

The Relationship between Self-Determined Motivation and Psychological Well-being, Life Well-being, and Workplace Well-being: A Canonical Correlational Study

Nasrin Arshadi*¹, Noori Kaabomeir²

Abstract

Objective: Today, work as a social identity plays an important role in success, health, and well-being. The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between self-determined motivation and psychological well-being, and well-being in life and workplace.

Method: The participants of this study consisted of 246 employees of Marun Oil and Gas Producing Company in Khuzestan in 2020, who were selected through stratified random sampling method. The instruments used in the study were Multidimensional Work Motivation Scale (Gagné et al., 2015), and Employee Well-being Scale (Zheng et al., 2015). Canonical correlation and multiple regression analysis were used for data analysis through SPSS-24.

Result: The results showed that among the three dimensions of job motivation, autonomous motivation with a structural coefficient of 0.94, and among the components of employee well-being, workplace well-being with a structural coefficient of 0.99, have the most relationship with the first fundamental variable from independent and dependent variables. According to the results of simultaneous regression analysis, autonomous motivation was the most important predictor for psychological well-being ($\beta=0.45$, $p=0.000$), life well-being ($\beta=0.30$, $p=0.001$), and workplace well-being ($\beta=0.45$, $p=0.000$). Amotivation could predict workplace well-being ($\beta= -0.34$, $p=0.000$). However, controlled motivation could not predict any component of employee well-being.

Conclusion: Based on the findings, autonomous motivation was the most important predictor of psychological, life, and workplace well-being. Therefore, it is recommended that organizations provide opportunity for development of this type of motivation.

Keywords: Self-determined motivation, Psychological well-being, life well-being, workplace well-being, Health.

Introduction

There has been fundamental shifts in the attitudes of some psychologists. The focus of this approach is called the psychology of perfection or health psychology, which deals with the healthy aspect of human nature; not in an unhealthy way (Schultz, 2009). From this point of view, the absence of symptoms of mental illness is no longer an indicator of health, but adaptation, happiness, self-esteem,

and other positive traits that represent one's primary health and purpose in life are the fulfillment of one's abilities (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Following the formation of theories, such as Maslow's self-actualization (1962), Rodgers's fully functioning person (1959), and Allport's mature human (1961), as well as the movement of positive psychology, a group of psychologists used psychological well-being instead of mental health, because they believed that the term would bring more positive dimensions to the mind (Abdel-Khalek, 2019). Since then, the subject of psychological well-being and happiness has devoted a great deal of research

1. Professor, Department of psychology, Shahid Chamran University of Ahvaz, Ahvaz, Iran
Tell: 09161112723

*Corresponding Author Email: narshadi@scu.ac.ir

2. Ph.D. student of psychology, Department of psychology, Shahid Chamran University of Ahvaz, Ahvaz, Iran
Tell: 09166020191 Email: noori.kaabomeir@yahoo.com

to identifying and promoting the positive aspects and strengths of human beings (Proctor, 2014; Behzadipour, Sadeghi, & Sepahmansour, 2019).

Today, work as a social identity plays an important role in success, health, and well-being. Since the working environment and working conditions are different from other life situations, it is, therefore, necessary to distinguish the concept of employee well-being from other general well-being concepts (Zheng, Zhu, Zhao, & Zhang, 2015). Employee well-being is defined as “the quality of life of employees and their psychological state in the workplace” (Siegrist, Wahrendorf, Knesebeck, Jürges, & Börsch-Supan, 2006). Vanhala and Tuomi (2006) point out that employee well-being refers to “overall well-being, and employee job satisfaction”. However, many researchers have emphasized this point that considering non-work aspects in explaining the concept of employee well-being is necessary; family relationships, personal life satisfaction, and personal and environmental characteristics are also part of employee well-being (Siegrist et al., 2006; Vanhala & Tuomi, 2006; Page & Vella-Brodrick, 2009; Zheng et al., 2015; Aghayosefi, Kharbu, & Hatami, 2015). According to this, Zheng et al. (2015), in a comprehensive definition of employee well-being, defines it as a multi-dimensional construct consisting of three components: Psychological well-being, life well-being, and workplace well-being. In this definition, in addition to work aspects, non-work factors such as personal well-being as well as family life well-being are considered as part of employee well-being.

Psychological well-being means having a positive attitude towards oneself, having a positive and intimate relationship with others, a sense of independence and having an active role in life, a sense of control over the environment, a purposeful life and a feeling of continuous growth (Cohen & Shamai, 2010). The component of life well-being consists of two personal and family dimensions.

