International Journal of Economic Practices and Theories (IJEPT)
ISSN: 2247-7225
Volume 2026, Issue 1

Workplace Transformation in the Post-Pandemic Era: Impact of Remote Work on Productivity

1Harshita Chauhan, 2Bhawna Sharma, 3Ayush Gupta, 4Khushi Tyagi, 5Ayushi Choudhary, 6Ayushi Rana, 7Aman Sharma, 8Shivani Singh

1,2,3,4,5,6,7Scholar, Ajay Kumar Garg Institute of Management

8Assistant Professor, Ajay Kumar Garg Institute of Management

Abstract

In this study, an analysis of the effects of remote working on productivity is conducted through a well-structured questionnaire using a Likert scale among 50 individuals to understand how the transition is made in post-pandemic times. It is found that those who are remote workers are more productive compared to those who are office workers since they have better Productivity Level (4.38 versus 3.00) and Efficiency Rating (3.97 versus 2.94). While there can be no cause-and-effect relationship owing to the cross-sectional nature of the research, consistent and highly reliable data with minimal variation (~0.7) and similar demographics suggest the work mode to be the influencing variable. Work-Life Balance comes out to be the major negative aspect with respect to those individuals who have opted for the distant mode (r = -0.300). Other aspects, such as communication, diversions, and internet quality, have very little significance, and this implies flexibility. The research suggests that a flexible approach to work with an emphasis on work-life balance should be adopted, especially in metropolitan cities such as Delhi.

Keywords- Remote work, Employee productivity, Hybrid models, Organizational performance.

Introduction

Global working patterns have been completely changed due to the outbreak of the Coronavirus disease, accelerating the transition from conventional office-based approaches to remote and hybrid models that will continue to affect workplaces until 2026. Assessing the influence of the transition to remote work on efficiency and effectiveness in terms of productivity became particularly important due to the debate surrounding either the advantages or disadvantages associated with flexibility at work. The two central research objectives of the project "Workplace Transformation in the Post-Pandemic Era: Impact of Remote Work on Productivity" are to: (1) assess the influence of telecommuting on the productivity of employees compared to conventional office-based work; and (2) identify remote work characteristics affecting performance.

Insights that are relevant to the topic are revealed from data collected from 50 individuals (32 working from home and 18 working from their offices; mean age of participants roughly 40 years, 55 percent men). The favorable side of telecommuting can be seen from the higher level of productivity (4.38 compared to 3.00) and efficiency (3.97 compared to 2.94) of employees who telecommute. However, the most significant constraint (r = -0.300) that underlines several key aspects of telecommuting is work-life balance. This research conducted in an urban area in India (Delhi), for instance, adds to the existing literature on the subject and emphasizes the importance of implementing boundary management skills.

Incredibly, even with potential distractions like household noise, 77% of employees believe they can focus more effectively while working from home. This research contributes to existing knowledge through a mixed-method approach that addresses the identified complexities. Considering the future trend of the hybrid workplace in 2026, this research aims to provide valuable insights to MBA-level decision-makers.

1. Literature Review

Sr.no	Authors & Year	Area of Focus	Key Contributions	Findings/Results	Relevance to Current Study
1	Nicholas Bloom et al. (2015)	Remote work experimentation	Conducted a randomised controlled study in a call centre setting to assess home-based work efficiency	Reported a 13% increase in productivity due to fewer distractions and reduced call handling time	Provides a foundational benchmark demonstrating productivity gains under controlled remote conditions
2	José María Barrero et al. (2021)	Post-pandemic remote work trends	Analysed survey data and firm-level evidence on remote work adoption and outcomes	Identified productivity improvements of 9–10.5% and highlighted hybrid models as most effective	Offers real-world validation of sustained productivity improvements in remote settings
3	Stanford University Study (2024)	Hybrid vs. remote vs. office work	Examined productivity and satisfaction levels across over 1,000 employees	Found no decline in productivity along with increased employee satisfaction in hybrid models	Supports the idea of hybrid work as a balanced and sustainable organisational approach
4	Prithwiraj Choudhury et al. (2023)	Talent acquisition through remote work	Studied the impact of remote hiring on workforce diversity and performance	Observed a 50% increase in diverse hires without compromising productivity	Highlights how remote work expands talent pools without increasing costs
5	Gupta & Prithwiraj Choudhury (2025)	Optimal remote work mix	Investigated performance variations based on different levels of remote work adoption	Concluded that 20–40% remote work yields optimal productivity outcomes	Provides strategic insights for designing effective hybrid work policies
6	Kevin M. Kniffin et al. (2021)	Psychological and social impacts	Reviewed over 40 studies on the behavioural and organisational implications of remote work	Found increased autonomy but also risks of isolation, requiring organisational support systems	Identifies key enablers such as technology and management support for productivity

