

**NEEDS-BASED APPROACH: UNDERSTANDING THE
ROLE OF COMMUTING CONVENIENCE AND WORK
ARRANGEMENTS ON SUBJECTIVE WELL-BEING**



GÖZDE ÖZBAY

ÖZYEĞİN UNIVERSITY
AUGUST, 2024

NEEDS-BASED APPROACH: UNDERSTANDING THE ROLE OF COMMUTING CONVENIENCE AND WORK ARRANGEMENTS ON SUBJECTIVE WELL-BEING

by
Gözde Özbay

Thesis
Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts

in
Industrial and Organizational Psychology

Advisor: Prof. Gül Canan Ergin

Graduate School of Social Sciences
Özyeğin University
İstanbul

August, 2024

NEEDS-BASED APPROACH: UNDERSTANDING THE ROLE OF COMMUTING CONVENIENCE AND WORK ARRANGEMENTS ON SUBJECTIVE WELL-BEING

Approved by:

Prof. Gül Canan Ergin, Advisor

Department of Psychology

Özyeğin University

Assoc. Prof. Gökçe Tarcan Kumkale

Department of Psychology

Özyeğin University

Assoc. Prof. Afife Başak Ok

Department of Psychology

Ankara University

Approval Date: 08.08.2024

To my mother, Aysel, I hope she can see me from heaven and be proud of me.



DECLARATION OF ORIGINALITY

I hereby declare that I am the sole author of this thesis and that this is the true copy of my thesis, including the final revisions, approved by my thesis committee. All data and information have been obtained, produced, and presented in accordance with the rules of research ethics and principles of academic honesty. As required by these rules, to the best of my knowledge I have acknowledged ideas, thoughts, and any copyrighted material in accordance with the standard referencing rules. I certify that any part of this thesis has not been submitted for a degree or diploma in another educational institution.

Gözde Özbay

ABSTRACT

Telework is a work arrangement that uses technology to work from home or any other location other than the office. Many pieces of the literature showed that those who are more sociable and attracted to developing relationships with others (i.e., higher on sociability) tended to report lower ratings on indices of telework performance. In this study, we focused on the relationship between individual needs and subjective well-being and aimed to see if work arrangements play a moderator role. Also, with this study, we further explored how commuting convenience and commuting time affect subjective well-being in a big metropolitan city such as Istanbul. Data for the current study were collected from 203 (123 Females, 80 Males) white collar employees who work for several companies in Istanbul by Qualtrics. Employees' current work arrangements (Hybrid, face-to-face and remote), their number of remote working days, commuting time, their individual needs (the need for affiliation, the need for status and the need for achievement) and subjective well-being are measured. Bivariate correlations and hierarchical regression models were conducted to test the hypotheses. Results showed that work arrangements don't play a role as a moderator and there isn't any significant relationship between individual needs and subjective well-being. However, we found that commuting convenience predicts subjective well-being and higher commuting times decrease subjective well-being. The findings are discussed based on the previous literature, future directions and implications.

Keywords: Telework, subjective well-being, individual needs, hybrid work, commuting

ÖZET

Uzaktan çalışma, evden ya da ofis dışındaki herhangi bir yerden teknoloji kullanımıyla gerçekleştirilen bir çalışma düzenidir. Önceki araştırmalar, sosyalleşme ihtiyacı yüksek olan kişilerin, uzaktan çalışma performanslarını diğer kişilere göre daha düşük olarak puanladıklarını göstermiştir. Bu çalışmada, bireysel ihtiyaçlar ile öznel iyilik hali arasındaki ilişkiye odaklanılarak, bu ilişkide çalışma düzeninin moderatör olarak rol alıp almadığı incelenmiştir. Ayrıca büyük bir metropol olan İstanbul’da yaşayan katılımcıların işe gidiş-gelişlerine ilişkin rahatlık algılarının ve işe gidiş-geliş ortalama sürelerinin öznel iyilik hallerini nasıl etkilediği incelenmiştir. Veriler İstanbul’da çeşitli firmalarda çalışan 203 (123 kadın, 80 erkek) beyaz yaka çalışandan Qualtrics sistemi üzerinden toplanmıştır. Çalışanların mevcut çalışma düzenleri (hibrit, yüz yüze, uzaktan), bir ay içinde uzaktan çalıştıkları gün sayıları, işe gidiş-geliş süreleri, işe gidiş gelişlerine ilişkin rahatlık algıları, bireysel ihtiyaç çeşitleri (ilişki ihtiyacı, statü ihtiyacı ve başarı ihtiyacı) ve öznel iyilik hallerine ilişkin ölçümler alınmıştır. İki değişkenli korelasyonlar ve hiyerarşik regresyon modelleri, hipotezleri test etmek için çalıştırılmıştır. Bulgular, çalışma düzenlerinin, bireysel ihtiyaçlar ve öznel iyilik hali ilişkisinde herhangi bir moderatör rolü oynamadığını göstermiştir. Bunun yanı sıra sonuçlar, çalışanların işe gidiş gelişlerine ilişkin rahatlık algılarının öznel iyilik halini yordadığını ve işe gidiş-geliş süresinin artmasının öznel iyilik halini azalttığını ortaya çıkarmıştır. Elde edilen sonuçlar geçmiş literatür ışığında incelenmiş ve gelecek araştırmalar için önerilerde bulunulmuştur.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Uzaktan çalışma, hibrit çalışma, öznel iyilik hali, bireysel ihtiyaçlar, işe gidiş-geliş rahatlık algısı

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First, I would like to express my gratitude to my thesis advisor Prof. Dr. G. Canan Ergin for her endless support, great wisdom and patience. I am grateful to my mother Aysel Özbay and father, Ramazan Özbay, who always supported me unconditionally and respected every decision I made. Special thanks to my dear friend, Attorney Onurhan Özgöl, who supported me through my graduate journey.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION OF ORIGINALITY	iv
ABSTRACT	v
ÖZET	vi
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	vii
LIST OF TABLES.....	x
LIST OF SYMBOLS	xi
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Literature Review	3
1.1.1 Work Arrangements.....	3
1.1.2 Subjective Well-Being.....	4
1.1.2.1 Telework & Subjective Well-Being	5
1.1.3 Individual Needs.....	7
1.1.3.1 Need for Affiliation	7
1.1.3.2 Need for Status	8
1.1.3.3 Need for Achievement.....	10
1.1.4 Commuting and Subjective Well-being.....	12
2. METHOD	17
2.1 Participants.....	17
2.2 Measures	17
2.2.1 Work Arrangements.....	17
2.2.2 Individual Needs.....	18
2.2.3 Commuting Convenience	18
2.2.4 Subjective Well-Being.....	19
2.3 Data Collection Procedures	19
2.4 Data Analytical Approach	20
3. RESULTS	24
3.1 Confirmatory Factor Analysis	24
3.2 Bivariate Correlations	25
3.3 Hierarchical Regression Analyses	26
3.4 Independent Samples T-Test	32

4. DISCUSSION	33
4.1 Individual Needs	33
4.2 Commuting & Subjective Well-Being.....	34
4.3 Strengths, Limitations, and Future Directions	35
4.4 Implications	36
4.5 Conclusion	37
REFERENCES	38
APPENDICES	54
APPENDIX A. DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONNAIRE	55
APPENDIX B. MOTIVATION ORIENTATION INVENTORY	56
APPENDIX C. COMMUTING TIME MEASUREMENT & COMMUTING CONVENIENCE SCALE	57
APPENDIX D. SUBJECTIVE WELL-BEING SCALE	58

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1 Descriptive Statistics (N=203)	22
Table 2.2 The Pearson Correlations of the Study Variables	23
Table 3.1 Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Age, Commuting Convenience and Subjective Well-Being (N=203)	29
Table 3.2 Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Individual Needs, Remote Working Days and Subjective Well-Being (N=203)	30
Table 3.3 Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Gender, Commuting Time and Subjective Well-Being (N=203)	31

LIST OF SYMBOLS

B: In regression and multiple regression analyses, estimated values of raw (unstandardized) regression coefficients

β : Estimated values of standardized regression coefficients in regression

df: Degrees of freedom

F: F distribution

M: Mean

r: Estimate of Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient

R²: Multiple correlation squared

SD: Standard Deviation

SE: Standard Error

SWB: Subjective Well-Being

t: The sample value of the t-test statistic

1. INTRODUCTION

Teleworking is a work arrangement where employees use information technology for operation and communication while working away from the office (Allen et al., 2015). Even though telework is not a new concept, the COVID-19 pandemic has given it a fresh start. Before the pandemic, it was primarily part-time or occasionally available to a small number of workers (Messenger, 2019). The pandemic caused a sharp increase in teleworking, with many employees starting to telework for the first time. For example, the COVID-19 pandemic caused an increase in teleworking in the European Union from 12.3% to 48% (Eurofound, 2020; Eurostat, 2021). After the pandemic, workers in the European Union have returned to the office full-time, but others are using flexible work arrangements that combine face-to-face and remote work (Eurofound, 2023). In an HR Trends and Salary report that is published by Randstad in 2024, they found that 55% of private sector employers in Turkey provide the opportunity to work in a hybrid work arrangement (Randstad, 2024). Hybrid work can also be defined as the ‘New Normal’ because of the significant shift towards hybrid work adaptation of the companies (Ro, 2022).

Despite the benefits of teleworking, not all employees can benefit from teleworking, especially when employees don’t select teleworking (O’Neill et al., 2009). Teleworker personalities are gaining importance because it has been found that it is crucial to determine telework preferences and attitudes (Beckel & Fisher, 2022). Workers who prefer independence and working alone would prefer teleworking to those who have high affiliation needs, which might feel isolated (Baruch, 2000; Doberstein & Charbonneau, 2022). The relationship between personality traits associated with telework

(Catana et al., 2022; Gavaille & Hazans 2022) and personality traits and well-being (Michinov et al., 2022; O'Neill et al., 2009) should be further studied.

Many pieces of literature forecast that several types of job roles will continue with a combination of office and teleworking, known as a hybrid work model post-pandemic (Wang et al., 2020). This concept of hybrid work could take on various shapes and sizes. Workers with high education and income levels comprise a smaller portion of the labor force and are likelier to continue using hybrid work methods. Several elements, such as organizational goals, productivity, cost reduction, talent attraction, and others, may influence the organizations' future choice of hybrid combination ratio (Lund et al., 2020). Lots of companies after COVID-19 applied hybrid work arrangements that combine both remote and face-to-face work settings in a month (Choudhury, 2022). It has been found that full-remote employees, who experience less stress during commuting showed higher satisfaction levels than hybrid work arrangement employees (Sakapurnama, 2022). However, other studies found that people who have a positive experience while commuting can experience commuting benefits by using the time effectively and productively (Ory et al., 2004).

