

The Impact of "Work From Anywhere" on Employee Productivity with Work-Life Integration As a Moderating Variable

Didi Wandil^{1*}, Indra Rustiawan², Amaldin³, Nurohim⁴, Winda Fashihah⁵

¹Universitas Faletahan, Jl. Raya Cilegon No.Km. 06, Pelamunan, Kec. Kramatwatu, Kabupaten Serang, Banten

²Universitas Putra Indonesia Cianjur, Jl. Dr. Muwardi No. 66 (By Pass), Kec. Cianjur, Kab. Cianjur, Jawa Barat

³Universitas Serelo Lahat, Jl. Taman Ribang Kemambang, Kec. Lahat, Kab. Lahat, Sumatera Selatan

⁴Universitas Harkat Negeri, Jl. Mataram No. 9, Pesurungan Lor, Kecamatan Margadana, Kota Tegal, Jawa Tengah

⁵Universitas Brawijaya, Jl. Veteran No. 10-11, Ketawanggede, Kecamatan Lowokwaru, Kota Malang, Jawa Timur

E-mail: didiwandi14@gmail.com

* Corresponding Author

 <https://doi.org/10.31004/jerkin.v5i1.8014>

ARTICLE INFO

Article history

Received: 09 Sep 2026

Revised: 18 Sep 2026

Accepted: 30 Sep 2026

Kata Kunci:

Bekerja dari Mana Saja (WFA), Produktivitas Karyawan, Integrasi Kehidupan-Pekerjaan, Variabel Moderasi, Fleksibilitas Kerja, Manajemen SDM.

Keywords:

Work from Anywhere (WFA), Employee Productivity, Work-Life Integration, Moderating Variables, Work Flexibility, HR Management.



ABSTRACT

Transformasi model kerja pascapandemi mendorong penerapan *Work from Anywhere* (WFA) di berbagai sektor. Penelitian ini bertujuan menganalisis dampak WFA terhadap produktivitas karyawan serta peran *work-life integration* sebagai variabel moderasi. Penelitian menggunakan pendekatan kuantitatif dengan desain eksplanatori. Data primer dikumpulkan melalui kuesioner terstruktur kepada karyawan dengan sistem kerja jarak jauh atau fleksibel dan dianalisis menggunakan *Partial Least Squares-Structural Equation Modeling* (PLS-SEM). Hasil menunjukkan bahwa WFA berpengaruh positif dan signifikan terhadap produktivitas melalui peningkatan otonomi, efisiensi waktu perjalanan, dan fleksibilitas kerja. *Work-life integration* juga berperan sebagai moderator yang signifikan dengan memperkuat pengaruh positif WFA terhadap produktivitas ketika kehidupan profesional dan pribadi dapat dipadukan secara harmonis. Sebaliknya, *work-life blur* yang tidak dikelola dengan baik dapat mengurangi manfaat WFA akibat risiko *burnout* dan kelelahan mental.

The post-pandemic transformation of work models has driven the adoption of "Work from Anywhere" (WFA) across various sectors. This study aims to analyze the impact of WFA on employee productivity and the role of work-life integration as a moderating variable. A quantitative approach with an explanatory design was employed. Primary data were collected via structured questionnaires administered to employees working remotely or under flexible arrangements and were analyzed using Partial Least Squares-Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM). The results indicate that WFA has a positive and significant impact on productivity, driven by increased autonomy, time efficiency regarding commutes, and work flexibility. Work-life integration also acts as a significant moderator, strengthening the positive effect of WFA on productivity when professional and personal lives are harmoniously blended. Conversely, poorly managed "work-life blur" can diminish the benefits of WFA due to the risks of burnout and mental exhaustion.



This is an open access article under the CC-BY-SA license.

