



Vaasan yliopisto  
UNIVERSITY OF VAASA

**OSUVA** Open  
Science

This is a self-archived – parallel published version of this article in the publication archive of the University of Vaasa. It might differ from the original.

## Employee well-being: the role of perceived competence

**Author(s):** Kultalahti, Susanna; Viitala, Riitta; Hujala, Maija; Kekäle, Tauno

**Title:** Employee well-being: the role of perceived competence

**Year:** 2023

**Version:** Accepted manuscript

**Copyright** ©2023 Emerald Publishing Limited. This manuscript version is made available under the Creative Commons Attribution–NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY–NC 4.0) license, <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

### **Please cite the original version:**

Kultalahti, S., Viitala, R., Hujala, M. & Kekäle, T. (2023). Employee well-being: the role of perceived competence. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 38(7), 648-661. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JWL-06-2023-0095>

## **Employee well-being: The role of perceived competence**

### **ABSTRACT**

#### **Purpose**

The purpose of the study is to gain more understanding of how competence might matter from the perspective of well-being at work. We explore how perceived competence is connected to perceived work-related well-being among Baby Boomer, Generation X, and Generation Y employees.

#### **Design/methodology/approach**

We explore how perceived competence is connected to perceived work-related well-being among Baby Boomer, Generation X, and Generation Y employees. The frames of reference of the study is based on literature on employee well-being (measured with work engagement and overcommitment) and competence, as well as on generational discussions. The quantitative, questionnaire-based study was conducted in 88 companies in Finland the total number of respondents being 4418.

#### **Findings**

The main finding was that perceived competence related to current duties are a statistically significantly connected to employee well-being. The results indicate that high competence results in high employee well-being in all generational groups. Further, Generation Y estimated their work well-being, both in terms of work engagement and overcommitment, lower than Baby Boomers or Generation X.

The results suggest that developing competence of employees in organizations seems to be an important means to also support work well-being. It is especially important to pay attention to that among generation Y, who take their first steps in working life. Competence is a meaningful factor for coping in working life in continually changing work environments. Incompetence is not just a factor for poor performance, but also a potential threat for employee well-being.

#### **Originality**

Most of the competence/workplace learning results research concentrate on cognitive competence and skills, and often also from the employers' benefit viewpoint (useful skills, productivity increase). This study starts from the finding that new generations of workers rather look for a meaningful work life, and

thus a feeling of having the necessary competences directly improves their well-being and, thus, life quality.

Furthermore, the study is based on an original questionnaire-based study was conducted in 88 companies in Finland the total number of respondents being 4418.

**Keywords:** competence, employee well-being, generations

## **THE WORK WELL-BEING AND GENERATIONS**

According to previous studies, employees who report high well-being at work are more efficient, more committed, more helpful, and more cooperative with their colleagues and show better performance (Harter, Schmidt, & Keyes 2002; Krekel, Ward & De Neve, 2019; Sawitri, Suswati, & Huda, 2016). Problems with employee well-being in organizations likewise have many impacts: for example, rising costs and low-level performance caused by employee health care, accidents, sick leave, and turnover and indirect costs of inefficiency, underperformance, decrease in quality, and lost innovations (Cascio, 2006; Qiao, Schaufeli, & Taris, 2013; Rasool, Wang, Tang, Saeed & Iqbal, 2021).

Many previous studies have shown that individual's well-being at work is dependent on both job demands (physical and psychological effort the job requires) and job resources (autonomy at work, social support, supervisory support, feedback and opportunities for professional development; Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Hauff, Felfe & Klug, 2022), but also personal resources play an important role (see Xanthopoulou, Bakker, Demerouti, & Schaufeli, 2009). One essential factor for personal resources is individual's competence (Aggarwal-Gupta, Vohra & Bhatnagar, 2010; Fotiadis, Abdulrahman & Spyridou, 2019).

Sufficient competence of employees is less self-evident and hard to maintain in rapidly changing working life. Due to fast technological development, shortening life cycles of knowledge, as well as continual changes and restructurings of work organizations, it is more and more challenging to sustain the competence needed throughout the career. It can be assumed, that if an individual does not have necessary skills for the job, s/he cannot not perform well, s/he must exert him/herself, and as a result s/he will be stressed, which has also negative impacts on work.

