

Managing Work from Anywhere: Six Points to Consider for HR Professionals

Susanna Allstrin

The Ratio Institute, Stockholm, Sweden, e-mail: susanna.allstrin@ratio.se

Jonas Grafström

The Ratio Institute & Luleå University of Technology, e-mail: jonas.grafstrom@ratio.se

Lotta Stern

The Ratio Institute & Stockholm University, e-mail: charlotta.stern@ratio.se

Linda Weidenstedt*

The Ratio Institute & Stockholm University, e-mail: linda.weidenstedt@ratio.se

Abstract

Purpose: The aim of this study is to assist human resource practitioners, leaders, and managers in their decision-making processes regarding the future of remote work by contributing with insights into, and synthesis of, existing research regarding working from home and working from anywhere.

Design/methodology/approach: We conducted a general review of the international literature in the fields of remote work, work from home, and work from anywhere with the aim to inductively discern themes research hitherto has dealt with.

Findings: We identified three larger themes: (1) productivity and efficiency, (2) remote leadership, and (3) work environment and work-life balance, each incorporating subthemes that contribute to a greater understanding of relevant topics in the context of remote work. In order to provide relevant information regarding the research front and guidance towards worthwhile considerations for HR professionals, leaders, and managers, we summarize our results in six concise points, each suggesting relevant questions to assess in relation to the future of remote work.

Originality: Companies will be forced to determine how to approach the post-Covid era and establish a new status quo regarding the future of office work that, ideally, will be mutually beneficial for employers and employees—whether it incorporates office, remote, or hybrid work. To the best of our knowledge a general review of the literature on remote work with specific, evidence-based, points to consider for HR professionals has not yet been undertaken.

Keywords: working from home (WFH), working from anywhere (WFA), remote work, future of work, human resource management, HR professionals

JEL classification: E61, O32, Q2, Q58

The paper was presented digitally on November 2nd 2021 as part of Ratio's seminar series.

*All authors have contributed to and are equally responsible for the paper. SA was responsible for collecting and summarizing previous research on remote work. SA and LW have jointly written the English version of this paper; JG and LS have contributed with text, revisions, and advice. Thanks to Johanna Grönbäck for reading the Swedish version of this work and for giving valuable feedback.

Introduction

As Covid-19 turned into a global pandemic, the workplaces of millions of people shifted from offices to homes and in many countries almost half of the workforce worked from home in periods of high infection rates (Brynjolfsson et al. 2020). Companies were forced to implement remote work on a large scale for the first time—and it is possible that some of these changes will remain.

The stigma surrounding remote work, working from anywhere (WFA), and in particular working from home (WFH), seems to have faded and is no longer equated with dodging one's job responsibilities (Barrero et al. 2020). In addition, previous thresholds for the implementation of remote work, such as investment costs and coordination problems, as well as preconceptions and expectations, have been overridden (Barrero et al. 2020). With the forced shift to WFH, new innovations have emerged that support, enhance and facilitate smoother ways of working remotely: Patent applications for WFH technologies in the US more than doubled in 2020 (Bloom et al. 2020).

Both employers' and employees' interest in WFA has grown and so has the body of literature investigating how work could or should be organized in the future (Citrin & DeRosa 2021): While some employees desire to return to the office, others will prefer to continue WFA. Thus, companies will be forced to determine how to approach the post-Covid era and establish a new status quo that, ideally, will be mutually beneficial for employers and employees—whether it incorporates office, remote, or hybrid work.

In light of these changes, the aim of this study is to assist human resource practitioners, leaders, and managers in their decision-making processes regarding the future of remote work by contributing insights into, and synthesis of, existing research regarding working from home and working from anywhere. We do so by means of a general literature review, summarizing the main areas of interest in previous research, and by providing insights regarding three of the most researched themes so far: 1) productivity and efficiency; 2) remote leadership; and 3) work environment and work-life balance. Based on these themes we present six questions that provide food for thought by highlighting important topics that HR practitioners might want to consider in order to make informed decisions regarding the future of office work.

Productivity and Efficiency

Employee preferences are an important factor to consider for companies when planning for the future of (office) work. However, beyond preferences, one major concern for companies is the

question of how employees' performance may change when working remotely. Since the quality of performed work tasks is usually discussed in terms of productivity, one key issue to contemplate is thus how productivity is affected by remote work settings. Previous research shows that the answer depends on several factors.

International research indicates that employee productivity in remote work varies depending on the degree of digital competence (Eurofound & ILO 2017; Russo et al. 2021), boredom and distractions (Golden & Vega 2008; Martinez-Sanchez et al. 2008; Russo et al. 2021; Tremblay & Genin 2007), stress levels (Toscano & Zappalà 2020), the degree of communication with colleagues (Nakrošienė et al. 2019; Russo et al. 2021), resource and environmental constraints (lack of workplace equipment and software) (Eurofound & ILO 2017; Wong et al. 2020), social isolation (Galanti et al. 2021), autonomy (Galanti et al. 2021), and work-life balance (Wong et al. 2020). Country specific influences, however, make drawing distinct conclusions pertaining to productivity development difficult. One reason is that productivity is often measured based on employees' subjective experiences of their performance, which can both be under- and overestimated. Gajendran and Harrison (2007) find that telecommuting has a positive impact on objective measures of performance, but not on self-rated performances.

Productivity during Pandemic WFH

The most recent studies on remote work and its effect on productivity have all been conducted in the context of the Covid-19 pandemic, where stress, anxiety, grief, hard lockdowns, quarantines, and not least closed schools and preschools, have subjected people to constantly changing and unforeseen situations that impact their work environment, working conditions, and possibly their productivity (Barrero et al. 2020; European Commission 2020).

Some studies find that WFH has increased productivity during the pandemic (Baert et al. 2020; Barrero et al. 2020; Criscuolo et al. 2021; Ipsen et al. 2020; Ozimek 2020), while others show that it has decreased (Bartik et al. 2020; Gibbs et al. 2021; Moretti et al. 2020; Morikawa 2020) or remained the same as before the pandemic (Beno & Hvorecky 2021). The discrepancy between different findings may be due to the fact that remote workers are a heterogeneous population with different needs and prerequisites (Bolisani et al. 2020).

