RICHTMANN
P U B L I S H I N G

Research Article

Face-to-Display Work: Czech Managers' Experiences and Expectations

Michal Beňo

Kateřina Křížová

Institute of Technology and Business in Ceske Budejovice,
370 01 Ceske Budejovice, Czech Republic

Abstract

There has been a clear increase in the number of e-workers across countries and industries. But the experience of working from home has not been the same in all countries. The purpose of this quantitative study was to explore and understand the managers' perspectives of and attitudes towards face-to-display working, namely the reactions of managers working from home, their use of the home-office during the ongoing Covid-19 epidemic, advantages and disadvantages, their productivity, how they cooperated and organised teleworking, and how they evaluated the reasons that led to their experience and their views on future home-office development. One hundred and sixty-two respondents from the Czech Republic participated in the online survey from February to March 2022. Eleven hypotheses were established that needed to be proved or disproved (six hypotheses were confirmed and five were not). Face-to-display working was identified as an effective, time-saving tool that fostered increased productivity and satisfaction (especially among the younger generation), promoted cost-saving and provided a future work model option. Conversely, management professionals were concerned that face-to-display working affected work-life balance and resulted in a lack of physical human interaction, also that productivity was not affected by less support from colleagues, by gender or by having an at-home work space and that workers were not spending more time at their desks. The findings from this study demonstrate positive social change involving the adoption of face-to-display working in businesses. Understanding the management perspective regarding face-to-display working in the Czech Republic may lead to ways of dealing with problems that will allow more employees to work in other premises.

Keywords: Face-to-display working, future of work, pros and cons, managers' perceptions and attitudes, productivity, Czech Republic

1. Introduction

Human beings and work are interlinked economically and socially. We all spend a substantial part of our lives at work. People generally work eight hours a day, which is 40 hours a week and 160 hours a month. Månsson (2019) argued that human beings spend one-third of their lives at work (72 000 hours and 9 000 days). With this sizeable amount of time at work, job satisfaction, which leads to greater productivity and work-life balance, becomes very important. Since the global spread of the pandemic, policies and rules were introduced to move office work into the home environment.

The concept of face-to-display working is a move from the traditional way of work to face-to-

display working where the workforce performs the tasks/duties remotely away from the place of work (Ansong & Boateng, 2017), which is in accordance with Illegems and Verbeke's explanation (2004, p. 319) that face-to-display working means changing the location of certain professional activities from the organisation's conventional office to elsewhere. Beňo (2021a, p. 12) further describes this kind of work as an activity where an employee works part- or full-time at home, partly from home or on the road and the rest of the time at the workplace, possibly in different countries.

Statistics indicate increased rates of work remotely compared to traditional office settings (OECD, 2021). Within the European Union, in the pre-pandemic time the incidence of face-to-display working varied enormously (Samek Ludovici et al., 2021). However, in 2020, as a result of the stay-home policies, many individuals started working from home, leading to the growth of face-to-display working (Eurofound, 2020; Samek Ludovici et al., 2021).

Beňo et al. (2021, p. 80) emphasise that in a time of crisis, people often call for strong managers. It is evident that traditional modes of control in the working environment are equally vital for effective management of the workforce. In the Czech Republic, managers are still reluctant to allow their workforce to work remotely (Beňo, 2021b). According to Allen et al. (2015) and Beňo and Ferenčiková (2019), the possible reason for this reluctance may be the fear of not seeing whether the employees are working. Additional factors are employee accessibility, productivity and possible loss of management roles (Arnold, 2006). Noonan and Glass (2012) see the obstacles or barriers to face-to-display working to be more organisational.

The objective of this study was consequently to explore and understand the managers' perspectives of and attitudes towards face-to-display working, namely the reactions of managers working from home, their use of the home-office during the ongoing Covid-19 epidemic, advantages and disadvantages, their productivity, how they cooperated and organised teleworking, evaluated the reasons that led to their experience and their views on future home-office development. In contrast to most existing literature on face-to-display working that has focused on the employees' point of view, this paper targeted managers. Quantitative data were used to find answers to the following research questions: (i) RQ1: How do managers perceive the impact of face-to-display work? (ii) RQ2: Do the advantages of face-to-display work outweigh the disadvantages? (iii) RQ3: How is work productivity (quantitatively, qualitatively and over time) affected by the home office? and (iv) RQ4: To what extent has the Covid-19 crisis impacted managers' personal views on face-to-display work?

The structure of this paper is as follows: To define the face-to-display working model, including management perceptions; the methodology used; an analysis of the data obtained; discussion; and a summary of the findings.

2. Face-to-Display Working Model

Various definitions of the term "telework" exist (Abilash & Siju, 2021; Beno, 2018, 2022; Catană et al., 2022; Ericsson, 2016; Gajendran, 2017; Gray et al., 1996; Holts, 2018; Hynes, 2013; Saraceni, 2020) and various names are used in place of the term "telework" (Allen et al., 2015; Beno, 2022; Beno & Hvorecky, 2021; Gajendran, 2017; Hynes, 2013; Urbaniec et al., 2022). We understand the face-to-display working model to be a flexible method covering a wide range of work duties and activities related to business that rely on modern information and communication technology (ICT).

