

FACTORS SHAPING ATTITUDES TOWARDS REMOTE WORK IN THE CZECH REPUBLIC

ONDŘEJ DVOULETÝ¹ - MARKO OREL² - DANA HAGUE³
- DAVID ANTHONY PROCHÁZKA⁴ - SOFIYA ZEMLYANSKAYA⁵

Abstract: *The COVID-19 pandemic has accelerated remote work adoption globally, prompting an investigation into factors influencing employees' work arrangement preferences. This study examines remote work preferences among employees in remote-friendly companies in the Czech Republic, with particular focus on employment status - an understudied yet significant predictor. Drawing on data from an online survey of 227 respondents conducted in 2024, we employed descriptive statistics and regression analysis to investigate factors shaping remote work preferences. Our findings reveal that full-time employees demonstrate a significantly stronger inclination toward remote work than their part-time counterparts, while demographic factors such as age and gender show no statistically significant effects. The study provides nuanced insights into the motivations for and barriers to remote work adoption, including considerations of work-life balance and productivity. These findings contribute to Human Resource Development (HRD) theory and practice by challenging conventional assumptions about remote work preferences in post-socialist economies, such as the Czech Republic, and by providing evidence-based insights for organizations developing flexible work policies. The results suggest that employment status, rather than previously emphasized generational or gender differences, may be a more crucial factor in shaping remote work preferences within the Czech context.*

Keywords: *remote work, workplace, generation Z, millennial, the Czech Republic*

JEL Classification: J20, J22

¹Ondřej Dvouletý, School of Business and IT, University of New York in Prague, Czech Republic, e-mail: odvoulety@unyp.cz  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9151-2033>

² Marko Orel, Department of Entrepreneurship, Prague University of Economics and Business, Czech Republic, email: marko.orel@vse.cz  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1931-7310>

³ Dana Hague, School of Business and IT, University of New York in Prague, Czech Republic, e-mail: dhague@unyp.cz  <https://orcid.org/0009-0005-1167-1349>

⁴ David Anthony Procházka, School of Business and IT, University of New York in Prague, Czech Republic, e-mail: dprochazka@unyp.cz  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1007-8907>

⁵ Sofiya Zemlyanskaya, School of Business and IT, University of New York in Prague, Czech Republic, e-mail: xzemlyanskayas@student.unyp.cz

1 Introduction

"I had enormous freedom to work whenever and on whatever I wanted. I sometimes even worked seven days a week, but my own boss urged me to take a break. I didn't care. That was how much I loved my work."

Vlach (2022, p. 14)

Workplace trends have changed vastly in recent years, with remote work becoming more common. This shift has been dramatically accelerated by the COVID-19 pandemic, catalyzing what some scholars term as "digitalization comparable to the introduction of electricity" (Björkdahl & Kronblad, 2021; Janikovičová et al., 2026), seeing the "new normal" (Bonacini et al., 2021) and "uncharted territory for remote work" (Shirmohammadi et al., 2022). The pandemic has forced many organizations to rapidly adopt remote work practices, leading to significant changes in how and where work is conducted. Czech author Robert Vlach, known for his work promoting work flexibility and popularization of remote work practices, encapsulates this shift in his observation from the opening quote. This sentiment reflects the growing desire for autonomy and flexibility in the modern workplace. In the Czech Republic, this shift was particularly notable. Prior to the pandemic, remote work was relatively uncommon in the country. However, as Sladká & Kreidl (2022) report, the pandemic led to a substantial increase in remote work adoption, with many Czech employees experiencing this work arrangement for the first time. This is a rather swift (and swingy – if we note that 'swinging' back and forth, the home office during the initial waves of the pandemic) transition has not only reshaped organizational practices but also employee expectations, highlighting the need for a deeper understanding of remote work dynamics in diverse economic contexts.

Understanding the factors that influence remote work preferences is settling for several reasons. First, it allows organizations to develop more effective and inclusive remote work policies, potentially improving employee satisfaction, productivity, and retention (Choudhury et al., 2021; Antonacopoulou & Georgiadou, 2021; Rajeev et al., 2025). Second, it provides insights into the changing nature of work, helping policymakers and business leaders anticipate and respond to future workforce trends (Wang et al., 2021; Chatterjee et al., 2022; Sýkorová et al., 2024; Shannaq, 2025). Third, in the context of post-

socialist economies like the Czech Republic, understanding remote work preferences can elucidate how digital transformation interacts with existing labor market structures and cultural norms (Kogus et al., 2022; Lee et al., 2025; Vyhlídal, 2025). Moreover, while extensive research has been conducted on remote work preferences in Western contexts (e.g., Braesemann et al., 2022; Yang et al., 2022; Emanuel & Harrington, 2024), there remains a notable gap in understanding these dynamics in Central and Eastern European countries. This gap is particularly notable given the unique economic and cultural factors that may influence work preferences in these regions, such as the legacy of socialist work cultures and ongoing economic transitions. Furthermore, as Bočková & Lajčín (2021) and Sladká & Kreidl (2022) highlight in their studies of Czech workers during the pandemic, remote work can significantly affect work-family conflicts and partnership quality, underscoring the importance of understanding these preferences in their broader societal context.

With the latter in mind, this study examines the determinants of remote work preferences among employees in remote-friendly companies in the Czech Republic, with a particular focus on employment status. This focus is warranted for several reasons. First, while existing research has extensively examined demographic factors like age (Calk & Patrick, 2017) and gender (Chung & Van der Lippe, 2020) in remote work preferences, the role of employment status remains understudied (Spagnoli et al., 2020). Second, employment status significantly shapes work experiences and organizational commitment (Biron et al., 2023), yet its influence on remote work preferences remains poorly understood, particularly in post-socialist economies. Third, as organizations increasingly offer both full-time and part-time remote arrangements (Shirmohammadi et al., 2022), understanding how employment status affects remote work preferences becomes crucial for effective policy development. Our primary hypothesis is that full-time employees in the Czech Republic are more likely to prefer remote work than their part-time counterparts, building on Spagnoli et al.'s (2020) findings that full-time employees exhibit distinct patterns of remote work adaptation. This hypothesis challenges prevailing assumptions about flexible work arrangements and aims to provide insights specific to the Czech labor market.

Our study makes several distinct contributions to the expanding literature on flexible work arrangements. First (i), it provides empirical evidence from a post-socialist economy, offering a valuable comparison to existing studies primarily

focused on Western contexts (Yang et al., 2022; Emanuel & Harrington, 2024). Second (ii), it sheds critical light on the relationship between employment status and remote work preferences, responding to calls for research examining how different employment arrangements influence remote work adoption (Spagnoli et al., 2020; Biron et al., 2023). Third (iii), by focusing on the Czech Republic, this research advances our understanding of how employment status intersects with remote work preferences in transitional economies, where organizational practices and work cultures differ significantly from Western contexts (Kogus et al., 2022; Barczyk et al., 2022). Through a combination of descriptive statistics and regression analysis, our study challenges existing narratives about remote work preferences while emphasizing the importance of context-specific research in organizational behavior and human resource management. This approach provides valuable insights for both scholars studying flexible work arrangements and practitioners developing remote work policies in post-socialist economies.

