WORKPLACE ISOLATION: THE IMPACT OF ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE ON REMOTE AND ONSITE EMPLOYEES IN THE INDIAN IT SECTOR

Shibita Satheesh[1], Dr. Anupama Sadasivan[2]

[1]Student, School of Psychological Sciences, CHRIST (Deemed to be University), Bangalore, India.

[2]Professor, School of Psychological Sciences, CHRIST (Deemed to be University), Bangalore, India.

DOI: https://www.doi.org/10.58257/IJPREMS38698

ABSTRACT

Workplace isolation is a growing concern, particularly in the context of remote work, which has become prevalent in the Indian IT sector. This study investigates how different organizational culture types—Clan, Hierarchy, Adhocracy, and Market—affect workplace isolation among onsite and remote employees. A sample of 281 IT employees in India was surveyed using the Workplace Isolation Scale (WIS) and the Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI). Data were collected through an online survey and analyzed using statistical tests, including the Kruskal-Wallis H test, to explore differences in isolation based on work environments and organizational culture types. The results indicated that remote employees experienced higher levels of workplace isolation compared to their onsite counterparts. Among the organizational culture types, Clan Culture—characterized by a supportive and collaborative environment—showed a negative correlation with workplace isolation, indicating that organizations with strong Clan Cultures can mitigate isolation. Conversely, Hierarchy Culture—marked by rigid structures and formal control—was positively correlated with workplace isolation, suggesting that such environments contribute to feelings of disconnection. No significant correlations were found between workplace isolation and Adhocracy or Market Cultures. Future research could further investigate how different organizational culture types influence other employee outcomes in remote versus onsite settings.

Keywords: Workplace Isolation, Organizational Culture, Remote Work, Onsite Work, Clan Culture, Hierarchy Culture

1. INTRODUCTION

The transformation of the modern workplace, driven by the rise of remote work, has amplified concerns surrounding workplace isolation. In the Indian IT sector, remote work has become a defining feature of flexible work arrangements, yet it has also highlighted the disconnect employees often feel from their teams and organizations. This study delves into the interplay between organizational culture and workplace isolation, exploring how different cultural types impact isolation among remote and onsite employees.

1.1 Background- The modern workplace, especially in the Information Technology (IT) sector, has undergone a paradigm shift with the widespread adoption of remote work. Initially viewed as a preference-based concept, "remote work" has become a widely accepted feature of flexible work arrangements (Ateeq et al., 2022). Despite its many advantages, teleworking presents unique challenges. Research has shown that remote work can lead to negative outcomes such as workplace isolation and blurred work-life boundaries (Weinert et al., 2014). These challenges are particularly evident in the Indian IT sector, where remote work has become increasingly prevalent. As employees are physically separated from their teams and organizations, feelings of disconnection may arise, which can adversely affect job satisfaction, productivity, and overall well-being.

1.2 Research Problem- The transition to remote work in the Indian IT sector has significantly altered employees' workplace experiences. Workplace isolation (WI) is one of the key challenges, particularly among remote employees. While organizational culture is a critical factor in shaping employee experiences, its role in mitigating or exacerbating isolation remains unclear. Specifically, the impact of different organizational culture types—Clan, Hierarchy, Adhocracy, and Market—on workplace isolation is understudied. This research addresses this gap by exploring the relationship between workplace isolation and organizational culture, aiming to identify which cultural dimensions are most effective in reducing isolation.

Research Objectives

1. Measure the level of workplace isolation among onsite and remote employees in the Indian IT sector.

2. Compare work environments and analyze differences in workplace isolation between onsite and remote workers.

3. Identify which organizational culture types are associated with lower or higher levels of workplace isolation.

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1 Prevalence of Workplace Isolation

Workplace isolation is characterized by a sense of being separated or disconnected from others in the workplace. It can take many forms, including physical isolation (physical separation from colleagues), social isolation (lack of satisfying relationships or access to social networks in the workplace) and informational isolation (loss of important information or lack of access to key people). Workplace isolation often leads to negative impacts on efficiency, job satisfaction and overall well-being. (Orhan, 2016)

Workplace isolation is a major problem for employees, especially in remote work environments. In virtual work environments, salespeople often experience the feeling of being "out-of-sight" and "out-of-mind" in the organization, leading to a sense of isolation. Research has concluded that reduced opportunities for informal interaction with colleagues and superiors increase workers' feelings of isolation. (Mulki & Jaramillo, 2011)

In particular, major players in the IT industry such as Tata Consultancy Services have outlined plans to continue remote work-style and predict that around 75% of their workforce will be working remotely by 2025. Other companies such as Gitland, Zapier, Infosys and MobSquad have already started to implement remote work practices (Prasad et al., 2023).

