Journal of Excellence in Business Administration (2026) 4(1): 72–86
ISSN (E): 2755-3787

The Dark Side of Remote Work: A Critical Review of Productivity, Employee Well-Being, and Organizational Culture

Asif Noor[1]
Hassan Raza[1]

How to cite this article:

Noor, A., & Raza, H. (2026). The dark side of remote work: A critical review of productivity, employee well-being, and organizational culture. *Journal of Excellence in Business Administration Sciences, 4*(1), 72–86.

Received: 18 January 2026 / Accepted: 14 March 2026 / Published online: 25 June 2026

Abstract

Remote work has become a major transformation in contemporary business administration, reshaping how organizations manage productivity, employee well-being, leadership, communication, and organizational culture. Although remote work is often presented as a flexible and efficient work arrangement, its consequences are complex and sometimes contradictory. This critical review examines the dark side of remote work by evaluating its effects on productivity, employee well-being, and organizational culture. Drawing on Job Demands-Resources Theory, Social Exchange Theory, and Organizational Culture Theory, the review argues that remote work can function as both a resource and a demand depending on how it is designed and managed. The review highlights that remote work may improve flexibility, autonomy, and retention; however, it can also create productivity fragmentation, collaboration silos, work-life boundary blurring, social isolation, digital fatigue, technostress, emotional exhaustion, weakened cultural identity, and unequal employee experiences. Existing literature suggests that hybrid work may offer a balanced alternative, but only when supported by trust-based leadership, clear communication norms, digital well-being policies, fair performance evaluation, and intentional culture-building practices. The review concludes that remote work is not inherently harmful; rather, its negative outcomes emerge when organizations adopt it without redesigning managerial systems, employee support mechanisms, and cultural integration practices. Therefore, organizations must move beyond simplistic flexibility narratives and develop evidence-based remote work strategies that protect productivity, psychological well-being, and organizational cohesion.

Keywords: Remote work; hybrid work; employee well-being; productivity; organizational culture; technostress; work-life balance; business administration; digital fatigue; organizational behavior.

1 Introduction

Remote work has become one of the most influential developments in contemporary business administration because it has reshaped how organizations structure work, manage employees, coordinate teams, evaluate performance, and sustain organizational culture. Although

[1]Lahore Business School, The University of Lahore, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan
e-mail: muhammad.asif@oric.uol.edu.pk

Copyright (c) 2026 Author(s)
This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

telecommuting and flexible work arrangements existed before the COVID-19 pandemic, they were traditionally limited to selected professional groups, knowledge workers, senior employees, or organizations with advanced technological infrastructure (Allen et al., 2015; Golden & Eddleston, 2020). The pandemic accelerated this transformation by forcing organizations across sectors to adopt remote work at an unprecedented scale, thereby converting it from a discretionary human resource practice into a mainstream organizational arrangement (Kniffin et al., 2021; Waizenegger et al., 2020). Since then, remote and hybrid work have remained central to debates on the future of work, suggesting that the shift is not merely a temporary response to crisis but part of a broader reconfiguration of employment relationships, workplace design, and managerial control (Aksoy et al., 2022; Barrero et al., 2023).

From a business administration perspective, remote work is important because it challenges traditional assumptions about physical presence, supervision, productivity, communication, employee engagement, and organizational belonging. In conventional office-based organizations, work is often coordinated through direct observation, informal interaction, shared routines, and face-to-face leadership practices (Schein, 2010; Gajendran & Harrison, 2007). Remote work disrupts these assumptions by relocating work from centralized offices to digitally mediated environments, where employees rely on virtual communication platforms, cloud systems, online meetings, and asynchronous coordination (Wang et al., 2021; Leonardi, 2021). This shift creates both opportunities and risks because remote work can increase flexibility and autonomy while also intensifying coordination challenges, digital dependence, and social disconnection (Molino et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2021).

The growing popularity of remote work is largely associated with its perceived benefits. Employees often value remote work because it reduces commuting time, provides greater schedule control, supports autonomy, and allows better integration of professional and personal responsibilities (Gajendran & Harrison, 2007; Ipsen et al., 2021). Organizations may also benefit from reduced office costs, wider access to talent, improved retention, and greater flexibility in workforce planning (Choudhury et al., 2021; Bloom et al., 2024). Recent evidence suggests that hybrid work can support employee retention without necessarily damaging performance, especially when remote work is implemented in a structured manner rather than as an unmanaged arrangement (Bloom et al., 2024). However, these benefits should be interpreted cautiously because remote work outcomes depend on job type, leadership style, technological support, employee personality, home environment, and organizational culture (Wang et al., 2021; Beckel & Fisher, 2022).

A critical review of remote work is necessary because the dominant managerial narrative often presents it as a flexible, efficient, and employee-friendly work model. While this view is partially valid, it can obscure the hidden costs experienced by employees and organizations. Remote work may improve autonomy, but it can also increase work intensification, digital overload, social isolation, and blurred boundaries between work and family life (Charalampous et al., 2019; Palumbo, 2020). Employees working remotely may experience difficulty disconnecting from work because digital technologies make them continuously reachable through emails, messaging platforms, video meetings, and task management systems (Mazmanian et al., 2013; Molino et al., 2020). Thus, the same technologies that enable flexibility may also create new forms of pressure, surveillance, and psychological strain.

