Home Sweet Home Office? Job Satisfaction in Home Office Versus Traditional Office Settings

Michelle Hillmann , Johannes Pfeifer * , Nicki Marquardt

Posted Date: 5 February 2026

doi: 10.20944/preprints202602.0385.v1

Keywords: home office; job satisfaction; remote work; working conditions; traditional office

Article

Home Sweet Home Office? Job Satisfaction in Home Office Versus Traditional Office Settings

Michelle Hillmann, Johannes Pfeifer * and Nicki Marquardt

Psychology, Hochschule Rhein-Waal, Kamp-Lintfort, Germany

* Correspondence: johannes.pfeifer@hsrw.eu; Tel.: +49-(2842)-90825-9710

Abstract

During the COVID-19 pandemic, working from home became widespread due to contact restrictions, substantially altering work arrangements. As organizations reassess long-term work policies, this study examines whether working from home is associated with higher job satisfaction than traditional office work and which factors influence job satisfaction in a home-office context. Data were collected via an online survey of 201 employees in Germany. Job satisfaction was measured using the Job Description Form (ABB), and personality traits were assessed with the Big Five Inventory (BFI-10), which was included as a control variable. Results indicate that employees working predominantly from home report significantly higher overall job satisfaction than those working mainly in traditional office settings. This effect remained stable after controlling for personality traits and age and was evident across all job satisfaction subdimensions. Furthermore, effective communication tools, adequate technical equipment, a quiet workspace, and prior experience with working from home were positively associated with job satisfaction. In contrast, the presence of children or other household co-workers did not significantly reduce job satisfaction, whereas sufficient childcare arrangements showed a strong positive association. Overall, the findings highlight the importance of supportive home office conditions for sustaining job satisfaction beyond the pandemic.

Keywords: home office; job satisfaction; remote work; working conditions; traditional office

1. Introduction

Home office (HO) and related forms of remote work have shifted from a selective flexibility practice to a normalized work arrangement in many organizations, particularly following the large-scale transition to remote work during the COVID-19 pandemic. As organizations now redefine sustainable hybrid and remote work models, a central question is the impact of HO on employees' job-related attitudes, particularly job satisfaction. Job satisfaction is consistently associated with desirable organizational outcomes, including performance, retention, and employee well-being, and therefore remains a key indicator for evaluating new work arrangements [1,2]. Prior research generally suggests that remote work can be associated with higher job satisfaction, often attributed to increased autonomy and flexibility [3,4]. However, findings are not uniformly positive. Some studies report comparable levels of satisfaction across remote and office contexts or highlight potential downsides such as reduced social interaction and feelings of isolation [5,6]. To reconcile these heterogeneous findings, several authors propose a nonlinear relationship between the extent of HO and job satisfaction, with benefits increasing at low to moderate levels of HO but diminishing at higher levels [7,8]. Beyond the amount of HO, variability in implementation quality may further explain why some employees benefit more than others. From an applied ergonomics and socio-technical systems perspective, HO represents a work system in which performance and well-being depend on the fit between job demands and available resources in the home-based work environment. Inadequate communication channels, insufficient technical equipment, or an unsuitable workspace may increase friction and strain, potentially attenuating the autonomy-related

 doi:10.20944/preprints202602.0385.v1

benefits of HO. Conversely, practical collaboration tools and an appropriate workspace may support efficient task completion and positive work experiences [9,10]. In addition, employees' prior experience with HO may reduce coordination and technology-related barriers, facilitating adaptation to home-based work routines [11]. Finally, HO is embedded in the household context, which may introduce competing demands. Childcare responsibilities or concurrent remote work by other household members may increase interruptions and permeability of boundaries, potentially undermining concentration and work–family balance. At the same time, adequate childcare arrangements may mitigate these effects and support more favorable work experiences. Moreover, evidence on gender differences in HO-related outcomes is mixed, but pandemic-related changes in the distribution of household and caregiving responsibilities suggest that gender may moderate HO experiences and job satisfaction [12]. Against this background, the present study examines whether employees working predominantly from home differ in job satisfaction from employees working predominantly at traditional office locations. Furthermore, we investigate whether key HO characteristics (communication quality, technical equipment, and workspace suitability), prior HO experience, and household-context factors (children and childcare arrangements; other employees present in the household) are associated with job satisfaction among employees working in HO. By focusing on concrete and modifiable aspects of the HO work environment, the study aims to provide actionable insights for organizations designing sustainable remote or hybrid work policies.

