

Biljana Bogičević Milikić\*, Ana Aleksić Mirić, Nebojša Janićijević  
University of Belgrade, Faculty of Economics and Business, Serbia

# Working from Home, Work-Related Attitudes, Work-Life Balance and Employee Well-Being – Implications for HRM in the Post-COVID Era

DOI: 10.7595/management.fon.2023.0009

---

## Abstract:

**Research Question:** This paper explores the relationship between working from home, work-related attitudes, work-life balance and employee well-being. **Motivation:** The paper is inspired by an evident lack of research of factors that possibly cause differences in the employees' work-related attitudes, work-life balance and employee well-being especially in the Covid Era. In this paper, we search for a better understanding of the relationship between working from home, work-related attitudes, work-life balance and employee well-being. **Idea:** The paper aims to identify factors that make a difference in certain work-related attitudes (job satisfaction and organizational commitment), work-life balance and employee well-being in working from home environment in order to provide for better understanding of employees' behaviour in the Covid Era and the implications for more effective Human Resource Management of working from home employees in Post-Covid time. **Data:** Primary data were collected through a questionnaire with 2,171 employees, over the period from the end of March till the beginning of May 2021. The sample included only respondents who have experienced working from home from the beginning of the Covid 19 pandemic in Serbia. **Tools:** Statistical analysis was performed (using descriptive stats, t-test for testing equality of means, chi-square test and ANOVA, and some non-parametrical tests). **Findings:** Preliminary findings signify a lack of previous experience in applying the working from home practice; an increase in the length of working hours; some resistance to working from home; most employees would choose a balance in which office work dominates, but there is also work from home, at least one day a week; the dominant majority of employees report feeling cheerful and moody, calm and relaxed and active and energetic when working from home, while slightly different results are recorded in the field of physical well-being; overall work-life balance is not interrupted. **Contribution:** This paper contributes to the research of factors of work-related attitudes, work-life balance and employee well-being while working from home by bringing original field data from Serbia. From the standpoint of HR policies and practices, it offers valuable implications for managers working in post-Covid Era.

**Keywords:** Working from Home, Work-Related Attitudes, Work-Life Balance, Employee Well-Being, Post-Covid Era, Human Resource Management

**JEL Classification:** M10, M12, M51, M54, I3

---

## 1. Introduction

The use of flexible working arrangements is only one of the many available strategies that provide employers with opportunities to improve their own ability to attract and retain talented employees through various ways of organizing work (either in terms of work location or employee work schedule). Among the various flexible practices, working from home has become particularly important in the last years due to the outbreak of the Covid-19 virus. The Covid-19 pandemic had a deeply disturbing impact on organizations in different sectors around the world, forcing them to quickly adapt and find new, flexible forms of organizing and functioning in order to achieve their goals and social roles, while simultaneously enabling the required level of employees' and clients' protection. Companies had to adapt quickly and find new, flexible forms of

---

\* Corresponding author: Biljana Bogičević Milikić, e-mail: biljana.bogicevic@ekof.bg.ac.rs; bogicevicmilikic@gmail.com

organization and functioning in order to achieve their goals and social roles while providing the necessary level of health care for employees and clients. Thus, working from home has proven to be an important business strategy for attracting and retaining talent and a key strategy for ensuring the health and safety of employees. Working from home (WFH) assumes a work arrangement in which the employee fulfils the key tasks and essential responsibilities of his job while staying at home, using information and communication technology (ICT) (International Labour Office, 2020, p. 5). So, the Covid-19 pandemic has changed the traditional workplace in so many ways. The main organizational challenges included the fast-organizational redesign and a new focus in HRM. One of the most important changes was the work from home. Covid-19 sent office people worldwide home, moving them from the usual office workplace to their living areas, making a huge change in the life of those who did not have this kind of experience before (Tietze & Musson, 2005).

Numerous studies suggested that employees are willing to abandon their current job for another one that offers WFH opportunities (Prasad et al., 2020; Molino et al., 2020). However, different studies before the pandemic reveal uncertain evidence regarding the influence of WFH on employees' quality of work life, finding both positive and negative effects on well-being (Anderson et al., 2015) productivity (Delanoëje & Verbruggen, 2020, Nakrosiene et al., 2019), and engagement (Kim & Coghlan, 2020). On one hand, there is strong support for claiming that WFH brings a number of benefits to the employees, such as improved job satisfaction and work-life balance, more flexibility to work and enhanced employee engagement (Grant et al., 2013), as well as less stress and better well-being (Prasad et al., 2020). On the other hand, there is a evidence that WFH may lead to poor well-being (Eurofound, 2020; Galanti et al., 2021; George et al., 2021; Syrek et al., 2022) and work-life balance and dramatically increased work overload and workplace pressure (Barber & Santuzzi, 2015; Molino et al., 2020; Charalampous et al., 2019; Song & Gao, 2020), which can negatively affect job performance and productivity (Grant et al., 2019). The review of the literature therefore indicates insufficient knowledge of the effects of WFH on work-related attitudes, work-life balance and employee well-being, as well as on the mediator variables in that relationship. This paper aims to fill that gap.

