

STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT OF REMOTE AND HYBRID WORK MODELS IN MODERN ORGANIZATIONS

M. Rizqi Padma Negara, SE., S.Tr., A.K.P., MM

1 Yayasan Kreatif Indonesia Emas

Padmarizqi99@gmail.com

Abstract

Background: Remote and hybrid work are not simply location policies. They change coordination costs, access to information, the rhythm of meetings, the meaning of visibility and the way employees experience autonomy. **Aims:** This article examines the mechanisms that connect the topic to organizational or policy performance and identifies the conditions that make those mechanisms stronger or weaker. **Research Method:** A structured narrative review integrates peer-reviewed research with authoritative policy, statistical, and professional sources, including OECD (2024b); Barrero et al. (2023). Sources are coded by outcome, mechanism, boundary condition, and practical implication. **Results and Conclusion:** The synthesis indicates that outcomes are heterogeneous. The debate is often framed as office versus home, but the more useful question is which tasks require co-location, which benefit from quiet individual work, and what management practices keep the two modes connected. Six recurring themes show that implementation quality, information, capability, and institutional context frequently matter as much as the headline policy or technology. **Contribution:** The article offers an evidence-based framework for organizations managing distributed knowledge work that translates the literature into decision principles without claiming primary data that were not collected.

Keywords: *Hybrid Work, Remote Work, Strategic Management, Productivity, Collaboration, Work Design*

Introduction

Remote and hybrid work are not simply location policies. They change coordination costs, access to information, the rhythm of meetings, the meaning of visibility and the way employees experience autonomy. This question is timely for workplaces where employees alternate between offices, homes and other locations while teams remain responsible for shared outcomes. Recent institutional and research sources such as ILO (2025); OECD (2024b) provide the broader context for the discussion.

The debate is often framed as office versus home, but the more useful question is which tasks require co-location, which benefit from quiet individual work, and what management practices keep the two modes connected. For organizations managing distributed knowledge work, the practical issue is therefore to separate the part of the problem that can be managed internally from the part that depends on markets, infrastructure or public policy. That distinction keeps the analysis from turning into either technological optimism or policy fatalism.

The topic also has a measurement problem. Organizations tend to record what is easiest to observe, while the outcome that matters is often delayed, distributed across functions or affected by several causes at once. Verhoef et al. (2021); Grant (1996) illustrate why aggregate indicators are useful for context but insufficient for firm-level judgment. A good analysis must connect the indicator to a mechanism and then ask whether the mechanism is plausible in the specific operating environment.

Another complication is heterogeneity. Organizations managing distributed knowledge work do not start from the same position. Size, skills, access to finance, technology, governance quality and market exposure all shape the capacity to respond. The same intervention can therefore be beneficial for one organization and premature for another. This variation is not a weakness in the literature; it is information about the conditions under which a practice is likely to work.

The article asks three questions. First, which mechanisms explain the relationship implied by the title? Second, which organizational or institutional conditions strengthen or weaken those

mechanisms? Third, what can decision makers do without assuming that a single policy, technology or management tool will solve the entire problem? The questions are deliberately practical because the objective is to support judgment rather than to manufacture a universal formula.

The contribution is an integrative framework that treats performance as the result of interacting choices. It organizes recent evidence around six themes, identifies recurring tensions, and translates the synthesis into a set of actions for organizations managing distributed knowledge work. The article does not claim original survey or experimental data. It is a structured evidence review intended for author development and editorial refinement before any formal publication decision.

Literature Review

The literature relevant to this topic sits across more than one field. Some sources focus on macro or institutional conditions, while others examine organizational routines, technology adoption or behavioral responses. World Economic Forum (2025); ILO (2025); Edmondson & Lei (2014) are representative of that range. Reading them together is useful because a change in the external environment affects performance only after it passes through decisions about resources, incentives and implementation.

A first conceptual distinction is between an input and a capability. An input may be a technology, source of finance, policy instrument, data set or formal rule. A capability is the repeated ability to use that input well. The distinction matters for organizations managing distributed knowledge work because adoption can be measured immediately, whereas capability often becomes visible only when conditions are difficult or when the organization must adapt without losing control.

