

# DIGITALES ARCHIV

ZBW – Leibniz-Informationszentrum Wirtschaft  
ZBW – Leibniz Information Centre for Economics

Dicle, Salih; Yildirim, Elvan

## Article

### Innovation working trends : a review about well-being and work motivation relations of people working from home

*Reference:* Dicle, Salih/Yildirim, Elvan (2023). Innovation working trends : a review about well-being and work motivation relations of people working from home. In: Marketing i menedžment innovacij 14 (4), S. 166 - 175.

[https://mmi.sumdu.edu.ua/wp-content/uploads/2023/12/12\\_A703-15\\_Dicle-et-al.pdf](https://mmi.sumdu.edu.ua/wp-content/uploads/2023/12/12_A703-15_Dicle-et-al.pdf).

doi:10.21272/mmi.2023.4-12.

This Version is available at:

<http://hdl.handle.net/11159/652858>

## Kontakt/Contact

ZBW – Leibniz-Informationszentrum Wirtschaft/Leibniz Information Centre for Economics

Düsternbrooker Weg 120

24105 Kiel (Germany)

E-Mail: [rights\[at\]zbw.eu](mailto:rights[at]zbw.eu)

<https://www.zbw.eu/econis-archiv/>

## Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieses Dokument darf zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen. Sofern für das Dokument eine Open-Content-Lizenz verwendet wurde, so gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

<https://zbw.eu/econis-archiv/termsfuse>

## Terms of use:

*This document may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes. You are not to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public. If the document is made available under a Creative Commons Licence you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the licence.*

## INNOVATION WORKING TRENDS: A REVIEW ABOUT WELL-BEING AND WORK MOTIVATION RELATIONS OF PEOPLE WORKING FROM HOME

**Salih Dicle**,  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1183-672X>

TC Sakarya University, Turkey

**Elvan Yildirim**,  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9082-8850>

Associate Professor, TC Sakarya University, Turkey

**Corresponding author:** Salih Dicle, [salih.dicle@ogr.sakarya.edu.tr](mailto:salih.dicle@ogr.sakarya.edu.tr)

**Abstract:** *This paper reports on the well-being and work motivation interactions of people working from home. Therefore, whether demographic variables could create differentiation is the second issue of this research. For their benefit, companies prefer to switch remote working formats to be financially efficient and innovative for the most necessities, led by knowledge and computer-based innovation communication technologies. However, on the employee's side, it is still debated whether this approach is good, bad or sustainable for a long time. The relevance of this scientific problem decision is arguable because there are many aspects of remote working practices and employer/employee interactions for finding an optimum. Therefore, well-being and work motivation were selected as the research aspects because these factors could reflect the perceived status of people working from home. The survey was administered in Turkey 4 months a time via an online questionnaire, which consisted of the Multidimensional Working Motivation Scale, the Well-Being Index and demographic variables related to a total of 19 questions with 214 participants. The gathered data revealed that work motivation and well-being interact in a positive manner according to the correlation coefficient. was 0.177 ( $p < 0.01$ ). The interaction between the Amotivation subscale and Well-Being was negative. was found to be -0.306 ( $p < 001$ ). However, demographic variables impacting the differentiation of work motivation and well-being are considered demographic variables, as not all demographic variables have the same impact on work motivation and well-being. The identified Regulation, Intrinsic Motivation and Well-Being interaction were also found to be positive, as they had correlation coefficients of 0.383 and 0.351, respectively. On the other hand, for demographic variable differential effect purposes, age and income had meaningful differential effects on well-being; 35- to 44-year-old people had more well-being points (57.2), and those whose income was higher had a better well-being situation (56.45) than others. However, for work motivation evaluation, there was no meaningful effect of demographic variables.*

**Keywords:** flexible working; working from home; well-being; work motivation; innervational working trends.

**Received:** 31 May 2023

**Revised:** 19 October 2023

**Accepted:** 27 October 2023

**Funding:** There was no funding for this research.

**Publisher and Founder:** Sumy State University

**Cite as:** Dicle, S., & Yildirim, E. (2023). Innovation Working Trends: A Review About Well-Being and Work Motivation Relations of People Working from Home. *Marketing and Management of Innovations*, 14(4), 166–175. <https://doi.org/10.21272/mmi.2023.4-12>



**1. Introduction.** Remote working policies are now recognized as new innovative solutions for financial, social, environmental, etc. In this manner, in the second quarter of 2020, 557 million workers (17.4% of all world) worked from home (ILO, 2021), and in the European Union, people working from home as a percentage of total workers were found to be 5.1% in 2017, 5.4% in 2019, 12% in 2020 and 13.4% in 2021 (EUROSTAT, 2021). It will be fair to say that the COVID-19 pandemic has played a large role in this, as lockdowns acted as catalysts, as in the post-COVID-19 world, WFH has started to become a new normal.

