



THRIVING IN THE MODERN WORKPLACE: EXPLORING PERSONALITIES, WORK ARRANGEMENTS AND WELL-BEING AMONG YOUNGER WORKERS IN THE SWEDISH CONTEXT

Anna Nguyen & Jacqueline Ortiz

Essay/Thesis:	30 hp
Program and/or course:	Master Thesis in Strategic HRM and Labour Relations
Level:	Second Cycle
Semester/year:	St/2023
Supervisor:	Jing Wu
Examiner:	Monica Andersson Bäck

Abstract

Essay/Thesis: 30 hp

Program and/or course: Master Thesis in Strategic HRM and Labour Relations

Level: Second Cycle

Semester/year: St/2023

Supervisor: Jing Wu

Examiner: Monica Andersson Bäck

Keyword: *Work arrangement, remote, office, hybrid, employee well-being, personality*

Purpose: The purpose of this study is to explore how participants perceive their employee well-being and whether they prefer different work arrangements according to their personalities. In addition, the study also seeks to explore how participants assess the impact of work arrangements on their workplace well-being.

Theory: Theoretical frameworks used in this thesis are Job Demand-Resource Theory (JDR), Job Demand-Control-Support Theory (JDCS) and Five-Factor Model (FFM). JDR is used to evaluate employee well-being by investigating the balance between demands and resources among the participants. JDCS is used in this study to explore the impact of social support on participants' employee well-being. FFM is used to measure characteristics through a scale and shows tendencies toward a specific personality trait.

Method: The data collection strategy used in this study is a qualitative method where purposive sampling was used. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with open ended questions and the NEO IPIP-120 questionnaire was used to collect data regarding personality traits. Moreover, a qualitative content analysis method was used to analyse and interpret the collected empirical data.

Results: Links between personality traits and work arrangements were not perceived by the participants. The results show that work arrangement is more influenced by organizational job demands, job resources, and social support among the participants. Employee well-being such as stress seemed to be manageable when the participants had social support either from private life or from work.

Foreword

We would like to give our sincerest thanks to our amazing supervisor Dr. Jing Wu who has guided us as well as shown support and commitment to our work during the whole period of writing our thesis. We are extremely grateful for your vast knowledge and genuine kindness. We would also like to express gratitude towards our participants who gave us their time to join the study. To our classmates, we appreciate the help and feedback that we received during the few seminars. Lastly, we are thankful to our partners, friends and each other, who have shown love and support during this tough journey. We would not have been able to produce this thesis without the amazing support we have received. Thank you!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	5
1.2. PURPOSE AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS.....	6
1.3. DISPOSITION	7
2. PREVIOUS RESEARCH	7
3. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND CONCEPTS	9
3.1. JOB DEMAND-RESOURCES THEORY	10
3.2. DEMAND-CONTROL-SUPPORT THEORY	12
3.3. EMPLOYEE WELL-BEING	13
3.4. FIVE FACTOR MODEL AND PERSONALITY TRAITS	13
3.5. WORKING ARRANGEMENTS	14
4. METHOD	16
4.1. SAMPLING STRATEGY	16
4.2. DATA COLLECTION STRATEGY	17
4.3. INTERNATIONAL PERSONALITY INVENTORY POOL NEO	18
4.4. ANALYTICAL STRATEGY	19
4.5. RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY	20
4.6. ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS	21
5. RESULT	22
5.1 WELL-BEING AND PERSONALITY	23
5.2 WORK ARRANGEMENT AND PERSONALITY	24
5.3 WORK ARRANGEMENT AND WELL-BEING.....	26
6. DISCUSSION	34
6.1 WELL-BEING, WORK ARRANGEMENT AND PERSONALITY	34
6.2 WORK ARRANGEMENT AND WELL-BEING.....	36
6.3 LIMITATIONS.....	39
7. CONCLUSION	40
7.1. IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH AND PRACTICE.....	41
8. REFERENCES	42
APPENDIX A	48
APPENDIX B	50

1. INTRODUCTION

Over the past few years, the Covid-19 virus has dramatically impacted the world in various ways. Evidently the labour market, and in turn organisations, employers as well as employees all around the world have been affected and forced to change the traditional way of working in order to comply and adapt to the imposed restrictions of lockdowns, social distancing, self-quarantine and isolation among many other (OECD iLibrary, 2021). Although remote work was rare before the Covid-19 pandemic and carried a bad reputation among employers just a decade ago, it seems as many companies are rethinking and adopting a hybrid work model in present time when the world is opening up again and going back to normalcy (Peek, 2023). The main reasons as to why companies seemed to express concerns regarding remote work were lack of monitoring, supervising, uncontactable employees and loss of productivity among the employees (Kelly, 2021). However, employees found themselves to be more productive when remote working compared to working at a conventional office space according to a case study (Blitchok, 2023). For employees, remote work can imply less commute stress, increased performance, autonomy and flexibility in their working life (Herrity, 2023). In addition, remote work has been proven to benefit not only employees but also the companies in terms of higher engagement among employees, resulting in lower absenteeism, turnover reduction, and profitability (Farrer, 2020).

Further, a change in the traditional work model is not the only topic that has risen to the top of the business agenda among organisations. Employee health and well-being has also been elevated as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic and its implications (CIPD, 2022). Employee well-being was affected in terms of loneliness, stress, detachment and mental health challenges (Barbato & Thomas, 2021). According to Hamilton Skurak et al. (2018) engagement is positively associated with employee well-being in terms of life satisfaction, job satisfaction and performance and states that previous research has been shown to have a positive outcome for well-being. In addition, it is argued that job resources such as autonomy have a positive association with well-being (Hamilton Skurak et al., 2018). As previously mentioned, employees experience higher levels of autonomy when working both hybrid and remotely compared to working in the office, affirming that work arrangement may influence employee well-being.

Further, an extensive amount of previous research has investigated the role of personality traits at work in relation to various aspects such as job satisfaction, work-life balance, work-life conflict, work involvement and job performance (Bozionelos, 2004; Le et al., 2011; Leka & De Alwis, 2016; Bui, 2017). Since the Covid-19 outbreak and changes in the labour market, the topic has gained additional attention. However, there is little attention paid to whether the preferences of work arrangements among employees are dependent or influenced by their personality traits. The Five-Factor model (FFM), commonly referred to as the Big Five, measures characteristics in specific personalities. According to the model, there are five traits that can explain an individuals' tendencies within the different personality dimensions, which influences behaviour, thoughts and feelings (Mitsopolou & Giovazolias, 2015). Investigating links between personality traits and wellbeing has been a focus in previous research. Additionally, links between personality traits and wellbeing have been discovered and some personality traits, such as neuroticism and openness to new experiences, were found to have a stronger link to well-being compared to others (Marzukii, 2020). Moreover, previous studies investigate links between personality traits and tendencies for remote work exhaustion in which it was found that individuals with high neuroticism were more prone to be affected by this, while agreeableness and conscientiousness personality traits were more suitable in a remote work arrangement (Parra et al., 2022). Another study showed that extroverted individuals suffered during Covid-19 and the shift to remote work impacted them in terms of increase of burnout, less productiveness, less job satisfaction as well as less job engagement (Evans et al., 2022). Therefore, it is interesting and of high importance to investigate how employees understand and perceive their preferences on work arrangements as well as how they understand and evaluate their well-being at work. In addition, the study also aims to explore whether participants with different personality traits have different preferences on work arrangements and different perceptions on their well-being condition. Lastly, this study aims to give basis in developing and improving the "new normal" of hybrid working models so that employees can be given the opportunity to perform their work to the best of their ability in a working arrangement and environment that they are able to perform their work best in.

1.2. PURPOSE AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The purpose of this study is to explore how participants perceive their employee well-being and whether they prefer different work arrangements based on their personalities. In addition, the study also seeks to explore how participants assess the impact of work arrangements on

their employee well-being. Therefore, the following research questions have been formulated to answer the purpose of the study.

1. How do participants perceive their well-being situation at work, according to their personality traits?
2. What work arrangements do the participants prefer, according to their personality traits?
3. How do the participants evaluate the influence of work arrangements on their well-being situation at work?

1.3. DISPOSITION

The following study is structured in sections starting with a presentation of relevant previous literature and concepts, theoretical frameworks and research design. Thereafter, results, discussion, conclusion and suggestions for future research will be presented.

2. PREVIOUS RESEARCH

The following section aims to present relevant previous studies regarding similar topics such as personality, subjective well-being and JDR model and working models. In addition, they will be further used in the discussion section.

Previous studies have investigated the link between personality and subjective well-being which both general well-being and employee well-being are included in. Udayar et al. (2020) used work stress as a negative indicator of work-related well-being while job satisfaction was used as a positive indicator. Work stress connected to personality traits, high neuroticism individuals were shown to have less life satisfaction as well as work satisfaction, which may be due to the sensitivity to negative emotions. On the other hand, extroverted individuals have been shown to have more life and work satisfaction, emotional stability could explain this. This research was done over a one-year period on working adults in Switzerland (Udayar et al., 2020). A similar study by Bakker et al. (2010), conducted on 3 753 Australian academics in 17 universities in Australia, showed that neuroticism predicted health impairment and that extraversion predicted organisational commitment. The researchers mention that extraversion and neuroticism have a link to psychological well-being at work. Furthermore, Marzukis' study (2013), which took place in Malaysia and had 117 lecturers from a public university, this study

found indications that all personality traits from the Big Five model have a correlation with well-being. Unlike previously mentioned studies, it was found that openness to experience and conscientiousness has the strongest link to well-being followed by extraversion (Marzuki, 2013). In an editorial written by Molin-Sánchez et al. (2022), the authors refer to a paper by Ceular-Villamandos and colleagues that observes negative effects of physical and psychological demands on well-being. They investigate how more than a thousand self-employed people in Ecuador experience high work pressure and limited resources. Connected to Job Demand-Resources Theory, the researchers observed negative physical and psychological effects on the workers due to high job demand and limited job resources. The psychological demand affected the speed performance of tasks while social support from colleagues and collaborators acted as job resources that helped with the job demands (Molin-Sánchez et al., 2022).

Further, according to several previous research, well-being is influenced by and regarded as an important aspect in relation to motivation, performance, commitment and goal achievement among employees. Comparably, while some factors may influence employee well-being positively, other factors may influence employee well-being negatively within the work organisation (Parent-Lamarche & Marchand, 2019). The authors continue to argue for the importance of investigating whether there is a correlation between well-being, personality traits and work organisation conditions; defined as conditions and resources that may affect workers both physically and psychologically with either negative or positive outcomes (Parent-Lamarche & Marchand, 2019). Further, the study resulted in a rejected hypothesis denoting that personality traits, work organisation conditions and well-being had a meaningful association. However, the results correlated with previous research that work organisation conditions are of critical importance to well-being and that personality traits also had significant associations with well-being (Ibid). Similarly, Mihalache & Mihalache (2021) made a study about the correlations between employee well-being, environmental disruptions and organisational responses among a total of 295 individuals working in the United Kingdom. The results were in line with previous research and showed a drop in employee well-being due to environmental disruption caused by crisis. However, unlike previous research, the authors highlight positive outcomes through organisational support and thereby showing the importance of it. In addition, the study also showed that perceived organisational support with a focus on individual traits were positively associated with efficiency in encouraging individual

outcomes. Hence, the authors argue that support should be based on individuals and their traits rather than universal support (Ibid).