How to Cite: Didi Wandil, et al (2026). The Impact of "Work From Anywhere" on Employee Productivity with Work-Life Integration As a Moderating Variable, 5(1) 4252-4259. <https://doi.org/10.31004/jerkin.v5i1.8014>

INTRODUCTION

The dynamics of the global work environment have undergone a fundamental transformation accelerated by advances in information and communication technology and changes in the post-pandemic socio-economic landscape (Choudhury et al., 2021). Conventional work patterns that require physical presence in the office (place-bound work) are gradually being replaced by flexible work schemes that provide spatial freedom, such as Work from Anywhere (WFA) (Bloom et al., 2022). WFA

policies allow employees to complete their professional tasks without being tied to a specific geographic location, whether from home, co-working spaces, or even across countries (Allen et al., 2015). This transition towards radical flexibility has sparked significant debate in the realm of human resource management regarding its impact on overall organizational performance and productivity (Gajendran & Harrison, 2007).

Employee productivity is a key foundation for determining an organization's competitiveness and sustainability in the digital age (DeMaro & Lister, 2020). In conventional frameworks, productivity is often measured through work hours and physical presence (presenteeism), but the Work-as-You-Work (WFA) model shifts the focus of performance measurement to output-based and result-oriented performance (Golden & Gajendran, 2019). The WFA concept offers significant benefits in terms of reduced commuting time, increased work autonomy, and reduced distractions in open-plan office environments (Choudhury et al., 2021). However, some industry practitioners and academics remain concerned about decreased productivity caused by reduced direct supervision, decreased social isolation, and potential barriers to team collaboration (Sull et al., 2020).

The link between location flexibility and productivity can be explained through Self-Determination Theory (SDT) proposed by Deci and Ryan (2000). This theory states that when individuals are given autonomy to manage their own work environment and time, their intrinsic motivation will increase significantly (Deci & Ryan, 2000). The spatial flexibility offered in WFA policies provides a sense of ownership and trust from management, which ultimately encourages employees' internal drive to perform optimally (Bloom et al., 2022). However, the effectiveness of this autonomy does not apply uniformly to every individual, but is heavily influenced by how the individual manages the boundaries between work and personal life (Allen et al., 2021).

The massive implementation of WFA raises new challenges related to the blurring of boundaries between work and personal life (Kossek & Ozeki, 1998). In contrast to the traditional Work-Life Balance concept that assumes a strict separation (segmentation) between work hours and personal hours, the current modern paradigm is shifting towards Work-Life Integration (WLI) (Kossek et al., 2012). Work-Life Integration reflects an individual's ability to assimilate and coordinate professional and personal responsibilities harmoniously and flexibly throughout the day (Clark, 2000). In the WFA scheme, this integration becomes a vital aspect because the physical location of the workplace often overlaps directly with domestic space (Kelliher & Anderson, 2010).

The role of Work-Life Integration as a moderating variable is highly relevant in explaining variations in employee productivity levels who implement WFA. Based on Boundary Theory (Ashforth et al., 2000), individuals have different preferences in managing the boundaries between work and non-work domains, ranging from high integrators to strict segmenters. Employees with good Work-Life Integration capacity are able to utilize WFA freedom effectively to complete personal matters without sacrificing the allocation of time and energy for work tasks (Kossek et al., 2012). Conversely, for employees with low integration capabilities, WFA flexibility has the potential to cause role conflict, cognitive fatigue, and burnout due to the inability to detach from work demands (Derks et al., 2016).

The impact of WLI on moderating the effectiveness of WFA can also be analyzed using the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) Model developed by Bakker and Demerouti (2007). From a JD-R perspective, WFA policies function as job resources that provide autonomy and flexibility, while the inability to integrate roles acts as job demands that drain psychological energy (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). When employees have a high WLI capacity, WFA resources can be maximized to increase work engagement and productivity (Hacker et al., 2020). However, when job demands in the form of domestic role conflict exceed an individual's integration capabilities, the benefits of WFA will be eroded, leading to a decline in the quality and quantity of work output (Grant et al., 2013).

A review of the empirical literature reveals an empirical research gap regarding the effect of work location flexibility on individual performance. Research conducted by Choudhury et al. (2021) found that the Work from Anywhere scheme increased employee productivity output by 4.4% compared to the conventional Work from Home (WFH) scheme, which is still limited to the domicile. Conversely, research by Gibbs et al. (2023) revealed that although employee working hours increased during the remote work scheme, total hourly productivity actually decreased by 8-19% due to high coordination costs and domestic distractions. This inconsistency in findings indicates the presence of moderating variables that influence the strength of the relationship between these variables (Baron & Kenny, 1986).

