

Table 1 Socio-Demographic and Occupational Characteristics

	N
	747
<i>Private companies</i>	
Automotive	368
Consulting	165
Payroll and workforce	111
<i>Public Administration</i>	
Municipality	103
Age (years)	43.7±10.7 (22-65)
Sex (male/female/other)	337 (45.1%) / 404 (54.1%) / 6 (0.8%)
Organizational Tenure	16.1 ±10.7(0.8 - 43)
Educational Level	
Primary and Secondary Education	276(37.2%)
Higher and Post-Graduate Education	466 (62.4%)
Role	
Leader	166 (22.2%)
Follower	577 (77.2%)
Missing	4 (0.5%)
Number of remote working days in the past 15 days*	
≤3 days	251 (33.6%)
4 - 6 days	322 (43.1%)
≥ 7 days	174 (23.3%)

Note: The number of remote working days was categorized into the three brackets shown in the table (≤3, 4-6, and ≥7) based on the most frequent remote work intensity observed in the Italian context (Assolombarda, 2024; Confindustria, 2024; Osservatorio Smart Working, 2024).

Table 2. Moderation results (PROCESS Model 1) predicting AffRum

Model summary						
N	R	R ²	MSE	F	Df1, df2	p
708	0.25	0.06	0.76	9.66	5, 702	< .001
703 (with controls: organisation, tenure, sex)	0.27	0.07	0.76	6.77	8, 694	< .001

Regression coefficients						
Term	b	SE	t	p	95% CI LL	95% CI UL
Constant	3.00	0.06	53.45	< .001	2.89	3.11
X1 (Group 2 vs Ref)	0.06	0.08	0.85	.398	-0.08	0.21
X2 (Group 3 vs Ref)	0.09	0.09	1.01	.314	-0.09	0.27
GSE	0.05	0.10	0.46	.647	-0.15	0.24
X1 x GSE (int_1)	-0.25	0.13	-1.88	.061	-0.50	0.01
X2 x GSE (int_2)	-0.80	0.15	-5.25	< .001	-1.09	-0.50
Constant	3.09	0.16	18.93	< .001	2.77	3.41
X1 (Group 2 vs Ref)	0.05	0.08	0.63	.527	-0.10	0.20
X2 (Group 3 vs Ref)	0.05	0.09	0.58	.563	-0.13	0.23
GSE	0.02	0.10	0.19	.849	-0.18	0.21
X1 x GSE (int_1)	-0.23	0.13	-1.76	.078	-0.49	0.03
X2 x GSE (int_2)	-0.77	0.15	-5.04	< .001	-1.07	-0.47
Organisation (covariate)	-0.07	0.04	-1.86	.064	-0.15	0.00
Tenure (covariate)	0.00	0.00	0.15	.879	-0.01	0.01
Sex (covariate)	0.06	0.07	0.94	.347	-0.07	0.19
Highest-order interaction test						
Test	ΔR^2	F	df1, df2	p		
X × W (RWI x GSE)	0.04	14.01	2, 702	< .001		
X × W (RWI x GSE)	0.03	12.98	2, 695	< .001		
Conditional effects of RWI (vs reference group) at values of GSE						
GSE level	GSE value	Contrast	Effect (b)	SE	p	Estimated means (Ref / G2 / G3)
Low (≈16th pct; -1SD)	-0.51	X1 (G2 vs Ref)	0.19	0.10	.062	2.98 / 3.17 / 3.48
		X2 (G3 vs Ref)	0.50	0.12	< .001	
Low (≈16th pct; -1SD)	-0.51	X1 (G2 vs Ref)	0.16	0.10	.107	3.01 / 3.17 / 3.45

		X2 (G3 vs Ref)	0.44	0.12	< .001	
Mean (≈50th pct)	−0.01	X1 (G2 vs Ref)	0.07	0.08	.378	3.00 / 3.07 / 3.10
		X2 (G3 vs Ref)	0.10	0.09	.269	
Mean (≈50th pct)	−0.01	X1 (G2 vs Ref)	0.04	0.08	.574	3.02 / 3.07 / 3.08
		X2 (G3 vs Ref)	0.06	0.09	.470	
High (≈84th pct; +1SD)	0.59	X1 (G2 vs Ref)	−0.08	0.11	.451	3.03 / 2.95 / 2.65
		X2 (G3 vs Ref)	−0.38	0.12	.002	
High (≈84th pct; +1SD)	0.59	X1 (G2 vs Ref)	−0.10	0.11	.349	3.04 / 2.94 / 2.64
		X2 (G3 vs Ref)	−0.40	0.12	.001	

Note: X was indicator-coded with the reference group coded as $X1 = 0$, $X2 = 0$ (Group 1: ≤ 3 remote days). Group 2: $X1 = 1$, $X2 = 0$; Group 3: $X1 = 0$, $X2 = 1$. GSE was mean-centered; conditional tables use the 16th, 50th, and 84th percentiles of GSE as probe values.

Values highlighted in blue are from the sensitivity model including organisation, tenure, and sex as covariates ($N = 703$). The $RW1 \times GSE$ interaction remained significant in both models.