Gori et al. (2021) made a quantitative study with the purpose of exploring associations between personality traits, using the Big Five Model, and job crafting. Further, the authors also aimed to investigate the insight in mediation the relationship between these two aspects and what role it plays. In the study, which had a sample size of 159 Italian workers, it is argued that job crafting enables employees to determine their work environment through their behaviour. This leads to increased autonomy, better person-job fit in relation to individual preferences, characteristics and passions. In addition, the study concluded that when employees experience greater autonomy, which includes having the opportunity to influence their work environment, it impacts both productivity and well-being positively (Gori et al, 2021). Moreover, Gori et al. (2021) state in their study that significant questions were raised based on their results that workers dealt with job crafting more difficult or easily depending on type of personality. These include questions concerning elements that impact well-being and productivity among both employees and organisations. The study also highlights the relationship between personality traits and job design and the importance of insight in mediating these terms to improve job-person fit, which in turn will positively influence organisational productivity and outcomes (Ibid).

3. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND CONCEPTS

The following chapter aims to explain the Job-demand and Resource Theory as well as the Demand-Control-Support Theory, which the study will use to analyse the collected data. In this study, the Job-Demand and Resources Theory will be used as the main theory while the Job-Demand-Control-Support will be used as a complementary theory. Therefore, a longer description of JDR is presented and a shorter description of JDCS is presented. In addition, employee well-being, Five Factor Model and working arrangements; default workplace, remote working and hybrid working, will be presented to give further insight to central concepts of this study.

3.1. JOB DEMAND-RESOURCES THEORY

Earlier models such as the two-factor theory, job characteristics model, effort-reward imbalance model, and the demand-control model (and support) inspired the creation of job demand-resources theory by combining their principles. The theory started off as a model but has since then been developed into a theory. This model-turned-theory could also be used to aid organisations in job crafting, job redesign, training and strengths-based intervention (Bakker & Demerouti, 2014). The job demand-resources theory (JDR) consists of job demands and job resources. This theory has been used to investigate work enjoyment, organisational commitment, employee well-being as well as predicting job burnout and work engagement. JDR can be applied to all work environments and job characteristics which is an advantage in the ever-evolving job market, where we do not only have physical demands but cognitive demands for occupations such as developers and scientists (Bakker & Demerouti, 2014).

Job demands consist of psychological, social, physical, and organisational aspects. Job demands are aspects that essentially requires effort and use up energetic resources of the worker, which is the cause of the work stressors. Whereas job resources can be considered as a counter against stress factors that are included in job demands (Bakker & Demerouti, 2014). The psychological stress factors in the workplace can cause exhaustion, burnout, health impairment and reduced personal efficacy (Bakker & Demerouti, 2014; Bakker & Demerouti, 2017; Schaufeli, 2017). These factors could be role ambiguity, work overload, reduced work autonomy, and poor work relationship. Managerial support, work autonomy and available resources that reduce work-related stress, as well as, improving employees work are a part of job resources. Job demands can predict factors that could lead to sick absenteeism, affect job performance, organisational commitment, work enjoyment, alienation, and work engagement (Bakker & Demerouti, 2014).

Job resources have been shown to work well against job demands, having job resources available can help employees handle job demands better (Bakker & Demerouti, 2014). Job resources include factors that reduce the job demands, possible work goal achievement and encouragement of employee growth, learning and development. For example, having control over one's job, competency and achieving work goals (Bakker & Demerouti, 2014; Schaufeli, 2017). Job resources can predict organisational commitment and engagement. Different jobs require different job resources, such as good teamwork and leadership in a project or good safety equipment for miners.

An extension of JDR is personal resources which involve self-efficacy, organisationally based self-esteem, and optimism. It refers to worker's perception of their capacity to control and to influence their surroundings, it is connected to workers' resilience. High personal resources are connected to positive self-regard and motivation to pursue goals. Thus, positive perception of workers' own capacity has been shown to be able to predict goal-setting, motivation, performance, job and life satisfaction. It is suggested that job resources predict and contribute to advancement of personal resources. (Bakker & Demerouti, 2014)

Together, job demands and job resources predict occupational well-being even though they have different processes. The effects of job resource factors have been shown to dampen the effect of job demands. It has also been shown that job demands have increased the effect of motivation and engagement through job resources. In other words, job resources are valuable through improving the work tasks and have a positive significant impact on high job demands. A study by Bakker et al. (2007) found that high job demands such as students' misconduct had a negative relationship with teachers' work engagement. Job resources helped increase work engagement by helping the teachers cope with students' misbehaviours. As mentioned before, challenges can sometimes be good. Bakker et al. (2010) found that employees that had been given stimulating and challenging tasks along with enough resources to handle their work, had high task enjoyment and commitment. This was due to the interaction between job demands and sufficient job resources.

To conclude, JDR can predict, understand and explain employee well-being. JDR has a broad flexibility as job demands and job resources include all working environments and job characteristics, making it applicable for a lot of organisations and studies. JDR can be applied for example, at work that have interactions that are emotionally, cognitive demanding or high-pressure work. Job demands are linked to health impairment due to work stressors which can lead to burnout and physical problems. Job resources are connected to organisational motivation that influences job satisfaction and engagement (Bakker & Demerouti, 2014). Mapping out the job demands and planning job resources could benefit organisations greatly in terms of reduced sickness leave and increased productivity.

3.2. DEMAND-CONTROL-SUPPORT THEORY

The Demand-Control model is a theory developed by Robert Karasek (Karasek & Theorell, 1990). The purpose of the theory is to detect whether and how job characteristics, such as high job demands in conjunction with low job control, influences an employee's psychological well-being. According to the theory, job demands implies work tasks that an employee is given and supposed to conduct by the employer whilst job control implies the amount of decision-making or influence an employee has over her own work (Karasek & Theorell, 1990). Further, the theory states that work can be divided into four different environment categories, namely passive and active work as well as low-strain and high-strain. Firstly, passive work entails that an individual experiences low job demands along with low control and thereby the psychological well-being is influenced in terms of low motivation for development and effectiveness as well as increased stress and mental illness. Secondly, active work rather implies high job demands, however in conjunction with high job control in contrast to passive work. According to Karasek & Theorell (1990) active work are associated with increased effectiveness, development and motivation. Moreover, active work does not show any tendencies towards negative stress. Thirdly, a low-strain environment can cause increased stress when an employee experiences high job demands together with low control, whilst high-strain environments are more characterised by low job demands and high control allowing the employee to positively influence stress levels.

In 1990, the Demand-Control Model was developed and support (DCS) was added as an aspect by Töres Theorell highlighting the importance of social support in relation to psychological well-being (Karaksek & Theorell, 1990). Social support is regarded as important and the theory argues that social support gives room for a social community as well as group or organisational feeling. Further, social support may be regarded or used as a tool in improving the work environment. According to the theory, support can be divided into four themes, namely emotional; support from colleagues in which they are able to manage emotional burden, instrumental; the opportunity of receiving practical help from colleagues, informational: an employee's opportunity and ability to receive information regarding work-related topics and appraisal; receiving feedback and constructive criticism from managers and colleagues.

3.3. EMPLOYEE WELL-BEING

Juniper (2011, p. 25) defines employee well-being as *“that part of an employees’ overall well-being that they perceive to be determined primarily by work and can be influenced by workplace interventions”*. Another definition proposed by Zheng et al. (2015) includes employee's psychological experience as well as satisfaction, not only in their professional life but also in their private life. Psychological well-being is connected to support from the workplace, working from home balance, changes in workload and work demand, job competence and training, job insecurity and financial stress. If these fail, it could lead to poor health which affects work performance and absenteeism (Molina-Sánchez et al., 2022). Well-being can be divided in two parts, hedonic well-being which is life satisfaction and eudaimonic well-being that is meaningful life and flourishing. The latter is connected to maximising and sustaining health and well-being within organisations (Fabio & Kenny, 2019). As presented, there is no clear definition as to what exactly employee well-being is and what is included in the term, however there is substantial research regarding employee well-being and the topic is considered crucial in the human resource management debate (Vakkayil et al., 2017). Understanding the efforts of the employer to promote health and well-being among their workers is still a work in progress and thus should be explored continuously. In addition, it is stated that healthy and satisfied employees can benefit the company in terms of lower turnovers, good corporate culture and performance, increased competitiveness as well as productivity (Gorgenyi-Heyges et al., 2021). Wilson et al. (2004) also proposes a similar argument stating that promoting employee well-being is fundamental for organisations as it illustrates organisational health and well-being. Hence, promoting health and good employee well-being is beneficial for all parties.

3.4. FIVE FACTOR MODEL AND PERSONALITY TRAITS

Wei (2020) presents that the personality traits of extraverted and introverted individuals are defined by how outgoing and talkative an individual is. In other words, extraversion and introversion are two opposite ends of the personality trait spectrum. The definition of personality traits is further explained by Umukoro et al. (2021) as unique characteristics within each individual that influences their behaviour. In addition, personality traits are based and developed on a great number of factors in different psychological systems in which some are included in the workplace. Further, the Five Factor model is used as a measurement on individuals' tendencies to lean toward different personality traits; Extraversion-Introversion,

Openness to Experience, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism, and Agreeableness ((Mitsopolou & Giovazolias, 2015).

Seeing that personality traits are a key concept in this study, the Five-Factor model will be used to measure the personality traits of the participants. As previously mentioned, The Five-Factor model (FFM), also known as the Big Five, measures on a scale how much one is leaning toward a specific personality trait or dimension. The model tells us about five traits that could explain an individual's tendency within the personality dimensions, which can affect behaviour, thoughts and feelings (Mitsopolou & Giovazolias, 2015). The traits included in FFM are Extraversion-introversion, Openness to Experience, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism, and Agreeableness. Extraversion-introversion describes how outgoing and talkative an individual is. Openness is about an individual's engagement in culture, new activities, new experiences, and flexibility in stressful situations. A low score on Openness means that the individual may tend to keep to old routines and has a limited range of interests. Conscientiousness explains an individual's trustworthiness, ability to plan and organise, dutifulness and degree of self-discipline. Neuroticism shows an individual's tendency to anxiousness, instability, and worry. Individuals with a high degree of neuroticism can likely be easily upset and unsure. Finally, agreeableness is characterised by generosity, sympathy and a tendency to cooperate (McCrae & John, 1992).

3.5. WORKING ARRANGEMENTS

Default workplace - In a study made by Bergefurt et al. (2022), the authors make a systematic review regarding the physical workplace as a resource for mental health. According to the study, stimuli as well as everything an employee encounters in or at their work is considered as the physical work environment. Previous literature regarding the traditional workplace points out different environmental factors that affect employees such as issues with concentration when performing demanding work tasks in shared open-plan or office space. Other positive aspects are also presented in terms of easy access to communication and collaboration, social interaction with colleagues which has proven to impact performance positively. In addition, depending on the office design or layout, office workers can choose areas based on their work task; choosing a quiet area when performing demanding tasks or an open space which allows for communication when performing work tasks that require collaboration (Jahncke & Hallman, 2020). Further, a study investigating employee satisfaction towards organisational culture showed that a majority of the respondents preferred to work in

an office space compared to remote work and that the work-life balance when working from the conventional office space was better (Sarasu et al., 2021).

