

## THE RECOGNITION AND IMPORTANCE OF WELLBEING ACTIVITIES FOR EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT

Anna SOŁTYS

Kielce University of Technology; asoltys@tu.kielce.pl, ORCID: 0000-0003-1045-8923

**Purpose:** The objective of the article is to present a partial result of the research aimed at showing the correlation between the performance of the activities carried out in the field of wellbeing and personal engagement.

**Design/methodology/approach:** The research is quantitative and has been conducted continuously since January 2021 using an online questionnaire, on the most vacancies and desired group of employees in the modern labour market - young engineers.

**Findings:** The results allow us to conclude that in some cases, wellbeing solutions and applied activities as they are recognized are loosely related to employees' needs and engagement - more than 50% claimed that they are important. The indicator of the level of engagement and disengagement are almost the same – 0,49 of involvement and 0,36 disengagement. The engagement is stronger related with the recognition of wellbeing activities (especially with recognition and importance of clear and transparent system of access to training, as well as compliance with labour law) and loosely with wellbeing policy, on the other hand, the active disengagement is closer to not recognized wellbeing activities and indifferently with wellbeing policy.

**Research limitations/implications:** The study must be continued, and at this stage the particular indicators of engagement and their relations to wellbeing are not taken into account.

**Practical implications:** The results of the survey can be applied to define the company's wellbeing policy in practice and to focus on the issues that are significant to a particular group of professionals.

**Social implications:** It is essential for contemporary companies to carry out the activities that have the greatest influence on the general wellbeing having regard the balance and effectiveness. The results of the study have been addressed to employers, human resources managers to focus on the most efficient activities and to understand that the only some activities have a real impact on employees' satisfaction.

**Originality/value:** The innovative nature of the research is related to the perspective adopted by the surveyed employees (bottom-up methodology) - focusing on the analysis the importance of wellbeing activities carried out by employers, as well to define if the company's activities in the field of wellbeing are noticed and then how important they are in relation to the employees' engagement.

**Keywords:** wellbeing, employee engagement, communication, human resources management.

**Category of the paper:** research and viewpoint paper.

## 1. Introduction

The concept both well-being and engagement has ambiguous references to organizational practice. While in the theory of positive psychology, focusing on the factors, both individual and social and environmental, that keep a person in good psychophysical shape, allow him to maintain health and mental resilience, feed motivation, allow him to gain wisdom, and increase the level of well-being and happiness (Makowski, 2017), both terms refer to basic and higher-order needs of an individual (sense of happiness, fulfilment, sense of meaning, achieving the state of optimal experience referred to as *flow* or *flourishing* (Csikszentmihalyi, 1996), (Seligmann, 2002). The theory of well-being, as well as the concepts related to employee satisfaction and motivation – defined as *job satisfaction*, *job involvement*, *job engagement* and *organizational commitment* (Bukowski, 2019) in psychological and social sciences take into account the entire spectrum of internal (personal) and external (organizational) factors determining the emergence of specific behavioral and verbal attitudes (Christian, Garza, Slaughter, 2011). Therefore, the postulates that in organizational practice, commitment can become an inexhaustible source, a motivation, and energy resource if only the management provides employees with a sense of autonomy, the possibility of striving for mastery, and a sense of purpose may sound like telling fairy tales to many managers (Makowski, 2017). It seems that the rationality of organizations and managerial functions consciously focuses on tasks and goals, leaving the issues of deciding and searching for an experience of fulfillment and satisfaction at work to the interested parties themselves, which is basically consistent with the concept of Self-Determination Theory by E. Deci (Deci, 1971), as the most desirable state.

## 2. Importance of Wellbeing and Engagement in Survey

Wellbeing can be defined as the state of an individual or group characterized by health, happiness, prosperity and wellness and it is at the heart of an organization's responsibility towards its employees. It is believed and proven that healthy employees have a positive impact on their organizations and societies when they engage in meaningful activities for the greater good (Boschoff, Mels, 1995; Makowski, 2017). Since 2018, the concept of wellbeing has been reported as the most important trend in human resources management. It is declared to be the most powerful factor in employee effectiveness and the most important factor in the engagement and professional experience of employees, 'As the line between work and private life blurs, employees expect companies to expand their benefits offering with a variety of programs for mental health, physical health, spiritual development and financial wellbeing. To meet these expectations, employers invest in employee programs, which are also part of a corporate social responsibility and talent development strategy (Raport Trendy HR, 2018). In 2019, the tendency to focus on the wellbeing of employees was still discussed as the need to

build and improve the quality of employees' experiences based on the sense of the meaning of the work that was done (Raport Trendy HR, 2019). In 2018, 63% of the respondents defined the level of programs to support the construction of wellbeing provided by Polish companies as only basic. If companies seek more advanced solutions, they usually give employees the opportunity to work at a remote location (43%), offer flexible working hours (54%), and often declare reimbursements for fitness costs (65%) (Raport Trendy HR, 2018). Despite the great interest and many statements made by employers and experts in the area that support wellbeing employees, 47.9 percent of respondents said that the approach of employers to health and wellbeing problems has not changed, and 19.3 percent did not in this area. According to 1200 of Polish companies' employees in 2020, attitudes and participation of employers in the wellbeing activities have been considered the most important areas of health and security (more than 40% of respondents), and the lowest participation of employers is in relation to physical activity, personal development, social relationships, and financial security (less than 20% of respondents). However, the most average percent of respondents indicated that employers were neutral or had undertaken only a few individual actions in terms of health protection, physical activities, fine fettle, sense of security, personal development, social relations, financial security, mental state, ergonomics. Finally, the final note was 3,3 points on 5 (maximum) for the employer's approach to employees' health and wellbeing (at the beginning of the new COVID-19 pandemic situation).