Personal dimension refers to employees' emotions, psychological experience, and the level of satisfaction expressed in their personal life. Everyday personal experiences can affect one's health and well-being in the workplace. On the other hand, the family aspect is also an integral part of every person's life. Although, work and family life seem to be two separate areas, family conditions can affect employee well-being (Zheng et al., 2015). The last component in Zheng et al. (2015) definition is the workplace well-being, which means the absence of negative experiences such as anxiety, stress, and burnout in the workplace. Workplace well-being also refers to the quality of life and job satisfaction of employees (Siegrist et al., 2006). This dimension can be influenced by job factors such as salaries, job security, workplace support, management style, and job structure (Page & Vella-Brodrick, 2009). Employee well-being is associated with important outcomes such as job performance (Haddon, 2018; Medina-Garrido, Biedma-Ferrer, & Ramos-Rodríguez, 2017), organizational commitment (Veld & Alfes, 2017; Cohen & Shamai, 2010), organizational citizenship behavior (Garg, Rastogi, & Kataria, 2015), job satisfaction (Olatunde, 2015), and turnover intention (Amin & Akbar, 2013).

Regarding the importance of employee well-being and influential role of this variable in relation to important and positive organizational outcomes, such as organizational productivity, job performance, and job satisfaction, it is necessary to consider the factors that make an impact on this variable. One of the most important factors in this regard is work motivation (Slemp, Kern, Patrick, & Ryan, 2018; Nie, Chua, Yeung, Ryan, & Chan, 2015; Sexton, 2013; Gillet, Gagné, Sauvagère, & Fouquereau, 2013).

Work motivation is a set of energetic forces that originate both within as well as beyond an individual's being, to initiate work-related behavior, and to determine its form, direction, intensity,

and duration (Pinder, 1998). There are different theories regarding work motivation that each has a different explanation of this variable. One of the new and endorsed theories is Deci and Ryan's self-determination theory (SDT), which focuses on the types of motivation in individuals rather than its value (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Deci & Ryan, 2000).

Self-determination theory (SDT) is a key theory of motivation that has made a substantial contribution to predicting self-regulated behavior, including numerous health-related behaviors (Ryan & Deci, 2017). The theory suggests that the quality of individuals' motivation affects the extent to which individuals will engage in, and persist with, behaviors (Deci, Olafsen, & Ryan, 2017). Central to the theory is the distinction between two forms of motivation: autonomous and controlled. The forms of motivation reflect individuals' rationale or reasons for engaging in tasks and are driven by perceptions as to whether the behavior will satisfy an individual's psychological needs (Hagger et al., 2014).

Autonomous motivation is defined as engaging in a behavior because it is perceived to be consistent with intrinsic goals or outcomes and emanates from the self. In other words, the behavior is self-determined (Hagger et al., 2014). Autonomous motivation is characterized by people being engaged in an activity with a full sense of willingness, volition, and choice. Often, autonomously regulated activities are intrinsically motivated (Deci et al., 2017). However, perhaps more important to the workplace, is that extrinsically motivated activities can, under the right circumstances, be autonomously motivated, that is, engaged with authenticity and vitality. When individuals understand the worth and purpose of their jobs, feel ownership and autonomy in carrying them out, and receive clear feedback and supports, they are likely to become more autonomously motivated and reliably perform better, learn better, and be better adjusted (Deci et al., 2017).

Controlled motivation, in contrast, reflects engaging in behaviors for externally referenced reasons such as to gain rewards or perceived approval from others or to avoid punishment or feelings of guilt. Individuals engaging in behavior for controlled reasons, feel a sense of obligation and pressure when engaging in the behavior and are only likely to persist with the behavior as long as the external contingency is present (Hagger et al., 2014). When motivation is controlled, either through contingent rewards or power dynamics, the extrinsic focus that results can narrow the range of employees' efforts, produce short-term gains on targeted outcomes and have negative spillover effects on subsequent performance and work engagement (Deci et al., 2017; Van den Broeck, Carpini, Leroy, & Diefendorff, 2017).

Self-determination theory (SDT) proposes a more nuanced differentiation of the autonomous and controlled forms of motivation underpinning the action. Ryan and Connell (1989) developed a taxonomy of motivational regulations known as the perceived locus of causality. The taxonomy was conceptualized as akin to a continuum ranging from the most autonomous to the most controlling forms. Intrinsic motivation was identified as the prototypical form of autonomous motivation, reflecting motives for engaging in behavior for the inherent interest and satisfaction derived from engaging in the action itself. Identified regulation, a form of autonomous motivation, was situated immediately adjacent to intrinsic motivation on the continuum. Identified regulation reflects engaging in a behavior for personally relevant outcomes that are important to the individual's sense of self rather than for the inherent interest derived from engaging in the behavior itself. Although identified regulation reflects engaging in behaviors for reasons separate from the behavior itself, both are conceived as autonomous. External regulation represents the prototypical form of control regulation and reflects engaging in actions for external reinforcement

such as gaining a reward or avoiding punishment. Moving along the extrinsic continuum, introjected regulation refers to being motivated by internalizing the extrinsic pressures to perform, resulting in the motivation to perform an action so as to feel proud or to avoid guilt feeling and shame (Van den Broeck et al., 2017). Although the perceived locus of causality is conceived as a continuum, research has demonstrated that a profile approach toward the taxonomy is perhaps more effective and better characterizes the true nature of individuals' motivational orientations toward behaviors. Individuals can, therefore, identify varying levels of autonomous and controlled reasons for acting, the relative contribution of which likely determines the extent to which individuals will persist with or desist from the behavior in the long run (Hagger et al., 2014).

