

Happiness at Work of Employees in State-Owned General Company and Start-Up Company

Megawati Batubara^{1*}, Karissa Meithalia², Inge Foresta Marthatianty³

[1] Universitas Padjadjaran, Indonesia, [2] Universitas Padjadjaran, Indonesia, [3] Universitas Padjadjaran, Indonesia.

Abstract

The topic of happiness at work cannot be separated from the aspects of the workplace, work environment, and job characteristics, which have an essential role in shaping work happiness. Considering the importance of these aspects, there are differences in the types of work from one job to another are one of the causes that can lead to differences in happiness in the workplace. In Indonesia, the types of work are quite different: a state-owned public company and a start-up company. The fundamental differences are in almost all aspects of the organization, some of which are the way of interacting with colleagues and superiors, the intensity of using gadgets and information technology, salaries, facilities, and working hours. This research is non-experimental quantitative research, with a sampling approach, a non-probability sampling with a convenience sampling technique. Ninety-eight employees from the state-owned public Company and 69 from the start-up company were collected by self-administered questionnaires. The employees collected self-administered questionnaires. The results showed that the level of happiness at work of employees in a state-owned public company and start-up company was at the same level, *slightly happy* ($M = 4.2$ and $M = 4.79$). The same result is identified for the dimension of the work itself, which is *slightly happy* ($M = 4.64$ and $M = 4.91$). The start-up shows a higher value between these two companies than the state-owned general Company. This result is similar to other companies, such as public universities, small and medium-sized enterprises, and nurses from private hospitals.

Keywords

happiness at work; state-owned general company; start-up company

Article Info

Artikel History: Submitted: 2022-02-09 | Published: 2022-04-30

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.24127/gdn.v12i1.4949>

Vol 12, No 1 (2022) Page: 1 - 11

(*) Corresponding Author: Megawati Batubara, Departemen Psikologi Industri dan Organisasi, Fakultas Psikologi, Universitas Padjadjaran, Email: megawati.batubara@unpad.ac.id



This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium provided the original work is properly cited.

INTRODUCTION

At this time, work is essential to people's lives (Dulk, Groeneveld, Ollier-Malaterre, & Valcour, 2013). The majority of people spend much time and their everyday lives at work. Employees work during working hours, on holiday, and sometimes out of their working time. With this condition, employees will get much experience and evaluate their lives from the working condition. It can be determined whether the employee is happy at work or not. Happy employees are productive employees (Quick & Quick, 2004; Rego & Cunha, 2008), and unhappy employees reduce productivity (Fereidouni, Najdi & Amiri, 2013). Otherwise, the Company needs productive workers to work so that the Company can meet organizational goals (Chong & Eggleton, 2007; Hales & Williamson, 2010). Talking about workplace happiness must be distinct from employees' work types. The type of work is based on how the Company creates and sets the work rules, so it is critically important to consider how happiness relates to the types of the Company. We assume that those companies have significantly different working conditions, such as how employees interact with colleagues and superiors, the intensity of using gadgets and information technology, salaries, facilities, employee status, organizational structure, lines of communication, and working hours. Previous research showed that employees in well-paying jobs are happier and more satisfied with their lives and jobs. However, several further aspects of people's jobs are strongly predictive of various measures of happiness (Jan-Emmanuel De Neve, George W. Ward, 2017).

Employees perform their work in exchange for either monetary (e.g., salary and benefits) or non-monetary rewards (e.g., psychological fulfillment from work) (Stiglbauer & Batinic, 2012). The changing work environments (e.g., the increasing internationalization of business, new technology, and new organizational practices) lead to the changing nature of work (Connell, Gough, McDonnell, & Burgess, 2014; Koukoulaki, 2010). Employment status creates individuals' happiness (Frey & Stutzer, 2000b; Ha & Kim, 2013), such as being employed or unemployed (Jiang et al., 2012) and full-time or part-time employment (Berger, 2009). Positive friendship influences employees' happiness and productivity (Bader et al., 2013). Workers have different experiences at work activities, happy and unhappy (Siegall & McDonald, 2004). Different work activities could give individuals happiness (Tadić et al., 2013). Employees may be happy with specific work activities (Tadić et al., 2013; Waryszak & King, 2001). This research focuses on the type of work shaping employee happiness in state-owned public and start-up companies. The objective is to get an idea of the difference in the level of happiness between a state-owned public company and a start-up company.