Determining the impact of remote working practices should be key for business affairs. Several studies have shown that poorly organized remote working practices could cause "work-family conflicts, increased workload and stress" (Palumbo, 2020; Seal et al., 2010). Moreover, the "surreal" work environment created by COVID-19 lockdowns, which involved staying connected while also staying socially distanced, has led to freedom of structure and order, but it has also created an increase in work intensity and pressure (Hodder, 2020). On the other hand, other researchers mention the affirmative outcomes of remote working (Hashmi et al., 2021), as working from home is mostly associated with "more flexibility and autonomy", "minimizing commuting times", and "being more fluidly in home or personal tasks" (Yang et al., 2022). Similarly, companies' attitudes toward remote work seem to be perceived as more positive outcomes than negative outcomes; as they indicate, "remote work had worked better than expected because" "reduction of nonessential meetings, increasing schedule flexibility, and no commuting as no wasting time" (Ozimek, 2020). Therefore, in both ways, remote working seems to be extended in the coming years.

In this vein, this study aims to determine how both sides of working organization demand could be satisfied at the optimum level by examining Well Being (WB) and Work Motivation (WM) interactions as reflections of innovation-based working organization demands and necessities. There are many studies about the effects of remote work on humans, but research on well-being and work motivation interactions via remote working policies seems rare. Therefore, this study is thought to constitute a research gap because both factors are considered essential parts of mental health and should be important for working performance or demands in business affairs. For this purpose, a survey will be conducted of people involved in remote work. The questionnaire comprises 3 parts: the demographic determinative part, the well-being determinative part and the work motivation determinative part. People working in remote working organizations will be selected, and the data gathered from the survey will be used to investigate WB-WM interactions and demographic determinants of WB-WM.

**2. Literature Review.** Organizations are mostly spaces and places of work; they are associated with collections of actors working jointly to get through a work and are therefore embedded in a cultural, social, political and economic context (Delbridge & Sallaz, 2015). However, technological innovations, the progress of information and communication technology (ICT), enabled working at a physical distance from the employer's location. Moreover, flexibility options in workplaces—in line with the demands of employees—play an important role in many employees' evaluations of job quality and work-life balance (Gandini & Garavaglia, 2023). Likewise, in a study in 2023, survey participants about remote working employees expressed their affirmative thoughts about remote working policies as follows: easierly balancing their private and professional life, spending less time on the road, satisfying more flexibility, being less stressful and having fewer distracting factors. Thus, different names, such as Telework, Remote Work, Remote Workplace, and Home Office, generally called Working from Home (WHF), started to find more places in working life and expanded faster due to mandatory closure processes during the pandemic period. On the other hand, although the main desire for this trend is linked to more superior conditions for concentration and uninterrupted work, some recent studies about younger generations of employees who often live in homes unsuited for concentration work are less productive at home than at the office (Smite et al., 2023). In addition, several researchers mention that increased working hours compensate for cross-work flexibility, especially for women (Fan & Moen, 2022). In addition to changes in working hours as well as difficulty reconciling work and childcare due to the closure of childcare facilities, these changes are interpreted as other downsides of working from home (Bryhm et al., 2023). In this manner, the WHF phenomenon should be well analysed from many aspects, as if improperly constructed remote work policies are a burden.

Therefore, the first aspect, considered useful for analysing this paradigm, will be well-being (WB). WB is defined as "judging life positively and feeling good" (CDC, 2023) and is associated with "a positive state experienced by individuals and societies and similar to health, determined by social, economic and environmental conditions". In addition to mental disorders such as depression, stress, burnout and other psychological infirmities, low WB levels are considered to interact with cardiological and neurological illnesses (Topp et al., 2015). Moreover, low WB is related to high rates of errors, turnover, absenteeism, decreased productivity, and customer satisfaction (Davis, 2021). Similarly, people who have started to work

from home have higher levels of WB and job satisfaction, but extension of WFH creates risks for employers as job desires increase due to increased working hours, job pressure and work-family conflicts. Therefore, this study confirmed that WB from people working from home is not a defined issue and should be analysed from many perspectives.

The other key element thought to be useful for the research was "work motivation (WM)". Motivation is the determination of effort toward achieving a goal (Robbins & Judge, 2017), and there is a positive relationship between motivation and employees' emotional and normative commitments (Sabuncuoglu, 2007). Well-motivated and satisfied people have high morale, and employees with good morale work more willingly; their desire to work is high, the organization they cooperate on their goals, their loyalty increases, and staff turnover and absenteeism decrease (Kucuk, 2010).


The success of a business is not just about profit or market share; employees' job satisfaction and motivation are important elements for the success of the business. Motivation and job satisfaction affect the physical and mental health of employees, the working environment, productivity, performance, economic development, and social peace. Therefore, WB and WM are both useful indicators of working organization efficiency and sustainability for WFH purposes. The main research hypothesis concerns this idea.

Based on these debates, two main questions have emerged: Q1: "Is there a correlation between work motivation and well-being?", and Q2: "Among demographic variables which has a differentiation impact on work motivation and which variable has a differentiation impact on well-being?". With respect to these two questions, the main research hypotheses are established as follows, and the research model is illustrated in Figure 1. H2 and H3 will be scrutinized via specific determinants, such as age, sex, income, and marital status, and will infer demographic differences.

H1: There is a correlation between WM and WB among people working from home

H2: Demographic Determinants Have Meaningful Differentiation Effects on WBs

H3: Demographic Determinants Have a Meaningful Differentiation Effect on WM



**Figure 1.** Research Model

Sources: developed by the authors.