2 Literature Review

2.1 On Remote Work

Remote work refers to arrangements in which employees and professionals perform their duties from locations other than traditional centralized workplaces (Allen et al., 2015; Gajendran & Harrison, 2007; Orel & Dvoutěý, 2020). Recent research has highlighted additional complexities in remote work adoption, including concerns about career progression and promotion prospects (Bloom et al., 2015), which were further amplified during the COVID-19 pandemic (Craig & Churchill, 2021). For this study, we define remote work broadly as the practice of performing regular work duties outside the traditional workplace for any portion of the weekly schedule (≥ 0.5 days per week), whether from home or another location, while maintaining primary communication through digital means. This includes both technology-enabled home-based work and location-independent professionals such as field engineers, consultants, and sales representatives who have historically operated outside traditional office settings (see Felstead & Blakely, 2005; Messenger & Gschwing, 2016; Leonardi et al., 2024).

This definition deliberately extends beyond traditional concepts of 'telework' or 'telecommuting' to acknowledge diverse manifestations of remote work

across professions and industries. While early remote work research focused primarily on home-based telework (Nilles, 1975), contemporary understanding recognizes a spectrum of remote work arrangements, from occasional remote days to fully distributed teams, with each format presenting distinct challenges for career development and advancement opportunities (Bloom et al., 2015).

The evolution of remote work has been shaped by technological advancement and changing workplace paradigms (Baruch, 2000; Bailey & Kurland, 2002). Initially conceived in the 1970s as a solution to traffic congestion and energy consumption concerns, remote work has transformed through several technological epochs: the personal computer revolution of the 1980s, internet adoption in the 1990s, and recent innovations in cloud computing, video conferencing, and collaborative platforms (Pérez et al., 2002; Felstead & Henseke, 2017; Wang et al., 2021).

This technological progression has coincided with the rise of knowledge-based work, which often does not require physical presence (Pyöriä, 2011; Ojala et al., 2014; Junicke et al., 2025). The COVID-19 pandemic accelerated this transformation, compelling organizations to rapidly implement remote work policies while raising new questions about gender equity and work-life balance in remote settings (Craig & Churchill, 2021; Banjo et al., 2020; Waizenegger et al., 2020). This shift has elevated remote work from an occasional arrangement to a strategic operational model for many organizations, offering benefits such as enhanced productivity, reduced overhead costs, access to global talent, and improved work-life balance (Golden & Gajendran, 2019; Shirmohammadi et al., 2022).

However, organizations implementing remote work face significant challenges, including maintaining organizational culture, ensuring effective communication and productivity, managing dispersed teams, addressing worker isolation, and ensuring equitable career progression opportunities (Bartel et al., 2012; Collins et al., 2016; Rockmann & Pratt, 2015). These challenges vary across cultural and economic contexts, necessitating research in diverse geographical settings, such as the Czech Republic, to understand how remote work manifests in different environments (Charalampous et al., 2019; Kirchner et al., 2021).

2.2 Factors Influencing Remote Work Preferences

Factors such as demographics, occupation, personality, and company culture all play a role in shaping people's choices about remote work. Demographic factors, such as age, gender, and family status, have been extensively studied in relation to remote work preferences. Age-related differences in remote work preferences have been observed, with some studies suggesting that younger workers, particularly millennials and Generation Z, show a stronger inclination towards flexible work arrangements, including remote work (Calk & Patrick, 2017; Ozcelik & Barsade, 2018; Orel et al., 2021; Pospisil & Sabolovic, 2025; Tímea et al., 2025). Katz et al. (2022, 75) noted in this context that *"...(the) generation really highly value flexibility. Flexibility of identity, the flexibility of movement, the flexibility of transactions, the flexibility of time"*. However, other research indicates that older workers may also value remote work opportunities, especially as a means to extend their careers (Moen et al., 2016; Richardson et al., 2020).

Gender has been found to play a role in remote work preferences, with some studies indicating that women, particularly those with caregiving responsibilities, may have a stronger preference for remote work due to its potential for better work-family balance (Chung & Van der Lippe, 2020). Family status, including the presence of children or other dependents, has been consistently associated with a higher preference for remote work options (Kaduk et al., 2019). Job-related factors also significantly influence remote work preferences. Employment status (i.e., full-time vs. part-time) has been linked to differing remote work preferences, with full-time employees often showing a stronger inclination towards remote work (e.g., Spagnoli et al., 2020). Job type and industry sector play crucial roles, with knowledge-based and information-intensive jobs being more amenable to remote work arrangements (Felstead & Henseke, 2017). Certain industries, such as technology and professional services, have shown a higher propensity for remote work adoption and preference.

Personal factors, including personality traits and individual work style preferences, exert a substantial influence on remote work preferences. Research has explored the role of the Big Five personality traits in shaping remote work preferences and outcomes (see Mammadov, 2022). For instance, individuals high in conscientiousness and low in extraversion have been found to adapt

more readily to remote work environments (Clark et al., 2012; Seddigh et al., 2016). Work style preferences, such as the need for autonomy or preference for structured environments, also play a significant role in determining remote work preferences (Adekoya et al., 2022). What is more, an individual's self-efficacy in managing remote work tasks and technology has been identified as a key factor influencing remote work preferences and success (Biron et al., 2023).

Organizational factors constitute a fundamental framework within which remote work practices are conceived, implemented, and sustained. Contemporary research has established that organizational cultures emphasizing trust, autonomy, and results-oriented performance management significantly influence employee attitudes toward remote work arrangements (Greer & Payne, 2014; Kaplan et al., 2018). The operationalization of remote work necessitates a comprehensive organizational approach that encompasses supportive policies, robust technological infrastructure, and sophisticated management practices, all of which contribute to employee satisfaction and organizational effectiveness (Gajendran et al., 2015; Shirmohammadi et al., 2022).

A particularly salient consideration in contemporary remote work discourse is the proliferation of employee monitoring technologies. Organizations increasingly implement various forms of digital surveillance mechanisms to maintain productivity metrics and ensure accountability in distributed work environments. These technological interventions range from 'rudimentary' time-tracking applications to sophisticated systems that monitor multiple dimensions of employee activity, including keyboard engagement, email communication patterns, and application utilization metrics (Charbonneau & Doberstein, 2020; Aloisi & De Stefano, 2022). However, empirical evidence suggests that extensive monitoring practices may inadvertently undermine the trust-based organizational culture that fundamentally supports successful remote work implementation. This creates a notable tension between organizational control mechanisms and employee autonomy, potentially affecting both job satisfaction and work outcomes (Vitak & Zimmer, 2023; Grisold et al., 2024).

Leadership approaches emerge as critical determinants of remote work effectiveness, with transformational leadership styles and elevated levels of

supervisor support demonstrating positive correlations with remote work satisfaction and engagement (Kelliher & de Menezes, 2019; Wang et al., 2021). Organizations that successfully facilitate remote work arrangements typically manifest three essential characteristics: workplace flexibility, temporal adaptability, and robust infrastructure capability (Chatterjee et al., 2022). However, the capacity to implement such arrangements varies significantly across organizational typologies. Large-scale service-oriented and knowledge-intensive organizations generally possess superior capabilities for supporting remote work arrangements compared to small and medium enterprises, particularly within manufacturing sectors, due to disparities in resource allocation, technological sophistication, and operational constraints. Against this backdrop, this study seeks to provide a nuanced understanding of remote work preferences within the specific context of the Czech Republic, exploring how these (global) organizational insights manifest in its historical, social, and industrial landscape.

