

**Working from Home as Necessary but Unusual Arrangement: The case of Croatian Workers
During COVID-19 Pandemic – Supplementary Materials**

Table SI

Means, Standard Deviations and Zero Order Correlations for all Variables in Study 1 (N = 166)¹

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1. Experience with working from home prior to the pandemic, in days per week	1.32	1.72	-											
2. Gender (1 = male, 2 = female)	1.51	0.50	-.07	-										
3. Age	40.41	11.25	-.13	.04	-									
4. Education level	1.32	0.86	-.01	-.01	.07	-								
5. Pandemic-related worries	3.39	0.89	-.06	.14	-.02	.04	-							
6. Childcare responsibilities	0.37	0.49	-.01	-.11	-.03	-.08	-.22**	-						
7. WTF conflict	2.84	1.08	.11	.05	-.02	.13	.26**	.17*	-					
8. FTW conflict	2.62	1.05	.15	.00	-.08	.03	.15*	.16*	.54**	-				
9. Time structure	3.60	0.89	.05	.13	.09	-.08	-.16*	.02	-.31**	-.33**	-			
10. Psychological detachment	2.95	1.19	.03	-.16*	-.19*	-.13	.08	.06	-.37**	-.19**	.21**	-		
11. Job performance	2.97	0.88	-.04	-.01	-.18*	-.09	-.16*	.01	-.07	-.09	.22**	.06	-	
12. Well-being	0.00	0.85	.15	-.01	-.14	-.18*	-.32**	.08	-.29**	-.23**	.57**	.17*	.31**	-

Note. WTF = work-to-family, FTW = family-to-work.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table SII

Childcare Responsibilities as Predictors of Aspects of Work-Life Balance While Working From Home in Study 1, With Control Variables (N = 166)^{1,2}

Criteria:	WTF conflict		FTW conflict		Time structure		Psychological detachment	
	<i>B (SE)</i>	<i>RW</i>	<i>B (SE)</i>	<i>RW</i>	<i>B (SE)</i>	<i>RW</i>	<i>B (SE)</i>	<i>RW</i>
Experience with working from home prior to the pandemic	0.08 (0.05)	.01	0.10 (0.05)	.02	0.03 (0.04)	.00	0.00 (0.05)	.00
Gender (1 = male, 2 = female)	0.09 (0.16)	.00	0.01 (0.16)	.00	0.27 (0.14)	.02	-0.39 (0.18)*	.03
Age	0.00 (0.01)	.00	0.00 (0.01)	.00	0.01 (0.01)	.01	-0.02 (0.01)*	.03
Education level	0.18 (0.10)	.02	0.06 (0.09)	.00	-0.08 (0.08)	.01	-0.16 (0.11)	.02
Pandemic-related worries	0.38 (0.09)**	.08	0.24 (0.09)**	.03	-0.18 (0.08)*	.03	0.15 (0.10)	.01
Childcare responsibilities	0.57 (0.17)**	.05	0.36 (0.17)**	.03	0.05 (0.15)	.00	0.13 (0.19)	.00
R^2	.16**		.10*		.07		.09*	
ΔR^2 over control variables	.06**		.04*		.00		.00	

Note. WTF = work-to-family, FTW = family-to-work, *RW* = relative weights.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table SIII

Childcare Responsibilities and Aspects of Work-Life Balance as Predictors of Job Performance and Well-Being While Working From Home in Study 1, With Control Variables (N = 166)¹