In this study, we will focus on the relationship between individual needs and subjective well-being and aim to see if work arrangements play a moderator role. Also, with this study, we would like to further explore how commuting convenience and commuting time affect subjective well-being in a big metropolitan city such as Istanbul, which has 64% traffic congestion daily (Karaismailoğlu, 2024). The following sections will review the literature on work arrangements, subjective well-being, individual needs, and commuting.

1.1 Literature Review

1.1.1 Work Arrangements

Studies indicate that telework does offer some benefits (Golden & Gajendran, 2019) and some disadvantages (Golden & Eddleston, 2020; Kazekami, 2020). Two studies have been published recently by Ipsen et al. (2021) and Ingusci et al. (2023) reviewing the advantages and disadvantages of teleworking. Ipsen et al. (2021) found the benefits of teleworking as improved work-life balance, productivity, and control. The benefits of working remotely, according to Ingusci et al. (2023), are having greater autonomy and flexibility, as well as better work-life balance, cost and time savings, lower stress levels, improved relations with colleagues and managers, higher satisfaction with the job done, and better use of technology one has at one's disposal. Contrarily, Ipsen, et al. (2021) listed some of the disadvantages of teleworking as work instability and inadequate equipment. Telework might also cause experiencing isolation, difficulty in obtaining recognition of efforts, difficulty in promotion, reduced protection, difficulty in accessing documents in the office and colleagues for consultation, difficulty in maintaining relationships with colleagues, feelings that one is always being monitored and lack of concentration (Ingusci et al., 2021). Deschenes (2023) found that professional isolation has a negative influence on telework satisfaction but not organizational commitment. Perceived organizational support attenuates the connection between telework satisfaction and professional isolation, indicating that a supportive work environment may mitigate possible negative impacts of telework. Butoi and colleagues (2020) found that company assistance programs might positively impact employees who switched to digital communication.

Different work arrangements have an impact on subjective well-being as discussed above. In the next section, subjective well-being literature and its relationship with work arrangements will be reviewed.

1.1.2 Subjective Well-Being

Subjective well-being (SWB) aims to measure well-being according to the perspective that "people are the best judges of how their life is going" (OECD, 2011, p. 265). "Good mental states, including all the various evaluations, positive and negative, that people make of their lives and the affective reactions of people to their experiences" is the official definition of SWB given by the OECD (OECD, 2013, p. 10).

Subjective well-being is a broad field that covers how and why people enjoy positive experiences in life. The SWB literature encompasses ideas on happiness, life satisfaction, and positive affect. Diener groups the SWB definitions into two major categories (Diener et al., 1999). Early SWB definitions, which get down to the root, consider life satisfaction and depend on personal determinants of a quality life. It considers what allows people to evaluate their lives in a positive way, and the criteria may differ from one person to another. Some might think that relationship satisfaction is more crucial, and others might think that physical health is more important. The second definition of SWB, however, focuses on happiness and positive emotional experiences from either an inborn disposition for happiness or any other external influence. A standard measure of this type of well-being deals with how frequently one feels happy over time (Diener et al., 1999). In this study, we proceed based on the first definition of the subjective well-being as mentioned above.

1.1.2.1 Telework & Subjective Well-Being

To better understand the connection between telework and subjective well-being, we will discuss the related research findings. However, the research findings are mixed. According to Hartman et al. (1992), the flexibility and freedom to pursue personal interests and other activities outside of work and the increased job satisfaction of working remotely lead to a positive correlation between remote work and life satisfaction. According to another study, employees who work in hybrid environments are more likely to be satisfied and retain their jobs longer than those who work in offices, which is good for their well-being (Tsipursky, 2022). The ability to work remotely was favorably correlated with employee satisfaction, based on the survey by the mental health research website 'Tracking Happiness'. Additionally, the study found that, full-time remote workers reported a satisfaction level of almost 20% higher than those who worked in offices (Shumway, 2022). Research has indicated that employees who own pets benefit from teleworking since it allows them to spend more time with them, making them happier (Junça-Silva, 2022). Thus, teleworking with pets nearby has been demonstrated in recent studies to enhance positive work attitudes, including organizational identification (Biron et al., 2022) and work engagement (Grant et al., 2019), as well as well-being indicators, including positive affect (Kaltiainen & Hakanen, 2023) and job satisfaction (Lu & Zhuang, 2023). Therefore, people with a better work-life balance and less friction between their personal and professional lives may view telework more favorably (Gualano et al., 2023). According to Silva et al. (2022), telework was substantially and favorably associated with positive affect, which raised self-reported job performance. According to Boulet et al. (2022), job performance is positively correlated with workers' well-being, and job performance is positively correlated with

satisfaction with work-life balance across all domains. According to this research, performance and happiness with work-life balance are mediated by employees' well-being. According to Chambel et al. (2022), the move to telework improved employee well-being at work.

According to a comprehensive assessment by Ferrara et al. (2022), working remotely impacts how people view their jobs and themselves and how their physical and mental health, particularly regarding work-life balance, is affected. Resources for improved employee well-being include social support, job autonomy, and effective communication. Telework has been shown by Kröner and Mueller (2023) to improve well-being by mitigating the detrimental consequences of increased workload. The findings show that having access to telework when feasible can enhance well-being outcomes and assist staff in adjusting to unique circumstances like the COVID-19 pandemic. However, work-home conflict brought on by job pressures was linked to worse employee well-being, according to research by Mahomed et al. (2022). Work-home conflict was significantly positively connected with gender, and job autonomy was strongly correlated with the frequency of remote work. However, compared to working at the office, Song and Gao (2020) discovered that working from home during the week is linked to lower levels of enjoyment. As discussed above, the results are mixed. There are several personality factors that can have an impact on the relationship between subjective well-being and telework. In order to explore this impact we'll examine how individual needs play a role when working in different work arrangements.

1.1.3 Individual Needs

In this section, we will focus on individual needs, such as the need for affiliation, status, and achievement, to better understand how employees' characteristics affect subjective well-being.

1.1.3.1 Need for Affiliation

According to Veroff and Veroff (1980), affiliation is a personality attribute that correlates with a person's need for social interaction or belonging. It is linked to a desire for social gratification (rewards) from harmonious relationships and communion with others (Murray, 1938 as cited in Weisenfeld, 2001). According to Markus and Kitayama, individuals differ in their perceptions of themselves as independent from or connected to other persons or groups. Their research showed that people's self-perceptions affect their wants and values, impacting their motives, cognition, and emotions in social situations (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). Personality factors also highly influence employee engagement in telework (Clark et al., 2012).

Teleworkers' organizational identity was strongly and positively connected to their affiliation needs. Even when perceived work-based social support was low, organizational identification remained strong among virtual workers with a high need for affiliation (Weisenfeld et al., 2001).

Telecommuters with a low need for affiliation motivation reported more significant work/life quality improvements and higher satisfaction levels with telecommuting (Haines et al., 2002). Haines et al. (2002) found a significant negative relationship between the need for affiliation, reported work/life quality, and telecommuting satisfaction. They urged those with more critical needs for affiliation to recognize this quality about themselves and avoid a telecommuting arrangement (Wright

& Oldford, 1993). Those who are more sociable and attracted to developing relationships with others (i.e., higher on sociability) tended to report lower ratings on indices of telework performance (O'Neill et al., 2009). These results are in line with suggestions that teleworkers generally experience difficulties because of the isolation of working remotely (Batenburg & Peters, 2005), which are probably compounded for those who are more sociable and affiliative (Harpaz, 2002). The previous findings show that to adapt to the telework environment, it is suggested to have a low need for affiliation. Therefore, we recommend the hypothesis below.

H1: Employees with higher needs for affiliation will have lower subjective well-being as the amount of remote working days increases.

1.1.3.2 Need for Status

According to Anderson (2015), status is defined by the Merriam-Webster dictionary as a position or rank to others. It is different from power, financial success, and social belongingness. Anderson and Kraus (2012) examined status differences among individuals in a diverse range of group contexts, including friendship groups, workplaces, and neighborhood communities. Measuring status via peer ratings (respect, admiration, and who is looked up to by others), self-reports (of similar items), and ascendance to leadership positions, they found that individuals' status in their groups consistently predicted SWB. Furthermore, these effects did not appear simply due to belongingness; self-reported status still predicted SWB even after controlling for self-reports of how much individuals felt accepted, included, liked, and welcomed by their group members.

In a longitudinal study that tracked Master of Business Administration (MBA) students during school and after they had graduated and entered the workforce, it was found that many students' status changed as they moved from one group (comprised of

classmates) to another (comprised of coworkers; Anderson, Kraus, et al., 2012). Status was assessed via self-reports of respect, admiration, social standing, social regard, and how much others looked up to the individual. When students' status increased across this significant life transition, their SWB rose, but their SWB correspondingly fell when it decreased. Anderson and Kraus (2012) found evidence for the causal effects of status: Status was manipulated by asking individuals to imagine interacting with someone who had either a high or low level of respect, admiration, and influence in their important social groups (Anderson and Kraus, 2010). Those with higher status reported higher SWB than those who felt lower. Moreover, the status manipulation did not affect individuals' sense of social acceptance, ruling out the possibility that the status induction affected SWB simply because it shaped participants' sense of belongingness.

Tay and Diener (2011) examined the association between the fulfillment of important life goals and SWB in a sample that included more than 60,000 individuals across 123 countries. They found that SWB depends on the degree to which people see themselves respected by others. Measured via self-report items, they were asked whether they felt treated with respect by others and proud of something. The relation between respect and SWB emerged in all geographic regions examined. Relative to the satisfaction of other motives, the attainment of respect was the strongest predictor of long-term positive and negative feelings— even more vital than whether mastery was needed.

Specifically, individuals with lower status in their community experience more depression (Subramanyam et al., 2012), and chronic anxiety and stress (John et al., 2012) compared with individuals with higher status in the community. For example, status in one's community accounted for an additional 9.5% of the variance in depressive symptoms above and beyond significant demographic predictors such as age, gender, and

race (Goodman et al., 2001). One of the disadvantages mentioned above of telework has been argued to be social isolation. Employees with a high need for status would have negative work experiences in an isolated environment. Therefore, we argue that;

H2: Employees with higher needs for status will have lower subjective well-being as the amount of remote working days increases.