Happiness at work is a feeling of happiness towards the work itself, the job, contextual features, and the organization (Fisher, 2010). Fisher (2010) stated that three big dimensions are required to measure happiness at work at the individual level, namely (1) the work itself, (2) the job including contextual features, and (3) the organization as a whole. These three dimensions can be measured sequentially through engagement, job satisfaction, and affective organizational commitment (Fisher, 2010). These constructs have something in common: how all three constructs refer to pleasant assessment (positive attitude) or pleasant experiences (positive feelings, moods, and emotions) of an individual. Other than that, happiness and positive attitudes are not made directly by the environment or events but are shaped by perceptions, interpretations, and individual assessments of the environment and events (Fisher, 2010). The first dimension, the work itself, describes affective, cognitive, and pleasurable engagement with the work itself. According to Fisher

(2010), this engagement can be measured through Schaufeli & Bakker's (2004) work engagement. Employee engagement in work is the opposite of burnout.

In contrast to employees who suffer from burnout, employees who are engaged in their work have a sense of affective and energetic connection with the work activities performed and see themselves able to cope with the work demands (Schaufeli, Bakker, & Salanova, 2006). According to Fisher (2010), using engagement to measure the dimension of the work itself is necessary because engagement is closer to the motivational construct than the other two attitude constructs, representing other dimensions of happiness at work. Hence the measurement with these three constructs can produce better predictions and measurements broadly related to employee behavior and organizational contributions. The second dimension, the job including contextual features, refers to job satisfaction which is an evaluative assessment of job characteristics such as salary, career opportunities, and relationships with co-workers (Fisher, 2010).

The job satisfaction measurement tool that includes the aspects presented by Fisher (2010) is the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) proposed by Spector (1994). According to Spector (1997), job satisfaction is an attitude variable that reflects how a person feels about his job and various aspects of his job. Furthermore, job satisfaction is the most researched construct related to happiness at work (Fisher, 2010). Organization as a whole refers to affective commitment, namely feelings of attachment, ownership, and values that follow the organization (Fisher, 2010). According to Fisher (2010), this dimension can be measured through affective organizational commitment, which is one of the three organizational commitments by Meyer and Allen (1991). Affective organizational commitment was the most relevant organizational commitment compared to the other two because it is the most compatible with happiness as it represents an emotional bond with the organization (Fisher, 2010). The affective component refers to an employee's emotional attachment to the organization, identification with the organization, and involvement in the organization (Meyer & Allen, 1991).

In addition, commitments based on personal identification with the goals and values of the organization and being affectionately tied to the Company will be considered part of happiness at work (Fisher, 2010). Employees with high affective commitment continue to work in the organization based on their desires. Several factors can affect happiness at work, including organizational culture, job characteristics, and interpersonal relationships in the workplace. The first factor, organizational culture, refers to the collection of values, beliefs, and practices (behavior, organizational norms, morals, laws, basic assumptions, and beliefs) that provide a shared vision to unite organizational members by guiding behavior and providing goals to them (Schein, 2004). Organizational factors determining employee happiness are harmony at work, considering employees as an essential asset, mutual trust between employees, and honesty (Januwarsono, 2015).

Furthermore, several characteristics in the workplace that have been proven in several previous studies to affect happiness or unhappiness based on Warr (2007) are environmental clarity, availability of money, career outlook, and externally generated goals. Environmental clarity is the clarity of job demands, requirements, task feedback, predictable work results, and low future ambiguity. Money's availability is related to income received, pay level, and payment for results. Career outlook or job prospect is having a safe job where employees have less chance of being laid off and the opportunity to be promoted or change to another position. Externally generated goals are things that are set

by external parties and are outside the control of the individual, such as external demands, challenges, workloads (too light or too heavy), competition between employees, task identity, namely the extent to which tasks are carried out from start to finish and how the results can be predicted, role conflict, namely the mismatch of demands made on employees regarding their job. The third factor, interpersonal relationships in the workplace, have also begun to attract attention. They have shown that high-quality relationships with others are an essential source of employee happiness and energy (Dutton, 2003). According to Tom Rath in his book entitled *Vital Friends* (2006), it can be seen that individuals who have close friends at work have a happiness level seven times higher and are more engaged in their work. In this research, happiness at work in the state-owned public company and start-up company will measure with three big dimensions at the individual level, namely (1) the work itself, (2) the job including contextual features, and (3) organization as a whole (Fisher, 2010).