Productivity is one of the most debated areas in remote work literature. Some scholars argue that remote work can improve productivity by reducing office distractions, increasing autonomy, and allowing employees to work during their most productive hours (Choudhury et al., 2021; Bloom et al., 2015). However, productivity in remote work should not be understood only as individual

task completion. Organizational productivity also depends on collaboration, knowledge sharing, creativity, mentoring, informal learning, and team-level coordination (Gibbs et al., 2023; Yang et al., 2022). Evidence indicates that remote work can make collaboration networks more static and siloed, reducing weak ties and cross-functional communication that are essential for innovation and organizational learning (Yang et al., 2022). Therefore, remote work may enhance individual efficiency in some cases while weakening collective productivity and long-term organizational capability.

Employee well-being is another critical issue because remote work can operate as both a resource and a demand. On the one hand, remote work may support well-being by giving employees greater autonomy, reducing commuting stress, and improving perceived control over work schedules (Gajendran & Harrison, 2007; Ipsen et al., 2021). On the other hand, remote work may harm well-being when it increases loneliness, emotional exhaustion, work-family conflict, digital fatigue, and technostress (Charalampous et al., 2019; Oakman et al., 2020). This dual nature can be explained through the Job Demands-Resources perspective, which suggests that job resources such as autonomy and flexibility improve motivation, whereas excessive demands such as workload, role ambiguity, and constant connectivity increase strain (Demerouti et al., 2001; Bakker & Demerouti, 2017). Therefore, remote work is not automatically beneficial for well-being; its impact depends on whether organizations balance flexibility with adequate support, workload control, and recovery opportunities.

The issue of technostress is particularly important in remote work environments because digital tools become the primary medium through which employees communicate, collaborate, and perform their work. Technostress occurs when employees experience stress due to technology overload, technology invasion, complexity, uncertainty, and pressure for constant availability (Tarafdar et al., 2011; Ayyagari et al., 2011). In remote work settings, employees may face excessive online meetings, continuous notifications, rapid message expectations, multiple communication platforms, and reduced psychological separation from work (Molino et al., 2020; Spagnoli et al., 2020). As a result, remote work can create a paradox in which digital technologies provide operational flexibility but simultaneously increase cognitive and emotional strain.

Remote work also has serious implications for organizational culture. Culture is not created only through formal policies; it is developed through shared meanings, symbols, rituals, stories, leadership behavior, socialization, and daily interaction among organizational members (Schein, 2010; Alvesson, 2013). In physical workplaces, employees learn organizational values and informal norms through observation, mentoring, spontaneous conversations, and participation in collective routines (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979; Schein, 2010). Remote work weakens many of these informal mechanisms because communication becomes more scheduled, task-oriented, and digitally mediated (Waizenegger et al., 2020; Yang et al., 2022). This can reduce employee belongingness, organizational identification, trust, and cultural integration, particularly among new employees and early-career workers who depend heavily on social learning.

Leadership practices are also challenged by remote work because managers cannot rely on physical presence and direct supervision to assess employee effort. Effective remote leadership requires trust, communication clarity, emotional support, empowerment, and outcome-based performance management (Contreras et al., 2020; Bartsch et al., 2021). However, when managers lack confidence in remote employees, they may respond through micromanagement, excessive virtual meetings, frequent reporting, or digital surveillance (Sewell & Taskin, 2015; Jeske & Santuzzi, 2015). Such control-oriented practices can reduce autonomy, increase stress, and weaken the psychological contract between employees and organizations (Rousseau, 1995; Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). Therefore, the success of remote work depends not only on technology but also

on leadership maturity and organizational trust.

Another major concern is that remote work experiences are unequal across employees. Employees with private workspaces, stable internet, supportive families, and fewer caregiving responsibilities may benefit more from remote work than those facing overcrowded homes, poor infrastructure, family interruptions, or limited digital resources (Oakman et al., 2020; Beckel & Fisher, 2022). Gender, career stage, income level, job role, and organizational status may also shape how employees experience remote work (Shockley et al., 2021; Lyttelton et al., 2022). For example, employees with caregiving responsibilities may experience remote work as both a flexibility resource and an additional burden because domestic and professional responsibilities occur in the same physical space (Palumbo, 2020; Shockley et al., 2021). Therefore, remote work should also be examined as an equity and inclusion issue, not only as a productivity or flexibility issue.

This critical review is significant because remote work affects multiple domains of business administration, including human resource management, organizational behavior, leadership, strategic management, operations management, and organizational development. A purely positive view of remote work may ignore hidden problems such as employee isolation, cultural weakening, digital fatigue, and managerial surveillance (Charalampous et al., 2019; Sewell & Taskin, 2015). Similarly, a purely negative view may ignore the genuine advantages of autonomy, flexibility, retention, and access to talent (Allen et al., 2015; Bloom et al., 2024). Therefore, a balanced scholarly review is needed to examine remote work as a complex managerial phenomenon that produces both beneficial and harmful consequences depending on how it is designed, supported, and governed.

The purpose of this review is to critically examine the dark side of remote work with specific attention to productivity, employee well-being, and organizational culture. Drawing on Job Demands-Resources Theory, Social Exchange Theory, and Organizational Culture Theory, this review argues that remote work functions as a double-edged sword. It can provide flexibility, autonomy, and satisfaction when supported by effective leadership and clear work design, but it can also produce stress, isolation, cultural fragmentation, and performance challenges when organizations fail to manage its hidden demands (Demerouti et al., 2001; Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005; Schein, 2010). Thus, the central argument of this paper is that remote work should not be accepted or rejected simplistically; instead, it should be critically managed through evidence-based policies that protect employee well-being, sustain productivity, and preserve organizational culture.