1.1.3.3 Need for Achievement

According to McClelland (1976), managers with a low need for affiliation and a high socialized need for power generate a tremendous spirit among juniors. Higher needs for power, moderate needs for achievement, and lower needs for affiliation are ideal characteristics of an influential and effective manager (Stahl, 1986). Studies have shown that when a group's members have a high achievement need, they take greater ownership of the group's successes (Zander, 1968) and are more likely to solve more complex problems efficiently (Smelser, 1961; Shaw, 1976). Workers with a high achievement need score will favor working alone to finish projects rather than collaboratively (Bhattacharya et al., 2020).

Some of the most frequently proposed teleworker characteristics are self-discipline, self-motivation, or self-starters (e.g., Atkinson, 1985; DeSanctis, 1983; Hamilton, 1987; Shamir & Saloman, 1985). Although these terms are not precise psychological characteristics, the themes that emerge is that teleworkers must have a strong work orientation. Furthermore, teleworkers' need to be achievement-oriented is indicated by a need or want to accomplish or be results-oriented (Filipczak, 1992; Hamilton, 1987; Shamir & Saloman, 1985; Staker, 1991). Research addressing teleworkers' achievement orientation provides moderate support for the above speculation. In the only study to directly address this issue, Sharp (1988) found that

teleworkers had significantly higher achievement needs than non-teleworkers. Indirect support comes from Olson and Primps (1984), who found that teleworkers with strong work role orientations were likelier to exhibit workaholism. Neither of these studies, however, examined the impact of achievement needs on teleworker performance.

Further tentative support for the potential moderating role of the need for achievement on teleworker job performance can be found in research examining the interaction of the need for achievement with job characteristics. Steers and Braunstein (1976) and Orpen (1985) found that the need for achievement moderated the relationship between job characteristics and job performance. Both found significant positive correlations between job characteristics and performance for high need for achievement subjects but not for low need for achievement subjects. Teleworking should benefit people with a strong drive for achievement if it increases autonomy, skill variety, and task identification (Loverde et al. 2003).

According to achievement theorists, a person's motivation and performance differ depending on how strongly they feel the need for achievement (Kreitner, 1998). Tang et al. (2020) found that essential psychological need satisfaction and motivation are positively associated with positive indicators of well-being (meaning in life, life satisfaction, positive affect, self-esteem) and negatively associated with negative indicators of well-being (depression, apathy). Based on the findings above, we can argue that employees with higher achievement needs would like to work alone.

H3: Employees with higher needs for achievement will have lower subjective well-being as the amount of remote working day increases.

In the next part, we'll discuss the relationship between subjective well-being and commuting.

1.1.4 Commuting and Subjective Well-being

Lancee et al. (2017) found that people typically feel worse when commuting, especially when using public transportation and on the way to work. According to research by Stutzer and Frey (2008), longer commute time is correlated to lower life satisfaction. Choi et al. (2013) found that commute time is statistically significant and negatively related to SWB. According to research conducted in the U.K. by the Office for National Statistics (ONS), life satisfaction declines with every minute spent traveling. After 45 minutes, commuters' average life satisfaction drops dramatically, and their average mood drops even further after 15 minutes. Commuting between 60 and 90 minutes is most detrimental to subjective well-being levels (ONS, 2014). Long commutes are linked to less free time, according to an examination of General Social Survey data for car commuters from Statistics Canada (Hilbrecht et al., 2014). Another study found that increased commute duration is associated with decreased satisfaction with family and friends, negatively affecting happiness (Kroesen, 2014). An American Time Use Survey study found that longer commute durations are associated with less time spent with spouses, children, and friends (Christian, 2012). Rüger et al. (2017) found that employees with long commutes report poorer health, with the adverse effects becoming quite strong in the case of very long commutes. Hilbrecht et al. (2014) found that commuting time increases are associated with decreased satisfaction and an increased sense of time pressure.

According to Chatterjee et al. (2020), stress can be brought on by traffic, crowding, and unpredictability, and mood is lower during the commute than it is throughout other everyday activities. Commuters who walk or cycle to work are happier with their commutes than those who drive, especially if they take public transportation.

Satisfaction decreases with the commute duration, regardless of the mode used, and increases when traveling with company. They also found that the commuting experience "spills over" into people's feelings and performance at work and home after that. The results above show that lengthier commutes harm total SWB through more significant stress, sleep loss, and decreased social participation and leisure time satisfaction. According to Clark et al. (2020), longer commutes are linked to worse mental health, stress, and lower employment and leisure time satisfaction. The highest correlation between leisure time satisfaction and lower life satisfaction is observed. Longer commute times are more negatively associated with women's job satisfaction than men's. This is interpreted as that women's greater household responsibilities meant longer commute durations were unfavorable to them. When commute time increases, job satisfaction reduces, as Roberts et al. (2011) suggested.

Previous research highlights that teleworking reduces the need for individuals to commute to the office space; this does not just increase mental well-being and reduce stress levels but also provides avenues for saving time and money for commuting between locations (Kahneman et al., 2004; Ipsen et al., 2021). Research has further reported that individuals who work from home experience positive affective well-being because they perceive a positive work environment (Anderson et al., 2015). Ravalet et al. (2019) found that being able to telework for part of the week may increase tolerance for long-distance commuting. Controlling the start and end of the workday may assist employees in avoiding traffic congestion, resulting in shorter travel times, which is why flexible work hours have been associated with increased well-being (Lucas & Heady, 2002). Flexible work hours also allow workers more opportunities to engage in physical activity because they can more easily access organized activities or fit physically active leisure into daily

routines. Blount et al. (2015) found that reduced commute time for teleworkers is linked to reduced commute stress.

While leisure is sometimes disregarded when discussing commuting and health, it can improve well-being. For workers facing late modernity job-related consequences like time pressure and employment uncertainty, leisure can offer health advantages (Cartwright & Warner-Smith, 2003). Engaging in leisure activities increases psychological well-being, happiness, and life satisfaction. Additionally, engaging in physically active leisure can mitigate the negative impacts of stress (IsoAhola, 1997). Leisure can provide a way to cope with stressful work situations (Iwasaki, 2003) and chronic stressors (Hutchinson & Kleiber, 2005). Physically active leisure time was an effective mediator with both life satisfaction and time pressure. Its usefulness as a tool for stress management is probably diminished by the loss of leisure time spent engaging in physical activity (e.g., Hutchinson & Kleiber, 2005; Iwasaki, 2003).

Longer commute distances are negatively associated with physical activity and positively associated with hypertension, waist circumference, and body mass index (Hoehner et al., 2012). Osteoporosis, metabolic risk syndrome, Type 2 diabetes, and cardiovascular disease are all at risk due to physical inactivity (Wijndaele et al., 2009; Katzmarzyk et al., 2009; Warburton et al., 2006). Lengthy commutes have been linked to poor physical and mental health outcomes such as hypertension, obesity, decreased cardiovascular fitness, stress, low energy, and illness-related work absence (Hansson et al., 2011; Hoehner et al., 2012).

Reducing commute duration frees up time for individuals to engage in more rewarding activities, and traffic congestion reduction can indirectly increase subjective well-being (Higgins et al., 2018).

Nonetheless, studies have shown that employees who feel satisfied with their commutes are more content with their jobs (Abou-Zeid & Ben-Akiva, 2011) and work-family balance (Denstadli et al., 2017). Satisfaction with the commute is positively associated with affect balance (experiential well-being) and life satisfaction (evaluative well-being) for Swedish commuters (Olsson et al., 2013). Commuting may allow a mental shift between different activity spheres. It can create a time out from other commitments and responsibilities, including enjoyable activities such as listening to music, enjoying the view, or simply allowing some coveted time alone (Jain & Lyons, 2008). Even though the time spent commuting keeps them from engaging in other activities, some people find that their commute includes leisure time. Commuting convenience is associated with higher commute satisfaction (Handy & Thigpen, 2019). Other studies have explored the role of travel satisfaction in overall life satisfaction. Olsson et al. surveyed Sweden's three largest urban areas and demonstrated that satisfaction with work commute contributes to overall happiness (Olsson et al., 2013). Ettema et al. posited that travel affects SWB in three ways: the experience while traveling, the idea that travel allows participation in activities, and how time pressure affected by traveling influences the experience of those activities (Ettema et al., 2010).

Research on the connection between subjective well-being and commuting has yielded conflicting findings. These contradictory findings have multiple causes. One explanation is that commuting may or may not be beneficial depending on the various types of subjective well-being covered above. For instance, the employee may be in a bad

mood when commuting to work; however, employee satisfaction with the job can be more significant because jobs at a distance are probably better than jobs close to one's home. Another reason is that people's experiences with commuting might vary based on their personal and commuting characteristics; in other words, there is a mixed link between commuting and subjective well-being. To explain these conflicting results, in this study, we will shift our focus from commuting time to commuting convenience and investigate its effect on subjective well-being.

H4: Employees who have higher commuting convenience will have higher subjective well-being.

H5: Employees who have higher commuting time will have lower subjective well-being.

2. METHOD

2.1 Participants

Data for the current study were collected from 203 (123 females, 80 males) white collar employees who work for several companies in Istanbul. A priori power analysis for hierarchical regression models showed that a minimum of 129 would be enough to detect a medium effect (.15) for the variables in hand at the level of 80% power (Sopper 2015).

Employees' age ranged from 18 to 61 ($M=31.47$, $SD=7.87$). 65 % of the employees has college degrees, 28% of them have master's degrees, 3% of them have vocational degrees, and 2% of them have high school degrees.

The total tenure of employees ranges from 8.4 months to 41 years ($M=8.39$, $SD=8.33$), and the tenure of the current company ranges from 1 month to 35 years ($M=4.85$, $SD=6.88$.) 66% of the employees are working in a hybrid work arrangement and their number of remote working days range between 2 days to 21 days in a month ($M=9.95$, $SD=3.85$). The commuting time for the employees ranges from 10 to 270 minutes daily. ($M=72.72$, $SD=47.80$).

2.2 Measures

2.2.1 Work Arrangements

To measure employees' current work arrangement, participants are asked to choose their current work arrangement via 'Which one of the options defines your work arrangements for the last six months?' and the answers were 'Face-to-face, Remote, and Hybrid.' When they chose the 'Hybrid' option, we also asked their number of remote working days via, 'How many days do you work remotely in a month?'. 66% of the

participants was working in a hybrid arrangement, and 34% of the participants was working in a face-to-face arrangement. (See Appendix A for the details.)

