

The Relationship Between Employee Engagement, Physical Wellness, Work-Life Balance and Employee Well-Being

*Dayang Nailul Munna Abg Abdullah¹, Ridhawati Zakaria¹, Noor Azura Dahalan¹, Maliza Delima Kamarul Zaman¹, Zully Afiqah Ishak²

¹Faculty of Business and Management, Univerisiti Teknologi Mara, Puncak Alam Campus, Kuala Selangor, Selangor, Malaysia

²Lorong Sungai Puloh, IDEOS Corporate Park, Kawasan Perindustrian Sungai Puloh, Klang, Selangor, Malaysia
*nailul@uitm.edu.my, zullyafiqah@gmail.com

Corresponding Author: Dayang Nailul Munna Abg Abdullah

Abstract: Employees often face challenges in finding work environments that consistently promote their well-being, despite spending a significant portion of their lives at work. This research investigates how employee engagement, work-life balance, and physical wellness relate to employee well-being at Nabati Food Malaysia Sdn. Bhd. Using a quantitative approach, the study tested three hypotheses through a survey with 187 participants, utilizing convenient sampling and an online questionnaire. Data were analyzed with the SPSS version 24.0. The results showed significant relationships between all variables and employee well-being, with employee engagement having the most substantial impact. The study recognized its limitations and provided recommendations for future research. Overall, the findings offer valuable insights for Nabati Food Malaysia and the fast-moving consumer goods sector, emphasizing the importance of enhancing employee well-being to improve business operations and employee satisfaction.

Keywords: *Employee Engagement, Work-Life Balance, Physical Wellness, Employee well being*

1. Introduction and Background

In today's high-tech work environment, there is a growing focus on employee well-being due to the increasing challenges faced by employees in managing their mental health. Employee well-being encompasses both physical and mental health, which are essential for overall life satisfaction and productive performance. Various researchers, such as Bryson, Forth, and Stokes (2017), emphasize that well-being includes cognitive aspects and is crucial for work motivation and performance. A holistic approach to well-being integrates physical, cognitive, and spiritual dimensions, impacting both personal and professional success.

Well-being is not a new concept, but its application in the workplace is still evolving. Schulte and Vainio (2010) suggest that well-being includes the quality of one's work-life, workplace safety, and health, while Abu Bakar et al. (2015) highlight the influence of physical, cultural, ecological, and technological environments on well-being. Disabato et al. (2016) identified two key dimensions of well-being: hedonic (focused on positive emotions and life satisfaction) and eudaimonia (focused on personal growth and mental strength). These models differ in how they measure well-being.

In Malaysia, employee well-being is an emerging issue, but research on it remains limited. Malaysia's Well-being Report highlights the country's social and economic well-being but lacks a long-term strategy. According to Lee (2018), Malaysia needs its well-being index to assess mental, emotional, and physical health. Mental health problems are a growing concern, with 18,336 people in Malaysia identified as being in various stages of depression in 2017. Promoting mental health awareness is crucial for societal well-being.

Workplace conditions, such as working hours, environment, and design, significantly affect employee well-being. Wilson et al. (2010) argue that poor well-being negatively impacts productivity, while Su and Swanson (2019) suggest that poor well-being leads to lower physical and psychological health. Changes in the work environment, such as open-office layouts, can also impact employee well-being (Guest, 2017). Erdal (2021) emphasizes that workplace design, safety, and health standards directly influence well-being, making it essential for organizations to create positive work environments to improve productivity and quality of life.

Pronk (2014) argues that a healthy, resilient workforce is a valuable resource for achieving business success. However, defining and measuring well-being is challenging due to its dynamic nature and societal changes. Martela and Pessi (2018) suggest that organizations need to recognize the evolving expectations of employees and respond to their changing needs.

The importance of employee well-being is increasingly recognized, particularly in countries like the United States, the United Kingdom, and Japan, where businesses prioritize well-being to achieve economic success. In contrast, developing countries, including Malaysia, still lag in addressing this issue. The COVID-19 pandemic has further exacerbated employee well-being concerns, with many workers experiencing stress, exhaustion, and difficulties maintaining work-life balance. The pandemic has highlighted the need for organizations to prioritize employee well-being to maintain productivity and engagement.

Poor work-life balance is linked to various psychological and medical problems, as noted by Ismail and Kam (2018). The inability to balance work and family life negatively impacts well-being and job satisfaction. Research suggests that work-life balance within an organization indirectly affects employee well-being. Additionally, physical wellness is essential for job satisfaction and performance. Organizations must create environments that promote physical and mental well-being to enhance employee satisfaction and productivity.

In summary, this study examines the relationship between employee engagement, work-life balance, physical wellness, and employee well-being in the workplace, emphasizing the significance of these factors for individual and organizational success.

