**Structuring of Time is Key for Job Performance and Well-being: The Case of Croatians
Working from Home During COVID-19 Pandemic**

Mitja Ružojčić¹

Zvonimir Galić¹

Antun Palanović¹

Maja Parmač Kovačić¹

Krešimir Žnidar²

¹Department of Psychology, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of

Zagreb, Croatia

²Prizma CPI, Zagreb, Croatia

Corresponding author:

Mitja Ružojčić

Department of Psychology

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

University of Zagreb

Luciceva 3, 10 000 Zagreb, Croatia

E-mail: mruzojci@ffzg.hr

Tel/fax: 00385 1 4092216

Structuring of Time is Key for Job Performance and Well-being: The Case of Workers from Home During COVID-19 Pandemic

Abstract

In this research, we aimed to explore determinants of job performance and well-being while working from home (WFH) in a specific context of mandatory WFH during COVID-19 lockdown in Croatia, a country where WFH is a highly unusual arrangement. In Study 1, on a nationally representative sample of 166 Croatian employees WFH during lockdown, we tested if aspects of work-life balance (WLB) – work-to-family and family-to-work conflict, time structure of the work day and psychological detachment from work – would predict job performance and well-being. We showed that of the four WLB aspects, only time structure was important both for job performance and well-being. In Study 2, we used a convenient sample of 575 Croatian employees who were WFH during lockdown to investigate conscientiousness, emotional stability and autonomy at work as drivers of the WLB during WFH, and to constructively replicate Study 1 findings using different and more advanced measures. Findings showed that autonomy, conscientiousness and, especially, emotional stability contributed to the WLB and were important for job performance and well-being. WLB, especially time structure, predicted both job performance and well-being, and enhanced time structure mediated the effects of personality traits and autonomy on both outcomes.

Keywords: work from home; telecommuting; work-life balance; personality; autonomy; work and organizational psychology; occupational health psychology; Croatia

Introduction

One of the most notable impacts of COVID-19 pandemic has been a sudden increase in working from home (WFH). While there is an abundance of research about the impact of WFH in general (cf. Allen, Golden, & Shockley, 2015), the WFH as a response to the pandemic seems largely different from WFH in “ordinary” circumstances. WFH is typically viewed as a form of work organization that helps to improve the balance between professional and private life. Implicit in this assumption is that WFH is voluntary - a choice made by employees who believe that in this way they can better balance their life roles. However, during the pandemic, employees were not able to choose if they would like to WFH. Mandatory and abrupt start of WFH left workers with little time to adjust to the new type of work-life organization. Furthermore, prior to the pandemic WFH was not a very common way of working, and in some countries, such as Croatia, this form of work was virtually non-existent (Eurostat, 2020). All the facts listed above make WFH in Croatia during the COVID-19 pandemic an extremely important research subject because it seems uncertain to what extent the current scientific knowledge on WFH (Gajendran & Harrison, 2007; Kniffin et al., 2020) is applicable to the specific experience of mandatory WFH during crises such as current pandemic.

In this paper, we describe two studies in which we aimed to investigate factors that determine job-performance and well-being of workers who were mandatorily WFH during the pandemic in Croatia. In Study 1, using a nationally representative sample of Croatian workers WFH, we explored how certain aspects of work-life balance are related to job performance and well-being. In Study 2, we aimed to replicate the Study 1 findings and investigate additional individual and organizational factors that might drive both work-life balance and job performance and well-being. Before reporting the results, we will briefly review the current knowledge on work-life balance, job performance and well-being while WFH in “ordinary” conditions and describe a few studies that investigated mandatory WFH.

Work from Home, Job Performance and Well-Being: Work-Life Balance as the Key Psychological Mediator

WFH is usually related with somewhat higher levels of productivity. The relation between WFH and higher levels of job performance has been shown meta-analytically (Gajendran & Harrison, 2007), though the question of causal direction is far from being resolved (i.e., are workers more productive because they WFH or more productive workers get to WFH). At the same time, the research investigating the impact of WFH on psychological well-being has been somewhat scarce but studies generally show a trend of positive relations. For example, WFH has been related to specific indicators of well-being such as lower work exhaustion (Golden, 2006; Sardeshmukh, Sharma, & Golden, 2012), lower work-role stress and higher job satisfaction (Gajendran & Harrison, 2007). Therefore, at least under ordinary conditions, WFH seems to be beneficial for general psychological well-being. The positive effects of WFH probably stem from added flexibility in organizing and combining demands from different life domains (Allen et al., 2015) which, if used to achieve better balance between work and private life demands, leads to better functioning (Amstad, Meier, Fasel, Elfering, & Semmer, 2011; Gajendran & Harrison, 2007; Van Steenbergen, & Ellemers, 2009). So, it would seem that if employees perform well at work and simultaneously preserve their psychological well-being while WFH, they do that by achieving a better balance between their work and private life.

If we apply the reasoning from Job Demands and Resources (JDR; Bakker & Demerouti, 2007) and Conservation of Resources (COR; Hobfoll, 1989) models, we can conclude that work-life balance (WLB) is likely to build and preserve important personal resources (e.g. engagement, optimism, self-esteem; Xanthopoulou, Bakker, Demerouti, & Schaufeli, 2007) that positively affect both job performance and well-being of employees. Conversely, when work and life roles are at a disbalance, the limited resources are likely to be

depleted, leading to decrements in functioning. The empirical findings support this idea, showing that WLB is positively related to job performance and general well-being (Amstad et al., 2011). To our knowledge, the relation has not been investigated in specific populations of employees working mostly from home. However, it seems logical that WLB would be even more important for these workers, as WFH minimizes the boundaries between the two areas of life (Allen et al., 2015). In their meta-analysis, Gajendran and Harrison (2007) indirectly showed that work-family conflict mediated the impact of telecommuting on job satisfaction, turnover intent and role stress, thus giving some support for this idea. However, work-family conflict did not mediate the impact of telecommuting on job performance. Given these somewhat conflicting findings, it would seem important to investigate the importance of WLB for functioning of employees who are primarily WFH.

