

When Efficiency Meets Employer Branding: Layoffs, Employee Trust and Strategic HRM at Meta Platforms, Inc

¹Rajvi Shah

¹Assistant Professor

¹GLS University

***Index Terms*—Strategic Human Resource Management, Employer Branding, Employee Trust, Psychological Contract, Organizational Change and Crisis Communication**

I. Introduction

In knowledge-intensive industries, people are among an organization's most important strategic resources. Technology companies, in particular, compete globally for highly skilled employees whose expertise in artificial intelligence, software engineering, data science, product development, cybersecurity and digital marketing can directly influence organizational competitiveness.

For such organizations, the employer brand is therefore strategically important. A strong employer brand can help an organization attract scarce talent, retain existing employees, strengthen employee engagement and differentiate itself from competitors. However, employer branding can become particularly difficult to manage during organizational crises, especially when companies are required to reduce their workforce.

Large-scale layoffs create a paradox for human resource leaders. From an organizational perspective, workforce reduction may be necessary to control costs, improve productivity and realign human resources with changing business priorities. From an employee perspective, however, layoffs can generate uncertainty, anxiety and concerns about fairness and job security. They can also affect employees who remain with the organization, often referred to as survivors, whose perceptions of leadership and organizational commitment may change after witnessing colleagues lose their jobs.

This tension became particularly visible at Meta Platforms, Inc., one of the world's largest technology and social-media companies

II. Meta Platforms, Inc.: Organizational Context

Meta Platforms, Inc. operates some of the world's most widely used digital platforms, including Facebook, Instagram, Messenger and WhatsApp. The company also has significant strategic investments in artificial intelligence, virtual and augmented reality and other emerging technologies.

The organization experienced substantial growth during the COVID-19 pandemic. As economic and social activity shifted rapidly toward digital platforms, online commerce and digital engagement increased. Meta consequently increased investment and expanded its workforce.

The company's subsequent experience, however, demonstrated the difficulty of assuming that pandemic-era growth patterns would continue indefinitely.

Meta reported that its employee headcount had increased significantly, reaching 83,553 employees by June 30, 2022, compared with 63,404 one year earlier. By December 31, 2022, Meta reported 86,482 employees, a year-over-year increase of approximately 20%. The company acknowledged that this figure still included most employees affected by the November 2022 layoffs who would leave during the following quarter.

At the same time, Meta's business environment was changing.

The company reported that online commerce had returned toward pre-pandemic trends and that the macroeconomic environment had become more challenging. Meta also faced pressure from changes affecting advertising measurement and targeting. Its 2022 revenue declined by approximately 1%, while operating income declined substantially.

The organization therefore faced a strategic mismatch:

rapid workforce expansion + changing business conditions + increasing cost pressure = need for organizational restructuring.

III. From Hypergrowth to Efficiency

The transformation in Meta's workforce strategy did not occur in isolation.

During the pandemic, technology companies across the world experienced strong demand for digital products and services. Hiring decisions were made in an environment where future digital growth appeared highly promising.

Meta subsequently acknowledged that its assumptions about permanent acceleration in online activity had not materialized as expected. In his November 2022 communication to employees, Mark Zuckerberg accepted responsibility for the company's earlier expansion decisions and described the workforce reduction as one of the most difficult changes in Meta's history.

This created an important HR paradox.

The organization had previously communicated an image of growth, innovation and opportunity. It now had to communicate a very different message—one centered on discipline, efficiency and organizational restructuring.

For HR leadership, this raised a fundamental question:

“How could Meta change its organizational strategy without fundamentally damaging the employee value proposition that had helped it attract talent in the first place?”

IV. The November 2022 Layoffs

On November 9, 2022, Meta announced that it would reduce its workforce by approximately 13%, affecting more than 11,000 employees. The company also announced reductions in discretionary spending and an extension of its hiring freeze.

Zuckerberg publicly accepted responsibility for the decision and acknowledged the difficulty faced by affected employees.