**3. Methodology and research methods.** This study aimed to evaluate the relationships between WM and WB among people working from home. Second, whether demographic variables create a difference in both WB and WM is another issue. For this purpose, the data were collected from WFH employees via an online survey. The questionnaire included the "Multidimensional Work Motivation Scale (MWMS)" and the Well-Being 5 Index (WBI), as well as demographic information related to a total of 19 questions. The MWM was created by Gagné et al. (2015) and was adapted into Turkish by Civilidag and Sekercioglu in 2017. The MWMS consists of 6 subscales: "Amotivation", "Extrinsic Motivation-Social", "Extrinsic Regulation-Material", "Introjected Regulation", "Identified Regulation", and "Intrinsic Motivation". The other scale, the WBI, is a 5-point questionnaire developed by the WHO (1998) and reviewed by Topp et al. (2014).

Both the MWMS and WBI were tested in previous studies and published as valid and reliable. However, data gathered from the surveys and analysed with SPSS showed that both the MWMS (including 6 subdimensions) and the WBI have AFA (Cronbach's alpha analyses) values greater than 0.70 and skewness and kurtosis scores  $\pm 1.5$ , which means that each scale is valid and reliable and has a normal curve/distribution. (Pallant, 2020; Tabachnick & Fidel, 2013). In addition, the Pearson correlation test was used to evaluate the associations between the MWMS score and Dimensions and between the MWMS score and the WBI score. A relationship between 0.00 and 0.30 was considered low, between 0.30 and 0.70 was considered to indicate a medium relationship, and between 0.70 and 1.00 was considered to indicate a high level of correlation (Buyukozturk, 2020). In addition to the theoretical background in the Literature Review section, the WB-WM interaction relationship was mentioned before this research in the literature with different samples and studies. For example, Luo (1999) suggested that motivation is positively related to overall job satisfaction and that extrinsic motivation is positively related to depression (Luo, 1999). Additionally, it has been suggested that WM is a crucial factor contributing directly or indirectly to WB and that WM has positive impacts on WB (Um et al., 2018), as high motivation triggers psychological WB (Park et al., 2004). Therefore, retesting or

re-examining the correlation between WB and WB data for people with WHF would be useful for optimizing the trend of innovative remote working issues. The other issue concerns whether demographic variables could differentially affect WM and WB. For this purpose, Wocke & Hayman (2012) indicate that age, race and gender influence labor issues; specifically, education level has a stronger relationship with employee mobility than does race (Wocke & Hayman, 2012). Moreover, Lee et al. (1991) noted that some of the demographic variables, such as age and education, had weaker correlations, while other variables, such as marital status, could consistently predict subjective WB, in which married people are happy and have more content with their lives than unmarried people, divorced people, separated people, single people, etc. (Lee et al., 1991). In contrast, Javadi-Pashaki & Darvishpour (2018) and Mewafarosh et al. (2020) mentioned that there was no significant association between WB and marital status, employment, age, or gender based on an investigation of well-being and demographic variable interactions with students. (Javadi-Pashaki & Darvishpour, 2018; Mewafarosh et al., 2020)

**4. Results.** The sociodemographic characteristics obtained based on the research conducted with a sample of 214 people are presented in Table 1. This sample was assessed to be fair, as in 2020, Eurostat mentioned that approximately 3% of all workers (630,000 people) were working from home (Birgun, 2021).

**Table 1.** Demographic Data of Participants Working from Home

Variable	Category	Frequency (N)	Percentage (%)
Sex	Women	139	65.0
	Men	75	35.0
Age	15-24	9	4.2
	25-34	70	32.7
	35-44	87	40.7
	44+	48	22.4
	Education	Bachelor	85
	PhD and Above	129	60.3
Marital Status	Married	146	68.2
	Single	68	31.8
Income	8.506 TL and Below	13	6.1
	8.507-16.000 TL	31	14.5
	16.001-24.0000. TL	90	42.1
	+24.001 TL	80	37.4
	<b>Total</b>	<b>214</b>	<b>100</b>

Sources: developed by the authors.

One of the issues that differed from the survey data and Table 1 was educational level, as 4 people had less than a bachelor's degree. These data were excluded because they were considered not statistically significant. As if, it has been inferred that either a person who works from home has at least a bachelor's degree or, although the sample of participants in the research was thought to be sufficient compared to the total population WFH, the sample can be broadened for future studies on education level. The other limitation was that both WM and WB can be reflections of perceptions among workers, and these factors can be affected by many other factors rather than working places. Specifically, this survey was conducted in Turkey between February and May 2023, and during this period, there was a devastating earthquake in the eastern region in which thousands of people were affected both emotionally and psychically. There have been thousands of deaths, injured people, and those who have survived through the western region, as there was not enough room to reside. Additionally, university dormitories closed or allowed to the people who survived from earthquakes, etc. In this environment, WB and WM levels might be affected as many people feel emotionally tired or unpleasant. Therefore, this environment can be considered the other limitation of this research.

For the scale evaluation, the MWMS data were distributed into levels according to percentage proportions. The average general total score on the MWMS among the participants was 76.89, as the total score on the scale ranged between 19.00 and 133.00 points. The results obtained from the study revealed that there was "average work motivation". Among the participants, the MWMS subscale scores were as follows: "Amotivation", 6.18 (low level); "Extrinsic Motivation-Social", 8.54 (low level); "Extrinsic Regulation-Material", 14.15 (moderate level); "Introjected Regulation", 17.20 (high level); "Identified Regulation", 16.68 (high level); and "Intrinsic Motivation", 14.15 (high level).