2.3 Remote Work in the Czech Context

The adoption of remote work in the Czech Republic has been evolving, particularly in the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic. Prior to the pandemic, remote work was relatively uncommon in the Czech Republic compared to other European countries, and this persists to this day. The prevailing Czech employer-employee model remains office-based, also limited by the older Labor Code (Martínková, 2023). Under the Czech Labor Code (Act No. 262/2006 Coll.), standard full-time employment is defined as 40 hours per week, with part-time work encompassing any regular employment below this threshold. This legal framework provides the foundation for understanding employment arrangements in the Czech context. The code was modified in 2023, officially establishing rules for home working in the country. According to a recent survey reported by BusinessInfo.cz (2024), the largest business-related portal in the country, respondents still see remote work primarily as a benefit. The findings of the most recent survey, conducted in 2024 (representative survey of 18-59 population, N=322) by Předvýchěr.cz Agency, 59% of respondents considered remote work a benefit, while only 29% considered it a work-related standard. Suchánek et al. (2024) explain that Czech employers remain concerned about decreased productivity and increased distractions while working remotely, as noted in flash surveys conducted during the pandemic

(BusinessInfo.cz, 2021). This has also been reflected in the recent actions of large country-based employers, such as Amazon, which have canceled work-from-home initiatives and, as of January 2025, require an office presence for all employees in response to the decline in productivity (Hospodářské Noviny, September 2024).

On the other hand, there has been a growing trend towards digitalization and the expansion of the service sector, which has increased the potential for remote work in the Czech Republic, driven by the wider implementation of smart technologies. However, prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, remote work was relatively uncommon in the country. The pandemic acted as a catalyst for change, with Beno et al. (2023) reporting that 70% of respondents had the opportunity to work from home during the first wave, revealing complex attitudes towards remote work among Czech employees, with top motivations being an absence of commuting (47.33%), flexibility (43.33%), and fewer interruptions (26%), while challenges included difficulty separating from housework and maintaining self-discipline. Despite these apparent benefits and drawbacks, most employees in the study reported no change in their attitude towards remote work, suggesting that its widespread adoption was more necessity-driven than preference-based.

Understanding the factors that influence remote work in the Czech Republic requires consideration of two key elements, with cultural factors playing a particularly significant role. The Czech work culture has traditionally placed a high value on face-to-face interactions and physical presence in the workplace. This cultural preference for in-person work significantly shapes both employer and employee attitudes towards remote work arrangements. The latter ingrained cultural norm can act as a potential barrier to the widespread adoption of remote work practices in the Czech Republic, despite technological advancements that make such arrangements increasingly feasible (see Cravens, 2006; Kyzlinková et al., 2020; Barczyk et al., 2022; Fellegi et al., 2023). From a Human Resource Development (HRD) perspective, understanding these preferences is particularly vital as organizations navigate the complexities of remote workforce development and learning. As Shirmohammadi et al. (2022) underline, remote work fundamentally reshapes how organizations approach employee development, knowledge sharing, and career progression. Bierema (2020) further argues that the shift to remote work necessitates new HRD frameworks that can effectively support virtual learning and development.

Gold et al. (2024) argue that integrating futures and foresight learning (FFL) into HRD can strengthen the profession's impact, moving it from a traditionally "weakened" position to one that enhances organizational success through three key processes: scanning, futuring, and reconfiguring. Similarly, Bennett et al. (2021) and Donnelly and Johns (2021) highlight how remote work transformation requires HRD practitioners to reconceptualize traditional approaches to talent development and organizational learning, suggesting that the field must evolve beyond conventional practices to remain relevant in changing workplace dynamics. This is especially relevant in post-socialist economies like the Czech Republic, where HRD practices are still evolving alongside broader organizational transformations.

The second crucial factor influencing remote work adoption in the Czech Republic is the economy. Historically, the relatively lower cost of office space in the Czech Republic compared to Western European countries may have reduced companies' economic incentives to adopt remote work policies (Property Forum, 2023). This cost differential potentially made maintaining traditional office-based work more financially viable for Czech companies. However, over the past few years, this dynamic has shifted, primarily driven by increased competition for talent, especially in the IT and service sectors. In response to this competitive pressure, some companies have begun offering remote work options to attract and retain skilled employees. Interestingly, this trend has been supported by the emergence of new organizational mechanisms, such as coworking spaces. Orel et al. (2022), for example, argue that these spaces play a vital role in identifying and attracting talent while simultaneously supporting the popularization of dislocated work practices.

When comparing remote work trends across European countries, significant variations emerge in adoption rates and regulatory frameworks. Nordic countries and the Netherlands demonstrate consistently higher remote work adoption, supported by progressive policies and cultural norms (Özgüzel et al., 2023). The OECD comparative study reveals that while the Czech Republic experienced a sharp increase in remote work during the 2021 pandemic period, countries like Finland maintained stable rates, reflecting their pre-established remote work infrastructure (Özgüzel et al., 2023).

Pre-pandemic data from Milasi et al. (2021) highlight these disparities: while countries like Sweden, Finland, and the Netherlands reported over 30% of their

workforce engaging in regular or occasional remote work in 2019, the Czech Republic, along with Italy and Spain, showed significantly lower adoption rates (below 10%). Although the pandemic temporarily narrowed these differences, the persistence of pre-existing trends suggests that organizational culture and national policy frameworks, rather than industrial structure, primarily drive these variations. The Netherlands' legal framework explicitly supports flexible work arrangements (Yerkes & Visser, 2006; Possenriede et al., 2016), while the Czech Republic has been more conservative in adapting its regulatory framework (Kyzlinková & Vychová, 2020). The EU's Work-Life Balance Directive aims to harmonize these varying approaches across member states (Bednarowicz, 2020).

While research has extensively examined cross-country differences in remote work adoption (Choudhury et al., 2021; Wang et al., 2021), the relationship between employment status and remote work preferences, particularly in post-socialist economies like the Czech Republic, remains understudied. This gap is significant given the Czech Republic's position in digital transformation and its distinct labor market structures. Our study addresses this knowledge gap by examining how employment status influences remote work preferences in the Czech workforce, contributing to a more nuanced understanding of flexible work arrangements in transitional economies.

3 Materials and Methods

To reach the main research aim of the study, i.e., to explore various factors potentially influencing remote work preferences and test the stated hypothesis, assuming that H1: *Full-time employees in Czechia are more likely to prefer remote work*, we collected primary data through an online survey. The survey's questions were designed to meet this paper's needs while also drawing on the responses from the studies by Peters et al. (2004) and Hampel and Hampel (2023).

All the questions were precisely tailored to the research objectives and informed by prior literature, such as the methodological considerations of Ingusci et al. (2023). However, we acknowledge that we could not find specific, verified, and reliable scales to assess remote working preferences. Therefore, our survey design adopted an exploratory approach, resulting in severe limitations to our empirical findings. Specifically, the survey aimed

to determine gender, age, and preferences for remote work, along with the reasons behind them. Additionally, the preferred split between in-office and remote work, and the preferred days of the week for remote work, should be identified. The options for questions about respondents' reasons for their preferences were drawn from the literature review. The survey included rating scales, open-ended questions, and multiple-choice questions, with the option to provide additional information or alternative choices.

For operational clarity, this study employs definitions aligned with the Czech Labor Code. Full-time employment refers to work of 40 hours or more per week, while part-time employment encompasses any regular employment below 40 hours per week. This standardized definition ensures consistent classification of employment status across our sample and aligns with national regulatory frameworks.

