

Remote Working and Job Satisfaction during Covid-19

Dimitra Christodoulou

Department of Business, University of Cyprus

HRM595: Thesis

Dr. Eleni Stavrou-Kostea

December 2021

Contents

Abstract.....3

Literature Review.....4-21

Methodology.....21-24

Results.....24-26

Discussion.....27-34

References.....35-60

Appendix.....61-67

Dimitra Christodoulou

Abstract

Remote working plays a major role in organizations since it brings both advantages and disadvantages for both employees and employers. It is broadly described as a situation in which employees work mainly from home or other remote location while they communicate with their employers through technology tools (Azimov, 2020). During the pandemic crisis, remote working was quickly established across most organizations. Remote working is directly related with the employees' job satisfaction and so, it is worthy identifying its consequences and acting accordingly. Job satisfaction is simply defined as an individual's feeling towards his or her job that can be either positive or negative (Ankenman & Nelson, 2012; Schermerhorn et al., 2012; Smith, 1969). This study examines the relationship between the experience of remote working and the levels of job satisfaction across employees within the Cypriot context during the new environment that Covid-19 created. Sixty participants took part in an online survey and their responses were further analyzed. In the survey, the levels of job satisfaction were measured in relation with the employees' remote location. Consistent with some of the existing studies, a positive relationship between remote working and job satisfaction was found.

Remote Working and Job Satisfaction during Covid-19

Literature review

Definition of remote working

Remote working has been introduced in the early 2000s (Xiao et al., 2020) but during the new environment caused by Covid-19 pandemic, it has been necessarily adopted in most of peoples' lives. Organizations during the pandemic, had to adopt working from home arrangements immediately to adjust to the new situation. However, remote working was being used even before the pandemic and has been increasing throughout the years. According to Eurofound (2010), in 2010 only 20% of European workers were working remotely, but in 2015 the percentage reached approximately 30% (Eurofound & ILO, 2017). In addition, according to the Global Workplace Analytics, since 2009, the number of people working remotely (working from home) has increased by 159% (Steward, 2021). So, even before the pandemic, remote working was well introduced to peoples' lives. This progression was becoming more common due to the technology development in the workplace (Caramela, 2017). However, after the first lockdown during Covid-19 which was enforced across the world, from about 12% of the staff working from home, increased to almost 100% (Clews, 2021). Not all employees can adjust easily to the new unexcepted way of working and for some jobs, remote working is not suitable (CIPD, 2021). Nevertheless, it has also been suggested that by 2028, 73% of the departments across different industries will be working remotely (Steward, 2021). It is clear that the new environment caused by the pandemic has brought to the surface many issues and new ways of working for both employers and employees (Diab-Bahman & Al-Enzi, 2020; Modgil, 2020). Thus, it is important to consider all the issues caused by the pandemic and take the necessary actions.

At this point, it is necessary to define what remote working is and what are its consequences. Remote working, also called telecommuting or telework, is described as the working style that allows employees to work from home or other places outside of their business' premises (Cambridge Dictionary, 2021). Long ago, remote working was defined as a work arrangement in which employees can perform their work duties and responsibilities outside their company's premises while being supported by the necessary equipment (Fitzer, 1997). Although the definitions of remote working have been discussed for many years (Madsen, 2011; Sullivan, 2003), the most accurate point is that regardless of the location, the work can be completed anywhere at any time (Wiesenfeld et al., 2001). This was further analyzed by Kurland and Bailey (1999a) who have been among the first researchers who defined teleworking as "working from anywhere at any time" and they divided it into four types (home-based, satellite office, neighborhood work center, mobile). Telecommuters or remote workers are allocating their work time between their home location and their business premises (Golden et al., 2006; Madsen, 2003; Nuwer, 2016).

Additionally, the term "telework" is being mostly used as "telecommuting" or "virtual work" (Gajendran & Harrison, 2007; Siha & Monroe, 2006). Remote workers can work from whatever location they want but still, they need to meet their personal and business needs (Kolb et al., 2008). Similarly, according to CIPD (2016), remote working is a flexible working practice which gives the opportunity to employees to choose when, where, what time and for how long they can work. The work duties and responsibilities are carried out like they were at the traditional office space, but the difference is that employees work from whenever location they want and in their own pace. Mostly, the location is the employees' home, but the choice is up to employees. Ross (2016) has recently reported that remote workers are working in a remote location, and they do not have a centralized work location owned and operated by their companies and so, the connections to their employers vary

significantly. This flexibility provided to employees holds many consequences that can be either positive or negative. Both employees and employers should be critical and skeptical when using and providing, respectively, these flexible practices. However, in the next section the general consequences of remote working will be further explained.

Consequences of remote working

Remote working has dramatically changed the nature of work and its consequences are obvious on both employees and employers. In general, there are both positive and negative points of remote working across the workplace, ranging from flexible working hours and increased job satisfaction to feelings of loneliness and poor communication (CIPD, 2021; Eddleston, & Mulki, 2017; Grant et al., 2013; Staples, 2001; Wheatley, 2017). These findings will be briefly explained in the current section.

To start with, remote working has many advantages for organizations. It is mostly perceived as a way in which organizations can offer flexible working practices to their employees and consider their well-being and work-life balance while also, reducing organizational costs (Lewis & Cooper, 2005). For example, companies do not need huge premises for their employees which result to a lower cost of construction and maintenance. This flexible work arrangement provides employees with the opportunity to work from remote locations, like their home, which is equipped with the necessary technological tools (Caillier, 2012). This opportunity helps employees to cope with the daily demands of their work and family domains and so, manage to reduce the conflict between these two environments (Rau & Hyland, 2002; Stephens & Szajna, 1998). Individuals through remote working are able to set their time schedule and work in their own pace while they can control any interruptions that might occur (Stadtlander et al., 2017). Indeed, it was found that there are lower distractions for people who are working from home than those who work at the

office (Kelliher & Anderson, 2009). Through that specific study, it was found that remote workers were found to be more satisfied and committed to their jobs and organizations, while being able to achieve a greater work-life balance than those who were traditionally working from the office (Kelliher & Anderson, 2009). These findings were also confirmed through other studies that found higher levels of overall job satisfaction for remote workers (Bloom et al., 2015; Hill et al., 1998; Hyman & Summers, 2004; Igarria & Guimaraes, 1999) and higher organizational commitment (Grover & Crooker, 1995; Roehling et al., 2001). However, the international studies and results were conducted under different circumstances than the Covid-19 crisis. Remote working was provided as a flexible practice by their company for the purposes of the above studies while during Covid-19, employees were forced to work remotely. So, further research is needed.

Despite the positives, several negative points of remote working are reported. The new remote working environment as mentioned above, was suddenly adopted because of the pandemic which led to a big crisis since organizations were not well prepared for this work arrangement. Due to the limited information that the organizations had before the emerged adaptation of remote working, employees had mixed feelings. The stress levels were increased, training and development programs became necessary, while new practices were required to help employees and employers easily adjust and succeed in the new working conditions (Mello, 2007; Stadtlander et al., 2017; Taskin & Bridoux, 2010). Also, due to the many family demands caused by the greater accessibility and proximity, conflict has been increased (Igarria & Guimaraes, 1999; Kurland & Bailey, 1999b) while other findings support no effect on work-life balance (Hill et al., 1998; Nuwer, 2016). In addition, individuals who work from home were found to be working for longer hours and harder and this can be explained through the fewer workplace distractions that are limited when working from home (Kelliher & Anderson, 2009). Also, remote workers reported negative feelings

and social isolation due to the disconnection from their co-workers (Fonner & Roloff, 2012; Pinsonneault & Boisvert, 2001).

A recent study by Kłopotek (2017) also found some main advantages and disadvantages of remote working. The main advantages of the study were consisted of the flexible working hours, the ability to save time and design the best possible workplace (i.e., furniture, temperature, music and background effects), being independent while being able to take care of children or people with disabilities in relation to when working from the office. In contrast, the main disadvantages were the difficulty of separating the home and the professional matters, and the feeling of loneliness and social isolation. Furthermore, a recent study by Aczel et al. (2021) found some mixed findings of the consequences of remote working. Firstly, it was found that the pandemic decreased the work efficiency for 47% of the employees while 23% were reported to be more efficient during remote working.

Therefore, it is clear through the international literature findings that remote working raises two major issues (Bloom et al., 2015). Firstly, it is being questioned if it is a useful practice to raise the employees' productivity and motivation while also helping organizations to increase their profits. This question is not answered yet, thus, further research is needed. Because of the inconsistency through the existing studies, the remote working practices vary across and within industries. For example, some airlines allow their employees to work remotely while others do not see its benefits. The second major issue is regarding the work-life balance. It is still questionable if employees manage to achieve a balance between their work and personal life environment. However, the advantages and disadvantages of remote working will be described in greater detail in the next section.

The advantages of remote working

Models explaining the advantages of remote working. Remote working when provided as a flexible working practice is defined as a ‘win-win’ situation where both employees and employers benefit (Felstead & Henseke, 2017). For employers, remote working is more cost effective since employees work from home and they do not use the company’s tools. For employees, the levels of job satisfaction and commitment tend to be higher due to remote working. This can be explained by social exchange theory (Blau, 1964; Gouldner, 1960) since remote workers feel more enthusiastic and committed to their organization, their job satisfaction levels are higher and so, they are able to consume more effort in their work tasks (Felstead & Henseke, 2017). Moving on, drawing from Hackman and Oldham’s job characteristics model (1980), remote working is believed to provide benefits to employees. Working away from the traditional office space will offer higher autonomy, motivation and more control over when and how the work is performed (Feldman & Gainey, 1997). In line with this model, Sparrow (2000) stated that the work location can impact employees’ psychological contract. For example, employees who are allowed to work remotely, perceive that their organization trusts them, and this flexible practice of remote working is viewed as a gesture of kindness and appreciation. Employees who are able to work from home represent the privileged employees who are being provided with high trust relationships and higher autonomy (Sparrow, 2000).

The advantages of remote working on employees and organizations will be explained further below.

Employees’ advantages. To start with, findings support higher levels of job satisfaction for remote workers in comparison with employees who work in their office space (Kelliher & Anderson, 2010; Madsen, 2011). Remote working is found to be associated with

happier employees and indeed, it was agreed through a study that 77% of the respondents would be happier if they keep working remotely after the pandemic (Celano, 2021). The fact that employees tend to be happier when working from home, can be explained by the flexibility that employees have in allocating their own time and determining their work and leisure activities (Reuschke, 2019). Thus, due to the greater autonomy and flexibility that employees have to complete their duties, greater job satisfaction is reported (Baltes et al., 1999; Golden & Veiga, 2005). Also, using the BHPS survey, it was found that remote workers are more satisfied with their jobs in comparison with the ones who work from the traditional workplace (Wheatley, 2012). This can also be explained due to the flexibility of working at home while being able to complete other tasks related with the family domain (Wheatley, 2012).

Furthermore, individuals who work remotely, have a positive impact on their job satisfaction levels (Belanger, 1999; Dubrin, 1991; Norman et al., 1995) and they are more able to satisfy their personal needs by adjusting their working schedule (Baltes et al., 1999; Pierce & Newstrom, 1980, 1983). Therefore, it was found that the stress levels are lower since employees are not working under pressure as they did from their traditional office space (Clarke & Holdsworth, 2017; Guimaraes & Dallow, 1999; Sardeshmukh et al., 2012). Last but not least, according to Dery and Hafermalz (2016), it was found that the sense of belongingness can be enhanced through teleworking. More specifically, their findings suggest that through new technologies and new practices, remote workers can establish this sense of belonging by participating remotely in various organizational activities.

