PRZEGLĄD PSYCHOLOGICZNY – THE REVIEW OF PSYCHOLOGY
2025, TOM 68, NR 1, 129–147
DOI: 10.31648/przegldpsychologiczny.11718

The Psychological Capital of Workers and Professional Wellbeing.

The Moderating Role of Work Mode

Olga Zwardoń-Kuchciak[1]
University of Lodz, Faculty of Educational Sciences, Institute of Psychology
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8463-0496

Mateusz Hauk
University of Lodz, Faculty of Educational Sciences, Institute of Psychology
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1202-9022

Abstract

Aim: In times of increasingly dynamic change, the responsibility for ensuring the professional wellbeing of employees has fallen to the employer, and organizations are systematically looking for ways to take care of their employees. The question of which factors influence the formation of occupational well-being, especially in the context of work mode, is extremely relevant to the functioning of modern organizations.

Methods: The study used the *Occupational Wellbeing Questionnaire*, which allows a subjective self-assessment of one's work and its environment. In addition, psychological capital and its components were evaluated with the *Psychological Capital Questionnaire*. Work mode was determined using a closed question included in the survey. The study included a total of 162 people (111 women and 51 men), aged 21 to 55 (M = 35, SD = 7.63).

Results: A positive relationship was observed between psychological capital and occupational wellbeing, with work mode having varying effects on occupational wellbeing. In addition, remote and hybrid working had significant indirect moderating effects on the relationship between psychological capital and professional wellbeing.

Conclusion: The relationships between psychological capital, professional wellbeing and work mode require further study. Nevertheless, our findings indicate directions for preparing development and support activities aimed at maintaining or increasing wellbeing

[1] Correspondence address: olga.zwardon@now.uni.lodz.pl.

and the effect of work mode; as such they have important practical implications for employers, HR departments and managers.

Keywords: occupational wellbeing, psychological capital, work mode

Following the dynamic changes resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic, organisations have been faced with new challenges concerning organizational fluidity, rapid adaptation to unpredictable situations, and employee retention and support. Most notably, the introduction of asynchronous, remote or hybrid work has driven dramatic changes in the professional landscape. In many regards, remote and hybrid work modes have become the new norm, both for fulfilling professional duties and conducting development activities such as training, mentoring or coaching (De Klerk et al., 2021; Dojwa-Turczyńska, 2021; Eniola, 2022; Gierszon, 2021).

Understanding the effects of these changes poses a challenge for researchers and practitioners in Organizational and Occupational Psychology, as well as for employers hoping to support the psychological and professional wellbeing of employees, and strengthen their internal psychological resources. Employees are in particular need of support when coping with instability and family and professional duties; appropriate interventions in these areas can increase effectiveness, efficiency and wellbeing, both at work and in life in general (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017; Kozusznik et al., 2023; Saks, 2019).

Currently, many organizations offer remote and hybrid work modes on a partial basis, and are looking for ways of improving organisational efficiency by maximising employee efficiency (Poles in the Workplace Report, 2021; State of Remote Work, 2022). Both employees and organizations are adjusting their expectations regarding work mode, with 86% of employees wanting their company to develop fully remote or hybrid work environments, and 72% indicating their current employers have already implemented or are developing a form of permanent remote work (Poles in the Workplace Report, 2021).

It is also important to emphasize the importance of individual dispositional factors when developing professional wellbeing in employees. Although the concept of *capital* is primarily associated with material resources, the social sciences have expanded its meaning to include various resources held by individuals or groups; the term can now encompass *economic capital* (i.e. what we have), *human capital* (what we know), *cultural capital* (what we do, what we create), *social capital* (who we know) and *psychological capital* (who we are). Therefore, to build professional wellbeing and foster a supportive environment, it is necessary to fit the employee to a suitable work mode.

The aim of this study is to analyse the occupational wellbeing and psychological capital of employees, taking into consideration the moderating role of work mode.

Professional Wellbeing and Psychological Capital

The relationship between occupational wellbeing and psychological capital is an important area of research in the field of Organizational Psychology. The

two concepts are closely related but concern different aspects of functioning regarding work. The sense of wellbeing is a multidimensional construct that refers to the individual's expectations regarding different areas of life (Ratajczak, 2007).

Occupational wellbeing is an important construct in Occupational Psychology, and plays a key role in describing the quality of professional life. While it is sometimes understood in a similar way to the classic concepts of personal wellbeing, *viz.* the hedonic model, focused on pleasure and satisfaction, and the eudaimonistic model, referring to the realization of values and a sense of meaning, its specific nature requires a separate analytical approach that takes into account the context of the work environment and professional activity (Czerw, 2017; Zalewska, 2003). It is most often defined as an assessment of one's own professional functioning, which is closely related to the nature of the work performed, the position held and relationships with colleagues (Czerw, 2017). Employees with a high sense of wellbeing are usually more valued in the workplace, and achieve better professional results and greater success.

Analogous to the concept of personal well-being, like those mentioned above, professional well-being can be considered from hedonistic and eudaimonistic perspectives. The former refers to satisfaction with one's job, and was analyzed by researchers in the early 20th century; in the professional sense, hedonistic wellbeing refers to satisfaction with the job performed (Zalewska, 2003). In contrast eudaimonistic wellbeing concerns the meaning and value of work as a "professional mission"; in this sense, professional wellbeing is associated with happiness and satisfaction with work as a state resulting from appropriate behaviour, rather than as a subjective phenomenon (Czerw, 2017), i.e. work has subjective meaning and significance (Barrick et al., 2013). Czerw (2017) present an empirically-verified concept of occupational wellbeing based on five dimensions reflecting both its hedonic and eudaimonistic nature:

- Job satisfaction – refers to subjective satisfaction with the performance of professional tasks, meeting needs and achieving goals.
- Work engagement – includes a sense of identification with the work performed, high energy level and readiness to take on challenges. It refers to the motivational aspects of professional functioning, emphasizing the eudaimonistic dimension of work as a space for realizing one's potential.
- A sense of meaningfulness in work – the belief that the work performed has a deeper meaning and is consistent with the values of the individual.
- Workplace relationships – the quality of interpersonal contacts in the professional environment.
- Work-life balance – the ability to maintain harmony between the demands of professional life and the needs of private life.