2.2 Comparative Analysis of Onsite vs. Remote Work

The study (Orhan, 2016) examines the comparative dynamics of workplace isolation between on-site and remote work environments, emphasizing the effects of team virtuality and task virtuality. Working on-site benefits from face-to-face interaction that facilitates communication, collaboration and utilization of resources that can alleviate feelings of isolation. In contrast, remote work often results in greater isolation due to the lack of daily face-to-face interaction, resulting in physical and cognitive disconnects. However, the study emphasizes that both on-site and remote work can effectively combat isolation with a supportive organizational culture and leadership. Although working on-site allows for more face-to-face interaction, remote work can still be successful with the right support systems.

Virtual work is becoming more common in organizations due to its cost-effectiveness and benefits. While remote work offers flexibility and eliminates commuting, it can also lower the morale of some employees and reduce work-life conflicts. Managers understand the need to adapt their leadership style to effectively manage remote teams. (Mulki & Jaramillo, 2011)

Working locally often fosters a strong sense of organizational culture through shared physical space, face-to-face interactions and cultural norms. Remote work challenges organizations to maintain and grow their culture through virtual means, which requires a conscious effort to foster engagement and alignment with organizational values (Cole et al., 2014).

2.3 Workplace Isolation and Remote Work

The isolation of the workplace is often an important issue in remote work, where employees work outside of traditional office spaces and have limited face-to-face interaction with colleagues. Remote workers can feel isolated in the workplace because they don't interact with co-workers, supervisors or team members on a daily basis. This can lead to feelings of isolation, loneliness, and a lack of social support, which can affect job satisfaction and overall well-being.

In addition, remote workers can experience physical isolation because they are physically separated from their colleagues and the organizational environment. This physical distance can make collaboration and coordination difficult, which can hinder teamwork and communication. In addition, teleworkers may experience informational isolation because they may miss the informal exchanges and important updates that are typically shared in face-to-face interactions (Orhan, 2016).

Research (Mulki & Jaramillo, 2011) focuses on the relationships between workplace isolation, self-efficacy, leadership style, external role performance, supervisor satisfaction and turnover. Workplace isolation has a significant impact on satisfaction with the boss and extra-role performance.

Studies show that remote work can increase employee productivity because there is less work than in an office environment (Ateeq et al., 2022). However, it also points out that iJorkers may experience increased social isolation due to the lack of face-to-face interaction.

Work alienation has become a major negative factor affecting remote workers, as has the lack of peer networks. and face-to-face meetings rob them of the valuable guidance and inspiration needed to complete complex tasks (Hickman, 2019).

A recent study by Prasad et al. (2023) considered remote work as an important factor causing employee anxiety and stress. The study also found that a lack of interaction with peers while working remotely leads to demotivation because there is a lack of healthy competition between employees.

Remote workers may struggle to feel part of a cohesive team or organizational culture, especially if they are geographically located separated from his colleagues. This lack of cohesion can affect motivation, engagement and job satisfaction (Cole et al., 2014).

It is worth noting that workplace isolation does not only apply to remote workers. it has also been described in traditional work environments (Bunjak & Černe, 2018). Research has shown that workplace isolation, whether in a physical office or a remote environment, can have negative effects on employee well-being, such as increased burnout and turnover (Yang & Lu, 2023).

2.4 The Role of Organizational Culture

Organizational culture plays a key role in shaping the level of workplace isolation experienced by employees. A supportive and inclusive organizational culture can help alleviate feelings of isolation and promote a sense of belonging among employees. On the other hand, a culture that lacks communication, collaboration and social connections can increase workplace isolation (Orhan, 2016).

Organizational culture plays a key role in shaping employees' workplace isolation experiences. Factors such as acceptable behavioral norms, interpersonal support, and shared beliefs influenced by organizational culture can influence employees' perceptions of isolation (Mulki & Jaramillo, 2011).

