

MRP_52_Avika.pdf

Document Details

Submission ID

trn:oid:::30110:140381093

Submission Date

May 25, 2026, 4:19 PM GMT+5:30

Download Date

May 25, 2026, 4:28 PM GMT+5:30

File Name

MRP_52_Avika.pdf

File Size

259.5 KB

44 Pages**10,226 Words****59,316 Characters**

14% Overall Similarity

The combined total of all matches, including overlapping sources, for each database.

Filtered from the Report

- Bibliography

Match Groups

-  **108 Not Cited or Quoted 12%**
Matches with neither in-text citation nor quotation marks
-  **19 Missing Quotations 2%**
Matches that are still very similar to source material
-  **2 Missing Citation 0%**
Matches that have quotation marks, but no in-text citation
-  **0 Cited and Quoted 0%**
Matches with in-text citation present, but no quotation marks

Top Sources

- 7%  Internet sources
- 5%  Publications
- 11%  Submitted works (Student Papers)

Integrity Flags

0 Integrity Flags for Review

No suspicious text manipulations found.

Our system's algorithms look deeply at a document for any inconsistencies that would set it apart from a normal submission. If we notice something strange, we flag it for you to review.

A Flag is not necessarily an indicator of a problem. However, we'd recommend you focus your attention there for further review.

Match Groups

- 108 Not Cited or Quoted 12%**
Matches with neither in-text citation nor quotation marks
- 19 Missing Quotations 2%**
Matches that are still very similar to source material
- 2 Missing Citation 0%**
Matches that have quotation marks, but no in-text citation
- 0 Cited and Quoted 0%**
Matches with in-text citation present, but no quotation marks

Top Sources

- 7% Internet sources
- 5% Publications
- 11% Submitted works (Student Papers)

Top Sources

The sources with the highest number of matches within the submission. Overlapping sources will not be displayed.

1	Submitted works	Delhi Technological University on 2026-05-25	<1%
2	Internet	dspace.dtu.ac.in:8080	<1%
3	Submitted works	Ellenki College of Engineering & Technology on 2026-03-24	<1%
4	Publication	Asafu-Adjaye, Patience. "Exploring the Impact of Remote Work on Team Commun..."	<1%
5	Submitted works	Delhi Technological University on 2026-05-18	<1%
6	Submitted works	University of West Alabama on 2024-09-09	<1%
7	Submitted works	Further Learning Academy on 2025-06-24	<1%
8	Submitted works	Dublin City University on 2025-08-02	<1%
9	Submitted works	Norwalk-La Mirada Unified School District on 2026-04-22	<1%
10	Internet	en.wikipedia.org	<1%

11	Internet	download.bibis.ir	<1%
12	Submitted works	Simpson University on 2026-02-22	<1%
13	Internet	assets.pc.gov.au	<1%
14	Publication	Bierman, Leonard; Ferrell, O. C.; Ferrell, Linda. "Management: Principles and Appl...	<1%
15	Submitted works	WHU - Otto Beisheim School of Management on 2026-05-20	<1%
16	Submitted works	Delhi Technological University on 2026-05-25	<1%
17	Submitted works	IIMT University on 2026-05-14	<1%
18	Submitted works	University of Applied Sciences Europe on 2026-05-19	<1%
19	Submitted works	University of Technology, Sydney on 2026-04-24	<1%
20	Internet	diverseek.com	<1%
21	Submitted works	Blackboard Production on 2025-03-19	<1%
22	Submitted works	Liberty University on 2026-05-21	<1%
23	Internet	beyondlinepublisher.com	<1%
24	Publication	Goodwin-Ortiz de León, Craig D.. "Telecommuting During Disasters: Perceptions ...	<1%

25	Internet	gaganiwu.github.io	<1%
26	Submitted works	Strathmore University (Main Account) on 2026-03-30	<1%
27	Submitted works	Westcliff University on 2026-05-18	<1%
28	Internet	academic.oup.com	<1%
29	Internet	www.greatplacetowork.com	<1%
30	Submitted works	Teesside University (Blackboard Ultra) on 2026-05-18	<1%
31	Internet	africanjournalofbiomedicalresearch.com	<1%
32	Internet	eliteproject.com.ng	<1%
33	Publication	Amefia, Senami Eulalie A.. "Reconstructing Engagement and Professional Identity..."	<1%
34	Internet	www.biotech-now.org	<1%
35	Internet	www.slideshare.net	<1%
36	Submitted works	Heriot-Watt University on 2026-04-20	<1%
37	Submitted works	Domain Academy on 2026-05-15	<1%
38	Internet	edlabor.house.gov	<1%

39	Internet	www.yomly.com	<1%
40	Submitted works	City University on 2010-05-17	<1%
41	Submitted works	Oklahoma State University on 2025-09-08	<1%
42	Submitted works	Westcliff University on 2025-12-15	<1%
43	Internet	docplayer.net	<1%
44	Internet	imoveaustralia.com	<1%
45	Internet	incop.org	<1%
46	Internet	www.coursehero.com	<1%
47	Internet	www.genosinternational.com	<1%
48	Internet	www.mayas.info	<1%
49	Publication	Cordell, Zachary James. "Facilitating Connectedness in Virtual Meetings: How Trai...	<1%
50	Submitted works	Eastern Gateway Community College on 2023-05-05	<1%
51	Submitted works	Hogeschool Rotterdam on 2026-05-25	<1%
52	Submitted works	Jackson State University on 2026-02-12	<1%

53	Submitted works	London School of Management Education on 2025-12-07	<1%
54	Submitted works	Middlesex University on 2026-04-24	<1%
55	Submitted works	Morgan State University on 2024-06-26	<1%
56	Submitted works	Southeastern College on 2024-08-12	<1%
57	Submitted works	Southern New Hampshire University - Continuing Education on 2022-10-03	<1%
58	Publication	Stroud, Jeanine. "The Relationship Between Followers' Perceptions of Leader's Em...	<1%
59	Submitted works	The City College on 2019-09-26	<1%
60	Submitted works	Trident University International on 2026-02-10	<1%
61	Submitted works	University of Maryland, Global Campus on 2025-10-27	<1%
62	Internet	euraseans.com	<1%
63	Internet	trick-tack.com	<1%
64	Internet	www-emerald-com-443.webvpn.sxu.edu.cn	<1%
65	Internet	www.frontiersin.org	<1%
66	Submitted works	American Public University System on 2024-02-25	<1%

67	Submitted works	FBM on 2026-03-10	<1%
68	Submitted works	International Business School on 2026-04-24	<1%
69	Submitted works	Laureate Higher Education Group on 2025-12-13	<1%
70	Publication	Maswoba, Konanani. "Management Implications of COVID-19 Work Arrangement..."	<1%
71	Submitted works	Melbourne Central Catholic High School on 2026-02-24	<1%
72	Submitted works	Singapore International School on 2025-02-17	<1%
73	Submitted works	Texas A & M International University on 2026-04-27	<1%
74	Submitted works	University of Glamorgan on 2024-09-17	<1%
75	Submitted works	University of Limerick on 2020-04-26	<1%
76	Submitted works	University of Westminster on 2025-07-25	<1%
77	Internet	bibliotekanauki.pl	<1%
78	Internet	documents.worldbank.org	<1%
79	Internet	ebm.ekf.rs	<1%
80	Internet	erepo.uef.fi	<1%