Challenges with maintaining sustainable competencies at work have changed during the last decades. In the 70's and 80's people entering the working life could expect long careers in

organizations, where competency gradually and firmly strengthened along with work experience and by human resource development activities offered by those organizations. We cannot rely anymore on that long work experience is any kind of assurance for better competence in working life. In the new industrial revolution, all employees face the increasing need to constantly renew and develop their knowledge and skills (Flores, Xu & Lu, 2020).

The rapid and extensive development of technology is challenging the competencies of all employees, whose preconditions to face the development varies a lot between generations. Young people entering working life now – sometimes-called digital-natives – have adopted the information technology skills in their childhood, whereas their parents have had to learn them in their adulthood (Szymkowiak, Melović, Dabić, Jeganathan & Kundi, 2021). Another trend challenging the maintenance of occupational competences is the tightening time frames in business life and increasing haste, which easily weaken the possibilities to concentrate on learning new things with proper concentration and reflection. Especially young employees may face big challenges in attaining the skills needed for a good performance in their increasingly scattered careers, where they often are employed for filling an urgent gap in workforce in new organizations (Casey et al., 2004). For these perspectives, we include generational differences in this study to investigate the connection between competence and well-being. By adopting the concept of generations we refer not only to different states in life-cycle and career, but also to different historical contexts in which individuals adopt knowledge and skills, socialize into their work lives and face different challenges (see, e.g., Costanza et al., 2012; Kupperschmidt, 2006; 2000; Smola & Sutton, 2002).

In this study, we seek to answer the following overarching questions: *What kind of relation exists between employee perceived competence, in current as well as in more demanding tasks, and perceived well-being? Are there differences between the generations?* Answering these questions contributes to the academic discussion on employee well-being, and especially on the role of competence in it. From the practical perspective, answering these questions benefits those practitioners who are responsible for human resource development and well-being activities in organizations.

## THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Recently, many researchers who study employee well-being have focused especially on *work engagement*, which is a positive perspective on employee well-being instead of negative stress and burnout. Work engagement has been identified as “a positive, fulfilling work related state of mind that is characterized by vigor, dedication and absorption” (Schaufeli, Bakker & Salanova, 2006: 702).. The other side of well-being discussion relates to the ‘heavy work investment’ (a negative type of working hard) and ‘workaholism’ (Ivanova & Osin, 2016; Spence & Robbins, 1992), as well as overcommitment. Overcommitment refers to a set of attitudes, behaviors, and emotions reflecting excessive endeavor in combination with a strong desire for approval and esteem (Siegrist, 2001).

According to previous studies, engaged employees feel happy and enthusiastic, experience better physical and psychological health, transfer their engagement to others, and perform well and innovatively (Bakker, Demerouti, & Verbeke, 2004; Salanova & Schaufeli, 2008; Xanthopoulou et al., 2009). In addition, studies have shown that employees with high psychological well-being are more accepting of change in organizations (Robertson & Flint-Taylor, 2009; Van den Heuvel, Demerouti, Bakker, Hetland & Schaufeli, 2020).

One of the negative symptoms of affective dimension of employee well-being is *overcommitment* (Siegrist, 2001). Siegrist (1996) has described overcommitment as an individual propensity to overstrain oneself and to perform over one’s resources. In other words, one underestimates the demands at work and overestimates own coping resources (Siegrist, 1996). Overcommitted persons are driven by a high need for approval and control (Hetland, Saksvik, Albertsen, Berntsen & Henriksen, 2012). Overcommitment can thus cause severe risk of stress (e.g. Aggarwal-Gupta et al., 2010). Employees who overcommit have a higher risk of experiencing job strain than employees who do not, and overcommitted employees also may have difficulties performing well and may have intentions to quit (e.g. van Beek et al., 2012; van Horn, Tavis, Schaufeli & Schreurs, 2004).