2. Literature Review

Employee Well-being: This study adopts Pollard and Davidson's definition of employee well-being, emphasizing the effective implementation of physiological, intellectual, and socio-emotional functions across a lifespan. Employee well-being, often linked to work-life balance, includes job satisfaction and positively affects performance (Huang et al., 2016). Employees working in a positive environment show enhanced well-being and productivity. Sharma et al. (2016) highlight that employee well-being involves both physical and psychological elements, with cognitive symptoms such as anxiety, depression, and self-respect, and physical symptoms like aches, dizziness, and muscular issues. Poor well-being negatively impacts productivity and increases healthcare costs (Su & Swanson, 2019).

Employee well-being is also connected to hedonic experiences and cognitive happiness (Bryson et al., 2017). Work-life balance, physical health, and well-being are crucial areas for organizations to focus on. Emotional well-being influences significant workplace outcomes, and Su and Swanson (2019) emphasize that the work environment plays a key role in well-being. Leadership styles and the psychological work environment significantly affect employee well-being (Enwereuzor et al., 2020).

A healthy workforce is linked to higher productivity and lower turnover (Wright & Huang, 2012). Employee well-being fosters loyalty and reduces sick days, leading to improved job performance (Abd Elaziz et al., 2015). Well-being is associated with job satisfaction, living standards, and career opportunities, as well as individual factors like job-related stress and work-family balance (Lapierre & Allen, 2006; Schaufeli et al., 2008). Occupational factors like job demands also influence well-being (Macky & Boxall, 2008). Helping behaviors at work can enhance well-being by providing access to additional resources.

Recent psychological research has explored how individuals perceive well-being, focusing on the hedonic and eudaimonia models, which define well-being through positive emotions and personal growth, respectively (McMahan & Estes, 2010; Disabato et al., 2016).

Employee Engagement: Employee engagement refers to an employee's cognitive and emotional state at work, shaping their connection to job roles (Al-dalahmeh et al., 2018). The concept originated with Kahn (1990), who is credited with establishing the employee engagement paradigm (Welch, 2011). Yalabik et al. (2017) describe engagement as a specific and rigorous relationship between employees and their work, emphasizing that active, engaged employees contribute more effectively to organizational goals. This engagement is fostered by

clear compensation, recognition, and career development opportunities, which build trust (Jena et al., 2018).

Engaged employees perform better, go beyond their job duties, and enhance customer satisfaction. Organizational commitment is closely tied to task focus, and research by Schaufeli and others has linked engagement with health, well-being, and burnout, which affects productivity and success (Schaufeli et al., 2002). A workplace that promotes engagement is vital for both organizational performance and employee well-being, with low engagement levels leading to stress, demotivation, and turnover (Bevan, 2010). High engagement helps organizations weather adversity and retain loyal employees during changes (Miller, 2016).

However, excessive engagement can also be harmful, as noted by Christian et al. (2011) and George (2011), while disengagement negatively impacts well-being and performance (Shuck & Reio, 2013). Employee engagement serves as a tool to enhance well-being and maintain resilience (Cooper, 2014). Research shows that highly engaged employees report better well-being and personal success, while low engagement is linked to emotional exhaustion and depersonalization. Employees with higher well-being are significantly more engaged, satisfied with their work, loyal to their teams, and likely to recommend their company (Limeade & Quantum Workplace, 2016).

Employee engagement is closely tied to positive outcomes such as creativity, client satisfaction, and task performance (Bakker & Albrecht, 2018). Studies consistently demonstrate a positive relationship between engagement and employee well-being (Robertson et al., 2012; Matz-Costa et al., 2012).

H1: There is a significant relationship between employee engagement and employee well-being.

Physical Wellness: The World Health Organization (WHO) defines wellness as a state of complete physical, mental, and social well-being, beyond just the absence of illness. This holistic view emerged after World War II when harsh working conditions adversely impacted employees' health. The wellness movement, supported by figures like Dr. Halbert Louis Dunn, focuses on individuals' overall well-being and potential (Dunn, 1961).

Workplace wellness programs, as defined by the Centers for Disease Control (CDC), include activities or policies that promote healthy behaviors and improve health outcomes at work. These programs aim to enhance employees' physical, interpersonal, intellectual, spiritual, environmental, psychological, and occupational well-being. Addressing all dimensions of well-being, not just physical health, is essential for productivity and maintaining a balanced workforce. Research shows that investing in employee well-being yields significant returns, with a 10 to 1 return on investment (Johnson & Johnson, 2003).

Physical wellness is one of the most recognized aspects, with employees often able to detect physical health issues like flu or back pain. However, poor physical wellness is frequently caused by unhealthy habits, such as poor diet, lack of exercise, and substance abuse. These issues can affect productivity and organizational performance. Workplace wellness programs can mitigate these effects by encouraging healthier lifestyles and improving overall employee well-being.