2.2.2 Individual Needs

We used the Motivation Orientation Inventory to measure the need for affiliation, status, and achievement (Barrick et al., 2002). The Motivation Orientation Inventory has three subscales: Communion Striving, Achievement Motivation, Status Striving. The Communion Striving subscale includes nine questions scored on the 5-point Likert-type scale. An example question is, 'I frequently think about ways to better cooperate with coworkers and supervisors.' The Achievement Motivation subscale includes 11 questions. An example question is, "I get worked up thinking about finishing work." The Status Striving subscale consists of 11 questions. An example question is, "Every day, I try to be the most successful employee in the office." (See Appendix B for the details.) We used the Turkish adaptation of the scale by Muçaoğlu (2006). The internal consistency for the total scale was .90, the need for affiliation subscale was .826, the need for achievement was .816 and the need for status was .859. The Comparative Fit Index (CFI) = 0.982, TLI = 0.980, RMSEA = 0.039 (90% CI = 0.029 ~ 0.049), SRMR = 0.088.

2.2.3 Commuting Convenience

We created a semantical differential scale to measure employees' commuting convenience. We used bipolar adjectives such as 'Good - Bad' and 'Easy - Hard.' The main question was, 'How would you define your commuting?'. Participants were asked to score on a 7-point scale. (See Appendix C for the details.) We have conducted an Exploratory Factor Analysis to analyze the underlying factors of the scale and investigate the fit indices using the JASP (JASP, 2022). Due to the expected factor correlation,

Maximum likelihood estimation was used with normalized direct oblimin rotation. After testing the scale, as we suggested, we found that they all loaded for one factor. This model had a good fit. Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin's measure of sampling adequacy was .87, above the commonly recommended value of .6, and Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant ($\chi^2(15) = 772.042, p < .001$). Additional fit indices scores that are calculated were Comparative Fit Index = .962, TLI = .919, RMSEA = .14 (90% CI = 0.10 ~ 0.18), SRMR = .0388.

2.2.4 Subjective Well-Being

We have adapted the Subjective Well-being scale (Clark et al., 2020). A proficient English-speaking field professional translated the scale into Turkish. After that, back-translation was carried out, and comparisons were made using the original scale, which includes four categorical items measuring life satisfaction, job satisfaction, leisure time satisfaction, and general health. They were scored on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (very dissatisfied) to 5 (very satisfied), except the general health measure, which was reversely scored on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1(Very Good) to 5(Very Bad). The internal consistency for the scale was .67, and the additional fit indices scores that are calculated were Comparative Fit Index (CFI) = 0.962, TLI = 0.886, RMSEA = 0.106 (90% CI = 0.023 ~ 0.201), SRMR = 0.032. (See Appendix D for the details.)

2.3 Data Collection Procedures

Before the data collection, ethical review board approval (Approval Code: 2023/08/04) is received from the Research Ethics Committee of Özyeğin University. Data were collected using Qualtrics (Qualtrics, Provo, UT), an online platform allowing data collection. Data is collected from employees who work for companies located in İstanbul,

Turkey. Anonymous online survey links are shared via the LinkedIn platform and through HR Leaders in different companies, which they can access after approving the voluntary consent form.

2.4 Data Analytical Approach

The preliminary analyses in the next section were conducted using SPSS Version 27 (IBM Corp. Released 2021).

In the next step, outliers, normality, and missing values were screened before the primary analysis. According to the missing value analysis, the study had no missing data. The next step involved computing Z-Scores to identify univariate outliers and discover multivariate and univariate outliers. A score needs to be higher than 3.29 ($p < .001$, two-tailed) to be considered a possible outlier (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2006). Therefore, there aren't any univariate outliers. Mahalanobis Distance, used to identify multivariate outliers, was examined following the univariate outlier analysis (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2006). No multivariate outliers were higher than the χ^2 value of 20.51, as suggested by Tabachnick and Fidell (2006)

Skewness and kurtosis tests were performed to evaluate the normality assumption. The components of the normality assumptions are skewness and kurtosis, with their criterion falling between +2 and -2 (George & Mallery, 2019). Every variable fell within a reasonable range for normality. The skewness and kurtosis values of each variable in the current investigation are shown in Table 2.1.

A bivariate correlation was run to check for multicollinearity and singularity in all variables, but no multicollinearity was found. Lastly, we checked the Tolerance and VIF (Variance Inflation Factor) values to test the multicollinearity of the independent variables.

According to Pallant (2016), multicollinearity may be indicated if the tolerance is less than 10 and the VIF is greater than 10. The results showed the following tolerance values: the need for status .635, the need for affiliation .599, the need for achievement .783, commuting convenience .719, and remote workday .895 and commuting time .719. On the other hand, the need for status was 1.57, the need for affiliation was 1.66, the need for achievement was 1.27, commuting convenience was 1.39, and the remote workday was 1.11 and commuting time 1.39, representing the VIF values. Therefore, there was no concern for multicollinearity. The multivariate normality plot showed that the results were normal. The normal P-P Plot of regression standardized residual scatter plot shows that the variables were linear. The Standardized Regression Scatter plot shows that the results were homogenous and homoscedastic.

Table 2.1 Descriptive Statistics (N=203)

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis
Age	18	61	31.47	7.87	1.555	2.170
Gender	1	2	1.39	.490	.437	-1.827
Total Tenure	.70	41	8.42	8.34	1.633	2.140
Current Company Tenure	.08	35	4.87	6.89	2.415	5.631
Commuting Time*	10	270	72.72	47.80	1.155	1.024
Commuting Convenience	1.00	7.00	4.31	1.62	-.067	-.788
Remote Working Days	0	21	6.62	5.65	.198	-1.050
Subjective Well-Being	1.25	5.00	3.66	.732	-.455	-.043
Need for Affiliation	1.00	4.89	3.31	.669	-.440	.444
Need for Status	1.00	4.40	2.55	.663	-.039	-.450
Need for Achievement	1.56	5.00	3.53	.585	-.303	.344

*SD = Standard Deviation. *Daily Commuting Time in Minutes.*

Table 2.2 *The Pearson Correlations of the Study Variables*

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1.Age	-										
2.Gender	.079	-									
3.Total Tenure	.954**	.102	-								
4.Current Company Tenure	.784**	.062	.781**	-							
5.Remote Working Days	-.166*	-.088	-.200**	-.111	-						
6.Commuting Time	-.045	-.150*	-.030	-.054	.133	-					
7.Commuting Convenience	.065	.083	.040	.084	-.125	-.518**	-				
8.Subjective Well-Being	.086	-.050	.059	.130	.043	-.194**	.221**	-			
9.Need for Achievement	.040	.104	.062	.024	.169*	-.064	.013	.050	-		
10.Need for Affiliation	-.234**	-.038	-.244**	-.119	.234**	-.028	-.062	.014	.413**	-	
11.Need for Status	-.118	.058	-.095	-.055	.033	-.022	-.088	.016	.379**	.566**	-

Note. * $p < .05$ (2-tailed), ** $p < .01$ (2 tailed)

3. RESULTS

In this section, we'll discuss the study findings. We have conducted a Confirmatory factor analysis for the Motivation Orientation Inventory and Subjective Well-Being scale. Afterward, we looked at the correlations between study variables. To test our hypotheses, three separate hierarchical regression and independent t-tests were conducted.

3.1 Confirmatory Factor Analysis

Confirmatory factor analyses (CFA) were conducted using JASP (0.18.3) to analyze the effectiveness of measurement models. For the Comparative Fit Index (CFI) and the Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI), 0.90 and above values indicate acceptable model fit. For Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA), values lower than 0.06 indicates a good fit, between 0.06-0.08 indicates an acceptable fit, and between 0.08-0.10 indicates a mediocre fit. For SRMR, values below 0.08 indicate a good fit.

Motivation Orientation Inventory. Individual needs were analyzed under three subscales: need for status, achievement, and affiliation. Regarding the need for status subscale the loading of item 1 was less than .30. Therefore, this item was removed from the subscale. The factor loadings were between .342 and .789. For the need for affiliation subscale, there wasn't any item less than .30, so there was no need for item removal. The factor loadings were between .398 and .854. For the need for achievement subscale, the loading of items 2 and 5 was less than .30. Therefore, these items were removed from the subscale. The factor loadings were between .343 and .724. The model fit for the motivation model indicates a good fit. CFI = 0.982, TLI = 0.980, RMSEA = 0.039 (90% CI = 0.029 ~ 0.049), SRMR = 0.088.

Subjective Well-Being Scale. Subjective well-being is analyzed under four subscales, which contain 1 question each. There weren't any factor loadings below .30; therefore, there was no need for item removal. The factor loadings for the items were between .442 and .676. The model fit for subjective well-being model was acceptable, CFI = 0.962, TLI = 0.886, RMSEA = 0.106 (90% CI = 0.023 ~ 0.201), SRMR = 0.032.

3.2 Bivariate Correlations

We conducted bivariate correlations to investigate the associations between individual needs (the need for affiliation, the need for status, the need for achievement), the number of remote working days, commuting convenience, commuting time, age, gender, total tenure and current company tenure. (See Table 2.2)

Results showed that none of the individual needs were significantly associated with subjective well-being. In detail, the need for affiliation wasn't significantly associated with subjective well-being ($r(203) = .014, p = .846$). The need for achievement wasn't significantly associated with subjective well-being ($r(203) = .050, p = .477$). The need for status wasn't significantly associated with subjective well-being ($r(203) = .016, p = .818$).

The need for achievement is significantly and positively correlated with the amount of remote working day ($r(203) = .169, p < .05$), the need for affiliation ($r(203) = .413, p < .01$), and the need for status ($r(203) = .379, p < .01$). The need for affiliation is significantly and positively correlated with the number of remote working days ($r(203) = .234, p < .01$), and the need for status ($r(203) = .566, p < .01$), and negatively correlated with age ($r(203) = -.234, p < .01$).

Commuting convenience was significantly and positively correlated with subjective well-being ($r(203) = .221, p < .01$). Commuting time is significantly and

negatively correlated with commuting convenience ($r(203) = -.150, p < .05$) and subjective well-being ($r(203) = -.194, p < .05$) and gender ($r(203) = -.194, p < .05$). Also, age is significantly and negatively correlated with the number of remote working days ($r(203) = -.166, p < .05$).

Age was significantly and positively correlated with total tenure ($r(203) = .954, p < .01$) and current company tenure ($r(203) = .784, p < .01$) of the employees.