A second distinction concerns efficiency and resilience. Many practices improve average performance by reducing slack, duplication or transaction cost. Yet highly optimized systems can become brittle if they lack alternative suppliers, skills, channels or decision pathways. The relevant question is not whether slack is good or bad, but which forms of redundancy protect important outcomes and which merely preserve inefficient routines. Edmondson & Lei (2014); OECD (2024b) provide useful context for this trade-off.

Finally, the literature suggests that trust and information quality are recurring mediators. Managers, employees, customers, investors or citizens act on information only when they regard the process behind it as sufficiently credible. That observation links seemingly different topics: financial reporting, digital platforms, team innovation and public policy all depend on the quality of information and the legitimacy of the process through which decisions are made.

Analytical dimension	Central question	Practical concern
Task fit and work design	location should reflect the interdependence, concentration and equipment needs of the work	blanket attendance rules ignore meaningful differences between roles
Coordination and meeting architecture	distributed teams need deliberate routines for decisions, handoffs and shared context	digital calendars can fill with meetings that compensate for weak process design
Performance management	outcomes matter more when managers cannot rely on physical presence as a proxy for effort	poor goals can lead to intrusive monitoring and employee gaming
Culture and belonging	informal interaction is harder to reproduce when teams are rarely together	new employees and peripheral members can lose access to tacit knowledge
Well-being and boundaries	flexibility can reduce commuting but blur working-time boundaries	employees may experience isolation or extended availability expectations
Technology, security and workspace	reliable tools and appropriate home or office environments influence performance	unequal equipment and connectivity create hidden differences in opportunity

Research Method

The research design is a conceptual review with structured source coding. It is appropriate for the present objective because the article seeks to compare mechanisms across settings without inventing primary observations that were not collected by the authors.

The evidence base for this draft includes 8 core references covering research, policy reports, standards or official statistics. Priority is given to sources published from 2020 onward, with older references retained only where they are widely used to define a core organizational or accounting concept. The review does not use unattributed web commentary as evidence.

Each source is read against four coding questions: what outcome is being explained; what mechanism is proposed; what conditions appear to strengthen or weaken the effect; and what decision can reasonably be informed by the finding. The six analytical themes used in the results section emerged from that coding and from the problem structure defined in the introduction.

The method has limitations. Evidence drawn from different sectors, countries and research designs cannot support one causal coefficient for workplaces where employees alternate between offices, homes and other locations while teams remain responsible for shared outcomes. In addition, this editorial draft has not been validated with interviews or original field data. Its claims are therefore framed as a synthesis of supported mechanisms and practical propositions that should be reviewed by the named authors before publication.

Source	Primary relevance	Use in this review
Bloom et al. (2024)	causal evidence on hybrid work and employee outcomes	Used for contextual or thematic synthesis
Barrero et al. (2023)	evolution and economics of work from home	Used for contextual or thematic synthesis
World Economic Forum (2025)	workforce, skills, technology and organizational change	Used for contextual or thematic synthesis
ILO (2025)	employment trends, job quality and labour-market conditions	Used for contextual or thematic synthesis
OECD (2024b)	digital technology, policy, skills and trust	Used for contextual or thematic synthesis
Edmondson & Lei (2014)	psychological safety research synthesis	Used for contextual or thematic synthesis

Results and Discussion

Task fit and work design

A useful way to read this issue is to start with the decision that managers actually have to make. Location should reflect the interdependence, concentration and equipment needs of the work. That distinction matters because blanket attendance rules ignore meaningful differences between roles. In workplaces where employees alternate between offices, homes and other locations while teams remain responsible for shared outcomes, this can change the economics and timing of decisions even when the broad direction of policy or technology appears favorable. The sources reviewed for this draft, including Grant (1996); Verhoef et al. (2021), are useful because they place the issue inside a wider system of incentives, capabilities and constraints rather than treating one variable as sufficient. For organizations managing distributed knowledge work, the practical response is to classify work by collaboration intensity and customer or equipment constraints. That response is deliberately modest: it does not remove uncertainty, but it makes the trade-off visible and easier to govern.

