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Executive Summary

A large multinational randomized 3-2 hybrid WFH vs 5 days per week in the office for 1600 professional graduate employees for six months. They found three results:

1. 35% reductions in quit rates and 12% reduction in sick leave
2. No impact on performance or promotions
3. Employees shifted work from WFH days to evenings and weekends (“flexitme”)

The results were so positive the firm immediately rolled-out hybrid WFH to all divisions.

Their view is hybrid WFH substantially reduces quit rates and improves hiring at zero cost (productivity and employee performance was unchanged).
Working from home has jumped during the pandemic

Full days worked from home, %

Source: Data from 61,238 survey responses May 20 to Feb 22 weighted using the CPS to match the US working population aged 20 to 64. Pre-covid data from the American Time Use Survey. Post-COVID from 4,759 Feb 2022 responses. Data from the Survey of Workforce Attitudes and Arrangements (SWAA) Details on https://wfhresearch.com/
Post-pandemic most US graduates will return to the office on a hybrid schedule (e.g. 3-2)

**Planned Post-COVID Working Arrangements**

- **Fully on site**: 55.6%
- **Hybrid**: 29.0%
- **Full WFH**: 15.4%

**Most front-line non-graduates**

- Fully on site: 55.6%
- Hybrid: 29.0%
- Full WFH: 15.4%

**Most graduates (higher paid managers and professionals)**

- Fully on site: 55.6%
- Hybrid: 29.0%
- Full WFH: 15.4%

**Mostly technical: IT support, HR, payroll, programming etc**

**Source:** Data from 16,575 US responses in August through December 2021, reweighted to match the US population. Data from the Survey of Workforce Attitudes and Arrangements (SWAA). Details on [https://wfhresearch.com/](https://wfhresearch.com/)
This surge in hybrid WFH has broad effects – e.g. the “donut effect”

Cumulative net flows (moves in – moves out) from Feb 2020 - Jan 2022 as a % of the zipcode population

This WFH induced “donut effect” is impacting rents and home values

Notes: The figure shows Zillow's observed rental index (left) and home value index (right) in the 12 largest US metro areas (New York, Los Angeles, Chicago, Dallas, Houston, Miami, Philadelphia, Washington DC, Atlanta, Boston, San Francisco, and Phoenix – ordered by population). Zip codes are grouped by population density or presence in a Central Business District (CBD). A population weighted average is taken across all zipcodes in each bucket, and each aggregated index is normalized such that Feb 2020 = 100. Groups are given by high density = top 10%, suburb = 50-90th percentile, exurb = 0-50th percentile. The city center is defined by taking all zipcodes with centroids contained within a 2 km radius of Central Business District coordinates taken from Holian (2019). Population data taken from the 2015-19 5-yr ACS. Sources: Zillow, Census Bureau, Holian (2019). Data: Jan 2018 – Jan 2022.
But views vary widely on the efficacy and duration of hybrid WFH.
One recent Economist article argued hybrid will eventually collapse.
Paper runs a randomized control trial on Hybrid WFH

Randomizes hybrid WFH on 1600 engineers in a large multinational finding
1. 35% reductions in quit rates and 12% reduction in sick leave
2. No impact on performance or promotions
3. Employees shift work from WFH days to evenings and weekends – “flexitime”

The firm was so happy with the results it rolled out hybrid WFH to all divisions

Extends prior well identified impact of WFH literature by:
A. Looking at graduates in creative jobs
B. Looking at 3-2 hybrid WFH (rather than full remote)
C. Investigating mechanism (time use, messages etc)
Experimental design
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Working with trip.com on a hybrid WFH randomized control trial

Headquartered in Shanghai

Employs about 35,000 people

NASDAQ listed

Provides flights, hotel bookings, package and corporate travel

Pre-experiment employees in the office every day
The firm decided to run an RCT on the Apple hybrid WFH plan.
During 2021 China had an extremely low covid case rate, so employees were coming into the official full time (and not in masks)

Notes: From the WHO COVID-19 Dashboard https://covid19.who.int/info
The firm ran a two-stage roll-out of hybrid WFH

On July 27 firm surveyed all 1612 employees in two divisions (Airfare and IT) asking if they wanted to WFH on Wednesday and Friday.
Subject: WFH Trials Invite Your Participation!