An alternative way of studying productivity during the pandemic is to examine objective productivity measures, for instance occupations in the knowledge economy where productivity was not impacted by the supply of raw materials or a declining customer base. One such field is academia where the number of scientific publications could be an indicator for productivity

(Schurchkov et al. 2020). For academics, the possibility of WFH has to a larger extent than for other occupations always been a part of their working lives, and thus the change to pandemic WFH was presumably less remarkable (with the caveat of having to homeschool/take care of children at home).

Cui et al. (2021) studied 76,000 academics' publications all around the world over a period of ten weeks. They found that productivity, measured as the number of publications, increased by 35 percent, with female academics' publication productivity being 13.2 percent lower than that of their male colleagues. Based on their studies of academics' productivity, both Myers et al. (2020) and Schurchkov et al. (2020) argue that female researchers seem to have allocated their time between different work tasks differently, but also between work and private life: Research has consistently shown that women on average take greater responsibility for home and family life (Bianchi et al. 2012), which likely affected their productivity during pandemic WFH.

Similar effects of pandemic WFH can be expected to apply to contexts outside of academia. There might, however, be differences between sectors, industries, occupations, and countries depending on the distribution of older vs younger, and parents vs non-parents in the labor force.

Pre-Pandemic WFA Productivity

Productivity of remote workers during the pandemic can only tell us so much about WFA performance in general. To understand which factors to consider before making decisions on the future of office work, research on remote work *before* the pandemic is also relevant.

Pre-pandemic research on remote work suggests that employees rate their productivity as higher when working remotely (Angelici & Profeta 2020; Bailey & Kurland 2002; Beauregard et al. 2013; Fonner & Roloff 2010; Golden & Veiga 2008; Lasfargue & Fauconnier 2015; Martinez -Sanchez et al. 2008; Trembley & Genin 2007). In a randomized experimental study at a call center in China, for instance, productivity was measured as the number of calls made. Productivity increased by up to 22 percent as a result of a voluntary shift to remote work (Bloom et al. 2015). Employees who had chosen to work remotely tended to be happier, less likely to resign, and more productive compared to the control group working at the office. Employees who worked remotely made, on average, 13.5 percent more calls. The increase in productivity was, according to the study, due to a quieter work environment, more worked hours due to less commuting and less time spent on breaks or sick leave.

However, *the type* of work that is executed remotely has an impact on how well WFA works: Monteiro et al. (2019) found that remote work in general had a negative impact (-2.3%) on productivity, especially in small and non-exporting companies with non-demanding tasks (-19%). In contrast, companies working with research and development reported a positive change in productivity. This is in line with Dutcher's (2012) study, indicating that remote work can have a positive effect on productivity particularly for creative tasks and a negative impact for routine tasks. The reason for the difference in productivity is unclear, but Dutcher addresses peer effects as possible impact, i.e., a monitoring function between office workers. Similarly, temporal and geographical flexibility can be of importance. Choudhury et al. (2020) studied how productivity was affected when employees were given the opportunity to WFA rather than WFH, with employees' average productivity increasing by 4.4 percent.

The question is whether remote work has a continuous effect on productivity. OECD's (2020, p. 13) report on productivity gains from remote working presents a curvilinear relationship between efficiency and the proportion of work that takes place remotely, where efficiency increases initially but decreases when more than half of the working hours are executed remotely. This curvilinear relationship implies that employees' possible preferences for working from anywhere are not necessarily aligned with what is best for the company in terms of productivity and neither is a *complete* transition to remote work necessarily preferable. Rather, the offer of *increased* flexibility through WFA is what makes the difference for employees.

1. Assess whether the company should offer voluntary solutions for hybrid/part-time remote work.

Summarizing, existing research, both pre-pandemic and during the pandemic, indicates that productivity increases the most in cases where employees choose whether to work remotely or at the office (Beno & Hvorecky 2021; Fana et al. 2020; Gajendran & Harrison 2007; OECD 2020; Wong et al. 2020). The number of working hours executed remotely matters as well, where a moderate amount of remote work has been shown to have the best effect (Allen et al. 2015; Lasfargue & Fauconnier 2015).

Indirect Productivity

Aside from directly influencing a company's output through employees' efficiency and motivation, remote work can have an indirect impact on a company's productivity through the

reduction of a company's expenses and the redirection of the thus saved capital to areas that can increase productivity and innovation (OECD 2020). It can also improve matching opportunities and reduce staff turnover. Certain industries across the globe (like healthcare and IT) have difficulties recruiting the right skills. Part of solving the recruitment problem could be greater geographical flexibility: If skills are geographically independent, WFA facilitates access to larger geographical areas and pool of skills—making it easier to find the right competence. Research confirms this logic, showing that WFA can be a way to attract new employees (Clancy 2020; Gajendran & Harrison 2007): The degree of geographical flexibility can be decisive for the decision to accept or resign from a job (Gallup 2017).

In addition, more flexible working conditions can help companies succeed better in retaining their staff. The argument is supported by a meta-study done by Martin and MacDonnell (2012) that shows that reducing staff turnover can be a factor that contributes positively to the company's productivity, especially if the training period is long. In addition, saved costs from reduced staff turnover can be redirected to innovation investments.

2. Assess whether the company would gain from offering solutions for (hybrid) remote work considering its skill supply and employee retention.

In sum, the flexibility of WFA creates significant competitive advantages for companies. Some reports from the US suggest that companies risk losing skills if they withdraw the opportunity to work remotely after the pandemic (Indeed 2018; Orrell & Leger 2020; Owl Labs 2019). One report states that as many as 75 percent of companies experience positive effects on retaining their staff by offering WFA (BEST 2020). Thus, the question companies need to ask themselves is whether they can afford not to offer WFA or hybrid solutions at all.