The point also has an organizational side. Location should reflect the interdependence, concentration and equipment needs of the work, but the benefit depends on who owns the information, who is permitted to act on it and how exceptions are handled. A common failure mode is to adopt the visible part of a practice while leaving the underlying routine unchanged. Blanket attendance rules ignore meaningful differences between roles. This helps explain why organizations exposed to similar conditions can report very different outcomes. ILO (2025) provides a complementary perspective on the institutional or managerial conditions surrounding the issue. A more credible approach is therefore to classify work by collaboration intensity and customer or equipment constraints, while documenting assumptions and reviewing them when conditions materially change.

There is also a boundary to the argument. Location should reflect the interdependence, concentration and equipment needs of the work should not be interpreted as a universal rule or a guaranteed

performance effect. Where resources, incentives or local conditions differ, blanket attendance rules ignore meaningful differences between roles. Short-term results may therefore move in a different direction from longer-term capability. This is one reason the present article favors conditional interpretation over a single average effect. Evidence summarized by Bloom et al. (2024); Verhoef et al. (2021) supports the value of examining the mechanism and the surrounding context together. The managerial implication remains concrete: classify work by collaboration intensity and customer or equipment constraints. The quality of execution, not the label attached to the initiative, determines whether that principle improves performance.

Coordination and meeting architecture

The practical difficulty becomes clearer when the analysis moves from broad trends to the operating decision. Distributed teams need deliberate routines for decisions, handoffs and shared context. The underlying mechanism is not difficult to see: digital calendars can fill with meetings that compensate for weak process design. In workplaces where employees alternate between offices, homes and other locations while teams remain responsible for shared outcomes, this can change the economics and timing of decisions even when the broad direction of policy or technology appears favorable. The sources reviewed for this draft, including OECD (2024b); World Economic Forum (2025), are useful because they place the issue inside a wider system of incentives, capabilities and constraints rather than treating one variable as sufficient. For organizations managing distributed knowledge work, the practical response is to use fewer recurring meetings with clearer purposes and written decision records. That response is deliberately modest: it does not remove uncertainty, but it makes the trade-off visible and easier to govern.

The point also has an organizational side. Distributed teams need deliberate routines for decisions, handoffs and shared context, but the benefit depends on who owns the information, who is permitted to act on it and how exceptions are handled. A common failure mode is to adopt the visible part of a practice while leaving the underlying routine unchanged. Digital calendars can fill with meetings that compensate for weak process design. This helps explain why organizations exposed to similar conditions can report very different outcomes. Barrero et al. (2023) provides a complementary perspective on the institutional or managerial conditions surrounding the issue. A more credible approach is therefore to use fewer recurring meetings with clearer purposes and written decision records, while documenting assumptions and reviewing them when conditions materially change.

There is also a boundary to the argument. Distributed teams need deliberate routines for decisions, handoffs and shared context should not be interpreted as a universal rule or a guaranteed performance effect. Where resources, incentives or local conditions differ, digital calendars can fill with meetings that compensate for weak process design. Short-term results may therefore move in a different direction from longer-term capability. This is one reason the present article favors conditional interpretation over a single average effect. Evidence summarized by ILO (2025); Bloom et al. (2024) supports the value of examining the mechanism and the surrounding context together. The managerial implication remains concrete: use fewer recurring meetings with clearer purposes and written decision records. The quality of execution, not the label attached to the initiative, determines whether that principle improves performance.

Performance management

The evidence is less tidy than a simple positive-or-negative relationship would suggest. Outcomes matter more when managers cannot rely on physical presence as a proxy for effort. The point is especially relevant where poor goals can lead to intrusive monitoring and employee gaming. In workplaces where employees alternate between offices, homes and other locations while teams remain responsible for shared outcomes, this can change the economics and timing of decisions even when the broad direction of policy or technology appears favorable. The sources reviewed for this draft, including ILO (2025); Edmondson & Lei (2014), are useful because they place the issue inside a wider system of incentives, capabilities and constraints rather than treating one variable as

sufficient. For organizations managing distributed knowledge work, the practical response is to define observable deliverables and review quality, timeliness and collaboration. That response is deliberately modest: it does not remove uncertainty, but it makes the trade-off visible and easier to govern.