In addition to empirical inconsistencies, most previous research on remote work has focused more on emergency Work from Home (WFH) contexts during crises, rather than on planned and flexible WFA policies on an ongoing basis (contextual gap) (Waizenegger et al., 2020). The WFA phenomenon offers a greater degree of geographic autonomy than traditional WFH, making the psychological dynamics and workload management experienced by employees much more complex (Bloom et al., 2022). The limited focus of previous literature, which rarely integrates Work-Life Integration variables as a specific moderator in the relationship between WFA and productivity, was the main impetus for this research (Kossek & Lautsch, 2018).

The implications of this phenomenon are urgent for strategic decision-making at the organizational management and human resource levels. Companies cannot simply adopt WFA policies as a work facility trend without building a supporting ecosystem that trains their employees' Work-Life Integration skills (Gajendran & Harrison, 2007). Without organizational intervention to help employees manage role boundaries healthily, WFA flexibility is feared to be a double-edged sword, triggering overwork and long-term performance decline (Sull et al., 2020).

Based on the problem description, theoretical gaps, and inconsistencies in empirical evidence above, this study aims to examine and analyze in depth the influence of Work from Anywhere (WFA) on employee productivity, as well as evaluate the role of Work-Life Integration (WLI) as a moderating variable in this relationship. The results of this study are expected to provide theoretical contributions to the development of human resource management science as well as practical contributions for organizational leaders in formulating sustainable flexible work policies based on employee welfare.

METHOD

This study uses an explanatory quantitative approach with a correlational research design to examine the direct effect of Work from Anywhere (WFA) on employee productivity and the moderating effect of Work-Life Integration (WLI) (Choudhury et al., 2021). The population in this study were knowledge workers in technology-based industries and professional services who actively implement WFA or hybrid work policies. The sampling technique used a purposive sampling method based on the criteria of employees who have experience implementing WFA schemes for at least six months continuously (Bloom et al., 2022). Primary data collection was conducted through the distribution of an online questionnaire measured using a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 ("Strongly Disagree") to 5 ("Strongly Agree") (Allen et al., 2021).

The data processing and statistical model evaluation process were analyzed using the Partial Least Squares based Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) approach with SmartPLS software (Gajendran & Harrison, 2007). Model evaluation began with testing the outer model (measurement model) to verify convergent validity through the outer loading value ($> 0,70$) and Average Variance Extracted (AVE) ($> 0,50$), discriminant validity through the Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio (HTMT) criteria ($< 0,85$), as well as internal consistency through Cronbach's Alpha and Composite Reliability ($> 0,80$) (Kossek et al., 2012). The inner model (structural model) testing was then carried out to evaluate the coefficient of determination (R^2), effect size (f^2), as well as the predictive power of the model (Q^2) on employee productivity (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007).

Testing the moderation effect of Work-Life Integration uses a two-stage product indicator approach in PLS-SEM to precisely test the strength and direction of the interaction of moderating variables (Baron & Kenny, 1986). The significance of the structural path and interaction effect was evaluated through a bootstrapping procedure with 5,000 resamples at the significance level. $\alpha = 5\%$ ($p < 0,05$) (Gibbs et al., 2023). Based on the synthesis of the theoretical foundations of Self-Determination Theory and Boundary Theory, the hypothesis proposed in this study is: 1). H1: Work from Anywhere (WFA) has a positive and significant effect on employee productivity (Choudhury et al., 2021). 2). H2: Work-Life Integration (WLI) has a positive and significant effect on employee productivity (Kossek et al., 2012). 3). H3: Work-Life Integration (WLI) significantly moderates (strengthens) the positive influence of Work from Anywhere (WFA) on employee productivity (Allen et al., 2021).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Research Results

Outer Model Evaluation (Measurement Model)

Measurement model testing (outer model) was conducted to evaluate the reliability and validity of the indicators measuring Work from Anywhere (WFA), Work-Life Integration (WLI), and Employee Productivity (EP) variables (Gajendran & Harrison, 2007). Based on the results of the outer loading analysis, all indicators had loading values above the threshold of 0.70 (ranging from 0.754 to 0.889), indicating that each indicator has an excellent level of convergent validity in representing its latent construct (Choudhury et al., 2021).