Mandatory Work from Home

The above-described findings apply to voluntary WFH, but the effects of *mandatory* WFH amidst a crisis seem to be an understudied topic. We located only two studies that investigated the problem. Lapierre, Van Steenbergen, Peeters and Kluwers (2015) compared work-to-family conflict on a sample of sales professionals from a Dutch company, before and after the company implemented a new cost-saving policy that required all employees to WFH. Unexpectedly, the study showed that switching from voluntary to mandatory WFH had only a small effect on increased work-to-family conflict. However, the generalizability of these findings is questionable because of the highly specific sample of sales professionals, who were mostly male, highly educated, married/cohabitating and/or with children. In addition, the mandatory nature of WFH in this sample was not a response to crisis, thus missing the stressfulness and suddenness that would be associated with switching to WFH during crisis. Finally, Lapierre et al. (2015) investigated only work-to-family conflict and not more distant but highly important outcomes such as job performance and well-being.

Another study was conducted by Donnelly and Proctor-Thomson (2015) in the aftermath of a 2011 earthquake in Christchurch, New Zealand on a sample of workers who were WFH in a response to the disaster. The findings showed that the benefits of the post-disaster WFH outweighed its costs, enabling the employees to better address challenges imposed on WLB in a crisis. The positive effect of WFH could be traced to increased flexibility in scheduling obligations from different life domains. These findings seem to be relevant to the case of COVID-19-related WFH, given that they describe mandatory WFH associated with heightened crisis-related stress. However, the study by Donnelly and Proctor-Thomson (2015) was mostly descriptive and did not investigate relations among constructs associated with WFH, thus offering little information if higher WLB led to more favorable work and health related outcomes.

Our Research

The goal of our research was to explore determinants of job performance and well-being of Croatian workers who worked from home during the COVID-19-related lockdown in the spring of 2020. We believe that our research significantly adds to the WFH literature both due to the specificity of the pandemic, but also because of the cultural context where WFH is a highly unusual work arrangement. Working from home during the COVID-19 pandemic was different from “ordinary” WFH for at least three reasons. First, it was sudden and mandatory, so even participants that did not have proper working conditions in their household (e.g. separate working space) had to WFH. Second, mandatory WFH was accompanied by increased childcare demands due to the fact that, at least during a portion of time, schools and childcare facilities were also closed. Both of these might have diminished the flexibility usually associated with WFH and, consequently, limit its potential for better WLB (Lapierre et al., 2015). Third, amidst pandemic employees were likely working under heightened stress and

anxiety (Salari et al., 2020) because they worried that they and/or their significant others might suffer from COVID-19 related issues.

Furthermore, while working from home has generally been on the rise in the age of increasing development of novel technologies (e.g. Global Workplace Analytics, 2015; Reaney, 2012), Croatia has been lagging in this trend. For example, Eurostat (2020) recently showed that only 1.9% of Croatian workers worked from home usually in 2019 and only 5% sometimes, compared to 5.3% (usually) and 10.8% (sometimes) in EU in general. This indicates that a sudden transfer to WFH might have been even more challenging for Croatian workers.

We focused on WLB as probably the most important factor for maintaining high levels of functioning while WFH. Similar to other studies (e.g., Allen, Johnson, Kiburz, & Shockley, 2013; Allen et al., 2015), we measured how work demands interfere with family (*work-to-family conflict*; WTF) and how family obligations interfere with work (*family-to-work conflict*; FTW). Additionally, we captured two additional indicators of WLB: *time structure of working days and psychological detachment from work*. Given that the time structure of the day is one of the most important latent benefits of work (Jahoda, 1981) and that removal of physical boundaries between work and private life in WFH is likely to pose challenge for maintaining the time structure, we believed that more structured days would reflect a more balanced life. Also, we believed that psychological detachment from work – a sense of mental disengagement from work and not thinking about work-related problems and opportunities during private time (Sonnentag & Fritz, 2007) - would also be made more difficult because of erasing of physical boundaries between work and private life while WFH. As detaching oneself from work during private time enables recovery from work demands (Meijman & Mulder, 1998), we believed that psychological detachment also indicates WLB.

As for the outcomes reflecting the adjustment to WFH, we focused on two broad outcomes related to work and life in general – job performance and psychological well-being.

Study 1

In Study 1 we used a nationally representative sample of Croatian employees that WFH during the lockdown due to COVID-19 pandemic to investigate whether four aspects of WLB would be related to better functioning of employees who are WFH. In line with the reasoning above, we expected that *better WLB, indicated by lower WTF and FTW conflict and higher time structure and psychological detachment from work, would be related to higher job performance (Hypothesis 1) and higher well-being (Hypothesis 2).*

Method

Procedure & Participants

We collected responses on a nationally representative sample of 794 Croatian citizens during April 2020 lockdown, i.e., while most of the strict measures to suppress the COVID-19 epidemic were in power (e.g. most hospitality objects were still closed, as well as schools and kindergartens, stores and supermarkets had strict working time limits). Data were collected through computer assisted web-interviewing method (CAWI) conducted by a market research agency. A link to the survey was sent to the members of the market research agency's on-line panel that has over 65 000 members.

In order to ensure that the sample represented Croatian population, the market research agency that was in charge of the data collection used quotas according to the county of residence, settlement size, age and gender. After the data collection was completed, collected sample was compared with Croatian population (Census 2011) in terms of geographical location, age, gender and education level.

Of the full sample, in our study we focused on 166 participants that WFH three or more days a week during the lockdown. Average age of WFH participants was 40.4 years ($SD = 11.25$), 51% of them were female and they were mostly highly educated (74.1%). On average, participants lived in households with 3.1 members ($SD = 1.29$) and 37.3% had at least one underage child living with them. Most of the participants (53.6%) did not have any experience with WFH prior to the pandemic.