Remote working - According to Eurofound (2023) remote work, also termed telework or telecommuting, refers to a work arrangement whereby work is executed offsite rather than at a conventional workplace; typically at the employers offices, using technology for information and communication (ICT). Although remote work is not a new phenomenon, since the Covid-19 was declared a pandemic, 50% of U.S workforce shifted to remote work which impacted workers, companies and the labour market both positively and negatively (Ozimek, 2020). Previous studies suggest that remote work satisfaction based on sociodemographic factors differs in terms of age, race and household situation (Tahlyan et al., 2021). A survey with the purpose of measuring remote work satisfaction strengthens this suggested difference in remote work satisfaction by showing that younger and older individuals felt less satisfaction with remote work compared to middle aged individuals. Further it was stated that the reason for less satisfaction regarding remote work among younger individuals were related to loss of opportunities in social networking that is needed for advancement in their careers. For older individuals less satisfaction regarding remote work were related to technological limitations and workplace anchoring (Ibid). Other previous studies show that remote work allows for job autonomy which has a positive impact on satisfaction, engagement as well as performance. In turn, job autonomy may also foster profitable innovations (Galanti et al., 2021). Further, previous studies also point out that improved work productivity and efficiency is positively associated with remote work among white-collar workers (Eriksson et al., 2022).

Hybrid working - It is indicated that a hybrid work model will become the “new normal” after the Covid-19 pandemic and its implications. A hybrid work model is defined by Predotova & Vargas Llave (2021) as a work arrangement in which employees have the opportunity to work at both the conventional office; often at the employer's premise, as well as remotely from home or any other location. In a survey made by Eurofound (2021) many employees stated that they were satisfied with the overall experience of remote work, however, were critical to continue with these work arrangements. Instead, employees showed a preference to a hybrid working model which allows for a combination of remote work and work at the office (Beno, 2021). In addition, according to Vinueza-Cabezas et al. (2022) research regarding hybrid work is still in the early stages, however the existing studies are showing positive results on employee conditions such as productivity, flexibility and satisfaction in comparison with full time remote

working. A study investigating the hybrid work model found that applying this type of work model was beneficial for employees in terms of work autonomy, increased productivity, performance as well as motivation. Another aspect that employees found positive with a hybrid work model was that they could spend more time working due to reduction of travel and commuting time (Fridrihsone & Suhodolska, 2021). Although the hybrid work model comes with many advantages, implications cannot be denied. It was also found that challenges with the hybrid work model include social isolation, worsened work-life balance, less efficient collaboration and communication, technical problems as well as procrastination and discipline (Ibid).

4. METHOD

The following section intends to present the methodology behind the study. Firstly, sampling strategy will be described followed by data collection. Further, it also includes the NEO-IPIP 120 questionnaire, ethical considerations and lastly validity as well as reliability will be discussed.

4.1. SAMPLING STRATEGY

Semi-structured interviews were executed in order to collect data that is of relevance for the study. On account of the purpose of the study, which is to investigate whether personality traits and work arrangement have an impact on employee well-being among different work classes, the sampling strategy used to gather data was based on homogenous purposive sampling. According to Ritchie et al. (2014), purposive sampling is a method in which participants or sampling units are chosen based on criteria. In addition, in order to explore and understand central themes in a study, participants are carefully selected based on key characteristics or particular features such as specific roles, behaviours, experiences or socio-demographic characteristics (Ibid). Likewise, Bryman (2018) states that participants in homogenous purposive sampling are selected based on their relevance to the study, and therefore not randomly selected. To conduct this study, participants have been chosen based on one key characteristic which is their access to different work arrangements; hybrid, office based or remotely. In addition, the participants were searched and recruited via friends and acquaintances and in turn selected based on the key criteria for the study. Neither socio-demographic background or a specific sector was used as a criteria for this study, however, these aspects have been taken into account when analysing the collected data. Further, the

researchers believe that interviewing individuals with different work tasks/classes will lead to a diverse but interesting result.

Table 1. Spreadsheet of socio-demographic background among the 14 participants

Participant	Age	Gender	Organisation	Occupation	Time of employment	Sector	Agent work
A	25	Male	Automotive	UX/UI designer	0-1 year	Private	Private
B	28	Male	Data industry	Software engineer	0-1 year	Private	Private
C	23	Male	Data industry	Software developer	0-1 year	Private	Private
D	25	Female	IT	IT health care consultant	0-1 year	Private	Public
E	26	Female	Scientific instrument	Quality technician	0-1 year	Public	-
F	29	Male	Industrial manufacturing	Project manager	0-1 year	Private	Private
G	23	Male	IT	Software engineer	0-1 year	Private	Private
H	28	Male	Automotive	Software engineer	0-1 year	Private	-
I	26	Female	Social Welfare	Social work	0-1 year	Public	-
J	25	Male	IT	Software developer	8 years	Private	-
K	23	Female	Automotive	Accounting consultant	1-2 years	Private	Private
L	26	Female	IT	Digital communicator	0-1 year	Private	-
M	27	Female	IT	IT health care consultant	3 years	Private	Public
N	24	Male	Data industry	Research and development	0-1 year	Private	

4.2. DATA COLLECTION STRATEGY

The method chosen to collect data for this study is through semi-structured interviews. According to Ritchie et al. (2014) research methods should be carefully chosen based on feasibility of the research in terms of resources, time, participant engagement as well as research skills. As mentioned, interviews were conducted to collect data due to the nature of this study, which is to explore the aspects between personality traits, work arrangements and

employee well-being through experiences. Hence, interviews have given insight to lives, views, experiences and perspective through verbal communication that is of relevance for a study (Ritchie et al., 2014). In addition, interviews allow for in depth-understanding of complex issues within the frames of research topics that aim to explore personal experience or history (Ibid). Further, David & Sutton (2017) state that semi structured interviews are based on predetermined themes with both structured and open questions allowing for the participants to some extent interpret the questions freely.

Interviews can be conducted variously in the form of face-to-face, via telephone or video call. Face-to-face has traditionally been viewed as the preferred way to conduct interviews as it allows for an open environment in which the participants can respond freely and the interviewer is also able to take into account body language or other non-verbal communication (Ritchie et al., 2014). Further, telephone or video call may at times be preferred by interviewers or participants in certain situations such as availability in terms of time or busy participants, a scattered sample or budget (Ibid). The participants of this study were given the opportunity to choose freely which form of interview they prefer, whether it be face-to-face, via telephone or video call in order to make the interview as comfortable as possible for them. Almost all participants chose to be interviewed via video call except for two participants. One participant chose to be interviewed via video call but with cameras turned off and the other one chose to be interviewed face to face.

When collecting data, the semi-structured interviews were executed first. Thereafter, the participants received a link to the NEO IPIP-120 questionnaire which they filled out. The desire was to examine whether personality has an influence on choice of work arrangement and sequentially employee well-being. This order was intentionally chosen in order to avoid reflections among the participants about the results of the personality assessment in conjunction with employee well-being and choice of work arrangement when answering the interview questions.

4.3. INTERNATIONAL PERSONALITY INVENTORY POOL NEO

NEO IPIP-120 is a self-evaluation questionnaire with 120 personality items to measure the five personality dimensions of Five Factor Model which is made up of: extraversion, openness to experience, conscientiousness, agreeableness and neuroticism. Every personality trait includes 30 facets and sub-facets which the 120 personality items are built upon. Every personality dimension is measured through statements. For example, a statement to measure neuroticism

is “Worry about things” and one for extraversion is “Make friends easily”. The scales for these statements are ranked with a five-point scale between 1, which is “Very inaccurate” and 5, which is “Very accurate” (Goldberg, 1999; McCrae & Costa, 1987). NEO IPIP-120 has shown good reliability and validity and therefore is an appropriate predictor to measure personality traits and has been validated through 600 000 people globally (Johnson, 2014).

Table 2. Spreadsheet of scores on the NEO IPIP-120 among the 14 participants

Participants	Extrovert	Agreeableness	Conscientiousness	Neuroticism	Openness
A	80 (high)	75 (high)	61 (average)	39 (average)	32 (low)
B	66 (average)	93 (high)	70 (high)	10 (low)	13 (low)
C	61 (average)	68 (high)	51 (average)	67 (average)	29 (low)
D	73 (high)	79 (high)	15 (low)	28 (low)	79 (high)
E	45 (average)	77 (average)	53 (average)	90 (high)	60 (average)
F	21 (low)	49 (average)	63 (average)	78 (high)	21 (low)
G	25 (low)	82 (high)	20 (low)	83 (high)	62 (average)
H	38 (average)	18 (low)	75 (high)	35 (average)	5 (low)
I	62 (average)	65 (average)	61 (average)	75 (high)	71 (high)
J	25 (low)	77 (high)	48 (average)	52 (average)	6 (low)
K	60 (average)	26 (low)	97 (high)	22 (low)	49 (average)
L	52 (average)	53 (average)	56 (average)	43 (average)	14 (low)
M	55 (average)	79 (high)	21 (low)	51 (average)	49 (average)
N	27 (low)	52 (average)	65 (average)	73 (high)	37 (average)

4.4. ANALYTICAL STRATEGY

According to Flick (2014), the process of describing the context of qualitative data in a systematic technique is known as qualitative content analysis. In addition, Graneheim & Lundman (2004) argue that qualitative content analysis aims to seek a deeper understanding on the subject matter of a document or text by identifying units of meaning when performing a thorough readthrough of the complete text. Further, a key characteristic of qualitative content analysis that is distinct from other qualitative methods is managing data by reduction in terms of focusing on overall features that are clearly related to the research questions rather than creating a big amount of categories (Flick, 2014). Although this method may lead to loss of concrete information due to the abstract characteristics of the overall categorization, the method offers the opportunity for diverse understanding with regard to how the different parts

of the data both relate and compare to one another (Ibid). Hence, the chosen form of analytical strategy was qualitative content analysis by reason of the purpose of the study which is to explore and understand the personal experiences of younger workers in terms of personality traits, work arrangement and well-being. In addition, qualitative content analysis gives the advantages of managing collected data with limited time resources which is suitable for this study.

When performing qualitative content analysis, a thorough readthrough of the complete data is necessary (Flick, 2014). Hence, transcription of all the interviews will be conducted in order to identify units of meaning that are of high relevance for the research questions and proceed to the next step of the process. Thereafter, deductive coding will be operated with the purpose of finding correlations in terms of similarities and differences among all the collected data. According to David & Sutton (2017), deductive coding is predicated on a forethought set of codes, also termed category. Considering that theories and concepts were chosen beforehand, and in turn categories, the natural process to analyse was through deductive coding. After doing a thorough readthrough of all transcripts, codes such as communication, autonomy, flexibility, support, focus and productivity were identified and categorised in office, remote or hybrid themes.

4.5. RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY

When conducting research, it is of high importance to consider reliability. The concept is used to measure whether participants would generate the same responses if the study were to be carried out at a different time. It is important to note that it is impossible to guarantee reliability because one cannot make a measurement completely without errors. However, there are possibilities to establish high reliability by conducting the test-retest method implying that a participant takes part in the same interview on different occasions to test whether the responses remain the same (David & Sutton, 2017).

