

Assessment of the level of employee performances in some selected organizations in Kampala, Uganda.

¹Tom Mulegi, ²Mary Tunde Nalubega, and ²Eleanor Kirahora Barongo

¹Department of Public Administration, College of Humanities and Social Sciences, Kampala International University.

²Department of Development Peace and Conflict studies, College of Humanities and Social Sciences, Kampala International University.

ABSTRACT

This study assessed the level of employee performances in some selected organizations in Kampala, Uganda. The study objective was achieved through descriptive, cross sectional and correlative survey designs. A study population of 484 was earmarked, from which a sample population of 219 respondents were derived using Slovene's Formula. Data was collected primary using self-administered questionnaires (SAQs) and structured interviews. An extensive review of literature contributed a significant amount of secondary data. Findings showed that the r-value indicated that 67.7% of employee performance is influenced by job safety, implying that the remaining 23.3% of change in employee productivity could be explained by other factors other than Job safety. The study recommended that the Different stakeholders including government and non-governmental organizations need to put in place mechanisms to ensure that employees are protected from work. The government should put in place laws aiming at protecting workers against health issues associated with work related Hazards.

Keywords: Employee, performances, and organizations

INTRODUCTION

It is generally accepted that productivity growth in most Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) countries has been far from stellar during the last three decades [1, 2, 3, 4]. One result is slow increases in living standards. This has motivated policy advisors and social scientists to more closely examine the factors driving productivity performance [5, 6, 7, 8]. Traditionally, good health was thought to arise from economic prosperity, but economists now propose that prosperity depends on a healthy population. Healthy citizens lead to healthy economies [9, 10, 11]. This idea should resonate now, given that individuals' knowledge and skills are widely viewed as cornerstones of innovation and growth [12, 13]. Behind this thinking is the new growth theory in economics, which focuses attention on firm-level contributions to growth. This theory explores how technology operates through 'facilitating structures' in the context of specific public policy

frameworks [14, 15, 16]. The focus on facilitating structures is important, because included here are human capital and organizational and managerial systems in firms [17]. If productivity growth depends on firm-level innovation (OECD 1998: 3), then the fundamental question is: What are the organizational and work environment factors that support individual employees to be innovative? Once that question is posed, the psycho-social work environment, work-family balance, and physical health and safety become important productivity issues.

The lack of a common theoretical perspective for examining workplace productivity poses challenges for workplace health researchers and practitioners [18, 19, 20]. There are three distinct perspectives on productivity: research on workers as individuals and as groups, focusing on their effectiveness and performance; research on organizations (firms) that focuses on outcomes related to costs and profits;

and research on aggregate productivity. Each uses different units and levels of analysis, conceptual frameworks and research methodologies [21]. Health promotion researchers are constrained by the complexities of productivity and, as a result, tend to take a very narrow view of productivity outcomes. The most developed area examines the financial impact of workplace health promotion programs. [22], review of 72 peer-reviewed articles on this topic documents that the main productivity-related outcomes studied are employer health care costs and absenteeism. While both absenteeism and employer health care costs affect operating efficiency, neither capture current human-capital based conceptions of productivity, nor do they address how work environment factors affect these outcomes. But as [23] observes, "in an economy that is increasingly information-based, the concept of productivity is somewhat more difficult to quantify." Clearly, here is a common challenge for economists and workplace health researchers to take up together. Or stated in the context of major policy priorities in Canada: What workplace conditions establish a virtuous circle connecting worker health and well-being with innovation and skill development? And furthermore, what are the most effective economic incentives that would lead employers to adopt healthy workplace practices [24].

There are different productivity definitions in literature. [25], defined the productivity as, "productivity is that which people can produce with the least effort". Employee Performance is also defined by [26] as, "output per employee hour, quality considered". [27], defines productivity as, "the increased functional and organizational performance, including quality". Productivity is a ratio to measure how well an organization (or individual, industry, country) converts input resources (labor, materials, machines etc.) into goods and services. In some case, the productivity is measured considering performance increase as when there is less

