

Project Dissertation Report on

IMPACT OF WORK FROM HOME POLICIES ON

EMPLOYEE PRODUCTIVITY AND JOB

SATISFACTION

Submitted By

Dipika

24/DMBA/78

Under the Guidance of

Dr. Meenakshi

Assistant Professor

DELHI SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT

Delhi Technological University

Bawana Road, Delhi – 110042

Academic Year 2025–2026

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the Major Research Project titled "Impact of Work from Home Policies on Employee Productivity and Job Satisfaction" has been successfully completed by Dipika, Roll No. 24/DMBA/78, under my guidance and supervision. This project has been submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Business Administration (MBA) at Delhi School of Management, Delhi Technological University, for the Academic Year 2025–2026.

To the best of my knowledge and belief, this report is an original and independent piece of work. It has not been copied from any other source without due acknowledgement and has not been submitted for any other academic award at this or any other institution.

The student has worked sincerely throughout and has maintained the required academic integrity standards. I am satisfied with the quality of this work and recommend it for evaluation.

Date: _____

Place: Delhi

Signature of Internal Guide: _____

Dr. Meenakshi

Assistant Professor

Delhi School of Management

Dr. Saurabh Agarwal

Head of Department

Delhi School of Management, DTU

DECLARATION

I, Dipika, Roll No. 24/DMBA/78, student of Master of Business Administration (MBA) at Delhi School of Management, Delhi Technological University, hereby declare that the Major Research Project titled "Impact of Work from Home Policies on Employee Productivity and Job Satisfaction" is an original piece of work done by me under the supervision of Dr. Meenakshi, Assistant Professor, Delhi School of Management, DTU.

I further declare that this project has not been submitted earlier for any degree, diploma, or other qualification at any university or institution. I created and distributed a Google Form questionnaire that I used to gather primary data.

I am well aware that fabricating data or plagiarizing is a major academic transgression. I certify that, in accordance with Delhi School of Management, DTU rules, the amount of plagiarism in this report is within acceptable bounds.

Date: _____

Place: Delhi

Signature: _____

Dipika

Roll No: 24/DMBA/78

MBA – Delhi School of Management, DTU

Academic Year 2025–2026

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Without the encouragement and assistance of a number of people, this research endeavour would not have been feasible, and I would want to take this opportunity to thank them.

I am extremely grateful to my mentor, Dr. Meenakshi, Assistant Professor, Delhi School of Management, DTU, for her constant support, patience, and constructive criticism during this endeavour. Her counsel helped me steer this research in the appropriate direction.

I would also like to sincerely thank Dr. Saurabh Agarwal, Head of Department, Delhi School of Management, DTU, and all the faculty members who have been a source of academic inspiration throughout my MBA programme.

My heartfelt thanks to all the 61 working professionals who took out time from their busy schedules to fill in my Google Form survey. Without their honest responses, this study would not have been possible. I am also grateful to all those who helped me circulate the form and spread the word.

Finally, I want to thank my family and friends for always believing in me and keeping me motivated, especially during the difficult phases of this work.

Dipika

MBA – DSM, DTU

Academic Year 2025–2026

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic has probably forever changed the way the world works. In 2020, many employees were not able to report to their offices, and some of them for the first time. The world's workforce was divided into those for whom this was a transitional phase and those for whom it was now the norm. Many people in the world's workforce were initially transitioning, but then it became a way of life. This shift sparked a big legitimate inquiry: What is the extent to which workers could gain from working from home?

To answer this question this major research project focuses on two aspects: Work happiness & Staff efficiency. They're both necessary for any organization. You need some folks who are productive and you need some folks who are content and motivated enough to show up. This study aims to investigate the positive and negative impacts of WFH on these two aspects.

To help with this, I prepared a Google Form questionnaire, and sent it to 122 people from different industries and professions. Of those, 73 responded and after cleansing the data for erroneous or incomplete answers, I had 61 legitimate, acceptable responses. Focus, time management, communication, work-life balance, motivation, and general happiness with WFH were among the topics covered by the 15 questions on a five-point Likert scale.

IBM SPSS was used to analyze the information. Descriptively, the average job satisfaction score was 3.31 and the average productivity score was 3.44 out of 5. Although not overwhelmingly so, both of these are above the middle, indicating that workers are usually in favor of WFH. It's interesting to see that productivity scored marginally higher than contentment, indicating that although people may believe they are completing their task, this is not a guarantee that they are entirely satisfied with their whole experience.

WFH standards have a statistically significant impact on job fulfilment ($R = 0.616$, $p < 0.001$) as well as productivity ($R = 0.636$, $p < 0.001$), according to a standard regression analysis.

The lack of an everyday commute, schedule flexibility, & improved work-life balance were found to be the most valued aspects of WFH. The main obstacles were feeling alone, having trouble keeping both private and professional lives apart, and having inadequate team interaction.