In light of the findings of D'Oliveira and Persico (2023), increased opportunities for interpersonal communication, facilitated by greater task interdependence, alone are not sufficient to combat the negative effects of workplace isolation on well-being. Research shows that investing in a supportive work environment is critical to reversing these negative effects and emphasizes the importance of fostering a culture that promotes well-being.

In relation to workplace isolation and remote work, organizational culture can have a significant impact on how employees experience and navigate their work environment. A strong and positive organizational culture that prioritizes communication, collaboration and employee well-being can help reduce remote workers' feelings of isolation (Cole et al., 2014).

Organizational culture becomes even more critical because it sets the tone for employee interaction, communication and collaboration in a virtual environment. A culture that emphasizes trust, communication, and inclusion can help telecommuters feel supported and connected to their colleagues and organization despite physical distance (Yang & Lu, 2023).

2.5 Types of Organizational Culture

Organizational culture plays a significant role in shaping employees' experiences of workplace isolation (WPI). Different cultural types promote varying levels of collaboration, communication, and engagement, which directly influence feelings of connection or isolation in both onsite and remote work settings. In this study, the relationship between organizational culture and workplace isolation is explored through four dominant culture types: Clan, Adhocracy, Market, and Hierarchy.

Clan culture is characterized by shared values, teamwork, and group cohesion. In organizations that adopt clan control, individuals behave according to shared norms and strive to fit in by aligning with accepted behaviors, earning rewards or censures based on conformity (Ouchi, 1979). Clan culture fosters a family-like environment that encourages employee participation, commitment, and loyalty (Cameron & Quinn, 2006). With a strong emphasis on human resources and training, this culture promotes a collaborative, supportive environment where employees are seen as integral members of a close-knit team rather than isolated individuals (Beytek et al., 2010). As a result, employees in a clan culture may experience lower levels of workplace isolation due to the focus on personal connections and teamwork, which are integral to the organization's success.

Adhocracy culture emphasizes creativity, innovation, and flexibility, which aligns with an open, dynamic work environment (Khurosani, 2013). This entrepreneurial culture encourages risk-taking, experimentation, and constant adaptation to new challenges. While the individualistic nature of this culture may seem to limit knowledge sharing, it simultaneously fosters collaboration through creative problem-solving and adaptability (Gaál, n.d.). The willingness to take action and confront challenges can mitigate isolation by promoting frequent interaction and the exchange of ideas, particularly in remote work settings where adaptability and proactive communication are critical to reducing feelings of disconnection.

Market culture focuses on external positioning, competitiveness, and productivity. Organizations with this culture prioritize transactional relationships with suppliers, customers, and other external stakeholders to drive performance (Cameron & Quinn, 2006). Competitiveness and success are defined by measurable achievements, such as market influence and profitability (Banihashemi et al., 2016). In such environments, employees may experience heightened workplace isolation due to the emphasis on individual performance and external targets. The relentless focus on competition may reduce opportunities for social bonding and informal communication, increasing the risk of isolation, especially among remote workers who may feel disconnected from team-based achievements.

Hierarchy culture is grounded in formal structures, control, and stability, with an internal focus on maintaining order and integration (Tharp, 2009). Organizations with hierarchical cultures operate through clearly defined roles and responsibilities, as each position is supervised and controlled by a higher office (Weber, 2002). This structured approach can result in rigid communication channels, limiting informal interactions and contributing to workplace isolation. Employees, particularly those working remotely, may experience isolation as a consequence of the formal processes and lack of spontaneous social interactions that are typical in a hierarchical environment.

Each organizational culture type offers unique mechanisms that either mitigate or exacerbate workplace isolation, depending on the levels of collaboration, communication, and flexibility promoted within the work environment. Understanding these cultural influences is key to addressing workplace isolation, especially in diverse settings like the Indian IT sector.

2.6 Workplace Policies and Practices

The abrupt implementation of economic lockdowns caught both employers and employees off guard, leading to challenges in establishing comprehensive remote-work policies that could sustain productivity levels comparable to office settings. Many employees encounter difficulties in their daily routines due to reduced access to support and communication from supervisors. Moreover, new hires, who were unable to foster strong connections with their team members, face challenges in gathering information from colleagues (Ateeq et al., 2022).