81	Internet	essaypro.com	<1%
82	Internet	ir.canterbury.ac.nz	<1%
83	Internet	iris.unipv.it	<1%
84	Internet	newcastle.pressbooks.pub	<1%
85	Internet	repozitorij.uni-lj.si	<1%
86	Internet	www.flexjobs.com	<1%
87	Publication	Amy S. Wharton. "Working in America - Continuity, Conflict, and Change in a New ...	<1%
88	Submitted works	Barry University on 2023-10-13	<1%
89	Publication	Cahyaning Haswari, Gusti Ayu Desy Dwi Cahyani, Ni Luh Putu Widyani Puspitaw...	<1%
90	Submitted works	Glyndwr University on 2025-08-25	<1%
91	Publication	Tomas Kliestik, Katarina Valaskova, Dan-Cristian Dabija. "Editorial: Remote work ...	<1%
92	Submitted works	University of Bolton on 2025-12-16	<1%

62

Major Research Project on

THE EVOLUTION OF REMOTE WORK: ITS INFLUENCE ON EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE AND JOB SATISFACTION

Submitted by:

AVIKA BHASKAR

24/DMBA/52

1

Under the Guidance of:

Dr. SHELLY GUPTA



Delhi School of Management

Delhi Technological University

Bawana Road, Delhi 110042

34

CERTIFICATE

17

1

This certified that the project report with title “The Evolution of Remote Work: Its Influence On Employee Performance and Job Satisfaction” is an original and authentic work done by Avika Bhaskar, a student of the MBA batch 2024-26. The report has been submitted to the Delhi School of Management, Delhi Technological University, Delhi-110042, as a partial fulfilment of the requirements for the Master of Business Administration (MBA) program.

16

Dr. Shelly Gupta

Delhi School of Management,

Delhi Technological University

DECLARATION

I, **Avika Bhaskar**, student of MBA 2026 at Delhi School of Management, Delhi Technological University, hereby declare that the project report entitled "**The Evolution of Remote Work: Its Influence on Employee Performance and Job Satisfaction**" submitted to Delhi School of Management, Delhi Technological University is a genuine and original piece of work done by me under the guidance of Dr. Shelly Gupta.

I further declare that this project has not been submitted either in part or in full to any other university or institution for the award of any degree or diploma. All the information and data presented in this report have been gathered through secondary and primary sources and are presented to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Avika Bhaskar

24/DMBA/52

5

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The completion of this research report would not have been possible without the support, guidance, and encouragement of several individuals, to whom I extend my heartfelt gratitude.

52

First and foremost, I would like to express my deep sense of appreciation to my faculty guide, Dr. Shelly Gupta, whose insightful direction, patient mentorship, and constructive feedback throughout the course of this research has been invaluable.

2

I am equally grateful to the faculty members of Delhi School of Management, Delhi Technological University for creating an intellectually stimulating academic environment and for encouraging students to pursue meaningful, real-world research questions.

I also owe a debt of gratitude to the many researchers, authors, and institutions whose published works, surveys, and datasets form the empirical backbone of this paper. Their tireless efforts to document the shifting landscape of work have made studies like this one possible.

Avika Bhaskar

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Over the past ten years change within workforce setup has been more drastic than ever before in the first one hundred years. The proliferation of working from home is perhaps the most vivid of the changes, as has shifted from being a gradual advancement through technology into what has now become the new global normal.

This research paper will look at the history of telecommuting from the origins in 1970 and on to how it evolved to become one of the most widely accepted ways of employing workers of all time, also examines, for example, has this change on job satisfaction and work performance.

Drawing on a comprehensive review of academic literature, published surveys, institutional data from organisations such as Gallup, Stanford University, the U.S. Bureau of Labour Statistics, McKinsey & Company, and Buffer, the paper presents a multi-layered analysis of the remote work phenomenon. The findings reveal a nuanced picture: remote work demonstrably improves productivity and satisfaction under the right conditions, yet it simultaneously introduces risks of burnout, social isolation, and blurred work-life boundaries when poorly managed.

Key data points include Stanford University's finding that remote workers demonstrate a 13 percent productivity gain under certain conditions; Gallup's data that over 90 percent of hybrid employees feel as productive or more productive than in-office peers; and research showing that 65 percent of remote employees report being "extremely satisfied" with their work, compared to just 34 percent of office-based counterparts. At the same time, studies find that 86 percent of remote workers experience burnout, while 76 percent report some negative impact on their mental health due to isolation and overwork.

21

The paper concludes with a set of evidence-based recommendations for organisations seeking to harness the benefits of remote and hybrid work while managing its risks. These include investing in digital infrastructure, training managers in remote leadership, establishing clear boundary-setting norms, and designing hybrid schedules around collaboration needs.

42

35

TABLE OF CONTENTS

2

Section	Page No.
Certificate	2
Declaration	3
Acknowledgement	4
Executive Summary	5
Table of Contents	7
1. Introduction	8
1.1 Background	8
1.2 Problem Statement	11
1.3 Objectives of the Study	13
1.4 Scope of Study	14
2. Literature Review	15
3. Research Methodology	21
4. Analysis, Discussion and Recommendations	24
4.1 Introduction to the Analysis	24
4.2 Data Collection: Sources and Approach	24
4.3 Data Analysis: Key Findings	25
4.4 Findings and Recommendations	31
4.5 Limitations of the Study	34
5. Conclusion	36
References / Bibliography	38
Annexure	42

59

40

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

Work has changed a lot over time because of the tools and pressures people face. It used to be that people worked from their homes in Britain before factories were built. Then people worked in factories during the twentieth century. After that people started working in offices and then in small cubicles. The way people work is always changing. What is happening now is a change in the way people work and it is called remote work.

Remote work started in the 1970s with a man named Jack Nilles. He is often called the person who started the idea of working from home. Jack Nilles was working on a project with NASA. He came up with the idea of remote work. At that time the United States was having problems with oil. It seemed like a good idea to let people work from home to save money. Jack Nilles thought that people could work from home or from offices near their homes and they would not have to travel to a big office every day. He wrote about this idea in 1976. However the technology at that time was not very good. It was hard for most people to work from home. People only had phones and simple computers so remote work was an idea that people thought about but it was not really possible, for most workers.

It was not until the 1980s that remote work began to take a more concrete shape. The rollout of personal computers and, later, the modem allowed early adopters to access work files remotely for the first time. In 1983, IBM — then one of the world's largest employers — ran a remote work experiment that involved approximately 2,000 employees, providing them with computers and terminals to work from home. While the experiment was modest by today's standards, it represented a significant corporate acknowledgement that office presence was not always a prerequisite for productivity (Remoteopia, 2024).

Remote work started to become more real in the 1980s. This was when people began to use computers and modems. These tools allowed people to access their work files from home for the time.

In 1983 a big company called IBM did an experiment with work. They gave about 2,000 employees computers and terminals to work from home. This was a deal because it showed that companies did not need people to be in the office to be productive.

The 1990s were a time for change. The internet became really popular. People started using email of memos. They used instant messaging of phones. Tools like Lotus Notes and Microsoft Office made it possible for teams to work together on documents without being in the room.

Companies like American Express started to offer work arrangements in the mid-1990s. They did this because they knew it would make their employees happy and also save the company money. Remote work was becoming more common. Companies were starting to see the benefits of remote work, for their employees and for the company itself.

By the 2000s broadband internet and laptops made it possible for more and more people to work from home. This was especially true for people who do knowledge work. The number of people working from home grew a lot. It went up by 216 percent since 2005. This is what Global Workplace Analytics found out. With this growth most people still went to an office every day.

In the 2010s some big companies like Yahoo and IBM decided to bring their remote workers back to the office. The people in charge thought that working together in person was very important, for coming up with ideas.. Even with these companies changing their minds it did not really change the way things were going. More and more people were able to work from home. The tools to help teams work together from different places were getting better and better. So no matter what any one company decided it was not going to stop the trend of work. Remote work was going to keep growing and remote work was going to keep changing the way people worked.

Then came 2020.