In this paper, we search for a better understanding of the relationship between WFH, work-related attitudes, work-life balance and employee well-being by researching potential differences among respondents' WFH based on variables, such as gender, age, marital status, kids, education, work experience, occupation, organisation size, years with the organization, organization age and ownership. In addition, some other factors are explored, such as household size, household members being present at home while WFH, and previous WFH experience. In this paper, we have addressed these issues in three sections. The first section presents the research methodology including research hypotheses, the context and timeline of the study, the method, the sample, and measurements of investigated variables. In the second section, we present research findings, discussion, and possible implications for managers. Finally, we address the main conclusions, and the potential limitations of our approach and identify some possible directions for further research.

## 2. Research methodology

*Research hypothesis.* In order to provide for better understanding of the relationship between WFH and work-related attitudes, work-life balance and employee well-being we tested the following hypothesis:

*H1:* The relationship between WFH and job satisfaction is moderated by the following factors: gender, age, marital status, kids, education, work experience, occupation, organisation size, years within organization, organization age and ownership.

*H2:* The relationship between WFH and work-life balance is moderated by the following factors: gender, age, marital status, kids, education, work experience, occupation, organisation size, years within organization, organization age and ownership.

*H3:* The relationship between WFH and employee well-being is moderated by the following factors: gender, age, marital status, kids, education, work experience, occupation, organization size, years within organization, organization age and ownership.

*The context and timeline of the study.* The research took place in Serbia during the Covid-19 pandemic. It started in March 2021, when many organizations in Serbia have already introduced WFH as a working practice and lasted till May 2021.

*Method.* We tested our hypotheses on a sample of employees who experienced WFH during the Covid-19 pandemic in Serbia. Data were gathered via an online questionnaire for which we used Google Forms platform. The questionnaire contained a large number of questions covering various areas of the organization - from the topics of WFH, work-life balance and stress, to organizational culture, leadership and other important issues of any business system. When filling out the questionnaire, respondents could turn to

student researchers if they had doubts or needed guidance through the questionnaire. The questionnaire contained already tested and validated measurement scales, as well as scales specially developed for this study, such as the group of questions related to WFH.

*The sample.* We undertook research among 2,171 employees in different industry sectors in Serbia. The sample included only respondents who have experienced WFH since the beginning of the Covid 19 pandemic in Serbia. At the time of the survey, 30.2% of respondents had been WFH for more than a year, 22.9% had been WFH for between 6 and 12 months, 17.2% between 3 and 6 months, 21% for about 3 months and only 8.7% were recently started WFH. A total of 2,171 respondents participated in the survey, of which 852 were men (39.2%) and 1,286 were women (59.2%), while 1.6% of respondents said they did not feel comfortable answering the question about gender. In terms of age, the distribution is as follows: up to 24 - 290 respondents (13.4%), from 25 to 34 - 838 respondents (38.6%), from 35 to 44 - 425 respondents (19.6%), from 45 to 54 - 455 respondents (21.0%), from 55 to 64 - 152 respondents (7.0%) and over 65 years - 11 respondents (0.5%). Regarding marital status, single (47.6%), married (46.2%), divorced (5.1%) and widowed (1.2%). The largest number of respondents are without children (49%), with two (25%) or one child, (21%), at least higher education (bachelor's degree, master's degree, etc. over 70%), employed in positions in administration (18.3%), specialist jobs (41.3%) or managerial positions at various levels (34%). Regarding work experience, the distribution is as follows: up to 1 year - 6.3%, 1-3 years - 16.6%, 3-5 years 16.0%, 5-10 years - 18.0%, 10-20 years - 20.5%, 20-30 years - 17.9%, over 30 years - 4.8%. The organizations in which the respondents are employed are private companies (48.6%), public companies or public sector organizations (27.2%), and multinational companies (21.3%). In terms of the number of employees, there are organizations with up to 50 employees at 30.1%, from 50 to 100 employees with 17.0%, from 100 to 250 employees at 15.4%, from 250 to 500 employees at 11.5% and over 500 employees with 25.9%. To the greatest extent, these are organizations aged 30-50 years (36.5%), but younger organizations are also represented - up to 5 years (7.3%), from 5 to 10 years (13.5%) and from 10 - 20 years (22%); from 20 - 30 years - 18.7%; and more than 50 years of age - 1.8%.

