Chapter 4

Research Results

This chapter shows the results of the data analysis. Demographic fundamentals, current situation analysis, Descriptive statistics Report The number of observations, percentage (%), mean, and standard deviation used to describe the demographic characteristics of the sample. Then, the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient is used to explore the relationship between the independent variables. Next, the effect of HRD interventions (self-varying) on the overall efficiency of (dependent variable) remote work is analyzed and reported using ordinary least squares (OLS).

Basic Information About The Sample

This section is intended to report general information about the respondents. The information reported in this section includes the nature of the company, age distribution, job title, working week, marital status and partner's working attire, the highest level of education of the employee, and work experience prior to joining the organization. These data are detailed in the following table (see Table 4.1-4.4).

Table 4.1 Basic Information of Sample

Items		Frequency	Percent
Age	22-24	51	10.20
	25-29	154	30.80
	30-34	182	36.40
	35-39	77	15.40
	40~	36	7.20
Gender	Male	252	50.40
	Female	248	49.60

Table 4.1 Basic Information of Sample (Cont.)

Items		Frequency	Percent
Education	Junior	20	4.00
	College	234	46.80

Master	154	30.80
Doctor	77	15.40
Other	15	3.00

The study included a total of 500 participants and conducted a detailed investigation of the distribution of different age groups and genders.

In terms of age distribution, 51 subjects were 22-24 years old, accounting for 10.2% of the total. There were 154 subjects aged 25-29, accounting for 30.8% of the total. There were 182 subjects aged 30~34, accounting for 36.4% of the total; There were 77 subjects aged 35-39, accounting for 15.4% of the total; There were 36 subjects aged 40 and over, accounting for 7.2% of the total. It can be seen that subjects between the ages of 25 and 25 occupy the majority of the sample and as a whole show a certain normality.

In terms of gender distribution, there were 252 male subjects, accounting for 50.4%; There were 248 female subjects, accounting for 49.6%. The gender distribution is relatively balanced, and the number of male and female subjects is basically equal.

In addition, for the academic qualifications of the subjects, the junior college degree accounted for 4% of the total, the undergraduate degree accounted for 46.8% of the total, the postgraduate degree accounted for 30.8% of the total, the doctor's degree accounted for 15.4% of the total, and the other 15 people who did not want to disclose their academic degree or lower education accounted for 3% of the total. It can be seen that there are a large number of subjects with a bachelor's degree or above, indicating that the subjects have a higher educational background as a whole.

Table 4.2 Basic Family Information of Sample

	Items	Frequency	Percent
Marital status	Unmarried	138	27.60
	Married without children	85	17.00
	Married with children	214	42.80
	Divorced and childless	42	8.77
	Divorced with children	21	4.20
Partners' work	Unemployed	83	27.76
	Same company	16	5.35

	Different companies	167	55.85
	Different cities	33	11.04

Among the 500 subjects, 138 were unmarried, accounting for 27.6%; There were 85 married subjects without children, or 17 percent; There were 214 married subjects with children accounting for 42.8%; There were 42 divorced subjects without children, accounting for 8.77%; There were 21 divorced subjects with children (4.2%).

Among the 299 married subjects, 83 had non-working partners, accounting for 27.76%; There were 16 partners working in the same company, accounting for 5.35%; There were 167 people whose partner worked in the same city but not in the same company, accounting for 55.85%; There were 33 people whose partner did not work in the same city, accounting for 11.04%.

Of the 500 subjects, 235 had children, while of the 299 who were married, 33 were separated from their partners. A screening of the raw data revealed that eight of the 33 were married without children and the remaining 25 were married with children, meaning that at least 25 of the children were not living with their parents at the same time. These data results provide an in-depth understanding of the subjects' family status and partners and provide an important reference for research and analysis. At the same time, we noticed that the family situation may have a certain impact on the behavior and psychological state of the subjects.

Table 4.3 Basic Information of Work of Sample

	Items	Frequency	Percent
Nature enterprise	foreign	153	30.60
	private	271	54.20
	state-owned	76	15.20
Work type	management	43	8.60
	R&D	277	55.40
	Salse	72	14.40
	Operation and maintenance	108	21.60
Job title	ordinary staff	457	91.40
	grass-roots management	27	5.40
	middle management	11	2.20
	top management	5	1.00
	~1	15	3.00

Work experience	2~5	254	50.80
	5~10	154	30.80
	10~	77	15.40
Telework is active	active	400	80.00
	passive	100	20.00

Among the 500 subjects, the nature of the enterprise was involved: 153 worked in foreign companies, accounting for 30.6%; 271 people worked in private enterprises, accounting for 54.2%; 76 people worked in state-owned enterprises, accounting for 15.2 percent. As can be seen from the data, private enterprises accounted for the vast majority of subjects, while the proportion of state-owned enterprises and foreign enterprises was relatively small.

In terms of job types, 43 people were engaged in management work, accounting for 8.6%; 277 people engaged in research and development, accounting for 55.4%; 72 people engaged in sales work, accounting for 14.4%; 108 people were engaged in operation and maintenance work, accounting for 21.6%. The proportion of research and development staff is the highest, while the proportion of management and sales staff is relatively low.

In the job distribution, 457 were ordinary staff, accounting for 91.4%; 27 were grass-roots managers, accounting for 5.4%; 11 were middle managers, accounting for 2.2%; 5 were senior managers, accounting for 1%. Most of the subjects were ordinary staff, with a smaller proportion of senior managers.

