

25 demonstrated that females, persons who used public transportation, persons who have longer
26 commute times and persons who are less satisfied with the commute infrastructure are more
27 likely to report that they experience symptoms associated with stress while engaged in the
28 daily commute compared to males, persons who use private transportation, persons who have
29 shorter commute times and persons who are more satisfied with the commute infrastructure
30 respectively. Once all controlled variables were accounted for, it appears that for this study
31 population, age, where they live and whether or not they actively or passively commuted did
32 not have any meaningful impact on whether they would report if they experienced stress
33 associated symptoms while engaged in the daily commute. he results suggest the need for a
34 multi-pronged approach to address commuting stress, involving individual healthcare,
35 mental-health-centric urban transport design, improved commute infrastructure, and
36 increased employer engagement. Future studies employing qualitative and experimental
37 methods are recommended.

38

39 **Keywords:** Stress, Commute, Urbanization, Daily hassles, Mental Health

40

41 **Introduction**

42 The majority of contemporary urbanisation, a complex social and economic process that
43 occurs through various forms of urban growth and expansion drastically altering the social
44 and physical environment in which people live and operate, is occurring in low and middle
45 income countries(LMICS).[1,2] Not surprisingly these changes can have a significant impact
46 on both physical and mental health on urban inhabitants.[3-5] Increased access to modern
47 technology in the urban environment has induced a fast-paced life which is also characterised
48 by a heavy workload, fast paced lifestyle, communication, quick decisions, multitasking,
49 pressure to be active on social media, and high mobility, all of which have a direct impact on

50 people's health [6,7] however for the purposes of this paper, there is going to be an exclusive
51 focus on high mobility.

52

53 The majority of mobility in the urban environment consists of the daily commute which appears
54 to be intensifying in both the developed and developing world. This intensification is a result
55 of an increase in both the frequency and length/duration of commutes to work.[8,9] There is a
56 significant body of literature that examines how the increased intensity of commuting *to* and
57 *from* work can have detrimental effects on health. Impacts of lengthy commutes include an
58 increased incidence of respiratory illnesses, muscular injuries, and reduced physical activity
59 along with the associated undesirable health outcomes.[10-14] Additionally, an emerging body
60 of scholarship reveals that a lengthy commute to workplaces is also associated with poor mental
61 health which may be expressed as stress.[15-19] The commute is more often than not a daily
62 activity, thus if it is stressful, a person may be placed under stress on an ongoing basis.

63

64 Stress is the physiological and psychological response to a situation that a person has perceived
65 to be negative and has made a determination that they do not have the resources to address the
66 problem, accounting for all other factors.[20-22] In addition to being an indicator of poor
67 mental health, chronic exposure to stress is also associated with many chronic non-
68 communicable diseases (CNCDs) including but not limited to diabetes, cardiovascular and
69 cerebrovascular pathologies, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, and malignant
70 neoplasms.[23] CNCDs continue to be a significant public health concern globally, accounting
71 for most of the reported global mortality and morbidity with the global burden rapidly shifting
72 towards the LMICs.[24-26] Furthermore, long-term exposure to stress is more likely to be in a
73 state of constant anger and irritability, leading to strained personal relationships which can

74 further lead to to potential isolation, anxiety, and depression. If it is severe enough, it may even
75 lead to suicide.[27-29]

76

77 The question therefore becomes who is more likely to experience commuter stress and there
78 have been a few studies that attempted to examine these factors. For example, women are more
79 likely to experience commuter stress than men.[30-34] Similarly, active commuters are less
80 likely to experience stress than passive commuters.[35-37] The issue however with the majority
81 of these studies either examined only the intrinsic factors (factors related to the commuter) or
82 the extrinsic factors (factors related to the commute process). Also, almost all of the previous
83 studies were conducted in economies that were considered fully urbanised (that is, more than
84 50% of their population live in urban agglomerations) and there has been a dearth of studies
85 that examined this issue in economies that are in transition to urbanisation. Also, the majority
86 of previous studies used only Likert or binary scales to examine stress experienced during the
87 commute. They did not focus on the physical and psychological symptoms of stress. In order
88 to address the preceding gaps identified, this paper aims to to identify what factors (both
89 extrinsic and intrinsic) are associated with experiencing stress while engaged in the daily
90 commute using in an emerging economy that has less than 50% of its population living in an
91 urban environment using symptomatology to measure commuting stress.

92

93 The next section of this paper detailed the methods This is followed by the presentation of the
94 results which consists of the presentation of the sample characteristics, the individual risk factor
95 assessment and regression models that include all of the factors that were tested. These results
96 and the implications with respect to the literature are then discussed in the next section after
97 which some final conclusions along with some recommendations are made.