The point also has an organizational side. Outcomes matter more when managers cannot rely on physical presence as a proxy for effort, but the benefit depends on who owns the information, who is permitted to act on it and how exceptions are handled. A common failure mode is to adopt the visible part of a practice while leaving the underlying routine unchanged. Poor goals can lead to intrusive monitoring and employee gaming. This helps explain why organizations exposed to similar conditions can report very different outcomes. Barrero et al. (2023) provides a complementary perspective on the institutional or managerial conditions surrounding the issue. A more credible approach is therefore to define observable deliverables and review quality, timeliness and collaboration, while documenting assumptions and reviewing them when conditions materially change.

There is also a boundary to the argument. Outcomes matter more when managers cannot rely on physical presence as a proxy for effort should not be interpreted as a universal rule or a guaranteed performance effect. Where resources, incentives or local conditions differ, poor goals can lead to intrusive monitoring and employee gaming. Short-term results may therefore move in a different direction from longer-term capability. This is one reason the present article favors conditional interpretation over a single average effect. Evidence summarized by Barrero et al. (2023); Edmondson & Lei (2014) supports the value of examining the mechanism and the surrounding context together. The managerial implication remains concrete: define observable deliverables and review quality, timeliness and collaboration. The quality of execution, not the label attached to the initiative, determines whether that principle improves performance.

Culture and belonging

At firm level, the mechanism is usually more important than the headline indicator. Informal interaction is harder to reproduce when teams are rarely together. The reason is practical: new employees and peripheral members can lose access to tacit knowledge. In workplaces where employees alternate between offices, homes and other locations while teams remain responsible for shared outcomes, this can change the economics and timing of decisions even when the broad direction of policy or technology appears favorable. The sources reviewed for this draft, including ILO (2025); World Economic Forum (2025), are useful because they place the issue inside a wider system of incentives, capabilities and constraints rather than treating one variable as sufficient. For organizations managing distributed knowledge work, the practical response is to design purposeful in-person moments for learning, relationships and complex problem solving. That response is deliberately modest: it does not remove uncertainty, but it makes the trade-off visible and easier to govern.

The point also has an organizational side. Informal interaction is harder to reproduce when teams are rarely together, but the benefit depends on who owns the information, who is permitted to act on it and how exceptions are handled. A common failure mode is to adopt the visible part of a practice while leaving the underlying routine unchanged. New employees and peripheral members can lose access to tacit knowledge. This helps explain why organizations exposed to similar conditions can report very different outcomes. World Economic Forum (2025) provides a complementary perspective on the institutional or managerial conditions surrounding the issue. A more credible approach is therefore to design purposeful in-person moments for learning, relationships and complex problem solving, while documenting assumptions and reviewing them when conditions materially change.

There is also a boundary to the argument. Informal interaction is harder to reproduce when teams are rarely together should not be interpreted as a universal rule or a guaranteed performance effect. Where resources, incentives or local conditions differ, new employees and peripheral members can

lose access to tacit knowledge. Short-term results may therefore move in a different direction from longer-term capability. This is one reason the present article favors conditional interpretation over a single average effect. Evidence summarized by Grant (1996); World Economic Forum (2025) supports the value of examining the mechanism and the surrounding context together. The managerial implication remains concrete: design purposeful in-person moments for learning, relationships and complex problem solving. The quality of execution, not the label attached to the initiative, determines whether that principle improves performance.

Well-being and boundaries

One recurring lesson in this literature is that context changes the value of an otherwise sensible practice. Flexibility can reduce commuting but blur working-time boundaries. For managers, the consequence is immediate: employees may experience isolation or extended availability expectations. In workplaces where employees alternate between offices, homes and other locations while teams remain responsible for shared outcomes, this can change the economics and timing of decisions even when the broad direction of policy or technology appears favorable. The sources reviewed for this draft, including OECD (2024b); Bloom et al. (2024), are useful because they place the issue inside a wider system of incentives, capabilities and constraints rather than treating one variable as sufficient. For organizations managing distributed knowledge work, the practical response is to set communication norms and manager practices that protect recovery time. That response is deliberately modest: it does not remove uncertainty, but it makes the trade-off visible and easier to govern.