Some studies have indicated that individual’s competence has a role in employee well-being (Ilmarinen et al., 2005; van Horn et al., 2004), but it has not gained much attention in research and in comparison with, for example, personality traits such as self-efficacy, self-esteem and optimism (Hajek & Konig, 2019; Tremblay & Messervey, 2011). Among the few empirical studies

on the topic focusing on employees in working life, Baard, Deci and Ryan (2004) found an association between competence and reduced anxiety among 59 banking sector employees; Lauermann & König (2016) found a connection between professional competence and wellbeing among 119 teachers; and Fotiadis, Abdulrahman & Spyridou, (2019) found a relation between psychological competence and wellbeing among 220 hospitality employees .

The definitions of individual *competence* refer most often to knowledge and understanding as well as to practical skills for achieving effective performance at work (Collins, 2010; Garavan & McGuire, 2001). Competence is a broad concept including individual skills (e.g. technical skills, communication skills and conceptual skills) and other capabilities (e.g. ethical, motivational, attitudinal, social) (Rychen & Salganik, 2003). Much of the work-related competence is experience-based (Paloniemi, 2006), and therefore, the process of and ability to adapt skills, e.g., concerning digital tools, plays an important role in maintaining and increasing competencies at work. Due to different historical and societal situations, people born and raised at different times, i.e., generation, have a different basis for learning and finding different issues more natural than others (Szymkowiak et al., 2021).

There are currently three major *generations* in the workforce, whose experiences in childhood and early adulthood differ considerably. The oldest generation, Baby Boomers, were born between 1944 and 1960, while members of Generation X were born between 1961 and 1980, and Generation Y between 1981 and 2000 (Kupperschmidt, 2006; see, e.g., Arsenault, 2004 or Smola & Sutton, 2002, for further definitions concerning the birth years). In contrast to the characteristics caused by age, scholars see generational mind-set as a more stable construct, which is linked to the society in which the individual lived and was raised, including economic shifts and worldwide incidents, such as wars (Kupperschmidt, 2006; 2000; Smola & Sutton, 2002). The generations as a contextual, historical-based and cultural phenomenon (Arsenault, 2004; Balda & Mora, 2011; Costanza et al., 2012), cause variations in many respect regarding to work-related factors, such as work values (Cennamo & Gardner, 2008; Cogin, 2012; Smola & Sutton, 2002; Stevanin, Palese, Bressan, Vehviläinen-Julkunen & Kvist, 2018), work style and traits (Glass, 2007), characteristics (Kupperschmidt, 2006), work attitudes (Hendricks & Cope, 2012; Sullivan, Forret, Carraher, & Mainiero, 2009), and commitment at work (James, McKechnie, & Swanberg, 2011; Park & Gursoy, 2012; Pitt-Catsouphes & Matz-Costa, 2008; Stevanin et al., 2018). For example, Park and Gursoy's (2012) findings revealed that Baby Boomers are the most loyal and

committed generation and Generation Y is the most vulnerable to negative factors at work. Further, Stevanin et al. (2018) found in their systematic review that Baby Boomers are less stressed and report less burnout than Generations X and Y, concluding that Generation Y is more easily affected by stress than other generations. However, the perspectives of well-being and competence have not received much attention in previous literature on generational comparisons (Aggarwal-Gupta et al., 2010; and relating to Baby Boomers: Wanka, Kolland & Psihoda, 2015; France, Leahy & Parsons, 2009; see also Stevanin et al., 2018 for their systematic review.)

## **THE PRESENT STUDY**

With this research setting we aim to find out what kind of role perceived competence plays in perceived well-being in diverse workforce. More specified, the aim of the present study is to gain more understanding of the relations between perceptions of competence and well-being at work among three different generations. On managerial level, this study produces some views for competence development, employee well-being management and diversity management in companies.

The research questions of this study are as follows:

*Research Question 1:* What is the role of perceived competence in current tasks in perceived well-being?

*Research Question 2:* What is the role of perceived competence in regard to more challenging tasks in perceived well-being?

*Research Question 3:* Are there differences between the generations in perceived well-being?