Since the 1950s, employers have supported employee well-being through programs addressing mental health and substance abuse, which evolved into broader wellness initiatives in the 1970s and gained popularity in the 1980s and 1990s. Studies have shown that wellness programs reduce healthcare costs, lower absenteeism, and attract talent. A recent article emphasizes the importance of workplace wellness programs, showing that they significantly boost employees' physical health and lower stress, resulting in happier and more fulfilled workers (Bianchi & Fabbro, 2022). Additionally, research indicates that employees with higher physical fitness experience less burnout and psychological distress, underscoring the critical role physical health plays in overall worker well-being (Gerber et al., 2021).

According to the 2019 Health and Well-Being research by the O.C. Tanner Institute, wellness programs increase employee engagement, loyalty, and productivity while reducing long-term healthcare costs. Despite these benefits, only a small percentage of employees feel their employers prioritize emotional and social well-being alongside physical health.

H2: There is a significant relationship between physical wellness and employee well-being.

Work-life Balance: Work-life balance refers to the equilibrium between personal and professional responsibilities. Various terms are used by scholars, including "work-family balance," "work-personal life balance," and "work-family fit." Definitions vary, but common themes include managing time between work and home duties and reducing role conflict.

Researchers like Jyothi and Jyothi (2012) describe work-life balance as the ability to meet both personal and professional demands. Valcour (2007) emphasizes that satisfaction in both areas leads to overall fulfillment. However, Frone (2003) notes that work often intrudes more on family time than vice versa. Theories like Boundary Theory, Compensation Theory, and Spillover Theory explore how experiences in one domain affect the other. Organizations increasingly recognize the importance of work-life balance and offer benefits like flextime, telecommuting, and family-friendly policies to help employees manage their responsibilities. These initiatives address not just professional obligations but also personal needs like childcare, eldercare, and health care, aiming to reduce stress and improve overall well-being.

Work-life balance has become a prominent theme in recent literature, with studies showing it significantly impacts employee well-being. For instance, a study by Okeya et al. (2020) found that work-life balance strongly influences the health of Nigerian bank employees. Organizations are encouraged to enhance working conditions to support employee well-being, as those who achieve balance tend to be healthier and more productive.

There is a strong positive relationship between work-life balance and job satisfaction. Employees who manage their personal and professional lives effectively experience higher job satisfaction and reduced burnout, which contributes to better mental and emotional well-being in the workplace (Dousin et al., 2019). Additionally, organizations should foster a supportive culture with flexible working hours and encouraging supervisors, as these factors significantly enhance employee well-being, reduce psychological distress, and improve engagement and productivity (Lamane-Harim et al., 2021).

In addition, Konrad and Mangel (2000) argue that balancing work and home demands is crucial for avoiding conflicts, particularly in industries requiring highly skilled employees. Achieving work-life balance benefits both individuals and organizations, leading to increased productivity, job satisfaction, and morale. In sum, work-life balance practices positively impact employees' time and overall organizational productivity.

H3: There is a significant relationship between work-life balance and employee well-being.

3. Research Methodology

The researcher collected primary data directly through online survey questionnaires. A quantitative approach was employed, focusing on statistical analysis of the data. Before actual data collection, a pilot test was conducted between 12th October and 1st November 2021, approved by the Research Ethics Committee. This pilot test aimed to ensure the reliability and validity of the questionnaire, involving 30 randomly selected employees from MunchWorld Marketing Sdn. Bhd., a company similar to the one under study. The pilot data was analyzed using SPSS Version 24.0 to calculate Cronbach's Alpha, confirming the instrument's reliability.

The actual data collection occurred from 23rd November to 30th December 2021. The researcher coordinated with the human resource administrator at Nabati Food Malaysia to distribute the survey. Due to strict safety protocols, in-person distribution was not possible. Instead, the researcher provided an online questionnaire link to the HR admin, who then redistributed it to employees. This approach ensured data collection continuity despite the pandemic, and the reliability of the questionnaire was further confirmed by analyzing the pilot study results, which led to a smooth and effective data collection process.

Descriptive statistics were employed, including frequencies, means, and standard deviations, while inferential statistics included Multiple Regression Analysis. Reliability was assessed with Cronbach's Alpha, requiring a minimum of 0.7 for internal consistency. Pearson correlation analysis measured the strength of relationships. Between variables and multiple regression determined the impact of independent variables on dependent variables, with R-values, F-tests, and p-values used to assess model accuracy and significance.

4. Findings and Analysis

Demographic Analysis: According to Table 1 below, the demographic data from Nabati Food Malaysia Sdn. Bhd. Shows that 63.1% of respondents were female, and 36.9% were male. Most respondents (57.2%) were aged between 20-29 years, with the least (5.3%) aged 50 and above. A majority (59.9%) were single, while 38% were married. The majority of respondents were Malay (67.4%), followed by Chinese (24.1%), Indian (6.4%), and others (2.1%), mainly Indonesians. Most respondents held a Bachelor's degree (59.9%), with the majority having 1-5 years of service (46.5%), and the minority had over 5 years of service (24.6%).