Kurkland and Bailey (1999) divide this kind of work into four different types: 1) The Home Office, (2) The Satellite Office, (3) The Neighborhood Work Center and (4) Mobile Working. The first type simply means SOHO (small office/home office) which is very common in the Czech Republic. But in the Czech Republic the rate of face-to-display work utilisation does not reach the average of the European Union (Vrchota et al., 2018). In this model, the workforce's tasks take place at the home premises (Belzunegui-Eraso & Erro-Garcés, 2020; Rocha & Amador, 2018). Additionally, we can add working in remote companies and informal or hybrid face-to-display work.

Feldman and Gainey (1997) developed dimensions of face-to-display work as follows: full-time or part-time, at the home premises or with others in an off-site environment and those who are

working remotely at the behest of the organisation or at their own request. Donati et al. (2021) emphasise these five dimensions to be related to remote workers' technology acceptance and well-being, namely personal (having a child/children, previous remote work experience), work (working in a team, number of days spent working remotely), and organisational characteristics (organisational size). We can conclude that face-to-display work depends on the following dimensions: the individual, organisational, technical, sociological and societal aspects (Bjursell et al., 2021; Dima et al., 2019; Jackson & Wielen, 1998; Maruyama & Tietze, 2012; Putri & Amran, 2021; Suomi et al., 1998).

2.1 Management perceptions of face-to-display work

Traditional management disapproved of most face-to-display working (Farrell, 2017). Suomi et al. (1998, p. 329) stress that the reasons for the moderate adoption of face-to-display work particularly in larger organisations can be found in management communication styles and practices. Face-to-face requests are still preferred above e-mails (Bohns, 2018; Roghanizad & Bohns, 2017). Suomi et al. (1998) add that management capabilities and opinions seem to be the critical factor for the introduction of this kind of work. Managers with experience of adopting face-to-display work recognise a variety of long-term, strategic impacts on their organisation's resource base (Illegems & Verbeke, 2004).

Beno (2018) stated that the key to success in face-to-display work is an effective leader, and Snell (2009) stated that it was recruiting the right people. Madlock (2018) adds the leadership style of supervisors (task and or relational). Generally speaking, if managers deny the face-to-display work demands, this may lead to demotivation among their workforce. Additionally, managers may be concerned about employee accessibility, productivity and possible loss of management roles (Arnold, 2006). Beňo and Ferenčiková (2019) stress that the biggest obstacle to face-to-display working is management's mistrust over whether the workers are working. Nicholas (2016) further highlights connectivity as one of the challenges for management. We can conclude that motivation, inspiration and providing information seem to be important factors. Managers agree that trust is the main element that influences leadership in face-to-display working (Beno, 2018). Pyöriä (2011) added respect in addition to agreed rules as the key for successful face-to-display working. Crucially, the effects of face-to-display work on organisations depend on the managers' ability to engage and motivate face-to-display workers effectively (Samek Lodovici et al., 2021). Employees' work characteristics are a crucial face-to-display work factor (Wang et al., 2020). According to Saarinen (2016), managing virtual teams, and according to recent data (Beno, 2022), managing e-workers, can be challenging. Because, as Verburg et al. (2013) emphasise, virtual managers act as coordinators, decision-makers and facilitators in the organisation of work.

3. Methodology

Online surveys are simpler to manage than paper surveys; the response rates seem to be higher and there is less work in terms of posting and entering data (Harlow, 2010). In this paper, an ad hoc online questionnaire was used to explore and understand managers' perspectives of and attitudes toward face-to-display working, namely the reactions of managers working from home, their use of the home-office during the ongoing Covid-19 epidemic, advantages and disadvantages, their productivity, how they cooperated and organised teleworking, evaluated the reasons that led to their experience and their views on future home-office development.

Survey pretesting was done with a small test group before the real survey. Data were obtained using the snowball technique. Several managers from five selected enterprises (in the tertiary sector) in the Czech Republic were contacted and these recommended 23 additional colleagues who met the criteria. The sample grew through connection with social contacts. Data were collected in February and March 2022.

We analysed the responses of a sample of top management and middle management employees. The average age of the respondents was 36 years. In total, 162 questionnaires (48 by men and 114 by

women) were completed to evaluate and demonstrate the findings. Not surprisingly, in this study as elsewhere, women tend to be over-represented in service sector jobs (OECD, 2017).

An ad hoc questionnaire was developed for data collection with closed-ended questions on different Likert scale (agreement, value, frequency, likelihood) and open-ended questions. Demographic variables were added to the instrument, namely: sex, age, education, employment, sector, organisation size and family/marital/residence status.

All respondents were asked to evaluate face-to-display work and how the Covid-19 crisis affected their current work arrangements, as well as the future. The questionnaire covered the following items: periodicity, social isolation, performance, work-life balance, satisfaction and well-being. We started the survey by questioning the respondents about the general status of the face-to-display working environment. Then we asked them about the potential advantages and disadvantages. Next came a critical aspect of successful face-to-display working, namely the issues of productivity, satisfaction and relationship with colleagues. A final question dealt with the extent to which the Covid-19 crisis had changed the respondents' views on the future of face-to-display working and whether they hoped to perform more face-to-display work in the future.