Aim of the study

The aim of this research was to assess the level of employee performances in some

absenteeism, fewer employee leaving early and less breaks; whereas increase in performance can be measured by the number of units produced per employee per hour. In this study, subjective productivity measurement method is used. The measures of this method are not based on quantitative operational information. Instead, they are based on personnel's subjective assessments. [28], have defined subjective performance measure as an indicator used to assess individuals' aggregated perceptions, attitudes or assessments toward an organizations product or service. Subjective productivity data is usually collected using survey questionnaires. Productivity contributes to value creation or added value by making continuously better use of resources to contribute to growth, innovation and employment; it is not seen just as a statistical ratio. Productivity is an expression of how efficiently and effectively goods and services (i.e. goods and services which are demanded by users) are being produced. Thus, its key characteristics are that it is expressed in physical or economic units - in quantities or values (money) - based on measurements which are made at different levels: on the level of the economy overall, that of a sector or branch of the economy, that of the enterprise and its individual plants/units and that of individuals [29]. Moreover, productivity is not only measured by quantity and quality, but also by the benefit the customer obtains. This is especially true for the service industry. The concept of productivity is also increasingly linked with quality - of output, input and the process itself. An element of key importance is the quality of workforce, its management and its working conditions and it has been generally recognized that improving quality of working life and rising productivity do tend to go hand in hand. Generally speaking, productivity could be considered as a comprehensive measure of how organizations satisfy the following criteria [29].

selected organizations in Kampala, Uganda.

Research Question

- i. What is the level of Employee performance among selected Organizations in Kampala, Uganda?

Geographical Scope

The study was confined to the Makerere University, Mukwano Industry, and National Organization of Teachers Association among in Kampala where the materials for study are based.

Content Scope

This study sought to achieve the objective as stated above. That is; to examine the level of Employees' Productivity among Public and Private Organizations in Kampala, Uganda.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study employed the descriptive Cross sectional and correlative survey design. It was descriptive study which is non-experimental. It describes the characteristics of a particular individual, or of a group. It dealt with the relationship between job safety and employee performance, testing of hypothesis and development of generalizations and use of theories that have universal validity.

Research Population

The target population of this study consisted of 484 respondents from Mukwano Industry, Makerere University, National Organization of teachers associations.

Sample Size

To get the sample size of 219 respondents; Mukwano Industry, Makerere University staffs, and national organization of teachers association were got from these sample categories. Table 1 shows the respondents of the study with the following categories: The Sloven's formula is used to determine the minimum sample size

Table 1: Respondents of the Study

Category of Employees	Accessible Population	Sample Size	Sampling Method
Mukwano Industry	120	54	Simple Random
Makerere University Administrators	220	100	Simple Random
National Association of teachers	144	64	Simple Random
Total	484	219	

Source: Researcher (2014)

Table 1: the above shows the criteria for selection of the respondents

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + Ne^2}$$

Where: n = sample size, N = accessible population size, e = margin of error.

$$n = \frac{484}{1 + (484)0.05^2}$$

$$n = 219$$

Sampling Procedures

The sampling technique in this research was simple random sampling. This is because, it is free from bias and therefore likely to led to valid observation and generalizations. If the sample is selected well, it would be a representative of the entire population.

Research Instruments Questionnaire

A standardized self-administered questionnaire on employee productivity in public and private organizations in selected organizations in Kampala was used to determine employee productivity. The scoring system of this questionnaire is as follows: strongly agree (4); agree (3); disagree (2); strongly disagree (1). The questionnaire was

divided into three parts or section, where the first section contained items on demographic characteristics of respondents, second section contained items on determining the level of employee productivity. The researcher also used an interview guide to have a clear cut understanding of the variables.

Interviews

Interviews offered a rich source of data [5], interview guide was used to explore on the job safety and employees' productivity among public and private Organizations in Kampala. It gave a platform for illiterate respondents who were part of the target population to express their views. This instrument was selected because offered trust and understanding with respondents and data was collected using a Semi-structured interview guide which contained an open ended questions. The

researcher was able to elicit information relating to their category of employment. In this case, Mukwano industry employees, Makerere University administrators and National Association of teachers enabled researcher to access non formal information and it provided to transit to formal to establish the different job safety and employee productivity among public and private organizations in Kampala. It helped the researcher to attain for information in the interview carried out.

Validity and Reliability of the Instruments Reliability

To test for reliability, Cronbach's Alpha was used. The researcher measured internal consistence by using Cronbach's

Alpha. The results from the measure of reliability are shown in table 2 below.