Table 3. Moderation results (PROCESS Model 1) predicting PSP

Model summary						
N	R	R ²	MSE	F	Df1, df2	p
708	0.15	0.02	0.81	3.43	5, 702	.005
703 (with controls: organisation, tenure, sex)	0.20	0.04	0.81	3.46	8, 694	.001
Regression coefficients						
Term	b	SE	t	p	95% CI LL	95% CI UL
Constant	2.99	0.06	51.11	< .001	2.85	3.08
X1 (Group 2 vs Ref)	−0.07	0.08	−0.87	.383	−0.22	0.09
X2 (Group 3 vs Ref)	0.00	0.09	0.02	.988	−0.18	0.18
GSE	0.17	0.10	1.68	.094	−0.03	0.37
X1 x GSE (int_1)	0.14	0.14	1.04	.297	−0.12	0.41
X2 x GSE (int_2)	−0.29	0.16	−1.84	.066	−0.60	0.02
Constant	2.94	0.17	17.45	< .001	2.61	3.27

X1 (Group 2 vs Ref)	-0.08	0.08	-0.96	.337	-0.23	0.08
X2 (Group 3 vs Ref)	-0.04	0.09	-0.39	.696	-0.22	0.15
GSE	0.12	0.10	1.21	.226	-0.08	0.33
X1 x GSE (int_1)	0.18	0.14	1.31	.192	-0.09	0.45
X2 x GSE (int_2)	-0.26	0.16	-1.63	.104	-0.57	0.05
Organisation (covariate)	-0.08	0.04	-1.92	.055	-0.15	0.00
Tenure (covariate)	0.00	0.00	-0.08	.939	-0.01	0.01
Sex (covariate)	0.15	0.07	2.19	.029	0.02	0.28
Highest-order interaction test						
Test	ΔR^2	F	df1, df2	p		
X × W (RWI x GSE)	0.01	4.10	2, 702	.017		
X × W (RWI x GSE)	0.01	4.16	2, 694	.016		
Conditional effects of RWI (vs reference group) at values of GSE						
GSE level	GSE value	Contrast	Effect (b)	SE	p	Estimated means (Ref / G2 / G3)
Low (≈16th pct; -1SD)	-0.51	X1 (G2 vs Ref)	-0.14	0.11	.181	2.88 / 2.74 / 3.03
		X2 (G3 vs Ref)	0.15	0.13	.233	
Low (≈16th pct; -1SD)	-0.51	X1 (G2 vs Ref)	-0.17	0.11	.115	2.92 / 2.75 / 3.01
		X2 (G3 vs Ref)	0.09	0.13	.460	
Mean (≈50th pct)	-0.01	X1 (G2 vs Ref)	-0.07	0.08	.373	2.97 / 2.90 / 2.97
		X2 (G3 vs Ref)	0.01	0.09	.960	
Mean (≈50th pct)	-0.01	X1 (G2 vs Ref)	-0.08	0.08	.327	2.98 / 2.90 / 2.94
		X2 (G3 vs Ref)	-0.03	0.09	.716	
High (≈84th pct; +1SD)	0.59	X1 (G2 vs Ref)	0.02	0.11	.890	3.07 / 3.08 / 2.90

		X2 (G3 vs Ref)	-0.17	0.13	.186	
High (≈84th pct; +1SD)	0.59	X1 (G2 vs Ref)	0.03	0.11	.796	3.05 / 3.08 / 2.86
		X2 (G3 vs Ref)	-0.19	0.13	.142	

Note: X was indicator-coded with the reference group coded as $X1 = 0$, $X2 = 0$ (Group 1: ≤ 3 remote days). Group 2: $X1 = 1$, $X2 = 0$; Group 3: $X1 = 0$, $X2 = 1$. GSE was mean-centered; conditional tables use the 16th, 50th, and 84th percentiles of GSE as probe values.

Robustness Check: Remote Work Intensity as a Continuous Variable

In the main text, remote work intensity (RWI) was operationalized as a three-category ordinal variable (≤ 3 , 4–6, and ≥ 7 remote days in the previous 15 days). To assess whether this categorization affected the substantive conclusions, the moderation analysis was re-estimated using RWI as a continuous variable (raw count of remote workdays in the previous 15 days, range 0–15). As shown in Table S1, RWI's main effect remained non-significant for both affective rumination (AffRum) and problem-solving pondering (PSP). The RWI $\times$ GSE interaction remained significant for AffRum and non-significant for PSP, mirroring the pattern of results obtained with the categorical operationalization reported in the main text. These results indicate that the substantive conclusions of the study are not an artifact of the categorization strategy.

Table 4. Moderation Results Using RWI as a Continuous Variable (0–15 Remote Days)

Outcome	Predictor	b	SE	p
AffRum	RWI (main effect)	0.05	0.06	.434
AffRum	RWI $\times$ GSE (interaction)	-0.36	0.10	< .001
PSP	RWI (main effect)	-0.02	0.06	.720
PSP	RWI $\times$ GSE (interaction)	-0.14	0.11	.207

Note: b = unstandardized regression coefficient; SE = standard error. RWI = remote work intensity (continuous, 0–15 days); GSE = general self-efficacy; AffRum = Affective Rumination; PSP = Problem-solving Pondering. Models included organization, tenure, and sex as covariates.