, which was below 2% in 2019, increased significantly after 2020, reaching double digits (Turkstat, 2022).

This transformation has reshaped concepts related to working life. The aspects most affected by the remote working model are employee-focused concepts such as work-life balance, organizational commitment, motivation, and productivity. The literature shows that remote work can increase job satisfaction by giving employees flexibility and autonomy, but it also brings negative aspects such as social isolation, digital fatigue, and unclear work boundaries. With the remote work model, the concept of "work" has begun to integrate into an ecosystem woven with digital networks and virtual interactions rather than a physical space. This situation has ignited a process that forces organizations to rethink how they maintain both productivity and employee engagement. As much as where and how employees do their jobs, their sense of belonging to the organization, their motivation levels, and their perceptions of work-life balance have also become decisive for organizational success.

The literature review reveals that there is no consensus on the effects of the remote work model on employees and that there are different perspectives on its outcomes. While some studies in the field focus on the positive effects of remote work, showing positive results in terms of productivity, motivation, and psychological well-being (Jha, 2025; Dangi, 2025; Turan-Torun et al., 2025; Ziomek, 2023), other studies take a negative perspective, suggesting that remote workers may experience weakened organizational commitment and that prolonged isolation increases the risk of burnout (Raneses et al., 2022; Costin et al., 2023; Moulton et al., 2022; Sharma & Khurana, 2025). In addition, it is emphasized that factors such as organizational support, open communication, and leadership quality are critical for the positive effects of remote work to be sustainable from the employees' perspective (Aziz et al., 2023).

Although the existing literature discusses different aspects of remote work, a comprehensive assessment from the employees' perspective is still limited. While many studies focus on organizational performance or productivity dimensions, they do not sufficiently examine employees' individual experiences, psychological well-being, and forms of organizational commitment in depth. Furthermore, there is limited empirical evidence on how cultural context shapes this relationship. In the case of Türkiye, while findings on the effects of remote work on organizational culture, leadership, and employee motivation are increasing, systematic studies that analyze these effects holistically are still lacking (Al, 2023).

In this context, examining the remote work model from the employees' perspective fills an important research gap, both theoretically and practically. Employees' perceptions of remote work reshape organizational commitment, motivation, and work-life balance dynamics, which in turn have direct effects on organizations' human resources strategies, performance measurement systems, and leadership approaches. Particularly in the post-pandemic period, the decision of many organizations to make remote or hybrid work permanent has made understanding the long-term consequences of this model even more critical (Yamoah, 2025).

This study aims to examine the relationships between work-life balance, motivation, and organizational commitment by addressing the remote work model from the employee's perspective. This approach aims to contribute to developing a new understanding of the sustainability of remote work at both the individual and organizational levels. The findings of the study are expected to be instructive, particularly in the design of human resource management, leadership practices, and digital work policies.

2. Conceptual Framework

2.1. Chronological Transformation in Working Models

Work patterns have continuously evolved throughout history alongside changes in economic systems, production technologies, and social values. The classical understanding of work that emerged with the Industrial Revolution was based on the principle that work should be carried out in a specific place, usually under physical supervision and within standard hours (Braverman, 1998). During this period, time discipline and physical attachment to the workplace were considered fundamental determinants of productivity. The classical Taylorism approach viewed workers as an element of production factors and centralized control over work.

From the second half of the 20th century onwards, with the rise of information technologies and the expansion of the service sector, working patterns have increasingly shifted towards cognitive labor and knowledge-based production. This transformation has led to work being defined not only as a physical but also as

an intellectual activity, bringing the concept of the “knowledge worker” to the fore (Drucker, 1999). With the development of the knowledge economy, the remote accessibility and digital skills of employees have become more important than their physical presence. This trend has become more pronounced with the acceleration of globalization and digitalization processes in the early 21st century. The proliferation of information and communication technologies, the development of internet-based platforms, and the use of cloud computing systems have eliminated the spatial boundaries of work, enabling the concept of “working from anywhere.” The ability of employees to participate in work processes through digital tools has allowed organizations to transcend geographical boundaries and adopt distributed working models.

One of the critical turning points in this transformation was the COVID-19 pandemic. The pandemic turned remote work into a mandatory practice on a global scale and permanently changed the work culture. According to ILO data, while approximately 260 million people worldwide worked from home before the pandemic, this number exceeded half a billion in 2020 (ILO, 2023). This increase represents not only a temporary adaptation but also a structural transformation in how organizations operate. In the post-pandemic period, organizations have begun to abandon the “one-size-fits-all” approach to work and adopt multi-model strategies that combine flexible, hybrid, and remote working arrangements (Dangi, 2025). This new paradigm has transformed the concept of work from being solely an economic activity into a social, psychological, and digital phenomenon. Employees now have to strike a new balance not only in terms of time and place but also in terms of personal boundaries, interaction with technology, and organizational belonging while performing their jobs.

In this context, modern working models can be defined by the concept of “digital labor structure.” Digital labor refers to a network-based form of work that is independent of time and carried out through digital tools, platforms, and data rather than physical production (Fuchs, 2014). This new structure reshapes organizations’ management processes, performance metrics, and employee relations, while also bringing risks such as traceability, boundary ambiguity, and burnout, as well as autonomy, flexibility, and freedom for employees (Costin et al., 2023; Oktaysoy, 2026). Therefore, this transformation in working styles is not merely a technological innovation but also a fundamental shift in organizational behavior, leadership, and human resources management disciplines. In this context, remote, hybrid, and flexible working models have begun to take center stage in modern organizations’ sustainability, employee well-being, and performance management policies.

2.2. Remote Working Model

Remote work is defined as a form of work in which employees perform their duties outside the traditional office environment, using information and communication technologies (ILO, 2023). Conceptually expressed by terms such

as “teleworking,” “virtual work,” or “home-based work,” the remote work model is based on spatial independence and enables individuals to participate in work processes through digital tools. In this respect, it is considered one of the most visible reflections of the transition from the industrial society’s physical labor-centered work approach to the information society’s digital labor structure.

When considered in the context of its development, it is seen that the first examples of remote working models emerged in the 1970s with the aim of reducing the costs created by the energy crisis and urban concentration (Toffler, 1980), but it did not find widespread application during this period due to technological infrastructure deficiencies. In the 1990s, with the proliferation of personal computers and the internet, it became possible to perform work independently of location, particularly in knowledge-intensive sectors. In the 2000s, technological developments such as cloud computing, email, video conferencing, and digital project management tools transformed remote work into a model that could be implemented at the corporate level. However, the global spread of remote work was primarily driven by the COVID-19 pandemic that emerged in 2020. The pandemic transformed remote work from a temporary crisis management tool into a permanent organizational structure, fundamentally redefining the concept of space in the business world.

The remote work model has produced multifaceted results for both organizations and employees. For organizations, this model saves on physical space and operational costs while also providing access to a global talent pool. For employees, remote work provides spatial and temporal flexibility, strengthening their sense of autonomy and improving their perception of work-life balance. Mamatha and Thoti (2023) note that remote work offers employees advantages in terms of time management and autonomy, which in turn increases job satisfaction. Similarly, Jha (2025) found that remote work reduces stress levels and has a positive impact on productivity. Dangi (2025) emphasizes that remote work supports psychological well-being and that individuals’ ability to establish their own work routines has positive effects on motivation. These findings show that remote work has significant potential not only in terms of organizational productivity but also in terms of individual well-being and job satisfaction.

However, as well as its positive aspects, remote working has some negative consequences that need to be carefully considered. The reduction in physical interaction creates social isolation and a lack of belonging among employees, which can lead to a weakening of organizational commitment levels in the long term. Raneses and colleagues (2022), in their study conducted in Dubai, found that remote work showed a weak relationship with organizational commitment and that blurred work-life boundaries increased stress levels. Similarly, Costin and colleagues (2023) revealed that remote workers experience high levels of burnout due to a lack of organizational support and the pressure to be constantly online. Moulton and colleagues (2022) also note that long-term remote work leads to loss of motivation and emotional exhaustion. These findings indicate that the sustainability of remote work depends not only on technical infrastructure but also

on organizational support mechanisms, leadership styles, and policy designs that prioritize employee well-being.