Due to experts' conclusion, implementation of wellbeing program results in a 25% lower absence and 2.5 times return on investment of companies investing in employees' health. More important almost 80% of job candidates pay attention whether the employer implemented wellbeing strategy or not (Well HR Report, PWC). The AON report published in cooperation with IPSOS confirms the link between wellbeing and company performance. The 2021 Global Wellbeing Survey found that improving employee wellbeing has an impact on customer satisfaction and retention (Table 1). However, it turns out that single and unrelated initiatives give negligible results - it is crucial to develop a wellbeing strategy that allows for synergy between individual elements.

**Table 1.**  
*Relationship between wellbeing and business outcomes*

<b>Business area</b>	<b>Increase in wellbeing results</b>	<b>Increased business results</b>
Customer satisfaction and retention	3,0%	1,0%
Employee satisfaction	3,5%	1,0%
Customer acquisition	4,0%	1,0%
Company profit	4,0%	1,0%
Commitment to innovation	5,0%	1,0%
Net Promoter Score (NPS)	5,0%	1,0%
Employee engagement	5,0%	1,0%
Decrease in employee turnover	4,0%	1,0%

Source: Raport Global Wellbeing 2021, <https://www.aon.com/poland/risk/publikacje/raport-global-wellbeing-2021.jsp>

Globally, 82% of the companies surveyed said employee wellbeing is important, 87% had at least one initiative, but only 55% had a strategy, and only 24% fully integrated wellbeing into their business and talent strategy (Raport Global Wellbeing, 2021). Another important issue is the effectiveness of the wellbeing solutions implemented, as demonstrated by the research results, ‘What we found is that leaders cannot rely on perks and programs alone, which often come at a high cost. In fact, more than two thirds of the 68% workers surveyed said they did not use the full value of the well-being resources their organizations offered because accessing programs was either too time-consuming, confusing, or cumbersome’ (Bhatt, Fisher, Bordeaux, 2023). Referring to the cost and benefits of workplace wellbeing there is a discrepancy in ratings appear between executives and workers – 80% executives claim the wellbeing is their top priority while in the same time 90% of workers feel their work life is getting worse; and 57% of employees are considering quitting job for one that better supports their wellbeing while 70% executives say they plan to quit for the same reason (Deloitte, 2020 Global Human Capital Trends; Moss, 2021).

Referring to engagement, commitment, or job involvement (Borowski, 2018, pp. 9-10) ‘can manifest itself in the following behaviors: a) willingness to defend the company and its products in situations of crisis and conflict, b) pride in one's work in the given organization, identification expressed through statements such as ‘my company’, ‘we’, etc., c) demonstration of high activity and initiative, d) long-term employment and lack of interest in changing the workplace, e) availability and consent to work overtime when it is required by the situation, f) understanding additional duties, willingness to take responsibility, g) loyalty, h) trust in superiors and co-workers.’

Considering the impact of high engagement, Gallup analysis concludes ‘in short, team members with higher levels of engagement: produce substantially better outcomes; treat customers better and attract new once; are more likely to remain with their organization than those who are less engaged; ... are also healthier and less likely to experience burnout’ (Harter, 2020), at the same time, the productivity of engaged teams is 17% higher than that the workers who ‘do not care’ (Janik, 2019). In the same survey, 5% of Polish respondents claimed their work as ‘great job’ and 37% as ‘good’. Gallup Institute promotes Q12 survey presenting the results of raising engagement:

- Knowing expectations: ‘Employees who strongly agree that their job description aligns with the work they do are 2.5 times more likely than other employees to be engaged’ and ‘by increasing that ratio to eight in 10, organizations could realize a 22% reduction in turnover, a 29% reduction in safety incidents, and a 10% increase in productivity’.
- Having materials and equipment: By doubling that ratio, organizations could realize a 11% increase in profitability, a 35% reduction in safety incidents, and a 28% improvement in quality’.