Remote working has also helped both employees and employers to achieve a balance between their work and personal life domains (Duxbury et al., 1992; Golden & Veiga, 2005; Riley & McClosky, 1997; Toscano & Zappala, 2020). Many studies have found that remote

working enhances the work-life balance of employees (Hilbrecht et al., 2008; Hill et al., 1998; Sullivan & Lewis, 2001). Indeed, it was suggested that the more the employees work remotely, the more they will be able to satisfy their personal and organizational needs and so, reducing the chances of work-family conflict (Allen et al., 2015; Ergeneli et al., 2010; Gajendran & Harrison, 2007; Golden & Veiga, 2005). By working remotely, employees are more able to take a break from their duties and focus a bit on their family responsibilities such as cooking, cleaning and taking care of their children. In this way, they are able to achieve a healthier lifestyle in which both the work and family domains are considered (Xiao et al., 2020). It was also found that remote workers tend to be better able to achieve higher levels of work-life balance in comparison, with the traditional office workers (Hill et al., 2003).

Organizational advantages. Not only employees benefited from these flexible working arrangement, but also organizations reported higher financial performance, lower costs and better job quality (Caillier, 2011; Cooper & Kurland, 2002; Dex et al., 2001; Fonner & Roloff, 2010). Literature findings report that employees who work from home, have higher productivity levels and motivation (Belanger, 1999; Binder & Coad, 2016; Eaton, 2003; Felstead & Henseke, 2017; Hill et al., 2003; Konrad & Mangel, 2000; Wheatley, 2017) and so, they can complete their work tasks in the best possible manner. Working from home is a motivator for employees and so, they are more willing to work extra hours and complete their tasks. Indeed, according to Clarke and Holdsworth (2017), by being provided such a flexible working practice, employees are more committed and willing to “give back” to the organization. The fact that employees are more productive, can be explained due to the absence of the workplace distractions when working remotely. There is no time wasted on communicating with co-workers but still employees can chat with their

colleagues (text, email, call) while they are not interrupting their tasks (Erikson & Petrosian, 2020).

Indeed, it was found that the employees' performance went dramatically up, and it was explained by the fewer breaks and time off and the increase in working hours due to the greater convenience of working remotely (Bloom et al., 2015; Clarke & Holdsworth, 2017). Additionally, the higher performance can be explained through the fewer absences and the less sick days among remote workers (Bloom et al., 2015, Choudhury et al., 2019). Employees are more flexible to choose when to work according to the hours that are more productive (Xiao et al., 2020) while being able to avoid distractions from co-workers (Kim & De Dear, 2013). Employees have the control of environmental factors that might improve their productivity such as the temperature, air quality, noise and lightning. They can also set up their working from their workspace in a way that makes them more productive and engaged. These factors can improve the employees' physical and mental health of remote workers (Xiao et al., 2020).

To sum up, remote working can have both direct and indirect benefits for organizations (CIPD, 2021). The direct savings include the lower costs due to the savings on office space and services of the company as a result of employees' lower physical presence in the business premises. The indirect benefits include higher levels of employee job satisfaction and well-being, which lead to greater productivity and employee morale (Kelliher & Anderson, 2010). Indeed, employees do not perceive working overtime as something bad since they are more satisfied, motivated and engaged and they are willing to work longer hours to achieve their tasks (CIPD, 2021; Kelliher & Anderson, 2010). Thus, by offering remote working, organizations can attract and retain the best employees who are also loyal and committed to them (Branine, 2003; Rau & Hyland, 2002; Grover & Crooker, 1995;

Roehling et al., 2001) while they have reduced scores of absenteeism (Dalton & Mesch, 1990).

The disadvantages of remote working

In addition to the above, there are also many negative points of remote working which will be explained in detail in the current section. There are companies like Hewlett-Packard Development Company (HP) who strongly believe that remote working is not so beneficial. Specifically, it was stated that a culture of collaboration and engagement is needed, that can only be achieved by having the employees working from the offices (Hesseldahl, 2013).

Employees' disadvantages. Some findings report a negative relationship between remote working and job satisfaction and specifically, due to the work intensity and the longer hours that were found during remote working, lower levels of job satisfaction were reported (Chapman et al., 1995; Cooper & Kurland, 2002; Huws et al., 1990). Firstly, this can be explained due to the poor communication and the decrease of the face-to-face interactions (Kelliher & Anderson, 2009; Pool, 1990; Yap & Tng, 1990), which led to many negative thoughts and feelings (Orhan et al., 2016). Similarly, according to Bentley et al.'s research (2016), due to the greater stress levels and the social isolation, employees were feeling less satisfied with their job. Also, employees through remote working, tend to miss the social context of their traditional work (Chevron & Primeau, 1996; Cooper & Kurland, 2002; Gajendran & Harrison, 2007; Golden et al., 2008; Kurland & Cooper, 2002; Siha & Monroe, 2006). Thus, through the above studies (Bentley et al., 2015; Orhan et al., 2016) a negative association between social isolation and job satisfaction was found.

Furthermore, many consequences on employees' mental health were reported. Specifically, according to Campione (2008), depression and remote working were positively correlated, which was found to be a result of the limited social interactions with co-workers

that was explained above. These findings can be also explained by Baumeister and Leary (1995) who suggested that social interaction is a basic human need, and it is an important motivator. When it comes to the workplace, employees want to be included in their organization by feeling a sense of belongingness and by being invited to participate (Hayes et al., 2002). This is called workplace inclusion and when it does not exist, it has many negative outcomes like high turnover rate, lower job satisfaction and lack of engagement (Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Golden, 2006; Greenhaus et al., 1990).

Many negative feelings were also reported in relation to remote working like higher anxiety and stress, loneliness and negative symptoms on the employees' physiological health (Baumeister & Tice, 1990; DeWall & Baumeister, 2006; Jones, 1990; Kim & De Dear, 2013; Mann & Holdsworth, 2003; Stephenson & Bauer, 2010; Weinert et al., 2015). Especially for the employees who were living alone, higher rates of social isolation and depression were found (Mann & Holdsworth, 2003; Tavares, 2017). Furthermore, during the pandemic, remote workers experienced a decline in their overall physical and mental health by reporting many new health issues (Xiao et al., 2020). In the specific study, 66% of the employees reported one or more new issues related to their physical health while 75% of the employees reported at least one mental health issue (Xiao et al., 2020). This can be explained by another study that showed that the online social interaction was not sufficient enough in reducing the feelings of loneliness (Ozcelik & Barsade, 2018; Wright & Silard, 2020).

Last but not least, greater difficulty in achieving a balance in their everyday lives was found because of the increased work pressure that remote employees have (Russell et al., 2009). Specifically, it was found that employees were experiencing higher work intensity since they were working for longer hours (Hill et al., 1998). As a result, they were feeling more stressed, exhausted and overloaded with work (Hill et al., 1998; Konradt et al., 2003;

Russell et al., 2009; Towers et al., 2006). Similarly, due to the longer exposure to their computer screen, remote workers also reported higher fatigue, headaches and tiredness (Majumdar et al., 2020). Even in high stress jobs, employees might experience difficulty in escaping work, mentally or physically (Russell et al., 2009) which can lead to greater work intensity. Further to the above, Evanoff et al. (2020), reported that remote workers have found it difficult to set clear boundaries between their work and life boundaries, which made them feel stressed and anxious.

Additionally, Roster and Ferrari (2020) noted that because employees spend much time working at home, their performance is influenced by both the work and the home environment. If there is conflict at home, such as many distractions, then employees will be less motivated, productive and healthy (Dao & Ferrari, 2020). Specifically, parents who were working remotely, found it really difficult to work while having to take care of their children (Cramer & Zaveri, 2020). In addition, there were cases of parents who could not complete their tasks during the day and so, the fewer had to sleep fewer hours and work at nights when their kids were sleeping since there were no interruptions then (Thompson, 2020). It can be concluded that due to the greater work intensity and exhaustion that was mentioned above, employees were experiencing difficulties in achieving work-life balance (Morganson et al., 2020) and higher rate of conflict between their work and life environment (Allen et al., 2015; Gajendran & Harrison, 2007; Hartig et al., 2007; Marsh & Musson, 2008; Toscano & Zappala, 2020). Thus, considering the above findings, it can be easily hypothesized that the general well-being of remote employees can be influenced.

Organizational disadvantages. Remote workers, across many studies, were found to be less productive, motivated and engaged. Generally, it was stated by Khan (2015) that the different working environments influence employees' productivity. So, remote working as a

new working environment has led to decreased engagement and productivity across the organization (Adkins, 2015; Allen et al., 2015; Greer & Payne, 2014; Van Yperen et al., 2014). Specifically, more than half of the US employees were working remotely but their levels of engagement were too low (Dvorak & Sasaki, 2017). This was explained due to the limited visibility within the company that the remote workers had (Gajendran et al., 2015) and the feelings of isolation explained above (Van Yperen et al., 2014). Similarly, it was agreed by 80% of the managers across 24 different countries that employees working from home usually perform worse than the office-based employees (Parker et al., 2020).

Additionally, it was found that procrastination (decisional and behavioral) was higher during remote working and monitoring was important to keep carrying on (Ferrari et al., 2021; Wang et al., 2020). As a result, employees were more emotionally exhausted and less satisfied with their duties while there were higher employee-related job tensions (Ferrari et al., 2021). In addition, stress was an important factor that influences the levels of productivity, motivation and engagement (Imtiaz & Ahmad, 2009). Companies do not want employees who are not engaged and motivated for their jobs since their productivity levels will be decreased (Azimov, 2020). It was identified that due to the unexpected change of environment caused by the pandemic, employees' productivity was affected and so, their performance (Azimov, 2020). Good communication and preparation is related with productive and motivated employees and under such crisis, employees were unprepared and isolated by working from home. Thus, employees when working from home, had decreased productivity, motivation and engagement, which led to poor organizational performance (Azimov, 2020).

As mentioned above, poor communication among employees was reported. Specifically, since employees had to adjust to the new online environment (chat, calls,

emails), the face-to-face interactions were limited across the organization (Kelliher & Anderson, 2009). The poor communication and social interaction among employees, can lead to negative career implications (Wheatley, 2012). During the pandemic, it was also evaluated whether there is a decrease in the communication for remote employees. Similarly with the above findings, it was found that the main difference between the remote workers and the traditional office-based employees, was the decrease of employees' communication (Toscano & Zappalà, 2020). Consequently, employees are at a disadvantaged position where they are less connected to their co-workers, and they are feeling "out of the loop" across the company's decisions, meaning that they do not feel an important part of the company (Cooper & Kurland, 2002; Gainey et al., 1999; Weisenfeld et al., 2001).

Definition of Job Satisfaction

Moving on to the second main topic of the current study, job satisfaction is important to consider when studying remote working since its consequences on employees are many. Along these lines, employees nowadays spend most of their time at work and so, it is important to analyze their job satisfaction levels (Ebrahimian Jolodar, 2012). In point of fact, job satisfaction refers to the content of an individual's job and when studying remote working, it is one of the most common outcomes (Fonner & Roloff, 2010; West & Berman, 2009). However, it is a big debate whether the levels of job satisfaction are being influenced positively or negatively during remote working.