Czerw (2017) regards occupational wellbeing not as a one-dimensional category, but a complex construct embedded in both the subjective experiences of an individual and the objective organizational context. Its level depends not only on the content and conditions of work (Kapica et al., 2022; Matwiej, 2020), but also on individual resources, such as psychological capital (Avey et al., 2011; Lipińska-Grobelny et al., 2023; Luthans et al., 2007), mental resilience (Robertson et al., 2015; Tugade et al., 2004) and social support (Halbesleben, 2006; Viswesvaran et al., 1999).

Although the development of wellbeing is very much connected with situational conditions, they do not fully explain the variation observed between individuals experiencing the same working conditions; however, this variation may be accounted for to some extent by the positive internal resources of employees. Seligman, in his book *True Happiness* (2005), proposes that when engaging in work, performing an activity with full concentration, a person begins to experience a *flow* state, i.e. a state of mind and body characterized by a sense of elation or euphoria. When experiencing such a flow, workers begin to develop and use their internal resources, which make up future psychological capital. These principles have driven research into the positive psychological states that are open to development and could potentially influence desirable human attitudes and behaviour, with initial studies concerning self-efficacy belief, hope, optimism, subjective wellbeing (happiness) and emotional intelligence (Luthans, 2002a). These components of psychological capital were further refined by Luthans (2002b) and eventually reduced to four personal resources, namely self-efficacy belief, optimism, hope, and resilience.

Numerous empirical studies indicate that the main factor explaining the level of occupational wellbeing is psychological capital. Indeed, psychological capital has been found to correlate with better job performance (Luthans et al., 2007), strong motivation and engagement (Bakker & Xanthopoulou, 2013), positive self-esteem and drive to succeed (Peterson et al., 2011), proactivity (Chen, 2013), higher self-esteem (Peterson et al., 2011), happiness (Williams et al., 2015), and more effective problem-solving strategies and innovation in action (Luthans et al., 2011). Li et al. (2015) report that in addition to being associated with better wellbeing, psychological capital also mediates between social support and wellbeing; it also appears to influence organizational commitment, willingness to remain in a position and job satisfaction (Avey et al., 2011; Newman et al., 2014); it also increases employee wellbeing through stress reduction (Baron et al., 2013). Interestingly, Luthans et al. (2007) indicate that psychological capital as a general concept, along with latent variables such as positive orientation (Laguna et al., 2005) and key self-evaluation (Chirkowska-Smolak, 2012) plays a greater role in adaptive functioning than its component individual factors.

It is important to underline that psychological capital acts as an internal resource, and that it can both moderate the impact of working conditions and act as an independent predictor of wellbeing. In their model of psychological wellbeing, Ryff and Keyes (1995) emphasize that wellbeing represents not only the absence of any negative states of functioning, but rather the presence of its positive aspects: autonomy, purpose in life, personal development, positive relationships with others, mastery over one's environment and self-acceptance. They propose that psychological capital can significantly support the development and maintenance of these areas, and thus improve wellbeing. Importantly, psychological capital is not a fixed characteristic – it can be developed and strengthened through psychological interventions and organizational activities (Luthans & Youssef-Morgan, 2017). Thanks to its dynamic nature, it is of particular value in human resource management, and may be a valuable component of strategies aimed at supporting occupational wellbeing in different work modes.

Work Mode

In 2020, a number of countries implemented various solutions based on work mode to counter the COVID pandemic and its effects. What had been previously available only to a few became an everyday reality for the wider population, who may not have previously been able to work this way.

The use of remote and hybrid work can generate many benefits for both employer and employee. It is sometimes treated as a form of benefit for the latter, as the choice of location and time for working is reserved for employees who are regarded as the "core of the organization" (Majewska & Samol, 2016). The main advantage of remote working for the employee is that it can be performed from any location, while the employer has the opportunity to reduce facilities expenditures and the cost of maintaining infrastructure (Grycuk, 2013). Furthermore, the employer obtains the effect of the work, while the employee is able to save the time and resources otherwise spent commuting, and combine work with other activities and needs (Wiśniewski, 2014). It is becoming an attractive alternative option for offsetting the constraints placed on the employee by their place of residence, physical status, or responsibilities related to other social roles (Bąk, 2009; Majewska & Samol, 2016). It has also been found to improve employee efficiency (Wiśniewski, 2014), although this is primarily reliant on the self-organization ability of employees, which stems from their personal resources and skills.

However, the lack of contact with other employees associated with distance work, and possible problems with promotion, can cause problems with wellbeing (Mirecka, 2015; Olejniczak, 2000; Świątkowski, 2006). In addition, from the perspective of the organisation, it can be a challenge to communicate with employees, and to guide and support them in maintaining their effectiveness. It is worth noting that before the COVID-19 pandemic, remote work practices were rare in Poland, and the implementation of a remote or hybrid work mode involved a number of additional measures for the employer, including the provision, insurance and installation of appropriate equipment, ongoing technical service and support, and ensuring training in the use of digital tools. In return, organizations faced a range of new challenges, particularly regarding monitoring work performance, maintaining communication standards, and effectively managing teams in a dispersed environment.