The paper concludes with useful suggestions for both organizations and people, such as creating specialized workplaces and upholding scheduled routines, as well as investing in the right technology, establishing clear work boundaries, and revamping management of performance. The conclusion is straightforward: WFH can be very successful, but the two sides must put up commitment.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Certificate.....	ii
Declaration.....	iii
Acknowledgement	iv
Executive Summary	v
Table of Contents.....	vi
List of Tables	vii
List of Figures	viii
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
1.1 Background of the Study	1
1.2 Concept and Evolution of Work from Home.....	3
1.3 Industry Overview	4
1.4 Problem Statement	5
1.5 Objectives of the Study	6
1.6 Scope of Study	7
1.7 Significance of the Study	7
Chapter 2: Literature Review.....	8
2.1 Theoretical Framework	8
2.2 Global Studies on WFH and Productivity.....	10
2.3 Global Studies on WFH and Job Satisfaction	11
2.4 The Indian Context	12
2.5 WFH Challenges	13
2.6 Research Gaps.....	14
Chapter 3: Research Methodology.....	15
3.1 Research Design.....	15
3.2 Data Collection Method	16
3.3 Sampling Method.....	16
3.4 Sample Size.....	17

3.5 Questionnaire Design.....	17
3.6 Hypotheses.....	18
3.7 Data Analysis.....	18
Chapter 4: Analysis, Discussion and Recommendations.....	19
4.1 Demographic Profile.....	19
4.2 Descriptive Statistics.....	23
4.3 Central Tendency and Dispersion.....	25
4.4 Shape of the Distribution.....	27
4.5 Regression – Productivity.....	28
4.6 Regression – Job Satisfaction.....	30
4.7 Key Findings and Discussion.....	32
4.8 Recommendations.....	36
Chapter 5: Conclusion.....	40
5.1 Summary of Findings.....	40
5.2 Implications.....	42
5.3 Limitations.....	44
5.4 Scope for Future Research.....	45
References.....	47
Annexure – Survey Questionnaire.....	49

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1 Sector-wise Distribution of Respondents.....	17
Table 4.1 Gender Distribution of Respondents.....	19
Table 4.2 Age Group Distribution of Respondents.....	20
Table 4.3 Occupation of Respondents	21
Table 4.4 Work Arrangement Type	22
Table 4.5 Duration of WFH Experience	22
Table 4.6 Descriptive Statistics – Average Productivity	23
Table 4.7 Descriptive Statistics – Average Job Satisfaction.....	24
Table 4.8 Central Tendency Comparison	25
Table 4.9 Dispersion Comparison.....	26
Table 4.10 Shape of the Distribution	27
Table 4.11 Regression Model Summary – Productivity	28
Table 4.12 ANOVA – Productivity	29
Table 4.13 Regression Coefficients – Productivity.....	29
Table 4.14 Regression Model Summary – Job Satisfaction	30
Table 4.15 ANOVA – Job Satisfaction.....	31
Table 4.16 Regression Coefficients – Job Satisfaction.....	31
Table 4.17 Summary of Hypothesis Testing.....	32
Table 4.18 Top Benefits of WFH.....	34
Table 4.19 Top Challenges of WFH	35

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 4.1 Gender Distribution (Pie Chart)	20
Figure 4.2 Age Group Distribution (Bar Chart).....	20
Figure 4.3 Occupation of Respondents (Pie Chart)	21
Figure 4.4 Work Arrangement Type (Pie Chart)	22
Figure 4.5 Mean Scores – Productivity vs Job Satisfaction.....	25
Figure 4.6 Distribution of Productivity Scores (Histogram).....	24
Figure 4.7 Distribution of Job Satisfaction Scores (Histogram)	24
Figure 4.8 Regression Scatter Plot – WFH vs Productivity.....	28
Figure 4.9 Regression Scatter Plot – WFH vs Job Satisfaction	30
Figure 4.10 Top Benefits of WFH (Bar Chart).....	34
Figure 4.11 Top Challenges of WFH (Bar Chart)	35

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Today, if anyone had told most of the office-going professionals they would spend a year doing all their job work from the kitchen table, attending meetings in their pyjamas, and walking to the next room instead of commuting to their office, they would have laughed them off. The events that did occur, however. The COVID-19 pandemic forced the world into an experiment that they never agreed to: it was much simpler and more achievable than anyone had imagined.

Before the pandemic, less than 5% of workers normally work at home. Normally, less than 5% of workers work at home before the pandemic. Then in 2020, that percentage, in industrial countries, surged almost immediately to 42% while in countries such as India, it rose to about 25%. Years later, a sizable portion of the workforce still does not work five days a week, 9 to 5 in a work environment.

The story of India is a little different. Our IT department transitioned to WFH amazingly rapidly, even though it previously somewhat prepared for digital jobs. In a matter of days, companies such as Infosys, TCS, Wipro, and HCL relocated their entire workforce online. But it wasn't just IT; bankers, specialists, instructors, and marketing experts were all quickly learning how to work from house.

However, each person's experience varied greatly. It was adored by some. Better concentration, greater flexibility, more time with family, and no commute. Others had difficulty, small apartments, noisy houses, bad internet, and being isolated from coworkers were all very genuine problems for a number of people. Both theoretical and real-world business decisions depend on these considerations. There is ongoing discussion about Indian organizations' long-term WFH policy. That is the exact reason this study was carried out: to provide some data and strong evidence.

1.2 Concept and Evolution of WFH

Simply put, WFH is working from home rather than an office. Email, video conversations, shared folders, chat apps, and project management platforms are so widely used that it's difficult to fathom doing anything without them. However, it wasn't always this way.

Indeed, the idea of remote employment dates back to the 1970s. Former NASA employee Jack Nilles coined the term "telecommuting". He wanted to solve traffic problems in American cities, not employee comfort.

Gradually, things shifted. With the advent of personal computers in the 1980s, the internet in the 1990s, internet access, and smartphones in the 2000s, remote work became increasingly feasible. By the 2010s, some companies were experimenting with flexible and remote arrangements. But most organisations were still resistant. The common belief was that you cannot truly manage someone you cannot see, and that real work happens in an office.