Remote Leadership

A study of American call centers shows that more productive employees often choose to work at the office due to not wanting to jeopardize their career opportunities (Emanuel & Harrington 2021). What this result brings to the fore is the question of which consequences WFA can have on employees—beyond the logic of performance. If employees feel WFA could potentially threaten their career development, we need to ask what this tells us about remote leadership. Therefore, we synthesize literature on leadership in remote settings and hope to stimulate a thought process on these topics that helps human resource management and development professionals in their decision-making.

Managers' Attitudes Towards WFA

Regarding the topic of leadership, one important aspect is the question of what managers think about remote work and about having to lead remotely. An OECD survey shows that employees have become positively inclined towards various forms of WFA during the pandemic (Criscuolo et al. 2021). In contrast, according to Wong et al. (2020), managers are less optimistic compared to their coworkers (see also Carillo et. al 2020), with more than 70 percent of managers in OECD countries believing that remote working impedes teamwork and impairs employees' loyalty (Criscuolo et al. 2021). Managers need to avoid an overly active WFA leadership when trying to compensate for the missing face-to-face interaction, while at the same time ensuring certain levels of work performances (Richardson 2010). A more consensus-oriented leadership style with less power distance and more communication, involvement, and co-determination seems to be more successful when managing co-workers, but the question is how such a consensus-oriented leadership style can be achieved in WFA settings.

Research shows that the reduction of spontaneous "water cooler communication" leads to digital leaders showing less interest in their employees beyond a pure professional interaction (McGregor & Doshi 2020). According to McGregor and Doshi (2020), there are three key factors that managers should consider when leading employees remotely: Creating an interesting environment during digital meetings, creating a sense of purpose where employees feel that they are contributing, and creating opportunities for individual development. If WFA is to work well in the long run, companies may want to evaluate the need for tools that facilitate digital leadership and methods for exercising leadership at a distance, such as competence development among managers.

Trust, Empowerment, and Communication

Another relevant aspect of WFA leadership is the question of trust, where Cortellazzo et al. (2019) found that delegation and the transfer of responsibilities to employees are important ways to communicate trust and confidence in employees (Neeley 2021; Terkamo-Moisio et al. 2021). Previous research on empowerment has shown that trust, in turn, can lead to psychological empowerment, meaning employees perceive their work as meaningful, they feel competent in their work role, have the possibility to act autonomously, and feel they have an impact on the organization (Spreitzer 1995). Particularly self-determination in terms of task execution seems to play a crucial role for employee empowerment, well-being, and performance in the context of WFA, according to Gajendran and Harrison (2007). Considering that a study from Sri Lanka shows that empowerment fosters increased commitment among

remote workers (Manjaree & Perera 2021), it becomes apparent that manager's potential urge to become detail oriented and to control employees' work performance would be detrimental to employees' empowerment (Kniffin et al. 2021; Lee 2021; Stoker et al. 2021).

An aspect that is crucial and necessary for both trust and empowerment is communication (Terkamo-Moisio et al. 2021). For employees to be able to use their autonomy effectively, employees and managers need to be clear on expectations towards each other, where distinct key performance indicators with clear goals and achievements can be helpful and "presence" at the office as an approximation for performance can be detrimental (Aloisi & De Stefano 2021). Rather, remote managers need competence in communicating the meaning of, intention behind and goals with their instructions and assignments to create a mandate and decision-making capacity among employees (Walvoord et al. 2008).

3. Assess whether your managers trust their employees and whether they are willing to delegate and share responsibilities even in remote work settings.

In sum, successful communication where managers succeed in conveying empathy, trust, and consideration creates feelings of security, thus strengthening relationships between managers and employees, and of perceiving the manager as fair (Walvoord et al. 2008; Sukoco et al. 2020; Terkamo-Moisio et al. 2021). This, in turn, generates a sense of organizational support (Lee 2021; see also Daraba et al. 2021).

Organizational Culture

Being able to carry out one's work tasks successfully is to a certain degree dependent on the establishment of relationships: Research shows that networking is one of the most important aspects regarding career development (Wolff & Moser 2009). Some researchers even claim that networking is more important than talent, intelligence, courage, luck, or hard work (Burt 2004; Morrison 2002). Career studies of analysts, bank officials, and managers show that as much as half of all variation in career success is due to the difference in having an open or closed network, as people with an open network are exposed to different ideas and impressions (Granovetter 1983)—which can be turned into innovation, creativity, and productivity.

From the point of view of social network analysis, remote work thus means facing the challenge of networking and cooperating digitally, which can complicate teamwork and joint collaborations (Dutcher 2012; Gajendran & Harrison 2007; Orrell & Leger 2020). As Allen and Shockley (2009) show, remote workers seem to have greater difficulties with project coordination if they depend on their coworkers, and they feel that WFA impinges team spirit

(Baert et al. 2020; Turetken et al. 2011). This situation is aggravated in cases of hybrid solutions, where some employees choose the office while others choose WFA (Kossek et al. 2015) and a dynamic of "A- and B-teams" develops that risks impairing cooperation. A divide into "us-and-them" between office and WFA groups may, not least over time, lead to communication gaps between groups, possibly leading to a weakened cohesion and organizational culture (Gibbs et al. 2021; Orrell & Leger 2020; Terkamo-Moisio et al. 2021).

Cohesion and community have been shown to promote loyalty and reduce turnover (Gusfield 1975; Seppälä & Cameron 2015). On the one hand, cohesion is formed through informal contact, such as chatting over a cup of tea (Bonet & Salvadora 2017). On the other hand, cohesion is created when autonomous groups are jointly responsible for decision making and share practices that maintain the community spirit (Bellah et al. 1985). It can also be achieved through a sense of belonging, care for one another, integration, and emotional support (McMillan & Chavis 1986; Terkamo-Moisio et al. 2021), which contributes to better health and well-being, motivation, empowerment, job satisfaction, and retention (Boyd 2014; Boyd & Nowell 2014; Burroughs & Eby 1998; McMillan 2011; Nowell & Boyd 2010).