Research suggests the presence of a curvilinear relationship between remote work and job satisfaction, which largely depends on the amount of work done outside the office (Golden et al., 2006; Hill et al., 1998). The hybrid model is sometimes associated with greater satisfaction and lower turnover rates; in contrast, despite offering greater flexibility and autonomy, remote work can also foster feelings of isolation and weakened social ties within the team (Bloom et al., 2024; Tkalich et al., 2022). Employee expectations and the changing professional environment have forced employers to seek solutions that maximize efficiency regardless of work mode.

In the present study, work mode is assumed to be a potential moderator of the relationship between psychological resources and occupational wellbeing. This is supported by both practical observations and previous research demonstrating

that the choice of work mode is associated with varying demands, modes of communication, level of control over working time or access to social support (Eurofound, 2020; Wang et al., 2021). Remote mode may require the employee to have greater psychological capital: as less direct organizational support is available, the work mode place more demands on internal resources, such as self-regulation, mental toughness or a positive attitude; in contrast, situational factors such as team atmosphere or management style may be more important in the traditional office setting.

Therefore, to better understand the conditions under which psychological capital best promotes employee wellbeing, and to identify potential risks and opportunities associated with organizing work in variable environments, it may be a valuable strategy to include work mode as a moderating variable.

For the purposes of this study, three forms of work mode were adopted:

1. On-site work – the employee spends 100% of work time in the office.
2. Remote work – the employee spends 100% of work time outside the office.
3. Hybrid work – the employee engages in both on-site and remote work in various proportions.

Research Hypotheses

Hence, the purpose of the study is to examine the relationship between psychological capital and occupational wellbeing, taking into account the role of work mode (on-site, remote, hybrid) as a potential moderating factor in the relationship. The following research hypotheses are posed:

H1: A positive relationship exists between psychological capital in the employee and occupational wellbeing.

H2: Work mode differentiates occupational wellbeing in the studied groups.
- H2.1: Employees in hybrid mode achieve a higher level of occupational wellbeing than the other two groups.
- H2.2: Employees in on-site mode demonstrate higher levels of occupational wellbeing than those in remote mode.
- H2.3: Employees in remote work mode have a lower level of wellbeing than the other groups.

H3: Work mode moderates the relationship between psychological capital and occupational wellbeing in such a way that those performing remote work demonstrate a stronger relationship than the other groups.
- H3.1: Work mode moderates the relationship between psychological capital and occupational wellbeing with regard to the positive organization dimension, such that the relationship is stronger among remote workers than the other groups.
- H3.2: Work mode moderates the relationship between psychological capital and occupational wellbeing with regard to the positive relationships

dimension, such that the relationship is stronger among remote workers than the other groups.

H3.3: Work mode moderates the relationship between psychological capital and occupational wellbeing with regard to the contribution to the organization dimension, such that the relationship is stronger among remote workers than the other groups.

H3.4: Work mode moderates the relationship between psychological capital and occupational wellbeing with regard to the fit and development dimension, such that the relationship is stronger among individuals working remotely than other groups.

Methods

Procedure and Study Participants

The survey was conducted remotely, using an online questionnaire developed on the MS Forms platform. Information about the survey, including an invitation to participate and an active link to the questionnaire, was disseminated through social media channels. Prior to the start of the survey, participants were briefed on the purpose, conduct and rules of participation (in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki), and then gave their informed consent to participate. Participation in the study was voluntary and did not involve any form of compensation.

The study included 162 participants (111 women and 51 men) aged 21 to 55 ($M = 35$, $SD = 7.63$). The respondents were classified into one of three groups depending on work mode: 76 worked in on-site mode, 56 in hybrid mode, and 30 in remote mode. The vast majority of respondents (88.9%) had a university degree or a part-time university degree (10.5%); however, they represented a variety of professional positions and sectors, including commercial businesses, public administration and higher education. Most were residents of large cities (over 500,000 residents) i.e. 73.5% of those surveyed.

Tools

Occupational wellbeing was measured using the *Occupational Wellbeing Questionnaire* (Czerw, 2017), a tool based on the five-dimensional concept of wellbeing in the workplace. The questionnaire consists of 43 items, rated on a 5-point Likert scale, which provide a subjective assessment of work and the work environment. The items are grouped into four subscales corresponding to the main dimensions of occupational wellbeing: *Positive Organization*, *Fit and Development*, *Positive Relationship with Co-Workers*, *Contribution to the Organization*. The original version of the questionnaire has good internal consistency indicated by the high reliability ratings for the dimensions: *Positive Organization* ($\alpha = .88$

sample statement: "My job allows me to grow."), *Fit and Development* (α = .89; e.g., "My job fits me."), *Positive Relationships* (α = .91; e.g., "I can rely on my co-workers."), and *Contribution to the Organization* (α = .83; e.g., "I feel that my work gives a lot to the company where I work.").

Psychological capital was measured with the *Psychological Capital Questionnaire* (KKaPsy) developed by Lipińska-Grobelny and Zwardoń-Kuchciak (2023). This tool estimates the overall level of psychological capital and its four components, *viz.* hope, optimism, mental toughness and self-efficacy, according to Luthans et al. (2007). The questionnaire contains 12 items rated on a 6-point Likert scale. The original version has satisfactory psychometric reliability overall (α = .80), with varying results noted for the subscales. The highest value was recorded for *Optimism* (α = .91; sample statement: "I often hope for good things to happen to me."), followed by *Belief in Self-efficacy* (α = .77; e.g., "I usually know what to do in troublesome situations."), *Hope for Success* (α = .66; e.g., "I pursue my ideas with enthusiasm."), and then *Resilience* (α = .35; e.g., "People perceive me as a person full of energy."). While the very low Cronbach's alpha value obtained for the *Resilience* subscale prevents any analysis based on individual components of psychological capital, it was still possible to use the general result; therefore, the global score was used for the later analysis. The participants were asked to state whether they performed their duties in an onsite, remote or hybrid work mode their work mode. These responses were used to divide respondents into three comparison groups, and to verify the moderating role of work mode in the studied relationships.