The questionnaire was created via Google Forms and distributed in May 2024. The survey was distributed on several social media platforms to collect data from the Czech employees, including LinkedIn (in: "Jobs in Prague (Czech Republic)", "Alumni and Friends), Reddit (in "r/prague", "r/czechrepublic"), Facebook (Expats Czech Republic", "English speaking people living in Czech Republic", "Prague EXPATS", "Job for foreigners Czech republic", "Prague services", "Student & Alumni Services") and lastly was sent via email, WhatsApp, and Telegram to the relevant respondents and companies. Basically, the survey was designed to invite respondents to participate regardless of their qualifications, seniority, demographic characteristics, or other potentially influencing factors, ensuring the broadest possible range of respondents from the Czech labor market. The total number of responses was 228, with 227 respondents fully completing the questionnaire. That said, to achieve the objectives of our study, we use descriptive statistical tools and indicators presented in the next section, combined with a multivariate regression analysis to quantify the factors influencing RW preferences.

4 Results

Our sample contains 227 complete responses from employees, of which 52.4% are women; most respondents (76.3%) are working full-time, and the average age is 30 years, ranging from 19 to 51 years. Attitudes towards preferring RW are quantified on a Likert-type scale from 1 to 6, on which individuals indicate

their agreement with the following statement: "I tend to Choose Remote Work over In-Office Work" (average score is 4.38; see Table 1).

Table 1: Summary Statistics

Variable/indicator	Mean	Standard deviation	Min	Max	No. of Observations
<i>I tend to Choose Remote Work over In-Office Work</i>	4.38	1.59	1.0	6.0	228
<i>Age</i>	29.79	6.28	19.0	51.0	228
<i>Female</i> (52.4% =1)	0.52	0.50	0.0	1.0	227
<i>Working Full-Time</i> (76.3% =1)	0.76	0.43	0.0	1.0	228

Source: own processing and calculations based on the primary survey data.

We begin our data analysis by exploring why respondents prefer remote work. In this matter, the respondents could choose multiple answers. First, Table 2 presents the primary motivations for preferring remote work among the surveyed employees, ranked by the percentage of respondents who selected each reason.

Table 2: Reasons for Preferring Remote Work

Reason	Percentage	Description
<i>Balance</i>	85.5%	I appreciate the possibility to balance work with personal commitments
<i>Travel</i>	83.4%	I save time and money by not travelling to the office
<i>Autonomy</i>	68.3%	I am more productive and disciplined while working from home
<i>Comfort</i>	61.4%	I am more comfortable working from my own ergonomic space
<i>Distractions from Colleagues</i>	48.3%	There is an absence of distractions from colleagues when I work from home
<i>Productivity/ Discipline</i>	45.5%	I am more productive and disciplined while working from home
<i>Family</i>	42.8%	I spend more time with my family
<i>Absence of Supervision</i>	40.7%	I like the absence of constant supervision

Source: own processing and calculations based on the primary survey data.

The top three reasons stand out significantly: the ability to balance work with personal commitments (85.5%), saving time and money on commuting (83.4%), and the autonomy and independence associated with remote work (68.3%). These findings underscore the importance of work-life integration, practical financial considerations, and employee empowerment in the modern workforce. Additional open-ended responses uncovered further motivations, including the benefits of having lunch at home, the ability to work while mildly ill without risking the spread of infections, better accommodation for mental health needs or physical disabilities, and easier pet care. Collectively, these reasons suggest that the preference for remote work is driven by a complex interplay of professional, personal, and health-related factors, extending beyond mere convenience or cost savings.

Second, while remote work offers numerous advantages, it is necessary to acknowledge that not all employees prefer this arrangement. Table 3 below presents the primary reasons cited by respondents for not favoring remote work, ranked – similarly to the previous table - by the percentage of participants who identified each factor. These findings shed light on the challenges and concerns associated with remote work, including social and psychological factors and practical considerations.

Table 3: Reasons for Not Preferring Remote Work

Reason	Percentage	Description
<i>Face-to-Face Interaction</i>	71.7%	I miss the face-to-face interaction with colleagues
<i>Isolation/Loneliness</i>	58.3%	Remote work feels isolating and creates feelings of loneliness compared to being in the office
<i>Work Mindset</i>	51.7%	Dressing up and going to the office helps me get into a work mindset
<i>Boundaries</i>	50.0%	I struggle to establish boundaries between work and personal life
<i>Self-Discipline</i>	48.3%	I lack self-discipline and I tend to procrastinate more when I work from home
<i>Communication Tools</i>	45.0%	Remote communication tools are not as effective as in-person conversations about job-related matters
<i>Distractions</i>	41.7%	Household chores and family responsibilities distract me from work tasks
<i>Benefits</i>	21.7%	I do not have benefits that the office can provide for me (in-office events, coffee, snacks, etc.)
<i>Company Culture</i>	20.0%	I do not feel connected to the company culture
<i>Work Setup</i>	13.3%	I do not have an appropriate setup for work at home

Source: own processing and calculations based on the primary survey data.

We can see the key concerns raised about remote work, with social and psychological factors predominating. The lack of face-to-face interaction (71.7%) and feelings of isolation (58.3%) emerge as the top issues, underscoring the importance of workplace social connections. Work mindset challenges (51.7%) and boundary-setting difficulties (50.0%) also rank highly, suggesting that the mental separation of work and home life is a significant hurdle. Interestingly, practical concerns such as home distractions (41.7%) and inadequate work setups (13.3%) are less prevalent, suggesting that social and psychological aspects of remote work are more challenging than physical or logistical ones. The effectiveness of remote communication tools (45.0%) remains a notable concern, highlighting an area where improvements could alleviate issues.

Next, after understanding the respondents' preferences for remote work, we proceeded to further analysis to explore the factors shaping remote work attitudes. The regression analysis approach, as reported in Table 4, uses the available variables, with the RW preferences scale as the dependent variable and age, gender, and full-time vs part-time job as independent factors. We estimated our model using Ordinary Least Squares (OLS), and the reported standard errors are robust.

Table 4: Regression Analysis Results

Model number	(1)	Estimated coefficient (Standard error)
Independent/dependent variables		<i>I tend to Choose Remote Work over In-Office Work.</i>
Age		0.00106 (0.0184)
Female		0.00796 (0.241)
Working Full-Time		0.874*** (0.243)
Constant		3.673*** (0.540)
R-squared		0.0556
Adjusted R-squared		0.0429
Wald chi2(3)		14.82
Prob > chi2		0.00
Observations		227
Akaike information criterion		849.5
Bayesian information criterion		863.2

Notes: Robust standard errors are in parentheses; statistical significance is reported as follows:
*** p < 0.001.

Source: own processing and calculations based on the primary survey data.

The regression analysis results presented above offer compelling insights into the factors influencing remote work preferences among Czech employees. Notably, full-time employment emerges as a statistically significant predictor of remote work preference ($\beta = 0.874$, $p < 0.001$), strongly supporting our hypothesis that full-time employees are more likely to favor remote work arrangements. This substantial effect underlines the importance of employment status in shaping attitudes toward work arrangements. Interestingly, neither age nor gender showed a statistically significant relationship with remote

work preferences, challenging prevailing assumptions about generational or gender-based differences in this context.

5 Discussion

Our study reveals compelling insights into remote work preferences in the Czech Republic, particularly highlighting the significant role of employment status. The strong positive association between full-time employment and a preference for remote work challenges conventional wisdom (see Shevchuk & Strebkov, 2016). This discrepancy likely reflects the unique labor market structures in the Czech Republic, where full-time employment often confers greater job security and benefits, potentially making employees more comfortable with non-traditional work arrangements (Felstead & Henseke, 2017). These findings align with recent research by Beno et al. (2023), which found that most Czech knowledge workers had the opportunity to work from home during the first wave of the COVID-19 pandemic, indicating a rapid shift in remote work adoption.