98

99 **Method**

100 **Study design and setting**

101 This observational cross-sectional study was conducted in Georgetown, the capital city of
102 Guyana, between March 1st to April 30th, 2023. As the country's political and economic
103 centre, it serves as a critical hub for administrative, commercial, and cultural activities. While
104 the reliable data on the population of Georgetown is limited, the National Census of 2012 puts
105 its population to be around 120,000 people.

106

107 **Study Participants**

108 Participants were drawn from among employees at the University and the University's affiliate
109 partners. The University of Guyana serves as the National University of Guyana and has just
110 about 8,000 students and employs about 1,000 teaching and non-teaching staff. Universities
111 are normally microcosms of the wider society in which they operate, therefore it is to be
112 expected that the demographic makeup of the university would be similar to that of the society
113 in which they function.[\[38-39\]](#)

114

115 Using an online sample size calculator, (Raofost, 2004), assuming an unknown population a
116 sample size of 377 was recommended. Assuming that all questionnaires would not be returned
117 or only partially completed, it was determined that 33% more questionnaires should be
118 distributed therefore 505 questionnaires were distributed. To be included in the study,
119 participants must work in Georgetown for at least 30 hours per week at an in person job. The
120 participant must also be at least 18 years of age and have worked on the job for at least 6
121 months.

122

123 Convenience sampling was used until the desired sample size was achieved. Employees would
124 be approached and given a short presentation about the rationale, objectives, and significance
125 of the study along with guarantees that no identifiable information will be collected and that
126 all information collected would remain confidential. After the employee gave their verbal
127 consent to participate in the study, each employee was informed that there were three different
128 ways to participate in the study: a shared link, a tablet with the questionnaire on it, or a physical
129 paper questionnaire and it was for them to choose the method that they were most comfortable
130 with. Once a choice was made, the 83-item questionnaire was made available using the medium
131 of their choice, and the employee was thanked for their time.

132

133 **Variables**

134 The dependent variable commuting stress was evaluated using symptomatology. This was done
135 by asking participants to report the frequency in which they experienced a variety of symptoms
136 associated with stress while engaged in the daily commute. These included physical symptoms
137 such as muscle pain, headaches, nausea, difficulty breathing, fatigue, chest pain, indigestion,
138 dizziness, sweating and constipation/diarrhoea and psychological symptoms such as feeling
139 irritable, overwhelmed, anxious, having uncontrollable thoughts, depressed, a sense of dread,
140 lonely, pressured, and distressed. For each symptom, they were asked whether it was
141 experienced very often, fairly often, sometimes, almost never, or never. Based on the response
142 a score was assigned to each symptom with very often=4 and never=1. A total commuting
143 stress score was then generated.

144

145 The independent variables aimed to assess personal (intrinsic) factors, commute specific
146 factors, and built environment factors. The demographic factors which were tested include age,
147 sex, place of residence (whether they lived in the city or the suburbs), and hours of work per

148 day. Other intrinsic factor included was the perceived quality of sleep which was measured on
149 a five-point Likert scale, the general life stress which was measured using the Cohen's
150 Perceived Stress Scale (PSS-10), and how hassled a person perceived their job to be, which
151 was measured using a sub-scale of the Daily Hassles and Mood Questionnaire (DHMQ). The
152 DHMQ is a self-report measure developed by Dr. Thomas W. Kamarck and his colleagues in
153 1991, which assesses the daily hassles, mood, and health status of individuals. The job sub-
154 scale consists of seven questions that aimed to elicit how people felt about their fellow workers,
155 their supervisors, and their workload. It was scored from 0-21. Higher scores were associated
156 with negative feelings about the job. The DHMQ has been found to be a valid and reliable
157 measure, with high levels of internal consistency and test-retest reliability. It has been used in
158 various populations, including healthy adults, medical patients, and college students. The scale
159 has been found to be positively associated with a variety of health outcomes, such as
160 cardiovascular disease, hypertension, and depression.[40-42] The Perceived Life Stress
161 measured by Cohen's Perceived Stress Scale (PSS-10) is another independent variable. The
162 PSS-10 is a 10-item version of the scale, which was developed by Sheldon Cohen and his
163 colleagues in 1983. The scale assesses the extent to which respondents find their lives
164 unpredictable, uncontrollable, and overloaded in the last month. Respondents are asked to rate
165 the degree to which they agree with each statement on a 5-point Likert scale, where 0 = never
166 and 4 = very often. The PSS-10 has been found to be a valid and reliable measure of perceived
167 stress, with high levels of internal consistency and test-retest reliability. In addition, the scale
168 has been validated in various populations including, but not limited to, healthy adults, medical
169 patients, and college students. It has been found to be positively associated with a variety of
170 health outcomes, including cardiovascular disease, hypertension, and depression.[43-45]
171