Results

Data analysis was performed using IBM SPSS Statistics (version 29), with the PROCESS macro by Andrew F. Hayes. Relationships between psychological capital and occupational wellbeing were verified using Pearson's *r* (Table 1). Significant relationships were noted for the overall psychological capital index ($r = .27$, $p < .05$).

Table 1

The Correlation Between Occupational Well-Being and Psychological Capital

	Psychological Capital				
	Overall score	**Self-efficacy**	**Hope**	**Resilience**	**Optimist**
Occupational well-being	.27**	.11	.01	.18*	.37*

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Work mode was found to have a significant influence on occupational well-being, $F(2, 159) = 3.31$, $p = .039$, based on one-way ANOVA for independent

groups (Table 2). *Post hoc* comparisons using the Bonfferoni correction revealed significant differences ($p < .05$) between on-site and hybrid modes. The highest overall wellbeing was recorded for hybrid workers ($M = 244.64$, $SD = 33.74$), followed by remote workers ($M = 232.90$, $SD = 43.72$) and finally on-site workers ($M = 226.11$, $SD = 44.55$).

Regarding the individual subscales of psychological wellbeing, significant differences were observed for the *Positive Relationships* and *Contribution to Organization* scales, with the trends being analogous to those noted for overall wellbeing.

Table 2

Average Levels of Occupational Well-Being Among Employees Working in: On-site, Remote, and Hybrid Modes

		On-site mode $n = 76$	**Remote mode** $n = 30$	**Hybrid mode** $n = 56$	F	p	η^2
Occupational well-being	*M*	226.11	232.90	244.64	3.31	.039	.05
	min.	69	128	151			
	max.	289	290	284			
	SD	44.55	43.72	33.74			

The next stage examined the moderating role of work mode in the relationship between psychological capital (WO) and occupational wellbeing. Firstly, the assumptions of the moderation analysis were checked; an analysis of the scatter plot of residuals against predicted values found no heteroscedasticity, and the Durbin-Watson statistic indicated no autocorrelation. In addition, the values of the VIF coefficients for all variables remained below the accepted threshold of 5, indicating the absence of collinearity. Therefore, the prerequisites for further steps were met.

Moderation analysis was performed using Hayes' Macro PROCESS (version 3.1), model 1 (moderation analysis; 95% confidence interval for effect values; number of bootstrap trials: 5000). Since the mode of operation (i.e. the moderator) is a categorical variable with three values, dummy coding was used, with on-site operation designated as the reference category.

The model proved to be a good fit to the data: $F(5, 156) = 5.43$, $p = .001$, explaining 14.83% of the variance in occupational wellbeing ($R^2 = .15$). Regression analysis revealed a significant interaction effect between psychological capital and hybrid work mode ($B = 3.48$, $p = .007$) and a marginally significant effect in remote mode ($B = 2.18$, $p = .066$), indicating that work mode moderates the relationship between psychological capital and overall occupational wellbeing (Table 3).

Regarding the moderating role of work mode, significant indirect effects were observed for remote and hybrid work. Psychological capital exerted the strongest effect on overall occupational wellbeing for those working in the hybrid mode (Table 4).

Table 3

Regression Analysis: The Effect of Psychological Capital on Occupational Well-Being Depending on the Work Mode

Predictor	*B*	*SE*	*t*	*p*	95% CI (LL – UL)
Intercept	226.19	4.47	50.59	< .001	[217.36, 235.02]
Psychological Capital (X)	0.39	0.67	0.58	.566	[–0.94, 1.71]
Work mode: Remote (W1)	12.81	8.71	1.47	.144	[–4.40, 30.01]
Work mode: Hybrid (W2)	12.42	7.07	1.76	.081	[–1.55, 26.39]
Psychological Capital × Remote (X × W1)	2.18	1.18	1.85	.066	[–0.15, 4.50]
Psychological Capital × Hybrid (X × W2)	3.48	1.28	2.71	.007	[0.95, 6.01]

Note. *B* = unstandardized regression coefficient; *SE* = standard error; *CI* = confidence interval; *LL* = lower limit; *UL* = upper limit.

Table 4

Moderation Analysis – Psychological Capital (Overall Score) and Occupational Well-Being. Moderator: Work Mode

Work mode	Effect	*SE*	*t*	*p*	95% CI (LL – UL)
On-site	0.39	0.67	0.58	.566	[–0.94, 1.71]
Remote	2.56	0.97	2.65	.009	[0.65, 4.48]
Hybrid	3.86	1.09	3.54	< .001	[1.71, 6.02]

Note. *SE* = standard error; *CI* = confidence interval; *LL* = lower limit; *UL* = upper limit.

