Comparative Study

Perceived Productivity and Organisational Climate Among Two Models of Work - A Comparative Study

Shreya Shitole[1]*, Rema M K[2]

ABSTRACT

The aim of the study is to assess the relationship between perceived productivity and organisational climate among two models of work, i.e., Hybrid work mode and In-office work mode. The research was conducted on 200 participants working at corporate jobs in India. The questionnaires used in the study were General Measure of Perceived Productivity (GMPP) and the Organisational Climate Scale. The results showed a high, positive correlation between the variables Organizational Climate and Perceived Productivity. Results also indicates that there was some significant difference between Work from home and In-Office with respect to Organisational Climate, but no significant difference was seen between Work from Home and In-Office with respect to perceived productivity.

The pandemic-induced rise of Remote and Hybrid work modes.
The COVID-19 pandemic triggered a strange experiment for all businesses as companies closed their offices and employees were forced to work from home. As many companies announce their post-COVID permanent remote work or hybrid home/office policies, the questions like; what can be expected from employees and how that has an impact on job performances, employees' perspectives on their role in the company and employee-employer dynamics arise. Due to this pandemic, businesses were also compelled to implement new work procedures, new policies, and a new set of structures and guidelines accommodating the various models of work. Many different professionals were asked to work remotely, and some were asked to adopt a hybrid model of work that combined working from home and working in an office. This transition of work-life also gave the employees the freedom to choose when they worked and where they worked. As a result, employees began reassessing what they wanted from their work life and started prioritising their needs.

The acknowledgement and deep understanding of this series of events bring us to the question of, how these colossal changes in one's work life affected one's performance at

---

[1]Department of Psychology, Kristu Jayanti College, Bengaluru
[2]Department of Psychology, Kristu Jayanti College, Bengaluru
*Corresponding Author

their job.It is also well-documented that remote workers' well-being, health and productivity have been affected during the pandemic (Pang, et. al., 2021). There is scarce evidence of how the post-pandemic remote and hybrid work models are affecting productivity, organizational climate, and other crucial aspects of job performance. (Virtaneva, Feshchenko, Hossain, et. al., 2021). Overall, the pandemic has resulted in a change in work habits that has seen office-based models replaced with remote and hybrid ones. This pattern persisted even after the pandemic was over as more businesses realized the benefits of these models.

Perceived Productivity

Being able to dedicate time to specific tasks, completing them and ending your workday with a quality output can be an overall measure of productivity at the workplace (Indeed Editorial Team, 2019). Perceived productivity is defined as the attitudinal state of an individual is derived from the perception, that an environment, conducive to the effective or efficient use of organizational resources and processes is present. (Castelle, 2017)

In our study, "Perceived productivity" refers to a person's assessment, of their own or another person's, output effectiveness. It measures an individual's perception of their productivity at work. It is influenced by things like workload, organizational climate, job satisfaction, and interpersonal relationships. Employee performance and mental health are significantly impacted by perceived productivity, and people who feel more productive also tend to be more engaged in their work tasks, which produces better results. Aside from that, feeling productive fosters feelings of worth and meaning, both of which frequently have positive psychological effects, including improved well-being.

Organisational Climate

Organizations must now ensure a great workplace experience and offer secure, enjoyable, and healthy environments if they want to retain top talent. "Organisational climate refers 'to an employee's long-lasting perception of the working environment and culture of the business they work for.' Every organisation has a unique climate. This is echoed as a set of characteristics and features perceived by employees.

In our study, the features of an organization's climate refer to how an employee is rewarded, and the nature and quality of their workplace relationships. These influence employees' behaviour at work across various dimensions such as relationships, autonomy, and organisational structure. Organisational climate is a narrower concept of how employees perceive these behaviours and norms.

Researchers have reported psychological climate as a significant covariate of individual-level outcomes such as job involvement, job satisfaction, in-role performance, and extra-role performance (Schneider & Snyder, 1975). The experiences of a favourable psychological climate would significantly accentuate an individual's clarity and attachment to his/her job and would add to his/her level of job involvement (Brown & Leigh,1996).

Organisational Climate & Perceived productivity

Organizational climate in relation to perceived productivity has previously been explored in research mainly by Castelle (2017), where she aimed to find the influence of perceived productivity on organisational climate as well as affective commitment. Wherein Castelle

used the exact term "perceived productivity," which very few researchers have explored upon.

The climate of an organization has a significant impact on its perceived productivity. Higher levels of employee motivation, engagement, and cooperation can be fostered by a positive organizational climate, which in turn boosts productivity. An unfavourable organizational climate, however, can have the opposite result; employees may become demotivated or dissatisfied with their workplace, which will lower productivity. (Castelle,2017)

The organizational climate that harbours high levels of employee productivity, gives staff members clear expectations and goals while granting them autonomy over how those goals are attained. Along with providing the right incentives—such as praise and rewards for excellent work—it also entails fostering open communication among employees at all organizational levels, allowing for flexible work schedules or telecommuting options when feasible, and promoting cooperation among team members. (Dhar, 2001)

Organizations that concentrate on developing systems for decision-making processes, implementing regular feedback loops so that employees feel heard, establishing trust through management's transparency about decisions being made at all stages of the process, investing in resources designed to help eliminate distractions, and finally creating an environment where everyone feels comfortable expressing ideas without fear of judgment or criticism from colleagues. All of these factors help to create the ideal organizational climate, which will ultimately result in improved perceptions of worker productivity. (Seppälä & Cameron, 2015).

