



## Workplace Well-Being and Employee Engagement: Does It Affect Each Other?

Tiara Rizki Larasati<sup>1</sup>

Dr. Inge Andriani<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup>Faculty of Psychology Gunadarma University

Jl. Margonda Raya No. 100, Pondok Cina, Depok, 16424, Indonesia

E-mail: tiararizkilarasati@yahoo.co.id

### Abstract

*This research's aim was to empirically examine the effect of workplace well-being to employee engagement in company "X" located in Indonesia. Using quantitative method with 65 employees as sample, simple linear regression method was conducted to produce validated data as provided. Regression coefficient shown  $r=0,851$  ( $p=0,00$ ). Meanwhile, R Square value obtained shown  $R = 0,725$  which mean there are 72,5 % contributions linked from employees' well-being in the workplace with their employee engagement value.*

**Keywords:** *Workplace Well-Being, Employee Engagement, Contribution, Employee.*

### Background

As part of the organization, individual hold on a very important role. According to Robbins (1994), organization defined as a social integrity which consciously

coordinated with relatively identifiable boundary, continuously working in order to accomplish mutual or collective goals. Employee engagement is one prior issue in organization. Fay and Luhrmann (Peng Lin, 2009) stated that less engaged employee tend to have lower commitment and less faith (Chughtai & Buckley, 2008). Meanwhile, Gonzalez-Roma and Salanova mentioned higher burnout level (Peng Lin, 2009) and low performances.

Schaufeli and Baker (2003) define employee engagement as a positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind that is characterized by vigor, dedication and absorption. *Vigor* is characterized by high levels of energy and mental resilience while working, the willingness to invest effort in one's work and persistence even in the face of difficulties. *Dedication* is characterized by a sense of significance, enthusiasm, inspiration, pride and challenge. Meanwhile *absorption* is characterized by being



fully concentrated and deeply engrossed in one's work.

Affirmed by Gallup (2008), the concept which stated that employee engagement impact company's productivity means that world best organizations, nowadays, are enlightened in employee engagement as a resource to direct their businesses. Furthermore, MacLeod and Brady (2006) added, a study conducted by ISR (*International Survey Research*) provided evidence which underlined how employee engagement can affect employees' turnover, absenteeism, consumer's satisfaction and loyalty, less accident within workplace and increasing sales.

Besides intensifying trainings, sufficient tools, benefits and compensations, employee engagement could be improving whilst enriching employees' experiences. In fact, amount of tasks given, stated Pavot and Diener (Russell, 2008) provide income resources and meaningful activities, as well as productivity from individuals to society. It is highly important for organization to really pay attention in well-being.

Employee well-being in the workplace or WWB is a construct which complementing and parallel with subjective well-being. Page (2005) describes WWB as employees' prosperous feeling toward their core affect and work values to the job. Moreover, Firhaust (2009) defined

well-being as an outreach to three connected aspects in a work life. *First*, physical health, include general health issues, energy and stamina. *Second*, psychological health which contain of stress, anxiety, intrinsic satisfaction, settlement, optimism, confidence, control, learning and safety. *Third*, social health which are interwork relationship, work life balance, justification, equality, concern and social linkage.

Harter, et al argued that employee with high level of well-being tend to have increasing customer's satisfaction and loyalty, improvement in productivity and profit, as well as lower turnover (Russell, 2008). Keyes and Magyar-Moe (Little, Gotty & Neldon, 2007) stated better performances will be more visible in employee with adequate level of well-being.

Based on earlier studies, employee well-being is important to company. Supported with fact which denoted the linked between well-being and health to organization performance (Fairhaust, 2009). Schmidt (2004) also provide evidence that WWB is one factor which affecting employee engagement. Furthermore, Fairhaust (2009) argued when both WWB and engagement shows higher values, it is more possible for employee in engaging within the company rather than high engagement but low well-being. Moreover, less well-being will



definitely affect engagement which impact their motivation and performances through times.

A research conducted by Wustari and Mangunwijaya (2010) in employee (not devoted within certain company or work field), WWB does have a significant and positive relationship with employee engagement ( $r = 0,551$ ) with a very significant contribution from WWB as much as 80,3% in emerging engagement.

*H1.* There is an effect given from workplace well-being to employee engagement in company “X”

## Methods

### *Sample*

Data used in this study was based on 65 respondents collected from company “X” located in Indonesia. From sampling assessed gathered 20 males respondents (30,8%) and 45 females (69,2%). Meanwhile, from age preferences gathered 42 respondents from age range of 20-30 years old (64,6%), 20 respondents within 31-40 years old (30,8%) and 3 respondents in their age range of 41-50 years old (4,6%).

### *Measures*

A six-point Likert-type scale ranging from SS (strongly agree) to

STS (strongly disagree) used as measurement instrument.

Workplace well-being variable was measured using a modified Page’s (2005) original scale with 14 items, which are 5 items for intrinsic dimension, 8 items for extrinsic dimension and 1 item represent core affect. Then, employee engagement scale used in this study was based on Schaufeli’s (Lin, 2009) original scale with 17 items represent vigor, dedication and absorption as its dimension.

## Results and Discussion

Based on hypothesis test run through the study, it shown that there is a positive and significant impact made from workplace well-being to employee engagement in company “X”. Data also shown significant values 0,000 ( $p \leq 0,01$ ) and R value of 0,851. Provided in the test, also, R square value of 0,725 which indicated 72,5% contributions by workplace well-being to employee engagement.

Research conducted by Schmidt and Faye (2004) also stated that workplace well-being take part as on important factor in emerging employee engagement. George and Brief (Russel, 2008) also argued that an engaged employees are caused by high well-being within workplace. Subsequently, a research brought by Fairhaust (2009) shown that employees’ well-being could



strengthening their engagement at work.

Based on empirical mean in respondents' workplace well-being signified in high category which implied a strong feeling of well-being manifested throughout the workplace. Meanwhile, employee engagement empirical mean shown value of 73,7 which categorized as high. This means respondents can accomplish their tasks efficiently, felt more motivated and resilient.

Furthermore, the study also shown that workplace well-being will escalated throughout individual's age. This finding suitable with Keyes, Shmotkin and Ryff (Sivanathan, 2004) research. Then, Schaufeli and Bakker (2003) also argued that older employee will be more engaged with their job. Meanwhile, based on gender, female respondents shown to have lower workplace well-being than male caused by a tendency focusing more into family than job. Berardo, Shehan and Leslie (Hendrix, 1994) denoted that female's primary responsibility is household rather than male which affected their engagement. Peter (2008) also implied a sensitive linked between gender and employee engagement due to factors such as, reward, relationship and child care.

Moreover, compared by working tenure, a year to two years tenure's employee have the highest workplace well-being level than a two

to three years of tenure. The fact that respondents using shift type of job could provide a stressor, stated by Pease and Rather (2003). Longer shift working tenure, higher stress could occurred. Stressors can affect employees' well-being at work (Grebner, Semmer & Elfering, 2005). Meanwhile, a one to two years of working tenure shown highest employee engagement compared to other respondents. This result were completely unexpected. Along with that, Saks (2006) that engaged employee tend to hold in their organization by feeling inseparable. This study conducted using fixed and contracted employee with mostly under 1 year of tenure. While, previous researches was done only using fixed employee as the respondents, therefore opposite results were shown than theories used.

### Conclusion

Hypothesis proposed was accepted with significant value of 0,000 ( $p < 0,01$ ) and R value obtained 0,851. These means that there is positive and significant impact given from workplace well-being to company "X" employees' employee engagement.

Meanwhile, based on regression test shown R square values of 0,725 (72,5%). This signified that workplace well-being approximately give 72,55 impact in the emergence of employee



engagement, while the remainder 27,55 was given from other factors.

### Suggestions

For employee, it is necessary to comply in trainings which beneficial in working life. Moreover, it is also helpful to enhancing employees' motivation in order to maintain and improve engagement.

Furthermore, holding in surveys for training is considerably important to enriching each resources inside employees. Reward programs, also, consider as noteworthy to increase employee engagement.

Moreover, further researchers are suggested to include other variables which are related to employee engagement other than workplace well-being, such as commitment and others. A larger population uses as sampling, also, could provide a more sufficient data.

### References

Bakker, A. B & Demerouti, E. (2008). Toward a model of work engagement. *Journal of career development international*. Emerald Group Publishing Limited. 13 (3). 209 – 223.

Bakker, A.B; M.P Leither (Eds.): *Work engagement: A Handbook of Essential Theory and Research*. New York, Psychology Press.

Cascio, W.F. (2003). *Managing human resources: Productivity, quality of work life, profits*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Chungtai, A & Buckley, F. (2008). Work engagement and its relationship with state and trait trust: a conceptual analysis. *Institute of Behavioral and Applied Management*.

Csikszentmihalyi, mihaly. (1997). *Finding flow: The psychology of engagement with everyday life*. New York: Basic Books.

Danna, Karen. & Griffin, W. (1999). Health and well-being in the workplace: A review and synthesis of the literature, *Journal of Management* 1999; 25; 357

Fairhaust, Denise. (2009). *Employee well-being: Taking engagement and performance to the next level*. Towers Perrin.

Federman, Bard. (2009). *Employee engagement: a road for creating profits, optimizing performance, and increasing loyalty*. San Fransisco: Jossey Bass

Gallup. (2008). *Employee engagement: what's your engagement ratio?*. Gallup, Inc



- Grebner, Simon., Semmer, N. K., & Elfering, Achim. (2005). Working conditions and three types of well-being: a longitudinal study with self-report and rating data. *Journal of occupational health psychology*.
- MacLeod, David & Brady, Chris. (2008). *The extra mile: How to engage your people to win*. Harlow: Prentice-Hall.
- Page, K. (2005). *Subjective wellbeing in the workplace*. Unpublished honours thesis, Deakin University, Melbourne, Australia.
- Page, Kathryn M. & Vella-Brodrick, Dianne A. (2008). The 'What', 'Why' and 'How' of Employee Well-Being: A New Model. *Soc Indic Res*
- Peng, Lin, Chieh. (2009). Modeling corporate citizenship, organizational trust, and work engagement based on attachment theory. *Journal of Business Ethics*. Springer.
- Russell, Joyce (2008). Promoting subjective well-being at work. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 16; 117. Sage Publication
- Schaufeli, Wilmar, Bakker, and Arnold. (2004). Occupational health psychology unit - utrecht university. *Utrecht Work Engagement Scale*, 4-5.
- Schmidt, Faye. (2004). *Workplace well-being in the public sector – a review of the literature and the road ahead*. Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat.
- Seitjs, Gerald H. & Crim, Dan. (2006). What engaged employees the most or, The Ten C'S of employee engagement. *Business Journal*.
- Sivanathan, N., Arnold, K. A., Turner, N., & Barling J. (2004). *Leading well: transformational leadership and well-being. Positive Psychology in Practice*. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Wustari, LHM. (2010). Pengaruh workplace wellbeing terhadap psychology capital dan employee engagement. *Kumpulan karya tulis ilmiah APIO IV Surabaya*.