The same analyses were performed for each dimension of occupational well-being. For fit and development, the model was found to be a good fit to the data – $F(5, 156) = 4.51$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .13$; regression analysis revealed a marginally significant interaction effect ($p = .095$), suggesting that work mode moderates the relationship between psychological capital and this aspect of wellbeing. For positive orientation, the model was also a good fit – $F(5, 156) = 5.82$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .16$; the analysis revealed a significant interaction effect ($p = .0014$), indicating a moderating role for work mode. For positive relationships, the model was also a good fit – $F(5, 156) = 4.36$, $p = .001$, $R^2 = .12$; a significant interaction effect was noted ($p = .006$), suggesting that work mode moderates the relationship between psychological capital and positive relationships. However, the model turned out to be a good fit for contribution to the organization – $F(5, 156) = 5.71$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .16$, although without any significant interaction effect ($p = .44$). Interestingly, psychological capital was found to have a significant effect, $B = 0.28$, $SE = 0.13$, $t = 2.18$, $p = .031$, suggesting that higher levels of psychological capital are associated with greater wellbeing in this regard. The indirect effects are presented in Table 5.

Psychological capital had the strongest effect on the dimensions of wellbeing in hybrid mode, especially for positive relationships, fit and development and

positive orientation, with all effects being statistically significant. In remote mode, a significant relationship was only found with positive orientation, while in on-site mode, the only significant relationship was noted with contributions to the organization.

Table 5

Moderation Analysis – Psychological Capital and Occupational Well-Being (Dimensions). Moderator: Work Mode

Work mode (TRPR)	Dimension of well-being	*B*	*SE*	*t*	*p*	95% CI (LL– UL)
On-site (1)	Fit and development	0.24	0.17	1.43	.155	[–0.09, 0.58]
	Positive relationships	–0.09	0.19	–0.47	.642	[–0.47, 0.29]
	Contribution to the organization	0.28	0.13	2.18	.031	[0.03, 0.53]
	Positive orientation	–0.04	0.23	–0.20	.844	[–0.50, 0.41]
Remote (2)	Fit and development	0.44	0.25	1.80	.074	[–0.04, 0.93]
	Positive relationships	0.50	0.28	1.78	.078	[–0.06, 1.05]
	Contribution to the organization	0.59	0.34	1.73	.087	[–0.08, 1.26]
	Positive orientation	1.13	0.33	3.43	< .001	[0.48, 1.79]
Hybrid (3)	Fit and development	0.96	0.28	3.44	< .001	[0.41, 1.51]
	Positive relationships	1.08	0.32	3.42	< .001	[0.45, 1.70]
	Contribution to the organization	0.27	0.24	1.11	.269	[–0.21, 0.75]
	Positive orientation	1.29	0.37	3.45	< .001	[0.55, 2.02]

Discussion

The study was intended as a pilot, and exploratory in nature, whose main aim is to initially identify the relationship between psychological capital and occupational wellbeing, and analyse whether, and how, work mode moderates this relationship.

A significant positive association was noted between the overall level of psychological capital and occupational wellbeing ($r = .27$, $p < .05$). The results obtained correspond with those obtained by the authors of the concept of psychological capital (Luthans et al., 2007), who note that resources such as hope, mental resilience or optimism act as psychological buffers, supporting the individual to function effectively at work. Similar relationships were also identified in a meta-analysis by Avey and colleagues (2011), in which psychological capital was shown to exhibit significant positive associations with engagement, job satisfaction and overall employee wellbeing.

The results of the analysis of variance showed that work mode differentiated the level of experienced occupational wellbeing [$F(2, 159) = 3.31$, $p = .039$],

which confirms hypothesis H2. The highest levels of wellbeing were found among those working in hybrid mode (M = 244.64), which remains consistent with hypothesis H2.1 and the results of previous studies (Wang et al., 2021), indicating that the combination of working remotely and at the office can promote wellbeing by offering flexibility and the ability to maintain social contacts. Slightly lower scores were obtained among remote workers (M = 232.90), followed by on-site workers (M = 226.11). These results do not support hypotheses H2.2 and H2.3, which propose that remote working was associated with the lowest levels of wellbeing. One potential explanation could be the greater autonomy experienced by remote workers, and the easier reconciliation of work and private responsibilities, which may have a positive impact on overall wellbeing, despite offering limited social contact. Such flexibility may support professional wellbeing by allowing both contact with colleagues and work in a home environment, allowing the employee to deal with family matters and other issues outside work. It can also be assumed that if employees are given influence and freedom to choose their work mode, this will have a positive impact on their evaluation of their work, their organisation, as well as their occupational wellbeing. It is also surprising to see that the lowest levels of wellbeing were reported by those working in on-site mode. This may be due to pandemic or post-pandemic times, in which health concerns discouraged some people from direct contact. Further research in this area is therefore warranted.

Moderation analysis found work mode to significantly moderate the relationship between psychological capital and occupational wellbeing, thus supporting hypothesis H3. However, contrary to hypothesis H3.1, the strongest relationship between psychological capital and occupational wellbeing was observed among hybrid workers (B = 3.86, p < .001) rather than remote workers (B = 2.56, p = .009). In on-site work, the relationship was found to be statistically insignificant. Hence, it appears that the most favourable conditions for activating individual psychological resources are created by the hybrid model; perhaps due to the greater flexibility of work practices and the possibility to adapt work to individual preferences. Similar observations emerged from Eurofound (2020), where it was indicated that hybrid working may provide the optimal environment for supporting mental health and performance among employees.

Psychological capital may play a particularly important role in shaping occupational wellbeing in remote and hybrid working. In such contexts, the individual is exposed to much more limited contact with others, less intensive relationships and lower levels of social support, which can be important determinants of wellbeing; as such, psychological capital may act as a buffer when working outside the organisation, or at least gain in importance compared to other determinants of occupational wellbeing.

Further analyses found work mode to also moderate the relationship between psychological capital and individual dimensions of occupational wellbeing. Our findings confirm hypothesis H3.1 for positive organisation, with the strongest effect occurring among hybrid employees (B = 1.29, p < .001), indicating that when organisational conditions are favourable, individuals with high psychological capital may be better able to use their resources to build a positive

image of the organisation. Indeed, Luthans et al. (2007) report that employees with higher levels of psychological capital tend to have more positive perceptions of their work environment and greater organisational support.