Interestingly, our findings show no significant effect of age or gender on remote work preferences, in contrast to previous research in other European countries (Chung & Van der Lippe, 2020). This suggests that the Czech labor market may exhibit more egalitarian attitudes towards work arrangements, or that factors such as industry sector or organizational culture may play a more dominant role in shaping preferences. These results challenge popular narratives about generational differences in work preferences and highlight the danger of overgeneralizing across different cultural and economic contexts (Lyons & Kuron, 2014; Calk & Patrick, 2017).

The high preference for remote work among full-time employees, driven by work-life balance, time and cost savings, and increased autonomy, aligns with research on the productivity benefits of geographic flexibility (Choudhury et al., 2021). However, our study also reveals potential downsides, particularly regarding social isolation and work-home boundary management. These concerns echo findings on the "loneliness of the distant worker" (Rockmann & Pratt, 2015) and suggest that optimal work arrangements may require a hybrid model balancing remote and office-based work (Laker et al., 2023; Telu & Kumar, 2025). This tension between flexibility and social connection aligns with the findings of Bočková & Lajčín (2021) and Sladká & Kreidl

(2022), who highlighted the significant impacts of remote work on work-family conflicts and partnership quality in the Czech context.

Finally – and coming to a close with the discussion - our findings do stress the rather complex interplay between remote work preferences and contextual factors, with significant implications for HRD theory and practice. The Czech Republic's position as a post-socialist economy undergoing digital transformation significantly influences work preferences, demonstrating how cultural and economic factors shape attitudes differently from other European contexts (Kogus et al., 2022; Barczyk et al., 2022). This complex context somewhat challenges traditional HRD frameworks and aligns with arguments that successful remote work arrangements depend on a nuanced interplay of individual, organizational, and societal factors (Baruch, 2000; Bierema, 2020; Athanasiadou & Theriou, 2021; Donnelly & Johns, 2021). With that being said, our findings suggest that HRD practitioners should reconceptualize their approaches to account for these contextual specificities, developing new competency models that incorporate digital literacy, virtual collaboration, and remote self-management capabilities. The divergence of our findings from the established literature underscores the need for country-specific research and practice to understand remote work dynamics, particularly in HRD contexts. Organizations in the Czech Republic may need to radically rethink their approach to talent development and remote work policies, moving beyond generalized assumptions about age, gender, or employment status. The latter includes implementing i) hybrid learning approaches, ii) establishing virtual communities of practice, and iii) developing remote-specific career pathways that align with Czech organizational culture(s). Indeed, our results indicate that the Czech workforce may be more prepared for widespread remote work adoption than previously assumed (see Milasi et al., 2021), necessitating a transformation in how organizations approach performance management and career development in remote settings. However, this would require maintaining or even increasing current productivity levels, as some employers are now starting to reduce home working and demand the return of their employees to the office for the full working day. The key question is what mechanisms will be used for that, what motivational schemes will be implemented to foster the return to the office, and whether this will be the case only for some professions and business types (concerning size, location, business model and industry category) or will whether in the long-term this will be a pattern implemented at the large scale (Appel-Meulenbroek et al.,

2022; Behrens et al., 2024; Junicke et al., 2025).

6 Conclusion, Limitations, and Implications for Future Research

Our study sheds light on how Czech employees view remote work, revealing surprising insights. Most importantly, we confirmed our main hypothesis: full-time workers in the Czech Republic do indeed show a stronger preference for remote work compared to part-time employees. The latter finding challenges common assumptions and highlights the unique dynamics of a post-socialist economy still in transition. Interestingly, while employment status played a significant role, age and gender did not have the impact many might expect based on studies from other countries. These results underline a rather crucial point: when it comes to work preferences, context matters. What is true of Western countries may not hold for Central and Eastern Europe. We have also seen that people's "feelings" about remote work are complex – they appreciate the flexibility it offers, but they also worry about feeling isolated or struggling to separate work from home life. This calls for more research on employees' job satisfaction and overall mental and physical well-being, as highlighted by recent studies (Ilenčíková, 2025; Dvouletý & Dileo, 2026; Tacket & Lemon, 2026). With that in mind, our study sheds light on the changing nature of labor in the Czech Republic and related countries by validating our hypothesis regarding full-time workers and unearthing these complex opinions. This will be important for scholars and policymakers.

Several limitations of this study should be acknowledged. First (i), the relatively low R-squared value of our regression model suggests that additional factors influencing remote work preferences were not captured in our analysis. Second (ii), our study focused on employees in remote-friendly companies, which may have introduced a selection bias and limited the generalizability of our findings to the broader Czech workforce. Third (iii), the cross-sectional nature of our data prevents us from making causal inferences or observing how preferences might change over time, particularly in response to changing circumstances such as the COVID-19 pandemic. What is more, while our sample size was adequate for the analyses conducted, a larger and more diverse sample might have revealed more nuanced patterns or effects that were not detectable in the current study. Fourth (iv), our reliance on self-reported preferences and reasons for these preferences may be subject to social desirability bias or other

forms of response bias. Lastly (v), we need to acknowledge the limitations of using non-validated scales, such as the remote work preferences scale, which was not calibrated in previous studies. Yet, to our knowledge and based on our literature search (e.g., Ingusci et al., 2023), there is currently no validated scale we could have used. This brings us to an important takeaway for the scholarly community to validate this scale in future studies or recalibrate it and expand it into a multidimensional item that could, for example, reflect upon both the benefits and ‘dark sides’ of remote work. Creation, calibration, and widespread usage of such a measure could advance the clarity and academic rigor of flexible work research.

Future research could address these limitations and build upon our findings in several ways. First (a), longitudinal studies could provide insights into how remote work preferences evolve over time and in response to changing personal and organizational circumstances, including the relationship between the widespread usage of artificial intelligence (AI) technologies and their effect on the proportions of office-based to remote-working employees. For example, qualitative research, such as in-depth interviews or focus groups, could offer a clearer understanding of the complex factors shaping remote work preferences, particularly in the Czech context. Second (b), future studies might also benefit from incorporating a wider range of variables, including personality traits, specific job characteristics, and more detailed organizational factors, to develop a more comprehensive model of remote work preferences. Third (c), comparative studies across countries in Central and Eastern Europe could help illuminate the role of cultural and economic factors in shaping preferences for work arrangements. Finally, and to close (d), research exploring the effectiveness of hybrid work models in addressing both the desire for flexibility and the need for social connection could provide practical insights for organizations developing remote work policies.

