

Commuting versus e-flexibility: the workforce's choice

Michal Beno

Prague City University, School of Business, Hybernská 24, 110 00 Nové Město, Czech Republic, EU,
michal.b@praguecityuniversity.cz (corresponding author)

Dagmar Caganova

Newton University, 5. května 1640/65, 140 00 Prague 4, Czech Republic, EU,
dagmar.caganova@newton.university

Ales Sliva

Faculty of Mechanical Engineering, VSB – Technical University of Ostrava, 17. Listopadu 2172/15, 708 00 Ostrava, Czech Republic, EU, ales.sliva@vsb.cz

Keywords: Austria, e-flexibility, mobility, commuting time, coworking space.

Abstract: Covid-19 changed people's mobility and lifestyles. An ad hoc Google Forms questionnaire was sent to N=843 Austrian e-commuters across the tertiary sector to capture the impact of the commute on the workforce's e-flexibility inclination. The findings show that, where possible e-flexibility may help to reduce the general reliance on commuting. All hypotheses were supported: the data show that the proportion of satisfied people working remotely increases as commuting time increases; interestingly, the ideal e-working model is a hybrid one of commuting 3-4 times a week (41.4%); the debate on whether or not to return to the office is far from settled, 73% of respondents are reluctant to give up the 9-5 space, the workforce living further from the office prefers to work remotely more often, and, not surprisingly, the workforce living not far from the organisation prefers to keep working in the office; coworking space seems to be on the rise (72%) among employees in shared work environments. Employees who live further from the office do not want the coworking possibility. Overall, spending some of the week working from home is a boon for employees in many circumstances, especially those who live far from the office.

1 Introduction

Mobility is one of the daily stressors faced by the global workforce. We live in a society of commuting. Commuting to and from work builds consequential changes. Commuting changes the workforce's relationship with work and the workplace in many ways - especially how and where the workforce works and does work-related activities every day. In simple terms, commuting is the shifting of the workforce in terms of where it works and lives. Many negative factors are associated with commuting, e.g. cost, time consumed, frequent stops, delays, congested traffic, discomfort, noise and pollution. According to Hernandez-Tamurejo et al. [1] data there is a decrease of the number of trips in urban settings when working remotely, but the effectiveness on traffic in the city of Madrid during the rush hour is limited.

Under workforce e-flexibility we understand the enabling of the workforce with different modern technologies and in different places to adjust the ability to work in line with the demand of control over when, where and how the work is done. One of the perks of this flexibility is spending less time commuting. E-working 3 days a week is interlinked with less travel distance [2]. E-working "leads to reduced travel demand, more use of active transport modes, and congestion relief" [3, p. 8]. Generally, a commuter is a person who travels regularly between private and business premises using private or public transport. More precisely, an e-commuter is a person who travels digitally between private and business premises. We can divide commuters into three groups: 1)

zero commuters where cubicles are close to their homes and no commuting is done, 2) short commuters where cubicles are close to their homes and are reached on foot or by bicycle, and 3) long commuters where cubicles are not close to their homes and are reached by car or other transport mode. "Coworking spaces are shared workplaces utilised by different sorts of knowledge professionals, mostly freelancers, working in various degrees of specialisation in the vast domain of the knowledge industry" [4, p. 194]. The true meaning of the commute can only be understood in the context of how it relates to workforce e-flexibility. Business and private life seep into the commute in many ways, and vice versa. Workers commonly commute on a daily basis. Commuting is equal to a significant ratio of the workers' daily routine and has a major influence on the workers' well-being [5]. More precisely, e-flexibility has had a greater impact on the workforce (their job satisfaction, motivation and performance), especially on the freight forwarding workforce [6]. But "feelings of loneliness affect employees' flow levels when working remotely" [7, p. 7]. Thus, an engaged workforce was able to leverage a higher flow for better performance [8]. According to Demirhan and Bulgur [9, p. 73] "remote work has an effect on the workflow experience and the psychological well-being of the employees plays a mediating role in this relationship." COVID-19 accelerated many existing trends, including those related to the supply chain [10]. "Logistics companies were forced to digitalize and automate processes, work remotely, and based on e-commerce" (sic) [10, p. 92]. Therefore, it requires a reconsideration of the

Commuting versus e-flexibility: the workforce's choice

Michal Beno, Dagmar Caganova, Ales Sliva

supply and demand of the transport mode. This flexibility represents a possible way of decreasing mobility.