Based on prior evidence suggesting higher job satisfaction among remote workers relative to office-based workers [3,4], we propose the following hypotheses. H1: Employees working predominantly in HO report higher overall job satisfaction (and higher job satisfaction facets) than employees working predominantly at the traditional office. Given that communication quality, adequate technical resources, and workspace suitability are frequently discussed as prerequisites for practical remote work, we further hypothesize that better perceived communication conditions in HO are associated with higher job satisfaction (H2a), that a more suitable HO workspace (i.e., quiet and separate) is associated with higher job satisfaction (H2b), and that better perceived technical equipment in HO is associated with higher job satisfaction (H2c). Adaptation processes may further influence how employees experience HO; therefore, we hypothesize that higher pre-pandemic HO frequency is associated with higher job satisfaction among employees working in HO (H3). Regarding household-context factors, we hypothesize that among employees working in HO, those with children report lower job satisfaction than those without (H4a). In contrast, among employees working in HO with children, better childcare arrangements are associated with higher job satisfaction (H4b). With respect to concurrent remote work by other household members, we hypothesize that among employees working in HO, those with other employees present in the same household during working hours report lower job satisfaction than those without (H5). Finally, in light of evidence suggesting increased domestic demands for women during crisis periods, we hypothesize that among employees working in HO, women report lower job satisfaction than men (H6).

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Study Design and Procedure

The study employed a quantitative, cross-sectional survey design to test the theoretically derived hypotheses. Data were collected via a standardized online questionnaire. Participation was voluntary and anonymous, and informed consent was *obtained* before survey initiation.

The questionnaire was distributed via social media platforms (e.g., *WhatsApp, Instagram, Facebook*), professional networking sites (*LinkedIn, Xing*), topic-specific online groups related to home office work, and the SurveyCircle research exchange platform. A short pretest (N = 8) was conducted to assess the clarity and comprehensibility of the questionnaire, resulting in minor wording adjustments before launch.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202602.0385.v1

In total, 532 individuals accessed the survey link; 241 respondents started the questionnaire, and 215 completed it. After excluding respondents who did not provide informed consent or did not meet the employment criteria, the final sample consisted of N = 201 participants. The average completion time was approximately five minutes.

2.2. Measures

2.2.1. Home Office Status and Conditions

Participants indicated whether they worked predominantly from home or predominantly at a traditional office location. Consistent with prior research, respondents were classified as working predominantly from home if they spent more than half of their working time there. Participants further reported their frequency of working from home before the COVID-19 pandemic.

Perceived home office conditions were assessed using self-report items capturing (a) quality of communication means, (b) adequacy of technical equipment, and (c) suitability of the physical workspace (e.g., quiet and separate). Participants with children additionally reported on childcare arrangements during working hours. Household composition (number of children and number of other employees working from home) was recorded.

2.2.2. Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction was measured using the Arbeitsbeschreibungsbogen (ABB) by Neuberger and Allerbeck [13], the German adaptation of the Job Descriptive Index. The ABB is a well-established, multifaceted instrument that assesses job satisfaction across seven domains: colleagues, supervisor, activity, working conditions, organization and performance, development, and pay. Subscale scores were calculated by averaging the respective items, excluding the single-item Kunin face indicators. Overall job satisfaction was computed as the mean across all subscales. Reported internal consistencies of the ABB subscales range from .81 to .91 [13].

2.2.3. Control Variables

Personality traits were assessed using the Big Five Inventory–10 (BFI-10) from Rammstedt et al. [14], which measures openness, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, and emotional stability with 2 items per dimension. All items were rated on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Demographic control variables included age, gender, educational level, employment status, household size, number of children, and number of other employees working from the same household.

2.3. Participants

The final sample consisted of 201 employed respondents (58.7% female, 40.8% male, 0.5% diverse) with a mean age of 32.14 years (SD = 10.00). Of the participants, 56.2% reported working predominantly from home, while 43.8% worked predominantly at a traditional office location. Most respondents were employed full-time (63.7%). The majority lived in households with two persons and without children. Descriptive statistics for demographic and home office characteristics are provided in Appendix A.