Instruments

Work–Life Balance. We asked participants to assess different aspects of WLB for the month preceding the data collection (i.e., for the period of the strict lockdown measures).

We measured WTF and FTW conflict each with one item: “*How often do you feel that demands of your work interfere with your family life?*” (WTF) and “*How often do you feel that demands of your family life interfere with your work?*” (FTW). Participants answered on a scale from 1 (*never*) to 5 (*always*).

We measured time structure with two items from a subscale of a shortened version of Latent and Manifest Benefits of Work (LAMB) scale by Kovacs, Batinic, Stiglbauer and Gnambs (2019): „*My days are usually well organized*“ and „*I have a good balance in my day between responsibilities and free time*“. Participants responded on a scale from 1 (*not at all*) to 5 (*very much*), and internal consistency was .83.

Lastly, to capture psychological detachment, we used two items taken from the Recovery Experience Questionnaire (Sonnentag & Fritz, 2007): „*I don't think about work at all*“ and „*I get a break from the demands of work*“. Answers were given on a scale from 1 (*completely disagree*) to 5 (*completely agree*) and internal consistency of the scale was .79.

Job Performance. We asked participants to compare their current effectiveness in completing work tasks with the time before the pandemic, using one item which they rated on a scale from 1 (*significantly less effective*) to 5 (*significantly more effective*).

Well-Being. We used the three items from the WHO-5 Well-Being Index (Topp, Østergaard, Søndergaard, & Bech, 2015) to assess how participants had felt during the last month, since the beginning of the strict lockdown measures. Items are: „*I have felt cheerful and in good spirits*“, „*I have felt calm and relaxed*“ and „*I have felt active and vigorous*“. Participants rated their responses on a six-point scale ranging from 1 (*at no time*) to 6 (*all of the time*). We also asked them to report their overall life satisfaction with one item: „*All things considered, to what degree are you satisfied with your life these days?*“ on a scale from 1 (*very unsatisfied*) to 10 (*very satisfied*). Because confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) showed an excellent fit for the model in which well-being and life satisfaction items loaded on one general factor ($\chi^2(2) = 1.30, p > .05, CFI = 1, RMSEA = 0$, standardized loadings ranging from .72 to .89), we combined standardized responses on these two scales into one composite measure of well-being, which showed an internal consistency of .87.

Control Variables. Alongside our focal constructs, we measured several control variables that should be important for adjusting to WFH. Participants reported their *gender*, *age*, *education level* and if they had *children younger than 18 years living in their household*. They also reported *how often have they worked from home prior to the pandemic*, on a scale from 0 (*never*) to 5 (*all the time*).

Results

We analyzed our data through correlational and regression analyses. Due to the limited space, we omit the correlation and regression coefficients of control variables but they are available in the online supplemental materials.

Table 1 presents the means, standard deviations and zero order correlations for the key variables in Study 1. Compared to the theoretical range of the scales, our participants reported average levels of WLB aspects, indicating that during the lockdown-WFH, most of them occasionally experienced WTF and FTW conflict and had difficulties with structuring their workdays and detaching themselves from work. As for the job performance, most of the participants perceived that they were equally effective while WFH during lockdown as before the pandemic. Participants' average score on WHO-5 Well-Being Index items was $M = 3.36$ ($SD = 1.16$) and they were slightly above theoretical average on a life satisfaction item ($M = 6.08$, $SD = 2.28$), which is somewhat lower compared to the last available Eurofund data (2017).

Out of four aspects of WLB, only time structure had a positive correlation with job performance during the pandemic. At the same time, all four aspects showed significant correlations with well-being. The direction of the relationships was in line with the expectations, with WTF and FTW conflict being related to decreased well-being, and time structure and psychological detachment related to higher well-being. Correlation of time structure with well-being by far outweighed the correlation of other three WLB aspects.

The correlations among aspects of WLB were as expected: WTF and FTW conflict were positively related, while time structure and psychological detachment showed mutually positive correlation, and negative correlations with WTF and FTW conflict. Also, job performance was related to higher well-being.

Table 1.

Means, standard deviations and zero order correlations for focal variables in Study 1 (N = 166)

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5
1. WTF conflict	2.84	1.08	-				
2. FTW conflict	2.62	1.05	.54**	-			
3. Time structure	3.60	0.89	-.31**	-.33**	-		
4. Psychological detachment	2.95	1.19	-.37**	-.19*	.21**	-	
5. Job performance	2.97	0.88	-.07	-.09	.22**	.06	-
6. Well being	0.00	0.85	-.29**	-.23**	.57**	.17*	.31**

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

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

To check if WLB indicators would predict job performance and well-being over and above the control variables, we conducted regression analyses in which we entered the control variables in step one and the aspects of WLB as predictors in step two (Table 2). To further facilitate the interpretation of the importance of each of the predictor, we calculated *relative weights (RW)*, which reflect a proportion of explained variance in the dependent variable that can be attributed to a predictor, considering its unique contribution as well as its contribution in the presence of other predictors (LeBreton, Hargis, Griepentrog, Oswald, & Ployhart, 2007). We calculated *RWs* in *yhat* package (Nimon, Oswald, & Roberts, 2013) in R (R Core Team, 2019).

Although control variables and aspects of WLB did not explain large proportion of variance in job performance ($R^2 = .10$, $p = .055$), the aspects of WLB explained 6% ($p < .05$) of variance over and above control variables. As expected from the results of correlational analyses, the only aspect of WLB that significantly predicted job performance was time structure. According to the *RWs*, time structure was also the most important predictor across both control variables and aspects of WLB, explaining in total 5% of variance in job performance.

As for the regression analyses with well-being as criterion, control variables and aspects of WLB explained statistically significant 41% ($p < .01$) of variance but most of the explained variance could be attributed to aspects of WLB, which predicted 34% ($p < .01$) of variance over and above the control variables. Again, the only aspect of WLB that was a significant predictor of well-being was time structure and it was by far the most important among all tested predictors, explaining 27% of variance.