Table 2: Reliability statistics of different constructs of the questionnaire

Constructs	Number of items	Cronbach's Alpha
Electronic Safety	4	0.721
Fire Safety	6	0.846
Hazardous materials	7	0.884
Sanitation	4	0.761
Tools and equipments	6	0.867
Time management	5	0.551
Leadership and motivation	8	0.819
Overall	40	0.778

Source: Researcher (2014)

Overall, the results indicate that the research tool was reliable in measuring

the variable since the overall reliability was above 0.6.

Validity

It measures the extent to which a research instrument measures what it is intended to measure or the extent to which the research findings can be generalized to other populations. To test the validity of the instrument, the researcher used first inter-judge co-

efficiency of validity. Three expert judges (in this case three lecturers of the researcher) made independent appraisal of the items in the questionnaire. Their results were used to establish the content validity Index (CVI) using the following formula.

Data Gathering Procedures

Before the administration of the questionnaires

1. An introduction letter was obtained from the College of Higher Degrees and Research for the researcher to solicit approval to conduct the study from respective Ministry of education, Makerere University, Organisation of national association of teachers.
2. When approved, the researcher secured a list of the respondents from Mukwano Industry, Makerere University, Organisation of national association of teachers and were selected through random sampling from this list to arrive at the minimum sample size.
3. The respondents were explained to about the study and were requested to sign the Informed Consent Form.
4. The researcher produced more than enough questionnaires for distribution.
5. The researcher selected research assistants who assisted in the data collection. They were briefed and oriented in order to be consistent in administering the questionnaires.

During the administration of the questionnaires

1. The respondents were requested to answer completely and not to leave any part of the questionnaires unanswered.
2. The researcher and assistants emphasized retrieval of the questionnaires within five days from the date of distribution.
3. On retrieval, all returned questionnaires were checked if all are answered.

After the administration of the questionnaires

The data gathered were collated, encoded into the computer and statistically treated using the frequencies and Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). The data processing was the presentation of every

level taken to structure and analyze the collected data. This was both qualitative and quantitative methods necessary for different ways of analyzing questionnaires and interviews.

Data Analysis

The mean and standard deviations and analysis of variance were applied in establishing differences in employee productivity in Private and Public Organizations. This was both qualitative and quantitative methods necessary for different ways of analyzing questionnaires and interviews. Thematic content analysis was used to expand and establish the relation between job safety

and employee productivity in organization in Kampala. The researcher established a set of categories and then compiled the information that was found in specific categories. An item analysis was used to illustrate the strengths and weaknesses based on the indicators in terms of mean and rank. From these strengths and weaknesses, the recommendations were derived.

Ethical Considerations

To ensure confidentiality of the information provided by the respondents and to ascertain the practice of ethics in this study, the following activities were implemented by the researcher:

1. The respondents were coded instead of reflecting the names through a written request to the concerned officials in order to access data from them
2. The researcher requested the respondents to sign the informed consent form specifically, participants were informed about the aim and nature of the research
3. The researcher acknowledged the authors quoted in the study through citations and referencing.
4. Findings to the study were presented in a generalized manner to enhance privacy and confidentiality.

Limitations of the Study

In view of the following threats to validity, the researchers claim an allowable 5% margin of error. Mitigating measures were taken to minimize if not to eradicate threats to validity of findings of the study as shown below;

Extraneous variables which were beyond the researchers control such as

respondents honesty, personal biases and uncontrolled setting of the study.

Instrumentation: The research instruments are not standardized.

Therefore a validity and reliability test was done to produce credible measurements of the research variables.

DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

The study investigated employees' productivity among public and private organizations in Kampala, Uganda. It was guided by one objective; to examine the level of employees' productivity among public and private Organizations in Kampala, Uganda. To achieve this objective, the researcher designed a questionnaire. The questionnaire was

The Level of Employees' Productivity among Public and Private Organizations in Kampala, Uganda

The second objective of the study was to examine the level of employees' productivity among public and private organizations in Kampala Uganda. To achieve this objective, the researcher analyzed section B of the questionnaire. This section contained two construct that is time management and leadership and motivation. The items under these constructs are all based on a four Likert scale where 1 = strongly disagree, 2 =

divided into time management (with five items), leadership and motivation (with eight items). All this items were based on a four Likert scale where 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = agree and 4 = strongly agree. The questionnaire was accompanied by an interview guide. The results from analysis, following objective by objective are illustrated below.

disagree, 3 = agree and 4 = strongly agree. The questionnaire was accompanied and was analyzed and interpreted, the voices of the respondents were clearly presented or quoted. The researcher used means and standard deviation in determining the level of employees' productivity among public and private organizations in Kampala Uganda. The results are shown in tables 3 and 5 below.