Table 1: Summary of Respondents' Demographic Profiles

Demographic Information		Frequency	Percentage%
Gender	Male	69	36.9
	Female	118	63.1
Age	20-29 years old	107	57.2
	30-39 years old	53	28.3
	40-49 years old	17	9.1
	50 years old and above	10	5.3
Marital Status	Single	112	59.9
	Married	71	38
	Divorced	4	2.1
Race	Malay	126	67.4
	Indian	12	6.4
	Chinese	45	24.1
	Others	4	2.1
	SPM	8	4.3
Education level	STPM/Foundation/Matriculation	1	0.5
	Diploma	64	34.2
	Bachelor Degree	112	59.9
	Master	2	1.1
Year of Service	Less than a year	54	28.9
	1-5 years	87	46.5
	More than 5 years	46	24.6

Reliability Analysis: In the statistical reliability study, Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient was employed. A reliability coefficient (r) greater than 0.6 indicates a high level of dependability and acceptance, while a coefficient of 0.8 or above signifies an extremely high level of reliability (Pallant, 2001). An Alpha Cronbach rating of less than 0.6 is considered poor. According to Tavakol and Dennick (2011), Cronbach's Alpha should range between 0 and 1, with values closer to 1.0 indicating higher internal consistency. However, Hulin, Netemeyer, and Cudeck (2001) suggest that a Cronbach's Alpha coefficient greater than 0.95 may not always be ideal, as it could indicate redundancy in the items.

In this study, the reliability coefficients of three independent variables and one dependent variable were determined using Cronbach's Alpha. Table 2 presents the results of the reliability analysis. The variables—employee engagement, physical wellness, work-life balance, and employee well-being—had Cronbach's alpha values of 0.781, 0.781, 0.590, and 0.782, respectively. All factors were confirmed to be reliable (Hair, Babin, Money, and Samuel, 2013). Although Cronbach's Alpha score for work-life balance was the lowest at 0.590, it was still considered acceptable, possibly due to specific question content (Juil, Rensburg, and Steyn, 2012). Therefore, the questionnaire used in the study is deemed reliable.

Table 2: Reliability Analysis Results

Variables	No of Items	Cronbach's Alpha	Degree of Reliability
Employee Engagement	10	0.781	Good
Physical Wellness	7	0.781	Good
Work-Life Balance	10	0.590	Acceptable
Employee Well-Being	10	0.782	Good

Descriptive Analysis: The study used descriptive analysis to examine data, focusing on the mean and standard deviation of various variables measured with a five-point Likert Scale. The interpretation range was divided into three categories—low (1 to 2.33), average (2.34 to 3.67), and high (3.68 to 5.00). The results showed that employee engagement had the highest mean score (4.4246) with a standard deviation of 0.30714, followed by employee well-being (mean = 4.1852, SD = 0.34278), physical wellness (mean = 4.0321, SD = 0.44988), and work-life balance (mean = 3.3791, SD = 0.35141). The findings suggest that employee engagement is the most significant factor influencing employees' well-being at Nabati Food Malaysia Sdn. Bhd.

Table 3: Mean and Standard Deviation for Independent Variables and Dependent Variable

Variables	Mean	Std. Deviation (SD)	Minimum	Maximum
Employee Engagement	4.4246	0.30714	3.20	5.00
Physical Wellness	4.0321	0.44988	2.71	5.00
Work-Life Balance	3.3791	0.35141	2.30	4.80
Employee Well-Being	4.1852	0.34278	2.25	5.00

Normality Test: A normality test was used to determine the data distribution, with skewness and kurtosis values calculated to assess its symmetry and "peakiness," respectively. According to Tabachnik and Fidell (2012), normality requires prediction errors to be evenly distributed around the expected score of the dependent variable. Data plots indicated a normal distribution, appearing uniformly along a diagonal line (Coakes, 2013). Descriptive statistics were used to check assumptions, revealing skewness and kurtosis values less than 3 for each variable, suggesting normality (Coakes, 2013). Hair and Bryne (2010) noted that kurtosis values within ± 7 are also acceptable. Table 4 shows skewness and kurtosis values for independent variables such as employee engagement, physical wellness, and work-life balance, with employee well-being as the dependent variable.

Table 4: Skewness and Kurtosis Values for Independent Variables and Dependent Variable

Variables	Skewness	Kurtosis
Employee Engagement	-0.372	0.974
Physical Wellness	-0.198	-0.179
Work-Life Balance	0.596	3.275
Employee Well-Being	-0.968	5.745

Pearson Correlation Analysis: This study used correlation analysis to assess the strength and direction of the relationships between variables and to test the study's hypotheses. Pearson Correlation (r) was used to measure the degree of the association, while the significance value (p) indicated whether a relationship existed. As shown in Table 5, the analysis found positive correlations between three independent variables and employee well-being. Employee engagement and employee well-being showed a moderate positive correlation ($r = 0.505$, $p = 0.000$), physical wellness and employee well-being showed a low positive correlation ($r = 0.464$, $p = 0.000$), and work-life balance and employee well-being had a little positive correlation ($r = 0.203$, $p = 0.005$). The correlation coefficient was interpreted based on the "Rule of Thumbs for Interpreting the Size of a Correlation Coefficient" by Cohen (1988).