REFERENCES

- [1] Adekoya, O. D., Adisa, T. A., & Aiyenitaju, O. (2022). Going forward: remote working in the post-COVID-19 era. *Employee Relations: The International Journal*, 44(6), 1410–1427. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ER-04-2021-0161>
- [2] 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. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1529100615593273>
- [3] Aloisi, A., & De Stefano, V. (2022). Essential jobs, remote work and digital surveillance: Addressing the COVID-19 pandemic panopticon. *International Labour Review*, 161(2), 289–314. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ilr.12219>
- [4] Appel-Meulenbroek, R., Kemperman, A., van de Water, A., Weijs-Perrée, M., & Verhaegh, J. (2022). How to attract employees back to the office? A stated choice study on hybrid working preferences. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 81, 101784. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2022.101784>
- [5] Antonacopoulou, E. P., & Georgiadou, A. (2021). Leading through social distancing: The future of work, corporations and leadership from home. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 28(2), 749–767. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12533>
- [6] Athanasiadou, C., & Theriou, G. (2021). Telework: systematic literature review and future research agenda. *Heliyon*, 7(10), e08165. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e08165>
- [7] Bailey, D. E., & Kurland, N. B. (2002). A review of telework research: Findings, new directions, and lessons for the study of modern work. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23(4), 383–400. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.144>
- [8] Banjo, S., Yap, L., Murphy, C., & Chan, V. (2020, February 3). The coronavirus outbreak has become the world's largest work-from-home experiment. Time. Available from: <https://time.com/5776660/coronavirus-work-from-home/>
- [9] Barczyk, R., Spychała, J., Urbanowicz, Z., & Ziomek, A. (2022). What to look for to increase work added value? Remote work and perceived productivity: A study in Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic. *Research Papers in Economics & Finance*, 6(1), 45–71. <https://doi.org/10.18559/ref.2022.1.4>
- [10] Bartel, C. A., Wrzesniewski, A., & Wiesenfeld, B. M. (2012). Knowing where you stand: Physical isolation, perceived respect, and organizational identification among virtual employees. *Organization Science*, 23(3), 743–757. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1110.0661>
- [11] Baruch, Y. (2000). Teleworking: Benefits and pitfalls as perceived by professionals and managers. *New Technology, Work and Employment*, 15(1), 34–49. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-005X.00063>
- [12] Behrens, K., Kichko, S., & Thisse, J. F. (2024). Working from home: Too much of a good thing?. *Regional Science and Urban Economics*, 105, 103990. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.regsciurbeco.2024.103990>

- [13] Bennett, E. E., & McWhorter, R. R. (2021). Virtual HRD's role in crisis and the post Covid-19 professional lifeworld: Accelerating skills for digital transformation. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 23(1), 5-25.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1523422320973288>
- [14] Beno, M., Krzova, J., & Caganova, D. (2023). Czech workers reconsideration of work from home during COVID-19. *Journal of Eastern European and Central Asian Research*, 10(2), 339-359. <https://doi.org/10.15549/jecar.v10i2.1125>
- [15] Bierema, L. L. (2020). HRD research and practice after 'The Great COVID-19 Pause': The time is now for bold, critical, research. *Human Resource Development International*, 23(4), 347-360. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13678868.2020.1779912>
- [16] Biron, M., Casper, W. J., & Raghuram, S. (2023). Crafting telework: a process model of need satisfaction to foster telework outcomes. *Personnel Review*, 52(3), 671-686.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-04-2021-0259>
- [17] Bočková, K., & Lajčín, D. (2021). Home Office and Its Influence on Employee Motivation. *GATR Journal of Management & Marketing Review*, 6(2), 94-109.
[https://doi.org/10.35609/JMMR.2021.6.2\(1\)](https://doi.org/10.35609/JMMR.2021.6.2(1))
- [18] Bloom, N., Liang, J., Roberts, J., & Ying, Z. J. (2015). Does working from home work? Evidence from a Chinese experiment. *The Quarterly journal of economics*, 130(1), 165-218. <https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qju032>
- [19] Bonacini, L., Gallo, G., & Scicchitano, S. (2021). Working from home and income inequality: risks of a 'new normal' with COVID-19. *Journal of population economics*, 34(1), 303-360. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00148-020-00800-7>
- [20] Björkdahl, J., & Kronblad, C. (2021). Getting on track for digital work: Digital transformation in an administrative court before and during COVID-19. *Journal of professions and organization*, 8(3), 374-393. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jpo/joab015>
- [21] Brynjolfsson, E., Horton, J. J., Ozimek, A., Rock, D., Sharma, G., & TuYe, H. Y. (2020). COVID-19 and remote work: An early look at US data. National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper Series, No. 27344.
<https://doi.org/10.3386/w27344>
- [22] BusinessInfo.cz (2021). Během covidu klesla produktivita práce, stěžují si firmy. Available from: <https://www.businessinfo.cz/clanky/behem-covidu-klesla-produktivita-prace-stezuji-si-firmy/>
- [23] BusinessInfo.cz (2024). Home office jako benefit vnímají zaměstnanci i čtyři roky po kovidu. Available from: <https://www.businessinfo.cz/clanky/home-office-jako-benefit-vnimaji-zamestnanci-i-ctyri-roky-po-kovidu/>
- [24] Calk, R., & Patrick, A. (2017). Millennials through the looking glass: Workplace motivating factors. *The Journal of Business Inquiry*, 16(2), 131-139.
- [25] Charbonneau, É., & Doberstein, C. (2020). An empirical assessment of the intrusiveness and reasonableness of emerging work surveillance technologies in the public sector. *Public Administration Review*, 80(5), 780-791.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.13278>

- [26] Charalampous, M., Grant, C. A., Tramontano, C., & Michailidis, E. (2019). Systematically reviewing remote e-workers' well-being at work: A multidimensional approach. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 28(1), 51-73. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2018.1541886>
- [27] Chatterjee, S., Chaudhuri, R., & Vrontis, D. (2022). Does remote work flexibility enhance organization performance? Moderating role of organization policy and top management support. *Journal of Business Research*, 139, 1501-1512. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2021.10.069>
- [28] Choudhury, P., Foroughi, C., & Larson, B. (2021). Work-from-anywhere: The productivity effects of geographic flexibility. *Strategic Management Journal*, 42(4), 655-683. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.3251>
- [29] Chung, H., & Van der Lippe, T. (2020). Flexible working, work-life balance, and gender equality: Introduction. *Social Indicators Research*, 151(2), 365-381. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-018-2025-x>
- [30] Clark, L. A., Karau, S. J., & Michalisin, M. D. (2012). Telecommuting attitudes and the 'big five' personality dimensions. *Journal of Management Policy and Practice*, 13(3), 31-46.
- [31] Collins, A. M., Hislop, D., & Cartwright, S. (2016). Social support in the workplace between teleworkers, office-based colleagues and supervisors. *New Technology, Work and Employment*, 31(2), 161-175. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ntwe.12065>
- [32] Cravens, C. (2006). *Culture and customs of the Czech Republic and Slovakia*. Bloomsbury Publishing USA. <https://doi.org/10.5040/9798400635939>
- [33] Craig, L., & Churchill, B. (2021). Working and caring at home: Gender differences in the effects of COVID-19 on paid and unpaid labor in Australia. *Feminist economics*, 27(1-2), 310-326. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13545701.2020.1831039>
- [34] Donnelly, R., & Johns, J. (2021). Recontextualising remote working and its HRM in the digital economy: An integrated framework for theory and practice. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 32(1), 84-105. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2020.1737834>
- [35] Dvouletý, O., & Dileo, I. (2024). Job satisfaction and heterogeneity of entrepreneurship nexus. *Journal of Enterprising Communities: People and Places in the Global Economy*, 20(1), 176-210. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEC-10-2024-0213>
- [36] Emanuel, N., & Harrington, E. (2024). Working remotely? Selection, treatment, and the market for remote work. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 16(4), 528-559. <https://doi.org/10.1257/app.20230376>
- [37] Fellegi, Z., Kočí, K., & Benešová, K. (2023). Work and Family Balance in Top Diplomacy: The Case of the Czech Republic. *Politics & Gender*, 19(1), 220-246. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1743923X21000489>
- [38] Felstead, A., & Blakely, H. (2005). Changing places of work. *Sociology, Work, and Organisations*, 309-322. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003314769-27>