2 Background of Remote Work

Remote work refers to a work arrangement in which employees perform job tasks outside the traditional office environment through digital communication technologies, cloud-based systems, virtual platforms, and online collaboration tools (Barrero et al., 2021; Yang et al., 2022). It includes several forms, such as fully remote work, hybrid work, telework, work-from-home arrangements, and work-from-anywhere models (Choudhury et al., 2021; Bloom et al., 2024). The growth of remote work is closely linked with digital transformation, internet-based communication, knowledge work, and the changing expectations of employees regarding autonomy and flexibility (Barrero et al., 2023). In business administration, remote work is not merely an operational adjustment; it is a strategic and managerial transformation because it changes supervision, coordination, leadership, performance measurement, employee engagement, and organizational culture (Yang et al., 2022).

The rapid expansion of remote work after the pandemic created a new managerial reality in which organizations discovered that many tasks could be performed outside the physical workplace

(Barrero et al., 2021). Research from work-from-home studies indicates that employees and employers were often surprised by the feasibility of remote work, leading many organizations to retain hybrid or flexible work arrangements even after pandemic restrictions ended (Barrero et al., 2023). However, the continuation of remote work also revealed that productivity is not only a matter of task completion but also depends on communication quality, employee energy, collaboration networks, organizational trust, and shared identity (Yang et al., 2022). Therefore, the background of remote work shows a shift from emergency adoption to strategic institutionalization, but this shift has also exposed serious managerial challenges.

3 Theoretical Foundation

3.1 Job Demands-Resources Theory

Job Demands-Resources theory provides a useful foundation for critically reviewing remote work because it explains how job characteristics can either support or exhaust employees (Demerouti et al., 2001; Bakker & Demerouti, 2017). According to this theory, job resources such as autonomy, flexibility, supervisor support, and technological support can enhance motivation and performance, while job demands such as workload, emotional strain, role ambiguity, constant connectivity, and digital overload can increase stress and burnout (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017; Pansini et al., 2023). Remote work reflects this dual structure because it provides autonomy and flexibility, but it also increases digital demands, self-management pressure, isolation, and blurred boundaries between personal and professional life (Pansini et al., 2023).

From the JD-R perspective, the dark side of remote work emerges when job demands exceed available resources (Demerouti et al., 2001; Pansini et al., 2023). For example, remote employees may benefit from reduced commuting and flexible scheduling, but they may also experience constant online availability, excessive virtual meetings, reduced emotional support, and difficulty disconnecting from work (Pansini et al., 2023). If organizations provide clear expectations, digital well-being policies, supportive leadership, and collaborative systems, remote work may become a resource-enhancing arrangement (Bloom et al., 2024). However, if organizations simply transfer office routines into virtual spaces without redesigning workload, communication norms, and managerial support, remote work can become a source of chronic strain (Yang et al., 2022; Pansini et al., 2023).

3.2 Social Exchange Theory

Social Exchange Theory is also relevant because remote work affects the psychological relationship between employees and organizations (Blau, 1964; Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). Employees are more likely to show commitment, loyalty, and performance when they perceive that the organization supports their needs and treats them fairly (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). Remote work can strengthen this exchange when employees interpret flexibility as organizational support, but it can weaken the exchange when employees feel ignored, isolated, over-monitored, or excluded from career opportunities (Bloom et al., 2024; Yang et al., 2022). Therefore, remote work changes not only where employees work but also how they interpret the organization's care, trust, and fairness.

The social exchange perspective is particularly important for understanding why remote work outcomes differ across employees and organizations (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). Employees who receive adequate communication, managerial trust, mental health support, and fair evaluation may reciprocate through stronger performance and retention (Bloom et al., 2024). Conversely, employees who experience digital surveillance, weak communication, and reduced visibility may feel that the organization has violated relational expectations, resulting in lower commitment and weaker organizational identification (Yang et al., 2022). Thus, the quality of remote work depends heavily on perceived organizational support and fairness.

3.3 Organizational Culture Theory

Organizational culture refers to shared values, beliefs, norms, rituals, and practices that guide employee behavior and create a sense of collective identity within organizations (Schein, 2010). Remote work challenges organizational culture because culture is often transmitted through informal communication, shared physical experiences, observation, mentoring, rituals, and everyday interactions (Schein, 2010; Yang et al., 2022). When employees work remotely, cultural transmission becomes more dependent on formal meetings, digital messages, and managerial communication, which may not fully replace informal learning and social belonging (Yang et al., 2022).

The cultural risk of remote work is not simply that employees are physically absent from the office; rather, the deeper problem is that remote work can weaken the social processes through which employees learn "how things are done" in an organization (Schein, 2010; Yang et al., 2022). New employees may struggle to understand organizational expectations, informal norms, team relationships, and leadership styles when they have limited face-to-face exposure (Yang et al., 2022). Similarly, existing employees may maintain task performance but gradually lose emotional connection with the organization. Therefore, remote work requires intentional culture-building practices rather than assuming that digital communication alone can sustain organizational identity.