## **METHOD**

### **Procedure and Participants**

We present survey data gathered via an electronic or paper questionnaire from employees of 88 SME companies representing broad variety of business fields and located in different parts of Finland. The number of respondents per organization ranged from seven to 245, the average being of 50 employees, and the total number of respondents was 4418. The demographic profile of the respondents is presented in Table 1. As shown, men (67.4%) are somewhat over-represented

in the study. However, the survey included several areas of business and geographic locations in order to increase the representativeness of the data. Half of the respondents (50.0%) are members of Generation X, the second largest group are members of Generation Y (32.7%), and the rest are Baby Boomers (17.0%). The respondents with supervisory positions accounted for 14.9% of the total.

-----  
Insert Table 1 about here  
-----

## Measures

**Employee well-being.** *Work engagement* was measured with the validated Finnish version (Seppälä et al., 2009) of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) with nine items. Components of the work engagement scale included, for example: “At work, I burst with energy” and “I am enthusiastic about my job.” The response scale ranged from 1 = *never* to 7 = *daily*. We averaged the items to form a measure with excellent internal consistency (Cronbach’s  $\alpha = 0.945$ ).

**Overcommitment** was measured with Siegrist’s Effort-Reward Imbalance scale with six items. The components of the overcommitment scale included, for example: “I get easily overwhelmed by time pressures at work” and “People close to me say I sacrifice too much for my job.” The response scale ranged from 1 = *disagree totally* to 4 = *agree totally*. The six items exhibited good reliability (Cronbach’s  $\alpha = 0.810$ ), and they were averaged together.

**Perceived competence.** Perceived competence was measured with two single-item measures: “My competence level is sufficient for accomplishing my current tasks” and “My know-how would be enough for clearly more challenging tasks.” We adapted these items from measures in Jones Johnson and Johnson (2000). The response scale ranged from 1 = *disagree totally* to 7 = *agree totally*. Sufficient competence is a fundamental factor for good performance at work (Harter et al., 2002), but perceived over-qualification has been shown to be a threat to job satisfaction that is closely connected to employee well-being (Jones Johnson & Johnson, 2000; van Beek et al., 2012).

**Generation.** Participants self-reported their year of birth. Birth years were further transformed into generations: 1 (Baby Boomer, year of birth  $\leq 1960$ ), 2 (Generation X, year of birth between 1961 and 1980), 3 (Generation Y, year of birth  $\geq 1981$ ).



**Demographic characteristics.** Participants self-reported their gender (male or female) and their position at the organization (non-supervisory or supervisory). Demographic characteristics were included as control variables in the models.

### **Statistical Analysis and Model Specifications**

We used multilevel regression analysis (Raudenbush & Bryk, 2002), more precisely two-level random intercept models, to address the research questions. The assumption of multilevel analysis is that data are hierarchically structured. In our data, this is the case because employees are nested within organizations. First, two unconditional models, one for each measure of employee well-being (work engagement and overcommitment), were estimated to measure and compare organization-level variance and individual-level variance in employee well-being. Second, two main effect models (one for each measure of employee well-being), were estimated to answer the research questions. Predictors included perceived competence, generation (with Generation Y as reference category), gender (1 = female, 0 = male) and position at the organization (0 = non-supervisory, 1 = supervisory). Perceived competence included grand-mean-centered measures of perceived competence in current duties and perceived competence in more demanding duties.

## **RESULTS**

We present the descriptive statistics as well as correlation matrix of the key variables in Table 2. As shown, on average, the respondents' perceived competence is high (range 1.00–7.00,  $M = 6.06$ ,  $SD = 0.99$  for current duties;  $M = 5.39$ ,  $SD = 1.34$  for more demanding duties). Furthermore, respondents' work engagement also seems to be quite high (range 1.00–7.00,  $M = 5.52$ ,  $SD = 1.26$ ). The average overcommitment (range 1.00–4.00,  $M = 2.02$ ,  $SD = 0.720$ ) is below middle of the scale, indicating that, on average, overcommitment does not seem to be an issue.

