

ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE AND SUBJECTIVE AND WORK WELL-BEING. THE CASE OF EMPLOYEES OF PORTUGUESE UNIVERSITIES

Joana Santos
Gabriela Gonçalves
Alexandra Gomes

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the determination of Organizational Culture on the Well-Being at Work and determination on the Subjective Well-being of employees of Public Institutions of Higher Education in Portugal.

The final total sample had 635 participants, employees of Portuguese Public Higher Education Institutions. The hierarchical regression shows a significant effect of Organizational Culture on the criterion variable, Subjective Well-Being. By adding Well-Being at Work, it increased the explanatory power of the model. It was still possible to establish a structural equation model, which considers the determination of Support Organizational Culture on Well-being at Work and this on Well-being Professional. These results reveal the importance of organizations implementing a culture of support, particularly in ensuring the Well-being of its employees.

Keywords: Organizational Culture, Subjective Well-Being, Well-Being at Work.

JEL Classification: L32, M14

1. INTRODUCTION

In the globalized economy of the twenty-first century society, companies find themselves compelled to systematically raise their performance in order to ensure a competitive presence in the markets they serve. For this, they modernize their activities. However, only investing in new technologies is not enough to modernize an organization, public or private. One factor that differentiates companies with greater success is the combination of technology with human resource strategies.

In a macro prospective analysis of organizations, organizational culture can be considered a set of values, behavioral norms, artifacts and patterns of behavior that govern how people interact and are committed to the work and the organization (Schein, 1992). The wealth of Organizational Culture can be characterized by different typologies. In this study the model was privileged contrasting values of Quinn and Cameron (1983); it constitutes an important aspect in the essence of organizational functioning, which results in tension between opposites, and the structures typically being sought (Neves, 2000). Research has shown the influence of organizational factors (e.g. organizational culture) on employees, particularly in terms of their Well-Being (Miles & Mangold, 2007; Stark, Shaw, & Duffy, 2007; Zempetakis, Beldekos, & Moustaris, 2009).

After some initial crisis in the definition of Subjective Well-being, it is now more or less agreed that the concept consists of a cognitive dimension, where there is an evaluative judgment, usually exposed in terms of satisfaction with life, and an emotional dimension, positive or negative. The life satisfaction is a cognitive evaluation of positive personal life as a whole; the positive effect refers to the frequency of positive emotions in an individual, the negative effect is the frequency of negative emotions (McCullough, Heubner & Laughlin, 2000). Thus, people who demonstrate a positive wellness experience a preponderance of positive emotions in relation to negative emotions and positively evaluate their life as a whole. The subjective well-being is structured so that the components form a global factor or interrelated variables (Diener, Suh, & Oishi, 1997; McCullough, Heubner, & Laughlin, 2000).

Research on the topic of Subjective Well-being seeks, essentially, to understand what is affecting the well-being of an individual and what makes us really happy. According to theorists, the best way to do this is by asking people how they feel (Powdthavee, 2008). In a professional context, the senses of belonging and togetherness, as well as identification with the organizational culture, have a positive impact on Subjective Well-being, and specifically in Life Satisfaction (Blanchflower & Oswald, 1998). Similarly, Ryan and Deci (2001) note that professional autonomy reflects positively on Subjective Well-being. Specifically at the level of consequential professionals, the Subjective Well-being has a positive impact on productivity levels, both individual and organizational (Harter, Schmidt, & Hayes, 2002; Helliwell & Putnam, 2005; MacCallum, Browne, & Sugawara, 1996).

For Conrad (1998), professionals spend at least a third of their waking hours at work and do not necessarily leave the tasks when they leave these places. In fact, personal life and work life are not separate entities; in contrast, they are interrelated domains that have reciprocal effects. The recent trend of organizational literature, in considering their affection of the workplace, not just satisfaction, has influenced studies on Well-being in the organizational context. Despite the similarity with the approach of Subjective Well-being, Daniels (2000) does not consider the Job Satisfaction of the defining Well-being. Recently, Warr (2007, 2009) advocates for a more complete conceptualization of Well-being at Work, compatible with efforts to establish the limits of the construct. The Well-being at Work can be considered, therefore, as the prevalence of positive emotions on the job and the individuals' perceptions that, in their work, they express and develops their potential / skills and progress in achieving their life goals. In this perspective, the Well-being at Work includes both affective aspects (emotions and moods) and cognitive (perception of achievement).