3.3 Hierarchical Regression Analyses

Hierarchical regression analyses were conducted on subjective well-being scores regressed on their need for affiliation, need for status, need for achievement, commuting convenience, remote working days and commuting time. We conducted three different hierarchical regression analyses to test our hypotheses.

The first one was a two-step hierarchical regression analysis in which the first step included age as a control variable. Commuting convenience was entered in the second step (See Table 3.1). In block 1 of the first regression, age accounted for 0.7% of the variance in subjective well-being $F(1, 201) = 1.481, p < .225, R^2 = .007$. Age ($B = .008, \beta = .086, t = 1.217, p < .225$) wasn't significantly related to subjective well-being.

In the second block, the commuting convenience variable explained 0.47% of additional variance in subjective well-being, $F(2, 200) = 5.694, p < .05, R^2 = .054$. In the block 3, commuting convenience ($B = .159, \beta = .216, t = 3.137, p < .01$) were significantly related to subjective well-being. So, the fourth hypothesis (Employees who have higher commuting convenience will have higher subjective well-being.) was supported.

We have conducted the second hierarchical regression analysis to measure the moderator relationship of the work arrangements. The first step included age as a control

variable, the need for status, the need for affiliation, and the need for achievement, which were entered in the second step, and two-way interactions between individual needs and the number of remote working days were entered in the third step. (See Table 3.3)

In block 1 of the first regression, age accounted for 0.7% of the variance in subjective well-being $F(1, 201) = 1.481, p < .225, R^2 = .007$. Age ($B = .008, \beta = .086, t = 1.217, p < .225$) wasn't significantly related to subjective well-being. The second block consisted of the need for status, the need for affiliation, and the need for achievement variables explained 0.2% of additional variance in subjective well-being, $F(4, 198) = 488, p < .744, R^2 = .010$. In the block 2, the need for status ($B = .002, \beta = .002, t = .026, p = .979$), the need for affiliation ($B = .029, \beta = .017, t = .186, p < .853$) and the need for achievement ($B = .028, \beta = .039, t = .485, p < .628$) were not significantly related to subjective well-being.

In the third block, the interactions between individual needs and the amount of remote working day variable explained 0.25% of additional variance in subjective well-being, $F(7, 195) = 1.000, p < .433, R^2 = .035$. In block 3, the interaction between the need for status and the number of remote working days ($B = .032, \beta = .685, t = 1.912, p = .057$), the interaction between the need for affiliation and the number of remote working days ($B = -.002, \beta = -.043, t = -.093, p = .926$) and the interaction between the need for achievement and the number of remote working days ($B = -.020, \beta = -.574, t = -1.387, p = .167$) were not significantly related to subjective well-being. Thus, the amount of remote working day doesn't play a moderator role between individual needs and subjective well-being. Hypothesis 1 (Employees with higher needs for affiliation will have lower subjective well-being as the amount of remote working day increases.), Hypothesis 2 (Employees with higher needs for status will have lower subjective well-

being as the amount of remote working day increases.) and Hypothesis 3 (Employees with higher needs for achievement will have lower subjective well-being as the amount of remote working day increases.) were rejected. (See Table 3.2)

The third hierarchical regression is conducted to test the fifth hypothesis. In the first block of the first regression, age accounted for 0.7% of the variance in subjective well-being $F(1, 201) = 1.481, p < .225, R^2 = .007$. Age ($B = .008, \beta = .086, t = 1.217, p < .225$) wasn't significantly related to subjective well-being.

In the second block, the commuting time variable explained 0.41% of additional variance in subjective well-being, $F(2, 200) = 4.604, p < .05, R^2 = .044$. In the block 2, commuting time ($B = -.163, \beta = -.206, t = -2.945, p < .01$) were significantly related to subjective well-being. Thus, the fifth hypothesis (Employees who have higher commuting time will have lower subjective well-being.) was supported. (See Table 3.3)

Table 3.1 *Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Age, Commuting Convenience and Subjective Well-Being (N=203)*

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Subjective Well-Being</i>		
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β
Block 1			
Age	.008	.007	.086
Total			.007
R Δ			.007
F			1.481
Block 2			
Age	.007	.006	.071
Commuting Convenience	.159	.051	.216*
Total			.054
R Δ			.047
F			5.694*

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 3.2 *Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Individual Needs, Remote Working Days and Subjective Well-Being (N=203)*

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Subjective Well-Being</i>		
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	<i>β</i>
Block 1			
Age	.008	.007	.086
Total			.007
R Δ			.007
F			1.481
Block 2			
Age	.008	.007	.088
Need for Status	.002	.064	.002
Need for Affiliation	.012	.067	.017
Need for Achievement	.028	.059	.039
Total			.010
R Δ			.002
F			.488
Block 3			
Age	.010	.007	.104
Need for Status	-.140	.101	-.191
Need for Affiliation	.018	.154	.025
Need for Achievement	.103	.079	.141
Need for Status X Remote Working Days	.032	.017	.685
Need for Affiliation X Remote Working Days	-.002	.016	-.043
Need for Achievement X Remote Working Days	-.020	.014	-.574
Total			.035
R Δ			.025
F			1.000

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 3.3 *Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Gender, Commuting Time and Subjective Well-Being (N=203)*

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Subjective Well-Being</i>		
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β
Block 1			
Age	.008	.007	.086
Total			.007
R Δ			.007
F			.514
Block 2			
Gender	-.122	.104	-.081
Commuting Time	-.163	.055	-.206
Total			.044
R Δ			.034
F			4.604*

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

3.4 Independent Samples T-Test

An independent samples t-test was conducted to see if there are any differences between face-to-face and hybrid work arrangement groups on subjective well-being.

There was no significant effect on subjective well-being, $t(202) = .455$ $p = .064$ despite the employees working in a hybrid work arrangement ($M = 3.68$, $SD = 0.7$) attaining higher scores than the employees working in a face-to-face work arrangement ($M = 3.63$, $SD = 0.75$).



4. DISCUSSION

The current study is conducted to examine the relationship between individual needs, commuting convenience, and subjective well-being and how work arrangements moderate this relationship. In this section, the findings are discussed in the light of the relevant literature.

4.1 Individual Needs

The first three hypotheses focus on the relationship between individual needs and subjective well-being and to see if this relationship moderates with work arrangements. Contrary to our expectations, we couldn't find any significant correlations between any of the individual needs and subjective well-being and two-way interactions between individual needs and work arrangements. Results showed that work arrangements don't play a role as a moderator and there isn't any significant relationship between individual needs and subjective well-being.

However, we found that the need for achievement and the need for affiliation is significantly and positively correlated with the number of remote working days. Even though there isn't any causal relationship here, a previous study showed that when employees work remotely, they might feel alone and not get enough credit for what they have accomplished (Ingusci et al. 2023). Despite the positive correlation between the need for affiliation and achievement and the number of remote working days, individual needs haven't predicted subjective well-being. This result might be explained by the positive impact of high usage of digital communication tools. With Teams, Zoom, and Skype calls, employees might feel like they are working together with their colleagues. There are a lot of virtual team bonding activities and if they are used properly, it might decrease

the negative effect of being away from colleagues. Also, during the COVID-19 period, employees were forced to work from home and lots of them still are working in a hybrid work arrangement. There is a chance that they have adapted to these work arrangements and thus, they don't feel the negative effects of working remotely. Also, we couldn't find any subjective well-being differences between hybrid work arrangements and face-to-face work arrangements. To go further, the hybrid working model can be a model that makes employees tolerate the negative side of telework, such as social isolation, because they are also still in contact with their managers and colleagues face-to-face for a couple of days a week.

In addition, we also found that age is negatively correlated with the need for affiliation. This is consistent with the previous findings. The need for affiliation tends to decrease with age (Rhodes, 1983 as cited in Kooij et al., 2011).

4.2 Commuting & Subjective Well-Being

The fourth hypothesis was related to how commuting convenience affects subjective well-being. Our results showed that commuting convenience predicts subjective well-being. This is especially important because there are mixed findings regarding commuting time and well-being. For example, Olsson (2013) surveyed Sweden's three largest urban areas and demonstrated that satisfaction with work commute contributes to overall happiness (Olsson et al., 2013) and commuting time doesn't always necessarily decrease subjective well-being because, in some cases, it can allow leisure time satisfaction (Jain & Lyons, 2008). The fifth hypothesis was related to commuting time and subjective well-being, and our findings showed that higher commuting times predict decreases in employees' subjective well-being.

These results are great examples of how important employees' perception of their situations is. Even though our participants' commuting time to work ranges between 10 to 270 minutes daily and we have found that longer commuting times cause a decrease in subjective well-being, when employees see their commuting as convenient, it not only neutralizes this situation but also increases subjective well-being. To sum up, not only investigating the commuting time but also adding the commuting convenience showed us how important it is to employees to be satisfied with their commuting to work. Especially in İstanbul, there are several commuting modes available, such as ferries across the Bosphorus, trams, cars, subways, trains, and shuttles. For instance, employees may enjoy the Bosphorus view, reading a book and listening to podcasts and songs while commuting to work. When we think of commuting, we shouldn't be thinking of it only as 'time', but we should also think of it as the satisfaction of commuting.

4.3 Strengths, Limitations, and Future Directions

The primary strength of the current study is the contribution of the literature by investigating individual needs, work arrangements, commuting, and subjective well-being altogether. To our knowledge, there has been no research conducted on all the variables above in the same study. In addition, the current study extends the literature by providing both commuting time and commuting convenience together and examining the correlation between individual needs and subjective well-being.

Nevertheless, this study has some limitations. One major limitation is that to truly understand the nature of commuting, we have collected the data from a big metropolitan city, İstanbul. The study can be repeated by collecting data from other metropolitan cities. The other limitation is the number of participants working face-to-face was low in our sample, probably because most of the companies are nowadays working in a hybrid work

arrangement. This study was a cross-sectional study. Therefore, longitudinal studies can provide more comprehensive and diverse results.

We have found that when commuting time increases it decreases subjective well-being. However, when they are satisfied with their commuting, it also increases their subjective well-being. Further studies can focus on how employees, even in the long commute time, can be satisfied with their commuting. The reason behind the commuting convenience might be spending the commuting time effectively, such as listening to a podcast or a book, enjoying the view, catching up with work, etc. In several companies, some of the employees are working remotely, some of them working in a hybrid work arrangement, and the rest of them are working from the office. Further studies can explore how the different work arrangements in the same company affect subjective well-being. In our study, we couldn't find any subjective well-being differences between hybrid and face-to-face work arrangement groups. The group differences between work arrangements can be also further studied.