In order to achieve reliability, the interview guide was designed to facilitate the test-retest method. Since the focus of this study is to explore personal experience, it is important to note that results and outcomes may vary with the test-retest method. One aspect that may strengthen the reliability is the participants' personality scores, which has a low probability of changing. In addition, it is also believed that the participants' who prefer and have a hybrid work arrangement will generate the same responses unless their work arrangement changes.

Validity is a term defined as a measurement for testing whether data and reality matches. The term can be divided into two categories, namely internal validity which emphasises focus on correlation between informants (David & Sutton, 2017), in this case the 14 participants. The latter category, external validity, focuses on correlations between the informants and the entire population included in the research question (Ibid), in this case young adult workers in the Swedish context. Moreover, qualitative interviews with a smaller sample size allows for greater prerequisites in establishing internal validity. Conversely, a smaller sample size can not represent an entire population, which may lead to a greater liability in external validity.

The purpose of this study is to explore connections between personality traits, work arrangements and employee well-being and whether they impact one another. The chosen sample strategy has been based on the key criteria of having the opportunity for different types of work arrangements, namely office, remote and hybrid. 14 qualitative semi-structured interviews have since been conducted with participants that match the given criteria. The focus in terms of validity in this study should therefore lie in the internal category. Further, the internal validity is recognised as high because the interview guide has been carefully designed in a semi-structured manner. The interview guide is based on predetermined themes that are considered suitable for the research questions, with open questions allowing the participants to make their own interpretations. A thorough readthrough of the collected empirical data has been done, and the researchers have individually interpreted the content. Once the interpretation of the content was completed, the researchers clarified the interpreted content with all participants in order to verify their answers.

4.6. ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

The researchers have chosen to conduct this study within the frames of Vetenskapsrådets (2002) four requirements. Firstly, all participants in the study will be informed about the study as well as the role of their contributions in order to comply with the requirements on information (Vetenskapsrådet, 2002, p. 7). To properly inform all participants, the researchers will send out information regarding the aim and purpose of the study. Secondly, to comply with the requirements regarding consent; which implies that the participants have the rights to share and partake in the study based on their own free will, a letter of consent will be sent out together with the information letter. Before participating in the study, all participants will have to sign the letter of consent which includes information that their participation in the study is completely voluntary and that the option of being anonymous is given. In addition, the participants will also be made aware, through the letter of consent, that they at any given time

have the choice to withdraw from the study (Vetenskapsrådet, 2002, p. 9). Further, the researchers will manage the collected data from participants in a safe way in which no outsider will be able to access it (Ritche et al., 2014). Thirdly, according to the requirements of confidentiality all participants should be guaranteed anonymity (Vetenskapsrådet, 2002, p. 12). Based on the criteria, the researcher will try to meet the requirements of guaranteeing anonymity, however also want to highlight that this is extremely difficult. If the participants wish to be anonymous, company names will be left out, their names will be altered or alternatively mentioned by their title. This will be informed via the consent and information letter, however the participants will also be reminded of this before the interview starts as an extra step to ensure confidentiality. Lastly, to comply with the requirements of utilisation; implying that collected personal data and information will be exclusively used in this study and will not be spread further (Vetenskapsrådet, 2002, p. 14). To attest utilisation, the researchers will inform all participants, through the letter of information and consent as well as before the interview, that the collected data will be terminated once the study has been handed in and approved.

The researchers have also considered The European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity (2020) which states that all types of researchers, whether it be academics, funding agencies, publishers or any other, are responsible for following the guidelines and principles presented by them. The principles include reliability, honesty, respect and accountability (ALLEA, 2020).

5. RESULT

This section intends to present the results of the collected data stemming from the semi-structured interviews and the NEO IPIP-120 questionnaire. Further, the section is divided in three themes, namely well-being and personality, work arrangement and personality, lastly work arrangement and well-being.

Participants A and D scored high on the extroversion dimension and expressed different preferences in work arrangements. Participant A preferred working remotely while participant D preferred working at the office.

Participants B, C, E, H, I, K, L and M all have average scores on the extroversion dimension. When looking at the preferences of the eight participants, the majority expressed a preference

for hybrid work arrangement due to mainly being able to work autonomously and be flexible. However, participants B as well as M preferred working remotely and participant E preferred to work at the office.

Participants F, G, J and N scored lower than other participants and are low on extraversion. Participants F and N described that they were able to choose their own working arrangement, in which they all expressed a preference for hybrid. Participants F, J and N expressed that they preferred a hybrid work arrangement, mainly by reason of specific work tasks. While participant G prefers working at the office mostly because of the social aspect.

5.1 WELL-BEING AND PERSONALITY

After collecting the empirical data, few associations between well-being and personality were identified by the participants. However, the results did generate some valuable points and insights.

Out of the 14 participants of this study, five scored above 73 on the neuroticism measurement scale, which is regarded as high. This implies that participants E, F, G, I and N experience emotional instability, anxiousness, irritability to a higher extent compared to the participant that scored either average or low. Among participants E, F, G, I and N, a common denominator was identified when they were asked about well-being and workload, namely stress. However, when the participants were asked about how they dealt with stress, participants F, G, I and N all responded that they try to work remotely to get away from distractions at the office that is characterised by social aspects such as talking with colleagues, coffee breaks, background noises and the feeling of being monitored.

“You work from home, there’s less stress in the sense where there’s not always somebody popping by, disturbing your work. You can you know, focus on your work.” - Participant F

“When I work at home I would most definitely just work, try to work harder. Yeah, to relieve the stress and get me out of the stressful situation.” - Participant N

Participant A scored high at 80 on the extrovert measurement scale and expressed that he has a hybrid working arrangement with one mandatory day at the office. When asked about participant A’s employee well-being, he explained that it was mostly affected by stress factors in his private life. Overall, participant A described physical activities such as dancing, going to the gym and hanging out with friends as important to enhance employee well-being. In other

words, doing fun and physical activities outside of work, helps with improving his employee well-being. Similarly, Participant D, who also scored high at 73 on extraversion, described an overall good employee well-being and that doing fun and physical activities helps to keep a good employee well-being. In addition and unlike participant A, participant D explained that the social aspect, such as talking with colleagues, having coffee breaks and lunch together, is a very important aspect of employee well-being.

Participant E, who scored average on extraversion, works completely remotely because the company headquarters are based four hours away from her home. However she does have the opportunity to work at the office if she wants to. Compared to the other participants that also scored high on the neuroticism measurement scale who have easier access to working both remotely and at the office, participant E expressed that her stress is more characterised by personal stress that affects her work, rather than stress due to work-related things. Participants A and E share similar perceptions and describe that their employee well-being is more influenced by stress in their private life rather than working life even though they have different personalities. Moreover, since the commute to the office is lengthy for participant E she does not have the same conditions of choosing to work at the office during stressful periods compared to the other participants. Instead, participant E deals with stress by structuring and planning her work in countervailing purpose of avoiding stress.

5.2 WORK ARRANGEMENT AND PERSONALITY

This sub-section aims to present the links between work arrangement and personality. Overall focus lies in participants A, D, J and C as they were more prominent compared to the other participants with regards to these aspects.

Participant A elaborated that, every other day, except for the day it is mandatory to be in the office. He is able to choose where to work from, in which he said that he mostly chooses to work remotely. Meanwhile, participant D expressed a preference for working at the office due to the social aspect of meeting colleagues, taking breaks with them, and coffee breaks. Further, she expressed that the company she works for, recommended that their employees should work at least three days at the office, however, it was not mandatory. Regardless, participant D went on to explain that she chooses to work mostly at the office. This is interesting because although participant A scored higher than participant D on the extrovert measurement scale, A still expressed a preference for working remotely unlike D who expressed a preference for working at the office.

“ I’m very social, which is great in the way that. As I said, in our project there are quite a few parts, so for me getting to know everyone at the office, helps me in them helping me later. Like I was at the office and I have a friend of mine, a close friend of mine that has worked there for three years and I have been there for less. But I introduce her to people she has never met even though she has been in the office for three years.” - Participant D

“I think... Me as a person, I’m not fit as much for an IT job as I thought. I need to be more around constant movement, constant working, constant new challenges within other sectors. So, me as a person, like, what I’ve done throughout the years and what I work with now doesn’t really fit my personality style as much as I thought it would.” - Participant D

Participant J scored low on the extrovert measurement scale at 25, implying that he leans more towards the introverted dimension. Further, he expressed that he has worked both at the office or remotely but prefers a hybrid work arrangement even though he has not been able to try the hybrid work model. Participant J explained that he has worked at the same company for eight years, however the last three years have been full time. He used to work at the office, but since Covid he has worked completely remote. During the interview, participant J was asked what type of working arrangement he preferred in which he expressed that he would prefer a hybrid work arrangement but has no problems with working completely remote. He also stated that he has never tried a hybrid working arrangement. This implies that the participant knows how it is to work at the office but is only able to work remotely at the moment. The reasoning for this preference is because some days he would feel less productive at home and that going to an office would help.

“It’s a mixed feeling kind of... It’s awesome to work remotely but it’s close to the office but it’s kind of frustrating at times because there are periods when you’re not productive at home because there are distractions around and such... then an office would be good. There are pros and cons with everything.” - Participant J

“ I prefer remotely over only in the office. I haven’t tried hybrid but I think I’d like that better. because there are periods where I feel like I would be more efficient at an office and sometimes I want to meet colleagues in order to have a conversation about issues. I find it to be okay to meet them via link but it could be better in real life.” - Participant J

In addition, Participant J explained that his attention would be negatively affected if he were to work at the office. It could therefore be interpreted that the overall environment at the

conventional office is regarded as worse compared to the environment when he is working remotely. This is also in line with his low scores on the extroversion measurement scale. However, an interesting aspect is that J scored 77 on agreeableness, which is high, signifying that he is more likely to compromise his own preferences and abide by others. In turn, J adjusts to his surroundings but still seeks out solutions and actions to combat stress factors and improve his employee well-being.

Participant C, who had an average score on extraversion and 67 on neuroticism said he preferred hybrid work arrangement but acknowledges that the office environment is better overall. The hybrid work model allowed him to work based on his needs and wants. Working in the office allowed for better productivity and support from colleagues while working remotely was related to comfortability rather than being effective.

“I think working from home for me is more of a getaway from work somehow. It’s kind of hard to explain, some days you just wake up and you just don’t want to get into the office but I know it would be great for me to just continue to go to the office regularly ... Waking up in the morning and not being able to, need to actually wake up mentally to be able to talk to people and everything like that.” - Participant C

5.3 WORK ARRANGEMENT AND WELL-BEING

Participant J described many positive aspects of working completely remotely and that he preferred working completely remotely compared to working completely at the office. When participant C was asked about stress factors in relation to well-being and working arrangements he answered that working at the office would potentially have a negative effect.

“I think it would be potentially worse, because then I would have my boss and such around me all the time. It may kind of interrupt my thoughts.” - Participant J

“Yes I know that it will be affected negatively because then I definitely do not take breaks and not taking breaks are worse than taking breaks actually.” - Participant J

In accordance with the above citation, it is clear that J knows which factors that influence his well-being, both negatively and positively. Therefore, his working arrangement seems to both influence his employee well-being positively and match his personality dimensions of low on the extroversion measurement scale. In addition, Participant J expressed that his work can be challenging and motivating at the same time. However, he also explains that he sometimes

finds it draining. Further, he describes that his employee well-being is mostly affected negatively by aspects in his private life. Besides this, he experiences more stress when he finds work to be intense. To manage stress, the participant plans his work and goes through tasks one by one.

