Examining the Substantive Effects of Remote Work on the Advancement of Employee Flourishing within Professional Environments.

Agnes Nyamenaose Essuman[1], Michael Provide Fumey[2]*, John Wiredu[3], Gifty Takyiwaa Aboagye[4], Emmanuel Tettey Abaitey[5]

[1]School of Economics and Management, YanshanUniveristy, Hebei Avenue, Qinhuangdao, 066004, P. R. China.

[2]School of Public Policy and Administration, Northwestern Polytechnical University, Shaanxi Province, Xi'an, China.

[3]School of Management, Northwestern Polytechnical University, Shaanxi Province, Xi'an, China.

[4]School of Life Sciences, Northwestern Polytechnical University, Shaanxi Province, Xi'an, China.

[5]School of Business, Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Kumasi, Ghana.

***Corresponding Author**

DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2024.805025

Received: 06 April 2024; Revised: 24 April 2024; Accepted: 01 May 2024; Published: 29 May 2024

ABSTRACT

A national lockdown was declared in Ghana on 12 March 2020, and since then, working from home has been the main policy of many organizations. West African countries, such as Ghana, have dealt with the COVID-19 crisis more efficiently than most other countries due to the ease with which citizens maintain social distance and thus prevent spreading the virus. As a result, Covid-19 changed the work environment for individuals around the world in early 2020. Research concerning remote working and employee well-being is scarce. Researchers have studied the relationship between remote work and the well-being of employees during the pandemic but there is no study on the effect remote work had on lecturers. Accordingly, this study aims to address this gap by examining remote working, and in particular, how it affected lecturers' flourishing (socially, psychologically and physically) during the Covid-19 pandemic. Thus, this study used a quantitative method to explore the effect remote work had on employee flourishing during the COVID-19 pandemic among university lecturers in Kumasi Metropolitan, Ghana. The study used the quantitative approach, respondents were selected based on the simple random sampling technique. One hundred and fifty (150) questionnaires were distributed to university lecturers in the Kumasi metropolis. The data was analysed using the SPSS. The results showed that remote working had a positive effect on employee flourishing. However, it is equally evident from the findings that the social well-being of remote workers was negatively affected due to isolation. This study recommends that university lecturers adopt the remote working system to maximize their level of flourishing

Keywords: COVID-19, Kumasi- Ghana, Professional environments, Remote work, University lecturers

INTRODUCTION

Remote working did not begin as recently as many people believe. Working remotely became popular in the United States in the 1980s as a way to avoid traffic and save money on office space (Kylilli, 2020). Cultural

shifts fueled the phenomena throughout time, as employees demanded greater freedom to achieve a better work-life balance (Hunter, 2019). Currently, up to 68 percent of the global population wants to work remotely between 2019 and 2020 (Vyas and Butakhieo, 2021). In 2020, Covid-19 was labeled a global pandemic. To ensure the protection of their citizens, countries had to shut down businesses and institutions. As a result, remote working, which was popular among professionals and those in management positions at the time, became the sole practical option for keeping institutions and businesses running while avoiding staff infection (Mears, 2007). Remote working refers to performing regular duties in a location outside the traditional workspace (Smith et al., 2018).

The study's major goal is to look at the relationship between remote working and employee flourishing or well-being. The premise for the study was that there is a link between remote working and employee happiness. As part of the organization's adaptation (Goodstein, 1994), the flexibility of remote working allows a large group of people to be involved in specific projects at a company or institution at a specific time to improve quality and productivity in everyone's best interest (Rysavy & Michalak, 2020). Apart from time savings, employees who work from home save considerably on traveling costs and parking (Choo, 2020).

The Covid-19 pandemic caused sudden changes in work organization (working from home, virtual teamwork) and affected workers (through social distancing, stress, and unemployment) (Juchnowicz et al., 2021). Throughout the pandemic, employers have prioritized employee flourishing as one of their top objectives. Organizations' responses to the pandemic considered the need to respond to changing employee needs (Bogusky-Halper et al., 2020). Because of the volatility of the pandemic environment, organizations must act and make decisions based on individual experiences (Sparks & McCann, 2021). As a result, there is an urgent need for current study on employee flourishing. The purpose of this study is to investigate the relationship between employee well-being and remote working by assessing the link between employee flourishing and job productivity.

The concept of flourishing can be examined from a variety of perspectives. It encompasses dimensions such as life expectancy, poverty rates, and environmental concerns from a macro perspective. It contains subjective or psychological assessments of a person's satisfaction, a person's appraisal of their quality of life and employment, which is defined by three key aspects: physical, social, and psychological from the individual's perspective (Khoreva &Wechtler, 2018). Connecting to all realms of life, including work activity and occupational functioning, is connected with flourishing, which is the state in which a person feels good, healthy, and happy. Following assessments, the category of employee well-being was established, however, it still needs a defined definition (Khoreva &Wechtler, 2018).

The World Health Organization, on the other hand, provides a complete definition of employee well-being: it is the state of each employee in which they recognize their capabilities, manage life challenges, work productively, and contribute to their community (Misselbrook, 2014). According to research, psychological flourishing is the most important flourishing component in the workplace (Johnson et al., 2018Here is a concise and clear paraphrasing of that statement: Well-being is conceptualized as having positive self-esteem, trusting relationships, freedom from restrictive societal norms, control and ability to contribute to one's environment, a sense of life purpose, and opportunities for personal growth and realizing one's potential. The dimensions are based on self-actualization and self-determination theories (Deci et al., 2001). The others are based on the ideas of mastery and optimal performance. In the literature, a separate stream of research on workplace flourishing has evolved, which is described as an employee's whole experiences and function in both physical and psychological dimensions (Warr et al., 2006). The five-element PERMA model, which includes P for positive emotion, E for engagement, R for resource, M for meaning, and A for accomplishments/achievements, is used in research into employee thriving in the context of human resource management (Seligman et al., 2012). Another concept is a three-dimensional model (Voorde et al., 2017) with the following components: health, happiness, and relationships (Price et al., 2007). The first component looks at happiness in terms of mental and physical health, as well as how effectively they work. The second

sort of happiness combines hedonistic pleasure at work and the eudemonic perception of work as meaningful and fascinating (Ryan & Deci, 2001). The relational component considers the employee's perception of the quality of his or her interpersonal interactions and includes components such as trust, workplace fairness, and social support (Guest, 2017). The methodological assumptions of the current study effort were inspired by this paradigm. Employee and employer-focused tools can be used to assess well-being. Employee diagnostic instruments address a wide range of topics, including quality of life, job purpose, burnout risk, severe fatigue, work-life integration, and suicide ideation (e.g., Employee Well-Being Index) (Dyrbye et al., 2016). There are five items on the Gallup and Share Care Well-being Index scale: (1) a positive attitude toward everyday activities and motivation to pursue goals, (2) having supportive relationships with others in one's life, (3) financial security, (4) feeling safe and happy to belong to a certain community, and (5) having excellent health and enough energy to perform daily duties (Roy et al., 2018).

The processing of information and its distribution across telecommunication channels, which is largely or partially from an organization's numerous locations, is referred to as remote working (Kylilli, 2020). Working from home is not a new notion. It refers to work done from a remote location such as one's own home (Allen et al., 2015). With the advancement of information technology and a plethora of internet-based platforms, team collaboration and remote communication between leaders and employees, as well as between employees and their clients, has never been easier. Better job satisfaction, reduced travel time and expenses, increased productivity, reduced turnover and absenteeism are advantages of working from home. The drawbacks of working from home may include isolation from the work culture, potential conflicts between work and home, a lack of control over employees, difficulties in teamwork, and so on (Crandall et al., 2005). A meta-analysis demonstrated that working from home had small but mainly beneficial effects on proximal outcomes, such as perceived autonomy and decreased work–home conflict (Gajendran & Harrison, 2007). Working from home also had beneficial effects on more distal outcomes, such as job satisfaction, performance, turnover intention, and role stress. Hence, it is unclear whether working from home affects employee well-being positively or negatively, as the evidence from the existing literature is indeterminate and often contradictory. Since the outbreak of the Covid-19 pandemic, the concept of working from home has gained increased attention and additional meaning, as the proportion of people who worked from home experienced a first-time increase during the pandemic (Bick et al., 2020).