Particularly in relation to employee retention, the aspect of A- and B-teams, with managers possibly preferring to have employees on site, can have negative consequences for employees. Although it may be worthwhile for employees to belong to the B-team if they appreciate flexibility and the opportunity to work remotely, research shows that remote workers' wages and promotional opportunities tend to lag (see Bloom et al. 2015; Khalifa & Davidson 2000). This might be an indication of larger processes of career impediment, for instance in cases where the office team happens to get assigned more prestigious work tasks, while contributions made by the WFA team go unnoticed—dynamics that can promote a sense of injustice between employees (Kossek et al. 2015). Here, clear performance measures can create transparency regarding wage and career development.

4. Assess the risk of an us-and-them fragmentation between office and remote workers and how it can be prevented through clear communication and KPIs.

In light of the research on the impact of remote work on organizational culture, the following questions might be of relevance: How are relationships built and maintained within the company? How is the offer of flexibility framed and on what grounds is remote work allowed or office work demanded? Are performance measures and guidelines clearly communicated

and easy to assess? Summarizing, to maintain a good corporate culture the above-mentioned risks may be worthwhile to consider (Kossek et al. 2015).

Work Environment and Work-Life Balance

With the pandemic's serious health threats, working from home was adopted by many people all over the world to ensure their own and other's safety. However, what the situation of quickly being forced into a home office setting also made clear is that aspects such as housing situation, home-office equipment, family situation, individual (technical competence), and psychosocial aspects regarding isolation cannot be ignored as they are crucial factors influencing not only performance but above all employee well-being. In the following section we present two areas of interest regarding the question of work environment and work-life balance: Office space vs home office, and work-life balance

Office Space vs Home Office

The sudden shift to remote work—and thus empty offices—during the pandemic emphasized the costs involved for the employer in providing and maintaining expensive office spaces. An increase in remote work could allow for smaller offices with fewer workplaces, and thus a decrease in costs. In San Francisco, for example, companies are estimated to save \$6,000 per employee in reduced office needs, while the corresponding figure in Detroit is \$1,500 (Stanton & Tiwari 2021).

Still, while remote work may be a potential cash cow for employers, it is evident that remote work can become an expensive affair for the employee. Stanton and Tiwari (2021) studied individuals' increased spending by comparing the size and cost of housing among Americans who worked from home before the pandemic. Those who worked from home lived in residences that on average were 5–7 percent larger than those who worked in office spaces. For remote workers, the housing was also slightly more expensive in terms of square footage.

Thus, while companies may be downsizing their office spaces, it is reasonable to assume that companies will (have to) develop alternative ways of taking care of, and financially support, their employees' workplaces: Part of what companies save in office costs is likely to be transferred to employees in the form of pay raises that will be necessary if employees must find larger accommodations with enough space for a home office. In the US, extra costs for employees' home office setup corresponded to an income bonus of 10–15 percent for households in the lowest ten percent income segment, while those in the 80s- and 90s-income

segment were estimated to need about a three percent income bonus to finance a home office (Stanton & Tiwari 2021).

Apart from financial aspects, however, remote work from home has also been shown to lead to a variety of ergonomic risks, such as pain in joints and muscles (Charalampous et al. 2019; Eurofound 2020). Moretti et al. (2020) found in their study conducted during the pandemic that seven out of ten remote workers in Italy reported some form of pain in muscles or joints, often involving lower back and neck problems. Gerding et al. (2020) show in their study on employees in the US that more than four out of ten report mild to severe problems in their neck, head, or shoulders as a result of working from home.

The main reason for ergonomic problems seems to be poor posture due to bad office equipment (Davis et al. 2020; Gerding et al. 2021) since home offices are not always adapted to the needs of remote work, with chairs and desks of inadequate ergonomic quality possibly leading to physical health issues.

However, despite such obvious problems, it is difficult to determine whether companies should support employees' home offices financially. On the one hand, this is due to questions of work environment legislation and the question of who is responsible if employees get injuries *despite* their company paying for equipment. On the other hand, financing home offices could very well mean that companies in practice pay for two office spaces per employee, particularly in cases where employees are allowed to choose for themselves whether to work in the office or from home—and how often. An alternative to financing home offices could therefore be to offer employees workplaces in co-working spaces. Co-working spaces are becoming increasingly popular in big cities and provide equipped, remote offices.

- 5. a) Assess how your company can contribute to an ergonomically safe workplace in people's homes.**
- b) Assess whether co-working spaces close to home can be more suitable than financing employees' home offices.**

In sum, work environment acts, regulations, and legislations may have to be updated to fit a new reality where more employees want to work from home—or elsewhere—and where employers would like to save costs. Not least in the context of recruitment and retention, as discussed above, can co-working spaces close to employees' homes facilitate greater possibilities of a geographically independent recruitment strategy.

Work-Life Balance

When it comes to remote work from home, physical health is only one side of the coin, since the flexibility WFH provides is accompanied by risks regarding mental health and work-life balance, such as boundary issues. Working from home may lead to difficulties maintaining clear boundaries between work and leisure—to the point where they might become completely intertwined (Hartig et al. 2007; Rafnsdóttir & Júlíusdóttir 2018). Digitalization generally gives rise to boundary issues (Grunau et al. 2017) and was subject to discussions and research already before the pandemic. However, an increase in remote work gives cause for concern since boundary issues can create stress and anxiety.

Although this kind of work-lifestyle might be harmful to some, it is also perceived as creating possibilities for other ways of combining work and private life. Research shows that remote work is appreciated among many employees due to its flexibility and freedom and the fact that a lot of time can be saved for those usually commuting to the office, thus creating greater balance between work and private life and greater overall well-being (Angelicit & Profeta 2020; Baert et al. 2020; Charalampous et al. 2019; Eurofound 2020; Fonner & Roloff 2010; Gajendran & Harrison 2007; Rafnsdóttir & Júlíusdóttir 2018). Greater well-being, in turn, can increase overall (job) satisfaction, promote happiness in employees, and increase performance (Bataineh 2019; Noda 2020).