Participant C explained that working remotely can make the balance between private life and work seem hazy because it all happens in the same space. Working remotely could feel impersonal and at the office it could feel like the work had more importance as well as feeling valued. He also mentions that his well-being is positively affected by being in the office due to the social aspects with colleagues. The distractions at the office could be small talk, coffee breaks, noise and movement of the surrounding. At home, the distractions are from the phone, and since no one was monitoring him it reduced his productivity.

“When you work from home and you get a text getting arranged to another feature. It can feel like you’re just another cog in the wheel-feeling.” - Participant C

Participant I expressed that she preferred a hybrid working arrangement because the commute to her work is two hours back and forth. Therefore, being able to choose when to work at the office was heavily based on her desire to commute or not. Participant I found that the workload was heavy and would like additional resources such as an assistant to help with the work. The manager and colleagues showed support to the participant but it was limited as to how they could help with the work.

“I feel like maybe the, I would prefer the balance between the distance, working from home and working from the office is because you don’t have to do the commute every day. It’s the biggest perk of working from home, that some days you don’t have to go through all these open transports” - Participant I

Working at the office allowed for easier communication according to participant I, as it allows for easier access to help in terms of being able to walk around at the office to see who was available. She could also vent to her colleagues as they are going through the similar experience at work. When the participant encounters problems with her clients, she is able to talk to colleagues which helps her cope with the confrontation. In contrast, when working from home she does not have the same access to easy and direct communication which has a negative effect on her well-being. However, participant I elaborate further that working remotely allows her to control her own working time and plan the work more easily. Working remotely gives

her the opportunity for more flexibility in adapting her working hours based on her productivity. Due to this, her stress management is better when working from home.

“Yeah, working from home, I don’t have to focus as much. I decide what I need to do and what order I’m gonna do it. But in the office, it’s different, it’s harder.” - Participant I

Further, participant I expressed that her employee well-being was not good due to her heavy workload, which she described as unreasonable, in combination with a lack of resources. However, she regards her hybrid work arrangement as positive for her employee well-being. In addition, to increase her employee well-being she takes sick leave and does activities in her private time.

“It would be described as unreasonable. ... Yeah, having the opportunity to hybrid, to do hybrid things feels like it helps. It doesn’t magically take away the workload but it helps to manage it yeah.” - Participant I

Participant K expressed that she prefers a hybrid work arrangement. On the one hand, she described that she prefers to work at the office if her colleagues were there as well. On the other hand, she prefers working remotely if her colleagues also work remotely. Working at the office alone felt unnecessary and that it was more fun working there with colleagues being there. Being able to choose where to work allows for flexibility and gives her the opportunity to adapt her work life to private life requirements and activities.

Participant K further describes that her work arrangement is often dependent on her realtime mood of the day. She gives the example that if she has had a bad night of sleep, working remotely would be the preference as it allows her to decide her own working hours. Working remotely enables participant K to be more productive and flexible with her work.

“Yes, absolutely because let’s say you would work full time at [workplace name] then let’s say one day I have a real real bad night of sleep that I don’t have to call in sick that I can just work from home” - Participant K

Participant K enjoys the work tasks and gets staff benefit in terms of a paid gym membership. Further, she describes that her employee well-being is good and that does not experience much stress due to her working arrangements. Participant K also conveys that her workload is

manageable, however she expresses that her colleagues often ask for help and favors which is the main cause for stress.

“I would say I’m just- the colleagues that are calling me are harassing me. That’s the biggest problem with work demand because yeah, because I’m on time with everything so I’m not feeling the stress that they are feeling now.” - Participant K

Participant L articulated a preference for a hybrid work arrangement even though most of her work is done remotely. Participant L expressed that it was comfortable to just start her computer and start working instead of having to wake up earlier, get ready and commute one and a half hour to the office. In addition, commuting was described as even more bothersome if the weather is bad. However, one positive aspect with commuting is that the participant is able to get work done while commuting. When asked about distractions in different work locations, participant K described them with chores and taking care of her pet when working remotely. Another disturbance was a diffuse work-life balance as she experiences trouble with structuring when to do paid and unpaid work. At the office, the participant mentioned the work environment, specifically that it could get uncomfortably cold. In addition, she also experiences distractions such as technical difficulties with colleagues’ connection to meetings and that she had to help them when working at the office. The office environment is described as a stress trigger and in contrast she manages stress better when working remotely.

“Also because it’s easy, well for me it was easier because I know my tech. But if somebody else was connecting from the office I always had to help them.” - Participant L

“It’s easier for me to, well when I’m home to go to the gym, take a walk with the dog then I can do in the office. Because when I’m in the office it’s more like, you’re just work work work. Until I get home it’s, that’s when I can destress. I think it’s the environment that makes it easy to get stressed.” - Participant L

Participant H expressed that he prefers hybrid work arrangement due to the freedom of being able to choose his own workplace environment. In addition, he conveys that autonomy is of high importance. Moreover, similar to participant L, the weather is a central factor that affects whether or not he wants to commute to the office.

“I personally don’t like doing things that I am forced to do. So if I would be forced to, if I was forced to come to the office every day then I don’t think I would like being at the office hat much.” - Participant H

Participant H describes that working remotely can easily lead to losing discipline and that he ends up doing things unrelated to work because no one is monitoring him. However, the participant also mentions that he can easily overwork himself when working remotely. Further, participant H describes that working remotely is more comfortable as it allows him to completely relax without keeping a facade since remote work does not require any face-to-face interactions. Participant H expressed that when working at the office he has to act and dress a certain way. Moreover, although he recognises distractions at the office such as colleagues moving around, talking or doing other things, the participant emphasizes that his motivation is higher and focus is better at the office compared to remotely. When asked about his workload, participant H describes it in waves, most of the time it is manageable but can get heavy during periods. In order to handle stress, participant H expresses that he tries to relax at home or talk to colleagues depending on his work location. Participant H mentions that communication such as asking for help is easier to do at the office and that relationship bonding is easier in the office because it is easier to reach out to people there in comparison to at home.

“And then when you come to the office there are certain expectations on the way you dress and act at the office compared to when you work at home.” - Participant H

According to Participant F, he prefers a hybrid work arrangement because it allows for a mix of being able to meet colleagues or clients and the possibility to work remotely when he wants to. Participant F mentioned positive aspects with working remotely such as saving time by not commuting to the office and less distractions from colleagues asking for help. One negative aspect that participant F mentions about remote work is that he feels lonely and that it affects his mental health. In addition, he expresses that it is more difficult get in contact with colleagues when working remotely. It is easier for the participant to communicate when working at the office as well as establish good relationships during breaks and lunch. Further, working at the office together with colleagues feels similar to being in a community according to participant F.

“Because over the phone it can easily get out of hand because you don’t really see the person, you’re not really interacting so much in the same sense.” - Participant F

One major challenge for the participant was stress related to work. In relation to stress, participant F mentions managing multiple projects, micro-managing, meetings and delegating tasks to his many project teams. In addition, the participant describes his workload as high and therefore deals with a lot of stress. He also mentions that his employee well-being is difficult to manage as he is new to project management at his current company. On the one hand, he experiences that working remotely is less stressful. On the other, working remotely affects him in terms of loneliness and in turn his employee well-being. Moreover, participant F also expressed that there is a lack of employees and wishes for more resources in terms of personnel.

“Honestly, not so good. At the moment it’s very difficult to deal with because as a new person or when you are new to a job the first six months should be a learning experience and taking it slow and so on. But I’ve been just kind of thrown into the whole thing” - Participant F

“Because if you work from home, there’s less stress in the sense where there’s not always somebody popping by disturbing your work, you can, you know, focus on your job.” -

Participant F

Participant G prefers working at the office due to the opportunity for direct communication with colleagues and quick access to help in terms of being able to visually see whether his colleagues are busy or not. Participant G also positively mentions the office environment and that he gets motivated to work as well as being able to focus better at the office because he feels monitored and everyone else is also doing their work. Participant G expresses that the relationship with colleagues is affected by work arrangement. Establishing good relationships is easier when working at the office because it allows him to bond with them more during breaks and lunch. At the office, they also have table tennis which is described as a good activity for connecting with his colleagues since it allows them to spend more time together. In contrast, participant G expresses that working remotely and alone eight hours a day can be difficult for him as he misses the social interactions. He also emphasises the distraction when working remotely in terms of playing video games and discipline.

“For me it’s easier to ask for help at the office because it’s face to face so it’s always easier even though it’s a small task you sometimes skip and don’t ask them if you’re working from home. But if you’re on site you’ll always ask even if you have a small question.” - Participant

G

According to participant G, the workload is good and manageable. However, participant G mentions that he feels more stressed than he should because when he encounters problems he often tries to solve them by himself since he tries to avoid asking for help. In addition, he expresses that is afraid of not being able to perform or be good enough at work. He also mentions that regardless of his work arrangement, the stress he feels would not be different. Moreover, participant G explains that he manages stress by taking more breaks, talking to colleagues, watching videos and finding ways to forget about work. He also mentions afterworks together with colleagues is helpful.

Participant N mentioned that he prefers the hybrid work model because it gives him the opportunity to choose the fitting work location for different work tasks. To give an example, the participant prefers to work remotely when there are simple tasks that only require individual work. According to him, it is easier to focus on certain tasks at home. In contrast, participant N prefers to work at the office when the tasks are more complex and require teamwork. Moreover, he explains that asking and receiving help is easier at the office due to direct communication. Further, the participant expressed that communicating via text is not as elaborated as in person, however he does not regard it to make much of a difference in terms of communicating face-to-face or video mediated communication.

“Whilst you might not remember as much as if you, if it’s in an e-mail you would always have it in text and the discussion wouldn’t be as broad or as developed as in person talk. Ehm, if you have virtual talk, I don’t think there is a difference between the virtual talk and in person talk.” - Participant N

Communication related to work does not differ when working at the office compared to working remotely. However, when working at the office the communication more often leads to personal topics or topics unrelated to work. In contrast, communication done remotely is strictly about work. Further, communication at the office is also easily conveyed in detail regarding topics related to work as well as a more joking manner in topics unrelated to work.

According to the participant, the equipment at home is better than the equipment at the office. Participant N described that he has more control over the equipment when working remotely since he uses his personal equipment as well. At the office, participant N receives equipment such as a work laptop, headset, keyboard and mouse to perform his work tasks. Moreover, he

describes that he is only able to use flexdesks which implies that you have to book the desk space beforehand, and not a designated desk which is something he desires.

Participant N described that his workload can be a lot at times and during intense periods he would rather work at the office in order to be more innovative and be able to discuss the work with others. The participant also mentioned that being in the office will help him get more motivated because of the working environment. In addition, he finds it easier to receive and ask for help allowing him to find solutions quicker. In contrast, when working remotely he devotes all of his time to finding a solution by himself.

“Yes I can, with the freedom to choose I can decide to bunker down and be like all work, or I could be more like, I like to be innovative and discuss more, which I could do at work and not bunker down as much as you could do at home” - Participant N

Participant N described his well-being as very good, and that it is his work that affects his overall well-being, not only his employee well-being. Participant N explained that preparation helps to improve his employee well-being. Moreover, commuting to the office can affect the decision on where to work. He expresses that he does not like commuting due to crowdedness in public transportation and having to walk a long distance from the tram stop to the office. Even though he does not like walking to the office, he still regards it as healthy.