Research conducted in the Turkish context shows that cultural and organizational dynamics shape this relationship. Al (2023) found that the performance of remote workers in the Turkish banking sector increased thanks to the supportive and communication-focused structure of the organizational culture. This finding shows that the negative effects of remote work can be balanced with an appropriate management and leadership approach. Yamoah (2025) emphasizes the critical role of organizational support in remote work, noting that employee commitment and productivity levels rise significantly in organizations that prioritize work-life balance.

Overall, the remote work model has a multidimensional structure that presents both opportunities and risks for modern organizations. This model can increase motivation and productivity by giving employees more autonomy and flexibility, but it also raises new psychosocial issues such as lack of social interaction, communication difficulties, and the risk of burnout. Therefore, the success of remote work depends on organizations' ability to restructure not only their digital infrastructure but also their people-centered management policies, leadership styles, and organizational support systems. For this reason, remote work should be approached not only as a work style but also as a strategic management issue for contemporary organizations.

2.3. Hybrid Working Model

The hybrid work model refers to a work arrangement developed by organizations in response to changing work dynamics, where physical and digital forms of labor coexist. Representing a structure where work is not limited to a specific location, but where a certain degree of physical interaction is also maintained, this model is considered a comprehensive transformation process that requires not only a change in working style but also a redefinition of organizational structures and dynamics. In the post-pandemic period, many organizations have turned to hybrid applications in order to reduce the social distance and communication difficulties created by completely remote work, while not giving up the efficiency brought by flexibility (ILO, 2023).

The fundamental feature of this model is that organizational processes are carried out through both physical interaction and digital collaboration. In this context, hybrid work redefines the concept of "office" as a functional space rather than a physical location. Choudhury, Foroughi, and Larson (2021) note that hybrid systems can increase productivity because they offer employees geographical flexibility while allowing organizations to maintain control and social bonds. However, it should be emphasized that the success of a hybrid system depends not only on the use of technology but also on the adaptation capacity of the organizational culture. Indeed, Sabharwal (2023) highlights that the common

characteristics of organizations that are successful in a hybrid system are a “results-oriented performance approach” and a “management style based on mutual trust.”

At the individual level, the hybrid work model is extremely important in that it offers employees both flexibility and the opportunity to maintain a sense of belonging. Indeed, Dangi (2025) found in his research that the hybrid model increases employee satisfaction because individuals can adjust their working styles to suit their own productivity cycles. However, the literature also points out that the hybrid structure may give rise to certain socio-organizational tensions. In particular, the visibility gap that develops between “those in the office” and “those at a distance” weakens the perception of internal organizational justice and can lead to bias in decision-making processes (Raneses et al., 2022). This situation forms the basis of the increasingly debated phenomenon of “proximity bias” in hybrid organizations (Choudhury et al., 2021). Hybrid work has also transformed organizational control forms, with traditional control mechanisms being replaced by performance systems based on target-oriented and measurable outputs. In this new structure, the role of managers has shifted from supervision to coordination, communication, and trust building (Tanpipat et al., 2021). On the other hand, for the sustainability of this system, the strategic planning of face-to-face interactions is as critical as the quality of digital communication. In hybrid organizations, physical meetings are no longer a routine necessity but function as high-value interaction spaces where cultural bonds are reproduced.

Research conducted specifically in Türkiye reveals that, despite the high level of adoption of the hybrid model, particularly among younger generations of employees, organizations have not been able to fully adapt to this structure (Al, 2023). Since leadership styles often perpetuate traditional control approaches, the potential of the hybrid system cannot be fully realized. Therefore, the hybrid work model is not merely a technical restructuring but also means redesigning the organizational culture in a way that is compatible with digitalization.

A particularly important point to emphasize regarding the hybrid work model is that it emerged as an intermediate form between the classic office-based work and remote work models. The hybrid working model has the potential to combine the advantages of both models while balancing their disadvantages. This is because the hybrid model preserves elements such as face-to-face communication, corporate belonging, and team cohesion provided by the traditional model, while also benefiting from the flexibility and autonomy offered by remote working. In this respect, the hybrid system offers a balance point that can simultaneously enhance productivity, motivation, and work-life balance by blending the digital nature of work, which is not location-dependent, with traditional forms of organizational solidarity (Choudhury et al., 2021; ILO, 2023; Sabharwal, 2023).

2.4. Remote Working Model in Türkiye

Remote work practices in Türkiye have developed in line with global trends, but with certain structural and cultural differences. Remote work, which was quite limited in Türkiye before the pandemic, rapidly spread due to the impact of the COVID-19 outbreak and paved the way for a fundamental transformation in the labor market. According to TÜİK data, only about 2% of the working population worked remotely in 2019, while this rate reached double digits in 2020. This increase was particularly noticeable in white-collar-intensive sectors such as information technology, finance, education, public administration, and consulting (TÜİK, 2022).

The rapid adoption of remote work during the pandemic has led to a reassessment of customary organizational practices for both employers and employees in Türkiye. The rapid development of digital infrastructure in the public sector has accelerated digital transformation processes such as e-government and distance learning applications, while corporate policies supporting remote work have also begun to spread in the private sector. However, the legal and institutional framework for remote work became clearer in Türkiye with the pandemic. The “Remote Work Regulation” added to Labor Law No. 4857 in 2021 officially defined this form of work and established standards regarding employer responsibilities, data security, occupational health, and workplace accidents (Official Gazette, 2021). This regulation has been an important step towards transforming Türkiye’s remote working model from a crisis-period application into a permanent form of employment with a normative basis.

When academic studies in Turkish literature are evaluated in general, it is seen that they exhibit a bipolar structure, suggesting that remote working has both positive and negative effects for employees. In this context, a qualitative study conducted by Altun and Palaz (2025) found that remote work provides employees with advantages such as flexible time management, employee autonomy, and contribution to employment, but also leads to negative outcomes such as lack of social interaction, digital fatigue, and communication breakdowns. Similarly, a study conducted by Kuloğlu and Eğinli (2023) determined that while remote work creates positive effects on employees, such as increased freedom and productivity, it can also lead to negative outcomes such as weakened organizational commitment, feelings of isolation, and a lack of belonging. Another study by Al (2023) found that remote work practices increase employee autonomy and job satisfaction, but that the lack of social interaction can weaken organizational commitment. Another empirical study conducted in the Turkish context found that remote work improves employees’ work-life balance perception but also leads to negative effects such as role conflict and boundary ambiguity due to the intermingling of work and private life spheres. -life balance perception but also leads to negative effects such as role conflict and boundary ambiguity due to the overlap between work and private life (Eşici et al., 2024). These findings reveal that, in the Turkish context, remote work is not a one-sided gain for employees, but rather a multidimensional phenomenon

that varies depending on factors such as individual circumstances, sector structure, and level of organizational support.

This dual-dimensional approach in the Turkish literature has also manifested itself in practice, with the majority of organizations not completely abandoning remote or hybrid models after the pandemic but rather making them permanent in some form. In particular, the proliferation of hybrid systems in the local offices of international companies indicates that location-independent work is now accepted as a permanent alternative form of employment in the Turkish labor market, rather than a temporary trend. Indeed, according to a study, approximately 78% of employees prefer remote or hybrid working models, which shows that hybrid working can be considered not just a temporary application but a permanent alternative in the Turkish labor market (Anatolian Agency, 2025). However, it should be emphasized that the development of the remote working model in Türkiye depends not only on technological infrastructure but also on the transformation of organizational culture, leadership understanding, and social working habits. Traditionally prioritizing face-to-face communication and physical supervision, Turkish management culture has entered a new restructuring process under remote working conditions. Increasing expectations of autonomy, flexibility, and digital interaction, particularly among younger generations of employees, are forcing organizations to transform their human resources policies. On the other hand, it should also be noted that there are some structural problems in Türkiye that limit the sustainability of remote work. This is because regional differences in digital infrastructure, the inadequacy of home environments in terms of working conditions, and the social security system's lack of full compatibility with this new model are key factors limiting the widespread adoption of this practice (TÜİK, 2022; ILO, 2023).