*Variables.* Under job satisfaction, we assume "... a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences" (Locke, 1976, p. 1304). It comprises what an employee feels and what he thinks about different aspects of his job (Rayton & Yalabik, 2014). Under organizational commitment we assume only affective or attitudinal commitment which reflects person's feelings and beliefs about his or her working experience within the organization, and therefore can be considered to be a contributing factor to a person's well-being at work (Cook & Wall, 1980). Under work-life balance, we assume the division of one's time and focus between working and family or leisure activities. Under employee well-being, we assume subjective well-being which denotes how people experience and evaluate their lives, usually measured in relation to self-reported well-being obtained through questionnaires showing the rate of being cheerful, calm, active, fresh, having day filled with interesting things. To measure variables Job Satisfaction (JS), Organizational Commitment (OC), Work-life balance (WLB) and employee well-being (EWB) we used instruments which yielded high internal consistency in the previous research (Warr et al., 1979, Meyer et al., 1993, Hayman, 2005, and WHO 5-item well-being scale - WHO-5, respectively). The scales we used were translated from English to Serbian following the double translation method procedure. Statistical analysis was performed using t-test for testing equality of means, z-test for testing equality of proportion, hi-square test and some nonparametric tests to confirm the results obtained using parametric tests. For numerical variables we used t-test for testing equality of means. As the answers offered in the questionnaire follow Likert item logics, like 1 - Completely disagree, 2 - Disagree, 3 - Neither agree or disagree, 4 - Agree, 5 - Completely agree, results of the test have been checked by the application of non-parametric tests. For making statistical inferences we used a p-value of 0.05. Statistical analysis was performed using descriptive stats, t-test for testing equality of means, chi-square test and ANOVA, and some non-parametrical tests (Independent-Samples Kruskal-Wallis Test). For statistical inferences, we used a p-value of 0.05, if not stated differently in exceptions. As potential moderators of the researched relationships between WFH and dependent variables, we evaluated the influence of the following factors on employees' attitudes: gender, age, marital status, kids, education, work experience, occupation, organisation size, years within the organization, organization age and ownership. Also, some other factors are explored, such as: household size, household members being present at home while WFH, previous work from home experience.

### 3. Research results and discussion

For the vast majority of respondents (80%), WFH was an institutionally imposed decision. Only in a small number of cases the decision to switch to WFH was an expression of the respondents' free will or the necessity due to epidemiological reasons of compulsory individual isolation. Respondents also report (48.6% of the investigated sample) that their individual work style did not undergo changes due to WFH, 38.9% that

have invested more, and 12.2% that have invested less effort in individual planning of the work day during WFH. Compared to working in the office, WFH imposed challenges to the respondents to control their working hours as they lost awareness and worked more hours – reported by 52.6% of the investigated sample, while 38.6% did not find it difficult to divide working from non-working hours, and 8.75% worked less. The respondents' work tasks changed as they switched to WFH. Only 3% of respondents stated that their work tasks remained exactly the same and did not depend on whether they worked from home or in the office, while 53% of respondents noted that their work tasks changed significantly or greatly.

*WFH and job satisfaction.* The research results show that the respondents from the sample report, on average, have high overall job satisfaction, as the rated level of overall job satisfaction for each item has a value above the neutral mean of 3.5 (see Table 1). If the observed items are ranked according to the rated level, the highest female average – is satisfaction with co-workers (“colleagues” – M = 4.98), the lowest – is with the opportunities for promotion (M = 4.39); the highest male average is on job security (M = 4.87), the lowest is on pay (M = 4.5); The highest std. deviation in the responses occurred for the working hours item for male, (SD = 1.20), promotion” for female (SD = 1.71), while the smallest ones were colleagues for both female (SD = 1.36) and male respondents (SD = 1.43).