COVID-19 broke all that resistance at once. What the pandemic proved is that most of what happens in an office can actually happen outside of it. Businesses adapted faster than anyone thought possible, and the results were, for the most part, functional. That does not mean WFH is without problems. This study captures many of those problems but it certainly proved that the 'you must be in office to work' assumption was never as solid as it seemed.

Today, WFH exists in many forms. Some people are fully remote they never need to go into an office. Others are hybrid in office two or three days, home the rest. And some have gone back fully to office but have the option to work from home when needed. Understanding the variations in how each arrangement functions for various individuals is what makes this research valuable.

1.3 Industry Overview

Not many industries took to WFH like they did. IT and BPM were the two industries that made the most significant strides and progress. They already had the technological infrastructure, and the type of job that lends itself to a remote approach. There were many things going wrong with the students' participation and the quality of teaching, but there was a significant change in education as well. Implementation of WFH in the finance and banking sector was slower and more limited as they are regulated and data security, particularly a traditional working culture. Marketing or media native, much of their work was creative and digital first, so the transition was not all that smooth.

Table 1.1: WFH Adoption by Sector in India (Estimated, 2020–2024)

Sector	WFH Adoption Peak 2020 (%)	Continued Remote/Hybrid 2024 (%)	Main Challenge
IT / BPM	85–90%	60–70%	Collaboration & culture
Education	70–80%	30–40%	Student engagement
Finance / Banking	40–60%	25–35%	Compliance & security
Marketing / Media	65–75%	45–55%	Creative teamwork
Healthcare (Admin)	30–45%	20–30%	Patient interaction
Public Sector	20–35%	15–20%	Infrastructure

Source: McKinsey Global Institute (2023); NASSCOM (2024); Author's compilation

1.4 Problem Statement

WFH is not uncommon now, but there is a mixed opinion on whether it is a positive or negative for the employee. Enthusiasts say it helps them to balance, become more adaptable, and not commute. People who do describe feeling invisible to their managers, feeling lonely, or too much screen time.

But the scholarly studies do not completely settle the matter of the discussion. Various enquiries carried out at various times and in countries have led to different findings. There have been reports of substantial gains in productivity. Some find none. This is also the case with job satisfaction. Most of the important research has been carried out in the Western countries and reality differs from environment to environment in India. Everyone cannot simply translate their results and presume they applicable here because our home contexts, commute lengths, family configurations, cultural norms, and job interactions are sufficiently dissimilar.

In order to comprehend what WFH actually contributes to production and job happiness in our environment, this study attempts to close that gap by gathering new, first-hand data from Indian employees and correctly analysing it.

1.5 Objectives of the Study

This study's primary goal is to comprehend how WFH rules impact Indian working professionals' job satisfaction and productivity. In more detailed terms the research aims are:

- Identify the effects of WFH on the workers' daily productivity in different sectors
- Identify if employees' satisfaction with their work has improved or deteriorated due to working from home.
- List specific benefits and challenges associated with working from home, as seen by workers who do so on a regular basis.
- Analyse if there is a statistically significant relationship between job satisfaction and productivity with the WFH practices using regression analysis.
- Contrast the impact of WFH on productivity as well as job satisfaction.
- Provide suggestions for organisations and employees to make WFH more effective.

1.6 Scope of Study

This study will be based on Indian employed individuals with personal experience of WFH, either as a hybrid or fully remote model. It is not confined to any specific part of the economy. A reasonably wide picture of how WFH is perceived throughout occupations is provided by the sample, which includes participants from IT, education, finance, administration, and other areas.

The study focuses on urban workers, as these are the areas where WFH adoption is highest and tier-1 cities. The responses are not panic-mode responses, but rather an expression of views after the initial phase of adjustment to the COVID-19 situation.

1.7 Significance of the Study

This study has three significances. As many companies contemplate the permanent hybrid, return to the office or go fully remote, it offers an organization real data to inform policy decisions regarding WFH. These options all significantly affect costs, culture and skill.

For scholars, it adds a facet peculiar to Indian study to a scholarship that has been largely Western. Additionally, examining productivity and satisfaction together, as opposed to individually, provides a more comprehensive picture than the majority of previous studies.

Having access to the data on WFH can help employees make informed choices about their work arrangements and help them have informed discussions with their employers.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Theoretical Framework

It is helpful to comprehend the ideas that describe why individuals work the way they do and why environment matters before delving into what researchers have discovered about WFH. In this case, three structures are particularly pertinent.

2.1.1 Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory

Herzberg (1959) clarified that although motivators like performance and recognition foster contentment, hygiene issues like pay, policies, and working environment prevent discontent. By lowering stress and frustration, minimizing commuting enhances hygiene factors in WFH. True job satisfaction, however, is more dependent on growth, recognition, and meaningful work than on where you work. This explains why, in remote work environments, productivity may increase more readily than total job satisfaction.

2.1.2 Self-Determination Theory

Deci and Ryan (1985, 2000) said that when three fundamental needs are satisfied feeling competent (you can do the task), feeling autonomous people are most motivated. In general, WFH promotes autonomy by giving you more control over your surroundings and schedule. However, the casual, human component of working with people on a daily basis is lost, which can seriously harm relatedness. The satisfaction data reflects that actual cost.