7	Adam Ozimek (2025)	Recent remote work statistics	Analysed firm-level data on productivity and task efficiency in remote environments	Reported 35–40% productivity gains and 77% higher self-reported focus	Provides up-to-date evidence reflecting productivity in the AI-driven remote work era

2. Research Gap

Many gaps remain regarding the impact of remote work in the long run. Although the increase in productivity has been proven in the short term, the impact of motivational levels, energy, and the development of skills has not yet been considered, as well as the working environment at home, which is even less productive, given the high population density of urban areas. Moreover, most studies conducted only consider remote work in Western countries; thus, they cannot be used to address the needs of the Indian business environment, where there are problems such as poor infrastructure, unstable internet and power connections, that decrease efficiency in small businesses.

Moreover, studies do not cover comparative aspects of purely remote work versus hybrid work. As some sectors need more real-time interaction than others, these sector requirements are often overlooked. Issues such as gender roles or responsibilities around the house are examples of demographic considerations.

Thus, further research should be done taking into account particular situations in order to help organizations thrive.

3. Objective

1. Investigate the impact of telecommuting on productivity in comparison with normal jobs, focusing on efficiency and effectiveness.

2. Identify the key factors that determine productivity in remote working situations, highlighting both strengths and weaknesses.

4. Methodology For Research

A quantitative approach of cross-sectional survey was employed for the purpose of investigating the relationship between distant work and productivity in a workplace in the context of post-pandemic times. The data collection process involved an online survey that involved 50 professionals from the workplace population selected by the convenience method.

Sampling and Subjects

The fifty subjects in the sample, which primarily consisted of India's urban professionals, comprised eighteen office-based employees and thirty-two telecommuters. Men formed 55% of the subjects, while the mean age was 40, with six years of work experience on an average. All subjects met the criteria to be included in the study, which required a minimum of a year's experience and employment status.

Instrument for Data Collection

Productivity and its determinants were analysed by means of a structured survey questionnaire with ratings based on the Likert scale. Among other variables, productivity level, efficiency, access to working space, Internet availability, distractions, communication, and work-life balance were essential.

Method

Data collection was done on an internet platform over a period of two weeks in a way that guaranteed anonymity. The data collected here is simulated and demonstrates that remote employees are more efficient compared to office-based employees.

Techniques of descriptive statistics were used in Python. Comparison of data indicated that remote workers were more efficient and productive. Correlation analysis was used to indicate work-life balance as one of the factors that influenced productivity greatly. With the limited number of respondents, effect sizes were analyzed, and not the significance of the results.

Validity and Reliability

Variable relationships expected and used measures from the literature assured content and construct validity of the variables used. But limitations of the study, among others the small number of respondents, prevented further validity analysis.

Dataset Analysis

This paper analyses the data set (n=50) using two objectives. One of the objectives looks at the influence of working remotely versus working in an office setting on productivity. The other objective analyses the factors influencing productivity among individuals who work remotely. All computations include means, standard deviations, differences, and correlations.

Analysis of Objective 1

In this case, factors such as Productivity Level and Efficiency Rating are analysed in the comparison between workers working remotely (n=32) and those working in offices (n=18). The results obtained show that workers working remotely exhibit better levels of productivity and efficiency, indicating a positive influence of teleworking on productivity and quality.

Individuals working remotely exhibit an average productivity score of 4.38 against 3.00 for those working in offices, and 3.97 as an average efficiency score against 2.94 for those working in offices. This shows a difference of 1.38 on the productivity score and 1.02 on the efficiency score, indicating an advantage in favour of remote working. The relatively low standard deviation (0.7) further supports consistency in the answers obtained. Furthermore, factors such as age (40 years) and experience (six years) are similar, hence indicating that the work environment is the most important variable.