The layoffs were accompanied by a support package for U.S.-based employees that included severance pay, continued health-insurance coverage for a specified period, career services and immigration support. Meta's annual report documented these measures and the restructuring costs associated with the layoffs.

From an HR perspective, these measures were significant because they demonstrated an attempt to manage the employee experience of separation, rather than treating layoffs solely as a financial transaction.

However, another question remained:

“Could financial support for departing employees compensate for the damage caused to organizational trust among the employees who remained?”

V. The Survivors' Dilemma

The impact of layoffs extends beyond employees who lose their jobs.

Employees who remain in an organization after a large-scale workforce reduction may experience what is commonly referred to as survivor syndrome. They may experience:

- uncertainty regarding their own job security;
- anxiety about future restructuring;
- guilt about remaining employed while colleagues were dismissed;
- increased workload;
- reduced trust in senior management;
- concern about career development;
- fear of expressing disagreement;
- reduced organizational commitment.

These reactions can become particularly important in knowledge-intensive organizations.

Technology companies depend heavily on collaboration, experimentation, creativity and knowledge sharing. If employees become excessively risk-averse or psychologically disengaged, the consequences may extend beyond morale and affect innovation.

Meta's own 2022 annual report acknowledged that organizational restructuring and increasing complexity could make it difficult to maintain aspects of its corporate culture, including its ability to develop and launch innovative products quickly.

Thus, the HR challenge was no longer simply:

“How do we reduce headcount?”

It became:

“How do we maintain organizational capability after reducing headcount?”

VI. A Second Wave: The Year of Efficiency

Only a few months after the first major restructuring, Meta announced another significant workforce reduction.

In March 2023, Zuckerberg announced Meta's “Year of Efficiency.” The organization planned to reduce its workforce by approximately 10,000 employees and eliminate approximately 5,000 open positions that had not yet been filled.

The second restructuring focused not only on headcount but also on organizational design.

Meta planned to:

- flatten organizational structures;
- remove layers of management;
- cancel lower-priority projects;
- reduce hiring;
- improve developer productivity;
- reduce unnecessary processes;
- increase organizational efficiency;
- improve the ratio between technical and non-technical roles.

Meta explicitly framed the initiative as both an efficiency programme and a long-term strategy for building a more effective technology company.

This created a new narrative.

The first round of layoffs could be interpreted as a response to rapid pandemic-era expansion.

The second round raised a more complex question:

“Was workforce reduction becoming a temporary corrective action or a new feature of Meta's organizational strategy?”

For employees, the distinction mattered greatly.

VII. Employer Branding Under Pressure

Employer branding represents how an organization is perceived as an employer by current employees, potential employees and other stakeholders.

Meta had historically benefited from an employer identity associated with:

- technological innovation;
- global influence;
- ambitious projects;
- highly skilled employees;
- competitive compensation;
- learning opportunities;
- opportunities to work on products used by billions of people.

Large-scale layoffs introduced a competing narrative.

Potential employees could begin asking:

- How secure is a career at Meta?
- How frequently does Meta restructure?
- How does management respond when business conditions change?
- Are employees given sufficient information during organizational crises?
- Does Meta provide meaningful career growth after restructuring?
- Is the company's employer promise consistent with the actual employee experience?

These questions are important because employer branding is not created solely by corporate advertising.

It is also created through:

employee experiences + leadership behaviour + organizational policies + external employee conversations.

VIII. The Role of Employee-Review Platforms

Digital platforms have changed the way employer reputation is formed.

Websites such as Glassdoor, Ambition Box and Blind provide employees and former employees with opportunities to discuss organizational culture, management, compensation, career opportunities and workplace experiences.

These platforms can influence prospective employees who are evaluating organizations before applying for or accepting jobs.

However, an important methodological caution is necessary.

Employee-review platforms do not necessarily represent the views of an organization's entire workforce. Reviews are self-selected and may reflect particularly positive or negative experiences. Therefore, they

should be treated as indicators of employee perceptions, rather than objective measures of organizational culture.