Moving from most to least self-determined in the taxonomy of motivational regulations, the least self-determined regulation is amotivation. When the individual has a relative absence of intrinsic or extrinsic motivation and lacks a reason to act, he/she is said to be amotivated (Deci & Ryan, 2002). When amotivated, a person's behavior lacks intentionality and a sense of personal causation. Amotivation can stem from two general sources. The first type results from a lack of concern or value for the activity. An individual may be amotivated when he or she sees no gains or benefits in changing and when he or she simply does not see it as important or worthwhile. This type of amotivation can be observed in the satisfied spouse who does not see a need for a couple's therapy or the employee who disagrees with the need for an anger management intervention after his recent blowup. In these cases there is a clear lack of motivation to address the issue (Ryan, Lynch, Vansteenkiste, & Deci, 2011). A second, somewhat distinct type of amotivation, stems from a lack of perceived competence (Deci & Ryan, 1985) or positive efficacy beliefs (Bandura, 1996). One may not believe that counseling is

reliably linked to positive outcomes, or one might feel that even if it were potentially helpful, one is not personally competent to use it in a way that would successfully make the change (Ryan et al., 2011).

Research has demonstrated that engaging in behavior for largely autonomous reasons is associated with uptake and persistence with health-related behavior in a number of behavioral domains (e.g. Ljubin-Golub, Rijavec, & Olčar, 2020; Benita, Benish-Weisman, Matos, & Torres, 2020; Chatzisarantis et al., 2019; Hope, Holding, Verner-Filion, Sheldon, & Koestner, 2019; Cuevas, Ntoumanis, Fernandez-Bustos, & Bartholomew, 2018; Hagger et al., 2014; Williams et al., 2014). The environmental conditions that likely affect motivation to engage in different health behaviors may vary. Some behaviors may have a greater tendency to engender autonomous reasons for engaging in them while others may have a greater propensity to be determined by external forces (Ryan & Deci, 2000). While autonomous motivation may be important for successful engagement in, and persistence with, many behaviors, it may be that the relative contribution of the different forms of motivation varies. While some researchers have compared the effects of autonomous forms of motivation on more than one health behavior (Hagger et al., 2014; Williams et al., 2014), they have tended to focus only on a handful of conceptually related health behaviors (e.g. behaviors like exercise and healthy eating that are related to energy balance).

The relationships between different dimensions of self-determined motivation and employees' well-being, reveals the necessity for more attention and research regarding this issue. Accordingly, the main purpose of this study was to investigate the canonical correlations of autonomous motivation, controlled motivation, and also amotivation with components of employees' well-being (psychological well-being, life well-being, and workplace well-being).

Method

The purpose of the study was to investigate the relationship between the dimensions of self-determined work motivation and components of employee well-being using the canonical correlation analysis method; therefore, the design of present study was a descriptive-correlational survey.

Participants and Procedure

The statistical population of this research included all employees of Marun Oil and Gas Producing Company in Khuzestan, among whom 50 employees were selected through stratified random sampling method (The sample size was determined using the Cochran's formula). Out of 250 distributed questionnaires, 246 questionnaires were returned (response rate= 98.4%); 35.4% (87 employees) of the sample consisted of staff and 64.6% (159 employees) of line employees. The mean (standard deviation) of age and tenure of the participants were 41.04 (8.22) and 17.65 (9.91) years, respectively.

Ethical Considerations

Ethical Principles for protecting the identity and personal information of participants included:

The researchers guaranteed the participants that all their personal details (e.g. name and contact details) would not be disclosed to anyone else except to the researchers. In addition, researchers ensured them that participation in this study has no social or occupational danger. All participants had the right to withdraw from this study at any time.

This article was extracted from a project which approved under the ethics code No., EE/98.24.3.41508/scu.ac.ir.

Measures

Multidimensional Work Motivation Scale (MWMS). Multidimensional Work Motivation Scale (MWMS) was used to measure autonomous

and controlled motivation (Gagné et al., 2015). This scale has 19 items and six subscales including amotivation (3 items), social external regulation (3 items), material external regulation (3 items), introjected regulation (4 items), identified regulation (3 items), and intrinsic motivation (3 items). Responses are scored on a 7-point Likert scale from 1 (not at all) to 7 (completely). Sum of social external regulation, material external regulation, and introjected regulation items was used for controlled motivation and, total sum of identified regulation and intrinsic motivation items were used to measure autonomous motivation. Reliability coefficients of this scale in Gagné et al. (2015) for different samples were: French sample 0.74–0.88, English sample 0.70–0.90, Dutch sample 0.70–0.91, Norwegian sample 0.79–0.95, German sample 0.55–0.93, Chinese sample 0.77–0.88, and Indonesian sample 0.82–0.94. This scale has been translated and validated for the first time in the present study. In this study, the reliability coefficients of amotivation, controlled motivation, and autonomous motivation were 0.86, 0.79, and 0.94, respectively, calculated through Cronbach's alpha coefficient. To determine the validity of this scale, a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was conducted. The results of confirmatory factor analysis also indicated acceptable validity of this scale (GFI=0.88, CFI=0.95, RMSEA=0.077).