To start with, a simple definition of job satisfaction states that it is the feeling that someone has about his or her job and it can be either positive or negative (Ankenman & Nelson, 2012; Schermerhorn et al., 2012; Smith, 1969). Regarding Schermerhorn et al.'s findings (2012), job satisfaction was described as an attitude mirroring a person's feeling towards his or her work at a specific time while Ankenman and Nelson (2012) added that it

can be influenced by the employees' work experiences. It can be also described as an affective relationship to an individual's job, which is operated by many situational factors like the nature of the work and the environment of the organization (Boswell et al., 2009). Job satisfaction has been defined in many ways like employee engagement (Lee, 2018) while it was indeed linked to employee engagement (Sattar & Hassan, 2015). More specifically, job satisfaction is found to influence the levels of employee engagement and motivation (Abraham, 2012; Biswas & Bhatnagar, 2013; Rich et al., 2010; Nimon et al., 2016; Saks, 2006; Warr & Inceoglu, 2012). Therefore, the more satisfied the employees are with their work, the more productive, motivated and engaged they will be at their duties and responsibilities (Böckerman & Ilmakunnas, 2012; Judge et al., 2001; Rayton & Yalabik, 2014; Watson et al., 1999) and so, will provide higher quality outcomes (Shooshtarian et al., 2013).

However, the most common definition of job satisfaction is similar with the one stated firstly above. Job satisfaction is characterized as an individual's feeling towards his or her job, which can be either positive or negative (Ankenman & Nelson, 2012; Schermerhorn et al., 2012; Smith, 1969). Thus, it can be briefly characterized as an employee's preference of his or her job (if he or she likes or dislikes the job) (Hofmans et al., 2013; Locke, 1966). Last but not least, it was found that job satisfaction can be influenced by the flexibility within their organization. Specifically, when flexible practices are offered to employees, then their levels of job satisfaction can be increased (Aziz-Ur-Rehman & Siddiqui, 2019). Similarly, many studies have found a positive relationship between organizational commitment, job satisfaction and flexible working practices within the organization (Almer & Kaplan, 2002; Cotti et al., 2014; Hooker et al., 2007; Maxwell et al., 2007). These findings were further explained by the high autonomy that employees have within their organization, which is the main contributor to higher job satisfaction (Hackman & Oldman, 1975). Concluding, it can

be hypothesized that Covid-19 had negatively influenced employees' job satisfaction levels since there are many restrictions for employees, like the fewer communication and social interaction among employees (Begum & Mobeen, 2020).

The relationship of Remote Working and Job Satisfaction

Given what was previously mentioned through the literature, it can be stated that the relationship between remote working and job satisfaction is still debatable and further research is needed, since the findings reported are mixed (Bailey & Kurland, 2002; Cooper & Kurland, 2002). In the current section, I will report findings with a positive relationship between these two variables (Allen et al., 2015; Dubrin, 1991; Fonner & Roloff, 2010; Gajendran & Harrison, 2007; Guimaraes & Dallow, 1999; Kossek & Ozeki, 1998; Manochehri & Pinkerton, 2003; Schall, 2019) as well as a negative relationship between these variables (Pinsonneault & Boisvert, 2001; Toscano & Zappala, 2020; Virick et al., 2010; Xiao et al., 2020).

Positive relationship between remote working and job satisfaction

To start with, a positive relationship was reported between remote working and job satisfaction. Specifically, it was found that as employees work remotely, their levels of job satisfaction are increased due to several factors described above (Dubrin, 1991; Fonner & Roloff, 2010; Guimaraes & Dallow, 1999; Schall, 2019). Similarly, Allen et al., (2015) have found that remote working and job satisfaction are being correlated positively. So, along with the above findings (Dubrin, 1991; Guimaraes & Dallow, 1999), the more employees work remotely, the more satisfied with their jobs they will be. Additionally, a meta-analysis by Gajendran and Harrison (2007) has found that telework is positively associated with job satisfaction. More specifically, they did not find any negative consequences of remote working on employees while they reported that the advantages of remote working on job

satisfaction outweigh the disadvantages. These findings confirmed previous findings that reported a positive relationship between teleworking and the employees' level of job satisfaction (Dallow, 1999; Dubrin, 1991; Fonner & Roloff, 2010; Guimaraes & Schall, 2019; Kossek & Ozeki, 1998; Manochehri & Pinkerton, 2003).

Negative relationship between remote working and job satisfaction

In contrast to the above findings, a negative relationship was also found between remote working and job satisfaction. Firstly, it is reported that as employees work remotely extensively, their levels of job satisfaction are being decreased (Pinsonneault & Boisvert, 2001; Virick et al., 2010). Along these lines, Xiao et al.'s study (2020) has found that if employees are working entirely from home, then their physical and mental health wellbeing are being decreased due to important factors such as lack of physical exercise and poor communication. Therefore, their levels of job satisfaction are also decreased. In addition, due to the new design of their workplace, employees' level of job satisfaction are influenced negatively (Fassoulis & Alexopoulos, 2015). Furthermore, Toscano and Zappala (2020) reported that due to the greater social isolation and the additional stress, employees' job satisfaction is influenced negatively. Therefore, according to these findings, it can be hypothesized that a negative linear relationship exists between remote working and job satisfaction. The more the employees work from home, the more their levels of job satisfaction are decreased (Fassoulis & Alexopoulos, 2015; Pinsonneault & Boisvert, 2001; Toscano & Zappala, 2020; Virick et al., 2010).

Present study

The current study aims to examine the relationship between two important variables, remote working experience and the levels of job satisfaction during the new pandemic environment. Through previous literature, findings are not consistent regarding the link

between remote working and job satisfaction and so, further research is needed. For the current study, an online questionnaire was shared in which remote working and job satisfaction were measured. Specifically, the extent of remote working was measured along with the participants' thoughts and feelings during this new environment while their levels of job satisfaction were also examined. Specifically, based on previous literature, two hypotheses can be made:

1. A positive relationship exists between remote working and the employees' level of job satisfaction. For example, higher levels of job satisfaction will be associated with higher levels of remote working.
2. A negative relationship exists between remote working and the employees' level of job satisfaction. For example, lower levels of job satisfaction will be associated with lower levels of remote working.

The current study will explore the above hypotheses through the online survey which will be carried out.

Methodology

Sample

Data were collected from a sample (N= 60, 40 females and 20 males) of adults from 18 to 65 years old. Specifically, 41 of the candidates were between 18-33 years old, 13 of the candidates were between 34-49 years old and 6 of the candidates were between 50-65 years old (see Results section). 25 of the participants were working only from home while 35 of the participants were working from both the home and office. Participants were informed about the survey via posts across social media platforms (LinkedIn and Facebook). A short description with the study along with a link for the questionnaire were shared. The exclusion criteria for the current study was the condition where participants were working only from their offices during Covid-19, during the last two years. Specifically, if a participant

answered that his/her primary work location was his/her office during the pandemic, then the survey was terminated. Because of this criterion, 6 participants were excluded prior the data analysis.

Materials

In this study, the levels of job satisfaction and the remote working experience were measured. To measure the below, two questionnaires were used which will be described below.

- 1) *Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS)*: The Job Satisfaction Survey was created by Spector (1994), and it consisted of 36 items, nine facet scale (nine dimensions of job satisfaction) to assess employee attitudes about the job and aspects of the job. The Cronbach's Alpha for the survey was $\alpha = .91$. Each facet is assessed with four items, and a total score is computed from all items. A 5-point Likert rating scale was used, with five choices per item ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree" to show the participants' degree of preference. Items are written in both directions, so about half must be reverse scored. The nine facets are Pay, Promotion, Supervision, Fringe Benefits, Contingent Rewards (performance based rewards), Operating Procedures (required rules and procedures), Coworkers, Nature of Work, and Communication (see Appendix A). The JSS was originally developed for use in human service organizations, but it was found applicable to all type of organizations in both private and public sectors.
- 2) *Remote Working Questionnaire*: The Remote Working Questionnaire was created for the purposes of this study after analyzing the international literature and findings on the specific topic. The questionnaire consisted of 21 items and the value for Cronbach's Alpha for the survey was $\alpha = .84$. Each item was assessed using a 5-point

Likert scale with five choices per item ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree" to show their degree of preference (see Appendix B). The questionnaire as a whole was not tested enough before the current study so, it should be further used in different populations and circumstances to assess its replicability and reliability.

However, the questions were created through previous research that explored remote working (i.e., Felstead & Henseke, 2017; Toscano & Zappalà, 2020).

Procedure

Firstly, the online questionnaire was shared across social media platforms (LinkedIn, Facebook) with a short description attached in the post, during the first week of October 2021 and it was available until the first week of November 2021. Before sharing the questionnaire, a small research by examining published reports and statistics, was conducted in order to select in which social platforms the questionnaire should be shared. It was found that nowadays Facebook and LinkedIn are two social media platforms that are used on a daily basis (Auxier & Anderson, 2021). Also, it was reported that they are useful social media sources to collect academic and research findings (Academic Designer, 2019) and so, it was decided to use these two platforms for the current study. Moving on, participants were informed about the topic of the study and that it was conducted for my master's thesis. The average time needed to complete the questionnaire was mentioned in the short description (10 minutes). Participants were informed that their responses will be used only for the research purposes and their participation will stay anonymous.

The online questionnaire consisted of three sections. The first was about the demographic characteristics of the participants. Participants were asked to complete their gender, age, the working industry along with their level of current position, their total years of experience and their parental status (parent/non-parent). Also, participants were asked about the primary work location and if a participant answered that their office was their

primary work location, the survey was terminated. The second section included the questions regarding remote working. Participants were asked about their thoughts, feelings and behaviors while working remotely the last two years. The third section included the job satisfaction questionnaire where participants' level of job satisfaction was measured. When completing the survey, participants received a thank you message.

Data analysis

Firstly, some preliminary checks by using one-way repeated measures ANOVA were carried out to see whether significant differences exist between any demographic variable (gender, age, work industry, level of positions, years of experience, parental status) and remote working. Next, correlations were carried out to see whether remote working was correlated, either positively or negatively, with any of the nine dimensions of job satisfaction (pay, promotion, supervision, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, operating conditions, coworkers, nature of work, communication). Along with the nine dimensions of job satisfaction, the total of job satisfaction for each candidate was calculated. Also, the total of remote working for each candidate was calculated through questions including the employees' feelings and thoughts (see Appendix B). Then, multiple regression analyses were carried out to test the main hypotheses. Remote working was used as the dependent variable and job satisfaction along with the nine dimensions of it were entered as a predictor.

Results

Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics of the demographic variables in the sample including gender, age, working industry, years of experience and parental status.

Preliminary checks for demographic variables and remote working

According to the RMANOVA findings, Mauchly's test indicated that the assumption of sphericity was violated, $\chi^2 = 91.28$, $p < 0.001$, therefore degrees of freedom were corrected

using Greenhouse-Geisser estimates of sphericity ($\epsilon = 0.59$). The results showed that the effect of remote working was significantly influenced by the sample's demographic variables ($F(3.54, 208.71) = 49.80, p < 0.001, \text{partial } \eta^2 = 0.46$). Post hoc analyses were conducted using Bonferroni post-hoc test, which revealed that gender, age, work industry, level of position and parental status were found to be significantly different towards remote working ($p < 0.001$) than the years of experience and remote working, which revealed no significant differences ($p > 0.05$).

The preliminary checks showed significant differences in most measures, except the years of experience. Therefore, the demographic characteristics in the current study, were successful in showing differences in remote working.