2.4. Statistical Analysis

All statistical analyses were conducted using *IBM SPSS Statistics* (Version 23). Internal consistencies were evaluated using Cronbach's α. Hypotheses were tested using Pearson product–moment correlations, Spearman rank-order correlations where distributional assumptions were violated, independent-samples t-tests, and analyses of covariance (ANCOVA) to adjust for relevant covariates. Effect sizes were reported as Cohen's d for t-tests and partial η^2 for ANCOVA.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202602.0385.v1

3. Results

3.1. Sample Characteristics

The final sample consisted of 201 employed respondents. Of these, 56.2% reported working predominantly from home, whereas 43.8% worked predominantly at a traditional office location. The mean age of the participants was 32.14 years (SD = 10.00). Regarding gender, 58.7% identified as female, 40.8% as male, and 0.5% as diverse.

Most participants were employed full-time (63.7%), followed by working students (18.4%). Regarding educational background, the largest proportion held a bachelor's degree (43.8%), followed by vocational training (21.4%) and a master's degree (17.4%). The majority of respondents lived in two-person households, most commonly with two employed individuals. Most households did not include children (71.6%).

Participants working from home generally reported adequate technical equipment, functioning communication, and access to a quiet, secluded workspace. A detailed overview of demographic, occupational, and household characteristics is provided in the Appendix (Table A1).

3.2. Scale Reliability and Validity

3.2.1. Reliability Analysis

Internal consistency was examined to assess the reliability of the measurement instruments. Cronbach's alpha was calculated for all subscales of the Job Description Form (ABB). All ABB subscales demonstrated excellent internal consistencies, with α values of .91 or higher. Item discrimination indices were satisfactory for nearly all items (≥.30). Two items showed lower discrimination; however, removing them resulted in only negligible increases in alpha coefficients. Therefore, all items were retained for further analyses.

For the Big Five Inventory-10 (BFI-10), Openness (α = .72), Extraversion (α = .71), and Emotional Stability (α = .71) showed acceptable internal consistencies. Conscientiousness (α = .42) and Agreeableness (α = .34) demonstrated lower reliability coefficients. Given the brevity of the scale and evidence that Cronbach's alpha tends to underestimate reliability in very short scales, all BFI-10 dimensions were retained as control variables.

3.2.2. Validity Analysis

Convergent validity of the ABB subscales was assessed by correlating each subscale score with its corresponding Kunin item. All ABB subscales were significantly and positively correlated with their respective Kunin item, with correlation coefficients ranging from r = .80 to r = .88 ($p < .01$), indicating strong convergent validity and supporting the construct validity of the ABB.

3.3. Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics for overall job satisfaction and its subscales are reported in Table A2. Overall job satisfaction had a mean of M = 2.93 (SD = .48). Among the subscales, satisfaction with colleagues yielded the highest mean, whereas organization and performance yielded the lowest.

When comparing employees working predominantly from home with those working predominantly in a traditional office, the home-office group showed higher overall job satisfaction. This pattern was consistent across all job satisfaction subscales, providing an initial descriptive indication in support of Hypothesis 1.

Table 1. Means and standard deviations of the ABB (HO / traditional office).

Scale	Variable	Mean	SD
Job Satisfaction	HO (n = 113)	3.15	.43

 doi:10.20944/preprints202602.0385.v1

Colleagues	Traditional office (n = 88)	2.64	.37
	HO (n = 113)	3.38	.47
Supervisor	Traditional office (n = 88)	2.70	.50
	HO (n = 113)	3.29	.51
Activity	Traditional office (n = 88)	2.70	.47
	HO (n = 113)	3.09	.58
Working Conditions	Traditional office (n = 88)	2.72	.55
	HO (n = 113)	3.25	.49
Organization and Performance	Traditional office (n = 88)	2.64	.52
	HO (n = 113)	2.97	.56
Development	Traditional office (n = 88)	2.53	.44
	HO (n = 113)	3.01	.71
Pay	Traditional office (n = 88)	2.56	.58
	HO (n = 113)	3.12	.63
	Traditional office (n = 88)	2.61	.61

Descriptive mean differences related to home office conditions (communication, workspace, technical equipment, childcare arrangements), prior experience with home office before the pandemic, and household composition (children, additional employees in the household) as well as subgroup means are reported for transparency in the Appendix B.