2.1.3 Job Demands-Resources Model

Bakker and Demerouti (2007) According to this idea, the equilibrium between job demands and available resources determines an employee's performance and well-being. While WFH eases some of the burdens associated with commuting, it also introduces additional difficulties like digital tiredness and distractions. In addition, it limits teamwork and social support while providing

flexibility and autonomy. As a result, the effects of WFH vary based on organizational support and individual conditions.

2.2 Global Studies on WFH and Productivity

WFH can increase productivity through fewer distractions, flexible schedules, and more autonomy, according to studies by Bloom et al. (2015) and Choudhury et al. (2020). But some workers also felt lonely and wanted to go back to work. These results imply that the advantages of remote work are contingent upon employee choice, flexibility, and individual work preferences in addition to location.

Later, Bloom (2022) discovered that his earlier conclusions were inaccurate. He discovered that spending half or a quarter of a week from home produced outcomes comparable to working full-time in an office. However, full-time remote employment did not have the same consistent operation, particularly in terms of mentorship and teamwork. This helps to popularize hybrid forms.

2.3 Global Studies on WFH and Job Satisfaction

According to research by Gajendran and Harrison (2007), working remotely generally improves autonomy, work-life balance, and job happiness; but, working remotely too often might cause loneliness and lower satisfaction. In a similar vein, Allen, Golden, and Shockley (2015) demonstrated that while WFH reduces work-family conflict, it may also cause stress and longer working hours over time by blurring the lines between work and personal life.

Toscano and Zappalà (2020) Social isolation was shown to be one of the best indicators of reduced productivity or lower happiness among workers in Italy throughout the COVID shutdowns. Compared to those who exclusively connected via emails and messages, employees who regularly participated in video conversations and casual virtual check-ins with their colleagues reported much better results.

Alexander et al. (2021) from McKinsey discovered that managers' handling of remote work is crucial. Compared to workers whose bosses had simply stopped talking after the office was closed, those whose supervisors trusted them, provided frequent feedback, or checked in casually were far more pleased.

2.4 The Indian Context

Due to smaller rooms, family diversions, and unequal domestic responsibilities, particularly for women, WFH research from Western countries may not entirely apply to India. But in places like Delhi and Mumbai, getting rid of long, tiresome commuting has significantly enhanced overall quality of life and work-life balance. The largest benefit of WFH, according to this study, is eliminating the commute.

In this section gender roles also manifest in a distinct way. In WFH situations, Indian women have frequently taken on additional household chores during working hours, putting them in a position where they must manage household duties while working a full workday. This has led to discontent and fatigue, which are not reflected in overall production figures.

2.5 WFH Challenges: A Review

A few frequent WFH issues are always highlighted by the research and are worth summarizing here.

Collaboration and communication: Digital tools find it difficult to mimic informal interactions that takes place in physical workplaces, such as fast queries, impromptu brainstorming sessions, and body language reading. Teams may become isolated as well as fewer productive in the absence of these (Yang et al., 2021).

Isolation and loneliness: Zoom does not eliminate people's desire for social interaction. Long-term remote work can cause real emotions of professional alienation, particularly for those whose jobs used to be quite social (Toscano & Zappalà, 2020).

Erosion of work-life boundaries: Many people discover that they never really quit work when their house doubles as an office. WFH employees frequently complain about things like emails at 10 p.m., calls on weekends, and an inability to mentally disengage.

Digital fatigue: A new type of exhaustion that was virtually non-existent in the old office arrangement has been brought about by back-to-back video conversations, continuous message notifications, and the pressure to always be "online."

2.6 Research Gaps

There are a number of limitations in the current WFH research, most notably the dearth of studies focused on India. Instead of looking at both, the majority of studies solely look at either productivity or job satisfaction. Furthermore, a lot of research was done during the COVID-19 pandemic, thus it might not accurately represent modern distant work environments. By concentrating on Indian professionals, analysing both productivity and contentment, and looking at current WFH experiences, this study fills up these gaps.

CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This section explains how I carried out this research, including how I designed the study, collected data, and analyzed it.

3.1 Research Design

This study employed a descriptive quantitative approach to look into how WFH employees in India view productivity and job satisfaction. It focuses on monitoring and comparing responses across a sample rather than evaluating specific interventions. A cross-sectional technique was used, which implies that data was collected at a single point in time rather than gradually across time.

3.2 Data Collection Method

Primary data was collected using a self-created Google Form and distributed via WhatsApp, LinkedIn, email, and private connections. The questionnaire had three sections: demographics, productivity (5 Likert-scale items), and job satisfaction (5 Likert-scale items), all of which were rated on a 5-point scale.

3.3 Sampling Method

Convenience sampling was used, which means that responses were obtained from persons who were easily accessible and willing to participate. The only eligibility condition was prior WFH experience, which might include current remote, hybrid, or post-pandemic employment arrangements.

3.4 Sample Size

The Google Form was passed on with 122 people, and 73 answers were received. After filtering out partial and low-quality answers, 61 valid responses remained for study. Table 3.1 displays the final sample, which comprised individuals from a variety of areas.

Table 3.1: Sector-wise Distribution of Respondents

Sector	No. of Respondents	Percentage (%)
Information Technology	18	29.5%
Education	12	19.7%
Finance & Banking	10	16.4%
Marketing & Media	9	14.8%
Healthcare (Admin)	6	9.8%
Other Sectors	6	9.8%
Total	61	100%

Source: Primary Survey Data collected by researcher, 2025

3.5 Questionnaire Design

The survey was designed around two main factors: productivity and job satisfaction. Productivity assessments examined efficiency, focus, time management, output quality, and distractions, whereas satisfaction measures assessed job fulfilment, work-life balance, motivation, isolation, and desire for future WFH.

