Resilience and Adaptivity Were Strong Correlates of Wellbeing in the Early Stages of the Covid-19 Pandemic

Matthew J. Grawitch^{a*}, Kristi N. Lavigne^b, Andrea M. Cornelius^b, Roger Gill^c, and Steven L. Winton^a

^a School for Professional Studies, Saint Louis University, St. Louis, MO, USA; ^b Department of Psychology, Saint Louis University, St. Louis, MO, USA; ^c Roger Gill, Durham University Business School, Durham, UK.

* Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Matthew J. Grawitch, Saint Louis University, School for Professional Studies, 3840 Lindell Blvd., St. Louis, MO, 63108, matthew.grawitch@slu.edu, (314) 977-2335.

Resilience and Adaptivity Were Strong Correlates of Wellbeing in the Early Stages of the Covid-19 Pandemic

Abstract

This multinational survey study draws upon the Personal Resource Allocation (PRA) framework to explore how resilience and adaptivity relates to work engagement and general wellbeing across five countries during the early stages of lockdown due to the COVID-19 pandemic (June 2020). Both resilience and adaptivity were shown to be important correlates of work engagement, but only resilience was related to general wellbeing. We also found that workers' remote work training was associated with greater levels of work engagement, and age was associated with better overall wellbeing. Findings highlight the importance of individual differences in resilience and adaptivity in determining the pandemic's impact on wellbeing.

Keywords: adaptivity, resilience, remote work training, engagement, wellbeing

Word Count: 4,488

The COVID-19 pandemic and decisions made by local, state, and national leaders to stem its spread in countries around the world produced disruption to people's everyday lives. Many organizations were forced to adapt to new rules and regulations, which often involved (1) requiring employees to work remotely, (2) temporarily shutting down/reducing staff, and/or (3) making renovations to the physical work environment to limit employee/customer exposure to the virus. This led to numerous challenges in responding to human resources needs within those organizations, especially as they concerned employee wellbeing (Carnevale & Hatak, 2020).

The current study examined the way the early stages of the pandemic impacted people across five countries - Canada, France, Germany, the United Kingdom, and the United States - and the degree to which resilience and adaptivity were related to work engagement (i.e., being energetic about, absorbed by, and dedicated to one's work; Schaufeli et al., 2006) and general wellbeing (i.e., general feeling of mental and emotional stability; Taylor et al., 2003) during this period. We also explored possible differences across respondents in the five countries in terms of the associations between resilience/adaptivity and work engagement/wellbeing. We draw upon Grawitch et al.'s (2010) Personal Resource Allocation (PRA) framework, which is grounded in Conservation of Resources (COR) Theory (Hobfoll, 1989; Hobfoll et al., 2018), to explain why individual differences may be differentially associated with work engagement and wellbeing.

Conservation of Resources and Personal Resource Allocation

The central claim of COR Theory is that “individuals (and groups) strive to obtain, retain, foster, and protect those things they centrally value” (Hobfoll et al., 2018, p. 106). Many contemporary self-regulation perspectives rely on COR theory as an underlying foundation. The PRA framework (Grawitch et al., 2010) is one such perspective and argues that the way people manage their personal resources will influence several outcomes, including their wellbeing. The PRA framework focuses specifically on personal resources - defined as time, energy, and money - and how those resources are allocated to respond to various demands. A demand, as defined by the PRA framework, is any stimulus, event, or activity toward which people allocate personal resources, either because they have to or want to. Grawitch et al. (2010) argued that influencing factors, which include demographic, personality trait, and external resource factors, all play a critical role in the types of demands people experience, how they appraise demands, and how they manage their personal resources. In the current study we were interested in examining how

two personality traits (i.e., resilience, adaptivity) influenced the way individuals experienced the early stages of the pandemic with an emphasis on work engagement and general wellbeing.