It is challenging to fully comprehend the intricate relationship between workplace culture and productivity. Employees who felt their workplace was supportive, for instance, were more likely to report higher levels of job commitment and satisfaction as well as lower levels of stress and burnout. These workers additionally reported higher levels of productivity. (Nagar, K. 2012).

Thus, it would seem that organizational climate and perceived productivity are related. This association may result from the fact that a healthy workplace culture fosters a feeling of psychological safety that encourages employees to take chances and try new things.

There is a large body of research that suggests that productivity is enhanced when employees feel that their work is meaningful and that their employer cares about their well-being. To foster this sense of purpose and meaning at work, an organization must have a supportive environment where employees feel valued and supported.

Need and Significance of The Study
Researchers have lightly discussed the relationship between perceived productivity and organisational climate. One research conducted by Patterson, Wart & West in 2010 discussed job satisfaction, wherein they predicted that associations between company climate and productivity would be mediated by the average level of job satisfaction. Another study conducted by Castelle in 2019 established the relationship between perceived productivity and its influence on organizational climate and affective commitment.

While both perceived (subjective) and actual (objective) productivity is important, this research paper is mainly focused on the perceived (subjective) productivity of an employee.

The reason for this is several reasons: (a) organizational climate and objective productivity have previously been correlated. (Patterson et al., 2004), (b) objective metrics of productivity do not account for ideas about productivity, which are relevant in relation to how one feels about the culture of their workplace; (c) While analysing the sample population, measures for gauging objective productivity differ between organisations and within departments; (d) subjective productivity has been given significantly less attention in the industrial psychology literature, instead focusing on objective productivity, and (5) in many instances, actual productivity is difficult to measure, for example, in software development when project milestones are less tangible (Abdel-Hamid, 1989). (Castelle, 2017). These points for rationale are inspired by the research conducted by Katie Castelle in 2017 on "An Investigation into Perceived Productivity and Its Influence on the Relationship Between Organizational Climate and Affective Commitment."

These are relatively unexplored concepts in the defined context. Although there are research papers that explore workplace productivity, very few studies have explored perceived productivity at an individual level. Going even further, there are no studies that explore the exact relationship between perceived productivity and organizational climate, among the post-covid remote & hybrid work mode corporate population.

This topic is extensively less researched upon, as the sample population selected for this study is limited only to the Indian population, as there are no researches where these two variables have been studied among the Indian corporate population. The rationale behind the corporate employees being the sample of the study is corporate is an organizational entity, where it's more sensible to assess the organizational climate of the organisation or the company. Corporate employees possess the relevant form of work and have a specific structure that connects to their organisational climate which in turn gives the researcher the opportunity to assess individual perceived productivity with more clarity. Another rationale being most corporate employees have the ability to read and understand the questionnaire.

In our research, the central focus is on the relationship between organisational climate and perceived productivity and how this relationship varies by the type of work model in the organisation. This includes the hybrid work mode and the in-office work mode.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The concept of organisational climate and productivity is being embraced in recent times by an increasing number of organizations. Companies are now focusing on other complementary aspects such as employee mental health, organisational climate, commitment, employee burnout etc., to prevent and remove such factors from influencing employee performance. In this new post-pandemic, pro-mental health era where we can see an exponential rise of hybrid workplaces and the rise of work-from-home jobs, corporate firms are going above and beyond to now prove to employees why their workplace is the best. Thus, to help and add more insight for the firms, to create more healthy, safe, and motivating workplaces, we are focusing on these topics i.e., Organisational Climate and Perceived Productivity in this paper.

Perceived Productivity and Organisational Climate Among Two Models of Work - A Comparative Study

The purpose of the research by Castelle (2019) is to investigate the relationship between individuals' perceptions of their productivity, as measured using an instrument developed in this study, and their commitment to their organization. The instrument, called the General Measure of Perceived Productivity (GMPP), was originally designed to measure employees' perceptions of their own productivity. In order to establish validity and reliability, exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was performed on this instrument with pilot survey data. The results demonstrate that the relationship between organizational climate and affective commitment depends on perceived productivity level and is strengthened in the presence of higher perceived productivity levels. Castelle's findings support existing body of literature relating to organizational behaviour while developing a theory on a new concept, perceived productivity.

The concept of a non-territorial workplace is being embraced by an increasing number of organizations. In a study by Kim, et.al., (2016), the results point to a decline in occupant self-assessed productivity as certain spatial factors—like an office layout that encourages easy interaction with coworkers, the ability to modify or personalize one's workspace, and the amount of storage space offered—perform less. This also showed that employees working in non-territorial workplaces had a stronger correlation between spatial characteristics and their self-assessed productivity (as determined by odds ratios), compared to those assigned to pre-allocated desks. Kim (2016) discovered that the surroundings' comfort level was the best predictor of shared-desk users.