In addition, for many employees, the change in the overall work situation has been sudden and mandatory (Carrillo et al., 2020) leaving them unprepared for the transition. As a result, existing work-at-home literature may not apply to the pandemic situation (Wang et al., 2021). In three ways, our study attempts to contribute to the literature on work from home during the Covid-19 pandemic (Bick et al., 2020).

Moreso, previous studies have done some descriptive analyses, such as the demographic characteristics of work from home employees after the outbreak of the pandemic (Allen et al., 2015). While prior research compared employees who work from home to those who work in an office, precise comparisons were difficult to do, and the results were inconsistent because groups of employees who work from home are typically much smaller than those who work in an office. As a result, lockdown policies, such as the move to work from home during the Covid-19 pandemic, provide a unique chance to compare and contrast the experiences of employees who worked from home with those who worked from the office (Allen et al., 2015).

Additionally, different countries responded to the Covid-19 epidemic in different ways, and few studies on work from home during the pandemic in Ghana have been published. A national lockdown was declared in Ghana on 12 March 2020, and since then, working from home has been the main policy of many organizations. West African countries, such as Ghana, have dealt with the Covid-19 crisis more efficiently than most other countries due to the ease with which citizens maintain social distance and thus prevent spreading the virus. Ghana also has a public welfare system that is well adapted to reduce the negative influence of redundancies, unemployment insurance, and sick leave. The research examined the interactions between job demands (work-home conflict and workload), job resources (coworker support, leader support,

and family-work facilitation), and well-being (burnout and work engagement) in order to better understand employee thriving. It contrasted two groups: the change group (those who switched from working in the office to working from home during the pandemic) and the no-change group (those who stayed in the office) (Conyon et al., 2020).

Motivation and contribution of the study

Covid-19 changed the work environment for individuals around the world in the early 2020 (Chang et al., 2021). The Covid-19's impact on the well-being of employees who left traditional office space to work remotely is unknown. Although, numerous studies have been done on remote work and employee thriving. The main issue is that research regarding employee flourishing is lacking among the population of individuals who were asked to work from home and those who worked from different places aside the traditional working environment due to the pandemic (Chen, 2021). Lastly, to analyse the relationships between remote working and employee flourishing. Also, to achieve the objectives of the study, the following research questions were designed; **(1)**How do lecturers fare in terms of their level of employee flourishing? **(2)** What is the level of remote working among lecturers?**(3)** What is the relationship between remote working and employee flourishing?

The current research makes three contributions: first, it gives results that may encourage those who are interested in working remotely to pursue it, and it also makes suggestions on how to improve the experience for others who are not as inclined in that direction. Furthermore, it serves as an invaluable study resource for scholars and students who may be interested in investigating related subjects in the future. Finally, by helping organizations, decision-makers, and employers create better strategies and policies that support employee well-being, the research should be beneficial.

The rest of the investigation is structured as follows; section 2 of the study entails the theory that underpins the study and review of related literature. Section 3 gives a thorough explanation of the research methodology, research design, demographic, sample size, and data collection procedure. Section 4 presents the study results and discussions. Section 5 provides the conclusion, limitations and recommendations for future research.

THEORETICAL UNDERPINNING AND LITERATURE REVIEW

Social Exchange Theory and Organizational Adaptation Theory

Social Exchange Theory and Organizational Adaptation Theory operate on the premise of individual interactions where costs are exchanged for benefits. Rewards are considered as desired outcomes, while costs are perceived as valuable investments (Spash, 2015). Individuals are driven to accrue profit in these exchanges where the benefits gained are larger than the costs supplied (Spash2015). When it comes to remote working, social exchange theory can be applied to the employee-employer relationship. Employees may benefit in a variety of ways, including improved work-life balance and schedule flexibility. The employer benefits in other ways as well, such as cost savings. With the pandemic affecting remote working, there is also a profit for both the employer and the employee. Employees benefit from their jobs while maintaining safety standards, and employers profit from employees who continue to work and support the company.

Accordingly, regarding organizational adaptation theory, the organizational adaptation idea is based on the requirement for a company to adapt to its surroundings to survive. An organization should be able to adapt or change before a perceived need for change arises (Boin et al., 2015). This notion can be linked to the millennial generation and remote working. According to Deloitte's (2016) millennial survey, this generation wants a better work-life balance, which includes flexibility and the ability to work from home (Jenkins, 2018). Organizations have to adjust to this shift in the workforce by giving more flexibility and remote work

choices to these newly hired employees. Organizational adaptation theory was required as the Covid-19 pandemic spread. Organizations have to react to the requirement to keep staff working while adhering to health and safety regulations. Organizational failure resulted from the incapacity to do so. Hence, this research adopted these two theories in an attempt to have a better grasp of the relationship between remote working and employee flourishing. Thus, social exchange theory and organizational adaptation theory are two theories that apply to remote working.

EMPIRICAL LITERATURE

Remote Working

According to a recent poll, half of employees prefer cross-working arrangements, thus working some days from home and others from the office. A large percentage of respondents (41%) prefer to work totally from home, while 10% prefer working from the office (Bird, 2021). According to research, over 80% of businesses and institutions intend to have a largely remote work structure even after the COVID-19 pandemic has passed; what many businesses and organizations saw as a temporary circumstance has now become a consideration for some institutions and businesses (Brain, 2021). Remote working also known as teleworking, telecommunication, distributed work, or flexible work arrangements (Allen et al., 2015) has grown in popularity as information and communication technologies have advanced in their capabilities, particularly with the increased availability of high-speed internet (Apple et al, 2020). According to Smith et al. (2018). Remote working is defined as "a work arrangement in which employees perform their regular work at a site other than the ordinary workplace, supported by technological connections" or "a flexible work arrangement that allows employees to perform work for their employers from home or another remote location that is equipped with the appropriate computer-based technology on a periodic, regular, or exclusive basis." (Smith et al., 2018).

According to Felstead and Henseke (2017) "Remote working" encompasses a wide range of activities and can be defined in a variety of ways; one of the most common definitions is "any activity that involves the processing of information and its delivery via a telecommunications link that is carried out away primarily or partially from an organization's main premises." Remote working, when considered in this light, aids in the solving of important environmental issues as well as the transition to smart cities and communities. Patrao et al. (2020), smart cities make use of digital and communications technology to boost the efficiency of existing networks and services for its citizens and companies.

Working from Home versusworking from anywhere nexus

Beyond the traditional sorts of working in an organization's setting, the types of remote working that are relevant and explored in this study include office working, co-working, and home office working. (Nickson & Siddons, 2012). Work done in an office with co-workers from the same company is referred to as "office working." Employees who work in an office or a similar setting alongside people who are self-employed or employed by different companies are referred to as co-working. Working from home. Instead of commuting or driving to a central office, employees work from home (Kylili et al., 2020).

Accordingly, working from home is defined as working from a location that is a set distance from a corporate office. This does not always imply that the person is working from home, though it does for the vast majority of employees. Working from home allows for greater temporal flexibility, allowing the employee to set their working hours. It also eliminates the need for commuting and cuts down on sick days (Choudhury et al., 2019).

Also, in terms of geographical freedom, working from anywhere offers a distinct benefit over working from home. The employee not only chooses their hours but also where they work, with no limitations and minimal physical presence at the company (a few times per year) (Choudhury et al., 2019). This gives

workers the option of selecting a location with lower living costs or one that matches their specific needs(Choudhury et al., 2019). The COVID-19 pandemic, which is affecting the entire world, has radically altered everyday life and established procedures in all activities, including the most vital ones like the energy system, health system, and economic models that keep society running. It has altered our perceptions of many areas of our daily lives, establishing practices that restrict the spread of the virus while also being poisonous and posing major health hazards to humans and the environment (Mahmood et al., 2020).