Trait Resilience

We defined resilience, based on Smith et al. (2008), as an individual's capacity to bounce back from adversity or recover from unexpected circumstances. From a PRA perspective, those who possess higher levels of trait resilience should be more capable of responding to demands they encounter, especially those outside of their control, such as would be expected during a global pandemic (Chen & Bonanno, 2020). Although Harms et al. (2018) argued resilience is inevitably related to both the specific adversity (i.e., types of demands) individuals experience and the resources available to them for overcoming that adversity, our primary focus was less about social/community support aspects of resilience and more about individual differences that would exist outside of situational factors like pay cuts, hours worked, or family obligations. We could not assume such situational factors would be irrelevant, but we expected trait resilience to show significant associations with work engagement and general wellbeing after considering relevant idiosyncratic demands people faced because of the pandemic. As such, we predicted:

H1: Resilience will explain unique variance in work engagement (H1a) and general wellbeing (H1b) after controlling for other factors.

Adaptivity

Whereas resilience represents a more general trait-like factor, adaptivity represents “the degree to which individuals cope with, respond to, and/or support changes that affect their roles as organization members” (Griffin et al., 2007, p. 332). Griffin et al. (2007) demonstrated that adaptivity was most associated with an individual's openness to change and commitment to the organization. Adaptivity has also displayed meaningful associations with person-environment fit

(Wang et al., 2011) and job crafting behaviors (Berg et al., 2010), both of which are positively related to work engagement (Rudolph et al., 2017; Warr & Inceoglu, 2012). Van den Heuvel et al. (2014) and Strauss et al. (2015) showed that adaptivity may be related to the personal resources people perceive themselves to possess and their willingness to proactively allocate resources to the workplace during uncertain times. As a workplace-oriented factor, however, it would not necessarily be associated with higher general wellbeing. As such, we predicted:

H2: Adaptivity will explain unique variance in work engagement after controlling for other factors.

Demands and Resources

We recognized that there were a lot of idiosyncratic demands people experienced as a function of the pandemic (especially when considering different countries) and that individuals varied in relevant demographic factors that might serve as subsequent influencing factors. Various demographic factors could affect different aspects of the PRA process. First, demographics may affect which types of demands (i.e., time, energy, money) individuals encounter (e.g., married/cohabitating individuals are likely to have qualitatively and potentially quantitatively different demands than those unmarried/living alone). Second, they may affect the degree to which various characteristics provide greater or fewer resources (e.g., earning a better salary may indicate more financial resources). Finally, they may affect whether various constraints exist on when, where, or how people allocate their resources (e.g., parents of school-aged children may have different limitations on how time and energy are allocated than non-parents). These differing effects explain why demographics like these are often significant (though sometimes weak) correlates of wellbeing (Mikucka & Rizzi, 2020; Nelson et al., 2014; Purol et al., 2020; Wright & Brown, 2017). At the time of data collection, we did not know

enough to make any significant predictions regarding the impact of any of the demographic data we collected, as many of them were specific to the COVID-19 pandemic (e.g., essential worker status, pandemic pay cuts, differential hours worked) as opposed to traditional demographics (e.g., marital status, parental status). However, our goal was to explore which, if any, might play a role in the way resilience and adaptivity related to work engagement and general wellbeing.

Method

Participants and Procedure

We recruited respondents for the current study using CINT (<https://www.cint.com/>), an online platform allowing researchers to collect survey panel data. Respondents were recruited from five countries (i.e., Canada, France, Germany, the United Kingdom, and the United States) and were required to be employed or furloughed. Data were collected between May 29 and June 2, 2020. Originally, 1,191 respondents were solicited to complete the survey, with 715 respondents completing it. After deleting those with duplicate run numbers (i.e., data from the same respondent, $n=5$), whose response times for the survey was less than two minutes ($n=14$), those who were unemployed ($n=36$), and with extremely high response times (i.e., over 140 minutes, more than 2 SD above mean response time of 20 minutes, $n=8$), sample size was 652 (40.6% male; $M_{\text{age}}=39.65$, $SD=11.91$), with country representation as follows: Canada ($n=98$), France ($n=94$), Germany ($n=101$), UK ($n=96$), US ($n=256$), and not indicated ($n=7$)¹.