In terms of work experience, 15 people just started to work, and working experience is less than 1 year, accounting for 3%; 254 people have 2-5 years of work experience, accounting for 50.8%; 154 people have 5~10 years of work experience, accounting for 30.8%; 77 people have more than 10 years of work experience, accounting for 15.4%. The number of people with work experience of 2-5 years is the largest, while the number of people with more than 10 years of work experience is relatively small.

In terms of the telecommuting initiative, 400 people took the initiative or responded positively to telecommuting, accounting for 80%; There are 100 passive telecommuters, accounting for 20%. Most of the subjects had a positive attitude toward telecommuting, but some were more passive.

Table 4.4 Work Intensity of Sample

Items	Frequency	Percent

Work hours in day	1~2	11	2.20
	2~4	57	11.40
	4~8	231	46.20
	8~	201	40.20
Work days in week	~1	16	3.20
	2~3	66	13.20
	3~5	224	44.80
	5~	194	38.80

In the daily work intensity statistics, it is found that 11 people, accounting for 2.2%, work remotely for 1-2 hours every day; 57 people (11.4%) work remotely for two to four hours a day. 46.2 percent (231) of them work remotely for four to eight hours a day. The number of people working remotely for more than eight hours a day was 201, or 40.2 percent.

In the weekly work intensity statistics, the number of people who telecommute less than or equal to 1 day per week is 16, accounting for 3.2%; There were 66 telecommuters 23 days a week, accounting for 13.2%; There were 224 people working remotely for 35 days per week, accounting for 44.8%; There are 194 people who telecommute more than 5 days per week, accounting for 38.8%.

We learned that most of the subjects worked remotely for 4~8 hours a day, accounting for 46.2%; In terms of work intensity per week, the largest number of people telecommute 3-5 days per week, accounting for 44.8%. In addition, 40.2 percent work more than eight hours a day remotely. The number of people who telecommute more than 5 days per week reached 38.8%. The researchers concluded that this is strongly related to the 996 work system implemented by Chinese IT enterprises.

Through the above data analysis and summary, we have a comprehensive understanding of the sample group of this study. These data provide the basis for research and analysis, as well as for interpretation and inference of the results.

Analysis of Current Situation (Descriptive Statistics)

According to the literature in Chapter 2 and the conceptual model, the researchers divided 48 scale questions into 8 independent variables and 3 dependent variables and performed score calculations. Finally, the average of the three variable scores was calculated to obtain the total score as shown in the following table.

As can be seen from the above table, the average value of all influencing factors is greater than 4 points, which indicates that the overall subjects agree with many influencing factors in telecommuting. Among them, the average influence factor of communication is the highest, reaching 5.12 points, indicating that most subjects believe that communication is a very important factor in remote work. Secondly, the mean of organizational culture is 5.07 points, the mean of asynchronous work is 5.01 points, the mean of environment is 4.96 points, and the mean of management is 4.74 points. The average of the technology was 4.71, the average of the teleworker characteristic was 4.65, and the average of the final job characteristics was 4.53.

Table 4.5 Descriptive Statistics of Independent Variables

Variables	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
environment	500	3.00	6.50	4.96	0.74
job_characteristics	500	2.75	5.50	4.53	0.43
teleworker_characteristics	500	2.25	6.50	4.65	0.67
communication	500	2.50	6.50	5.12	0.75
management	500	2.90	6.30	4.74	0.82
organizational_culture	500	1.50	6.50	5.07	1.18
technology	500	2.50	6.50	4.71	0.84
asynchronous_work	500	2.25	6.25	5.01	0.80

In summary, the subjects generally agreed with the factors affecting remote work, especially communication, organizational culture, and asynchronous work.

Table 4.6 Descriptive Statistics of Dependent Variables

Variables	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
job_effectiveness	500	2.50	6.50	5.00	0.61
worklife_blance	500	3.25	6.50	4.90	0.58
well_being	500	2.50	6.50	4.92	0.72
Overall score	500	40.48	92.86	70.54	8.75

As can be seen from the above table, the average score of all telecommuting feelings is greater than 4 points, which indicates that the overall subjects have a good

feeling about the efficiency, life-work balance, and happiness of telecommuting. Specifically, the subjects' average value on job_effectiveness is the highest, reaching 5.0, indicating that they generally believe that remote work effectiveness is high. Secondly, the average score for well-being was 4.92, and the average score for work-life balance was 4.9, indicating that the subjects had better well-being and life-work balance in remote working.

Overall, the participants had a positive attitude toward work efficiency, work-life balance, and happiness in telecommuting.

Difference Comparison of Demographic Variables

1. Comparison of Age Differences

From the Table 4.7, the environment, job characteristics, teleworker characteristics, management, technology, asynchronous work, The significance of job effectiveness, work-life balance, and well-being were all less than 0.05, which proved that there were significant differences between these items in sample age. At the same time, through the above data, we can see that 30-34 years old and 34-39 years old have a higher overall recognition of various factors related to remote work, and the total score reaches 72.23 and 72.14 respectively, while it can be found that the overall difference between 22 and 24 years old is only 63.

Table 4.7 One-way ANOVA for Age

Variables	Age					F	P
	22~24	25~29	30~34	35~39	40~		
environment	4.47	4.87	5.05	5.18	5.10	9.60	0.00
	±0.79	±0.71	±0.70	±0.68	±0.77		
job_characteristics	4.00	4.60	4.59	4.61	4.48	26.18	0.00
	±0.53	±0.37	±0.35	±0.39	±0.49		
teleworker_characteristics	3.75	4.63	4.82	4.89	4.65	35.61	0.00
	±0.70	±0.63	±0.53	±0.56	±0.69		
communication	4.99	5.21	5.16	4.99	5.02	1.78	0.13
	±0.83	±0.70	±0.77	±0.74	±0.76		

Table 4.7 One-way ANOVA for Age (Cont.)