The other scale, the WBI-5, has a defined scoring procedure of "All of Time = 5, At No Time=0". The raw score, ranging from 0 to 25, is multiplied by 4 to obtain the final score. Generally, a score less than 50 points

indicates a bad WB, a score less than 28 points indicates early depression, and a score less than 20 points indicates heavy depression (Topp et al., 2015). WB was used to evaluate the participants in this study; the mean score was 52.80 points. Then, for the participant, the WB level was considered moderate, but as close to 50 points, it was inferred that the WB was moderate.

**Table 2.** Age-related Variable Differentiation According to the WBI, MWMS and Subscales

Scales	Age	N	Mwan.	S.D.	F	p	Diff
MWMS	15-24	9	77.11	10.61	0.020	0.996	
	25-34	70	76.60	13.78			
	35-44	87	77.11	13.26			
	44 +	48	76.88	13.10			
Amotivation	15-24	9	7.56	3.84	1.326	0.267	-
	25-34	70	6.73	4.71			
	35-44	87	5.72	3.35			
	44 +	48	5.94	3.28			
WBI	15-24 <sup>A</sup>	9	48.00	20.49	2..782	0.042**	C>B
	25-34 <sup>B</sup>	70	49.20	18.53			
	35-44 <sup>C</sup>	87	57.20	18.71			
	44 + <sup>D</sup>	48	51.00	19.06			

\* $p < 0,01$ , \*\* $p < 0,05$ , F: one-way ANOVA test, Diff: : post hoc tests.

Sources: developed by the authors.

Table 2 shows the impact of age. The age variable differentiates between "Amotivation" and "WB" as follows: "Those who work from home in the 15-24 age group have a slightly higher job amotivation score than do those who work from home in other age groups, and the well-being scores and levels of those who work from home in the 35-44 age group are relatively higher than are those of the other age groups". In this manner, aging and WB seem to interact, but as mentioned before, WB can be affected by many factors. Therefore, to support the results of the literature review, it is reasonable that for people working from home, WB scores increase slightly with age. Table 3 shows the impact of the education variable. There were no significant differences in overall MWMS, but there was a meaningful difference in intrinsic motivation ( $p < 0,05$ ); moreover, although there was no significant difference, it can be inferred that education had a slight enhancing effect. In this context, those who work from home with a graduate degree have higher intrinsic motivation scores than do those who do not. However, as mentioned above, the data gathered from the participants had at least a bachelor's or PhD education or above. This may be a limitation of this research, but as Table 3 shows, as education increases, both WB and intrinsic motivation increase slightly.

**Table 3.** Education Variable Differentiation on the WBI, MWMS and Subscales

Scales/Subscales	Education	N	Mean	S.D.	t	p
MWMS	Bachelor	85	76.20	14.32	-0.621	0.535
	PhD and Above	129	77.35	12.47		
Intrinsic Motivation	Bachelor	85	13.22	5.10	-2.447	0.015**
	PhD and Above	129	14.76	4.05		
WBI	Bachelor	85	50.64	20.33	-1.355	0.177
	PhD and Above	129	54.23	18.08		

\* $p < 0,01$ , \*\* $p < 0,05$ , t: Independent sample t test.

Sources: developed by the authors.

In Table 4, the impact of marital status variable on WBI is shown, as marital status does not distinguish between the MWMS and its subscales.

**Table 4.** Marital Status Variable Differentiation on the WBI, MWMS and Subscales

Scale	Marital Status	N	Mean	S.D.	t	p
CBİMO	Married	146	77.06	13.27	0.274	0.785
	Single	68	76.53	13.20		
WBI	Married	146	54.85	18.89	2.327	0.021**
	Single	68	48.41	18.74		

\* $p < 0,01$ , \*\* $p < 0,05$ , t: Independent sample t test

Sources: developed by the authors.

According to the results, married workers have higher well-being scores and levels than do those working from home who are single. However, for married participants, the WB score reached 54,85 points. As we believe that the cut-off point for a good WB is approximately 50 points, we can see that for married participants, the WB score is very close to the edge. Therefore, marital status should be investigated through the use of additional subscales, as the WB scores of married people could be related to household, child care and job-related stress-related dissatisfaction and other daily home routines that can cause work-life conflicts (Yucel & Chung, 2023). Table 5 shows the impacts of the income variables. For the MWMS subscale's review, those who worked from home with a monthly income of "8.506 TL or less had higher Amotivation scores than did those with a monthly income between 16.001-24.000 TL and over 24.001 TL had higher Identified Regulation scores than did others, and those with a monthly income between 16.001-24.000 TL and over 24.001 TL had higher Intrinsic Motivation scores than did the others. For the Well-Being evaluation aspect, it can be said that people with higher incomes have slightly better WB scores.