Employee Flourishing as Eudemonic and Hedonic Nexus

A flourishing workforce's functional determinants are more likely to be eudemonic factors, which are broadly defined as social and psychological flourishing (Keyes et al., 2001). Both eudemonic and hedonic flourishing have been linked to well-being (Huppert et al., 2012). A more in-depth investigation of these characteristics of flourishing will provide additional insight into the possible benefits of a thriving workforce. Hedonic flourishing is a concept that dates back to the fourth century B. C., when Aristippus, a Greek philosopher, stated that the objective in life should be to maximize pleasure. Many philosophers, including Hobbes and Bentham, (2020) have held this hedonic viewpoint throughout history. Psychologists who study flourishing from a hedonic perspective cast a wide net by defining hedonic pleasures in terms of both mental and physical pleasures. Flourishing, in this view, entails maximum pleasure while reducing misery. Both kinds of flourishing are achieved and contribute to overall well-being in different ways. Eudemonic flourishing is achieved through experiences of meaning and purpose, while Hedonic flourishing is achieved through experiences of pleasure and enjoyment. (Fisher, 2020).

Eudemonic flourishing receives less emphasis in American culture as a whole, yet it is just as essential in happiness and well-being research (Vinney, 2020). The notion of eudaimonia, like hedonic, was first suggested by Aristotle in his Nicomachean Ethics in the fourth century B.C. According to Aristotle, one should live their life in accordance with their virtues to happiness. People, he claims, are constantly striving to reach their full potential and be their best selves, which leads to a greater sense of purpose and meaning (Vinney, 2020).

Several philosophers, including Plato, Marcus Aurelius, and Kant, allied themselves with the eudemonic perspective, like the hedonic perspective. Maslow's hierarchy of needs, which emphasizes self-actualization as the highest aim in life, promotes a eudemonic perspective on human happiness and flourishing. The CIPD (2016) propose that there are five inter domains of employee flourishing (health, personal growth, collective/social, values/principles and work) relating to both the individual and the organizations.

Employee Well-Being, Thriving, and Work-Life Balance Nexus

Physical, social, and psychological well-being are the three key components of employee well-being (Robertson et al., 2018). Earlier definitions of happiness centered on an individual's physical characteristics, whereas more modern interpretations integrate physical, emotional, mental, and social components (Simone, 2014). Personal experiences and the ability to function in the workplace are referred to as psychological flourishing (Khoreva and Wechtler, 2018). Psychological flourishing is divided into two categories: eudemonic and hedonic employee flourishing (Hoffmann-Burdziska et al., 2015). Dagenais-Desmarais and Savoie (2012), on the other hand, look at psychological well-being in terms of five factors: personal fitness at work, success at work, competence, involvement, and recognition. Previous research has looked at the impact of flexible working on the well-being of office workers (Hayman, 2010). Physical flourishing at work refers to physical health and function at work, such as exercise and sleep, as well as workplace safety, such as equipment and atmosphere (CIPD, 2019; Khoreva and Wechtler, 2018). Future studies on employee physical flourishing may, however, include aspects such as increased job load and stress, according to Khoreva and Wechtler (2018).

Furthermore, in the positive organizational scholarship and behavior movements, the concept of “thriving”

is one of the most recent to gain traction. Specifically, thriving at work has been conceptualized as a combined learning and vitality experience (Spreitzer et al., 2015). The vitality component signifies pleasant sentiments connected with having energy and zest, and such learning is characterized by the acquisition and application of new knowledge and abilities (Elliott et al., 1988). Although learning and vitality have been researched separately, recent research on thriving at work suggests that considering them together has advantages (Bernstein, 2004). This is because having both of these psychological states at the same time at work has been linked to positive outcomes for both individuals and businesses (Spreitzer et al., 2012). According to the Spreitzer et al. (2005) conceptual model of thriving at work, thriving should include self-development. Self-development entails obtaining and using feedback, establishing growth objectives, participating in developmental activities, and keeping track of one's own progress (London et al., 1999). Employees' ability to continue to learn on the job has become vital for firms to thrive and even survive as they operate in an increasingly fast-paced and complicated competitive landscape. Given the growing body of data linking thriving at work to a variety of desired human and organizational outcomes, a more profound understanding of the elements that promote thriving at work is required. Agentic work behaviors such as task attention, investigation, and heedful relating, according to Spreitzer et al. (2005), are the engine of thriving.

Accordingly, work-life balance is defined as a person's capacity to balance work and family obligations, as well as other non-work responsibilities and hobbies. Work-life balance encompasses not only the relationships between work and family functions, but also other aspects of life. The notion of work–life balance is preferred in this study due to its more comprehensive links. Scholars have characterized work-life balance in a variety of ways. Some definitions will be offered to extend our perspectives (Bodhlyera, 2017). Work–life balance, according to Greenhouse (2002), is described as contentment and good functioning at work and at home with a minimumof role conflict. Work-life balance is defined by Felstead et al. (2002) as the link between the institutional and cultural times and spaces of work and nonwork in countries where revenue is created and dispersed primarily through labour markets. Aycan et al. (2007) limited the discussion to job and family, proposed the idea of “life balance” from a broader perspective. Scholars defined life balance as satisfying demands in the three major areas of life: job, family, and personal life. Work necessitates work hours, work intensity, and the percentage of time spent working. Work-life balance involves more than only family and work life leisure, vacations, sports, and personal development programs. Work–life balance does not imply an equal distribution of time between work, family, and personal obligations. Work-life balance is also emphasized in literature as a subjective phenomenon that varies from person to person. In this context, work-life balance should be viewed as wisely allocating available resources such as time, thinking, and labour among the various aspects of life. While some people believe in “working to live” and see work as the goal, others believe in “living to work” and place work at the centre of their lives in achieving a holistic sense of well-being, such as family contentment, psychological health, and overall life satisfaction, through balancing paid job with family and personal duties (Le et al., 2020). Similarly, the work-life balance phenomenon has become a subject of worry about several firms lately. Work-life balance policies and practices are being aligned and integrated with the company's larger and more strategic goals. Organizations frequently look for different strategies to improve employee perceptions of their work-life balance. They also seek to provide a healthy work environment for their employees so that they can achieve a variety of work-related objectives such as job performance, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction (Haar et al., 2016). More notably, the exceptional coronavirus illness catastrophe of 2019 (Covid-19) pandemic has dramatically affected the notion of for work-life balance in millions of individual’s manifolds.

Remote Working and Employee Flourishing Nexus

According to Gallup's State of the American workplace report, remote work has a variety of advantages that contribute to greater employee morale. Gallup's State of the American workplace report claims that technology has aided this transition in the workplace. Although remote employment is not a new concept, the pandemic has brought it to the forefront. When it comes to remote working, there are several schools of

thought. Some say it is weak, while others believe it is worse (Kingsley & Acheampong 2022). The most common concern is employee flourishing, and the question is whether distant work promotes or worsens employee flourishing. This trend is unsurprising, given the advantages of remote work: firms may save a lot of money by cutting down on office space. Employees are frequently ecstatic about the improved work-life balance (Allen et al., 2015). And when these advantages come without sacrificing performance, it's a clear win-win situation. Employee flourishing is linked to remote working in a favorable and meaningful way(Smith et al., 2018).

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The research design outlines the guiding principles that connect the element of the methodology that was used in conducting this study. Fetters and Molina-Azorin (2018) defines research design as a plan for a study, providing the overall framework for collecting data. The questionnaires used for the main survey were guided by literature review, articles, and internet and other findings on remote working and employee flourishing. The survey collected the views of respondents on the effect of remote working on employee flourishing from lecturers in the selected universities (Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Garden City and Kumasi Technical University) in Kumasi metropolitan. This chapter further discussed the methodology of this study and provided a justification for the use of the research methods.

Quantitative research involves utilizing a questionnaire or statistics that produce numerical data (Saunders et al., 2016). Quantitative methods determine new information based on previous insights and develops this knowledge in contrast to qualitative methods which provides insights that develop new directions of theory (Bansal et al., 2018). According to Creswell (2002), thisstudy technique considers honesty or reality to be something that exists in the world and can be assessed objectively and quantitatively. This study is quantitative. For a quantitative study, the researcher collects primarily quantitative data. The hypothesis necessitate collection of quantitative data-they are expressed in a way that is clearer and quantitative analysis provide the best answer (Moore, 2016). This quantitative method was adopted in the understanding of this study.