4.4 Implications

The findings showed that to increase subjective well-being, employers might focus on increasing the commuting convenience of their employees. This might also have a positive impact on talent attraction. Employees might choose closer locations or locations that are easily accessible, or have a pleasant experience while commuting, if possible, such as ferries.

Commuting convenience might increase by adapting flexible work models such as daily or annual flexible work hours, remote working, or hybrid work models. In that way employees might reduce commuting times by avoiding rush hours. Employers can also provide the opportunity to choose which commuting mode they prefer to increase

commuting convenience. The previous findings showed employees who walk or cycle to work are happier than others. (Chatterjee et al., 2020) Employers might also provide budget-friendly housing, such as university campuses, or add company shuttles to make commuting to work more convenient to employees.

4.5 Conclusion

Even though this study mainly focuses on the relationship between individual needs and subjective well-being and the moderator role of work arrangements, the findings showed us the importance of commuting on employees' subjective well-being.

Our results showed that commuting time was negatively associated with subjective well-being and commuting convenience. Also, when the commuting time increases employees' subjective well-being decreases. However, we also found that commuting convenience predicts subjective well-being. When employees' commuting convenience increases, their subjective well-being is also increases. This finding is especially important because it adds to the literature that commuting time and commuting convenience are two different concepts and how important it is for employees to be satisfied with their commuting to work. Furthermore, we examined the moderating role of work arrangements on the association between individual needs and subjective well-being however, work arrangements didn't moderate this association, and neither of the individual needs were significantly correlated with subjective well-being. It can also be argued that hybrid working eliminates the negative effects seen in other remote working models. Based on these findings employers might integrate several commuting policies to increase employee satisfaction and subjective well-being. And further studies can explore the factors behind commuting convenience even in long commuting times.

REFERENCES

- Abou-Zeid, M., & Ben-Akiva, M. (2011). The effect of social comparisons on commute well-being. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, 45(4), 345-361. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tra.2011.01.011>
- 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>
- Anderson, A. J., Kaplan, S. A., & Vega, R. P. (2015). The impact of telework on emotional experience: When, and for whom, does telework improve daily affective well-being? *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 24(6), 882-897. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2014.966086>
- Anderson, C., Kraus, M. W., Galinsky, A. D., & Keltner, D. (2012). The local-ladder effect: Social status and subjective well-being. *Psychological Science*, 23(7), 764-771. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797611434537>
- Atkinson, D. R. (1985). A meta-review of research on cross-cultural counseling and psychotherapy. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, 13(4), 138-153. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-1912.1985.tb00151.x>
- Bali-Mahomed, N. J., Ku-Johari, K. S., Mahmud, M. I., Amat, S., & Saadon, S. (2022). Psychological Well-Being of School Counsellors Model. *European Journal of Educational Research*, 11(2), 621-638. <https://doi.org/10.12973/eu-jer.11.2.621>
- Barrick, M. R., Stewart, G. L., & Piotrowski, M. (2002). Personality and job performance: Test of the mediating effects of motivation among sales representatives. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(1), 43-51. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.1.43>

- Baruch, Y. (2000). Teleworking: benefits and pitfalls as perceived by professionals and managers. *New Technology, Work and Employment*, 15(1), 34-49.
- Beckel, J. L., & Fisher, G. G. (2022). Telework and worker health and well-being: a review and recommendations for research and practice. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(7), 3879.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19073879>
- Bhattacharya, S., & Mittal, P. (2020). The impact of individual needs on employee performance while teleworking. *Australasian Accounting, Business and Finance Journal*, 14(5), 65-85. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14453/aabfj.v14i5.5>
- 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>
- Blount, Y. (2015). Pondering the fault lines of anywhere working (telework, telecommuting): A literature review. *Foundations and Trends® in Information Systems*, 1(3), 163-276. <https://doi.org/10.1561/29000000001>
- Boulet, M., & Parent-Lamarche, A. (2022). Paradoxical effects of teleworking on workers' well-being in the COVID-19 context: A comparison between different public administrations and the private sector. *Public Personnel Management*, 51(4), 430-457. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0091026022110294>
- Butoi, E., Feneşan, A. R., & Balint, C. I. (2022). Teleworkers' perception of well-being and work-life balance. *Studia Universitatis Babeş-Bolyai Negotia*, 65-78.
<https://doi.org/10.24193/subbnegotia.2022.4.04>

- Cartwright, S., & Warner-Smith, P. (2003). 'Melt down': Young women's talk of time and its implications for health, well-being and identity in late modernity. *Annals of Leisure Research*, 6(4), 319-338.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/11745398.2003.10600930>
- Catană, Ș. A., Toma, S. G., Imbrișcă, C., & Burcea, M. (2022). Teleworking impact on wellbeing and productivity: A cluster analysis of the Romanian graduate employees. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 856196.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.856196>
- Chambel, M. J., Castanheira, F., & Santos, A. (2023). Teleworking in times of COVID-19: the role of Family-Supportive supervisor behaviors in workers' work-family management, exhaustion, and work engagement. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 34(15), 2924-2959.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2022.2063064>
- Chatterjee, S. S., Vora, M., Malathesh, B. C., & Mukherjee, A. (2020). Stigma, COVID-19 and mental health: where do we stand? *Bengal Journal of Psychiatry*, 19-23.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajp.2020.102071>
- Choi, J., Coughlin, J. F., & D'Ambrosio, L. (2013). Travel time and subjective well-being. *Transportation Research Record*, 2357(1), 100-108.
<https://doi.org/10.3141/2357-12>
- Choudhury, P. (2022). Geographic mobility, immobility, and geographic flexibility: A review and agenda for research on the changing geography of work. *Academy of Management Annals*, 16(1), 258-296. <https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2020.0242>

- Christian, T. J. (2012). Trade-offs between commuting time and health-related activities. *Journal of Urban Health*, 89, 746-757. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11524-012-9678-6>
- Clark, B., Chatterjee, K., Martin, A., & Davis, A. (2020). How commuting affects subjective wellbeing. *Transportation*, 47(6), 2777-2805. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11116-019-09983-9>
- 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.
- Denstadli, J. M., Julsrud, T. E., & Christiansen, P. (2017). Urban commuting—A threat to the work-family balance? *Journal of Transport Geography*, 61, 87-94. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtrangeo.2017.04.011>
- Deschênes, A. A. (2023). Professional isolation and pandemic teleworkers’ satisfaction and commitment: The role of perceived organizational and supervisor support. *European Review of Applied Psychology*, 73(2), 100823. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erap.2022.100823>
- Diener, E., Suh, E. M., Lucas, R. E., & Smith, H. L. (1999). Subjective well-being: Three decades of progress. *Psychological Bulletin*, 125(2), 276.–302.
- Doberstein, C., & Charbonneau, É. (2022). Alienation in pandemic-induced telework in the public sector. *Public Personnel Management*, 51(4), 491-515. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00910260221114788>
- Ettema, D., Gärling, T., Olsson, L. E., & Friman, M. (2010). Out-of-home activities, daily travel, and subjective well-being. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, 44(9), 723–732. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tra.2010.07.005>

Eurofound (2020). *Regulations to address work–life balance in digital flexible working arrangements*. New Forms of Employment Series, Publications Office of the European Union.

https://www.eurofound.europa.eu/sites/default/files/ef_publication/field_ef_document/ef19046en.pdf

Eurofound (2023). *Anticipating and managing the impact of change, the future of telework and hybrid work*. New Forms of Employment Series, Publications Office of the European Union. <https://www.eurofound.europa.eu/system/files/2023-04/ef22028en.pdf>

Eurofound. (2019, October 22). *Right to disconnect*. European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions.

<https://www.eurofound.europa.eu/observatories/eurwork/industrialrelations-dictionary/right-to-disconnect>.

Eurostat (2022). *Rise in EU population working from home*. European Union. <https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/products-eurostat-news/-/ddn-20221108-1>

Ferrara, B., Pansini, M., De Vincenzi, C., Buonomo, I., & Benevene, P. (2022). Investigating the role of remote working on employees' performance and well-being: an evidence-based systematic review. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(19), 12373. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph191912373>

Filipczak, B. (1992). Telecommuting: A better way to work? *Training*, May, 53–61.

Gavoille, N., & Hazans, M. (2022). Personality traits, remote work and productivity. *Remote Work and Productivity* (September 29, 2022). <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4188297>

- George, D., & Mallery, P. (2019). *IBM SPSS statistics 26 step by step: A simple guide and reference*. Routledge.
- 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>
- Golden, T. D., & Eddleston, K. A. (2020). Is there a price telecommuters pay? Examining the relationship between telecommuting and objective career success. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 116, 103348. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2019.103348>
- Goodman, R. (2001). Psychometric properties of the strengths and difficulties questionnaire. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, 40(11), 1337-1345. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00004583-200111000-00015>
- Grant, C. A., Wallace, L. M., Spurgeon, P. C., Tramontano, C., & Charalampous, M. (2019). Construction and initial validation of the E-Work Life Scale to measure remote e-working. *Employee Relations*, 41(1), 16-33. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ER-09-2017-0229>
- Gualano, M. R., Santoro, P. E., Borrelli, I., Rossi, M. F., Amantea, C., Daniele, A., & Moscato, U. (2023). TElewoRk-RelAted stress (TERRA), psychological and physical strain of working from home during the COVID-19 pandemic: A systematic review. *Workplace Health & Safety*, 71(2), 58-67. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21650799221119155>

- Haines III, V. Y., St-Onge, S., & Archambault, M. (2002). Environmental and person antecedents of telecommuting outcomes. *Journal of Organizational and End User Computing (JOEUC)*, 14(3), 32-50. <https://doi.org/10.4018/joeuc.2002070103>
- Hamilton, C. (1987). Telecommuting. *Personnel Journal*, 66 (4), 90-101.
- Handy, S., & Thigpen, C. (2019). Commute quality and its implications for commute satisfaction: Exploring the role of mode, location, and other factors. *Travel Behaviour and Society*, 16, 241-248. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tbs.2018.03.001>
- Hansson, E., Mattisson, K., Björk, J., Östergren, P. O., & Jakobsson, K. (2011). Relationship between commuting and health outcomes in a cross-sectional population survey in southern Sweden. *BMC Public Health*, 11, 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2458-11-834>
- 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>
- Hartman, R. I., Stoner, C. R., & Arora, R. (1992). Developing successful organizational telecommuting arrangements: Worker perceptions and managerial prescriptions. *SAM Advanced Management Journal* (07497075), 57(3).
- Higgins, C. D., Sweet, M. N., & Kanaroglou, P. S. (2018). All minutes are not equal: travel time and the effects of congestion on commute satisfaction in Canadian cities. *Transportation*, 45, 1249-1268. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11116-017-9766-2>
- Hilbrecht, M., Smale, B., & Mock, S. E. (2014). Highway to health? Commute time and well-being among Canadian adults. *World Leisure Journal*, 56(2), 151-163. <https://doi.org/10.1080/16078055.2014.903723>