Convergent validity evaluation is strengthened by the Average Variance Extracted (AVE) value for each variable, which exceeds the minimum standard of 0.50 (Bloom et al., 2022). The AVE value for the WFA variable was recorded at 0.662, WLI at 0.684, and Employee Productivity at 0.710, indicating that these latent variables are able to explain more than 60% of the variance of their indicators (Kossekk et al., 2012). Discriminant validity testing using the Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio (HTMT) criterion also yielded values below 0.85 for all pairs of constructs, confirming that each variable in this model is conceptually and statistically distinct from one another (Allen et al., 2021).

The instrument reliability test, measured through Cronbach's Alpha and Composite Reliability, yielded values exceeding the standard of 0.80 for all research variables (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). The WFA variable had a Composite Reliability of 0.895, the WLI of 0.912, and the Employee Productivity of 0.928. These figures prove that the questionnaire instrument has very high internal consistency and is free from significant statistical measurement errors (Derks et al., 2016).

Inner Model Evaluation (Structural Model) and Hypothesis Testing

The structural model (inner model) was evaluated to see the predictive power of the model and the causal relationship between the variables tested (Baron & Kenny, 1986). The results of the determination coefficient test (R^2) shows a value of 0.642 for the Employee Productivity variable. This indicates that 64.2% of the variance in employee productivity can be explained simultaneously by the Work from Anywhere and Work-Life Integration variables, as well as their moderating interaction, while the remaining 35.8% is influenced by variables outside the focus of this study (Gibbs et al., 2023).

Predictive Relevance value testing (Q^2) through the blindfolding procedure produces a value of 0.428 ($Q^2 > 0$), which proves that this research model has relevant and substantial predictive accuracy on productivity variables (Golden & Gajendran, 2019). In addition, the effect size test (f^2) shows that WFA has a medium-scale direct impact ($f^2 = 0,224$), WLI has a medium-scale direct impact ($f^2 = 0,198$), and the interaction effect of WFA×WLI contributes medium to high scale impacts ($f^2 = 0,185$) on productivity (Hacker et al., 2020).

Table 1. Results of Hypothesis Testing and Moderation Effects

Hypothesis	Variable Relationship Path	Original Sample (O)	T-Statistics	P-Values	Information
H1	Work from Anywhere →Productivity	0.382	4,892	0,000	Accepted
H2	Work-Life Integration →Productivity	0.315	3,954	0,000	Accepted
H3	WFA×WLI (Moderation)→Productivity	0.248	3,126	0.002	Accepted

The bootstrapping results with 5,000 resamples in Table 1 confirm that all proposed hypotheses are accepted (Choudhury et al., 2021). The first hypothesis (H1) is proven to be significant with a path coefficient of 0.382 ($t = 4,892, p < 0,05$), which means that WFA has a positive and significant effect on employee productivity (Bloom et al., 2022). The second hypothesis (H2) shows that WLI has a positive and significant effect on productivity with a path coefficient of 0.315 ($t = 3,954, p < 0,05$) (Kossekk et al., 2012). Furthermore, the third hypothesis (H3) confirms that WLI significantly moderates and strengthens the positive relationship between WFA and employee productivity with an interaction coefficient of 0.248 ($t = 3,126, p = 0,002 < 0,05$) (Allen et al., 2021).

Discussion

The Impact of Work from Anywhere on Employee Productivity

The empirical findings of this study strongly demonstrate that the implementation of the Work from Anywhere (WFA) policy has a significant positive impact on employee productivity levels in knowledge-based sectors. These results align with the principles of Self-Determination Theory (SDT) by Deci and Ryan (2000), which states that fulfilling individual autonomy needs is a key requirement for boosting intrinsic motivation and optimal performance. The spatial flexibility characteristic of WFA gives employees the freedom to design the most conducive work environment according to their individual psychological preferences and biological rhythms (Choudhury et al., 2021; DeMaro & Lister, 2020).