Employee Well-Being Scale: The employee well-being in the present study was measured using the Employee Well-being Scale of Zheng et al. (2015). This scale has 18 items and three subscales of life well-being (6 items), workplace well-being (6 items), and psychological well-being (6 items). Responses were scored on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Zheng et al. (2015) calculated the internal consistency of this scale using Cronbach's alpha coefficients for psychological well-being, life well-being, workplace well-being and total scale, 0.88, 0.92, 0.93, and 0.93, respectively. This

scale was translated and validated by Kaabomeir, Shanbedi, & Hashemi (2016). Kaabomeir et al. (2016) confirmed the reliability (Cronbach's alpha coefficients for psychological well-being, life well-being, workplace well-being and total scale were 0.86, 0.90, 0.74, and 0.91, respectively) and construct validity ($X^2/df=1.92$, $IFI=0.95$, $CFI=0.94$, $RMSEA=0.068$) of this scale. In the present study, the reliability coefficients of life well-being, workplace well-being, and psychological well-being were 0.92, 0.92 and 0.87 respectively, using Cronbach's alpha coefficient. The results of confirmatory factor analysis indicates an acceptable validity of this scale ($GFI=0.88$, $CFI=0.93$, $RMSEA=0.084$).

Results

The correlations among variables, means, and standard deviations are reported in Table 1.

As shown in Table 1, all correlation coefficients between the dimensions of self-determined work motivation and components of employee well-being are significant at the $P<0.01$.

The results of the canonical correlation analysis, that is, the relationship between two latent or canonical variables that one of which is derived from the linear combination of independent variables and the other from the linear combination of dependent variables are reported in Table 2 presents.

As shown in Table 2, the overall research model, which is a common variance between the two

Table 1.

Mean, standard deviation and correlation coefficients matrix of research variables

Variables	S.D Mean	1	2	3	4	5	6
1 Amotivation	4.116.11	1					
2 Controlled motivation	10.8238.15	-0.12	1				
3 Autonomous motivation	9.6831.10	-0.61**	0.52**	1			
4 Psychological well-being	5.9234.63	-0.41**	0.29**	0.55**	1		
5 Life well-being	7.4532.77	-0.33**	0.25**	0.43**	0.81**	1	
6 Workplace well-being	8.4931.60	-0.62**	0.30**	0.68**	0.70**	0.59**	1

** $P<0/01$

Table 2.

Structural coefficients, Standardized coefficients, and fitness indicators of canonical correlation analysis

Variables	Structure coefficients	Standardized canonical coefficients	Fitness indices
Amotivation	0.85	0.45	Wilk's=0.46 F=78/24 P=0.0001 Canon Cor.=0.73 Sq. Canon=0.53
Controlled motivation	-0.42	-0.03	
Autonomous motivation	-0.94	-0.64	
Psychological well-being	-0.76	-	
Life well-being	-0.59	-	
Workplace well-being	-0.99	-	

variables, self-determined work motivation and employee well-being is significant at $p<0.0001$ with the squared of canonical correlation coefficient 0.53 and $F=78.24$. According to square of canonical correlation coefficient, 53% of employee well-being variance is explained by the dimensions of

self-determined work motivation. The high weight of the determination coefficient (Sq. Canon) shows the strong influence of the dimensions of self-determined work motivation on employee well-being. The Wilk's test, which is actually the most important multivariate test, indicates the non-

determination coefficient and also tests the overall research model. In the present study, this parameter is 0.46, in other words, 46% of the variance of the dependent variable (employee well-being) is predicted by variables other than the dimensions of self-determined work motivation. In this analysis, the structural coefficients indicate the importance of each variable in constructing the canonical variable of its category. Among the three dimensions of work motivation, autonomous motivation with a structural coefficient of 0.94, and among the components of employee well-being, workplace well-being with a structural coefficient of 0.99, have the most relationship with the first combined or canonical variable resulting from independent and dependent variables. Regarding the relative importance of each of the independent variables in explaining the common variance of the dependent variable, standardized canonical coefficients should be used. According to the results of the analysis, autonomous motivation, and controlled motivation with standardized coefficients of 0.64 and 0.03, respectively, have the most and least relationship

with the first canonical variable of employee well-being. However, structural coefficients are used to explain how the increase or decrease in the scores of independent variables is related to the increase or decrease in the dependent variables. According to the positive structural coefficient of amotivation (+0.85) and the negative coefficients of controlled motivation (-0.42) and autonomous motivation (-0.94), it can be said that whatever the amotivation score of individuals is high, but controlled motivation and autonomous motivation scores are low, their scores on psychological well-being (-0.76), life well-being (-0.59) and workplace well-being (-0.99), according to the negative structural coefficients, will be low. Table 3 shows the results of regression analysis regarding prediction of employee well-being components.