All participants were informed about the aim of the investigation, with participation being entirely voluntary. The anonymity of all participants was respected.

Eleven hypotheses were established that required to be proved or disproved. Starting with the above objectives, the following 11 research hypotheses were set:

H1: Most employees at a home office (> 50%) are satisfied with their work.

H2: Home office employees feel socially isolated from other colleagues or other people.

H3: Home office staff work more hours than usual.

H4: Home office employees feel more tied to their computers than they do to their workplace.

H5: When working at a home office, the advantages outweigh the disadvantages.

H6: The productivity of a large part of employees (> 20%) is affected by the lack of support from the manager.

H7: The productivity of employees at the home office depends on gender.

H8: The productivity of employees at the home office depends on age.

H9: The productivity of employees working in a home office depends on whether a person has a separate office at home.

H10: More than a fifth of employees (> 20%) who use a home office evaluate their work productivity positively.

H11: Most employees (> 50%) would prefer to work from home in the future.

The descriptive statistical method was used to analyse and describe the basic features of the data in developing results and drawing conclusions.

4. Results

In this section, we briefly outline the main results. As mentioned in the introduction, because of the rapid growth of face-to-display working and the necessary physical presence at home premises, the workforce organised its own coordination of work, and traditional managerial control and supervision changed into having more autonomy and flexibility.

Through the investigation, the authors identified the following face-to-display variables, by taking into account the specific factors. In this respect, they focused on the values of these variables, namely the general status of the face-to-display working environment, advantages and disadvantages, productivity and face-to-display work in the future.

4.1 General status of face-to-display working environment

The increase of modern ICT, digitalisation, the Covid-19 pandemic and the switch to face-to-display work are already having an important impact on how, when and where we work.

- ➤ 7.41% of respondents definitely agree with being satisfied at the home office and 49.38% of respondents agree. Almost 20% cannot comment on this; 20.99% of respondents disagree with being satisfied with the home office and 3.09% of respondents definitely do not agree. For the purpose of verifying the hypothesis, we combine the categories of agreement with satisfaction into three (satisfied, dissatisfied and undecided). The P-value of the test is 0.0423. It is therefore lower than the selected significance level of 0.05. It was therefore confirmed that more than half of the employees are satisfied with their work at the home office. H1 was confirmed.

- ➤ 3.09% of respondents strongly disagree with the statement about social isolation and 17.28% of respondents disagree. They therefore do not feel isolated. A total of 13.58% of respondents strongly agree with the statement and 45.06% agree. These therefore feel isolated from other colleagues. For the purpose of verifying the hypothesis, we combine the categories of agreement with satisfaction into three (they feel socially isolated, they do not feel socially isolated and undecided). This will allow us to find out whether the share of respondents assessing social isolation is negatively significantly higher than 50% by a share test. The P-value of the test is equal to 0.0141. It is therefore lower than the selected significance level of 0.05. It has been confirmed that more than half of the employees feel socially isolated. The second hypothesis was confirmed.

- ➤ 4.94% of respondents strongly disagree with the statement that respondents work at the home office for more hours than usual, and 46.30% of respondents disagree. They therefore do not work at the home office for more hours than usual. Only 1.85% of respondents strongly agree with the statement and 24.69% of respondents agree. They therefore work at the home office for more hours than usual. For the purpose of verifying the hypothesis, we combine the categories of agreement with satisfaction into three (I work more hours than usual, I don't work more hours than normal and undecided). Whether the share of respondents working more hours than normal is significantly higher than 50% is determined by a share test. The P-value of the test is 0.3764. It is therefore higher than the selected significance level of 0.05. It has not been confirmed that more than half of the employees work more hours than normal. H3 was not confirmed.

- ➤ 3.7% of respondents strongly disagree with the statement that respondents at the home office feel more tied to their computer than they are at their workplace, and 52.47% disagree. They therefore do not feel tied to the home office by their computers. A total of 3.09% of respondents strongly agree with the statement and 19.14% agree. They therefore do feel tied to the home office by their computers. For the purpose of verifying the hypothesis, we combine the categories of agreement with satisfaction into three (they feel bound, they do not feel bound and undecided). We can now find out whether the share of respondents who feel connected to their computer is significantly higher than 50% by a share test. The P-value of the test is equal to 0.0586. It is therefore higher than the selected significance level of 0.05. It has not been confirmed that more than half of employees feel more connected to their computers than they are at the workplace. The fourth hypothesis was not confirmed.

4.2 Advantages and disadvantages of face-to-display work for managers

Face-to-display work is associated with positive and negative effects on the workforce, employers and society. The advantages were determined using items 16 – 28 in the questionnaire. The disadvantages were determined using items 29 – 44 in the questionnaire. The items of advantages and disadvantages were evaluated on a scale of one to five going from "I definitely do not agree" to "I definitely agree". The median evaluation was subsequently determined from the listed items. The median benefits were most often four. The finding is therefore "I agree". The median disadvantage was most often two, which is "I disagree". The advantages were evaluated positively and the disadvantages negatively. The advantages would therefore outweigh the disadvantages in our study

group. We can find out whether we can claim that this applies in general by a sign test. The value of the test criterion is equal to 9.352 and the P-value of the test is 0.000. The P-value is therefore lower than the selected significance level. A statistically significant difference in the evaluation of advantages and disadvantages was demonstrated. H5 was confirmed.