Similarly, our data confirm hypothesis H3.2 concerning positive relationships: a significant moderating effect observed in the hybrid group (B = 1.08, p < .001), which may indicate that those working in this mode have more opportunities to enjoy social relationships at work, perhaps due to the potential for both remote work and face-to-face contact, and this effect is reinforced by psychological capital. Baker and Austin (2019) suggest that a hybrid form of work can foster more sustainable and satisfying work relationships if employees have sufficient individual resources, such as optimism or resilience.

Hypothesis H3.3, relating to contribution to the organisation, was not confirmed. Although the effect was statistically significant among on-site employees (B = 0.28, p = .031), no significant interaction was noted with work mode; this indicates that the relationship between psychological capital and sense of contribution did not differ according to work mode. This may indicate that a sense of meaningfulness of work and its impact on the organisation is less dependent on the flexibility of the work mode and more related to ongoing task engagement; this has been suggested by, among others, Halbesleben and Wheeler (2008), who propose that a sense of usefulness and job role recognition plays an import role in building engagement.

However, hypothesis H3.4 was confirmed. In the hybrid mode, a particularly strong and statistically significant relationship was observed between psychological capital and fit and development (B = 0.96, p < .001), which may indicate that employees with resources in the form of optimism, resilience or a sense of efficacy are better able to make use of flexible conditions to develop themselves and adapt the work environment to their needs. Similar conclusions are drawn by Robertson and Cooper (2010), indicating that occupational wellbeing is based not only on experiencing positive emotional states, but also on being able to realise one's potential and align work with personal goals and values.

Our results also have important practical implications for employers, HR departments and managers, insofar that they provide guidance on which employees, depending on work mode, can or should be supported more in terms of their occupational wellbeing. The findings confirm that psychological capital is a key resource for supporting occupational wellbeing, and that its importance varies according to work mode. Therefore, the development of components such as hope, resilience, optimism and a sense of efficacy should be an important part of HR policies, especially for employees engaging in remote and hybrid working. Hybrid workers show the greatest capacity to transform psychological resources into wellbeing, especially in the areas of relationships and work fit.

Organisations that offer greater flexibility and support the development of individual resources may offer greater engagement and satisfaction in non-on-site workers. In remote working, it is particularly important to build a culture of support and contact, through regular meetings or team-building activities for example, as isolation can reduce their sense of belonging. In this context, psychological capital has a protective function. While on-site employees may benefit less from

the effects of relationship wellbeing or development, they can nevertheless gain from possessing a sense of influence on the organisation; as such it is still worth reinforcing recognition, feedback and participation in decisions within this group.

It can be said, therefore, that our findings indicate that psychological capital can be treated as a powerful individual resource, translating into better quality of life and functioning in various spheres. Furthermore, investing in such development can yield benefits at both the organisational and the individual level, and occupational wellbeing can translate into higher employee satisfaction, a better opinion of the employer and "stronger" *employer branding*.

Limitations and Directions for Future Research

The study has some limitations which should be taken into account when interpreting the results. Most importantly, it should be noted that the study was a pilot and hence exploratory in nature, and the results should therefore be seen as a starting point for further, more in-depth analysis. One key limitation is the uneven size of the groups of participants working in different modes. A considerably larger proportion of participants were working in on-site mode ($n = 76$) than those working remotely ($n = 30$). This disproportion may have affected the strength of the statistical effects obtained and thus may limit the generalisability of the findings, particularly regarding remote working. Hence, future studies, should aim to ensure a more balanced distribution of numbers between groups or to use appropriate statistical control methods. Another limitation is the failure to account for important differences in job characteristics, such as the level of position, the specific tasks performed, the sector of activity or the size of the organisation; these factors can significantly modify both levels of psychological capital and occupational wellbeing. It is also worth performing studies that address individual organisations, as this would allow a more detailed analysis of employee wellbeing with regard to work mode, industry specifics and job hierarchies within the same company. Such a study could provide valuable data on the importance of organisational context in shaping the wellbeing of employed individuals. In addition, subsequent research should attempt to define and operationalise hybrid work more precisely, so that respondents indicate the number of hours spent working both inside and outside the organisation: in the present study, the term hybrid work was simply applied to employees who divided their work between the office and another location. The number of hours or days away from the organisation, and the ability to influence the place and hours will work, can be an important factor influencing occupational wellbeing. Furthermore, the analysis does not fully control the sociodemographic and situational variables that may be related to occupational wellbeing, especially when working outside the office. Further research should consider other factors, such as marital status, having children, having to care for dependents or having access to a dedicated space to work at home or in the office.

Another important limitation is its reliability; although the overall KPsych measure had satisfactory consistency, this result was very low for the *Resilience*

scale (α = .36). As such, this value should be confirmed by further research, and it should be taken into consideration when interpreting the result. Finally, it is worth noting that due to the cross-sectional nature of the study, it is not possible to capture the dynamics of the analysed relationships. As such, it would be desirable to perform a longitudinal study could complement the work and observe changes in wellbeing over time, depending on work mode and possible changes in its organisation.

References

Avey, J. B., Reichard, R. J., Luthans, F., & Mhatre, K. H. (2011). Meta-analysis of the impact of positive psychological capital on employee attitudes, behaviors, and performance. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, *22*(2), 127–152. https://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.20070

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). Job demands-resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *22*(3), 273–285. https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000056

Bakker, A. B., & Xanthopoulou, D. (2013). Creativity and charisma among female leaders: The role of resources and work engagement. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, *24*(14), 2760–2779. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2012.751438

Baron, R. A., Franklin, R. J., & Hmieleski, K. M. (2013). Why entrepreneurs often experience low, not high, levels of stress: The joint effects of selection and psychological capital. *Journal of Management*, *42*(3), 742–768. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206313495411

Barrick, M. R., Mount, M. K., & Li, N. (2013). The theory of purposeful work behavior: The role of personality, higher-order goals, and job characteristics. *Academy of Management Review*, *38*(1), 132–153. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2010.0479

Bąk, E. (2009). *Nietypowe formy zatrudnienia na rynku pracy* [*Atypical forms of employment in the labor market*]. C.H. Beck.

Bloom, N., Liang, J., Roberts, J., & Ying, Z. J. (2024). Does working from home work? Evidence from a Chinese experiment. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, *139*(1), 165–218. https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qju032

Buffer. (2022). *State of remote work 2022*. https://buffer.com/state-of-remote-work/2022

Chen, H. (2013). *The relationship between psychological capital and proactive career behavior of Chinese white collar workers in their early career* [unpublished manuscript]. Department of Economics, University of Tokyo. https://img.atwiki.jp/sekiguchizemi/attach/9/29/Chen2013.pdf

Chen, C. C., Chen, M. Y. C., & Liu, Y. C. (2013). Negative affectivity and workplace deviance: The moderating role of ethical climate. *The International Journal of Human Resources Management*, *24*(15), 2894–2910. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2012.753550

Chirkowska-Smolak, T. (2012). *Psychologiczny model zaangażowania w pracę* [*Psychological model of work engagement*]. Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM.

Czerw, A. (2017). *Psychologiczny model dobrostanu w pracy. Wartość i sens pracy* [*A psychological model of well-being at work: The value and meaning of work*]. Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

De Klerk, J. D., Joubert, M., & Mosca, H. F. (2021). Is working from home the new workplace panacea? Lessons from the COVID-19 pandemic for the future world of work. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, *47*, Article 1883. https://doi.org/10.4102/sajip.v47i0.1883

Dojwa-Turczyńska, K. (2021). Remote work during the pandemic: The analysis of selected secondary data. *Polityka Społeczna*, *569*(8), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.5604/01.3001.0015.3612

Eniola, O. (2022). Work-from-home engagement during COVID-19: Implications for human resource management. *International Journal of Business and Management*, *17*(3), 134–147. https://doi.org/10.5539/ijbm.v17n3p134

Eurofound, Ahrendt, D., Cabrita, J., Clerici, E., Hurley, J., Leončikas, T., Mascherini, M., Riso, S., & Sandor, E. (2020). *Living, working and COVID-19: First findings – April 2020*. Publications Office of the European Union. https://doi.org/10.2806/467608

Gierszon, B. (2021). Zrównoważone wykorzystanie technologii cyfrowych w pracy zdalnej i hybrydowej [Sustainable use of digital technologies in remote and hybrid work]. *Zarządzanie Zasobami Ludzkimi*, *141*(4), 115–129. https://doi.org/10.5604/01.3001.0015.2764

Golden, T. D., Veiga, J. F., & Simsek, Z. (2006). Telecommuting's differential impact on work-family conflict: Is there no place like home? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *91*(6), 1340–1350. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.6.1340

Grycuk, A. (2013). Najważniejsze tendencje na rynku pracy w krajach rozwiniętych [Key labor market trends in developed countries]. *Studia BAS*, *4*(36), 9–25.

Halbesleben, J. R. B. (2006). Sources of social support and burnout: A meta-analytic test of the conservation of resources model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *91*(5), 1134–1145. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.5.1134

Halbesleben, J. R. B., & Wheeler, A. R. (2008). The relative roles of engagement and embeddedness in predicting job performance and intention to leave. *Work & Stress*, *22*(3), 242–256. https://doi.org/10.1080/02678370802383962

Hill, E. J., Miller, B. C., Weiner, S. P., & Colihan, J. (1998). Influences of the virtual office on aspects of work and work/life balance. *Personnel Psychology*, *51*(3), 667–683. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1998.tb00256.x

Kapica, Ł., Baka, Ł., & Najmiec, A. (2022). *Kształtowanie się zdolności do pracy i dobrostanu w grupie pracowników ochrony zdrowia, oświaty i nauki oraz usług związanych z kontaktem z klientem* [*Development of work ability and well-being among groups of healthcare, education and science workers, and service employees in customer-facing roles*]. https://m.ciop.pl/CIOPPortalWAR/file/96032/Baka_Dobrostan_pracownikow_sluzby_zdrowia_2022.pdf

Kozusznik, M., Soriano, A., & Peiró, J. (2023). Well-being at work. *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Psychology*. https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190236557.013.105

Lipińska-Grobelny, A., & Zwardoń-Kuchciak, O. (2023). Psychometric properties of the *Psychological Capital Questionnaire* (KKaPsy). *Current Issues in Personality Psychology*, *11*(2), 162–173. https://doi.org/10.5114/cipp.2021.112374

Luthans, F. (2002a). Positive organizational behavior: Developing and managing psychological strengths. *Academy of Management Executive*, *16*(1), 57–75. https://doi.org/10.5465/ame.2002.6640181

Luthans, F. (2002b). The need for and meaning of positive organizational behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *23*(6), 695–706. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.165

Luthans, F., Avolio, B. J., Avey, J. B., & Norman, S. M. (2007). Positive psychological capital: Measurement and relationship with performance and satisfaction. *Personnel Psychology*, *60*(3), 541–572. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2007.00083.x

Luthans, F., Youssef, C. M., & Avolio, B. J. (2007). *Psychological capital: Developing the human competitive edge*. Oxford University Press.