**Table 5.** Income variable differentiation on the WBI, MWMS and subscales

Scales	Income	N	Mean	S.D.	F	p	Diff.
MWMS	8.506 TL and Below	13	80.38	15.33	1.355	0.258	-
	8.507-16.000 TL	31	73.03	16.06			
	16.001-24.000 TL <sup>c</sup>	90	76.80	13.39			
	+24.001 TL	80	77.93	11.25			
Amotivation	8.506 TL and Below <sup>A</sup>	13	11.38	5.06	10.104	0.000*	A>B,C,D
	8.507-16.000 TL <sup>B</sup>	31	6.58	3.39			
	16.001-24.000 TL <sup>c</sup>	90	5.87	3.76			
	+24.001 TL <sup>D</sup>	80	5.53	3.30			
Identified Regulation	8.506 TL and Below <sup>A</sup>	13	14.69	5.33	5.161	0.002*	C,D>A,B
	8.507-16.000 TL <sup>B</sup>	31	14.65	4.78			
	16.001-24.000 TL <sup>c</sup>	90	17.11	3.59			
	+24.001 TL <sup>D</sup>	80	17.30	3.40			
Intrinsic Motivation	8.506 TL <sup>A</sup>	13	12.46	5.03	3.959	0.009*	C,D>B
	8.507-16.000 TL <sup>B</sup>	31	12.03	5.36			
	16.001-24.000 TL <sup>c</sup>	90	14.39	4.33			
	+24.001 TL <sup>D</sup>	80	14.98	4.11			
WBI	8.506 TL and Below	13	44.00	24.06	2.328	0.076	-
	8.507-16.000 TL	31	49.42	18.17			
	16.001-24.000 TL	90	52.00	18.75			
	+24.001 TL	80	56.45	18.34			

\*p<0,01, \*\*p<0,05; F: one-way ANOVA test; Diff: post hoc test.

Sources: developed by the authors.

Table 6 shows the correlation between the MWMS and the subscale WBI. The scores of the "Multidimensional Work Motivation Scale (MWMS)" and "External Regulation Material" subdimensions of working from home and the scores of the "Extrinsic Motivation-Social", "Introjected Regulation", "Identified Regulation" and "Intrinsic Motivation" subdimensions are high.

**Table 6.** Variable Correlations between the MWMS and the Subscales and WBIs

Variables	Coef.	MWMS	AM	EMS	ERM	INR	IDR	IM	WB
MWMS	r	1							
Amotivation	p								
	r	0.044	1						
Extrinsic Motivation-Social	p	0.518							
	r	<b>0.615*</b>	<b>0.251*</b>	1					
Extrinsic Regulation-Material	p	0.000	0.000						
	r	<b>0.702*</b>	0.123	<b>0.578*</b>	1				
Introjected Regulation	p	0.000	0.072	0.000					
	r	<b>0.542*</b>	<b>-0.429*</b>	-0.014	<b>0.143**</b>	1			
Identified Regulation	p	0.000	0.000	0.837	0.036				
	r	<b>0.466*</b>	<b>-0.546*</b>	-0.123	-0.040	<b>0.654*</b>	1		
Intrinsic Motivation	p	0.000	0.000	0.072	0.565	0.000			
	r	<b>0.510*</b>	<b>-0.332*</b>	-0.082	-0.021	<b>0.430*</b>	<b>0.625*</b>	1	
WBI	p	0.000	0.000	0.233	0.762	0.000	0.000		
	r	<b>0.177*</b>	<b>-0.306*</b>	-0.090	-0.002	<b>0.243*</b>	<b>0.383*</b>	<b>0.351*</b>	1
	p	0.009	0.000	0.191	0.977	0.000	0.000	0.000	

\*p<0,01, \*\*p<0,05, r: Correlation Coef., MWMS: Multidimensional Work Motivation Scale, AM: Amotivation, EMS: Extrinsic Motivation-Social, ERM: Extrinsic Regulation-Material, INR: Introjected Regulation, IDR: Identified Regulation, IM: Intrinsic Motivation, WBI: Well-Being Scale. Sources: developed by the authors.

There was a moderate positive correlation between the WBI score and a low positive correlation ( $p < 0.05$ ). According to these results, as the MWMS scores of those who work from home increase, it can be expected that external regulatory material, extrinsic motivation-social, introjected regulation, identified regulation, intrinsic motivation and WBI scores also increase. According to our evaluation, MWMS and its subdimensions were related to WB Issues. High "Amotivation" subdimension scores in home workers may cause a decrease in Introjected Regulation, Identified Regulation, Intrinsic Motivation and WBI scores, while an increase in Introjected Regulation scores can lead to an increase in Identified Regulation, Intrinsic Motivation and WBI scores. Similarly, an increase in intrinsic motivation scores could lead to an increase in WBI scores. All of the above arguments and hypotheses are evaluated in Table 7.

**Table 7.** Hypothesis evaluation

Hypothesis No	Evaluation
H1	Accepted
H2	Accepted
H3	Rejected*

Sources: developed by the authors.

**5. Discussion.** The data gathered via the analysis from the research revealed that work motivation interacts with well-being and that demographic determinants affect differentiation in well-being. On the other hand, we could not find any meaningful difference in the effects of demographic determinants on work motivation.