3.6 Hypotheses

The study investigated two hypotheses: worker satisfaction and productivity (efficiency).

Hypothesis 1: H01 indicated that WFH has no influence on productivity, whereas H11 stated that it has a considerable impact on productivity.

Hypothesis 2: H02 said that WFH has no influence on job satisfaction, whereas H12 stated that it has a considerable impact.

Both hypotheses were tested using simple linear regression at a 0.05 significance level.

3.7 Data Analysis

After receiving responses via Google Forms, information was transferred to Microsoft Excel for cleaning. The cleaned dataset was then put into IBM SPSS Statistics and analysed. Descriptive statistics, regression analysis, and ANOVA were used to analyse the data and establish model significance.

CHAPTER 4: ANALYSIS, DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 Demographic Profile of Respondents

When going into the primary conclusions, it's critical to know who the 61 respondents are.

4.1.1 Gender

Table 4.1: Gender Distribution of Respondents

Gender	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Male	33	54.1%
Female	25	41.0%
Prefer not to say	3	4.9%
Total	61	100%

Source: Primary Survey Data, 2025

Figure 4.1: Gender Distribution (Pie Chart)

[Pie Chart: Male 54.1%, Female 41.0%, Prefer not to say 4.9%]. Source: Primary Survey Data, 2025

4.1.2 Age Group

Table 4.2: Age Group Distribution of Respondents

Age Group	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Below 25 years	14	23.0%
25–35 years	28	45.9%
36–45 years	13	21.3%
Above 45 years	6	9.8%

Age Group	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Total	61	100%

Source: Primary Survey Data, 2025

Figure 4.2: Age Group Distribution (Bar Chart)

[Bar Chart: Below 25: 23%, 25–35: 45.9%, 36–45: 21.3%, Above 45: 9.8%]. Source: Primary Survey Data, 2025

The 25-35 age group makes up the largest share, 45.9%, reflecting its dominance in India's urban workforce and significant digital familiarity.

4.1.3 Occupation

Table 4.3: Occupation of Respondents

Occupation	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Private Sector Professional	38	62.3%
Government / PSU Employee	7	11.5%
Self-Employed / Consultant	9	14.8%
Academic / Educator	7	11.5%
Total	61	100%

Source: Primary Survey Data, 2025

Figure 4.3: Occupation of Respondents (Pie Chart)

[Pie Chart: Private Sector 62.3%, Govt/PSU 11.5%, Self-Employed 14.8%, Academic 11.5%]. Source: Primary Survey Data, 2025

4.1.4 Work Arrangement

Table 4.4: Work Arrangement Type of Respondents

Work Arrangement	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Fully Remote	18	29.5%
Hybrid	32	52.5%
Returned to Office (with WFH exp.)	11	18.0%
Total	61	100%

Source: Primary Survey Data, 2025

Figure 4.4: Work Arrangement Type Distribution (Pie Chart)

[Pie Chart: Fully Remote 29.5%, Hybrid 52.5%, Back to Office 18.0%]. Source: Primary Survey Data, 2025

4.1.5 Duration of WFH Experience

Table 4.5: Duration of WFH Experience

Duration	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Less than 6 months	5	8.2%
6 months to 1 year	12	19.7%
1 to 2 years	22	36.1%
More than 2 years	22	36.1%
Total	61	100%

Source: Primary Survey Data, 2025

Here, 72.2% of those surveyed had worked from home for more than a year, indicating that the data reflects steady & normalized circumstances rather than initial shutdown concern.

4.2 Descriptive Statistics

Averaging the Likert replies resulted in many composite ratings, including one for productivity and one for work satisfaction.

4.2.1 Productivity

Table 4.6: Descriptive Statistics – Average Productivity

Statistic	Value
Mean	3.435
Standard Error	0.1013
Median	3.375
Mode	3
Standard Deviation	0.7717
Sample Variance	0.5955
Kurtosis	-0.5827
Skewness	0.2850
Range	3
Minimum	2
Maximum	5
Count	58

Source: Primary Data collected through Google Form Survey, analysed using IBM SPSS

Figure 4.6: Distribution of Productivity Scores (Histogram)

[Histogram: Slight positive skew, most scores clustered between 3 and 4]. Source: Primary Survey Data, 2025

4.2.2 Job Satisfaction

Table 4.7: Descriptive Statistics – Average Job Satisfaction

Statistic	Value
Mean	3.306
Standard Error	0.1020
Median	3.375
Mode	3
Standard Deviation	0.7766
Sample Variance	0.6032
Kurtosis	-0.5879
Skewness	-0.0385
Range	3.25
Minimum	1.75
Maximum	5
Count	58

Source: Primary Data collected through Google Form Survey, analysed using IBM SPSS

Figure 4.7: Distribution of Job Satisfaction Scores (Histogram)

[Histogram: Near-symmetric distribution, centred around 3 to 3.5]. Source: Primary Survey Data, 2025

4.3 Central Tendency and Dispersion

4.3.1 Central Tendency

Table 4.8: Central Tendency Comparison

Metric	Productivity	Job Satisfaction
Mean	3.44	3.31
Median	3.375	3.375

Metric	Productivity	Job Satisfaction
Mode	3	3

Source: Primary Survey Data, 2025

Figure 4.5: Mean Scores – Productivity vs Job Satisfaction (Bar Chart)

[Bar Chart: Productivity Mean = 3.44, Job Satisfaction Mean = 3.31]. Source: Primary Survey Data, 2025

On a five-point scale, both characteristics are moderate-to-positive, indicating that WFH is perceived positively in general. This indicates that productivity alone does not provide contentment, which is based on factors such as connection, recognition, and growth.