Variables	Age					F	P
	22~24	25~29	30~34	35~39	40~		
management	4.59	4.88	4.80	4.56	4.46	3.87	0.00

						t	P
	±0.77	±0.83	±0.78	±0.79	±0.91		
organizational_culture	4.95 ±1.30	5.08 ±1.19	5.15 ±1.11	4.97 ±1.12	4.95 ±1.44	0.57	0.69
technology	4.32 ±0.91	4.90 ±0.77	4.78 ±0.80	4.50 ±0.79	4.52 ±1.04	7.03	0.00
asynchronous_work	3.93 ±0.82	4.95 ±0.76	5.18 ±0.69	5.36 ±0.48	5.12 ±0.76	37.90	0.00
job_effectiveness	4.34 ±0.72	5.00 ±0.58	5.14 ±0.50	5.13 ±0.54	4.91 ±0.70	21.13	0.00
worlife_blance	4.45 ±0.61	4.90 ±0.53	4.98 ±0.54	5.04 ±0.56	4.75 ±0.67	11.16	0.00
well_being	4.44 ±0.86	4.94 ±0.70	5.05 ±0.64	4.98 ±0.64	4.73 ±0.86	8.28	0.00
Overall score	63.00 ±10.09	70.69 ±8.27	72.24 ±7.56	72.14 ±7.96	68.52 ±10.26	13.56	0.00

2. Comparison of Gender Differences

Table 4.8 T-test for Gender

Variables	Male	Female	t	P
environment	5.01±0.78	4.90±0.69	0.04	0.84
job_characteristics	4.59±0.43	4.47±0.42	1.03	0.31
teleworker_characteristics	4.63±0.68	4.67±0.66	0.42	0.52
communication	5.07±0.79	5.17±0.72	0.13	0.72
management	4.74±0.82	4.74±0.82	0.00	0.98
organizational_culture	5.11±1.17	5.02±1.20	0.03	0.86
technology	4.67±0.83	4.75±0.85	0.23	0.64
asynchronous_work	5.05±0.79	4.96±0.81	0.00	0.99
job_effectiveness	5.00±0.62	4.99±0.61	0.08	0.77

Table 4.8 T-test for Gender (Cont.)

Variables	Male	Female	t	P
worlife_blance	4.92±0.58	4.87±0.58	0.03	0.86
well_being	4.93±0.73	4.91±0.71	0.10	0.75
overall score	70.73±8.85	70.34±8.65	0.09	0.76

Through the above data, it can be found that there is no significant difference between genders in various factors in telecommuting, and there is no significant difference in the total score, which proves that men and women have similar feelings

about telecommuting, but women still bear more housework in daily social production and life, so it reflects from the side that there are some factors in telecommuting that lead to this phenomenon.

3. Comparison of Educational Background Differences

Table 4.9 One-way ANOVA for Educational Background

Variables	Educational background					F	P
	junior	college	master	Doctor	other		
environment	4.71±0.80	4.94±0.75	4.99±0.71	5.10±0.70	4.63±0.78	2.14	0.08
job_characteristics	3.90±0.36	4.56±0.38	4.68±0.34	4.46±0.38	3.55±0.40	49.19	0.00
teleworker_ characteristics	3.64±0.60	4.46±0.56	5.07±0.49	4.89±0.50	3.37±0.60	73.64	0.00
communication	4.95±0.73	5.20±0.76	5.12±0.74	4.94±0.75	5.05±0.77	2.06	0.09
management	4.52±0.74	4.94±0.81	4.71±0.76	4.32±0.78	4.33±0.81	10.84	0.00
organizational_ culture	4.81±1.33	5.12±1.17	5.09±1.16	4.89±1.23	5.10±1.12	0.82	0.51
technology	4.18±0.81	4.90±0.77	4.85±0.75	4.19±0.80	3.59±0.88	23.87	0.00
asynchronous_ work	3.89±0.13	4.60±0.25	5.92±0.21	5.20±0.12	2.40±0.18	1,558.55	0.00
job_effectiveness	4.23±0.60	4.93±0.49	5.35±0.50	4.97±0.54	3.62±0.61	58.64	0.00
worlife_blance	4.54±0.66	4.88±0.52	5.05±0.56	4.91±0.58	4.02±0.54	15.01	0.00
well_being	4.34±0.81	4.95±0.69	5.09±0.66	4.81±0.69	4.00±0.77	13.35	0.00
overall score	62.38±9.54	70.27±7.82	73.78±7.86	69.93±8.28	55.40±8.84	25.07	0.00

From the above data, it can be seen that job characteristics, teleworker characteristics, communication, technology, asynchronous work, The significance of job effectiveness, work-life balance, and well-being were all less than 0.05, which could prove that there were significant differences in these items in the educational background of samples. At the same time, from the above data, we can see that the sample with a master's degree has a higher overall recognition of various factors related to remote work, and the total score is 73.78, followed by the sample with a college degree and Doctor degree, the total score is 70.27 and 69.93, respectively. The lower total score of the sample with junior education and the sample with other education is 62.38 and 55.4 respectively, and the difference between the sample with master education and the sample with other education is about 18.38. It can be seen from the citation that there are significant differences between samples with different educational backgrounds in this study. Further observation shows that in asynchronous work, the sample with

other degrees is only 2.4, while that of the master is 5.92. It seems that education is positively related to the ability to do asynchronous work.