Recognizing the challenges, Issa & Jaleel (2021) proposed proactive measures for decision-makers to mitigate the negative effects of isolation. These include mental health training, support for social isolation, coaching in emotional intelligence, well-being surveys, counseling sessions, and leadership training emphasizing emotional intelligence.

By recognizing the challenges of workplace isolation in a remote work setting and implementing targeted strategies to address them, organizations can create a more supportive and connected work environment for remote employees, ultimately improving employee satisfaction, productivity, and retention (Yang & Lu, 2023).

3. HYPOTHESES DEVELOPMENT

This study seeks to explore the relationship between workplace isolation (WI) and organizational culture within the Indian IT sector, particularly focusing on the differences between remote and onsite employees. Previous research suggests that certain dimensions of organizational culture significantly influence employee experiences of isolation. The Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI) defines four types of organizational culture: Clan, Adhocracy, Market, and Hierarchy. Each culture type offers varying degrees of support, collaboration, and communication, which could either mitigate or exacerbate workplace isolation.

H1: Remote employees experience higher levels of workplace isolation compared to on-site employees.

H2: Different types of organizational cultures have varying levels of impact on workplace isolation. The introduction should be typed in Times New with font size 10. In this section highlight the importance of topic, making general statements about the topic and Presenting an overview on current research on the subject. The simplest way is to replace(copy-paste) the content with your own material. Your introduction should clearly identify the subject area of interest.

4. METHODOLOGY

4.1 Research Design

This study employs a quantitative research design to investigate the relationship between workplace isolation and organizational culture among remote and onsite employees in the Indian IT sector. A cross-sectional survey approach was adopted to collect data at a single point in time, providing a snapshot of employees' perceptions of isolation and their work environment. The quantitative design allows for the examination of relationships between variables and comparisons between different groups (remote and onsite workers).

The study specifically focuses on comparing workplace isolation levels across different work environments and explores how organizational culture (Clan, Adhocracy, Market, and Hierarchy) may influence these isolation perceptions. By using established scales for workplace isolation and organizational culture, the research aims to offer

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF PROGRESSIVE
RESEARCH IN ENGINEERING MANAGEMENT
AND SCIENCE (IJPREMS)
(Int Peer Reviewed Journal)
Vol. 05, Issue 02, February 2025, pp : 1017-1026

www.ijprems.com
editor@ijprems.com

e-ISSN :
2583-1062

Impact
Factor :
7.001

insights into how organizational factors contribute to employees' feelings of isolation in diverse work settings. A Kruskal-Wallis H test was used to examine differences in workplace isolation between remote and onsite employees, given the non-normal distribution of the data.

4.2 Sample

The study on workplace isolation among onsite and remote employees in the Indian IT sector comprises a sample of 300 individuals with diverse demographic characteristics and occupational backgrounds. Participants, aged 22 to 55 years, include both genders, various educational qualifications, and work experiences ranging from entry-level to senior management roles. They are recruited from major IT hubs across India, representing a range of job roles within different organizational cultures, such as hierarchical, innovative, collaborative, and different environments. This comprehensive sample facilitates the examination of workplace isolation while considering the influence of organizational culture, offering valuable insights into the complex dynamics of isolation within the Indian IT sector.

4.3 Measures

4.3.1 Workplace Isolation Scale

The Workplace Isolation Scale, developed by Marshall et al. in 2007 the 10-item tool, aims to measure employees' perceptions of detachment from both their organization and colleagues, representing a psychological aspect of the workplace. This sense of isolation emerges from deficient social and emotional engagement with team members. Marshall et al. (2007) identifies two primary dimensions of workplace isolation. Firstly, there is isolation concerning the company, where employees perceive a lack of support from supervisors and the organization itself. Secondly, there is isolation among colleagues, indicating employees feeling disconnected due to limited formal interaction, absence of friendships, and inadequate coworker assistance.

The reliability of the scale was assessed using Cronbach's alpha coefficient. For the Colleague subscale, which measures workplace social isolation, the coefficient was found to be 0.88, indicating high internal consistency. Similarly, for the Company subscale, which measures workplace organizational isolation, the coefficient was 0.81, also indicating good internal consistency (Marshall et al., 2007).