Adeyemo, Dzever and Lambert (2015) examined how organizational climate, leadership style, and emotional intelligence impacted the quality of work life. The findings show a significant difference in participant quality of life at work under Democratic, Autocratic, and Laissez-faire leadership, with Democratic leadership's contributions being the most significant. The authors suggest that management acknowledges the significance and the roles of emotional intelligence and leadership styles in enhancing employees' quality of work life based on their findings.

The working environment, employee morale, and perceived productivity were all factors that were examined in this study of industrial organisations in Nigeria conducted by Akintayo (2012). Akintayo's study used a descriptive survey approach. Based on the study's findings, it is advised that employers give employees with a working environment that includes organisational support programmes, training and development opportunities, substantial welfare benefits, and a favourable socio-political climate. This will help to raise employee morale and boost workplace productivity.

The study conducted by Leuken, A. and others (2022) investigates the relationship between workplace environment and job satisfaction and productivity in remote working during the COVID-19 pandemic. The results reveal that a residential built environment has an indirect effect on both remote work satisfaction and productivity. Leuken and the co-authors presented a holistic approach to evaluating environmental factors affecting remote workers' comfort levels during an outbreak by illustrating possible differences among countries that may prove useful for future country-specific analyses.

Raghuram's study (2001) investigated the variables that affect how well employees acclimatise to virtual employment. The structural elements (such as work autonomy and assessment standards) and relational factors (such as trust and organisational connectivity)

as predictors of transition to virtual work are of special importance. The study's findings demonstrated the significance of structural and relational elements in predicting adjustment, as well as the dependence of relationship strength on individual differences.

The purpose of the study by Kumar & Singh (2012) was to determine the association between organisational climate and burnout in the field of education. The study's findings revealed a non-significant inverse relationship between organisational climate and the two aspects of teacher burnout, namely emotional exhaustion and depersonalization, as well as an inverse but nonetheless positive relationship between organisational climate and personal achievement (third dimension of burnout).

The study by Baker and his team studied the impact of four factors on WFH outcomes for experienced WFH employees from 20 Australian organisations in order to better understand how employers may support professional employees to WFH. According to the Crawford's (2007) findings, work habits and household traits are less likely to have an impact on WFH employees' contentment and perceived productivity.

This study by Gamal & Mohamed (2012) attempts to investigate how Egyptian teleworkers' perceived productivity is influenced by demographic, technological, personal, and organisational aspects. The importance of contentment, dedication, work flexibility, and management support is stressed in addition to the rise of job security as a significant factor of perceived teleworking productivity. The report by authors also emphasizes the productivity of teleworking in the Arab world, which has received little attention in teleworking studies.

In the study conducted by Smite, D & others (2019) examined the evidence of perceived productivity changes comparing office work prior to the pandemic with work from home during the epidemic in order to comprehend the nature of home telework. The authors draw the conclusion that a wide range of experiences lies behind the typical "no change," suggesting that working from home may not be suitable for everyone.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The objective of our study is to assess the relationship between perceived productivity and organizational climate among 2 models of work. This identifies how the level of perceived productivity is affected among employees by their organizational climate. This study also compares the relationship between hybrid work mode and in-office work mode.

We used Correlational research Design is to investigate relationships between variables without the researcher controlling or manipulating any of them. A correlation reflects the strength and/or direction of the relationship between two (or more) variables. The direction of a correlation can be either positive or negative. We used a correlational design to investigate the relationship between perceived productivity and organisational climate. The results of the correlation were then compared between 2 groups i.e., the Hybrid work mode group and the in-office work mode group. Thus, this becomes a comparative study between two groups. Comparative research essentially compares two groups to draw a conclusion about them. It is used attempt to identify and analyse similarities and differences between groups. This can also be referred to as Between Groups (between subjects) design. This is a

quantitative study which emphasizes the statistical analysis of data collected through standardized questionnaires.

Statement of the Problem

The aim of the study is to compare the perceived productivity and organisational climate between 2 models of work, i.e., Hybrid work mode and Work from Home work mode.

Objectives of the Study

- To assess if there is any relationship between perceived productivity and organisational climate
- To examine the significant difference for perceived productivity between employees of hybrid and in-office work model
- To examine the significant difference for organisational climate between employees of hybrid and in-office work model

Hypotheses

- H_{01} - There is no relationship between perceived productivity and organisational climate.
- H_{02} - There is no significant difference in Perceived Productivity between the employees of hybrid work model and the in-office work model.
- H_{03} - There is no significant difference in Organisational Climate between the employees of hybrid work model and the in-office work model.

Operational Definitions

- **Perceived productivity:** Perceived productivity is the perception or appraisal of one's productivity at work, which is a combination of time management, focus on the task at hand, motivation to achieve success, or simply achieve more.
- **Organisational Climate:** Organisational climate refers to an employee's long-lasting perception of the working environment and culture of the business they work for. This is echoed as a set of characteristics and features perceived by employees. These characteristics or dimensions are as follows: Rewards and interpersonal relations, Organisational processes, Clarity of roles, and sharing of information. These influence employees' work across various dimensions such as work performance, productivity, achievement, and other such factors.
- **Work Model:** Work models are methods for organising a work environment and determining where employees conduct daily tasks. There are several types of work models that organisations commonly use. These work models can affect how employees interact and where they complete their daily tasks.
- **In-office mode:** In this mode, people are expected to clock in between 9 am and 5 pm every workday in an office setup, which usually involves commuting to the office. With in-office mode, employees can communicate with one another and get visibility of other coworkers who will also be onsite.
- **Hybrid Work Mode:** Hybrid work is a flexible work model that supports a blend of in-office, remote, and on-the-go workers. It offers employees the autonomy to choose to work wherever and however they are most productive.
- **Corporate Company:** A corporation is an organisation—usually, a group of people or a company, that is a business entity that is owned by its shareholder(s), who elect

a board of directors to oversee the organization's activities. The corporation is liable for the actions and finances of the business – the shareholders are not.