4. Comparison of Corporate Nature Differences

Table 4.10 One-way ANOVA for Corporate Nature

Variables	Corporate nature			F	P
	foreign	private	state-owned		
environment	5.68±0.50	4.70±0.57	4.41±0.58	197.27	0.00
job_characteristics	4.77±0.36	4.46±0.40	4.27±0.43	49.55	0.00
teleworker_characteristics	5.11±0.56	4.54±0.58	4.11±0.62	84.98	0.00
communication	5.52±0.66	5.05±0.70	4.58±0.71	50.25	0.00
management	5.81±0.38	4.35±0.38	3.98±0.37	905.47	0.00
organizational_culture	5.91±0.77	5.02±0.97	3.51±0.88	180.48	0.00
technology	5.50±0.56	4.23±0.66	4.83±0.65	198.74	0.00
asynchronous_work	5.02±0.78	4.98±0.82	5.07±0.79	0.36	0.70
job_effectiveness	5.49±0.41	4.87±0.54	4.46±0.50	128.20	0.00
worlife_blance	5.53±0.31	4.68±0.43	4.38±0.33	316.83	0.00
well_being	5.63±0.39	4.74±0.55	4.13±0.52	266.61	0.00
Overall score	79.32±4.81	68.04±6.84	61.78±6.01	254.49	0.00

Through the above data can be seen that the environment, job characteristics, teleworker characteristics, communication, management, The significance of organizational culture, technology, job effectiveness, work-life balance and well-being are all less than 0.05, which proves that there are significant differences between these items in the nature of the company where the samples are located. Among them, the sample working in foreign enterprises had higher identification with the overall influencing factors than the sample working in state-owned enterprises. From the perspective of total score, 79.32 and 61.78, respectively, the gap is 18.32.

5. Job Type Difference Comparison

Table 4.11 One-way ANOVA for Job Type

Variables	Job type				F	P
	management	R & D	Salse	O & M		
environment	4.52±0.61	5.35±0.57	4.63±0.64	4.35±0.61	93.69	0.00
job_characteristics	4.95±0.34	4.55±0.42	4.34±0.39	4.44±0.41	23.12	0.00
teleworker_characteristics	5.17±0.58	4.75±0.62	4.48±0.64	4.29±0.65	25.85	0.00
communication	5.32±0.56	5.34±0.69	5.11±0.70	4.47±0.65	45.35	0.00
management	4.76±0.77	4.94±0.78	4.74±0.79	4.23±0.73	21.69	0.00

					F	P
organizational_culture	5.28±0.84	5.70±0.82	4.68±0.85	3.59±0.81	176.62	0.00
technology	5.26±0.69	5.00±0.72	4.38±0.72	3.98±0.71	65.85	0.00
asynchronous_work	4.57±0.94	5.04±0.81	5.13±0.74	5.02±0.71	5.00	0.00
job_effectiveness	5.12±0.51	5.18±0.57	4.89±0.58	4.57±0.55	31.72	0.00
worlife_blance	4.72±0.52	5.08±0.53	4.81±0.52	4.54±0.57	29.01	0.00
well_being	5.10±0.60	5.19±0.62	4.73±0.62	4.29±0.66	56.22	0.00
overall score	71.12±7.26	73.54±7.83	68.70±7.71	63.82±8.21	41.28	0.00

Through the above data can be seen that the environment, job characteristics, teleworker characteristics, communication, management, organizational culture, technology, asynchronous work, job effectiveness, work-life balance, The significance of well-being is less than 0.05, which proves that all items have significant differences in sample job types. Among them, the sample whose job type is R&D has a higher sense of identity than the sample whose job type is Operation and Maintenance. The total score is 73.54 and 63.82 respectively, with a gap of 9.72.

6. Position Level Comparison

Table 4.12 One-way ANOVA for Position Level

Variables	Position level				F	P
	Ordinary staff	grass-roots management	middle management	top management		
environment	5.00±0.74	4.59±0.68	4.41±0.56	4.35±0.22	6.03	0.00
job_characteristics	4.49±0.42	4.94±0.39	4.93±0.25	5.05±0.21	16.77	0.00
teleworker_ characteristics	4.60±0.66	5.25±0.65	5.11±0.34	4.90±0.55	10.49	0.00
communication	5.10±0.77	5.39±0.59	5.27±0.53	5.05±0.45	1.41	0.24
management	4.74±0.82	4.92±0.70	4.70±0.92	4.06±0.26	1.58	0.19
organizational_ culture	5.04±1.21	5.20±0.88	5.52±0.81	5.18±0.72	0.72	0.54
technology	4.66±0.84	5.51±0.62	4.98±0.64	4.50±0.41	9.71	0.00
asynchronous_work	5.05±0.78	4.87±0.97	4.02±0.63	4.15±0.70	8.37	0.00
job_effectiveness	4.99±0.62	5.23±0.55	5.05±0.37	4.65±0.29	1.92	0.13
worlife_blance	4.91±0.58	4.77±0.51	4.77±0.55	4.35±0.34	2.22	0.09
well_being	4.90±0.73	5.26±0.62	4.98±0.47	4.50±0.31	2.69	0.05
overall score	70.48±8.88	72.66±7.44	70.45±6.32	64.29±4.21	1.39	0.24

Based on the above data, it can be seen that environment, job characteristics, teleworker characteristics, technology, and The significance of asynchronous work are

less than 0.05, which proves that these terms are significantly different in the sample job types. Further observation shows that there are big differences between grass-roots management and top management in technology and asynchronous work, which reflects that top management is less dependent on more specific technologies and working methods.