METHOD

Participant

The samples focus on employees from companies, both state-owned general and start-ups. Eligibility to participate in this study requires full-time employees. An online questionnaire was carried out in the survey. Participants were informed through informed consent that the purpose of the study was "to study the happy feelings at work, such as feeling passionate at work, feelings related to working conditions such as salary, career opportunities and relationships with co-workers, and feelings of compassion and belonging to the organization." *The sample* consisted of a convenience sample of 166, reporting to 98 employees from a state-owned public company and 68 from a start-up company.

Design

The research design used in this study is a non-experimental research design with a quantitative descriptive study approach. Descriptive research explains issues or problems through data that allows researchers to describe an in-depth picture of the situation.

Instrument

The employees collected self-administered questionnaires. The conceptual framework of the questionnaire was developed by Fisher (2010), which were 1) The work itself, 2) The job, including contextual features 3) the Organization as a whole. Happiness at work measured instruments compiled based on Fisher's (2010) theory. The work Itself was measured using Utrecht Work Engagement Scales (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004), with 17 questions from elimination items for representatives of each dimension. Sample items of this scale included "At my work, I feel bursting with energy" (vigor), "I find the work that I do full of meaning and purpose" (dedication), and "Time flies when I am working" (absorption). The job, including contextual features, was measured using Job Satisfaction Survey (Spector, 1994), with 30 questions from elimination items based on each dimension, such as "I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do." Organization as a whole is measured using Affective Organizational Commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1991), with eight questions, "I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization," is an example of the item of this scale. There are 55 items rated on a five-point Likert-Scale from 1 (unhappy) to 6 (happy). The average score on the happiness at work measurement tool is grouped based on the five categories in the study of Omar et al. (2018) regarding

organizational happiness. The categories are happy, slightly happy, neither happy nor unhappy, slightly unhappy, and unhappy (Omar et al., 2018). The following calculation does determination of the average score limit for each category:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Class Interval} &= \frac{\text{Range}}{\text{Amount of Class}} \\ \text{Range} &= \text{Highest Score} - \text{Lowest Score} \\ \text{Range} &= 6 - 1 = 5 \\ \text{Class Interval} &= \frac{5}{5} = 1 \end{aligned}$$

Data Analysis

The class categories used in this study each contain the following meanings. The first category, happy ($M = 5-6$), describes employees' happiness with their work, job characteristics, and organization. Employees perceive that their work provides a positive experience. The second category, slightly happy ($M = 4-4.99$), illustrates that employees feel slightly happy about their work, job characteristics, and organization. Employees interpret that work provides a positive experience, but a few experiences are interpreted as unfavorable. The third category, neither nor unhappy ($M = 3-3.99$), describes employees feeling neither happy nor unhappy about their job, job characteristics, and organization. Employees perceive that their work sometimes provides positive experiences but also provides negative experiences. The fourth category, slightly unhappy ($M = 2-2.99$), describes that employees are slightly unhappy with their work, job characteristics, and organization. Employees perceive that their work provides negative experiences, and only a few are interpreted as positive experiences. The fifth category, unhappy ($M = 1-1.99$), describes employees' unhappiness with their work, job characteristics, and organization. Employees perceive that their work provides negative experiences.

Table 1. Happiness at Work Categorization

Categorization	<i>M</i>
<i>Happy</i>	1-1.99
<i>Slightly Happy</i>	2-2.99
<i>Neither Happy nor Unhappy</i>	3-3.99
<i>Slightly Unhappy</i>	2-2.99
<i>Unhappy</i>	1-1.99

Cronbach alphas for each of the three measures for the studies were as follows: the work itself (.90), the job including contextual features (.92), and organization as a whole (.74). Statistical descriptive and independent sample t-tests were utilized to analyze data. The statistical descriptive aimed to find the average score of happiness at work among employees, the standard deviation, and the categorization of the happiness score at work, which are presented in tabular form. Meanwhile, to find the differences in scores between data groups using an independent sample t-test.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

It contains the study's findings in which the results and discussion are not separated. In this discussion, the author examines the findings and cross-references with the review of theoretical and empirical studies. Written by systematic, critical analysis, and informative. The use of tables, images, etc., only supported clarify the discussion and is confined to helping a genuinely substantial, e.g., statistical tables of test results, test results in image models, and so on. Discussion of results to be argumentative regarding the relevance of the results, theory, previous research, and empirical facts are found and demonstrate the novelty of the findings. The use table is strongly recommended not too long, and if it is necessary to enter a long table is then created in the Annex.

In order to confirm the normal distribution, fundamental descriptive analyses were conducted considering the pattern and shape of the sample distribution.

Table 1. Demography Data

Aspect	Category	Frekuensi	
		n	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	102	63
	Female	62	37
Age	25 – 39	126	77.8
	40 – 60	36	22.2
The type of Company	state-owned general	98	60.5
	Start-Up	64	39.5

Table 2. Description of Happiness at Work in the *state-owned general* Company

Variable	n	M	SD	Categorized
Happiness at Work	98	4.20	0.51	Slightly Happy
The Work Itself	98	4.64	0.68	Slightly Happy
The Job Including Contextual Features	98	3.88	0.58	Neither Happy nor Unhappy
Organization As a Whole	98	4.43	0.68	Slightly Happy

Table 3. Description of Happiness at Work in the Start-up Company

Variable	n	M	SD	Categorized
Happiness at Work	64	4.78	0.50	Slightly Happy
The Work Itself	64	4.84	0.51	Slightly Happy
The Job Including Contextual Features	64	4.72	0.54	Slightly Happy
Organization As a Whole	64	4.82	0.59	Slightly Happy

As indicated in Table. 2, happiness at work in the state-owned general Company is slightly happy ($M = 4.20$). The dimensions with the same level are the work itself ($M = 4.64$) and the organization as a whole ($M = 4.43$). The job, including contextual features, is neither happy nor unhappy ($M = 3.88$). As indicated in Table. 3, happiness at work in the start-up company has a higher number but still at the same level, slightly happy ($M = 4.79$).

All the dimensions in this Company are at the same level, slightly happy. Referring to the results of data analysis with the Independent Sample T-test based on the gender listed in the Table, it shows that H_0 is accepted, which means that there is no significant difference between the average happiness at work based on male gender ($M = 4.44$, $SD = .57$) and women ($M = 4.41$, $SD = .61$) with conditions; $t(160) = -.33$, $p = .74$. When viewed from the comparison of the average score of happiness at work, male participants have a higher level of happiness than female participants, but it is not significantly different.

Then, based on the age factor, it shows that H_0 is accepted, which means that there is no significant average difference between happiness at work based on the age range 25 - 39 years ($M = 4.47$, $SD = .61$) with the condition; $t(160) = .19$, $p = .36$ and the age range of 40 - 60 years ($M = 4.36$, $SD = .56$). Participants with an age range of 40-60 years had a slightly lower mean score than participants with an age range of 25-39 years. Then, based on the type of Company, it shows that H_0 is rejected, which means that there is a significant difference between the average happiness at work based on a state-owned public company ($M = 4.20$, $SD = .51$) and a start-up company ($M = 4.78$, $SD = .50$) and condition; $t(160) = -.71$, $p = .00$. The results of the Independent t-test show that the average happiness at work score of employees in start-up companies is higher than the happiness at work of employees in state-owned public companies.

