



Motivating Hybrid Teams in the Digital Era: Leadership Strategies, FOMO Dynamics, and the Psychology of Dispersed Workforce Engagement

Mr.C.Rahuram, Zubair Ahamed.S

III BBA, Department of Business Administration, [Sri Krishna Adithya College of Arts and Science],
India.

Abstract- When organisations split their workforces between home offices and central buildings, they gain scheduling flexibility but quietly erode something harder to measure: the motivational glue that holds teams together. This paper investigates why that erosion happens and what leaders can do about it. Two interrelated forces are placed at the centre of the analysis. The first is a phenomenon the authors term **Occupational FOMO**—a workplace variant of the consumer-behaviour concept in which remote employees develop a persistent worry that career-shaping conversations, project opportunities, and collegial trust are accumulating on the other side of a screen they cannot fully access. The second force is leadership style, specifically whether managers actively compensate for the structural disadvantages remote workers face or allow physical proximity to quietly determine who gets noticed. Drawing on Self-Determination Theory, Social Comparison Theory, the Job Demands-Resources Model, and Transformational Leadership Theory, the paper maps the psychological mechanisms through which these two forces either compound each other into disengagement or, when well managed, cancel out into sustained motivation. The study concludes with a four-pillar strategic framework intended for immediate application in BBA-level management practice and broader organisational HR planning.

Keywords- Hybrid Work, Occupational FOMO, Team Motivation, Transformational Leadership, Digital Equity, Employee Engagement, Proximity Bias

I. INTRODUCTION

Walk into any mid-sized company today and the weekly calendar will tell a revealing story. Monday brings a rush of video-call links; Wednesday, a half-empty floor where some desks are occupied and others glow only with screen savers; Friday, near-silence punctuated by the occasional ping of a collaboration app. This is what hybrid work looks like in practice—an arrangement that is less a single policy and more a patchwork of individual schedules, room-booking systems, and unwritten norms about who is expected to show up and when. By mid-2023, McKinsey estimated that well over half of all professional workers globally were spending at least part of their week outside a traditional office, a figure that shows little sign of reversing.



What neither the room-booking software nor the hybrid policy documents tend to capture is the uneven motivational experience that comes with this arrangement. The person seated at a desk three metres from their manager inhabits a very different psychological world from the colleague dialling in from a spare bedroom. The former overhears spontaneous project conversations, is visibly present for impromptu praise, and builds the kind of low-level social trust that accumulates through shared coffee runs and corridor small talk. The latter must reconstruct all of that through chat threads and meeting summaries—and frequently suspects, rightly or wrongly, that they are missing pieces of a puzzle that will matter to their career.

That suspicion is the starting point of this paper. Borrowing the concept of Fear of Missing Out from consumer psychology, where it describes the anxiety that drives impulsive purchasing (Rahuram and Zubair Ahamed, 2026), the study reframes it as an occupational phenomenon: a workplace-specific dread of career-relevant exclusion that quietly hollows out motivation among remote and semi-remote workers. The paper then asks which leadership behaviours either amplify or neutralise that dread, and what a practical action plan for managers might look like.

Objectives and Scope

Three questions organise this study. First, through which psychological pathways does the hybrid setup undermine intrinsic motivation? Second, how does Occupational FOMO interact with leadership behaviour to determine whether a hybrid employee stays committed or quietly disengages? Third, what concrete strategies can managers deploy to close the motivation gap across distributed teams? The theoretical scope spans scholarship published between 2019 and 2025, supplemented by foundational theories that remain empirically active. The practical scope targets BBA-level management students, early-career HR practitioners, and frontline team leaders operating in hybrid-work contexts in India and comparable emerging-market economies.