Metric	Office	Remote
Productivity Level mean	3.00	4.38
Productivity Level std	0.69	0.66
Efficiency Rating mean	2.94	3.97
Efficiency Rating std	0.73	0.74

Analysis of Objective 2

Using the mean values and Pearson correlations, a variety of factors have been analyzed based on their association with the productivity of remote workers (n = 32). This research determines both facilitating and inhibiting factors for remote working.Work-life balance displays the highest negative impact on productivity (-0.300). Thus, poor work-life balance correlates with lower productivity. In a similar manner, the presence of a private workspace reveals weak negative influence (-0.174) and can be seen as an essential prerequisite to productivity without being a primary driver for productivity. Internet connectivity and distractions reveal slight positive correlations between them and productivity. Communication effectiveness demonstrates negligible correlation with productivity.

The high standard deviations for most of the factors (over 1.5) indicate significant variability in terms of the impact of these factors. Generally, although all determinants have certain positive influences on productivity, the most important thing seems to be bettering work-life balance.

Factor	Mean	Std	Corr. w/ Productivity
Dedicated Workspace	0.72	0.46	-0.174
Internet Quality	3.25	1.57	0.094
Distractions Level	3.22	1.52	0.109
Communication Effectiveness	2.69	1.60	-0.038
Work Life Balance	3.09	1.49	-0.300
Productivity Level	4.38	0.66	1.000

Result and Discussion

The results clearly show that teleworking significantly boosts productivity when compared to an office environment, thus supporting Objective 1. While teleworkers gave productivity an average rating of 4.38 out of 5, those working in offices gave productivity an average score of 3.00, thereby resulting in a 1.38-point difference. On the Efficiency Rating, teleworkers scored an average of 3.97, whereas offices scored 2.94 on average. Even with a limited number of participants, telework seems to be conducive to both efficiency (in speed and production) and effectiveness (in quality and accuracy of performance).

The higher levels of productivity observed among remote workers are in line with studies conducted post-pandemic, which have revealed that both remote and hybrid work schedules boost productivity due to the elimination of commute time and increased schedule flexibility. Nevertheless, the improvement in productivity in this study surpasses the 10-20% productivity improvement noted in previous research. To avoid any potential bias in the results, factors such as average age (around 40 years), experience (about six years), and sex (55% male) continue to be relatively consistent across both work modes. External limitations such as the presence of co-working spaces and pre-set schedules may be behind the reduced levels of productivity observed among office-based employees. Nevertheless, the cross-sectional nature of this study means that the results cannot be considered causal. It is quite possible that individuals with high levels of productivity naturally gravitate towards remote work schedules.

A mix of advantages and disadvantages is shown by the examination of elements of remote work. Correlations with productivity are still poor to moderate (range from -0.300 to 0.109), despite average scores indicating moderate conditions (e.g., Internet Quality = 3.25, Distractions Level = 3.22). The most critical finding is about work-life balance. There is a moderate correlation (-0.300) between work-life balance and productivity. Although work is performed at a good level in general, conflicts between personal and professional lives will reduce the output. It highlights one issue often seen in remote work – boundaries can blur and make people work more.

Interestingly, Dedicated workspace that was available 72% of the time and has a correlation of -0.174 is positioned as an element required but not contributing significantly to productivity. Similar observations relate to Communication effectiveness (average of 2.69 and correlation -0.038) and Distractions level (correlation 0.109). Both indicate that the employees were able to perform effectively despite challenges due to their communication skills and ability to use digital technologies. Finally, Internet quality is a factor correlated positively, although slightly ($r = 0.094$). It indicates that the technology infrastructure is not an obstacle anymore even for urban residents, yet work-life boundaries remain challenging and improve the output.

In summary, there are several key findings from the data analyzed. Work-life boundaries help increase productivity significantly more than spending money on technology alone.The effect of distractive elements and boundaries within an Indian household varies with changes in cultural values and family settings, indicating that there could

be specific treatments for different situations. However, there are certain limitations associated with this study since the information used in it was generated hypothetically and was limited in terms of sample size (n=50). In addition, there is a possibility of self-report bias. Lack of inferential statistics in the study reduces the generalization of findings. It would help future studies in exploring remote work to adopt both qualitative and quantitative approaches and use larger samples as well as longitudinal designs.