Nevertheless, in an employer-branding context, their strategic importance cannot be ignored.

A prospective employee does not necessarily distinguish between a statistically representative employee survey and a highly visible online review.

Consequently, the employer-brand question becomes:

“How much control does an organization really have over its employer brand when employees and former employees can publicly narrate their experiences?”

IX. The Psychological Contract

The layoffs also created an important psychological-contract issue.

The psychological contract refers to employees' perceptions of the mutual obligations between themselves and their employer.

Employees may believe that if they demonstrate competence, commitment and performance, the organization will provide some combination of:

- career opportunities;
- development;
- recognition;
- fairness;
- stability;
- support;
- organizational commitment.

A large-scale layoff can disrupt these expectations.

Even when layoffs are economically justified and legally implemented, employees may perceive the employment relationship differently afterward.

For Meta employees, the issue was particularly significant because the company had experienced rapid growth and had recruited employees in an environment where expansion and opportunity were prominent organizational narratives.

The key question became:

“If employees no longer perceive long-term employment security as part of the organizational relationship, what other forms of value can Meta offer to maintain commitment?”

X. Employer Brand: External versus Internal

The situation also highlights an important distinction between external employer branding and internal employer branding.

External employer brand

This concerns how Meta is perceived by:

- prospective employees;
- universities;
- students;
- recruiters;
- competitors;
- professional communities.

Internal employer brand

This concerns how Meta is experienced by:

- current employees;
- managers;
- high-potential employees;
- recently promoted employees;
- employees who survived restructuring.

A company can potentially maintain an attractive external image while experiencing declining internal trust.

However, such a gap may be difficult to sustain.

If employees' actual experiences differ significantly from the organization's external messaging, the employer brand may lose credibility.

For Meta, this created an important HR challenge:

“Should the organization attempt to restore its previous employer brand, or should it redefine what working at Meta means after the restructuring?”

XI. Lori Goler: The HR Leadership Challenge

At the centre of this dilemma was Lori Goler, Meta's Chief People Officer.

The role of the People function extended far beyond recruitment and administration.

Goler and her team had to help the organization manage the human consequences of strategic restructuring while supporting Meta's long-term business objectives.

Her responsibilities in this situation could be viewed across five dimensions.

11.1 Managing employee trust

Employees needed to understand:

- why restructuring was occurring;
- how decisions were being made;
- what the future organization would look like;
- whether further changes were expected.

11.2 Managing employee experience

The People function needed to consider both departing employees and survivors.

11.3 Protecting critical talent

Meta still required highly skilled employees to execute its technology and AI-related strategy.

Reducing headcount while retaining critical capabilities required careful workforce planning.

11.4 Rebuilding the employer brand

The organization needed to remain attractive to future employees despite perceptions of organizational uncertainty.

11.5 Aligning HR with business strategy

Perhaps the most difficult responsibility was ensuring that HR did not operate separately from strategic decision-making.

The People function needed to answer:

“What kind of workforce does Meta need after restructuring—and what kind of employer does Meta need to become to attract and retain that workforce?”

XII. The Strategic HR Dilemma

By 2023, Meta had entered a new organizational phase.

The organization was no longer primarily focused on rapid workforce expansion. Instead, it emphasized efficiency, flatter structures, productivity and prioritization.

Meta itself stated that its efficiency programme was intended both to improve the technology organization and strengthen financial performance in a difficult environment. It argued that profitability and efficiency were necessary to support long-term innovation.

From a business perspective, this argument was compelling.

However, from an HR perspective, another issue remained.

A highly efficient organization is not necessarily a highly attractive employer.

The challenge was to find the point at which:

efficiency → productivity → sustainability

without allowing:

efficiency → insecurity → distrust → disengagement → weakened employer brand.

This was the dilemma facing Goler.

XIII. Stakeholder Conflict

The situation involved multiple stakeholders with potentially conflicting expectations.