Correlations

Pearson correlations were carried out to assess the relationships between the nine dimensions of job satisfaction (pay, promotion, supervision, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, operating conditions, coworkers, nature of work, communication), the total score of job satisfaction and remote working. Remote working was found to be correlated positively with most of the dimensions and the total score of job satisfaction; however, some non-significant correlations were found. Remote working and the total score of job satisfaction were found to be positively correlated with a moderate significant relation ($r = .52, p < .01$). So, as employees work remotely, their levels of job satisfaction increase along. A significant moderate positive correlation was found also between remote working and pay ($r = .54, p < .01$). A significant positive correlation was found between remote working and promotion ($r = .40, p < .01$), fringe benefits ($r = .21, p < .01$) and coworkers ($r = .30, p < .01$). A non-significant positive correlation was found between remote working and contingent rewards ($r = .34, p > .05$), nature of work ($r = .20, p > .05$) and communication ($r = .21, p > .05$),

supervision ($r = .08$) and operating conditions ($r = .07$). So, as the nine dimensions and the total score of job satisfaction increase or decrease, remote working increases or decreases respectively (see Table 2).

Regression

Multiple regression analysis was used to test whether the higher levels of remote working predicted higher levels of job satisfaction. The higher and lower levels of remote working were calculated by the total score for each candidate (1 was the lowest degree of preference while 5 was the highest degree of preference). The dependent variable was the remote working experience, and the predictor was the total score of job satisfaction. In separate analysis, the predictors were each of the nine dimensions of job satisfaction.

1) Remote working and Job Satisfaction

For remote working and job satisfaction, the results of the regression analysis indicated that it was explained 20% (adjusted $R^2 = 0.20$) of the variance ($F(1, 58) = 1.17$, $p < 0.01$). It was found that remote working is significantly associated with higher job satisfaction ($\beta = 0.23$; $t(60) = 1.08$, $p < 0.01$; 95% CI 0.20-0.66). So, significant associations were found between remote working and job satisfaction.

2) Remote Working and nine dimensions of Job Satisfaction

For remote working and the nine dimensions of job satisfaction, the results of the regression analysis indicated that remote working did not significantly predict any of the nine dimensions of job satisfaction ($F(9, 50) = 1.68$, $p > 0.05$). No significant associations were found between remote working and each of the nine dimensions of job satisfaction (pay, promotion, supervision, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, operating conditions, coworkers, nature of work, communication) (see Table 3).

Discussion

In the current study, the role of remote working during Covid-19 and the relationship with the employees' level of job satisfaction were measured. An online questionnaire measuring both the employees' experience of remote working and their levels of job satisfaction during the pandemic period, was carried out. Participants, to be eligible for the current study, were either working only from home or from both the home and office. Based on previous literature, the findings between remote working and job satisfaction were not consistent, so the below hypotheses were created for the current study:

- 1) A positive relationship exists between remote working and the employees' level of job satisfaction
- 2) A negative relationship exists between remote working and the employees' level of job satisfaction

Correlation and regression analyses were carried out to test the study's hypotheses. Firstly, correlations were carried out between remote working, the nine dimensions of job satisfaction and the total score of job satisfaction. The main important finding of this study is the positive relationship found between remote working and overall job satisfaction. So, it can be stated that as remote working increases within organizations, then job satisfaction increases along and as remote working decreases, then job satisfaction decreases too. This can be justified through previous studies reporting that when employees are working remotely, their levels of job satisfaction tend to be higher in comparison to those who work from their traditional office spaces (Bloom et al., 2015; Hill et al., 1998; Hyman & Summers, 2004; Igarria & Guimaraes, 1999; Kelliher & Anderson, 2009). This can be also explained by the higher autonomy and flexibility that remote workers have since they can adjust their own tasks and time according to their preferences. Indeed, as mentioned above, it was found

by Celano (2021) that more than half of the respondents of the study, agreed that they want to keep working remotely.

These established findings are being validated by the current study since a significant positive relationship was found between remote working and job satisfaction. Employees by working remotely, their level of job satisfaction increases. Another reason for this finding might be the perception of employees that their organization appreciates them by providing them the practice of remote working. Employees perceive remote working as a flexible working arrangement which can help them enhance their well-being and work-life balance (Lewis & Cooper, 2005). Indeed, it was found that remote workers can achieve greater work-life balance by being able to cope with the daily demands of their work and family domains in their own time (Rau & Hyland, 2002; Reuschke, 2019; Stephens & Szajna, 1998) and so, increase their job satisfaction (Almer & Kaplan, 2002; Aziz-Ur-Rehman & Siddiqui, 2019; Cotti et al., 2014; Hooker et al., 2007; Maxwell et al., 2007).

Moving on, multiple regression analyses were carried out to examine further the study's hypotheses, which were whether a positive or negative relationship exists between remote working and job satisfaction. It was also found that significant associations exist between remote working and job satisfaction. Greater experience of remote working is significantly associated with higher levels of job satisfaction among employees, meaning that as the practice of remote working increases for employees and organizations, then job satisfaction levels will be higher. Established studies have also concluded that as employees keep working remotely, then their employees' level of job satisfaction will tend to be higher along with greater work-life balance and well-being (Allen et al., 2015; Ergeneli et al., 2010; Gajendran & Harrison, 2007; Golden & Veiga, 2005).

Given what was analyzed above, it can be concluded that the first hypothesis of the current study is confirmed. Specifically, the current study reports a positive relationship

between remote working and job satisfaction and so, there is not a negative relationship between these two variables. Thus, as employees work remotely, their levels of job satisfaction are increasing along. The current study validates some of the previous international findings that reported greater job satisfaction across remote employees (Allen et al., 2015; Dubrin, 1991; Fonner & Roloff, 2010; Gajendran & Harrison, 2007; Guimaraes & Dallow, 1999; Kossek & Ozeki, 1998; Manochehri & Pinkerton, 2003; Schall, 2019).

However, it should be stated that the above international findings were reported before the new working pandemic environment occurred. Indeed, in a study that was mentioned above (Begum & Mobeen, 2020), Covid-19 can be easily hypothesized on negatively influencing employees' level of job satisfaction since there were many restrictions for employees during the pandemic. In contrast, the current study can confirm that employees during the pandemic and the new remote working environment, were found to be more satisfied with their jobs. An important reason that can possibly explain this is the greater autonomy and flexibility that employees had by working remotely (Baltes et al., 1999; Golden & Veiga, 2005; Reuschke, 2019; Wheatley, 2012).

To conclude, the established findings through literature are not consistent since the majority of current studies report a negative relationship while others report a positive relationship between remote working and job satisfaction. However, it is important to point out that the current study had been conducted during the pandemic period and indeed, a positive relationship between remote working and job satisfaction was found. Thus, the current study's findings are more reliable and representative when the condition of remote working is given during such crisis.

Implications of the study

The purpose of the current study was to examine the relationship between remote working and employees' job satisfaction during the pandemic. The established research on remote working and job satisfaction, was not consistent enough since. They were reported mixed findings regarding the effect of remote working on job satisfaction. Some argued about a positive relationship between remote working and job satisfaction (Allen et al., 2015; Dubrin, 1991; Fonner & Roloff, 2010; Gajendran & Harrison, 2007; Guimaraes & Dallow, 1999; Kossek & Ozeki, 1998; Manochehri & Pinkerton, 2003; Schall, 2019) while others argued for a negative relationship between the two variables (Pinsonneault & Boisvert, 2001; Toscano & Zappala, 2020; Virick et al., 2010; Xiao et al., 2020).

However, most of the established findings can be considered as not reliable enough and replicable during such difficult environments, like the Covid-19 pandemic since they were not tested under the current circumstances of the pandemic period. The existing literature was studying remote working and job satisfaction when employees had a choice to work either from home or from the office. The pandemic crisis came unexpectedly, and many employees had to immediately transit to remote working without having another option. The sudden change of the working environment turned out to affect the productivity and performance of employees, as it takes time to get used to the new routine (Azimov, 2020).

However, the findings of the current study are important to consider since it was found that remote working affects job satisfaction and specifically, a positive relationship was found. Therefore, our findings can help organizations and managers to understand how remote working can easily affect employee well-being along with their levels of job satisfaction, motivation and productivity. Although further research is needed, our study suggests that if the organization successfully manages remote workers' productivity and well-being via designing high-quality remote work environments (salary and benefits, recognition,

communication, etc.), remote working can be considered as a positive and flexible working practice to employees. Thus, organizations should try and adjust flexible working practices and arrangements for their workforce. Employees can be provided with a hybrid working model where they can design their weekly or monthly schedule. For example, they can work 3 days per week from the office and 2 from home. Or they can discuss with their teams to work on a rotation basis, such as 1 week working remotely and the other working from the office.

Also, the current study points out that is important to understand that there are many challenges when working remotely, of which employees and managers should be aware. Nowadays, remote working is attractive to organizations and individuals while many researchers are insisting that remote working will become even more attractive after COVID-19 as a flexible working practice (Hern, 2020). So, it is important for all organizations to try and find the best possible way to adopt remote working to their employees and help them find ways to be as productive and motivated as when working from the office. As mentioned, a hybrid working model along with attractive salaries, bonus packages and benefits can retain and attract the best talent in organizations.

Limitations of the study

As every research, the current study has its own limitations, that leave opportunities for future research. Firstly, the sample size could be bigger to increase the reliability of the findings. Indeed, another major limitation within the sample, are the gender differences since the females were many more than the males in our study (N=60, 40 females and 20 males). Based on past research (Schraedley et al., 1999; Costa, Terracciano, & McCrae, 2001), females tend to experience more negative emotions and feelings. Differently, it was found that male employees tend to be more satisfied with their job than female employees (Rahman et al., 2017). However, some researchers found no significant difference among male and

female employees on their job satisfaction levels (Ali & Akhter, 2009; Azad et al., 2011; Budría & Baleix, 2020). In the current study, females were many more than males, which makes it difficult to agree or disagree with the below studies, further research is needed to examine the gender differences between males and females.

Another limitation can be the age difference in the sample (N=60, 41 were 18-33 years old, 13 were 34-49 years old, 6 were 50-65 years old). According to some literature on nature of job satisfaction, it was found that the older employees had different levels of job satisfaction compared to younger ones (Molla, 2015; Rahman et al., 2017). In addition, it was found that age has an effect on job satisfaction (Vickovic & Morrow, 2020) and specifically, as mentioned, younger employees tend to have higher levels of job satisfaction compared with older employees (Molla, 2015; Rahman et al., 2017). In the current study, 41 out of the 60 participants were 18 to 33 years old, which can be assumed that the age of the study's participants might influence the results. Specifically, the degree of job satisfaction might be higher in the current study since the participants were young adults.

Last but not least, personality plays a major role in how to cope with remote working. Specifically, it was found that different personality traits reflect differences in how to face the new remote working environment and the effect on job satisfaction (Smith et al., 2018). Recently, individuals who are extrovert and sociable are more likely to feel a sense of isolation and to experience lower job satisfaction when working remotely. Differently, individuals who are introverted and prefer spending more time alone are more likely to be more or equally productive and satisfied when working online as when working from the office (Grelle & Popp, 2021). Similarly, remote workers depending on their personality characteristics, might value differently the flexibility, autonomy and lower social interaction

that remote working provides (Morganson et al., 2010).

Directions for future research

Future research should consider the above limitations. Firstly, a larger sample should be created with equal male and female participants, and with a wider range of age. For example, studies should be carried out in different populations (not many post-graduate students) so that the findings could be generalized. The online survey could be shared in more social media platforms that not only students and academics use (i.e., could be shared on Twitter). Also, in future studies, measuring personality traits towards remote working and job satisfaction, can be important to find more reliable findings. In this way, it will be very helpful to have an idea how different personality traits react to remote working and how their levels of job satisfaction are being influenced. Last but not least, to have a holistic and more representative idea of how remote working affects job satisfaction, interviews can be conducted along with the quantitative data method (questionnaire) used. Specifically, according to Jamshed (2014), interviews allow interviewees to answer open-ended questions and express their opinions so, they include the flexibility to move to new topics as needed, to measure the abilities of candidates and easily compare the results when there are the same set of questions. Concluding, further research should investigate the effect of remote working on job satisfaction by considering the above limitations and providing more replicable and reliable findings for different populations.