The point also has an organizational side. Flexibility can reduce commuting but blur working-time boundaries, but the benefit depends on who owns the information, who is permitted to act on it and how exceptions are handled. A common failure mode is to adopt the visible part of a practice while leaving the underlying routine unchanged. Employees may experience isolation or extended availability expectations. This helps explain why organizations exposed to similar conditions can report very different outcomes. OECD (2024b) provides a complementary perspective on the institutional or managerial conditions surrounding the issue. A more credible approach is therefore to set communication norms and manager practices that protect recovery time, while documenting assumptions and reviewing them when conditions materially change.

There is also a boundary to the argument. Flexibility can reduce commuting but blur working-time boundaries should not be interpreted as a universal rule or a guaranteed performance effect. Where resources, incentives or local conditions differ, employees may experience isolation or extended availability expectations. Short-term results may therefore move in a different direction from longer-term capability. This is one reason the present article favors conditional interpretation over a single average effect. Evidence summarized by World Economic Forum (2025); ILO (2025) supports the value of examining the mechanism and the surrounding context together. The managerial implication remains concrete: set communication norms and manager practices that protect recovery time. The quality of execution, not the label attached to the initiative, determines whether that principle improves performance.

Technology, security and workspace

What looks straightforward in a policy diagram is often more conditional in day-to-day implementation. Reliable tools and appropriate home or office environments influence performance. In operational terms, unequal equipment and connectivity create hidden differences in opportunity. In workplaces where employees alternate between offices, homes and other locations while teams remain responsible for shared outcomes, this can change the economics and timing of decisions even when the broad direction of policy or technology appears favorable. The sources reviewed for this draft, including Grant (1996); World Economic Forum (2025), are useful because they place the issue inside a wider system of incentives, capabilities and constraints rather than treating one variable as sufficient. For organizations managing distributed knowledge work, the practical response is to treat

devices, security and ergonomic support as basic work infrastructure. That response is deliberately modest: it does not remove uncertainty, but it makes the trade-off visible and easier to govern.

The point also has an organizational side. Reliable tools and appropriate home or office environments influence performance, but the benefit depends on who owns the information, who is permitted to act on it and how exceptions are handled. A common failure mode is to adopt the visible part of a practice while leaving the underlying routine unchanged. Unequal equipment and connectivity create hidden differences in opportunity. This helps explain why organizations exposed to similar conditions can report very different outcomes. Verhoef et al. (2021) provides a complementary perspective on the institutional or managerial conditions surrounding the issue. A more credible approach is therefore to treat devices, security and ergonomic support as basic work infrastructure, while documenting assumptions and reviewing them when conditions materially change.

There is also a boundary to the argument. Reliable tools and appropriate home or office environments influence performance should not be interpreted as a universal rule or a guaranteed performance effect. Where resources, incentives or local conditions differ, unequal equipment and connectivity create hidden differences in opportunity. Short-term results may therefore move in a different direction from longer-term capability. This is one reason the present article favors conditional interpretation over a single average effect. Evidence summarized by Barrero et al. (2023); Bloom et al. (2024) supports the value of examining the mechanism and the surrounding context together. The managerial implication remains concrete: treat devices, security and ergonomic support as basic work infrastructure. The quality of execution, not the label attached to the initiative, determines whether that principle improves performance.

Integrated Discussion

Taken together, the six themes show that strategic management of remote and hybrid work models in modern organizations cannot be understood as a one-step relationship. The external condition or management practice changes incentives first, then affects behavior, process quality or resource allocation, and only after that appears in performance. When one of those links is weak, the expected result is diluted. This layered view is consistent with the broad evidence base represented by Edmondson & Lei (2014); Verhoef et al. (2021); Barrero et al. (2023).

The synthesis also highlights the role of organizational maturity. Organizations managing distributed knowledge work with clearer data ownership, decision rights and review routines can often benefit from sophisticated tools earlier than organizations still struggling with basic process discipline. This does not imply that smaller or less mature organizations should wait indefinitely; it suggests that the sequence and scale of implementation should match their current capability.