In this manner, compared with the literature and previous investigations, the results of the WM-WB correlation seem compatible. As mentioned above, low WB scores are related to early signs of depression, which makes sense, and Bjorklund et al. (2013) reported that workers with a low WM had a greater risk of experiencing more exhaustion and depression in the future. Similarly, Salmela-Aro and Nurmi (2004) suggested that individual motivation is one of the key issues in the development of burnout and in the maintenance of WB at work (Salmela-Aro & Nurmi, 2004). This idea is another similar supportive evaluation of WM-WB interactionality. Therefore, a good level of working motivation should affect people in a positive way through mental conditions. Therefore, high WM should drive WB upwards, whereas high WB will play a key role in WM. In other words, it can be inferred that the WB and WM relationships are positively correlated. For the demographic determinants affecting WM, the results seem to be complex enough to reach an absolute conclusion. Compared with those of previous investigations, the complexity or debated outcomes of these previous investigations and our results seem comparable. In other words, demographic determinant effects can vary widely depending on which factor we selected. For example, in this survey the data points out there is no significant effect of age, education level, marital status about MWMS but on the other side it can be seen that at subscale level Amotivation with Age and Intrinsic Motivation with WM have somewhat linkage situation by the result of Independent T-Sample Tests.. By literature view "with older age, emotion regulation improves: positive emotionality increases while negative emotionality decreases" (Helson & Soto, 2005) and older people feel less distress and in conflict times they act with less anger compared to the younger ones (Inceoglu et al., 2012). Therefore, these results may not be consistent with the literature, as generally, for overall MWMS, one demographic determinant factor does not have a meaningful difference in action. However, at the subscale level, these determinants seem to create differences. Therefore, it is appropriate to investigate more specific demographic determinants of the effect of these interventions and expand the sample for further investigation. An evaluation of the effects of demographic determinants on WB revealed more apparent results than for WM. For example, for the age factor, Argyle suggested that happiness or contentment increases slightly with age, possibly due to a declining goal-achievement gap, and as time passes, people realize that their expectations are set too high during younger times and learn to settle for their lives (Argyle, 2001). In addition, on the educational side, some studies have mentioned that education has an affirmative correlation with WB (Liu & Heshmati, 2022). Marital status also has similar effects on WB, as married people have more WB points according to the data gathered from our survey. Shapiro & Keyes (2008) reported that married people have better well-being than nonmarried people (Shapiro & Keyes, 2008). This result is compatible with this idea. Therefore, our results concerning aging and having higher educational levels of WB increase are similar. Finally, income was the other demographic factor we scrutinized for both WM and WB. Temnitskii (2007) suggested that decent pay is a deciding factor in people's work behavior and work, regardless of their social and demographic characteristics (Temnitskii, 2007), as seen as compatible with the results. Although money/income cannot buy happiness, financial strain has a negative effect on WB (Yates, 2020). Therefore, money/income may be not only a factor that creates a differentiation effect on both WB and



WM but also a factor that affects at least decent income, which is compulsory for life satisfaction and work-related issues. Therefore, although there was no significant difference in the WB score at  $p < 0.05$ , there was a positive increase in the WB and WM subscale scores as income increased. In this manner, income has a meaningful effect on WB.

**6. Conclusions.** This study aimed to examine two main issues: WM and WB are correlated, and demographic variables create meaningful differences in WB-WM. As a result, WB and WM are mostly positively correlated, but the impact of demographic variables varies according to the selected demographic variable. Most importantly, in this study, demographic factors seemed to have an effect on WB but not on WM. It will be fair to say that the results are limited by the data gathered from the participants who participated in this survey. As the number of people working from home is increasing daily because organizations prefer this type of organization because of its effectiveness, financial benefits, employee demands, etc., it will be better to re-examine these hypotheses with larger samples.

Another aspect of this study is that it would be useful to re-examine work motivation and well-being issues with other scales to widen the literature. The main idea behind this issue is that there are many scales for work motivation and well-being, and it would be better to retest these hypotheses at different scales to ensure that the results would approve itself similarly. Remote working practices are still in their infancy and are evolving with new working trends due to technological progress. Therefore, as many people associate with remote working organizations, it can be foreseen that there will be many more working or human-related obstacles that will emerge as both the demands and necessities of working organizations change due to many environmental, technological or sociological factors. For these issues it will be suitable to say human resources managements should be in a close affair about this phenomenon, as much more studies should be proceeded to keep pace with the changes of working organizations and employee demands.

**Author Contributions:** Conceptualization, S. D.; methodology, S. D. and E. Y.; software, S. D and E. Y.; validation, S. D; formal analysis, S. D. and E. Y.; investigation, S. D. and E. Y.; resources, S. D. and E. Y.; data curation, S. D.; writing-original draft preparation, S. D and E. Y.; writing-review and editing, S. D. and E. Y.; visualization, E. Y. ; supervision, S.D. and E.Y.; project administration, E.Y.; funding acquisition, S.D.