The COVID-19 pandemic did not invent remote work. What it did was compress decades of gradual adoption into a matter of weeks. When

84 governments around the world issued lockdown orders in March 2020, organisations that had spent years deliberating over work-from-home policies found themselves implementing them overnight. According to the Stanford Institute for Economic Policy Research, over 60 percent of the U.S. labour force switched to remote work during the height of the pandemic — 28 a scale of change without precedent in the history of modern employment (Bloom et al., 2020).

66 What emerged from that forced experiment was deeply instructive. For millions of workers and their employers, it demonstrated that remote work 49 was not merely possible but, in many cases, preferable. Productivity held up — and in some cases improved. Recruitment expanded geographically. Commute times disappeared. Office real-estate costs fell. But the experience also laid bare a set of challenges that would define the ongoing conversation about the future of work: the blurring of boundaries between professional and personal life, the isolation of working without colleagues, the difficulty of building culture and trust in a distributed team, and the unequal experience of remote work across different industries, roles, and demographic groups. 4

20 The COVID-19 pandemic didn't create remote work. It took years of slowly getting used to something and squeezed it into just a few weeks. In March 2020, when governments everywhere announced lockdowns, companies that had taken years to think about work-from-home rules suddenly had to put them into action right away. The Stanford Institute for Economic Policy Research reports that more than 60 percent of workers in the U.S. moved to remote work during the peak of the pandemic. 33 28 87

This level of change is unlike anything seen before in the history of modern jobs (Bloom et al., 2020).

What came out of that forced experiment was very educational. For millions of employees and their bosses, it showed that working from home was not just doable but often better. Productivity stayed strong, and in some cases, even got better. Recruitment expanded geographically. Commute times disappeared. Office real-estate costs fell. However, the experience also

77

22

73

29

14

highlighted several challenges that will shape the ongoing discussion about the future of work. These include the fading lines between work and personal life, the loneliness that comes from working alone without coworkers, the struggle to create a sense of community and trust in a team that is spread out, and the different experiences of remote work depending on the industry, job roles, and demographic groups. By 2024, in the U.S. The Bureau of Labor Statistics stated that around 34 to 35.5 million people who are 25 years old and older were doing paid work from home. This is an increase of about 5 million compared to the year before (Great Place to Work, 2025). About 27 percent of workers in the United States were in hybrid work setups, while 11 percent worked completely remote. This is an increase from 7 percent in 2023 (High5Test, 2026). These numbers show a worldwide trend: remote work, whether in a mix of office and home or entirely from home, has moved from being a nice perk to a normal part of today's economy.

This paper takes its place during this time of change. It looks at how remote work has changed over time and specifically explores what these changes have meant for the two key signs of a healthy workforce: how well individual employees perform and how happy they are with their jobs.

1.2 Problem Statement

Even though remote work became prevalent, there still exists much confusion about its real impact on employees' efficiency and their satisfaction with jobs. The amount of information gathered is vast, yet it sometimes contradicts itself. According to the study conducted at Stanford University, employees engaged in remote work enjoy a productivity boost by 13 percent under particular circumstances (Bloom et al., 2015). Conversely, other research reveals that completely remote positions experience 10 percent lower productivity than those which have both face-to-face and remote components.

The above contradiction seems not to be surprising since remote work affects the efficiency of an employee through complex dynamics that cannot

be easily captured by numbers. A person doing remote work from his or her home equipped with a proper infrastructure, having a manageable workload, and possessing a supportive management can be quite productive and satisfied with his/her work. On the contrary, another individual who is forced to stay at home with his/her child and work simultaneously without any technical equipment will experience tremendous difficulties in performing tasks effectively.

4 It gets worse when one considers the rapidity of change. Academic research tends to have a lead time of two to four years before publication. In some cases, by the time findings on the impact of remote work productivity have been published, organizations have long shifted to a hybrid model, mandated employees' return to the office, or even changed the composition of teams altogether. There is always a gap between the current reality and academic knowledge, which makes it difficult for researchers to stay on top of the situation.

88 In addition to this temporal issue, there is also a practical problem of measurement. "Productivity," as applied to knowledge workers, is hard to define. Measuring hours spent at work, tasks completed, and deadlines met is not an exact science when we talk about creative, strategic, and innovative thinking, which is valued above all else. When supporters of remote work point to productivity increases, it usually means increased output in the form of calls made, texts written, or lines of code committed. It does not necessarily mean more innovation, mentorship, collaboration, and sharing of institutional knowledge.

"Job satisfaction" is also not without its issues. Questionnaire-based metrics measure an employee's level of satisfaction on the job at one point in time; they do not necessarily indicate future behavior, such as job retention or increased motivation. An individual can be highly satisfied with the flexible work arrangement of telecommuting yet experience the slow deterioration of his professional connections, his purpose at work, or his career prospects, something that may not become clear until much later.

As such, the issue addressed by this paper is not simply: "Does telecommuting increase productivity and employee job satisfaction?" It is rather the far more complex question of: "Under what circumstances does telecommuting enhance or detract from employee job performance and job satisfaction?"

1.3 Objectives of the Study

This study pursues the following specific objectives:

- To trace the historical evolution of remote work, from early telecommuting experiments in the 1970s to the hybrid work models of the mid-2020s, identifying the key technological, social, and economic drivers of each phase.
- To synthesise existing academic and organisational research on the relationship between remote work arrangements and employee performance, examining both the productivity gains and the performance risks associated with distributed work.
- To examine how remote work affects job satisfaction, including its influence on work-life balance, autonomy, engagement, social connection, and career development.
- To identify the moderating factors — including industry, job type, managerial quality, digital infrastructure, and individual characteristics — that determine whether remote work produces positive or negative outcomes for employees and organisations.
- To analyse specific challenges associated with remote work, including burnout, isolation, communication breakdowns, and inequalities in the remote work experience.
- To derive evidence-based recommendations for organisations designing remote and hybrid work policies that maximise employee performance and satisfaction while managing the associated risks.

1.4 Scope of Study

In essence, this paper can be described as secondary research since it draws information from the academic literature, reports, surveys, and case studies conducted within various industries and geographical locations. Its scope concerns remote working as a phenomenon that occurs among employees in knowledge-intensive professions, where it is technologically possible to work from home. Therefore, it will not cover experiences of people engaged in inherently location-bound activities, including, for instance, manufacturing, health care, agriculture, and retail.

From a geographical point of view, the study will concentrate on data from the United States as well as Western Europe. In fact, the focus is determined by several reasons. On the one hand, there is more published research on remote work in these two regions than in any other places on Earth. On the other hand, remote working has received much more discussion in these parts of the world than anywhere else.

With regard to time limits, the study will span twenty years between 2005 and 2025, paying special attention to the post-COVID era since 2020.

The study does not conduct original primary research through surveys or interviews. Instead, it synthesises findings from dozens of published studies, institutional surveys, and longitudinal datasets. Where possible, the most recent data available at the time of writing has been prioritised to reflect the current state of the remote work landscape.

The scope deliberately includes both the benefits and the challenges of remote work, resisting the temptation to present a one-sided narrative. The goal is to provide a balanced, evidence-grounded analysis that is useful to managers, HR professionals, policy makers, and researchers seeking to understand and navigate the complexities of distributed work.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The academic study of remote work, variously called telecommuting, telework, or distributed work, has a history almost as long as the practice itself, though the volume and rigour of research has grown substantially in the post-pandemic era. This literature review synthesises key findings across four thematic areas: productivity and performance, job satisfaction and engagement, psychological well-being and burnout, and the structural and organisational factors that mediate remote work outcomes.