Criteria:	Job performance			Well-being		
	Step 2	Step 3		Step 2	Step 3	
	<i>B</i> (<i>SE</i>)	<i>RW</i>	<i>B</i> (<i>SE</i>)	<i>RW</i>	<i>B</i> (<i>SE</i>)	<i>RW</i>
Experience with working from home prior to the pandemic	-0.04 (0.04)	-0.05 (0.04)	.00	0.06 (0.04)	0.05 (0.05)	.02
Gender (1 = male, 2 = female)	-0.03 (0.14)	-0.04 (0.14)	.00	0.08 (0.12)	-0.05 (0.11)	.00
Age	-0.01 (0.01)*	-0.02 (0.01)**	.04	-0.01 (0.01)	-0.01 (0.00)**	.02
Education level	-0.08 (0.08)	-0.07 (0.08)	.01	-0.16 (0.07)*	-0.11 (0.06)	.02
Pandemic-related worries	-0.17 (0.08)*	-0.15 (0.08)	.02	-0.30 (0.07)**	-0.18 (0.07)**	.06
Childcare responsibilities	-0.06 (0.14)	-0.01 (0.15)	.00	0.01 (0.13)	0.06 (0.12)	.01
WTF conflict		0.06 (0.08)	.00		-0.07 (0.06)	.03
FTW conflict		-0.01 (0.08)	.00		-0.01 (0.06)	.02
Time structure		0.23 (0.08)**	.04		0.48 (0.06)**	.25
Psychological detachment		0.00 (0.06)	.00		-0.01 (0.05)	.01
<i>R</i> ²	.07	.12*		.16**	.44**	
ΔR^2	.00	.05		.00	.27**	

Note. WTF = work-to-family, FTW = family-to-work, *RW* = relative weights.

p* < .05. *p* < .01.

Table SIV*Means, Standard Deviations and Zero Order Correlations for all Variables in Study 2 (N = 575)³*

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1. Work conditions at home	2.77	0.78	-														
2. Experience with working from home prior to the pandemic, in days per week	0.65	1.27	.07	-													
3. Gender (1 = male, 2 = female)	1.69	0.46	-.14**	-.03	-												
4. Age	37.1	9.99	-.11*	.06	.08	-											
5. Education level	3.8	0.78	-.12*	.03	.06	.00	-										
6. Digital literacy	5.62	1.25	.11*	.07	-.11*	-.37**	.10*	-									
7. Childcare responsibilities	0.37	0.67	-.30**	.06	.00	.15**	.10	-.02	-								
8. Conscientiousness	3.62	0.76	.05	-.08	.09	.08	.02	-.03	-.01	-							
9. Emotional stability	3.27	0.80	.15**	-.05	-.22**	-.11*	.08	.21**	-.05	.15**	-						
10. Autonomy at work	3.51	0.81	.24**	.07	-.08	.02	.09	.19**	-.01	.09	.30**	-					
11. WTF conflict	3.65	1.86	-.29**	.09*	.14**	.12*	.06	-.03	.21**	-.09*	-.31**	-.15**	-				
12. FTW conflict	3.02	1.68	-.38**	.12**	.10*	.13**	.08	-.07	.35**	-.12**	-.23**	-.11**	.57**	-			
13. Time structure	3.27	1.05	.27**	-.11*	-.05	.03	-.05	.04	-.13**	.30**	.44**	.27**	-.47**	-.35**	-		
14. Psychological detachment	2.53	1.23	.09*	-.10*	-.15**	-.10*	-.12**	.05	-.07	.06	.32**	.01	-.46**	-.21**	.41**	-	
15. Job performance	4.49	0.55	.25**	-.15**	.10*	-.03	-.03	.18**	-.03	.24**	.14**	.20**	-.12**	-.30**	.28**	.02	-
16. Well-being	3.08	0.93	.21**	-.05	-.13**	-.07	-.01	.10*	-.11*	.10*	.46**	.23**	-.45**	-.28**	.51**	.42**	.14**

Note. WTF = work-to-family, FTW = family-to-work.**p* < .05. ***p* < .01.

Table SV

Personality Traits and Autonomy at Work as Predictors of Aspects of Work-Life Balance While Working From Home in Study 2, With Control Variables (N = 487)³