- Ho, Y. S., Fu, H. Z., & McKay, D. (2021). A bibliometric analysis of COVID-19 publications in the ten psychology-related Web of Science categories in the social science citation index. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 77(12), 2832-2848. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.seppur.2021.118898>
- Hoehner, C. M., Barlow, C. E., Allen, P., & Schootman, M. (2012). Commuting distance, cardiorespiratory fitness, and metabolic risk. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 42(6), 571-578. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2012.02020>
- Hutchinson, S. L., & Kleiber, D. A. (2005). Gifts of the ordinary: Casual leisure's contributions to health and well-being. *World Leisure Journal*, 47(3), 2-16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/04419057.2005.9674401>
- 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.
- Ingusci, E., Signore, F., Giancaspro, M. L., Manuti, A., Molino, M., Russo, V., ... & Cortese, C. G. (2021). Workload, techno overload, and behavioral stress during COVID-19 emergency: The role of job crafting in remote workers. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 655148. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.655148>
- 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.
- Iso-Ahola, S. E. (2006). A psychological analysis of leisure and health. In *Work, leisure and well-being* (pp. 143-156). Routledge.

- Iwasaki, Y. (2003). The impact of leisure coping beliefs and strategies on adaptive outcomes. *Leisure Studies*, 22(2), 93-108.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/026143603200058777>
- Jain, J., & Lyons, G. (2008). The gift of travel time. *Journal of transport Geography*, 16(2), 81-89. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtrangeo.2007.05.001>
- John, D. A., De Castro, A. B., Martin, D. P., Duran, B., & Takeuchi, D. T. (2012). Does an immigrant health paradox exist among Asian Americans? Associations of nativity and occupational class with self-rated health and mental disorders. *Social Science & Medicine*, 75(12), 2085-2098.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2012.01.035>
- Junça Silva, A., Almeida, A., & Rebelo, C. (2024). The effect of telework on emotional exhaustion and task performance via work overload: the moderating role of self-leadership. *International Journal of Manpower*, 45(2), 398-421.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/IJM-08-2022-0352>
- Junça Silva, A., Neves, P., & Caetano, A. (2024). Procrastination is not only a “thief of time”, but also a thief of happiness: It buffers the beneficial effects of telework on well-being via daily micro-events of IT workers. *International Journal of Manpower*, 45(1), 89-108. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJM-05-2022-0223>
- Kahneman, D., Krueger, A. B., Schkade, D. A., Schwarz, N., & Stone, A. A. (2004). The day reconstruction method (DRM). Instrument documentation.
<https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1103572>
- Kaltainen, J., & Hakanen, J. J. (2024). Why increase in telework may have affected employee well-being during the COVID-19 pandemic? The role of work and non-work life domains. *Current Psychology*, 43(13), 12169-12187.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-023-04250-8>

Karaismailoğlu (2024, May). *İstanbul'da trafik sıkışıklığı yıllık 10 milyar dolar kayba neden oluyor*. Anadolu Ajansı. <https://www.aa.com.tr/tr/ekonomi/istanbulda-trafik-sikisikligi-yillik-10-milyar-dolar-kayba-neden-oluyor/3208987>

Katzmarzyk, P. T., Church, T. S., Craig, C. L., & Bouchard, C. (2009). Sitting time and mortality from all causes, cardiovascular disease, and cancer. *Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise*, 41(5), 998-1005.

<https://doi.org/10.1249/MSS.0b013e3181930355>

Kazekami, S. (2020). Mechanisms to improve labor productivity by performing telework. *Telecommunications Policy*, 44(2), 101868.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.telpol.2019.101868>

Kooij, D. T., De Lange, A. H., Jansen, P. G., Kanfer, R., & Dijkers, J. S. (2011). Age and work-related motives: Results of a meta-analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 32(2), 197-225.

Kraus, M. W., Huang, C., & Keltner, D. (2010). Tactile communication, cooperation, and performance: an ethological study of the NBA. *Emotion*, 10(5), 745.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0019382>

Kreitner, R., & Kinicki, A. (1998). *Organizational Behavior (4 ed.)*. Boston: Irwin McGrawHill.

Kroesen, M., & Handy, S. (2014). The influence of holiday-taking on affect and contentment. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 45, 89-101.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2013.12.006>

- Kröner, F., & Müller, A. (2023). Development of well-being after moving to telework: A longitudinal latent class analysis. *Frontiers in Psychology, 14*, 1098336. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1098336>
- Lancee, J., Yaseiny, S. L., Brendel, R. S., Boffo, M., Clarke, P. J., & Salemin, E. (2017). Attentional bias modification training for insomnia: A double-blind placebo controlled randomized trial. *PloS one, 12*(4), e0174531. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0174531>
- Love, Mark & Ayman, Roy & DeLay, Nancy. (2003). The Effects of Individuals' Psychological Needs on Telework's Impact on Job Performance.
- Lu, Z., & Zhuang, W. (2023). Can teleworking improve workers' job satisfaction? Exploring the roles of gender and emotional well-being. *Applied Research in Quality of Life, 18*(3), 1433-1452. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11482-023-10145-4>
- Lucas, J. L., & Heady, R. B. (2002). Flextime commuters and their driver stress, feelings of time urgency, and commute satisfaction. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 16*, 565-571. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1015402302281>
- Lund, E. M., Forber-Pratt, A. J., Wilson, C., & Mona, L. R. (2020). The COVID-19 pandemic, stress, and trauma in the disability community: A call to action. *Rehabilitation Psychology, 65*(4), 313. <https://doi.org/10.1037/rep0000368>
- Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Cultural variation in the self-concept. In *The self: Interdisciplinary approaches* (pp. 18-48). New York, NY: Springer New York. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.98.2.224>
- McClelland, D. (1976). *The Achieving Society*. New York: Irvington

- Messenger, J. C. (2019). Conclusions and recommendations for policy and practice. In *Telework in the 21st Century* (pp. 286-316). Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Michinov, E., Ruiller, C., Chedotel, F., Dodeler, V., & Michinov, N. (2022). Work-from-home during COVID-19 lockdown: When employees' well-being and creativity depend on their psychological profiles. *Frontiers in Psychology, 13*, 862987. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.862987>
- Muaoğlu, D. (2006). alıřanların Arkadařlık, Bařarı ve Statü abaları ve Bu abaların Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranıřlarıyla İliřkisinin İncelenmesi. *Yayımlanmamıř Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü. Ankara.*
- O'Neill, T. A., Hambley, L. A., Greidanus, N. S., MacDonnell, R., & Kline, T. J. (2009). Predicting teleworker success: An exploration of personality, motivational, situational, and job characteristics. *New Technology, Work and Employment, 24*(2), 144-162.
- OECD. (2013). *OECD guidelines on measuring subjective well-being*. OECD Publishing.
- Olson, M. H., & Primps, S. B. (1984). Working at home with computers: Work and nonwork issues. *Journal of Social Issues, 40*(3), 97-112.
- Olsson, L. E., Gärling, T., Ettema, D., Friman, M., & Fujii, S. (2013). Happiness and satisfaction with work commute. *Social indicators research, 111*, 255-263. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-012-0003-2>
- ONS (2014). *Commuting and Personal Well-Being*. Office for National Statistics, London, UK.
- Orpen, C. (1985). The effects of need for achievement and need for independence on the relationship between perceived job attributes and managerial satisfaction and performance. *International Journal of Psychology, 20*(2), 207-219.

- Ory, D. T., Mokhtarian, P. L., Redmond, L. S., Salomon, I., Collantes, G. O., & Choo, S. (2004). When is commuting desirable to the individual? *Growth and Change*, 35(3), 334-359. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2257.2004.00252.x>
- Pallant, J. (2016) *SPSS Survival Manual: A Step-by-Step Guide to Data Analysis Using SPSS Program* (7th ed.). A&U Academic.
- Peters, P., & Batenburg, R. (2015). Telework adoption and formalization in organizations from a knowledge transfer perspective. *International Journal of Work Innovation*, 1(3), 251-270. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJWI.2015.074169>
- Randstad. (2024, April). *Turkey HR Trends Report 2023*.
https://www.randstad.com.tr/s3fs-media/tr/public/202304/TR_Turkey%20HR%20Trends%202023_0.pdf
- Ravalet, E., & Rérat, P. (2019). Teleworking: Decreasing mobility or increasing tolerance of commuting distances? *Built Environment*, 45(4), 582-602.
<https://doi.org/10.2148/benv.45.4.582>
- Ro, C. (2020). *Companies are looking to the post-Covid future. For many, the vision is a model that combines remote work and office time*. BBC Work life, 31.
<https://www.bbc.com/worklife/article/20200824-whythe-future-of-work-might-be-hybrid>
- Roberts, J., Hodgson, R., & Dolan, P. (2011). “It's driving her mad”: Gender differences in the effects of commuting on psychological health. *Journal of Health Economics*, 30(5), 1064-1076. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhealeco.2011.07.006>
- Rüger, H., Pfaff, S., Weishaar, H., & Wiernik, B. M. (2017). Does perceived stress mediate the relationship between commuting and health-related quality of

- life? *Transportation research part F: traffic psychology and behavior*, 50, 100-108. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trf.2017.07.005>
- Sakapurnama, E., Huseini, M., & Soeling, P. D. (2019). The Challenges in Higher Education Institutions in Indonesia: Are We Entrepreneurial University Yet? *Hasanuddin Economics and Business Review*, 2(3), 153-171.
- Shamir, B., & Salomon, I. (1985). Work-at-home and the quality of working life. *Academy of Management Review*, 10(3), 455-464.
- Sharp Jr, B. J. (1988). *Telecommuter personality characteristics: A comparison of workers in the home and office*. California School of Professional Psychology-Los Angeles.
- Shaw, M. E., & Harkey, B. (1976). Some effects of congruency of member characteristics and group structure upon group behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 34(3), 412-418. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.34.3.412>
- Shaw, M. E. (1976). *Group Dynamics (2nd ed.)*. New Delhi: Tata McGraw Hill.
- Shumway, E. (2022, March). *Remote Work is Linked to Happiness: Study of 12,455 Respondents*, Tracking Happiness <https://www.trackinghappiness.com/remote-work-leads-to-happiness-study/#remote-work-increases-happiness>
- Smelser, W. T. (1961). Dominance as a factor in achievement and perception in cooperative problem-solving interactions. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 62(3), 535-542. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0049303>
- Song, Y., & Gao, J. (2020). Does telework stress employees out? A study on working at home and subjective well-being for wage/salary workers. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 21(7), 2649-2668. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-019-00196-6>
- Soper, D. S. (2015). A-priori sample size calculator for multiple regression [Software].