II. CONCEPTUAL BACKGROUND

What Makes Hybrid Work Motivationally Distinct

It is tempting to treat hybrid work as simply a diluted version of full remote work, but that framing misses its most consequential feature: the simultaneous existence of two different working realities inside one team. A fully remote team, whatever its challenges, operates on a level playing field—every member is a face in a grid of video tiles, every conversation passes through the same digital filter. Hybrid teams break that symmetry. The in-person employee and the remote employee are nominally peers on the same organisational chart, but they are navigating structurally different environments, and those differences compound into unequal motivational outcomes over time.

The chief culprit is what organisational researchers have begun calling proximity bias—a cognitive shortcut through which managers, without necessarily realising it, assign more value, trust, and opportunity to the people who share their physical space. This is not a moral failing so much as a perceptual one: face-to-face interaction generates richer social data, and brains tuned by millions of years of in-person community life find that data more compelling than its digital substitute. The downstream consequence—that career advancement in a hybrid team quietly correlates with desk location rather than output—is what makes Occupational FOMO not merely a psychological curiosity but a material organisational problem.

Occupational FOMO: Adapting a Consumer Concept to the Workplace

Przybylski and colleagues (2013) anchored the academic study of FOMO in the domain of social behaviour, describing it as the apprehension triggered by the sense that one's peers are having rewarding experiences from which one is absent. E-commerce marketers subsequently weaponised this



apprehension through countdown timers, dwindling-stock alerts, and live purchase feeds designed to manufacture urgency. The mechanism in both settings is structurally identical: a person perceives a gap between their own access to something valuable and the access enjoyed by others, and that perception generates emotional discomfort that drives behaviour.

In the workplace variant, the 'something valuable' is not a flash-sale product but a constellation of career assets: being the person the manager thinks of first for a stretch project, being in the room when a strategy pivot is discussed informally, being the face that senior leaders associate with a successful quarter. Remote members of hybrid teams routinely sense that these assets are being distributed unequally, and that awareness—whether accurate or not—degrades their engagement, their sense of organisational belonging, and eventually their intention to stay.

III. LITERATURE REVIEW

Academic interest in distributed work motivation predates the pandemic but accelerated sharply after 2020, producing a body of work that is still coalescing around shared frameworks. The studies most directly relevant to this paper cluster around three themes: the conditions under which autonomy improves rather than undermines remote performance, the social comparison dynamics unique to mixed physical-digital environments, and the specific role of leadership in buffering against disengagement.

On the first theme, Choudhury, Foroughi, and Larson (2021) compared remote-work arrangements that gave employees full discretion over their work geography against conventional models and found consistent productivity advantages—but only where managerial trust was explicitly signalled. Where managers responded to remote flexibility with monitoring and micro-oversight, the productivity advantage disappeared. Their finding positions trust not as a nice-to-have management virtue but as the structural prerequisite for autonomous motivation to function.

Gratton (2022) approached the problem from an organisational design angle, arguing that the central error companies make in hybrid transitions is allowing arrangements to grow organically from individual preference rather than designing them with explicit equity goals. Left to emerge on their own, hybrid patterns reliably reproduce the in-group/out-group dynamics that define proximity bias—not because managers are ill-intentioned but because no structural corrective has been built in.

Kelly and Moen (2020) provided longitudinal evidence that schedule control—the degree to which employees can determine when and where they work—is a stronger predictor of engagement and burnout prevention than almost any compensation variable. This finding challenges the common managerial assumption that motivation is primarily a financial lever, pointing instead to autonomy and fairness perception as the dominant drivers.

On social comparison and FOMO specifically, Nguyen Gia Nhu (2025) found that individuals with higher financial literacy were significantly more resistant to urgency-driven consumer FOMO—a result that may have a workplace parallel: employees with higher career-literacy or stronger professional self-efficacy may be better insulated against Occupational FOMO, suggesting that career development investment is also a motivation protection strategy. Ayyasy et al. (2025) further documented how FOMO dynamics intensify in synchronous digital environments, a pattern observable in hybrid meeting rooms where remote participants experience real-time awareness of a social scene they cannot fully enter.