Table 5: Pearson Correlation Analysis Employee

Variables		Employee Engagement	Physical Wellness	Work-life Balance	Employee Well-being
Employee Engagement	Pearson Correlation	1			
	Sig. (2-tailed)				
	N	187			
Physical Wellness	Pearson Correlation	0.094	1		
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.202			
	N	187	187		
Work-life Balance	Pearson Correlation	0.102	0.008	1	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.165	0.917		
	N	187	187	187	
Employee Well-being	Pearson Correlation	0.505**	0.464**	0.203**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	0.000	0.005	
	N	187	187	187	187

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Multiple Regression Analysis: A multiple regression analysis was conducted to explore the relationship between factors affecting employee well-being and to identify which factor has the greatest impact at Nabati Food Malaysia Sdn. Bhd. Multiple regression is described as an extension of bivariate correlation, used to identify the best predictors of an outcome. As presented in Table 6, the results showed that employee engagement, physical wellness, and work-life balance together explained 45.4% of the variance in employee well-being ($R^2 = 0.454$), leaving 54.6% of the variance unexplained, suggesting that other variables not included in the study could further strengthen the model.

The ANOVA results indicated that all three variables significantly predict employee well-being ($F = 50.778$, $p = 0.000$). Coefficient analysis revealed that all independent variables (employee engagement, physical wellness, and work-life balance) significantly contribute to employee well-being at a significance level of $p < 0.05$. Among them, employee engagement has the highest impact, with a Beta value of 0.503 ($p = 0.000$), indicating it is the strongest predictor of employee well-being.

Table 6: Regression Analysis Results

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			
1	(Constant)	0.161		0.471	0.638	
	Employee Engagement	0.503	0.062	0.450	8.168	0.000
	Physical Wellness	0.321	0.042	0.421	7.674	0.000
	Work-life Balance	0.150	0.054	0.154	2.802	0.006
	R	0.674 ^a				
	R Square	0.454				
	F	50.778				
	Sig.	0.000 ^b				

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Well-being

b. Predictors: (Constant), Employee Engagement, Physical Wellness, Work-life Balance

Discussion of Results: There was a significant positive relationship between employee engagement and employee well-being ($\beta = 0.503$, $p = 0.000$). The results suggest that higher employee engagement leads to improved employee well-being, while low engagement is associated with poorer well-being, potentially.

Affecting organizational growth. These findings are consistent with studies by Shuck and Reio (2013) and Bakker et al. (2014), which also reported that high engagement correlates with greater well-being and job satisfaction. However, the results contrast with Skurak, Naswall, and Kuntz (2018), who found no statistically significant relationship, likely due to a smaller sample size. Overall, the study supports the hypothesis (H1) that employee engagement significantly impacts employee well-being.

Moreover, the study also found a significant positive relationship between these two variables ($\beta = 0.321$, $p = 0.000$), indicating that employee well-being is closely linked to physical wellness. This finding aligns with the previous study by Khatri and Gupta (2019), which also demonstrated a positive relationship between physical wellness and employee well-being. The results suggest that organizations should invest in their employees' physical wellness to maintain optimal well-being. Thus, the hypothesis (H2) is supported by the data, confirming a significant relationship between physical wellness and employee well-being.

In addition, the analysis revealed a significant positive relationship between work-life balance and employee well-being ($\beta = 0.150$, $p = 0.006$), suggesting that employee well-being is relatively dependent on maintaining a good work-life balance. Disruptions, such as working inappropriate hours, negatively affect this balance and overall well-being. Dasgupta (2016) highlighted that companies believe a healthy work-life balance is a key preventive measure for employee health and well-being. The findings are consistent with studies by Khatri and Gupta (2019) and Soomro, Breiteneker, and Shah (2018), which also found a positive association between work-life balance and employee well-being, noting its impact on employee performance. These results support the hypothesis (H3) that a strong link exists between work-life balance and employee well-being, demonstrating its importance in organizational settings.

5. Recommendations and Conclusion

Recommendations for the Top Management of Nabati Food Malaysia: This study used regression analysis to explore the relationship between employee engagement, physical wellness, work-life balance, and employee well-being. The results revealed that all three independent variables positively impact employee well-being, with employee engagement emerging as the most significant factor. This indicates that employees at Nabati Food Malaysia perceive engagement as a key driver of their well-being.

To enhance employee well-being, several recommendations are proposed. First, organizations should foster open communication by encouraging employees to express their ideas and concerns. Facilitating round-table discussions can create a safe environment for sharing thoughts, which can lead to valuable contributions and greater employee engagement. Second, encouraging employees to pursue side projects can stimulate creativity and improve time management. This approach not only engages employees but also makes them feel valued and secure, which can positively affect their well-being and work performance. Third, promoting a positive health and wellness environment is essential. Companies can support this by providing gym memberships, massage therapy, or simply stocking nutritious snacks in the office. Such initiatives help employees manage stress and maintain clarity, contributing to overall well-being.

