Supplementary online appendices

## Appendix A. Additional tables and figures

Table SA1. The Big Five dimensions and facets

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Big Five dimension | Definition | Facets (and correlated trait adjective) |
| Conscientiousness | The tendency to be organized, responsible and hardworking. | Competence (efficient)  Order (organized)  Dutifulness (not careless) Achievement striving (ambitious)  Self-discipline (not lazy) Deliberation (not impulsive) |
| Extraversion | An orientation of one’s interests and energies towards the outer world of people and things rather than the inner world of subjective experience, characterized by positive affect and sociability. | Warmth (friendly)  Gregariousness (sociable) Assertiveness (self-confident) Activity (energetic)  Excitement seeking (adventurous)  Positive emotions (enthusiastic) |
| Openness to experience | The tendency to be open to new aesthetic, cultural or intellectual experiences. | Fantasy (imaginative)  Aesthetic (artistic)  Feelings (excitable)  Actions (wide interests)  Ideas (curious)  Values (unconventional) |
| Agreeableness | The tendency to act in a cooperative, unselfish manner. | Trust (forgiving) Straightforwardness (not demanding)  Altruism (warm)  Compliance (not stubborn)  Modesty (not show-off)  Tender-mindedness (sympathetic) |
| Emotional stability/Neuroticism | Emotional stability: predictability and consistency in emotional reactions, with absence of rapid mood changes. Neuroticism: a chronic level of emotional instability and proneness to psychological distress. | Anxiety (worrying)  Hostility (irritable)  Depression (not contented)  Self-consciousness (shy) Impulsiveness (moody) Vulnerability to stress (not self-confident) |

Source: Definitions are drawn from the APA Dictionary of Psychology. Table adapted from Almlund et al. (2011).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Disagree strongly | Disagree moderately | Disagree a little | Neither agree nor disagree | Agree a little | Agree moderately | Agree strongly |
| I see myself as: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 1. Extraverted, enthusiastic. |  | | | | | | |
| 2. Critical, quarrelsome. |  | | | | | | |
| 3. Dependable, self-disciplined. |  | | | | | | |
| 4. Anxious, easily upset. |  | | | | | | |
| 5. Open to new experiences, complex. |  | | | | | | |
| 6. Reserved, quiet. |  | | | | | | |
| 7. Sympathetic, warm. |  | | | | | | |
| 8. Disorganized, careless. |  | | | | | | |
| 9. Calm, emotionally stable. |  | | | | | | |
| 10. Conventional, uncreative. |  | | | | | | |

Table SA2. Ten-item personality inventory

Notes: TIPI scale scoring (“R” denotes reverse-scored items): Extraversion = 1, 6R; Agreeableness = 2R, 7; Conscientiousness = 3, 8R; Emotional stability = 4R, 9; Openness to experience = 5, 10R.

Source: Gosling, Rentfrow and Swann (2003).

Table SA3. Relative productivity of WFH, preferred mode of work post-pandemic

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Are you more productive* *when working…* | Preferred mode of work post-pandemic | | | | | |
| In office | No difference | | From home | | Total |
| In office | 0.821 | 0.430 | | 0.164 | | 0.367 |
| No difference | 0.134 | 0.501 | | 0.376 | | 0.323 |
| From home | 0.045 | 0.069 | | 0.460 | | 0.310 |
| Total | 1.000 | 1.000 | | 1.000 | | 1.000 |
| T |  | |  | |  | |

Notes:This table provides the joint distribution between self-reported relative productivity and the preferred mode of working post-pandemic. It reads as follows: among respondents preferring to WFO after the pandemic, 82.1 per cent report a higher productivity in office than at home.

Source: Our own calculations based on our survey data.

Table SA4. Correlation between personality traits

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Extraversion | Agreeableness | Conscientiousness | Emotional stability | Openness to experience |
| Extraversion | 1.000 |  |  |  |  |
| Agreeableness | 0.136 | 1.000 |  |  |  |
| Conscientiousness | 0.094 | 0.286 | 1.000 |  |  |
| Emotional stability | 0.106 | 0.204 | 0.229 | 1.000 |  |
| Openness to experience | 0.340 | 0.133 | 0.117 | 0.128 | 1.000 |

Notes*:*  *N* = 1,704. All correlations are significant at the 1 per cent level.

Source: Our own calculations based on our survey data.