172 The participants' coping capabilities were the third mediating variable that was tested using
173 the Brief Resilient Coping Scale (BRCS). This is a 4-item unidimensional scale that is
174 designed to capture tendencies to cope with stress in a highly adaptive manner. The scale
175 ranges from 0-20 and the higher the score, the greater the coping capabilities of the person
176 This instrument has also been successfully subjected to multiple reliability and validity
177 evaluations.[\[46-48\]](#)

178

179 Resiliency refers to the ability to adapt despite encountering less-than-ideal circumstances.
180 This was measured by using the Brief Resilience Scale (BRS) which is a 6-point
181 unidimensional scale that does not take into account external factors. [\[49\]](#) A person who is
182 resilient tends to demonstrate high levels of emotional stability, self-efficacy, and sociability
183 and thus better able to handle life stresses. The BRS score ranges from 1-5 with the higher
184 values indicating higher levels of resilience. Like the BCRS, the BRS was also subject to
185 multiple reliability and validity testing. [\[50-52\]](#)

186

187 The first commute-specific factors which were tested were the method of commuting whether
188 it was active or passive, or where commuting was done by public or private means. The second
189 commute-specific factor that was tested was the length of the commute. The study used 5-point
190 Likert Scale questions to assess commuters' satisfaction with various built environment factors.
191 These factors included greenery along the route, frequency of traffic congestion, and road-use
192 compliance by others. Additionally, satisfaction with transportation infrastructure was gauged
193 through multiple aspects like road conditions, street lighting, and public transport. A composite
194 score ranging from 9-45 was generated, with higher scores indicating greater satisfaction.

195

196 **Data analysis**

197 All data were analysed using Stata Version 17.0. Descriptive analysis was performed on all
198 variables. Non numerical data was converted to binary. For gender, males were assigned a
199 value of 0 and females a value of 1. Those who lived in the city were assigned a value of 1
200 while those who lived in the suburbs were assigned a value of 0. Persons who used active and
201 private commute modes were assigned a value of 0 while persons who used active and public
202 forms of transportation were assigned a value of 1. Regression analysis was conducted. All
203 values are reported with a 95% confidence interval. A *p*-value of less than 0.05 was considered
204 to be statistically significant.

205

206 **Ethical Issues**

207 For each participant, the purpose of the study was explained. They were informed that
208 participation in this study was completely voluntary and that there were no consequences
209 whether good or bad if they chose to participate in the study. They were also informed that they
210 do not have to answer any question they feel uncomfortable about asking and they can chose
211 to terminate their participation in the study at any point. Participants were also informed that
212 no personally identifying data will be collected and therefore there was no way to trace a
213 particular submission to any one participant. This information was repeated on the cover of the
214 questionnaire that was provided. The first question of the questionnaire asked whether or not
215 they agreed to participate in the study.

216 This study was approved by the Institutional Review Board of Arizona State University.
217 (Protocol number: STUDY00017507)

218

219 Results

220 Out of 505 questionnaires initially distributed, several were excluded from the final analysis
221 for various reasons: 22 had over 10% of questions unanswered; 24 were completed by
222 individuals working fewer than 30 hours per week; 2 were filled out by minors under the age
223 of 18; 29 were from respondents who neither worked or lived in the study area; and 1 came
224 from a remote worker. This left 427 valid questionnaires for final analysis. These participants
225 were relatively diverse with respect to gender, age, relationship status, ethnicity, religious
226 affiliation, educational levels, length of commute, total life stress levels and where they resided.
227 Table 1 shows the nominal characteristics of the participants included in the final analysis while
228 table 2 provides a summary of the numerical characteristics.

229

230 **Table 1: Summary of nominal characteristics of study participants (n=427)**

231

232

Parameter	Number (%)
Gender	
Male	100 (25.6)
Female	317 (74.4)
Relationship status	
Committed Relationship	205 (48.2)
Single	187 (44.1)
No response	35 (8.2)

Income level	
Low income	280 (65.5)
High and middle income	147 (34.5)
Ethnicity	
Indigenous	3 (0.7)
African Guyanese	153 (36.0)
East Indian Guyanese	121 (28.5)
Mixed descent	148 (34.8)
No Response	2 (0.5)
Religious affiliation	
Christian	311 (73.3)
Hindu	64 (15.1)
Muslim	29 (6.8)
Other/ Non-affiliated	23 (5.4)
Educational Level Completed	
Tertiary	363 (85.2)
Non-Tertiary	64 (14.8)
Residence	
In Georgetown (main city)	149 (38.8)
Outside of Georgetown	278 (61.2)
Commute Mode (Private/Public)	
Private	240 (56.2)