Regarding antecedents of Well-being at Work, the professional environments through flexibility and autonomy (Mendes & Tamayo, 2001), or organizational support (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986; Siqueira, Padovam, Chiuzi, & Covacs, 2006) passed on to employees, can lead to increased levels of Well-Being at Work. Thus, in the central role that work has on society in general, and in people's lives, in particular, the Well-being assumes professional repercussions both for the person (individual Well-Being) and for work (productivity and income) (Huppert & Whittington, 2003). This study aims to analyze the determination of Organizational Culture on Well-Being, Subjective and at work, of employees of universities.

2. METHODOLOGY

In this study we focus on a quantitative methodology for analyzing and gathering information.

2.1. Sample

Our convenience sample was selected from the population that integrates the employees, teachers and staff, of Portuguese Public Higher Education Institutions. The final total sample consists of 635 participants: the employees of Portuguese Public Higher Education Institutions. We used as inclusion criteria the answer to all questions of the questionnaire. The respondents were predominantly female ($n = 375$, 60%), with a mean age of 39.77 ($SD = 9.13$); ages varied between 23 and 64 years.

2.2. Instruments

Regarding the instruments for gathering information to measure organizational culture, First Organizational Culture Unified Search (FOCUS) (VanMuijen, Papalexandris, Branyiscki, Spaltro, Jesuino, & Neves, 1999; Neves, 2000) was used, which is divided into two parts that reflect aspects of organizational life, the internal and external aspects. The first part, descriptive in nature, is intended to assess the organizational climate (behavioral aspects of culture). The respondent has a six-level scale to rule on the different questions (1 = never / none to 6 = all / always). The second part contains questions of evaluative content that intend to evaluate the guidelines of Organizational Culture (deeper aspects of culture) (Neves, 2000). This time, there are thirty-five different statements that constitute it, and the response scale has six levels (1 = not at all to 6 = extremely). The investigation of Neves (2000) showed that only thirty-four items of Focus would be relevant for a reliable evaluation of the four directions.

Well-Being at Work Scale (Warr, 1990): The Affective Well-being at Work was measured by validated instrument by Warr (1990), with a sample of 1686 individuals employed. The version used refers to the Portuguese adaptation of Santos and Gonçalves (2010). The scale consists of two dimensions, anxiety / depression and contentment / excitement, distributed along six items each on a scale of type Rating Scale consisting of six levels (1 = Never, Always = 6). The first three items in each dimension are reversed. Regarding internal consistency, both dimensions have rates above 0.70, i.e. 0.76 to 0.80 for the first and second.

Satisfaction with Life Scale (Diener et al., 1985; Simões, 1992): The Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS), developed by Diener and colleagues (Diener et al., 1985), had the latest revision of the translation and validation to the Portuguese population by Simões (1992). In the study of Simões (1992) with a sample of 203 participants, an alpha was found of 0.77. The Satisfaction with Life Scale is one of the most used tools in assessing the cognitive component of Subjective Well-being. The scale consists of five items, for which it offers five levels of response (1: strongly disagree, 5: strongly agree).

The Positive and Negative Affect Scale (PANAS) developed by Watson, Clark and Tellegen (1988) was adapted for the Portuguese population by Simões (1993). For the authors, the aim is to evaluate the affective dimension of Subjective Well-being. In our study we considered the temporal reference “last week”; individuals were asked to indicate to what extent they experienced the feelings or effects listed on each item on a scale with 22 items, consisting of five levels: 1 = very little or nothing to 5 = very much. The original version of alphas ranging was, for positive effects between 0.86 and 0.90, and, for negative effects, between 0.84 to 0.87 for NA depending on the temporal directions.