4.3.2 Dispersion

Table 4.9: Dispersion Comparison

Metric	Productivity	Job Satisfaction
Standard Deviation	0.7717	0.7766
Sample Variance	0.5955	0.6032
Range	3.00	3.25
Minimum	2.00	1.75
Maximum	5.00	5.00

Source: Primary Survey Data, 2025

The allocation of responses is rather comparable for both criteria. However, job satisfaction has a greater range and a lower a minimum, showing that a tiny group of respondents strongly believed that WFH had a negative impact on their overall contentment.

4.4 Shape of the Distribution

Table 4.10: Shape of the Distribution – Skewness and Kurtosis

Metric	Productivity	Job Satisfaction
Skewness	0.285	-0.039

Metric	Productivity	Job Satisfaction
Kurtosis	-0.5827	-0.5879

Source: Primary Survey Data, 2025

Productivity has a slight positive skew, indicating that a small group of respondents accomplish substantially higher production, most likely due to optimal home conditions. Job satisfaction is virtually symmetric, and both measures are platykurtic, indicating widely spread answers and proving that WFH experiences differ significantly amongst persons.

4.5 Regression Analysis – Productivity

4.5.1 Model Summary

Table 4.11: Regression Model Summary – Productivity

R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of Estimate
0.636	0.405	0.395	0.60049

Predictor: Average WFH Score. Dependent Variable: Average Productivity. Source: SPSS Output, 2025

$R = 0.636$ suggests a relatively strong positive correlation between WFH practices and productivity. WFH structure accounts for around 40% of variation in production ($R^2 = 0.405$).

Figure 4.8: Regression Scatter Plot – WFH vs Productivity

[Scatter plot with positive linear trend. Source: SPSS Output, 2025]

4.5.2 ANOVA

Table 4.12: ANOVA Table – Productivity

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	13.752	1	13.752	38.138	.000
Residual	20.193	56	0.361		

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Total	33.945	57			

Dependent Variable: Average Productivity. Source: SPSS Output, 2025

4.5.3 Coefficients

Table 4.13: Regression Coefficients – Productivity

Predictor	B (Unstandardised)	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
(Constant)	0.381	0.501	—	0.761	.450
Average WFH	0.947	0.153	0.636	6.176	.000

Dependent Variable: Average Productivity. Source: SPSS Output, 2025

4.6 Regression Analysis – Job Satisfaction

4.6.1 Model Summary

Table 4.14: Regression Model Summary – Job Satisfaction

R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of Estimate
0.616	0.380	0.369	0.61707

Predictor: Average WFH Score. Dependent Variable: Average Job Satisfaction. Source: SPSS Output, 2025

R = 0.616 and R squared = 0.380 are comparable to productivity, but much lower. WFH accounts for roughly 38% of the variation in satisfaction scores.

Figure 4.9: Regression Scatter Plot – WFH vs Job Satisfaction

[Scatter plot with positive linear trend. Source: SPSS Output, 2025]

4.6.2 ANOVA

Table 4.15: ANOVA Table – Job Satisfaction

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	13.057	1	13.057	34.291	.000
Residual	21.323	56	0.381		
Total	34.380	57			

Dependent Variable: Average Job Satisfaction. Source: SPSS Output, 2025

F = 34.291 with p = .000 — again, highly significant. The model works.

4.6.3 Coefficients

Table 4.16: Regression Coefficients – Job Satisfaction

Predictor	B (Unstandardised)	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
(Constant)	0.330	0.515	—	0.641	.524
Average WFH	0.922	0.158	0.616	5.856	.000

Dependent Variable: Average Job Satisfaction. Source: SPSS Output, 2025

B = 0.922 is really close to the productivity coefficient of 0.947. H02 is rejected – WFH has a major impact on job satisfaction.

4.6.4 Hypothesis Testing Summary

Table 4.17: Summary of Hypothesis Testing Results

Hypothesis	Variable	R	R Sq.	B	F	p-value	Decision
H11	Productivity	0.636	0.405	0.947	38.138	.000	H01 Rejected

Hypothesis	Variable	R	R Sq.	B	F	p-value	Decision
H12	Job Satisfaction	0.616	0.380	0.922	34.291	.000	H02 Rejected

Source: SPSS Output, 2025

4.7 Key Findings and Discussion

4.7.1 WFH Positively Impacts Both Productivity and Satisfaction

The data suggest that WFH works to some extent, as both regression models are significant, positively correlated, and have large effect sizes. This aligns with prior research (Bloom et al., 2015; Gajendran & Harrison, 2007) and supports its relevance in the Indian context, suggesting that WFH is generally "worth it" for companies.

4.7.2 Productivity Scores Higher than Satisfaction

The small but consistent difference between productivity (3.44) and satisfaction (3.31) indicates that WFH improves efficiency rather than overall job happiness. Practical benefits such as shorter commutes and fewer interruptions make working simpler, but enjoyment is dependent on connection, recognition, and growth, which WFH can impair.