Dear Airline/Technology Center partners: In order to improve employee satisfaction and happiness, and to attract and retain outstanding talents, the company is currently researching the feasibility of working from home policy. We hope that "working from home freely" can become company's corporate culture in the future, and employee benefits. In order to verify the feasibility of the policy more scientifically and rigorously, the Air-Ticket Business Department / Technology Center became one of the first batch of experimental departments.

We are very supportive and welcome our Airline/Tech Center mates to join the work from home experiment! During the trial period, I experienced first-hand whether working from home was beneficial to personal output, team management, and my own living conditions. Your real feelings and every feedback will help the company to better think and design policies, so that working from home can become a "good office form, good culture and good welfare" that employees like to hear and hear. Please click this link to fill in the "Home Office Test Willingness Questionnaire" before July 31, express your participation and click this link to fill in your willingness and ideas. We invite you to join and try again, let us create a different working scene together!

For more details, please refer to the FAQ below. If you have any other questions, please consult the Organization and talents Development Center for details.

FAQ:

1. How long will the trial last?
The official trial period is from August 9, 2021, to January 30, 2022.
2. Can I start working from home if I choose to participate?
The project team will conduct scientific sampling from the employees who have chosen "willing" to participate, and there will be half of the employees were selected as the "experimental group" and the other half were selected as the "control group".
3. When will I know if I have been selected as the "experimental group"?
The project team will officially announce the sampling results from August 4th to 6th. The "experimental group", will sign the corresponding documents to ensure that you are in the experimental period. If there are no special circumstances, please participate in the whole process of the experiment.
4. How is the attendance calculated during the home office period?
During the test period, the employees of the "experimental group" will be uniformly set. For special classes, workdays that cannot be clocked in due to working from home are counted as normal attendance. In case of taking sick leave or annual leave, please log in to the attendance system normally submit a leave application within .
5. Will working from home affect my assessment?
No, the work goals of working from home are the same as working in the company, but you can arrange the office space more flexibly, the goals will not change, and the assessment method will not change. Participate in year-end assessments.
6. I have a desktop but no laptop, can I still apply for working from home?
Yes. You only need a home computer and network at home.
The firm ran a two-stage roll-out of hybrid WFH

On July 27, firm surveyed all 1612 employees in two divisions (Airfare and IT) asking if they wanted to WFH on Wednesday and Friday.

**Stage 1:**
518 volunteered - odd birthdays randomized into hybrid WFH starting on 9\textsuperscript{th} Aug

**Stage 2:**
1094 non-volunteers - odd birthdays randomized into hybrid starting 13\textsuperscript{th} September

Note the hybrid scheme was optional – nobody required to WFH on Weds/Friday

But even birthday employees signed a contract allowing them to WFH on Wed/Fri
Office vs Home

Employees typically with team members on 4 person desks
Teams generally located together.
Volunteers no different on prior performance, but less likely to be managers (managers expressed most ex-ante concern)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Volunteer</th>
<th>Non-volunteer</th>
<th>p-value of the difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>1094</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior performance (1-5)</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>0.534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>.681</td>
<td>.630</td>
<td>0.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure (months)</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>.488</td>
<td>.518</td>
<td>0.263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>.459</td>
<td>.485</td>
<td>0.331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level (1-7)</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>0.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad School</td>
<td>.336</td>
<td>.318</td>
<td>0.478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial Role</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>.281</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commute Time (mins)</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>95.7</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Sample of 1612 employees
Experimental design
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Take-up of WFH 55% for the volunteers and 38% for non-volunteers

Employees mostly chose to WFH on Friday and come in Wednesday (hence ≈50% take-up rate)

Notes: Sample of 1612 employees. Public holidays, personal holidays and excused absence (e.g. sick leave) excluded. Take-up rate is percentage of Wednesday & Friday each week they WFH.
A huge issue right now for hybrid is WFH day choice vs coordination.