What the existing literature has not fully addressed is an integrated model that links Occupational FOMO to specific, testable leadership behaviours and provides managers with a structured response rather than general advice to 'be more inclusive.' This paper attempts to fill that gap.

IV. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Four complementary theories underpin the analysis. Rather than applying each independently, the paper uses them in conversation with one another—each illuminating a different layer of the same motivational problem.

Self-Determination Theory: The Three Needs Under Threat

Deci and Ryan's Self-Determination Theory (SDT) holds that durable, intrinsic motivation depends on three psychological nutrients: autonomy (ownership over one's actions and decisions), competence (a reliable sense of being effective), and relatedness (the felt experience of mattering to others and belonging to a group). Hybrid work does not automatically deprive remote employees of any of these—but it does create structural conditions in which all three can erode simultaneously if nothing intervenes.

Autonomy degrades when managerial anxiety about invisible workers produces surveillance-style oversight—check-in calls, activity trackers, mandatory camera-on policies that communicate distrust rather than flexibility. Competence suffers when asynchronous communication delays mean remote workers receive feedback slowly, incompletely, or not at all. And relatedness, arguably the most fragile of the three in a digital environment, erodes steadily when informal social fabric—the background hum of shared space—is replaced entirely by scheduled video calls with agendas. SDT predicts that when any of these three needs is chronically unmet, the result is not merely reduced motivation but active disengagement and psychological withdrawal.

Social Comparison Theory: Competition Without a Shared Scoreboard

Festinger's Social Comparison Theory describes the human tendency to calibrate self-assessment by measuring oneself against nearby others. In a hybrid team, the 'nearby others' are selectively visible: a remote employee can see a colleague's LinkedIn post announcing a promotion but cannot see the eighteen months of visibility-building that preceded it. This partial-information environment creates a particularly corrosive form of upward comparison, because the remote worker perceives the outcome (someone else's advancement) without perceiving the inputs (their proximity-enabled relationship with the manager).

Unlike the consumer version of social comparison—where seeing a peer purchase a limited-edition product might prompt impulsive buying—the occupational version tends to produce the opposite response: learned helplessness, a belief that the game is rigged by location, and a gradual withdrawal of discretionary effort. The employee does not race to win; they stop running.

Job Demands-Resources Model: Mapping the Imbalance

Bakker and Demerouti's Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) Model organises workplace well-being around two opposing forces. Job demands are the aspects of a role that require sustained cognitive or emotional investment—deadlines, conflicting priorities, interpersonal friction. Job resources are the factors that offset those demands—autonomy, social support, developmental feedback, clear role expectations. Motivation is high when resources are plentiful relative to demands; burnout and disengagement emerge when the ratio inverts.

Remote participants in hybrid teams routinely face an inverted ratio. Their demands include the cognitive overhead of navigating imperfect digital tools, the emotional labour of establishing presence



and legitimacy across a screen, and the background stress of Occupational FOMO. Their resources, meanwhile, are structurally reduced: managerial attention flows preferentially toward the visible, informal mentorship happens in hallways they are not in, and peer social support requires deliberate effort rather than simple propinquity. The JD-R lens makes the intervention logic clear: effective hybrid leadership is fundamentally a resource-restoration exercise.

Transformational Leadership: The Corrective Variable

Transformational Leadership Theory, developed by Burns and extended empirically by Bass and Riggio, identifies a cluster of leadership behaviours that consistently predict higher motivation and performance than their transactional counterparts. These behaviours—articulating an inspiring shared vision, acting as a trustworthy role model, intellectually challenging team members, and attending carefully to each individual's unique circumstances—function as powerful resource generators in JD-R terms.

In hybrid contexts, the dimension of individualised consideration is especially consequential. A leader who notices that a specific remote employee is struggling with visibility, who proactively creates opportunities for that employee to contribute in high-profile settings, and who explicitly names and rewards distributed contributions, directly addresses the proximity bias and recognition deficit at the root of Occupational FOMO. The theory predicts—and recent hybrid-work research confirms—that this kind of attentive, personalised leadership can compensate for much of the structural disadvantage remote workers face.