Measures

Resilience. The Brief Resilience Scale (BRS; Smith et al., 2008) was employed to measure participant resiliency to life's setbacks. The BRS includes six items (3 positively keyed and 3 negatively keyed). Respondents rated their level of agreement with each statement on a

¹ The 7 respondents with no country indicated were excluded from all analyses in which country was used as a variable.

five-point scale (1=Strongly disagree; 5=Strongly agree). A sample item is “I tend to bounce back quickly after hard times.” In conducting our scale analysis, we found that the negative items were poorly correlated with the positive items (near 0). Therefore, we dropped the negative items and retained only the three positive items ($\omega = .52$ before dropping negative items, $.77$ after).

Adaptivity. Adaptivity was assessed using two subscales from Griffin et al. (2007): individual task adaptivity and organizational member adaptivity. Each subscale consists of three items, and participants rated their level of agreement with each statement on a five-point scale (1=Strongly disagree; 5=Strongly agree). Example items include “Learned new skills to help you adapt to changes in your core tasks” (individual task adaptivity) and “Coped with changes to the way the organization operates” (organizational task adaptivity). Due to a high correlation between subscales ($r=.76$) and lack of a mean difference between them, $t(652)=0.03$, $p=.167$, we collapsed them ($\omega = .71$ for each) into an overall adaptivity score ($\omega = .84$).

General Well-Being. The 18-item General Well-Being Schedule (Taylor et al., 2003) captures aspects of mental wellbeing including symptoms of depression and anxiety. Respondents were asked to read a series of questions and choose the response that best applied to them within the past month. Example items include “Have you been anxious, worried, or upset?”, “Have felt downhearted and blue?”, and “How have you been feeling in general?”, with a response scale ranging from 1 (all of the time) to 5 (none of the time). Thus, a high score indicates low symptomatology and greater wellbeing ($\omega = .83$).

Work Engagement. An adapted version of the 9-item Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES-9; Schaufeli et al., 2006) was administered to measure work engagement. The UWES-9 contains three scales (vigor, dedication, absorption), each containing three items. We asked respondents how often each item applied to them in the past month using a 5-point scale (1 =

Never; 5 = Every day). Example items include “At my work, I feel bursting with energy” (vigor), “My job inspires me” (dedication), and “I get carried away when I’m working (absorption).” We collapsed the nine items to form a single work engagement score ($\omega = .92$).

Demographics. Demographic variables included dependents 12 or under (yes/no), sex (male/female), participant age, married/cohabitating (yes/no), annual household income, and country of residence (as described above). In addition to these demographic variables, items inquiring about changes in individual experiences because of COVID-19 were also included. These included whether respondents were working at least the same number of hours as before the pandemic (yes/no); had received a post-COVID-19 pay cut (yes/no); had remote work experience before COVID-19 (yes/no); and were classified as an essential worker (yes/no). We also included an assessment of remote working and learning experiences using three items from Staples et al. (1999), adapted to assess remote work training (e.g., “I am trained to work remotely from my manager”). Participants responded to items on a 7-point scale (1 = Strongly disagree; 7 = Strongly agree; $\omega = .88$). Original response options for all demographic variables can be found in the Supplemental Materials available on the Open Science Framework (OSF)².

Results

Due to the number of analyses conducted, the relative size of the sample, and recent calls by scholars (Benjamin et al., 2017), we employed conservative estimates for statistical significance testing. We set an α of .005 as the critical threshold for statistical significance and .01 as the threshold for suggestive results, with results above .01 deemed non-significant. We also interpret our results within the context of both their effect size and confidence intervals to provide a more accurate interpretation.