In general, all participants expressed that mood and type of work task was more of a deciding factor in the choice of working at the office, remotely or hybrid. Regardless of if they scored low, average or high on the measurement scales of all five personality dimensions, the majority of the participants expressed a preference for a hybrid working arrangement because of the freedom, flexibility and autonomy that a hybrid working arrangement entails. On the one hand, many of the participants answered that they preferred to work remotely when performing work tasks that are characterised by simple, individual work as well as less communication. Working remotely allowed them to concentrate and focus more on the tasks previously mentioned. On the other hand, the participants answered that they preferred to work at the office when the work tasks required cooperation and a lot of communication with colleagues. Based on what the participants answered, this could be because they expressed that communicating at the office, face to face, was easier and more direct compared to when working remotely and communicating via digital forums. In this case, a common theme among the participants was identified, namely that communication at the office was regarded as an advantage.

6. DISCUSSION

The following chapter will seek to understand the participants' experiences and perceptions of work arrangement and well-being by analysing the results using the chosen theoretical framework; Job Demand-Resource Theory, Job Demand-Control-Support Theory and Five-Factor Model, as well as previous literature mentioned in this study. Similar to the results section, the discussion will be presented in two themes: well-being, work arrangement and personality as well as work arrangement and well-being.

6.1 WELL-BEING, WORK ARRANGEMENT AND PERSONALITY

Based on the collected empirical data, the anticipation was to identify if participants have different perceptions of their well-being situation based on their different personalities. However, it seems as if there are few links between these two aspects and therefore this subsection will remain short.

Starting with participant A and D, the only two who scored high on extraversion, seemed to prefer different work arrangements, namely remote and office. The results showed that participant A preferred to seek support and relationship in private life more to uphold a good employee well-being whilst participant D may value both private life and work relationships to the same extent in terms of employee well-being. A potential reason for this could be that participant D scored 67 on the sub-facet gregariousness, which could indicate that participant D feels more stimulated and rewarded in the company of others in comparison to A who scored 46. In addition, participant D mentioned that she really enjoys the company of her colleagues and has developed a good relationship with them. Participant A also spoke about having good relationships with his colleagues but not to the same extent as D. Participant A also mentioned that the communication is better at the office for certain tasks.

Participant E's work is remote based but has expressed that she would prefer to work at the office. She has the choice of working at the office but since the company is based four hours away from her home, it is difficult for her. From the perspective of participant E, this situation may be understood as a job demand since working remotely is involuntary and requires self-motivation and discipline to perform her work. According to what is stated in the JDR model about high job demands in conjunction with her high score on neuroticism, it is reasonable to

believe that her employee well-being would have been negatively impacted. However, participant E describes her employee well-being as good which is not in line with the JDR model stating that employees who experience higher job demands and less job resources oftentimes perceive their well-being as poor. In addition, previous literature (Bakker et al., 2010; Uddayar et al., 2020) found that individuals with high neuroticism had associations with less life and work satisfaction as well as were prone to health impairment. The case of participant E is therefore not in line with the findings of previous literature. Furthermore, previous literature (Marzuki, 2013) found that conscientiousness, out of the five personality dimensions, has one of the strongest associations to well-being. It could be discussed that participant E has found adequate ways to deal with stress by structuring and planning her work ahead, which is connected to her high score on conscientiousness; characterised by being organised. This could indicate that participant E works proactively to keep a good employee's well-being and therefore does not perceive her employee well-being as bad.

From the perspective of the Five Factor Model, participant J's low score on extraversion indicates that he may be more reserved and introverted, which may explain why he is comfortable with remote work. However, his average score on neuroticism suggests that he may experience some emotional instability, which could be a factor in the preference for a hybrid work model, as it allows for some social interaction and support from colleagues while still allowing for some autonomy and control over his own schedule.

Using the Five Factor Model, it could be interpreted that Participant G's personality traits and their influence on his job-related experiences. His high score on neuroticism suggests that he is more likely to experience negative emotions and stress, which could affect his well-being when working alone. However, his low score on extroversion is not in line with his expressed need for social interaction with colleagues and seems to deviate from the typical tendencies of low extroversion which are characterised by being reserved and enjoying solitude (McCrae & John, 1992).

Using the Job Demands-Resources Theory, several job demands and resources that affect Participant G's well-being and job performance were also identified. One job demand that stands out is the need for social interaction and support, as Participant G mentions feeling lonely and stressed when working alone. This demand seems to be alleviated when he is working at the office and can interact with his colleagues. Another job demand that affects him is the distraction he experiences when working remotely, which can lead to procrastination and

poor work quality. However, this demand is reduced when he is working at the office and feels motivated and focused. In terms of resources, social support provided by colleagues at the office has been identified. This helps Participant G feel less stressed and more connected. In addition, it could also be interpreted that social support in JDCS, in particular emotional and instrumental support, is important for participant Gs' employee well-being. The availability of better equipment at the office also serves as a resource, as it allows him to work more comfortably and efficiently. Additionally, the manageable workload provides a resource for Participant G, reducing his stress and allowing him to perform well at work.

In conclusion, Participant G's job demands and resources seem to have a significant impact on his well-being and job performance. Providing social support, better equipment, and a manageable workload can serve as resources to improve his job satisfaction and performance. Additionally, personality traits, in this case, do not seem to be able to explain his choice and preference of work arrangement.

6.2 WORK ARRANGEMENT AND WELL-BEING

Connections between work arrangement and well-being were more apparent and therefore further analysis has been elaborated here.

Participant D describes that she has a workload of two people, which she regarded as an unreasonable amount of workload. She expresses that she is tired and that her well-being is negatively affected as a result. Moreover, she perceives the social aspect as an important factor for her employee well-being and articulates that she has established good relationships with both her manager and colleagues and receives good support from them. This is in line with the JDR model in terms of job resources reducing the job demands (Bakker & Demerouti, 2014) and therefore participant D may perceive her employee well-being to be overall good rather than bad. This can also be connected to JDCS, specifically social support, as participant D emphasises the importance of both emotional and instrumental support characterised by receiving help from colleagues in terms of emotional burden as well as practical help from colleagues and managers (Karakse & Theorell, 1990). This also aligns with Mihalache and Mihalache's study (2021) where organisational support had a positive link with individual outcomes. Further analysis can be made with regards to participant D's perception of equipment. She explains that she is provided with more equipment at the office compared to remotely and therefore working at the office is easier. Together with the job resources in terms of support and being able to socialise with her colleagues, as well as better equipment, it could

be interpreted that participant D perceives the job resources she is provided with at the office are better and more substantial compared to when working remotely. This is consistent with the JDR model, which suggests that job resources such as social support and equipment as job resources can help employees cope with job demands and maintain their employee well-being (Bakker & Demerouti, 2014; Schaufeli, 2017).

Participant A experienced a heavy workload but has been able to decrease it with support from his manager who prolonged project periods. In addition, participant A receives equal equipment both when working remotely and at the office. He also described his work tasks to be more individual based and therefore prefers to work remotely, in contrast to participant D. Further, participant A perceives that his employee well-being is more affected by resources such as support and relationships in his personal life. This could be connected to both the job resources in JDR as well as the social support aspect in JDCS and can be interpreted as A valuing support and relationships in his private life to a higher extent than support and relationships with manager and colleagues when it comes to employee well-being. Based on the fact that participant A seems to value support and relationships outside of work more in regard to his employee well-being, therefore it is logical to assume that his preference in working remotely stems from personal life environment and values. With the managerial support he has received in order to be able to handle his workload, it can be confirmed additionally with Mihalache and Mihalache's study (2021) that support is positively linked with individual outcomes. Since participant A also receives equal equipment when working remotely which allows him to handle his workload just as well remotely as at the office.

For participant D, managerial and collegial support which is included in job resources of JDR (Bakker & Demerouti, 2014) is central for keeping up a good employee well-being. The amount of job resources that participant D is given, is substantial in being able to manage her job demands which is in line with JDR. Participant A also receives substantial job resources that enable him to manage his job demands. However, job resources in JDR are not valued to the same extent as social support stemming from private life, included in JDCS and therefore he relies more on emotional support to uphold a good employee well-being. However, it can also be discussed that participant A does not realise that job resources in terms of managerial support (JDR) impacts his employee well-being since he described and emphasised that his manager made adaptations in participants A job demands during stressful periods.

In addition, the differences in preference for work arrangement could be related to their levels of gregariousness which may impact their employee well-being and job performance in different ways. In addition, both Participant A and D can determine their own work arrangement which is a prerequisite for autonomy and in turn a positive impact on their employee well-being. In accordance with the perspectives of participants A and D, allowing employees to adapt their work to their liking and personality (person-fit job) creates good conditions for a good employee well-being. This is also in line with previous research on job crafting and personality which states that being able to influence the work environment leads to greater autonomy which leads to a positive impact on both productivity and well-being (Gori et al., 2021).

Participant M preferred working remotely as it increased productivity, and that it allowed her to go to private appointments. This is like participant B's reasons as well, as he mentioned that working remotely increased productivity in terms of not having anyone monitoring him, which would have otherwise put pressure on his work. From participant M's perspective it could be understood that the office environment contains other types of job demands such as psychological, social or physical distractions at the office, and that she is more prone to get stressed there. Even if it is easier for her to get help at the office, it is not enough for her to choose the office as the preferred work arrangement. Consequently, it can be presumed that the job resources lie within working remotely and that job demands are tied to work at the office. In addition, it can also be interpreted as participant M associating job resources and demands differently depending on the work environment. She associates the office environment more with job demands, such as feelings of being monitored, less productivity and disturbed focus. In contrast, job resources are more associated with working remotely in which she has additional flexibility as well as autonomy.

Autonomy can be understood as a positive job resource that can improve well-being and productivity. Participants B and M expressed that having the autonomy to choose their work arrangement and work schedule positively affects their well-being. While participant B expressed that his equipment was enough, participant M found that she could be given better equipment. When interpreting participant B's well-being, it can be understood as being good, as the workload is manageable and that there are no strict deadlines. In addition, he mentioned that the work is customised to him and therefore it does not negatively affect his well-being much. This is also in line with previous literature (Gori et al., 2021) in which it was concluded

that focusing and improving job-person fit lead to positive outcomes, both for the individual employees as well as organisational.

Participants B and M prefer working remotely because it reduces job demands such as distractions, stress, and pressure from monitoring. They feel that working remotely increases their productivity and allows them to attend to personal appointments or household chores. This is also in line with a study made by Galanti et al. (2021) in which autonomy serves as a central resource when working remotely and that it increased both productivity and work engagement.

In terms of JDR, participant J's preference for a hybrid work arrangement may be due to the fact that it allows for both the resources of social support from colleagues as well as some autonomy and control over his own work schedule. This may help to buffer against the demands of their challenging work, which he finds both fun and draining at the same time. His ability to manage stress by planning tasks one-by-one suggests that he can engage in proactive coping, a type of personal resource in the JDR model that may help to mitigate the impact of job demands on his employee well-being. Overall, it seems that Participant J's work experiences seem to have influenced his preference for a hybrid work model. In participant J's case, Shimura et al. (2021) study can be discussed as they found that a hybrid work arrangement increased productivity and performance due to autonomy. However, the findings also showed that full-time remote work decreased the same aspects. In addition, Chafi et al. (2022) landed similar findings, that a hybrid work arrangement offered a good balance between productivity, social connection and well-being. This is something participant J recognised and based his preference for a hybrid work arrangement. It would provide him with a balance between job demands and resources associated with the office respectively remote work and would serve to promote being able to manage his job demands and maintain his employee well-being.