Conclusion

To conclude, the current study provides important insights and information about the new reality of remote working. Our results can give us a better understanding of how remote working can influence the levels of job satisfaction during the pandemic crisis. Specifically, a positive relationship between remote working and job satisfaction was found. It is now time

for organizations to adopt flexible working practices like providing remote working on a weekly basis for employees. The advantages on employees are obvious so it is worth establishing this practice in order to be competitive across the market (Bloom, 2014; Cheng, 2019; CIPD, 2021; Kersley et al., 2006). Also, findings suggest that it is worth examining remote working since it has both positive and negative points across the workplace on both employees and employers (CIPD, 2021; Eddleston, & Mulki, 2017; Grant et al., 2013; Staples, 2001; Wheatley, 2017). So, through the findings of the present study, we can confirm that remote working must be further analyzed since its effect is very important on employees' job satisfaction.

References

- Abraham, S. (2012). Job satisfaction as an antecedent to employee engagement. *SIES Journal of Management*, 8(2).
<http://web.b.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=1&sid=d583bed5-cb17-4841-a15e-37169daad179%40sessionmgr103>
- Academic Designer. (2019, August 19). *Social Media Platforms for Academics, A Breakdown of the Networks*. 18 Comments. <https://theacademicdesigner.com/2019/social-media-platforms/#comments>
- Aczel, B., Kovacs, M., van der Lippe T., Szaszi, B. (2021). Researchers working from home: Benefits and challenges. *PLoS ONE* 16(3).
<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0249127>
- Adkins, A. (2015, January 28). *Majority of U.S. employees not engaged despite gains in 2014*. Gallup. <https://news.gallup.com/poll/181289/majority-employees-notengaged-despite-gains-2014.aspx>
- 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>
- Ali, T. & Akhter, I. (2009). Job Satisfaction of Faculty Members in Private Universities-In Context of Bangladesh. *International Business Research*, 2(4). 167-175. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ibr.v2n4p167>

- Almer, E. D., & Kaplan, S. E. (2002). The effects of flexible work arrangements on stressors, burnout, and behavioral job outcomes in public accounting. *Behavioral Research in Accounting*, 14(1), 1-34. <https://doi.org/10.2308/bria.2002.14.1.1>
- Ankenman, B. E., & Nelson, B. L. (2012). A quick assessment of input uncertainty. In *Proceedings of the 2012 Winter Simulation Conference (WSC)*, 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1109/WSC.2012.6465124>
- Auxier, B. & Anderson, M. (2021, April 7). *Social Media Use in 2021*. Pew Research Center. <https://www.pewresearch.org/internet/2021/04/07/social-media-use-in-2021/>
- Azad, M. R., Khan, W., & Ahmed, A. A. A. (2011). HR Practices in Banking Sector on Perceived Employee Performance: A Case of Bangladesh. *Eastern University Journal*, 3(3), 30–39.
- Azimov, P. (2020). *Effects of remote work on the workplace and workers How quality of life and work are affected by being away from the office and what can managers and supervisors do about it*. [Master Thesis, Lab University of Applied Sciences Ltd]. Refworks. <https://www.theseus.fi/handle/10024/353225>
- Aziz-Ur-Rehman, M. & Siddiqui, D. A. (2019). Relationship between Flexible Working Arrangements and Job Satisfaction Mediated by Work-Life Balance: Evidence from Public Sector Universities Employees of Pakistan. *SSRN*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3510918>
- Bailey, D. E., & Kurland, N. B. (1999a). The advantages and challenges of working here, there, anywhere, and anytime. *Organizational dynamics*, 28(2), 53-68.
- Bailey, D. E., & Kurland, N. B. (2002). A review of telework research: Findings, new directions, and lessons for the study of modern work. *Journal of Organizational*

Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior, 23(4), 383-400. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.144>

Baltes, B. B., Briggs, T. E., Huff, J. W., Wright, J. A., & Neuman, G. A. (1999). Flexible and compressed workweek schedules: A meta-analysis of their effects on work-related criteria. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84(4), 496–513.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.84.4.496>

Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological bulletin*, 117(3), 497-529.

Baumeister, R. F., & Tice, D. M. (1990). Point-counterpoints: Anxiety and social exclusion. *Journal of social and clinical Psychology*, 9(2), 165-195.
<https://doi.org/10.1521/jscp.1990.9.2.165>

Begum, R., & Mobeen, A. (2020). Impacts of Pandemics on Economy - Focusing on the Measures and Employee Performance in Banking Industry of Pakistan during COVID-19. *European Scientific Journal (ESJ)*, 16(16).
<https://doi.org/10.19044/ESJ.2020.V16N16P13>

Bé langer, F. (1999). Workers' propensity to telecommute: An empirical study. *Information & Management*, 35(3), 139-153. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-7206\(98\)00091-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-7206(98)00091-3)

Bentley, T. A., Teo, S. T., McLeod, L., Tan, F., Bosua, R., & Gloet, M. (2016). The role of organisational support in teleworker wellbeing: A socio-technical systems approach. *Applied ergonomics*, 52, 207-215.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apergo.2015.07.019>

Binder, M., & Coad, A. (2016). How Satisfied are the Self-Employed? A Life Domain View. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 17(4), 1409–1433.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-015-9650-8>

Biswas, S., & Bhatnagar, J. (2013). Mediator Analysis of Employee Engagement: Role of Perceived Organizational Support, P-O Fit, Organizational Commitment and Job Satisfaction. *Vikalpa*, 38(1), 27–40. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0256090920130103>

Blau, P. (1964). *Power and exchange in social life*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.

Bloom, N., Liang, J., Roberts, J., Ying, Z.J. (2015). Does working from home work? Evidence from a Chinese experiment. *Q J Econ*, 130(1), 165–218.

<https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qju032>

Bloom, N. (2014). *To raise productivity, let more employees work from home*. Harvard

Business Review, January–February. <https://stayinthegame.net/wp-content/uploads/2019/07/HBR-To-Raise-Productivity-Let-More-Employees-Work-from-Home.pdf>

Brooks, S. K., Webster, R. K., Smith, L. E., Woodland, L., Wessely, S., Greenberg, N., & Rubin, G. J. (2020). The psychological impact of quarantine and how to reduce it: rapid review of the evidence. *The lancet*, 395(10227), 912-920.

[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(20\)30460-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30460-8)

Böckerman, P., & Ilmakunnas, P. (2012). The Job Satisfaction-Productivity Nexus: A Study Using Matched Survey and Register Data. *ILR Review*, 65(2), 244–262.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/001979391206500203>

Boswell, W. R., Shipp, A. J., Payne, S. C., & Culbertson, S. S. (2009). Changes in newcomer job satisfaction over time: Examining the pattern of honeymoons and

hangovers. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(4), 844–858.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0014975>

Budría, S., & Baleix, J. M. (2020). Offshoring, job satisfaction and job insecurity.

Economics, 14(23), 1-32. <https://doi.org/10.5018/economics-ejournal.ja.2020-23>

Caillier, J. G. (2012). The Impact of Teleworking on Work Motivation in a U.S. Federal

Government Agency. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 42(4), 461–

480. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0275074011409394>

Cambridge Dictionary. (2021). *Remote working*.

<https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/remote-working>

Caramela, S. (2017, December). *Communication technology and inclusion will shape*

the future of remote work. Business News Daily.

<https://www.businessnewsdaily.com/8156-future-of-remote-work.html>

Campione, W., Morgan, J., & Jerrell, M. (2004). Employed women's well-being: The global

And daily impact of work: Working paper series--04-05. NAU W.A.

Celano, K. (2021, March 2021). *45 Key WFA & Remote Work Statistics for 2021*. Owl Labs.

<https://resources.owlabs.com/blog/remote-work-statistics>

Cheng, S. (2019, October 1). *Let's talk flexible working*. Acas. [https://www.acas.org.uk/lets-](https://www.acas.org.uk/lets-talk-flexible-working)

[talk-flexible-working](https://www.acas.org.uk/lets-talk-flexible-working)

CIPD (2016). Flexible Working Practices.

[https://www.cipd.co.uk/knowledge/fundamentals/reasons/flexible-](https://www.cipd.co.uk/knowledge/fundamentals/reasons/flexible-working/factsheet)

[working/factsheet](https://www.cipd.co.uk/knowledge/fundamentals/reasons/flexible-working/factsheet) (accessed 20 March 2017).

CIPD (2021). Flexible Working Practises.

<https://www.cipd.co.uk/knowledge/fundamentals/reasons/flexible-working/factsheet>

- Chapman, A. J., Sheehy, N. P., Heywood, S., Dooley, B., & Collins, S. C. (1995). The organizational implications of teleworking. *International review of industrial and organizational psychology*, 10, 229-248.
- Chevron, J. & Primeau, M. (1996). The telecommuting innovation opportunity. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 13(4), 40-48. <https://doi.org/10.1108/07363769610124537>
- Choudhury, P., Foroughi, C., & Larson, B. (2021). Work-from-anywhere: The productivity effects of geographic flexibility. *Strategic Management Journal*, 42(4), 655-683. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.3251>
- Clarke, S., & Holdsworth, L. (2017). Flexibility in the workplace: Implications of flexible work arrangements for individuals, teams and organizations. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 27. <https://www.acas.org.uk/flexibility-in-the-workplace-implications-of-flexible-work-arrangements-for-individuals-teams-and?web=1&wdLOR=cA3D4DD8A-1DCB-4998-B0DE-B4F7EB761EE0>
- Clews, S. (2021, May 10). *The secret of smarter working: not just when and where, but how?* Guest Blog. <https://www.workwiseuk.org/blog/2021/5/9/guest-blog>
- Cooper, C. D., & Kurland, N. B. (2002). Telecommuting, professional isolation, and employee development in public and private organizations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, 23(4), 511-532. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.145>
- Costa Jr, P. T., Terracciano, A., & McCrae, R. R. (2001). Gender differences in personality traits across cultures: robust and surprising findings. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 81(2), 322.

Cotti, C. D., Haley, M. R., & Miller, L. A. (2014). Workplace flexibilities, job satisfaction and union membership in the US workforce. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 52(3), 403-425. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjir.12025>

Cramer, M. & Zaveri, M. (2020, May 31). *What if You Don't Want to Go Back to the Office?*. The New York Times.
<https://www.nytimes.com/2020/05/05/business/pandemic-work-from-home-coronavirus.html>

Dalton, D., & Mesch, D. (1990). The Impact of Flexible Scheduling on Employee Attendance and Turnover. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 35(2), 370-387.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/2393395>

Dao, T. N., & Ferrari, J. R. (2020). The negative side of office clutter: Impact of work-related well-being and job satisfaction. *North American Journal of Psychology*, 22(3), 397-410.

Dery, K. & Hafermalz, E. (2016). Seeing Is Belonging: Remote Working, Identity and Staying Connected. *The Impact of ICT on Work*, 109-126.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-287-612-6_6

DeWall, C. N., & Baumeister, R. F. (2006). Alone but feeling no pain: Effects of social exclusion on physical pain tolerance and pain threshold, affective forecasting, and interpersonal empathy. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 91(1), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.91.1.1>

Dex, S., Smith, C., & Winter, S. (2001). Effects of family-friendly policies on business performance. *Research Papers in Management Studies-University of Cambridge Judge Institute of Management Studies WP*.