Despite its importance in everyday life, commuting in relation to e-flexibility has been studied in detail in only a few papers. An ad hoc Google Forms questionnaire was sent to N=843 Austrian e-commuters across the tertiary sector to capture the impact of the commute on the workforce's e-flexibility inclination. In the next section, we hypothesise that the data obtained can be used to assess the impact of commuting on workplace e-flexibility inclination. We then present the methodology used in this investigation, followed by an empirical section. Then follows a discussion of the results, and the final section gives the authors' conclusions and ideas about possible future directions of research.

2 Methodology

Austria, as the surveyed country, provides valuable insights and data for various reasons. Firstly, the Austrian economy is dominated by the service sector in which many workers favour e-working. Secondly, there is an extensive transport infrastructure, including information and communication technologies. Moreover, Austrians tend to be attached to their place of residence, because only 2.3 million commute to work [11].

The authors followed Beño et al.'s [12] methodology using an ad hoc Google Forms questionnaire to collect data in the period 1 to 31 August 2024. As highlighted by Jenn [13, p. 32], "a good questionnaire should be valid, reliable, clear, interesting and succinct," and the authors followed these guidelines. Close-ended Likert scale questions (agreement, periodicity) were used. Due to the specific research area in which data were collected at one point in time from one sample, the following questions were designed: 1) Overall, how do you feel about working remotely? 2) What is the ideal number of times to work remotely? 3) Should your organisation keep a cubicle of some kind? and 4) Would you use a coworking space if offered and paid for by the employer?

We analysed the responses of a sample of 843 Austrian workers who commuted and experienced working

remotely. First the authors contacted the organisations by telephone for the initial step of gathering potential respondents. After this approval had been obtained, the next step was to send an email with an invitation to participate in the questionnaire, with a Google Forms link.

One research question was formulated for this survey, namely: Does the workforce appreciate the e-flexibility that comes with no commuting? While the research question determines what the authors are trying to find out, the following hypotheses are the predicted answers to that question:

- H1: There is a relationship between commuting time and e-work satisfaction.
- H2: Increased distance from the cubicle results in increased inclination to work remotely.
- H3: A workforce working close to the cubicle is more likely to keep the cubicle.
- H4: Decreased distance from the cubicle results in decreased inclination to use a coworking space.

A descriptive statistical method was used to analyse and describe the basic features of the data. All respondents were informed about the aims of the survey. Participation was voluntary, and anonymity was guaranteed.

3 Results

Although e-working existed much earlier, workforce e-flexibility numbers increased significantly during the Covid-19 pandemic. In general, one of the key assets of e-working is the absence of commuting. In this study, the authors investigate the impact of commuting on the workforce's e-flexibility inclination.

All hypotheses were tested using Pearson's chi-square test of independence. The strength of the proved dependence was described in each case by a suitable contingency or association coefficient.

- H1: There is a relationship between commuting time and e-work satisfaction.

Table 1 There is a relationship between commuting time and e-work satisfaction

Overall, how do you feel about working remotely?		Commuting time per day					Total
		under 15 min	15 - 30 min	31 - 60 min	61 - 120 min	121+ min	
Positive	n	183	176	84	64	33	540
	%	56.3%	63.5%	69.4%	79.0%	84.6%	64.1%
Negative	n	50	28	7	3	1	89
	%	15.4%	10.1%	5.8%	3.7%	2.6%	10.6%
Neutral	n	92	73	30	14	5	214
	%	28.3%	26.4%	24.8%	17.3%	12.8%	25.4%
Total	n	325	277	121	81	39	843
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

$\chi^2=30.536$; $p<0.001$; Kendall's tau-c=-0.143

Commuting versus e-flexibility: the workforce's choice

Michal Beno, Dagmar Caganova, Ales Sliva

Our findings suggest that the workforce has enjoyed the modern aspect of working remotely (64.1% positive). In Table 1, the data show that the proportion of satisfied people working remotely increases as commuting time increases. At the same time, as the commuting time increases, the proportion of dissatisfied employees working remotely decreases. Looking at the respondents' commuting time (under 15 mins, 15-30 mins, 31-60 mins, 61-120 mins or 121+ mins), the authors found that there is

a direct correlation between the workforce's commuting time and the enjoyment of e-flexibility. According to the p-value of the test ($p < 0.001$), this relationship is statistically significant. The hypothesis was confirmed. However, the correlation between e-employees and commuting time is very weak ($\tau = -0.143$).