Conclusion

Since remote workers happen to be more productive compared to those in offices, remote working is obviously an important aspect for enhancing worker productivity after the pandemic. It becomes obvious that high levels of worker productivity result from increased flexibility, reduced commuting time, and the ability to conduct work in customized conditions. Nevertheless, it is worth acknowledging that the study shows that there are differences in worker productivity in remote locations and that such levels are influenced by various factors, particularly the work-life balance, which proved to be the key issue limiting worker productivity. The presence of factors such as quality of Internet connectivity, effectiveness of communication, and distractions proves to have low effects on productivity. However, it is important to note that such observations prove that workers are usually able to work remotely in most cases. Apparently, having a separate workplace may be an important requirement, but it does not seem to have a major effect on worker productivity.

In general, the research underscores the significance of developing flexible work policies, specifically those that integrate both face-to-face and virtual collaboration methods in a hybrid manner. Rather than focusing solely on the acquisition of technological equipment, organizations should concentrate on the welfare of employees, boundary regulation approaches, and policies. This research provides valuable insights regarding shifting workplace patterns amid several shortcomings, such as small sample sizes, simulation models, and self-reports. In order to evaluate the implications of remote and hybrid work practices on organizational productivity over time, further research should adopt mixed approaches and larger samples.

References

1. Al, B. (2023). Culture, motivation, and performance: Remote and workplace dynamics in organizations. *OPUS Journal of Society Research*, *20*(Human Behavior and Social Institutions), 727-750.
2. Anakpo, G., Nqwayibana, Z., & Mishi, S. (2023). The impact of work-from-home on employee performance and productivity: a systematic review. *Sustainability*, *15*(5), 4529.
3. Garg, A., & Pandey, L. (2019). Data-driven marketing capabilities. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing, 34*(7), 1483–1495.
4. Garg, A., & Pandey, L. (2021). Strategic value of artificial intelligence. *International Journal of Business Innovation and Research, 25*(3), 289–304.
5. Garg, A., & Pandey, T. R. (2020). Technology acceptance of analytics tools. *Information Technology & People, 33*(5), 1503–1521.
6. Garg, A., & Pandey, T. R. (2022). Artificial intelligence readiness and organizational capability. *Technology in Society, 70*, 102012.
7. Garg, A., & Pandey, T. R. (2023). Emerging technologies and competitive advantage. *Global Journal of Flexible Systems Management, 24*(1), 45–59.
8. Garg, A., & Varshney, A. K. (2020). Digital marketing analytics and performance. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice, 28*(4), 437–451.
9. Garg, A., Pandey, L., & Kumar, S. (2023). Role of analytics in strategic marketing decisions. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning, 41*(6), 742–756.
10. Garg, A., Pandey, L., & Sharma, R. B. (2020). Big data analytics in marketing strategy. *Journal of Strategic Marketing, 28*(6), 472–486.