Research Purpose

Descriptive study was used in this research purpose. Descriptive research design is a type of research design that aims to obtain information to systematically describe a phenomenon, situation, or population (Bloomfield & Fisher, 2019). More specifically, it helps answer the what, when, where, and how questions regarding the research issue. The descriptive method of research can involve the use of many different research methods to investigate the variables in question. It predominantly employs the quantitative data. This type of research is usually conducted to study a problem that has not been clearly defined yet. This study was better-off with descriptive studies because it investigates the effects remote work had on employee flourishing in the selected universities during the pandemic.

Research Population

Cooper et al. (2017) defined target population as the list of all the elements from which the sample is actually drawn. In this research study, the targeted population is lecturers in the universities. The characteristics of the targeted population are lecturers who worked remotely during the Covid-19 Pandemic. Polit & Hunger (1999) define a research population as the totality of all subjects that conform to a set of specifications, comprising the entire group of individuals that is of interest to the researchers and to whom the research can be generalized. The population of this research is lecturers in both private and public universities in Kumasi Metropolis. Kumasi Metropolis is appropriate for this study since it is one of Ghanaians main commercial and administrative centres. 150 Lecturers from both private and public

universities made up our study's population.

Sample Size and Sampling Techniques

Kindey et al. (2016) defined sampling as the process of selecting individuals to participate in research. According to Kothari and Njoya (2017), sampling size is defined as the number of items to be selected from the universe to constitute a sample. Sampling techniques are categorized into two major types, which are probability sampling method and non-probability sampling method (Alvi, 2016). The study used the quantitative approach, respondents were selected based on the simple random sampling technique, a form of probability sampling where each member of the population has an equal chance of being selected. This method helps ensure that the sample is representative of the larger population, allowing for more reliable generalizations to be made from the study's findings(Pace , 2021).

The overarching objective of this study is to explore the impact of remote work on employee flourishing. Lecturers who engaged in remote work and were readily accessible were chosen to participate in this study as they represented the target population. Given the exploratory nature of the research, the study seeks to gather the experiences and opinions of remote workers. Simple random sampling, a type of probability sampling, was utilized to select participants, ensuring an unbiased representation of the variables under study. The stratification was based on public and private universities in Kumasi, Ghana. Within each category, lecturers were selected through simple random sampling, enhancing the reliability of the sample. This process involved distributing questionnaires to lecturers who worked remotely during the pandemic. The study applied the Yamane formula, where "N" denotes the population size, "e" represents the margin of error, and "n" indicates the sample size, to determine the appropriate sample size.

The population size is (N) = 1459.

The sample size is (n) =150.

Data Collection

The research aimed to describe the relationship between remote working and employee flourishing. There are two main types of data for research. They are primary data and secondary data. This research used primary data. Primary data is data that is collected by a researcher from first-hand sources, using methods like surveys, interviews, or experiments. It is collected with the research project in mind, directly from primary sources (Windle & Silke, 2019). In this research, the primary data was obtained by handing out questionnaires to the lecturers. Primary data were processed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences version 25.

A questionnaire serves as a research tool comprising a series of inquiries and prompts aimed at gathering information from respondents (Gatton, 2012). It involves presenting a list of questions to a sample of individuals (Check & Schutt, 2012). In this study, well-structured questionnaires were effectively utilized to collect reliable data from lecturers within selected universities in the Kumasi metropolis. Questionnaires were chosen due to their ability to swiftly, efficiently, and cost-effectively gather a substantial amount of information from a sizable sample size. According to Colin et al. (2007) and Wiredu et al. (2021), the design of questionnaires should prioritize brevity, logical sequencing of questions, division into segments corresponding to the research problem, and an engaging format. These principles guided the formulation of questions in this study. The questionnaire consisted of two phases: the first phase aimed to gather demographic information from the respondents, while the final phase sought insights into remote working experiences and employee flourishing.

Data Analysis Technique

The data analysis technique helps the researchers make sense of the data collected because the data collected

at the initial phase was raw. It enables the researcher to report the result and make interpretations. How the data is analyzed depends on the data collected. The data analysis was conducted using the SPSS package (Statistical Package for Social Sciences, 2010). Descriptive statistics was computed in Microsoft Excel to determine the distribution of the data and the degrees to which the variables exist in the sample. Cronbach's alpha was computed to assess the reliability by comparing the amount of shared variance, or covariance, among the items making up the instrument. Correlations were computed utilizing Spearman's Rank-Order correlation coefficient (Stoch, 2009). Statistical significance was set at 0.05 (Stoch, 2009). Correlations between the variables were reported. Ordinal regression was computed using remote working as an independent variable and employee flourishing as the dependent variable.

Validity and Reliability

Validity according to Mugenda (2018) estimates how accurately the data obtained in the study represent a given variable in a study. Validity is trying to explain the truth of research findings as explained by Zohrabi (2013). To ensure data validity, in this study, the group together with the supervisor reviewed and checked the content validity of the tool (questionnaire) to be distributed. Validity is measured using both the theoretical and empirical evidence. Theoretical evidence is where an idea or construct is translated or represented into an operational measure. This is done by university lecturers whoratethe suitability of each item and evaluate its fitness in the definition of the construct. Empirical assessment is where the validity is based on quantitative analysis involving statistical techniques.

On the other hand, according to Dost (2011) and Wiredu et al., (2023), reliability is the extent to which measurements are repeatable when different people measure different occasions under different conditions, supposedly with alternative instruments which measure the construct or skill. It can also be defined as the degree to which the measure of a construct is consistent or dependable. In quantitative research, reliability refers to the consistency, stability, and repeatability of results; which is the result of research is considered reliable if consistent results were obtained in identical situations but different circumstances (Taber, 2017). The researcher used Cronbach's alpha as the method to analyze the reliability of this research. The values for the reliability coefficients range from 0 to 1. Cronbach's alpha coefficient below 0 indicates no reliability, 0 to <0.2 indicates slight reliability, 0.2 - <0.4 indicates fair reliability, 0.4 - <0.6 indicates moderate, 0.6 - <0.8 indicates substantial, and 0.8 – 1.0 indicates almost perfect reliability (Taber, 2017).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

This section deals with findings from the questionnaires. The section discusses the results obtained from the analyses concerning the objectives of the study. One hundred and fifty (150) questionnaires were administered to the selected sample groups, of which the valid response rate was observed to be 80%. This means that one hundred and twenty (120) questionnaires were validly filled, returned, and captured in the subsequent analysis, whereas the remaining 20%, representing thirty (30) questionnaires were either not returned, or not appropriately filled out. For that matter, the analysis is based on 80% valid responses.

Socio-demographic Characteristics of Respondents.

The sociodemographic characteristics of the respondents are presented in the tables below. The respondents of this questionnaire represented lecturers in the selected universities: Kwame Nkrumah University of science and Technology, Kumasi Technical University, and Garden City University. Out of the 120 respondents, 31 representing 25.8% were females and 89 representing 74.2% of the total survey were males who participated. 12 respondents from Garden City University participated, which represented 10%, 72 respondents from Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology participated which represented 60% and 36 respondents from Kumasi Technical University participated which represented 30%. The age distribution of the respondents shows that most of the respondents are in the category 41-50 years' the total number of respondents is 53 representing 44.2% of the total respondents. 31-40 years are 30 respondents

representing 25% of the total percentage, 50-60 years are 26 respondentsrepresenting 21.7%, 60-above years are 9 respondents representing 7.5% and 21-30 are 2 respondents which represented 1.7% of the total respondents. Regarding the marital status distribution of the respondents, a total of 110 which represented 91.7% of the sample were married, 5 which also represented 4.2% of the sample were single, and 5 which represented 4.2%. Respondents with 6-10 years of work accounted for 31.7% (38), respondents with 0-5 years of work accounted for 29.2% (35), 11-15 years of work represented 24.2% (29), and 16 years and above represented 15.0% (18). The respondents were asked to indicate their highest qualifications. According to the given data, respondents with Ph.D. were 87, representing 72.5% of the respondents. Respondents with masters' degrees were 29 representing 24.2% of the respondents. Respondents with a degree were 2 representing 1.7% of the respondents and others were also 2 representing 1.7% of the respondents which is the least respondents.

