

Work Engagement within the Employees of Pt. Vector 41

Dwiana Wulandari*, Siti Zahreni, Zulkarnaen

Faculty of Psychology, Universitas Sumatera Utara, Indonesia



Abstract – The aim of this research is to find out the level of work engagement within the employees of PT. Vector 41. This research use survey model with 85 employees of PT. Vector 41 in Medan city (Indonesia) chosen with total sampling technique. The data is analyzed with descriptive statistical and One Way Anova. The result shows that work engagement within the employees of PT. Vector 41 is low. This conclusion can be used as a guide to further explore and give intervention in order to increase work engagement in employees.

Keywords – *Work engagement.*

I. INTRODUCTION

Every company that is founded certainly has a purpose. The goal will be achieved if the company's management is able to manage, operate, and control its human resources. The company's goals will be more easily achieved if it is accompanied by the support of productive human resources.

To improve the quality of the industry, an industry requires dedicated employees, employees who have participation or work engagement to carry out their work (Bakker & Leiter, 2010). Lockwood in Mani (2015) explains that employee work involvement is the key to the success of achieving the goals of an organization. Work engagement is defined as something positive, work-related conditions and self-satisfaction characterized by enthusiasm, dedication and determination (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2013).

PT. Vector 41 is a service company engaged in building planning consulting that was established in 2010, located in Medan, Indonesia. The motive for the formation of the PT. Vector 41 company originated from the attitude and form of affection towards artistic construction in the city of Medan. PT. Vector 41 believes that each building can have a great base of charm and maximum function if maintained properly and correctly. As a consulting services company, Vector 41 requires good work engagement to align with company goals.

II. OBJECTIVES AND METHODS

The purpose of this study was to examine work engagement on employees of PT. Vector 41. The study was conducted on 85 employees using total sampling. The research data was obtained through a work engagement scale consisting of 10 items with reference to the concept proposed by Schaufeli and Bakker (2013). Likert scale model, consists of five alternative answers: most suitable, suitable, neutral, not suitable and most not suitable with score from 1 to 5. The data analyze with statistical descriptive and One Way Anova.

III. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The results of this study were 47 people (53.09%) showed low work engagement, 29 people (40.39%) had high work engagement, the remaining 9 people (6.52%) were not categorized. Low work engagement indicates a low level of persistence, willingness and focus in completing tasks.

According to Little & Little (2006; in Endres & Mancheno-Smoak, 2008) argues that the concept of work engagement can be used as a solution to problems related to motivation and performance. Work engagement can predict employee work results, organizational success, and financial performance (Bates, 2004; Baumruk, 2004; Harter et al., 2002; Richman, 2006; Saks, 2006).

IV. CONCLUSION

This research lays out the descriptive assessment of work e within the employees of work engagement PT. Vector 41 in Medan city, Indonesia. The result shows that 47 employees (53,09%) shows low work engagement, 29 employees (40,39%) with high work engagement, and 9 employees (6,52%) unspecified. This result can be used as a guide to further explore the reason why the work engagement exist and give intervention to increase the work engagement in employees.

REFERENCES

- [1] Bakker, A.B & Leiter, M.P. (2010). *Work engagement : a handbook of essential theory and research*. New York: Psychology Press
- [2] Bakker, A.B. (2011). An evidence-based model of work engagement. *Current directions in psychological science*, 20(4), 265-269.
- [3] Baumruk, R. (2004). The Missing Link: The Role of Employee Engagement in Business Success. *Workspan*, 47, 48-52.
- [4] Bates, S. 2004. Getting Engaged. *HR Magazine*, Vol. 49, No. 2, pp. 44-51.
- [5] Endres, G.M. & Mancheno-Smoak, L. (2008). The Human Resource Craze: Human Performance Improvement and Employee Engagement. *Organizational Development Journal*; Spring 26 (1).pp.69-78.
- [6] Harter, J. K., Schmidl, F. L., and Hayes, T. L. (2002). Business-unit level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes : A Meta-analysis. *Journal of applied psychology* Vol. 87 : hal. 268-79.
- [7] Lockwood, N. (2007). Leveraging employee engagement for competitive advantage : HR strategic role. *SHRM Research Quarterly*. 1-11.
- [8] Richman, A. 2006. Everyone Wants an Engaged Workforce How Can You Create It?. *Workspan*. Vol. 49: 36-39.
- [9] Mani, V. (2015). Analysis of Employee Engagement and its Predictors. *International Journal of Business, Social Sciences and Education*, Vol. 2, No. 1.
- [10] Saks, A.M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, vol. 21 (7). pp. 600-619.
- [11] Schaufeli, W.B. (2013). What is engagement ? In C. Truss, K. Alfes, R. Delbridge, A. Shantz, & E. Soane (Eds.), *Employee engagement in theory and practice*. London : Routledge.