**Table 1:** Job satisfaction while WFH<sup>2</sup>

|         | Gen | 1    | 2    | 3    | 4    | 5    | 6    | 7    | 8    | 9    | 10   | 11   | 12   | 13   | 14   | 15   |
|---------|-----|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| N       | M   | 848  | 850  | 851  | 851  | 851  | 851  | 850  | 852  | 851  | 852  | 851  | 851  | 852  | 852  | 852  |
|         | F   | 1280 | 1282 | 1284 | 1283 | 1283 | 1282 | 1283 | 1280 | 1284 | 1283 | 1283 | 1282 | 1281 | 1282 | 1284 |
| Missing | M   | 4    | 2    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 2    | 0    | 1    | 0    | 1    | 1    | 0    | 0    | 0    |
|         | F   | 6    | 4    | 2    | 3    | 3    | 4    | 3    | 6    | 2    | 3    | 3    | 4    | 5    | 4    | 2    |
| Mean    | M   | 4.55 | 4.74 | 4.83 | 4.57 | 4.74 | 4.71 | 4.5  | 4.74 | 4.69 | 4.48 | 4.65 | 4.56 | 4.74 | 4.71 | 4.87 |
|         | F   | 4.49 | 4.81 | 4.98 | 4.63 | 4.82 | 4.81 | 4.47 | 4.87 | 4.78 | 4.39 | 4.7  | 4.67 | 4.72 | 4.76 | 4.93 |
| Median  | M   | 5    | 5    | 5    | 5    | 5    | 5    | 5    | 5    | 5    | 5    | 5    | 5    | 5    | 5    | 5    |
|         | F   | 5    | 5    | 5    | 5    | 5    | 5    | 5    | 5    | 5    | 5    | 5    | 5    | 5    | 5    | 5    |
| StDev   | M   | 1.61 | 1.51 | 1.43 | 1.55 | 1.54 | 1.47 | 1.61 | 1.54 | 1.58 | 1.62 | 1.58 | 1.59 | 1.64 | 1.52 | 1.62 |
|         | F   | 1.53 | 1.45 | 1.36 | 1.58 | 1.47 | 1.48 | 1.66 | 1.49 | 1.55 | 1.71 | 1.6  | 1.58 | 1.63 | 1.57 | 1.61 |
| Minimum | M   | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1    |
|         | F   | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1    |
| Maximum | M   | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    |
|         | F   | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    |

Further analysis using non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis's test methods derive the following findings (Table 2):

- *Gender:* There is statistical significance in the difference in the level of job satisfaction while WFH by gender – on average, women are more satisfied with the skills that they can use at work and with colleagues than men.
- *Age:* There is statistical significance in the difference in the level of job satisfaction while WFH depending on the age of the respondent. Young people (up to 24 years of age) and at a very early stage of career development report very high job satisfaction during work through the maximum average job satisfaction ratings, while those over 55 years of age report statistically significantly lower average satisfaction ratings with the recognition they receive for a job well done, in relation to their superiors, the level of responsibility at work, the opportunity to use skills, opportunities for advancement, the attitude of top management towards employees and the way in which top management treats employees. When we form only two groups, with respondents younger than 34 and older than 34, statistically significant differences in job satisfaction appear in all aspects except “Freedom to choose their own work method”.
- *Marital status:* Although the number of widows and widowers is very small within the sample, it is notable that they reported a higher level of dissatisfaction on average compared to other groups. However, if we form on the one hand a group (widows, divorcees, and singles) and on the other hand a married group, we get differences in the level of satisfaction in the relationship with superiors, the recognition they get and the physical conditions for work. Regarding all these items, on average, the first group is more satisfied.

<sup>2</sup> (1) Physical working conditions, (2) Freedom in work, (3) Colleagues, (4) Recognition, (5) Superiors, (6) Responsibility, (7) Pay, (8) Use skills, (9) Management vs employees, (10) Promotion, (11) Top management runs organization, (12) Attention to your suggestions, (13) Work hours, (14) Tasks variety, (15) Job security

- *Household members*: Respondents who report having the largest number of household members (5 and more) also report the highest level of dissatisfaction. People who live alone report statistically significantly lower satisfaction with colleagues at work. People who do not have children are on average more satisfied with opportunities for promotion, opportunity to use skills, superiors, recognition, freedom to work, and physical working conditions.

**Table 2:** Factors influencing job satisfaction while WFH<sup>3</sup>

|  | 1   | 2   | 3            | 4   | 5   | 6   | 7   | 8            | 9   | 10                | 11  | 12  | 13  | 14  | 15  |
|--|-----|-----|--------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|--------------|-----|-------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Gender   |     |     | yes (female) |     |     |     |     | yes (female) |     |                   |     |     |     |     |     |
| Age  | yes | yes | yes          | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes          | yes | yes               | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| Marital status                                 |     |     |              | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes          |     | yes               |     |     |     |     |     |
| Household member                               |     |     |              |     |     |     | yes | yes          |     | yes               | yes |     |     |     |     |
| Presence of other people in home while working | yes | yes | yes          |     |     |     |     |              |     |                   |     |     |     |     |     |
| Kids   | yes | yes |              | yes | yes |     |     | yes          |     | yes (esp. babies) |     |     |     |     |     |
| Education                                      |     | yes |              |     |     |     |     |              |     |                   |     |     |     |     |     |
| Years within org                               |     |     |              |     | yes |     |     |              |     |                   |     |     |     |     |     |

*Well-being.* At the level of significance of 0.05, we claim that during WFH people (see Table 3):

- Felt calm and relaxed depending on gender, years they spent within a firm, having independent kids and kids in secondary school.
- Felt cheerful and in good spirits depending on the occupation, work experience and having independent kids:
- Felt active and vigorous depending on the size of the organization; and at the level of significance 0.1 – having small kids, work experience and other people being present in the house while they are working.
- Felt fresh and rested depending on gender, having babies, years within the organization, occupation, and at the level of significance 0.1 – work experience.
- Felt that their daily life is filled depending on gender, age and other people being present while they are working.