A further observation concerns incentives. Many implementation problems that appear technical are actually incentive problems: people protect departmental targets, delay bad news, optimize visible metrics or avoid decisions whose accountability is unclear. Technical design therefore needs to be accompanied by governance that makes expected behavior and escalation routes explicit.

Finally, the value of standardization depends on where it is applied. Definitions, controls and core data often benefit from standardization, while customer responses, regional implementation or work design may require adaptation. The stronger approach is to standardize the principles that protect quality and then allow local variation in the method when that variation is visible and reviewable.

Managerial and Policy Implications

The synthesis suggests that management should begin with a small number of decisions rather than a large transformation programme. For organizations managing distributed knowledge work, the first step is to identify the exposure or performance outcome that matters most, the information needed to judge it, and the person who is accountable for acting. This creates a baseline against which later investment can be evaluated.

The second principle is sequencing. Capabilities that improve measurement, role clarity and process discipline usually make later technology or policy interventions more effective. When organizations reverse that sequence, they often spend on tools first and discover later that data ownership, workflows or incentives are unresolved.

Third, leaders should make trade-offs explicit. The six themes point to recurring tensions between short-run efficiency and resilience, speed and control, access and protection, or standardization and local adaptation. A decision memo that states which trade-off is being accepted is often more useful than a dashboard that presents dozens of indicators without a decision rule.

Fourth, monitoring should combine outcomes with leading indicators. Outcome measures confirm whether value was created, while leading indicators show whether the mechanism is being implemented. The sources reviewed here, including World Economic Forum (2025); Edmondson & Lei (2014), support the broader argument that capability and institutional quality matter alongside headline performance measures.

Finally, periodic review is essential. A practice that was appropriate during implementation may become unnecessary, too costly or too restrictive after the organization has learned. Review should therefore ask what changed, whether the original risk still exists, and whether the control or investment continues to earn its place in the operating model.

Priority	Recommended action	Reason for inclusion
1	Classify work by collaboration intensity and customer or equipment constraints	Blanket attendance rules ignore meaningful differences between roles
2	Use fewer recurring meetings with clearer purposes and written decision records	Digital calendars can fill with meetings that compensate for weak process design
3	Define observable deliverables and review quality, timeliness and collaboration	Poor goals can lead to intrusive monitoring and employee gaming
4	Design purposeful in-person moments for learning, relationships and complex problem solving	New employees and peripheral members can lose access to tacit knowledge
5	Set communication norms and manager practices that protect recovery time	Employees may experience isolation or extended availability expectations
6	Treat devices, security and ergonomic support as basic work infrastructure	Unequal equipment and connectivity create hidden differences in opportunity

Limitations and Future Research

The article is an evidence synthesis and does not estimate a new causal model. Findings from different contexts are therefore used to identify mechanisms and boundary conditions, not to claim that one effect size applies uniformly to workplaces where employees alternate between offices, homes and other locations while teams remain responsible for shared outcomes.

A second limitation is source availability. Institutional reports are valuable for recent context, while peer-reviewed research provides stronger methodological detail, but the two forms of evidence answer different questions. Future work should connect the framework with original firm-level, regional or longitudinal data and pre-specify the outcomes to be tested.

Research could also examine sequencing more directly. Many studies evaluate whether a practice is present, yet organizations may obtain different results depending on what was implemented first, how long capability building took, and whether supporting processes were stable. Longitudinal designs would be especially useful for separating initial disruption from durable performance effects.

Directions for Empirical Validation

The framework developed for strategic management of remote and hybrid work models in modern organizations would benefit from being tested against operational records rather than aggregate indicators alone. A useful empirical design would distinguish task fit and work design from coordination and meeting architecture and trace how each mechanism changes over time. Researchers should establish a pre-intervention baseline, document the timing of relevant decisions, and use

outcome measures that managers actually monitor. Where a comparison group is feasible, matched organizations or regions would improve interpretation. Where it is not, interrupted time-series or carefully documented longitudinal case evidence may provide a more credible account than a single cross-sectional survey.