2.1 Productivity and Performance

One of the first empirical studies about remote work productivity was performed in 2015 by Nicholas Bloom and his Stanford colleagues. The results of their randomized controlled experiment showed that remote employees had a 13 percent boost in productivity when compared with those who worked in offices. Such results can be explained by the fact that remote workers take fewer breaks, enjoy more days off due to the lack of diseases, and have a quieter environment (Bloom et al., 2015). Besides, those working remotely had greater job satisfaction and lower rates of attrition (Bloom et al., 2015).

In general, Bloom's data became one of the most popular arguments in discussions about remote work and its benefits. However, further evidence has shown that productivity cannot always be guaranteed. According to a survey analysis performed in 2024 by Great Place to Work, where almost 1.3 million workers gave their opinions about their employers among certified workplaces, it turned out that extraordinary productivity was associated with cooperation rather than remote work (Great Place to Work, 2025). Thus, employees who felt that their co-workers would help in case of difficulties were 8.2 times more likely to put some extra effort into their work.

A National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER) working paper published in 2024, drawing on PayScale data from May 2020 to December 2023, examined the association between remote work and job satisfaction across 11 occupational categories. The analysis found a generally positive and

27 statistically significant relationship between full-time remote work and
83 satisfaction, though this relationship became less robust in 2023, potentially
reflecting the stabilisation of the remote work experience and the onset of
remote work fatigue (NBER, 2024).

From an industry perspective, the technology sector has consistently demonstrated the strongest productivity outcomes for remote workers. A 2023 analysis found that 60 percent of technology companies reported increased productivity among remote employees, compared to lower gains in education and healthcare (IRJMETs, 2024). This differential reflects the degree to which technology roles are inherently compatible with digital collaboration tools and asynchronous workflows.

Conversely, research by Stanford's Work from Home Research project, updated in 2023, found that fully remote work was associated with a 10 percent productivity reduction compared to hybrid arrangements — a finding that has strengthened the case for hybrid models as the optimal balance between flexibility and collaboration (Work from Home Research, 2023). This finding aligns with Quantum Workplace research showing that hybrid employees report the highest engagement levels, with over 80 percent describing their engagement as "high," compared to 78 percent for fully remote workers and 72 percent for on-site workers

2.2 Job Satisfaction and Engagement

22 The relationship between remote work and job satisfaction is among the
6 most extensively documented in the literature. A widely cited 2024 survey
found that 65 percent of remote workers described themselves as "extremely
satisfied" with their jobs, compared to just 34 percent of office-based
employees — a gap of more than 30 percentage points (NetworkDepot,
2024). When asked to rate their happiness on a scale of one to ten, 42 percent
of remote workers rated themselves at eight or above, compared to lower
rates among office workers.

25 This satisfaction premium appears to be driven primarily by autonomy and
flexibility. Multiple studies identify the ability to control one's working
hours and environment as the primary source of remote work satisfaction,

aligning with Deci and Ryan's Self-Determination Theory, which posits that autonomy is a fundamental driver of intrinsic motivation and well-being (Deci & Ryan, 2000). A FlexJobs survey found that 63 percent of remote workers rated remote work as more important than even salary — a striking finding that reflects the depth of preference for flexibility among knowledge workers (Newsweek, 2025).

Gallup's ongoing workplace research reinforces these findings. Their data indicate that remote work satisfaction directly correlates with employee retention and organisational performance, and that 75 percent of companies that offer flexible arrangements report improved employee satisfaction scores (Second Talent, 2026). Moreover, research from the Yomly database shows that in 2025, 97 of the top 100 companies recognised for employee satisfaction offer either remote or hybrid work models — suggesting that flexibility has become an expectation, not merely a preference, among high-performing organisations (Yomly, 2026).

The retention implications are significant. Research shows that 26 percent of full-time office workers changed jobs in 2023, compared to only 17 percent of hybrid or remote workers — a nine percentage point difference in turnover that represents a meaningful financial and operational advantage for organisations that embrace flexible working (NetworkDepot, 2024). Furthermore, 40 percent of workers surveyed indicated they would consider leaving their employer if denied some form of work-from-home flexibility (NetworkDepot, 2024).

The literature also highlights satisfaction differentials by demographic group. Older workers, higher-income earners, and employees with established home offices tend to report greater remote work satisfaction than younger workers, lower-income employees, and those in smaller living spaces. This demographic dimension is often underrepresented in aggregate survey data and has important implications for equitable workplace policy design.

2.3 Psychological Well-Being and Burnout

71 While the evidence on satisfaction broadly favours remote work, the picture becomes more complex when the analysis turns to psychological well-being. A 2023 study found that among remote workers, 86 percent reported experiencing burnout in their current positions, compared to 70 percent of in-person workers — a counterintuitive finding given the widely reported satisfaction benefits of remote work (ThinkRemote, 2023). The explanation lies in the mechanisms of remote burnout: it tends to stem not from job demands per se, but from the blurring of work and personal life, extended working hours, and social isolation.

25 The difficulty of "unplugging" is one of the most consistently documented challenges of remote work. During the pandemic period, 61 percent of remote workers reported difficulty disconnecting from work during non-work hours — nearly triple the 22 percent who struggled with this before the pandemic (ThinkRemote, 2023). A study published in PLoS ONE in 70 2024 identified unplugging and the inability to delineate between work and home environments as major drivers of psychological distress, sleep deprivation, and musculoskeletal pain among remote workers (PLoS ONE, 61 2024).

9 Social isolation represents the other major psychological risk of remote work. A 2024 study by the Headway app found that 56 percent of remote workers go entire weeks without leaving their homes, while one in four reported going days without speaking to anyone (Newsweek, 2025). Research from Buffer consistently identifies loneliness as one of the top challenges cited by fully remote workers, with 51 percent of fully remote employees identifying limited connection with colleagues as a primary concern (CurrentWare, 2025). Remote work has been estimated to have affected 76 percent of workers' mental health negatively, with loneliness increasing by 67 percent among those who work remotely full-time (ThinkRemote, 2023). 45

Unresolved depression, which can be exacerbated by isolation, reduces workplace productivity by approximately 35 percent, according to the American Psychiatric Association, contributing to an annual productivity

loss of over USD 210 billion in the United States alone (Ankerhuisrehab, 2025). This figure underscores the financial stakes of failing to address the psychological dimensions of remote work.

A 2024 editorial in *Frontiers in Psychology* by Kliestik, Valaskova, and Dabija synthesised evidence on remote work burnout during the COVID-19 pandemic, concluding that proper time management, mood tracking tools, and organisational burnout assessment programmes are essential interventions for companies whose workforces are predominantly remote (Frontiers in Psychology, 2024).

2.4 Structural and Organisational Factors

A consistent finding across the literature is that remote work outcomes are not determined by location alone. They are mediated by a range of structural and organisational factors that organisations can, to a significant degree, control. These include the quality of digital infrastructure, managerial leadership style, clarity of expectations, team culture, and the design of collaborative processes.

The Great Place to Work analysis noted above emphasises the central role of trust and culture. In organisations where employees felt trusted by their managers and confident that colleagues would cooperate, remote work amplified performance. Where trust was low or communication norms unclear, remote work exacerbated disconnection and performance gaps (Great Place to Work, 2025). Similarly, research from the NBER found that the positive association between remote work and satisfaction was strongest in organisations with high baseline levels of employee engagement — suggesting that remote work rewards good management rather than compensating for poor management (NBER, 2024).

Schedule predictability also emerges as a significant moderator. A multi-year study found that employees with unpredictable working hours reported significantly lower job satisfaction, with a measurable drop on standardised satisfaction scales even when controlling for compensation and workload (High5Test, 2026). This finding is particularly relevant for hybrid workers whose in-office days are subject to last-minute change.