During the pandemic, women in particular have been shown to be positively inclined towards WFH (Hiselius & Arnfalk 2021). Studies show that a large proportion of women—especially women with children—find that juggling work and family has become easier during the pandemic due to remote working (Baert et al. 2020). The fact that mainly women experience stress relief when working from home could be due to remote work reducing the complexity of combining work and family life (Baert et al. 2020). However, some studies show that remote work has increased the total amount of time that men spend on childcare (Angelici & Profeta 2020; Carli 2020; Sevilla & Smith 2020), which could indicate that men's share of responsibility for home and care work also will increase if employees have the possibility to work from home in the future (Alon et al. 2020).

Considering the above results, the possibility that predominantly women will be interested in WFH/WFA alternatives in the future adds another dimension to the discussed problem of A- and B-teams, or in-and-out-groups. According to Criscuolo et al. (2021) women in OECD countries reported a fear of reduced career opportunities during the pandemic when working from home, on the account of their performance going unseen by colleagues and managers. Depending on future circumstances, remote work may thus risk negatively

influencing women's wage and career development (see Allen et al. 2015; Emanuel & Harrington 2021; Glass 2004). ‘

However, the opposite might be true as well: Being able to work from anywhere and reduce work-life balance related stress could increase women's productivity and have an accelerating effect on wage and career development. Gajendran and Harrison (2007) find in their meta-analysis that the samples that had a greater proportion of women in them experienced greater advantages concerning improved work performance and improved career prospects when telecommuting. Telecommuting might particularly have a positive effect on working mothers' salaries. Lundborg et al. (2017) find in their natural experiment made in Denmark that mothers to a greater extent choose to work in less-well-paid jobs closer to home, reducing the distance from work by 44 percent. WFA can therefore potentially increase the wages of working mothers by them not having to choose between commuting and better paid jobs.

6. Assess whether offering WFA solutions might affect male and female employees differently.

Summarizing, discussions about and solutions for healthy boundaries and mental well-being at work might become more important than ever in a flexible future work setting. Furthermore, given that many companies strive for greater gender equality, assessing prerequisites and possible solutions for the role of WFA in women's (working) lives might be worthwhile.

Conclusion

A global study by McKinsey & Company (Alexander et al. 2021) highlighted the importance of employers communicating their post-pandemic office arrangements for employees all around the world. Organizations that provided more detail on how they will handle remote work in the future, largely increased their productivity, as well as well-being among the employees. In contrast, employees that worked in organizations that vaguely, if at all, communicated their plans for post-pandemic work stated that they felt worried or anxious (Alexander et al. 2021).

In other words, it is of great importance that organizations inform their employees as soon as possible about how their future working lives will look like. Here, sensible decisions based on evidence-based knowledge are needed. The purpose of this article is to provide a scientific foundation that facilitates discussions, processes and decisions for HR professionals,

leaders, and managers, as well as other people with supporting functions in companies. The six points that have been crystallized in the article offer a guideline for relevant considerations and necessary evaluations that might be valuable in order to make informed decisions about the future of remote work.

References

- Alexander, A., De Smet, A., Langstaff, M. & D. Ravid (2021). "What Employees are Saying About the Future of Remote work". *McKinsey & Company*. 1st of April. <https://www.mckinsey.com/business-functions/organization/our-insights/what-employees-are-saying-about-the-future-of-remote-work> (Accessed: 2021-09-15)
- Allen, T. D. & K. Shockley (2009). "Flexible Work Arrangements: Help or Hype?". In Crane, D. R. & E. J. Hill (Ed.) *Handbook of Families and Work: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. (p. 265–284). Lanham: University Press of America.
- Allen, T. D., Golden, T. D. & K. M. Shockley (2015). "How Effective Is Telecommuting? Assessing the Status of Our Scientific Findings". *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 16(2): 40–68.
- Aloisi, A. & V. De Stefano (2021). "Essential Jobs, Remote Work and Digital Surveillance: Addressing the COVID-19 Pandemic Panopticon." *International Labour Review*. doi.org/10.1111/ilr.12219
- Alon, T., Doepke, M., Olmstead-Rumsey, J. & M. Tertilt (2020). "The Impact of Covid-19 on Gender Equality". NBER Working Paper No. 26947. National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Angelici, M. & P. Profeta (2020). "Smart-Working: Work Flexibility without Constraints". CESifo Working Papers 8165.
- Baert, S., Lippens, L., Moens, E., Sterkens, P. & J. Weytjens (2020). "The COVID-19 Crisis and Remote work: A Research Survey on Experiences, Expectations and Hopes". Discussion paper Series No. 13229, IZA Institute of Labor Economics.
- Bailey, D. E. & N. B. Kurland (2002). "A Review of Remote work Research: Findings, New Directions, and Lessons for the Study of Modern Work". *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23(4): 383–400.
- Barrero J. M., Bloom, N. & S. J. Davis (2020). "Why Working From Home Will Stick". Working Paper No. 2020-174. Becker Friedman Institute.
- Bartik, A. W., Cullen, Z. B., Glaeser, A. L., Luca, M. & C. T. Stanton (2020). "What Jobs are Being Done at Home During the Covid-19 Crisis? Evidence from Firm-Level Surveys". NBER Working Paper 27422. National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Bataineh, K.A. (2019) "Impact of Work-Life-Balance, Happiness at Work, on Employee Performance". *International Business Research* 12(2): 1-14. doi:[10.5539/ibr.v12n2p99](https://doi.org/10.5539/ibr.v12n2p99).
- Beauregard, T. A., Basile, K. & E. Canonico (2013). *Home is Where the Work Is: A New Study of Homeworking in Acas – and Beyond*. London: Acas.
- Bellah, R. N., Madsen, N., Sullivan, W. M., Swidler, A. & S. M. Tipton (1985). *Habits of the Heart: Individualism and Commitment in American life*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Beno, M. & J. Hvorecky (2021). "Data on an Austrian Company's Productivity in the Pre-Covid-19 Era, During the Lockdown and After Its Easing: To Work Remotely or Not?". *Frontiers in Communication*, 6(641199).
- BEST (2020). *The Rise of the Remote Workforce: Benefits, Behaviors and BEST Practices*. BEST Human Capital & Advisory Group. <https://bhcgagroup.com/remote-workforce> (Accessed: 2021-09-15)