4 Claimed Benefits of Remote Work

Remote work is widely associated with several benefits, including flexibility, autonomy, reduced commuting time, improved work-life balance, wider access to talent, and reduced office costs (Barrero et al., 2021; Bloom et al., 2024). These benefits explain why many employees prefer hybrid or flexible work models and why many organizations continue to integrate remote work into their post-pandemic strategies (Barrero et al., 2023). Research evidence indicates that hybrid working arrangements can improve job satisfaction and reduce quit rates without necessarily damaging performance, particularly when employees work from home for part of the week rather than full time (Bloom et al., 2024). This finding is important because it shows that remote work can produce positive outcomes when implemented as a structured and balanced work design.

However, a critical review must avoid romanticizing remote work as a universal solution to modern workplace problems (Yang et al., 2022; Pansini et al., 2023). The benefits of remote work are not equally distributed across all workers, occupations, genders, sectors, or countries (Barrero et al., 2023). Knowledge workers with stable internet access, private workspace, and supportive managers may benefit more than employees with caregiving burdens, poor home environments, weak digital infrastructure, or jobs requiring high collaboration (Barrero et al., 2021; Maity, 2025). Therefore, remote work should be viewed as a conditional benefit rather than an automatic improvement in employee experience.

5 The Dark Side of Remote Work

5.1 Productivity Paradox in Remote Work

One of the most debated issues in remote work literature is the productivity paradox. Some studies suggest that employees can remain equally productive or even more productive when working remotely because they save commuting time, experience fewer office interruptions, and gain greater autonomy over their schedules (Barrero et al., 2021; Bloom et al., 2024). For example, Bloom et al. (2024) found that hybrid work did not damage performance and reduced employee quit rates in a randomized controlled trial. This evidence challenges traditional managerial assumptions that employees must be physically present to remain productive. However, the same evidence does not prove that all forms of remote work automatically improve productivity because productivity depends on task type, coordination needs, managerial capability, and employee self-

regulation (Bloom et al., 2024; Yang et al., 2022).

The darker side of productivity appears when remote work creates fragmented attention, excessive digital communication, home-based distractions, unclear work routines, and reduced coordination (Yang et al., 2022). Productivity in organizations is not only individual output; it also includes collaboration, innovation, knowledge sharing, mentoring, and collective problem solving (Yang et al., 2022). A major study of Microsoft employees found that firm-wide remote work made collaboration networks more static and siloed, reducing cross-group communication and weakening bridges between teams (Yang et al., 2022). This means that remote workers may complete individual tasks efficiently while organizational-level learning and innovation suffer. Therefore, remote productivity must be evaluated at both individual and collective levels.

A critical issue is that remote work can encourage organizations to measure productivity through visible digital activity rather than meaningful performance outcomes (Pansini et al., 2023). When managers cannot observe employees physically, they may rely on online status, meeting attendance, message response speed, or digital tracking systems as proxies for productivity (Yang et al., 2022). Such practices may increase performative work, where employees appear busy online without necessarily producing higher-quality outcomes. This creates a managerial paradox: remote work requires trust and autonomy, but poor managerial design may increase surveillance and control, which can reduce motivation and well-being (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005; Pansini et al., 2023).

5.2 Work-Life Boundary Blurring

Remote work is often promoted as a solution for work-life balance, but it can also weaken the boundary between work and personal life (Pansini et al., 2023). When the home becomes the workplace, employees may struggle to separate professional duties from family responsibilities, rest, and personal identity (Demerouti et al., 2001; Pansini et al., 2023). The absence of physical separation between office and home can extend working hours, increase after-hours communication, and create a feeling of constant availability. Therefore, remote work may reduce commuting stress but create a new form of psychological burden through boundaryless work.

Boundary blurring is especially problematic because employees may internalize the pressure to prove productivity while working remotely (Pansini et al., 2023). In traditional offices, presence itself can signal availability, but in remote settings employees may feel compelled to respond quickly to emails, attend more meetings, or remain online beyond official work hours (Yang et al., 2022). This can create a cycle of digital presenteeism, where employees are physically at home but psychologically unable to disconnect from work. From a JD-R perspective, this condition increases job demands and reduces recovery time, which can contribute to emotional exhaustion and burnout (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017; Pansini et al., 2023).

5.3 Employee Isolation and Loneliness

Employee isolation is one of the most serious dark sides of remote work because workplaces are not only spaces for task completion but also social systems that provide belonging, informal learning, emotional support, and professional identity (Schein, 2010; Yang et al., 2022). Remote work reduces spontaneous conversations, informal mentoring, social rituals, and casual interactions that normally occur in physical workplaces (Yang et al., 2022). Although virtual meetings can support formal communication, they often fail to reproduce the emotional richness and social depth of face-to-face interaction. As a result, employees may remain technically connected but socially disconnected.

Loneliness and isolation can negatively affect both well-being and productivity because employees who feel disconnected may experience lower motivation, weaker commitment, and reduced organizational identification (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005; Figueiredo, 2025). Remote work can

be particularly challenging for new employees, early-career professionals, and employees who depend on social learning to understand organizational norms (Yang et al., 2022). In addition, isolation may reduce psychological safety because employees may hesitate to ask informal questions, seek help, or share concerns in virtual settings. Therefore, remote work can silently weaken the relational foundation of organizational performance.

5.4 Digital Fatigue and Technostress

Technostress refers to stress caused by the use of information and communication technologies, including overload, complexity, invasion, uncertainty, and constant connectivity (Tarafdar et al., 2011; Pansini et al., 2023). Remote work increases dependence on digital platforms for meetings, task coordination, communication, monitoring, and social interaction (Yang et al., 2022). Although technology enables remote work, excessive technology use can generate digital fatigue, screen exhaustion, communication overload, and reduced cognitive energy (Pansini et al., 2023). This shows that digital tools are not neutral; they can become both resources and demands depending on how organizations use them.