Table 3 shows the results of simultaneous regression analysis for the components of employee well-being. R is multiple correlation coefficient of the dependent variable with the independent variables and R^2 is coefficient of determination. The coefficient of determination indicates the amount of

Table 3.

Predicting the employee well-being components through the dimensions of self-determination work motivation

Independent Variables	B	β	S.E.	T	P	Lower	Upper
Dependent Variable: Psychological well-being							
Amotivation	-0.19	-0.14	0.10	-1.92	0.056	-0.40	0.01
Controlled motivation	0.02	0.04	0.04	0.66	0.512	-0.05	0.09
Autonomous motivation	0.27	0.45	0.05	5.47	0.000	0.17	0.37
F=36.98, R=0.56, $R^2=0.31$, $p<0.000$							
Dependent Variable: Life well-being							
Amotivation	-0.24	-0.13	0.14	-1.74	0.082	-0.52	0.03
Controlled motivation	0.06	0.08	0.05	1.17	0.241	-0.04	0.15
Autonomous motivation	0.23	0.30	0.07	3.38	0.001	0.10	0.37
F=19.17, R=0.44, $R^2=0.19$, $p<0.000$							
Dependent Variable: Workplace well-being							
Amotivation	-0.71	-0.34	0.12	-5.86	0.000	-0.95	-0.47
Controlled motivation	0.02	0.02	0.04	0.46	0.646	-0.06	0.10
Autonomous motivation	0.40	0.45	0.06	6.67	0.000	0.28	0.51
F=89.75, R=0.73, $R^2=0.53$, $p<0.000$							

explained variance of the dependent variable by the independent variables. β indicates the standardized regression weight of each independent variable on the dependent variable. T and F are other statistical indicators of this analysis that their significance means that β and R^2 are significant, respectively.

Table 3 indicates that autonomous motivation is the most important predictor for psychological well-being ($\beta=0.45$, $p=0.000$), life well-being ($\beta=0.30$, $p=0.001$), and workplace well-being ($\beta=0.45$, $p=0.000$). Amotivation, also predicted workplace well-being ($\beta= -0.34$, $p=0.000$). However, controlled motivation was unable to predict any component of employee well-being.

Discussion

The aim of this research was to investigate the relationship between dimensions of self-determined work motivation and components of employee well-being, which had received support from previous studies. The results showed that the more autonomous one's motivation is, the more the person is likely to experience greater well-being; in other words, autonomous motivation was the most important predictor of employee well-being. These findings are consistent with the results of Ljubin-Golub et al. (2020), Benita et al. (2020), Chatzisarantis et al. (2019), Hope et al. (2019), Cuevas et al. (2018), Hagger et al. (2014), and Williams et al. (2014).

Work is a very important part of life. As such, the contributing role of work to individuals' well-being and quality of life, gained increasing attention in research (e.g., Nie et al., 2015). According to SDT, one of the most important predictors of employees' well-being and vitality is motivation. SDT is a motivation theory that focuses on people's volitional motivation— specifically, the degree to which individuals experience their actions as autonomous (i.e., acting based on choice, interest, pleasure or values) versus controlled (i.e., acting based on rewards, punishment, sense of guilt

or obligation). This theory has generated much empirical research in the organizational literature, with findings showing that more autonomous forms of motivation are generally associated with more positive outcomes (e.g., self-regulation, persistence, commitment, job satisfaction, and well-being).

Autonomous motivation is a central SDT variable for predicting workplace outcomes. It is comprised of employees' reports of both intrinsic motivation and well-internalized extrinsic motivation. The theory assumes that when people can identify with the value and importance of their work, they will show enhanced qualities of work motivation. For example, in a study of more than 500 employees of a college, Fernet et al. (2010) found that autonomous work motivation led to less burnout. Richer et al.'s (2002) research on alumni from a business school showed that employees' autonomous motivation regarding their jobs was related to more job satisfaction and less emotional exhaustion; in turn, job satisfaction and emotional exhaustion related to lower and higher rates of turnover intentions, respectively. The level of turnover intentions predicted subsequent employee actual turnover. Hagger et al. (2014) suggested that self-determined or autonomous forms of motivation are more effective in predicting health behavior than non-self-determined or controlled forms. The results of this study provide evidence for the consistent effects of autonomous motivation on intentions and behavior across multiple health-related behaviors, with little evidence for moderating role of individual differences.