3. Method

This research was designed based on a qualitative research approach to thoroughly examine the effects of the remote work model on employees. Qualitative research is highly functional in revealing the meaning dimension of social phenomena by analyzing individuals' lives, perceptions, and experiences in detail (Creswell, 2009). Since remote work is a multidimensional phenomenon that transforms not only individuals' work processes but also their psychological, social, and organizational experiences, a qualitative approach was deemed appropriate to understand this topic from the employees' perspective. In this context, the phenomenological design, which is among the qualitative research methods, was used in the study. Phenomenology is an approach that aims to reveal how individuals experience a particular phenomenon and what meanings they attach to this experience (Patton, 2014). This design allows us to understand how participants experience remote work, what emotional and organizational responses they exhibit during this process, and their common points of experience. It contributed to understanding the multidimensional nature of the phenomenon through the narratives of employees.

Semi-structured interviews were used as the data collection tool in the study. The interview form was developed based on a review of the literature and the opinions of three academics and two human resources experts. The nine open-ended questions in the form were designed to address the effects of remote work on employees in terms of work output, motivation, social relationships, organizational attitudes, advantages, disadvantages, and personal suggestions. This approach allowed participants to convey their experiences in their own words.

To ensure the validity of the research, participant validation and expert review techniques were used. First, the themes obtained were shared with the participants, and necessary adjustments were made based on their feedback. In addition, expert opinions were sought to review the interpretations of the analysis findings. To increase the reliability of the findings, direct quotes from participant statements were added to each theme. The participants' identity information was kept confidential, and the interview data was used solely for scientific purposes. The research was conducted with the ethical committee approval of Kafkas University No. 56/9 for 2024 and with the voluntary consent of the participants.

The interview form contains 9 open-ended questions suitable for qualitative data collection. Table 1 below presents the scale statements used in the study.

Table 1. Scale Statements Used in the Study.

Remote Work Experience Interview Form Questions

1. *What does information security bring to mind in your daily life? Can you describe it as a metaphor?*
 2. *How has remote work affected your motivation and productivity at work?*
 3. *If you had the choice of how you worked, would you prefer working remotely or in an office?*
 4. *What measures have you taken to protect your personal data? Do you think these measures are sufficient?*
 5. *Have you noticed any changes in your attitude and behavior toward your organization during the remote work process?*
 6. *What do you think are the positive aspects of the remote work model from the employee's perspective?*
 7. *What do you think are the negative aspects of the remote work model from the employee's perspective?*
 8. *What do you think are the advantages and disadvantages of remote work for businesses?*
 9. *What are your personal recommendations regarding the remote work model?*
-

The study group consisted of 56 participants with remote work experience. Participants were selected using purposive sampling. This method was chosen to include individuals with a wealth of knowledge and experience that could directly contribute to the research objective (Patton, 2015). Interviews were conducted online (Zoom and GoogleMeet), with each interview lasting an average of 25-40 minutes. With the participants' permission, audio recordings were made, and the

interviews were transcribed while preserving the integrity of the verbal expressions. The collected data was evaluated using thematic analysis. The interview recordings were converted into written texts, and then the participants' statements were examined in detail, and statements with similar meanings were coded. Main themes were created based on recurring concepts during the coding process.

4. Findings

4.1. Demographic Findings

The study's working group consisted of 56 participants with experience in remote work. Participants were selected from individuals working in diverse sectors who had firsthand experience with remote work. This approach allowed for a deeper understanding of how the phenomenon is experienced in different institutional and individual contexts. When examining the gender distribution of the participants, women (52%) make up approximately half of the group, while men (48%) make up the other half. The age range varies between 24 and 58, with a large proportion of participants falling within the 30-40 age bracket. This indicates that the research group consists of individuals in the middle stage of their active working lives. The educational level of the participants is predominantly at the higher education level. Sixty percent of the participants have a bachelor's degree, 35% have a master's degree, and 5% have a doctorate. This indicates that employees who have experienced remote work are generally in the IT and service sectors and in occupational groups with a high level of education. In terms of marital status, 57% of participants are married and 43% are single. Some of the married participants, especially during the pandemic, drew attention to the effects of remote work on roles within the family and shared their experiences regarding the aspects of work-life balance that have become both easier and more complicated.

This demographic distribution reveals that the research group consists of individuals with different ages, education levels, and family dynamics regarding the phenomenon of remote work, and that this diversity offers meaningful richness for phenomenological analysis.

4.2. Analyzing Research Questions

4.2.1. Participant Perceptions Regarding the Difference Between Remote Work and Office Work

Participants were first asked, "Do you think there is a difference in terms of work outcomes between remote work and office work?" This question aimed to understand participants' perceptions of remote work. The findings from the responses show that participants' perceptions of the difference between remote work and office work are interpreted around three distinct common themes. Table 2 below presents the findings obtained in the context of this question.

Table 2. Thematic Distribution Regarding the Difference Between Remote/Office Work in Terms of Work Output.

| Themes | Sub-themes / Codes | Sample Answers | Frequency (n) | Participant Examples |
|---|---|---|---------------|--|
| 1. Increase in Work Output | Time saving, increased concentration, working from the comfort of home, flexibility, less stress. | <i>“There’s no time wasted at home; I dedicate the time I would have spent commuting to work, which increases my productivity.” (K12)</i> | 28 | K3, K7, K12, K19, K26, K33, K45 |
| 2. Decrease in Work Output | Communication breakdown, lack of team coordination, low motivation, procrastination, lack of supervision. | <i>“There are constant distractions at home, and my work performance is lower than in the office.” (K31)</i> | 18 | K2, K5, K14, K21, K31, K40 |
| 3. Conditional / Neutral Effects | Sector differences, personal discipline, home environment conditions, adaptation to digital tools. | <i>“Productivity doesn’t increase if the nature of the job isn’t suitable for remote work.” (K44)</i> | 10 | K8, K10, K20, K28, K44, K53 |

The thematic distribution in Table 2 shows that participants’ experiences regarding the impact of remote work on job outcomes have a dual-sided and contextually sensitive structure. At this point, the vast majority of participants stated that remote work had positive outcomes in terms of productivity, time management, and attention levels. This group emphasized that factors such as flexible working hours and the elimination of commute time contributed to increased performance. Remote work was defined by these participants as “an area of autonomy that increases individual productivity.” In contrast, n=18 participants indicated that remote work had negative effects on work coordination, communication effectiveness, and motivation. These findings show that phenomena such as difficulties in interacting in digital environments and weak organizational commitment can reduce work output. Particularly in sectors requiring teamwork, it is noteworthy that factors such as lack of supervision and digital fatigue negatively affect productivity. A group outside these two opposing poles formed the third theme. Namely, n=10 participants stated that the effect of remote work on work output varied depending on personal and sectoral variables.

These views indicate that the most critical factors determining the efficiency of remote work are the nature of the job, individual self-discipline, and the level of organizational support. Therefore, the findings reveal that remote work does not have a homogeneous effect on work output; rather, employees experience it in different ways depending on their personal characteristics, job type, and organizational structure.

4.2.2. The Impact of Remote Work on Employee Motivation

Another question posed to participants is: “How has remote work affected your motivation and productivity at work?” This question aims to understand participants’ perceptions of remote work’s impact on productivity, motivation, and work performance. Findings from the responses reveal that participants’ perceptions of the difference between remote work and office work can be categorized into four distinct themes and twenty codes. Table 3 below presents the findings obtained in the context of this question.