Digital fatigue is particularly important in business administration because it affects decision-making, creativity, attention, and interpersonal communication (Pansini et al., 2023). Employees may experience back-to-back video meetings, constant notifications, duplicated communication across platforms, and pressure to remain digitally visible (Yang et al., 2022). Over time, this can reduce concentration and increase emotional exhaustion. From the JD-R perspective, digital tools become harmful when they increase work demands without providing sufficient control, recovery, or support (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017; Pansini et al., 2023). Therefore, organizations must manage digital work intentionally rather than assuming that more connectivity always improves performance.

5.5 Mental Health and Well-Being Challenges

Remote work can support well-being when it gives employees flexibility, reduces commuting stress, and allows better control over personal schedules (Bloom et al., 2024). However, it can also damage mental health when employees experience loneliness, overwork, unclear expectations, lack of recognition, and work-family conflict (Pansini et al., 2023; Figueiredo, 2025). The mental health consequences of remote work are therefore mixed and depend on organizational support, leadership behavior, individual circumstances, and home environment (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017). A critical review must recognize that remote work does not automatically produce well-being; rather, well-being depends on whether remote work is designed humanely.

The dark side of remote work is visible in emotional exhaustion, reduced motivation, burnout, anxiety, and difficulty disconnecting from work (Pansini et al., 2023). Employees who work remotely may also experience invisible emotional labor because they must manage professional communication, family interruptions, digital expectations, and self-discipline simultaneously (Demerouti et al., 2001; Pansini et al., 2023). Moreover, when organizations fail to provide emotional support and clear communication, remote employees may feel abandoned rather than empowered. Therefore, remote work should be evaluated not only through output metrics but also through employee mental health and long-term sustainability.

5.6 Weakening of Organizational Culture

Organizational culture is vulnerable in remote work settings because culture is built through repeated social interaction, shared experiences, symbols, stories, leadership behavior, and informal communication (Schein, 2010). Remote work can weaken culture when employees interact mainly through task-focused digital communication and have fewer opportunities to develop shared identity and emotional connection (Yang et al., 2022). In physical workplaces, culture is reinforced through observation, rituals, office routines, informal conversations, and collective experiences.

In remote environments, these cultural mechanisms become weaker unless organizations intentionally replace them with meaningful digital or hybrid practices.

The weakening of culture can affect employee commitment, collaboration, innovation, and retention (Schein, 2010; Yang et al., 2022). When employees feel detached from organizational values and colleagues, they may treat work as a transactional arrangement rather than a shared mission (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). This risk is especially high in organizations that use remote work primarily for cost reduction without investing in communication, leadership, and community-building practices. Therefore, remote work requires cultural redesign, including deliberate onboarding, virtual mentoring, team rituals, transparent communication, and periodic face-to-face interaction where possible (Yang et al., 2022; Bloom et al., 2024).

5.7 Leadership and Control Challenges

Remote work changes the role of leadership because managers can no longer rely on physical supervision, informal observation, or immediate office-based interaction (Yang et al., 2022). Effective remote leadership requires trust, clarity, empathy, communication discipline, outcome-based performance evaluation, and emotional support (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005; Bloom et al., 2024). However, many managers respond to remote work with micromanagement, excessive meetings, digital monitoring, and rigid reporting systems. Such practices may reduce autonomy and increase stress, thereby undermining the very benefits remote work is supposed to provide (Pansini et al., 2023).

The leadership challenge is also cultural because remote employees need stronger communication about priorities, expectations, feedback, and organizational purpose (Schein, 2010; Yang et al., 2022). In remote settings, silence from leaders can easily be interpreted as neglect, while excessive communication can become overload. Therefore, remote leadership requires balance: managers must remain accessible without becoming intrusive, provide structure without reducing autonomy, and maintain accountability without relying on surveillance. This makes remote work a test of leadership maturity and organizational trust.

5.8 Inequality in Remote Work Experiences

Remote work is often presented as a universal benefit, but employees do not experience it equally (Barrero et al., 2023; Maity, 2025). Employees with comfortable homes, private workspaces, reliable internet, and fewer caregiving responsibilities may benefit more from remote work than those facing crowded living conditions, family demands, poor infrastructure, or limited digital resources (Barrero et al., 2021). In developing economies, these inequalities can be even more visible because digital infrastructure, household space, and organizational support may vary significantly across employees and sectors (Maity, 2025). Therefore, remote work can reproduce or intensify existing social and workplace inequalities.

Gender is also an important issue in remote work because women may experience both benefits and burdens from flexible work arrangements (Bloom et al., 2024). Hybrid work may support retention among employees with long commutes and family responsibilities, but remote work can also increase unpaid domestic labor and work-family conflict if household roles remain unequal (Bloom et al., 2024; Pansini et al., 2023). Similarly, early-career employees may face disadvantages because remote work can reduce mentoring, visibility, networking, and career development opportunities (Yang et al., 2022). Therefore, organizations must treat remote work as an equity issue, not only an efficiency strategy.