3.4. Hypothesis Testing

3.4.1. Differences in Job Satisfaction by Work Location

To test Hypothesis 1, a one-way analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was conducted to examine differences in job satisfaction between employees working predominantly from home and those working predominantly at a traditional office location while controlling for age and the Big Five personality traits. Assumptions for ANCOVA were met, with no severe violations detected.

Results showed a significant main effect of work location on overall job satisfaction. Employees working predominantly from home reported significantly higher job satisfaction than employees working predominantly at a traditional office location, even after controlling for age and personality traits, $F(1, 193) = 69.79$, $p < .001$, with a large effect size (partial $\eta^2 = .27$).

Table 2. ANCOVA testing differences in Job Satisfaction controlling for Big Five and Age.

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig. p	Partial η^2
Corrected Model	14.48[a]	7	2.07	12.64	<.001	= .31
Intercept	15.37	1	15.37	93.96	<.001	=.33
Extraversion	5.79E-5	1	5.79E-5	.00	= .99	=.00
Agreeableness	.03	1	.03	.21	= .65	=.00
Conscientiousness	1.10	1	1.10	6.73	= .01	=.03
Neuroticism	.13	1	.13	.79	= .37	=.00
Openness	.06	1	.06	.36	= .55	=.00
Age	.17	1	.17	1.06	= .31	=.01

 doi:10.20944/preprints202602.0385.v1

HO	11.42	1	11.42	69.79	<.001	=.27
Error	31.57	193	.16			
Total	1769.91	201				
Corrected Total	46.05	200				

Note. *R*-squared = .314 (corrected *R*-squared = .290) .

To further examine this effect across job satisfaction facets, independent-samples t-tests were conducted. Results indicated that employees working predominantly from home reported significantly higher satisfaction across all seven job satisfaction subscales, with medium to large effect sizes.

Table 3. t-Test results for Subscales of Job Satisfaction (HO vs. traditional office).

Subscale	**Equal variances assumed**	**Levene's Test**		***t*-Test**		
		F	Sig. *p*	*T*	*df*	Sig. 2-tailed
Colleagues	yes	.01	$p = .94$	$t = 9.42$	199	< .001
Supervisor	yes	1.27	$p = .26$	$t = 8.45$	199	< .001
Activity	yes	1.26	$p = .26$	$t = 4.57$	199	< .001
Working Conditions	yes	.09	$p = .76$	$t = 8.43$	199	< .001
Org. & Performance	no	13.45	$p < .001$	$t = 6.29$	199	< .001
Development	no	4.02	$p = .05$	$t = 4.93$	199	< .001
Pay	yes	.06	$p = .81$	$t = 5.72$	199	< .001

3.4.2. Group Differences in the Home Office

Hypothesis 4a examined whether employees working from home with children reported lower job satisfaction than those without children. Independent-samples t-tests revealed no significant difference in overall job satisfaction. However, a significant difference was observed on the Working Conditions subscale, with employees with children reporting lower satisfaction, indicating partial support limited to this specific facet.

Hypothesis 5 addressed whether the presence of additional employees working in the same home office affected job satisfaction. No significant differences were found for overall job satisfaction or any subscale, leading to rejection of Hypothesis 5.

Hypothesis 6 examined gender differences in job satisfaction among employees working from home. Male employees reported significantly higher overall job satisfaction than female employees. Significant gender differences were also observed for the subscales Activity, Organization, and Performance, Development, and Pay, with small to medium effect sizes.

Table 4. t-Test for Job Satisfaction and subscales (male/ female).

Dimenion	Equal variances assumed	Levene's Test		*t*-Test		
		F	Sig.	*T*	*df*	Sig. 2-tailed

 doi:10.20944/preprints202602.0385.v1

Job Satisfaction	no	1.78	= .19	t = 2.31	68,15	= .02
Activity	no	.38	= .54	t = 2.30	84.82	= .02
Org. & Performance	no	1.75	= .19	t = 1.91	70.39	= .06
Development	no	1.95	= .17	t = 3.44	98	= .00
Pay	no	.08	= .78	t = 2.40	84.89	= .02

3.4.3. Correlational Analyses

Pearson correlations were used to test Hypotheses 2 and 3. Functioning means of communication, a quiet and secluded workspace, and sufficient technical equipment in the home office were all significantly and positively associated with overall job satisfaction. These results supported Hypotheses 2a, 2b, and 2c, although associations varied in magnitude across subscales.