-----  
Insert Table 2 about here  
-----

We present mean values of work engagement, overcommitment and perceived competences by generation in Table 3. A one-way between subjects ANOVA was conducted to compare the effect of generation on these variables. There was a significant effect of generation

on work engagement,  $F(2, 4383) = 24.27, p < .0001$ , overcommitment,  $F(2, 4386) = 16.66, p < .0001$  and perceived competence in more demanding duties,  $F(2, 4367) = 4.79, p = 0.0084$ . There was no significant effect of generation on perceived competence in current duties,  $F(2, 4376) = 1.46, p = 0.233$ ).

Post hoc analyses were conducted given the statistically significant ANOVA F test. Specifically, Bonferroni tests were conducted on all pairwise contrasts. With work engagement, all pairs of generations were found to be significantly different ( $p < .05$ ) from each other. On average, Baby Boomers had the highest work engagement ( $M = 5.72, SD = 1.20$ ), Generation X had the second highest ( $M = 5.57, SD = 1.25$ ) and Generation Y had the lowest work engagement ( $M = 5.31, SD = 1.29$ ). In regard to overcommitment, Generation Y ( $M = 1.93, SD = 0.71$ ) significantly ( $p < .05$ ) differs from both Generation X ( $M = 2.07, SD = 0.72$ ) and Baby Boomers ( $M = 2.07, SD = 0.73$ ). Thus it seems that, on average, members of Generation Y are slightly, yet significantly, less overcommitted compared to the older generations. Finally, what comes to perceived competence in more demanding duties, Generation X ( $M = 5.45, SD = 1.32$ ) significantly ( $p < .05$ ) differs from Baby Boomers ( $M = 5.28, SD = 1.35$ ). In other words, members of Generation X perceive, on average, higher competence in more demanding duties compared to Baby Boomers

-----  
Insert Table 3 about here  
-----

In order to analyze relationships between perceived competence and employee well-being as well as between generations and well-being we conduct multilevel regression analysis. We present the estimated parameters and the variance components of the unconditional models (M0) and the full models (M1) in Table 4. As shown, the intra-class correlations (ICC) of unconditional models are more than 5% for both employee well-being dimensions, indicating that more than 5% of the total variability in work engagement and overcommitment attributable to the organization level. Thus, the use of multilevel modeling is justified compared with the ordinary least squares (OLS) regression that ignores the hierarchical structure of the data.

-----  
Insert Table 4 about here  
-----

Our estimation results reveal that generation and perceived competence related to current duties have a statistically significant impact on employee well-being. Compared to members of Generation Y, Baby Boomers ( $b = 0.245, p < 0.001$ ) and members of Generation X ( $b = 0.099, p < 0.01$ ) experience statistically significantly higher work engagement. The same applies to overcommitment (Baby Boomers:  $b = 0.079, p < 0.05$ ; Generation X:  $b = 0.064, p < 0.05$ ). Thus, it seems that members of Generation Y differ statistically significantly from the members of the older generations in employee well-being.

For perceived competence related to current duties, it seems that the higher the perception of competence, the higher the work engagement ( $b = 0.249, p < 0.001$ ), and the lower the overcommitment ( $b = -0.145, p < 0.001$ ). Instead, perceived competence related to more demanding duties does not seem to be a statistically significant factor in employee well-being.

For the control variables, women seem to experience statistically significantly higher work engagement ( $b = 0.252, p < 0.001$ ) and overcommitment ( $b = 0.101, p < 0.001$ ) compared with men. Employees in supervisory positions experience statistically significantly higher work engagement ( $b = 0.653, p < 0.001$ ), and overcommitment ( $b = 0.378, p < 0.001$ ), compared those with non-supervisory positions.

## DISCUSSION

Our study showed empirical evidence of the connection between perceived competence and perceived well-being of employees. It confirmed the previous indications about the role of competence as an important personal resource affecting well-being of an employee (Ilmarinen et al., 2005; van Horn et al., 2004). In our sample, the higher the perceived competence in current tasks, the higher the work engagement (as a positive indicator of work wellbeing, Research Question 1). Accordingly, feelings of coping and success at work naturally increase happiness and engagement at work, compared to the opposite situation. Competence forms the necessary toolkit for coping at work and therefore it is an important factor for work engagement. However, it is also possible that employees, who are motivated and engaged in their work, also put more efforts to develop their competences related to the work and therefore feel themselves competent.