² <https://osf.io/kdvn6/>

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics for all study variables (Table 1) produced a few noteworthy observations. First, there was relative independence among demographic variables with few significant associations with work engagement or wellbeing. Second, reports of prior remote work training showed a stronger correlation with both work engagement and general wellbeing than did prior remote work experience. Third, resilience and adaptivity were both significantly associated with work engagement and general wellbeing, but the correlation of adaptivity with wellbeing appeared to be much weaker than its correlation with work engagement. Finally, country was associated with few differences in work engagement and general wellbeing.

[Insert Table 1 about here]

To test H1 and H2, we conducted a pair of multiple regression analyses. In both analyses, resilience and adaptivity were entered as predictors. In the first analysis, work engagement was the criterion, and in the second analysis general wellbeing was the criterion.

In support of H1a and H2, both resilience and adaptivity significantly predicted reported levels of work engagement, accounting for 15.1% of the overall variance, with both resilience and adaptivity making similar contributions to the prediction (top panel Table 2). In support of H1b, resilience (but not adaptivity) significantly predicted general wellbeing, accounting for 10.03% of the variance (second panel Table 2).

[Insert Table 2 about here]

We followed up with tests of possible interaction effects (using the PROCESS macro for SPSS; Hayes, 2017) based on both country (using multicategorical indicator coding) and region (North American vs. European). None of the regression results varied based on individual country or region. Finally, we assessed whether any of the other demographics added to the

prediction of either work engagement or general wellbeing. We replicated the results of the hypothesis tests in Block 1, and then entered any demographic variables that demonstrated bivariate correlational significance with the outcomes using a forward selection analysis in Block 2 (p to enter = .01; p to remove = .02). Remote work training was shown to add significantly to the prediction of work engagement (Table 2, third panel), and age was shown to add significantly to the prediction of general wellbeing (Table 2, bottom panel).

Discussion

The results of the current study resulted in five primary conclusions. First, resilience was an important predictor of both work engagement and general wellbeing during the pandemic. Second, adaptivity, though it was a significant predictor of work engagement, was not a significant predictor of general wellbeing. Third, workers who possessed more remote work training prior to the onset of the pandemic also reported higher levels of work engagement. Fourth, older workers reported higher levels of general wellbeing. Finally, respondent country and region both failed to be significant predictors of worker engagement or wellbeing.

Overall, the results suggest that, independent of country, workers who were effectively able to bounce back from adversity (Smith et al., 2008) and cope with the changes to their work arrangements (Griffin et al., 2007) experienced wellbeing benefits that other workers did not. When interpreting the results through the lens of the PRA process (Grawitch et al., 2010), it appears likely that both resilience and adaptivity were important influencing factors in the way individuals responded to the various demands brought on by the pandemic. Additionally, and consistent with the PRA framework, those who possessed greater remote work training pre-pandemic (which would be expected to increase competence in managing a remote work

environment) benefited in terms of work engagement, which likely indicates that those workers were able to manage their work-life interface more effectively (Grawitch et al., 2010).

What was surprising was that few demographic factors showed any significant association with resilience, adaptivity, work engagement, or general wellbeing. Thus, at least with the regard to the current study, the four primary variables largely existed independently of such factors as age, marital/cohabitation status, essential worker status, and prior remote work experience. It may be that many of these demographic factors demonstrate more context-dependent associations (e.g., in specific industries, companies, and sectors) but may lack more systemic associations across more diverse samples.

Limitations

There are a few limitations that deserve mention. First, the current study was a cross-sectional single-method study. A longitudinal design would have afforded us the opportunity to examine progression over time or over various governmental stages of pandemic recovery. However, given the unexpected nature of crises, this would have likely required that pre-pandemic or pre-lockdown data be collected by happenstance. A cross-sectional study was satisfactory, and arguably more appropriate, for the current study, given participants' potentially strained resources, the current state of knowledge, and the sense of urgency (Spector, 2019).

