Business Cases & Literature Framework: Implementing Work-From-Anywhere (WFA)

1. Conceptual Foundations: WFH vs. WFA

Work-From-Anywhere (WFA) represents an evolutionary paradigm shift beyond traditional Work-From-Home (WFH) models. While standard WFH provides employees primarily with **temporal flexibility** (discretion over *when* work is executed), WFA confers dual flexibility by incorporating comprehensive **geographic flexibility** (discretion over *where* employees reside and work, across local, regional, or international jurisdictions).

When governed by structured organizational policies, WFA functions as both a high-utility **nonpecuniary benefit** and a potent **firm-specific incentive** that enhances workforce attraction and motivation.

2. Empirical Evidence Base & Core Performance Outcomes

Although direct empirical investigations targeting WFA remain an emerging literature, synthesized findings across flexible-work research consistently demonstrate robust, positive impacts across multiple consequential organizational metrics:

- **Multidimensional Workforce Outcomes**: Both WFA and WFH exert significant positive effects across a spectrum of individual and firm-level outcomes, including **job satisfaction, organizational commitment, psychological well-being, perceived organizational support, reduced turnover intentions, supervisor-rated performance and perceived productivity** (Beno et al., 2024; Gajendran et al., 2024; Harrop et al., 2025; Imai et al., 2025; Lee et al., 2024; Martin & MacDonnell, 2012; Mutiganda et al., 2022).
- **Causal Evidence on Productivity & Quality**: Investigating a natural experiment at the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO), Choudhury et al. (2020) established that **transitioning workers from WFH to WFA generated a 4.4% increase in net output without affecting output quality or increasing the incidence of rework**. Granular mechanism analyses confirm that these performance gains were driven by an **increase in observable effort once workers acquired geographic flexibility**. This provides the cleanest causal evidence that granting employees geographic choice enhances productivity rather than impairing it.

3. Moderating Enablers & Policy Boundary Conditions

The empirical literature indicates that the benefits of geographic flexibility depend heavily on specific organizational, managerial, and environmental moderators:

- **Voluntary Adoption & Calibrated Intensity**: Flexibility operates most effectively when participation is **voluntary, moderate in intensity, and structurally supported**. Non-mandatory remote work arrangements consistently yield more favourable outcomes than crisis-driven or mandated full-time remote regimes (Ferdous et al., 2025; Hackney et al., 2022). Furthermore, moderate flexibility - exemplified by hybrid models - frequently outperforms

extreme configurations by balancing worker autonomy with organizational cohesion to prevent professional isolation (Bloom et al., 2024; Davidescu et al., 2020; Vacchiano et al., 2024).

- **Managerial & Infrastructure Support Systems**: Realizing positive outcomes requires robust institutional support, including **supervisor trust, established organizational communication norms, accessible technology, and proactive HR leadership** (Chaudhuri et al., 2022; Nakrošienė et al., 2019; Raj et al., 2023; Tanpipat et al., 2021).
- **Institutional & Regional Alignment**: The efficacy and perceived satisfaction of remote arrangements are significantly moderated by country-level institutional frameworks, labor regulations, and cultural alignment (Çivilidağ & Durmaz, 2026; Peretz, 2023). In supranational institutional environments - such as the European Commission - pre-existing harmonized legal frameworks, shared administrative norms, and super-partes governance uniquely eliminate traditional cross-border frictions. Consequently, **the actual productivity, satisfaction and operational gains achievable in such contexts could plausibly outperform the baseline metrics reported in the current literature.**

Conclusion: Strategic Implications for HR & Leadership

Work-From-Anywhere (WFA) is far more than a flexible perk, it is an evidence-based, high-leverage strategy that reconciles organizational performance with employee utility. The empirical literature demonstrates that granting geographic flexibility generates net productivity gains, while simultaneously driving retention, job satisfaction and well-being.