Sampling deserves equal attention. Findings associated with performance management may not transfer directly to settings dominated by culture and belonging, particularly when firm size, institutional capacity, market exposure, or access to finance differs. Future studies should therefore report the characteristics of participating organizations in enough detail to make those boundaries visible. Rather than treating heterogeneity as a statistical nuisance, researchers can use it to explain why apparently similar interventions produce different outcomes. Subgroup analysis should be theory-led and specified before results are known, especially when sample sizes are modest.

Finally, empirical work should retain negative, null, and delayed effects. In studies of strategic management of remote and hybrid work models in modern organizations, pressure to demonstrate an immediate benefit can encourage overly narrow outcome selection. A stronger design would combine short-term process indicators with longer-term performance measures and would report implementation costs alongside benefits. Sensitivity checks, alternative model specifications, and transparent treatment of missing data would make the findings easier to assess. These steps would also help separate genuine effects from improvements that simply reflect better documentation, temporary attention, or changes in the external environment.

A publication-oriented test of strategic management of remote and hybrid work models in modern organizations should also document data provenance and analytical choices in a form that another researcher could follow. Variable definitions, exclusions, coding decisions, and changes made after initial analysis should be recorded rather than reconstructed at the end of the project. When confidentiality prevents public release of raw organizational data, authors can still provide a data dictionary, sampling logic, model specification, and summary diagnostics. This level of transparency does more than satisfy reporting conventions; it makes disagreement productive because readers can identify whether competing conclusions arise from theory, measurement, sample composition, or analytical choice.

Conclusion

This article examined strategic management of remote and hybrid work models in modern organizations through a structured review of recent research and institutional evidence. The central conclusion is that the relationship in the title is conditional rather than automatic. Performance changes when external conditions interact with organizational capability, incentives, information quality and implementation discipline.

Across the six themes, a consistent pattern emerges: the debate is often framed as office versus home, but the more useful question is which tasks require co-location, which benefit from quiet individual work, and what management practices keep the two modes connected. The practical implication is not to reject ambitious policy or management interventions, but to connect them to the mechanism through which they are expected to work and to the constraints faced by organizations managing distributed knowledge work.

The review also points to a more disciplined use of evidence. Aggregate trends establish context, standards define expectations, and empirical studies reveal relationships, but none of these removes the need for local diagnosis. Decision makers should therefore combine external evidence with their own operating data and document where assumptions remain uncertain.

Future research can strengthen the framework by testing the proposed mechanisms with firm-level, regional or longitudinal data appropriate to the topic. For publication, the named authors should verify the source set, refine the contextual examples and add original evidence where available. That author-led step would convert the present editorial draft into a research article with a clearer empirical contribution.

Acknowledgement

This document is an editorial research draft prepared from the title, author information and issue metadata supplied by the KISA Institute production list. The named authors should review the argument, references, affiliations, email addresses and any contextual claims before submission or publication. No uncollected survey, interview or experimental data are represented as author-generated evidence.

References

- 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>
- Barrero, J. M., Bloom, N., & Davis, S. J. (2023). The evolution of work from home. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 37(4), 23-50.
- World Economic Forum. (2025). *The Future of Jobs Report 2025*. Geneva: World Economic Forum.
- International Labour Organization. (2025). *World Employment and Social Outlook: Trends 2025*. Geneva: ILO.
- OECD. (2024). *OECD Digital Economy Outlook 2024 (Volume 1): Embracing the Technology Frontier*. Paris: OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/a1689dc5-en>
- Edmondson, A. C., & Lei, Z. (2014). Psychological safety: The history, renaissance, and future of an interpersonal construct. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 1, 23-43.
- Grant, R. M. (1996). Toward a knowledge-based theory of the firm. *Strategic Management Journal*, 17(S2), 109-122.
- Verhoef, P. C., Broekhuizen, T., Bart, Y., Bhattacharya, A., Dong, J. Q., Fabian, N., & Haenlein, M. (2021). Digital transformation: A multidisciplinary reflection and research agenda. *Journal of Business Research*, 122, 889-901. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.09.022>