4.3 *Effects of face-to-display work on productivity*

Face-to-display work may affect productivity in a positive or negative way. Batut and Tabet (2020) emphasise these factors: (a) face-to-display set-up, (b) work organisation and management technique and (c) character of occupation. According to these factors, digital skills may affect the productivity of face-to-display workers positively or negatively.

According to the data obtained, there is a positive correlation between face-to-display working and productivity.

➢ The results of our analysis indicated that 62% disagree that their productivity is affected by a lack of support from the manager. Less than 15% cannot comment on this. And 24% of respondents agree that their productivity is affected by a lack of support from the manager. We will find out whether this share is significantly higher than 20% by using the share test. We will perform this at the 5% level of significance. The P-value is equal to 0.1361. It is therefore higher than the selected significance level of 0.05. We have failed to demonstrate that the productivity of a large proportion of employees is affected by a lack of support from the manager. H6 was not confirmed.

➢ 42.55% of men and 30.36% of women rate their productivity as the same, while 31.25% of women and only 14.89% of men rate it as higher. Whether these differences are statistically significant is determined by using Pearson's chi-square test of independence, which verifies the independence of two categorical variables. This presupposes that the conditions for good approximation are met. That is, the expected frequencies are higher than five in 80% and do not fall below one in the remaining 20%. This has been verified. We perform the test at a significance level of 0.05. Respondents who were unable to comment on productivity are excluded from the analysis. The value of the test criterion is equal to 5.128 and the P-value of the test is 0.275. The P-value is therefore higher than the selected significance level. A statistically significant difference between men and women could not be demonstrated. H7 was not confirmed.

➢ The highest age according to the average and median is achieved by employees who rate productivity at the home office as significantly lower. The second-oldest group consists of those who rate productivity as lower. Employees who rate home office productivity as much higher are the youngest generation. The second-youngest group evaluates labour productivity as higher. Respondents who were unable to comment on productivity are excluded from the analysis. Based on the Shapiro-Wilk normality test, age does not meet the normal distribution assumption in all productivity selections. Therefore, we verify the differences between the groups using the non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis test. Non-parametric tests are based on the order of values and compare the medians of the samples. The value of the test criterion is equal to 24.567 and the P-value of the test is 0.0001. The P-value is therefore lower than the selected significance level. A statistically significant age difference between employees evaluating labour productivity positively or negatively was confirmed. Younger employees rate their home office productivity significantly higher or much higher more often than older employees. H8 has been confirmed.

➢ We see that the larger differences in productivity ratings are higher, the same and lower in productivity ratings. It is considered the same by 37.69% of respondents who have a separate office and by only 17.24% of respondents who do not have a separate office. Respondents who do not have a separate office more often rate their productivity as higher or lower. Whether these differences are statistically significant is determined using

Pearson's chi-square test of independence, which verifies the independence of two categorical variables. This presupposes that the conditions for good approximation are met. These are not met in this case. For the test, it is necessary to merge the categories of much higher and higher productivity assessment. Respondents who were unable to comment on productivity are excluded from the analysis. The value of the test criterion is equal to 5.1824 and the P-value of the test is 0.121. The P-value is therefore higher than the selected significance level. A statistically significant difference in productivity assessments between employees who have and do not have a separate office has not been demonstrated. H9 was not confirmed.

➤ Respondents most often rate their productivity at the home office as the same (33.96%). The same share of respondents rate it as higher or lower (26.42%). Respondents rate it as much higher in 3.14% of cases, and 10.06% of respondents' rate it as significantly lower. For the purpose of verifying the hypothesis, we merge the productivity categories into two; 29.56% of respondents rate their productivity positively and 70.44% of respondents rate it as positive or lower. We will find out whether the share of respondents evaluating labour productivity is significantly higher than 20% by a share test. The P-value of the test is 0.0013. It is therefore lower than the selected significance level of 0.05. It was confirmed that more than a fifth of employees evaluate their work at the home office positively. H10 was confirmed.

4.4 *Future of face-to-display work*

Almost 18% of respondents would definitely prefer to work at a home office in the future. Almost half of the respondents (42.59%) would probably prefer a home office, and 19.75% of respondents would rather not use a home office in the future. Less than 4% of respondents would definitely not want to work at a home office in the future. Further, we combine the answers into categories so that those who prefer working from home answered "definitely" or "probably". Those who answered "no" or "under no circumstances" will be in a category that does not prefer working from home. Others will be included in the category "I do not know". The analysis of these outcomes highlights the following: home office is preferred by 60.49% of all respondents. The next step was to find out whether this share is significantly higher than 50%, using the share test. We will perform it at the 5% level of significance. The software provides a P-value in the output for this test. That is equal to 0.0039. The P-value is therefore lower than the selected significance level of 0.05. A statistically significant difference was confirmed. We can therefore confirm hypothesis 11. We have shown that most employees would prefer to work at a home office in the future.