6.3 LIMITATIONS

The study has resulted in valuable observations with regard to the 14 participants. However, it has been considered that the research has some limitations based on the sample, sample size as well as study design. Firstly, the study is based on 14 participants and conclusions drawn in the study can therefore only be made with regard to the small sample size. In addition, the 14 participants consist of young adults between the ages of 20-30 working in Sweden and exclusively present their perspectives and experiences of well-being, working arrangements and personality traits. Even though a bigger generalisation cannot be drawn due to the sample

size being so small as well as the study design, the researchers highlight the fact that the 14 participants are diverse in terms of working in both public and private sectors, as consultants or direct employees at a company, different working positions, industries as well as gender within the sample size. In addition, this study cannot make any statements regarding the entire population of young adults working in the Swedish context and is only able to present the perceptions and experiences of the 14 individuals taking part in this study. Moreover, it is also important to note that the study cannot state anything regarding the participants' personality because as with any personality inventory, scores and descriptions can only approximate an individual's actual personality. Further, to calculate the participants' personality dimension a short version of the NEO IPIP questionnaire was used. To be able to state anything, the participants would have to undergo a real psychological evaluation in relation to personality dimensions. Due to limited time resources given to conduct this study, the short NEO IPIP questionnaire was chosen as it is scientifically based and considered to be highly accurate in testing personality.

7. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, it has been found that the participants base their preference for work arrangement on type of work tasks; in terms of individual or collaborative tasks, what type of resources they value; support from managers and colleagues or personal life, rather than their personality dimensions affect their choice or preference. Another identified factor that was central, based on the results, in determining preference for work arrangement among all participants was mood (emotion), regardless of what they scored on the five personality dimensions. Before conducting the study, the preliminary expected conclusion was that certain personality dimensions would share the same preference on work arrangement, for instance, participants who scored low on extroverts prefer working remotely while participants who scored high would prefer working at the office. However, based on the collected data and results of the 14 participants, employee well-being seems to be influenced more based on the level and opportunity for autonomy and support, whether they value it more from managers and colleagues or their personal life is individual.

Further, although the results of this study show that personality traits are not a central factor in the preference for work arrangement, they may still affect the employee well-being of the participants, and in turn influences the choice of work arrangement subconsciously. Moreover,

based on the findings of this study, the preference for work arrangement among the 14 participants does not seem to be influenced by personality traits to a big extent. Employee well-being (as a broad definition) was not found as a central aspect in preference for work arrangement either. On the contrary, it was emotional well-being or mood (as one aspect or dimension of well-being) that may be related to preference for work arrangements. The participants base their choice on the workplace depending on their mood, or emotional well-being, of each day.

7.1. IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH AND PRACTICE

Based on the findings of this study, a recommendation for future research in HR practices is to test whether personality traits have a correlation with employee well-being, as well as preference for work arrangement. In addition, a proposal for a research method is to conduct a quantitative study using a suitable database that may or will lead to substantial results. A more diverse sample size in terms of socio-demographic background such as age, gender, family situation and industry/sectors should also be taken into account for future research to make a generalisation. Another suggestion we would put forward is to conduct an international study to test whether the context matters. Moreover, another suggestion is for companies to consider personality when designing work organisation or work model by executing surveys directed towards employees and their perceptions/attitudes. Companies may benefit from this in terms of satisfied employees as well as good health or well-being among employees. In turn, designing a work organisation or work model adapted to fit employees may lead to increased efficiency and productivity and thereby positive organisational outcomes such as lower absenteeism, higher retention as well as a competitive advantage. Lastly, one major breakthrough of this study is highlight the importance of emotional well-being or mood on the choice of workplace among the 14 participants. Therefore, investigating links or relationships between the two concepts should be taken into serious consideration for future research, both in quantitative and qualitative studies.

8. REFERENCES

- Bakker, A., Boyd, C., Dollard, M., Gillespie, N., Winefield, A., & Stough, C. (2010). The role of personality in the job demands-resources model. *Career Development International*, 15(7), 622-636. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2019.02.022>
- Bakker, A. B., Hakanen, J. J., Demerouti, E., & Xanthopoulou, D. (2007). Job resources boost work engagement, particularly when job demands are high. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 99, 274–284. doi:[10.1037/0022-0663.99.2.274](https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.99.2.274)
- Bakker, A. B., Van Veldhoven, M. J. P. M., & Xanthopoulou, D. (2010). Beyond the Demand-Control model: Thriving on high job demands and resources. *Journal of Personnel Psychology*, 9, 3–16. doi:[10.1027/1866-5888/a000006](https://doi.org/10.1027/1866-5888/a000006)
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2014). Job demands-resources theory. In P. Y. Chen & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *Work and wellbeing* (pp. 37–64). Wiley Blackwell. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118539415.wbwell019>
- Bakker, A., & Demerouti, E. (2017). Job demands–resources theory. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 22(3), 273-285.
- Barbato, M. & Thomas, J. (2021). *In this together*: Psychological wellbeing of foreign workers in the United Arab Emirates during the COVID-19 pandemic. *International journal of psychology*, 56(6), p.825-833. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.ub.gu.se/10.1002/ijop.12786>
- Bergefurt, L., Weijs-Perrée, M., Appel-Meulenbroek, R., & Arentze, T. (2022). The physical office workplace as a resource for mental health – A systematic scoping review. *ScienceDirect*, 207(A), 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2021.108505>
- Beno, M. (2021). On-Site and Hybrid Workplace Culture of Positivity and Effectiveness: Case Study from Austria. *Richtmann*, 10(5), 331-339. <https://doi.org/10.36941/ajis-2021-0142>
- Blitchok, A. (2023, February 20). How Technology Is Changing The Way People Work From Home. *Beyond the office door*. Retrieved 2023-02-23 from <https://www.btod.com/blog/technology-work-from-home/>

Bozionelos, N. (2004). The big five of personality and work involvement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 19(1), 69-81. doi:10.1108/02683940410520664

Bryman, A. (2018). *Samhällsvetenskapliga metoder*. (3., [rev.] uppl.) Mamö: Liber.

Bui, H. T. (2017). Big Five personality traits and job satisfaction: Evidence from a national sample. *Journal of General Management*, 42(3), 21–30. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306307016687990>

Chafi, M., Hultberg, A., & Yams, N. (2022). Post-pandemic office work: Perceived challenges and opportunities for a sustainable work environment. *Sustainability (Basel, Switzerland)*, 14(1), 294. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14010294>

Di Fabio, A., & Kenny, M. (2019). Resources for enhancing employee and organizational well-being beyond personality traits: The promise of Emotional Intelligence and Positive Relational Management. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 151, 109278.

Eriksson, A., Dellve, L., Williamsson, A., & Skagert, K. (2022). How Conditions and Resources Connected to Digital Management Systems and Remote Work Are Associated with Sustainable Work. *MDPI*, 19(23), 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph192315731>

Eurofound. (2023). *Teleworking*. Retrieved 2023-02-23 from <https://www.eurofound.europa.eu/topic/teleworking>

Evans, A., Meyers, M., Van de Calseyde, P., & Stavrova, O. (2022). Extroversion and conscientiousness predict deteriorating job outcomes during the COVID-19 transition to enforced remote work. *Social Psychological & Personality Science*, 13(3), 781-791. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.ub.gu.se/10.1177/1948550621103909>

European Science Foundation, & All European Academies. (2011). *The European code of conduct for research integrity*. European Science Foundation.

Farrer, L. (2020, February 12). 5 Proven Benefits Of Remote Work For Companies. *Forbes*. Retrieved 2023-02-23 from <https://www.forbes.com/sites/laurelfarrer/2020/02/12/top-5-benefits-of-remote-work-for-companies/?sh=6a2e431516c8>

Galanti, T., Guidetti, G., Mazzei, E., Zappalá, S., & Toscano, F. (2021). Work From Home During the COVID-19 Outbreak. *National Library of Medicine*, 63(7), 426-432. doi: [10.1097/JOM.0000000000002236](https://doi.org/10.1097/JOM.0000000000002236)

Goldberg, L. R. (1999). A broad-bandwidth, public domain, personality inventory measuring the lower-level facets of several five-factor models. In I Mervielde, I. Deary, F. De Fruyt, & F. Ostendorf (Eds.), *Personality psychology in Europe* (Vol. 7, pp. 7–28). Tilburg, The Netherlands: Tilburg University Press.

Gorgenyi-Hegybes, E., Jeyakumar Nathan, R., & Fekete-Farkas, M. (2021). Workplace Health Promotion, Employee Wellbeing and Loyalty during Covid-19 Pandemic—Large Scale Empirical Evidence from Hungary. *MDPI*, 9(2), 2-22. <https://doi.org/10.3390/economies9020055>

Gori, A., Arcioni, A., Topino, E., Palazzeschi, L., & Di Fabio, A. (2021). Constructing Well-Being in Organizations: First Empirical Results on Job Crafting, Personality Traits, and Insight. *Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(12), 6661. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18126661>

Hamilton Skurak, H., Malinen, S., Näswall, K., & Kuntz C, J. (2018). Employee wellbeing: The role of psychological detachment on the relationship between engagement and work–life conflict. *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, 42(1), 116-141. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.ub.gu.se/10.1177/0143831X17750473>

Herrity, J. (2023, February 17). The Pros and Cons of Working From Home. *Indeed*. Retrieved 2023-02-23 from <https://www.indeed.com/career-advice/finding-a-job/the-pros-and-cons-of-working-from-home>

Jahncke, H., & Hallman, D-M. (2020). Objective measures of cognitive performance in activity based workplaces and traditional office types. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 72, 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2020.101503>

James, J. (2020). I'm an introvert, and I'm so happy to be working from home. *Regional Business News*, 35(6), 22. <https://www.utahbusiness.com/introverts-love-working-from-home/>

Johnson, J. A. (2014). Measuring thirty facets of the five factor model with a 120-item public domain inventory: development of the IPIP-NEO-120. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 51, 78-89. doi: [10.1016/j.jrp.2014.05.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2014.05.003)

Juniper, B. (2011). Defining employee wellbeing. *Occupational Health*, 63(10), 1-25. <https://www.proquest.com/openview/65888b376f379560d4d91f4a1afb1d6d/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=49149>

Karasek, R. & Theorell, T. (1990). *Healthy work: stress, productivity, and the reconstruction of working life*. New York, N.Y.: Basic Books.