Additionally, prior experience with working from home before the pandemic showed a small but significant positive association with overall job satisfaction, supporting Hypothesis 3.

Table 5. Pearson product-moment correlation for the ABB and workplace characteristics/ experience of the employees in the HO.

		JS	**C**	**S**	**A**	**WC**	**O**	**D**	**P**
Functioning means of communication	r	.50**	.50**	.44**	.45**	.55**	.28**	.30**	.19**
	n	113	113	113	113	113	113	113	113
Quiet, secluded workspace	r	.29**	.24**	.27**	.32**	.38**	.18	.20*	.00
	n	112	112	112	112	112	112	112	112
Necessary technical equipment	r	.44**	.37**	.38**	.44**	.48**	.20*	.33**	.17
	n	113	113	113	113	113	113	113	113
Working at the HO before the Pandemic	r	.19**	.18	.23*	.19*	.08	.14	.11	.10
	n	113	113	113	113	113	113	113	113

Note. *p < .05 (2-tailed); **p < .01 (2-tailed); JS = Job Satisfaction; C = Colleagues; S= Supervisor; A = Activity; WC = Working Conditions; OP = Organization and Performance; D = Development; P = Pay.

To test Hypothesis 4b, Spearman's rank correlations were conducted due to non-normality and small sample size. Results revealed strong positive associations between sufficient childcare arrangements and overall job satisfaction as well as all job satisfaction subscales, indicating strong support for Hypothesis 4b.

Table 6. Spearman's rank correlation for the ABB and childcare arrangements in the HO.

		JS	C	S	A	WC	O	D	P
Sufficient childcare arrangements	ρ	.72**	.81**	.69**	.83**	.78**	.60**	.72**	.53**
	n	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27

Note. **p < .01 (2-tailed); JS = Job Satisfaction; C = Colleagues; S= Supervisor; A = Activity; WC = Working Conditions; OP = Organization and Performance; D = Development; P = Pay.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202602.0385.v1

4. Discussion

4.1. Summary of Key Findings

This study investigated the relationship between predominantly working from home (home office; HO) and job satisfaction, with a specific focus on workplace characteristics, prior experience with HO, household context, and gender differences. Overall, the findings provide strong empirical support for a positive association between HO and job satisfaction. Employees working predominantly from home reported significantly higher overall job satisfaction than employees working predominantly in a traditional office setting. This effect was robust across all job satisfaction subscales and remained stable when controlling for personality traits and age.

Beyond the work location, several contextual factors in the home office environment were associated with job satisfaction. Functioning communication tools, adequate technical equipment, and access to a quiet and secluded workspace were positively related to job satisfaction. In addition, prior experience working from home before the COVID-19 pandemic was associated with higher job satisfaction. Gender differences emerged, with women working from home reporting lower job satisfaction than men. In contrast, the presence of children or additional working household members did not have a substantial adverse effect on overall job satisfaction.

4.2. Interpretation in Relation to Previous Research

The finding that employees working predominantly from home report higher job satisfaction is consistent with a broad body of research highlighting the benefits of flexible work arrangements [3,4,15]. Significantly, the present study extends previous findings by demonstrating that this positive effect is not limited to overall job satisfaction but applies across multiple facets, including satisfaction with colleagues, supervisors, work activities, and working conditions.

Contrary to earlier concerns that working from home may reduce social interaction and foster isolation [5], employees in the home office reported higher satisfaction with colleagues than their counterparts in traditional office settings. This deviation from earlier findings may be explained by a non-linear relationship between the extent of home office use and job satisfaction [7,8]. The present study focused on employees who predominantly work either from home or in the office, but did not examine extreme or exclusive home-office arrangements. It is therefore plausible that moderate or dominant, but not exclusive, home office use fosters autonomy and satisfaction without inducing social isolation.

Workplace characteristics in the home office emerged as relevant, albeit with small to moderate effect sizes. Functioning communication tools showed the strongest associations with job satisfaction, underscoring the importance of social and task-related connectivity in remote work contexts. The weaker or non-significant associations with pay and organizational performance are unsurprising, as these dimensions are determined mainly by contractual and organizational structures rather than by individual workplace conditions. Overall, the findings align with prior research emphasizing the role of adequate infrastructure and communication in remote work success [9,10,16].