Responses to the questions:
- Which of the following would you prefer?
  - Being able to choose which days you work from home (if any)
  - Your employer sets a policy that determines who works from home on which days
- Would you like your co-workers to come into work on the same days as you?

Notes: The sample for the blue bar includes employed respondents from the July and December 2021 SWAA waves who passed the attention check questions (for December respondents) and worked from home at some point since the start of the COVID-19 pandemic. The SWAA samples US residents aged 20 to 64 who earned $10,000 or more in 2019. N = 3,949 (blue bar).

The sample for the red bar includes employed respondents from the February 2022 SWAA who reported their employer is planning them to work from home 1 or more days per week after the end of the pandemic. N = 1810 (red bar).
Find strong coordination by team members on WFH take-up days

Going from none to all of your team WFH on any day increases your probability of WFH by 55% - this large and highly significant.

Suggests employees deliberately choose to WFH on the same day their colleagues do.

Note: Calculated over 25,638 person days. WFH% are calculated using colleagues who participants the experiment, leave oneself out. Team size has mean=5.87, sd=3.19
Co ordination is not due to particular events (e.g. holidays) or team differences – even present with individual fixed-effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Y: WFH</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team WFH%</td>
<td>0.551***</td>
<td>0.526***</td>
<td>0.439***</td>
<td>0.423***</td>
<td>0.327***</td>
<td>0.00202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0333)</td>
<td>(0.0362)</td>
<td>(0.0388)</td>
<td>(0.0390)</td>
<td>(0.0302)</td>
<td>(0.00278)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager WFH</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0858***</td>
<td>0.0677***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0193)</td>
<td>(0.0107)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building*Floor</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual FE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Exp</td>
<td>Exp</td>
<td>Exp</td>
<td>Exp</td>
<td>Exp</td>
<td>Pre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean WFH</td>
<td>0.478</td>
<td>0.478</td>
<td>0.478</td>
<td>0.478</td>
<td>0.478</td>
<td>0.00115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N(person*day)</td>
<td>25638</td>
<td>25638</td>
<td>25638</td>
<td>25638</td>
<td>25638</td>
<td>21322</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note in columns (3) and (4) that the team coordination effects are 4x the manager coordination effects – employees come in on the days their coworkers are in the office (less so when their managers are in the office).

Footnote: Team WFH% are calculated using colleagues who participants the experiment, leave oneself out.
Consistent with US survey data – workers come into the office mainly to see co-workers (not to see their manager to use the equipment)

What are the top 3 benefits of working on your employer's business premises?

Notes: The sample includes respondents to the February 2022 SWAA who passed the attention check questions and worked from home at some point since the start of the COVID-19 pandemic. The SWAA samples US residents aged 20 to 64 who earned $10,000 or more in 2019. \( N = 2,973 \).
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The firm relies heavily on a messaging system (rather than email)

Used for work messaging and “chatting”

WeChat used for social messaging

Email used for formal work communication
Find treatment (WFH) employees sent 16% more messages during Wednesday and Friday than control (not-WFH) employees.

Consistent with findings from Yang et al. (2021) that WFH increases asynchronous communications (email, and messaging).
Interestingly treatment employees also sent 9% more messages during Monday, Tuesday and Thursday than control employees. Increase in asynchronous communications spilling over onto office days (increases 11%, 8% and 7% on Monday, Tuesday and Thursday respectively).

The fact that this occurs on Tuesday is particularly telling – this is 4 days from the last WFH day so cannot all be due to conservations spanning multiple days.