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

Demographics	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Male	89	74.2%
	female	31	25.8%
Age	21-30	2	1.7%
	31-40	30	25%
	41-50	53	44.2%
	51-60	26	21.7%
	60-above	9	7.5%
Marital status	Married	110	91.7%
	Single	5	4.2%
	Divorced	5	4.2%
Work experience	0-5 years	35	29.1%
	6-10 years	38	31.7%
	11-15 years	29	24.2%
	16 years and above	18	15%
Institution	KNUST	72	60%
	KsTU	36	30%
	Garden City	12	10%

Source: Researcher's survey 2023.

Description of Variables

Employee Flourishing

The present study findings from section three are subjected to further analysis. The statistical techniques employed here are Factor Analysis and Regression Analysis. Factor analysis was employed to extract the factors that contribute to employee level of flourishing and remote working among lecturers. Regression analysis was employed to determine the effect remote working has on employee flourishing. The analysis considered twenty variables to measure the factors. The first is EF, which represents employee flourishing in the table below. EF1, EF2, and in that order represent each item on the table. STD means standard deviation.

1. EF1= I led a purposeful and meaningful life during the COVID-19 pandemic, it follows in that order.
2. EF2= My social relationships were supportive and rewarding during the COVID-19 pandemic.
3. EF3= During the COVID-19 pandemic, I was engaged and interested in my daily activities.

4. EF4= I actively contributed to the happiness and well-being of others during the COVID-19 pandemic.
5. EF5= I was able to effectively engage in the activities that were important to me during the pandemic.
6. EF6= I am a good person and live a good life.
7. EF7= I am optimistic about my future.
8. EF8= People respect me.

Table 2: Distribution of Responses on Employee Flourishing

ITEM	1	2	3	4	5	MEAN	STD
EF1	4(3.3%)	9(7.5%)	15(12.5%)	45(37.5%)	47 (39.2%)	4.02	1.061
EF2	3(2.5%)	16(13.3%)	10(8.3%)	49(40.8%)	42(35.0%)	3.93	1.094
EF3	1(0.8%)	9(7.5%)	21(17.5%)	53(44.2%)	36(30.0%)	3.95	0.924
EF4	0	14(11.7%)	11(9.2%)	55(45.8%)	40(33.3%)	4.01	0.948
EF5	3(2.5%)	13(10.8%)	11(9.2%)	41(34.2%)	52(43.3%)	4.05	1.091
EF6	0	0	6(5.0%)	43(35.8%)	71(59.2%)	4.54	0.593
EF7	0	0	9(7.5%)	44(36.7%)	67(55.8%)	4.48	0.635
EF8	0	1(0.8%)	20(16.7%)	42(35.0%)	57(47.5%)	4.29	0.771

Source: Researcher's survey 2023

Remote Working

The results from the remote work data collected from the respondents have been presented in the table below. In the table below, the second variable, which is remote working, is represented by RW. RW1, RW2, and so on represent the items under the variable.

RW1= I was able to communicate through various electronic modes such as email, WhatsApp, chat, skype, Zoom, and Microsoft Teams.

RW2= My role was essential for achieving the objectives of the university through working remotely.

RW3= I had enough knowledge/technical know-how to carry out my work remotely without or with minimal supervision.

RW4= I was provided with all the required resources (laptop/desktop/internet) etc. for remote working.

RW5= My university provided all the software/technology needed for remote working (virtual classroom).

RW6= Provisions were made for digital/virtual meetings of staff with students during the COVID-19 pandemic

RW7= The University paid additional operational costs like internet charges while working remotely.

RW8= Prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, I had an experience of working remotely

RW9= my meeting with other lecturers/students were remote-friendly during the COVID-19 pandemic.

RW10= I felt workplace isolation while working remotely during the COVID-19 pandemic (R).

RW11= I was able to connect to other lecturers through remote working and had fun during the COVID-19 era.

RW12= I felt I was alienated from the workplace and teamwork during remote working.

Table 3: Distribution of Responses on Remote Working

ITEMS	1	2	3	4	5	MEAN	STD
RW1	3 (2.5%)	1(0.8%)	7(5.8%)	35(29.2%)	74(61.7%)	4.88	4.601
RW2	1(1.7%)	5(4.2%)	14(11.7%)	40(33.3%)	59(49.2%)	4.24	0.935
RW3	3(2.5%)	4(3.3%)	20(16.7%)	51(42.5%)	42(35.0)	4.04	0.938
RW4	17(14.2%)	25(20.8%)	26(21.7%)	39(32.5%)	13(10.85)	3.05	1.242
RW5	14(11.7%)	14(11.7%)	35(29.2%)	40(33.3%)	17(14.2%)	3.27	1.193
RW6	9(7.5%)	13(10.8%)	24(20.0%)	52(43.3%)	22(18.3%)	3.54	1.137
RW7	29(24.2%)	29(24.2%)	25(20.8%)	25(20.8%)	12(10.0%)	2.68	1.316
RW8	4(3.3%)	10(8.3%)	33(27.5%)	38(31.7%)	35(29.2%)	3.75	1.071
RW9	5(4.2%)	14(11.7%)	27(22.5%)	47(39.2%)	27(22.5%)	3.64	1.083
RW10r	8(6.8%)	51(42.5%)	35(29.2%)	18(15.0%)	8(6.7%)	2.7250	1.02048
RW11	5(4.2%)	21(17.5%)	35(29.2%)	42(35.0%)	17(14.2%)	3.38	1.062
RW12	16(13.3%)	38(31.7%)	30(25.0%)	29(24.2%)	7(5.8%)	2.78	1.134

Source: Researcher's survey 2023

Measurements Issues

Reliability Statistics

The Cronbach's alpha values were calculated to assess the internal consistency reliabilities of employee flourishing and remote working, as shown in table 1 Hinton et al. (2004) have suggested four cut-off points for reliability, which include excellent reliability (0.90 and above), high reliability (0.70-0.90), moderate reliability (0.50-0.70) and low reliability (0.50 and below). For the remote working construct, the results indicated a high reliability value of 0.856. Furthermore, employee flourishing gave moderate reliability of 0.684.From table 4, the KMO value .727 (that is greater than .6, acceptable range), and Bartlett's test is significant (p <0.000). This is indicative that Factor Analysis used was appropriate. Also, by comparing Apha-value of 0.05 to the significance value (p-value) of 0.000, the p-value is less than the Apha-value. The study therefore is in Favor of the alternate hypothesis and conclude, there is high correlation among Indicator variables and therefore factor analysis is appropriate

Table 4: Reliability Test for Employee Flourishing and Remote Working

Item	Cronbach's alpha	N of item
Remote working	0.856	12
Employee flourishing	0.684	8

Source: Researcher's survey 2023

Table 4: KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure Sampling Adequacy.		**.727**
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	923.383
	Df	190
	Sig	0.000

Source: Researcher's survey 2023

Total Variance Explained

The study used Kaiser's criterion to determine the number of components to extract. Criterion was based on the values of eigenvalues. In general, the choice is eigenvalue greater than one. That is the factors, which are having eigenvalue high or equal to 1 will be extracted though the analysis.