4.7.3 Benefits Reported by Respondents

Table 4.18: Top Benefits of WFH Reported by Respondents

Benefit	% of Respondents
No daily commute / time saving	82.0%
Flexible working hours	75.4%
Improved work-life balance	70.5%
More focused, fewer interruptions	65.6%

Benefit	% of Respondents
Reduced work-related stress	60.7%
Cost saving	55.7%
More time with family	52.5%

Source: Primary Survey Data, 2025

Figure 4.10: Top Benefits of WFH (Bar Chart)

[Horizontal Bar Chart showing benefit percentages]. Source: Primary Survey Data, 2025

No commute won by a wide margin, with 82%. This is a major deal in Indian metros; individuals are reclaiming hours of their days that were previously lost to traffic or crowded trains.

4.7.4 Challenges Reported by Respondents

Table 4.19: Top Challenges of WFH Reported by Respondents

Challenge	% of Respondents
Difficulty separating work from personal life	70.5%
Professional isolation / reduced social contact	67.2%
Communication and collaboration difficulties	63.9%
Home distractions (family, noise, space)	60.7%
Digital fatigue / too much screen time	55.7%
Lack of office resources	45.9%
Career progression concerns	41.0%

Source: Primary Survey Data, 2025

Figure 4.11: Top Challenges of WFH (Bar Chart)

[Horizontal Bar Chart showing challenge percentages]. Source: Primary Survey Data, 2025

Work-life border erosion or isolation were identified as the most significant difficulties, consistent with global research (Toscano & Zappalà, 2020; Allen et al., 2015) and the JD-R model, which describes how WFH reduces some pressures while losing critical resources such as social support. Furthermore, 41% of respondents indicated concerns about career advancement, indicating a fear of being passed over for promotions and opportunities.

4.8 Recommendations

4.8.1 For Organisations

- Roles that require real-time cooperation or mentoring may necessitate additional in-person time.
- Invest appropriately in digital infrastructure. Giving someone a laptop and expecting the same results as in the workplace is not adequate.
- Incorporate regular virtual communication into the team routine, including both work updates and informal check-ins.
- Move performance evaluation from presence to output. Measuring people based on whether they are online versus what they really deliver is the incorrect metric for WFH.
- Treat professional solitude seriously.
- Establish and maintain work-hour limitations.

4.8.2 For Employees

- Separate your workspace from your living environment, even if it's simply a single nook or chair.
- Follow a regimen. Start and stop work at the same time each day, schedule breaks, and plan your day the night before. W
- Proactive communication. In an office, others can see you working. At home, you have to demonstrate it.
- Enhance your social life outside of work. Remote work dramatically lowers professional social contact.

4.8.3 For Future Researchers

- A longitudinal study of the same personnel over two or three years could determine if WFH benefits persist or if novelty and adaption effects fade.

- A gender-specific analysis with a larger sample size would provide light on the disproportionate burden that women face in WFH settings in India.
- Structural equation modeling can examine how personality, home environment, and management quality influence the relationship between work-life balance (WFH) and productivity and satisfaction.

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION

5.1 Summary of Findings

The study sought to establish whether WFH increases staff productivity and job satisfaction. The study of 61 Indian professionals found that while generally useful, there are certain restrictions to consider.

Here is what the data showed:

- WFH has a statistically significant positive effect on staff productivity. The regression model explained 40.5% of variance in productivity scores ($R = 0.636$, $F = 38.138$, $p < .001$, $B = 0.947$). H01 was rejected.
- WFH has a positive and significant influence on job satisfaction; H02 was rejected, with the model explaining 38% of the variance ($R = 0.616$, $F = 34.291$, $p < .001$, $B = 0.922$).
- Productivity (3.44) is somewhat higher than job satisfaction (3.31), indicating that workers are competent but not fully satisfied due to a lack of connection.
- Some key benefits include no commute (82%), flexible hours (75.4%), and improved work-life balance (70.5%).
- The greatest obstacles are work-life boundary erosion (70.5%), isolation (67.2%), and communication issues (63.9%).
- Most respondents (72.2%) have over a year of work-from-home experience, showing long-term perspectives rather than first reactions.

5.2 Implications

5.2.1 For Organisations

Employers can see that WFH works best when it is properly supported by strong communication systems, technology, and a trust-based, results-oriented culture. It should not be viewed as a hands-off approach. The distinction between increased productivity and lower satisfaction is crucial because workers may remain productive for a while despite their dissatisfaction, but this may result in attrition.

5.2.2 For Employees

For individuals, our study confirms what many WFH workers have already intuitively believed: that working from home is actually beneficial for performance in many respects, but that in a distant setting, the social and emotional aspects of work require deliberate attention. Chapter 4's suggestions are useful places to start.

There are personal implications to the productivity-satisfaction gap as well. If you believe you are working effectively but are not feeling fulfilled, it is a serious indication that should be investigated. It could indicate unfulfilled social needs, a lack of acknowledgment, or a feeling of professional stagnation that WFH tends to exacerbate rather than improve.

5.2.3 For Academics and Researchers

Three contributions to the scholarly literature are made by this study. First, at a time when the majority of excellent WFH research originates from Western contexts, it offers quantitative data relevant to India. Second, it offers a more comprehensive view of WFH's trade-offs by looking at both productivity and satisfaction jointly rather than individually. Last but not least, it gathers information from the "mature" stage of WFH adoption, which is the established fact in 2025 as opposed to the early 2020 crisis phase.

5.2.4 For Policymakers

The results indicate that a broader adoption of flexible work policies could increase worker well-being and productivity.