**Table 3:** Well-being\*

| Calm and relaxed             | Cheerful and in good spirits | Active and vigorous                                       | Fresh and rested                                    | Daily life filled                                   |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|---|
| Gender                       | Occupation                   | Small kids (10%)  | Gender  | Gender  |
| Kids in primary school (10%) | Independent kids             | Organisational size                                       | Babies  | Age   |
| Kids in secondary school     | Work experience              | Presence of other people in the house while working (10%) | Presence of other people in the house while working | Presence of other people in the house while working |
| Independent kids             |                              | Work experience (10%)                                     | Work experience (10%)                               |   |
| Years within organisation    |                              |   | Years within organisation                           |   |
|                              |                              |   | Occupation  |   |

*Work-life balance.* WLB was measured with a 15-item scale designed to assess three dimensions of work-life balance: work interference with personal life (WIPL), personal life interference with work (PLIW), and work/personal life enhancement (WPLE). At the level of significance of 0.05, we claim that during WFH WLB is influenced as systematized in Tables 4 – 6:

<sup>3</sup> (1) Physical working conditions, (2) Freedom in work, (3) Colleagues, (4) Recognition, (5) Superiors, (6) Responsibility, (7) Pay, (8) Use skills, (9) Management vs employees, (10) Promotion, (11) Top management runs organization, (12) Attention to your suggestions, (13) Work hours, (14) Tasks variety, (15) Job security.

**Table 4:** Factors influencing work interference with personal life

| My personal life suffers because of work | Job makes personal life difficult | Neglect personal needs because of work | Put personal life on hold for work | Miss personal activities because of work | Struggle to juggle work and non-work | Happy with the amount of time for non-work activities (reversed) |
|--|-----------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|--|
| Gender                                   | Gender                            | Gender                                 | Independent kids                   | Household members being present          | Gender                               | Small kids   |
| Work track length in org                 | Household members                 | Household members                      | Work track length in org           | Independent kids                         | Age                                  | Ownership  |
| Organizational age                       | Household members being present   | Work track length in organization      | Working experience                 | Work track length in org                 | Household members                    |  |
|  | Work track length in org          | Occupation                             | Gender                             |  | Work track length in org             |  |
|  | Kids                              |  | Household members                  |  |                                      |  |

**Table 5:** Factors influencing personal life interference with work

| Personal life drains me of energy for work | Too tired to be effective at work | My work suffers because of my personal life | Hard to work because of personal matters |
|--|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| Gender                                     | Branch                            | Gender                                      | Branch                                   |
| Household members                          | Age                               | Household members                           | Household members                        |
|  | Household members                 | Branch                                      | Gender                                   |
|  | Second. school kids               | Age   | Age                                      |

**Table 6:** Factors influencing work/personal life enhancement

| Personal life gives me energy for my job | Job gives me the energy to pursue personal activities                   | Better mood at work because of personal life | Better mood because of my job |
|--|---|--|-------------------------------|
| Organizational age                       | Education   | /  | Occupation                    |
|  | Occupation  |  | Household. Members            |
|  | Kids  |  | Being                         |
|  | School-kids   |  | present                       |
|  | Work track length in organization<br>Age<br>Household. members presence |  |                               |

By summarizing the most important influences we may notice that:

- *Gender* reports a significant influence on respondents' feelings in a way that their personal life suffers because of work, their job makes personal life difficult, they neglect personal needs because of work, they put their personal life on hold because of work and struggle to juggle work and non-work activities. Additionally, gender is reported to be significant in respondents' differences in feelings that their personal life drains their energy for work, that their work suffers because of their personal life and that they find it hard to work because of personal matters.
- *Household members* significantly influence respondents' feelings in a way that their job makes personal life difficult, that they neglect personal needs because of work, and put their personal life on hold because of work, as well as in all aspects of personal life interference with work; while the presence of household members during ones' WHF influences feelings of difficulty in performing job and them being missing personal activities because of work, thus reporting influence on work-personal life enhancement through being in the better mood because of the job.
- *Work track length* within the organization significantly influence all aspects of work interference with personal life except for being happy with the amount of time for non-work activities.