Table SA5. Ordered logit regression results: Children in the household and WFH duration

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Dependent variable | Productivity | | | Preference for WFH | | | | |
|  | Coefficient | Marginal effects | | Coefficient | Marginal effects | | | |
|  |  | Higher in office | Higher from home |  | | Prefers in office | Prefers from home | |
| Children below 18 in the household (vs none) |  |  |  |  | |  |  | |
| 1–2 | –0.327\*\*\* | 0.066\*\*\* | –0.060\*\*\* | –0.204 | | 0.033 | –0.038 | |
|  | (0.119) | (0.024) | (0.022) | (0.138) | | (0.022) | (0.025) | |
| 3+ | –0.565\*\* | 0.116\*\* | –0.100\*\* | –0.490\* | | 0.082\* | –0.092\* | |
|  | (0.262) | (0.055) | (0.042) | (0.267) | | (0.047) | (0.051) | |
| WFH duration |  |  |  |  | |  |  | |
| (vs > 6 months) |  |  |  |  | |  |  | |
| 1 month | –1.031\*\*\* | 0.221\*\*\* | –0.173\*\*\* | –1.376\*\*\* | | 0.252\*\*\* | –0.270\*\*\* | |
|  | (0.332) | (0.073) | (0.045) | (0.301) | | (0.060) | (0.059) | |
| 2–3 months | –0.887\*\*\* | 0.189\*\*\* | –0.154\*\*\* | –0.790\*\*\* | | 0.136\*\*\* | –0.154\*\*\* | |
|  | (0.169) | (0.037) | (0.026) | (0.183) | | (0.034) | (0.037) | |
| 4–6 months | –0.446\*\*\* | 0.092\*\*\* | –0.084\*\*\* | –0.428\*\*\* | | 0.070\*\*\* | –0.081\*\*\* | |
|  | (0.137) | (0.029) | (0.022) | (0.149) | | (0.025) | (0.029) | |
| Base rates |  | 0.367 | 0.310 |  | | 0.271 | | 0.631 |
| *N* | 1 638 |  |  | 1 704 | |  | |  |

\*, \*\* and \*\*\* indicate statistical significance at the 10, 5 and 1 per cent levels, respectively.

Notes:Three-category ordered logit estimates. Marginal effects (averaged across the estimation sample) show the change in predicted probabilities: for the given duration of WFH compared with otherwise similar workers experiencing WFH for more than six months; for the given number of children compared with otherwise similar workers without children. Other controls: personality traits; commuting to the office (time and cost); age, gender and family status (three categories); native language; educational attainment (six categories); dummy for living in a detached house; job characteristics: NACE classification (ten categories), supervisory position, pre-COVID experience of WFH and cross-border teleworking. Robust standard errors appear in parentheses.

Source: Our own calculations based on our survey data.

Figure SA1. Self-reported relative productivity, by quartile of conscientiousness

Notes: This figure displays the share of respondents reporting to be more productive at home/in office by quartile of conscientiousness. Quartiles are approximate, since the scale of conscientiousness is discrete.

Source: Our own calculations based on our survey data.

## Appendix B. Analysis of the reservation value associated with WFH: Technical details

In the survey, respondents whose preferred mode of work after the pandemic was “at home” (or “mostly at home”) were asked “By how much would your monthly pay need to go up to make you choose working in office?”Of these respondents, 574 quoted some amount (which we interpret as the reservation *value for leaving WFH*,or the subjective *value of WFH*), but 506 chose the answer “I would in any case choose to work at home”, thus formally stating an “infinite” value of WFH. Plausibly, the value they assign to WFH is simply larger than any realistic wage premium their employers can offer.

Similarly, the respondents whose preferred mode of work after the pandemic was “in office” or “mostly in office” were asked “By how much should your monthly pay go up to make you choose working from home?” Among them, 288 respondents quoted their *value* for WFO; for this group, we set = − . On the other hand, 191 respondents answered: “I would in any case choose to work in office”, thus formally revealing an “infinite” (hence, ). Lastly, we assign = 0 for respondents indifferent between WFH or WFO ().

To sum up, the value of WFH is a specific number for 574 + 288 + 169 = 1,031 respondents, while it is “infinite” for 506 + 191 = 697 respondents. After excluding 30 observations with missing values for personality traits or other important variables, the working sample includes 1,698 respondents. To account for censoring (the cases with an infinite subjective value for WFH), we apply two approaches: (i) winsorization; and (ii) interval regression. Irrespective of the approach, for the econometric analysis of the covariates of the subjective value of WFH, we use a log-transform of : if ; if ; and if . Note that all values of are integers, and our transformation does not distinguish from (in fact, there are just two cases with ).

1. ***Winsorization***. For the respondents with a positive “infinite” value for WFH, we assume that equals the 99th percentile of the reported , which is €2,000 per month. Similarly, for the respondents with a positive “infinite” value for WFO, we set at €2,000 per month. Given that the average net monthly wage for a full-time worker in Latvia in 2021 was €939, a wage premium exceeding €2,000 per month for changing the mode of work seems indeed unrealistic for most workers. Winsorized values of are realistic[[1]](#footnote-1) and available for all 1,698 respondents from the working sample.
2. ***Interval regression****.* We implement *interval regression* (Wooldrige 2002, section 15.2) assuming an unknown between and (−€10,000 and −€2,000) per month for the respondents with a positive “infinite” value for WFH (WFO). Outliers with per month or per month are treated in the same way. According to administrative data,[[2]](#footnote-2) average gross monthly earnings in 2021 exceeded €3,000 for 5.3 per cent of Latvia’s employees, while just 0.8 per cent earned more than €6,000. This suggests that, for a non-negligible group of workers, the subjective value of WFH can exceed per month, but an upper limit of per month seems reasonable for practical purposes.
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