5. Discussion

Based on the analysis, the outcomes of the online survey presented some positive and some negative effects of face-to-display working from the managers' point of view. The authors identified and analysed four variables: general status of face-to-display working environment, advantages and disadvantages, productivity and face-to-display work in the future.

The managers' perception of satisfaction was measured by various questions. The authors checked statistically significant differences. Based on the data, more than half of the respondents are satisfied with their work at the home office. This is similar to Ansong and Boateng's (2017) data where the employees had more significant job satisfaction compared with the traditional cubicle work environment. Furthermore, the results obtained are in line with a recent study (Moens et al., 2021) where respondents indicate their overall satisfaction (65.7%). However, it is also possible that face-to-display workforce performance can decrease as a result of increased social isolation. It has been confirmed that more than half of the managers feel socially isolated. This result matches Collins et al.'s (2016) data that when the boss and jobholder articulate expectations and work priorities, it is less

likely that the jobholder will feel isolated. It has not been confirmed that more than half of the workers work more hours than normal. This is similar to Chow et al.'s (2022) study. Interestingly, this outcome differs from Noonan and Glass's (2012) data where the face-to-display workforce worked between five and seven hours more per week than the non-face-to-display workforce. Maintaining a work-life balance seems not to be the biggest stress factor when viewed in relation to Bencsik et al.'s data (2020). It has not been confirmed that more than half of the participants feel more connected to their computers than in the workplace. This means that satisfaction flourishes in a technology-friendly environment, no matter the workplace environment. Conversely, Ko et al. (2018) stress that ICT's role is confined to supporting smart work. But Al-Habaibeh et al.'s (2021) data indicate that within a short period of time the workforce managed to develop the necessary digital skills.

A statistically significant difference in the evaluation of advantages and disadvantages was demonstrated. It can be concluded that policymakers and organisations made the most of the advantages of face-to-display work while mitigating the negative impacts. Just as other research (Ansong & Boateng, 2017; Beňo, 2021a; Harpaz, 2002) has done, this study confirms that there are more positive than negative aspects of face-to-display working. Another survey also reported relatively more positive and fewer negative experiences in face-to-display working (Ipsen et al., 2021).

Face-to-display work can influence productivity. According to Cho (2020), Covid-19 had a significant impact on productivity outcomes. An analysis of the data collected identified that face-to-display working was associated with increased managerial productivity. We agree with Cho (2020) that the workforce will have to learn how to maintain daily productivity despite frequent interruptions. Further analysis shows that we have failed to demonstrate that the productivity of a large proportion of respondents is affected by a lack of support from the manager. This differs from Nicholas's (2016) statement that setting up an e-workforce will also depend on easy-to-use technology and readily available support. A statistically significant difference between men and women in respect of productivity could also not be demonstrated. For example, Cui et al. (2022) found that although total research productivity increased by 35%, female academics' productivity dropped by 13.2% relative to that of male academics. On the other hand, another study reveals that the female workforce reported being more productive than men (Gurschiek, 2021). Younger employees more often rate their home office productivity significantly higher or much higher than older employees do. These are the ones who have already acquired the necessary social skills and the ones who prefer modern tools of flexibility and mobility. But the younger generation remains increasingly overwhelmed when working remotely (Gibbs et al., 2021). A statistically significant difference in productivity assessments between managers who have and do not have a separate office has not been demonstrated. Our results do not confirm the recommendation concerning work space for higher productivity. This does not agree with Birimoglu Okuyan and Begen's (2021, p. 2) explanation that in order to stay healthy and productive it is crucial to adopt an ergonomic approach when setting up the working space at home and working from home. Overall, it was confirmed that more than a fifth of employees evaluate their work at the home office positively. This is similar to Beno and Hvorecky's (2021) study which reveals that productivity has increased on average. Mello (2007) also highlights gains of productivity. Beno and Hvorecky (2021) further add that those who do not feel comfortable with e-work tend to be less productive.

It is clear that e-work is a good solution for many, but it is not suitable for everyone (Beňo & Ferenčiková, 2019, p. 13). On the contrary, data from this study indicated a statistically significant positive perception of managers' future utilisation of face-to-display work. We have shown that most participants would prefer to work at a home office in the future. In order to determine the right face-to-display working model for a business it is necessary to find out what works best, and this can be done by asking the workforce what they want and by responding to their needs (Beno, 2020).

6. Conclusion

Workplace norms have fundamentally changed and shifted over the past few years. The study analysed recent experiences and expectations in the use of face-to-display work of Czech managers. On the basis of the analysis of how the managers expressed their attitude about face-to-display work, we argue that this kind of work is successful (enhances workforce satisfaction and thus efficiency), and an efficient and adaptable manager is an important tool in the global working environment. The findings obtained demonstrate this.

Quantitative data were used to find answers to the following research questions:

- RQ1: How do managers perceive the impact of face-to-display work?
  The role of managers at work is crucial as they have the most direct influence on their workforce. Generally, the professionals perceive face-to-display work as an effective working tool. It was confirmed that more than half of the managers are satisfied with their work at the home office. It has been confirmed that more than half of them feel socially isolated. It has not been confirmed that more than half of the managers work more hours than normal. It has not been confirmed that more than half of them feel more connected to their computers than in the workplace.

