

Phase 1 - Individual Project - Framing Brief

Domain Overview

Remote work refers to a flexible labor arrangement where employees perform job duties outside traditional workplaces, typically from home or other remote locations, enabled by digital technologies. The domain focuses on the economic and behavioral impacts of remote and hybrid work arrangements on organizational and individual productivity. This domain is rich with high-quality evidence, ranging from Stanford's empirical studies to U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics reports, making it ideal for a citation-heavy research portal.

Main Research Question:

How does remote work impact productivity at individual, organizational, and industry levels?

Sub questions:

What evidence links remote work to changes in individual productivity and work-life integration?

Does remote or hybrid work correlate with firm-level productivity, output, or cost changes?

How is productivity defined and measured in remote work research? Does it differ by industry or job type?

What role do management practices, technological infrastructure, and job characteristics play in shaping productivity outcomes?

What is the measurable impact of "commute-time reclamation" on labor output and employee discretionary effort?

Which management styles (e.g., outcome-based vs. surveillance-based) show the highest correlation with high-performer retention and output?

Scope:

Inclusions:

- Evidence from empirical research, including peer-reviewed articles, government statistics, and technical reports focused on the association between remote work and productivity.
- Both quantitative and qualitative measures of productivity, including output measures (e.g., performance metrics, total factor productivity) and perceptual or self-reported productivity from surveys.
- Focus Areas: Knowledge-work sectors (Tech, Finance, Professional Services) where remote work is highly feasible.

Exclusions:

- Non-credible opinion pieces lacking empirical support (e.g., purely anecdotal blog posts without systematic data).
- Sources focused solely on unrelated remote work topics, such as social effects that do not intersect with productivity measures unless they are tied back to productivity outcomes.
- Industry marketing material and unverified surveys that do not provide methodological transparency or peer-review validation.
- Ineligible Industries: Manual labor, manufacturing, or healthcare roles that require physical presence.

Chosen Tasks from the Task Menu:

Paper Triage, Cross-Source Synthesis

Paper Triage

Test case:

Prompt A:

Summarize the following paper about remote work. Tell me the contribution, method, data used, findings, and limitations.

Prompt B:

You are performing PAPER TRIAGE for a research corpus on remote work and productivity.

INPUT:

- Paper text or excerpt (with chunk_ids).

TASK:

Produce a structured summary with EXACTLY the following five fields:

1. Contribution – What new knowledge this paper adds.
2. Method – Study design and analytical approach.
3. Data – Data source(s), sample size, and time period.
4. Findings – Empirical results supported by the data.
5. Limitations – Explicit weaknesses stated by the authors OR implied by the method/data.

CONSTRAINTS:

- Use only information present in the provided text.
- Cite at least one chunk_id per field.
- If a field cannot be answered from the text, write: "Not specified in the provided text."
- Do NOT infer causality unless the paper explicitly claims causal identification.
- Keep each field to 2–4 sentences.

OUTPUT FORMAT:

- Five bullet points labeled exactly as the field names above.

Why these constraints exist

- Exact fields: enables cross-paper comparison
- chunk_id citations: forces grounding, prevents hallucination
- “Not specified” rule: exposes corpus gaps instead of guessing
- Causality guardrail: critical in remote-work research
- Length limits: discourages vague or padded summaries

Cross-Source Synthesis

Test case:

Prompt A:

Compare the following sources on remote work and productivity.

Summarize where they agree and disagree.

Prompt B:

You are performing CROSS-SOURCE SYNTHESIS for a research corpus on remote work and productivity.

INPUT:

- Multiple sources, each with source_id and chunk_ids.

TASK:

Produce a comparison table with the following columns:

1. Agreement
2. Disagreement
3. What evidence supports each side

CONSTRAINTS:

- Each row must reference at least TWO different sources.
- Every claim must be supported with citations in the form (source_id, chunk_id).
- Clearly distinguish differences caused by:
 - a) Level of analysis (individual, firm, macro)
 - b) Measurement type (self-reported vs objective)
 - c) Study design (causal vs correlational)
- Do NOT resolve disagreements unless the sources explicitly reconcile them.
- If evidence is insufficient to support a conclusion, state that explicitly.

OUTPUT FORMAT:

- Markdown table only (no prose before or after).

Why these constraints exist

- Two-source minimum: prevents single-paper “synthesis”
- Evidence column: makes disagreement explainable, not rhetorical
- Measurement/level distinctions: core to this domain
- No forced resolution: avoids artificial consensus
- Table-only output: machine-checkable structure for Phase 2

Models: ChatGPT 5.2 Plus & Gemini 3 Pro