- *Kids* are reported to be an important factor for work interference with personal life, feelings that a job gives the energy to pursue personal activities and that one is too tired to be effective at work.
- *Age* reports to be an important factor for personal life interference with work in all aspects except for the issue of personal life-draining energy of work.

## Conclusion and Recommendations

The paper presents the results of research that aims to expand knowledge about the impact that WFH has on work-related attitudes, work-life balance and employee well-being through the analysis of factors that moderate that impact, such as gender, age, marital status, children, education, work experience, occupation, organization size, years within the organization, organization age and ownership. The results of the research clearly show that the level and direction of the impact that WFH has on work-related attitudes, work-life balance and employee well-being depends on a number of factors related to the context in which the employee works from home.

The results show that gender affects job satisfaction as well as well-being and work-life balance, and in such a way that women have less chance of realizing the potential positive effects of WFH on these aspects of work than men (Song & Gao, 2020). Women WFH during Covid-19 pandemics report having conflicts between taking care of their families and their jobs, due to longer working hours compared to those who worked in formal offices. This comes as a major reason for work-family imbalance and the breakdown of the boundaries between work and non-work (Allen et al., 2021). Longer working hours can be explained by the fact that flexible work patterns and absence from the regular workplace make it easier for people to work harder or longer (Green, 2004), due to the removal of possible distractions at the workplace (demands from colleagues, social interactions, etc.), although this does not mean that at home there will be no distractions from household members (Harris, 2003; Tietze & Musson, 2005). Despite evidence that managers are often very concerned about the performance of those who work from home (Felstead et al., 2003), the results of our study are consistent with the findings of previous studies showing that telecommuters work increased hours at home (Baruch & Nicholson, 1997; Behrens et al., 2021). One of possible explanation is that the older employees, with longer working experience, do not have necessary skills which are sufficient for the WFH pattern, and so they tend to make less use of the opportunities that WFH has for improving job satisfaction, well-being and work-life balance. Another possible explanation for the increased number of working hours of employees who work from home can be found in the assumptions of social exchange theory (Blau, 1964; Homans, 1958). In exchange for the possibility of WFH, which creates a sense of obligation to the employer, workers are sometimes willing to make sacrifices in order to increase the number of working hours, even though this may lead to a decrease in their free time. Employees consciously extend their working hours to complete work with the expectation that future benefits will be available to them, which is a form of reciprocal exchange (Molm et al., 1999). Finally, it is also possible that most employees work longer hours, because they work with reduced efficiency due to significant distractions at home (children who stay at home due to the closure of schools and kindergartens in pandemic conditions and partners who work from home or older family members) or because work they see from home as a temporary solution. Therefore, the HRM function should focus on upgrading employees' WFH work through innovative training methods and contents (such as ICT, the most effective use of time, etc.) to improve their performances and support the company's growth in post-pandemic (Caligiuri et al., 2020), especially in the case of older employees with longer working experience, since WFH is driving the digitization of human work at an alarming rate (Savic, 2020).

Finally, the research results confirm that organization age has a statistically significant influence on relations between WFH and work-related attitudes, work-life balance and employee well-being. This could be explain by the fact that older companies do have stronger culture which may be quite different compared to a WFH culture which requires a more collaborative spirit among the employees, stronger leadership skills to resolve possible conflicts, meet the WFH employees' expectations and to wisely assess the performances of WFH employees who cannot supervise directly. Therefore, HRM function should focus on analyzing the company's organizational culture and its compatibility with values suitable for WFH.

A very clear overall implication of the research findings is that in creating favourable conditions for WFH to be effective, a large number of different factors related to the employee's personal situation must be considered. This is also a clear recommendation for general management and especially for HRM. When designing WFH, it is necessary to apply the custom-made approach and, as much as possible, adapt the WFH arrangement to the employee's personal situation, which depends on gender, marital status, age, work experience, number of household members, number of kids, etc. Recommendations can also be made for employees because, to the extent that they can influence whether they will WFH or not, they should make decisions based on the results and findings of this research with a clear message that WFH does not automatically guarantee high job satisfaction, work-life balance and well-being.

The research results also have implications for further research in HRM. It is necessary to focus research on individual aspects of work and the reactions of employees to work and to further expand the knowledge base on the conditions in

which WFH has a positive impact on engagements, turnover intentions, commitment as well as on their productivity, absenteeism and turnover. The future research could also focus on virtual online HR management which suits better to the practice of WFH especially in sectors like ICT.