Table 2.

Aspects of work-life balance as predictors of job performance and well-being while working from home in Study 1 (N = 166)

Criteria:	Job performance		Well-being	
	<i>B (SE)</i>	<i>RW</i>	<i>B (SE)</i>	<i>RW</i>
WTF conflict	0.02 (0.08)	.00	-0.12 (0.06)	.04
FTW conflict	-0.02 (0.08)	.00	-0.02 (0.06)	.02
Time structure	0.25 (0.08)**	.05	0.50 (0.07)**	.27
Psychological detachment	-0.03 (0.06)	.00	-0.05 (0.05)	.01
<i>R</i> ²	.10		.41**	
ΔR^2 over control variables	.06*		.34**	

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

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

In sum, Study 1 findings indicated that achieving WLB was important for both job performance and well-being while WFH during the pandemic. However, the only WLB aspect that was important for both job performance and well-being was the time structure of days and activities while WFH.

Study 2

In Study 2, we used a convenient sample of Croatian employees who WFH during the COVID-19 lockdown. The procedure of data collection enabled us to dig more deeply into the relationship between WLB and mandatory WFH. The WHF and WLB researchers consider

increased *autonomy and control* in completing job tasks as key mechanisms of the beneficial effects of WFH (Allen et al., 2015; Donnelly & Proctor-Thomson, 2015; Gajendran & Harrison, 2007). However, it has been argued that involuntary WFH might actually decrease sense of control over work and life demands, because it removes the possibility of combining WFH with working from office/central work location (Lapierre et al., 2015). Thus, in the case of mandatory WFH, such as the one during the COVID-19 pandemic, it might be especially important to identify personal and organizational resources (Bakker, Demerouti, & Sanz-Vergel, 2014) that determine WLB, job performance and well-being. These resources would help scientists and practitioners to identify particularly vulnerable groups (in the case of personal resources) and helpful organizational practices (in the case of organizational resources).

Among personal resources, we focused on two personality dispositions from the Big Five that were shown to be among the most important psychological determinants of work motivation and job performance: *conscientiousness and emotional stability* (Judge & Ilies, 2002, Barrick, Mount, & Judge, 2001). Given that conscientious individuals are well-organized, self-disciplined and efficient, and emotionally stable individuals are calm and stress-resilient (Goldberg, 1990), it seemed likely that they will be able to take control over the flexibility induced by WFH and thus, by achieving higher WLB, obtain higher levels of job performance and well-being. The link between the two traits and lower levels of WTF and FTW conflict has already been established on general population of workers in a meta-analysis by Allen et al. (2012).

We also focused on a specific organizational resource that could be significantly related to WFH – *autonomy at work* (Ryan & Deci, 2000). If a job provides more autonomy to employees, they should be able to better organize and balance their work and private life demands. As with personal resources, we also expected that satisfaction of the need for autonomy at work would

be directly positively related to job performance (Cerasoli, Nicklin, & NassreIrgawi, 2016) and well-being (Yu, Levesque-Bristol, & Maeda, 2017).

In line with the above, we expected that *higher levels of conscientiousness, emotional stability and autonomy at work would be related to better WLB, indicated by lower WTF and FTW conflict, and higher time structure and psychological detachment from work (Hypothesis 3), higher job performance (Hypothesis 4) and higher well-being (Hypothesis 5)*. Also, we expected that the *positive effects of conscientiousness, emotional stability and autonomy at work on job performance (Hypothesis 6) and well-being (Hypothesis 7) would be partially mediated by higher levels of WLB*.

Additionally, in Study 2 we aimed to constructively replicate (Lykken, 1968) findings from Study 1, using different and psychometrically more advanced indicators of WTF and FTW conflict and, especially, job performance.

Method

Participants & Procedure

We collected a convenient sample of 575 Croatian employees who were WFH at least three days a week during strict lockdown measures. The participants filled-in an online survey. We recruited 67.7% of participants through social media channels and 32.3% with the help of undergraduate psychology students. As in Study 1, we collected our data in April and at the beginning of May 2020, while most of the strict lockdown measures were still in power.

Average age of our participants was 37.10 years ($SD = 9.99$), with 59% females. Participants were mostly highly educated (76.8%) and had 12.61 ($SD = 9.71$) years of work experience on average. A third (29.6%) of participants had at least one underage child in the

household, and 22.8% had at least one kindergarten or elementary school-aged child. Most of the participants had never WFH prior to the pandemic (69.2%).

Instruments

Personality Traits. We measured conscientiousness and emotional stability with four items per subscale from the Mini-IPIP scale (Donnellan, Oswald, Baird & Lucas, 2006), using a rating scale from 1 (*completely disagree*) to 5 (*completely agree*). Examples of the items include „*I like order*“ (conscientiousness) and „*I am relaxed most of the time*“ (emotional stability). Internal consistencies were .75 for conscientiousness and .77 for emotional stability.

Autonomy at work. We used four items from Need Satisfaction and Need Support at Work Scales (Tavfelin & Stenling, 2018). Example items are: „*I can make meaningful choices in my job*“ and „*I have the possibility to influence my situation at work*“. Participants responded on a five-point scale from 1 (*completely disagree*) to 5 (*completely agree*). Internal consistency of the scale was .83.

Work–life balance. As in Study 1, we asked participants to assess WLB during the previous month (since the beginning of the strict lockdown measures).

We measured WTF and FTW conflict each with three items from scales developed by Netemeyer, Boles, and McMurrian (1996). The items for WTF were: „*The demands of my work interfere with my home and family life*“, „*My job produces strain that makes it difficult to fulfill family duties*“ and „*The amount of time my job takes up makes it difficult to fulfill family responsibilities*“. The items for FTW were: „*The demands of my family or spouse/partner interfere with work-related activities*“, „*I have to put off doing things at work because of demands on my time at home*“ and „*My home life interferes with my responsibilities at work such as doing the work on time, accomplishing daily tasks, and working overtime*“.