- Having opportunity to do the best: 'By doubling that ratio, organizations could realize a 6% increase in customer engagement scores, an 11% increase in profitability, a 30% reduction in turnover, and a 36% reduction in safety incident'.
- Receiving recognition or praise: 'By moving that ratio to six in 10, organizations could realize a 28% improvement in quality, a 31% reduction in absenteeism, and a 12% reduction in shrinkage'.
- Having someone who cares: 'By doubling that ratio to eight in 10, organizations could realize an 8% improvement in customer engagement scores, a 46% reduction in safety incidents, and a 41% reduction in absenteeism'.
- Having someone encourages the professional devolvement: 'By moving that ratio to six in 10, organizations could realize a 6% improvement in customer engagement scores, a 11% improvement in profitability, and a 28% reduction in absenteeism'.
- Taking employee opinions to count: 'By doubling that ratio, organizations could realize a 22% reduction in turnover, a 33% reduction in safety incidents, and a 10% increase in productivity'.
- Feeling the job is important: 'By doubling that ratio, organizations could realize a 34% reduction in absenteeism, a 41% drop in patient safety incidents, and a 19% improvement in quality'.
- Having fellow employees committed to doing a quality job: 'By doubling this ratio, organizations could realize a 31% reduction in turnover and absenteeism, a 12% improvement in profit, and a 7% increase in customer engagement scores'.
- Having the best friend at work: 'By moving that ratio to six in 10, organizations could realize 28% fewer safety incidents, 5% higher customer engagement scores, and 10% higher profit'.
- Having someone talking about the progress: 'By doubling that ratio, organizations could realize 38% fewer safety incidents, 28% less absenteeism, and 11% higher profit'.
- Having the opportunities to learn and grow: 'By doubling that ratio, organizations could realize 39% less absenteeism, 36% fewer safety incidents, and 14% higher productivity.' (How to Measure Employee Engagement with the Q<sup>12</sup>).

Even if we assume that the features have more promotional purpose, it can be worth considering them. As well as the common background of the wellbeing, self-determination and engagement as a result of autonomy, competence, bonds.

### 3. Methodology of the Research

As well as the widespread discussion, research and implementation of wellbeing activities and strategies arises the question to the extent to which they are recognized and important for a relatively specific category of employees – 121 young engineers working as Informatics, Programmers, Production, Data Engineers as the most employable and desirable group of employees in the modern labour market. The study was launched in January 2021 and is still underway, but the preliminary results can be discussed. The main research interests focus on three issues:

1. recognition of wellbeing activities performed by employers,
2. recognition of the importance of employee wellbeing activities,
3. recognition of the employee engagement,
4. correlation amongst recognition, importance of wellbeing activities, and personal engagement.

The wellbeing policy and activities have been defined on the basis of the most frequently summoned wellbeing dimensions and factors that compose the general sense of wellbeing of employees. The study was based on an online questionnaire. The presentation describes the results obtained during the research period from January 2021 to April 2023. The wellbeing policy and activities have been defined on the basis of the most frequently summoned wellbeing dimensions and factors that compose the general sense of wellbeing of employees. The study was based on an online questionnaire. The presentation describes the results obtained during the research period from January 2021 to April 2023. The group of respondents was selected deliberately from the graduates and working students of Kielce University of Technology and Lodz University of Technology in the age of 22-36 years old. The description of research sample is presented in a Table 2. As the research data are in process the relations of sex and age with others responses are not determined.

**Table 2.**

*The characteristic of respondents*

Status	Sex	Age				Total
		22-25	26-30	31-35	36 and more	
graduate	female	3	2	0		5
	male	14	19	12		45
working and studing both on daily and external basis	female	4	3	1		8
	male	17	22	19	5	63
Total		38	46	32	5	121

Source: Own Survey.

The innovative nature of the research is related to the perspective adopted by the surveyed employees (bottom-up methodology) and results from a deviation from the traditionally conducted research on the field of wellbeing - focusing on the analysis of the needs of employees or the analysis of wellbeing activities carried out by employers. The result of this

approach is the achievement of results showing to what extent the company's activities in the field of general wellbeing are first noticed (effectiveness of organizational communication, ability to promote the employer's brand and image) and then how important they are in relation to the employee categories studied. This research method allows the assessment of:

- the effectiveness, relevance, appropriateness, and importance of the actions taken,
- in addition, it is possible to define and specify a welfare strategy and the implementation of such measures, which, at least in principle, are considered important and potentially effective.

#### 4. Results of survey

The first part of the survey was about general wellbeing activities defined as clear and fair employment regulations (Table 3).

**Table 3.**

*The recognition of wellbeing activities implemented in the company*

Wellbeing policy implemented in your company	Yes		No		Do not know	
	N = 121	%	N = 121	%	N = 121	%
counteracting discrimination and mobbing in the workplace, particularly in:						
at the stage of recruiting employees	6	4,96	3	2,48	112	92,56
by creating a clear and transparent system of access to training	102	84,30	7	5,79	12	9,92
by creating a clear and transparent system of access to promotions	14	11,57	26	21,49	81	66,94
by creating a clear and transparent employee appraisal system	26	21,49	34	28,10	62	51,24
by creating a clear and transparent system of remuneration and rewards	23	19,01	34	28,10	64	52,89
<b>Total</b>	<b>177</b>		<b>107</b>		<b>443</b>	

Source: Own Survey.

The results presented show that the most recognized activity involves access to the training system (102 responses; 84,30% of respondents), while the other activities are almost invisible to the respondents, or are indifferent. The average recognition of wellbeing policy estimated as percentage of total number of answers (727) is 23,38% of 'yes' answers, of 'no' answers is 14,74% and 'do not know' is 61,02%. The following group of questions refers to employment conditions (Table 4).