Public	187 (43.8)
Commute Mode	
Active	23 (5.4)
Non-Active	404 (94.6)

233

234 **Table 2: Summary of numerical characteristics of study participants (n=427)**

235

236

Parameter	Range	Mean	Standard Deviation
Age	0-65	29.62	8.66
Perceived Stress Score (0-40)	0-37	19.03	6.97
Length of Commute (min)	5-165	39.20	25.67
Basic Coping Score (4-20)	4-20	15.08	3.04
Resiliency (1-5)	1-5	3.39	0.75
Job Perception (0-21)	0-21	7.47	7.45
Infrastructure Satisfaction (9-45)	9-45	21.37	7.53
Commute Stress Score (0-88)	1-88	36.77	16.01

237

238 The three most frequently reported symptoms associated with stress while engaged in the

239 daily commute are complaints about feeling fatigued, excessive sweating and feeling hassled.

240 The four least commonly reported symptoms are feelings of indigestion, chest pains,
241 dizziness and bowel dysfunction. Figure 1 shows the distribution of all the symptoms
242 examined in this study.

243

244 **Table 3: Effect of intrinsic and extrinsic factors on commuting stress score**

245

Commuting Stress	Coef.	St.Err.	t-value	p- value	[95% Conf Interval]	Sig
Female	4.606	1.614	2.85	.005	1.432 7.781	***
Age	.053	.092	0.58	.564	-.127 .233	
Lives outside of Georgetown	-.957	1.505	-0.64	.525	-3.917 2.003	
Non-Active commute	3.265	3.243	1.01	.315	-3.113 9.644	

Public commute	3.803	1.48	2.57	.011	.892	6.713	**
Time for commute (min)	.059	.03	1.97	.049	0	.117	**
Satisfaction with commute infrastructure	-.277	.095	-2.90	.004	-.465	-.089	***
Resilience	-3.261	1.085	-3.01	.003	-5.395	-1.127	***
Coping	.576	.264	2.18	.03	.056	1.096	**
Satisfaction with job	4.557	1.677	2.72	.007	1.257	7.856	***
Total life stress	.917	.114	8.05	0	.693	1.14	***

Low income	1.68	1.392	1.21	.228	-1.057	4.418
Non tertiary educated	-2.026	1.911	-1.06	.29	-5.784	1.733
Constant	11.309	7.62	1.48	.139	-3.679	26.297
<hr/>						
Mean dependent var		34.441	SD dependent var			15.997
R-squared		0.409	Number of obs			363
F-test		18.551	Prob > F			0.000
Akaike crit. (AIC)		2879.231	Bayesian crit. (BIC)			2933.753

*** $p < .01$, ** $p < .05$, * $p < .1$

246 The results in Table 3 shows that after controlling for resilience, coping, perceived life stress,
 247 satisfaction with job, income levels and educational attainment, commuting stress levels
 248 measured using symptomatology were significantly higher in females, persons who used
 249 public means of transportation, persons with longer commute times and persons who were

250 not satisfied with commute infrastructure. Age and location of residence appear to have no
251 effect on the level of commuting stress as measured using symptomatology.

252

253 **Discussion**

254 The main aim of this paper was to determine what factors were associated with experiencing
255 commuter stress during the daily commute using symptomatology. After controlling for
256 resiliency, coping, perception of job, total life stress, income levels and education all of which
257 can contribute to how persons perceive hassles in their lives, the regression model
258 demonstrated that females, persons who used public transportation, persons who have longer
259 commute times and persons who are less satisfied with the commute infrastructure are more
260 likely to report that they experience symptoms associated with stress while engaged in the daily
261 commute compared to males, persons who use private transportation, persons who have shorter
262 commute times and persons who are more satisfied with the commute infrastructure
263 respectively. Once all controlled variables were accounted for, it appears that for this study
264 population, age, where they live and whether or not they actively or passively commuted did
265 not have any meaningful impact on whether they would report if they experienced stress
266 associated symptoms while engaged in the daily commute. These findings are for the most part
267 consistent with what is already published in the literature that used alternative methods of
268 measuring commuting stress. In the present study, the non-association that was found between
269 the active/non-active commuting and commuting stress was discordant with previous studies,
270 however this could be explained due to sampling inefficiencies which resulted in the majority
271 of the sample being users of non-active commuting modes.