Looks like WFH leads workers to message more even in the office.
Treatment also sent more messages on Saturday and Sunday.

Consistent with treatment employees sending more messages, but the size of the increase on weekends is particularly large (20% higher) so also indicates WFH employees more likely to work on the weekend too (more data on this later).
Also find treatment employees more likely to message other treatment employees (T2T) than control (T2C and C2T).

Suggests home workers more likely to interact with other home workers – not something we expected, but consistent with workers forming groups based on WFH or not-WFH status.
Zoom meetings increased 74% in the experimental divisions (mostly on Wednesday and Friday)

- Zoom meetings normalized to 100 pre-experiment in WFH experiment divisions and Business Trip (control) division.

- Online meetings goes up 74% compared to the control division (as we would expect – zoom meetings replace in-person meetings)
Experimental design
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Treatment employees have less office time and more home VPN time on Wednesday and Friday

Notes: 1612 participants, from May 2021 to Jan 2022. Office Time measured as time between card swap at office entry and exit (capped at 15 hours). VPN Time is the time connected to internal websites.
Calculations suggest working time similar for treatment and control
  - Treatment 6 hours less office time total on Weds and Friday
  - Treatment 4 hours more VPN time total throughout the week
  - VPN used ≈75% of time when WFH, implying about 5.5 more home hours

Note: 1612 participants, from May 2021 to Jan 2022; N(person*days)=221,794
Also see more messages sent outside 9am-5pm regular working hours

Significant increase of 4.4% of messages sent outside regulars 9am-5pm hours

Occurs on all weekdays (Monday to Friday)

Consistent with WFH employees working more mornings and evening

Note: Weekly plot from May 2021 to Feb 2022
Supports view that WFH combines “flexiplace” with “flexitime”

Employees mention in discussion occasionally using Weds and Friday to go to the Dentist, gym, shopping, play golf etc (use these when they are less busy) and make up the time in evenings and weekend.

Increase in GitHub activity post-pandemic from Grant McDermott and Ben Hansen (2021), NBER WP 29598
Consistent with second WFH benefit in US data (schedule flexibility)

What are the top 3 benefits of working from home?

Notes: The sample includes respondents to the February 2022 SWAA who passed the attention check questions and worked from home at some point since the start of the COVID-19 pandemic. The SWAA samples US residents aged 20 to 64 who earned $10,000 or more in 2019. N = 2,973.
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Firm has a rigorous 6-month performance appraisal to set pay and promotions: we see no significant impact (in the first 6-months)

Not significantly different: $b[T]=-0.055$ (.043)

Not significantly different: $b[T]=0.037$ (0.029)
However, the experiment has improved views on WFH productivity

- Response to the question: “How do you think Wednesday and Friday WFH will impact your productivity compared to working in the office”

- Mean productivity impact is 0.06% (August 21) and 1.8% (January 22)

- Both January 22 level and change vs August 21 significant at the 1%

- Change is not different between Treatment and Control (both increase), so you do not need to experience WFH yourself to update
Consistent with global data showing WFH turned out better than expected for employees that were forced to WFH during the pandemic.

WFH productivity, relative to expectations

Source: Responses to the questions: “Compared to your expectations before COVID how has working from home turned out for you?”. Response bins in terms of increase or decrease in productivity of WFH compared to expectations. Only respondents who report they have worked primarily from home at some point during the COVID-19 pandemic. Controls for gender, age groups, education, industry and wave fixed effects.

Sample of N=16,983 Global WFH respondents, surveyed in August 2021 and February 2022.
Increase in WFH productivity views reflects convergence: volunteers slightly moderated, and non-volunteers became more positive.

Consistent with evidence from the COVID-pandemic and other work-from-home experiments that individuals ex ante can have quite extreme views (e.g. people claiming “Working from home is shirking from home…”).

The experience of WFH moderates and improves individuals’ expectations.