Theory	Core Claim	Hybrid Relevance
Self-Determination Theory	Motivation flows from autonomy, competence, and relatedness.	All three needs erode structurally for remote workers in hybrid teams.
Social Comparison Theory	People judge themselves by comparing with nearby others.	Partial digital visibility creates unfair upward comparisons, producing helplessness.
Job Demands-Resources Model	Engagement depends on the ratio of demands to available resources.	Remote workers face elevated demands with reduced managerial and social resources.
Transformational Leadership	Certain leader behaviours generate motivation-sustaining resources.	Individualised attention and equitable recognition can neutralise proximity bias.

V. THE MECHANICS OF OCCUPATIONAL FOMO IN HYBRID SETTINGS

The Invisible Decision Problem

One of the most disruptive features of hybrid work is what might be called the invisible decision problem: consequential choices about projects, priorities, and people get made in the fifteen minutes after a formal meeting ends, when the in-person attendees linger and the remote attendees have already closed their laptop lids. These post-meeting conversations are rarely malicious. They are simply the natural residue of shared physical space—and their effect is to route organisational intelligence through a channel that remote workers cannot access. Over time, the remote employee notices that they are always slightly behind, always finding out about things after the fact, always a step removed from where the real conversation apparently happened. That is Occupational FOMO in its purest form.

The Surveillance–Autonomy Trap

Managers who are uncomfortable with the invisibility of remote work frequently respond with monitoring mechanisms: productivity dashboards, mandatory check-in calls, requirements to keep cameras on throughout the workday. Each of these interventions is understandable from a managerial anxiety standpoint, but each directly attacks the autonomy dimension of SDT, substituting control for



trust. The paradox is that the monitoring behaviour, designed to improve performance, predictably degrades intrinsic motivation—transforming what could be a self-directed, competence-driven work experience into a supervised one where effort is performed rather than genuinely invested.

Relationship Capital Drain

In conventional offices, social capital—the web of informal trust, mutual understanding, and goodwill that lubricates collaboration—accumulates through repeated low-stakes interactions: shared meals, overheard conversations, spontaneous problem-solving at a whiteboard. Remote workers in hybrid teams are structurally excluded from most of these micro-interactions, which means their social capital grows more slowly and depletes more easily. When a conflict arises or a favour needs asking, the remote employee has thinner reserves of relational credit to draw on—and they know it. That awareness feeds Occupational FOMO by reminding them, continuously, of what their location is costing them.

FOMO Trigger	Psychological Mechanism	Observed Outcome
Invisible post-meeting decisions	Exclusion anxiety; recurring sense of being out of the loop	Reduced proactivity; increased information-seeking behaviour
Surveillance-style oversight	Autonomy deprivation; shift from intrinsic to controlled motivation	Effort becomes performative; creativity declines
Relationship capital drain	Weakening of social belonging and peer trust	Reduced team identification; growing attrition intent
Digital communication overload	Cognitive fatigue; inability to sustain deep focus	Burnout; declining responsiveness and initiative

VI. A FOUR-PILLAR LEADERSHIP FRAMEWORK FOR HYBRID MOTIVATION

The analysis so far suggests that Occupational FOMO is not an individual psychological weakness but a predictable structural product of the hybrid arrangement itself. This reframing matters for intervention design: the target is not the remote employee's resilience but the organisational systems and leadership behaviours that generate—or could prevent—the FOMO experience in the first place. The following four pillars translate the theoretical analysis into a practical leadership agenda.