Individuals engaging in behaviors feel a sense of choice, personal endorsement, interest, and satisfaction and, as a consequence, are likely to persist with the behavior. The behavior is consistent with and supports the individuals' innate needs for autonomy, the need to feel like a personal agent in one's environment, competence, and the need to experience a sense of control and efficacy in

one's actions. Individuals acting for autonomous reasons are more likely to initiate and persist with behavior without any external reinforcement and contingency. Autonomously motivated individuals are, therefore, more likely to be effective in self-regulation of behavior.

The results also revealed that amotivation can only predict workplace well-being ($\beta = -0.34$, $p = 0.000$), which is in line with the results of previous research (Bakker, 2004; Petersen, Louw, & Dumont, 2009; Chen, Chen, & Li, 2011; Bailey & Phillips, 2015). Baker (2004) examined the influence of motivational orientation on adaptation to university, stress, psychological ill-health, and performance in second-year university students. Only intrinsic motivation predicted lower stress, while amotivation predicted greater stress, poorer adjustment to university, and greater psychological illness, and extrinsic motivation showed no relationships to any of these outcomes. A study of disadvantaged South African students found that intrinsic motivation was positively correlated with adjustment to university and academic performance (Petersen et al., 2009). Moreover, students' adjustment predicted academic performance. In support of Baker's (2004) findings, intrinsic motivation was associated with lower stress, and also greater self-esteem. While amotivation was associated with lower academic performance.

According to self-determination theory (Deci & Ryan, 1985), amotivation refers to the absence of motivation. For those individuals who report high levels of amotivation, behaviors are non-regulated and non-intentional. Such behaviors may result from feelings of not being able to complete an activity successfully (Bandura, 1996), not expecting an activity to yield the desired outcome (Seligman, 1975), or not valuing a particular activity (Ryan, 1995). With no sense of purpose or expectation of changing events, over time, such individuals are likely to experience increased feelings of incompetence and uncontrollability; a state

proposed as similar to that of learned helplessness (Seligman, 1975). Amotivation is an important concept in the workplace. Individuals, who are amotivated, are unwilling to work, give up trying, do not have the energy and desire to work, and as a result will have lower levels of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and job performance. Finally, the results indicated that controlled motivation couldn't predict any component of well-being. Some studies have also confirmed the non-significant relationship between controlled motivation and well-being (Bakker, 2004; Lavasani, Khezriazar, Najafi, & Maleki, 2017). Regarding the standardized canonical coefficients in Table 2, controlled motivation had the least relationship with the first canonical variable of employee well-being. Extrinsic motivation is a controlled (i.e., non-autonomous) type, when one's behavior allows for satisfaction of an external demand or reward contingency, or to avoid guilt feeling or anxiety (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Individuals who are motivated by extrinsic rewards, less likely are self-regulated. Therefore, controlled motivation has short-term effects and is not an important and effective variable for predicting individuals' behavior and attitudes.

It is important to highlight some limitations of the present study. First, given the cross-sectional design of this study, causal relationships among the variables cannot be established. Longitudinal studies should be employed to test the hypotheses. Longitudinal research clarifies cause and effect relationships. Second, the use of self-report measures may have inherent limitations (e.g., inability to recall, social desirability). A combination of self-report questionnaires and objective assessments would be ideal. Finally, because the participants were employees of Marun Oil and Gas Producing Company, care should be taken in generalizing and extending the findings to other organizations.

According to the findings, autonomous motivation in organizations is an important key because it

is associated with important outcomes such as employee well-being. According to Deci and Ryan (2000), autonomous motivation or in other words, the most self-determined motivational regulation occurs when a person has a sense of choice and autonomy and has control over his (her) behaviors. Being self-determined means having the ability to choose what internal or external incentives will determine one's behavior and activities (Deci & Ryan, 1985).

Autonomy and independence, creating a sense of competence and efficiency, as well as positive and effective relationships, which leads to more self-determined behaviors (Maguire, 1999). Numerous studies have shown that autonomous motivation also facilitate the internalization of extrinsic motivation because they lead to the satisfaction of basic psychological needs (Deci et al., 2017).

Conclusion

One of the most comprehensive theories in motivation is Self-Determination Theory (SDT). SDT proposes a multidimensional view on motivation and specifies how these different types of motivation can be promoted or discouraged. Three major categories of motivation are discerned: Internal motivation (autonomous motivation), external motivation (controlled motivation), and amotivation. Determining the type of motivation is important because each of them has in some cases been found to yield different behavioral and attitudinal outcomes in certain domains.

For decades SDT has addressed the links between motivation and the dual concerns of performance and wellness in organizations. It has focused on what facilitates high-quality, sustainable motivation, and what brings out volitional engagement in employees and customers. SDT suggests that fostering workplace conditions where employees feel supported in their autonomy is not only an appropriate end in itself but will lead to more employee satisfaction, thriving, engagement, and well-being, as well as

collateral benefits for organizational effectiveness. SDT specifically suggests that both employees' performance and their well-being are affected by the type of motivation they have for their work activities. SDT, therefore, differentiates types of motivation and maintains that different types of motivation have functionally different catalyzers, concomitants, and consequences.