Table 3. Thematic Distribution of the Impact of Remote Work on Motivation and Productivity.

| Themes | Sub-themes / Codes | Sample Answers | Frequency (n) | Participant Examples |
|---|--|--|---------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1. Increased Intrinsic Motivation Through Self-Determination and Flexibility | Setting your own work pace, a sense of autonomy, reduced external pressure, satisfaction from productivity, and control overtime management. | “Now that the pressure of the office environment is gone, I can do my job in my own style. This freedom motivates me.” (K11) | 17 | K3, K7, K11, K23, K26, K33, K41, K45 |
| 2. Decreased Motivation Due to Social Isolation and Lack of Interaction | Feelings of loneliness, loss of organizational belonging, lack of communication, burnout, monotony, insufficient external feedback. | “Working alone for extended periods increased my monotony and, I think, over time, decreased my productivity.” (K37) | 16 | K4, K9, K15, K20, K28, K37, K48 |
| 3. The Search for Psychological Fulfillment and Emotional Balance | Feeling peaceful at home, reduced stress, improved quality of life, and motivation through work-life balance. | “I feel more at peace at home, my stress has decreased. This prepares me better for my work.” (K24) | 12 | K1, K10, K16, K18, K24, K27, K31 |
| 4. Situational/Periodic Motivation Fluctuations | Workload, manager support, home environment conditions, technological fatigue, and the influence of organizational culture. | “Sometimes I’m motivated, sometimes I’m not. I think it completely depends on the conditions at home.” (K32) | 11 | K2, K5, K13, K25, K32, K46, K52 |

The findings in Table 3 show that remote work has a multidimensional and dual effect on employee motivation. A significant portion of participants stated that their intrinsic motivation was strengthened thanks to the autonomy, flexibility, and time management control offered by remote work. This finding shows that employees exhibit higher levels of self-regulation and productivity when removed from external control pressures, consistent with the predictions of self-determination theory. Conversely, some participants noted that remote work weakens motivation in the long term by creating social isolation, loss of organizational belonging, and lack of feedback. This result reveals that social

interaction limited to the digital environment does not fully meet employees' psychological needs and increases the risk of burnout. On the other hand, while some participants evaluated remote work as an element that increases psychological balance and quality of life, a group of employees stated that motivation varies depending on work intensity, managerial support, and home conditions.

Overall, the findings reveal that the effect of remote work on motivation is sensitive to contextual, individual, and organizational conditions. While remote work has the potential to increase intrinsic motivation by granting autonomy to employees, sustainable motivation appears to be possible only through a holistic digital work culture that includes social interaction, feedback, and leadership support.

4.2.3. Your Preferences Regarding Your Working Method

Another question posed to the participants was, "If you had the choice in your work method, would you prefer working remotely or in an office?" This question aimed to understand which work model the participants would prefer if they had the initiative. The findings from the responses show that the participants' perceptions in this regard were interpreted around 3 themes and 13 codes. Table 4 below presents the findings obtained in the context of this question.

Table 4. Thematic Distribution of Participants' Preferred Working Methods

| Themes | Sub-themes / Codes | Sample Answers | Frequency (n) | Participant Examples |
|---|---|--|---------------|---------------------------------------|
| 1. Those Who Prefer Remote Work: An Approach Focused on Self-Determination and Time Management | Flexibility, time saving, individual productivity, self-determination, quiet working environment. | <i>"Working remotely saves me time; I can turn the time I spend commuting into productive work."</i> (K12) | 22 | K3, K7, K12, K18, K26, K30, K41, K45 |
| 2. Those Who Prefer Working from the Office: The Need for Social Interaction and Organizational Commitment | Team communication, sociability, motivation, corporate culture, professional boundaries. | <i>"Being at the workplace motivates me; team interaction isn't the same remotely."</i> (K19) | 19 | K2, K5, K9, K14, K19, K33, K38, K47 |
| 3. Those Who Prefer Hybrid Models: The Search for Balance | Balancing flexibility with sociability, work-life balance, adaptability to changing needs. | <i>"It's good to be in the office a few days a week; working entirely remotely or entirely from the office isn't sustainable."</i> (K24) | 15 | K4, K10, K16, K20, K24, K27, K31, K40 |

The findings in Table 4 reveal that participants' work style preferences do not show a one-sided trend; rather, they prefer remote, office, and hybrid work for different reasons. Some participants preferred remote work due to factors such as autonomy, flexibility, and control overtime management, with the primary

motivation for this group being individual productivity and self-management skills. These participants stated that the reduction in physical supervision provided more control over their work and increased their motivation. In contrast, the determining factors for participants who preferred working from the office were social interaction, organizational commitment, and professional discipline. These participants emphasized that the sense of belonging provided by face-to-face communication was important in terms of both motivation and job satisfaction. The statement, "Being at work motivates me; team interaction is not the same remotely" (K19), is a characteristic example of this trend. On the other hand, a significant portion of the participants considered the hybrid work model, which combines the advantages of both models, to be the most suitable option. This group stated that working in the office on certain days of the week and remotely on other days offers a balanced solution in terms of both productivity and social connection. The participant statement, "It's good to be in the office a few days a week; working entirely remotely or entirely in the office is not sustainable" (K24), reflects this approach.

An examination of the themes and sub-themes reveals that work style preferences are not solely productivity-focused but also a combination of psychological, social, and organizational needs. Participants' preferences differ according to individual value priorities (autonomy, sociability, search for balance), indicating that there is no single model that suits everyone. The findings indicate that the hybrid work model is increasingly being adopted by more employees as a sustainable alternative.

4.2.4. Participant Views on the Impact of Remote Work on Social Relationships

The fourth question posed to participants is: "How has remote working affected your organizational social relationships (your social relationships with other employees at work)?" This question aims to understand how organizational communication, belonging, social interaction, and professional relationship dynamics have changed in the context of remote working. Participant statements formed 4 themes and 15 sub-themes/codes regarding the weakening of social bonds, the transformation of communication forms, and the emergence of new digital relationship norms, presenting important phenomenological findings. Table 5 below presents the findings obtained in the context of the question in question.

Table 5. Thematic Distribution of the Impact of Remote Work on Corporate Social Relations

| Themes | Sub-themes / Codes | Sample Answers | Frequency (n) | Participant Examples |
|---|---|--|---------------|--|
| 1. Weakening Social Connections and Feelings of Isolation | Lack of team interaction, superficial communication, loneliness, loss of organizational belonging. | <i>“Switching to remote work has created distance between me and my teammates; now we only talk about work.” (K18)</i> | 21 | K2, K6, K9, K13, K18, K25, K31, K38, K42 |
| 2. Limited Interaction Through Digital Communication | Digital contact replacing face-to-face communication, lack of emotional connection, online misunderstandings. | <i>“Communication in the meetings remained superficial; facial expressions and emotions were lost.” (K29)</i> | 16 | K5, K10, K14, K21, K29, K33, K40 |
| 3. Transformation in Social Interaction and New Communication Habits | Online support groups, digital socialization, increased written communication, new forms of connection. | <i>“We used to talk during tea breaks, but now we socialize in the team WhatsApp group.” (K44)</i> | 12 | K7, K12, K20, K27, K36, K44, K51 |
| 4. Decrease in Corporate Commitment | Weakening team spirit, alienation from corporate identity, lack of communication with the leader, decreased motivation. | <i>“I no longer have an emotional connection with the organization; I’m simply doing my job.” (K23)</i> | 7 | K4, K8, K15, K23, K32, K48 |

The findings in Table 5 show that remote work has a significant weakening effect on organizational social relationships. The majority of participants stated that team interaction decreased during remote work, communication became “task-based only,” and this situation weakened social bonds. In this regard, it was observed that emotional relationship elements, particularly intimacy, trust, and solidarity, could not be sustained in the online environment. Some participants emphasized that digital interactions, which replaced face-to-face communication, created superficiality and emotional disconnect in communication. It was noted that online meetings cannot fully replace natural communication in a physical environment, and that the loss of elements such as gestures, facial expressions, and emotional tone negatively affects the quality of relationships. Some participants stated that they tried to maintain their social bonds during the remote work process using new digital communication methods (such as internal online groups and messaging channels). However, the findings reveal that remote work weakens the sense of organizational belonging in the long term. Some participants stated that their emotional ties to the organization had diminished and that they no longer saw themselves as “part of a team.” This result points to the potential of remote work to create a loss of belonging and commitment at the organizational level.