Additionally, our international sampling method did allow us to study a more heterogeneous sample. When testing for differences based on country, we found none. This ameliorates some of the above pre-post pandemic concerns; however, it is also possible that the countries were homogenous in some critical ways. Only Western (North American and European) countries were included in the study. Western culture may provide a certain amount of homogeneity in the adaptation and coping processes that Eastern cultures do not share. Studies

have consistently shown that Western and Eastern cultures tend to learn, and thus adapt to their surroundings, differently (Chang et al., 2011).

Implications for Organizations

Though the current study was conducted in the early stages of the pandemic, the results offer implications for organizations even in the present stages of that pandemic. First and foremost, they should recognize that employees have limited amounts of personal resources, and, thus, different interventions will have different net effects on those personal resources. In many cases, interventions, such as virtual happy hours, weekly touch points, and stress management interventions may serve as net increases in demands on employee personal resources even if they are designed with the best of intentions. If employees do not have sufficient levels of resilience or adaptivity, such interventions could potentially have adverse consequences for work engagement and wellbeing. This has been an understudied aspect of the pandemic, but it would behoove researchers to better understand the upsides and downsides of interventions through a demands-resources perspective.

Lastly, it is important to keep in mind that adaptivity and resilience both appear to be relevant variables when it comes to work engagement, with resilience also demonstrating relevance for general wellbeing. Employees vary tremendously in their strengths, limitations, and challenges in these two areas. Given that both factors were associated with workplace wellbeing, it may be prudent to consider how employees' needs may vary in these areas and to tailor specific interventions to address those needs.

References

- Benjamin, D. J., Berger, J., Johannesson, M., Nosek, B. A., Wagenmakers, E.-J., Berk, R., Bollen, K., Björn, B., Brown, L., Camerer, C., Cesarini, D., Chambers, C., Clyde, M., Cook, T., De Boeck, P., Dienes, Z., Dreber, A., Easwaran, K., Efferson, C., ... Johnson, V. (2017, July 22). Redefine statistical significance. <https://psyarxiv.com/mky9j>
- Berg, J. M., Wrzeniewski, A. & Dutton, J. E. (2010). Perceiving and responding to challenges in job crafting at different ranks: When proactivity requires adaptivity. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 31, 158-186. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.645>
- Carnevale, J. B., & Hatak, I. (2020). Employee adjustment and well-being in the era of COVID-19: Implications for human resource management. *Journal of Business Research*, 116, 183-187. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.05.037>
- Chang, L., Mak, M. C., Li, T., Wu, B. P., Chen, B. B., & Lu, H. J. (2011). Cultural adaptations to environmental variability: An evolutionary account of East–West differences. *Educational Psychology Review*, 23, 99-129. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-010-9149-0>
- Chen, S., & Bonanno, G. A. (2020). Psychological adjustment during the global outbreak of COVID-19: A resilience perspective. *Psychological Trauma: Theory, Research, Practice, and Policy*, 12, S51-S54. <http://doi.org/10.1037/tra0000685>
- Grawitch, M. J., Barber, L. K., & Justice, L. (2010). Re-thinking the work-life interface: It's not about balance, it's about resource allocation. *Applied Psychology: Health and Well-Being*, 2(2), 127-159. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1758-0854.2009.01023.x>
- Griffin, M. A., Neal, A., & Parker, S. K. (2007). A new model of work role performance: Positive behavior in uncertain and interdependent contexts. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(2), 327–347. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMJ.2007.24634438>