4.3.2 Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument

The Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI) is a psychometric test created in 2006 by Kim Cameron and Robert Quinn at the University of Michigan. It is a validated tool for measuring organizational culture that is based on the Competing Values Framework (CVF). This approach is built on the "internal-external" and "stability-flexibility" dimensions. The four organizational cultures that correspond to CVF are: the Clan Culture, the Adhocracy Culture, the Market Culture, and the Hierarchy Culture.

The purpose of the OCAI is to assess six key dimensions of organizational culture: dominant characteristics, organizational leadership, management of employees, organization glue, strategic emphases, and criteria of success (Cameron & Quinn, 2006).

The OCAI is based on the Competing Values Framework: one of the most used and useful frameworks in business. The Competing Values Framework (CVF) emerged from research to identify the organizational effectiveness criteria (Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1983).

It is a self-report questionnaire in which participants score their organization's present and preferred culture using a variety of statements. According to the current organization, the participant is requested to divide 100 points among the four options that correspond to the four culture types.

Studies investigated the dimensionality and internal consistency properties of an early version of the OCAI, reporting excellent internal consistency indices (.80 alpha) for each of the four factors.The instrument demonstrated predictive validity due to its array of significant relationships with job satisfaction, a common indicator of organizational health.

4.4 Collection of Data

Data were collected through an online survey, providing convenience and accessibility for both remote and onsite employees. The survey link was distributed via email and messaging platforms, accompanied by a detailed explanation of the study's purpose and clear instructions for participation. Participation was entirely voluntary, and confidentiality was assured to encourage honest and open responses. During the survey period, reminders were periodically sent to increase participation rates.

In total, 281 valid responses were received and included in the final data analysis. This sample size was sufficient to ensure adequate statistical power to examine the differences in workplace isolation between remote and onsite employees, as well as to explore the moderating role of organizational culture in these experiences.

5. MODELING AND ANALYSIS

The collected data were analyzed using a combination of descriptive and inferential statistics, focusing on examining the differences in workplace isolation between remote and onsite employees and exploring the relationship between workplace isolation and organizational culture.

Descriptive statistics such as mean, median, and standard deviation were calculated for workplace isolation scores and organizational culture dimensions (Clan, Adhocracy, Market, and Hierarchy). These provided an overall view of the distribution of workplace isolation and the dominant organizational culture types within the sample.

Given the non-normal distribution of the workplace isolation data (as determined by skewness and kurtosis tests), a Kruskal-Wallis H test was conducted to examine differences in workplace isolation scores between remote and onsite employees. This non-parametric test was chosen as it does not assume normal distribution and is appropriate for comparing more than two independent groups. The Kruskal-Wallis H test allowed for a robust comparison of workplace isolation levels across different work environments.

Spearman's rank correlation was employed to assess the relationships between workplace isolation and organizational culture types (Clan, Adhocracy, Market, and Hierarchy). This non-parametric method was selected to account for the non-normal distribution of the data. Correlation coefficients were calculated to determine the strength and direction of the relationships between workplace isolation and the dominant organizational culture.

All statistical analyses were performed using Jamovi software. The findings were analyzed to offer insights into the impact of organizational culture on workplace isolation, highlighting how different cultural dimensions either mitigate or exacerbate isolation across various work environments.

6. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics						
	WIS	Work env	OCAI_Clan	OCAI_Adhocracy	OCAI_Market	OCAI_Hierarchy
N	281	281	281	281	281	281
Missing	4	4	4	4	4	4
Mean	25.8	0.505	32.3	25.7	19.5	22.5
Std. error mean	0.251	0.0299	0.514	0.411	0.406	0.660
Median	26	1	33.3	25.0	18.3	20.0
Mode	25.0	1.00	33.3	25.0	21.7 ᵃ	13.3
Standard deviation	4.20	0.501	8.61	6.88	6.81	11.1
Minimum	12	0	1.67	3.33	3.33	5.00
Maximum	37	1	56.7	41.7	78.3	85.0
Shapiro-Wilk W	0.990	0.636	0.978	0.984	0.852	0.741
Shapiro-Wilk p	0.065	< .001	< .001	0.004	< .001	< .001
ᵃ More than one mode exists, only the first is reported						

Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics for workplace isolation (WIS) and the various dimensions of organizational culture, highlighting the central tendencies, variability, and distributional characteristics of each variable.