- **Corporate Job:** Positions within a corporate organization are known as corporate jobs. This usually refers to a job within a larger business, group, or corporation, which occasionally consists of multiple branches in other countries or areas.

Sample and Technique
We conducted this research on 200 participants working at corporate jobs, with a minimum of 1 year of experience. The individuals who were between the age group of 21 to 50 participated in the survey. The sample was selected using a purposive sampling method from different parts of India. Google forms were used to collect the research data from the participants.

We included a sample size of 200 individuals, which is divided into two groups of 100 each. The first group is using a hybrid work model. The second group is using an in-office work model. Informed consent was obtained from the participants, they were briefed about the research and confidentiality was assured.

Inclusion Criteria:
The employees who are working professionals in the Corporate Sector. They have been working in Middle management roles for at least 1 year.

Exclusion Criteria:
Employees are working at startups. As startups are not established organizations.

Research Ethics
1) The consent of the subject is taken before starting of the test.
2) Feelings of the subject were not harmed at any instance.
3) The subject has their own decision of withdrawing from the study whenever they wanted.

TOOLS
1. General Measure of Perceived Productivity (GMPP)
The instrument, named the General Measure of Perceived Productivity (GMPP), was developed in a mixed-methods approach that employed both qualitative and quantitative tools. Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) of the instrument was performed to establish validity and reliability, using pilot survey data. the full 29-item (five-factor) instrument or the shorter, 18-item (three-factor) the instrument used in the main survey research. The GMPP scale is a 7-point Likert scale, with items ranging from No, Strongly disagree to Yes, Strongly agree. Factor analysis is performed on the data to score and analyse.
(Castelle, K. M. (2017). An investigation into perceived productivity and its influence on the relationship between organisational climate and affective commitment.)

2. Organisational Climate Scale
The Organisational Climate Scale developed by Pathe, Chaudhari and Dhar (2001) was administered to explore the general opinion of working managers of different organisations. It is the self-administering scale and is eminently suitable for the group as well as individual testing. This scale contains 22 items. Each item of this scale was rated on 7 point rating scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree with a score of 1 to 7 (1-strongly disagree, 2- moderately disagree, 3-slightly disagree, 4-neither agree nor disagree, 5-slightly agree, 6-

moderately agree and 7-strongly agree). The scale measures four different factors of Organisational Climate such as; Results, Rewards and Interpersonal Relations Organisational Processes, Clarity of Roles and Sharing of Information and Altruistic Behaviour.

The reliability of the scale was determined by calculating the reliability coefficient on a sample of 205 subjects. The split-half reliability coefficient was found to be 0.87. Besides face validity, as all items were related to the variable under focus, the scale has high content validity. In order to find out the validity from the coefficient of reliability, the reliability index was calculated, which indicated high validity on account of 0.93. (Dhar, 2001).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
The present chapter deals with analysis of the result, discussion, and interpretation of the result.

Table 1: Age of the participant's

Age	
Mean	27.02
Std. Deviation	5.85
Minimum	20
Maximum	56

Table 2: Gender Distribution

	Frequency	%
Female	103	52.82%
Male	91	46.67%
Non-binary	1	0.51%
Total	195	100%

Table 3: Work Experience

	Frequency	%
0 to 2	81	41.54%
2 to 3 years	63	32.31%
3 to 5 years	26	13.33%
5 years & above	23	11.79%
1 to 5 years	2	1.03%
Total	195	100%

Table 4: Shows the descriptive statistics for Organisational Climate and Perceived Productivity Organisational Climate and Sub-scales

	Mean	Median	SD	Min	Max
Organizational Climate	103.73	103	28.96	41	154
Results, Rewards and Interpersonal Relations	42.47	42	12.05	14	63
Organizational Process	37.69	39	11.22	11	56
Clarity of Role & Sharing of Information	18.91	19	5.65	4	28
Altruistic Behaviour	41	5	11	4	7

Table 4 shows the descriptive statistics of five different variables in an organizational context. These variables show the global score results for Organizational Climate and four subscales of Organisational climate which are; Results, Rewards and Interpersonal Relations, Organizational Process, Clarity of Role & Sharing of Information, and Altruistic Behavior. These values are useful for understanding the range, distribution, and central tendencies of each subscale in the context of an organization.

In this Table, in column 1 we can see Organizational Climate, which measures the overall organizational climate, which is the prevailing mood or atmosphere in an organization. The mean score of this variable is 103.73, indicating a relatively positive organizational climate, while the standard deviation of 28.96 suggests a moderate degree of variation in the perceptions of the organizational climate among the respondents. The minimum score for this variable is 41, indicating that some respondents reported a relatively negative climate, while the maximum score of 154 suggests that some respondents experienced a highly positive climate.