- H2: Increased distance from the cubicle results in increased inclination to work remotely.

Table 2 Increased distance from the cubicle results in increased inclination to work remotely

What is the ideal number of times to work remotely?		Commuting time per day					Total
		under 15 min	15 - 30 min	31 - 60 min	61 - 120 min	121+ min	
Not at all	n	12	11	1	0	0	24
	%	3.7%	4.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	2.9%
Seldom	n	54	29	4	2	0	89
	%	16.6%	10.5%	3.4%	2.9%	0.0%	10.8%
1 - 2 per week	n	101	111	47	9	3	271
	%	31.1%	40.4%	39.8%	13.0%	7.7%	32.8%
3 - 4 per week	n	128	101	51	45	17	342
	%	39.4%	36.7%	43.2%	65.2%	43.6%	41.4%
Daily	n	30	23	15	13	19	100
	%	9.2%	8.4%	12.7%	18.8%	48.7%	12.1%
Total	n	325	275	118	69	39	826
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

$\chi^2=116.268$; $p < 0.001$; Kendall's tau-b=0.198

Interestingly, the ideal e-working model is a hybrid one of 3-4 times a week (41.4%). Employees with a commuting time of up to 15 minutes would most often work remotely 3-4 times a week (39.4%) or 1-2 times a week (31.1%). The same applies to those who commute for 15 - 30 min and 31 - 60 min (all around 40%). For employees with a commuting time of 61-120 minutes, it is ideal to work remotely 3-4 times a week in 65.2% of cases. For employees with a commuting time of more than 120 minutes, it would be ideal to work remotely 3-4 times a

week in 43.6% of cases, and even daily in 48.7% of cases. A preference to work remotely daily or at least 3-4 times a week is higher among employees with a commuting time of 61 min. According to the p-value of the test ($p < 0.001$), this relationship is statistically significant. The hypothesis was confirmed. However, the strength of the dependence of the frequency is very weak ($\tau = 0.198$).

- H3: A workforce working close to the cubicle is more likely to keep the cubicle.

Table 3 A workforce working close to the cubicle is more likely to keep the cubicle

Should your organisation keep a cubicle of some kind?		Commuting time per day					Total
		under 15 min	15 - 30 min	31 - 60 min	61 - 120 min	121+ min	
Yes	n	245	210	87	53	20	615
	%	75.4%	75.8%	71.9%	65.4%	51.3%	73.0%
No	n	17	12	9	7	19	64
	%	5.2%	4.3%	7.4%	8.6%	48.7%	7.6%
Don't know	n	63	55	25	21	0	164
	%	19.4%	19.9%	20.7%	25.9%	0.0%	19.5%
Total	n	325	277	121	81	39	843
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

$\chi^2=106.446$; $p < 0.001$; Cramer's V=0.355

Commuting versus e-flexibility: the workforce's choice

Michal Beno, Dagmar Caganova, Ales Sliva

The debate on whether or not to return to the office is far from settled; 73% of respondents are reluctant to give up the 9-5 space. But the workforce living further from the office more often prefers to work remotely. Not surprisingly, the workforce living not far from the organisation prefers to keep working in the office. According to the p-value of the test ($p < 0.001$), this

relationship is statistically significant. The hypothesis was confirmed. However, the strength of the dependence is rather weak ($V = 0.355$).

- H4: Decreased distance from the cubicle results in decreased inclination to use a coworking space.