The Shapiro-Wilk test indicated that the data for several variables, including OCAI_Clan ($W = 0.978$, $p < .001$), OCAI_Adhocracy ($W = 0.984$, $p = .004$), OCAI_Market ($W = 0.852$, $p < .001$), and OCAI_Hierarchy ($W = 0.741$, $p < .001$), significantly deviated from a normal distribution. Given these results, non-parametric tests, specifically the Kruskal-Wallis H test, were used to analyze differences in workplace isolation between remote and onsite employees.

Table 2

Correlation Matrix				
		WIS		
WIS	Spearman's rho	—		
	df	—		
	p-value	—		
Work env	Spearman's rho	0.149	*	
	df	279		
	p-value	0.012		
OCAI_Clan	Spearman's rho	-0.176	**	
	df	279		
	p-value	0.003		
OCAI_Adhocracy	Spearman's rho	-0.088		
	df	279		
	p-value	0.140		
OCAI_Market	Spearman's rho	0.087		
	df	279		
	p-value	0.145		
OCAI_Hierarchy	Spearman's rho	0.164	**	
	df	279		
	p-value	0.006		
Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$				

Table 2 displays Spearman's rho correlation coefficients between workplace isolation (WIS) and the various dimensions of organizational culture, illustrating the strength and direction of the relationships among these variables.

A Spearman's rank-order correlation analysis revealed a statistically significant positive correlation between the work environment and workplace isolation (Spearman's $\rho = 0.149$, $p = .012$). Additionally, a significant negative correlation

was found between WIS and Clan Culture (OCAI_Clan) (Spearman's ρ = -0.176, p = .003), indicating that higher levels of Clan Culture are associated with lower workplace isolation.

Conversely, a significant positive correlation was noted between WIS and Hierarchy Culture (OCAI_Hierarchy) (Spearman's ρ = 0.164, p = .006), suggesting that higher levels of Hierarchy Culture are associated with higher workplace isolation. No significant correlations were observed with Adhocracy Culture (OCAI_Adhocracy) (Spearman's ρ = -0.088, p = .140) or Market Culture (OCAI_Market) (Spearman's ρ = 0.087, p = .145).

Table 3

Kruskal-Wallis				
	χ^2	df	p	ε^2
WIS	6.23	1	0.013	0.0223

Table 3 presents the results of a Kruskal-Wallis H test conducted to examine the differences in workplace isolation scores between remote and onsite employees, revealing a statistically significant difference between the two groups, $\chi^2(1)$ = 6.23, p = .013, with a small effect size, ε^2 = 0.0223.

The results of the descriptive statistics, as presented in Table 1, provide valuable insights into workplace isolation (WIS) and the dimensions of organizational culture within the study sample. The mean WIS score was 25.8, with a standard deviation of 4.20, indicating a moderate level of perceived isolation among employees. The variability in organizational culture dimensions is also noteworthy, with the Clan Culture (OCAI_Clan) exhibiting the highest mean score (32.3) and Hierarchy Culture (OCAI_Hierarchy) the lowest (22.5).

The Shapiro-Wilk test results revealed significant deviations from normality for several variables, including Clan Culture (W = 0.978, p < .001), Adhocracy Culture (W = 0.984, p = .004), Market Culture (W = 0.852, p < .001), and Hierarchy Culture (W = 0.741, p < .001). These findings suggest that the data for these dimensions of organizational culture do not conform to a normal distribution, necessitating the use of non-parametric tests for further analysis (Altman & Bland, 2009).