Table 5: Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigenvalues		
	eigenvalue	% Of variation	Cumulative
1	5.075	24.332	24.332
2	3.034	14.549	38.880
3	1.838	8.812	47.693
4	1.724	8.264	55.957
5	1.408	6.751	62.708
6	1.283	6.153	68.861
7	.999	4.789	73.649
8	.816	3.910	77.559
9	.711	3.408	80.967
10	.648	3.107	84.074
11	.583	2.797	86.871
12	.571	2.739	89.609
13	.480	2.301	91.911
14	.382	1.830	93.741
15	.326	1.564	95.305
16	.263	1.261	96.566
17	.253	1.212	97.779
18	.213	1.022	98.800
19	.132	.632	99.433
20	.118	.567	100.000

Source: Researcher's survey 2023

From the Table 6 below, going by the eigenvalue greater-than-one rule, it can be seen that six (6) out of twenty variable component explains 68.861% of the total variation in the data set. With the first component alone explaining 24.332% of the total variation, with the second, third and fourth components explaining 14.549%, 8.812% and 8.264% of the total variations in the data set respectively. The fifth and sixth component explains 6.751 and 6.153 percent respectively. The remaining sixteen variables accounted for 31.139% of the total variance. This suggest that six factor model is adequate for this study.

Table 6: Unrotated Component Matrix

	Component					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
EF1	**.525**	**.618**	-.113	.082	-.110	.238
EF2	**.683**	**.553**	-.358	-.127	-.081	.008
EF3	**.675**	.271	-.028	.002	-.026	-.075
EF4	**.628**	.269	-.042	.003	-.090	-.324
EF5	**.625**	**.690**	-.186	-.145	-.023	.070
EF6	.148	.320	.031	.034	-.039	-.075

EF7	.206	.266	.115	.049	-.119	-.120
EF8	.377	.127	.189	.012	-.178	-.274
RW1	.176	.037	-.009	.211	.448	.163
RW2	.469	-.099	.251	.130	.400	-.132
RW3	.357	-.247	.137	-.098	.407	.422
RW4	**.545**	-.418	**-.791**	-.105	.177	.457
RW5	**.646**	-.378	-.273	**.584**	.123	-.303
RW6	**.558**	**-.513**	-.018	.454	.119	-.306
RW7	**.529**	**-.716**	-.003	.155	**-.826**	.245
RW8	.489	-.104	**.535**	-.117	-.147	.387
RW9	**.613**	-.111	**.529**	-.152	.148	.074
RW11	**.665**	-.094	.466	-.152	.074	.022
RW12	.352	-.362	-.162	**-.784**	-.005	-.377
RW10	-.135	.454	.139	**.590**	-.116	.203

Source: Researcher's survey 2023

Using a cut-off of 0.5, the first factor loads highly on 12 variables (EF 1, EF 2, EF 3, EF 4, EF 5, R 4, RW 5, RW 5, RW 6, RW 7, RW 9 and RW 11). Therefore, the first factor can be described as the general view of respondents on the factor that contributes to employee flourishing among lecturers and remote working. The second factor loads highly on Purposeful and meaningful life (EF 1), Supportive and Rewarding social relationship (EF 2) and effectively engaged in activities (EF 5) as main component for employee flourishing. The variable RW 6 (Virtual meeting of staff with student) and RW 7 (Operational cost) as component of remote working recorded negative values. These variables can be seen as contrasting variable to employee flourishing. The second factor can therefore be seen the component of Employee Flourishing at the workplace. The third factor loads on RW 8 (Experience working remotely) and WR 9 (Lecturers/student were remote-friendly). These variables can therefore be regard as Remote working environment. The fourth factor loads highly on RW 5 (Provide needed technology) and RW 10 (Workplace Isolation). These variables can be related to workplace challenges. The fifth component loads negatively on RW 7 (Operational cost) while the Sixth component loads does not meet the required cut-off point for selection.

The unrotated table above does not give factors that clearly indicate the level of employee flourishing and remote working. Variable EF 1, EF and EF 5 loaded high on factor component 1 and 2, RW 9 load on factor 1 and 3. Which is a problem associated with quartimax method.

The Quartimax method is a factor rotation technique used in exploratory factor analysis (EFA). In EFA, the goal is to identify underlying factors that explain the correlations among observed variables. Factor rotation is applied to simplify the interpretation of these factors

Therefore, the study proceeded to conduct the rotation factor solution.

Rotated Factor Solution

The final factor solution obtained in this way might not adequately explain the relationship among the original variables. As a result of this, there is the need to rotate this initial factor solution to obtain an alternative solution for consideration. A way to obtain an alternative solution is to rotate the initial factor solution. A number of rotation methods are available. In Table 7 the obtained a rotation of the solution in Table 7

Table 7: Rotated Component Matrix

	Component					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
EF1	**.795**	.127	-.072	-.263	.154	.026
EF2	**.930**	.004	.048	.105	.211	.010
EF3	**.641**	.250	.239	.070	.031	.024
EF4	**.642**	.120	.320	.169	-.158	.027
EF5	**.940**	.109	-.088	.002	.126	-.098
EF6	.325	.004	-.021	-.085	-.126	-.066
EF7	.320	.072	.031	-.069	-.208	.021
EF8	.339	.182	.195	.089	-.307	.113
RW1	.041	.181	.201	-.189	.268	-.350
RW2	.110	.449	.433	.048	-.007	-.288
RW3	-.069	**.560**	.078	.040	.459	-.153
RW4	.170	-.015	.310	.304	**1.044**	.201
RW5	.168	.028	**1.006**	-.011	.183	.097
RW6	-.031	.211	**.908**	.069	.048	.114
RW7	-.064	.306	.387	.074	.177	**1.129**
RW8	.124	**.783**	-.069	-.067	.023	.288
RW9	.177	**.798**	.164	.140	-.067	-.017
RW11	.252	**.744**	.200	.176	-.080	.045
RW12	.087	.128	.042	**1.001**	.031	.095
RW10	.169	-.098	-.034	-.766	-.140	-.022

Source: Researcher's survey 2023

From table 7 above, the significant factors that contribute to the level of flourishing among lecturers are having a purposeful and meaningful life (EF 1), supportive and rewarding social relationship (EF 2), being engaged and interested in daily activities (EF 3), contributing to happiness and well-being of others (EF 4), and effective in activities that were important (EF 5). Factor 1 can therefore term the first factor as employee level of flourishing factor. Factor 2 consists of; having enough knowledge/technical know-how (RW 3), had enough working experience (RW 8), lecturer/student were remote friendly (RW 9) and being able to connect to other lecturers (RW 11). The third factor (Factor 3) loads on provided software/technology needed (RW 5) and Provisions were made for digital/virtual meeting (RW 6). This factor can be classified as the institution's contribution to remote working. The fourth factor, fifth and sixth factor loads highly on WR 12, WR 4 and WR 7 respectively. These factors can be classified as alienated from workplace and team, resources required for remote working and additional operational cost.

CORRELATION

The Spearman's correlation coefficient is a measure of linear association between two variables. The values of the correlation coefficient range from -1 to 1. The sign of the correlation coefficient indicates the direction of the relationship (positive or negative). The absolute value of the correlation coefficient indicates the strength, with larger absolute values indicating stronger relationships.

Table 8: Correlation Analysis Establishing Relationship between Employee Flourishing and Remote Working.

	Employee flourishing	Remote Working
Employee Flourishing	1	.313

Remote Working	.313	1
Sig. (2 tailed)		0.000

Source: Researcher's survey 2023

From the above Correlation matrix table, Employee flourishing has a positive correlation with Remote working. The relationship is significant at 5 percent significance level.

1. The null and alternative hypotheses are

H_0: There is no significant correlation among some of the variables

H_1: There is significant correlation among some of the variables

Regression Analysis

This research made use of this method to ascertain the effect of remote working on employee flourishing. From the model summary table below, the *R* of 0.313 means there exist a weak positive association among the response variable (Employee flourishing) and predictor variable (Remote working). The R^2 of 0.098 signifies that, remote working explains 9.8 percentage of the variation in employee flourishing.

Table 9: Model Summary for Remote working and employee flourishing

Mode	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	DurbinWatson
	.313	.098	.090	.77801	1.569
a. Predictors: (Constant): Remote Working					
b. Dependent Variable: Employee Flourishing					

Source: Researcher's survey 2023

The Analyses of Variance table shows a sig. value of .000. This mean rejecting the hypothesis of no difference in favor of the alternate hypothesis, that at least one mean among the groups is different since the significance value is .000 less than .05. This means that, overall model is significant at 5% significance level.