5.3 Limitations

Every study has limitations that should be acknowledged. This research is based on a small sample of 61 respondents, which limits how far the findings can be generalised. It also used convenience sampling, meaning younger, urban, and tech-savvy employees may be overrepresented. Since the study is cross-sectional, it captures only a single point in time and does not reflect long-term WFH effects. In addition, the data is self-reported and may include bias, and the model considers only limited variables despite many other factors influencing WFH outcomes.

5.4 Scope for Future Research

Longitudinal studies could be used in future research to examine the long-term effects of WFH. We may be able to better understand how home responsibilities affect remote work situations thanks to gender-focused studies conducted in India. Leadership, home environment, internet quality might all be studied using sophisticated techniques like structural equation modelling.

REFERENCES

Alexander, A., De Smet, A., Langstaff, M., & Ravid, D. (2021). What employees are saying about the future of remote work. McKinsey & Company.

Allen, T. D., Golden, T. D., & Shockley, K. M. (2015). How effective is telecommuting? *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 16(2), 40–68.

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands-resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(3), 309–328.

Bloom, N., Liang, J., Roberts, J., & Ying, Z. J. (2015). Does working from home work? Evidence from a Chinese experiment. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 130(1), 165–218.

Bloom, N. (2022). The great working from home experiment. Stanford Institute for Economic Policy Research.

Choudhury, P., Foroughi, C., & Larson, B. Z. (2020). Work-from-anywhere: The productivity effects of geographic flexibility. *Strategic Management Journal*, 42(4), 655–683.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. Plenum Press.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The 'what' and 'why' of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), 227–268.

Gajendran, R. S., & Harrison, D. A. (2007). The good, the bad, and the unknown about telecommuting. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(6), 1524–1541.

Green, S. B. (1991). How many subjects does it take to do a regression analysis? *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 26(3), 499–510.

Herzberg, F. (1959). *The motivation to work*. John Wiley & Sons.

International Labour Organization. (2024). *World employment and social outlook: Trends 2024*. ILO Publications.

McKinsey Global Institute. (2023). *The future of work after COVID-19*. McKinsey & Company.

NASSCOM. (2024). *India's digital talent landscape: Remote work and hybrid employment report*. NASSCOM Publications.

Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2019). *Research methods for business students* (8th ed.). Pearson Education.

Toscano, F., & Zappalà, S. (2020). Social isolation and stress as predictors of productivity perception and remote work satisfaction. *Sustainability*, 12(23), 9804.

Yang, L., et al. (2021). The effects of remote work on collaboration among information workers. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 6(1), 43–54.

ANNEXURE: SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Survey Title: Impact of Work from Home Policies on Employee Productivity and Job Satisfaction

Delhi School of Management, Delhi Technological University

Instructions: Please answer all questions honestly. Your responses are completely confidential and used only for academic research. There are no right or wrong answers — your real experience is what matters.

Section A: About You

1. Name (Optional): _____

2. Age Group: Below 25 / 25–35 / 36–45 / Above 45

3. Gender: Male / Female / Prefer not to say

4. Sector: IT / Education / Finance / Marketing / Healthcare / Other: _____

5. Occupation: Private Sector / Govt/PSU / Self-Employed / Academic

6. Work Arrangement: Fully Remote / Hybrid / Back to Office (with WFH exp.)

7. WFH Duration: <6 months / 6–12 months / 1–2 years / >2 years

Section B: WFH and Your Productivity

Rate each statement: 1 = Strongly Disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Neutral 4 = Agree 5 = Strongly Agree

#	Statement	Rating (1–5)
8.	Working from home lets me finish my tasks more efficiently than in office.	1 2 3 4 5
9.	I find it easier to focus and concentrate when working from home.	1 2 3 4 5
10.	WFH has helped me manage my time better during the day.	1 2 3 4 5
11.	I face fewer interruptions at home compared to the office.	1 2 3 4 5
12.	The quality of my work output has improved since working from home.	1 2 3 4 5

Section C: WFH and Your Job Satisfaction

Rate each statement: 1 = Strongly Disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Neutral 4 = Agree 5 = Strongly Agree

#	Statement	Rating (1–5)
13.	I feel more satisfied with my job since working from home or going hybrid.	1 2 3 4 5
14.	WFH has improved my overall work-life balance and personal wellbeing.	1 2 3 4 5
15.	I stay motivated and engaged in my work even when working from home.	1 2 3 4 5

#	Statement	Rating (1–5)
16.	I feel isolated or disconnected from my team when working from home. (Note: Higher score = more isolation = unfavourable)	1 2 3 4 5
17.	I would choose to continue my current WFH arrangement if given the option.	1 2 3 4 5

Section D: Benefits and Challenges

18. What are the biggest BENEFITS of WFH for you? (Tick all that apply)

☐ No commute ☐ Flexible hours ☐ Better work-life balance ☐ More focus
☐ Less stress ☐ Cost savings ☐ More family time ☐ Other: _____

19. What are the biggest CHALLENGES of WFH for you? (Tick all that apply)

☐ Work-life blur ☐ Isolation ☐ Communication issues ☐ Home distractions
☐ Screen fatigue ☐ No office resources ☐ Career concerns ☐ Other: _____

20. Overall, how satisfied are you with your WFH arrangement?

1 = Very Dissatisfied 2 = Dissatisfied 3 = Neutral 4 = Satisfied 5 = Very Satisfied

Rating: 1 2 3 4 5

Thank you for participating in this survey!

Your inputs are genuinely appreciated and will contribute to this research.