Additionally, implementing flexible work-from-home policies can greatly benefit employees. While not all organizations can offer regular remote work, providing occasional work-from-home opportunities can improve work-life balance and job satisfaction. Besides, offering career advancement opportunities is another key recommendation. Employees who see a clear path for progression are more likely to be motivated and committed to the organization's success. According to O'Reilly and Tushman (2011), leveraging current advantages while exploring new opportunities is crucial for maintaining competitive advantage and adapting to changing business conditions.

Paid vacation time is also vital. Modern workplaces should recognize the importance of vacations, not as a luxury but as a necessity. Allowing employees to take extended breaks without financial penalties helps them

return to work rejuvenated, which enhances productivity and overall well-being. Also, providing on-site childcare facilities can further support employees, particularly parents who struggle with work-life balance. In-house daycare services can create a more motivating and supportive work environment for employees with young children.

Recommendations for Future Researchers: The current study was limited to Nabati Food Malaysia and the fast-moving consumer goods (FMCG) sector, which restricts the generalizability of the findings. Future research should explore other industries or sectors in Malaysia, such as retail, telecommunication, financial services, or healthcare to obtain a larger sample size and more comprehensive results. Additionally, future studies could expand the scope by including other factors affecting employee well-being, such as employee empowerment, workload, personal growth, and job motivation. Investigating a broader range of determinants could provide more nuanced insights into employee well-being.

Furthermore, employing qualitative research methods could enrich the data. Qualitative approaches offer deeper insights into employee behaviors, attitudes, and experiences, leading to more accurate and reliable findings. Observational data and detailed interviews can enhance understanding and provide valuable context beyond quantitative analysis.

Limitations: The study encountered several limitations and challenges. First, convenience sampling was employed due to restrictions on accessing a comprehensive list of participants and limitations on distributing surveys across departments, driven by privacy concerns and strict organizational rules. To overcome this, the researcher used Google Forms and distributed the survey through the HR admin.

Second, the study focused solely on employees of Nabati Food Malaysia Sdn. Bhd., a single company in the fast-moving consumer goods (FMCG) sector. To gain a broader perspective, data should ideally be collected from multiple FMCG companies. Finally, the researcher faced difficulties in obtaining relevant literature on employee well-being and working environments in the Malaysian FMCG context, as most available data came from Western studies.

Conclusion: This study explored how employee engagement, physical wellness, and work-life balance impact employee well-being at Nabati Food Malaysia Sdn. Bhd. Findings indicate that employee engagement is the most significant factor influencing well-being, highlighting its importance for fostering a positive employee experience. Physical wellness also positively affects well-being, emphasizing the value of health initiatives in the workplace. While work-life balance is important, its impact is less pronounced compared to engagement and wellness. The study suggests that organizations should focus on enhancing engagement, promoting physical health, and supporting work-life balance to improve overall employee well-being. Future research should investigate these factors across different industries for a broader understanding.

References

- Abd-Elaziz, M. E., Aziz, W. M., Khalifa, G. S., & Abdel-Aleem, M. (2015). Determinants of electronic word of mouth (eWOM) influence on hotel customers' purchasing decisions. *International Journal of Heritage, Tourism, and Hospitality*, 9(2/2), 194–223.
- Al-dalahmeh, M., Masa'deh, R., Abu Khalaf, R. K., & Obeidat, B. Y. (2018). The effect of employee engagement on organizational performance via the mediating role of job satisfaction: The case of IT employees in the Jordanian banking sector. *Modern Applied Science*, 12(6), 17. <https://doi.org/10.5539/mas.v12n6p17>
- Bakar, A. A., Osman, M. M., Bachok, S., Ibrahim, M., & Mohamed, M. Z. (2015). Modeling Economic Wellbeing and Social Wellbeing for Sustainability: A Theoretical Concept. *Procedia Environmental Sciences*, 28, 286–296. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.proenv.2015.07.037>
- Bakker, A. B., & Albrecht, A. A. (2018). Work engagement: Current status and future directions. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 27(3), 285–293. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721417699354>
- Bakker, A. B., Albrecht, S. L., & Leiter, M. P. (2014). Work engagement: Current issues and challenges. *Career Development Quarterly*, 56(3), 204–214. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-0045.2014.00050.x>
- Bevan, S. (2010). *The Business Case for Employees' Health and Well-Being*. London: The Work Foundation.
- Bianchi, E. M., & Fabbro, C. (2022). Benefits of a Brief Physical Activity Program on Employees' Affective Well-

