

Factors associated with commuting stress among tertiary education employees in Georgetown, Guyana

Davon Van-Veen^{1*}, Hue-Tam Jamme², Heather Ross³, Netra Chhetri³

¹ School of Allied Health, College of Medical Sciences, University of Guyana

² School of Geographical Sciences and Urban Planning, Arizona State University

³ School for the Future of Innovation in Society, Arizona State University

*Corresponding author

Email: davon.vanveen@uog.edu.gy

Abstract

The aim of this study was to identify factors associated with commuting stress using symptomatology among tertiary education employees in Georgetown Guyana. A cross sectional survey was conducted among 427 (100 male, 317 female) participants, with a mean age of 29.6(sd=8.7) years. Data about their demographic characteristics, psychosocial measures (perceived stress, coping and resilience), characteristics about their commute (length, mode, and satisfaction with commute infrastructure), and how often they experienced selected symptoms associated with stress on the daily commute was collected using a self administered questionnaire. A commuting stress score was calculated for each participant and this was followed by regression analysis. The results showed that after controlling for resiliency, coping, perception of job, total life stress, income levels and education all of which can contribute to how persons perceive hassles in their lives, the regression model

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

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

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

Introduction

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

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

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

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

further lead to to potential isolation, anxiety, and depression. If it is severe enough, it may even lead to suicide.[\[27-29\]](#)

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

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

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

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

Variables

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

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

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

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

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

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

Data analysis

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

Ethical Issues

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

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

Results

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

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

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)

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

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

The three most frequently reported symptoms associated with stress while engaged in the daily commute are complaints about feeling fatigued, excessive sweating and feeling hassled.

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

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

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

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

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

Discussion

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

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

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

Conclusions

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

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

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

Reference

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Figure 1: Distribution of symptoms experienced by respondents





Figure 1: Distribution of symptoms experienced by respondents



Figure