Experience with working from home before the pandemic showed only a small association with job satisfaction. This limited effect may reflect the unique context of the COVID-19 pandemic, during which many employees were forced to adapt to remote work regardless of prior experience. By the time of data collection, most employees may already have developed sufficient routines and competencies to work effectively from home, particularly given the relatively young sample and its high level of digital familiarity.

4.3. Household Context and Gender Differences

The absence of substantial differences in job satisfaction between employees with and without children or additional working household members contrasts with earlier research suggesting that household distractions have adverse effects on work outcomes [9,17]. One explanation may be the

 doi:10.20944/preprints202602.0385.v1

easing of pandemic-related restrictions at the time of data collection, including the reopening of childcare facilities, which may have mitigated the disruptive effects previously observed during lockdown phases. Notably, however, sufficient childcare arrangements were strongly associated with higher job satisfaction among employees with children, highlighting that it is not parenthood per se but the availability of supportive structures that matters.

Gender differences in job satisfaction were evident: women reported lower job satisfaction than men when working from home. This finding is consistent with research indicating that women tend to assume a larger share of unpaid household and childcare responsibilities, particularly in remote work contexts [12,18]. Although the observed effects were minor, they suggest that home office arrangements may exacerbate existing gender inequalities rather than neutralize them, especially in the absence of adequate organizational and societal support.

4.4. Theoretical Implications

From a theoretical perspective, the findings support models emphasizing autonomy, flexibility, and resource availability as key mechanisms linking work arrangements to job satisfaction. The results are compatible with job design and job demands–resources frameworks, suggesting that home office work can enhance job satisfaction when it increases perceived control and reduces unnecessary constraints, provided that sufficient resources (e.g., communication tools, technical equipment) are available.

Moreover, the findings highlight the importance of contextual and boundary conditions. Home office work does not uniformly increase job satisfaction; instead, its effects depend on individual, organizational, and household-level factors. This underscores the need for more nuanced theoretical models that account for variability in remote work experiences.

4.5. Practical Implications

The results offer several practical implications for organizations. First, providing employees with the option to work from home appears to be a viable strategy for enhancing job satisfaction. However, home office arrangements should be offered as a choice rather than imposed, as excessive or mandatory remote work may undermine satisfaction over time.

Second, organizations should invest in reliable communication tools, adequate technical equipment, and explicit availability norms to support effective collaboration in remote settings. Third, targeted support for employees with caregiving responsibilities—such as flexible working hours, childcare support, or partnerships with external childcare providers—may help reduce gender disparities in job satisfaction.

Finally, organizations should actively monitor employees' experiences with remote work through regular feedback mechanisms and adapt their policies accordingly.

4.6. Limitations and Future Research

Several limitations should be acknowledged. The study employed a cross-sectional design, precluding causal conclusions. Longitudinal studies would be valuable for examining how job satisfaction evolves as employees transition into or out of home-office arrangements. In addition, the sample was relatively young and based on convenience sampling, limiting generalizability.

Future research should explore curvilinear effects of home office intensity, differentiate between voluntary and involuntary remote work, and examine industry-specific and cross-cultural differences. Furthermore, daily-level or experience-sampling approaches could shed light on within-person fluctuations in job satisfaction related to remote work dynamics.

5. Conclusions

In conclusion, this study provides robust evidence that working predominantly from home is associated with higher job satisfaction than traditional office work. The findings underscore the

 doi:10.20944/preprints202602.0385.v1

importance of supportive workplace conditions, prior experience, and contextual factors such as childcare arrangements and gender roles. As remote and hybrid work models continue to shape the future of work, understanding these dynamics is essential for designing work environments that promote employee well-being and organizational effectiveness.

Author Contributions: For research articles with several authors, a short paragraph specifying their individual contributions must be provided. The following statements should be used "Conceptualization, M.H. and N.M.; methodology, M.H.; software, M.H.; validation, M.H., J.P. and N.M.; formal analysis, M.H.; investigation, M.H.; resources, N.M.; data curation, M.H.; writing—original draft preparation, M.H.; writing—review and editing, J.P.; visualization, J.P.; supervision, J.P. and N.M.; project administration, M.H.. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.".

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement: The study was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki, and approved by the Program of Psychology of Rhine-Waal University of Applied Sciences.

Informed Consent Statement: Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in the study.

Data Availability Statement: The data presented in this study are available on request from the corresponding author.