Descriptive Result

The descriptive statistics section seeks to describe the data by the use frequencies means and standard deviations. It does not allow conclusion and generalization to be made on the outcome of the study, it simply summarizes the data into meaningful way and give the researcher an idea of the patterns that emerge from the data. Table 10 and 11 depicts the descriptive result of the study.

Table 10: Descriptive Result

	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Mean		Std. Deviation	Variance	Skewness		Kurtosis	
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Std. Error
EF Total	120	21.00	19.00	40.00	33.2667	.46858	5.13308	26.348	-.685	.221	-.133	.438
RW	120	33.00	23.00	56.00	42.1083	.61149	6.69855	44.87	-.163	.221	-.329	.438

Total								1				
Valid N (list wise)	120											

Source: Researcher's survey 2023

Table 11: ANOVA Result

		SS	df	MS	F	Sig.
	Regression	7.763	1	7.763	12.826	.000[b]
	Residual	71.425	118	.605		
	Total	79.188	119			
a. Response Variable: Employee Flourishing						
b. Predictors: (Constant) Remote Working						

Source: Researcher's survey 2023

From the coefficient table below, it can be observed that; the constant, employee flourishing and remote working are all significant. Since these variables recorded significant values that are less than 0.05.

Table 12: Coefficients Explaining the Effect of Remote Working on Employee Flourishing

Model		Unstandardized		Standardized	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
	(Constant)	2.751	.353		7.787	.032
	Remote working	.335	.093	.313	3.581	.002

Source: Researcher's survey 2023

The coefficient for the constant is 2.751 and that of remote working is 0.335. The relationship can be modelled as employee flourishing=2.751+ 0.335 remote working. That is a percentage increase in remote working will lead to an increase of 0.335 in the employee flourishing.

The findings agree with the assertion made by Keeling et al. (2015) and Vega et al. (2015) they presumed that; Remote workers enjoy superior flexibility in their work due to portable communications and lack of physical monitoring by offering an environmentally friendly practices due to less commuting which enhance employee productivity. The study supports the finding of Hayman (2010) and Yadav et al. (2014) that suggests that, Work-life balance, stress, workload, and job satisfaction are all characteristics that may influence well-being. They proposed concerns such as organizational support, work-life balance, workaholic, and job satisfaction as factors that may influence employee well-being.

Key Findings and Conclusion

The research studied the effect of remote working on employee flourishing in some selected universities in Ghana. Its objectives are; examining the level of employee flourishing among university lecturers, to determine the level of remote learning among lecturers in the selected universities and analyse the relationship between remote working and employee flourishing. Also, a total of 120 lecturers participated in the study. The literature review revealed twenty factors that influence the level of employee flourishing and remote working among lecturers. That is communicate through various modes, essential role, knowledge and technical know-how, provide required resources, provide needed technology for virtual classroom, provide digital meeting for staff and student, university paid additional operation cost, experienced remote

working, remote friendly meetings, workplace isolation, connect with other lecturers, alienated from teamwork, purposeful and meaningful life, supportive and rewarding, engaged and interested in activities, happiness and well-being, effectively engaged in activities, living a good life, optimistic about future and respect me. However, the factor analysis brought out six key factors that explain 68.87 percent of the factors that influence the level of employee flourishing and remote working. The level of employee flourishing among lecturers is influenced by having a purposeful and meaningful life, supportive and rewarding social relationship, being engaged and interested in daily activities, contributing to happiness and well-being of others, and effective in activities that were important. While the level of remote working is influenced by having enough knowledge/technical know-how, had enough working experience, lecturer/student were remote-friendly and being able to connect to other lecturers.

Furthermore, regression analyses were also use to test the impact of the predictor variable on the response variables. The study found a positive relationship between employee remote working and employee flourishing. The effect of remote working on employee flourishing can be modelled as $Employee\ Flourishing = 2.751 + 0.335\ Remote\ Working$. That is a percentage increase in remote working will lead to an increase of 0.335 in the Employee flourishing.

Accordingly, the study concluded that, the key variable to determine the level of employee flourishing among university lecturers are having a purposeful and meaningful life, supportive and rewarding social relationship, being engaged and interested in daily activities, contributing to happiness and well-being of others, and effective in activities that were important. Having enough knowledge/technical know-how, had enough working experience, lecturer/student were remote friendly and being able to connect to other lecturers are the determinants of the level of remote working among lecturers. Remote working has a positive relationship with employee flourishing.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The study recommends the following based on the results from the study: ***first,*** management of universities must have organized and support programs that seek the general well-being of lecturers. This will help in a long way to improve employee efficiency. ***Second,*** universities management must make provision for the required technology to enhance learning. This can be done by forming technical support team that work effectively.

Further Research

This research explores the effect of remote working on employee flourishing among university lecturers. The study however failed to analyse the impact of these variables on academic performance. The study therefore recommends further study into the impact of employee flourishing and remote working on lecturers' duties on students' academic performance.

Declaration Statements

Conflict of interest

The author declares no conflict of interest.

Data availability statement

Data used for the study will be provided upon request from the corresponding author.

Funding

This research received no external funding.

Informed consent statement

Not applicable.

REFERENCES

1. Adisa, T.A., Ogbonnaya, C. and Adekoya, O.D., (2021). Remote working and employee engagement: a qualitative study of British workers during the pandemic. Information Technology & People.
2. Allen, T.D.; Golden, T.D.; Shockley, K.M.,(2015). How effective is telecommuting? Assessing the status of our scientific findings. Psychol. Sci. Public Interest. 16, 40–68.
3. Bick, A.; Blandin, A.; Mertens, K., (2020). Work from Home after the COVID-19 Outbreak; Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas: Dallas, TX, USA.
4. Bloomfield, J. and Fisher, M.J., (2019). Quantitative research design. Journal of the Australasian Rehabilitation Nurses Association, 22(2), pp.27-30.
5. Bodhlyera, R., (2017). Relationships between work-life balance practices and retention of academics at a South African University (Doctoral dissertation).
6. Carillo, K.; Cachat-Rosset, G.; Marsan, J.; Saba, T.; Klarsfeld, A. (2020) Adjusting to epidemic-induced telework: Empirical insights from teleworkers in France. Eur. J. Inf. Syst. 30, 69–88.
7. Conyon, M.J.; He, L.; Thomsen, S. (2020). Lockdowns and COVID-19 deaths in Scandinavia. SSRN, preprint.
8. Crandall, W.; Gao, L. An Update on Telecommuting: (2005). Review and Prospects for Emerging Issues. SAM Adv. Manag. J., 70, 30–37
9. Curtis, S., Gesler, W., Smith, G. and Washburn, S., (2000). Approaches to sampling and case selection in qualitative research: examples in the geography of health. Social science & medicine, 50(7-8), pp.1001-1014.
10. D.R.; Usunov, J.; Kornazheva, B.P. (2001). Need satisfaction, motivation, and well-being in the work organizations of a former eastern bloc country: A cross-cultural study of self-determination. Personal. Soc. Psychol. Bull., 27.
11. Dyrbye, L.N.; Satele, D.; Shanafelt, T. (2016). Ability of a 9-Item Well-Being Index to Identify Distress and Stratify Quality of Life in US Workers. J.Occup. Environ. Med., 58.
12. Emmons, R.A., (1986). Personal strivings: An approach to personality and subjective well-being. Journal of Personality and Social psychology, 51(5), p.1058.
13. Fetters, M. D., & Molina-Azorin, J. F. (2018). Rebuttal—Conceptualizing Integration During Both the DataCollection and Data Interpretation Phases: A Response to David Morgan. Journal of Mixed Methods Research, 13(1), 12–14. https://doi.org/10.1177/1558689818780596a
14. G.S.W.B., (2018). About the Gallup-Sharecare Well-Being Index. Erişimtarihi, 23.
15. Gajendran, R.S.; Harrison, D.A. (2007). The good, the bad, and the unknown about telecommuting: Meta-analysis of psychological mediators and individual consequences. J. Appl. Psychol., 92, 1524.
16. Gillet, N., Fouquereau, E., Forest, J., Brunault, P. and Colombat, P., (2012). The impact of organizational factors on psychological needs and their relations with well-being. Journal of Business and Psychology, 27(4), pp.437-450.
17. Grant, A.M., Christianson, M.K. and Price, R.H., (2007). Happiness, health, or relationships? Managerial practices and employee well-being trade-offs. Academy of management perspectives, 21(3), pp.51-63.
18. Guest, D.E. Human resource management and employee well-being: (2017). Towards a new analytic framework. Hum. Resour. Manag. J. 27, 22–38.
19. Hornung, S. and Glaser, J., (2009). Home-based telecommuting and quality of life: further evidence on an employee-oriented human resource practice. Psychological Reports, 104(2), pp.395-402.
20. Johnson, J.; Hall, L.H.; Berzins, K.; Baker, J.; Melling, K.; Thompson, C. (2018). Mental healthcare staff well-being and burnout: A narrative review of trends, causes, implications, and recommendations for future interventions. Int. J. Ment. Health Nurs. 27, 20–32.