Criteria:	WTF conflict		FTW conflict		Time structure		Psychological detachment	
	<i>B</i> (SE)	<i>RW</i>	<i>B</i> (SE)	<i>RW</i>	<i>B</i> (SE)	<i>RW</i>	<i>B</i> (SE)	<i>RW</i>
Work conditions at home	-0.52 (0.11)**	.06	-0.63 (0.10)**	.10	0.24 (0.06)**	.04	0.07 (0.08)	.00
Experience with working from home prior to the pandemic	0.06 (0.07)	.00	0.10 (0.06)	.01	-0.07 (0.03)	.01	-0.06 (0.05)	.01
Gender (1 = male, 2 = female)	0.25 (0.17)	.01	0.08 (0.15)	.00	0.08 (0.09)	.00	-0.19 (0.12)	.01
Age	0.01 (0.01)	.01	0.01 (0.01)	.01	0.01 (0.00)	.00	-0.01 (0.01)	.01
Education level	0.06 (0.10)	.00	0.06 (0.09)	.00	-0.09 (0.05)	.00	-0.20 (0.07)**	.02
Digital literacy	0.12 (0.07)	.00	0.03 (0.06)	.00	-0.03 (0.04)	.00	-0.01 (0.05)	.00
Childcare responsibilities	0.34 (0.12)**	.03	0.61 (0.10)**	.09	-0.09 (0.06)	.01	-0.02 (0.08)	.00
Conscientiousness	-0.14 (0.10)	.01	-0.21 (0.09)*	.01	0.28 (0.05)**	.06	0.06 (0.07)	.00
Emotional stability	-0.61 (0.10)**	.08	-0.35 (0.09)**	.04	0.49 (0.05)**	.15	0.50 (0.07)**	.09
Autonomy at work	-0.04 (0.10)	.01	0.06 (0.09)	.00	0.17 (0.05)**	.04	-0.16 (0.07)*	.01
<i>R</i> ²	.20**		.26**		.33**		.15**	
ΔR^2 over control variables	.09**		.09**		.23**		.09**	

Note. WTF = work-to-family, FTW = family-to-work, *RW* = relative weights.

p* < .05. *p* < .01.

Table SVI

Personality Traits, Autonomy at Work, and Aspects of Work-Life Balance as Predictors of Job Performance and Well-Being While Working From Home in Study 2, With Control Variables (N = 486)³

Criteria:	Job performance			Well-being		
	Step 2	Step 3	<i>B</i> (<i>SE</i>)	Step 2	Step 3	<i>RW</i>
	<i>B</i> (<i>SE</i>)	<i>RW</i>		<i>B</i> (<i>SE</i>)	<i>B</i> (<i>SE</i>)	
Work conditions at home	0.16 (0.03)**	0.10 (0.03)**	.03	0.11 (0.05)*	0.01 (0.05)	.01
Experience with working from home prior to the pandemic	-0.07 (0.02)**	-0.06 (0.02)**	.02	-0.02 (0.03)	0.00 (0.03)	.00
Gender (1 = male, 2 = female)	0.17 (0.05)**	0.16 (0.05)**	.02	-0.05 (0.08)	-0.02 (0.08)	.01
Age	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	.00	-0.00 (0.00)	-0.00 (0.00)	.00
Education level	-0.03 (0.03)	-0.03 (0.03)	.00	-0.03 (0.05)	0.02 (0.04)	.00
Digital literacy	0.08 (0.20)**	0.08 (0.02)	.03	-0.10 (0.03)	0.10 (0.03)	.00
Childcare responsibilities	0.05 (0.04)	0.10 (0.04)**	.01	-0.07 (0.06)	-0.02 (0.06)	.00
Conscientiousness	0.14 (0.03)**	0.10 (0.03)**	.03	0.04 (0.05)	-0.05 (0.05)	.00
Emotional stability	0.02 (0.03)	-0.02 (0.03)	.00	0.47 (0.05)**	0.25 (0.05)**	.09
Autonomy at work	0.07 (0.03)**	0.05 (0.03)*	.02	0.10 (0.05)*	0.08 (0.05)	.02
WTF conflict		0.04 (0.02)*	.01		-0.09 (0.03)**	.07
FTW conflict		-0.09 (0.02)**	.06		0.00 (0.03)	.02
Time structure		0.10 (0.03)**	.04		0.24 (0.04)**	.11
Psychological detachment		-0.04 (0.02)	.00		0.12 (0.03)**	.07
<i>R</i> ²	.19**	.26**		.24**	.40**	
ΔR^2	.05**	.08**		.18**	.16**	

Note. WTF = work-to-family, FTW = family-to-work, *RW* = relative weights.

p* < .05. *p* < .01.