Participants answered on a scale from 1 (*completely disagree*) to 7 (*completely agree*). Internal consistencies for the scales were .94 (WTF) and .86 (FTW).

We used the same scales as in Study 1 to measure time structure and psychological detachment. The internal consistencies in this study were .81 for time structure and .83 for psychological detachment.

Job performance. We used a seven-item scale developed by Williams and Anderson (1991). The sample item is „*I fulfilled responsibilities specified in job description*”. The participants reported how often they engaged in the described behaviors during the last month (since the beginning of the strict lockdown measures) on a scale from 1 (*completely false*) to 5 (*completely accurate*). Internal consistency of the scale was .86.

Well-being. In this study we used all five items from WHO-5 Well-Being Index (Topp et al., 2015). Participants rated their well-being during the last month (since the beginning of the strict lockdown measures) on a scale from 1 (*at no time*) to 6 (*all of the time*). Internal consistency of the scale was .87.

Control variables. We used the same control variables as in Study 1 with two exceptions. First, instead of controlling for number of children under 18, we controlled for the number of kindergarten and elementary school-aged children in the household because we believed that these children would need more home care, being a more important factor for WLB and WFH. Second, we asked participants about the working conditions in their home (e.g. separate working space, adequate laptop) on a scale from 1 (*completely inadequate*) to 5 (*ideal*).

Results

As in Study 1, we tested our hypotheses through correlational and regression analyses and again show the correlation and regression coefficients of control variables only in supplemental materials. Additionally, we conducted mediation analyses to test *H6* and *H7*.

We report descriptive statistics and intercorrelations of focal variables of Study 2 in Table 3. Similar to Study 1, participants reported that, on average, they occasionally felt WTF and FTW conflict during WFH, with levels of WTF conflict being somewhat higher than FTW conflict. They also occasionally had difficulties in structuring their days and detaching from work at free time. They self-reported high levels of job performance and mid-levels of well-being, which is again somewhat lower compared to Eurofund data (2017).

As can be seen, with the exception of the relationship between psychological detachment from work and job performance, all aspects of WLB were significantly related to job performance and well-being. As expected, WTF and FTW conflict were negatively and time structure and psychological detachment positively related to the outcomes.

Personality traits and autonomy were mostly correlated with aspects of WLB. All three variables correlated negatively with WTF and FTW conflict, and positively with time structure, but only emotional stability correlated with psychological detachment from work. Also, all three variables correlated with higher job performance and well-being.

As in Study 1, the correlations between aspects of WLB were as expected. WTF and FTW conflict were positively related, as were time structure and psychological detachment. The correlations between time structure and psychological detachment with WTF and FTW conflict were negative. Also, job performance was related to higher well-being.

Table 3.

Means, standard deviations and zero order correlations for focal variables in Study 2 (N = 575)

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
1. Conscientiousness	3.62	0.76								
2. Emotional stability	3.27	0.80	.15**							
3. Autonomy at work	3.51	0.81	.09	.30**						
4. WTF conflict	3.65	1.86	-.09*	-.32**	-.15**					
5. FTW conflict	3.02	1.68	-.12**	-.23**	-.12**	.57**				
6. Time structure	3.27	1.05	.30**	.44**	.27**	-.47**	-.35**			
7. Psychological detachment	2.53	1.23	.07	.32**	.01	-.46**	-.21**	.42**		
8. Job performance	4.49	0.55	.24**	.14**	.20**	-.12**	-.30**	.28**	.02	
9. Well-being	3.08	0.93	.10*	.46**	.23**	-.45**	-.29**	.51**	.42**	.14**

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

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

To explain variance in aspects of WLB, we conducted regression analyses in which we entered the control variables as predictors in step one and the personality traits and autonomy at work as predictors in step two (Table 4). Again, we reported the *R*²s to investigate importance of each predictor. In general, control variables and personal (conscientiousness and emotional stability) and organizational (autonomy at work) resources explained 15% to 33% of variance of aspects of WLB. Compared to the control variables, personal and organizational resources explained more additional variance of time structure ($\Delta R^2 = .23$) and psychological detachment ($\Delta R^2 = .09$) than WTF ($\Delta R^2 = .07$) and FTW ($\Delta R^2 = .04$) conflict. Emotional stability was the most important predictor of WLB among personal and organizational resources, as it was the only variable that predicted all four aspects of WLB and explained more variance (4% to 15%) compared to conscientiousness (0% to 6%) and autonomy (0% to 4%). Emotional stability also outperformed most of the control variables in predicting WLB, with the exception of FTW conflict for which worse working conditions ($B = -0.62$, $SE = 0.09$, $p < .01$) and number of kindergarten and elementary school-aged children ($B = 0.61$, $SE = 0.10$, $p < .01$) explained 10% and 9% of variance, respectively. Conscientiousness significantly predicted FTW conflict, explaining 1% of variance, and time structure, explaining 6% of variance, while autonomy only predicted better time structure of the day, explaining 4% of variance.

Table 4.

Personality traits and autonomy at work as predictors of aspects of work-life balance while working from home in Study 2 (N = 487)

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>
Conscientiousness	-0.15 (0.10)	.01	-0.21 (0.09)*	.01	0.28 (0.05)**	.06	0.06 (0.07)	.00
Emotional stability	-0.59 (0.10)**	.07	-0.35 (0.09)**	.04	0.48 (0.05)**	.15	0.50 (0.07)**	.09
Autonomy at work	-0.19 (0.10)	.01	0.06 (0.09)	.00	0.17 (0.05)**	.04	-0.16 (0.07)*	.01
R^2	.20**		.26**		.33**		.15**	
ΔR^2 over control variables	.07**		.04**		.23**		.09**	

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

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

To test if personal and organizational resources and aspects of WLB would explain job performance and well-being over and above the control variables, we conducted regression analyses in which we entered the control variables as predictors in step one, personality traits and autonomy at work in step two, and aspects of WLB in step three (Table 5). The personality traits and autonomy at work predicted 6% of variance in job performance over and above the control variables, while aspects of WLB predicted 8% of additional variance over control variables and personality traits and autonomy at work. We explained 24% of variance in job performance with the full regression model. Among focal variables, the most important predictor of job performance was FTW conflict ($RW = .06$), followed by time structure ($RW = .04$). These variables were also more important predictors of job performance than any of the control variables.