- [39] Felstead, A., & Henseke, G. (2017). Assessing the growth of remote working and its consequences for effort, well-being and work-life balance. *New Technology, Work and Employment*, 32(3), 195-212. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ntwe.12097>
- [40] 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. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.6.1524>
- [41] Gajendran, R. S., Harrison, D. A., & Delaney-Klinger, K. (2015). Are telecommuters remotely good citizens? Unpacking telecommuting's effects on performance via i-deals and job resources. *Personnel Psychology*, 68(2), 353-393. <https://doi.org/10.1111/PEPS.12082>
- [42] Garrow, E. (2011). Receipt of government revenue among nonprofit human service organizations. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 21(3), 445–471. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/muq074>
- [43] Grisold, T., Seidel, S., Heck, M., & Berente, N. (2024). Digital surveillance in organizations. *Business & Information Systems Engineering*, 66(3), 401-410. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12599-024-00866-7>
- [44] Gold, J., Jolliffe, P., Stewart, J., Glaister, C., & Halliday, S. (2024). Futures and foresight learning in HRD. *European Journal of Training and Development*, 48(1/2), 133-148. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJTD-05-2022-0059>
- [45] Golden, T. D., & Gajendran, R. S. (2019). Unpacking the role of a telecommuter's job in their performance: Examining job complexity, problem-solving, interdependence, and social support. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 34(1), 55-69. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-018-9530-4>
- [46] Greer, T. W., & Payne, S. C. (2014). Overcoming telework challenges: Outcomes of successful telework strategies. *The Psychologist-Manager Journal*, 17(2), 87-111. <https://doi.org/10.1037/MGR0000014>
- [47] Hampel, T., & Hampel, N. (2023). Returning to the workplace after COVID-19: determinants of employee preferences for working onsite versus working from home in generation Y. *Decision*, 50(3), 321-331. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40622-023-00363-y>
- [48] Hospodářské Noviny (September, 2024). Amazon zavelel: Všichni povinně zpět na pět dní v týdnu do kanceláře. A jak jsou na tom české firmy?. Available from: <https://archiv.hn.cz/c1-67381730-amazon-zavelel-vsichni-povinne-zpet-na-pet-dni-v-tydnu-do-kancelare-a-jak-jsou-na-tom-ceske-firmy>
- [49] Ilenčíková, K. (2025). Identifying the relationship between wellbeing and financial vulnerability. *Economic Review*, 54(3), 196 – 207. <https://doi.org/10.53465/ER.2644-7185.2025.3.196-207>
- [50] Ingusci, E., Signore, F., Cortese, C. G., Molino, M., Pasca, P., & Ciavolino, E. (2023). Development and validation of the Remote Working Benefits & Disadvantages scale. *Quality & Quantity*, 57(2), 1159-1183. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-022-01364-2>
- [51] Leonardi, P. M., Parker, S. H., & Shen, R. (2024). How remote work changes the

- world of work. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 11(1), 193-219. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-091922-015852>
- [52] Janíkovičová, S., Barteková, M., Kolárik, M., & Konečný, M. (2026). How digitization is changing the creative industries: Analyzing the association of online marketing. *Economic Review*, 55(1), 29 - 44. <https://doi.org/10.53465/ER.2644-7185.2026.1.29-44>
- [53] Junicke, M., Matějů, J., Mumtaz, H., & Theophilopoulou, A. (2025). The heterogeneous effects of technology shocks. Evidence from the Czech Labour market. *Economics Letters*, 247, 112161. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econlet.2024.112161>
- [54] Kaduk, A., Genadek, K., Kelly, E. L., & Moen, P. (2019). Involuntary vs. voluntary flexible work: Insights for scholars and stakeholders. *Community, Work & Family*, 22(4), 412-442. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13668803.2019.1616532>
- [55] Kaplan, S., Engelsted, L., Lei, X., & Lockwood, K. (2018). Unpackaging manager mistrust in allowing telework: Comparing and integrating theoretical perspectives. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 33(3), 365-382. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-017-9498-5>
- [56] Katz, R., Ogilvie, S., Shaw, J., & Woodhead, L. (2022). *Gen Z, explained: The art of living in a digital age*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, United States. <https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226814988.001.0001>
- [57] Kelliher, C., & Anderson, D. (2010). Doing more with less? Flexible working practices and the intensification of work. *Human Relations*, 63(1), 83-106. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726709349199>
- [58] Kelliher, C., & de Menezes, L. M. (2019). *Flexible working in organisations: A research overview*. Routledge, London, United Kingdom. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351128346>
- [59] Kirchner, K., Ipsen, C., & Hansen, J. P. (2021). COVID-19 leadership challenges in knowledge work. *Knowledge Management Research & Practice*, 19(4), 493-500. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14778238.2021.1877579>
- [60] Kogus, A., Foltýnová, H. B., Gal-Tzur, A., Shiftan, Y., Vejchodská, E., & Shiftan, Y. (2022). Will COVID-19 accelerate telecommuting? A cross-country evaluation for Israel and Czechia. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, 164, 291-309. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tra.2022.08.011>
- [61] Kyzlinková, R., Veverková, S., & Vychová, H. (2020). Práce z domova-popis stavu před pandemií a možné konsekvence do nových poměrů organizace práce. *FÓRUM sociální politiky*, 5(3), 9-15.
- [62] Lee, E., Mitson, R., & Xu, H. (2025). The influence of leaders' motivational language on employee well-being through relatedness in remote work environments. *Journal of Communication Management*, 29(3), 401-421. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JCOM-02-2024-0038>
- [63] Martínková, J. (2023). Limits of home-office in perspective of the amendment to the Czech Labour Code. 17th International Scientific Conference *INPROFORUM Challenges and Opportunities in the Digital World*, November 2 - 3, 2023, České Budějovice, pp. 150-155, <https://doi.org/10.32725/978-80-7694-053-6.23>

- [64] Messenger, J. C., & Gschwind, L. (2016). Three generations of Telework: New ICT s and the (R) evolution from Home Office to Virtual Office. *New Technology, Work and Employment*, 31(3), 195-208. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ntwe.12073>
- [65] Moen, P., Kojola, E., Kelly, E. L., & Karakaya, Y. (2016). Men and women expecting to work longer: Do changing work conditions matter? *Work, Aging and Retirement*, 2(3), 321-344. <https://doi.org/10.1093/workar/waw018>
- [66] McVeigh-Schultz, J., & Isbister, K. (2022). A "beyond being there" for VR meetings: envisioning the future of remote work. *Human-Computer Interaction*, 37(5), 433-453. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07370024.2021.1994860>
- [67] Milasi, S., González-Vázquez, I., & Fernández-Macías, E. (2021). Telework before the COVID-19 pandemic: Trends and drivers of differences across the EU. *OECD Productivity Working Papers*, No. 21. OECD Publishing, Paris, France. <https://doi.org/10.1787/d5e42dd1-en>
- [68] Nilles, J. M. (1975). Telecommunications and organizational decentralization. *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, 23(10), 1142-1147. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TCOM.1975.1092687>
- [69] Ojala, S., Nätti, J., & Anttila, T. (2014). Informal overtime at home instead of telework: Increase in negative work-family interface. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, 34(1/2), 69-87. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSSP-03-2013-0037>
- [70] Ozcelik, H., & Barsade, S. G. (2018). No employee an island: Workplace loneliness and job performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 61(6), 2343-2366. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2015.1066>
- [71] Orel, M., & Dvoutely, O. (2020). Transformative Changes and Developments of the Coworking Model: A Narrative Review. In: Ratten, V. (eds) *Technological Progress, Inequality and Entrepreneurship. Studies on Entrepreneurship, Structural Change and Industrial Dynamics*, pp. 9-27, Springer, Cham, Switzerland. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-26245-7_2
- [72] Orel, M., Dvoutely, O., & Ratten, V. (2021). *The flexible workplace*. Cham: Springer International Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-62167-4>
- [73] Orel, M., Mayerhoffer, M., Fratricova, J., Pilkova, A., Starnawska, M., & Horvath, D. (2022). Coworking spaces as talent hubs: The imperative for community building in the changing context of new work. *Review of Managerial Science*, 16(5), 1503-1531. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11846-021-00487-4>
- [74] Özgüzel, C., Luca, D., & Wei, Z. (2023). The new geography of remote jobs? Evidence from Europe. *OECD Regional Development Papers No. 57*, OECD Publishing, Paris, France. <https://doi.org/10.1787/29f94cd0-en>
- [75] Pérez, M. P., Sánchez, A. M., & de Luis Carnicer, M. P. (2002). Benefits and barriers of telework: Perception differences of human resources managers according to company's operations strategy. *Technovation*, 22(12), 775-783. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0166-4972\(01\)00069-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0166-4972(01)00069-4)
- [76] Peters, P., Tijdens, K., & Wetzels, C. (2004). Employees' opportunities, preferences, and practices in telecommuting adoption. *Information & Management*, 41(4), 469–482. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-7206\(03\)00085-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-7206(03)00085-5)