Table SVII

Indirect Effects of Personality Traits and Need for Autonomy on Job Performance and Well-Being Through Aspects of Work-Life Balance in Study 2 (N = 486)³

Predictor	Criteria	Job performance			Well-being		
	Mediator	<i>b</i>	Lower 95% CI ^a	Upper 95% CI ^a	<i>b</i>	Lower 95% CI ^a	Upper 95% CI ^a
Childcare responsibilities	WTF conflict	0.015	0.000	0.035	-0.022	-0.046	-0.004
	FTW conflict	-0.070	-0.111	-0.036	0.002	-0.026	0.029
	Time structure	-0.011	-0.029	0.005	-0.015	-0.040	0.006
	Psychological detachment	0.001	-0.008	0.011	-0.002	-0.017	0.013
Conscientiousness	WTF conflict	-0.005	-0.017	0.002	0.013	-0.005	0.037
	FTW conflict	0.019	0.002	0.041	-0.001	-0.015	0.014
	Time structure	0.029	0.011	0.052	0.067	0.032	0.109
	Psychological detachment	-0.002	-0.011	0.004	0.007	-0.011	0.028
Emotional stability	WTF conflict	-0.022	-0.045	-0.002	0.055	0.020	0.098
	FTW conflict	0.033	0.014	0.058	-0.001	-0.024	0.020
	Time structure	0.050	0.019	0.085	0.115	0.069	0.166
	Psychological detachment	-0.018	-0.043	0.003	0.058	0.019	0.102
Autonomy at work	WTF conflict	-0.001	-0.011	0.007	0.004	-0.017	0.025
	FTW conflict	-0.006	-0.025	0.013	0.000	-0.008	0.007
	Time structure	0.018	0.005	0.035	0.040	0.013	0.075
	Psychological detachment	0.006	-0.001	0.017	-0.018	-0.044	-0.001

Note. Statistically significant effects and their confidence intervals are written in bold. In all analyses we controlled for gender, age, education level, experience with work from home prior to the pandemic and conditions for working from home.

^a95% confidence intervals were calculated through a *bootstrapping* procedure with 10 000 bootstrap samples.

¹ In Study 1 (Tables SI-SIV), we asked participants to rate, on a scale from 1 (*not worried at all*) to 5 (*extremely worried*), how concerned were they about the possible consequences of the COVID-19 pandemic in five domains: difficulties in doing everyday activities, difficulties in spending leisure time (e.g., traveling or going out), limits to civil liberties, changes in education and work, and a drop in standard of living due to economic recession.

² We also conducted a MANCOVA to test for differences among aspects of WLB and to check whether the findings were influenced by Type I error inflation. We used the control variables from the regression analyses as covariates. MANCOVA showed a significant multivariate difference between participants with and without children, $F(4, 156) = 4.91, p < .001$. The univariate differences followed the same pattern as regression analyses, with significant differences for WTF, $F(1, 159) = 11.57, p < .001$, and FTW conflict, $F(1, 159) = 7.31, p = .01$, and non-significant differences for time structure, $F(1, 159) = 0.02, p = .90$, and psychological detachment, $F(1, 159) = 0.48, p = .49$.

³ In Study 2 (Tables SIV-SVII), we asked participants to report on the working conditions in their homes (e.g., separate working space, adequate IT equipment) using a scale from 1 (*completely inadequate*) to 5 (*ideal*). We assessed participants' digital literacy with 5 items adapted from Redecker (2017) and Pahljina-Reinić et al. (2020), asking about their skills in using ICTs (e.g., Whatsapp, Skype), file editing, and data management (e.g., using cloud-based data storage services). Participants answered on a scale from 1 (*completely disagree*) to 7 (*completely agree*). Internal consistency for the scale was .86.

Pahljina-Reinić, R., Rončević Zubković, B. & Kolić-Vehovec, S. (2020). Digitalne kompetencije nastavnika i učenika [Digital competencies of teachers and students]. In S. Kolić-Vehovec (Ed.), *Uvođenje suvremenih tehnologija u učenje i poučavanje: istraživanje učinaka pilot-projekta e-škole* [Introducing modern technologies in learning and education: Investigation of effects of a pilot-project of e-school] (pp. 119–142.). University of Rijeka, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Rijeka, Croatia.

Redecker, C. (2017)., *European framework for the digital competence of educators: DigCompEdu*. In Y. Punie (Ed.). EUR 28775 EN, Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg. <https://doi.org/10.2760/159770>, JRC107466.