7. Year of Work Experience Difference Comparison

Table 4.13 One-way ANOVA for Year of Work Experience

Variables	Year of Work experience				F	P
	~1	2~5	5~10	10~		
environment	4.63±0.78	4.92±0.76	4.99±0.71	5.10±0.70	2.28	0.08
job_characteristics	3.55±0.40	4.51±0.41	4.68±0.34	4.46±0.38	40.79	0.00
teleworker_characteristics	3.37±0.60	4.40±0.61	5.07±0.49	4.89±0.50	76.88	0.00
communication	5.05±0.77	5.18±0.76	5.12±0.74	4.94±0.75	2.05	0.11
management	4.33±0.81	4.91±0.81	4.71±0.76	4.32±0.78	12.58	0.00
organizational_culture	5.10±1.12	5.10±1.18	5.09±1.16	4.89±1.23	0.67	0.57
technology	3.59±0.88	4.85±0.79	4.85±0.75	4.19±0.80	25.71	0.00
asynchronous_work	2.40±0.18	4.54±0.31	5.92±0.21	5.20±0.12	1,448.32	0.00
job_effectiveness	3.62±0.61	4.88±0.53	5.35±0.50	4.97±0.54	62.00	0.00
worlife_blance	4.02±0.54	4.85±0.54	5.05±0.56	4.91±0.58	17.48	0.00
well_being	4.00±0.77	4.90±0.72	5.09±0.66	4.81±0.69	12.56	0.00
overall score	55.40±8.84	69.65±8.23	73.78±7.86	69.93±8.28	26.55	0.00

From the above data, it can be seen that job characteristics, teleworker characteristics, management, technology, asynchronous work, The significance of job effectiveness, work-life balance, and well-being were all less than 0.05, which could prove that there were significant differences between these items in the sample years of work experience. For further observation, the samples with 5 to 10 years of work experience had the highest sense of identity, while the samples with less than 1 year of work experience had the lowest sense of identity, and the total score was 73.78 and 55.4, respectively, with a gap of 18.38. The difference between the total score of 2-5 years of work and 10 years of work is similar, and the identity of various factors of remote work is gradually improved from the beginning of work to 10 years of work, and it is slightly decreased after 10 years of work.

8. Comparison of Marital Status Differences

Table 4.14 One-way ANOVA for Marital Status

Variables	Marital status					F	P
	unmarried	married without children	married with children	divorced and childless	divorced with children		
environment	4.82±0.74	4.99±0.80	5.11±0.69	4.78±0.69	4.60±0.77	5.34	0.00
job_ characteristics	4.45±0.44	4.64±0.39	4.56±0.42	4.33±0.48	4.60±0.40	5.29	0.00
teleworker_ characteristics	4.54±0.71	4.66±0.63	4.75±0.63	4.36±0.74	4.93±0.57	5.25	0.00
communication	5.21±0.74	5.07±0.79	5.11±0.73	5.07±0.79	4.93±0.88	0.94	0.44
management	4.77±0.78	4.68±0.80	4.76±0.87	4.63±0.77	4.80±0.69	0.42	0.80
organizational_ culture	5.17±1.16	4.91±1.33	5.08±1.15	5.07±1.17	4.84±1.01	0.82	0.51
technology	4.77±0.84	4.71±0.77	4.69±0.87	4.60±0.87	4.79±0.85	0.47	0.76
asynchronous_ work	5.01±0.81	5.07±0.86	4.97±0.80	4.91±0.79	5.23±0.61	0.80	0.53
job_effectiveness	5.01±0.68	5.05±0.59	5.00±0.57	4.83±0.70	5.05±0.50	1.00	0.41
worlife_blance	4.87±0.58	4.88±0.57	4.95±0.58	4.71±0.59	4.95±0.48	1.54	0.19
well_being	4.89±0.73	4.91±0.74	4.96±0.72	4.77±0.73	5.07±0.64	0.87	0.48
overall score	70.35±9.14	70.67±8.63	70.95±8.53	68.17±9.36	71.77±7.43	1.01	0.40

It can be seen from the above data that the significance of environment, job characteristics, and teleworker characteristics are all less than 0.05, which proves that these items have significant differences in the marital status of the samples. Further, married and divorced people with children who are accompanied by a partner are more likely to identify with remote work than unmarried and divorced people without children

9. Differences in Working Status of Partners

Table 4.15 One-way ANOVA for Working Status of Partners

Variables	Working status				F	P
	unemployed	same company	different companies	different cities		
environment	5.07±0.74	4.72±0.40	5.15±0.73	4.88±0.69	2.71	0.05
job_characteristics	4.60±0.41	4.59±0.29	4.57±0.42	4.61±0.41	0.13	0.94
teleworker_characteristics	4.74±0.66	4.66±0.56	4.74±0.63	4.63±0.66	0.37	0.78
communication	5.08±0.76	4.97±0.51	5.12±0.76	5.09±0.80	0.24	0.87
management	4.74±0.92	4.54±0.58	4.72±0.82	4.91±0.92	0.78	0.50
organizational_culture	4.97±1.35	4.91±0.87	5.08±1.15	4.99±1.24	0.24	0.87
technology	4.74±0.86	4.54±0.63	4.68±0.85	4.72±0.88	0.31	0.82
asynchronous_work	5.05±0.82	5.11±0.74	4.98±0.79	4.92±0.96	0.32	0.81
job_effectiveness	5.02±0.63	4.94±0.37	5.02±0.56	4.95±0.61	0.23	0.87
worlife_blance	4.93±0.62	4.80±0.38	4.94±0.58	4.92±0.55	0.31	0.82
well_being	4.98±0.77	4.88±0.39	4.94±0.72	4.92±0.76	0.12	0.95
overall score	71.08±9.24	69.57±4.97	70.98±8.44	70.42±8.84	0.18	0.91

From the above data, it can be seen that the significance of all items is greater than or equal to 0.05, which proves that these items do not have significant differences in the work status of the sample partners. Further observation: People whose partners do not work have a higher sense of identification with remote work than those who work for the same company as their partners.