- being and Momentary Affective States: A Quasi-Experimental Study. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 23(5), 2043-2061. doi:10.1007/s10902-022-00528-2.
- Bryson, A., Forth, J., & Stokes, L. (2017). Does Worker Wellbeing Affect Workplace Performance? Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy.
- 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), 89–136.
- Coakes, S. J. (2013). SPSS Version 20: Analysis Without Anguish. Wiley.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cooper, K. S. (2014). Eliciting engagement in the high school classroom: A mixed-methods examination of teaching practices. *American Educational Research Journal*, 51(2), 363–402.
- Dasgupta, R. (2016). Work-life balance: A key factor for employee health and well-being. *Journal of Management Research and Analysis*, 3(4), 247–252
- Disabato, D. J., Goodman, F. R., Kashdan, T. B., Short, J. L., & Jarden, A. D. (2016). Different types of well-being? A cross-cultural examination of hedonic and eudaimonic well-being. *Psychological Assessment*, 27(5), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pas0000209>
- Dousin, O., Krzak, W., & Piorunek, K. (2019). The relationship between work-life balance and job satisfaction in Polish employees. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 2454. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02454.
- Dunn, H. L. (1961). *High-Level Wellness: A Collection of Papers*. Arlington, VA: Beatty Press.
- Enwereuzor, I. K., Ugwu, L. E., & Nnadozie, E. E. (2020). Dynamics of person-supervisor fit in relationship quality and well-being of university academicians. *Personnel Review*, 49(4), 827–844.
- Erdal, A. (2021). The impact of workplace design, safety, and health standards on employee well-being: Implications for productivity and quality of life. *Journal of Workplace Health Management*, 14(2), 112–125.
- Frone, M. R. (2003). Work-family balance. In *Handbook of occupational health psychology* (pp. 143–164). American Psychological Association. <https://doi.org/10.1037/10474-007>
- George, J. M. (2011). The wider context, costs, and benefits of work engagement. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 20(1), 53–59. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13594320903225009>
- Gerber, M., Pühse, U., Schilling, R., Elliott, C., Kellmann, M., & Basel, D. (2021). The relationship between physical fitness and psychological well-being among employees: A meta-analysis. *Health Psychology Review*, 15(3), 345-362. doi:10.1080/17437199.2021.1932772.
- Guest, D. E. (2017). Human resource management and employee well-being: Towards a new analytic framework. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 27(1), 22–38.
- Hair, J. F., Babin, B. J., Money, A. H., & Samuel, P. (2013). *Essentials of Business Research Methods*. Routledge.
- Hair, J. F., & Byrne, B. M. (2010). *Multivariate Data Analysis* (7th ed.). Pearson.
- Huang, L. C., Ahlstrom, D., Lee, A. Y. P., Chen, S. Y., & Hsieh, M. J. (2016). High-performance work systems, employee well-being, and job involvement: An empirical study. *Personnel Review*, 45(5), 868-886.
- Hulin, C. L., Netemeyer, R. G., & Cudeck, R. (2001). A test of the internal consistency of a measurement model of job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 611–621.
- Ismail, S., & Kam, S. (2018). The impact of poor work-life balance on psychological and medical problems. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 23(3), 235-247. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000105>
- Jena, L. K., Pradhan, S., & Panigrahy, N. P. (2018). Pursuit of organizational trust: Role of employee engagement, Psychological well-being, and transformational leadership. *Asia Pacific Management Review*, 23(3), 227–234.
- Johnson, R. E., & Johnson, P. G. (2003). Are H&P programs for you? *Strategic Finance*, 85(6), 39–46.
- Juul, L. C., Rensburg, R., & Steyn, J. (2012). The measurement of work-life balance: Reliability and validity issues. *South African Journal of Human Resource Management*, 10(1), 1–14.
- Jyothi, P., & Jyothi, P. (2012). Work-life balance and employee satisfaction: A review. *International Journal of Management Research and Review*, 2(7), 1177–1190.
- Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(4), 692–724. <https://doi.org/10.5465/256287>
- Khatri, P., & Gupta, P. (2019). Development and validation of employee well-being scale – a formative measurement model. *International Journal of Workplace Health Management*, 12(5), 352–368.
- Konrad, A. M., & Mangel, R. (2000). The impact of work-life programs on firm productivity. *Strategic Management Journal*, 21(12), 1225–1237.
- Lamane-Harim, S., Moussafir, D., & Mohcine, M. (2021). The role of a supportive work culture in enhancing