Subscale Interpretation:
In Table 4, column 2 we can see the subscale Results, Rewards and Interpersonal Relations, which measures the degree to which the organization provides rewards and recognition for good performance, and promotes positive interpersonal relationships among employees. The mean score of this variable is 42.47, suggesting a moderate level of satisfaction with these aspects of the organization. The standard deviation of 12.05 suggests a relatively low degree of variation in the perceptions of this variable among the respondents. The minimum score of 14 suggests that some respondents reported relatively low satisfaction with these aspects of the organization, while the maximum score of 63 indicates that some respondents reported a high level of satisfaction.

In column 3 we can see the subscale Organizational Process. This subscale measures the effectiveness and efficiency of organizational processes, such as decision-making, communication, and coordination. The mean score of this variable is 37.69, indicating a moderate degree of satisfaction with organizational processes. The standard deviation of 11.22 suggests a relatively low degree of variation in the perceptions of this variable among the respondents. The minimum score of 11 suggests that some respondents reported relatively low satisfaction with organizational processes, while the maximum score of 56 indicates that some respondents reported a high level of satisfaction.

In column 4 we can see the subscale Clarity of Role & Sharing of Information. This variable measures the degree to which employees feel clear about their roles and responsibilities, and are provided with the necessary information to perform their jobs effectively. The mean score of this variable is 18.91, indicating a relatively low level of satisfaction with clarity of roles and information sharing. The standard deviation of 5.65 suggests a moderate degree of variation in the perceptions of this variable among the respondents. The minimum score of 4 suggests that some respondents reported very low satisfaction with these aspects, while the maximum score of 28 indicates that some respondents reported a relatively high level of satisfaction.

In column 5 we can see the subscale Altruistic Behaviour. This variable measures the degree to which employees engage in prosocial or helpful behaviours towards their colleagues and the organization, beyond their formal job duties. The mean score of this variable is 4.65,

indicating a relatively low level of altruistic behaviour. The standard deviation of 1.55 suggests a moderate degree of variation in the perceptions of this variable among the respondents. The minimum score of 1 suggests that some respondents reported very low levels of altruistic behaviour, while the maximum score of 7 indicates that some respondents reported relatively high levels.

Table 5: Interpretation of the Organizational Climate

Organizational Climate Score	Frequency	%
Normal	66	33.85%
High	65	33.33%
Low	64	32.82%
Total	195	100%

Table 5 represents the interpretation of the organizational climate scale. The results were categorized into three levels: Normal, High, and Low.

The table indicates that out of the 195 participants, 66 participants or 33.85% rated the organizational climate as Normal, 65 participants or 33.33% rated it as High, and 64 participants or 32.82% rated it as Low.

This suggests that most of the participants rated the organizational climate either Normal or High, while a significant number of participants rated it as Low. Overall, the table provides a perception of the organizational climate among the participants.

Table 6: Subscale 1: Results, Rewards and Interpersonal Relations

Class Interval	N	Interpretation	Percentage
14-32	59	Low	30.25%
33-53	81	Normal	41.53%
54-63	55	High	28.20%

Table 6 represents the scores for Subscale 1, which includes Results, Rewards, and Interpersonal Relations. The scores have been grouped into three class intervals: 14-32, 33-53, and 54-63. The table shows that out of the total participants who participated in this subscale, 59 respondents or 30.25% scored in the Low interpretation range, 81 participants or 41.53% scored in the Normal interpretation range, and 55 participants or 28.20% scored in the High interpretation range. This indicates that a significant percentage of participants scored in the Normal interpretation range, suggesting that they had an average perception of the Results, Rewards, and Interpersonal Relations subscale. However, a considerable proportion of participants scored in the Low interpretation range, which could indicate that they had some concerns or negative perceptions regarding this subscale. The 28.20% of participants who scored in the High interpretation range could suggest that they had positive perceptions of Results, Rewards, and Interpersonal Relations in their organisation.

Table 7: Subscale 2: Organizational Process

Class Interval	N	Interpretation	Percentage
11-29	57	Low	29.3%
30-45	74	Normal	37.9%
46-56	64	High	32.8%

Table 7 shows the scores for Subscale 2, which includes Organizational Process. The scores have been grouped into three class intervals: 11-29, 30-45, and 46-56.

The table shows that out of the total participants who participated in this subscale, 57 respondents or 29.3% scored in the Low interpretation range, 74 participants or 37.9% scored in the Normal interpretation range, and 64 participants or 32.8% scored in the High interpretation range.

This suggests that the participants had varied perceptions of the Organizational Process subscale, with a slightly higher percentage of participants scoring in the Normal and High interpretation ranges. However, a significant proportion of participants scored in the Low interpretation range, which could indicate that they had some concerns or negative perceptions regarding the organizational process in their organisation.

Table 8: Subscale 3: Clarity of Role & Sharing of Information

Class Interval	N	Interpretation	Percentage
4-13	42	Low	21.5%
14-23	101	Normal	51.7%
24-28	52	High	26.6%

Table 8 represents the scores for Subscale 3, which includes Clarity of Role and Sharing of Information. The scores have been grouped into three class intervals: 4-13, 14-23, and 24-28. The table shows that out of the total participants who participated in this subscale, 42 participants or 21.5% scored in the Low interpretation range, 101 participants or 51.7% scored in the Normal interpretation range, and 52 participants or 26.6% scored in the High interpretation range.