Pillar 1 — Communication Equity: Making the Default Digital

The most structurally impactful change an organisation can make is to adopt a documentation-first communication norm: any decision, update, or initiative that affects the team must be recorded in a shared digital space before it is acted upon, regardless of how or where it was initially discussed. This is not about bureaucracy; it is about engineering equity into the information flow. Companies such as GitLab, which operates with a globally distributed workforce, have demonstrated that a genuinely asynchronous-first communication culture eliminates the invisible decision problem not by banning informal conversation but by making its outputs visible to everyone.

At the team level, this pillar translates into concrete habits: meeting notes circulated within two hours of every session, a single searchable channel where all project-critical decisions are logged, and an explicit norm against using in-person proximity as a substitute for proper communication. The leadership behaviour change required is not large, but its motivational effect on remote employees—who immediately begin receiving the information they previously feared they were missing—can be substantial.

Pillar 2 — Recognition Architecture: Designing Visibility

Recognition is one of the cheapest and most powerful motivational levers available to any manager—but in hybrid settings it defaults to proximity. Left unmanaged, the employees who receive public praise, stretch assignments, and client-facing opportunities are disproportionately those who are physically



present when the manager is in a generous mood. Correcting this requires not better intentions but a different system.

Practical recognition architecture might include a rotating structure that ensures all team members lead at least one visible initiative per quarter, regardless of location; a shared digital acknowledgement channel where contributions are named and attributed in writing; and explicit inclusion of remote workers in the performance narratives managers construct during appraisal cycles. Deloitte's 2022 workplace research found that employees who feel genuinely recognised are nearly three times more likely to report strong engagement. In hybrid teams, that multiplier sits largely untapped.

Pillar 3 — Psychological Safety by Design: Equalising Voice

Amy Edmondson's research on psychological safety established that teams where people feel genuinely safe to contribute, challenge, and admit error consistently outperform those where social risk suppresses honest communication. In hybrid meetings, the default structure—several people clustered around a table with one or two faces in a corner of the screen—reliably produces a power imbalance that suppresses remote voices.

Equalising voice requires deliberate meeting design. Assigning a rotating 'remote advocate' role to an in-person attendee whose job is to monitor and amplify screen-based contributions; opening meetings with a structured round in which every participant speaks before the main agenda begins; and establishing an explicit norm that the meeting chair actively pauses to invite remote input rather than waiting for it to surface organically. These are small mechanical interventions with large psychological effects: remote employees who are visibly sought out and heard disengage at markedly lower rates than those who must fight for airtime.

Pillar 4 — Intentional Social Design: Rebuilding the Informal Layer

The relationship capital drain described in Section 5.3 cannot be solved by scheduling another all-hands video call. What rebuilds informal trust is repeated, low-stakes social contact—the kind that office-based employees accumulate passively and remote employees must pursue deliberately. Effective hybrid leaders treat this as a resource allocation problem rather than a morale exercise.

Regular one-on-one conversations that explicitly invite discussion of career ambitions, personal challenges, and team culture—not just task status—provide remote employees with the relational touchpoints that SDT identifies as necessary for relatedness. Periodic in-person gatherings, designed around relationship formation rather than deliverable review, allow the weak social ties that sustain collaboration to regenerate. Organisations that budget for these gatherings as a workforce investment rather than a discretionary perk see measurable returns in retention and peer-reported trust scores.

Pillar	Problem Addressed	Core Leader Action
Communication Equity	Invisible decision-making; information asymmetry	Document all decisions digitally before acting on them
Recognition Architecture	Proximity-biased visibility and reward distribution	Build structured, rotation-based recognition into team rhythm
Psychological Safety Design	Remote voice suppression in hybrid meetings	Assign remote advocate roles; use structured turn-taking
Intentional Social Design	Relationship capital drain among distributed members	Schedule relational (not just task-focused) contact regularly



VII. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The conceptual architecture assembled across the preceding sections converges on a coherent diagnosis: hybrid work does not damage motivation through a single dramatic failure but through the quiet accumulation of small structural imbalances—in information access, in recognition visibility, in social proximity, and in the distribution of managerial attention. Each imbalance is individually manageable; together, and unaddressed, they compound into the 35-percent engagement deficit that survey evidence repeatedly surfaces among digitally side-lined hybrid workers.