**Table 4.**

*The wellbeing activities in the field of health protection and improvement of employee wellbeing are implemented in the company*

Which of the following activities in the field of health protection and improvement of employee wellbeing are implemented in your company	Yes		No		Do not know	
	N = 121	%	N = 121	%	N = 121	%
improvement of physical working conditions and workplace equipment (noise elimination, temperature, etc., ergonomic stations)	19	15,70	58	39,67	54	44,63
proper organization of work - adaptation of duties and work standards to the abilities of employees, precise definition of the scope of duties and working time	67	55,37	12	9,92	42	34,71
participatory management model - employee involvement in creating working conditions in the company	18	55,37	89	9,92	14	34,71
employee training in the field of improving interpersonal competences, e.g., coping with stress, communication, negotiation, conflict resolution, delegation of powers, assertiveness, psychological support	14	11,57	89	73,55	18	14,88
health protection programs (e.g., facilitation for employees returning after longer sick leave, subsidizing active and healthy free time spending, programs facilitating women's return after maternity leave, programs for people in the preretirement age)	0	0,00	114	94,21	7	5,79
employee's integration	83	68,60	8	6,61	30	24,79
creating friendly support groups	5	4,13	79	65,29	37	30,58
compliance with labour law	119	98,35	1	0,83	1	0,83
co-financing for health/medical insurance of a family member or partner of the employee	29	23,97	76	62,81	16	13,22
<b>Total</b>	<b>403</b>		<b>439</b>		<b>247</b>	

Source: Own Survey.

In determining the knowledge on activities aimed at promoting the health and wellbeing of employees, it can be concluded that, in this regard, the most important factor is the regulatory body of labour law (119 'yes' answers; 98,35% of respondents), followed by the integration of employees (83 'yes' answers; 68,60% of respondents) and the proper organization of work (67 'yes' answers; 55,37% of respondents).

The average recognition (Table 5) of activities in the field of health support and employee wellbeing estimated as percentage of the total number of responses (1089) is 30,07% of 'yes' answers, of 'no' answers is 40,01% and 'do not know' is 22,68%, while at the same time the recognition of wellbeing policy (727 total responses) amounts – 24,35% of 'yes' answers, 14,72% of 'no' answers and 60,93% of 'do not know' answers.



**Table 5.**

*The average percentage of recognition of the wellbeing policy and activities in the field of health protection and employee wellbeing*

Area	% of 'yes' answers	% of 'no' answers	% of 'do not know' answers
Wellbeing policy	24,35	14,72	60,93
Activities in the field of health protection and improvement of employees	30,07	40,01	22,68

Source: Own Survey.

Compering average recognition, it is visible that the respondents more easily indicated particular activities than general wellbeing policy, which may us draw to the conclusion that even though policy does not exist as a formal document or statement, some of the activities are implemented.

We can estimate the recognition rate (Table 6.) by dividing the given 'yes' answer in a given area by  $N = 121$ , so its value ranges from 0 (minimum) to 1 (maximum), and the indifference rate by dividing the given 'do not know' answer in a given area by  $N = 121$ , so its value ranges from 0 (maximum) to 1 (maximum).

**Table 6.**

*The Matrix of importance and indifference rates*

Rates	Low recognition (0,00-0,35)	Medium recognition importance (0,36-0,65)	High recognition (0,66-1,00)
Low indifference (0,00-0,35)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. participatory management model - employee involvement in creating working conditions in the company</li> <li>2. employee training in the field of improving interpersonal competences, e.g., coping with stress, communication, negotiation, conflict resolution, delegation of powers, assertiveness, psychological support</li> <li>3. health protection programs (facilitation for employees returning after longer sick leave, subsidizing active and healthy free time spending, programs facilitating women's return after maternity leave, programs for people in the preretirement age)</li> <li>4. cofinancing for health/medical insurance of a family member or partner of the employee</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. proper organization of work - adaptation of duties and work standards to the abilities of employees, precise definition of the scope of duties and working time</li> <li>2. integration of employees</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. compliance with labour law</li> </ol>
Medium indifference (0,36-0,65)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. creating a clear and transparent employee appraisal system</li> <li>2. creating a clear and transparent system of remuneration and rewards</li> <li>3. improvement of physical working conditions and workplace equipment</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. creating friendly support groups,</li> </ol>	-

Cont. table 6.

High Indifference (0,67-1,00)	1. counteracting discrimination and mobbing in the workplace: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-at the stage of recruiting employees</li> <li>-at the stage of creating a clear and transparent system of access to promotions</li> </ul>	-	1. creating a clear and transparent system of access to training
-------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------------------------------------

Source: Own Survey.

The results let us conclude on the level of communication between employers and employees where the employment and well-being standards are not the priority that the results that most respondents cannot even point to them (let us say that they are not in mind for both parts of employment relations). However, it can also be said that the high level of indifference indicates that the activities are not carried out or that the respondents are not interested in carrying out those activities or not. The last part of the study is to evaluate the importance of employment regulation and conditions – wellbeing policy (Table 7) by indicating on the scale from ‘very important’ (5 points) to ‘not at all important’ (1 point).

**Tabel 7.**

*The structure of importance rate of wellbeing activities in survey*

Employers' wellbeing policy	An average percent of responses
Very important	50,91
Important	24,85
Hard to say	18,51
Unimportant	3,80
Not at all important	1,93

Source: Own Survey.

In general, the structure presented enables to determine that more than 50% of respondents think welfare activities are ‘very important’ whether or not the company implements anything, 24.85% of employees think they are important, 18.52% of employees have no clear view of welfare issues, 3.80% say that implementation of welfare standards is not important, and 1.93% say they are ‘nothing important at all’.