- Harms, P. D., Brady, L., Wood, D., & Silard, A. (2018). Resilience and well-being. In E. Diener, S. Oishi, & L. Tay (Eds.), *Handbook of well-being*. Salt Lake City, UT: DEF Publishers.
DOI: nobascholar.com
- Hayes, A. F. (2017). *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regression-based approach* (2nd ed.). Guilford Press.
- Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist*, 44, 513–524. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.44.3.513>
- Hobfoll, S. E., Halbesleben, J., Neveu, J.-P., & Westman, M. (2018). Conservation of resources in the organizational context: The reality of resources and their consequences. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 5, 103-218.
<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032117-104640>
- Mikucka, M., & Rizzi, E. (2020). The parenthood and happiness link: Testing predictions from five theories. *European Journal of Population*, 36, 337-361.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10680-019-09532-1>
- Nelson, K. S., Kostadin, K., & Lyubomirsky, S. (2014). The pains and pleasures of parenting: When, why, and how is parenthood associated with more or less well-being? *Psychological Bulletin*, 140, 846–895. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0035444>
- Office of National Statistics (2020). Coronavirus and depression in adults, Great Britain: June 2020. London: ONS. Downloaded from
<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/wellbeing/articles/coronavirusanddepressioninadultsgreatbritain/june2020> on August 19, 2020.

- Purol, M. F., Keller, V. N., Oh, J., Chopik, W. J., & Lucas, R. E. (2020). Loved and lost or never loved at all? Lifelong marital histories and their links with subjective well-being. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2020.1791946>
- Rudolph, C. W., Katz, I. M., Lavigne, K. N., & Zacher, H. (2017). Job crafting: A meta-analysis of relationships with individual differences, job characteristics, and work outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 102, 112-138. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2017.05.008>
- Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., & Salanova, M. (2006). The measurement of work engagement with a short questionnaire: A cross-national study. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 66, 701-716. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164405282471>
- Smith, B. W., Dalen, J., Wiggins, K., Tooley, E., Christopher, P., & Bernard, J. (2008). The Brief Resilience Scale: Assessing the ability to bounce back. *International Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, 15, 194–200. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10705500802222972>
- Spector, P. E. (2019). Do not cross me: Optimizing the use of cross-sectional designs. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 34, 125-137. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-018-09613-8>
- Staples, D. S., Hulland, J. S., & Higgins, C. A. (1999). A self-efficacy theory explanation for the management of remote workers in virtual organizations. *Organization Science*, 10, 758–776. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.10.6.758>
- Strauss, K., Griffin, M. A., Parker, S. K., & Mason, C. M. (2015). Building and sustaining proactive behaviors: The role of adaptivity and job satisfaction. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 30, 63-72. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-013-9334-5>
- Taylor, J. E., Poston II, W. C., Haddock, C. K., Blackburn, G. L., Heber, D., Heymsfield, S. B., & Foreyt, J. P. (2003). Psychometric characteristics of the General Well-Being Schedule

(GWB) with African-American women. *Quality of Life Research*, 12, 31-39.

<https://doi.org/10.1023/a:1022052804109>

van den Heuvel, M., Demerouti, E., & Bakker, A. B. (2014). How psychological resources

facilitate adaptation to organizational change. *European Journal of Work and*

Organizational Psychology, 23, 847-858. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2013.817057>

Wang, M. O., Zhan, Y., McCune, E., & Truxillo, D. (2011). Understanding newcomers'

adaptability and work-related outcomes: Testing the mediating roles of perceived P-E fit

variables. *Personnel Psychology*, 64, 163-189. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744->

[6570.2010.01205.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2010.01205.x)

Warr, P., & Inceoglu, I. (2012). Job engagement, job satisfaction, and contrasting associations

with person-job fit. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 17, 129-138.

<https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940710726447>

Wright, M. R., & Brown, S. L. (2017). Psychological well-being among older adults: The role of

partnership status. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 79, 833-849.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12375>