272

273 The findings of this study are limited to persons who are employed with the University of
274 Guyana or one of its affiliate organisations/institutions for at least 6 months and have to
275 commute to work on a daily basis. Despite these limitations however, the findings of this study
276 add to the existing knowledge in a few ways. Firstly, this appears to be the first time an attempt
277 was made to examine all of the factors (both the intrinsic and extrinsic) that could potentially
278 contribute to commuting stress in a single study. Previous research tended to only focus on a
279 few of the factors and there was very little consistency across studies as to how commuting
280 stress should be measured. Secondly, for the most part, commuting stress has been measured
281 either by using electrodermal activity or a single Likert-point scale, however, this study used
282 symptomatology. The only other study that used symptomology to assess commuting stress
283 was conducted by Rezapour et al., (2021), however, the focus was narrow with respect to both
284 the factors examined and the symptoms used when compared to the present study. Further,
285 Rezaour treated each symptom as an individual outcome whereas in the present study, all of
286 the symptoms were reduced to a single value that factored in any positive emotions that may
287 occur on the daily commute to give a more holistic view of the stress experienced on the daily
288 commute. The third way in which this paper contributes to the literature is the fact that
289 symptomology could now potentially be used as an alternative method for measuring
290 commuting stress as the findings of this study for the most part replicate that of what exists in
291 the available literature. Furthermore, in doing so, this study strengthens the findings in the
292 previously published studies as the findings are similar even when using a different method to
293 measure the outcome variables. The fourth way in which this study contributes to the existing
294 literature is that it expands the list of factors that can be considered when thinking about
295 commuting stress. The two novel factors that emerged in this study are people's perception of
296 their jobs, their satisfaction with the commute infrastructure in place, and whether or not they
297 commute via public or private means. The fifth and final way in which this paper contributes

298 to the literature is that it adds to the geographical diversity in which this issue was examined.
299 A cursory review of previous papers would reveal that the studies which have examined this
300 issue have been skewed towards North America, Europe and Asia, where there has been heavy
301 investment in public transportation, with little to no studies emanating from South and Central
302 America, the Caribbean and Africa. Furthermore, the majority of studies that are available were
303 conducted in economies that have completed the urban transition, that is more than 50% of
304 their total population lives in urban areas. At the time of data collection, Guyana, located in
305 South America is an economy in transition with less than 50% of its population living in urban
306 agglomerations.

307

308 **Conclusions**

309 We found that both the intrinsic and the extrinsic factors interact in complex ways to influence
310 the overall stress experienced during commuting. Understanding these can help in designing
311 interventions to make commuting a less stressful experience, whether it involves improving
312 public transit systems, encouraging flexible work arrangements, or promoting stress
313 management strategies for individuals. Interventions such as these can significantly reduce their
314 exposure to stress which stands as an independent risk factor for CNCs that continues to
315 plague both the developed and developing world. As a policy response following three
316 measures can be implemented. First, at a personal level, health care providers could be provided
317 with some tools that they can use on their own to reduce stressful situations. For example, one
318 could provide mindfulness - often used as a therapeutic technique to manage stress and promote
319 mental wellbeing. It is a practice that involves focusing one's awareness on the present moment,
320 while calmly acknowledging and accepting one's feelings, thoughts, and bodily sensations. [53-
321 54]

322

323 The second, establishment of guidelines to ensure that the infrastructure that is being used by
324 commuters is mentally friendly, refers to physical infrastructure designed and constructed with
325 an understanding of the psychological and emotional impact it has on individuals who interact
326 with it. It aims to create an environment that promotes mental well-being and reduces stress
327 levels. City planners and transportation officials can create an infrastructure that supports mental
328 well-being and reduces the stress associated with commuting. In the long run, mentally friendly
329 infrastructure can contribute to happier, healthier, and more productive communities. This will
330 require high-level interventions as there may be a need to make the public transportation system
331 less chaotic, ensure that there is more greenery along major thoroughfares, and just simply
332 ensure that the commuting infrastructure such as roads and footpaths are maintained.

333 The third and final way that is proposed to reduce the stress on the daily commute for
334 organisations is to ensure that their employees are meaningfully engaged. An employee who is
335 meaningfully engaged at work is deeply connected and committed to their role, their team, and
336 their organisation. They find their work fulfilling and significant, feel that they are making a
337 valuable contribution, and are motivated to do their best. To foster meaningful engagement,
338 organisations need to provide supportive leadership, opportunities for growth and development,
339 a positive work environment, and recognition for contributions and achievements. While
340 everyone's circumstances are different, and a range of factors can influence commute-related
341 stress, a positive relationship with their work and their workplace can indeed help mitigate stress
342 during their commute. For example, when employees find meaning in their work and feel valued
343 in their roles, they may experience less anxiety about workplace challenges or pressures. This
344 positive mindset can extend to their commute, making them less stressed about potential delays
345 or complications on their way to work. Similarly, employees who are empowered to manage their
346 workloads effectively may have more flexible schedules, allowing them to avoid peak commuting
347 times or opt for less stressful modes of transport. In an organisation that nurtures meaningful