In detailed results this part shows how important certain activities are for young engineers who pay particular attention to the following: - establishment of a clear and transparent system of compensation and rewards - 76.03% - improvement of physical working conditions and workplace equipment (noise removal, temperature, etc., ergonomic facilities) - 73.55% - compliance with labour law - 73.55% - creation of a clear and transparent system of access to training - 71,90% - combating discrimination and violence in the workplace - 61.98% and these activities. Next of importance activities are: clear and transparent system for gaining access to promotions – 61.16%, clear and transparent employee evaluation system – 56.20%, adequate work organization with respect to duties, work standards, working time – 56.68%. Considered the least important, we can indicate activities such as: combating discrimination at the recruitment stage – 43,80%, creating friendly support groups – 42,98%, health co-financing – 35,94%, employee integration – 29,75%, management participation model – 28,10%, employee

training in the field of interpersonal competence – 27,27%, health protection programmes – 23,14% of indicators.

To define the level of personal engagement the Gallup Q12 with the modification of adding the answer category 'I don't know', to make all results comparably and to highlight the areas of lack of orientation resulting from the lack of personal involvement in obtaining adequate knowledge or the lack of clear information from the company (wellbeing activities, Table 2, 3), as well as the difficulty of providing a clear answer (Table 8).

**Table 8.**

*The respondents' engagement structure*

Indicator	Yes		No		Do not know	
	N = 121	%	N = 121	%	N = 121	%
Do you know what they expect from you at work?	119,00	98,35	1,00	0,83	1,00	0,83
Do you have the necessary materials and equipment to do your job well?	119,00	98,35	1,00	0,83	1,00	0,83
Do you have the opportunity to do what you are best at while working?	97,00	80,17	6,00	4,96	18,00	14,88
Have you been recognized or rewarded for doing a 'good job' in the last 7 days?	6,00	4,96	97,00	80,17	18,00	14,88
Does your supervisor or other person care about you as a person?	47,00	38,84	35,00	28,93	39,00	32,23
Is there someone at your job who encourages you to grow?	29,00	23,97	79,00	65,29	13,00	10,74
Do your opinions count in your work?	96,00	79,34	11,00	9,09	14,00	11,57
Do your company's mission/goals make you feel like you are doing something important?	17,00	14,05	36,00	29,75	68,00	56,20
Are your coworkers committed to doing the job well?	87,00	71,90	12,00	9,92	22,00	18,18
Do you have a best friend at work?	4,00	3,31	115,00	95,04	2,00	1,65
Has anyone from your company spoken to you about your progress in the last 6 months?	9,00	7,44	98,00	80,99	14,00	11,57
Have you had the opportunity to learn new things in the last year?	79,00	65,29	35,00	28,93	7,00	5,79

Source: Own Survey.

The analysis of the distribution of answers allows us to determine that the average level of involvement measured as the number of all 'yes' answers divided by the number of questions is 59.08%, which means that on average almost half of the respondents declare involvement; however, the strength of involvement varies in individual categories, and so the strongest factor involvement is: knowing the expectations and equipping the position (119 responses - 98.35%), a high engagement rate is also associated with the ability to perform the best job (97 responses - 80.17%), taking into account opinions (96 responses - 79.34%), noticing the involvement of others in work (87 indications - 71.90%) and the possibility of acquiring knowledge (79 indications - 65.29%), in other dimensions the number of indications is lower, which correlates with the attitude of disengagement. In such case, the disengagement indicator is 48.83 (calculated as above) and consists mainly of answers 'no' in the category: having a friend at work (115 responses - 95.04%), talk about further development (98 responses - 95.04%) 80.99%), appreciation of doing 'good work' (97 responses - 80.17%) and lack of

a person encouraging development (79 responses - 65.29%). It should also be noted that the lack of a clear answer appears in the category mission and goals of the company give a sense of doing something important (68 responses - 56.20%), caring for a person (39 responses - 32.23%), and noticing the involvement of others in work (22 indications - 18.18%). The respondents build their commitment mainly on the knowledge of expectations regarding their work and duties, the availability of materials and necessary equipment, the feeling that they do (try to) work as best as they can, and the opportunity to express their opinions in the team, which is also perceived as involved in the performance of work as best as possible. Generally, the engagement indicator (measured as an average of a particular group of responses – ‘yes’, ‘no’, ‘do not know’ divided by 100, about the range from 0 to 1) in the survey group amounts to 0,49 for engaged, 0,36 for disengaged and 0,15 for indifferent respondents.

The last phase of the survey was the indication of the correlations between active engagement/active disengagement and wellbeing policy and wellbeing activities referring to health protection and employee wellbeing (Table 8). As individual correlation has not been verified, it is possible at this stage to pull some tendencies regarding the existing relationship between recognition and engagement (Table 9).

**Table 9.**

*The correlation between wellbeing policy, wellbeing activities and employee engagement*

Components of survey	Indirect indicator as the average number of answers from of all participants N = 121		
	Yes	No	Do not know
wellbeing policy implemented in the company	1,46	0,88	3,66
wellbeing activities in the field of health protection and improvement of employee wellbeing	3,33	3,63	2,04
engagement	5,86	4,35	1,79

Source: Own Survey.