2.3. Procedure

Data collection was conducted online, which gives greater autonomy to participating in the response. The clarity in the presentation of the online questionnaire was tested with fifteen employees of public institutions of higher education (8 teachers, 7 non-teaching) who completed the questionnaire and gave some suggestions (presentation of the scale items, simplifying the presentation). These participants were not included in the final sample.

Then there were the requests to Rectories of Portuguese Public Universities and Presidencies of Public Portuguese, Polytechnics, the possibility to request disclosure of the study, and respective application for collaboration among human employees of that institution. This contact was established through registered post and email. The questionnaire was available for three months, so that the human assets of the institutions could access and respond.

3. RESULTS

Our purpose was to establish a relationship model between variables, based on the theoretical principles. Thus, the model considers the relationship between the orientations of organizational culture and Well-Being at Work and its impact on Subjective Well-Being. Statistical software, (SPSS 20.0) and Amos (version 20.0), was used for data analysis. The main outcomes were explored through: a) a statistical description that included, mean, standard deviation, skewness and kurtosis; b) Pearson correlations for each of the four scales; c) hierarchical regression analysis between variables; and d) testing the model observed through structural equations. The method of maximum likelihood estimation was used, which assumes multivariate normal distribution, and is robust when this assumption is not met (Schermelleh-Engel, Moosbrugger, & Müller, 2003), which occurred in our data.

Description of items: Table 1 presents descriptive statistics, mean, standard deviation, skewness and kurtosis, for each dimension. The minimum and maximum guidelines of organizational culture are located at 1 and 6, so the observed means are always above the midpoint, with greater emphasis on the dimension rules. The Well-Being at Work presents an average slightly above the midpoint. The Subjective Well-Being was analyzed by measuring the resulting composite sum of life satisfaction and value subtraction between positive effect minus negative. As regards the asymmetry, some variables have positive skewness.

Table 1: Descriptive statistics of items (n = 635)

Variables	M	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis	Normalcy ^a
Support OC	3.27	0.837	0.233	0.185	0.000
Innovation OC	3.44	0.791	0.334	-0.332	0.000
Objectives OC	3.19	0.969	0.241	-0.481	0.000
Rules OC	3.61	0.707	0.105	0.852	0.000
Subjective WB	0.86	2.182	-0.431	0.029	0.000
WB at Work	3.84	0.932	-0.453	-0.212	0.000

Legend: Support OC - Support Organizational Culture, Innovation OC – Innovation Organizational Culture, Objectives OC- Organizational Culture Objectives, Rules OC - Rules Organizational Culture; BES - Subjective Well-Being; BET – Well-Being at Work.

^a the p value obtained using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, with correction Lilliefors

Descriptive statistics and Pearson correlation matrix: The correlation matrix, for each variable in the analysis, appears in Table 2. Most organizational variables considered are significantly correlated with each other ($p = 0.01$). In general, each instrument within the different dimensions correlate only moderately, thus justifying the differentiation of these conceptual same dimensions. The four dimensions of organizational culture (Support, Innovation, Objectives and Rules) have moderate values of correlation between them (values between 0.40 and 0.50). The Organizational Culture and Subjective Well-Being correlations are mostly not significant, as they are moderate to weak. Dimensions of Organizational

Culture and Well-Being at Work also have moderate and weak correlations. The correlation between Well-Being at Work and Subjective Well-Being is moderate.

Table 2: Pearson correlations between the variables

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Support OC	1	0.520**	0.502**	0.489**	0.311**	0.471**
2. Innovation OC		1	0.544**	0.449**	0.182**	0.263**
3. Objectives OC			1	0.447**	0.155**	0.259**
4. Rules OC				1	0.073	0.128**
5. Subjective WB					1	0.647**
6. WB atWork						1

**p < 0.01 Legend: Support OC - Support Organizational Culture, Innovation OC – Innovation Organizational Culture, Objectives OC- Organizational Culture Objectives, Rules OC - Rules Organizational Culture; BES - Subjective Well-Being; BET – Well-Being at Work.