348 engagement, the employee is likely to handle commuting stresses more effectively, viewing them
349 as minor inconveniences which can contribute to an overall reduction in stress, both within and
350 outside of work

351

352 **Reference**

- 353 1. Zeng, C., Liu, Y., Liu, Y., & Qiu, L. Urban Sprawl and Related
354 Problems : Bibliometric Analysis and Refined Analysis from
355 1991 to 2011. *Chinese Geographical Science*, 2014, 24(2), 245–257
- 356 2. United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division
357 2019. World Urbanization Prospects: The 2018 Revision (ST/ESA/SER.A/420). New
358 York: United Nations, 2019
- 359 3. Aliyu, A. A., & Amadu, L. Urbanization, cities, and health: the challenges to
360 Nigeria—a review. *Annals of African medicine*, 2017, 16(4), 149.
- 361 4. Li, X., Song, J., Lin, T., Dixon, J., Zhang, G., & Ye, H. Urbanization and health in
362 China, thinking at the national, local and individual levels. *Environmental Health*,
363 2016, 15, 113-123
- 364 5. Eckert, S., & Kohler, S. Urbanization and health in developing countries: a systematic
365 review. *World Health Popul*, 2014, 15(1), 7-20.
- 366 6. Lippke, S., Schalk, T. M., Kühnen, U., & Shang, B. Pace of life and perceived stress
367 in international students. *PsyCh Journal*, 2021, 10(3), 425-436.
- 368 7. Qidwai, W., Khushk, I. A., Shamim, U., Altaf, S., Hadi, H., & Nanji, K. Fast pace of
369 life and its impact on health: results of a study from the largest city of Pakistan.
370 *Pakistan journal of public health*, 2016, 6(4), 10-16.

- 371 8. Sultana, & Weber, J. The Nature of Urban Growth and the Commuting Transition:
372 Endless Sprawl or a Growth Wave? *Urban Studies*, 2014, 51(3):544–576.
- 373 9. Travisi, Camagni, R., & Nijkamp, P. Impacts of urban sprawl and commuting: A
374 modelling study for Italy. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 2010, 18:383–392.
- 375 10. Ali, M., Ahsan, G. U., Uddin, Z., & Hossain, A. Road traffic delays in commuting
376 workplace and musculoskeletal health among sedentary workers: a cross-sectional
377 study in Dhaka city. *Journal of occupational health*, 2021, 63(1), e12289.
- 378 11. Kuenn. A. Does Commuting Affect Health? *Health Economics*, 2016, 25(8):984–
379 1004
- 380 12. Ramos, C. A., Wolterbeek, H. T., & Almeida, S. M. Air pollutant exposure and
381 inhaled dose during urban commuting: a comparison between cycling and motorized
382 modes. *Air Quality, Atmosphere & Health*, 2016, 9, 867-879.
- 383 13. Raza, A., Pulakka, A., Hanson, L. L. M., Westerlund, H., & Halonen, J. I. Commuting
384 distance and behavior-related health: a longitudinal study. *Preventive Medicine*, 2021,
385 150, 106665.
- 386 14. Wu, D. L., Lin, M., Chan, C. Y., Li, W. Z., Tao, J., Li, Y. P., ... & Bu, C. W.
387 Influences of commuting mode, air conditioning mode and meteorological parameters
388 on fine particle (PM_{2.5}) exposure levels in traffic microenvironments. *Aerosol and*
389 *Air Quality Research*, 2013, 13(2), 709-720.
- 390 15. Karan, M., Rahal, D., Almeida, D. M., Bower, J. E., Irwin, M. R., McCreath, H.,
391 Seeman, T., & Fuligni, A. J. School commute time, chronotype, and altered HPA axis
392 functioning during adolescence. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*, 2021, 133, 105371–
393 105371