6 Critical Review of Existing Literature

Existing literature on remote work presents a mixed and sometimes contradictory picture. Some research emphasizes the positive effects of remote and hybrid work on job satisfaction, retention,

flexibility, and productivity (Barrero et al., 2021; Bloom et al., 2024). For instance, Bloom et al. (2024) provides strong experimental evidence that hybrid work can reduce quit rates without harming performance. This finding is important because it challenges traditional managerial beliefs that remote work necessarily reduces employee effort. It also suggests that hybrid work may be a practical compromise between flexibility and organizational coordination.

However, other research highlights the negative consequences of remote work for collaboration, communication networks, social belonging, and innovation (Yang et al., 2022). Yang et al. (2022) show that firm-wide remote work made collaboration networks more siloed and less dynamic among Microsoft employees. This evidence is significant because it reveals that even if individual productivity remains stable, organizational collaboration may decline. Therefore, the literature suggests a distinction between short-term individual productivity and long-term organizational capability. Remote work may help employees complete individual tasks but weaken the social infrastructure that supports collective learning and innovation.

Another weakness in the literature is that many studies focus on knowledge workers in developed economies, while less attention is given to developing countries, SMEs, public sector organizations, and lower-income employees (Maity, 2025). This creates a contextual gap because remote work outcomes may differ across institutional environments, cultural settings, digital infrastructure, and managerial systems. For example, remote work in a multinational technology company may not have the same consequences as remote work in a small firm, university, public office, or developing-country organization (Maity, 2025). Therefore, future research should avoid generalizing findings from privileged occupational groups to all workers.

The literature also shows a methodological challenge because remote work outcomes are often measured through self-reported productivity, job satisfaction, or managerial perceptions (Barrero et al., 2021; Bloom et al., 2024). Although such measures are useful, they may not fully capture collaboration quality, innovation, tacit knowledge sharing, cultural belonging, or long-term psychological consequences (Yang et al., 2022). More longitudinal and multi-level studies are needed to examine how remote work affects employees, teams, and organizations over time. This is especially important because some negative effects, such as cultural weakening and career stagnation, may appear gradually rather than immediately.

7 Research Gaps

A major research gap concerns the long-term impact of remote work on organizational culture (Yang et al., 2022; Schein, 2010). While many studies examine productivity and satisfaction, fewer studies investigate how remote work reshapes shared values, organizational identity, trust, socialization, mentoring, and informal learning over several years. This gap is important because organizational culture is not destroyed immediately; it may erode slowly when employees lose social connection and shared experiences. Therefore, future research should examine whether remote or hybrid organizations can sustain strong cultures without regular physical interaction.

A second gap relates to employee well-being in different remote work designs (Pansini et al., 2023). Many studies discuss remote work broadly, but full-time remote work, hybrid work, flexible scheduling, and work-from-anywhere models may produce different psychological outcomes (Bloom et al., 2024). Future studies should compare these models more carefully and examine how leadership, workload, digital communication norms, and organizational support shape well-being. This would help organizations design remote work policies that protect mental health rather than simply offering flexibility.

A third gap concerns inequality and inclusion in remote work (Barrero et al., 2023; Maity, 2025). More research is needed on how remote work affects employees across gender, age, career stage, income level, family status, disability, and geographic location. Remote work may benefit some

employees while disadvantaging others through reduced visibility, limited mentoring, or unequal home resources. Therefore, researchers should examine remote work as a social and organizational justice issue rather than only a productivity issue.

A fourth gap exists in developing-country contexts, where digital infrastructure, household conditions, organizational maturity, and employment relations may differ from advanced economies (Maity, 2025). Most influential remote work research is based on the United States, Europe, China, or multinational technology firms (Barrero et al., 2021; Bloom et al., 2024; Yang et al., 2022). In countries such as Pakistan and other emerging economies, remote work may be shaped by internet reliability, electricity issues, collectivist work culture, managerial control norms, and household responsibilities. Therefore, context-specific research is needed to understand the real consequences of remote work in developing economies.

8 Practical Implications for Organizations

Organizations should avoid treating remote work as a simple policy choice and instead approach it as a strategic work design issue (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017; Bloom et al., 2024). A well-designed remote work system should include clear expectations, outcome-based performance evaluation, reasonable meeting norms, digital well-being practices, leadership training, and structured communication routines. These practices can reduce ambiguity and prevent remote work from becoming a source of stress and overwork. Therefore, managers should focus on work design rather than only deciding how many days employees should work from home.

Organizations should also protect employee well-being by establishing boundaries around availability, meeting load, and after-hours communication (Pansini et al., 2023). Digital tools should be used to support collaboration, not to create constant surveillance or pressure. Managers should encourage recovery time, asynchronous communication, and realistic workload planning. This is important because remote work can easily become invisible overwork when employees feel they must always remain available. Therefore, digital well-being should become part of human resource management and occupational health policy.

To maintain organizational culture, organizations should intentionally design social connection and cultural transmission mechanisms (Schein, 2010; Yang et al., 2022). These may include structured onboarding, mentoring programs, team-building rituals, hybrid meetings, periodic in-person gatherings, leadership storytelling, and informal virtual spaces. Culture cannot be maintained only through formal emails or performance dashboards. Therefore, organizations must create meaningful opportunities for employees to build trust, identity, and belonging.

Leadership development is also essential because remote work requires a shift from control-based management to trust-based management (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005; Bloom et al., 2024). Managers should be trained to evaluate outcomes rather than online presence, communicate clearly without overloading employees, and provide emotional support without micromanaging. Trust is especially important because remote work fails when managers assume that employees are unproductive unless constantly monitored. Therefore, remote leadership should combine accountability with autonomy.