The Occupational FOMO concept adds analytical precision to a problem that is often described in vague terms as 'remote employees feel left out.' By tracing the mechanism—from structural visibility gap, through social comparison and anticipatory career regret, to disengagement and attrition intent—the concept enables diagnosis at the level of specific organisational practices rather than generalised culture. This mirrors the precision that FOMO analysis has brought to e-commerce, where identifying the exact trigger mechanism (a countdown timer, a live stock alert) enabled targeted design interventions rather than broad appeals to consumer wellbeing (Rahuram and Zubair Ahamed, 2026).

The JD-R lens reinforces the practical implication: leadership interventions are effective to the extent that they restore the resource balance for remote workers. The four-pillar framework proposed in this paper functions precisely as a resource-restoration agenda—each pillar targeting a different depleted resource category (information, recognition, voice, and social belonging) and offering a structural remedy rather than a motivational exhortation.

Transformational leadership theory provides the behavioural specification. Managers who score high on individualised consideration—who notice which team member is struggling with visibility, who create specific opportunities to address it, and who name remote contributions loudly and publicly—demonstrate the clearest protective effect against Occupational FOMO. This aligns with the broader transformational leadership literature's finding that the relationship between leader and follower is the single most powerful predictor of sustainable, intrinsically driven work engagement.

VII. ETHICAL DIMENSIONS OF HYBRID MOTIVATION MANAGEMENT

Hybrid team management introduces ethical responsibilities that go beyond operational efficiency. Three warrant specific attention.

The first is the ethics of digital surveillance. When managers deploy activity-tracking software, keystroke loggers, or mandatory camera requirements to compensate for the invisibility of remote work, they are trading short-term performance visibility for long-term trust erosion. The research on surveillance and intrinsic motivation is unambiguous: being watched changes how people work in ways that reduce creative engagement and increase resentment. Organisations that cannot distinguish between accountability and surveillance are likely to find their hybrid policies undermining the very engagement they were designed to protect.

The second is the ethics of manufactured Occupational FOMO. Just as consumer-FOMO marketing is ethically questionable when the scarcity it communicates is fabricated rather than real (Rahuram and Zubair A, 2026), organisations that deliberately leak information about in-office opportunities to pressure remote employees back to the building are exploiting career anxiety for institutional convenience. The short-term return-to-office compliance this produces is likely to be accompanied by significant trust damage and voluntary attrition among the high-performing employees most capable of finding alternatives.



The third is the equity obligation in career progression. Organisations are not ethically neutral when they allow promotion and development decisions to be made by managers who have richer social information about their in-person reports than their remote ones. Making promotion criteria explicit, auditing advancement patterns by work location, and holding leaders accountable for equitable career development across the hybrid divide are not optional enhancement features but baseline fairness commitments.

VIII. FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

Three empirical priorities stand out from the conceptual work presented here.

Most immediately, the Occupational FOMO construct requires operationalisation and psychometric validation. A reliable scale measuring the intensity, frequency, and specific triggers of occupational exclusion anxiety would allow researchers to test the relationships proposed in this paper against real workforce data rather than conceptual inference. Such a scale would also give HR practitioners a diagnostic tool with far greater precision than current engagement surveys provide.

Second, generational variation in hybrid FOMO susceptibility deserves dedicated investigation. Generation Z employees—who entered the workforce during or after the pandemic normalisation of hybrid work and who carry the highest documented baseline FOMO from their social media environments (Nguyen Gia Nhu, 2025)—may experience Occupational FOMO with a different intensity and through different trigger mechanisms than Millennial or Gen X colleagues. Management strategies calibrated to cohort-specific vulnerability would be a practically valuable output of such research.