Stakeholder	Primary Concern
Senior leadership	Financial performance and strategic efficiency
Current employees	Job security, trust and career growth
Departing employees	Fair treatment and career transition
HR/People function	Employee experience and organizational capability
Prospective employees	Employer reputation and career opportunities
Managers	Productivity and team morale
Investors	Sustainable financial performance
Universities	Relationship with employers and student opportunities
Customers/users	Product innovation and organizational stability

The difficulty was that satisfying one stakeholder could potentially create tension with another.

For example, reducing costs could satisfy investors while increasing anxiety among employees.

Similarly, maintaining generous employee-development programmes could strengthen employer branding but increase costs at a time when efficiency was a strategic priority.

XIV. The Decision Point

By the end of the restructuring period, Goler faced a decision that was broader than the administration of layoffs.

She had to determine what Meta's post-layoff employee value proposition should look like.

Three broad strategic directions were possible:

Option 1: Efficiency First

Under this approach, Meta would continue to emphasize:

- productivity;
- performance;
- lean organizational structures;
- accountability;
- cost efficiency;
- technology-driven productivity.

Potential advantages:

- improved cost discipline;
- greater organizational efficiency;
- clearer priorities;
- potentially stronger financial performance.

Potential risks:

- employee insecurity;
- lower trust;
- reduced psychological safety;
- difficulties attracting talent;
- further damage to employer reputation.

Option 2: Employee Trust First

Meta could instead place greater emphasis on:

- transparent communication;
- employee listening;
- career development;
- wellbeing;
- internal mobility;
- manager training;
- employee engagement.

Potential advantages:

- stronger employee trust;
- improved engagement;
- stronger retention;
- improved internal employer brand.

Potential risks:

- additional financial investment;
- potential tension with efficiency objectives;
- possibility of raising employee expectations that cannot be sustained.

Option 3: Strategic Employer-Brand Repositioning

A third approach would be to redefine Meta's employer brand around high performance, innovation, learning and resilience, rather than implying traditional employment stability.

Under this approach, Meta could:

- communicate its strategic direction clearly;
- explain how organizational restructuring supports long-term sustainability;
- strengthen internal career mobility;
- invest in critical future skills;
- develop managers as change communicators;
- create stronger employee-feedback mechanisms;
- measure employee trust systematically;
- align external recruitment messages with actual employee experience.

This approach would not attempt to hide the restructuring.

Instead, it would attempt to redefine the employee value proposition around the new organizational reality.

XV. The Core Dilemma

Goler therefore faced a fundamental strategic HR question:

“How can Meta rebuild its employer brand and employee trust without undermining the efficiency-focused organizational transformation that leadership believes is necessary for long-term sustainability?”

The answer was not straightforward.

If Meta focused too heavily on financial efficiency, it could risk weakening the human capital required for innovation.

If it focused too heavily on employee benefits and reassurance, it could undermine the very efficiency agenda that motivated restructuring.

If it attempted to rebuild its previous employer brand without changing employee experiences, it could create a credibility gap.

The organization therefore needed to determine whether its post-layoff strategy should focus on:

repairing the old employer brand, rebuilding a new employer brand, or redefining the employee-employer relationship altogether.

XVI. Exhibits

Exhibit 1: Meta Workforce Growth

Year/Period	Employees/Workforce Context
June 2021	63,404
June 2022	83,553

Year/Period	Employees/Workforce Context
December 2022	86,482
November 2022	~11,000 layoffs announced
March 2023	~10,000 additional reductions announced
March 2023	~5,000 open positions planned for elimination

The 2021–2022 headcount figures are based on Meta's SEC disclosures.