The findings obtained within the scope of this question show that remote work creates a qualitative rather than quantitative transformation in terms of social

relationships. Although the frequency of communication between employees has been maintained, this communication has become more functional, superficial, and devoid of emotional connection. Therefore, the sustainability of corporate social relationships in remote work environments depends not only on digital tools but also on the quality of the organizational communication culture and leadership approaches that encourage social interaction.

4.2.5. Participant Views on Differences in Attitudes and Behaviors Towards the Organization During the Remote Work Process

Another question posed to participants in the study was, “Did your attitudes and behaviors towards your organization change during the remote work process?” This question aims to understand the effects of employees’ remote work experiences on their attitudes and behaviors towards the organization, such as organizational commitment, belonging, trust in the organization, and organizational citizenship behavior. The findings show that opposing trends emerged in employees’ perceptions and attitudes towards the organization, such as both emotional detachment and an increase in individual responsibility. Table 6 below presents the findings obtained in the context of this question.

Table 6. Thematic Distribution of Changes in Attitudes and Behaviors Towards the Organization During the Remote Work Process

| Themes | Sub-themes / Codes | Sample Answers | Frequency (n) | Participant Examples |
|---|--|---|---------------|---------------------------------------|
| 1. Weakening of Organizational Commitment | Emotional detachment from the organization, loss of belonging, disruption of identity integrity, loneliness. | “Since switching to working from home, my perception of the organization has changed; now I’m just doing my job.” (K19) | 18 | K4, K6, K9, K14, K19, K23, K31, K48 |
| 2. Maintaining Corporate Trust and Belonging | Commitment to corporate values, belonging strengthened by managerial support, digital solidarity. | “Even from afar, my trust in the company hasn’t diminished; our subscription process was well managed.” (K10) | 14 | K3, K5, K10, K17, K22, K28, K33, K45 |
| 3. Increased Individual Responsibility and Self-Discipline | Self-management skills, performance responsibility, self-control, awareness of ethical obligations towards the organization. | “I felt a greater sense of responsibility while working from home because my visibility decreased.” (K27) | 13 | K8, K13, K16, K24, K27, K30, K44, K50 |
| 4. Attitude Changes Related to Managerial Attitudes | Managerial support, communication style, expectation management, trust relationship | “My view of the organization was positive because I felt my manager was supportive, even from afar.” (K36) | 11 | K2, K12, K20, K29, K36, K41, K52 |

The findings in Table 6 show that the remote work process created significant differences in employees' attitudes and behaviors towards their organizations. A significant portion of the participants stated that physical distance weakened their feelings of organizational belonging and commitment. These participants indicated that their emotional connection to the organization decreased with remote work, and that they carried out their work in a more individual and task-oriented manner. On the other hand, some participants stated that their trust and commitment to their organizations were maintained or strengthened. The determining factor in these opinions appears to be how managers managed the process and the quality of organizational communication. In particular, supportive, transparent, and trust-based management approaches seem to facilitate employees maintaining positive attitudes towards the organization. Furthermore, some participants stated that remote work fostered a higher level of self-discipline and a sense of individual responsibility in them. It was emphasized that the need for self-control increased in the digital work environment where visibility decreased, which strengthened the sense of individual responsibility.

Overall, the findings show that organizational attitudes during the remote work process were reshaped in search of a balance between weakening emotional commitment and increasing cognitive and ethical responsibility. While physical distance created emotional disconnect for some employees, managerial support, trust, and continuous communication proved crucial in maintaining organizational commitment.

4.2.6. Participant Opinions on the Positive Aspects of the Remote Work Model from the Employees' Perspective

The sixth question posed to participants in the research was, "What do you think are the positive aspects of the remote work model for employees?" This question aimed to identify the dimensions in which remote work creates advantages for employees (especially in areas such as work-life balance, flexibility, psychological well-being, time management, productivity, etc.). Participants' statements indicate that remote work highlights themes of freedom, balance, and productivity at the individual level. The findings obtained in the context of this question are presented in Table 7 below.

Table 7. Thematic Distribution of the Positive Aspects of the Remote Work Model from the Employee's Perspective

| Themes | Sub-themes / Codes | Sample Answers | Frequency (n) | Participant Examples |
|---|--|--|----------------------|--|
| 1. Flexibility in Time and Space | Eliminating commuting stress, saving time, and having the freedom to organize working hours. | <i>"I can now dedicate the time I used to lose commuting to myself, which has increased both my productivity and my quality of life."</i> (K8) | 23 | K3, K5, K8, K14, K17, K24, K30, K41, K46 |

| Themes | Sub-themes / Codes | Sample Answers | Frequency (n) | Participant Examples |
|---|--|--|---------------|--------------------------------------|
| 2. Strengthening Work-Life Balance | Spending more time with family, protecting personal space, psychological relief. | <i>“Working from home has allowed me to spend more time with my family, which has had a positive impact on my motivation.”</i> (K12) | 18 | K6, K9, K12, K19, K25, K32, K40, K43 |
| 3. Psychological and Physical Comfort | Comfort at home, reduced stress, healthy lifestyle habits. | <i>“I feel more at peace; the office noise and competitive pressure are gone.”</i> (K29) | 14 | K7, K11, K15, K22, K29, K33, K47 |
| 4. Increased Productivity and Focus | Increased attention span, personal work discipline, and focus on productivity. | <i>“I was frequently interrupted at the office, but I can work more efficiently at home at my own pace.”</i> (K27) | 10 | K2, K10, K16, K20, K27, K31, K45 |
| 5. Self-Determination and Sense of Control | Managing your own business processes, independence, reduced external control. | <i>“I can make my own plans, and no one is constantly questioning what I’m doing. That freedom is motivating.”</i> (K21) | 8 | K4, K13, K21, K26, K35, K44, K50 |

The findings in Table 7 show that remote work is viewed positively by employees in multiple ways. According to Table 7, which consists of 5 themes and 15 codes, the majority of participants emphasized time and location flexibility as the most significant advantage of remote work. The elimination of commute time, the ability to manage the boundaries between work and personal life more effectively, and the opportunity to adjust working hours to personal rhythms have created significant relief for employees. Participants stated that this flexibility increased both their productivity and their quality of life. In addition, remote work was observed to have a strengthening effect on work-life balance. Most participants stated that working from home offers the opportunity to spend more time with family, take care of personal needs, and maintain psychological balance. This shows that remote work has become a factor that supports the psychological well-being of employees. Furthermore, the findings reveal that remote work is also associated with psychological and physical comfort, increased productivity, and a sense of autonomy. Participants stated that they felt freer and focused thanks to the comfort of the home environment and the reduction in external control, and that this increased their job satisfaction. The statement, “I can now devote the time I used to lose on the road to myself, which has increased both my productivity and my quality of life” (K8), is a typical example of this trend.

When the findings on the advantages of remote work are evaluated holistically, they show that remote work offers employees not only spatial freedom but also significant benefits in terms of individual autonomy, psychological comfort, and balance in life. These advantages indicate that remote work can be considered a sustainable model in terms of employee well-being and motivation as well as organizational productivity.

4.2.7. Participant Views on the Negative Aspects of the Remote Work Model from the Employees' Perspective

The seventh question posed to participants in the study was, “What do you think are the negative aspects of the remote work model for employees?” Unlike the sixth question, this question aimed to identify the limiting, challenging, and negative effects of remote work on employees. Participants’ responses focused particularly on themes such as social isolation, lack of communication, low motivation, boundary ambiguity, and digital burnout. The findings obtained in the context of this question are presented in Table 8 below.