Note: Sample from 1315 (463 volunteers, 852 non-v) on baseline, 1345 (446 volunteers, 899 non-v) on the endline.
Employees also predicted WFH would reduce attrition

- Response to the question: “How will Wednesday and Friday working from home likely impact your quit rates”

- Mean impact is -11.3% (August 21) and -12.1% (January 22).

- Levels significantly different from zero, but change is not significant
Attrition fell 35% in the treatment group (7.2% vs 4.7%), with the drop largest in the volunteer group (those who most want to WFH).

Attrition rates over 2021H2

Difference significant at 5%: $\beta_T = -0.025 (0.0117)$
Consistent with employees valuing WFH at about 5% of earnings

Raw perk value of the option to WFH

Source: Responses to the question: “After COVID-19, in 2022 and later, how would you feel about working from home 2 or 3 days a week?” and “How much of a pay raise [cut] (as a percent of your current pay) would you value as much as the option to work from home 2 or 3 days a week?”. Controls for gender, age groups, education, industry and wave fixed effects.

Sample of N=32,909 Global WFH respondents, surveyed in August 2021 and February 2022.
Firm believes it will also improve recruitment (but harder to test)

Note: Sample from 1315 on baseline and 1345 on endline
On February 14th the HR board decided to roll out hybrid WFH to the entire company (starting on March 1st, announced immediately)
This was major news in China as hybrid WFH is (currently) rare

Trip.com to Launch Hybrid Work Policy in First for Chinese Tech Sector

China’s largest online travel company Trip.com Group to roll out hybrid work model, allowing employees to do their jobs remotely up to two days per week.

- Shanghai-based Trip.com to launch the new policy from March 1
- The push to a hybrid work model is a response to the post-pandemic world

China’s travel booking giant
Trip.com adopts the hybrid office

Scores of tech companies around the world have switched to remote working model during the past two COVID-19 years. It’s time to bring everyone back to the office.
## Next steps

Continue to collect data on performance, promotion, attrition and recruitment
Collect this for experimental divisions and two other “control” divisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BU</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
<th>Days per week</th>
<th>Qualified employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td>Sourcing, O2O</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Airfare (experimental)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacation</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train ticket</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business Travel</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>Permission from higher level</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marketing</strong></td>
<td>ToG, ground force</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IT (experimental)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Business</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting</td>
<td>Documents, management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of results

1. Employees appear to enjoy WFH – even non-volunteers have a 38% take-up

2. WFH reduced attrition and leave by about 35% and 12%

3. Employees appear to also flexitime – work less on WFH days, more on others

4. Employees positively update on WFH from experiencing this

5. Impact on performance is small and insignificant

Suggests WFH positive for the firm and ex-ante probably under-appreciated
Back-Up
Employees thought the company could roll out WFH after the experiment but were not certain

Will Trip.com roll it out company-wise

- **No**: 1.2 (Baseline) / 0.4 (Endline)
- **Unlikely**: 5.5 (Baseline) / 17.9 (Endline)
- **Likely**: 39.9 (Baseline) / 47.0 (Endline)
- **Very likely**: 33.9 (Baseline) / 54.2 (Endline)

**Note**: 1442 and 1461 baseline/endline respondents
Pre-experiment daily average # messages

Mean Message Sent Pre-experiment by Hours with 95% CI
### Daily Message Regression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>dependent variable</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tues</th>
<th>Wed</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>Sat</th>
<th>Sun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>1.76***</td>
<td>2.10***</td>
<td>1.61**</td>
<td>3.06***</td>
<td>1.39**</td>
<td>3.62***</td>
<td>0.227**</td>
<td>0.105*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(sd)</td>
<td>.443</td>
<td>.591</td>
<td>.622</td>
<td>.687</td>
<td>.620</td>
<td>.609</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Means</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>22.57</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>.441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(sd)</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>18.68</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>6.65</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coef/Means</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.190</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>.238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N(person*days)</td>
<td>169305</td>
<td>24870</td>
<td>23275</td>
<td>24870</td>
<td>24870</td>
<td>24870</td>
<td>23275</td>
<td>23275</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Footnote: 1612 participants, from May 2021 to Jan 2022
Largest rises on WFH days Weds (16%) and Friday (25%), weekends Sat (27%) and Sun (61%), and Monday (7%)