Third, as artificial intelligence tools take over more of the administrative and scheduling infrastructure of hybrid work—from AI-driven meeting summarisers to algorithmic project allocation systems—researchers need to examine whether automation amplifies or attenuates the visibility and recognition asymmetries at the core of the Occupational FOMO problem. There is genuine risk that a poorly designed AI management layer simply encodes proximity bias at scale.

IX. CONCLUSION

Hybrid work is neither a transitional arrangement nor a niche experiment. It is the dominant mode of professional employment in the knowledge economy, and its motivational dynamics will shape organisational performance for the foreseeable future. This paper has argued that those dynamics turn, crucially, on whether the people who lead hybrid teams treat the arrangement as motivationally symmetrical—which it is not—or as a structurally unequal environment that requires deliberate corrective design.

The Occupational FOMO framework developed here offers a named, mechanistically grounded explanation for why remote members of hybrid teams so frequently disengage: not because they lack resilience, but because a series of structural imbalances in information access, recognition visibility, meeting voice, and social capital accumulation cumulatively communicate that their location is costing them their careers. That communication—whether accurate or simply perceived—is sufficient to degrade intrinsic motivation and accelerate attrition.

The four-pillar framework proposed in response—communication equity, recognition architecture, psychological safety design, and intentional social investment—offers managers a structured intervention agenda rooted in established motivational theory rather than intuitive people



management. None of the interventions described requires large budgets or complex systems change; most require only a shift in leadership attention and the willingness to design equity into the team's operating rhythm rather than hoping it emerges on its own. Ultimately, the hybrid motivation problem is a leadership design problem—and that is, precisely, a solvable one.

REFERENCES

1. Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 179–211.
2. Ayyasy, M., et al. (2025). A systematic review of FOMO-based mechanisms in digital marketing contexts. *Journal of Consumer Research*.
3. Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The Job Demands-Resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(3), 309–328.
4. Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational Leadership* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
5. Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. Harper & Row.
6. Choudhury, P., Foroughi, C., & Larson, B. (2021). Work-from-anywhere: The productivity effects of geographic flexibility. *Strategic Management Journal*, 42(4), 655–683.
7. Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The 'what' and 'why' of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), 227–268.
8. Deloitte. (2022). *The Deloitte Global Millennial and Gen Z Survey 2022*. Deloitte Insights.
9. Edmondson, A. C. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44(2), 350–383.
10. Festinger, L. (1954). A theory of social comparison processes. *Human Relations*, 7(2), 117–140.
11. Gallup. (2023). *State of the Global Workplace: 2023 Report*. Gallup Organization.
12. Gratton, L. (2022). *Redesigning Work: How to Transform Your Organization and Make Hybrid Work for Everyone*. MIT Press.
13. Kelly, E. L., & Moen, P. (2020). *Overload: How Good Jobs Went Bad and What We Can Do About It*. Princeton University Press.
14. McKinsey Global Institute. (2023). *The Future of Work After COVID-19*. McKinsey & Company.
15. Nguyen Gia Nhu. (2025). Financial literacy as a moderator of FOMO-induced impulsive purchase among Generation Z. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*.
16. Przybylski, A. K., Murayama, K., DeHaan, C. R., & Gladwell, V. (2013). Motivational, emotional, and behavioral correlates of fear of missing out. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 29(4), 1841–1848.
17. Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2017). *Self-Determination Theory: Basic Psychological Needs in Motivation, Development, and Wellness*. Guilford Press.
18. Rahuram.C and Zubair Ahamed.A . (2026). Analysing the 'FOMO' (Fear of Missing Out) strategy: How limited-time offers drive impulse buying in e-commerce. *Journal of Integrated Marketing Communications and Digital Marketing*, 7(1).
19. Widyariini, M., et al. (2025). Arousal and impulse buying in Shopee flash sales: An S-O-R framework analysis. *International Journal of Retail and Distribution Management*.
20. Zuboff, S. (2019). *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power*. PublicAffairs.