Organizations should also address inequality in remote work by assessing employees' home working conditions, caregiving responsibilities, digital access, and career development opportunities (Barrero et al., 2023; Maity, 2025). Remote employees should not be excluded from promotions, mentoring, networking, or leadership visibility. Human resource departments should monitor whether remote workers face hidden career penalties compared with office-based employees. Therefore, fairness and inclusion must be built into remote work policies from the beginning.

9 Future Research Directions

Future research should examine remote work through longitudinal designs because many consequences of remote work appear over time rather than immediately (Yang et al., 2022). For example, productivity may remain stable in the short term, but innovation, mentoring, culture, and employee belonging may decline gradually. Longitudinal studies would help researchers understand whether remote work creates cumulative benefits or hidden long-term costs. This is important for business administration because strategic decisions should be based on sustainable outcomes rather than short-term efficiency.

Future studies should also investigate hybrid work as a distinct model rather than treating it as a minor variation of remote work (Bloom et al., 2024). Hybrid work may reduce some negative effects of full-time remote work by preserving face-to-face interaction while maintaining flexibility. However, hybrid work also creates coordination challenges, fairness issues, and scheduling complexity. Therefore, future research should examine which hybrid designs are most effective for different industries, tasks, and employee groups.

Another important direction is the study of digital surveillance, algorithmic management, and trust in remote work (Pansini et al., 2023). As organizations use monitoring tools to track employee activity, researchers should examine how surveillance affects autonomy, motivation, stress, and organizational commitment. This is critical because remote work can either humanize work through flexibility or intensify control through digital monitoring. Therefore, future research should explore the ethical and psychological consequences of remote management technologies.

Finally, future research should focus more on developing economies and non-Western cultural contexts (Maity, 2025). Remote work in countries such as Pakistan may be influenced by family systems, internet infrastructure, power reliability, managerial norms, and cultural expectations around supervision and teamwork. Such research would add contextual richness to remote work literature and help organizations design policies suitable for local realities. Therefore, developing-country evidence is necessary for a more balanced and globally relevant understanding of remote work.

10 Conclusion

Remote work has become a permanent feature of contemporary business administration, but its consequences are complex and contradictory (Barrero et al., 2023; Bloom et al., 2024). It offers flexibility, autonomy, reduced commuting, job satisfaction, and retention benefits, especially when implemented through structured hybrid arrangements (Bloom et al., 2024). However, a critical review reveals that remote work also has a dark side, including productivity fragmentation, collaboration silos, work-life boundary blurring, social isolation, technostress, mental health risks, weakened organizational culture, leadership challenges, and unequal employee experiences (Yang et al., 2022; Pansini et al., 2023). Therefore, remote work should not be celebrated uncritically as the future of work, nor rejected simplistically as a threat to organizational control.

The most balanced conclusion is that remote work is not a problem in itself; poor remote work design is the real problem (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017; Bloom et al., 2024). When organizations provide resources such as clear communication, trust-based leadership, digital well-being policies, cultural connection, and fair evaluation, remote work can support both productivity and employee well-being. However, when organizations transfer office practices into digital spaces without redesigning work systems, remote work can intensify stress, weaken culture, and reduce collaboration. Therefore, the future of remote work depends on managerial maturity,

Author Contributions

Asif Noor and Hassan Raza contributed to the conceptualization, review design, literature search and analysis, interpretation, and preparation and critical revision of the manuscript. Both authors read and approved the final manuscript and agreed to be accountable for the work.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that they have no financial, commercial, professional, institutional, or personal conflicts of interest related to this article.

Data Availability

No new data were created or analyzed in this review article; therefore, data sharing is not applicable.

Informed Consent

Not applicable. This review article did not involve human participants.

Funding

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Use of Generative AI

The authors declare that no generative artificial intelligence tools were used to generate the scholarly content, conduct the analysis, interpret the findings, or formulate the conclusions presented in this article.

11 References

Aksoy, C. G., Barrero, J. M., Bloom, N., Davis, S. J., Dolls, M., & Zarate, P. (2022). Working from home around the world. Brookings Papers on Economic Activity, 2022(2), 281–360.

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

Alvesson, M. (2013). Understanding organizational culture (2nd ed.). SAGE.

Ayyagari, R., Grover, V., & Purvis, R. L. (2011). Technostress: Technological antecedents and implications. MIS Quarterly, 35(4), 831–858.

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). Job demands-resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward. Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 22(3), 273–285. https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000056

Barrero, J. M., Bloom, N., & Davis, S. J. (2021). Why working from home will stick (NBER Working Paper No. 28731). National Bureau of Economic Research.

Barrero, J. M., Bloom, N., & Davis, S. J. (2023). The evolution of work from home (NBER Working Paper No. 31686). National Bureau of Economic Research.

Bartsch, S., Weber, E., Büttgen, M., & Huber, A. (2021). Leadership matters in crisis-induced digital transformation: How to lead service employees effectively during the COVID-19 pandemic. Journal of Service Management, 32(1), 71–85.

Beckel, J. L. O., & Fisher, G. G. (2022). Telework and worker health and well-being: A review and recommendations for research and practice. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 19(7), Article 3879.

Blau, P. M. (1964). Exchange and power in social life. Wiley.