Table 3: Time Management

Items	Mean	Std. Deviation	Rank	Interpretation
Employees meet all deadlines on time	2.78	.943	1	High
The organization makes decisions quickly enough	2.74	.983	2	High
Employees have a hard time saying no to requests for your time.	2.60	.982	3	High
Employees are interrupted many times each day.	2.54	.997	4	High
There are delays that causes others to always wait for other employees	2.54	.986	5	High
Overall Mean	2.64			High

Source: Primary Data (2014)

Table 4: Interpretation

Mean range	Response range	Interpretation
3.26 - 4.00	Strongly agree	Very high
2.51 - 3.25	Agree	High
1.76 - 2.50	Disagree	Low
1.00 - 1.75	Strongly disagree	Very low

Table 3 shows the mean responses of the first construct in measuring the level of productivity of employees in selected private and public organizations in Kampala, Uganda. This construct is about measuring employee productivity in terms of time management. The results indicate that regarding whether employee meet all deadlines on time was ranked the highest with (mean = 2.78, std. dev = .943) interpreted as high. The second ranked item was "The organization makes decisions quickly

enough" with (mean = 2.74, std. dev = .983) interpreted as high. The item "Employees have a hard time saying no to requests for your time" was ranked 3rd with (mean = 2.60, std. dev = .982) interpreted as high. Concerning whether employees are interrupted many times at work, this was ranked 4th with (mean = 2.54, std. dev = .997) interpreted as high. The last ranked item was about whether there are delays that causes others to always wait for other employees with (mean = 2.54, std. dev = .986) interpreted

as high. The overall mean of time management construct was (mean = 2.64) interpreted as high as was time management is the most important factor in job safety and employee productivity among public and private organizations in Kampala, Uganda. Some respondents who took part in the interviews said that:

We report to our work places early enough because it's part of their commitment and we make sure that we meet the deadlines for every

assignments"

Further, in another interview with the one of the respondent stressed the issue of employees being interrupted many times each day that may one way or another affects time management of the employee job safety and productivity in public and private organizations in Kampala, Uganda. This indicates that time management was ranked high among the employees in the public and private organization where the study was carried out.

Table 5: Leadership and Motivation

Items	Mea	Std.	Ran	Interpretation
Different departments cooperate with each other	3.08	1.015	1	High
Employees know that productivity is measured	2.91	.968	2	High
Politics are kept to a minimum	2.89	.961	3	High
Managers and supervisors make it easy for employees to do their work well.	2.88	.950	4	High
Equipments needed to do the work are readily available	2.73	.981	5	High
The company implements change quickly enough.	2.67	1.015	6	High
Employees are rewarded for improving work processes.	2.63	1.066	7	High
It is easy to obtain training if needed	2.63	1.074	8	High
Overall Mean	2.80			High
General Mean	2.72			High

Source: Primary Data (2014)

Table 6: Interpretation

Mean range	Response range	Interpretation
3.26 - 4.00	Strongly agree	Very high
2.51 - 3.25	Agree	High
1.76 - 2.50	Disagree	Low
1.00 - 1.75	Strongly disagree	Very low

Table 5 shows the results from response analysis of the second construct of employee productivity that is leadership and motivation. The mean responses show that, concerning whether different

departments cooperate with each other, this was ranked the highest with (mean = 3.08, std. dev = 1.015) interpreted as high. In terms of whether employees know that productivity is measured, this

Mulegi *et al*

was ranked second with (mean = 2.91, std. dev = .968) interpreted as high. The third ranked item was "politics are kept to a minimum, with (mean = 2.89, std. dev = .961) interpreted as high. The item "Managers and supervisors make it easy for employees to do their work well" was ranked 4th with (mean = 2.88, std. dev = .950) interpreted as high. Concerning whether equipments needed to do the work are readily available, this was ranked 5th with mean (2.73), std. dev (.981) interpreted as high. The item "The company implements change quickly enough" was ranked the 6th with mean (2.67) std. dev (1.015) interpreted as high. Concerning whether employees are rewarded for improving work processes, this was ranked 7th with (mean = 2.63, std. dev = 1.066) interpreted as high. The last ranked item under this construct was "It is easy to obtain training if needed" with (mean = 2.63, std. dev = 1.074) interpreted as high. The overall average of this construct was (mean = 2.80) interpreted as high.

Generally, the overall level of employee productivity among employees in private and public organization in Kampala Uganda is high with (mean = 2.72) interpreted as high. This means that employees' productivity in these organizations is high. Factors that contribute to this considered under this study are conceptualized under job safety. The highest ranked item under employee productivity was about whether different departments cooperate

FINDINGS

The level of Employees' Productivity among Public and Private Organizations in Kampala, Uganda

The level of employee productivity among employees in private and public organization in Kampala Uganda is high with (mean = 2.72). This means that employees' productivity in these organizations is high. Factors that contribute to this considered under this study are conceptualized under job safety. The highest ranked item under employee productivity was about whether different departments cooperate

CONCLUSION

The level of employee productivity among employees in private and public organization in Kampala Uganda was

www.iaajournals.org

with each other, this was ranked the highest with (mean = 3.08, std. dev = 1.015) interpreted as high. The last ranked items were about whether employees are interrupted many times at work and whether there are delays that causes others to always wait for other employees with (mean = 2.54). It should however be noted that these items had differing standard deviations (std. dev = .997) and (std. dev = .986) respectively. Meaning that the employees are motivated by their leader in different departments as was quoted by the respondents interviewed:

"I like the way our bosses motivate us some time we are given reward for work done and like me I was taken for training to acquire skills to enhance productivity in this organization"

The findings found out in the interviews that the organization employees come from different political backgrounds and employment is by merit but the organization does not need to know about it. This was quoted from one of the respondents as:

"most of our bosses belong to the ruling party but they don't care whether you're from opposition because what they need is productivity of the organisation"

This indicated that research findings have significant relationship between leadership and motivation of job safety and employee productivity among public and private organizations in Kampala, Uganda.

with each other, this was ranked the highest with (mean = 3.08, std. dev = 1.015) interpreted as high. The last ranked items were about whether employees are interrupted many times at work and whether there are delays that causes others to always wait for other employees with (mean = 2.54). It should however be noted that these items had differing standard deviations (std. dev = .997) and (std. dev = .986) respectively.

high. This means that employees' productivity in these organizations are high. Factors that contribute to this

considered under this study are conceptualized under job safety as electronic safety, fire safety, hazardous materials and tools and equipments. The highest ranked item under employee productivity was about whether different departments cooperate with each other. Concerning employees' productivity, the last ranked items were about whether

employees are interrupted many times at work and whether there are delays that cause others to always wait for other employees. This suggested that there are minimal interruptions and delays in different organizations. It should however be noted that the rate is still high.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Depending on the findings, the researchers recommended the following

1. Different stakeholders (government, NGOs) in different organisations need to ensure that employees are protected from such health problems associated with work. The government should put in place laws aiming at

- protecting workers against health issues associated with their work.
2. Also, different organizations need to work on how workers are appraised as the interview guide showed that appraisal is still done but not so often. This may work as a motivation to work and thus improve productivity.