Table 8. Thematic Distribution of the Negative Aspects of the Remote Work Model from the Employee’s Perspective

| Themes | Sub-themes / Codes | Sample Answers | Frequency (n) | Participant Examples |
|--|--|--|---------------|--|
| 1. Social Isolation and Feelings of Loneliness | Disconnection from the team, lack of face-to-face communication, decreased socialization. | “Over time, I felt isolated, and my bond with my teammates weakened.” (K14) | 22 | K3, K6, K9, K14, K18, K21, K30, K37, K44 |
| 2. The Blurring of Work-Life Boundaries | The pressure to be constantly online, the disappearance of the concept of working hours, the invasion of personal space. | “The lines between work and personal life have completely blurred; I need to be constantly accessible.” (K27) | 18 | K4, K8, K10, K16, K20, K27, K34, K40 |
| 3. Motivation and Focus Problems | Lack of discipline, distractibility, routine, loss of productivity. | “I find it difficult to concentrate at home, and sometimes I can't get motivated at work.” (K11) | 14 | K2, K7, K11, K15, K19, K22, K28, K39 |
| 4. Digital Fatigue and Burnout | Excessive screen time, technological stress, physical ailments | “Spending all day in front of a screen is exhausting my eyes and mind.” (K25) | 11 | K5, K13, K17, K25, K32, K36, K45 |
| 5. Communication and Team Coordination Problems | Lack of feedback, misunderstandings, weakening team cohesion. | “Without face-to-face communication, misunderstandings became more frequent and team cohesion weakened.” (K31) | 10 | K1, K12, K23, K26, K31, K35, K41 |

Table 8 shows that participants’ statements indicate that remote work creates certain psychological, social, and structural challenges for employees. Accordingly, the most commonly expressed negative aspect is social isolation and loneliness. Most participants stated that the loss of physical contact with their teammates weakened their sense of belonging and reduced social support mechanisms. This situation stands out as a factor that negatively affects organizational commitment in the long term. In addition, the blurring of boundaries between work and private life is one of the most prominent complaints of the

participants. The state of “constant availability” that comes with working from home has created time management pressure and a perception of invasion of personal space among individuals. This situation increases psychological exhaustion along with the workload. Furthermore, some participants stated that remote work causes loss of motivation and difficulty concentrating, and that maintaining discipline and work pace at home has become more difficult. Digital fatigue and physical discomfort caused by constantly being in front of a screen were also frequently mentioned. Finally, the lack of directness in communication and misunderstandings have led to weakened team coordination.

The findings reveal that while remote work provides freedom and flexibility for employees, it also brings certain psychosocial risks. Physical isolation and digital fatigue were seen to limit employees’ social and cognitive capacities, while the blurring of work-life boundaries was found to increase organizational stress and burnout levels.

4.2.8. Participant Views on the Advantages and Disadvantages of the Remote Work Model for Businesses

Another question posed to participants in the research was, “What do you think are the advantages and disadvantages of remote work for businesses?” This question aimed to reveal the positive and negative impacts of remote work on productivity, cost, control, communication, and performance at the organizational level, from the perspective of employees. Participants’ opinions indicate that remote work provides both operational efficiency and cost advantages for businesses, but also creates significant challenges in terms of supervision, communication, and corporate commitment. The findings obtained in the context of this question are presented in Table 9 below.

Table 9. Thematic Distribution of Advantages and Disadvantages of Remote Work from a Business Perspective

| Themes | Sub-themes / Codes | Sample Answers | Frequency (n) | Participant Examples |
|--|---|---|---------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1. Cost Reduction and Productivity Increase | Lower office expenses, reduced time wasted, increased productivity. | <i>“From a business perspective, office costs have decreased, and work progresses faster because commuting time has been eliminated.” (K22)</i> | 21 | K3, K5, K10, K17, K22, K30, K41, K45 |
| 2. Challenges in Performance Monitoring | Lack of oversight, loss of visibility, difficulty in measuring performance. | <i>“In remote work, it's difficult to see who is actually working, and oversight is weak.” (K14)</i> | 18 | K6, K9, K14, K18, K23, K31, K37, K46 |
| 3. Communication and Coordination Problems | Disconnections in teamwork, delays in information sharing, misunderstandings. | <i>“Coordination in business processes has become difficult; everyone is working in their own world.” (K27)</i> | 16 | K4, K8, K15, K19, K25, K27, K33, K40 |

| Themes | Sub-themes / Codes | Sample Answers | Frequency (n) | Participant Examples |
|---|---|--|------------------|----------------------------------|
| 4. Weakening of Corporate Culture and Sense of Belonging | Disintegration of corporate identity, loss of team spirit, decline in sense of belonging. | <i>“Employees feel less committed to the organization, making it difficult to create a shared culture.” (K11)</i> | 13 | K2, K7, K11, K20, K24, K32, K42 |
| 5. Increased Flexibility and Employee Satisfaction | Employee motivation, talent retention, work-life balance, and corporate benefits. | <i>“Flexible working arrangements have increased employee satisfaction, which in turn positively impacts company performance.” (K29)</i> | 9 | K1, K12, K16, K26, K29, K35, K43 |

The participant statements obtained within the scope of the research, as presented in Table 9, show that remote work has a multifaceted impact on businesses. Accordingly, it has been observed that the remote work model, on the one hand, reduces operational costs, thus providing efficiency and resource savings for businesses, and on the other hand, creates new management challenges in terms of supervision, communication, and cultural commitment. The majority of participants emphasized that remote work creates cost-effectiveness for the business. Reduced office expenses decreased need for physical space, and elimination of time lost due to commuting were considered as factors that increased business efficiency. However, the difficulties in measuring performance remotely led to a perception of lack of control. Participants stated that managers experienced difficulties in the processes of monitoring and evaluating employee performance, and that this situation could create instability in productivity in the long term.

These findings reveal that remote work creates a balance problem between cost-effectiveness and organizational integrity for businesses. While productivity and flexibility provide short-term benefits to the business, supervision difficulties, communication deficiencies, and cultural disintegration bring long-term risks. Therefore, based on the participants’ statements, it is predicted that the sustainable implementation of remote work for businesses can be achieved through strategies such as digital performance management, effective communication systems, and the reconstruction of corporate culture in the digital environment.

4.2.9. Participant Suggestions Regarding the Remote Working Model

The ninth and final question posed to participants in the study was, “What are your personal suggestions regarding the remote work model?” This question aimed to elicit participants’ opinions on how remote work could be implemented more effectively, sustainably, and balanced, based on their own experiences. Participant responses indicated that suggestions were grouped at both managerial (corporate policies, communication, performance management) and individual levels (time management, motivation, digital balance). Table 10 below presents the findings obtained in the context of this question.