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for All Study Variables

Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1. Sex	0.41	0.49											
2. Age	39.65	11.91	.00										
3. Married/Cohab	0.60	0.49	.08	.20*									
4. Primary Caregiver	0.47	0.50	.08	-.07	.13*								
5. Dep. Under 12	0.30	0.46	.08	-.15*	.17*	.72*							
6. Working Less	0.28	0.45	.01	.09	.07	.02	.02						
7. Pay Cut	0.47	0.50	.03	-.12*	.05	.17*	.23*	.28*					
8. Household Income	6.02	3.18	.09	.14*	.34*	.01	.06	.04	-.07				
9. Essential	0.56	0.50	.12*	-.07	.04	.12*	.16*	-.12*	.02	-.02			
10. Remote Exp	0.55	0.50	.13*	-.10†	-.02	.20*	.22*	-.08	.20*	.04	.14*		
11. Remote Work Train	3.86	1.65	.10†	-.13*	.01	.15*	.16*	-.03	.10†	.06	.07	.35*	
12. Canada	0.15	0.36	.05	.12*	.02	-.04	.00	.06	.02	.27*	-.03	-.03	.02
13. Germany	0.16	0.36	.07	-.10	-.09	.09	.06	-.09	-.02	-.15*	-.02	.17*	.03
14. France	0.15	0.35	.01	-.02	.06	.13*	-.02	-.01	.00	-.24*	.12*	.08	-.03
15. UK	0.15	0.49	-.02	.07	.04	-.19*	-.09	.05	-.07	-.20*	-.08	-.21*	-.17*
16. US	0.40	0.49	-.09	-.05	-.03	.01	.04	.00	.04	.23*	.01	-.01	.10†
17. North American	0.54	0.50	-.05	.04	-.01	-.02	.04	.06	.06	.42*	-.01	-.04	.12*
18. Resilience	4.57	1.20	.06	.02	.03	.03	.12*	.03	.04	.14*	.04	.09	.30*
19. Adaptivity	3.43	0.79	.04	-.03	.00	-.01	.07	-.02	-.02	.09	.13*	.03	.30*
20. Work Engagement	3.28	0.93	.00	.05	.07	.05	.04	.03	.00	.13*	.07	.05	.29*
21. General Well-Being	61.63	15.88	.04	.22*	.03	.00	-.02	.04	-.04	.13*	-.03	-.08	.12*

Sex (1= Male, 0 = Not Male); Married/Cohab (1=Yes, 0=No), Primary Caregiver (1=Yes, 0=No), Dep Under 12 (1=Yes, 0 = N0), Working Less (1 = Yes, 0=No), Pay cut (1=Yes, 0=No), Household Income (1-12), Essential (1=Yes, 0=No), Remote Experience (1=Yes, 0=No), Country codes (1=Yes, 0=No), North American (1=US/Canada; 0=UK/France/Germany); * is significant at the .005 level; † is suggestive at .01 level

Table 2. Regression Results Predicting Work Engagement and General Wellbeing.

Variable	B	CI	SE	β	t	p
Model 1: Work Engagement						
Resilience	.18	.09; .27	.03	.23	5.69	.000
Adaptivity	.26	.18; .40	.05	.22	5.46	.000
Model 2: General Wellbeing						
Resilience	3.64	2.07; 5.20	.56	.27	6.54	.000
Adaptivity	1.66	-0.71; 4.03	.84	.08	1.97	.049
Model 3: Work Engagement						
Resilience	.15	.06; .24	.03	.19	4.75	.000
Adaptivity	.22	.08; .35	.05	.19	4.57	.000
Remote Work Training	.10	.04; .16	.02	.18	4.72	.000
Model 4: General Well-Being						
Resilience	3.52	1.98; 5.05	.54	.26	6.47	.000
Adaptivity	1.87	-.45; 4.19	.82	.09	2.27	.024
Age	.30	.16; .43	.05	.22	6.12	.000

Model 1 $R = .389$, $R^2 = .151$, $F(2, 649) = 57.87$, $p < .001$

Model 2 $R = .321$, $R^2 = .103$, $F(2, 649) = 37.25$, $p < .001$

Model 3 $R = .419$, $R^2 = .175$, $F(3, 648) = 47.28$, $p < .001$

Model 4 $R = .389$, $R^2 = .152$, $F(3, 641) = 38.18$, $p < .001$