Hierarchical regression: The following analyzes the power of determining variables Organizational Culture and Well-Being at Work on Subjective Well-Being. The first model shows a significant effect of Organizational Culture on the criterion variable ($r^2 = 11\%$, $p = 0.000$). In the second model, adding Well-Being at Work increases the explanatory power of the model ($\Delta r^2 = 31\%$, $p = 0.000$). Table 3 allows us to observe the contributions of each variable.

Table 3: Summary of hierarchical regression for variable Subjective Well-Being

Modelo	Variáveis	β	t	p
1.	S OC	0.336	6.971	0.000
	I OC	0.056	1.155	0.248
	O OC	0.010	0.210	0.834
	R OC	-0.121	-2.653	0.008
2	S OC	0.017	0.390	0.697
	I OC	0.027	0.693	0.489
	O OC	-0.026	-0.673	0.501
	R OC	-0.018	-0.481	0.631
	W WB	0.641	18.375	0.000

In the first model there is a determination of Culture Organizational Support on Subjective Well-Being. However, in the second model to be introduced, Well-Being at Work, this becomes more of an explanatory contribution in determining the Subjective Well-Being. Thus, in both models, the variables that significantly contribute to the explanation of the dependent variable are those with a strong affective character.

Confirmatory Analysis Model: In this section our aim is to establish an explanatory model of relations between the concepts studied, leaving much of its theoretical principles previously analyzed as relations between variables. Inferential statistical tests performed, including regression analysis, allowed us to provide an explanatory model which attempts to assess adjustment through structural equations. The model considers the determination of

Culture Organizational Support on Well-Being at Work on this and Subjective Well-Being. To assess the adjustment, different parameters were utilized. The reason X2 for the degrees of freedom (X2/df 0.052) between two and three indicates a good fit. A X2 not significant ($p = 0.051$) indicates a good fit (Byrne, 2001). The CFI (comparative fit index) and GFI (good adjustment index) of 0.987 and 0.998, respectively, by presenting values close to 1 represent a reference for a good fit (Bentler, 1992; Joreskog, 1996). With regard to measures of error, the SRMR (standardized residual square root) and RMSEA (root square error of approximation) should have values less than 0.05 to be considered a good fit, although values below 0.08 may yet be considered if it is a reasonable adjustment (Browne & Cudeck, 1993; MacCallum, Browne, & Sugawara, 1996). Thus, the value of SRMR 0.025 and 0.001 RMSEA are indicative of good / fair adjustment.

4. DISCUSSION / CONCLUSION

Empirical research shows that organizational variables, namely Organizational Culture (Brian Stanley, Achilles, & Christopher, 2009), have an impact on the performance of individual human assets. The Organizational Culture predicts organizational outcomes such as performance, satisfaction and Well-Being at Work (Wright & Davis, 2001; Wright & Bonett, 2002). For the central role that work has on society, in general, and in people's lives, in particular, the Well-Being at Work assumes repercussions both for the person and for the work (income and productivity) (Huppert & Whittington, 2003).

For the mean of the cognitive dimension of Subjective Well-Being, Life Satisfaction is also located above the center point, and there is a prevalence of experience of positive situations (McCullough, Heubner, & Laughlin, 2000). Similarly a higher mean of Positive Effects was also observed, which seems to reflect an enthusiasm for life, a tendency to experience pleasant emotions and feelings. Such emotions promote wakefulness and motivate individuals to avoid potentially threatening situations (Watson, Wiese, & Tellegen, 1999).

In terms of Well-Being at Work, values above the midpoint are a very positive indicator. Studies have shown the benefits of increased Well-Being at Work at various levels such as: reducing costs in health care (Whire & Jacques, 2007) and the decreased level of stress and frustration (Furnham & Walsh, 1991). The variables under study are correlated. It is common knowledge that people ensure the organization's survival. Thus, it is crucial that there is a clear union of quality of life of their employee's productivity with the purpose of the organization to achieve its objectives, implying an organization-employee relationship more carefully and closely related.

Although our purpose was to establish a model of relationship between variables, based on the theoretical principles and the results of the observed relationships, the proposed model shows that the Culture Support predicts Well-Being at Work. Simultaneously, the Well-Being at Work also contributes positively to the prediction of Subjective Well-Being.