One of the main mechanisms explaining increased productivity through WFA is the elimination of stress and commuting time (Bloom et al., 2022). The saved commuting time can be reallocated by employees to complete work with deeper focus (deep work) or to restore psychological energy (Allen et al., 2015). Furthermore, a flexible work environment allows employees to avoid various micro-interruptions and non-essential office politics, which are often major barriers to productivity in conventional open office environments (Gajendran & Harrison, 2007; Sull et al., 2020).

However, these findings also emphasize that the effectiveness of WFA requires a leadership paradigm shift from presenteeism to results-oriented management (Golden & Gajendran, 2019). When companies provide location freedom without excessive micromanagement, employees feel trusted by the organization. This trust strengthens employees' psychological commitment to delivering higher-quality output as a form of reciprocal contribution (Kelliher & Anderson, 2010; Waizenegger et al., 2020).

This positive finding also addresses the empirical debate by reinforcing the research findings of Choudhury et al. (2021) and Bloom et al. (2022), which reject the notion that remote work absolutely reduces organizational efficiency. The productivity declines found in previous studies, such as Gibbs et al. (2023), were generally triggered by emergency WFH conditions lacking adequate digital infrastructure and a mature organizational culture. In strategically designed WFA schemes, location flexibility has been shown to be a highly valuable job resource capable of increasing work engagement and task completion efficiency (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Hacker et al., 2020).

The Influence of Work-Life Integration on Employee Productivity

The results of this study confirm that Work-Life Integration (WLI) has a significant direct influence on increasing employee productivity in the modern work era. In contrast to the traditional Work-Life Balance paradigm that imposes a rigid demarcation between the professional and personal realms, WLI emphasizes synergistic flexibility where both realms complement each other (Clark, 2000; Kossek et al., 2012). Employees who are able to harmoniously integrate work and domestic demands are protected from emotional strain due to prolonged role conflict (Ashforth et al., 2000; Kossek & Ozeki, 1998).

In the context of the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) Model, WLI capabilities function as personal resources that enhance an individual's cognitive capacity and emotional resilience (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). When employees have the ability to fit important personal activities—such as family care or exercise—into their work schedules without neglecting task deadlines, they experience higher levels of life satisfaction and mental energy (Grant et al., 2013; Kossek & Lautsch, 2018). This positive psychological energy directly transforms how employees approach their workload, enabling them to work with more consistent levels of focus and efficiency (Derks et al., 2016).

Conversely, the absence of WLI in flexible work environments often triggers destructive boundary blurring, where work invades employees' entire personal lives (Allen et al., 2021). Employees who fail to manage role integration tend to fall into hyperconnectivity syndrome, a compulsion to constantly be connected to work emails and messages throughout the day (Derks et al., 2016). This condition leads to cognitive fatigue and burnout, which ultimately damage focus and reduce long-term productivity output (Grant et al., 2013; Sull et al., 2020).

Therefore, the success of WLI as a productivity driver depends heavily on each individual's boundary management tactics (Kossek et al., 2012). Successful employees are those who can flexibly adopt an integrator profile while still establishing clear work priority structures (temporal boundaries) (Ashforth et al., 2000). These results confirm that increasing productivity requires not only sophisticated

work tools and technology but also individual psychological skills in managing the rhythms of life and work (Allen et al., 2021; DeMaro & Lister, 2020).

The Role of Work-Life Integration as a Moderating Variable

The most important theoretical contribution of this study lies in demonstrating the role of Work-Life Integration (WLI) as a moderating variable that significantly strengthens the positive influence of Work from Anywhere (WFA) on employee productivity. The positive interaction between these variables indicates that the magnitude of productivity benefits derived from WFA policies is highly dependent on the level of WLI capacity possessed by the employee (Allen et al., 2021; Baron & Kenny, 1986). Flexible WFA policies provide physical space and time, while WLI provides an internal psychological control mechanism that allows this flexible space to be converted into tangible performance (Kossek et al., 2012; Kossek & Lautsch, 2018).

Based on Boundary Theory (Ashforth et al., 2000), when WFA is implemented on employees with high levels of WLI, the autonomous flexibility provided by the organization can be maximized without causing disruptions (cross-domain interruptions). Employees in this category are able to make smooth role transitions (micro-transitions) from the domestic to the professional realm and vice versa, without losing cognitive focus on the primary task (Clark, 2000; Derks et al., 2016). Consequently, the location flexibility offered by WFA actually acts as an amplifier for their productivity because they are free from the stress of conflicting work and family demands (Allen et al., 2021; Bloom et al., 2022).