In our sample, perceived competence in current tasks was statistically connected also to negative indicators of employee well-being: the higher the perceived competence, the lower the

overcommitment (RQ1). This may indicate that employees with sufficient knowledge and skills are able to work with less stress than employees who are unsure of their competence needed in fulfilling their tasks. Overcommitment has revealed to be a severe risk of stress (Trybou et al., 2014; Aggarwal-Gupta et al., 2010) and therefore this finding is awakening.

The non-existent connection between perceived employee well-being and the perceived competence for clearly more challenging tasks was also interesting (Research Question 2). The latter could be a signal of over-qualification, which has been shown to be a threat to employee well-being (Jones Johnson & Johnson, 2000; van Beek et al., 2012). If an employee underutilizes their competence, it increases job boredom, which has often defined as an opposite state to work engagement, where employees lack interest in their work activities and have difficulties in concentrating on them (see Harju & Hakanen, 2016).

Decades ago more experienced employees could trust that their competence is sufficient for fulfilling the demands of the work. In modern working life, any employee may repeatedly meet situations where the tasks change and new knowledge and skills are needed. Especially the rapid technological development and continual changes in organizations, as well as globalization of business environments cause repeated needs to develop competences at work. Generation Y, the digital natives, face technological changes at work differently compared to older generations. Therefore, we observed both the perceived competence and perceived well-being among employees representing different generations (Research Question 3).

As a result, we did not find statistically significant differences in perceived competence in current task among different generations. It seems that long tenure in current position or long career in business life do not matter in relation to perceived competence of employees. In general, all the respondents in our sample were positive when they evaluated their competence level as sufficient for current tasks. This may indicate that recruitments, placement of people in different tasks, orienteering in new tasks and continual training have been successful in the companies. However, we do not know what kind of feedback our respondents have received concerning their competence and how realistically they could evaluate it. All the same, the feeling of being competent is important for well-being at work (Yao, Qiu, Yang, Han & Li et al., 2022; Salanova, Bakker, & Llorens, 2006; Sonnentag, 2003).

However, there were some differences concerning the perceived competence for clearly more challenging tasks. Measured by statistical means, respondents representing Generation X felt

more than the other two generational groups that their competence would stretch to a lot more demanding tasks. The most modest evaluations in this respect gave the respondents representing Baby Boomers. Respondents in Generation Y remained between the two groups and were not statistically significantly different from them. On the contrary, there was a statistical difference in this respect between representatives of Generation X and Baby Boomers. The view of the latter group could be explained by their realistic considering of the possibilities in advancements in their late career. However, it can also reflect their feeling of good person-fit in their permanent positions.

Further, we found clear generational differences in perceived employee well-being. Employees of Generation Y perceived both less work engagement and less overcommitment than employees representing Baby Boomers or Generation X. This finding is in line with previous findings of lower work engagement for Generation Y than for other generations (Park & Gursoy, 2012). Thus, our study adds to the literature of overcommitment by extending the perceptions of young employees. They are in the early career stage where they probably are still seeking their “own place” in working life. In addition, the present finding may indicate that the meaning of work in general is different for Generation Y than for Baby Boomers or Generation X (Cennamo & Gardner, 2008). As a consequence for putting more emphasis on work-life balance (Kultalahti & Viitala, 2015; Behrstock-Sherratt & Coggshall, 2010), employees representing Generation Y might be more relaxed at work. On the basis of our results we argue that that perceived competence in current duties has a statistically significant impact on employee well-being. Further, this relationship is demonstrated differently between generations.

Overall, the relationship between perceived competence and employee well-being has two-fold positive effects on organizational performance: investing in competence management is itself beneficial, but the advantages are also reflected in employee well-being, i.e., another dimension that is proven to affect organizational performance and effectiveness. Our finding contributes to the academic discussion on the topic and hopefully inspires academics for further studies.