This suggests that most of the participants scored in the Normal interpretation range, indicating that they had an average perception of the Clarity of Role and Sharing of Information subscale. However, a significant proportion of participants scored in the Low interpretation range, which could indicate that they had some concerns or negative perceptions regarding Clarity of Roles in their organisation. On the other hand, the 26.6% of participants who scored in the High interpretation range could suggest that they had positive perceptions of the clarity of roles and sharing of information in their organisation.

Table 9: Subscale 4: Altruistic Behaviour

Class Interval	N	Interpretation	Percentage
1-3	50	Low	25.6%
4-6	121	Normal	62.1%
7-9	24	High	12.3%

Table 9 represents the scores for Subscale 4, which includes Altruistic Behaviour. The scores have been grouped into three class intervals: 1-3, 4-6, and 7-9. The table shows that out of the total the participants who participated in this subscale, 50 the participants or 25.6% scored in the Low interpretation range, 121 the participants or 62.1% scored in the Normal interpretation range, and 24 the participants or 12.3% scored in the High interpretation range.

This indicates that most of the participants scored in the Normal interpretation range, suggesting that they had an average perception of the Altruistic Behaviour subscale. However, a significant proportion of the participants scored in the Low interpretation range, which could indicate that they had some concerns or negative perceptions regarding altruistic behaviour in their organisation. On the other hand, the 12.3% of the participants who scored in the High interpretation range could suggest that they had positive perceptions of altruistic behaviour.

Table 10: Descriptive Statistics for Perceived Productivity

	Mean	**Median**	**Std. Deviation**	**Variance**	**Minimum**	**Maximum**
Perceived Productivity	119.61	120	30.06	903.84	57	179
Factor 1	30.36	30	7.55	57.08	12	45
Factor 2	22.7	21	6.53	6.38	12	35
Factor 3	19.7	19	6.38	40.73	6	34
Factor 4	19.39	18	6.61	43.7	6	33
Factor 5	22.72	22	6.98	48.7	6	35

Table 10 provides the descriptive statistics for Perceived Productivity and its five factors, including the mean, median, standard deviation, variance, minimum, and maximum.

The mean perceived productivity score was 119.61, which indicates that the participants had a relatively high perceived level of productivity on average. The median score was 120, suggesting that the distribution of scores was approximately symmetrical. The standard deviation was 30.06, indicating that there was some variability in the scores. The variance was 903.84, which is the square of the standard deviation.

For the five factors, Factor 1 had a mean score of 30.36, Factor 2 had a mean score of 22.7, Factor 3 had a mean score of 19.7, Factor 4 had a mean score of 19.39, and Factor 5 had a mean score of 22.72. The median scores for all five factors were lower than the mean scores, which suggests that the distributions were slightly skewed to the left. The standard deviation and variance for each factor varied, with Factor 1 having the highest standard deviation and variance, and Factor 3 having the lowest standard deviation and variance. Overall, the descriptive statistics suggest that the respondents perceived their productivity to be relatively high, with some variability across the five factors.

H_{01}: There is no significant relationship between Perceived productivity and Organizational Climate

Table 11: Shows the correlation between Perceived productivity and Organizational Climate.

	Perceived Productivity
Organizational Climate	0.69**

Note: **$p < .001$

Table 11 shows the Pearson correlation that was performed to test whether there was an association between Organizational Climate and Perceived Productivity. The result of the

Pearson correlation showed that there was a significant correlation between Organizational Climate and Perceived Productivity, r (193) = 0.69, p = <.001.

There is a high, positive correlation between the variables Organizational Climate and Perceived Productivity with r = 0.69. Thus, there is a high, positive correlation between Organizational Climate and Perceived Productivity in this sample. Hence, $H0_1$ is rejected, this indicates that there exists a significant positive relationship between Organizational Climate and Perceived Productivity.

H_{02} - There is no significant difference in Perceived Productivity between the employees of hybrid work model and the in-office work model.

H_{03} - There is no significant difference in Organisational Climate between the employee of hybrid work model and the in-office work model

Table 12: Shows the descriptive statistics and the difference between Work from home

		N	M	SD	t	df	p
Organizational Climate	Hybrid Work Mode	90	113.47	25.76	4.56	193	<.001
	In-Office Work Mode	105	95.38	29.05			
Perceived Productivity	Hybrid Work mode	90	123.94	30.52	1.88	193	.062
	In-Office Work Mode	105	115.89	29.3			

The results of the descriptive statistics show that the Hybrid work mode group has higher values for Organizational Climate (M = 113.47, SD = 25.76) than the In-Office group (M = 95.38, SD = 29.05).

A two-tailed t-test for independent samples (equal variances assumed) showed that the difference between Hybrid Work mode and In-Office mode with respect to Organizational Climate was statistically significant, t (193) = 4.56, p = <.001, 95% confidence interval.

The results of the descriptive statistics show that the Hybrid work group has higher values for Perceived Productivity (M = 123.94, SD = 30.52) than the In-Office group (M = 115.89, SD = 29.3).