The indirect indicator has been calculated as an averaged number of given particular answers in a total number of respondents, its strength varies from 12 – the maximum ‘yes’ answers given by all respondents, to 0 – the none of ‘yes’ answers, and the same for ‘no’ answers and ‘do not know’ responses. As may be observed the engagement is strong related with the recognition of wellbeing activities and loosely with wellbeing policy, on the other hand the active disengagement is closer to not recognized wellbeing activities and indifferently with wellbeing policy. The unsure respondents are both not recognizing wellbeing policy and wellbeing activities, which may be interpreted as a generally an attitude of disinterest that dimension of organizational and work.

## 5. Discussion

Such results (Table 3, 4) mean that companies employing respondents do not know the importance of these activities or that employers do not carry out conscious and integrated communication with employees, provided they recognize whether the company has applied certain standards or not. Interestingly, the results of the study indicate that it is easier for respondents to indicate specific actions taken by employers in the field of promoting the health and well-being of employees than the general policy in the field of wellbeing (Table 5). If we make a comparison between the results presented in Table 4 and Table 6, we can observe that it is important for employees to formalize and communicate the wellbeing policy as well as all activities promoting health and employee wellbeing are worth of implementation.

The evaluation of the level of indifference (Table 6) can be used to indicate to employers how communication procedures and the communication context of accepted standards should be improved or, in some cases, implemented as a social welfare policy. In summary, referring to the wellbeing part, the results can be assumed that the most important elements in the employee survey category are the 'hard' elements of employment – training, promotion, reward, and compliance with law; the least important components group includes most of the 'soft' elements – social relations, participation, integration, and health aspects. The results of the survey are parallel and compatible with the assumptions of the two factors in Herzberg's theory: the external factors with the highest motivation clearly dominate in terms of importance, while the hygiene factors are considered to be the least important (Rymaniak, 2013; Kobyłka, 2016). The results obtained can also be directly related to the age of respondents beginning their professional careers, and only in the long term the factors mentioned in Seligman's theory of the welfare of the PERMA model, positive emotions, commitment, relationships, meaning, achievement/defense, become more important (Seligman, 2011a, 2011b). We can argue that the priority of company wellbeing and communication policies should be strengthened by a clear communication of existing standards, which are more accepted as silent assumptions, not as part of employee branding and the increasing attractiveness of employment. Not only is it the most important indication of improving employee welfare policies, but it should first improve work conditions and employment conditions, focusing on creating motivational compensation and bonus systems, access to professional training and promotion, and then improving working conditions and creating a social working environment through integration, working in groups and the introduction of participatory management model, or combating discrimination. The last of the actions relates to employment solutions in the form of health promotion and soft skills training. Considering the level of engagement or disengagement (Table 8) the respondents build their commitment mainly on the knowledge of expectations regarding their work and duties, the availability of materials and necessary equipment, the feeling that they do (try to) work as best as they can, and the opportunity to express their opinions in the team, which is also

perceived as involved in the performance of work as best as possible. What made it difficult is that giving an unambiguous answer were two mainly ontological aspects - the sense of accomplishment of the company's mission and goals as important and the perception and care for the employee as a complex person. Although the engagement and disengagement are not total (only some aspects have been indicated), however some relation may be observed – especially within personal engagement and recognized wellbeing activities, and within personal disengagement and wellbeing activities.

## 6. Conclusions

Of course, the conducted research has certain limitations, but some regularities can be indicated.

1. Among of all the components of the welfare policy implemented in enterprises, the respondents most often identify the existence of transparent access to training, other aspects, such as preventing discrimination, availability of promotions, functioning of a clear reward and evaluation system, are indicated less frequently.
2. This can be interpreted as a general lack or weakness of the system solutions used in this area.
3. The most recognizable activities contributing to the employee's well-being implemented in the company are indicated by the respondents as observance of labor law, integration, adaptation of duties and work standards to the abilities of employees, precise definition of the scope of duties and working time, less often in the answers there are solutions such as care for physical working conditions, participatory model of management, development of social and personal competencies. On the other hand, solutions such as co-financing health care for the family or partners, creating support groups are indicated less often, and support and application of health promotion and protection programs not at all.
4. That data can be interpreted as an indicator of which activities can be recognized as strengthenings and standards in the organisations and which of them need to be improved to reinforce human resources management.
5. The respondents easily recognized particular wellbeing activities that wellbeing policy: however, they also often indicate the lack of them. More than 50% claimed that they are important.
6. The measured level of engagement reached mean values for both the level of involvement (0,49) and the level of disengagement (0,36).

7. The engagement is stronger related with the recognition of wellbeing activities (especially with recognition and importance of clear and transparent system of access to training, as well as compliance with labour law) and loosely with wellbeing policy, on the other hand, the active disengagement is closer to not recognized wellbeing activities and indifferently with wellbeing policy.

Finally, there are still some questions that rise when discussing the issue of employee wellbeing and engagement: is full involvement really possible and for how long? Are absolute commitment (absorption, enthusiasm, sense of importance and identification, flourishing) really achievable in each enterprise and with regard to each employee? Individual categories of involvement (Gallup method) and wellbeing solutions can be applied to each organization and workplace? Is it really necessary to perform its duties responsibly and reliably on the highest level of engagement or commitment? Is it not a coincidence that some individual inclinations and predispositions allow some people to experience a deep bond with others (coworkers) or a sense of importance? Will the strength and need for wellbeing and engagement be the same after experiencing a loss or change of job? Finally, is it ethical to deliberately and intentionally create and maintain a high level of commitment and engagement, regardless of its consequences (workaholism, burnout, dismissal, changes)?