Despite the importance of studying Well-Being at Work, theoretical models and empirical studies on the construct are scarce. The main research area refers to the general Well-being; studies that focus on teachers are fewer, and those who portray other professional schools are far fewer. Thus, there seems to be a need for a deeper understanding of the educational reality, particularly in the portrayal of several professionals who make up the school context. In the future it would be interesting, from the observed results, to develop an action inquiry, in order to enhance Well-Being at Work through strategic human resource management. Simultaneously, it would be able to reconcile a quantitative methodology with other qualitative ones, in order to better understand the needs of different professionals in the educational context. Only knowledge will allow the establishment of local initiatives, so

they can have a full coverage. In this sense, for Sequeira and Marques (2011) the knowledge management is a set of processes that, through the dissemination of knowledge, maintains or improves the performance of organizations.

REFERENCES

- Barreira, A. P. (2011). Spatial Strategic interaction non public expenditures of the northern portuguese local governments. *Spatial and Organizational Dynamics*, 6: 23-36.
- Bentler, P. M. (1992). On the fit of models to covariances and methodology to the Bulletin. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112: 400-404.
- Blanchflower, D. G., & Oswald, A. J. (1998). What makes an entrepreneur? . *Journal of Labor Economics*, 16(1): 26-60. doi:10.1086/209881.
- Brian, T. G., Stanley, G. H., Achilles, A. A., & Christopher, L. S. (2009). Organizational culture and effectiveness: A study of values, attitudes, and organizational outcomes. *Journal of Business Research*, 62(7): 673–679.
- Browne, M. W., & Cudeck, R. (1993). Alternative ways of assessing model fit. In K. A. Bollen, & J. S. Long, *Testing structural equation models* (pp. 445-455). Sage. Newbury Park.
- Byrne, B. M. (2001). Structural equation modeling: Perspectives on the present and the future. *International Journal of Testing*, 1(3-4):327-334.
- Conrad, L. (1998). Enhancing research through academic staff development. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 3(2):114-124. doi:10.1080/1360144980030204.
- Daniels, K. (2000). Measures of five aspects of affective well-being at work. *Human Relations*, 53: 275-294.
- Diener, E., & Suh, M. E. (1997). Subjective well-being and age: an international analysis. *Annual Review of Gerontology and Geriatrics*, 17: 304-324.
- Diener, E., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The satisfaction with life scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49(1):71-75. doi:10.1207/s15327752jpa4901_13.
- Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived Organizational Support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3): 500-507. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.71.3.500.
- Furnham, A., & Walsh, J. (1991). Consequences of person environment incongruence: absenteeism, frustration and stress. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 131: 187-204.
- Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F., & Hayes, T. L. (2002). Business- unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(2): 268-279. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.87.
- Helliwell, J., & Putnam, R. D. (2005). The social context of well-being. In F. A. Huppert, B. Keverne, & N. Baylis, *The science of well-being* (pp. 435-459). Oxford University Press. Oxford.
- Hofstede, G. (1997). *Culturas e Organizações: compreender a nossa programação mental*. Edições Sílabo. Lisboa.
- Huppert, F. A., & Whittington, J. E. (2003). Evidence for the independence of positive and negative well-being: implications for quality of life assessment. *British Journal of Health Psychology*, 8(1): 107-122. doi:10.1348/135910703762879246.