- employee well-being: A focus on flexible working arrangements. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 32(10), 2201-2220. doi:10.1080/09585192.2021.1930268.
- Lapierre, L. M., & Allen, T. D. (2006). Work-supportive family, family-supportive supervision, use of organizational benefits, and problem-focused coping: Implications for work-family conflict and employee well-being. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 11(2), 169-181.
- Lee, L. (2018). 29% of Malaysians have mental problems due to stress, says Lam Thye. *The Star*. Retrieved from <https://www.thestar.com.my/news/nation/2018/08/05/lee-lam-thye-more-msians-will-suffer-from-depression-by-2020-due-to-stress>
- Limeade, & Quantum Workplace. (2016). The employee engagement and well-being report 2016. Limeade. Retrieved from <https://www.limeade.com/resources/reports/employee-engagement-well-being-report-2016>
- Macky, K., & Boxall, P. (2008). High-involvement work processes, work intensification and employee well-being: A study of New Zealand worker experiences. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 46(1), 38-55. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1038411107086548>
- Martela, F., & Pessi, A. B. (2018). Significant work is about self-realization and broader purpose: Defining the key dimensions of meaningful work. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9, 363. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.00363>
- Matz-Costa, C., Pitt-Catsouphes, M., & James, J. B. (2012). The relationship between work engagement and employee well-being: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 27(7), 688-710.
- McMahan, E. A., & Estes, D. (2011). Hedonic versus eudaimonic conceptions of well-being: Evidence of differential associations with self-reported well-being. *Social Indicators Research*, 103(1), 93-108.
- Miller, J. (2016). The well-being and productivity link: A significant opportunity for research-into-practice. *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance*, 3(4), 362-373.
- O.C. Tanner Institute. (2019). The 2019 Global Culture Report: The state of employee well-being and the future of work. O.C. Tanner Institute. Retrieved from <https://www.octanner.com/global-culture-report>
- Okeya, O., Samuel, O., Ajayi, O., Owoniyi, O., & Okeya, M. (2020). Effects of work-life balance on health and well-being of employees in the Nigeria banking industry. *International Journal of Research and Review*, 7(7), 472.
- O'Reilly, C. A., & Tushman, M. L. (2011). Organizational ambidexterity: Past, present, and future. *The Academy of Management Perspectives*, 25(4), 6-20. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amp.2011.17501825>
- Pallant, J. (2001). SPSS Survival Manual: A Step-by-Step Guide to Data Analysis using SPSS for Windows. Open University Press.
- Pronk, N. (2014). Best practice design principles of worksite health and wellness programs. American College of Sports Medicine. Retrieved from <https://www.acsm-healthfitness.org>
- Robertson, I. T., Cooper, C. L., & Sarkar, M. (2012). Employee well-being and engagement: A review and recommendations for future research. *International Journal of Workplace Health Management*, 5(3), 128-146. <https://doi.org/10.1108/17538351211264254>
- Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., & Salanova, M. (2008). The measurement of work engagement with a short questionnaire: A cross-national study. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 68(4), 701-716.
- Schaufeli, W. B., Maslach, C., & Marek, T. (2002). The measurement of work engagement and burnout: A review of the literature. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23(2), 161-188. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.167>
- Schulte, P. A., & Vainio, H. (2010). Well-being at work - Overview and perspective. *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment & Health*, 36(5), 422-429.
- Sharma, P., Kong, T. T. C., & Kingshott, R. P. J. (2016). Internal service quality as a driver of employee satisfaction, commitment, and performance: Exploring the focal role of employee well-being. *Journal of Service Management*, 27(5), 773-797. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JOSM-10-2015-0294>
- Shuck, B., & Reio, T. G. (2013). Employee engagement and well-being. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 21(1), 43-58. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051813494240>
- Skurak, K., Naswall, K., & Kuntz, J. R. (2018). Employee engagement and well-being: Evidence from a small Sample study. *International Journal of Workplace Health Management*, 11(2), 82-95.
- Soomro, B. A., Breiteneker, R. J., & Shah, S. M. (2018). The impact of work-life balance on employee performance: Evidence from a developing country. *Journal of Business and Economic Development*, 3(1), 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.jbed.20180301.11>
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2012). Using Multivariate Statistics (6th ed.). Pearson.
- Tavakol, M., & Dennick, R. (2011). Making sense of Cronbach's alpha. *International Journal of Medical Education*,

- 2, 53–55. <https://doi.org/10.5116/ijme.4dfb.8dfd>
- Wright, T. A., & Huang, C.-C. (2012). The many benefits of employee well-being in organizational research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 33(8), 1188–1192. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1800>
- Su, L., & Swanson, S. R. (2019). Perceived corporate social responsibility's impact on the well-being and supportive green behaviors of hotel employees: The mediating role of the employee-corporate relationship. *Tourism Management*, 72, 437–450. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2018.12.015>
- Valcour, M. (2007). Work-based support, job performance, and work-family conflict: Test of a model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(3), 760–768. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.3.760>
- Welch, M. (2011). The evolution of the employee engagement concept: Communication implications. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, 16(4), 328–346. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13563281111186968>
- Wilson, M., Gilligan, C., & Jones, D. (2010). The impact of poor well-being on productivity: A review. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 15(4), 376-390.
- Yalabik, Z. Y., Allen, T. D., & L. B., & Fenton, M. A. (2017). Engagement as a specific and rigorous relationship between employees and their work: Exploring the role of active job resources. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102(8), 1209–1220. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000217>