References

- Abdel-Khalek, A. M. (2019). *Religiosity and subjective well-being in the Arab context*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Aghayosefi, A., Kharbu, A., & Hatami, H. R. (2015). The role of rumination on psychological well-being and anxiety the spouses' cancer patients. *Quarterly Journal of Health Psychology*, 14(14), 79–97.
- Amin, Z., & Akbar, K. P. (2013). Analysis of psychological well-being and turnover intentions of hotel employees: An empirical study. *International Journal of Innovation and Applied Studies*, 3(3), 662–671.
- Bailey, T. H., & Phillips, L. J. (2015). The influence of motivation and adaptation on students' subjective well-being, meaning in life and academic performance. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 35(2), 201–216.
- Baker, S. R. (2004). Intrinsic, extrinsic, and amotivational orientations: Their role in university adjustment, stress, well-being, and subsequent academic performance. *Current Psychology*, 23(3), 189–202.
- Bandura, A. (1996). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: Freeman.
- Barnett, R. (1998). Toward a review and re-conceptualizing of the work/family literature. *Genetic, Social and General Psychology Monographs*, 124, 125–182.
- Barnett, R., & Hyde, J. (2001). Women, men, work, and family: An expansionist theory. *American Psychologist*, 56, 781–796.
- Behzadipour, S., Sadeghi, A., & Sepahmansour, M. (2019). A study on the effect of gratitude on happiness and well-being. *Iranian Journal of Health Psychology*, 1(2), 65–72.
- Benita, M., Benish-Weisman, M., Matos, L., Torres, C. (2020). Integrative and suppressive emotion regulation

- differentially predict well-being through basic need satisfaction and frustration: A test of three countries. *Motivation and Emotion*, 44, 67–81.
- Chatzisarantis, N., Ada, E. N., Ahmadi, M., Caltabiano, N., Wang, D., Thogersen-Ntoumani, C., & Hagger, M. S. (2019). Differential effects of perceptions of equal, favorable and unfavorable autonomy support on educational and well-being outcomes. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 58, 33–43.
- Chen, C.-Y., Chen, C.-H. V., & Li, C.-I. (2011). The influence of leader's spiritual values of servant leadership on employee motivational autonomy and eudaemonic well-being. *Journal of Religion and Health*, 52(2), 418–438.
- Cohen, A., & Shamai, O. (2010). The relationship between individual values, psychological well-being, and organizational commitment among Israeli police officer. *An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 33(1), 30–51.
- Cuevas, R., Ntoumanis, N., Fernandez-Bustos, J. G., & Bartholomew, K. (2018). Does teacher evaluation based on student performance predict motivation, well-being, and ill-being? *Journal of School Psychology*, 68, 154–162.
- Deci, E. L., Olafsen, A. H., Ryan, R. M. (2017). Self-determination theory in work organizations: The state of a science. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 4, 19–43.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). The General Causality Orientations Scale: Self-determination in personality. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 19, 109–134.
- Deci, E.L., & Ryan, R.M. (2000). The “what” and “why” of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11, 227–268.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (Eds.). (2002). *Handbook of self-determination research*. Rochester NY: University Rochester Press.
- Gagné, M., Forest, J., Vansteenkiste, M., Crevier-Braud, L., Van den Broeck, A., Aspel, A. K., & et al. (2015). The Multidimensional Work Motivation Scale: Validation evidence in seven languages and nine countries. *European Journal of Organizational Psychology*, 24(2), 178–196.
- Garg, P., Rastogi, R., & Kataria, A. (2015). Promoting citizenship behaviors in workplace: The relevance of organizational justice and psychological well-being of employees. *Jindal Journal of Business Research*, 2(2), 1–18.
- Gillet, N., Gagné, M., Sauvagère, S., & Fouquereau, E. (2013b). The role of supervisor autonomy support, organizational support, and autonomous and controlled motivation in predicting employees' satisfaction and turnover intentions. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 22(4), 450–460.
- Haddon, J. (2018). The impact of employees' well-being on performance in the workplace. *Strategic HR Review*, 17(2), 72–77.
- Hagger, M. S., Hardcastle, S. J., Chater, A., Mallet, C., Pal, S., & Chatzisarantis, N. L. D. (2014). Autonomous and controlled motivational regulations for multiple health-related behaviors: Between- and within-participants analyses. *Health Psychology & Behavioral Medicine*, 2(1), 565–601.
- Hope, N. H., Holding, A. C., Verner-Filion, J., Sheldon, K. M., & Koestner, R. (2019). The path from intrinsic aspirations to subjective well-being is mediated by changes in basic psychological need satisfaction and autonomous motivation: A large prospective test. *Motivation and Emotion*, 43, 232–241.
- Kaabomeir, N., Shanbedi, F., & Hashemi, S. E. (2016). Investigation of psychometric properties of Employee Well-Being Scale. *Quarterly Journal of Career & Organizational Counseling*, 8(27), 9–29.
- Kinnunen, U., Feldt, T., Geurts, S., & Pulkkinen, L. (2006). Types of work-family interface: Well-being correlates of negative and positive spillover between work and family. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 47(2), 149–162.
- Lavasani, M. G., Khezriazar, H., Saleh Najafi, M., & Maleki, A. (2017). A structural model of the relationship between basic psychological needs, academic motivation and English academic engagement. *Quarterly Educational Psychology*, 13(43), 35–58.
- Ljubin-Golub, T., Rijavec, M. & Olčar, D. (2020). Student flow and burnout: The role of teacher autonomy support and student autonomous motivation. *Psychological Studies*, Online Published: 27 March 2020.
- Maguire, S. (1999). The discourse of control. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 19(1), 109–114.
- Medina-Garrido, J. A., Biedma-Ferrer, J. M., & Ramos-