21. Johnson, S., Robertson, I. and Cooper, C.L., (2018). Psychological well-being. in well-being (pp. 45-55).
22. Jordan, A.M., Kim, S.E., Van de Voorde, K., Pokorski, J.K. and Korley, L.T., (2017). In situ fabrication of fiber reinforced three-dimensional hydrogel tissue engineering scaffolds. Acs Biomaterials Science & Engineering, 3(8), pp.1869-1879.
23. Juchnowicz, M. and Kinowska, H., (2021). Employee well-being and digital work during the COVID-19 pandemic. Information, 12(8), p.293.
24. Kernis, M.H., (2005). Measuring self-esteem in context: The importance of stability of self-esteem in psychological functioning. Journal of personality, 73(6), pp.1569-1605.
25. Kniffin, K.M.; Narayanan, J.; Anseel, F.; Antonakis, J.; Ashford, S.P.; Bakker, A.B.; Bamberger, P.; Bapuji, H.; Bhave, D.P.; Choi, V.K.; et al. (2021). Covid-19 and the workplace: Implications, issues, and insights for future research and action. Am. Psychol. 76, 63–77. Mack, E., (2020). The history of broadband. In Geographies of the Internet (pp. 63-76).
26. Maguire, S.J., (2019). A Qualitative Investigation into Remote working in the Recruitment Industry and the Influence it has on Employee Well-Being (Doctoral dissertation, Dublin, National College of Ireland).
27. Martins, F., Patrão, C., Moura, P. and de Almeida, A.T., (2021). A Review of Energy Modeling Tools for Energy Efficiency in Smart Cities. Smart Cities, 4(4), pp.1420-1436.
28. Melendez, J., (2020). Happiness at Work: A Phenomenological Investigation of Clinic Managers.
29. Menges, J.I., Tussing, D.V., Wihler, A. and Grant, A.M., (2017). When job performance is all relative: How family motivation energizes effort and compensates for intrinsic motivation. Academy of Management Journal, 60(2), pp.695-719.
30. Misselbrook, D. ((2014), W is for Well-being and the WHO definition of health. Br. J. Gen. Pract. 64, 582.
31. Niessen, C., Sonnentag, S. and Sach, F., (2012). Thriving at work—A diary study. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 33(4), pp.468-487.
32. Patrão, C., Moura, P. and Almeida, A.T.D., (2020). Review of smart city assessment tools. Smart Cities, 3(4), pp.1117-1132.
33. Porath, C., Spreitzer, G., Gibson, C. and Garnett, F.G., (2012). Thriving at work: Toward its measurement, construct validation, and theoretical refinement. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 33(2), pp.250-275.
34. Pöysäri, A., 2020. Cultural Aspects of Telecommuting: Does individualism affect telecommuting outcomes?
35. Price, R.H.; Grant, A.M.; (2007). Christianson, M.K. Happiness, Health, or Relationships? Managerial Practices and Employee Well-Being Trade-offs. Acad. Manag. Perspect. 21.
36. Roy, B.; Riley, C.; Herrin, J.; Spatz, E.S.; Arora, A.; Kell, K.P.; Welsh, J.; Rula, E.Y.; (2018). Krumholz, H.M. Identifying County characteristics associated with resident well-being: A population-based study. PLoS ONE, 13.
37. Ryan, R.M.; Deci, E.L. (2001). On happiness and human potentials: A review of research on hedonic and eudaimonic well-being. Annu. Rev. Psychol., 52.
38. Ryff, C.D. (1989). Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning of psychological well-being. J. Pers. Soc. Psychol. 57, 1069–1081.
39. Deci, E.L; Ryan, R.M; Gagné, M; Leone, Saltiel, F. (2020). Who can work from home in developing countries. COVID Econ. 7, 104–118.
40. Seligman, M.E.P. Flourish: (2012). A Visionary New Understanding of Happiness and Well-Being; Atria Books: New York, NY, USA.
41. Soga, L.R., Bolade-Ogunfodun, Y., Mariani, M., Nasr, R. and Laker, B., (2022). Unmasking the other face of flexible working practices: A systematic literature review. Journal of Business Research, 142, pp.648-662.
42. Sparks, B. and McCann, J., (2021). Scenario Planning for a Post-Pandemic Workplace. International Management Review, 17(2), pp.23-145.

43. Spash, C.L., (2015). Bulldozing biodiversity: The economics of offsets and trading-in Nature. Biological conservation, 192, pp.541-551.
44. Stoch, F., Artheau, M., Brancelj, A., Galassi, D.M. and Malard, F., (2009). Biodiversity indicators in European ground waters: towards a predictive model of stygobiotic species richness. Freshwater Biology, 54(4), pp.745-755.
45. Suhail, A., Dar, K.A. and Iqbal, N., (2022). COVID-19 related fear and mental health in Indian sample: The buffering effect of support system. Current Psychology, 41(1), pp.480-491.
46. Swanson, S., Todd, S., Inoue, Y. and Welty Peachey, J., (2022). Leading for multidimensional sport employee well-being: the role of servant leadership and teamwork. Sport Management Review, pp.1-23.
47. Tinker, S., (2014). Flourishing through identification and engagement: Sustaining employee health and effectiveness (Doctoral dissertation, Deakin University).
48. Van De Voorde, K; Paauwe, J; Van Veldhoven, M. (2012). Employee Well-being and the HRM-Organizational Performance Relationship: A Review of Quantitative Studies. Int. J. Manag. Rev.
49. Vinney, C., (2020). What's the Difference Between Eudaimonic and Hedonic Happiness? ThoughtCo.
50. Vyas, L. and Butakhieo, N., (2021). The impact of working from home during COVID-19 on work and life domains: an exploratory study on Hong Kong. Policy design and practice, 4(1), pp.59-76.
51. Wang, B.; Liu, Y.; Qian, J.; Parker, S.K. (2021). Achieving effective remote working during the COVID-19 pandemic: A work design perspective. Appl. Psychol. 70, 16–59.
52. Wang, B.; Liu, Y.; Qian, J.; Parker, S.K. (2021). Achieving effective remote working during the COVID-19 pandemic: A work design perspective. Appl. Psychol. 70, 16–59.
53. Warr, P. (2006). Differential activation of judgments in employee well-being. J. Occup. Organ. Psychol. 79, 225–244.
54. Wiredu, J., Bo, Y., Yang, Q., & Agyemang, S. A. (2021). Customer Satisfaction on the Impact of ICT Based Products on Rural Banks: A Case Study of Anyinam-Rural Bank Limited in Ghana. Journal of Business, 9(4), 192–204.
55. Wiredu, J., Yang, Q., Saljoughipour, S., Olufunke, E. C., Sampene, A. K., & Brenya, R. (2023). Stimulating environmental performance through green human resource practice: Does green transformational leadership matter? Journal of Infrastructure, Policy and Development, 7(1), 2127.
56. Whitman, D.S., Van Rooy, D.L. and Viswesvaran, C., (2010). Satisfaction, citizenship behaviors, and performance in work units: A meta-analysis of collective construct relations. Personnel psychology, 63(1), pp.41-81.