Table 4. Independent sample t-test

Categorization	N	M (SD)	T	df	P	MSE
Gender						
Male	100	4.44(.57)	.33	160	.74*	.05
Female	62	4.41(.61)				.07
Age						
25 – 39	100	4.47(.61)	.91	160	.36*	.05
40 – 59	36	4.36(.56)				.09
Type of Company						
state-owned general	98	4.20 (.51)	-7.17	160	.00*	.05
Start-Up	64	4.78 (.50)				.06

* $p < .05$

Overall, the level of happiness at work of employees in state-owned public companies and start-up companies was at the same level, slightly happy. This result does not differ from other types of companies, and several studies support this at other companies. The OHI for a state-owned general university in Malaysia is at 6.47, indicating that employees were slightly happy working there (Omar, Ramdani, Mohd, & Hussein, 2018). Happiness at Work of Employees in Small and Medium-sized Enterprises in Thailand was high (Chaiprasit, Orapin Santidhirakul, 2011). The happiness of nurses from private hospitals in Bangkok was high (Ongkana, 2006). Happiness at work in First Drug Company Limited, Chiang Mai, was high ($M=3.49$) (Ouyprasert, 2009). The level of employee happiness at work was at a moderate level at the Quality Ceramic Company Limited, Lampang Province (Fapinyo, 2009).

The result for the dimensions of employees in state-owned public companies and start-up companies identified the work at the same level, slightly happy. Several studies about work characteristics support this. Self-value awareness and work environment positively correlated with happiness at work at the medium level (Ongkana, 2006). The

opinion towards the five factors affecting happiness at work was also high (Kemakorn Chaiprasit, Orapin Santidhirakul, 2011). Happiness at work which was ranked at the highest level, was social relationship within the organization, and that which was ranked at the lowest level was benefits provided by the organization. Personnel aged 20-34 were happier than 35-49, and female personnel was happier than male (Poopanit, 2008). Job Inspiration, the organization's shared value, relationships, leadership, and quality of work were the factors of happiness at work (Fapinyo, 2009). Age, marital status, and work experience had no relation to happiness at work (Ongkana, 2006).

CONCLUSION

The results showed that the level of happiness at work of employees in the state-owned public company and start-up company was at the same level, *slightly happy* ($M = 4.2$ and $M = 4.79$). The same result is identified for the dimension of the work itself, which is *slightly happy* ($M = 4.64$ and $M = 4.91$). The start-up shows a higher value between these two companies than the state-owned general Company. This result is similar to other companies, such as public universities, small and medium-sized enterprises, and nurses from private hospitals.

REFERENCES

- Bader, H. A. M., Hashim, I. H. M., & Zaharim, N. M. (2013). Workplace friendships among bank employees in Eastern Libya. *Digest of Middle East Studies*, 22(1), 94-116. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/dome.12020>
- Berger, E. M. (2009). Maternal employment and happiness: The effect of non-participation and part-time employment on mothers' life satisfaction. Retrieved June 11, 2014, from http://smye2009.org/file/334_Berger.pdf
- Chaiprasit, Kemakorn & Santidhiraku, Orapin. (2011). Happiness at Work of Employees in Small and Medium-sized Enterprises, Thailand. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*. 25. 189–200. 10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.10.540.
- Chong, V. K., & Eggleton, I. R. C. (2007). The impact of reliance on incentive-based compensation schemes, information asymmetry and organizational commitment on managerial performance. *Management Accounting Research*, pp. 18, 312–342. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.mar.2007.04.002>
- Connell, J., Gough, R., McDonnell, A., & Burgess, J. (2014). Technology, work organization, and job quality in the service sector: An introduction. *Labour and Industry*, 24(1), 1-8. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10301763.2013.877117>
- David, S. A., Boniwell, I., & Ayers, A. C. (2013). Conclusion: The Future of Happiness. *Oxford Handbook of Happiness*.
- De Neve, Jan-Emmanuel and Ward, George, Happiness at Work (February 1, 2017). Saïd Business School WP 2017-07, Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2943318> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2943318>
- Dutton, J. (2003). *Energize Your Workplace: How to Create and Sustain High-Quality Connections at Work*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass
- Dulk, L. D., Groeneveld, S., Ollier-Malaterre, A., & Valcour, M. (2013). National context in work-life research: A multi-level cross-national analysis of the adoption of