The correlation matrix in Table 2 reveals important relationships between workplace isolation (WIS) and the dimensions of organizational culture. A Spearman's rank-order correlation analysis indicated a significant positive correlation between the work environment and WIS (Spearman's ρ = 0.149, p = .012), suggesting that remote employees may experience higher levels of isolation compared to their onsite counterparts. This finding supports previous qualitative research that highlighted workplace isolation among remote workers, but this study provides quantitative evidence to substantiate these claims (Hickman, 2019). The results underscore the critical need for organizations to enhance social interactions within virtual workspaces

Moreover, a significant negative correlation was found between workplace isolation (WIS) and Clan Culture (OCAI_Clan) (Spearman's ρ = -0.176, p = .003), indicating that organizations with a strong collaborative culture can effectively reduce feelings of isolation. This aligns with previous research that emphasizes the importance of supportive and cooperative environments in mitigating workplace isolation (D'Oliveira & Persico, 2023). In contrast, there was a significant positive correlation between WIS and Hierarchy Culture (OCAI_Hierarchy) (Spearman's ρ = 0.164, p = .006), suggesting that rigid hierarchical structures may contribute to increased feelings of isolation among employees which is backed by empirical evidence (Harrington & Santiago, 2015).

No significant correlations were observed with Adhocracy Culture (OCAI_Adhocracy) (Spearman's ρ = -0.088, p = .140) or Market Culture (OCAI_Market) (Spearman's ρ = 0.087, p = .145), indicating that these cultural dimensions may have less influence on workplace isolation. Further studies could examine how innovation and flexibility in Adhocracy cultures promote collaboration among remote workers, as well as how competitiveness and goal orientation in Market cultures influence employees' support systems and sense of belonging.

The results from the Kruskal-Wallis H test presented in Table 3 indicate a statistically significant difference in workplace isolation scores between remote and onsite employees, $\chi^2(1)$ = 6.23, p = .013, with a small effect size, ε^2 = 0.0223. This finding suggests that the work environment significantly influences employees' experiences of isolation. Specifically, remote employees reported higher levels of workplace isolation compared to their onsite counterparts. This aligns with existing literature that highlights the challenges faced by remote workers, including feelings of disconnection and reduced social interaction, which can contribute to an increased sense of isolation (Davis & Cates, 2013).

7. CONCLUSION

The findings of this research study carry significant implications for practice within organizations, particularly in the context of the increasing prevalence of remote work. The study highlights a notable difference in workplace isolation scores between remote and onsite employees, indicating that remote workers are more likely to experience feelings of isolation. This underscores the need for organizations to implement targeted strategies to foster connection and engagement among remote teams. By promoting regular communication and collaboration, organizations can help mitigate the negative effects of isolation, enhancing employee well-being and productivity.

Moreover, the study reveals that organizational culture plays a crucial role in shaping employees' experiences of workplace isolation. The significant negative correlation between workplace isolation and Clan Culture suggests that environments characterized by strong interpersonal relationships and teamwork can effectively reduce feelings of isolation. In contrast, the positive correlation with Hierarchy Culture indicates that rigid structures and limited interaction may exacerbate feelings of isolation among employees. Organizations should strive to cultivate a balanced organizational culture that emphasizes collaboration and inclusivity while maintaining necessary structure and clarity.

8. REFERENCES

[1] Allen, T. D., Golden, T. D., & Shockley, K. M. (2015). How effective is telecommuting? Assessing the status of our scientific findings. Psychological Science in the Public Interest, 16(2), 40–68. https://doi.org/10.1177/1529100615593273

[2] Altman, D. G., & Bland, J. M. (2009). Parametric v non-parametric methods for data analysis. BMJ, 338, a3167. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.a3167

[3] Ateeq, A., Alzoraiki, M., & Al-Aghbas, N. (2022). Working Remotely, Social Isolation and Access To Support And Communication During Covid-19 Its Influence on Job Performance. International Journal of Intellectual Human Resource Management (IJIHRM), 03. https://doi.org/10.46988/IJIHRM.03.01.2022.004

[4] Banihashemi, S. A., Kaheni, T., & Nozadi, M. (2016). The study and rating of a variety of organizational cultures in public sector based on the Quinn model. International Academic Journal of Business Management, 3, 40–46.

[5] Beno, M. (2021). On-Site and Hybrid Workplace Culture of Positivity and Effectiveness: Case Study from Austria. Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies, 10, 331. https://doi.org/10.36941/ajis-2021-0142

[6] Beytek, O. F., Yalçinkaya, M., & Karakoç, N. (2010). The Organizational Culture At The University.

[7] Blau, P. M. (1960). A Theory of Social Integration. American Journal of Sociology, 65(6), 545–556.