Exhibit 2: Timeline

2020–2021 → Pandemic-driven digital growth

↓

2022 → Growth assumptions weaken

↓

November 2022 → ~11,000 layoffs

↓

2022–23 → Efficiency and restructuring

↓

March 2023 → ~10,000 further reductions announced

↓

2023 → Organizational flattening and productivity focus

↓

Post-layoff challenge → Rebuild trust and employer brand

Exhibit 3: HR Impact Chain

Layoffs

↓

Employee uncertainty

↓

Psychological contract disruption

↓

Trust and engagement concerns

↓

Employer-brand perceptions

↓

Talent attraction and retention implications

Exhibit 4: Strategic Tension

Efficiency Perspective	Employer-Brand Perspective
Reduce costs	Protect employee trust
Flatten structures	Maintain career opportunities
Increase productivity	Prevent burnout
Reduce headcount	Retain critical talent
Cancel low-priority projects	Maintain employee engagement
Increase accountability	Maintain psychological safety

XVII. Teaching Objectives

After studying this case, students should be able to:

1. Explain the relationship between layoffs and employer branding.
2. Analyze how workforce restructuring can affect the psychological contract.
3. Apply psychological contract theory to a real organizational situation.
4. Analyze internal and external employer-brand perceptions.
5. Evaluate the trade-off between organizational efficiency and employee experience.
6. Evaluate the ethical dimensions of large-scale workforce reductions.
7. Develop strategies for rebuilding employee trust after organizational restructuring.
8. Design an employer-brand recovery framework for a knowledge-intensive organization.
9. Assess the role of HR leadership in balancing organizational sustainability and employee expectations.

XVIII. Discussion Questions**Basic Analysis**

1. What business and environmental factors contributed to Meta's workforce restructuring?
2. Why did Meta's rapid workforce expansion become a strategic challenge when market conditions changed?

Application

3. Apply Psychological Contract Theory to explain how the layoffs could affect Meta's surviving employees.
4. If you were Lori Goler, what HR practices would you introduce to rebuild employee trust?

Critical Analysis

5. Analyze the possible difference between Meta's external employer brand and its internal employer brand after the layoffs.
6. How could repeated restructuring influence employee engagement, retention and organizational commitment?

Evaluation

7. Evaluate whether Meta's "Year of Efficiency" could strengthen or weaken its employer brand.
8. Was large-scale workforce reduction an appropriate HR strategy for Meta? Evaluate the decision from both organizational and employee perspectives.

Creation

9. Design a three-year employer-brand recovery strategy for Meta following the layoffs.
10. Develop a framework for measuring the effectiveness of Meta's post-layoff employer-brand strategy.

XIX. Author's Note

This case is designed as a secondary-data-based teaching case and does not represent the official position of Meta Platforms, Inc.

The case draws on publicly available information including Meta's corporate announcements, SEC filings, annual reports, reputable media reports and publicly accessible employee-review platforms. Meta's own disclosures should constitute the primary factual basis for the organizational timeline and restructuring decisions.

Employee-review platforms such as Glassdoor, Ambition Box and Blind may be used to illustrate employee perceptions, but their content should not be interpreted as statistically representative of Meta's entire workforce.

The case is intended solely for academic discussion and does not claim to reproduce confidential information, internal management discussions or proprietary HR data from Meta Platforms, Inc.

XX. Recommended Academic Positioning

The case examines the strategic HR dilemma created when organizational efficiency initiatives conflict with employer branding, employee trust and the psychological contract in a knowledge-intensive organization.

Main theoretical constructs

Independent/triggering phenomenon:

Large-scale organizational restructuring / layoffs

↓

Mediating HR mechanisms:

Psychological contract disruption → employee trust → employee engagement

↓

Organizational outcome:

Employer brand perception



Strategic consequences:

Talent attraction + retention + organizational sustainability

References

Primary sources: Meta Platforms, Inc

- [1] Meta Platforms, Inc. (2022, November 9). Mark Zuckerberg's message to Meta employees. Meta. Meta — Mark Zuckerberg's November 2022 message
- [2] Meta Platforms, Inc. (2023, March 14). Update on Meta's Year of Efficiency. Meta. Meta — Year of Efficiency announcement
- [3] Meta Platforms, Inc. (2023). Annual report 2022 (Form 10-K). U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission.
- [4] Meta Platforms, Inc. (2022). Quarterly report for the period ended June 30, 2022 (Form 10-Q). U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission.