Table 4 Decreased distance from the cubicle results in decreased inclination to use a coworking space

Would you use a coworking space if offered and paid for by the employer?		Commuting time per day					Total
		under 15 min	15 - 30 min	31 - 60 min	61 - 120 min	121+ min	
Yes	n	216	220	97	58	16	607
	%	66.5%	79.4%	80.2%	71.6%	41.0%	72.0%
No	n	92	45	17	11	19	184
	%	28.3%	16.2%	14.0%	13.6%	48.7%	21.8%
Don't know	n	17	12	7	12	4	52
	%	5.2%	4.3%	5.8%	14.8%	10.3%	6.2%
Total	n	325	277	121	81	39	843
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

$\chi^2 = 51.707$; $p < 0.001$; Cramer's $V = 0.248$

Coworking space seems to be on the rise (72%) among employees in shared work environments. Employees who live further from the office do not want the coworking possibility. According to the data obtained, the share of employees with a commute of 15 to 60 minutes do want to use a coworking space (around 80%). According to the p-value of the test ($p < 0.001$), this relationship is statistically significant. The hypothesis was confirmed. However, the strength of the dependence is rather weak ($V = 0.248$).

4 Discussion

As commuting undergoes a modern revival, shaped by modern technology and a global shift in the work environment, the traditional commute is being reevaluated. Commuting by driving is among the most stressful and least productive means of commuting, while also the most prevalent. Data in this study show that the proportion of satisfied people working remotely increases with the rise of commuting time. This is in the vein of the European Environment Agency's finding that "new ways of working could reduce commuting" [14]. It can be argued that the key motivators for choosing to work from home include saving on commuting costs and reducing travel time [15]. Caldarola and Sorrell [2] remark that teleworking 3 days a week means less commuting distance. To some extent, this corresponds with data obtained about the ideal e-working model, namely a hybrid one of 3-4 times a week, except in the case of 15-30 minutes commuting time (1-2 days) and, not surprisingly, 121+ minutes (daily). De Vos et al. describe this practice of working from the office for some days a week and from home for some days as telecommuting [16, p. 375]. De Vos et al. [16, p. 391] conclude that "telecommuting significantly affects

commuting time" and overall "the effect of telecommuting on commuting time remains positive and significant" [16, p. 393]. The results in this paper conform to the statement: "workers' commute time is the most important personal characteristic determining WFH preference" [17]. Based on our data, the workforce living further from the office prefers to work remotely more often. Not surprisingly, the workforce not far away from the organisation prefers to keep the office. Appel-Meulenbroek et al.'s [18 p. 7] findings confirm the similar outcome that "the employee-workplace alignment mechanism is not a one-size-fits-all solution, but also because they show the need to keep a diverse office workplace available to satisfy needs of all employees if hybrid working policies are introduced". Employees who live further from the office do not want the coworking possibility. In contrast, various studies highlight that perceived social isolation constitutes an important predictor of employees' intention to telework in a coworking space [19-22]. A recent study exclusively on teleworkers revealed that the intention to use a coworking space for telework is also strongly influenced by the cost of a coworking space and concerns about increased commuting time [23], which is similar to our data that the share of employees with a commuting time of 15 to 60 minutes do want to use a coworking space (around 80%).

5 Conclusions

As commuting undergoes a modern revival, shaped by modern technology and a global shift in the work environment, traditional commuting is being reevaluated. The authors tried to find the answer to the following research question: Does the workforce appreciate the e-flexibility that comes with no commuting?

Commuting versus e-flexibility: the workforce's choice

Michal Beno, Dagmar Caganova, Ales Sliva

- Although trends in the data can be found, preferences around e-flexibility can vary from person to person. Based on the findings, where possible e-flexibility may help to reduce the general reliance on commuting. It seems that commuting patterns of the past will start changing because the spaces and modes in this study offer the possibility of separating the home and workplace while still allowing people to work from a place (ideally) closer to the home, which will mean less reliance on commuting. The data show that the proportion of satisfied people working remotely increases as commuting time increases; interestingly, the ideal e-working model is a hybrid one of 3-4 times a week (41.4%); the debate on whether or not to return to the office is far from settled, 73% of respondents are reluctant to give up the 9-5 space, a workforce living further from the office prefers to work remotely more often, and, not surprisingly, the workforce that lives not far from the organisation prefers to keep working in the office; coworking space seems to be on the rise (72%) among employees in shared work environments. Employees who live further from the office do not want the coworking possibility. Overall, spending some of the week working from home is a boon for employees in many circumstances, especially those who live far from the office.