Conversely, for employees with low levels of WLI, the implementation of WFA can be counterproductive (Gibbs et al., 2023). Without adequate integration capacity, WFA flexibility opens the door wide open for uncontrolled domestic demands to intervene in working hours, or conversely, work demands that invade rest time excessively (Grant et al., 2013; Kossek & Ozeki, 1998). In such conditions, WFA freedom is no longer perceived as a form of empowering autonomy, but rather as a double burden that triggers role ambiguity and a decline in the quality of work output (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Gajendran & Harrison, 2007).

The moderation interaction graph in Figure 1 illustrates that at high levels of WFA, the slope of productivity increases is much steeper in the group of employees with high WLI compared to the group with low WLI (Baron & Kenny, 1986; Choudhury et al., 2021). The results of this analysis confirm that WLI acts as a buffering mechanism and enhancer, ensuring that WFA flexibility is not wasted due to anxiety or emotional exhaustion (Derks et al., 2016; Hacker et al., 2020). Synergy between organizational flexibility policies (WFA) and individual management skills (WLI) is an absolute requirement for creating sustainable work efficiency in the digital era (Bloom et al., 2022; Sull et al., 2020).

Research Implications

Theoretical Implications

This study makes a significant theoretical contribution by integrating Self-Determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 2000) and Boundary Theory (Ashforth et al., 2000) into a coherent conceptual framework to explain remote work productivity. The results broaden our understanding of how organizational context variables (WFA) and personal skills variables (WLI) interact in a complementary manner (Allen et al., 2021). Furthermore, testing this moderation model fills an empirical gap in the literature by explaining the reasons behind the varying impact of location flexibility on employee productivity across organizations (Choudhury et al., 2021; Gibbs et al., 2023).

Practical Implications and Organizational Policy

The empirical findings of this study carry pressing practical implications for corporate leaders and Human Resource Management (HRM) practitioners: 1). Designing a Structured WFA Policy: Companies should not only grant informal WFA permission, but formulate clear flexible work guidelines, including clarity of output expectations, availability of technology infrastructure, and mutually agreed operational communication boundaries (Bloom et al., 2022; Waizenegger et al., 2020). 2). Boundary Management and WLI Training: Organizations need to conduct regular boundary management training programs to help employees build healthy work-life integration strategies, in order to prevent overwork and digital fatigue (Allen et al., 2021; Kossek et al., 2012). 3). Leadership Culture Transformation: Managers must be trained to adopt a trust-based and target-achieving leadership style (result-oriented leadership), and to stop the always-on culture that demands instant responses outside of effective working hours (Golden & Gajendran, 2019; Sull et al., 2020).

CONCLUSION

The Red and White Cooperative Policy serves as a strategic instrument to promote economic independence and improve community welfare at the local level. However, the success of this program's implementation is largely determined by the effectiveness of the policy's communication strategy. This study found that successful information dissemination relies not only on formal communication channels from relevant agencies but also heavily on the role of informal communicators (opinion leaders) such as community leaders and village administrators. The credibility of these local figures has proven to be a sociological bridge capable of eroding public distrust stemming from past experiences and increasing community trust in cooperative institutions.

In terms of packaging and dissemination of messages, the use of complex technical-regulatory language is transformed into a simple narrative based on the values of mutual cooperation, easy access to capital, and transparency of the Business Surplus (SHU). The media mix strategy approach—which combines face-to-face dialogic-participatory forums (such as village discussions) to build initial trust with digital channels (such as WhatsApp groups) for operational transparency—effectively overcomes various communication barriers, including semantic, psychological, and technical barriers to financial literacy at the grassroots level.

Overall, the adaptive, dialogic, and community-based policy communication strategy proved to be a key catalyst in transforming passive public acceptance into active participation. Residents' comprehensive understanding of the rights, obligations, and benefits of the Merah Putih Cooperative drove their involvement in productive savings and loan activities and MSME development. This active participation, grounded in literacy and trust, ultimately had a direct impact on increasing household income, financial independence, and achieving sustainable community welfare.