As for the well-being, personality traits and autonomy at work explained 18% of variance over and above the control variables, and aspects of WLB explained 16% of additional variance over other variables in the model. In total, we explained 40% of variance in well-being among employees who WFH. The most important of predictor variables was time structure, explaining 11% of variance in well-being, followed by emotional stability, which explained 9% of variance. Psychological detachment and WTF conflict explained 7% of variance each. Compared to control variables, all of the focal variables were more important predictors of well-being.

Table 5.

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 (N = 486).

Criteria:	Job performance			Well-being		
	Step 2	Step 3		Step 2	Step 3	
	<i>B (SE)</i>	<i>B (SE)</i>	<i>RW</i>	<i>B (SE)</i>	<i>B (SE)</i>	<i>RW</i>
Conscientiousness	0.13 (0.03)**	0.09 (0.03)**	.03	0.04 (0.05)	-0.05 (0.05)	.00
Emotional stability	0.04 (0.03)	0.00 (0.03)	.00	0.47 (0.05)**	0.25 (0.05)**	.09
Autonomy at work	0.08 (0.03)**	0.07 (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		-0.10 (0.02)**	.06		0.00 (0.03)	.02
Time structure		0.10 (0.03)**	.04		0.24 (0.04)**	.11
Psychological detachment		-0.03 (0.02)	.00		0.12 (0.03)**	.07
R^2	.16**	.24**		.24**	.40**	
ΔR^2	.06**	.08**		.18**	.16**	

Notes. *RW* = relative weights, WTF = work-to-family, FTW = family-to-work; * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Finally, we conducted mediation analyses using Process (version 3.5) for SPSS (Hayes, 2018), estimating the indirect effects as significant if their bias-corrected 95% confidence intervals based on 10 000 bootstrap samples did not include zero. In all mediation analyses we also added control variables. The results of mediation analyses are shown in Table 6. For the criteria of job performance, effects of both personality traits were mediated through FTW conflict and time structure. Also, the effect of autonomy was mediated by time structure. As for the well-being, effects of conscientiousness and autonomy at work were mediated only through time structure, while the effects of emotional stability were mediated through WTF conflict, time structure and psychological detachment.

In sum, Study 2 findings showed that personality traits of conscientiousness and, especially, emotional stability act as personal resources that contribute to WLB of employees WFH during the pandemic. As for autonomy at work, it was shown to be important for achieving better structure of days while WFH. Moreover, conscientiousness and autonomy at work seem to be more important predictors of job performance whereas emotional stability is more important for well-being. In Study 2 we replicated Study 1 findings that achieving WLB is important while WFH during crisis. Although compared to Study 1 more WLB aspects predicted job performance and well-being, time structure once again stood out as the most consistent predictor across outcomes. Finally, mediation analyses showed that enhanced time structure was the main mechanism through which both personality traits and autonomy at work affect job performance and well-being as it was the only WLB variable that mediated the effects of the three resources across the outcomes.

Table 6.

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).

Criteria:		Job performance			Well-being		
Predictor	Mediator	<i>b</i>	Lower 95% CI ^a	Upper 95% CI ^a	<i>b</i>	Lower 95% CI ^a	Upper 95% CI ^a
Conscientiousness	WTF conflict	-0.006	-0.019	0.002	0.013	-0.005	0.037
	FTW conflict	0.020	0.001	0.040	-0.001	-0.015	0.014
	Time structure	0.028	0.009	0.051	0.067	0.033	0.109
	Psychological detachment	-0.002	-0.010	0.004	0.007	-0.011	0.028
Emotional stability	WTF conflict	-0.024	-0.047	-0.005	0.052	0.019	0.093
	FTW conflict	0.033	0.014	0.055	-0.001	-0.024	0.020
	Time structure	0.049	0.018	0.083	0.114	0.067	0.164
	Psychological detachment	-0.017	-0.041	0.004	0.058	0.021	0.103
Autonomy at work	WTF conflict	-0.001	-0.011	0.009	0.002	-0.019	0.022
	FTW conflict	-0.006	-0.025	0.011	0.000	-0.008	0.007

Time structure	0.017	0.004	0.033	0.039	0.012	0.073
Psychological detachment	0.005	-0.002	0.016	-0.018	-0.043	-0.001

Notes. Statistically significant effects and their confidence intervals are written in bold. In all analyses we controlled for gender, age, education level, number of kindergarten and school-aged children, experience with work from home prior the pandemic, and conditions for working from home.

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

Discussion

The “new normal” imposed to us by the COVID-19 pandemic has drastically and suddenly changed the way we work. Many of us are now WFH and it is almost certain that this change will persist in the coming months as a measure of coping with the pandemic (i.e., physical distancing that supposes to “flatten the curve”). Moreover, WFH will probably be much more frequent after the pandemic finally ends, given the advantages that have now come into light, both to employers (e.g., cost saving on office space) and employees (e.g., more flexibility and less commuting). All of this creates a pressing need for research of WFH during COVID-19 pandemic. We see two main contributions of our study. The first one is that it informs both workers and organizations about determinants of job performance and well-being of employees WFH. Insights from our studies should help both employees and organizations to manage WFH during the pandemic in order to create circumstances that will help people lead happy and productive lives. Second, we wanted to add to the WFH literature by examining determinants of job performance and well-being but also WLB in a “double” specific context that is marked by omnipresent and dangerous pandemic and low previous experience with WFH.