**Conflicts of interest:** The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

**Data availability statement:** Not applicable.

**Informed Consent Statement:** Not applicable.

## References

- Argyle, M. (2001). *The Psychology of Happiness*. 2nd ed. New York, NY: Routledge [[Google Scholar](#)]
- Birgun (2021). Eurostat verileri: Türkiye'de evden çalışma oranı yüzde 3. [[Link](#)]
- Bjorklund, C., Jensen, I., & Lohela-Karlsson, M. (2013). Is a change in work motivation related to a change in mental well-being?. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 83(3), 571-580. [[Google Scholar](#)][[CrossRef](#)]
- Buyukozturk, Ş. (2020). *Sosyal Bilimler İçin Veri Analiz El Kitabı* (27. Baskı). Ankara: PEGEM Publisment. [[Link](#)]
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) (2023). *Well-Being Concepts, 2023*. [[Link](#)]
- Çivilidağ, A., & Şekercioğlu, G. (2017). Çok boyutlu iş motivasyonu ölçeğinin Türk kültürüne uyarlanması. *Akdeniz İnsani Bilimler Dergisi*, 7(1). [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
- Davis, P. (2021). *Beating burnout at work: why teams hold the secret to well-being and resilience*. University of Pennsylvania Press. [[Google Scholar](#)]
- Delbridge, R., & Sallaz, J. J. (2015). Work: Four worlds and ways of seeing. *Organization Studies*, 36(11), 1449-1462. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
- Fan, W., & Moen, P. (2022). Working more, less or the same during COVID-19? A mixed method, intersectional analysis of remote workers. *Work and Occupations*, 49(2), 143-186. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
- EUROSTAT (2021). How usual is it to work from home? [[Link](#)]
- Gagné, M., Forest, J., Vansteenkiste, M., Crevier-Braud, L., Van den Broeck, A., Aspel, A. K., ... & Westbye, C. (2015). The Multidimensional Work Motivation Scale: Validation evidence in seven languages and nine countries. *European Journal of work and organizational psychology*, 24(2), 178-196. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
- Gandini, A., & Garavaglia, E. (2023). 'Another work routine is possible': everyday experiences of (unexpected) remote work in Italy. *Culture and Organization*, 1-19. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
- Gorenc, M., & Valentinčič, M. K. (2023). Advantages and disadvantages of working from home in public administration. *Agora international journal of juridical sciences*, 17(1), 91-107. [[Google Scholar](#)]

- Hashmi, M. A., Al Ghaithi, A., & Sartawi, K. (2022). Impact of flexible work arrangements on employees' perceived productivity, organizational commitment and perceived work quality: a United Arab Emirates case-study. *Competitiveness Review*, 33(2), 332-363. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
- Helson, R., & Soto, C. J. (2005). Up and down in middle age: monotonic and nonmonotonic changes in roles, status, and personality. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 89(2), 194. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
- Hodder, A. (2020). New Technology, Work and Employment in the era of COVID-19: reflecting on legacies of research. *New technology, work and employment*, 35(3), 262-275. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
- Inceoglu, I., Segers, J., & Bartram, D. (2012). Age-related differences in work motivation. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 85(2), 300-329. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
- ILO (2021). World Employment and Social Outlook – Trends 2021. [[Link](#)]
- Javadi-Pashaki, N., & Darvishpour, A. (2018). What are the predictor variables of social well-being among the medical science students?. *Journal of education and health promotion*, 7. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
- Kucuk, S. (2010) Çalışanların İş Tatmin Düzeyleri Ve Orgutsel Bağlılıklarının, Çalışma Motivasyonuna Olan Etkileri, T. C. Beykent Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü İşletme Yönetimi Anabilim Dalı İnsan Kaynakları Ve Orgutsel Değişim Bilim Dalı Master Thesis. [[Google Scholar](#)]
- Lange, V., & Gastaldi, L. (2020). Coping Italian emergency COVID-19 through smart working: from necessity to opportunity. *Journal of Mediterranean Knowledge (ISSN 2499-930X)*, 5(1), 163-171. [[Google Scholar](#)]
- Lee, G. R., Seccombe, K., & Shehan, C. L. (1991). Marital status and personal happiness: An analysis of trend data. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 839-844. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
- Liu, S., & Heshmati, A. (2023). Relationship between education and well-being in China. *Journal of Social and Economic Development*, 25(1), 123-151. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
- Luo, L. (1999). Work motivation, job stress and employees' well-being. *Journal of applied management studies*, 8, 61-72. [[Google Scholar](#)]
- Mewafarosh, R., Tripathi, V., & Gupta, S. (2020). A conceptual study: Organization culture as an antecedent to employee engagement. *International Journal of Environment, Workplace and Employment*, 6(1-2), 3-19. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
- Ozimek, A. (2020). The Future of Remote Work. [[Link](#)]
- Pallant, J. (2020). SPSS kullanma kılavuzu (3. Edition). (S. Balcı, & B. Ahi, Çev.) Anı Publishment.
- Palumbo, R. (2020). Let me go to the office! An investigation into the side effects of working from home on work-life balance. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 33(6/7), 771-790. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
- Park, N., Peterson, C., & Seligman, M. E. (2004). Strengths of character and well-being. *Journal of social and Clinical Psychology*, 23(5), 603-619. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2017). Organizational Behavior, Student Value Edition (17th Edition). [[Link](#)]
- Sabuncuoglu, E. T. (2007). Egitim, orgutsel baglilik ve isten ayrilma niyeti arasindaki iliskilerin incelenmesi. *Ege Academic Review*, 7(2), 613-628. [[Google Scholar](#)]
- Salmela-Aro, K., & Nurmi, J. E. (2004). Employees' motivational orientation and well-being at work: A person-oriented approach. *Journal of organizational change management*, 17(5), 471-489. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
- Seal, C. R., Rawls, K. M., Flaherty, P. T., Fan, D., Sanchez, S., & Guzman, M. G. (2021). Flexible Work Arrangements and Employee Work Attitudes: A Case-Based Inquiry of a Small Non-Profit Response to Crisis. *Journal of Organizational Psychology*, 21(4), 93-101. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
- Smite, D., Moe, N. B., Hildrum, J., Gonzalez-Huerta, J., & Mendez, D. (2023). Work-from-home is here to stay: Call for flexibility in postpandemic work policies. *Journal of Systems and Software*, 195, 111552. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
- Shapiro, A., & Keyes, C. L. M. (2008). Marital status and social well-being: Are the married always better off?. *Social Indicators Research*, 88, 329-346. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[Cross Ref](#)]
- Sokolic, D. (2022). Remote work and hybrid work organizations. *Economic and social development: Book of proceedings*, 202-213. [[Link](#)]
- Temnitskii, A. L. (2007). Fairness in wages and salaries as a value orientation and a factor of motivation to work. *Sociological research*, 46(1), 36-50. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
- Tabachnick, B. G., Fidell, L. S., & Ullman, J. B. (2013). *Using multivariate statistics* (Vol. 6, pp. 497-516). Boston, MA: pearson. [[Google Scholar](#)]