The gender dimension of remote work has also attracted growing scholarly attention. Several studies, particularly those examining the pandemic period, found that women with caregiving responsibilities bore a disproportionate burden in remote work settings, as the proximity to domestic responsibilities blurred professional and caregiving roles in ways that increased workload and reduced satisfaction relative to male counterparts. This structural inequality requires specific policy attention and represents a gap in much of the aggregated survey data (PLoS ONE, 2024).

69

Finally, the literature consistently identifies technology as both an enabler and a constraint. Organisations with mature digital ecosystems — robust cloud infrastructure, well-integrated collaboration tools, and high levels of digital literacy — report substantially better remote work outcomes than those with legacy systems and low technological readiness. A study synthesised by ResearchGate found that remote work productivity was not a direct consequence of adopting a digital tool, but of deliberate interaction within digitally mature organisational ecosystems (ResearchGate, 2025).

31

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

This study adopts a secondary qualitative and quantitative research design, synthesising published academic literature, institutional reports, longitudinal survey datasets, and case studies to construct a comprehensive understanding of how remote work has evolved and how this evolution has affected employee performance and job satisfaction.

A secondary research design was chosen for two primary reasons. First, the breadth of the research questions — spanning historical, psychological, managerial, and policy dimensions — makes it well-suited to synthesis rather than primary data collection. Second, the volume of high-quality published research on remote work, particularly post-pandemic, provides a sufficiently rich evidence base to support rigorous analysis without the need for new surveys or experiments.

The methodological approach draws on elements of a systematic literature review, in which sources are identified, screened, and synthesised according to predefined inclusion and exclusion criteria, as well as elements of a narrative review, which allows for a more interpretive, contextual discussion of findings across heterogeneous study designs.

3.2 Sources of Data

Data for this study was gathered from the following categories of secondary sources:

- Peer-reviewed academic journals, including the Quarterly Journal of Economics, Frontiers in Psychology, PLoS ONE, and the International Journal of Organisational Analysis.
- Working papers and preprints from established research institutions, including the National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER) and Stanford Institute for Economic Policy Research (SIEPR).

4

17

43

10

58

- Institutional and organisational surveys conducted by Gallup, McKinsey & Company, Buffer, Great Place to Work, FlexJobs, Quantum Workplace, and Owl Labs.
- Government data from the U.S. Bureau of Labour Statistics (BLS) and census sources.
- Industry databases and technology platforms including LinkedIn workforce data, PayScale compensation data, and Zoom usage analytics.
- Published case studies from organisations including IBM, Xerox, American Express, Google, and Microsoft.
- News and journalistic analyses from Newsweek, Fortune, Forbes, and CNBC, used for contextual narrative rather than primary data.

54

3.3 Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Sources were included if they: (a) were published between 2005 and 2025, with emphasis on post-2020 data; (b) addressed at least one of the core themes — remote work, employee performance, or job satisfaction; (c) were based on empirical data, whether quantitative surveys, randomised experiments, longitudinal tracking, or rigorous qualitative inquiry; and (d) were available in English.

Sources were excluded if they: (a) presented purely anecdotal or opinion-based content without empirical grounding; (b) were published before 2005 (except for foundational historical sources on telecommuting origins); or (c) focused exclusively on blue-collar, healthcare, or manufacturing work, which falls outside the scope of this study.

3.4 Data Analysis Approach

Quantitative data from surveys and institutional reports were identified, coded, and compared across different studies. In instances where there was more than one quantitative point of data on the same construct (such as satisfaction scores amongst remote workers across various survey methods), data triangulation was performed to determine areas of agreement and disagreement.

Thematic codes for qualitative results collected through case studies and literature reviews were generated through a thematic coding framework developed from the research aims within the study. There were four broad thematic categories of productivity and performance, job satisfaction and engagement, psychological well-being, and structural and organizational variables. These four thematic categories are the same as those described within the literature review chapter and analysis chapter.

While conducting the analysis, heterogeneity in the evidence was acknowledged, particularly the heterogeneity in terms of sample characteristics, industrial setting, methodology, and the period under which the study took place.

3.5 Ethical Considerations

As a secondary research study, this paper does not involve the collection of primary data from human subjects and therefore does not require formal ethical approval. However, all sources are attributed accurately, data is presented honestly without selective misrepresentation, and the limitations of individual studies are acknowledged throughout. The researcher has made a conscious effort to present a balanced analysis that reflects the genuine complexity and nuance of the evidence, rather than constructing a narrative designed to support a predetermined conclusion.

4. ANALYSIS, DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 Introduction to the Analysis

The preceding literature review established the landscape of existing knowledge on remote work, performance, and satisfaction. This chapter moves from synthesis to analysis, examining what the evidence means in aggregate, where the most significant patterns emerge, where contradictions persist, and what conclusions can responsibly be drawn.

The analysis is organised around four questions that flow from the study's objectives: How has performance changed as remote work has scaled? How has satisfaction been affected, and for whom? What conditions determine whether remote work produces positive or negative outcomes? And what should organisations do in response to this evidence?

Throughout this analysis, the data is engaged with critically. Remote work advocacy and remote work scepticism are both politically charged positions, and the evidence base has been deployed by both camps in ways that are sometimes selective. This analysis attempts to follow the evidence where it leads, including when it leads to conclusions that complicate simple narratives.

4.2 Data Collection: Sources and Approach

The primary datasets informing this analysis are drawn from the following sources, each contributing a distinct evidentiary dimension:

- Stanford University / SIEPR: Bloom et al. (2015) randomised trial at Ctrip; Bloom's ongoing Work from Home Research project (2020-2023); Bloom's Stanford productivity studies providing the foundational quantitative benchmarks.
- Great Place to Work (2024-2025): A 1.3 million-employee Trust Index survey analysis providing current, large-scale engagement and performance data.
- Gallup Workplace Studies (2023-2025): Longitudinal tracking of hybrid and remote engagement, satisfaction, and retention data.

- U.S. Bureau of Labour Statistics (2024): Official labour market data on the scale and distribution of remote work across occupational categories.
- Buffer State of Remote Work (2023): Annual survey of remote workers globally on challenges, preferences, and well-being.
- FlexJobs Remote Work Survey (2024-2025): Survey data on worker preferences, retention, and the prioritisation of flexibility.
- NBER Working Paper on Remote Work and Employee Engagement (2024): Longitudinal PayScale data across 11 occupational categories.
- Quantum Workplace Engagement Research (2024): Engagement comparisons across fully remote, hybrid, and in-person workers.
- ThinkRemote / Headway Burnout Studies (2023-2024): Burnout prevalence data among remote workers.
- Industry surveys from McKinsey, Deloitte, Owl Labs, and Pew Research Centre: Supplementary data on executive attitudes, demographic variations, and sectoral differences.

4.3 Data Analysis: Key Findings

4.3.1 The Performance Picture: Complex and Conditional

The finding that remote working is correlated with a 13 percent increase in productivity, as cited in Bloom et al. (2015), has found its way into common parlance in almost verbatim terms, being seen as an indisputable truth. This figure should be taken with great caution before used to bolster any policy argument.

Firstly, the Ctrip experiment happened in a certain context where call center employees in Shanghai performed tasks that were both clear and measurable. Indeed, there was a productivity increase, but there is no guarantee that the same applies to a creative group working in an advertising firm, a consulting group giving advice to clients, or a research and

development department trying to innovate. Context is of critical importance.

On the other hand, the finding that cooperation – the feeling that your colleagues will come through for you when needed – is the number one factor which predicts discretionary effort and thus high performance can easily be generalized (Great Place to Work, 2025). The workers who experience it tend to be eight times more likely to put in extra effort. It is a cultural finding and applies to remote, hybrid, and office workers alike.