Across both studies, it seemed clear that WLB is important both for job performance and, especially, well-being while WFH. Furthermore, the most important aspect of WLB seemed to be the time structure of working days – individuals who were able to retain the time structure at home and clearly differentiate between working and free time were most likely to achieve high job performance and well-being. This was the case even after we took into account important socio-demographic variables such as number of children in the household or conditions for WFH.

Study 2 findings added to Study 1 findings by showing that some groups of employees more easily adapt to WFH. Study 2 showed that conscientiousness and emotional stability were important drivers of the WLB. In addition to the two personality traits, autonomy at work also helps employees to achieve better time structure of the day. The three resources were also shown to have direct effect on job performance and well-being while WFH. As might be expected based on previous research (Anglim et al., 2020; Barrick et al., 2001), conscientiousness was more important for job performance, and emotional stability for well-being. Autonomy at work was shown to be especially important for job performance. Finally, mediation analyses indicated that better time structure of working days achieved by conscientious and emotionally stable employees, as well as those who have more autonomy at work, was the key mechanism through which the three resources indirectly affected both job performance and well-being.

Practical implications

Our findings have important practical implications for WFH. First, it seems that the most efficient way for employees to enhance their WLB and, consequently, job performance and well-being would be to structure their days in a way that would enable better balance between work and life demands. This could be done through time management trainings in which employees might learn how to engage in optimum goal setting and task prioritization (Fenner & Renn, 2010).

Second, time structuring behaviors could also be enhanced by providing workers with more autonomy while WFH. This could be done by allowing workers to work at their own time, when it is most convenient to them considering their family/private life obligations and avoiding micromanaging (Gajendran & Harrison, 2007; Shockley, 2014).

Finally, managers should consider that some workers might have more difficulties in adjusting to WFH. According to our findings, they should pay particular attention to the workers low on emotional stability and conscientiousness and, with the help from human resource specialists, invest additional effort to provide them additional resources (e.g., coaching interventions) that will help them to productively and happily WFH.

Limitations

Our findings might be qualified by the issue of common method variance, given that both of our studies were cross-sectional, using only self-reports. However, most of the relations shown here have been meta-analytically supported on general populations of workers (e.g. Amstad et al., 2011; Anglim et al., 2020; Barrick et al., 2001; Cerasoli et al., 2016; Gajendran & Harrison, 2007), and some of the relations held with objective indicators of performance and well-being (e.g. Gajendran & Harrison, 2007; Van Steenbergen, & Ellemers, 2009).

Also, in our research, we mostly focused on the upside of WFH in one specific measurement point, in an effort to provide guidelines on how to make the best of this type of work in the current situation. However, WFH also has downsides such as the feeling of social and professional isolation stemming from the fact that employees working from home are away from their coworkers and manager(s) (Allen et al., 2015). Those feelings probably accrue and might create problems that we were not able to capture with the study where the participants were not long into WFH. So, it might be interesting to investigate the feeling of isolation and its likely negative effects on well-being and job performance for individuals continuing WFH for a prolonged time.

Conclusion

Our findings show that to make the best of WFH during the pandemic of COVID-19 it is important to achieve WLB primarily through structuring one's days. The presented findings have important implications for handling the WFH both during the pandemic but also in its aftermath, as WFH is probably a work arrangement that is now here to stay.

References

- 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. doi:10.1177/1529100615593273
- Allen, T. D., Johnson, R. C., Kiburz, K. M., & Shockley, K. M. (2012). Work-Family Conflict and Flexible Work Arrangements: Deconstructing Flexibility. *Personnel Psychology*, 66(2), 345–376. doi:10.1111/peps.12012
- Allen, T. D., Johnson, R. C., Saboe, K. N., Cho, E., Dumani, S., & Evans, S. (2012). Dispositional variables and work–family conflict: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 80(1), 17–26. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2011.04.004
- Amstad, F. T., Meier, L. L., Fasel, U., Elfering, A., & Semmer, N. K. (2011). A meta-analysis of work–family conflict and various outcomes with a special emphasis on cross-domain versus matching-domain relations. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 16(2), 151–169. doi:10.1037/a0022170
- Anglim, J., Horwood, S., Smillie, L. D., Marrero, R. J., & Wood, J. K. (2020). Predicting psychological and subjective well-being from personality: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 146(4), 279–323. doi:10.1037/bul0000226
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The Job Demands-Resources model: state of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(3), 309–328. doi:10.1108/02683940710733115
- Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Sanz-Vergel, A. I. (2014). Burnout and Work Engagement: The JD–R Approach. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 1(1), 389–411. doi:10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-031413-091235

- Barrick, M. R., Mount, M. K., & Judge, T. A. (2001). Personality and Performance at the Beginning of the New Millennium: What Do We Know and Where Do We Go Next? *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 9(1&2), 9–30. doi:10.1111/1468-2389.00160
- Cerasoli, C. P., Nicklin, J. M., & Nassreelrgawi, A. S. (2016). Performance, incentives, and needs for autonomy, competence, and relatedness: a meta-analysis. *Motivation and Emotion*, 40(6), 781–813. doi:10.1007/s11031-016-9578-2
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. <http://dx.doi.org/1.4324/9780203771587>
- Donnellan, M. B., Oswald, F. L., Baird, B. M., & Lucas, R. E. (2006). The mini-IPIP scales: tiny-yet-effective measures of the Big Five factors of personality. *Psychological assessment*, 18(2), 192-203. doi:10.1037/1040-3590.18.2.192
- Donnelly, N., & Proctor-Thomson, S. B. (2015). Disrupted work: home-based teleworking (HbTW) in the aftermath of a natural disaster. *New Technology, Work and Employment*, 30(1), 47–61. doi:10.1111/ntwe.12040
- Eurofound (2017), *European Quality of Life Survey 2016: Quality of life, quality of public services, and quality of society*. Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg. Retrieved from <https://www.eurofound.europa.eu/publications/report/2017/fourth-european-quality-of-life-survey-overview-report>
- Eurostat (2020). *Employed persons working from home as a percentage of the total employment, by sex, age and professional status (%)* [Data set]. Retrieved from <https://appsso.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/nui/submitViewTableAction.do>