- Bianchi, S. M., Sayer, L. C., Milkie, M. A. & J. P. Robinson (2012). "Housework: Who Did, Does or Will Do It, and How Much Does It Matter?". *Social forces*, 91(1): 55–63.
- Bloom, N., Liang, J., Roberts, J. & Z. J. Ying (2015). "Does Working From Home Work? Evidence from a Chinese Experiment". *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 130(1): 165–218.
- Bloom, N., Davis, S. J. & Y. Zhestkova (2020). "COVID-19 Shifted Patent Applications toward Technologies that Support Working from Home". Working paper no. 2020-133. Becker Friedman Institute.
- Bolisani, E., Scarso, E., Ipsen, C., Kirchner, K. & J. P. Hansen (2020). "Working From Home During COVID-19 Pandemic: Lessons Learned and Issues". *Management & Marketing Challenges for the Knowledge Society*, 15(s1): 458–475.
- Bonet, R. & F. Salvadora (2017), "When the Boss Is Away: Manager-Worker Separation and Worker Performance in a Multisite Software Maintenance Organization", *Organization Science*, 28(2): 244–261.
- Boyd, N. M. (2014). "A 10-Year Retrospective of Organizational Studies in Community Psychology: Content, Theory, and Impact". *Journal of Community Psychology*, 42(2): 237–254.
- Boyd, N. M. & Nowell, B. (2014). "Psychological Sense of Community: A New Construct for the Field of Management". *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 23(2): 107–122.
- Brynjolfsson, E., Horton, J. J., Ozimek, A., Rock, D., Sharma, G. & H. Y. TuYe (2020). "COVID-19 and Remote Work: An Early Look at US Data". NBER Working Paper No. 27344. National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Burroughs, S. & L. Eby (1998). "Psychological Sense of Community at Work: A Measurement System and Explanatory Framework". *Journal of community psychology*, 26(6): 509–532.
- Carillo, K., Cachat-Rosset, G., Marsan, J., Saba, T. & A. Klarsfeld (2020). "Adjusting to epidemic-induced remote work: empiric insights from remote workers in France". *European Journal of Information Systems*, 30(1): 69–88.
- Carli, L. L. (2020). "Women, Gender Equality and COVID-19". *Gender in Management: An International Journal*, 35(7/8): 647–655.
- Charalampous, M., Grant, C. A., Tramontano, C. & E. Michailidis (2019). "Systematically Reviewing Remote E-Workers' Well-Being at Work: A Multidimensional Approach". *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 28(1): 51–73.
- Choudhury, P., Foroughi, C. & B. Z. Larson (2020). "Work-From-Anywhere: The Productivity Effects of Geographic Flexibility". *Strategic Management Journal*, 42(4): 655–683.
- Citrin, J. M. & D. DeRosa (2021). *Leading at a Distance: Practical Lessons for Virtual Success*. Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.
- Clancy, M. (2020), "The Case for Remote Work". Economics Working Papers No. 20007. Iowa State University, Department of Economics, https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/econ_workingpapers/102
- Cortellazzo, L., Bruni, E. & R. Zampieri (2019). "The Role of Leadership in a Digitalized World: A Review". *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10: 1938. doi: [10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01938](https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01938)

- Criscuolo, C., Gal, P., Leidecker, T., Losma, F. & G. Nicoletti (2021). *The Role of Remote work for Productivity and Well-Being During and Post-COVID-19: Key Highlights of an OECD Survey Among Managers and Workers*. OECD. Global Forum on Productivity.
- Cui, R., Ding, H. & F. Zhu (2021). "Gender Inequality in Research Productivity During the COVID-19 Pandemic". *Manufacturing & Service Operations Management*. Upcoming.
- Daraba, D., Wirawan, H., Salam, R. & M. Faisal (2021). "Working From Home During the Corona Pandemic: Investigating the Role of Authentic Leadership, Psychological Capital, and Gender on Employee Performance". *Cogent Business & Management* 8(1): 1–17.
- Davis, K. G., Kotowski, S. E., Daniel, D., Gerding, T., Naylor, J. och M. Syck (2020). "The Home Office: Ergonomic Lessons From the 'New Normal'". *Ergonomics in Design: The Quarterly of Human Factors Applications*, 28(4).
- Doshi, N. & L. McGregor (2015). *Primed to Perform*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Dutcher, E. G. (2012). "The Effects of Telecommuting on Productivity: An Experimental Examination. The Role of Dull and Creative Tasks". *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 84(1): 355–363.
- Emanuel, N. & E. Harrington (2021). "'Working' Remotely? Selection, Treatment and the Market Provision of Remote Work (JMP)". Working paper. Harvard University. <https://scholar.harvard.edu/eharrington/publications/working-remotely-selection-treatment-and-market-provision-remote-work>
- Eurofound (2020). *Remote work and ICT-based Mobile Work: Flexible Working in the Digital Age*. New forms of employment series. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
- Eurofound & the International Labour Office (2017). *Working Anytime, Anywhere: The Effects on the World of Work*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union. Geneva: The International Labour Office. https://www.eurofound.europa.eu/sites/default/files/ef_publication/field_ef_document/ef1658en.pdf
- European Commission (2020). *Remote work in the EU Before and After the COVID-19: Where We Are, Where We Head To*. Science for Policy Briefs, JRC120945. https://ec.europa.eu/jrc/sites/default/files/jrc120945_policy_brief_-_covid_and_remote_work_final.pdf
- Fana, M., Milasi, S., Napierala, J., Fernandez Macias, E. & I. Gonzalez Vazquez (2020). *Remote work, Work Organisation and Job Quality During the COVID-19 Crisis: A Qualitative Study*. European Commission, 2020, JRC122591.
- Fonner, K. L. & M. E. Roloff (2010). "Why Remote workers are More Satisfied with Their Jobs than are Office-Based Workers: When Less Contact is Beneficial". *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 38(4): 336–361.
- Gajendran, R. S. & D. A. Harrison (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.
- Galanti, T., Guidetti, G., Mazzei, E. & S. Zappalà (2021). "Work From Home During the COVID-19 Outbreak: The Impact on Employees' Remote Work Productivity, Engagement, and Stress". *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 63(7): 426–432.
- Gallup (2017). *State of the American Workplace*.