One problem in the way of work-life balance is a simple one, namely distance. On the basis on the data, it appears that Austrian organisations understand that the key to allowing employees to reclaim a better work-life balance is to offer commuting flexibility

There are some limitations to the research approach in this paper that could inspire further research directions. First, the authors only analyse commuting time, and not commuting distance. Secondly, to combat geographical problems, businesses take advantage of the rise of coworking spaces, as shown in this study, but the incidence of this being refused, for psychological reasons, has not been examined. The best-designed commuting plans should take into account both what employees want (via surveys and behaviour metrics) and what they need (via route tracking and mode data). It is important to understand where the workforce is coming from, how often the workforce commutes, the modes the workforce relies on and what alternative options exist. The behaviour and preferences of different age groups in regard to commuting affect the nature of the workforce and are important issues for the employer. These are further topics to be investigated. While this study explores dimensions of commuting time, it was limited to only the commute to the office itself. There are numerous incidental issues, such as means of commuting, how easy it is to reach a convenient railway station or bus stop for example, the role played by

weather conditions, the possibility of encountering criminal elements. These kinds of issues, as well as commuting distance, were not considered, which is therefore a limitation. The sample size for this research is adequate (843 respondents), but larger sample sizes from different countries in future work would be beneficial for characterising (or at least confirming) the effects of the variables found in the current study. Moreover, a questionnaire in English might have affected the responses of Austrian respondents. Therefore, a questionnaire in German was chosen, but because of this the authors' interpretation could have influenced the generalisability of the outcomes. Despite these limitations, this study provides a methodical approach to explore the involved and intricate interplay between e-flexibility arrangements and commuting.

Acknowledgement

This work was supported in part by the project Students Grant Competition "Applied Research, Experimental Development and Innovation in Transport and Logistics" financed by the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports and Faculty of Mechanical Engineering, Vysoka skola banska-Technical University of Ostrava (VSB-TUO), under Grant SP2024/095; in part by the Materials and Technologies for Sustainable Development within the Jan Amos Komensky Operational Program financed by the European Union (EU) and the State Budget of Czech Republic under Grant CZ.02.01.01/00/22_008/0004631; and in part by the EU through the REFRESH—Research Excellence For Region Sustainability and High-Tech Industries via the Operational Programme Just Transition under Project CZ.10.03.01/00/22_003/0000048.

References

- [1] HERNANDEZ-TAMUREJO, A., HERRAEZ, B., AGUDO, M.: Telework and the limited impact on traffic reduction – Case study Madrid (Spain), *Acta logistica*, Vol. 10, No. 3, pp. 423-434, 2023. <https://doi.org/10.22306/al.v10i3.411>
- [2] CALDAROLA, B., SORRELL, S.: Does teleworking encourage longer commute? Pre-pandemic evidence from the English National Travel Survey, *Travel Behaviour and Society*, Vol. 37, 100822, pp. 1-13, 2024. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tbs.2024.100822>
- [3] ELLDÉR, E.: Telework and daily travel: New evidence from Sweden, *Journal of Transport Geography*, Vol. 86, 102777, pp. 1-9, 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtrangeo.2020.102777>
- [4] GANDINI, A.: The rise of coworking spaces: A literature review, *Ephemera Journal*, Vol. 15, No. 1, pp. 193-205, 2015.
- [5] MAHESHWARI, R., VAN ACKER, V., GERBER, P.: Commuting vs teleworking: How does it impact the relationship between commuting satisfaction and subjective well-being, *Transportation Research Part A*