- workplace work-life arrangements in Europe. *European Management Journal*, 31, 478-494. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2013.04.010>
- Fapinyo, C. (2009). Happiness at work of employee at Quality Ceramic Company Limited, Lampang Province. Master's Thesis of Business Administration. Chiang Mai University.
- Fereidouni, H. G., Najdi, Y., & Amiri, R. E. (2013). Do governance factors matter for happiness in the MENA region? *International Journal of Social Economics*, 40(12), 1028-1040. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/IJSE-11-2012-0208>
- Fisher, C. D. (2010). Happiness at Work. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 12(4), 384-412. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2370.2009.00270.x>
- Frey, B. S., & Stutzer, A. (2000b). Happiness, economy, and institutions. *The Economic Journal*, 110(466), 918-938. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1468-0297.00570>
- Januwarsono, S. (2015). Analytical of Factors Determinants of Happiness at Work Case Study on PT. PLN (Persero) Region Suluttenggo, Sulawesi , Indonesia : *European Journal of Business and Management*, 7(8), 9-18.
- Jiang, S., Lu, M., & Sato, H. (2012). Identity, inequality, and happiness: Evidence from urban China. *World Development*, 40(6), 1190-1200. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2011.11.002>
- Omar, M. K., Ramdani, N. F. S. M., Mohd, I. H., & Hussein, N. (2018). Organizational Happiness Index (OHI): A Study of a Public University in Malaysia. *International Journal of Academic*
- Ongkana, K. (2006). Relationships between personal factors, self-esteem, work environment, and joy at work of staff nurses, private hospitals, Bangkok metropolis. Master's Thesis of Nursing. Chulalongkorn University.
- Ouyprasert, N.(2009). Happiness at work of employee at First Drug Company Limited, Chiang Mai Province.
- Poopanit, A. (2008). Happiness at work index of personnel of the Office of the Rector Thammasat University. Master's Thesis. Faculty of Social Administration. Thammasat University. *Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 8(11), 1984-1994.
- Quick, J. C., & Quick, J. D. (2004). Health, happy, productive work: A leadership challenge. *Organizational Dynamics*, 33(4), 329-337. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2004.09.001>
- Rath, T. (2006). *Vital friends: the people you cannot afford to live without*. Gallup Press.
- Schaufeli, W., & Bakker, A. (2004). *Manual UWES English*. Utrecht: Occupational Psychology Unit. <https://doi.org/10.1037/t01350-000>
- Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., & Salanova, M. (2006). The Measurement of Work Engagement With a Short Questionnaire: A Cross-National Study. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 66(4), 701-716.
- Schein, E.H. (2004). *Organizational Culture and Leadership*. Third edition. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Wiley Imprint. pp. 17-20.
- Siegall, M., & McDonald, T. (2004). Person-organization value congruence, burnout, and diversion of resources. *Personnel Review*, 33(3), 291-301. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/00483480410528832>
- Spector, P. E. (1997). *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes, and consequences* (Vol. 3). Sage publications.
- Spector, P. E. (1994). *Job Satisfaction Survey*. Tampa, FL: Department of Psychology, University of South Florida.

- Stiglbauer, B., & Batinic, B. (2012). The role of Jahoda's latent and financial benefits for work involvement: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 81, 259-268. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2012.07.008>
- Tadić, M., Bakker, A. B., & Oerlemans, W. G. M. (2013). Work happiness among teachers: A day reconstruction study on the role of self-concordance. *Journal of School Psychology*, 51, 735-750. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2013.07.002>
- Warr, P. (2007). *Work, happiness, and unhappiness*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Funding

The level of work happiness in the types of companies is the same.

Acknowledgments

The authors have no support to report.

About the Authors

Megawati Batubara has completed her master's degree in Professional Psychology at Padjadjaran University, majoring in Industrial and Organizational Psychology. Since 2015, he has been a lecturer at the Faculty of Psychology, University of Padjadjaran. He is interested in research in the field of industry and organization, especially positive psychology with work engagement, organizational commitment, happiness at work, and psychological well-being.

Karissa Meithalia graduated with a bachelor's degree in Psychology with a thesis focused on the descriptive study of happiness at work. I have shown interest in Industrial and Organizational Psychology by completing elective courses in this study area. My current activity is working at the leading Start-up Company in Indonesia as social media analytics.

Inge Foresta Marthiatanty graduated with a bachelor's degree in psychology and had finished an undergraduate thesis with a theme of happiness at work. Interest in Industrial and Organizational Psychology and having experience in the concerned field. The current activity is to become a supporting team at a consulting firm in Bandung.