On office days Monday shows the big increase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>dependent variable</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tues</th>
<th>Wed</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>Sat</th>
<th>Sun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T2T</td>
<td>1.126***</td>
<td>0.978**</td>
<td>-0.040</td>
<td>2.467***</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>3.082***</td>
<td>0.151*</td>
<td>0.097***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(sd)</td>
<td>0.307</td>
<td>0.485</td>
<td>0.528</td>
<td>0.597</td>
<td>0.467</td>
<td>0.494</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>0.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean C2C</td>
<td>10.904</td>
<td>14.683</td>
<td>16.334</td>
<td>15.932</td>
<td>14.837</td>
<td>12.482</td>
<td>0.557</td>
<td>0.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2T/Mean C2C</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>0.155</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.247</td>
<td>0.271</td>
<td>0.610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2T</td>
<td>0.411***</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
<td>1.258***</td>
<td>-0.244</td>
<td>1.263***</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.032*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2C</td>
<td>0.716***</td>
<td>0.734**</td>
<td>-0.030</td>
<td>1.208***</td>
<td>0.326</td>
<td>1.818***</td>
<td>0.117*</td>
<td>0.065**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N(person*days)</td>
<td>169305</td>
<td>24870</td>
<td>23275</td>
<td>24870</td>
<td>24870</td>
<td>24870</td>
<td>23275</td>
<td>23275</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Share of messages outside 9-5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>dependent variable</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tues</th>
<th>Wed</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>Sat</th>
<th>Sun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>.00692**</td>
<td>0.00470</td>
<td>.00959**</td>
<td>.00586</td>
<td>.00680*</td>
<td>.00556</td>
<td>.00262</td>
<td>.0422*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(sd)</td>
<td>.00286</td>
<td>.00401</td>
<td>.00432</td>
<td>.00384</td>
<td>.00397</td>
<td>.00353</td>
<td>.0143</td>
<td>.0243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Means</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>.298</td>
<td>.424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(sd)</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>.190</td>
<td>.404</td>
<td>.461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coef/Mean</td>
<td>.0438</td>
<td>.0313</td>
<td>.0578</td>
<td>.0373</td>
<td>.0425</td>
<td>.0483</td>
<td>.00879</td>
<td>.0995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N(person*days)</td>
<td>110949</td>
<td>20961</td>
<td>19638</td>
<td>22274</td>
<td>22005</td>
<td>21309</td>
<td>2988</td>
<td>1774</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Footnote: sample from May 2021 to Dec 2021
Sick leave 12% lower in the WFH group overall during experiment,

Sick leave 2.33% in control and 2.05% in treatment N(person*day)= 166,508, with t-stat of  -1.41
Improved self-reported work satisfaction

Treatment

Control

How satisfied are you with your current work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Grooming is 28 minutes on average if commuting, 19 minutes if WFH

Percent respondents who **shower or bathe** when they:

- Going into work: [85.1%]
- Work from home: [73.4%]

Percent respondents who **wear fresh clothes** when they:

- Going into work: [93.7%]
- Work from home: [71.5%]

Percent respondents who **shave** when they:

- Going into work: [52.4%]
- Work from home: [39.6%]

Percent respondents who **put on makeup** when they:

- Going into work: [44.4%]
- Work from home: [27.0%]

**Source:** Data from 3,997 respondees who can work from home in January 2022, reweighted to match the US population. Details on [https://wfhresearch.com/](https://wfhresearch.com/)