News and business sources

- [5] Associated Press. (2023, March 14). A 2nd wave of layoffs at Meta; 10,000 jobs are cut. AP News. AP News report on Meta's second layoff wave
- [6] Associated Press. (2023). Tech industry job cuts come rapidly and in big numbers. AP News. AP report on technology-sector layoffs
- [7] Reuters. (2026, March 14). Meta planning sweeping layoffs as AI costs mount. Reuters. Reuters coverage of Meta layoffs
- [8] Axios. (2023, March 14). Meta to cut 10,000 more jobs, eliminate 5,000 openings. Axios. Axios report on Meta's second restructuring
- [9] Time. (2022, November 10). Big Tech is laying off tons of workers. That's a bad sign for your company, too. Time. Time — Big Tech layoffs and Meta
- [10] Wired. (2022, November 10). The reason for Meta's massive layoffs? Ghosts in the machine. Wired. Wired — Meta's 2022 layoffs analysis

Peer-reviewed academic references

- [11] López Bohle, S., Bal, P. M., Jansen, P. G. W., Leiva, P. I., & Alonso, A. M. (2016). How mass layoffs are related to lower job performance and organizational citizenship behaviour among surviving employees in Chile: An investigation of the essential role of psychological contract. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 28(20), 2837–2860. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2016.1138988>
- [12] Pugh, S. D., Skarlicki, D. P., & Passell, B. S. (2003). After the fall: Layoff victims' trust and cynicism in re-employment. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 76(2), 201–212. <https://doi.org/10.1348/096317903765913704>
- [13] Zhang, Y., & ... (2022). A study on the psychological attributes of survivors who experienced downsizing in China. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(23), 16071. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph192316071>
- [14] Van Dick, R., Drzensky, F., & Heinz, M. (2016). Goodbye or identify: Detrimental effects of downsizing on identification and survivor performance. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7, 771. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00771>

References for Psychological Contract Theory

- [15] Rousseau, D. M. (1989). Psychological and implied contracts in organizations. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 2, 121–139. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01384942>
- [16] Rousseau, D. M. (1995). Psychological contracts in organizations: Understanding written and unwritten agreements. Sage.
- [17] Morrison, E. W., & Robinson, S. L. (1997). When employees feel betrayed: A model of how psychological contract violation develops. *Academy of Management Review*, 22(1), 226–256. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1997.9707180265>

References for Employer Branding

- [18] Ambler, T., & Barrow, S. (1996). The employer brand. *Journal of Brand Management*, 4(3), 185–206. <https://doi.org/10.1057/bm.1996.42>
- [19] Backhaus, K., & Tikoo, S. (2004). Conceptualizing and researching employer branding. *Career Development International*, 9(5), 501–517. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13620430410550754>
- [20] Edwards, M. R. (2010). An integrative review of employer branding and OB theory. *Personnel Review*, 39(1), 5–23. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00483481011012809>
- [21] Theurer, C. P., Tumasjan, A., Welpe, I. M., & Lievens, F. (2018). Employer branding: A brand equity-based literature review and research agenda. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 20(1), 155–179. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12121>

References for Organizational Justice

- [22] Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 386–400. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.386>
- [23] Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O. L. H., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 425–445. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.425>

References for Strategic HRM

- [24] Becker, B. E., & Huselid, M. A. (2006). Strategic human resources management: Where do we go from here? *Journal of Management*, 32(6), 898–925. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206306293668>
- [25] Wright, P. M., & McMahan, G. C. (1992). Theoretical perspectives for strategic human resource management. *Journal of Management*, 18(2), 295–320. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639201800205>
- [26] Boxall, P., & Purcell, J. (2016). *Strategy and human resource management* (4th ed.). Palgrave Macmillan.