- [77] Pospisil, J., & Sabolovic, M. (2025). Czech Labour Market in the Context of the Prospects of Gen Z. In *Gen Z at Work in Central and Eastern Europe* (pp. 62-79). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003647119-5>
- [78] Possenriede, D., Hassink, W. H., & Plantenga, J. (2016). Does temporal and locational flexibility of work increase the supply of working hours? Evidence from the Netherlands. *IZA Journal of Labor Policy*, 5, 1-34. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40173-016-0072-y>
- [79] Property Forum. (2023, April 11). *Czech office fit-out costs rank among highest in CEE*. <https://www.property-forum.eu/news/czech-office-fit-out-costs-rank-among-highest-in-cee/15296>
- [80] Pyöriä, P. (2011). Managing telework: Risks, fears and rules. *Management Research Review*, 34(4), 386-399. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01409171111117843>
- [81] Rajeev, K., Raju, S. S., & Rana, V. (2025). Artificial intelligence in talent management enhancing recruitment and workforce development. In *Innovative Approaches for International Competitiveness Through Human Resource Management* (pp. 195-220). IGI Global Scientific Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3373-1005-3.ch008>
- [82] Richardson, S. J., Carroll, C. B., Close, J., Gordon, A. L., O'Brien, J., Quinn, T. J., & Witham, M. D. (2020). Research with older people in a world with COVID-19: identification of current and future priorities, challenges and opportunities. *Age and ageing*, 49(6), 901-906. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ageing/afaa149>
- [83] Rockmann, K. W., & Pratt, M. G. (2015). Contagious offsite work and the lonely office: The unintended consequences of distributed work. *Academy of Management Discoveries*, 1(2), 150-164. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amd.2014.0016>
- [84] Sladká, D., & Kreidl, M. (2022). Práce z domova, konflikty mezi prací a rodinou a kvalita partnerství v době pandemie covidu-19. *Sociologický Casopis*, 58(4), 373-399. <https://doi.org/10.13060/csr.2022.024>
- [85] Spagnoli, P., Molino, M., Molinaro, D., Giancaspro, M. L., Manuti, A., & Ghislieri, C. (2020). Workaholism and technostress during the COVID-19 emergency: The crucial role of the leaders on remote working. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, 620310. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.620310>
- [86] Shevchuk, A., & Strebkov, D. (2016). Heterogeneous self-employment and work values: The evidence from online freelance marketplaces. In *Contemporary entrepreneurship: Multidisciplinary perspectives on innovation and growth* (pp. 141-158). Springer International Publishing, Cham, Switzerland. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-28134-6_9
- [87] Shirmohammadi, M., Au, W. C., & Beigi, M. (2022). Remote work and work-life balance: Lessons learned from the covid-19 pandemic and suggestions for HRD practitioners. *Human Resource Development International*, 25(2), 163-181. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13678868.2022.2047380>
- [88] Seddigh, A., Berntson, E., Danielson, C. B., & Westerlund, H. (2016). Concentration requirements modify the effect of office type on indicators of health and performance. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 38, 167-174. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2014.01.009>

- [89] Shannaq, B. (2025). Leveraging AI to forecast future job market trends: smart solutions and strategic recommendations for career success. *Journal of Information & Knowledge Management*, 24(06), 2550070. <https://doi.org/10.1142/S0219649225500704>
- [90] Suchánek, P., Ondráček, T., Kuchynková, L., Marciánová, P., Pirožek, P., & Mikuš, P. (2023). Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Labour Productivity and Business Activity in the Czech Republic. In *Digital Labour Markets in Central and Eastern European Countries* (pp. 124-141). Routledge, London, United Kingdom. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003326779-8>
- [91] Sýkorová, Z., Hague, D., Dvouletý, O., & Procházka, D. A. (2024). Incorporating artificial intelligence (AI) into recruitment processes: ethical considerations. *Vilakshan-XIMB Journal of Management*, 21(2), 293-307. <https://doi.org/10.1108/XJM-02-2024-0039>
- [92] Tackett, T., & Lemon, L. L. (2026). A balanced approach: remote employees' experiences with employee engagement and well-being. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, 31(1), 4-20. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CCIJ-08-2024-0154>
- [93] Telu, S., & Kumar, S. (2025). Towards a sustainable future: a comprehensive review of employee well-being in hybrid work settings. *Management & Sustainability: An Arab Review*, 4(3), 407-430. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MSAR-10-2024-0182>
- [94] Tímea, J., Čarvašová, A., & Řehoř, P. (2025). The labour market relevance of soft skills of students in business higher education (based on a Hungarian and Czech empirical study). *Journal of Contemporary Central and Eastern Europe*, 33(2), 501-514. <https://doi.org/10.1080/25739638.2025.2484148>
- [95] Vitak, J., & Zimmer, M. (2023). Surveillance and the future of work: exploring employees' attitudes toward monitoring in a post-COVID workplace. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 28(4), 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jcmc/zmad007>
- [96] Vlach, R. (2022). *The Freelance Way: Best Business Practices, Tools and Strategies for Freelancers*. Harper Collins.
- [97] Vyhlídal, J. (2025). Employers, recruitment and activation programmes experimental evidence from the Czech labour market. *European Journal of Training and Development*, 49(1-2), 97-135. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJTD-09-2023-0139>
- [98] Waizenegger, L., McKenna, B., Cai, W., & Bendz, T. (2020). An affordance perspective of team collaboration and enforced working from home during COVID-19. *European Journal of Information Systems*, 29(4), 429-442. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0960085X.2020.1800417>
- [99] Wang, B., Liu, Y., Qian, J., & Parker, S. K. (2021). Achieving effective remote working during the COVID-19 pandemic: A work design perspective. *Applied Psychology*, 70(1), 16-59. <https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12290>
- [100] Yang, L., Holtz, D., Jaffe, S., Suri, S., Sinha, S., Weston, J., Joyce, C., Shah, N., Sherman, K., Hecht, B. & Teevan, J. (2022). The effects of remote work on collaboration among information workers. *Nature human behaviour*, 6(1), 43-54. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-021-01196-4>

- [101] Yerkes, M. A., & Visser, J. (2006). Women's preferences or delineated policies? The development of part-time work in the Netherlands, Germany and the United Kingdom. In J. Y. Boulin, M. Lallement, J. C. Messenger, & F. Michon (Eds.), *Decent working time: New trends, new issues* (pp. 235-262). International Labour Office, Geneva, Switzerland.