Commuting versus e-flexibility: the workforce's choice

Michal Beno, Dagmar Caganova, Ales Sliva

- Policy and Practice*, Vol. 182, 104041, pp. 1-16, 2024. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tra.2024.104041>
- [6] TÜRKİSTANLI, T.T., TUĞDEMİR KÖK, G.: The impact of remote work arrangements on freight forwarders job performance, satisfaction, and motivation, *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Denizcilik Fakültesi Dergisi*, Vol. 16, No. 1, pp. 71-100, 2024. <https://doi.org/10.18613/deudfd.1459049>
- [7] TASER, D., AYDIN, E., TORGALOZ, A.O., ROFCANIN, Y.: An examination of remote e-working and flow experience: The role of technostress and loneliness. *Computers in Human Behavior*, Vol. 127, 107020, pp. 1-10, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2021.107020>
- [8] AITKEN, J.A., KAPLAN, S.A., KUYKENDALL, L.: Going with(out) the flow at home: day-to-day variability in flow and performance while teleworking, *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 32, No. 5, pp. 662-677, 2023. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432x.2023.2211271>
- [9] DEMIRHAN, A., BULGUR, N.E.: How does remote working enhance flow experience? the role of employees' psychological well-being, *Management Research and Practice*, Vol. 15, No. 2, pp. 65-76, 2023.
- [10] BINDA, J., BOLIBRUKH, L.: Pandemic covid-19 as a catalyst of the global logistic crisis and digitalization system, *ASEJ-Scientific Journal of Bielsko-Biala School of Finance and Law*, Vol. 26, No. 4, pp. 91-95, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.19192/wsfp.sj4.2022.14>
- [11] STATISTICS AUSTRIA: Commuters (place of work), [Online], Available: <https://www.statistik.at/en/statistics/labour-market/employment/commuters-place-of-work> [4 Oct 2024], 2024.
- [12] BEŇO, M., HVORECKÝ, J., JENEŠOVÁ, Š.: On-site workforce shortening the week in favour of flexibility, *Journal of Eastern European and Central Asian Research*, Vol. 9, No. 6, pp. 1034-1045, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.15549/jecar.v9i6.1044>
- [13] JENN, N.CH.: Designing a Questionnaire, *Malaysian Family Physician*, Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 32-35, 2006.
- [14] EEA: From the daily office commute to flexible working patterns — teleworking and sustainability, [Online], Available: <https://www.eea.europa.eu/publications/from-the-daily-office-commute> [4 Oct 2024], 2023.
- [15] CHALABI, G., DIA, H.: The impacts of remote work and attitudinal shifts on commuting reductions in Post-COVID Melbourne, Australia, *Sustainability*, Vol. 16, No. 17, 7289, pp. 1-30, 2024. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su16177289>
- [16] DE VOS, D., MEIJERS, E., VAN HAM, M.: Working from home and the willingness to accept a longer commute, *The Annals of Regional Science*, Vol. 61, pp. 375-398, 2018. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00168-018-0873-6>
- [17] DIAS, D.S.A., GEORGARAKOS, D., WEIBLER, M.: How people want to work – preferences for remote work after the pandemic, [Online], Available: https://www.ecb.europa.eu/press/economic-bulletin/focus/2023/html/ecb.ebbox202301_04~1b73ef4872.en.html [4 Oct 2024], 2023.
- [18] APPEL-MEULENBROEK, R., KEMPERMAN, A., VAN DE WATER, A., WEIJS-PERRÉE, M., VERHAEGH, J.: How to attract employees back to the office? A stated choice study on hybrid working preferences, *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, Vol. 81, 101784, pp. 1-12, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2022.101784>
- [19] GERDENITSCH, C., SCHEEL, T.E., ANDORFER, J., KORUNKA, C.: Coworking spaces: a source of social support for independent professionals, *Frontiers in Psychology*, Vol. 7, 581, pp. 1-12, 2016. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00581>
- [20] LASHANI, E., ZACHER, H.: Do we have a match? Assessing the role of community in coworking spaces based on a person-environment fit framework, *Frontiers in Psychology*, Vol. 12, 620794, pp. 1-15, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.620794>
- [21] RADMAN, E., JOHANSSON, E., BOSCH-SIJTSEMA, P., RAHARJO, H.: In search of member needs in coworking spaces, *Review of Managerial Science*, Vol. 17, No. 3, pp. 881-907, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11846-022-00546-4>
- [22] WRIGHT, A., MARSH, D., WIBBERLEY, G.: Favours within “the tribe”: Social support in coworking spaces, *New Technology Work and Employment*, Vol. 37, No. 1, pp. 59-78, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ntwe.12214>
- [23] LESCARRET, C., LEMERCIER, C., FLOCH, V.L.: Coworking spaces vs. home: Does employees' experience of the negative aspects of working from home predict their intention to telework in a coworking space?, *Frontiers in Psychology*, Vol. 13, pp. 1-15, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1079691>

Review process

Single-blind peer review process.