A two-tailed t-test for independent samples (equal variances assumed) showed that the difference between Hybrid Work mode and In-Office with respect Perceived Productivity was not statistically significant, t (193) = 1.88, p = .062, 95% confidence interval.

Here in the results, for Perceived Productivity there was no significant difference between Hybrid work mode and In-Office groups. Hence H_{02} is accepted. This indicates that there is no significant difference in Perceived Productivity between the employees of hybrid work model and the in-office work model.

On the other hand, there was a difference obtained for the Organizational Climate between Hybrid work mode and In-Office groups. Hence $H0_3$ is rejected. This indicates that there is a significant difference in Organisational Climate between the employee of hybrid work model and the in-office work model.

Hence, this indicates that there was some significant difference between Hybrid work mode and In-Office with respect to Organisational Climate, but no significant difference was seen between Hybrid work mode and In-Office mode with respect to perceived productivity.

Further, a simple linear regression analysis was conducted to see the predictive values.

Table 13: Show model summary of regression analysis

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.695[a]	.483	.481	14.8282

Note: Predictors: (Constant): Organisational Climate

A simple linear regression was conducted to see the predictive value of Organisational climate on perceived productivity. Table 13 shows the R value, R square, adjusted R square, standard error. The adjusted R square value is 0.481, which is 48.1% of total variance in perceived productivity, that can be explained by Organisational Climate.

Table 14: Shows the analysis of variance model.

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
	Regression	39700.609	1	39700.609	180.560	.000[b]
1	Residual	42435.925	193	219.875		
	Total	82136.533	194			

a. Dependent Variable: Perceived productivity
b. Predictors: (Constant): Organisational climate

Table 14 shows the analysis of variance model. Organisational Climate significantly predicts Perceived productivity, F (1, 193) = 180.560, p<0.05. The regression model is good fit of data.

Table 15: Shows the regression coefficient which establishes the relationship between Organisational Climate and Perceived productivity

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	71.623	3.959		18.093	.000
	Organisational Climate	.494	.037	.695	13.437	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Perceived productivity

Table 15 shows the regression coefficient which establishes the relationship between Organisational Climate and Perceived productivity. The unstandardized coefficient for Organisational Climate is 0.494, therefore increase in one unit of Organisational Climate predicts increase of 0.494 units in Perceived productivity. It is statistically significant as $p<0.05$.

DISCUSSION

Organizational climate and perceived productivity have been extensively studied in the field of organizational psychology. Various studies have been conducted in the Indian context during the time of COVID-19 to understand the difference between the work modalities and its impact on mental health. The main objectives of our study were to (i) assess if there is any relationship between perceived productivity and organisational climate, (ii) to examine the significant difference for perceived productivity between employees of hybrid and in-office work model and (iii) to examine the significant difference for organisational climate between employees of hybrid and in-office work model.

Research has consistently shown that organizational climate can have a significant impact on employee productivity. In our study, there was a significant positive correlation between the t scores of perceived productivity and organizational climate (r=0.69, p-value<0.001). A positive organizational climate characterized by a supportive and empowering work environment has been associated with higher levels of job satisfaction, employee engagement, and commitment, all of which are positively related to perceived productivity. In contrast, a negative organizational climate characterized by poor communication, lack of support, and high levels of conflict and stress has been associated with lower levels of perceived productivity. (Castelle, 2017). The significance of the correlation complements the existing literature on the two variables.

Our study establishes the positive correlation between Perceived productivity and Organizational Climate.

In our study, results for Perceived Productivity showed that there was no significant difference between Hybrid work mode and In-Office groups. This shows that participants did not feel much difference in their output with respect to their perceived productivity either in Hybrid work mode or In-Office work mode.

On the other hand, there was a significant difference obtained for Organizational Climate between Hybrid work mode and In-Office groups. This indicates that significant difference was seen in the organisational climate which consists of the results, rewards and

interpersonal relations among colleagues, organisational processes in companies, clarity of roles & sharing of information within departments and altruistic behaviours of colleagues, between employees of Hybrid work mode and In-Office work mode.

Some of the studies suggested the difference in the In-office work and Work from home of employees. A study published in the Harvard Business Review (2020) found that, on average, employees working from home were more productive than those working in the office. Another study published in the Journal of Business and Psychology (2016) found that employees who worked from home reported higher job satisfaction and lower levels of stress than those who worked in the office.

Overall, the literature suggests that organizational climate is an important factor in shaping employees' perceptions of their productivity. A positive organizational climate characterized by a supportive, empowering, and fair work environment is likely to lead to higher levels of perceived productivity, while a negative organizational climate characterized by poor communication, lack of support, and high levels of conflict and stress is likely to lead to lower levels of perceived productivity.

Further research is needed to better understand the specific mechanisms through which organizational climate influences perceived productivity and to identify effective strategies for improving organizational climate and promoting productivity in the workplace.

The literature suggests that remote work can be more productive than in-office work in some cases, but there are also potential drawbacks to consider, such as reduced communication and collaboration with colleagues. It is important for employers to carefully evaluate the specific needs of their organization and employees when deciding whether to implement remote work policies.