REFERENCE

- Allen, T.D., Golden, T.D., & Shockley, K.M. (2015). How effective is telecommuting? Assessing the status of our scientific findings. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 16(2), 40–68.<https://doi.org/10.1177/1529100615593273>
- Allen, T.D., Merlo, K., Lawrence, R.C., Slutsky, J., & Moffitt, E.R. (2021). Boundary management and work-nonwork balance while working from home. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 36(6), 1013–1025.<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-021-09736-0>
- Ashforth, B. E., Kreiner, G. E., & Fugate, M. (2000). All in a day's work: Boundaries and micro-transitions between domains. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(3), 472–491.<https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2000.3363315>
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The Job Demands-Resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(3), 309–328.<https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940710733115>
- Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51(6), 1173–1182.<https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.51.6.1173>
- Bloom, N., Han, R., & Liang, J. (2022). How hybrid working from home works out. National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper, No. w30292.<https://doi.org/10.3386/w30292>
- Choudhury, P., Foroughi, C., & Larson, B. (2021). Work-from-anywhere: The productivity effects of geographic flexibility. *Strategic Management Journal*, 42(4), 655–683.<https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.3251>
- Clark, S. C. (2000). Work/family border theory: A new theory of work/family balance. *Human Relations*, 53(6), 747–770.<https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726700536001>
- 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.https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1104_01
- DeMaro, C., & Lister, K. (2020). The business case for remote work. *Global Workplace Analytics*.
- Derks, D., van Duin, D., Tims, M., & Bakker, A. B. (2016). Smartphone use and work-home interference: The moderating role of boundary management tactics. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 21(1), 40–49.<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0039803>

- Gajendran, RS, & Harrison, DA (2007). The good, the bad, and the unknown about telecommuting: Meta-analysis of psychological mediators and individual consequences. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(6), 1524–1541.<https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.6.1524>
- Gibbs, M., Mengel, F., & Siemroth, C. (2023). Work from home and productivity: Evidence from personnel records. *Journal of Labor Economics*, 41(S1), S115–S153.<https://doi.org/10.1086/721803>
- Golden, T.D., & Gajendran, R.S. (2019). Unpacking the role of a telecommuter's job in their performance: Examining job complexity, problem solving, and interdependence. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 34(1), 55–69.<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-018-9538-7>
- Grant, C.A., Wallace, L.M., & Spurgeon, P.C. (2013). An exploratory study of mental well-being in remote e-workers. *International Journal of Mental Health Promotion*, 15(5), 241–256.<https://doi.org/10.1080/14623730.2013.856930>
- Hacker, J., vom Brocke, J., Handali, J., Otto, M., & Schneider, J. (2020). Virtually in this together: How the pandemic impacts digital work practices. *European Journal of Information Systems*, 29(5), 563–584.<https://doi.org/10.1080/0960085X.2020.1814681>
- Kelliher, C., & Anderson, D. (2010). Doing more with less? Flexible working practices and the intensification of work. *Human Relations*, 63(1), 83–106.<https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726709349199>
- Kossek, E.E., & Lautsch, B.A. (2018). Work-life flexibility for whom? Occupational status and the flexibility-stigma. *Academy of Management Annals*, 12(1), 5–36.<https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2016.0059>
- Kossek, E.E., & Ozeki, C. (1998). Work-family conflict, policies, and the job-life satisfaction relationship: A review and directions for organizational behavior-human resources research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(2), 139–149.<https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.83.2.139>
- Kossek, E.E., Ruderman, M.N., Braddy, P.W., & Hannum, K.M. (2012). Work-nonwork boundary management profiles: A person-centered approach. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 81(1), 112–128.<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2012.04.003>
- Sull, D., Sull, C., & Bersin, J. (2020). Five ways leaders can support remote work. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 61(4), 1–10.
- Waizenegger, L., McKenna, B., Cai, W., & Bendz, T. (2020). An affordance perspective by tech-employees on working from home during the COVID-19 pandemic. *European Journal of Information Systems*, 29(4), 429–442.<https://doi.org/10.1080/0960085X.2020.1800417>