Kelly, J. (2021, August 17). The Real Reasons Why Companies Don't Want You To Work Remotely. *Forbes*. Retrieved 2023-02-23 from <https://www.forbes.com/sites/jackkelly/2021/08/17/the-real-reasons-why-companies-dont-want-you-to-work-remotely/?sh=5a5fce077fb3>

Le, H., Robbins, S., Holland, E., Oh, I., Ilies, R., & Westrick, P. (2011). Too Much of a Good Thing: Curvilinear Relationships Between Personality Traits and Job Performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(1), 113-133. doi:10.1037/a0021016

Leka, S., & De Alwis, S. (2016). Work, Life and Personality: The Relationship Between the Big Five Personality Traits and Work-life Conflict. *South Asian Journal of Management*, 23(4), 31. doi:10.1037/a0021016

Marzuki, N. A. (2013). THE IMPACT OF PERSONALITY ON EMPLOYEE WELL-BEING. *European Scientific Journal*, ESJ, 9(20). <https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2013.v9n20p%p>

McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (1987). Validation of the five-factor model of personality across instruments and observers. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 52(1), 81. doi: [10.1037/0022-3514.52.1.81](https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.52.1.81)

Molina-Sánchez, H., Giorgi, G., Castillo Guajardo, D., & Ariza-Montes, A. (2022). Special Issue “Rethinking the Subjective Wellbeing for a New Workplace Scenario”. *Sustainability (Basel, Switzerland)*, 14(8), 4581.

OECDiLibrary. (2021). *Labour market developments: The unfolding COVID-19 crisis*. FÖRLAGSORT: OECDiLibrary. <https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/sites/5a700c4b-en/1/3/1/index.html?itemId=/content/publication/5a700c4b-en&csp=d31326a7706c58707d6aad05ad9dc5ab&itemIGO=oecd&itemContentType=book>

Ozimek, A. (2020). The Future of Remote Work. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3638597

Parent-Lamarche, A., & Marchand, A. (2019). Well-being at work from a multilevel perspective: what is the role of personality traits?. *International Journal of Workplace Health Management*, 12(5), 298-317. doi: 10.1108/IJWHM-05-2019-0066

Parra, C., Gupta, M., & Cadden, T. (2022). Towards an understanding of remote work exhaustion: A study on the effects of individuals' big five personality traits. *Journal of Business Research*, 150, 653-662. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2022.06.009>

Peek, S. (2021, February 21). Communication Technology and Inclusion Will Shape the Future of Remote Work. *Business News Daily*. Retrieved 2023-02-23 from <https://www.businessnewsdaily.com/8156-future-of-remote-work.html>

Predotova, K., & Vargas Llave, O. (2021). Workers want to telework but long working hours, isolation and inadequate equipment must be tackled. *Eurofound*, <https://www.eurofound.europa.eu/fr/publications/article/2021/workers-want-to-telework-but-long-working-hours-isolation-and-inadequate-equipment-must-be-tackled>

Mihalache, M., & Mihalache, O.R. (2021). How workplace support for the COVID-19 pandemic and personality traits affect changes in employees' affective commitment to the organization and job-related well-being. *Strategic human resource management in the era of environmental disruptions*, 61(3), 294-314. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.ub.gu.se/10.1002/hrm.22082>

Schaufeli, W., Leerstoel Schaufeli, & Work Organizational Psychology: Occupational Health Psychology. (2017). Applying the Job Demands-Resources model: A 'how to' guide to measuring and tackling work engagement and burnout. *Organizational Dynamics*, 46(2), 120-132.

Shimura, A., Yokoi, K., Ishibashi, Y., Akatsuka, Y., & Inoue, T. (2021). Remote Work Decreases Psychological and Physical Stress Responses, but Full-Remote Work Increases Presenteeism. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 730969. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.730969>

Tahlyan, D., Said, M., Mahmassani, H., Stathopoulos, A., Walker, J., & Shaheen, S. (2022). For whom did telework not work during the Pandemic? understanding the factors impacting telework satisfaction in the US using a multiple indicator multiple cause (MIMIC) model. *ScienceDirect*, 155, 387-402. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tra.2021.11.025>

The Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development. (2022). *Wellbeing at work*. Retrieved 2023-02-23 from <https://www.cipd.co.uk/knowledge/culture/well-being/factsheet?fbclid=IwAR3rvo3gHENayj9HNGEbTaznyo9RX-gp0ocYTIf7JXGFNfoj7zHvWDTfdhs#gref>

Udayar, S., Urbanaviciute, I., Massoudi, K., & Rossier, J. (2020). The Role of Personality Profiles in the Longitudinal Relationship between Work-Related Well-Being and Life Satisfaction among Working Adults in Switzerland. *European Journal of Personality*, 34(1), 77-92.

Umukoro, J., Egwakhe, J., & Akpa, V. (2021). Flexible wellbeing and organizational creativity: personality traits role. *Business: Theory and Practice*, 22(2), 370-379. <https://doi.org/10.3846/btp.2021.12330>

Vakkayil, J., Della Torre, E., & Giangreco, A. (2017). "It's not how it looks!" Exploring managerial perspectives on employee wellbeing. *ScienceDirect*, 35(4), 548-562. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2016.12.002>

Vinueza-Cabezas, A., Osejo-Taco, G., Unda-López, A., Paz, C., & Hidalgo-Andrade, P. (2022). Comparison of Working Conditions and Workers' Perceptions among On-Site, Telework, and Hybrid Workers in Ecuador during the COVID-19 Pandemic. *MDPI*, *19*(21), 2-13. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph192114337>

Warr, P., & Nielsen, K. (2018). Wellbeing and work performance. In E. Diener, S. Oishi, & L. Tay (Eds.), *Handbook of well-being*. Salt Lake City, UT: DEF Publishers. DOI:nobascholar.com

Zheng, X., Zhu, W., Zhao, H., & Zhang, C. (2015). Employee well-being in organizations: Theoretical model, scale development, and cross-cultural validation. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, *36*(5), 621-644. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1990>

APPENDIX A

Interview Guide

Background

1. How old are you?
2. What is your educational background?
3. Which type/area of organization/workplace you are working in now?
4. Is your workplace company (private sector) or government agency (public sector)?
5. What is your occupation (branch) and position (specifically what your job title is)?
6. What work tasks are included in your position in the workplace?
7. How long have you been at the organization/workplace you are working for?
8. Are you able to choose to either work at the office, remotely or hybrid working?
 - a. How much variety do you have at your work, for example, working location, working time and/or how to organize/arrange your work tasks?

Well-being:

Job Resources

9. What do you think your manager feels about your work?
 - a. Any difference in working at home or at the office?

- b. What does feedback look like from your manager? Is there any? Please specify.
- 10. Can you discuss work problems/difficulties with anyone from work? With whom you can discuss these work problems/difficulties?
 - a. Any difference asking through mail/mobile = home or ftf = office?
- 11. Does working in the office or working from home affect the relationship with your manager and colleagues differently? If so, how? Please specify.
- 12. Do you receive information on the results/outputs of your work? Do different types of work arrangements have an impact on your results/outputs?
- 13. How does the opportunity to participate in decision-making in your work look? Do you think you have the opportunity to participate in decision-making?
 - a. If not, why? If so, please specify which opportunities of decision-making you can have and/or you have had in the past?
 - b. Are these decisions closely related to your own work tasks or not? Please specify.
- 14. How does the communication between you and your manager work? Does it differ when working from the office or remotely? If so, please specify in which ways it differs.
- 15. How does the communication between you and your colleagues work? Does it differ when working from the office or remotely? If so, please specify in which ways it differs.
- 16. What does personal growth and development in your work look like? Please specify.
- 17. What personal characteristics do you think affects your work in terms of benefits and challenges?
- 18. What kind of equipment or resources does your work give you?
 - a. Do these differ if you work remotely or at the office?
 - b. Do you find it to be enough or do you believe you could be given more?
- 19. How do you deal with stress at work? Which stress you have at work? How do you manage and deal with these stresses at work? Do you think you deal with stress differently when you have different work locations, for example, working in the office, or working from home or working in a hybrid way? If so, please specify.

Job demands

20. How would you describe your workload?
 - a. Does work arrangement affect your ability to handle your workload?
21. What kinds of confrontations can you have at work? If so, do they differ depending on work arrangement? Please specify.
22. What kinds of problems with work do you often encounter? If so, please specify.
23. How is your attention during work? Does work require your continuous attention?
 - a. Hybrid: Do different work arrangements affect your attention differently, e.g., working in the office, working from home and working in a hybrid way?
24. How would you describe your well-being at work? e.g., physical health, mental health, happiness, satisfaction with your work, and that you feel you can have a good career etc.
25. What could impact your well-being at work?
 - a. Do work arrangements; working in the office, from home and/or hybrid, affect your wellbeing? If so, in which ways do they affect your well-being? Please specify.
 - b. Are there any specific ways your work has a positive and/or negative impact on your well-being?
26. How is the balance between your well-being and your work?
27. How do you take care of your health/well-being at work? Which strategies and methods you have and use in order to keep well-being at work? Please specify.

Work arrangement

28. How is your commute to your work? Does it affect you in any way? If so, please specify.
29. Which work arrangement (working in the office, from home and/or hybrid) do you prefer and why? Please specify.

Is there anything you would like to comment on or that you want to clarify?

Are there any questions that you think we have missed or that you would like to add?

Feel free to contact us if there is anything you would like to add or ask us.

APPENDIX B

Information to participants and consent form

Information to participants

In this document, you will receive information about “xx” which will lead to a Master Thesis and what it means to participate in the study. The Master thesis project is made by Anna Nguyen and Jacqueline Ortiz with supervisor Senior Lecturer Dr. Jing Wu at the Institute for Sociology and Work Science, University of Gothenburg.

We are interested in investigating employee well-being in relation to personality traits and different work arrangements in conventional workplaces, remote and/or hybrid workplaces, to improve employee work environment and well-being as well as the “new normal” of hybrid working models. Previous research about these concepts is extensive, however, there is little research about the relationship between the three so we find it essential to further investigate this area. We are contacting you because we are interested in your knowledge and experience with regard to employee wellbeing, personality traits, and work arrangement.

If you wish to participate, firstly a semi-structured interview will be conducted at a place of choice or via zoom and is estimated to take circa 40-50 minutes. No questions of sensitive nature will be asked, however, if any question makes you uncomfortable you are of course free to decline to answer. Thereafter, we will send out a questionnaire IPIP-NEO (International Personality Item Pool Representation of the NEO PI-R™) that we kindly ask you to fill out after the interview has been conducted. The questionnaire will be used to assess your personality trait and the estimated time to complete it is approximately 20 minutes. The project follows the Swedish Research Council’s research ethics principles.

Your name and personal details are confidential and will not be used orally or in writing in any other text the study may lead to. In order to be able to listen to the interview afterwards we would like to record the interview. The interview file will be stored on a password-protected computer. Your name will not appear on any of these files - just a code that hides your identity. Further, to guarantee anonymity we will not use any personal information about you or your company, alternatively, all names will be altered. If you wish to withdraw your participation, you are free to do so at any moment.

The results will be published in a Master Thesis that will be finished on 16 May. Participants can download the master thesis paper through GUPEA if the Thesis is uploaded publicly. Participants are welcome to the presentation if they want to at xx when the project's results will be presented.

Your participation is voluntary and consent is given orally or in the form of writing. You have the opportunity to ask questions about the project before you sign a ‘consent form’. If you regret your participation you can end your participation at any time during the interview and you do not have to inform us of the reason. You also have the right to delete all information afterwards.

Please do not hesitate to contact us if you wish to participate. We would be very grateful if you do. Looking forward to hearing from you!

Consent Form

Place and Date	Signature and name clarification (participant)
Place and Date	Signature and name clarification (students)
Gothenburg,	Anna Nguyen,
Gothenburg,	Jacqueline Ortiz,