<http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.392.5595&rep=rep1&type=pdf>

- Dubrin, A. J. (1991). Sex and Gender Differences in Tactics of Influence. *Psychological Reports*, 68(2), 635–646. <https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.1991.68.2.635>
- Duxbury, L. E. & Higgins, C. A. & Mills, S. (1992). After-Hours Telecommuting and Work-Family Conflict: A Comparative Analysis. *Information Systems Research* 3 (2) 173-190. <https://doi.org/10.1287/isre.3.2.173>
- Dubrin, A. J. (1991). Comparison of the Job Satisfaction and Productivity of Telecommuters versus in-House Employees: A Research Note on Work in Progress. *Psychological Reports*, 68(3), 1223–1234. <https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.1991.68.3c.1223>
- Dvorak, N., & Sasaki, J. (2017, March 30). *Employees at home: Less engaged*. Business Journal. <http://www.gallup.com/businessjournal/207539/employees-home-lessengaged.aspx/banner.html>
- Eaton, S. C. (2003). If you can use them: Flexibility policies, organizational commitment, and perceived performance. *Industrial Relations: A Journal of Economy and Society*, 42(2), 145-167. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-232X.00285>
- Ebrahimian Jolodar, S. Y. (2012). An investigation of social factors affecting on personnel job satisfaction of remedial service insurance department. *Iranian Journal of Management Studies (IJMS)*, 5(1), 97–110. <https://www.sid.ir/en/journal/ViewPaper.aspx?ID=316209>
- Eddleston, K. A., & Mulki, J. (2017). Toward Understanding Remote Workers' Management of Work–Family Boundaries: The Complexity of Workplace Embeddedness. *Group*

& *Organization Management*, 42(3), 346–387.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601115619548>

Ergeneli, A., Ilsev, A., & Karapınar, P. B. (2010). Work–family conflict and job satisfaction relationship: The roles of gender and interpretive habits. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 17(6), 679-695. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0432.2009.00487.x>

Eriksson, E., & Petrosian, A. (2020). Remote Work-Transitioning to Remote Work in Times of Crisis. *DiVA*.

<https://www.divaportal.org/smash/record.jsf?pid=diva2%3A1446999&dswid=-6087>

Evanoff, B. A., Strickland, J. R., Dale, A. M., Hayibor, L., Page, E., Duncan, J. G., ... & Gray, D. L. (2020). Work-related and personal factors associated with mental well-being during the COVID-19 response: survey of health care and other workers. *Journal of medical Internet research*, 22(8). <https://doi.org/10.2196/21366>

Fassoulis, K. & Alexopoulos, N. (2015). The workplace as a factor of job satisfaction and productivity: A case study of administrative personnel at the University of Athens. *Journal of Facilities Management*, 13(4), 332-349.

<https://doi.org/10.1108/JFM-06-2014-0018>

Feldman, D. C., & Gainey, T. W. (1997). Patterns of telecommuting and their consequences: Framing the research agenda. *Human Resource Management Review*, 7(4), 369-388.

[https://doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822\(97\)90025-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822(97)90025-5)

Felstead, A., & Henseke, G. (2017). Assessing the growth of remote working and its consequences for effort, well-being and work-life balance. *New Technology, Work Employment*, 32(3), 195–212. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ntwe.12097>

Fitzer, M. M. (1997). Managing from Afar: Performance and Rewards in a Telecommuting Environment. *Compensation & Benefits Review*, 29(1), 65-73.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/088636879702900110>

Fonner, K. L. & Roloff, M. E. (2010). Why Teleworkers are More Satisfied with Their Jobs than are Office-Based Workers: When Less Contact is Beneficial. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 38(4), 336-361.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/00909882.2010.513998>

Gainey, T. W., Kelley, D. E., & Hill, J. A. (1999). Telecommuting's impact on corporate culture and individual workers: Examining the effect of employee isolation: Quarterly Journal. *S.A.M. Advanced Management Journal*, 64(4), 4-10.

<https://www.proquest.com/docview/231139195?accountid=17200>

Gajendran, R. S., & Harrison, D. A. (2007). The good, the bad, and the unknown about telecommuting: Meta-analysis of psychological mediators and individual consequences. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(6), 1524-1541.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.6.1524>

Gajendran, R. S., Harrison, D. A., & Delaney-Klinger, K. (2015). Are telecommuters remotely good citizens? Unpacking telecommuting's effects on performance via i-deals and job resources. *Personnel Psychology*, 68(2), 353-393.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12082>

Grant, C.A., Wallace, L.M. & Spurgeon, P.C. (2013). An exploration of the psychological factors affecting remote e-worker's job effectiveness, well-being and work-life balance. *Employee Relations*, 35(5), 527-546.

<https://doi.org/10.1108/ER-08-2012-0059>

- Gregory, K. S. & Bernadette, S. (1998). Perceptions and Expectations: Why People Choose a Telecommuting Work Style. *International Journal of Electronic Commerce*, 3(1), 70-85. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10864415.1998.11518328>
- Greer, T. W., & Payne, S. C. (2014). Overcoming telework challenges: Outcomes of successful telework strategies. *The Psychologist-Manager Journal*, 17(2), 87-11. <https://doi.org/10.1037/mgr0000014>
- Grelle, D., & Popp, E. (2021). Considering the interaction of individual differences and remote work contexts. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 14(1-2), 244-247. <https://doi.org/10.1017/iop.2021.51>
- Grover, S. L., & Crooker, K. J. (1995). Who appreciates family-responsive human resource policies: The impact of family-friendly policies on the organizational attachment of parents and non-parents. *Personnel psychology*, 48(2), 271-288. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1995.tb01757.x>
- Golden, T. D. (2006). The role of relationships in understanding telecommuter satisfaction. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, 27(3), 319-340. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.369>
- Golden, T. D., & Veiga, J. F. (2005). The Impact of Extent of Telecommuting on Job Satisfaction: Resolving Inconsistent Findings. *Journal of Management*, 31(2), 301–318. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206304271768>
- Golden, T. D., Veiga, J. F., & Dino, R. N. (2008). The impact of professional isolation on teleworker job performance and turnover intentions: Does time spent teleworking, interacting face-to-face, or having access to communication-enhancing technology

matter?. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(6), 1412–1421.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0012722>

Golden, T. D., Veiga, J. F., & Simsek, Z. (2006). Telecommuting's differential impact on work-family conflict: Is there no place like home? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(6), 1340–1350. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.6.1340>

Gouldner, A. (1960). The Norm of Reciprocity: A Preliminary Statement. *American Sociological Review*, 25(2), 161-178. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2092623>

Guimaraes, T. & Dallow, P. (1999). Empirically testing the benefits, problems, and success factors for telecommuting programmes. *European Journal of Information Systems*, 8(1), 40-54. <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.ejis.3000317>

Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1975). Development of the Job Diagnostic Survey. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60(2), 159–170. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0076546>

Hartig, T., Kylin, C., & Johansson, G. (2007). The telework tradeoff: Stress mitigation vs. constrained restoration. *Applied Psychology*, 56(2), 231-253. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.2006.00252.x>

Hayes, B. C., Bartle, S. A., & Major, D. A. (2002). Climate for opportunity:: A conceptual model. *Human resource management review*, 12(3), 445-468. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822\(02\)00050-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822(02)00050-5)

Hern, A. (2020, March 13). *Covid-19 could cause permanent shift towards home working*. The Guardian. <http://www.miamidadetpo.org/library/2020-03-13-uk-covid19-could-cause-permanent-shift-towards-home-working.pdf>

Hesseldahl, A. (2013, October 8). *Yahoo Redux: HP Says "All Hands on Deck" Needed, Requiring Most Employees to Work at the Office (Memo)*. Allthings.

<https://allthingsd.com/20131008/yahoo-redux-hp-says-all-hands-on-deck-needed-requiring-most-employees-to-work-at-the-office-memo/>

Hilbrecht, M., Shaw, M. S., Johnson, L. C. & Andrey, J. (2008). "I'm home for the kids': contradictory implications for work–life balance of teleworking mothers. *Gender, Work & Organization* 15(5), 454-476.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0432.2008.00413.x>

Hill, E.J, Ferris, M., Mårtinson, V. (2003). Does it matter where you work? A comparison of how three work venues (traditional office, virtual office, and home office) influence aspects of work and personal/family life. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 63(2), 220–41. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0001-8791\(03\)00042-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0001-8791(03)00042-3)

Hill, E. J., Miller, B. C., Weiner, S. P., & Colihan, J. (1998). Influences of the virtual office on aspects of work and work/life balance. *Personnel psychology*, 51(3), 667-683.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1998.tb00256.x>

Hofmans, J., De Gieter, S., & Pepermans, R. (2013). Individual differences in the relationship between satisfaction with job rewards and job satisfaction. *Journal of vocational behavior*, 82(1), 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2012.06.007>

Hooker, H., Neathey, F., Casebourne, J., & Munro, M. (2007). The third work-life balance employee survey: Main findings. *Employment Market Analysis and Research*.

Huws, U., Robinson, W. B., & Robinson, S. (1990). *Telework towards the elusive office*.

John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

- Hyman, J. & Summers, J. (2004). Lacking balance? Work-life employment practices in the modern economy. *Personnel Review*, 33(94), 418-429.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/00483480410539498>
- Igbaria, M., & Guimaraes, T. (1999). Exploring differences in employee turnover intentions and its determinants among telecommuters and non-telecommuters. *Journal of management information systems*, 16(1), 147-164.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/07421222.1999.11518237>
- Imtiaz, S., & Ahmad, S. (2009). Impact of stress on employee productivity, performance and turnover; an important managerial issue. *International Review of Business Research Papers*, 5(4), 468-477.
- Jamshed, S. (2014). Qualitative research method-interviewing and observation. *Journal of basic and clinical pharmacy*, 5(4), 87-88. <https://doi.org/10.4103/0976-0105.141942>
- Jones, W. H. (1990). Loneliness and social exclusion. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 9(2), 214-220. <https://doi.org/10.1521/jscp.1990.9.2.214>
- Judge, T. A., Thoresen, C. J., Bono, J. E., & Patton, G. K. (2001). The job satisfaction–job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127(3), 376–407. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.127.3.376>
- Kelliher, C., & Anderson, D. (2010). Doing more with less? Flexible working practices and the intensification of work. *Human Relations*, 63(1), 83-106.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726709349199>
- Kersley, B., Alpin, C., Forth, J., Bryson, A., Bewley, H., Dix, G., & Oxenbridge, S. (2013). *Inside the workplace: findings from the 2004 Workplace Employment Relations Survey*. Routledge.

Kim, J., & De Dear, R. (2013). Workspace satisfaction: The privacy-communication trade-off in open-plan offices. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 36, 18-26.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2013.06.007>

Kłopotek, M. (2017). The advantages and disadvantages of remote working from the perspective of young employees. *Organizacja i Zarządzanie: kwartalnik naukowy*.

Kolb, D. G., Collins, P. D., & Lind, E. A. (2008). Requisite Connectivity:: Finding Flow in a Not-So-Flat World. *Organizational Dynamics*, 37(2), 181-189.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2008.02.004>

Konrad, A. M., & Mangel, R. (2000). The impact of work-life programs on firm productivity. *Strategic management journal*, 21(12), 1225-1237.