Table 10. Thematic Distribution of Participants' Personal Recommendations Regarding the Remote Work Model

| Themes | Sub-themes / Codes | Sample Answers | Frequency (n) | Participant Examples |
|---|--|--|---------------|---------------------------------------|
| 1. Strengthening Communication and Team Cohesion | Regular online meetings, social events, open communication culture. | <i>"Even remotely, team communication should be strengthened, and face-to-face meetings should be organized at regular intervals."</i> (K16) | 19 | K2, K6, K10, K16, K20, K25, K31, K43 |
| 2. Implementation of the Hybrid Model | Office work on certain days of the week, optional flexibility. | <i>"Working entirely remotely is not sustainable; a hybrid system would be the most suitable model."</i> (K27) | 17 | K3, K7, K14, K18, K21, K27, K32, K44 |
| 3. Reducing Digital Fatigue and Time Management | Limiting the number of meetings, taking breaks, managing online time. | <i>"Spending all your time in front of a screen is very tiring; you should take breaks at regular intervals throughout the day."</i> (K12) | 15 | K5, K8, K12, K19, K23, K30, K35, K41 |
| 4. Improving Performance and Feedback Systems | Measurable goals, regular evaluations, transparent performance tracking. | <i>"Performance evaluations should be clear even remotely, making employee contributions visible."</i> (K36) | 13 | K1, K9, K15, K22, K28, K33, K36, K47 |
| 5. Employee Support Programs and Training | Digital skills training, psychological support, remote team management training. | <i>"Organizations should offer training and support mechanisms to facilitate adaptation to digital working."</i> (K40) | 11 | K4, K11, K13, K24, K26, K34, K40, K46 |
| 6. Strengthening the Culture of Corporate Resilience and Trust | Results-oriented management, employee autonomy, a trust-based approach instead of control. | <i>"Management should foster a culture of trust rather than controlling employees."</i> (K29) | 9 | K17, K19, K29, K38, K45, K49 |

The findings in Table 10 show that participants' suggestions regarding the remote work model focus on both structural improvements at the organizational level and work-life balance at the individual level. The most frequently mentioned suggestion was strengthening communication and team cohesion. Participants, noting the weakening of social ties in the online environment, stated that regular digital meetings, offline social events, and an open communication culture are critical for maintaining corporate solidarity. In addition, a significant portion of participants emphasized that completely remote work is not sustainable in the long term, suggesting that a hybrid work model offers a more balanced alternative. This approach was considered a system that combines the advantages of both flexibility and face-to-face interaction. Suggestions also emerged regarding reducing digital fatigue, improving performance appraisal processes, and expanding employee support programs. Participants stated that the mental and physical fatigue caused by being constantly online negatively affects work quality and emphasized the need

for organizations to raise awareness about time management, online meeting intensity, and ergonomics. Some participants also indicated that developing a culture of corporate trust and autonomy is necessary to increase the effectiveness of remote work. It was stated that instead of measuring employee performance solely by results and implementing continuous monitoring practices, a management approach based on trust should be adopted.

The findings obtained within the scope of this question reveal that participants view remote work not merely as a technical arrangement, but as a holistic process requiring organizational communication, leadership, and cultural transformation. Accordingly, the recommendations highlight that a human-centered digital transformation is inevitable for the sustainability of remote work.

5. Conclusion and Discussion

This study examined the effects of the remote work model on employees using a qualitative approach and conducted an in-depth analysis of participants' experiences from a phenomenological perspective. The findings generally indicate that remote work has both liberating and flexibility-enhancing aspects for employees, as well as aspects that create social isolation and a loss of belonging. This finding reveals that remote work is a dual-dimensional phenomenon in terms of its effects and is consistent with the prevailing approach in literature.

According to the research findings, the most prominent advantages of remote work are time and location flexibility, elimination of commuting stress, increased individual productivity, and improved work-life balance. Participants stated that flexible time management improved their quality of life and increased their motivation. This result is consistent with the findings of Jha (2025) and Dangi (2025). Indeed, both studies reveal that remote work increases employee autonomy and productivity. Similarly, Gajendran and Harrison's (2007) meta-analysis studies also stated that remote work has positive effects on job satisfaction and work-life balance. However, in the context of research findings, it has also been observed that in long-term applications of remote work, social bonds weaken, organizational communication becomes superficial, and the sense of belonging decreases. Participants emphasized that the absence of physical interaction weakened team cohesion and organizational identity. This finding aligns with Costin et al. (2023) discovery of decreased organizational commitment and burnout risk among remote workers. Similarly, Raneses et al. (2022) found that long-term remote work weakened employees' emotional ties to the organization and increased feelings of social isolation.

When evaluated in terms of motivation, the findings reveal that remote work increases intrinsic motivation when supported by autonomy but leads to a loss of motivation when combined with a lack of feedback and social isolation. This is consistent with Ryan and Deci's (2000) self-determination theory. According to this theory, employees can maintain their intrinsic motivation when their needs for

autonomy, competence, and relatedness are met. Although remote work offers advantages in terms of autonomy and time control, it limits the need for relatedness. Therefore, the research shows that the sustainability of motivation depends not only on individual factors but also on organizational support and leadership styles.

Another key finding of the study is that the hybrid model is increasingly being adopted in terms of employees' work style preferences. Participants indicated that fully remote or fully office-based systems are unsustainable, and that the hybrid model strikes a balance between social interaction and flexibility. This finding is similar to the results reached in the studies by Choudhury, Foroughi, and Larson (2021) and Sabharwal (2023). These studies revealed that hybrid systems increase employee satisfaction and have the potential to maintain organizational commitment while sustaining productivity. In the Turkish context, Al's (2023) findings also support that the hybrid structure positively affects employee performance, particularly in communication-focused organizations.

In terms of organizational attitudes, while some participants indicated that their emotional attachment to the organization decreased during the remote work process, another group stated that they maintained their sense of belonging thanks to managerial support and trust relationships. This differentiation demonstrates the decisive role of managers' digital leadership skills. Research conducted by Bartsch et al. (2021) also supports this result, revealing that leadership and communication quality have a strong impact on organizational commitment in remote work.

When evaluating remote work from a business perspective, participants highlighted issues such as difficulties in performance tracking, communication breakdowns, and weakening of corporate culture, alongside advantages like cost savings and increased productivity. This supports the findings of Bloom et al. (2015) that remote work increases productivity but complicates managerial control. Furthermore, the research shows that remote work is implemented more sustainably in organizations with a strong corporate trust culture, a finding that aligns with the "trust-based leadership" concept emphasized in the work of Carillo et al. (2021).

The findings from the research indicate that remote work in Türkiye is closely related to cultural and structural conditions. Participant statements reveal that the traditional management culture, which prioritizes face-to-face communication and hierarchical control, limits full adaptation to remote work. This situation has also been similarly noted in the Turkish literature in the studies by Kuloğlu and Eğinli (2024) and Eşici et al. (2024). Therefore, the sustainability of the remote work model in Türkiye appears to depend not only on the development of digital infrastructure but also on the transformation of organizational culture.

Finally, participants' recommendations regarding remote work focused on communication, hybrid systems, performance management, and digital balance. Participants emphasized the importance of social interaction applications that strengthen team bonds, trust-based leadership, and policies that prioritize employee well-being. These recommendations align with the "human-centered digital

transformation” approach highlighted in the literature (Carillo et al., 2021; Yamoah, 2025).

This research comprehensively addressed the effects of the remote work model on employees, revealing multidimensional results at both the individual and organizational levels. Findings indicate that remote work offers significant advantages in terms of flexibility, autonomy, and time management, but also brings challenges such as social isolation, communication gaps, and boundary ambiguity. Motivation and commitment are directly related to organizational support, leadership style, and a culture of trust. The hybrid work model stands out as the most sustainable model, balancing employee satisfaction and organizational productivity. The sustainability of remote work for businesses depends not only on cost advantages but also on cultural alignment and the digitization of performance management systems. The results of the research show that organizations need to invest not only in technological infrastructure but also in strengthening psychosocial well-being, communication, and cultural belonging in their remote work processes. In the Turkish context, digital leadership, trust-based management, and the integration of hybrid systems into corporate strategies are highlighted as fundamental conditions for the long-term success of remote work. It should be emphasized that the remote work model has become a permanent organizational paradigm in contemporary working life, rather than a temporary crisis solution. The sustainability of this model will only be possible by building a people-centered, flexible, and trust-based work culture, not just through productivity-focused policies.

This research is a qualitative study aiming to deeply examine the effects of the remote work model on employees. However, generalizability is limited as the findings are based on the subjective experiences of 56 employees from different sectors. The study was conducted in the Turkish context, and cultural and organizational characteristics may have influenced the interpretation of the results, which is another limitation. Furthermore, the research only includes employee perspective. Therefore, including the views of managers or human resources professionals is recommended for future studies, as it would provide a more holistic perspective. Comparative analysis of the long-term effects of digital leadership, trust culture, and hybrid model applications is also suggested for future research.

REFERENCES

- Al, B. (2023). *Culture, Motivation, and Performance: Remote and Workplace Dynamics in Organizations*. *OPUS Journal of Society Research, 20*(Human Behavior and Social Institutions), 727-750. <https://doi.org/10.26466/opusjsr.1343604>
- Altun, B., & Palaz, S. (2025). *Pandemiyle Başlayan Uzaktan Çalışma: Türkiye Hizmet Sektöründe Bir Fenomenolojik Araştırma*. *Bandırma Onyeddi Eylül Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Araştırmaları Dergisi, 8*(2), 1-25. <https://doi.org/10.38120/banusad.1676155>

- Anatolian Agency (Anadolu Ajansı-AA). (2025). <https://www.aa.com.tr/tr/ekonomi/nitelikli-is-gucu-uzaktan-ve-hibrit-calisma-modeline-sahip-sirketlere-kayiyor/3556521>
- Aziz, R., Munap, R., Nor, S. M., Zakir, N. F. M., Jufri, N. N., & Kadir, M. N. A. A. (2023). A case study of a service organisation in Malaysia: employees' work-life balance, work commitment & leadership style on job satisfaction during remote working. *Adv. Int. J. Bus. Entrep. SMEs*, 5(15), 31-40. <https://doi.org/10.35631/AIJBES.515004>
- Bartsch, S., Weber, E., Büttgen, M., & Huber, A. (2021). Leadership matters in crisis-induced digital transformation: how to lead service employees effectively during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of service management*, 32(1), 71-85. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JOSM-05-2020-0160>
- Bloom, N., Liang, J., Roberts, J., & Ying, Z. J. (2015). Does working from home work? Evidence from a Chinese experiment. *The Quarterly journal of economics*, 130(1), 165-218. <https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qju032>
- Braverman, H. (1998). *Labor and monopoly capital: The degradation of work in the twentieth century*. nyu Press.
- Carillo, K., Cachat-Rosset, G., Marsan, J., Saba, T., & Klarsfeld, A. (2021). Adjusting to epidemic-induced telework: Empirical insights from teleworkers in France. *European Journal of Information Systems*, 30(1), 69-88. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0960085X.2020.1829512>
- Choudhury, P., Foroughi, C., & Larson, B. (2021). Work-from-anywhere: The productivity effects of geographic flexibility. *Strategic Management Journal*, 42(4), 655-683. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.3251>
- Costin, A., Roman, A. F., & Balica, R. S. (2023). Remote work burnout, professional job stress, and employee emotional exhaustion during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Frontiers in psychology*, 14, 1193854. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1193854>
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research designs. Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*.
- Dangi, A. (2025). The Dual Impact of Remote Work on Employee Productivity and Mental Health: A Generational Perspective. *International Journal of Advanced Research and Multidisciplinary Trends (IJARMT)*, 2(1), 204-208.
- Drucker, P. F. (1999). *Management challenges for the 21st century*. https://aghalibrary.com/storage/books/1614252371_AghaLibrary.pdf
- Eşici, H., Şehitoğlu, Y., Ayaz, A., & Karaman, MA (2024). Türkiye'deki Bir Teknoparkta Beyaz Yakalı Uzaktan Çalışanların İş-Yaşam Dengesi. *Nüfus ve Ekonomi*, 8 (3), 1-16.
- Fuchs, C. (2014). *Digital labour and Karl Marx*. Routledge. <https://westminsterresearch.westminster.ac.uk/item/8yq8y/digital-labour-and-karl-marx>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.6.1524>

- International Labour Organization-ILO. (2023). *Working from home: From invisibility to decent work*. Geneva: ILO Publications. <https://www.ilo.org/resource/other/working-home>
- Jha, A. (2025). *Productivity, Stress, and Work-life Balance in the Remote Work Era: A study of Kathmandu Valley*. *SAIM Journal of Social Science and Technology*, 2(1), 103-122. <https://doi.org/10.70320/sacm.2025.v02i01.008>
- Kuloğlu, E., & Temel Eğinli, A. (2024). *Uzaktan çalışma sisteminin çalışan motivasyonu üzerine etkileri*. *Sosyolojik Düşün*, 9 (2), 189-224. <https://doi.org/10.37991/sosdus.1486187>
- Mamatha, K., & Thoti, K. K. (2023). *The Effects of Working Remotely on Employee Productivity and Work-Life Balance*. *Journal of Advanced Zoology*, 44. <https://doi.org/10.17762/jaz.v44iS6.2442>
- Moulton, N. H., Fuzi, S. F. S. M., Yussoff, N. E., Shazali, N. M., Mahmud, M. B., & Rahmat, N. H. (2022). *Exploring Work Motivation and Work Burnout*. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 12(9), 488-507. <https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARBS/v12-i9/11541>
- Oktaysoy, O. (2026). *Dijital liderliğin iş tatminine etkisinde istismarcı denetim ve yenilikçi davranışın aracı rolü*. *Uluslararası İktisadi ve İdari İncelemeler Dergisi*, (50), 343-362.
- Patton, M. Q. (2014). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods: Integrating theory and practice*. Sage publications.
- Raneses, M. S., Bacason, E. S., & Martir, S. (2022). *Investigating the Impact of Remote Working on Employee Productivity and Work-life Balance: A Study on the Business Consultancy Industry in Dubai, UAE*. *International Journal of Business & Administrative Studies*, 8(2). <https://doi.org/10.20469/ijbas.8.10002-2>
- Resmî Gazete. (2021, Mart 10). *Uzaktan Çalışma Yönetmeliği*. T.C. Resmî Gazete, Sayı: 31419. <https://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/eskiler/2021/03/20210310-2.htm>
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). *Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being*. *American psychologist*, 55(1), 68. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.68>
- Sabharwal, D. S. (2023). *Remote work realities: Secondary analysis of employee productivity and well-being*. *International Journal of Applied Research*, 9(12), 242-248. <https://doi.org/10.22271/allresearch.2023.v9.i12c.11661>
- Sharma, A., & Khurana, B. (2025). *Relationship of Work Motivation and Burnout with Organizational Commitment of Employees*. *IJSAT-International Journal on Science and Technology*, 16(3). <https://doi.org/10.71097/IJSAT.v16.i3.6772>
- Tanpipat, W., Lim, H. W., & Deng, X. (2021). *Implementing remote working policy in corporate offices in Thailand: strategic facility management perspective*. *Sustainability*, 13(3), 1284. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13031284>

- Toffler, A. (1980). *The Third Wave*. New York: William Morrow and Company. *Inc. Toffler The Third Wave*.
- Turan-Torun, B., Oktaysoy, O., Kobanoglu, M. S., Topcuoglu, E., Yenikaya, M. A., Topcuoglu, V., & Uygungil-Erdogan, S. (2025). Identification of heavy work investment antecedents: research on digital leadership. *Frontiers in Psychology, 16*, 1588412.
- Turkish Statistical Institute (Turkstat). (2022). *Household Labor Force Survey*. Ankara: Turkstat Data Portal. <https://data.tuik.gov.tr/bulten/index?p=isgucu-istatistikleri-2022-49390>
- U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics-BLS. (2022). *Remote work and productivity*. Washington, DC: BLS. <https://www.bls.gov/opub/btn/volume-13/remote-work-productivity.htm?>
- Yamoah, E. E. (2025). *Work-Life Balance, Organisational Commitment, and Healthcare Worker Productivity*. *Management and Economics Review, 10(1)*, 133-146. <https://doi.org/10.24818/mer/2025.01-09>
- Ziomek, A. (2023). *Motivation to work remotely in the face of organizational and cost conditions*. *Ekonomia i Prawo. Economics and Law, 22(2)*, 399-418. <https://doi.org/10.12775/EiP.2023.023>