- Fenner, G. H., & Renn, R. W. (2009). Technology-assisted supplemental work and work-to-family conflict: The role of instrumentality beliefs, organizational expectations and time management. *Human Relations*, 63(1), 63–82. doi:10.1177/0018726709351064
- 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. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.92.6.1524
- Global Workplace Analytics (2015). *Latest Work-At-Home/Telecommuting/Mobile Work/Remote Work Statistics*. Retrieved from <https://globalworkplaceanalytics.com/telecommuting-statistics>
- Goldberg, L. R. (1990). An alternative “description of personality”: The Big-Five factor structure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59(6), 1216–1229. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.59.6.1216
- Golden, T. D. (2006). Avoiding depletion in virtual work: Telework and the intervening impact of work exhaustion on commitment and turnover intentions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 69(1), 176–187. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2006.02.003
- Hayes, A. F. (2018) *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regression-based approach* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist*, 44(3), 513–524. doi:10.1037/0003-066x.44.3.513
- Jahoda, M. (1981). Work, employment, and unemployment: Values, theories, and approaches in social research. *American Psychologist*, 36(2), 184–191. doi:10.1037/0003-066x.36.2.184

- Judge, T. A., & Ilies, R. (2002). Relationship of personality to performance motivation: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 797–807. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.87.4.797
- Kniffin, K. M., Narayanan, J., Anseel, F., Antonakis, J., Ashford, S. P., Bakker, A. B., . . . Vugt, M. V. (2020). COVID-19 and the workplace: Implications, issues, and insights for future research and action. *American Psychologist*. doi:10.1037/amp0000716
- Kovacs, C., Batinic, B., Stiglbauer, B., & Gnambs, T. (2019). Development of a Shortened Version of the Latent and Manifest Benefits of Work (LAMB) Scale. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 35(5), 685–697. doi:10.1027/1015-5759/a000434
- Lapierre, L. M., van Steenbergen, E. F., Peeters, M. C. W., & Kluwer, E. S. (2015). Juggling work and family responsibilities when involuntarily working more from home: A multiwave study of financial sales professionals. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 37(6), 804–822. doi:10.1002/job.2075
- Lebreton, J. M., Hargis, M. B., Griepentrog, B., Oswald, F. L., & Ployhart, R. E. (2007). A multidimensional approach for evaluating variables in organizational research and practice. *Personnel Psychology*, 60, 475–498. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2007.00080.x>
- Lykken, D. T. (1968). Statistical significance in psychological research. *Psychological Bulletin*, 70(3, Pt.1), 151–159. doi:10.1037/h0026141
- Meijman, T. F., & Mulder, G. (1998). Psychological aspects of workload. In P. J. D. Drenth & H. Thierry (Eds.), *Handbook of work and organizational psychology (Vol. 2: Work psychology*, pp. 5–33). Hove, England: Psychology Press.

- Netemeyer, R. G., Boles, J. S., & McMurrian, R. (1996). Development and validation of work–family conflict and family–work conflict scales. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81(4), 400–410. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.81.4.400
- Nimon, K., Oswald, F. and Roberts, J.K. (2013). *yhat: Interpreting Regression Effects*. R package version 2.0-0. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=yhat>
- R Core Team (2019). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. <https://www.R-project.org/>.
- Reaney, P. (2012). *About 20 percent of global workers telecommute: Poll*. Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/01/24/workers-telecommute_n_1228004.html
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 68–78. doi:10.1037/0003-066x.55.1.68
- Salari, N., Hosseini-Far, A., Jalali, R. et al. Prevalence of stress, anxiety, depression among the general population during the COVID-19 pandemic: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Global Health* 16, 57 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12992-020-00589-w>
- 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 & Employment*, 27, 193–207. doi:10.1111/j.1468-005X.2012.00284
- Shockley, K. (2014). *Telecommuting* [White paper]. Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology. <https://www.siop.org/portals/84/docs/white%20papers/scientificaffairs/telecommuting.pdf>

- Sonnentag, S., & Fritz, C. (2007). The Recovery Experience Questionnaire: Development and validation of a measure for assessing recuperation and unwinding from work. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 12*(3), 204–221. doi:10.1037/1076-8998.12.3.204
- Tafvelin, S., & Stenling, A. (2018). Development and Initial Validation of the Need Satisfaction and Need Support at Work Scales: A Validity-Focused Approach. *Scandinavian Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 3*(1), 1. doi:10.16993/sjwop.30
- Topp, C. W., Østergaard, S. D., Søndergaard, S., & Bech, P. (2015). The WHO-5 Well-Being Index: A Systematic Review of the Literature. *Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics, 84*(3), 167–176. doi:10.1159/000376585
- Van Steenbergen, E. F., & Ellemers, N. (2009). Is managing the work-family interface worthwhile? Benefits for employee health and performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 30*(5), 617–642. doi:10.1002/job.569
- Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment as Predictors of Organizational Citizenship and In-Role Behaviors. *Journal of Management, 17*(3), 601–617. doi:10.1177/014920639101700305
- Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2007). The role of personal resources in the job demands-resources model. *International Journal of Stress Management, 14*(2), 121–141. doi:10.1037/1072-5245.14.2.121
- Yu, S., Levesque-Bristol, C., & Maeda, Y. (2017). General Need for Autonomy and Subjective Well-Being: A Meta-Analysis of Studies in the US and East Asia. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 19*(6), 1863–1882. doi:10.1007/s10902-017-9898-2