The study certainly has its limitations. They refer to the selective choice of concepts and variables that will be included in the analysis. It is possible that some factors were excluded from the analysis that would interact with the existing ones and change their influence. In the analysis, the potential influence that some of the factors generally have on the dependent variables, such as the general influence of age on job satisfaction, was not specifically addressed. Those influences may be masking the effect found in the study. Finally, the limitations related to the choice of respondents in the sample are significant.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Allen, T. D., Merlo, K., Lawrence, R. C., Slutsky, J., & Gray, C. E. (2021). Boundary management and work-nonwork balance while working from home. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 70(1), 60–84. DOI: 10.1111/apps.12300
- [2] Anderson, A. J., Kaplan, S. A., & Vega, R. P. (2015). The impact of telework on emotional experience: When, and for whom, does telework improve daily affective well-being? *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 24(6), 882–897. DOI: 10.1080/1359432X.2014.966086
- [3] Barber, K. L., & Santuzzi, A. M. (2015). Please respond ASAP: Workplace tele pressure and employee recovery. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 20(2), 172–189. DOI: 10.1037/a0038278
- [4] Behrens, K., Kichko, S., & Thisse, J. F. (2021). Working from home: too much of a good thing? CEPR Discussion Papers No. 15669, 13 February 2021.
- [5] Baruch, Y., & Nicholson, N. (1997). Home, sweet work: Requirements for effective home working. *Journal of general management*, 23(2), 15–30. DOI: 202
- [6] Blau, P.M. (1964). *Exchange and Power in Social Life*. New York: Wiley.
- [7] Caligiuri, P., De Cieri, H., Minbaeva, D., Verbeke, A., & Zimmermann, A. (2020). International HRM insights for navigating the COVID-19 pandemic: implications for future research and practice. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 51, 697–713. DOI: 10.1057/s41267-020-00335-9
- [8] Charalampous, M., Grant, C. A., Tramontano, C., & Michailidis, E. (2019). Systematically reviewing remote-workers' wellbeing at work: A multidimensional approach. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 28(1), 51–73. DOI: 10.1080/1359432X.2018.1541886
- [9] Cook, J., & Wall, T. (1980). New work attitude measures of trust, organizational commitment and personal need non-fulfilment. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 53(1), 39–52. DOI: 10.1111/j.2044-8325.1980.tb00005.x
- [10] Delanoëije, J., & Verbruggen, M. (2020). Between-person and within-person effects of telework: A quasi-field experiment. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 29(6), 795–808. DOI: 10.1080/1359432X.2020.1774557
- [11] Eurofound. (2020). *Living, working and COVID-19*. COVID-19 series. Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg. Retrieved from: <https://www.eurofound.europa.eu/publications/report/2020/living-working-and-covid-19>
- [12] Felstead, A., Jewson, N., Walters, S. (2003). Managerial control of employees working from home. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 41, 241–264. DOI: 10.1111/1467-8543.00271
- [13] Galanti, T., Guidetti, G., Mazzei, E., Zappala, S., & Toscano, F. (2021). Work from home during the COVID-19 outbreak: The impact on employees' remote work productivity, engagement, and stress. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 63(7), e426–e432. DOI: 10.1097/JOM.0000000000002236
- [14] George, T. J., Atwater, L. E., Maneethai, D., & Madera, J. M. (2021). Supporting the productivity and wellbeing of remote workers. *Organizational Dynamics*, 51(2), 100869. DOI: 10.1016/j.orgdyn.2021.100869
- [15] Grant, C. A., Wallace, L. M., & Spurgeon, P. C. (2013). An exploration of the psychological factors affecting remote e worker's job effectiveness, wellbeing and work life balance. *Employee Relations*, 35(3), 527–546. DOI: 10.1108/ER-08-2012-0059
- [16] Grant, C. A., Wallace, L. M., Spurgeon, P. C., Tramontano, C., & Charalampous, M. (2019). Construction and initial validation of the e-work life scale to measure remote e-working. *Employee Relations*, 41(1), 16–33. DOI: 10.1108/ER-09-2017-0229
- [17] Green, F. (2004). Why has work effort become more intense? *Industrial Relations*, 43, 709–41. DOI: 10.1111/j.0019-8676.2004.00359.x
- [18] Harris, L. (2003). Home-based teleworking and the employment relationship: Managerial challenges and dilemmas. *Personnel Review*, 32, 422–437. DOI: 10.1108/00483480310477515
- [19] Hayman, J. (2005). Psychometric assessment of an instrument designed to measure work life balance. *Research and practice in human resource management*, 13(1), 85–91.