However, geographic flexibility is not a plug-and-play solution. Its success depends on deliberate organizational design: policies must be voluntary, balanced in intensity, and supported by asynchronous workflows, managerial trust, and robust digital infrastructure. When implemented with clear governance, WFA transforms geographic choice into a powerful firm-specific incentive, allowing organizations to maximize performance in an increasingly global market.

References

Beno, M., Cagáňová, D., & Bobinics, B. (2024). Working from abroad - workation as a mobility flow benefit. *Acta logistica*. https://doi.org/10.22306/al.v11i4.566

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

Chaudhuri, R., Chatterjee, S., Vrontis, D., & Alessio, I. (2022). Work from anywhere and employee psychological well-being: moderating role of HR leadership support. *Personnel Review*. https://doi.org/10.1108/pr-02-2022-0086

Choudhury, P., Foroughi, C., & Larson, B. (2020). Work-from-anywhere : The productivity effects of geographic flexibility. *Strategic Management Journal*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3494473

Çivilidağ, A., & Durmaz, Ş. (2026). The relationship of flexible working arrangements on work-family conflict, work-life balance and organizational commitment: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMC Psychology, 14*. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-026-04216-y

Davidescu, A., Apostu, S.-A., Paul, A., & Cășuneanu, I. (2020). Work Flexibility, Job Satisfaction, and Job Performance among Romanian Employees—Implications for Sustainable Human Resource Management. *Sustainability, 12*, 6086. https://doi.org/10.3390/su12156086

Ferdous, T., Ali, M., Desouza, K. C., & French, E. (2025). An integrated framework of remote work from organizational adoption to employee outcomes: A systematic literature review. *International Journal of Management Reviews*. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.70002

Gajendran, R. S., Ponnapalli, A., Wang, C., & Javalagi, A. A. (2024). A dual pathway model of remote work intensity: A meta-analysis of its simultaneous positive and negative effects. *Personnel Psychology*. https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12641

Hackney, A., Yung, M., Somasundram, K. G., Nowrouzi-Kia, B., Oakman, J., & Yazdani, A. (2022). Working in the digital economy: A systematic review of the impact of work from home arrangements on personal and organizational performance and productivity. *PLoS ONE, 17*. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0274728

Harrop, N., Jiang, L., & Overall, N. (2025). A Meta-Analysis of Antecedents and Outcomes of Flexible Working Arrangements. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2896

Imai, A., Shirai, M., Fujio, S., & Hayashi, Y. (2025). Effects of Participating in a Short-Term Workcation on Psychological and Physiological Responses.. *Psychological reports*, 332941251343546. https://doi.org/10.1177/00332941251343546

Lee, J., Shin, H., & Kang, J. (2024). Investigating the managerial effects of workcations (work(plus)vacations) on digital nomad employees: Workcation satisfaction, work engagement, innovation behavior, intention to stay, and revisit intention. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2024.05.003

Mutiganda, J., Wiitavaara, B., Heiden, M., Svensson, S., Fagerström, A., Bergström, G., & Aboagye, E. (2022). A systematic review of the research on telework and organizational economic performance indicators. *Frontiers in Psychology, 13*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1035310

Nakrošienė, A., Buciuniene, I., & Goštautaitė, B. (2019). Working from home: characteristics and outcomes of telework. *International Journal of Manpower*. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijm-07-2017-0172

Peretz, H. (2023). Where does working from home “work”?. *European Management Review*. https://doi.org/10.1111/emre.12590

Raj, R., Kumar, V., Sharma, N., Singh, S., Mahlawat, S., & Verma, P. (2023). The study of remote working outcome and its influence on firm performance. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2023.100528

Tanpipat, W., Lim, H. W., & Deng, X. (2021). Implementing Remote Working Policy in Corporate Offices in Thailand: Strategic Facility Management Perspective. *Sustainability*. https://doi.org/10.3390/su13031284

Vacchiano, M., Fernandez, G. P., & Schmutz, R. (2024). What’s going on with teleworking? a scoping review of its effects on well-being. *PLOS ONE, 19*. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0305567