- 394 16. Lucas, & Heady, R. B. Flextime Commuters and Their Driver Stress, Feelings of
395 Time Urgency, and Commute Satisfaction. *Journal of Business and Psychology*,
396 2002, 16(4), 565–571
- 397 17. Rosida, I., Sari, D. W., & Irjayanti, A. D. The Mode Choices And Commuting Stress:
398 Empirical Evidence From Jakarta And Denpasar. *Jurnal Pengembangan Kota*, 2019,
399 7(1), 68–76.
- 400 18. Rüger, H., Pfaff, S., Weishaar, H., & Wiernik, B. M. Does perceived stress mediate
401 the relationship between commuting and health-related quality of life? *Transportation*
402 *Research Part F: Traffic Psychology and Behavior*, 2017, 50, 100–108.
- 403 19. van Hooff. The Daily Commute from Work to Home: Examining Employees’
404 Experiences in Relation to Their Recovery Status. *Stress and Health*, 2015, 31(2),
405 124–137.
- 406 20. Hulbert, W. N. J., Morrison, V., Wilkinson, C., & Neal, R. D. Investigating the
407 cognitive precursors of emotional response to cancer stress: Re-testing Lazarus’s
408 transactional model. *British Journal of Health Psychology*, 2013, 18(1), 97–121.
- 409 21. Lazarus R. S., Folkman S. *Stress, appraisal, and coping*. Springer Publishing
410 Company, 1984
- 411 22. Wang, F., Pan, F., Shapiro, L. A., & Huang, J. H. Stress Induced Neuroplasticity and
412 Mental Disorders 2018. *Neural Plasticity*, 2018, 2018:5382537.
- 413 23. Payne, J. K. State of the Science: Stress, Inflammation, and Cancer. *Oncology*
414 *Nursing Forum*, 2014, 41(5):533–540.
- 415 24. Shobeiri, Aali, A., Khan, I. A., Khan, M. A. ., Kim, M. S., et al. Global burden of
416 chronic respiratory diseases and risk factors, 1990–2019: an update from the Global
417 Burden of Disease Study 2019. *EClinicalMedicine*, 2023, 59, 101936–101936.

- 418 25. Simpson, & Camorlinga, S. G. A Framework to Study the Emergence of Non-
419 Communicable Diseases. *Procedia Computer Science*, 2017, 114, 116–125
- 420 26. Sommer, Griebler, U., Mahlknecht, P., Thaler, K., Bouskill, K., Gartlehner, G., &
421 Mendis, S. Socioeconomic inequalities in non-communicable diseases and their risk
422 factors: an overview of systematic reviews. *BMC Public Health*, 2015, 15(1), 914–
423 914
- 424 27. Asarnow, Goldston, D. B., Tunno, A. M., Inscoc, A. B., & Pynoos, R. Suicide, Self-
425 Harm, & Traumatic Stress Exposure: A Trauma-Informed Approach to the Evaluation
426 and Management of Suicide Risk. *Evidence-Based Practice in Child and Adolescent*
427 *Mental Health*, 2020, 5(4), 483–500.
- 428 28. Heidari, M., Ghodusi Borujeni, M., Kabirian Abyaneh, S., & Rezaei, P. The Effect of
429 Spiritual Care on Perceived Stress and Mental Health Among the Elderlies Living in
430 Nursing Home. *Journal of Religion and Health*, 2019, 58(4):1328–1339.
- 431 29. Kim, Jeon, S.-W., Cho, S. J., Shin, Y. C., & Park, J.-H. Comparison of the factors for
432 suicidal ideation and suicide attempt: a comprehensive examination of stress, view of
433 life, mental health, and alcohol use. *Asian Journal of Psychiatry*, 2021, 65, 102844
- 434 30. Jahangeer, S. M. A., Hasnain, N., Tariq, M. T., Jamil, A., Zia, S. Y., & Amir, W. .
435 Frequency and Association of Stress Levels with Modes of Commuting Among
436 Medical Students of a Developing Country. *The Malaysian Journal of Medical*
437 *Sciences*, 2021, 28(4), 113–122
- 438 31. Magaña, P, Roberto, G., Sara, P., & Laura, P. Beside and Behind the Wheel: Factors
439 that Influence Driving Stress and Driving Behavior. *Sustainability (Basel,*
440 *Switzerland)*, 2021, 13(4775), 4775-

- 441 32. Plyushteva, A. Exploring the Role of the Workplace in Experiences of Commuter
442 Stress: A Mixed-Method Study from Sofia, Bulgaria. *Social Sciences*, 2021, 10(208),
443 208.
- 444 33. Rezapour, M., & Richard Ferraro, F. The impact of commuters' psychological
445 feelings due to delay on perceived quality of a rail transport. *Humanities and Social*
446 *Sciences Communications*, 2021, 8(1), 1–8.
- 447 34. Rosida, I., Sari, D. W., & Irjayanti, A. D. The Mode Choices And Commuting Stress:
448 Empirical Evidence From Jakarta And Denpasar. *Jurnal Pengembangan Kota*, 2019
449 7(1), 68–76.
- 450 35. Brutus, S., Javadian, R., & Panaccio, A. J. Cycling, car, or public transit: A study of
451 stress and mood upon arrival at work. *International Journal of Workplace Health*
452 *Management*, 2017, 10(1), 13–24
- 453 36. Legrain, A., Eluru, N., & El-Geneidy, A. M. Am stressed, must travel: The
454 relationship between mode choice and commuting stress. *Transportation Research*
455 *Part F: Traffic Psychology and Behaviour*, 2015, 34, 141–151.
- 456 37. Yang, X., McCoy, E., Anaya-Boig, E., Avila-Palencia, I., Brand, C., Carrasco-
457 Turigas, G., et al.. The effects of traveling in different transport modes on galvanic
458 skin response (GSR) as a measure of stress: An observational study. *Environment*
459 *International*, 2021, 156, 106764
- 460 38. Kaldis, B. The university as microcosm. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 2009,
461 41(5), 553-574.
- 462 39. Struppa, D. A university is a microcosm of the country: Daniele Struppa. *Orange*
463 *County Register*. (2021, Mar. 7). [https://www.ocregister.com/2021/03/07/a-](https://www.ocregister.com/2021/03/07/a-university-is-a-microcosm-of-the-country-daniele-struppa/)
464 [university-is-a-microcosm-of-the-country-daniele-struppa/](https://www.ocregister.com/2021/03/07/a-university-is-a-microcosm-of-the-country-daniele-struppa/)