- RQ2: Do the advantages of face-to-display work outweigh the disadvantages?
  Yes, a statistically significant difference in the evaluation of advantages and disadvantages was demonstrated. It can be concluded that policymakers and organisations made the most of the advantages of face-to-display work while mitigating the negative impacts.

- RQ3: How is the work productivity (quantitatively, qualitatively and over time) affected by the home office?
  An analysis of the data collected showed that face-to-display working was associated with increased manager productivity. But we have failed to demonstrate that the productivity of a large proportion of respondents is affected by a lack of support from the manager. A statistically significant difference between men and women regarding productivity could also not be demonstrated. Younger generations more often rate their home office productivity significantly higher or much higher than older generations do. A statistically significant difference in productivity assessments between managers who have and do not have a separate office has not been demonstrated. It was confirmed that more than a fifth of them evaluate their work at the home office positively.

- RQ4: To what extent has the Covid-19 crisis impacted on managers' personal views on face-to-display work?
  The results of the study indicated a statistically significant positive perception of managers' future utilisation of face-to-display work. We have shown that most participants would prefer to work at a home office in the future.

This study offers practical implications for managers, organisations and policymakers. To train managers and the workforce to operate in a face-to-display working environment, managers must learn to lead on the basis of their own experience (trial and error) and motivate their workforce.

The absence of triangulation can be seen as a first limitation which may limit credibility. The second limitation was related to the size of the sample and its structure (only Czech managers). Despite these limitations, this study's findings were accurate and credible.

There are several possibilities for other potential topics for future research. These could include further qualitative analysis or mixed methods (triangulation). Additionally, future research could include participants from other countries and states in different sectors where face-to-display work is possible.

7. Acknowledgements

References

Abilash, K. M., & Mary Siju, N. (2021). Telecommuting: An empirical study on job performance, job satisfaction and employees commitment during pandemic circumstances. *Shanlax International Journal of Management*, *8*(3), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.34293/management.v8i3.3547

Al-Habaibeh, A., Watkins, M., Waried, K., & Javareshk, M. B. (2021). Challenges and opportunities of remotely working from home during Covid-19 pandemic. *Global Transitions*, *3*, 99–108. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.glt.2021.11.001

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

Ansong, E., & Boateng, R. (2017). Organisational adoption of telecommuting: Evidence from a developing country. *The Electronic Journal of Information Systems in Developing Countries*, *84*(1). https://doi.org/10.1002/isd2.12008

Arnold, J. T. (2006). Making the leap. *HR Magazine, 51*(5), 80–86.

Batut, C., & Tabet, Y. (2020). What do we know about the economic effects of remote work? Retrieved May 03, 2022, from https://www.tresor.economie.gouv.fr/Articles/2020/11/19/what-do-we-know-about-the-economic-effects-of-remote-work

Belzunegui-Eraso, A., & Erro-Garcés, A. (2020). Teleworking in the context of the COVID-19 crisis. *Sustainability*, *12*(9), 3662. https://doi.org/10.3390/su12093662

Bencsik, A., Juhász, T., & Mura, L. (2020). Consequences of Workplace Stress – Company Case Study. *Littera Scripta*, 12 (2), 79–95.

Beno, M. (2018). Managing telework from an Austrian manager's perspective. *Advances in Intelligent Systems and Computing*, *1*(6), 16-29. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-77703-0_2

Beno, M. (2020). Out-of-Office Model – the Eight Factors and Barriers Controlling the Future of E-Working. *AUDOE*, *16*(4), 150-163.

Beňo, M. (2021a). The advantages and disadvantages of e-working: An examination using an Aldine analysis. *Emerging Science Journal*, 5, 11–20. https://doi.org/10.28991/esj-2021-sper-02

Beňo, M. (2021b). E-working: Country Versus Culture Dimension. *AGRIS on-line Papers in Economics and Informatics*, *13*(2), 23-34. DOI 10.7160/aol.2021.130202.

Beno, M. (2022). Differences between managing face-to-display workers and in-house workers (Hybrid work model): A qualitative study from Austria. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, *11*(2), 30. https://doi.org/10.36941/ajis-2022-0033

Beňo, M., & Ferenčíková, S. (2019). The Future of Work is e-Work. 4th IWKM 2019, 7–8 November 2019, Bratislava - Trenčín, Slovakia, 6-20.

Beno, M., & Hvorecky, J. (2021). Data on an Austrian company's productivity in the pre-covid-19 era, during the lockdown and after its easing: To work remotely or not? *Frontiers in Communication*, *6*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomm.2021.641199

Beňo, M., Hvorecký, J., & Cagáňová, D. (2021). From face-to-face to face-to-display management: An online survey. *Advances in Business Related Scientific Research Journal ; 12*(1),78-100.