- Spreitzer, G. M., Cameron, L., & Garrett, L. (2017). Alternative work arrangements: Two images of the new world of work. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 4(1), 473-499.
<https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032516-113332>
- Stahl, M. (1986). Managerial and Technical Motivation: Assessing Needs for Achievement, Power, and Affiliation. *New York: Praeger*.
- Staker, D. C. (1991). *Utah women telecommuters and personality: A case study in type and trait*. The Fielding Institute.
- Steers, R. M., & Braunstein, D. N. (1976). A behaviorally based measure of manifest needs in work settings. *Journal of Vocational behavior*, 9(2), 251-266.
- Stutzer, A., & Frey, B. S. (2008). Stress that doesn't pay: The commuting paradox. *Scandinavian Journal of Economics*, 110(2), 339-366.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9442.2008.00542.x>
- Subramanyam, M. A., Diez-Roux, A. V., Hickson, D. A., Sarpong, D. F., Sims, M., Taylor Jr, H. A., ... & Wyatt, S. B. (2012). Subjective social status and psychosocial and metabolic risk factors for cardiovascular disease among African Americans in the Jackson Heart Study. *Social Science & Medicine*, 74(8), 1146-1154.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2011.12.042>
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics* (6th ed.). Pearson.
- Tay, L., & Diener, E. (2011). Needs and subjective well-being around the world. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 101(2), 354-365.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0023779>

- Tsipursky, G. (2022). Does Remote Work Affect Wellbeing and Work-Life Balance? *Forbes*. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/glebtsipursky/2022/11/01/does-remote-work-hurt-wellbeingand-work-life-balance/?sh=3b60b1864b20>
- Veroff, J., & Veroff, J. B. (2013). *Social incentives: A life-span developmental approach*. Elsevier.
- Wang, C., Cheng, Z., Yue, X. G., & McAleer, M. (2020). Risk management of COVID-19 by universities in China. *Journal of Risk and Financial Management*, 13(2), 36. <https://doi.org/10.3390/jrfm13020036>
- Warburton, D. E., Nicol, C. W., & Bredin, S. S. (2006). Health benefits of physical activity: the evidence. *Cmaj*, 174(6), 801-809. <https://doi.org/10.1503/cmaj.051351>
- Wiesenfeld, B. M., Raghuram, S., & Garud, R. (2001). Organizational identification among virtual workers: The role of need for affiliation and perceived work-based social support. *Journal of Management*, 27(2), 213-229.
- Wijndaele, K., Duvigneaud, N., Matton, L., Duquet, W., Delecluse, C., Thomis, M., ... & Philippaerts, R. M. (2009). Sedentary behavior, physical activity and a continuous metabolic syndrome risk score in adults. *European Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, 63(3), 421-429. <https://doi.org/10.1038/sj.ejcn.1602944>
- Zander, A., & Forward, J. (1968). Position in group, achievement motivation, and group aspirations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 8(3pt.1), 282. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0025595>



APPENDICES

APPENDIX A. DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONNAIRE

Section 1

Bu bölümde sizinle ilgili bazı bilgilere ihtiyacımız bulunmaktadır, lütfen tüm soruları cevaplayınız.

1.Cinsiyetiniz

☐ Kadın ☐ Erkek ☐ Belirtmek İstemiyorum

2.Yaşınız

...

3. Yaşadığınız Şehir

...

4.Eğitim Durumunuz

☐ Lise ☐ Ön lisans. ☐ Lisans ☐ Lisansüstü

4.Toplam Çalışma Süreniz

...

5.Çalıştığınız İşletmedeki Çalışma Süreniz

...

7.Çalıştığınız İşletmenin Büyüklüğü

☐ 0-50 Çalışan ☐ 51-100 Çalışan ☐ 101-1000 Çalışan ☐ 1001-10.000 Çalışan ☐ 10.000+

8.Aşağıdaki seçeneklerden hangisi son 6 aylık çalışma şeklinizi tanımlar?

☐ Yüz Yüze

☐ Uzaktan

☐ Hibrit (Hem yüz yüze hem uzaktan)

-Hibrit der ise; *Ayda ortalama kaç gün uzaktan çalışıyorsunuz?*

APPENDIX B. MOTIVATION ORIENTATION INVENTORY

Section 4

Bu bölümde çalışanların işle ilgili tutumlarını yansıtan ifadeler bulunmaktadır. Lütfen her bir maddeyi okuyarak ifadenin size ne derece uyduğunu belirtiniz ve tüm maddeleri cevaplayınız.

1. Sık sık daha iyi iş imkanları ve ücret elde etmenin yollarını düşünürüm.
- () Hiç Katılmıyorum () Katılmıyorum () Kararsızım () Katılıyorum () Tamamen Katılıyorum
2. Birden çok işi tamamlayabilmek için kendime hedefler koyarım.
3. İş arkadaşlarımın aynı zamanda yakın arkadaşlarım olması fikri beni heyecanlandırır.
4. İş arkadaşlarımın beni sevip sevmediği üzerine çok düşünürüm.
5. İşlerimi nasıl yapacağım konusunda sık sık düşünürüm.
6. İş arkadaşlarımın önüne geçenlerin yollarını düşünerek çok zaman harcarım.
7. İş arkadaşlarımdan daha başarılı olma arzusu beni kışkırtıyor.
8. Görevlerimi tamamlamak için çok çaba harcarım.
9. Kendime benzer iş arkadaşlarımın ve yöneticilerimin olması benim için önemlidir.
10. İş arkadaşlarım ve yöneticilerim tarafından sevilme için çaba göstermekten hiç vazgeçmem.
11. İşlerimi tamamlayacağımı düşündüğümde heyecanlanırım.
12. İşte elde ettiğim başarıları sık sık iş arkadaşlarımın başarılarıyla karşılaştırırım.
13. Dikkatimi iş yerimdeki en iyi çalışan olmaya yoğunlaştırırım.
14. Bana verilen görevleri yerine getirmek için çok çaba gösteririm.
15. Geçinilmesi kolay bir insan olarak tanınmak için çok çaba gösteririm.
16. İş arkadaşlarımın önüne geçenlerin yollarını düşünerek çok zaman harcarım.
17. İş yerimdeki en başarılı kişi olabileceğimi düşündüğümde heyecanlanırım.
18. Sık sık nasıl daha çok iş yapabileceğimi düşünürüm.
19. Takım oyuncusu olma fikri beni heveslendiriyor.
20. Benim için önemli olan çok sayıda işi tamamlamaktır.
21. İş arkadaşlarım ve yöneticilerim tarafından beğenilmek için uğraşmaktan hiç vazgeçmem.
22. Diğerlerinden daha iyi olabilmek için kişisel hedefler belirlerim.
23. İşlerimi nasıl bitireceğimi uzun uzun düşünürüm.
24. İş arkadaşlarımla ve yöneticilerimle iyi geçinmeye odaklıyım.
25. Dikkatimi yapmam gereken işleri bitirmeye yoğunlaştırırım.
26. Diğerlerinden daha yüksek düzeyde performans göstermeye çalışmaktan hiç vazgeçmem.
27. Her zaman en yüksek performansı gösteren kişi olmaya çalışırım.
28. Görevlerimi yerine getirebilmek için çok çaba harcarım.
29. İşlerimi tamamlayabilmek için uğraşmayı hiç bırakmam.
30. İş arkadaşlarım ve yöneticilerimle iş birliği içerisinde çalıştığımı düşünmeyi severim.
31. İşimde daha yüksek bir pozisyona gelebileceğimi düşündüğümde heyecanlanırım.

APPENDIX C. COMMUTING TIME MEASUREMENT & COMMUTING

CONVENIENCE SCALE

Section 2

Bu bölümde çalışanların işyerlerine ulaşımlarıyla ilgili ifadeler bulunmaktadır. Lütfen her bir maddeyi okuyarak size ne derece uyduğunu belirtiniz ve tüm maddeleri cevaplayınız.

1)İşe gidip gelirken toplam yolculuğunuz yaklaşık kaç dakika sürüyor?

...

Aşağıda işyerinize ulaşımınız hakkındaki fikirlerinizi ve izlenimlerinizi öğrenmeyi amaçlayan sorular yer almaktadır. Cevaplarken size verilen sıfat çiftlerinden yaşadığınız duruma en uygun düşen basamağı işaretlemenizi rica ediyoruz.

2) İşe gidiş gelişiniz sırasında yaptığınız yolculuğu nasıl tanımlarsınız?

İyi	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Kötü
Keyifli	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Keyifsiz
Kolay	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Zor
Yakın	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Uzak
Rahat	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Rahatsız
Yorucu	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Yorucu Değil

APPENDIX D. SUBJECTIVE WELL-BEING SCALE

Section 3

Bu bölümde kendinizi nasıl hissettiğinizle ilgili ifadeler bulunmaktadır. Lütfen her bir maddeyi okuyarak size ne derece uyduğunu belirtiniz ve tüm maddeleri cevaplayınız.

1)İşinizden ne kadar memnunsunuz?

☐ Hiç Memnun Değilim ☐ Pek Memnun Değilim ☐ Kararsızım ☐ Biraz Memnunum ☐ Çok Memnunum

2)Sahip olduğunuz boş zamanın miktarından ne kadar memnunsunuz?

☐ Hiç Memnun Değilim ☐ Pek Memnun Değilim ☐ Kararsızım ☐ Biraz Memnunum ☐ Çok Memnunum

3)Genel olarak sağlığınız nasıldır?

☐ Çok iyi ☐ İyi ☐ Ne iyi Ne Kötü ☐ Kötü ☐ Çok Kötü

4) Genel olarak hayatınızdan ne kadar memnunsunuz?

☐ Hiç Memnun Değilim ☐ Pek Memnun Değilim ☐ Kararsızım ☐ Biraz Memnunum ☐ Çok Memnunum