- [20] Homans, G.C. (1958). Social behaviour as exchange. *American Journal of Sociology*, 63(6), pp. 597-606. DOI: 10.1086/222355
- [21] International Labour Office. (2020). An employers' guide to working from home in response to the outbreak of COVID-19 Geneva. Retrieved from [https://www.ilo.org/actemp/publications/WCMS\\_745024/lang-en/index.htm](https://www.ilo.org/actemp/publications/WCMS_745024/lang-en/index.htm)
- [22] Kim, V., & Coghlan, A. (2020). *Measuring the factors of teleworking productivity and engagement in a new reality of COVID-19: The case of Austria, Germany and Russia* [TU Vienna]. DataCite. Retrieved from: <https://repositum.tuwien.at/handle/20.500.12708/15211>
- [23] Locke, E.A. (1976) *The Nature and Causes of Job Satisfaction*. In: Dunnette, M.D. (Ed.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, pp. 1297–1343. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- [24] Meyer, J., Allen, N., & Smith, C. (1993). Commitment to organizations and occupations: Extension and test of a three-component conceptualization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(4), 538-551. DOI: 10.1037/0021-9010.78.4.538
- [25] Molino, M., Ingusci, E., Signore, F., Manuti, A., Giancaspro, M. L., Russo, V., & Cortese, C. G. (2020). Wellbeing costs of technology use during Covid-19 remote working: An investigation using the Italian translation of the technostress creators scale. *Sustainability*, 12(15), 5911. DOI: 10.3390/su12155911
- [26] Molm, L.D., Peterson, G., & Takahashi, N. (1999). Power in Negotiated and Reciprocal Exchange. *American Sociological Review*, 64(6), 876-890. DOI: 10.2307/2657408
- [27] Nakrosiene, A., Buciniene, I., & Gostautaitė, B. (2019). Working from home: Characteristics and outcomes of telework. *International Journal of Manpower*, 40(1), 87–101. DOI: 10.1108/IJM-07-2017-0172
- [28] Prasad, D. K., Rao, M., Vaidya, D. R., & Muralidhar, B. (2020). Organizational climate, opportunities, challenges and psychological wellbeing of the remote working employees during COVID-19 pandemic: A general linear model approach with reference to information technology industry in Hyderabad. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Engineering and Technology (IJARET)*, 11(4), 372-389.
- [29] Savic, D. (2020). COVID-19 and work from home: digital transformation of the workforce. *The Grey Journal*, 16(2), 101–104.
- [30] Rayton, B.A., & Yalabik, Z.Y. (2014). Work engagement, psychological contract breach and job satisfaction. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 25(17), 2382-2400. DOI: 10.1080/09585192.2013.876440
- [31] Song, Y., & Gao, J. (2020). Does telework stress employees out? A study on working at home and subjective well-being for wage/salary workers. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 21(7), 2649-2668. DOI: 10.1007/s10902-019-00196-6
- [32] Syrek, C., Kuhnel, J., Vahle Hinz, T., & Bloom, J. (2022). Being an accountant, cook, entertainer and teacher-all at the same time: Changes in employees' work and work-related well-being during the coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic. *International Journal of Psychology*, 57(1), 20–13. DOI: 10.1002/ijop.12761
- [33] Tietze, S., & Musson, G. (2005). Recasting the home-work relationship: A case of mutual adjustment? *Organization Studies*, 26(9), 1331-1352. DOI: 4619
- [34] Warr, P., Cook, J., & Wall, T. (1979) Scales for the measurement of some work attitudes and aspects of psychological well-being. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 52(2), 129-148. DOI: 10.1111/j.2044-8325.1979.tb00448.x

Received: 2023-01-22

Revision requested: 2023-03-15

Revised: 2023-04-02 (1 revision)

Accepted: 2023-05-22

////// About the Authors

**Biljana Bogičević Milikić**  
University of Belgrade, Faculty of Economics and Business  
[biljana.bogicevic@ekof.bg.ac.rs](mailto:biljana.bogicevic@ekof.bg.ac.rs)



Biljana Bogičević Milikić is a full professor at the Department of Management and Business Studies. Her areas of professional interest include organizational studies (theory, design, and behaviour), human resource management and public management. She published a few books and more than 140 research papers. She is engaged for 20 years in the process of public administration reform in Serbia and consulting for many private companies in the field of organization and management.

**Ana Aleksić Mirić**

University of Belgrade, Faculty of Economics and Business  
ana.aleksic@ekof.bg.ac.rs

Ana Aleksić Mirić is a full professor at the Department of Management and Business Studies. Her areas of professional interest include organizational studies (theory, design, and behaviour), knowledge management and network analysis. She has a rich publishing record, producing individual and joint chapters and articles in edited collections and scholarly journals. Ana has served as a consultant for both private and public organizations.



**Nebojša Janićijević**

University of Belgrade, Faculty of Economics and Business  
nebojsa.janicijevic@ekof.bg.ac.rs

Nebojša Janićijević is a full professor at the Department of Management and Business Studies. His areas of professional interest include organizational design and behaviour, organizational culture and change management. He published 10 books and more than 200 research papers. He is engaged as a consultant for many companies in the field of organization and management.