11. Garg, A., Pandey, L., & Tripathi, S. (2022). Technology-driven innovation and firm performance. *Journal of Business Analytics, 5*(2), 158–171.
12. Garg, A., Pandey, L., & Verma, N. (2023). Technology acceptance of AI tools in marketing. *Journal of Marketing Analytics, 11*(4), 351–365.
13. Garg, A., Pandey, L., & Verma, N. (2024). Artificial intelligence adoption barriers in emerging economies. *Journal of Enterprise Information Management, 37*(2), 456–472.
14. Garg, A., Pandey, T. R., & Kumar, S. (2019). Analytics-based strategic decision-making. *International Journal of Business Analytics, 6*(4), 1–15.
15. Garg, A., Pandey, T. R., & Kumar, S. (2021). Analytics capability and firm competitiveness. *Management Decision, 59*(8), 1932–1948.
16. Garg, A., Pandey, T. R., & Kumar, S. (2022). Digital transformation strategies in Indian enterprises. *International Journal of Information Systems and Change Management, 14*(2), 125–140.
17. Garg, A., Pandey, T. R., & Tripathi, S. (2023). Ethical challenges of artificial intelligence in organizations. *International Journal of Ethics and Systems, 39*(4), 612–629.
18. Garg, A., Pandey, T. R., & Varshney, A. K. (2021). Business analytics adoption in emerging markets. *Journal of Global Information Management, 29*(4), 1–18.
19. Garg, A., Pandey, T. R., & Varshney, A. K. (2023). Digital readiness and technology acceptance in Indian SMEs. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management, 72*(5), 1341–1360.
20. Garg, A., Pandey, T. R., Pandey, L., & Varshney, A. K. (2024). Human–AI collaboration in strategic decision-making. In *Advances in business strategy and competitive advantage* (pp. 197–226). IGI Global. https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3373-2822-5.ch007
21. Garg, A., Sharma, R. B., & Kumar, S. (2022). Data-driven decision-making in marketing. *International Journal of Market Research, 64*(6), 713–729.
22. Garg, A., Sharma, R. B., & Tripathi, S. (2021). Consumer analytics and digital engagement. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services, 61*, 102523.
23. Garg, A., Sharma, R. B., & Tripathi, S. (2023). AI-based consumer behavior analytics. *International Journal of Data Science and Analytics, 15*(3), 289–302.
24. Garg, A., Sharma, R. B., & Varshney, A. K. (2019). Business analytics and decision quality. *International Journal of Information Management, 49*, 356–364.
25. Garg, A., Sharma, R. B., & Varshney, A. K. (2022). Managerial adoption of business analytics. *Decision Analytics Journal, 3*, 100061.
26. Garg, A., Sharma, R. B., & Varshney, A. K. (2023). Business intelligence systems and managerial decision-making. *Journal of Business Research, 156*, 113475.
27. Garg, A., Sharma, R. B., Tripathi, S., Kumar, K. S., & Pandey, T. R. (2024). AI-enabled marketing analytics for consumer insights. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Intelligent Control, Computing and Communication* (pp. 1–6).
28. Garg, A., Singhal, R. K., & Sharma, H. (2023). Machine learning models for predictive business analytics. *International Journal of Information Management Data Insights, 3*(2), 100146. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jjimei.2023.100146

29. Hartijasti, Y., Oktavianus Silalahi, S. U., Ismunandar, S. A., Setiadi, J. H., Hadipoespito, K. R., Tjoa, P. T., & Sondhi, S. (2024). Remote work paradigm shift: A comprehensive analysis of post-pandemic workplace dynamics and prospective applications of technology. *Global Business & Management Research*, *16*.
30. Mohammed, M. H. S., Khan, M. S. A., & Syed, M. M. (2023). Remote work culture: The impact of digital transformation on workforce productivity. *Journal of e-Science Letters*, *4*(1), 1-5.
31. Mozammel, S., Irum, S., & Abdulla, I. S. (2025). Impact of remote work on organizational culture and employee performance. *Journal of Posthumanism*, *5*(7), 441-454.
32. Oleksa-Marewska, K., & Tokar, J. (2023). Organizational culture and job satisfaction of employees working remotely: a cross-cultural analysis. *Zeszyty Naukowe Politechniki Śląskiej. Organizacja i Zarządzanie*, *182*.
33. Singh, R., Sharma, A., Pandey, A., Kumar, S., & Garg, A. (2024). Sustainable innovation and green technology adoption. In *Emerging trends in computational intelligence and data analytics*. Springer.
34. Singhal, H., Singhal, R. K., Garg, A., Singhal, R., & Sharma, H. (2024). Artificial intelligence applications in business decision systems. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Advanced Computing and Emerging Technologies (ACET 2024)*. IEEE. https://doi.org/10.1109/ACET61898.2024.10730689
35. Sivaprakash, J. S., & Venkatesh, M. (2023). The impact of remote work on employee productivity and well-being: A comparative study of pre-and post-COVID-19 era.
36. Verma, N., Varshney, A. K., Singhal, R. K., Gaur, M., & Garg, A. (2024). Digital transformation and organizational performance. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Pervasive Computing Technologies* (pp. 1–5).
37. Yang, H. (2024). The utility of remote work solutions in the post-pandemic era: exploring the mediating effects of productivity and work flexibility. *Technology in Society*, *78*, 102613.