The benefit of remote work, when effective, is reduced friction. It gets rid of time spent on travel (average one way of over 27 minutes per trip in the U.S.), decreases presenteeism (going to work sick or without mental engagement), and enables the individual to organize work hours based on their optimal cognitive performance. For knowledge workers with enough discipline and proper tools to capitalize on these factors, the resulting boost is tangible.

The downside of remote work, when implemented poorly, is the loss of structure. Lack of the structuring elements of commute, set working hours, and the company of other employees causes some individuals to lose their focus, self-discipline, and professional identity necessary for achieving high performance levels. According to a 2024 survey conducted by Headway, only 23 percent of remote employees were able to complete an entire eight-hour shift, with most averaging about six hours of productive work per day (Newsweek, 2025). Additionally, 40 percent of the respondents admitted using methods of deceiving productivity tracking software.

The performance verdict, then, is conditional: remote work enhances performance for self-directed, well-supported, high-skill workers in organisations with strong cultures of cooperation and clear expectations. It impairs performance for workers who depend on environmental structure, social accountability, or high levels of in-person collaboration to function at their best.

4.3.2 The Satisfaction Story: Generally Positive, with Important Exceptions

The satisfaction data is, on balance, more consistently favourable toward remote work than the performance data. The 65 percent versus 34 percent "extreme satisfaction" differential between remote and office workers is a striking and consistently replicated finding (NetworkDepot, 2024). The 40 percent of workers who would consider leaving their employer over the loss of remote flexibility, and the 63 percent who rate remote work as more important than salary, are equally arresting (FlexJobs / Newsweek, 2025).

These numbers reflect something real about how people experience their working lives. The ability to structure one's day around personal rhythms, to work in a comfortable environment, to be present for family moments that an office commute would foreclose, and to exercise meaningful autonomy over one's working hours — these are not trivial gains. For many workers, particularly those with caregiving responsibilities, disabilities, or long commutes, remote flexibility has fundamentally improved the quality of their lives.

The retention data reinforces this. A nine-point difference in annual turnover between office and hybrid/remote workers — 26 percent versus 17 percent — is, in financial terms, enormous (NetworkDepot, 2024). The cost of replacing an employee is typically estimated at between 50 and 200 percent of their annual salary. Organisations that offer flexibility are not merely making a gesture to worker well-being; they are protecting themselves against a very real and very costly form of attrition.

However, the satisfaction narrative has important exceptions. The same workers who report high overall satisfaction with remote work also report concerning levels of burnout (86 percent), difficulty unplugging (61 percent), and social isolation (76 percent reporting some mental health impact). This apparent contradiction can be explained by the fact that satisfaction surveys tend to measure overall preferences and immediate feelings, while burnout and isolation studies tend to measure psychological states over time. A worker can genuinely prefer remote work to office work, and simultaneously be experiencing the slow erosion of their well-being that accumulates from chronic isolation.

The satisfaction data also varies significantly by role, seniority, and life stage. Senior employees with established professional networks, clear career paths, and significant job autonomy tend to report higher remote work satisfaction than junior employees who are still building skills, relationships, and professional identity. This generational and experiential dimension is critical for organisations designing onboarding and development programmes for distributed teams.

4.3.3 Burnout: The Shadow Side of Remote Flexibility

The burnout data really needs to be looked at closely because it is the biggest problem with moving to remote work. And it is something that people often do not think about when they talk about how happy people are with remote work.

74

It is pretty surprising that 86 percent of people who work from home say they get burnout compared to 70 percent of people who go to an office. This is especially surprising because one of the reasons people like remote work is that it is supposed to help them balance their work and personal life as ThinkRemote said in 2023. The reason for burnout is not that the work is harder but that it is harder to stop working when you work from home.

81

67

8

86

When you do not have to commute to work it can be hard to separate your work life from your life. A lot of people who work from home find that they end up working all the time. In fact more than half of people who work from home say they work hours than they did when they went to an office and 31 percent say they work a lot more according to ThinkRemote in 2023. This is sometimes called "presence-blindness burnout". It happens a lot, in companies where managers do not know when their employees are working and where people are expected to be available all the time.

The social isolation part of burnout is very important. People are animals and we need to talk to each other in person. The small talks we have at the

office like when we wait for coffee or hear someone talking about something are important. We cannot replace these talks with video calls.

Many people who work from home do not leave their houses for weeks. Some people even go days without talking to anyone. This is not good for our health and it affects how well we work. For example Newsweek said in 2025 that 56 percent of people who work from home stay inside their houses for weeks and 25 percent do not talk to anyone for days.

When people are depressed because they are alone they do not work well. They can be 35 percent less productive. This is a problem and it costs a lot of money. In the United States it costs, over 210 billion dollars every year. Ankerhuisrehab said this in 2025. These numbers are not just statistics they are real. We need to think about how working from home affects our minds.

4.3.4 The Hybrid Model: The Current Best Practice

The evidence says that hybrid work is the way to go. This means people work in the office three or four days a week and the rest of the time they work from home. This way of working seems to make people happy and do their jobs well.

Some research by Quantum Workplace found that people who work in a way are really engaged in their jobs. 80 Percent of them say they are very engaged. This is more than people who work from home all the time who're 78 percent engaged and people who work in the office all the time who are 72 percent engaged. Hybrid work gives people the freedom to work from home. Also the chance to see their coworkers and work together.

People really like work. Some data from Gallup says that 60 percent of people who can work from home want to work in a way. 10 Percent of people want to work in the office all the time. So it seems like most people and companies think that hybrid work is the way to go. They do not want to work in the office all the time because it can be boring and they do not want to work from home all the time because it can be lonely. Hybrid work is the ground that works for everyone.

By 2024 27 percent of workers, in the United States were working in a hybrid way and 11 percent were working from home all the time. It looks like work will be the main way that people work in the future even though people are still talking about how many days a week people should work in the office. Hybrid work is the way of the future. It is what most people and companies want. They like hybrid work because it gives them the freedom to work from home. Also the chance to see their coworkers and work together. Hybrid work is the way to go and it is what people prefer.

4.3.5 Industry and Role Variation

When we look at how people work from home and how happy they are with it we have to remember that it is very different from one type of job to another. People who work with technology always say they get a lot more work done when they work from home. This makes sense because jobs like making software looking at data and other technical work can be done well when people are not in the same room and are using tools to work together. In 2023 sixty seven percent of people who work in tech stayed home to work. This was because their jobs were already set up to be done from home even before the pandemic made everyone start working from home more often as noted by Yomly in 2026.

Some other types of jobs like banking, consulting and marketing have started to use a mix of working from home and working in the office. These jobs need people to work together closely at times like when they are coming up with new ideas or working with clients.. People can do other parts of their job like analyzing data or being creative from home. The hard part is figuring out which tasks are better when people are in the room and setting up a schedule that works for each project. We should not just say that people have to come into the office a number of days without thinking about what they need to do.

There are some jobs where working from home does not make a difference like healthcare, education and hospitality. This is because the main parts of these jobs like taking care of patients teaching in a classroom and helping

hotel guests have to be done in person.. Some people in these jobs do have tasks that can be done from home like administrative work or planning. What we found out in this study is important for these people. They are a small part of the people who work in these industries. Remote work is still relevant, for these people who have jobs that can be done from home.

4.4 Findings and Recommendations

4.4.1 Core Findings

Based on the analysis above, this study presents the following core findings:

- Remote work is associated with measurable productivity gains for self-directed, high-skill knowledge workers in organisations with strong cultures of trust and cooperation, but these gains are not universal and are highly context-dependent.
- Job satisfaction among remote workers is substantially higher than among exclusively in-office workers, driven primarily by autonomy, flexibility, and elimination of commuting time. However, satisfaction surveys may mask the slower-building effects of isolation and burnout.
- Burnout rates are higher among remote workers than in-office workers, driven principally by difficulty unplugging, extended working hours, and social isolation. This represents the most significant risk dimension of remote work adoption.
- Hybrid work arrangements consistently produce the best aggregate outcomes across performance, engagement, satisfaction, and well-being metrics, and reflect the preferences of the majority of the remote-capable workforce.
- The outcomes of remote work are mediated by a set of organisational and structural factors — including digital infrastructure, managerial quality, clarity of expectations, and culture — that organisations can and should actively manage.