- Gerding, T., Syck, M., Daniel, D., Naylor, J., Kotowski, S. E., Gillespie, G. L., Freeman, A. M., Huston, T. R., & K. G. Davis (2021). "An Assessment of Ergonomic Issues in the Home Offices of University Employees Sent Home due to the COVID-19 Pandemic". *Work*, 68(2021): 981–992.
- Gibbs, M., Mengel, F. & C. Siemroth (2021). "Work from Home & Productivity: Evidence from Personnel & Analytics Data on IT Professionals". Working Paper No. 2021-56. Becker Friedman Institute.
- Glass, J. (2004). "Blessing or Curse? Work-Family Policies and Mother's Wage Growth over Time". *Work and Occupations*, 31(3): 367–394.
- Golden, T. D. & J. F. Veiga (2008). "The Impact of Superior-Subordinate Relationships on the Commitment, Job Satisfaction, and Performance of Virtual Workers". *The Leadership Quarterly*, 19(1): 77–88.
- Grunau, P., Wolter, S., Bellman, L. & M. Dijst (2017). "ICT and Actual Working Time in Germany". *Management Revue*, 28(3): 359-374.
- Gusfield, J. R. (1975). *Community: A Critical Response*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Hartig, T., Kylin, C. & G. Johansson (2007). "The Remote work Tradeoff: Stress Mitigation vs. Constrained Restoration". *Applied Psychology: An international Review*, 56(2): 231–253.
- Hiselius, L. W. & P. Arnfalk (2021). "When the Impossible Becomes Possible: COVID-19's Impact on Work and Travel Patterns in Swedish Public Agencies". *European Transport Research Review*, 13(17).
- Ipsen, C., Kirchner, K. & J. Paulin (2020). "Experiences of Working from Home in Times of Covid-19 International Survey Conducted the First Months of the Lockdowns March-May, 2020". DTU
https://backend.orbit.dtu.dk/ws/portalfiles/portal/235334568/revised_Technical_report_D_K_and_international_survey_July_2020_.pdf
- Khalifa, M. & R. Davidson (200). "Viewpoint: Exploring the Telecommuting Paradox". *Communication of the ACM*, 43(3): 29–21.
- Kniffin, K. M., Narayanan, J., Anseel, F., Antonakis, J., Ashford, S. P., Bakker, A. B., . . . Vugt, M. V. (2021). "COVID-19 and the Workplace: Implications, Issues, and Insights for Future Research and Action". *American Psychologist*, 76(1): 63–77.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000716>
- Kossek, E. E., Thompson, R. J. & B. A. Lautsch (2015). "Balanced Workplace Flexibility: Avoiding the traps." *California Management Review*, 57(4): 5–25. doi: 10.1525/cmr.2015.57.4.5
- Lasfargue, Y. & S. Fauconnier (2015). *Télétravail salarié: Comment concilier liens de subordination et marges de liberté?* Paris: Obergo.
- LeanIn.Org (2020). "Women Are Maxing Out and Burning Out During COVID-19". 7th of May. <https://leanin.org/article/womens-workload-and-burnout> (Accessed: 2021-09-15)
- Lee, H. (2021). "Changes in Workplace Practices During the COVID-19 Pandemic: The Roles of Emotion, Psychological Safety and Organization Support." *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance*, 8(1): 97–128.
- Lundborg, P., Plug, E. & A. W. Rasmussen (2017). "Can Women Have Children and a Career? IV Evidence from IVF Treatments". *American Economic Review*, 107(6): 1611–1637.

- Manjaree, H. M. S. & D. A. S. Perera (2021). "Determinants of Employee Engagement during COVID 19 Pandemic (Case of Sri Lanka Technological Campus)." *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 5(7): 2454–6186.
- Martin, B. H. & R. Macdonnell (2012). "Is Remote work Effective for Organizations? A Meta-Analysis of Empirical Research on Perceptions of Remote work and Organizational Outcomes". *Management Research Review*, 35(7): 602–616.
- Martinez-Sanchez, A., Perez-Perez, M., Vela-Jimenez, M. J. & P. de-Luis-Carnicer (2008). "Remote work Adoption, Change Management, and Firm Performance". *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 21(1): 7–31.
- McGregor, L. & N. Doshi (2020). "How to Keep Your Team Motivated, Remotely". *Harvard Business Review*. 9th of April <https://hbr.org/2020/04/how-to-keep-your-team-motivated-remotely> (Accessed: 2021-10-06)
- McMillan, D. W. (2011). "Sense of Community, a Theory Not a Value: A Response to Nowell and Boyd". *Journal of Community Psychology*, 39(5): 507–519.
- McMillan, D. W. & D. M. Chavis (1986). "Sense of Community: A Definition and Theory". *Journal of Community Psychology*, 14(1): 6–23.
- Monteiro, N. P., Straume, O. R. & M. Valente (2019). "Does Remote Work Improve or impair Firm Labour Productivity? Longitudinal Evidence from Portugal". NIPE Working paper no. 14.
- Moretti A., Menna, F., Aulicino, M., Paoletta, M. Liguori S. & G. Iolascon (2020). "Characterization of Home Working Population during COVID-19 Emergency: A Cross-Sectional Analysis". *International Journal och Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(6284).
- Morikawa, M. (2020). *COVID-19, Remote working, and Productivity*. VoxEU.org. <https://voxeu.org/article/covid-19-remote-working-and-productivity>
- Myers, K. R., Tham, W.Y, Yin, Y., Cohodes, N., Thurby, J.G., Thursby, M.C., Schiffer, P., Walsh, J.T., Lakhani, K.R. och D. Wang (2020). "Unequal Effects of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Scientist". *Nature Human Behaviour*, 4(9): 880–883.
- Nakrošienė, A., Bučiūnienė, I. & B. Goštautaitė (2019). "Working from Home: Characteristics and Outcomes of Remote work". *International Journal of Manpower*, 40(1): 87–101.
- Neeley, T. (2021). *Remote Work Revolution. Succeeding from Anywhere*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Noda, H. (2020). "Work-Life Balance and Life Satisfaction in OECD Countries: A Cross-Sectional Analysis". *Journal of Happiness Studies* 21: 1325–1348.
- Nowell, B. & N. Boyd (2010). "Viewing Community as Responsibility versus Resource: Deconstructing the Theoretical Roots of Psychological Sense of Community". *Journal of Community Psychology*, 38(7): 828–841.
- OECD (2020). *Productivity Gains from Remote working in the Post COVID-19 Era: How Can Public Policies Make it Happen?* OECD Policy Responses to Coronavirus (COVID-19). Updated 7th of September 2020. <https://www.oecd.org/coronavirus/policy-responses/productivity-gains-from-remote-working-in-the-postcovid-19-era-a5d52e99/>
- Orrell, B. & M. Leger (2020). *The Trade-Offs of Remote Work: Building a More Resilient Workplace for the Post-Covid 19 World*. American Enterprise Institute. Report, November 2020.