Bloom, N., Han, R., & Liang, J. (2024). Hybrid working from home improves retention without damaging performance. Nature, 630, 920–925. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-024-07500-2

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

Choudhury, P., Foroughi, C., & Larson, B. Z. (2021). Work-from-anywhere: The productivity effects of geographic flexibility. Strategic Management Journal, 42(4), 655–683. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.3251

Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Social exchange theory: An interdisciplinary review. Journal of Management, 31(6), 874–900.

Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The job demands-resources model of burnout. Journal of Applied Psychology, 86(3), 499–512. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.499

Figueiredo, E. (2025). Loneliness and isolation in the era of telework. PMC.

Gibbs, M., Mengel, F., & Siemroth, C. (2023). Work from home and productivity: Evidence from personnel and analytics data on information technology professionals. Journal of Political Economy Microeconomics, 1(1), 7–41.

Golden, T. D., & Eddleston, K. A. (2020). Is there a price telecommuters pay? Examining the relationship between telecommuting and objective career success. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 116, Article 103348.

Ipsen, C., van Veldhoven, M., Kirchner, K., & Hansen, J. P. (2021). Six key advantages and disadvantages of working from home in Europe during COVID-19. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 18(4), Article 1826.

Jeske, D., & Santuzzi, A. M. (2015). Monitoring what and how: Psychological implications of electronic performance monitoring. New Technology, Work and Employment, 30(1), 62–78.

Kniffin, K. M., Narayanan, J., Anseel, F., Antonakis, J., Ashford, S. P., Bakker, A. B., Bamberger, P., Bapuji, H., Bhave, D. P., Choi, V. K., Creary, S. J., Demerouti, E., Flynn, F. J., Gelfand, M. J., Greer, L. L., Johns, G., Kesebir, S., Klein, P. G., Lee, S. Y., … van Vugt, M. (2021). COVID-19 and the workplace: Implications, issues, and insights for future research and action. American Psychologist, 76(1), 63–77.

Leonardi, P. M. (2021). COVID-19 and the new technologies of organizing: Digital exhaust, digital footprints, and artificial intelligence in the wake of remote work. Journal of Management Studies, 58(1), 249–253.

Lyttelton, T., Zang, E., & Musick, K. (2022). Telecommuting and gender inequalities in parents' paid and unpaid work before and during the COVID-19 pandemic. Journal of Marriage and Family, 84(1), 230–249.

Maity, R. (2025). The impact of remote and hybrid work models on small and medium enterprises: A systematic literature review. Discover Global Society.

Mazmanian, M., Orlikowski, W. J., & Yates, J. (2013). The autonomy paradox: The implications

of mobile email devices for knowledge professionals. Organization Science, 24(5), 1337–1357.

Molino, M., Ingusci, E., Signore, F., Manuti, A., Giancaspro, M. L., Russo, V., Zito, M., & Cortese, C. G. (2020). Wellbeing costs of technology use during COVID-19 remote working: An investigation using the Italian translation of the technostress creators scale. Sustainability, 12(15), Article 5911.

Oakman, J., Kinsman, N., Stuckey, R., Graham, M., & Weale, V. (2020). A rapid review of mental and physical health effects of working at home: How do we optimise health? BMC Public Health, 20, Article 1825.

Palumbo, R. (2020). Let me go to the office! An investigation into the side effects of working from home on work-life balance. International Journal of Public Sector Management, 33(6/7), 771–790.

Pansini, M., Buonomo, I., Ferrara, B., & Benevene, P. (2023). Positioning technostress in the JD-R model perspective. Frontiers in Psychology, 14, Article 1022693. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1022693

Rousseau, D. M. (1995). Psychological contracts in organizations: Understanding written and unwritten agreements. SAGE.

Schein, E. H. (2010). Organizational culture and leadership (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.

Sewell, G., & Taskin, L. (2015). Out of sight, out of mind in a new world of work? Autonomy, control, and spatiotemporal scaling in telework. Organization Studies, 36(11), 1507–1529.

Shockley, K. M., Clark, M. A., Dodd, H., & King, E. B. (2021). Work-family strategies during COVID-19: Examining gender dynamics among dual-earner couples with young children. Journal of Applied Psychology, 106(1), 15–28.

Spagnoli, P., Molino, M., Molinaro, D., Giancaspro, M. L., Manuti, A., & Ghislieri, C. (2020). Workaholism and technostress during the COVID-19 emergency: The crucial role of the leaders on remote working. Frontiers in Psychology, 11, Article 620310.

Tarafdar, M., Tu, Q., Ragu-Nathan, T. S., & Ragu-Nathan, B. S. (2011). Crossing to the dark side: Examining creators, outcomes, and inhibitors of technostress. Communications of the ACM, 54(9), 113–120. https://doi.org/10.1145/1995376.1995403

Van Maanen, J., & Schein, E. H. (1979). Toward a theory of organizational socialization. Research in Organizational Behavior, 1, 209–264.

Waizenegger, L., McKenna, B., Cai, W., & Bendz, T. (2020). An affordance perspective of team collaboration and enforced working from home during COVID-19. European Journal of Information Systems, 29(4), 429–442.

Wang, B., Liu, Y., Qian, J., & Parker, S. K. (2021). Achieving effective remote working during the COVID-19 pandemic: A work design perspective. Applied Psychology, 70(1), 16–59.

Yang, L., Holtz, D., Jaffe, S., Suri, S., Sinha, S., Weston, J., Joyce, C., Shah, N., Sherman, K., Hecht, B., & Teevan, J. (2022). The effects of remote work on collaboration among information workers. Nature Human Behaviour, 6, 43–54. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-021-01196-4