- 465 40. Stone AA, Neale JM, Shiftman S. Daily assessments of stress and coping and their
466 association with mood. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine*. 1993 Mar 1;15(1):8-16
- 467 41. Maybery D, Maybery M, Bresnan R, Croft B, Graham R, Macaulay J, McQualter S,
468 Mitchell E, Sherwell K, Szakacs E. Responding to daily event questionnaires: The
469 influence of the order of hassle and uplift scales. *Stress and health*. 2002
470 Feb;18(1):19-26.
- 471 42. Udayar S, Urbanaviciute I, Morselli D, Bollmann G, Rossier J, Spini D. The LIVES
472 daily hassles scale and its relation to life satisfaction. *Assessment*. 2023
473 Mar;30(2):348-63.
- 474 43. Lee EH. Review of the psychometric evidence of the perceived stress scale. *Asian*
475 *Nursing Research*. 2012 Dec 1;6(4):121-7.
- 476 44. Reis RS, Hino AA, Añez CR. Perceived stress scale. *J. health Psychol*.
477 2010;15(1):107-14.
- 478 45. Smith KJ, Emerson DJ. An assessment of the psychometric properties of the
479 Perceived Stress Scale-10 (PSS10) with a US public accounting sample. *Advances in*
480 *Accounting*. 2014 Dec 1;30(2):309-14.
- 481 46. Fung. Validity of the brief resilience scale and brief resilient coping scale in a Chinese
482 sample. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 2020
483 17(4), 1265–.
- 484 47. Kocalevent, Zenger, M., Hinz, A., Klapp, B., & Brähler, E. Resilient coping in the
485 general population: Standardization of the brief resilient coping scale (BRCS). *Health*
486 *and Quality of Life Outcomes*, 2017 15(1), 251–251
- 487 48. Sinclair, & Wallston, K. A. The Development and Psychometric Evaluation of the
488 Brief Resilient Coping Scale. *Assessment (Odessa, Fla.)*, 2004 11(1), 94–101.

- 489 49. Ye, Wu, C.-H., Huang, T.-Y., & Yang, C.-T. . The difference between the Connor-
490 Davidson Resilience Scale and the Brief Resilience Scale when assessing resilience:
491 confirmatory factor analysis and predictive effects. *Global Mental Health*, 2022 9,
492 339–346.
- 493 50. Konaszewski, Niesiobędzka, M., & Surzykiewicz, J. Validation of the Polish version
494 of the Brief Resilience Scale (BRS). *PloS One*, 2020 15(8), e0237038–e0237038
- 495 51. Sánchez, Estrada-Hernández, N., Booth, J., & Pan, D. Factor structure, internal
496 reliability, and construct validity of the Brief Resilience Scale (BRS): A study on
497 persons with serious mental illness living in the community. *Psychology and*
498 *Psychotherapy*, 2021 94(3), 620–645
- 499 52. Surzykiewicz J, Konaszewski K, Skalski S, Dobrakowski PP, Muszyńska J.
500 Resilience and mental health in the polish population during the COVID-19
501 lockdown: A mediation analysis. *Journal of clinical medicine*. 2021 26;10(21):4974.
- 502 53. Baer, Carmody, J., & Hunsinger, M. . Weekly Change in Mindfulness and Perceived
503 Stress in a Mindfulness-Based Stress Reduction Program: Weekly Change in
504 Mindfulness and Stress in MBSR. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 2012, 68(7), 755–
505 765.
- 506 54. Uysal, & Çalışkan, B. B. The effects of mindfulness-based stress reduction on
507 mindfulness and stress levels of nursing students during first clinical experience.
508 *Perspectives in Psychiatric Care*, 2022 58(4), 2639–2645.

509

Figure 1: Distribution of symptoms experienced by respondents





Figure 1: Distribution of symptoms experienced by respondents



Figure