## References

1. Bhatt, J., Fisher, J., Bordeaux, C. (2023). *The workforce well-being imperative. Paving the way for human sustainability in workplace culture*. Retrieved from: <https://www2.deloitte.com/us/en/insights/topics/talent/employee-wellbeing.html>, 19.07.2023.
2. Borowski, A. (2018). *Satisfaction, engagement and organisational commitment of employees – review of the concepts and proposal for a research model*. Retrieved from: [https://oamquarterly.polsl.pl/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/KN\\_41\\_2018.pdf](https://oamquarterly.polsl.pl/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/KN_41_2018.pdf), 22.08.2023.
3. Boshoff, Ch., Mels, G. (2000). The Impact of Multiple Commitments on Intentions to Resign: An Empirical Assessment. *British Journal of Management*, vol. 11, no. 3, pp. 1-14. Retrieved from: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/200824094\\_The\\_Impact\\_of\\_Multiple\\_Commitments\\_on\\_Intentions\\_to\\_Resign\\_An\\_Empirical\\_Assessment](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/200824094_The_Impact_of_Multiple_Commitments_on_Intentions_to_Resign_An_Empirical_Assessment), 23.07.2023.
4. Christian, M.S., Garza, A.S., Slaughter, J.E. (2011), Work engagement: A quantitative review and test of its relations with task and contextual performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 64(1), pp. 89-136. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2010.01203.x>, 22.08.2023.

5. Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1996). *Przepływ. Jak poprawić jakość życia*. Warszawa: Studio Emka.
6. Deci, E.L., Ryan, J.D. (2017). *Self-Determination Theory*. Retrieved from: [https://selfdeterminationtheory.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/01/2022\\_RyanDeci\\_SDT\\_Encyclopedia.pdf](https://selfdeterminationtheory.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/01/2022_RyanDeci_SDT_Encyclopedia.pdf), 21.07.2023.
7. *Global Human Capital Trends* (2020). Deloitte. Retrieved from: <https://www2.deloitte.com/us/en/insights/topics/talent/employee-wellbeing.html>, 24.07.2023.
8. Harter, J. (2020). *4 Factors Driving Record-High Employee Engagement in U.S.* Retrieved from: <https://www.gallup.com/workplace/284180/factors-driving-record-high-employee-engagement.aspx>, 21.07.2023.
9. Janik, M. (2019). *To badanie mówi o rynku pracy więcej niż rozważania analityków. Polacy chłodno o swoich pracodawcach*. Retrieved from: <https://innpoland.pl/150703,instytut-gallupa-tylko-5-proc-polakow-uwaza-swoja-prace-za-swietna>, 23.07.2023.
10. Keyes, C.L.M. (2006). Subjective wellbeing in mental health and human development research worldwide: An introduction. *Social Indicators Research*, 77(1), pp. 1-10. Retrieved from: [https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Corey-Keyes-2/publication/225113698\\_Subjective\\_Well-Being\\_in\\_Mental\\_Health\\_and\\_Human\\_Development\\_Research\\_Worldwide\\_An\\_Introduction/links/00b7d52b1f6d2eec78000000/Subjective-Well-Being-in-Mental-Health-and-Human-Development-Research-Worldwide-An-Introduction.pdf](https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Corey-Keyes-2/publication/225113698_Subjective_Well-Being_in_Mental_Health_and_Human_Development_Research_Worldwide_An_Introduction/links/00b7d52b1f6d2eec78000000/Subjective-Well-Being-in-Mental-Health-and-Human-Development-Research-Worldwide-An-Introduction.pdf), 21.06.2023.
11. Kobyłka, A. (2016). Źródła motywacji pokolenia Y w pracy zawodowe. *Studia Oeconomia Posnaniensia*, Vol 4, No. 6, pp. 40-56. Retrieved from: [https://d1wqtxts1xzle7.cloudfront.net/63844187/Studia\\_Oeconomica\\_Posnaniensia\\_6\\_2016\\_03\\_Kobyłka20200706-64519-1ty277y-libre.pdf?1594051362=&response-content-disposition=inline%3B+filename%3DZRODLA\\_MOTYWACJI\\_POKOLENIA\\_Y\\_W\\_P RACY\\_ZAW.pdf&Expires=1695910015&Signature=U9DPlvtwYpfzo8tiPaTRJc8qCdknETEv50jcPQ6DxJOLhWGEJUfOEJwNMAMg7Of~8gmr8HsMq0XmvB6KwKDcSy2Zj5TVi-mP-Vl84QdvvyRecbD5MLKILByTd3Ev5pt2CjbAWltandBfUGidv6bMAazCqeqP6cpE1~ffkDL2ImqLMsZd2EsOMhesALcojFo25f7SBaZM9IqQxmRr4XwKwgCb1YbMxPnpOu3yYb83FnEr2ZFJQmdJ~0LI6kqGboY17kdnsz45vnsEAYnoi3TGuTo0hND5w1wjDwt6oF7ZXSllum35QXg-ZSqURhcgY-V30BRT4eURpEI~hrPBCwK6dGA\\_\\_&Key-Pair-Id=APKAJLOHF5GGSLRBV4ZA](https://d1wqtxts1xzle7.cloudfront.net/63844187/Studia_Oeconomica_Posnaniensia_6_2016_03_Kobyłka20200706-64519-1ty277y-libre.pdf?1594051362=&response-content-disposition=inline%3B+filename%3DZRODLA_MOTYWACJI_POKOLENIA_Y_W_P RACY_ZAW.pdf&Expires=1695910015&Signature=U9DPlvtwYpfzo8tiPaTRJc8qCdknETEv50jcPQ6DxJOLhWGEJUfOEJwNMAMg7Of~8gmr8HsMq0XmvB6KwKDcSy2Zj5TVi-mP-Vl84QdvvyRecbD5MLKILByTd3Ev5pt2CjbAWltandBfUGidv6bMAazCqeqP6cpE1~ffkDL2ImqLMsZd2EsOMhesALcojFo25f7SBaZM9IqQxmRr4XwKwgCb1YbMxPnpOu3yYb83FnEr2ZFJQmdJ~0LI6kqGboY17kdnsz45vnsEAYnoi3TGuTo0hND5w1wjDwt6oF7ZXSllum35QXg-ZSqURhcgY-V30BRT4eURpEI~hrPBCwK6dGA__&Key-Pair-Id=APKAJLOHF5GGSLRBV4ZA), 22.06.2023.
12. Mindy (2021). *Raport Wellbeing mentalny pracowników w Polsce*. Retrieved from: [https://activitylandingslxcontent.blob.core.windows.net/content-bike/Raport\\_Wellbeing\\_mentalny\\_pracownikow-Mindy\\_2021.pdf](https://activitylandingslxcontent.blob.core.windows.net/content-bike/Raport_Wellbeing_mentalny_pracownikow-Mindy_2021.pdf), 24.04.2023.
13. Moss, J. (2021). Beyond Burning Out. *Harvard Business Review*, February 10, 2021. Retrieved from: <https://www2.deloitte.com/us/en/insights/topics/talent/employee-wellbeing.html>, 19.07.2023.