Luthans, F., Avey, J. B., Avolio, B. J., & Peterson, S. J. (2010). The development and resulting performance impact of positive psychological capital. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, *21*(1), 41–67. https://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.20034

Luthans, F., Youssef, C. M., & Rawski, S. L. (2011). A tale of two paradigms: The impact of psychological capital and reinforcing feedback on problem solving and innovation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior Management*, *31*(4), 333–350. https://doi.org/10.1080/01608061.2011.619421

Luthans, F., & Youssef-Morgan, C. M. (2017). Psychological capital: An evidence-based positive approach. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, *4*, 339–366. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032516-113324

Łaguna, M., Trzebiński, J., & Zięba, M. (2005). *Kwestionariusz Nadziei na Sukces. Podręcznik* [*Hope for Success Questionnaire: Manual*]. Pracownia Testów Psychologicznych Polskiego Towarzystwa Psychologicznego.

Majewska, M., & Samol, S. (2016). *Rozwój elastycznego rynku pracy. Uwarunkowania prawno-ekonomiczne* [*Development of a flexible labor market: Legal and economic conditions*]. Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM.

Matwiej, G. (2020). Dobrostan i satysfakcja z jakości życia zawodowego młodych kobiet. Wyniki badań [Well-being and job satisfaction of young women: Research findings]. *Annales Universitatis Mariae Curie-Skłodowska, Sectio H – Oeconomia*, *54*(3), 59–66. https:// 10.17951/h.2020.54.3.59-66

Mirecka, I. (2015). Elastyczne formy zatrudnienia jako element gospodarowania kapitałem ludzkim [Flexible forms of employment as an element of human capital management] In A. Rogozińska-Pawełczyk (Ed.), *Gospodarowanie kapitałem ludzkim. Wyzwania organizacyjne i prawne* (pp. 163–174). Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego. http://dx.doi.org/10.18778/7969-890-5.14

Newman, A., Ucbasaran, D., Zhu, F., & Hirst, G. (2014). Psychological capital: A review and synthesis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *35*(S1), 120–138. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1916

Olejniczak, E. (2012). Pracownicy o elastycznych formach zatrudnienia — analiza językowa wybranych przekazów internetowych [Employees with flexible forms of employment — A linguistic analysis of selected online messages]. *Folia Linguistica*, *46*, 60–70. https://doi.org/10.18778/0208-6077.46.05

Olejniczak, Z. (2000). Telepraca – nowa szansa na zatrudnienie [Telework – A new opportunity for employment]. *Polityka Społeczna*, *10*, 17–20.

Peterson, S. J., Luthans, F., Avolio, B. J., Walumbwa, F. O., & Zhang, Z. (2011). Psychological capital and employee performance: A latent growth modelling approach. *Personnel Psychology*, *64*(2), 427–450. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2011.01215.x

Pracuj.pl. (2021). *Polacy w środowisku pracy: sposoby szukania ofert i gotowość do zmiany. Polacy gotowi na zmianę pracy* [*Poles in the work environment. Methods of job searching and readiness to change*]. https://media.pracuj.pl/123872-polacy-gotowi-na-zmiane-pracy-badanie-pracujpl

Ratajczak, Z. (2007). *Psychologia pracy i organizacji* [*Work and organizational psychology*]. Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Robertson, I. T., & Cooper, C. L. (2010). Full engagement: The integration of employee engagement and psychological well-being. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *31*(4), 324–336. https://doi.org/10.1108/01437731011043348

Robertson, I. T., Cooper, C. L., Sarkar, M., & Curran, T. (2015). Resilience training in the workplace from 2003 to 2014: A systematic review. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *88*(3), 533–562. https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12120

Ryff, C. D., & Keyes, C. L. M. (1995). The structure of psychological well-being revisited. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *69*(4), 719–727. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.69.4.719

Saks, A. M. (2019). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement revisited. *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance*, *6*(1), 19–38. https://doi.org/10.1108/JOEPP-06-2018-0034

Seligman, M. (2005). *Prawdziwe szczęście* [*True Happiness*]. Wydawnictwo Media Rodzina.

Świątkowski, A. M. (2006). Telepraca – specyfika zatrudnienia na odległość [Telework – The specifics of remote employment]. *Monitor Prawa Pracy*, *7*, 347–352.

Tkalich, A., Smite, D., Andersen, N. H., & Moe, N. B. (2022). What happens to psychological safety when going remote? *arXiv preprint*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2208.12454

Tugade, M. M., & Fredrickson, B. L. (2004). Resilient individuals use positive emotions to bounce back from negative emotional experiences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *86*(2), 320–333. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.86.2.320

Viswesvaran, C., Sanchez, J. I., & Fisher, J. (1999). The role of social support in the process of work stress: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *54*(2), 314–334. https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1998.1661

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. https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12290

Williams, P., Kern, M. L., & Waters, L. (2015). A longitudinal examination of the association between psychological capital, perception of organizational virtues, and work happiness in school staff. *Psychology of Well-Being*, *5*, Article 5. https://www.doi.org/10.1186/s13612-015-0032-0

Wiśniewski, J. (2014). Istota telepracy [The essence of telework]. *Studia z Zakresu Prawa, Administracji i Zarządzania UKW*, *5*, 75–90.

Zalewska, A. (2003). Skala satysfakcji z pracy – pomiar poznawczego aspektu ogólnego zadowolenia z pracy [Job satisfaction scale – measuring the cognitive aspect of overall job satisfaction]. *Acta Universitatis Lodziensis, Folia Psychologica*, *7*, 49–61.