Acknowledgments: During the preparation of this manuscript, the authors used ChatGPT (OpenAI) for language editing and structural refinement. The authors reviewed and edited the output and take full responsibility for the content of this publication.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Abbreviations

The following abbreviations are used in this manuscript:

ABB	Arbeitsbeschreibungsbogen (German adaptation of the Job Descriptive Index)
BFI-10	Big Five Inventory–10
HO	Home Office
JS	Job Satisfaction
M	Mean
SD	Standard Deviation
ANCOVA	Analysis of Covariance
COVID-19	Coronavirus Disease 2019

Appendix A. Sample & Descriptive Statistics

Appendix A.1

Table A1. Descriptive statistics of the study sample.

Participants	***n***	**%**
Workplace		
predominantly HO	113	56.2
predominantly traditional office	88	43.8
Size of household		
1	39	19.4
2	76	37.8

 doi:10.20944/preprints202602.0385.v1

3	50	24.9
4	24	11.9
5	12	6.0
Employees per household		
1	63	31.3
2	112	55.7
3	22	10.9
4	4	2.0
Children per household		
0	144	71.6
1	30	14.9
2	17	8.6
3	10	5.0
Gender		
Female	118	58.7
Male	82	40.8
Diverse	1	0.5
Type of employment		
Full-time employed	128	63.7
Self-employed	9	4.5
Working student	37	18.4
Apprentice	7	3.5
Marginal employment	15	7.5
Other	5	2.5
Highest level of education		
Secondary school 1	4	2.0
Secondary school 2	9	4.5
A-level	13	5.5
Vocational training	43	21.4
Bachelor's degree	88	43.8
Master' degree	35	17.4
Doctorate	9	4.5

Note. N = 201; Secondary school 1 = *Hauptschule*; Secondary school 2 = *Realschule*.

Appendix B. Additional Analyses

Table A2. Means and standard deviations of the ABB of employees in the HO (communication/ workspace/ technical equipment/ childcare).

Scale	Variable	Value	*n*	*M*	*SD*
Job Satisfaction	Functioning means of communication	(1)	1	2.32	-
		(2)	7	2.63	.41
		(3)	47	3.03	.37
		(4)	58	3.33	.39

 doi:10.20944/preprints202602.0385.v1

	(1)	3	3.20	.47
Quiet, secluded	(2)	16	2.76	.40
workspace	(3)	31	3.17	.46
	(4)	62	3.24	.38
	(1)	0	-	-
Necessary technical	(2)	14	2.70	.41
equipment	(3)	23	3.04	.39
	(4)	76	3.27	.39
	(1)	5	2.66	.55
Sufficient childcare	(2)	6	2.42	.23
arrangements	(3)	2	2.56	.13
	(4)	14	3.58	.29

Note. The numbers indicate whether the employee is in possession of these workplace characteristics when working in the HO: *(1)* = Not at all, *(2)* = Rather not, *(3)* = Rather, *(4)* = Very.

Table A3. Means and standard deviations of the ABB of employees in the HO (Working in the HO before the Pandemic).

Scale	Variable	Value	*n*	*M*	*SD*
		(1)	56	3.10	.40
	Working in the HO	(2)	23	3.11	.44
Job	before the	(3)	18	3.11	.50
Satisfaction	Pandemic	(4)	12	3.47	.40
		(5)	4	3.27	.47

Note. The numbers indicate how often the employee worked in the HO before the Pandemic: *(1)* = Never, *(2)* = Rarely, *(3)* = Occasionally, *(4)* = Often, *(5)* = Always.

Table A4. Means and standard deviations of the ABB of employees in the HO (with(out) children/ with(out) other employees working in the same HO).

Scale	Variable	Value	M	SD
	Children in the same HO	Yes (n = 28)	3.09	.62
Job	(under 18 years)	No (n = 80)	3.15	.35
Satisfaction	Other Employees	Yes (n = 78)	3.11	.46
	working in the same HO	No (n = 35)	3.25	.36

References

1. Judge, T.A.; Bono, J.E. Relationship of Core Self-Evaluations Traits—Self-Esteem, Generalized Self-Efficacy, Locus of Control, and Emotional Stability—with Job Satisfaction and Job Performance: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology* **2001**, *86*, 80–92, doi:10.1037/0021-9010.86.1.80.
2. Judge, T.A.; Weiss, H.M.; Kammeyer-Mueller, J.D.; Hulin, C.L. Job Attitudes, Job Satisfaction, and Job Affect: A Century of Continuity and of Change. *Journal of Applied Psychology* **2017**, *102*, 356–374, doi:10.1037/apl0000181.
3. Gajendran, R.S.; Harrison, D.A. The Good, the Bad, and the Unknown about Telecommuting: Meta-Analysis of Psychological Mediators and Individual Consequences. *Journal of Applied Psychology* **2007**, *92*, 1524–1541, doi:10.1037/0021-9010.92.6.1524.