[https://doi.org/10.1002/1097-0266\(200012\)21:12<1225::AID-SMJ135>3.0.CO;2-3](https://doi.org/10.1002/1097-0266(200012)21:12<1225::AID-SMJ135>3.0.CO;2-3)

Konradt, U., Hertel, G. & Schmook, R. (2003). Quality of management by objectives, task-related stressors, and non-task-related stressors as predictors of stress and job satisfaction among teleworkers. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 12(1), 61-79.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/13594320344000020>

Kossek, E. & Ozeki, C. (1998). Work-family conflict, policies, and the job-life satisfaction relationship: A review and directions for organizational behavior-human resources research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(2), 139-149.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.83.2.139>

Kurland, N. B., & Bailey, D. E. (1999b). When workers are here, there, and everywhere: A discussion of the advantages and challenges of telework. *Organizational Dynamics*, 28, 53-68.

- Kurland, N. B., & Cooper, C. D. (2002). Manager control and employee isolation in telecommuting environments. *The Journal of High Technology Management Research*, 13(1), 107-126. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1047-8310\(01\)00051-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1047-8310(01)00051-7)
- Lee, A. M. (2018). An Exploratory Case Study of How Remote Employees Experience Workplace Engagement. *Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies*.
<https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations/5569>
- Lewis, S., & Cooper, C. (2005). *Work-life integration: Case studies of organisational change*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Locke, E. A. (1969). What is job satisfaction?. *Organizational behavior and human performance*, 4(4), 309-336. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073\(69\)90013-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073(69)90013-0)
- Madsen, S. R. (2003). The effects of home-based teleworking on work-family conflict. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 14(1), 35-58.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.1049>
- Madsen, S.R. (2011). The benefits, challenges, and implication of teleworking: a literature review. *Journal of Culture and Religion*, 1(1), 148-158.
- Majumdar, P., Biswas, A. & Sahu, S. (2020). COVID-19 pandemic and lockdown: cause of sleep disruption, depression, somatic pain, and increased screen exposure of office workers and students of India. *Chronobiol Int*, 37(8), 1191-1200.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/07420528.2020.1786107>
- Mann, S., & Holdsworth, L. (2003). The psychological impact of teleworking: stress, emotions and health. *New Technology, Work and Employment*, 18(3), 196-211.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-005X.00121>

- Manochehri, G., & Pinkerton, T. (2003). Managing telecommuters: Opportunities and challenges. *American Business Review*, 21(1), 9-16. Retrieved from <https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/managing-telecommuters-opportunities-challenges/docview/216305746/se-2?accountid=17200>
- Marsh, K., & Musson, G. (2008). Men at work and at home: Managing emotion in telework. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 15(1), 31-48. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0432.2007.00353.x>
- Maxwell, G., Rankine, L., Bell, S. & MacVicar, A. (2007). The incidence and impact of flexible working arrangements in smaller businesses. *Employee Relations*, 29(2), 138-161. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01425450710719987>
- McCloskey, D.W., & Igbaria, M. (2003). Does "out of sight" mean "out of mind"? An empirical investigation of the career advancement prospects of telecommuters. *Information Resources Management Journal (IRMJ)*, 16(2), 19–34. <https://doi.org/10.4018/irmj.2003040102>
- Mello, J.A. (2004). Managing telework programs effectively. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 19(4), 247-261. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10672-007-9051-1>
- Molla, M. I. H. (2015). Ensuring Job Satisfaction for Managing People at Work. *Global Disclosure of Economics and Business*, 4(2), 155-166. <https://doi.org/10.18034/gdeb.v4i2.144>
- Morganson, V.J., Major, D.A., Oborn, K.L., Verive, J.M. & Heelan, M.P. (2010). Comparing telework locations and traditional work arrangements: Differences in work-life balance support, job satisfaction, and inclusion. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 25(6), 578-595. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683941011056941>

- Nardi, B. A., & Whittaker, S. (2002). The place of face-to-face communication in distributed work. *Distributed work*, 83, 112.
- Nimon, K., Shuck, B., & Zigarmi, D. (2016). Construct overlap between employee engagement and job satisfaction: A function of semantic equivalence?. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 17(3), 1149-1171.
<https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007/s10902-015-9636-6.pdf>
- Norman, P., Collins, S., Conner, M., Martin, R., & Rance, J. (1995). Attributions, Cognitions, and Coping Styles: Teleworkers' Reactions to Work-Related Problems. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 25(2), 117-128. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.1995.tb01587.x>
- Nuwer, R. (2016). No Workplace Like Home. *Scientific American Mind*, 27(5), 38-43. Retrieved July 17, 2021, from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/24945495>
- Orhan, M. A., Rijsman, J. B., & Van Dijk, G. M. (2016). Invisible, therefore isolated: Comparative effects of team virtuality with task virtuality on workplace isolation and work outcomes. *Revista de Psicología del Trabajo y de las Organizaciones*, 32(2), 109-122. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rpto.2016.02.002>
- Ozcelik, H., & Barsade, S. G. (2018). No employee an island: Workplace loneliness and job performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 61(6), 2343-2366. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2015.1066>
- Parker, S. K., Knight, C. & Keller, A. (2020, August 20). *Remote managers are having trust issues*. Business Mirror. <https://businessmirror.com.ph/2020/08/10/remote-managers-are-having-trust-issues/>

- Pierce, J. L., & Newstrom, J. W. (1980). Toward A Conceptual Clarification Of Employee Responses To Flexible Working Hours: A Work Adjustment Approach. *Journal of Management*, 6(2), 117–134. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920638000600202>
- Pierce, J., & Newstrom, J. (1983). The Design of Flexible Work Schedules and Employee Responses: Relationships and Process. *Journal of Occupational Behaviour*, 4(4), 247-262. Retrieved July 18, 2021, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3000314>
- Pinsonneault, A. & Boisvert, M. (2001). The impacts of telecommuting on organizations and individuals: A review of the literature. In: Telecommuting and virtual offices: Issues and opportunities. *IGI Global*, 163–85. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-878289-79-7.ch010>
- Pool, I. D. S., & Pool, I. D. S. (1990). *Technologies without boundaries: On telecommunications in a global age*, 35-37. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Rahman, M., Ashraf, A., Hasan, N., Hoshen, S., Chowdhury, R. H. K., & Moni, M. (2017). Job satisfaction levels among employees of private commercial banks at Chuadanga District in Bangladesh. *J Bus Fin Aff*, 6(256), 2167-0234. <https://doi.org/10.18034/abr.v10i2.470>
- Rau, B. L., & Hyland, M. A. M. (2002). Role conflict and flexible work arrangements: The effects on applicant attraction. *Personnel psychology*, 55(1), 111-136. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2002.tb00105.x>
- Rayton, B. A. & Yalabik, Z. Y. (2014). Work engagement, psychological contract breach and job satisfaction. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 25(17), 2382-2400. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2013.876440>

Reuschke, D. (2019). The subjective well-being of homeworkers across life domains.

Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space, 51(6), 1326–

1349. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0308518X19842583>

Rich, B. L., Lepine, J. A., & Crawford, E. R. (2010). Job engagement: Antecedents and effects on job performance. *Academy of management journal*, 53(3), 617-635.

<https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2010.51468988>

Riley, F., & McCloskey, D. W. (1997). Telecommuting as a response to helping people balance work and family. In *Integrating work and family: Challenges and choices for a changing world*, 133-142.

Roster, C. A., & Ferrari, J. R. (2020). Does Work Stress Lead to Office Clutter, and How?

Mediating Influences of Emotional Exhaustion and Indecision. *Environment and*

Behavior, 52(9), 923–944. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013916518823041>

Roehling, P.V., Roehling, M.V. & Moen, P. (2001). The Relationship Between Work-Life Policies and Practices and Employee Loyalty:A Life Course Perspective. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, 22, 141–170.

<https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1016630229628>

Ross, L. M. (2016). *The human side of virtual work: Managing, trust, isolation, and presence*. New York, NY: Business Expert Press.

Russell, H., O'Connell, P. J., & McGinnity, F. (2009). The impact of flexible working arrangements on work–life conflict and work pressure in Ireland. *Gender, Work &*

Organization, 16(1), 73-97. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0432.2008.00431.x>

Saks, A.M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of*

Managerial Psychology, 21(7), 600-619. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940610690169>

- Sattar, T., Ahmad, K., & Hassan, S. (2015). Role of human resource practices in employee performance and job satisfaction with mediating effect of employee engagement. *Pakistan Economic and Social Review*, 53(1), 81-96. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/26153249>
- Sardeshmukh, S. R., Sharma, D., & Golden, T. D. (2012). Impact of telework on exhaustion and job engagement: A job demands and job resources model. *New Technology, Work and Employment*, 27(3), 193-207. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-005X.2012.00284.x>
- Schall, M. A. (2019). *The Relationship Between Remote Work and Job Satisfaction: The Mediating Roles of Perceived Autonomy, Work-Family Conflict, and Telecommuting Intensity*. [Master's Thesis], San Jose State University. Scholar works. <https://doi.org/10.31979/etd.2x82-58pg>
- Schermerhorn, J. R., Osborn, R. N., Uhl-Bien, M., & Hunt, J. G. (2012). *Organizational behaviour; experience, grow, contribute (12th ed.)*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley and Sons.
- Schraedley, P. K., Gotlib, I. H., & Hayward, C. (1999). Gender differences in correlates of depressive symptoms in adolescents. *Journal of adolescent health*, 25(2), 98-108.
- Shooshtarian, Z., Ameli, F., & Amini Lari, M. (2013). The effect of labor's emotional intelligence on their job satisfaction, job performance and commitment. *Iranian Journal of management studies*, 6(1), 27-43. <https://doi.org/10.22059/IJMS.2013.30123>
- Siha, S.M. & Monroe, R.W. (2006), "Telecommuting's past and future: a literature review and research agenda", *Business Process Management Journal*, 12(4), 455-482. <https://doi.org/10.1108/14637150610678078>

- Smith, P. C. (1969). The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement: A strategy for the study of attitudes. *ERIC*.
- Smith, S. A., Patmos, A., & Pitts, M. J. (2018). Communication and Teleworking: A Study of Communication Channel Satisfaction, Personality, and Job Satisfaction for Teleworking Employees. *International Journal of Business Communication*, 55(1), 44–68. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2329488415589101>
- Sparrow, P.R. (2000). New employee behaviours, work designs and forms of work organization: What is in store for the future of work?. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 15(3), 202-218. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940010320561>
- Stadlander, L., Sickel, A., LaCivita, L., & Giles, M. (2017). Home as workplace: A qualitative case study of online faculty using photovoice. *Journal of Educational Research and Practice*, 7(1), 4. <https://doi.org/10.5590/JERAP.2017.07.1.04>
- Staples, D. S. (2001). A study of remote workers and their differences from non-remote workers. *Journal of Organizational and End User Computing (JOEUC)*, 13(2), 3-14. <https://doi.org/10.4018/joeuc.2001040101>
- Stephenson, L.E. & Bauer, S.C. (2010). The Role of Isolation in Predicting New Principals' Burnout. *International Journal of Education Policy and Leadership*, 5(9), 1–17 . <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.994.6908&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- Steward, J. (2021, October 27). The Ultimate List Of Remote Work Statistics for 2021. Findstack. <https://findstack.com/remote-work-statistics/>