10. Comparison of Remote Worker Passive Difference

Table 4.16 T-test for Remote Worker Passive

Variables	Remote worker status		t	P
	active	passive		
environment	5.00±0.73	4.79±0.75	0.04	0.84
job_characteristics	4.55±0.42	4.45±0.46	1.03	0.31
teleworker_characteristics	4.76±0.63	4.22±0.67	0.42	0.52
communication	5.16±0.74	4.94±0.78	0.13	0.72

Table 4.16 T-test for Remote Worker Passive (Cont.)

Variables	Remote worker status		t	P
	active	passive		
management	4.78±0.81	4.56±0.83	0.00	0.98

organizational_culture	5.10±1.18	4.93±1.17	0.03	0.86
technology	4.80±0.82	4.34±0.83	0.23	0.64
asynchronous_work	4.99±0.82	5.08±0.75	0.00	0.99
job_effectiveness	5.05±0.60	4.81±0.64	0.08	0.77
worlife_blance	4.94±0.57	4.73±0.59	0.03	0.86
well_being	4.98±0.70	4.68±0.75	0.10	0.75
overall score	71.25±8.52	67.68±9.10	0.09	0.76

From the above data, it can be seen that the significance of all items is greater than or equal to 0.05, which proves that there is no significant difference between these items in the sample's initiative for remote work. Taking a closer look, people who volunteered to work remotely reported higher levels of identification.

11. Daily Working Time Difference Comparison

Table 4.17 One-way ANOVA for Daily Working Time

Variables	Daily working time				F	P
	1~2	2~4	4~8	8~		
environment	5.07±0.75	5.16±0.71	4.97±0.75	4.88±0.73	2.20	0.09
job_characteristics	4.93±0.28	4.63±0.44	4.62±0.42	4.37±0.40	18.29	0.00
teleworker_characteristics	5.00±0.61	4.65±0.77	4.63±0.64	4.65±0.68	1.05	0.37
communication	4.39±0.42	5.49±0.65	5.32±0.71	4.82±0.70	28.42	0.00
management	4.94±0.84	4.84±0.88	4.68±0.80	4.76±0.82	0.96	0.41
organizational_culture	5.57±1.13	5.15±1.05	4.96±1.23	5.14±1.16	1.71	0.17
technology	4.89±0.70	4.83±0.87	4.76±0.81	4.62±0.87	1.65	0.18
asynchronous_work	5.07±0.90	4.96±1.02	5.00±0.77	5.01±0.78	0.08	0.97
job_effectiveness	5.07±0.51	5.06±0.71	5.03±0.61	4.94±0.60	0.99	0.40

Table 4.17 One-way ANOVA for Daily Working Time

Variables	Daily working time				F	P
	1~2	2~4	4~8	8~		
worlife_blance	5.02±0.49	4.98±0.62	4.88±0.58	4.88±0.58	0.70	0.55
well_being	5.11±0.62	5.00±0.78	4.92±0.72	4.89±0.71	0.60	0.61
overall score	72.40±7.58	71.60±9.68	70.61±8.70	70.05±8.60	0.65	0.58

According to the above data, it can be seen that job characteristics and the significance of communication are less than 0.05, which proves that there are significant

differences between the two items in the daily working hours of the samples. Further looking at the sample with shorter working hours per day in terms of total score, the agreement on remote work was higher, but this was not significant.

12. Difference of Working Days Per Week

Table 4.18 One-way ANOVA for Working Days Per Week

Variables	Working days per week				F	P
	~1	2~3	3~5	5~		
environment	4.81±0.82	5.06±0.69	4.97±0.74	4.92±0.75	0.86	0.46
job_characteristics	4.59±0.57	4.58±0.37	4.62±0.39	4.40±0.46	10.53	0.00
teleworker_characteristics	4.50±0.96	4.73±0.69	4.64±0.60	4.65±0.72	0.59	0.62
communication	4.27±0.74	5.60±0.61	5.47±0.60	4.63±0.60	91.68	0.00
management	4.74±0.91	4.78±0.77	4.72±0.80	4.75±0.85	0.09	0.97
organizational_culture	5.08±1.19	5.18±1.17	5.04±1.17	5.05±1.20	0.23	0.88
technology	4.65±0.98	4.85±0.79	4.79±0.81	4.58±0.87	2.71	0.05
asynchronous_work	5.02±1.10	4.91±0.90	5.02±0.75	5.01±0.81	0.37	0.78
job_effectiveness	4.77±0.88	5.08±0.58	5.07±0.56	4.91±0.65	3.33	0.02
worlife_blance	4.75±0.67	4.94±0.58	4.93±0.56	4.86±0.59	0.96	0.41
well_being	4.73±0.94	5.04±0.71	4.97±0.68	4.84±0.75	2.25	0.08
overall score	67.86±11.67	71.68±8.37	71.25±8.23	69.54±9.10	2.23	0.08

It can be seen from the above data that job characteristics are the same as daily working time. The significance of communication is less than 0.05, which proves that there are significant differences between the two items in the daily working time of samples. Further looking at the sample with shorter working hours per day in terms of total score, the agreement on remote work was higher, but this was not significant.

Correlation Analysis

After the previous demographic differences, it is further verified that there is a significant correlation between each dimension and remote work output, and correlation analysis is carried out. Through the above data, you can find environment, job characteristics, teleworker characteristics, communication, management, organizational culture, technology, asynchronous work and job effectiveness, work-life balance, and well-being are all positively correlated.

Table 4.19 Bivariate Correlations of All Variables

	environment	job characteristics	teleworker characteristics	communication	management	organizational culture	technology	asynchronous work	job effectiveness	worlife blance	well being	overall score
environment	1											
job_ characteristics	.484**	1										
Teleworker characteristics	.595**	.669**	1									
communication	.604**	.494**	.408**	1								
management	.759**	.463**	.536**	.517**	1							
Organizational culture	.772**	.387**	.546**	.612**	.729**	1						
technology	.643**	.558**	.569**	.565**	.763**	.548**	1					
Asynchronous work	.133**	.383**	.546**	-0.018	-0.002	-0.003	.156**	1				
job_effectiveness	.722**	.710**	.845**	.594**	.684**	.682**	.695**	.537**	1			
Worlife blance	.834**	.590**	.722**	.553**	.834**	.707**	.692**	.325**	.850**	1		
Well-being	.834**	.653**	.777**	.668**	.846**	.842**	.748**	.255**	.888**	.896**	1	
overall score	.832**	.680**	.815**	.635**	.824**	.782**	.744**	.382**	.951**	.952**	.972**	1

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Analysis of Influencing Factors

1. Job Effectiveness

From data analysis, it can be seen that the linear regression model has a good fit, R square=0.91 > 0.6, which means that the result of this operation can truly and reliably reflect the environment, job characteristics, teleworker characteristics, communication, management, etc. The influence of organizational culture, technology, and asynchronous work on job effectiveness. There is no multicollinearity between the 8 variables, and VIF is all less than 5. The regression equation was significant, F=623.126, P<0.001, meaning that at least one of the eight variables can significantly affect the dependent variable job effectiveness.

Job characteristics could significantly influence satisfaction (B=0.162 P<0.05), teleworker characteristics had a significant positive impact on satisfaction (B=0.211 P<0.05), communication had a significant positive impact on satisfaction (B=0.134 P<0.05), management had a significant positive impact on satisfaction (B=0.148 P<0.05), organizational culture had a significant positive impact on satisfaction (B=0.109 P<0.05), asynchronous work can significantly positively affect satisfaction (B=0.273 P<0.05).

Finally, the regression equation between the variables is as follows:

job effectiveness = -0.364 + job characteristics * 0.162 + teleworker characteristics * 0.211 + communication*0.134 + management * 0.148 + organizational culture * 0.109 + asynchronous work * 0.273

Table 4.20 Linear Regression of All Independent Variables and Job Effectiveness

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Tolerance	VIF
	B	Std. Error	Beta				
(Constant)	-0.364	0.098	0	-3.719	0	0	0
environment	0.022	0.021	0.026	1.025	0.306	0.283	3.535
job_characteristics	0.162	0.028	0.114	5.673	0	0.454	2.205
teleworker_characteristics	0.211	0.023	0.231	9.29	0	0.295	3.385
communication	0.134	0.016	0.165	8.303	0	0.465	2.151
management	0.148	0.021	0.198	7.084	0	0.235	4.257
organizational_culture	0.109	0.013	0.21	8.381	0	0.29	3.451
technology	0.05	0.017	0.069	2.905	0.004	0.326	3.069
asynchronous_work	0.273	0.014	0.357	19.038	0	0.52	1.922
R Square							0.91
F							623.126
P(Sig.)							.000b

2. Work-life Balance

From the data analysis, it can be seen that the linear regression model has a good fit, R square=0.875>0.6, which means that the result of this operation can truly and reliably reflect the environment, job characteristics, teleworker characteristics, communication, management, etc. The influence of organizational culture, technology, and asynchronous work on work-life balance.

There is no multicollinearity between the 8 variables, and VIF is all less than 5. The regression equation was significant, F=430.081,P<0.001, meaning that at least one of the eight variables can significantly affect the dependent variable work-life balance.

environment could significantly influence satisfaction (B=0.259 P<0.05), teleworker characteristics had a significant positive impact on satisfaction (B=0.11 P<0.05), communication had a significant positive impact on satisfaction (B=0.054 P<0.05), management had a significant positive effect on satisfaction (B=0.392 P<0.05), technology can significantly negatively affect satisfaction (B=-0.064 P<0.05), asynchronous work can significantly positively affect satisfaction (B=0.155 P<0.05)

Finally, the regression equation between the variables is as follows:

work-life balance = 0.354 + environment*0.259 + teleworker characteristics * 0.11 + communication * 0.054 + management * 0.392 + technology * -0.064 + asynchronous work * 0.155

Table 4.21 Linear Regression of All Independent Variables and Work-life Balance

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Tolerance	VIF
	B	Std. Error	Beta				
(Constant)	0.354	0.109	0	3.251	0.001	0	0
environment	0.259	0.023	0.331	11.027	0	0.283	3.535
job_characteristics	0.045	0.032	0.034	1.424	0.155	0.454	2.205
teleworker_characteristics	0.11	0.025	0.128	4.369	0	0.295	3.385
communication	0.054	0.018	0.071	3.025	0.003	0.465	2.151
management	0.392	0.023	0.553	16.802	0	0.235	4.257
organizational_culture	-0.013	0.015	-0.026	-0.892	0.373	0.29	3.451
technology	-0.064	0.019	-0.093	-3.335	0.001	0.326	3.069
asynchronous_work	0.155	0.016	0.215	9.706	0	0.52	1.922
R Square							0.875
F							430.081
P(Sig.)							.000b

3. Well-being

From the data analysis, it can be seen that the linear regression model has a good fit, R square=0.947>0.6, which means that the result of this operation can truly and reliably reflect the environment, job characteristics, teleworker characteristics, communication, management, etc. The influence of organizational culture, technology, and asynchronous work on well-being.

There is no multicollinearity between the 8 variables, and VIF is all less than 5. The regression equation was significant, F=1099.946, P<0.001, meaning that at least one of the eight variables can significantly affect how well-being the dependent variable is.

environment can significantly influence satisfaction (B=0.078 P<0.05), job characteristics could significantly influence satisfaction (B=0.162 P<0.05), teleworker characteristics could significantly influence satisfaction (B=0.228 P<0.05), communication significantly influenced satisfaction (B=0.112 P<0.05), management could significantly influence satisfaction (B=0.285 P<0.05), organizational culture could significantly influence satisfaction (B=0.186 P<0.05), asynchronous work significantly positively influenced satisfaction (B=0.081 P<0.05).

Finally, the regression equation between the variables is as follows:

well-being = -0.644 + environment * 0.078 + job characteristics * 0.162 + teleworker characteristics * 0.228 + communication * 0.112 + management * 0.285 + organizational culture * 0.186 + asynchronous work * 0.081

Table 4.22 Linear Regression of All Independent Variables and Well-Being

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Tolerance	VIF
	B	Std. Error	Beta				
(Constant)	-0.644	0.088	0	-7.299	0	0	0
environment	0.078	0.019	0.08	4.097	0	0.283	3.535
job_characteristics	0.162	0.026	0.097	6.28	0	0.454	2.205
teleworker_characteristics	0.228	0.02	0.213	11.134	0	0.295	3.385
communication	0.112	0.015	0.117	7.678	0	0.465	2.151
management	0.285	0.019	0.323	15.082	0	0.235	4.257
organizational_culture	0.186	0.012	0.305	15.821	0	0.29	3.451
technology	0.024	0.016	0.028	1.557	0.12	0.326	3.069
asynchronous_work	0.081	0.013	0.09	6.256	0	0.52	1.922
R Square							0.947
F							1099.946
P(Sig.)							.000b

4. Telework Outcomes

From the data analysis, it can be seen that the linear regression model has a good fit, R square=0.954>0.6, which means that the result of this operation can truly and reliably reflect the environment, job characteristics, teleworker characteristics, communication, management, etc. The impact of organizational culture, technology, and asynchronous work on the overall score. There is no multicollinearity between the 8 variables, and VIF is all less than 5. The regression equation was significant, F=1286.439, P<0.001, meaning that at least one of the eight variables can significantly affect how well-being the dependent variable is.

environment can significantly influence satisfaction (B=1.707 P<0.05), job characteristics could significantly influence satisfaction (B=1.754 P<0.05), teleworker characteristics could significantly influence satisfaction (B=2.612 P<0.05), communication significantly influenced satisfaction (B=1.43 P<0.05), management could significantly influence satisfaction (B=3.93 P<0.05), organizational culture could significantly influence satisfaction (B=1.346 P< 0.05), asynchronous work had a significant positive influence on satisfaction (B=2.419 P<0.05).

Finally, the regression equation between the variables is as follows:

Telework outcomes = -3.115 + environment * 1.707 + job characteristics * 1.754 + teleworker characteristics * 2.612 + communication * 1.43 + management * 3.93 + organizational culture * 1.346 + asynchronous work * 2.419

Table 4.23 Linear Regression of All Independent Variables and Telework Outcomes

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Tolerance	VIF
	B	Std. Error	Beta				
(Constant)	-3.115	0.993	0	-3.137	0.002	0	0
environment	1.707	0.214	0.144	7.972	0	0.283	3.535
job_characteristics	1.754	0.289	0.087	6.063	0	0.454	2.205
teleworker_characteristics	2.612	0.23	0.201	11.352	0	0.295	3.385
communication	1.43	0.164	0.123	8.724	0	0.465	2.151
management	3.93	0.213	0.367	18.479	0	0.235	4.257
organizational_culture	1.346	0.132	0.182	10.163	0	0.29	3.451
technology	0.049	0.175	0.005	0.28	0.779	0.326	3.069
asynchronous_work	2.419	0.145	0.222	16.644	0	0.52	1.922
R Square						0.954	
F						1286.439	
P(Sig.)						.000b	

Summary

By comparing the variables of demographic differences, it is found that different job types have significant differences for all factors, followed by different company nature with only one item that has no significant difference, and in fact, age and educational background with only two items that have no significant difference, followed by job type, work experience, marital status, and working hours per day and per week. At the same time, it was found that gender, partner's working status, and remote work initiative did not have significant differences for all factors. After all the independent variable factor analysis environment, job characteristics, teleworker characteristics, communication, management, organizational culture, technology, and asynchronous work all have a significant impact on at least one of the three dependent variables, job effectiveness, work-life balance, and well-being. Among them, technology has the least impact on the overall situation, while management has the most impact on the overall situation. In a comprehensive analysis, remote worker characteristics, job characteristics, communication, management, organizational culture, environment, asynchronous work, and technology have a positive impact on remote work outcomes, including work efficiency, work-life balance, and happiness.