Birimoglu Okuyan, C., & Begen, M. A. (2021). Working from home during the COVID-19 pandemic, its effects on health, and recommendations: The pandemic and beyond. *Perspectives in Psychiatric Care*, *58*(1), 173–179. https://doi.org/10.1111/ppc.12847

Bjursell, C., Bergmo-Prvulovic, I., & Hedegaard, J. (2021). Telework and lifelong learning. *Frontiers in Sociology*, *6*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fsoc.2021.642277

Bohns, V. (2018, January 26). *A face-to-face request is 34 times more successful than an email*. Harvard Business Review. Retrieved May 2, 2022, from https://hbr.org/2017/04/a-face-to-face-request-is-34-times-more-successful-than-an-email

Catană, Ş.-A., Toma, S.-G., Imbrişcă, C., & Burcea, M. (2022). Teleworking impact on wellbeing and productivity: A cluster analysis of the Romanian graduate employees. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *13*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.856196

Cho, E. (2020). Examining boundaries to understand the impact of COVID-19 on vocational behaviors. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *119*, 103437. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2020.103437

Chow, J. S., Palamidas, D., Marshall, S., Loomes, W., Snook, S., & Leon, R. (2022). Teleworking from home experiences during the COVID-19 pandemic among public health workers (telex COVID-19 study). *BMC Public Health*, *22*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-022-13031-0

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

Cui, R., Ding, H., & Zhu, F. (2022). Gender inequality in research productivity during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Manufacturing & Service Operations Management*, *24*(2), 707–726. https://doi.org/10.1287/msom.2021.0991

Dima, A.-M., Țuclea, C.-E., Vrânceanu, D.-M., & Țigu, G. (2019). Sustainable Social and individual implications of telework: A new insight into the Romanian labor market. *Sustainability*, *11*(13), 3506. https://doi.org/10.3390/su11133506

Donati, S., Viola, G., Toscano, F., & Zappalà, S. (2021). Not all remote workers are similar: Technology acceptance, remote work beliefs, and wellbeing of remote workers during the second wave of the COVID-19 pandemic. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *18*(22), 12095. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph182212095

Ericsson, S. (2016). *Telework: Experiences of technostress in telework environments*. Retrieved May 03, 2022, from https://umu.diva-portal.org/smash/record.jsf?aq2=%5B%5B%5D%5D&c=1&af=%5B%5D&searchType=LIST_LATEST&query=&language=no&pid=diva2%3A1039303&aq=%5B%5B%5D%5D&sf=all&aqe=%5B%5D&sortOrder=author_sort_asc&onlyFullText=false&noOfRows=50&dswid=4633

Eurofound. (2020). *Living, working and COVID-19*, COVID-19 series, Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg.

Farrell, K. (2017). Working from home: A double edged sword, Home Renaissance Foundation Conference, November 16-17, 2017, Royal Society of Medicine in London. Retrieved May 02, 2022, from https://arrow.tudublin.ie/aaconmuscon/38/

Feldman, D. C., & Gainey, T. W. (1997). Patterns of telecommuting and their consequences: Framing the research agenda. *Human Resource Management Review*, *7*(4), 369–388. https://doi.org/10.1016/s1053-4822(97)90025-5

Gajendran, R. S. (2017). Unlocking the Promise of Telecommuting. Retrieved May 02, 2022, from https://www.businesstoday.in/magazine/features/story/unlocking-the-promise-of-telecommuting-64479-2016-12-26

Gibbs, M., Mengel, F., & Siemroth, Ch. (2021). Work from Home & Productivity: Evidence from Personnel & Analytics Data on IT Professionals. Retrieved May 03, 2022, https://bfi.uchicago.edu/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/BFI_WP_2021-56.pdf

Gray, M., Hodson, N., & Gordon, G. (1996). *Teleworking explained*. West Sussex, England: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Gurschiek, K. (2021, July 26). *Viewpoint on Remote Work Depends on Gender, Ethnicity, Industry*. Retrieved May 03, 2022, from https://www.shrm.org/hr-today/news/hr-news/pages/viewpoint-on-remote-work-depends-on-gender-ethnicity-industry.aspx

Harlow, A. (2010). Online surveys - possibilities, pitfalls and practicalities: the experience of the TELA evaluation. *Waikato Journal of Education*, *15*(2), 95-108.

Harpaz, I. (2002). Advantages and disadvantages of telecommuting for the individual, organization and society. *Work Study*, *51*(2), 74–80. https://doi.org/10.1108/00438020210418791

Holts, K. (2018). Understanding Virtual Work: Prospects for Estonia in the Digital Economy. Tallinn: Foresight Centre. Retrieved May 03, 2022, https://www.riigikogu.ee/wpcms/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/Virtual-work-size-and-trends_final.pdf

Hynes, M. (2013). Mobility Matters: Technology, Telework, and the (Un)sustainable Consumption of Distance. Retrieved May 03, 2022, https://aran.library.nuigalway.ie/handle/10379/3814

Illegems, V., & Verbeke, A. (2004). Telework: What does it mean for management? *Long Range Planning*, *37*(4), 319–334. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2004.03.004

Ipsen, C., van Veldhoven, M., Kirchner, K., & Hansen, J. P. (2021). Six key advantages and disadvantages of working from home in Europe during COVID-19. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *18*(4), 1826. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18041826

Jackson, P. J., & der Wielen, J. V. M. (1998). *Teleworking: New International Perspectives From Telecommuting to the Virtual Organisation (Routledge Studies in the Management of Technology and Innovation)* (1st ed.). Routledge.