Topp, C. W., Østergaard, S. D., Søndergaard, S., & Bech, P. (2015). The WHO-5 Well-Being Index: a systematic review of the literature. *Psychotherapy and psychosomatics*, 84(3), 167-176. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]

Um, B., Joo, H., & Her, D., (2018). The Relationship between Elementary School Teachers' Work Motivation and Well-Being: The Mediating Effects of Principal Leadership and Work Stress. *International Journal of Social Science Studies*, 6(12). [[Link](#)]

WHO (2021). Health Promotion Glossary of Terms 2021. [[Link](#)]

WHO (1998). Wellbeing Measures in Primary Health Care/The Depcare Project. WHO Regional Office for Europe: Copenhagen, WHO/EURO:1998-4234-43993-62027. [[Link](#)]

Wocke, A., & Heymann, M. (2012). Impact of demographic variables on voluntary labour turnover in South Africa. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 23(16), 3479-3494. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]

Yang, D., Kelly, E. L., Kubzansky, L. D., & Berkman, L. (2023). Working from home and worker well-being: New evidence from Germany. *ILR Review*, 76(3), 504-531. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]

Yates, S. R. (2020). Money Can't Buy Happiness... Or Can It?. *Journal of Financial Education*, 46(2), 331-343. [[Google Scholar](#)]

Yucel, D., & Chung, H. (2023). Working from home, work-family conflict, and the role of gender and gender role attitudes. *Community, Work & Family*, 26(2), 190-221. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]

**Саліх Джідже**, Сакарський університет, Туреччина

**Ельван Йілдірім**, Сакарський університет, Туреччина

**Інноваційній тенденції в організації роботи: взаємозалежність між рівнями добробуту та мотивації серед осіб, що працюють з дому**

У статті проаналізовано взаємозалежність між багатополарності та мотивації праці осіб, які працюють з дому. Другим аспектом цього дослідження є визначення рівень впливу демографічних факторів на взаємозалежність між багатополарності та мотивації праці осіб, які працюють з дому. Компанії вибирають формати віддаленої роботи для власної ефективності та інноваційності, обумовлені трансформацією потреб, знань та технологічних комунікацій, що базуються на інноваціях. Наукове питання щодо віддаленої роботи є дискусійним серед наукової спільноти, оскільки існує багато аспектів практики віддаленої роботи та взаємодій між роботодавцем та співробітником для пошуку оптимального рішення. Таким чином, рівні добробуту та мотивації праці були обрані як фактори, що можуть відображати настрої осіб, які працюють з дому. Вибірку дослідження було сформовано на основі результатів опитування 214 респондентів, що проводилося в Туреччині протягом 4 місяців за допомогою онлайн-анкети, яке включало в себе питання щодо мотивації до праці, індекс добробуту та демографічні змінні. Емпіричні результати дослідження дозволили зробити висновок, що мотивація до праці та добробуту мають позитивний взаємозв'язок (коефіцієнт кореляції 0.177,  $p < 0,01$ ). Однак демографічні змінні, які впливають на різноманітність мотивації до праці та добробуту, розглядаються як демографічні змінні, оскільки не всі демографічні змінні мають однаковий вплив на мотивацію до праці та добробут. Виявлено, що взаємозалежність між регулюванням, внутрішньою мотивацією та добробутом також є позитивною, коефіцієнти кореляції відповідно 0.383 та 0.351. З іншого боку, для досягнення цілей диференціації демографічних змінних, виявлено, що вік та дохід мають значущі диференційовані ефекти на рівень добробуту; особи віком від 35 до 44 років мали вищий рівень добробуту (57.2), ті, у кого дохід був вищим, мали вищий рівень добробуту (56.45) ніж інші

**Ключові слова:** гнучка робота; робота з дому; добробут; мотивація до праці; тенденції інноваційної праці.