- Owl Labs (2019). *State of Remote Work 2019*. September 2019. <https://resources.owlabs.com/state-of-remote-work/2019> (Accessed: 2021-09-15)
- Ozimek, A. (2020). *The Future of Remote Work*. Upwork. https://content-static.upwork.com/blog/uploads/sites/6/2020/05/26131624/Upwork_EconomistReport_FWR_052020.pdf
- Rafnsdóttir, G. L. & O. Júlíusdóttir (2018). "Reproducing Gender Roles Through Virtual Work: The Case of Senior Management". *International Journal of Media & Cultural Politics*, 14(1): 77–94.
- Richardson, J. (2010). "Managing Flexworkers: Holding on and Letting Go." *Journal of Management Development*, 29(2): 137–147.
- Russo, D., Hanel, P. H. P., Altnickel, S. & N. van Berkel (2021). "Predictors of Well-Being and Productivity Among Software Professionals During the COVID-19 Pandemic: A Longitudinal Study". *Empirical Software Engineering*, 26(4).
- Seppälä, E. & K. Cameron (2015). "Proof that Positive Work Cultures are More Productive". *Harvard Business Review*. 1st of December. <https://hbr.org/2015/12/proof-that-positive-work-cultures-are-more-productive> (Accessed: 2021-09-20)
- Sevilla, A. & S. Smith (2020). "Baby Steps: The gender Division of Childcare during the COVID-19 Pandemic". Discussion paper No. 13302. IZA Institute of Labor Economics.
- Shurchkov, O., Deryugina T. & J. Stearns (2020). "Is COVID-19 Turning Back the Clock on Gender Equality in Academia?" *Medium*. 23rd of April. <https://medium.com/@olga.shurchkov/is-covid-19-turning-back-the-clock-on-gender-equality-in-academia-70c00d6b8ba1> (Accessed: 2021-09-15)
- Spreitzer, G. (1995). "Psychological Empowerment in the Workplace: Dimensions, Measurement, and Validation." *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(5): 1442–1465.
- Stanton, C. T. & P. Tiwari (2021). "Housing Consumption and the Cost of Remote Work". NBER Working Paper No. 28483. National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Stoker, J. I., Garretsen, H., & J. Lammers (2021). "Leading and Working from Home in Times of Covid 19: On the Perceived Changes in Leadership Behaviors." *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*: 1–11. doi: 10.1177/15480518211007452.
- Sukoco, I., Evitha, Y., Hermanto, B. & T. Herawati (2020). "Optimizing Human Resources Empowerment in the Era of Covid-19: From Transactional to Transformational Leadership." *Technium Social Sciences Journal*, 13(1): 265–277.
- Terkamo-Moisio, A., Karki, S. Kangasniemi, M., Kammintakanen, J. & Häggman-Laitila, A. (2021). "Towards Remote Leadership in Health Care: Lessons Learned from an Integrative Review". *Journal of Advanced Nursing*. 1-14. doi.org/10.1111/jan.15028
- Toscano, F. & S. Zappalà (2020). "Social Isolation and Stress as Predictors of Productivity Perception and Remote Work Satisfaction during the COVID-19 Pandemic: The Role of Concern about the Virus in a Moderated Double Mediation". *Sustainability*, 12(23).
- Tremblay, D.G. & E. Genin (2007). "The Demand for Remote work of IT Self-Employed Workers". *The Journal of E-working*, 1(2): 98–115.
- Turetken, O., Jain, A., Quesenberry, B. & O. Ngwenyama (2011). "An Empirical Investigation of the Impact of Individual and Work Characteristics on Telecommuting Success". *IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication*, 54(1): 56–67.

- Walvoord, A. A. G, Redden, E. R., Elliott, L. R. & M. D. Covert (2008). "Empowering Followers in Virtual Teams: Guiding Principles from Theory and Practice." *Computers in Human Behavior*, 24(5): 1884–1906.
- Wolff, H.-G. & K. Moser (2009). "Effects on Networking on Career Success: A Longitudinal Study." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(1): 196-206.
- Wong, A. H. K., Cheung, J. O. & Z. Chen (2021). "Promoting Effectiveness of 'Working from Home': Findings from Hong Kong Working Population under COVID-19". *Asian Education and Development Studies*, 10(2): 210–228.