4. Felstead, A.; Henseke, G. Assessing the Growth of Remote Working and Its Consequences for Effort, Well-being and Work-life Balance. *New Technol Work Employ* **2017**, *32*, 195–212, doi:10.1111/ntwe.12097.
5. Cooper, C.D.; Kurland, N.B. Telecommuting, Professional Isolation, and Employee Development in Public and Private Organizations. *J Organ Behavior* **2002**, *23*, 511–532, doi:10.1002/job.145.
6. Morganson, V.J.; Major, D.A.; Oborn, K.L.; Verive, J.M.; Heelan, M.P. Comparing Telework Locations and Traditional Work Arrangements: Differences in Work-life Balance Support, Job Satisfaction, and Inclusion. *Journal of Managerial Psychology* **2010**, *25*, 578–595, doi:10.1108/02683941011056941.
7. Golden, T.D.; Veiga, J.F. The Impact of Extent of Telecommuting on Job Satisfaction: Resolving Inconsistent Findings. *Journal of Management* **2005**, *31*, 301–318, doi:10.1177/0149206304271768.
8. Virick, M.; DaSilva, N.; Arrington, K. Moderators of the Curvilinear Relation between Extent of Telecommuting and Job and Life Satisfaction: The Role of Performance Outcome Orientation and Worker Type. *Human Relations* **2010**, *63*, 137–154, doi:10.1177/0018726709349198.
9. Lee, S.Y.; Brand, J.L. Effects of Control over Office Workspace on Perceptions of the Work Environment and Work Outcomes. *Journal of Environmental Psychology* **2005**, *25*, 323–333, doi:10.1016/j.jenvp.2005.08.001.
10. Smith, S.A.; Patmos, A.; Pitts, M.J. Communication and Teleworking: A Study of Communication Channel Satisfaction, Personality, and Job Satisfaction for Teleworking Employees. *International Journal of Business Communication* **2018**, *55*, 44–68, doi:10.1177/2329488415589101.
11. Torten, R.; Reaiche, C.; Caraballo, Ervin.L. Teleworking in the New Milleneum. *The Journal of Developing Areas* **2016**, *50*, 317–326, doi:10.1353/jda.2016.0060.
12. Geist, C. Chapter Eleven. Men's and Women's Reports about Housework. In *Dividing the Domestic*; Treas, J., Drobnič, S., Eds.; Stanford University Press, 2020; pp. 217–240 ISBN 978-0-8047-7374-4.
13. Neuberger, O.; Allerbeck, M. Arbeitszufriedenheit. *Zusammenstellung sozialwissenschaftlicher Items und Skalen (ZIS)* **1997**, doi:10.6102/ZIS2.
14. Rammstedt, B.; Kemper, C.J.; Klein, M.C.; Beierlein, C.; Kovaleva, A. Big Five Inventory (BFI-10). *Zusammenstellung sozialwissenschaftlicher Items und Skalen (ZIS)* **2014**, doi:10.6102/ZIS76.
15. Kelliher, C.; Anderson, D. Doing More with Less? Flexible Working Practices and the Intensification of Work. *Human Relations* **2010**, *63*, 83–106, doi:10.1177/0018726709349199.
16. Mello, J.A. Managing Telework Programs Effectively. *Employ Respons Rights J* **2007**, *19*, 247–261, doi:10.1007/s10672-007-9051-1.
17. Ipsen, C.; Van Veldhoven, M.; Kirchner, K.; Hansen, J.P. Six Key Advantages and Disadvantages of Working from Home in Europe during COVID-19. *IJERPH* **2021**, *18*, 1826, doi:10.3390/ijerph18041826.
18. Blum, Sonja; Dobrotic, Ivana Die Kita- und Schulschließungen in der COVID-19-Pandemie. In; Waxmann, 2021.