- Significant demographic and role-based variation in remote work outcomes means that one-size-fits-all policies are unlikely to serve all segments of the workforce optimally.

4.4.2 Recommendations for Organisations

On the basis of these findings, the following evidence-based recommendations are offered to organisations designing or refining their remote and hybrid work policies:

Recommendation 1: Implement a purpose-driven hybrid schedule with designated in-office days. Instead of implementing a hybrid model with a fixed number of in-office days, organisations should construct their hybrid schedules based on collaboration requirements. Days when collaboration is needed for tasks such as brainstorming, engaging with clients, onboarding new employees, or coordinating a large team should be scheduled as in-office days. Days dedicated to solitary work like research, writing, coding, or analysing are best suited for being remote.

Recommendation 2: Upgrade your digital infrastructure and develop digital literacy. As the study indicates, productivity when working remotely depends largely on the digital maturity of the organisation rather than the use of any particular tool. Organisations should therefore assess their digital infrastructures, adopt collaborative tools, and train employees as well as managers on digital collaboration skills. The difference in performance between organisations with high digital maturity and low maturity equates to the performance gap in remote work.

Recommendation 3: Train managers in remote and hybrid leadership skills. Management is by far the most controllable variable in terms of remote work success. Managers who are available regularly, set clear expectations, create an environment for voicing concerns, and work hard to build cohesion among remote employees do much better at delivering their teams' potential than those taking a hands-off approach when dealing with distributed workers. Training of managers to lead their remote teams effectively, including best practices in virtual one-on-one meetings, managing performance without monitoring, and building team cohesion even when

team members are located remotely is an urgent need for organisations relying heavily on remote work.

Recommendation 4: Clearly establish right-to-disconnect policies and make sure they are respected. All research on remote work burnout is pointing towards the lack of delineation between work and personal life being the primary cause. From organisational responsibility perspective, it is imperative that such norms should be established and strictly adhered to. After all, in the current conditions, both organisations and remote workers would benefit greatly from not expecting people to always be on-call.

Recommendation 5: Design for social connection rather than mere functional communication. Employers should understand that the social fabric of the physical office environment – spontaneous discussions, team lunch meetings, and seeing a group of people working together on an objective – is something that does not easily carry over to virtual workplaces. Social connection needs deliberate effort through the use of virtual social activities, occasional physical meetups for the team, mentor-mentee pairing, and structured peer-to-peer learning to foster the feeling of belongingness and interpersonal trust critical to employee satisfaction and cooperation.

Recommendation 6: Design different policies based on experience, status, and age/life stage. Employees who are less experienced and in the process of gaining experience and relationships, employees who are in highly collaborative roles, and employees suffering from isolation and mental health problems can require more in-person meetings than those who are highly experienced and do individual contributions without a collaborative need. Employers should avoid designing rigid remote-work policies applicable universally to employees of all types and statuses but develop frameworks where employees can customize their arrangements.

Recommendation 7: Measure the things that matter. Firms that focus on output measures only for evaluating their remote workers' performances run the danger of promoting short-term efficiency gains over long-term investments that include building relationships, developing skills,

innovation, and organizational know-how necessary for sustained success. Performance management processes should be redesigned to incorporate not only measurable output but also less quantifiable achievements such as teamwork, mentoring, and creativity.

26

4.5 Limitations of the Study

This study has several limitations that should be acknowledged in interpreting its findings.

First, as a secondary research investigation, it is reliant on the quality and representativeness of the source material used. As pointed out above, many of the cited surveys – including those conducted by Buffer, FlexJobs, and Owl Labs – are reliant on self-selected opt-in respondents who have some personal interest in remote work, creating potential biases towards the positive nature of the remote experience.

Second, most of the statistics relating to the productivity and satisfaction aspects of working from home come from the United States, and in some instances, from Western Europe. The experiences of remote working in countries in the Global South, where the infrastructure, culture, and living standards are different, do not receive sufficient representation within the evidence base.

85

Finally, as the phenomenon of remote work continues to evolve quickly, certain data points, even when fairly recent, can already be considered somewhat obsolete due to changing circumstances. For instance, the period from 2022 to 2024 was marked by the return to office, with large corporations like Amazon, Google, and Meta issuing in-office mandates.

Fourth, the research does not seek to make causal inferences out of the correlational evidence provided. In all the researches conducted where there was found to be correlation between remote working and performance or satisfaction, it was ensured that the inference made was only on the fact that there is a correlation, and not causation.

Fifth, the fact that the research only concentrates on jobs which are knowledge intensive and involve desk work means that a huge section of

the population has been omitted out of the study. The results from this research will apply directly to only the technology, finance, consulting, and professional services industries.

5. CONCLUSION

Working remotely has gone through perhaps the most significant metamorphosis in the entire history of labor. It was once an abstract theory suggested during the energy crisis of the 1970s; then, it was experimented with cautiously by the pioneers of the tech industry; later on, it was enabled by the rise of the internet in the 2000s and 2010s, and finally, it became a reality because of a worldwide health crisis.

The message of this research is certainly not either one-dimensional or utopian. In fact, the conclusion to be drawn here is a much more truthful and meaningful observation about the trade-offs associated with working remotely, namely productivity boosts and satisfaction levels of people working with the appropriate infrastructure, as well as potential health and safety issues of individuals who are unable to adjust to a new reality.

It is beyond doubt that the future of knowledge work is a hybrid one. The results from the preference survey, the engagement surveys, the productivity surveys, and the well-being surveys all point toward a system wherein workers have the freedom to select the location from which they can undertake various kinds of activities, backed by organisational investments in both the digital architecture and the managerial and social infrastructure needed for optimal team collaboration.

What is needed to achieve this is a change in the way organisations view their key resource. This is not the office space. It is not even the daily commute. It is, rather, the individuals – their skill sets, interpersonal ties, motivations, and well-being. And remote work does this either by enhancing their well-being or by exploiting their flexibility while ignoring their needs for structure.

Organisations set up for success in the coming years won't be the ones making the toughest demands about a return to the office, nor will they be the ones that tout full remote as the solution to everything. The organisations that will be set up for success will be those that listen to the data, plan intelligently, measure what really counts, and see the discussion about the

location of work as just one part of a larger conversation about what sort of organisation we hope to be and what our workers need to succeed.

Remote working has altered the employment landscape permanently. Now it's about navigating that landscape intelligently — for the good of everyone involved.