REFERENCES

1. Kirahora, B. E., Busingye, J. D., & Lubale, G. (2021). Education Attainment and Women Entrepreneurship in Uganda: A Perspective. *European Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 1(6), 64-69.
2. Bachmann, K. 2000. *More Than Just Hard Hats and Safety Boots: Creating Healthier Work Environments*. Ottawa: Conference Board of Canada.
3. Baer, M. and Frese, M., 2002: Innovation is not enough: Climates for Initiative and Psychological Safety, *Process Innovation and Firm Performance Journal of Organizational Behaviour Wiley InterScience. Psychology and Marketing Vol 21(11) 961 - 986.*
4. Brandt-Rauf, P., W. N. Burton, and R. J. McCunney. 2001. "Health, Productivity, and Occupational Medicine." *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine* 43(1):1-2.
5. Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary.(2008) 3rded, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
6. Cascio, W.F. (1986).*Managing Human Resources Productivity,Quality of Life,Profit*.New York: MC Graw-Hill
7. Chu, C., G. Breucker, N. Harris, and A. Stitzel. 2000. "Health-Promoting Workplaces-International Settings Development." *Health Promotion International* 15(2):2000.
8. Chu, C., T. Driscoll, and S. Dwyer. 1997. "The Health-Promoting Workplace: An Integrative Perspective." *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Public Health* 21(4):377-85.
9. Cole, G. A. (2002)*f'e/-50/7/7e/ and Human Resource Management* London: Thompson Learning Bedford Row,
10. Dorgan, C.E. (1994) productivity Link to the Indoor Environment Estimated Relative to ASHRAE 62-1989, *Proceedings of Health Buildings '94, Budapest*, pp.461 472
11. Downey, D. *Met al.* (1995). *The development of case studies that Demonstrate the Business Benefit of Effective Management of Health and Safety*, London:
12. Dyktor H. G. (1940). "Integration of Industrial Hygiene with Industrial Medicine," *Industrial Medicine* 9, no. 4, 193.
13. Eakin, J. M., M. Cava, and T. F. Smith. 2001. "From Theory to Practice: A Determinants Approach to Workplace Health Promotion in Small Businesses."

Mulegi *et al*

- Health Promotion Practice 2(2): 172-81.
14. Eva, D. and Oswald R. (1981). *Health and Safety at Work*, London: Pan Books.
 - Golaszewski, T. 2001. "Shining Lights: Studies That Have Most Influenced the Understanding of Health Promotion's Financial Impact." *American Journal of Health Promotion* 15(5):332-40.
 15. Guhathakurta, S. and Yates, J. (1993). "International labor productivity." *Journal of Construction Engineering*, 35(1), 15-25.
 16. Gundecha M. M. (2012). *Study of Factors Affecting Labor Productivity at a Building Construction Project in the USA: Web Survey*, A Paper Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the North Dakota State University of Agriculture and Applied Science, In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements For the Degree of MASTER OF SCIENCE.
 17. Gunderson, M and D. Hyatt. 2002. *Economic Incentives: Strategies for Engendering Healthy Workplaces*. Ottawa, ON: Draft Report submitted to Health Canada.
 18. Gunderson, M. 2002. *Rethinking Productivity from a Workplace Perspective* . Ottawa, ON: Canadian Policy Research Networks. Discussion Paper W1 7.
 20. Heizer, J., and Render, B. (1990). *Production and Operations Management "Strategic and Tactical Decisions."* Prentice Hall, NJ.
 21. Hinze, J. W. (1999). *Construction Planning & Scheduling*. Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ.
 22. Holt, A. and Andrews, H. (1993). *Principles of Health and Safety at Work* London: IOSH Publishing.
 23. Lipsey, R. G. 1996. *Economic Growth, Technological Change, and Canadian Economic Policy*. Ottawa: C.D. Howe Institute, Benefactors Lecture
 24. Litwin, G. H. And String/ RA. {198&}. *Motivation and Organisation Climate/ Boston: Harvard University Press,*
 25. Lloyd, L Byars, and Leslie W. Rue.(2008). *Human Resource Management* New York :MC Graw-Hill/Irwin, 2008
 26. Malzon, R. A. and G. B. Lindsay. 1992. *Health Promotion at the Worksite: A Brief Survey of Large Organizations · in Europe*. Copenhagen: World Health Organization, Regional Office for Europe. European Occupational Health Series No. 4.
 27. Thomas, H. R., Riley, D. R., and Sanvido, V. E. (1999). "Loss of labor productivity due to delivery methods and weather." *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 125(1), 39-46.
 28. Tom Mulegi,(2022). *An Overview of Performance of Health Workers in Uganda*. IDOSR Journal of Social Sciences 7(1):113-124
 29. Yriänhelkkl, E. 2011. *Well-being at work on the Finnish agenda*. NES2011 - Wellbeing and Innovations through Ergonomics. Oulu, Finland 18 - 21 September 2011. Book of Abstracts pp. 17-23.