- Jorekog, K. G. (1996). Testing a simple structure hypothesis in factor analysis. *Psychometrika*, 34:165-178.
- MacCallum, R. C., Browne, M. W., & Sugawara, H. M. (1996). Power analysis and determination of size sample for covariance structure modeling. *Psychology Methods*, 1(2): 130-149. doi:10.1037/1082-989X.1.2.130.
- McCullough, G., Heubner, E. S., & Laughlin, J. (2000). Life events, self-concept and adolescents' positive subjective well-being. *Psychology in Schools*, 37(3): 281-291.
- Mendes, A. M., & Tamayo, A. (2001). Valores organizacionais e prazer sofrimento no trabalho. *PSICO*, 6(1): 39-46.
- Miles, S., & Mangold, M. (2007). Growing the employee brand at ASI. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 14(1): 77-85.
- Neves, J. (2000). *Clima Organizacional, Cultura Organizacional e Gestão de Recursos Humanos*. RH Editora. Lisboa.
- Quinn, R. E., & Cameron, K. (1983). Organizational life cycles and shifting criteria of effectiveness: some preliminary evidence. *Management Science*, 29(1): 33-51. doi:10.1287/mnsc.29.1.33.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2001). To be happy or to be self-fulfilled: a review of research on hedonic and eudaimonic well-being. In S. Fiske, *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52: pp. 141-166.
- Santos, J., Gonçalves, G. (2010). Contribuição para a adaptação portuguesa da escala de Bem-estar no Trabalho de Warr (1990). *Psicologia, Educação e Cultura*, XIV(2):285-300.
- Schein, E. H. (1992). *Organizational Culture and Leadership*. Jossey-Bass. San Francisco.
- Schermelleh-Engel, K., Moosbrugger, H., & Müller, H. (2003). Evaluating the fit of structural equation models: Test of significance and descriptive goodness-of-fit measures. *Methods of Psychological Research - Online*, 8(2): 23-74.
- Sequeira, B. & Marques, J. F. (2011). Knowledge management in tourism organisations: Proposal for an analytical model. *Spatial and Organizational Dynamics*, 7: 7-32.
- Simões, A. (1992). Ulterior validação de uma escala de satisfação com a vida (SWLS). *Revista Portuguesa de Pedagogia*, XXVI(3): 503-515.
- Siqueira, M. M., Padovam, V. A., Chiuzi, R. M., & Covacs, J. M. (2006). A interface Bem-estar subjectivo e Bem-estar no Trabalho. In I. Leal, J. L. Pais Ribeiro, & S. N. Jesus, *Actas do 6º Congresso Nacional de Psicologia da Saúde* (pp. 23-28). Instituto Superior de Psicologia Aplicada. Lisboa.
- Stark, E. M., Shaw, J. D., & Duffy, M. K. (2007). Preference for Group Work, Winning Orientation, and Social Loafing Behavior in Groups. *Group Organization Management*, 32(6): 699-723. doi:10.1177/1059601106291130.
- Van Muijen, J. K., Papalexandris, N., Branyiscki, I., Spaltro, E., Jesuino, J., & Neves, J. (1999). Organizational Culture: The Focus Questionnaire. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 8(4): 551-568. doi:10.1080/1359432.
- Warr, P. (1990). The measurement of well-being and other aspects of mental health. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63(3):193-210.
- Warr, P. (2008). Environmental vitamins, personal judgments, work values and happiness. In S. Cartwright, & C. L. Cooper, *The Oxford Handbook of Organizational Well-being* (pp. 57-85). Oxford University Press. Oxford.

- Warr, P. B. (1987). *Work, unemployment and mental health*. Oxford University Press. Oxford.
- Warr, P. B. (2007). *Work, Happiness and Unhappiness*. Routledge. New York.
- Watson, D., Clark, L. A., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of Positive and Negative Affect: The PANAS Scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54(6):1063-1070.
- Watson, D., Wiese, D. V., & Tellegen, A. (1999). The two general activation systems of affect: structural findings, evolutionary considerations and psychological evidence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 76(5): 820-838. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.76.5.820.
- Whire, K., & Jacques, P. (2007). Combined diet and exercise intervention in the workplace. *American Association of Occupational Health Nurses*, 55(3): 109-114.
- Wright, B. E., & Davis, B. S. (2001). Job satisfaction in public sector: The role of work environment. *American Review of Public Administration*, 33(1): 70-90.
- Wright, T., & Bonett, D. (2002). The moderating effects of employee tenure on the relations between organizational commitment and job performance: a meta analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(6):1183-1190. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.87.6.1183.
- Zempetakis, L. A., Beldekos, P., & Moustaris, V. S. (2009). "Day-to-day" entrepreneurship within organisations: the role of trait Emotional Intelligence and Perceived Organizational Support. *European Management Journal*, 27(3): 165-175.