CONCLUSION

Our comparative study collected a sample N=195 with a mean age of 27.02 years. The perceived productivity and organizational climate were measured using General Measure of Perceived productivity (GMPP) and Organisational Climate Scale. The purposive sampling technique was used to collect data for the study. The results showed that the correlation between Organizational Climate and Perceived productivity was found to be significant (r=.69, p-value<0.001). The difference between in-office and Hybrid work mode employees was found to be significant in the organizational climate. The difference was not significant for perceived productivity. The results are in line with the existing literature and support previous findings. A study with control variables could be the next step in identifying the impact of organizational climate on perceived productivity.

Limitations
- The tools used in the study have been validated on a different sample population but since there were no relevant Indian tools, these were selected.
- Perceived Productivity can be influenced by various confounding factors.
- Due to the time constraint and limitations of the outreach for the sample collection, no control variables were defined for the study.
- The sample collected was not from a particular geographical location or from a single work sector.

Suggestions

- A systematic review of literature shall possibly summarise the theoretical work in the field.
- Control variables like socio-economic status, work sector, number of hours of working can be taken in consideration as control variables
- To further measure and study Perceived productivity, more control variables can be used and considered.
- Relevant Indian measures and tools shall be utilised in the upcoming studies to have a clearer picture of the association of the two variables.

REFERENCES

Akintayo, D. (2012). Working environment, workers' morale and perceived productivity in industrial organisations in Nigeria. *Education Research Journal, 2*(3), 87-93.

Baker, E., Avery, G. C., & Crawford, J. D. (2007). Satisfaction and perceived productivity when professionals work from home. *Research & Practice in Human Resource Management*.

Castelle, K. M. (2017). "An investigation into perceived productivity and its influence on the relationship between organisational climate and affective commitment."

Choi, Y., & Ha, J. (2018). Job satisfaction and work productivity: The role of conflict-management culture. *Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal, 46*(7), 1101-1110.

Dzever, L. T., Lambert, N. J., & Adeyemo, D. A. (2015). Organizational culture, leadership style, and emotional quotient as indicators of the happiness of bank employees in Ibadan, Nigeria. *European Scientific Journal, 11*(4)

Feng, Z. and Savani, K. (2020), "Covid-19 created a gender gap in perceived work productivity and job satisfaction: implications for dual-career parents working from home", Gender in Management, Vol. 35 No. 7/8, pp. 719-736. https://doi.org/10.1108/GM-07-2020-0202

Gamal Aboelmaged, M. and Mohamed El Subbaugh, S. (2012), "Factors influencing perceived productivity of Egyptian teleworkers: an empirical study", Measuring Business Excellence, Vol. 16 No. 2, pp. 3-22. https://doi.org/10.1108/13683041211230285

Haapakangas, A., Hallman, D. M., Mathiassen, S. E., & Jahncke, H. (2018). Self-rated productivity and employee well-being in activity-based offices: The role of environmental perceptions and workspace use. Building and Environment, 145, 115–124. doi: 10.1016/j.buildenv.2018.09.017

Khandelwal, S., & Dhar, U. (2003). Locus of control and hierarchy as determinants of organisational commitment in the banking industry. In Hawaii International Conference on Business (Vol. 3).

Kim, J., Candido, C., Thomas, L., & de Dear, R. (2016). Desk ownership in the workplace: The effect of non-territorial working on employee workplace satisfaction, perceived productivity and health. *Building and Environment, 103,* 203-214.

Kumar, K., & Singh, J. (2012). Study of Burnout Among Face to Face and Distance Mode Teachers in Relation to Their Organizational Climate. The Communications, 21(2), 41.

Leuken, A., Turkyilmaz, A., Sovetnik, M., Durdyev, S., Guney, M., Tokazhanov, G., ... & Karaca, F. (2022). Effects of the residential built environment on remote work

productivity and satisfaction during COVID-19 lockdowns: An analysis of workers' perceptions. Building and Environment, 109234.

Raghuram, S., Garud, R., Wiesenfeld, B., & Gupta, V. (2001). Factors contributing to virtual work adjustment. Journal of Management, 27(3), 383–405. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206301027000309

Raj, A., Reddy, T. O., & Singh, V. (2017). Organisational climate among personnel of different categories from Banaras Hindu University.

Smite, D., Tkalich, A., Moe, N. B., Papatheocharous, E., Klotins, E., & Buvik, M. P. (2022). Changes in perceived productivity of software engineers during COVID-19 pandemic: The voice of evidence. Journal of Systems and Software, 186, 111197

Soto Muñoz, J., Trebilcock Kelly, M., Flores-Alés, V., & Ramírez-Vielma, R. (2021). Understanding the perceived productivity of office occupants in the workspace thermal environment. Building Research & Information, 1–19. doi:10.1080/09613218.2021.1897501

Stogdill, Ralph M. "Group productivity, drive, and cohesiveness." Organizational behavior and human performance 8.1 (1972): 26-43.

Virtaneva, M., Feshchenko, P., Hossain, A., Kariluoto, A., Himmanen, J., Kaitila, P., ... & Abrahamsson, P. (2021). COVID-19 remote work: Body stress, self-efficacy, teamwork, and perceived productivity of knowledge workers. At the Scandinavian Conference on Information Systems. Association for Information Systems.