REFERENCES / BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Psychiatric Association. (2023). Mental health in the workplace: Productivity and the cost of depression. American Psychiatric Association Foundation. <https://www.psychiatry.org/>

Ankerhuisrehab. (2025). Remote work and mental health: Stress and productivity effects. <https://ankerhuisrehab.com/remote-work-mental-health/>

Bloom, N., Liang, J., Roberts, J., & Ying, Z. J. (2015). Does working from home work? Evidence from a Chinese experiment. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 130(1), 165–218. <https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qju032>

Bloom, N., Han, R., & Liang, J. (2023). How hybrid working from home works out. Stanford Institute for Economic Policy Research. <https://siepr.stanford.edu/>

Buffer. (2023). State of remote work 2023. Buffer. <https://buffer.com/state-of-remote-work/2023>

CantechLetter. (2023). Working from home companies: A history. Cantech Letter. <https://www.cantechletter.com/2023/04/working-from-home-a-history-of-telecommuting/>

CurrentWare. (2025). Remote work productivity statistics: Data, trends and insights. <https://www.currentware.com/blog/remote-work-productivity-statistics/>

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behaviour. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), 227–268. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1104_01

FlexJobs. (2024). Remote work statistics and trends 2024. FlexJobs. <https://www.flexjobs.com/blog/post/remote-work-statistics/>

Frontiers in Psychology. (2024). Editorial: Remote work burnout during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 15. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1389984>

Gajendran, R. S., & Harrison, D. A. (2007). The good, the bad, and the unknown about telecommuting: Meta-analysis of psychological mediators and individual consequences. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(6), 1524–1541. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.6.1524>

Gallup. (2024). State of the global workplace 2024. Gallup. <https://www.gallup.com/workplace/349484/state-of-the-global-workplace.aspx>

Global Workplace Analytics. (2023). Latest telecommuting statistics. Global Workplace Analytics. <https://globalworkplaceanalytics.com/telecommuting-statistics>

Great Place to Work. (2025). Remote work productivity study: Surprising findings from a 4-year analysis. Great Place to Work. <https://www.greatplacetowork.com/resources/blog/remote-work-productivity-study-finds-surprising-reality-2-year-study>

High5Test. (2026). Employee and job satisfaction statistics in the US (2024–2025). <https://high5test.com/employee-satisfaction-statistics/>

Improve Workspace. (2025). The history of remote work: When did it start? <https://improveworkspace.com/the-history-of-remote-work/>

IRJMETs. (2024). The impact of remote work on employee productivity and mental health. *International Research Journal of Modernisation in Engineering Technology and Science*. <https://www.irjmets.com/>

Kliestik, T., Valaskova, K., & Dabija, D.-C. (2024). Editorial: Remote work burnout during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 15. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1389984>

McKinsey & Company. (2023). The future of work after COVID-19. McKinsey Global Institute. <https://www.mckinsey.com/featured-insights/future-of-work/the-future-of-work-after-covid-19>

Medium / Navarrete, P. (2024). The evolution and facets of remote work: Navigating the new normal. Medium. <https://medium.com/@nemexxis/the-evolution-and-facets-of-remote-work-navigating-the-new-normal-cc3874821416>

NBER. (2024). Remote work trends and employee engagement across occupations. National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper No. 33315. <https://www.nber.org/papers/w33315>

NetworkDepot. (2024). Interesting remote work trends and statistics in 2024. <https://networkdepot.us/blogs/interesting-remote-work-trends-and-statistics-in-2024>

Newsweek. (2025). Remote work and mental health — Is employment trend sparking a crisis? Newsweek. <https://www.newsweek.com/remote-work-mental-health-employment-trend-sparking-crisis-2083509>

Nilles, J. (1976). The telecommunications-transportation tradeoff: Options for tomorrow. John Wiley & Sons.

Owl Labs. (2024). State of hybrid work 2024. Owl Labs. <https://owllabs.com/state-of-hybrid-work/2024>

PLoS ONE. (2024). Organizational and occupational health issues with working remotely during the pandemic: A scoping review. PLoS ONE. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11069417/>

Quantum Workplace. (2024). Employee engagement in a hybrid workplace. Quantum Workplace. <https://www.quantumworkplace.com/>

Remoteopia. (2024). The history of remote work. <https://remoteopia.com/history-of-remote-work/>

ResearchGate. (2025). The impact of remote work on employee productivity and satisfaction. ResearchGate. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/391969961>

Second Talent. (2026). Top 100+ remote work and hiring statistics 2026. <https://www.secondtalent.com/resources/remote-work-hiring-statistics/>

Shortform. (2025). The history of remote work and why it is still valuable today. <https://www.shortform.com/blog/history-of-remote-work/>

ThinkRemote. (2023). Remote work burnout statistics: Trends and insights. <https://thinkremote.com/remote-work-burnout-statistics/>

U.S. Bureau of Labour Statistics. (2024). American Time Use Survey 2024. BLS. <https://www.bls.gov/tus/>

VirtualVocations. (2024). A history of telecommuting: Remote work's evolution explained. <https://www.virtualvocations.com/blog/telecommuting-job-search-help/history-of-telecommuting-remote-work/>

Wang, B., Liu, Y., Qian, J., & Parker, S. K. (2021). Achieving effective remote working during the COVID-19 pandemic: A work design perspective. *Applied Psychology*, 70(1), 16–59. <https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12290>

Yomly. (2026). 50+ important remote work statistics of 2026. <https://www.yomly.com/remote-work-statistics/>

ANNEXURE

Annexure A: Summary of Key Statistics Referenced in This Report

Statistic	Source
65% of remote workers are 'extremely satisfied' vs 34% of office workers	NetworkDepot, 2024
13% productivity gain for remote workers under certain conditions	Bloom et al., Stanford, 2015
86% of remote workers report burnout vs 70% in-person	ThinkRemote, 2023
34–35.5 million U.S. workers aged 25+ worked from home for pay in 2024	U.S. Bureau of Labour Statistics, 2024
27% hybrid, 11% fully remote in U.S. workforce (2024)	High5Test / Gallup, 2026
60% of remote-capable workers prefer hybrid schedules	Gallup, 2026
40% would consider quitting without some work-from-home flexibility	NetworkDepot, 2024
Hybrid employees have 80% high engagement vs 72% for in-office	Quantum Workplace, 2024
8.2x more likely to give extra effort when cooperation is felt	Great Place to Work, 2024
Unresolved depression reduces productivity by 35%; costs \$210.5bn annually	American Psychiatric Association, 2023

56% of remote workers go entire weeks without leaving home	Headway / Newsweek, 2025
26% of office workers changed jobs in 2023 vs 17% of hybrid/remote	NetworkDepot, 2024
98% of professionals want to work remotely at least part-time long-term	Yomly, 2026
97 of top 100 employee satisfaction companies offer remote/hybrid work	Yomly, 2026

Annexure B: Glossary of Key Terms

Remote Work (Telework / Telecommuting): A work arrangement in which employees perform their job duties from a location outside the traditional office, typically from home, using digital communication and collaboration tools.

Hybrid Work: A flexible work model in which employees split their working time between a remote location (typically home) and a physical office or workplace, often based on a predefined schedule or task-based arrangement.

Burnout: A state of chronic occupational stress characterised by emotional exhaustion, depersonalisation, and a reduced sense of personal accomplishment, as defined by Maslach and Jackson (1981).

Job Satisfaction: An attitudinal construct reflecting an employee's overall affective evaluation of their job, encompassing dimensions such as compensation, autonomy, relationships, growth opportunities, and work-life balance.

Employee Engagement: A measure of an employee's intellectual and emotional commitment to their organisation and its goals, associated with

discretionary effort, retention, and performance above baseline requirements.

Asynchronous Communication: Communication that does not require participants to be available at the same time, such as email, recorded video messages, and collaborative documents — a hallmark of remote work environments.

Digital Maturity: The degree to which an organisation has integrated digital technologies into its processes, culture, and workforce capabilities, determining its ability to support effective remote and hybrid work.

Presenteeism: The practice of attending work (physically or virtually) while unwell, disengaged, or not functioning at full capacity — a phenomenon associated with both office and remote work environments.

Annexure C: Abbreviations

Abbreviation	Full Form
WFH	Work From Home
BLS	Bureau of Labour Statistics (U.S.)
NBER	National Bureau of Economic Research
SIEPR	Stanford Institute for Economic Policy Research
MBA	Master of Business Administration
HR	Human Resources
KPI	Key Performance Indicator
USD	United States Dollar
R&D	Research and Development