[8] Brown, A. D. (1995). Organisational Culture. Pitman.

[9] Bunjak, A., & Černe, M. (2018). The Role of Leader-Follower Defensive Pessimism (In)Congruence in Fostering Perceptions of Followers' Isolation. Economic and Business Review, 20(1). https://doi.org/10.15458/85451.58

[10] Cameron, K. S., & Quinn, R. E. (2006). Diagnosing and changing organizational culture: Based on the competing values framework (Rev. ed). Jossey-Bass.

[11] Cole, R. J., Oliver, A., & Blaviesciunaite, A. (2014). The changing nature of workplace culture.

[12] D'Oliveira, T. C., & Persico, L. (2023). Workplace isolation, loneliness and wellbeing at work: The mediating role of task interdependence and supportive behaviours. Applied Ergonomics, 106, 103894. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apergo.2022.103894

[13] Davis, R., & Cates, S. (2013). The Dark Side of Working in a Virtual World: An Investigation of the Relationship between Workplace Isolation and Engagement among Teleworkers. Journal of Human Resource and Sustainability Studies, 01, 9–13. https://doi.org/10.4236/jhrss.2013.12002

[14] Gaál, D. Z. (n.d.). CLAN, ADHOCRACY, MARKET OR HIERARCHY?

[15] Harrington, S., & Santiago, J. (2015). Organizational Culture and Telecommuters' Quality of Work Life and Professional Isolation. Communications of the IIMA, 6(3). https://doi.org/10.58729/1941-6687.1320

[16] Hickman, A. (2019). Workplace Isolation Occurring in Remote Workers.

[17] Issa, H., & Jaleel, E. (2021). Social isolation and psychological wellbeing: Lessons from Covid-19. Management Science Letters, 11(2), 609–618.

[18] Khurosani, A. (2013). Adhocracy Culture Support and Leader's Working Creativity. International Journal of Social Science and Humanity, 411–415. https://doi.org/10.7763/IJSSH.2013.V3.272

[19] Marshall, G. W., Michaels, C. E., & Mulki, J. P. (2007). Workplace isolation: Exploring the construct and its measurement. Psychology & Marketing, 24(3), 195–223. https://doi.org/10.1002/mar.20158

[20] Mulki, J. P., & Jaramillo, F. (2011). Workplace isolation: Salespeople and supervisors in USA. The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 22(4), 902–923. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2011.555133

[21] Orhan, M. A. (2016). Invisible, therefore isolated: Comparative effects of team virtuality with task virtuality on workplace isolation and work outcomes. M. A.

[22] Ouchi, W. G. (1979). A Conceptual Framework for the Design of Organizational Control Mechanisms. Management Science, 25(9), 833–848. https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.25.9.833

[23] Prasad, K. D. V., Vaidya, R., & Rani, R. (2023). Remote working and occupational stress: Effects on IT-enabled industry employees in Hyderabad Metro, India. Frontiers in Psychology, 14. https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1069402

[24] Quinn, R. E., & Rohrbaugh, J. (1983). A Spatial Model of Effectiveness Criteria: Towards a Competing Values Approach to Organizational Analysis. Management Science, 29(3), 363–377.

[25] Tharp, B. M. (2009). Four Organizational Culture Types.

[26] Van, de M. T. F. (2020). Faking It: Social Desirability Response Bias in Self-report Research. The Australian Journal of Advanced Nursing, 25(4), 40–48. https://doi.org/10.3316/informit.210155003844269

[27] [26] Weber, M. (2002). Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft. In Grundriss der verstehenden Soziologie (pp. 1–948). Mohr Siebeck GmbH & Co. KG. https://www.mohrsiebeck.com/buch/wirtschaft-und-gesellschaft-9783161477492/

[28] Weinert, C., Maier, C., Laumer, S., & Weitzel, T. (2014). Does teleworking negatively influence IT professionals? An empirical analysis of IT personnel's telework-enabled stress. Proceedings of the 52nd ACM Conference on Computers and People Research, 139–147. https://doi.org/10.1145/2599990.2600011

[29] Yang, Y.-J., & Lu, L. (2023). Influence mechanism and impacting boundary of workplace isolation on the employee's negative behaviors. Frontiers in Public Health, 11. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2023.1077739