14. OECD Health Policy Studies (2020). *Promoting health and wellbeing at work. Practices and Policies*. Retrieved from: <https://www.oecd.org/health/promoting-health-and-wellbeing-at-work-e179b2a5-en.html>, 15.04.2023.
15. *Pandemia wpływa na kondycję psychiczną pracowników* (2020). Retrieved from: <https://www.hays.pl/blog/insights/pandemia-wplywa-na-kondycje-psychiczna-pracownikow>, 15.04.2023.
16. *Raport 2020* (2020). *Przyszłość wellbeingu i benefitów pracowniczych*. Nowe Porządki, Activity. Retrieved from: <https://raport.activy.app>. 12.04.2023.
17. *Raport Global Wellbeing 2021*. Retrieved from: <https://www.aon.com/poland/risk/publikacje/raport-global-wellbeing-2021.jsp>. 12.04.2023.
18. *Raport Trendy HR 2018* (2018). Deloitte. Retrieved from: <https://www2.deloitte.com/pl/pl/pages/human-capital/articles/raport-trendy-hr-2018.html>, 11.04.2023.
19. *Raport Trendy HR 2019* (2019). Deloitte. Retrieved from: <https://www2.deloitte.com/pl/pl/pages/human-capital/articles/raport-trendy-hr-2019.html>, 23.04.2023.
20. *Raport z badania: Jak radziły sobie firmy w pandemii i czego obawiają się pracownicy*. Retrieved from: <https://gfk.pl/raport-z-badania-jak-firmy-radzily-sobie-w-pandemii-i-czego-obawiaja-sie-pracownicy>, 26.04.2023.
21. Rymaniak, J. (2013). Właściwości pracy - ewolucja rozwiązań teoretycznych i zastosowań praktycznych. *Studia Oeconomia Posnaniensia, Vol. 1, No. 7*.
22. Seligman, M. (2002). *Authentic Happiness: Using the New Positive Psychology to Realise Your Potential for Lasting Fulfilment*. New York: Free Press.
23. Seligman, M.E.P. (2011a). Happiness Is Not Enough. In: *Authentic Happiness*. Penn University of Pennsylvania. Retrieved from: <https://www.authentic happiness.sas.upenn.edu/newsletters/flourishnewsletters/newtheory>, 21.06.2020.
24. Seligman, M.E.P. (2011b). *Pełnia życia. Nowe spojrzenie na kwestię szczęścia i dobrego życia*. Poznań: Media Rodzina.
25. Well HR Report (2019). *Na zdrowie. Jak zadbać o kondycję zdrowotną pracowników*. PWC. Retrieved from: <https://well.hr/pl/article/32/na-zdrowie-darmowy-raport-pe-en-inspiracji-.html>, 15.04.2023.
26. *Wpływ epidemii COVID-19 na zmianę sposobu świadczenia pracy wśród studentów i osób z ich otoczenia wykonujących pracę zawodową*. Retrieved from: [https://prawoiekonomia.ukw.edu.pl/download/58636/raport\\_z\\_bada%C5%84-COVID-19.pdf](https://prawoiekonomia.ukw.edu.pl/download/58636/raport_z_bada%C5%84-COVID-19.pdf). 23.04.2023.