- Sullivan, C. (2003). What's in a name? Definitions and conceptualisations of teleworking and homeworking. *New Technology, Work and Employment*, 18(3), 158-165. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-005X.00118>
- Sullivan, C. & Lewis, S. (2001). Home-based telework, gender, and the synchronization of work and family: perspectives of teleworkers and their co-residents. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 8(2), 123-145. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0432.00125>
- Taskin, L.; Bridoux, F. (2010). Telework: A challenge to knowledge transfer in organizations. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 21(13), 2503-2520. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2010.516600>
- Tavares, A. I. (2017). Telework and health effects review. *International Journal of Healthcare*, 3(2), 30. <https://doi.org/10.5430/ijh.v3n2p30>
- Thompson C. (2020, June 9). *What if working from home goes on ... forever?*. The New York Times Magazine. <https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2020/06/09/magazine/remote-work-covid.html>
- Toscano, F., & Zappalà, S. (2020). Smart working in Italy: Origin, diffusion and potential outcomes. *Psicologia sociale*, 15(2), 203-223. <https://doi.org/10.1482/96843>
- Towers, I., Duxbury, L., Higgins, C. & Thomas, J. (2006). Time thieves and space invaders: technology, work and the organization. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 19(5), 593-618. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09534810610686076>
- Van Yperen NW, Rietzschel EF, De Jonge KMM (2014) Blended Working: For Whom It May (Not) Work. *PLoS ONE*, 9(7). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0102921>
- Vickovic, S. G., & Morrow, W. J. (2020). Examining the influence of Work–Family conflict on job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment among correctional

officers. *Criminal Justice Review*, 45(1), 5-25.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0734016819863099>

Virick, M., DaSilva, N., & Arrington, K. (2010). Moderators of the curvilinear relation between extent of telecommuting and job and life satisfaction: The role of performance outcome orientation and worker type. *Human Relations*, 63(1), 137–154. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726709349198>

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. <https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12290>

Wang, C., Pan, R., Wan, X., Tan, Y., Xu, L., Ho, C. S., & Ho, R. C. (2020). Immediate psychological responses and associated factors during the initial stage of the 2019 coronavirus disease (COVID-19) epidemic among the general population in China. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 17(5), 1729. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17051729>

Warr, P., & Inceoglu, I. (2012). Job engagement, job satisfaction, and contrasting associations with person–job fit. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 17(2), 129–138. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0026859>

Watson, D. , Wiese, D. , Vaidya, J. & Tellegen, A. (1999). The two general activation systems of affect: structural findings, evolutionary considerations, and psychological evidence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 76(5), 820-838.

Weinert, C., Maier, C. & Laumer, S. (2015). Why are teleworkers stressed? An empirical analysis of the causes of telework-enabled stress. *Wirtschaftsinformatik Proceedings*

2, 1407–1421.

<https://aisel.aisnet.org/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1093&context=wi2015>

West, J. P., & Berman, E. M. (2009). Job Satisfaction of Public Managers in Special Districts. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 29(4), 327–353.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0734371X09337710>

Wiesenfeld, B. M., Raghuram, S., & Garud, R. (2001). Organizational identification among virtual workers: the role of need for affiliation and perceived work-based social support. *Journal of Management*, 27(2), 213229.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/014920630102700205>

Wheatley, D. (2012). Good to be home? Time-use and satisfaction levels among home-based teleworkers. *New Technology, Work and Employment*, 27(3), 224–241.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-005X.2012.00289.x>

Wheatley, D. (2017). Employee satisfaction and use of flexible working arrangements. *Work, Employment and Society*, 31(4), 567–585. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0950017016631447>

Wright, S., & Silard, A. (2021). Unravelling the antecedents of loneliness in the workplace. *Human Relations*, 74(7), 1060–1081.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726720906013>

Xiao, Y., Becerik-Gerber, B., Lucas, G., & Roll, S. C. (2020). Impacts of working from home during COVID-19 pandemic on physical and mental well-being of office workstation users. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 63(3), 181.

<https://doi.org/10.1097/JOM.0000000000002097>

Yap, C. S., & Tng, H. (1990). Factors associated with attitudes towards telecommuting. *Information & Management*, 19(4), 227-235.

[https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-7206\(90\)90032-D](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-7206(90)90032-D)

Dimitra Christodoulou

Table 1*Descriptive Statistics of Participants, N=60*

| | n | % |
|-------------------------|----|-------|
| Gender | | |
| Female | 40 | 66.67 |
| Male | 20 | 33.33 |
| Age | | |
| 18-33 | 41 | 68.33 |
| 34 - 49 | 13 | 21.67 |
| 50 – 65 | 6 | 10 |
| Work Industry | | |
| Public Sector | 10 | 16.67 |
| Private Sector | 40 | 66.67 |
| Semi-public Sector | 10 | 16.67 |
| Years of Experience | | |
| Less than 1 year | 9 | 15 |
| 1-3 years of experience | 28 | 46.67 |
| 4-6 years of experience | 16 | 26.67 |
| 7+ years of experience | 7 | 11.67 |
| Level of position | | |
| Entry-level | 28 | 46.67 |
| Middle-level | 24 | 40 |
| Top-level | 8 | 13.33 |
| Parental Status | | |
| Parent | 20 | 33.33 |
| Non-parent | 40 | 66.67 |

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for Remote Working, Job Satisfaction (JS) and the Dimensions of JS

| Variable | n | M | SD | 1. | 2. | 3. | 4. | 5. | 6. | 7. | 8. | 9. | 10. | 11. |
|----------------------------|----|------|-----|--------|--------|------|-------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------|-------|-----|
| 1. Pay | 60 | 3.10 | .63 | - | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Promotion | 60 | 3.01 | .63 | .54*** | - | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Supervision | 60 | 2.68 | .55 | .05 | -.04 | - | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Fringe Benefits | 60 | 2.98 | .56 | .22 | .04 | -.21 | - | | | | | | | |
| 5. Contingent Rewards | 60 | 3.15 | .66 | .48*** | .61*** | .04 | .01 | - | | | | | | |
| 6. Operating Conditions | 60 | 3.18 | .68 | .01 | .03 | -.04 | .02 | .34** | - | | | | | |
| 7. Coworkers | 60 | 2.44 | .61 | .09 | .10 | .10 | .17 | .33** | .34** | - | | | | |
| 8. Nature of work | 60 | 2.85 | .49 | .41** | .18 | -.15 | .18 | .23 | -.11 | .09 | - | | | |
| 9. Communication | 60 | 2.83 | .41 | .07 | .07 | .18 | -.13 | .07 | .14 | .22 | .09 | - | | |
| 10. Job Satisfaction_Total | 60 | 2.91 | .29 | .65*** | .58*** | .21 | .37** | .73*** | .47*** | .55*** | .42*** | .34** | - | |
| 11. Remote Working | 60 | 2.82 | .48 | .54** | .40** | .08 | .21** | .34 | .07 | .30* | .20 | .21 | .52** | - |

Table 3

Multiple Regressions for Remote Working: remote working is the dependent variable, and the predictors are the nine dimensions of job satisfaction and the total score of job satisfaction.

| | DV: Remote Working | | |
|------------------------|--------------------|-----|---------|
| | B | SE | β |
| Pay | -.08 | .13 | -.11 |
| Promotion | .35 | .13 | .47 |
| Supervision | -.04 | .12 | -.05 |
| Fridge Benefits | -.16 | .12 | -.19 |
| Contingent Rewards | -.04 | .14 | -.06 |
| Operating Conditions | .01 | .11 | .01 |
| Coworkers | .03 | .11 | .04 |
| Nature of Work | .20 | .14 | .21 |
| Communication | -.15 | .15 | -.13 |
| Job Satisfaction_Total | .23 | .21 | .14** |

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

APPENDIX A

| JOB SATISFACTION SURVEY | | | | | | |
|--|---|----------------|-------|---------|----------|-------------------|
| Copyright Paul E. Spector 1994, All rights reserved. | | | | | | |
| | Thinking of the last two years, where remote working was suddenly introduced to our working routine, complete the below statements by selecting your personal level of agreement, in relation to working from home, using a 5-point Likert scale. | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| 1 | I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2 | There is really too little chance for promotion on my job. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3 | My supervisor is quite competent in doing his/her job. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4 | I am not satisfied with the benefits I receive. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5 | When I do a good job, I receive the recognition for it that I should receive. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6 | Many of our rules and procedures make doing a good job difficult. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7 | I like the people I work with. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8 | I sometimes feel my job is meaningless. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9 | Communications seem good within this organization. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 10 | Raises are too few and far between. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 11 | Those who do well on the job stand a fair chance of being promoted. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 12 | My supervisor is unfair to me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 13 | The benefits we receive are as good as most other organizations offer. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 14 | I do not feel that the work I do is appreciated. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 15 | My efforts to do a good job are seldom blocked by red tape. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 16 | I find I have to work harder at my job because of the incompetence of people I work with. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 17 | I like doing the things I do at work. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 18 | The goals of this organization are not clear to me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

| | | | | | | |
|----|---|----|---|---|---|---|
| 19 | I feel unappreciated by the organization when I think about what they pay me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 20 | People get ahead as fast here as they do in other places. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 21 | My supervisor shows too little interest in the feelings of subordinates. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 22 | The benefit package we have is equitable. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 23 | There are few rewards for those who work here. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 24 | I have too much to do at work. | 11 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 25 | I enjoy my coworkers. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 26 | I often feel that I do not know what is going on with the organization. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 27 | I feel a sense of pride in doing my job. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 28 | I feel satisfied with my chances for salary increases. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 29 | There are benefits we do not have which we should have. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 30 | I like my supervisor. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 31 | I have too much paperwork. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 32 | I don't feel my efforts are rewarded the way they should be. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 33 | I am satisfied with my chances for promotion. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 34 | There is too much bickering and fighting at work. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 35 | My job is enjoyable. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 36 | Work assignments are not fully explained. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

APPENDIX B

| REMOTE WORKING QUESTIONNAIRE | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|----------------|-------|---------|----------|-------------------|
| | Thinking of the last two years, where remote working was suddenly introduced to our working routine, complete the below statements by selecting your personal level of agreement, in relation to working from home, using a 5-point Likert scale. | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| 1 | Compared to when I was working from the office, my job now by working remotely makes me feel: | | | | | |
| | Depressed | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| | Moody | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| | Exhausted | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| | Stressed | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| | Enthusiastic | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| | Cheerful | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2 | I feel connected to my colleagues and team leaders in my organization | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3 | I miss the face-to-face interactions with my colleagues and team leaders in my organization | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4 | I feel that I can easily reach my colleagues and team leaders in my organization any time | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5 | I feel that there is adequate communication from my colleagues and team leaders in my organization | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6 | I am satisfied with the quality of communication from my organization's leadership | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7 | I feel supported and trusted by my colleagues and team leaders in my organization | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8 | I feel informed about my organizations goals when working from home | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9 | I know what is expected from me each day | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 10 | I feel that I receive valuable and constructive feedback from my colleagues and team leaders in my organization | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 11 | I believe that I can set and follow my personal goals as efficient in when working from home | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

| | | | | | | |
|----|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 12 | I feel motivated and energized to complete my daily tasks | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 13 | I have been able to learn and grow during this period | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 14 | I feel that my organization has set clear working from home policies | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 15 | I have all the appropriate equipment and remote tools to complete my tasks at home | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 16 | I feel that I am as productive at home as I was at the office | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 17 | I am able to stick to a normal working schedule as at the office | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 18 | I feel that I am getting easily distracted when working remotely | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 19 | I believe that I can set clear boundaries between work and family | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 20 | I feel that I can achieve a good work and life balance | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 21 | Overall, I believe that I am satisfied with my current work from home arrangement | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |