TURKISH PSYCHOLOGICAL COUNSELING AND GUIDANCE JOURNAL
2025, VOL. 15, NO. 77, 376-392

Official Journal of
Turkish Psychological Counseling
and Guidance Association

ISSN: 1302 – 1370, E-ISSN: 2822 – 6569 https://doi.org/10.17066/tpdrd.1515439

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Hedonic vs. Eudaimonic Ways of Living on the Path to Well-Being and Psychological Distress: Turkish Validation of HEMA-R

Mustafa SUBAŞI[a,b,c] Veronika HUTA[d] Evgeny N. OSIN[e]

[a] HSE University, Moscow, Russia. [b] International Laboratory of Positive Psychology of Personality and Motivation, Moscow, Russia. [c] Ibn Haldun University, Istanbul, Türkiye. [d] University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Canada. [e] University of Paris Nanterre, Paris, France.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received: 13/07/2024
Accepted: 30/10/2024

KEYWORDS

Eudaimonia, hedonia, motivation, orientation, psychometric properties, psychological distress, well-being

ABSTRACT

The Hedonic and Eudaimonic Motives for Activities-Revised (HEMA-R) measures eudaimonic, hedonic, hedonic pleasure, and hedonic comfort motivations. We tested the psychometric properties of the HEMA-R among Turkish-speaking university students (N = 255) and adults (N = 460). Confirmatory factor analyses among university students demonstrated both two-factor and three-factor solutions of the HEMA-R, while confirmatory factor analyses among adults identified a three-factor solution. Internal consistencies of the HEMA-R were largely good. In both samples, eudaimonic motivation always had at least slightly more positive associations with well-being indicators compared to hedonic motivation, hedonic pleasure motivation, and hedonic comfort motivation, while having negative weak relationships in half of the analyses with ill-being indicators. Hedonic motivation mostly had weak positive associations with the majority of well-being outcomes, while having weak positive associations with several indices of ill-being. Hedonic pleasure motivation had weak positive associations with the majority of well-being indicators, and hedonic comfort motivation did not have any association with some of the well-being indicators. They predominantly had no associations with ill-being indicators. Eudaimonic and hedonic indicators of motivation both related to need satisfaction and meaning in life indicators. Implications are discussed for future research.

There has been a long-term debate about well-being among philosophers, psychologists, social scientists, and researchers. They have particularly discussed how to conceptualize well-being and how it can be pursued. A large body of studies have predominantly focused on hedonic and eudaimonic perspectives to well-being. The hedonic perspective considers well-being the result of enjoyment, and of physical and emotional pleasure pursuits, involving biological, emotional, and cognitive components (Huta & Waterman, 2014). This perspective suggests that people orient themselves towards having comfort, pleasure, and enjoyment. The hedonic perspective is often operationalized as Subjective Well-Being, including the presence of positive emotions, the absence or lack of negative emotions, and a global evaluation of life satisfaction (Diener et al., 1985, 2009). Conversely, the eudaimonic perspective maintains that well-being comes from developing strengths and personal qualities by pursuing valued goals. This perspective proposes that well-being can be

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR Mustafa SUBAŞI, mustafa.subasim@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0003-4170-6280, HSE University, Moscow, Russia.

achieved when people pursue their own values, develop personal strengths, and harness personal resources on the path to well-being and self-growth (Huta & Ryan, 2010). The eudaimonic perspective has often been operationalized as Psychological Well-Being. Psychological well-being in a broad sense includes personal growth, autonomy, positive relations with others, self-acceptance, purpose in life, and environmental mastery (Ryff & Keyes, 1995).

This focus on the distinction between hedonia and eudaimonia in well-being has shown that well-being conceptualizations are distinct but also correlated (Huta & Ryan, 2010). Nevertheless, the distinctiveness of well-being constructs based on hedonic and eudaimonic perspectives remains to be resolved. Theoretical confusions, operational ambiguities, philosophical perspectives, and empirical findings have prompted researchers to develop integrative approaches to well-being. Huta and Waterman (2014) maintained that concerns regarding the distinction between hedonic and eudaimonic approaches to well-being emerged from different conceptualizations, analysis categories, and measurement levels. To support this position, Huta (2022) demonstrated that hedonia and eudaimonia were distinct when operationalized as trait-level orientations/motives, state-level orientations/motives, trait-level behaviors, and state-level experiences; in addition, Huta (2024) has shown that they are distinct when operationalized as trait-level functioning. Huta and Waterman (2014) suggested that well-being concepts can be classified in the following definition categories: orientations/motives, behaviors, experiences, and functioning. Orientations include individual reasons, goals, motives, priorities, or values. For example, one can seek pleasure or look for self-growth. Behaviors refer to activities and actions including thoughts. For example, one can eat a tasty dish or help a person in need. Experiences encompass feelings, emotions, and affective-cognitive appraisals. For example, one can feel relaxed or inspired. Functioning involves trait-level abilities, achievements, habits, and strengths. For example, one can be good at spontaneity or self-regulation.

Huta (2015, 2016) argues that all four definition categories are important for understanding eudaimonia and hedonia, but considers orientations to be the primary definition category. She sees orientations and behaviors as better descriptions of personality/character because they are chosen ways of living, while experiences and functioning often are outcomes of ways of living, and are less under direct control. In this context, orientations/motives are distinct from well-being experiences and functioning. Furthermore, when contrasting orientations and behaviors, she notes that two people can do the same behavior for very different reasons, and that the reasons/orientations more closely characterize a person.

Well-Being Motives

As a measure of well-being motives, the HEMA-R measures hedonic and eudaimonic motivation (Huta & Ryan, 2010). Hedonic motivation is defined as pursuing what subjectively is pleasant, and consists of the pursuit of two main components: pleasure and comfort. Hedonic pleasure motivation includes pursuing pleasant emotions and sensations, and emotional satisfaction. Hedonic comfort motivation comprises pursuing relaxation, the absence of pain, and ease. Eudaimonic motivation is described as striving for what matters and is meaningful, and consists of the pursuit of four main components as summarized by Huta and Waterman (2014) and elaborated by Huta (2016): authenticity, meaning, excellence, and growth. Eudaimonic motivation refers to striving to: know one's true self and values, be autonomous, and pursue value-congruent goals; be committed to what matters, and understand and contribute to the surrounding world; be dedicated to high standards in one's ethics, behavior, and performance; and seek knowledge, develop personal qualities, and pursue self-actualization. As they are distinct evaluations of what is "good," eudaimonic motivation and hedonic motivation can be in conflict with each other while they can also be present at the same time (Huta, 2015, 2016).

Previous factor-analytic research on the HEMA(-R) has shown that the English version often has a two-factor solution (eudaimonic motivation, hedonic motivation) but sometimes has a three-factor solution (eudaimonic motivation, hedonic pleasure motivation, hedonic comfort motivation) (e.g., Anić, 2014; Asano et al., 2020, 2021; Braaten et al., 2019; Bujacz et al., 2014; Gentzler et al., 2021; Huta, 2015; Huta & Ryan, 2010; LeFebvre & Huta, 2021; Li et al., 2021). Translations into other languages have shown two-factor and/or three-factor

solutions in Chinese (Li et al., 2021) and English (Huta & Ryan, 2010; Huta, 2016) versions. To illustrate, a two-factor solution of the HEMA(-R) was confirmed in Crotian (Anić, 2014) and in Greek (Koumantarou Malisiova et al., 2021), while a three-factor solution of the HEMA-R was obtained in Italian (Giuntoli et al., 2021), Persian (Behzadnia & Ryan, 2018), Polish (Bujacz et al., 2014), and Japanese (Asano et al., 2014; Asano et al., 2021). The Chinese version of the HEMA-R revealed that the HEMA-R could form both two- and three-factor solutions (Li et al., 2021). These studies have additionally investigated the links of motives with distinct outcomes.

Prior research has examined the links of eudaimonic motivation and hedonic motivation with measures of well-being and ill-being. The measures of well-being used in these studies were often the Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS) (Diener et al., 1985), the Scale of Positive and Negative Experience (SPANE) (Diener et al., 2009), the Meaning in Life Questionnaire (Steger et al., 2006), the Psychological Well-Being Scale (PWB) (Ryff & Keyes, 1995), the Balanced Measure of Psychological Needs Scale (BMPN) (Sheldon & Hilpert, 2012), and the Flourishing Scale (Diener et al., 2009). The measures of ill-being employed in these studies often were the negative experience subscale of the SPANE (Diener et al., 2009) and Depression Anxiety Stress Scale-21 (DASS-21) (Lovibond & Lovibond, 1995).

When studying well-being, researchers have often found that eudaimonic motivation had stronger positive relationships to indicators of well-being compared to hedonic motivation, hedonic pleasure motivation, and hedonic comfort motivation (e.g., Asano et al., 2014, 2021; Braaten et al., 2019; Chen & Zeng, 2021; Chen & Zheng, 2023a; Gentzler et al., 2021; Giuntoli et al., 2021; Huta & Ryan, 2010; Koumantarou Malisiova et al., 2020; Kryza-Lacombe et al., 2019; Li et al., 2021; Lin & Chan, 2020; Zeng & Chen, 2020). Hedonic motivation sometimes had weak associations with life satisfaction, positive affect, and meaning (Asano et al., 2014; Braaten et al., 2019; Koumantarou Malisiova et al., 2020; Zeng & Chen, 2020) or no relationships with some of them (Chen & Zeng, 2021; Lin & Chan, 2020). Hedonic pleasure motivation had weak or moderate positive associations with life satisfaction, positive affect, and psychological well-being. Hedonic comfort motivation had no relationship to positive affect and flourishing (e.g., Asano et al., 2014; Braaten et al., 2019; Chen & Zeng, 2023; Giuntoli et al., 2021).

When examining ill-being, researchers have often found that eudaimonic motivation was more negatively associated with ill-being indicators compared to hedonic motivation (Chen & Zheng, 2023a; Huta & Ryan, 2010; Koumantarou Malisiova et al., 2021; Kryza-Lacombe et al., 2019). Hedonic motivation did not have any relationship to negative affect (Braaten et al., 2019; Chen & Zeng, 2021; Lin & Chan, 2020) or had a positive association with negative affect (Zeng & Chen, 2020) and with autonomy and competence frustration (Lin & Chan, 2020). Hedonic pleasure motivation had weak or moderate associations with depression, anxiety, and stress (Braaten et al., 2019; Giuntoli et al., 2021), whereas some research demonstrated no association with negative affect (Asano et al., 2021; Chen & Zeng, 2023a). Hedonic comfort motivation mainly had no association with ill-being indicators (e.g., Asano et al., 2021; Braaten et al., 2019; Giuntoli et al., 2021).

Despite some inconsistencies among previous studies, it can be suggested that the majority of research indicated that eudaimonic motivation had stronger positive relationships with the above well-being indicators, and relatively stronger negative relationships with the ill-being indicators. Hedonic motivation and hedonic pleasure motivation appeared to positively correlate with the majority of well-being indicators and negatively with some of the ill-being indicators. Hedonic comfort motivation seemed to not be related to the ill-being indicators while it sometimes had weak positive associations with well-being indicators.

The present research adopts the distinction between well-being motives and outcomes as suggested by Huta and Waterman (2014), and aims to investigate psychometric properties of HEMA-R orientations/motives in Turkish. In addition, the present research attempts to explore the associations between well-being motives, well-being outcomes, and ill-being indicators.

The Present Research

The present research recruited two samples among Turkish-speaking adults and university students to evaluate the psychometric properties of the HEMA-R scale. Study 1 focused on university students and included

measures of hedonic and eudaimonic motivation, basic psychological need satisfaction and frustration, positive affect, negative affect, and life satisfaction. Study 2 focused on adults of all ages and included the measures of hedonic and eudaimonic motivation, life satisfaction, basic psychological need satisfaction and frustration, coherence, purpose, and significance as indicators of eudaimonic well-being outcomes, and depression, anxiety, and stress as indicators of ill-being.

Study 1

Methodology

Participants

Study 1 recruited a total of 255 Turkish university students (58 males, 197 females). The mean age of male participants was 22.59 years (*SD* = 4.40, *range* = 18 – 48). The mean age of female participants was 22.55 years (*SD* = 5.22, *range* = 18 – 52). The age mean of the sample was 22.56 (*SD* = 5.04, *range* = 18 - 52). There were 45 participants who reported having low socioeconomic status (SESS), 204 reported having middle SESS, and 6 reported high SESS. All participants granted informed consent prior to participating in the research.

Measures

Demographics. The demographics form collected information about informed consent, gender, age, and subjective economic status.

Hedonic and Eudaimonic Motives for Activities-Revised Scale (HEMA-R): Huta and Ryan (2010) developed the HEMA and it was revised by Huta (2016) through the addition of one eudaimonic item and one hedonic comfort item. Bozdemir (2023) provided the Turkish translation of the HEEMA (Hedonic, Eudaimonic, and Extrinsic Motives for Activities) using rigorous back-translation methodology, which includes the items of the HEMA-R (as well as a subscale assessing extrinsic motivation, which is not studied here). A written permission was granted to this study to investigate the psychometric properties of the HEMA-R using the translated items by Bozdemir (2023). Both the originator of the scale and Bozdemir (2023) approved the permission. The HEMA-R measures hedonic (pleasure and comfort) motivation and eudaimonic motivation rated on a seven-point Likert scale from 1 (not at all) to 7 (very much). Hedonic motivation can be measured as a single scale through 5 items (e.g., “Seeking enjoyment?” “Seeking relaxation?”) or be divided into two subscales, both of which are measured through 3 items: hedonic pleasure motivation and hedonic comfort motivation. An additional item, “Seeking to have things comfortable?,” is employed to measure hedonic comfort motivation. Eudaimonic motivation is measured through 5 items (e.g., “Seeking to develop a skill, learn, or gain insight into something?”). The HEMA-R can be adapted for trait, state, and situational purposes. In the present research, the instructions to the HEMA-R targeted the trait level, and the wording was “To what degree do you typically approach your activities with each of the following intentions, whether or not you actually achieve your aim?” Reliability scores of the HEMA-R are provided in the results section.

Balanced Measure of Psychological Needs (BMPN) Scale: Sheldon and Hilpert (2012) developed the BMPN. Kardaş and Yalcin (2018) translated the BMPN into Turkish. With a total of eighteen items, the BMPN assesses need satisfaction and need frustration of basic psychological needs. Need satisfaction and need frustration scores are scored using three items in each subscale for autonomy, competence, and relatedness such as “I felt a sense of contact with people who care for me, and whom I care for” or “I struggled doing something I should be good at.” It is also possible to have general need satisfaction scores by calculating total scores for autonomy, competence, and relatedness by deducting dissatisfaction scores from satisfaction scores. A seven-point Likert scale, ranging from “1 = Strongly disagree” to “7 = Strongly agree”, is utilized to rate the BMPN items. The wording was “Please typically answer the following questions considering the scale below.” The original version of the BPMN and its Turkish version respectively had the following reliability: Autonomy Satisfaction (AUS) (α = .69; α = .65); Autonomy Frustration (AUF) (α = .72; α = .72); Competence Satisfaction (COS) (α = .71; α = .70); Competence Frustration (COF) (α = .70; α = .63); Relatedness Satisfaction (RES) (α

= .73; α = .79); Relatedness Frustration (REF) (α = .85; α = .68). The BMPN demonstrated the following reliability scores in Study 1: Autonomy Satisfaction (AUS) (α = .79); Autonomy Frustration (AUF) (α = .83); Competence Satisfaction (COS) (α = .86); Competence Frustration (COF) (α = .83); Relatedness Satisfaction (RES) (α = .80); Relatedness Frustration (REF) (α = .71).

Scale of Positive and Negative Experience (SPANE): Diener et al. (2009) developed the SPANE, translated by Telef (2015) into Turkish. The SPANE measures negative and positive affect through 12 items, having two subscales (positive affect; SPANE-P; e.g., "pleasant"; negative affect; SPANE-N; e.g., "sad"). It employs a five-point Likert scale, ranging from "1 = Very rarely or never" to "5 = Very often or always", to rate emotion frequency regarding the past month. Participants were asked to respond to the items considering "Please think about what you have been doing and experiencing during the past four weeks. Then report how much you experienced each of the following feelings, using the scale below." The original version of the SPANE and its Turkish version respectively had the following reliability scores: SPANE-P: α = .87; α = .88; SPANE-N: α = .81; α = .83. The SPANE demonstrated the following reliability scores in Study 1: SPANE-P (α = .88); SPANE-N (α = .80).

Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS): Diener et al. (1985) developed the SWLS, adapted into Turkish by Köker (1991). The SWLS includes 5 items to assess a global judgment of life satisfaction on a single factor with items such as "If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing." A seven-point Likert scale, ranging from "1 = Strongly disagree" to "7 = Strongly agree", is used to rate the SWLS items. Participants were asked to respond to the items considering "Please answer the following questions that you may agree or disagree with in general using the scale below." The original version of the SWLS and its Turkish version respectively had the following reliability: α = .87; α = .76. The SWLS showed the following reliability score in Study 1: SWLS (α = .86).

Data Analysis

The analyses for Study 1 were carried out using R language. Raw data was evaluated and no outliers were detected. Additionally, there were no missing values. Multivariate normality was predominantly assumed following the suggestion of -1.5 and 1.5 regarding skewness and kurtosis values (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). Descriptive statistics and corrected item-rest correlations of the HEMA-R among Turkish university students were analyzed. Single-factor, two-factor, and three-factor versions of the HEMA-R were tested through confirmatory factor analyses (CFAs). The single-factor model included eleven items as in the newest version of the HEMA-R. The two-factor model included ten items as hedonic motivation and eudaimonic motivation with five items were tested. The three-factor model included eleven items as three-item hedonic pleasure motivation, three-item hedonic comfort motivation, and five-item eudaimonic motivation were tested. The two-factor model with five hedonia items and the two-factor model with six items were additionally analyzed as we nested the models to evaluate whether the inclusion of the item "Seeking to have things comfortable?" significantly improves the model fit indices. The internal consistency scores of the two-factor and three-factor versions of the HEMA-R were calculated. The associations among well-being motives, well-being outcomes, and ill-being indicators were tested using Pearson correlations.

The actual sample size for CFAs of the HEMA-R was adequate as Kline (2015) suggested that at least 200 participants should be recruited for CFAs. Several fit indices were included in this study. The present research included chi-square, the Comparative Fit Index (CFI), the Tucker-Lewis index (TLI), the (Standardized) Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR), and the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA). The chi-squared/df should be less than or equal to 10 to indicate marginal fit, 5 to show acceptable fit and 3 to demonstrate good fit. The CFI value should be at least .85 to indicate marginal fit, .90 to show acceptable fit and .95 to demonstrate good fit. The TLI value should be at least .85 to show marginal fit, .90 to indicate acceptable fit, and .95 to demonstrate good fit. The SRMR should be less than or equal to .12 to demonstrate marginal fit, .10 to indicate acceptable fit, and .08 to show good fit. The RMSEA should be less than or equal to .12 to show marginal fit, .10 to indicate acceptable fit and .08 to demonstrate good fit (Hu & Bentler 1999; West et al., 2012). In addition to CFAs, this study calculated reliability of the HEMA-R and its associations with well-being and ill-being indicators.

Results

As shown in Table 1, descriptive statistics demonstrated that the HEMA-R items mainly fell within acceptable boundaries of normality except for eighth and sixteenth items. The skewness scores of the items were between -1.61 and -0.50. The kurtosis scores of the items were between -0.60 and 2.79. The mean scores of the items ranged between 4.97 and 6.00. The standard deviation scores of the items ranged from 1.13 to 1.72. All the corrected item-rest correlations were higher than .30, showing an acceptable level of similarity.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics of the HEMA-R items among turkish university students and adults

HEMA-R Subscale		Study 1					Study 2				
		M	*SD*	*S*	*K*	*Item-total r*	*M*	*SD*	*S*	*K*	*Item-total r*
Eudaimonic motivation	Seeking to develop a skill, learn, or gain insight into something?	5.67	1.26	-1.08	1.46	0.54	5.67	1.47	-1.07	0.46	0.69
	Seeking to do what you believe in?	6	1.13	-1.23	1.32	0.44	5.79	1.41	-1.11	0.46	0.68
	Seeking to pursue excellence or a personal ideal?	5.51	1.38	-0.93	0.75	0.45	5.45	1.51	-0.87	0.12	0.61
	Seeking to use the best in yourself?	5.68	1.37	-1.24	1.64	0.56	5.68	1.42	-1.09	0.62	0.65
	Seeking to contribute to others or the surrounding world?	5.36	1.48	-0.9	0.46	0.42	5.38	1.58	-0.87	0.1	0.6
	Total	5.64	0.91	-0.89	1.3	-	5.59	1.15	-0.85	0.04	-
Hedonic pleasure motivation	Seeking pleasure?	5.3	1.4	-0.94	0.56	0.65	5.14	1.69	-0.7	-0.41	0.75
	Seeking enjoyment?	5.3	1.35	-0.8	0.45	0.68	5.16	1.62	-0.72	-0.27	0.78
	Seeking fun?	5.39	1.49	-1.12	1.26	0.49	5.07	1.63	-0.55	-0.57	0.59
	Total	5.33	1.17	-0.88	0.87	-	5.12	1.43	-0.57	-0.32	-
Hedonic comfort motivation	Seeking relaxation?	5.57	1.39	-1.13	1.39	0.46	5.41	1.67	-1.02	0.18	0.44
	Seeking to take it easy?	4.97	1.72	-0.5	-0.6	0.34	4.88	1.69	-0.46	-0.62	0.43
	Seeking to have things comfortable?	5.87	1.39	-1.61	2.79	0.5	5.47	1.61	-0.93	0.03	0.49
	Total	5.47	1.13	-0.93	1.39	-	5.25	1.26	-0.59	-0.22	-
Hedonic motivation	Seeking relaxation?	5.57	1.39	-1.13	1.39	0.41	5.41	1.67	-1.02	0.18	0.52
	Seeking pleasure?	5.3	1.4	-0.94	0.56	0.57	5.14	1.69	-0.7	-0.41	0.72
	Seeking enjoyment?	5.3	1.35	-0.8	0.45	0.64	5.16	1.62	-0.72	-0.27	0.71
	Seeking to take it easy?	4.97	1.72	-0.5	-0.6	0.41	4.88	1.69	-0.46	-0.62	0.46
	Seeking fun?	5.39	1.49	-1.12	1.26	0.56	5.07	1.63	-0.55	-0.57	0.63
	Total	5.31	1.04	-0.67	0.33	-	5.13	1.26	-0.49	-0.34	-

Note. Undergraduates *Ns1* = 255; Adults *Ns2* = 460; *M* = Mean; *SD* = Standard Deviation; *S* = Skewness; *K* = Kurtosis.

Scale Reliability

Cronbach's alpha and Omega coefficients were calculated to test the reliability of the HEMA-R factors. The internal consistency coefficients of the HEMA-R demonstrated acceptable levels of reliability: Eudaimonic motivation (α = .72; ω = .73); Hedonic pleasure motivation (α = .77; ω = .78); Hedonic comfort motivation (α = .62; ω = .63); Hedonic motivation (α = .75; ω = .74). Eudaimonic motivation and hedonic motivation had a moderate correlation, which was a bit higher than the correlation of around .30 found in English-speaking samples (Huta 2022); the remaining correlations are provided for reference purposes. In addition, hedonic motivation, hedonic pleasure motivation, and hedonic comfort motivation had moderate associations with eudaimonic motivation. Hedonic motivation had large associations with hedonic pleasure and hedonic comfort motivation. Hedonic pleasure motivation had a moderate association with hedonic comfort motivation. Correlations ranged from .38 to .91.

Confirmatory Factor Analysis

To assess the factor structure of the HEMA-R, the present research performed CFAs for single-factor, two-factor, and three factor versions of the HEMA-R. CFAs were conducted through the R Mplus mimic package using the DWLS estimator and robust standard errors with listwise deletion. No item was removed and no modifications were made. As shown in Table 2, the single-factor structure of the HEMA-R had fit indices which were not in the adequate or even marginal range. The two-factor structure of the HEMA-R mostly demonstrated good fit to the data, though the RMSEA was in the marginal range. The three-factor structure of the HEMA-R showed a good fit to the data. Furthermore, we tested the HEMA-R as the two-factor structure of with five hedonia items and the two-factor structure with six hedonia items since the HEMA including only

hedonic motivation was revised as the HEMA-R with the item "Seeking to have things comfortable?," allowing it to be evaluated as hedonic pleasure motivation and hedonic comfort motivation. As a result, the models were nested to be compared, and the two-factor model with five hedonia items and the two-factor model with six hedonia items were analyzed. The two-factor model with five hedonia items demonstrated the following fit indices: χ^2 = 102.45, df = 34, χ^2/df = 3.01, CFI = .98, TLI = .97, SRMR = .07, RMSEA = .09. The two-factor model with six hedonia items demonstrated the following fit indices χ^2 = 140.61, df = 43, χ^2/df = 3.27, CFI = .97, TLI = .96, SRMR = .07, RMSEA = .10. The difference between the CFI values of the models was equal to .01, and the chi-squared difference was significant (Δchi-squared = 38.16, df difference = 9, $p < .05$) demonstrating that the model with six hedonia items significantly evidenced a better fit in comparison to the model with five hedonia items. Consequently, the three-factor solution indicated superior fit indices, while the two-factor model was viable. Factor loadings of the three-factor solution of the HEMA-R ranged between .48 and .90. Factor loadings of the two-factor solution of the HEMA-R ranged between .42 and .88. The correlations among the factors of the three-factor solution of the HEMA-R were .62 for the eudaimonic factor and the hedonic pleasure factor, .63 for the eudaimonic factor and the hedonic comfort factor, and .72 for the hedonic pleasure factor and the hedonic comfort factor. The correlation between eudaimonic and hedonic factors of the two-factor solution of the HEMA-R was .67. In sum, we found support for both a two-factor solution and a three-factor solution. Therefore, from this point onward, Study 1 results will be reported for eudaimonic motivation, hedonic motivation, hedonic pleasure motivation, and hedonic comfort motivation.

Table 2. Fit indices for confirmatory factor analysis of HEMA-R items in Study 1 and Study 2

Sample / Model	χ^2	df	χ^2/df	CFI	TLI	SRMR	RMSEA
Study 1							
One-factor	242.53	44	5.51	.84	.82	.16	.21
Two-factor	102.45	34	3.01	.98	.97	.07	.09
Three-factor	102.63	41	2.50	.98	.98	.07	.08
Study 2							
One-factor	517.29	44	11.76	.79	.74	.07	.15
Two-factor	230.48	34	6.78	.91	.87	.07	.11
Three-factor	206.31	41	5.03	.93	.90	.05	.09

Note. χ^2 = Chi-square; *df* = Degree of Freedom; *CFI* = Comparative Fit Index; *TLI* = Tucker Lewis Index; *RMSEA* = Root Mean Square Error of Approximation; *SRMR* = Standardized Root Mean Square Residual.

The Associations Between Well-Being Motives and Well-Being Indicators

According to Table 3, eudaimonic motivation had either weak or moderate positive associations with life satisfaction, positive affect, autonomy satisfaction, competence satisfaction, and relatedness satisfaction. Hedonic pleasure motivation had weak positive associations with positive affect, autonomy satisfaction, competence satisfaction, and relatedness satisfaction. Hedonic comfort motivation had weak positive associations with autonomy satisfaction and relatedness satisfaction. Hedonic motivation had weak positive associations with autonomy satisfaction and relatedness satisfaction.

Table 3. The associations between well-being motives and well-being indicators

Study / Variable	Eudaimonic Motivation	Hedonic Pleasure Motivation	Hedonic Comfort Motivation	Hedonic Motivation	*M*	*SD*
Study 1						
Life satisfaction	.21 ***	.06	.03	.05	4.12	1.29
Positive affect	.22 ***	.15 *	.03	.11	3.63	0.77
Autonomy satisfaction	.36 ***	.26 ***	.21 ***	.27 ***	3.78	0.85
Competence satisfaction	.36 ***	.17 **	.07	.12	3.73	0.88

Table 3. *(Continued)*

Relatedness satisfaction	.31 ***	.25 ***	.28 ***	.30 ***	4.16	0.82
Study 2						
Life satisfaction	.20 ***	.18 ***	.03	.13 **	3.96	1.36
Coherence	.44 ***	.27 ***	.21 ***	.27 ***	4.89	1.36
Purpose	.51 ***	.28 ***	.22 ***	.28 ***	4.99	1.30
Significance	.42 ***	.34 ***	.28 ***	.34 ***	5.27	1.60
Autonomy satisfaction	.38 ***	.27 ***	.21 ***	.27 ***	3.66	0.87
Competence satisfaction	.48 ***	.28 ***	.26 ***	.29 ***	3.69	0.86
Relatedness satisfaction	.54 ***	.35 ***	.43 ***	.41 ***	4.11	0.85

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

The Associations Between Well-Being Motives and Ill-Being Indicators

As shown in Table 4, eudaimonic motivation had a weak negative association with competence frustration while it did not have any significant relationships with negative affect, autonomy frustration, and relatedness frustration. Hedonic pleasure motivation and hedonic comfort motivation did not have any significant associations with negative affect, autonomy frustration, competence frustration, and relatedness frustration. Hedonic motivation had weak positive associations with negative affect and autonomy frustration while it did not have significant associations with competence frustration and relatedness frustration.

Table 4. The associations between well-being motives and ill-being indicators

Study / Variable	Eudaimonic Motivation	Hedonic Pleasure Motivation	Hedonic Comfort Motivation	Hedonic Motivation	*M*	*SD*
Study 1						
Negative affect	-.02	.12	.11	.13 *	2.86	0.78
Autonomy frustration	.03	.11	.11	.14 *	3.04	1.10
Competence frustration	-.14 *	-.01	.08	.03	2.58	1.10
Relatedness frustration	-.05	.02	.00	.02	2.75	1.05
Study 2						
Depression	-.17 ***	-.08	.05	-.03	1.27	0.73
Anxiety	-.20 ***	-.07	-.01	-.05	1.07	0.72
Stress	-.05	.04	.16 ***	.10 *	1.39	0.70

Table 4. *(Continued)*

Autonomy frustration	.01	.04	.15 **	.08	3.10	1.02
Competence frustration	-.20 ***	-.10 *	-.02	-.08	2.59	0.98
Relatedness frustration	-.15 **	-.08	.01	-.07	2.75	0.96

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Study 2

Methodology

Participants

Study 2 recruited a total of 460 Turkish adults (125 males, 335 females). The mean age of male participants was 28.86 years (*SD* = 10.36, *range* = 18 – 75). The mean age of female participants was 28.14 years (*SD* = 9.24, *range* = 18 – 89). The age mean of the sample was 28.33 (*SD* = 9.56, *range* = 18 - 89). There were 76 participants who reported a low level of SESS, 347 reported a middle level, and 37 reported a high level. 120 participants were married and 340 participants were single. All participants granted informed consent prior to participating in the research.

Measurement

Demographics, the HEMA-R, the BMPN, and the SWLS data were collected through the same instruments as in Study 1. The original and Turkish versions' reliability scores of these scales were provided in Study 1. The BMPN demonstrated the following reliability scores in Study 2: Autonomy Satisfaction (AUS) (α = .73); Autonomy Frustration (AUF) (α = .74); Competence Satisfaction (COS) (α = .83); Competence Frustration (COF) (α = .73); Relatedness Satisfaction (RES) (α = .76); Relatedness Frustration (REF) (α = .63). The SWLS showed the following reliability score in Study 2: SWLS (α = .85).

Depression Anxiety Stress Scale-21 (DASS-21): Lovibond and Lovibond (1995) developed the DASS-21 evaluating depression (e.g., "I found it difficult to work up the initiative to do things"), anxiety (e.g., "I felt I was close to panic"), and stress (e.g., "I found it hard to wind down") levels. It includes three subscales with a total of 21 items. The DASS-21 was translated by Yildirim et al. (2018) into Turkish. A four-point Likert scale, ranging from "0 = did not apply to me at all" to "3 = applied to me very much or most of the time", is used to rate the DASS-21 items. Participants were asked to respond to the items considering "Please read each statement below and choose the number from 0, 1, 2 or 3 that best fits you throughout the past week. There are no right or wrong answers to the questions." When the total scores are high in any subscale, this indicates a high level in that subscale. The original version of the DASS-21 and its Turkish version respectively had the following reliability: Depression (α = .90; α = .89); Anxiety (α = .82; α = .87); Stress (α = .90; α = .90). The subscales of the DASS-21 exhibited the following reliability scores in Study 2: Depression (α = .85); Anxiety (α = .84); Stress (α = .84).

Three Dimensional Meaning in Life Scale (3DM): Martela and Steger (2023) developed the 3DM including coherence (e.g., "Most things happening in my life do make sense."), significance (e.g., "My personal existence is significant."), and purpose (e.g., "My daily activities are consistent with a broader life purpose.") subscales with a total of 11 items. Coherence and purpose encompass 4 items while significance involves 3 items. Subasi et al. (2024) adapted the 3DM into Turkish. A seven-point Likert scale, ranging from "1 = Not at all true" to "7 = Very true", is used to rate the 3DM items. Participants were asked to respond to the items considering "Please read each of the following items carefully, thinking about how it relates to your life, and then indicate how true it is for you. Use the scale below." The original version of the 3DM and its Turkish version respectively had the following reliability: Coherence (α = .90; α = .76); Purpose (α = .90; α = .81); Significance (α = .90; α = .81). The 3DM demonstrated the following reliability scores in Study 2: Coherence (α = .85); Purpose (α = .85); Significance (α = .87).

Data Analysis

Study 2 analyses were performed through R language. Raw data was assessed and fourteen participants who reported that they were under eighteen were excluded from the data. Upon the removal of these cases, there were 460 participants who attended the study. No outliers and missing values were found in the data. Multivariate normality was assumed following the suggestion of -1.5 and 1.5 regarding skewness and kurtosis values (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). Descriptive statistics and corrected item-rest correlations of the HEMA-R among Turkish adults were analyzed. Single-factor, two-factor, and three-factor versions of the HEMA-R were tested through confirmatory factor analyses (CFAs). The single-factor model included eleven items as in the newest version of the HEMA-R. The two-factor model included ten items as hedonic motivation and eudaimonic motivation with five items were tested. The three-factor model included eleven items as three-item hedonic pleasure motivation, three-item hedonic comfort motivation, and five-item eudaimonic motivation were tested. We nested the model in Study 2 as described in Study 1. The internal consistency scores of the two-factor and three-factor versions of the HEMA-R were calculated. The fit indices were the same as in Study 1. Exploratory links with indices of well-being and ill-being were tested using Pearson correlations.

Results

Descriptive Statistics of the HEMA-R Among Turkish Adults

As shown in Table 1, descriptive statistics showed that the HEMA-R items were sufficiently normally distributed. The skewness scores of the items were between -1.11 and -0.46. The kurtosis scores of the items were between -0.62 and 0.62. The mean scores of the items ranged between 4.88 and 5.79. The standard deviation scores of the items ranged from 1.41 to 1.69. All the corrected item-rest correlations were greater than .30, demonstrating an acceptable level of discrimination.

Scale Reliability

Cronbach's alpha and Omega coefficients were calculated to test the reliability of the HEMA-R factors. The reliability coefficients of the HEMA-R predominantly showed good levels of reliability: Eudaimonic motivation (α = .84; ω = .84); Hedonic pleasure motivation (α = .84; ω = .85); Hedonic comfort motivation (α = .64; ω = .64); Hedonic motivation (α = .82; ω = .82). Hedonic motivation had a moderate correlation with eudaimonic motivation. Similar to Study 1, this was a bit higher than the correlation of around .30 observed in English-speaking samples (Huta 2022); the remaining correlations are provided for reference purposes. In addition, hedonic motivation, hedonic pleasure motivation, and hedonic comfort motivation had moderate associations with eudaimonic motivation. Hedonic motivation had large associations with hedonic pleasure and hedonic comfort motivation. Hedonic pleasure motivation had a moderate association with hedonic comfort motivation. Correlations ranged from .56 to .94.

Confirmatory Factor Analysis

Study 2 carried out CFAs for single-factor, two-factor, and three factor versions of the HEMA-R. CFAs were performed through the R lavaan package using the maximum likelihood estimator and standard error with full information maximum likelihood. No item was removed and no modifications were made. As shown in Table 2, the single-factor structure of the HEMA-R demonstrated poor fit. The two-factor structure of the HEMA-R partially demonstrated acceptable fit to the data. The three-factor structure of the HEMA-R showed acceptable fit to the data. The two-factor model with five hedonia items showed the following fit indices: χ^2 = 230.49, df = 34, χ^2/df = 6.78, CFI = .91, TLI = .87, SRMR = .07, RMSEA = .11. The two-factor model with six hedonia items indicated the following fit indices χ^2 = 274.74, df = 43, χ^2/df = 6.39, CFI = .90, TLI = .87, SRMR = .07, RMSEA = .11. The difference between the CFI values of the models was equal to .01, and the chi-squared difference was significant (Δchi-squared = 44.26, df difference = 9, $p < .05$), demonstrating that the model with six hedonia items significantly evidenced a better fit in comparison to the model with five hedonia items. Consequently, the three-factor solution demonstrate superior fit indices. Therefore, from this point onward, Study 2 results will be reported for eudaimonic motivation, hedonic pleasure motivation, and hedonic comfort

motivation; results will also be reported for hedonic motivation overall, for the sake of comparability with Study 1. The three-factor HEMA-R factor loadings were between .51 and .89. The correlations among the factors were .63 for the eudaimonic factor and the hedonic pleasure factor, for the eudaimonic factor and the hedonic comfort factor .81, and for the hedonic pleasure factor and the hedonic comfort factor .81. The two-factor HEMA-R factor loadings were between .47 and .87. The correlation among the eudaimonic and hedonic factors was .67.

The Associations Between Well-Being Motives and Well-Being Indicators

As shown in Table 3, eudaimonic motivation had weak positive associations with life satisfaction while it had moderate positive associations with coherence, purpose, significance, autonomy satisfaction, competence satisfaction, and relatedness satisfaction. Hedonic pleasure motivation had weak positive associations with life satisfaction, coherence, purpose, autonomy satisfaction, and competence satisfaction while it had moderate positive associations with significance and relatedness satisfaction. Hedonic comfort motivation had weak positive associations with coherence, purpose, significance, autonomy satisfaction, and competence satisfaction and had a moderate association with relatedness satisfaction. Hedonic motivation had weak positive associations with life satisfaction, coherence, purpose, autonomy satisfaction, and competence satisfaction, and had moderate positive associations with significance and relatedness satisfaction.

The Associations Between Well-Being Motives and Ill-Being Indicators

As shown in Table 4, eudaimonic motivation had weak negative associations with competence frustration, relatedness frustration, depression, and anxiety. Hedonic pleasure motivation had a weak negative association with competence frustration. Hedonic comfort motivation had weak positive associations with autonomy frustration and stress. Hedonic motivation had a weak positive association with stress.

Comparing the HEMA-R Between University Students and Adult Samples

In order to compare the differences of the HEMA-R subscales, we performed independent-samples t-tests. As Levene's tests were significant, Welch corrections were conducted. Welch's t-test for eudaimonic motivation demonstrated that there was no significant difference between students (M = 5.64, SD = 0.91) and adults (M = 5.59, SD = 1.15); t (629.88) = - 0.64 , p = .521, Cohen's d = - 0.05. The effect size (Cohen's d) was very small. Welch's t-test for hedonic motivation indicated that there was a significant difference between students (M = 5.31, SD = 1.04) and adults (M = 5.13, SD = 1.26); t(612.72) = - 1.98 , p = .048, Cohen's d = - 0.15. Cohen's d was near the lower limit of a small effect size. Welch's t-test for hedonic pleasure motivation showed that students (M = 5.33, SD = 1.17) scored significantly higher than adults (M = 5.12, SD = 1.43); t (616.50) = - 2.08 , p = .038, Cohen's d = - 0.16. Cohen's d was very small. Welch's t-test for hedonic comfort motivation indicated that students (M = 5.47, SD = 1.13) scored significantly higher than adults (M = 5.25, SD = 1.26); t (574.51) = - 2.34 , p = .020, Cohen's d = - 0.18. Cohen's d was near the lower limit of a small effect size.

Discussion

The present research examined the psychometric properties of the HEMA-R using two samples in Türkiye – students and adults. There was support for both two-factor and three-factor solutions in undergraduates, but only support for a three-factor solution in adults. This suggests that adults drew a greater distinction between comfort-seeking and pleasure-seeking than did undergraduates. Previously, research suggested that culture/language played a role in the number of factors obtained for the HEMA(-R), with two-factor solutions obtained in Croatian and Greek samples, three-factor solutions obtained in Italian, Persian, Polish, and Japanese samples, and both two-factor and three-factor solutions obtained in English and Chinese samples (see review in introduction). The present findings suggest that a person's age may also play a role as the age mean of the previous HEMA(-R) versions largely ranged from 18.6 to 24.25. In terms of the internal consistencies, the scales assessing eudaimonic motivation, hedonic motivation, and hedonic pleasure motivation were in the adequate range, exceeding .70. The internal consistency of the hedonic comfort scale only exceeded .60. Previous studies found that the latter scale had good internal consistency, often being in the .72 - .92 range (Asano et al., 2020, 2021; Behzadnia & Ryan, 2018; Braaten et al., 2019; Bujacz et al., 2014; LeFebvre & Huta, 2021).

Across Study 1 and Study 2, eudaimonic motivation always had at least slightly more positive associations with well-being indicators compared to hedonic motivation, hedonic pleasure motivation, and hedonic comfort motivation. It had positive weak or moderate associations with all well-being indicators. It had negative weak relationships in half of the analyses with ill-being indicators. These findings largely replicated previous findings, which similarly showed that eudaimonic motivation tends to be the well-being motivation most consistently and most strongly associated with positive outcomes and with low negative outcomes (e.g., Asano et al., 2014, 2021; Braaten et al., 2019; Chen & Zeng, 2021; Chen & Zeng, 2023a; Gentzler et al., 2021; Giuntoli et al., 2021; Koumantarou Malisiova et al., 2021; Kryza-Lacombe et al., 2019; Li et al., 2021; Lin & Chan, 2020; Zeng & Chen, 2020). This lends nice support to the convergent and discriminant validity of the Turkish translation of the HEMA-R.

The negative relationships between eudaimonic motivation and depression, anxiety, competence frustration, and relatedness frustration deserve a closer attention in particular. One explanation comes from self-determination theory (SDT) in this context (Ryan & Deci, 2017). SDT suggests that need satisfaction is essential to well-being, while need frustration has harmful negative effects on well-being. Individuals with greater eudaimonic motivation are more likely to more frequently experience feelings of accomplishment, fulfillment, and joy in meaningful goal pursuits, and engage in activities that can improve social connectedness, leading to emotional support and a sense of belonging. However, need frustration and lack of a sense of coherence, purpose or significance may make individuals more vulnerable to depressive symptoms, whereas the presence and pursuit of eudaimonic activities may buffer against feelings of hopelessness and despair, foster social belonging, facilitate resilience, and act as protective factors against depression. Furthermore, the results support previous research in the context of orientation priority and their effects on well-being as Chen and Zeng (2021) revealed that when people prioritize eudaimonia over hedonia they have greater levels of well-being compared to prioritizing hedonia over eudaimonia, leading to decreased effects of well-being motives.

Hedonic motivation had mostly weak positive associations with the majority of well-being outcomes. Interestingly, it also had weak positive associations with several indices of ill-being. This is consistent with previous findings, where hedonic motivation similarly related to positive outcomes the majority of the time (Braaten et al., 2019; Koumantarou Malisiova et al., 2020; Li et al., 2021; Lin & Chan, 2020; Zeng & Chen, 2020), but occasionally proved to be a "double-edged sword," relating negatively to some positive outcomes or positively to some negative outcomes (Gentzler et al., 2021; Huta et al., 2012; Zeng & Chen, 2020). These results imply that individuals high in hedonic motivation may have more frequent positive experiences and less negative emotions, leading to have more meaning experiences, experiencing satisfying relationships, and feel one's life matters although this may be momentary (Huta & Ryan, 2010). The positive association between hedonic motivation and stress suggests that there may be a bidirectional causal arrow from stress to hedonic behaviors. Although engagement in rewarding or pleasurable activities can lead to immediate gratification and offer momentary relief, indulging oneself in those activities may cause the neglect of one's obligations or responsibilities and using maladaptive coping strategies, and result in less productivity, which can bring about greater levels of stress.

Hedonic pleasure motivation had weak positive associations with some of the well-being indicators in line with prior research, indicating that hedonic pleasure motivation had moderate positive associations with satisfaction with life and positive affect (Asano et al., 2021; Braaten et al., 2019; Giuntoli et al., 2021), weak and moderate negative associations with negative affect (Braaten et al., 2019; Giuntoli et al., 2021), and moderate negative associations with depression, anxiety, and stress (Giuntoli et al., 2021). In contrast, hedonic comfort motivation did not have any association with some of the well-being indicators as in the majority of previous research. Hedonic comfort motivation had weak positive associations with need satisfaction and meaning in life indicators, and weak positive associations with stress and autonomy frustration. These results were in line with previous research (e.g., Asano et al., 2014; Braaten et al., 2019; Giuntoli et al., 2021).

In terms of the comparison between students and adults, the results indicated that students scored significantly higher than adults on hedonic, hedonic pleasure and hedonic comfort motivations. These findings should be treated as tentative, given that effect sizes were in the very small range, and given that the mean ages of the two groups were not vastly different (Student $M = 22.56$, Adult $M = 28.33$). Nevertheless, the findings suggest that the pursuit of hedonism, pleasure and comfort may decrease with age. This is consistent with previous findings where hedonic motivation decreased from childhood to late adolescence (Gentzler et al., 2021). In contrast, LeFebvre and Huta (2021) found that hedonic pleasure motivation and hedonic comfort motivation were both stable among individuals whose ages ranged between 18 and 35 years. Further research is needed to shed light on the reasons for these differing findings, though some possibilities include cultural emphasis on hedonic pleasure and comfort motivation, identity formation during university years, transition to adult life and having more responsibilities, and micro or macro events such as pandemic, earthquake, and inflation as experienced in Türkiye.

As previously emphasized, prior studies already examined the links of eudaimonic motivation and hedonic motivation with the majority of well-being and ill-being variables studied here – life satisfaction, positive affect, need satisfaction, negative affect, need frustration, depression, anxiety, and stress. A novel contribution in the present research was examination of the three-dimensional model of meaning in life, which includes significance/value, purpose, and coherence/understanding. We found that all subscales of the HEMA-R related to all three meaning dimensions, though the links for eudaimonic motivation were in the moderate range, while the links for the hedonic subscales were mostly in the weak range. It would seem that both eudaimonic and hedonic pursuits relate to the different ways in which a person can conceptualize "a meaningful life." Another novel contribution of the present research was the separation of hedonic pleasure motivation from hedonic comfort motivation when analyzing need satisfaction and need frustration. We found that both subscales related to autonomy satisfaction and relatedness satisfaction in both samples, showing relationships mostly in the weak range. Hedonic pleasure motivation related to competence satisfaction in both samples (to a weak degree), while hedonic comfort motivation only related to competence satisfaction in the adult sample (to a weak degree). This hints at the possibility that the comfort component of hedonic pursuits plays little or no role in building feelings of skill and self-efficacy, while hedonic pleasure motivation appears to be important and supportive in need-satisfying and meaning experiences.

Overall, the results provided support for using the HEMA-R in Türkiye in both undergraduates and adults, by confirming the factor structure, providing descriptive statistics, and demonstrating links with well-being and ill-being indicators. The present findings contribute to setting the groundwork for cross-cultural analysis of the ways in which people conceptualize and pursue "a good life."

Limitations and Future Research

The cross-sectional nature of two studies in the present research is a limitation. The samples include Turkish-speaking university students and adults. This can affect the generalizability of the current findings to other populations. Another limitation is that the present research employs self-report measures. The current research does not measure the temporal stability of the HEMA-R with the same population, posing a limitation that should be addressed in further research. The present research adapts a trait version of the HEMA-R and does not assess state/situational orientations or experiences.

Further research should longitudinally examine the psychometric properties of the HEMA-R with various populations such as disadvantaged people, elderly, and children (e.g., Gentzler et al., 2021; LeFebvre & Huta, 2021). Novel dimensions of the HEMA-R such as otherism (Dong et al., 2023) can also be investigated and explored in different cultural contexts. Although the correlational associations between the HEMA-R and well-being are relatively established, the predictive roles of well-being motives on well-being outcomes deserve special attention in various contexts and populations.

In addition, what variables mediate and moderate the relationship between well-being motives and outcomes remains to be discovered. This could be explored in cultural, health, workplace, educational and technological contexts through orientation priority (Chen & Zeng, 2021), self-control (Zeng & Chen, 2020), academic behavioral engagement and procrastination (Chen & Zeng, 2022), and mastery behavior and smartphone

addiction (Chen & Zeng, 2024). Such research may provide a fruitful research avenue when studying how to put orientations/motives into action on the path to well-being. Future studies can shed light on the causal relationship between hedonic behavior, hedonic comfort-seeking, and stress. These studies can particularly address approach-avoidance motivation, emotion regulation, coping styles, adaptive and maladaptive self-regulation, self-control, and mindfulness. Further research can also seek to integrate well-being motives with other theoretical perspectives such as regulatory focus theory (Chen & Zeng, 2023a) and motivational conflict theory (Chen & Zeng, 2023b). Further studies will hopefully shed light on the antecedents, mediators, moderators, and outcomes of well-being motives in both Turkish and cross-cultural contexts. Understanding the underlying mechanisms of well-being motives and well-being outcomes appears to have theoretical and practical implications to live a richer and fuller life and promote well-being.

Author Contributions: MS substantially contributed to all stages of the research. VH contributed to conceptualization, literature writing, data analysis, data interpretation, discussion, and supervision. EO contributed to conceptualization, data analysis, discussion, and supervision. All authors have read the final version of the manuscript and confirmed it.

Funding Disclosure: This article was prepared within the framework of the HSE University Basic Research Program. The authors do not have any financial interests to disclose that can be considered influencing the current study or its results.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest regarding this study.

Data Availability: Available upon reasonable request.

Ethics Approval and Consent to Participate: This study was conducted following ethical guidelines and adhered to the principles in the 1963 Helsinki Declaration, including its later amendments. This study has been approved by the Commission for the Ethical Evaluation of Empirical Research Projects of the Department of Psychology of the HSE University on 3 April 2024.

References

Anić, P. (2014). Hedonic and eudaimonic motives for favourite leisure activities. Primenjena psihologija, 7(1), 5-21. https://doi.org/10.19090/pp.2014.1.5-21

Asano, R., Igarashi, T., & Tsukamoto, S. (2014). The Hedonic and Eudaimonic Motives for Activities (HEMA) in Japan: The pursuit of well-being. Shinrigaku kenkyu: The Japanese journal of psychology, 85(1), 69-79. https://doi.org/10.4992/jjpsy.85.69

Asano, R., Igarashi, T., & Tsukamoto, S. (2020). The hedonic and eudaimonic motives for activities: Measurement invariance and psychometric properties in an adult japanese sample. Frontiers in Psychology, 11, 524894. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.01220

Asano, R., Tsukamoto, S., Igarashi, T., & Huta, V. (2021). Psychometric properties of measures of hedonic and eudaimonic orientations in Japan: The HEMA scale. Current Psychology, 40, 390-401. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-018-9954-z

Behzadnia, B., & Ryan, R.M. (2018). Eudaimonic and hedonic orientations in physical education and their relations with motivation and wellness. International Journal of Sport Psychology, 49, 363-385. http://doi.org/10.7352/IJSP.2018.49.363

Bozdemir, M. (2023). Psychometric properties of the Turkish translation of the Hedonic, Eudaimonic, and Extrinsic Motives for Activities scale (HEEMA). Unpublished data.

Braaten, A., Huta, V., Tyrany, L., & Thompson, A. (2019). Hedonic and eudaimonic motives toward university studies: How they relate to each other and to well-being derived from school. Journal of Positive Psychology and Wellbeing, 3(2), 179-196.

Bujacz, A., Vittersø, J., Huta, V., & Kaczmarek, L. D. (2014). Measuring hedonia and eudaimonia as motives for activities: cross-national investigation through traditional and Bayesian structural equation modeling. Frontiers in psychology, 5, 984. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2014.00984

Chen, H., & Zeng, Z. (2021). When do hedonic and eudaimonic orientations lead to happiness? Moderating effects of orientation priority. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 18(18), 9798. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18189798

Chen, H., & Zeng, Z. (2022). Associations of hedonic and eudaimonic orientations with subjective experience and objective functioning in academic settings: The mediating roles of academic behavioral engagement and procrastination. Frontiers in psychology, 13, 948768. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.948768

Chen, H., & Zeng, Z. (2023a). Seeking Pleasure is Good, but Avoiding Pain is Bad: Distinguishing Hedonic Approach from Hedonic Avoidance Orientations. Journal of Happiness Studies, 24(7), 2377-2393. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-023-00687-7

Chen, H., & Zeng, Z. (2023b). Longitudinal well-being through the pursuit of hedonia and eudaimonia: inhibition and enhancement of eudaimonic behavior. Current Psychology, 1-10. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-023-04857-x

Chen, H., & Zeng, Z. (2024). Happiness motives and mental health mediated by mastery behavior and smartphone addiction: Variable-centered and person-centered approaches. Personality and Individual Differences, 222, 112575. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2024.112575

Diener, E. D., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The satisfaction with life scale. Journal of personality assessment, 49(1), 71-75. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa4901_13

Diener, E., Wirtz, D., Biswas-Diener, R., Tov, W., Kim-Prieto, C., Choi, D. W., & Oishi, S. (2009). New measures of well-being. Assessing well-being: The collected works of Ed Diener, 247-266. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-90-481-2354-4_12

Dong, R., Wang, Y., Wei, C., Hou, X., Ju, K., Liang, Y., & Xi, J. (2023). A New Factor "Otherism" Added to the Hedonic and Eudaimonic Motives for Activities Scale (HEMA) in Chinese Culture. Behavioral Sciences, 13(9), 746. https://doi.org/10.3390/bs13090746

Gentzler, A. L., DeLong, K. L., Palmer, C. A., & Huta, V. (2021). Hedonic and eudaimonic motives to pursue well-being in three samples of youth. Motivation and Emotion, 45, 312-326. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11031-021-09882-6

Giuntoli, L., Condini, F., Ceccarini, F., Huta, V., & Vidotto, G. (2021). The different roles of hedonic and eudaimonic motives for activities in predicting functioning and well-being experiences. Journal of Happiness Studies, 22, 1657-1671. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-020-00290-0

Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. Structural Equation Modeling, 6(1), 1–55. https://doi.org/10.1080/10705519909540118

Huta, V. (2015). The complementary roles of eudaimonia and hedonia and how they can be pursued in practice. Positive psychology in practice: Promoting human flourishing in work, health, education, and everyday life, 159-182. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118996874.ch10

Huta, V. (2016). Eudaimonic and hedonic orientations: Theoretical considerations and research findings. In J. Vittersø (Ed.), Handbook of Eudaimonic Well-Being (pp. 215-231). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-42445-3_15

Huta, V. (2022). How distinct are eudaimonia and hedonia? It depends on how they are measured. Journal of Well-Being Assessment, 4(3), 511-537. https://doi.org/10.1007/s41543-021-00046-4

Huta, V. (2024). Introducing a model of healthy hedonic functioning, and demonstrating its distinctness from eudaimonic functioning (Psychological Well-Being). Manuscript in preparation.

Huta, V., & Ryan, R. M. (2010). Pursuing pleasure or virtue: The differential and overlapping well-being benefits of hedonic and eudaimonic motives. Journal of Happiness Studies, 11, 735-762. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-009-9171-4

Huta, V., & Waterman, A. S. (2014). Eudaimonia and its distinction from hedonia: Developing a classification and terminology for understanding conceptual and operational definitions. Journal of Happiness Studies, 15, 1425-1456. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-013-9485-0

Huta, V., Pelletier, L. G., Baxter, D., & Thompson, A. (2012). How eudaimonic and hedonic motives relate to the well-being of close others. The Journal of Positive Psychology, 7(5), 399-404. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2012.705318

Kardaş, F., & Yalcin, I. (2018). An Adaptation Study of the Balanced Measure of Psychological Needs (BMPN) Scale to Turkish Culture. Çukurova University Faculty of Education Journal, 47(2). DOI: 10.14812/cuefd.408515

Kline, R. B. (2015). Principles and Practice of Structural Equation Modeling. The Guilford Press.

Köker, S. (1991). Normal ve sorunlu ergenlerin yaşam doyumu düzeyinin karşılaştırılması (Master's thesis, Institute of Social Sciences).

Koumantarou Malisiova, E., Mourikis, I., Darviri, C., Michou, M., Provi, K., Vlachakis, D., ... & Chrousos, G. P. (2021). Validation of the Greek Version of Hedonic, Eudaimonic, and Extrinsic Motives for Activities (HEEMA) Instrument. In GeNeDis 2020: Geriatrics (pp. 137-147). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-78771-4_16

Kryza-Lacombe, M., Tanzini, E., & O'Neill, S. (2019). Hedonic and eudaimonic motives: Associations with academic achievement and negative emotional states among urban college students. Journal of Happiness studies, 20, 1323-1341. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-018-9994-y

LeFebvre, A., & Huta, V. (2021). Age and gender differences in eudaimonic, hedonic, and extrinsic motivations. Journal of Happiness Studies, 22(5), 2299-2321. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-020-00319-4

Li, W., Zhang, L., Jia, N., & Kong, F. (2021). Validation of the hedonic and eudaimonic motives for activities-revised scale in chinese adults. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 18(8), 3959. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18083959

Lin, L., & Chan, H. W. (2020). The associations between happiness motives and well-being in China: The mediating role of psychological need satisfaction and frustration. Frontiers in psychology, 11, 540346. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.02198

Martela, F., & Steger, M. F. (2023). The role of significance relative to the other dimensions of meaning in life–an examination utilizing the three dimensional meaning in life scale (3DM). The Journal of Positive Psychology, 18(4), 606-626. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2022.2070528

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2017). Self-determination theory: Basic psychological needs in motivation, development, and wellness. Guilford publications.

Ryff, C. D., & Keyes, C. L. M. (1995). The structure of psychological well-being revisited. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69(4), 719–727. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.69.4.719

Sheldon, K. M., & Hilpert, J. C. (2012). The balanced measure of psychological needs (BMPN) scale: An alternative domain general measure of need satisfaction. Motivation and Emotion, 36, 439-451. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11031-012-9279-4

Steger, M. F., Frazier, P., Oishi, S., & Kaler, M. (2006). The meaning in life questionnaire: assessing the presence of and search for meaning in life. Journal of counseling psychology, 53(1), 80. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.53.1.80

Subasi, M., Bulut, S., Karaman, H., Osin, E. N. (2024). Multidimensional Meaning in Life: Turkish Validation of the 3DM Using a Bifactor Model. Cyprus Turkish Journal of Psychiatry and Psychology, 6(4), 313-320. https://doi.org/10.35365/ctjpp.24.4.02

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). Using Multivariate Statistics. Pearson.

Telef, B. B. (2015). The positive and negative experience scale adaptation for Turkish university students. European Scientific Journal, 11(14), 49-59. http://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.1.3987.3124

West, S. G., Taylor, A. B., & Wei, W. (2012). Model fit and model selection in structural equation modeling. In R. H. Hoyle (Ed.), Handbook of structural equation modeling (pp. 209–231). New York: Guilford Press.

Yildirim, A., Boysan, M., & Kefeli, M. C. (2018). Psychometric properties of the Turkish version of the Depression Anxiety Stress Scale-21 (DASS-21). British Journal of Guidance & Counselling, 46(5), 582-595. https://doi.org/10.1080/03069885.2018.1442558

Zeng, Z., & Chen, H. (2020). Distinct associations of hedonic and eudaimonic motives with well-being: Mediating role of self-control. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 17(15), 5547. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17155547