- Rodríguez, A. R. (2017). Relationship between work-family balance, employee well-being and job performance. *Academia Revista Latinoamericana de Administración*, 30(1), 40–58.
- Nie, Y., Chua, B. L., Yeung, A. S., Ryan, R. M., & Chan, W. Y. (2015). The importance of autonomy support and the mediating role of work motivation for well-being: Testing self-determination theory in a Chinese work organization. *International Journal of Psychology*, 50(4), 245–255.
- Olatunde, B. E. (2015). Job satisfaction and psychological wellbeing among mental health nurses. *International Journal of Nursing Didactics*, 5(8), 12–18.
- Page, K. M., & Vella-Brodrick, D. A. (2009). The “what,” “why” and “how” of employee well-being: A new model. *Social Indicators Research*, 90(3), 441–458.
- Petersen, I.-h., Louw, J., & Dumont, K. (2009). Adjustment to university and academic performance among disadvantaged students in South Africa. *Educational Psychology: An International Journal of Experimental Educational Psychology*, 29(1), 99–115.
- Pinder, C., C. (1998). *Work motivation in organizational behavior*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Proctor, C. (2014). Subjective well-being. In A. Michalos, *Encyclopedia of quality of life and well-being research*. Publisher: Springer.
- Ryan, R. M. (1995). Psychological needs and the facilitation of integrative processes. *Journal of Personality*, 63, 397–427.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25(1), 54–67.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2017). *Self-determination theory: Basic psychological needs in motivation, development, and wellness*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Ryan, R. M., & Connell, J. P. (1989). Perceived locus of causality and internalization: Examining reasons for acting in two domains. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57(5), 749–761.
- Ryan, R. M., Lynch, M. F., Vansteenkiste, M., & Deci, E. L. (2011). Motivation and autonomy in counseling, psychotherapy, and behavior change: A look at theory and practice. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 39(2), 193–260.
- Schultz, I. Z. (2009). *Determining Disability: New Advances in Conceptualization and Research*. *Psychological Injury and Law*, 2(3), 199–204.
- Seligman, M. E. E. (1975). *Helplessness*. San Francisco: Freeman.
- Sexton, J. (2013). The application of self-determination theory to employee motivation in Irish workplaces. Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the Post-Graduate Higher Diploma in Psychology at DBS School of Arts, Dublin, Ireland.
- Siegrist, J., Wahrendorf, M., Knesebeck, O., Jürges, H., & Börsch-Supan, A. (2006). Quality of work, well-being, and intended early retirement of older employees: Baseline results from the SHARE Study. *European Journal of Public Health*, 17(1), 62–68.
- Slemp, G. R., Kern, M. L., Patrick, K. J., & Ryan, R. M. (2018). Leader autonomy support in the workplace: A meta-analytic view. *Motivation and Emotion*, 42(5), 706–724.
- Van den Broeck, A., Carpini, J., Leroy, H., & Diefendorff, J. (2017). How much effort will I put into my work? It depends on your type of motivation. In F. Francaroli, N. Chmiel, & M. Sverke (Eds), *An introduction to work and organizational psychology: An international perspective* (3rd ed.).
- Vanhala, S., & Tuomi, K. (2006). HRM, company performance and employee well-being. *International Review of Management Studies*, 17(3), 241–255.
- Veld, M., & Alfes, K. (2017). HRM, climate and employee well-being: Comparing an optimistic and critical perspective. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 28(16), 299–318.
- Williams, G. C., Halvari, H., Niemiec, C. P., Sorebo, O., Olafson, A. H., & Wesbye, C. (2014). Managerial support for basic psychological needs, somatic symptom burden and work-related correlates: A self-determination theory perspective. *Work & Stress*, 28(4), 404–419.
- Zheng, X., Zhu, W., Zhao, H., & Zhang, C. H. (2015). Employee well-being in organizations: Theoretical model, scale development, and cross-cultural validation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 36(5), 621–644.