Ko, E. J., Kim, S. S., & Lee, S. J. (2018). Effects of Job Autonomy and Self-Efficacy on Creative Behavior: Focusing on the Mediation Effect of Knowledge Sharing in Smart Work Environment. *Knowledge Management Review*. 한 국 지 식 경 영 학 회 , *19*(2), 163–186. doi: 10.15813/KMR.2018.19.2.009.

Kurkland, N. B., & Bailey, D. E. (1999). The advantages and challenges of working here, there anywhere, and anytime. *Organizational Dynamics*, *28*(2), 53–68. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0090-2616(00)80016-9

Madlock, P. E. (2018). The Influence of Leadership Style on Telecommuters in the Insurance Industry: A Contingency Theory Approach. *Journal of Leadership, Accountability and Ethics*, *15*(2). https://doi.org/10.33423/jlae.v15i2.645

Månsson, A. (2019, January 15). *9 000 days => 1/3rd of your life spent at work. are you making the most of it?* Irish Tech News. Retrieved April 29, 2022, from https://irishtechnews.ie/9-000-days/

Maruyama, T., & Tietze, S. (2012). From anxiety to assurance: Concerns and outcomes of Telework. *Personnel Review*, *41*(4), 450–469. https://doi.org/10.1108/00483481211229375

Mello, J. A. (2007). Managing telework programs effectively. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, *19*(4), 247–261. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10672-007-9051-1

Moens, E., Lippens, L., Sterkens, P., Weytjens, J., & Baert, S. (2021). The COVID-19 crisis and Telework: A research survey on experiences, expectations and hopes. *The European Journal of Health Economics*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10198-021-01392-z

Nicholas, A. J. (2016). Management and Telework. Faculty and Staff - Articles & Papers. 60. Retrieved April 29, 2022, from https://digitalcommons.salve.edu/fac_staff_pub/60/

Noonan, M. C., & Glass, J. L. (2012). The hard truth about telecommuting. MonthlyLabor Review, *135*(6), 38-45.

OECD. (2017). *The pursuit of gender equality*. Digital Object Identifier System. (n.d.). Retrieved May 2, 2022, from https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264281318-en

OECD. (2021, September 21). *Teleworking in the COVID-19 pandemic: Trends and prospects*. OECD. Retrieved April 29, 2022, from https://www.oecd.org/coronavirus/policy-responses/teleworking-in-the-covid-19-pandemic-trends-and-prospects-72a416b6/

Putri, A., & Amran, A. (2021). Employees' work-life balance reviewed from work from home aspect during COVID-19 pandemic. *International Journal of Management Science and Information Technology*, *1*(1), 30. https://doi.org/10.35870/ijmsit.v1i1.231

Pyöriä, P. (2011). Managing Telework: Risks, fears and rules. *Management Research Review*, *34*(4), 386–399. https://doi.org/10.1108/01409171111117843

Rocha, C. T., & Amador, F. S. (2018). O teletrabalho: Conceituação e Questões Para Análise. *Cadernos EBAPE.BR*, *16*(1), 152–162. https://doi.org/10.1590/1679-395154516

Roghanizad, M. M., & Bohns, V. K. (2017). Ask in person: You're less persuasive than you think over email. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *69*, 223–226. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2016.10.002

Saarinen, J. (2016). *Managing global virtual teams*. The URN resolver of The National Library of Finland. Retrieved May 2, 2022, from http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-952-60-7013-1

Samek Lodovici, M, et al. (2021). *The impact of teleworking and digital work on workers and society*, Publication for the committee on Employment and Social Affairs, Policy Department for Economic, Scientific and Quality of Life Policies, European Parliament, Luxembourg. Retrieved April 29, 2022, https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2021/662904/IPOL_STU(2021)662904_EN.pdf

Snell, A. (2009). Tackling the challenges of employee engagement. *Strategic HR Review*, *8* (2), 37-38. https://doi.org/10.1108/shr.2009.37208baa.002

Suomi, R., Luukinen, A., Pekkola, J., & Zamindar, M. (1998). *Telework: the Critical Management Dimension*. In *Teleworking: New International Perspectives From Telecommuting to the Virtual Organisation (Routledge Studies in the Management of Technology and Innovation)* (1st ed.). Routledge.

Urbaniec, M., Małkowska, A., & Włodarkiewicz-Klimek, H. (2022). The impact of technological developments on remote working: Insights from the Polish managers' perspective. *Sustainability*, *14*(1), 552. https://doi.org/10.3390/su14010552

Verburg, R. M., Bosch-Sijtsema, P., & Vartiainen, M. (2013). Getting it done: Critical success factors for project managers in virtual work settings. *International Journal of Project Management*, *31*(1), 68–79. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2012.04.005

Vrchota, J., Frantíkova, Z., & Vlčková, M. (2018). Comparison of telework in the Czech Republic and Poland and Slovakia with respect to the gender. *Hradec Economic Days*. https://doi.org/10.36689/uhk/hed/2018-02-044

Wang, B., Liu, Y., Qian, J., & Parker, S. K. (2020). 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