From the managerial perspective, the findings emphasize the meaning of competence and knowledge development in organizations. The purpose of developing employees’ competences may not be just to improve their performance but also to improve their well-being. In the light of our findings, it is important to manage human resource development activities well in work organizations, for example orientation of employees in new tasks, training activities as well as coaching and mentoring of employees not just as a part of competence development but also as a

part of employee well-being management. Recruitments and career management resulting in a good fit between demands of the job and an employee with right skills is important. The increasingly diverse workforce, also in terms of generational characteristics, might result in the need to tailor development and learning programs for employees. For example, generational differences can be tackled with strategies that emphasize mentoring to harness the technological skills and a change-oriented mind-set of Generation Y to benefit the whole work community. In addition, the competence should not be underestimated or ignored in any field of industry or level of hierarchy, even though the meaning of competence has been highlighted especially in expert and knowledge work.

In the light of our study, feeling of sufficient competence results in work engagement, which according to previous studies results in good work performance (Yao et.al., 2022; Salanova et al., 2006; Sonnentag, 2003). We suggest that managers and HR professionals investigate this among employees in organizations regularly. If they succeed to create safe and approving organizational climate, where people are encouraged to be honest in these evaluations, the inquiry could give valuable cornerstones to develop employee well-being.

Even though the results revealed interesting aspects, our study has several limitations. First, men and some industries, such as manufacturing technology, were slightly over-represented in the data. However, the overall data represent Finnish work life well, and the sample size is large. Second, the measures are based on self-assessments, and the nature of the study is cross-sectional. In relation to generation, age and cohort effects can be controlled for only in longitudinal studies. Thus, generalizing the results at the generational level must be done with caution, as this study did not concentrate on variations within the generations. Moderating or mediating factors within a generation could have an effect on the relation between perceived competence and employee well-being. Third, we approached competence from only two perspectives with two simple questions: current and more demanding duties. To fully understand this relation, the measurements could be more multi-faceted.

Future studies should examine perceived competence more deeply, as the setting and measures in the current study might not fully encompass the dimensions of competence, especially how competence is perceived by individuals. Further, more objective measures could be utilized as well, such as competence and performance appraisals made by supervisors and/or colleagues and/or clients, although this task is very challenging. Understanding the formation of perceived

competence in relation to perceived employee well-being is important, as these perceptions are highly subjective.

## REFERENCES

- Aggarwal-Gupta, M., Vohra, N., & Bhatnagar, D. 2010. Perceived organizational support and organizational commitment: the mediational influence of psychological well-being. *Journal of Business and Management*, 16(2): 105–124.
- Allis, P., & O’Driscoll, M. 2008. Positive effects of nonwork-to-work facilitation on well-being in work, family and personal domains. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 23(3): 273–291.
- Arsenault, P.M. 2004. Validating Generational Differences. A Legitimate Diversity and Leadership Issue. *The Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 25(2): 124–141.
- Bakker, A.B., & Demerouti, E. 2007. The Job Demands-Resources model: state of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(3): 309–328.
- Bakker, A., Demerouti, E., & Verbeke, W. 2004. Using the job demands-resources model to predict burnout and performance. *Human Resource Management* 43(1): 83-104.
- Bakker, A., Schaufeli, W, Leiter, M., & Taris, T. 2008. Work engagement: An emerging concept in occupational health psychology. *Work and Stress* 22(3): 187-200.
- Balda, J., & Mora, F. 2011. Adapting Leadership Theory and Practice for the Networked, Millennial Generation. *Health Informatics and Organizations and Technology*, 5(3): 13-24.
- Behrstock-Sherratt, E., and Coggshall, J.G. 2010. Realizing the promise of Generation Y. *Educational Leadership*, 67(8): 28–34.
- Cascio, W. 2006. The economic impact of employee behaviors on organizational performance. *California Management Review*, 48(4): 41–59.

Casey, K., Fink, R., Krugman, M., & Propst, J. 2004. The graduate nurse experience. *Journal of Nursing Administration*, 34: 303–311.

Cennamo, L. & Gardner, D. 2008. Generation differences in work values, outcomes and person-organisation values fit. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 23(8): 891–906.

Cogin, J. 2012. Are generational differences in work values fact or fiction? Multi-country evidence and implications. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 23(11): 2268–2294.

Collins, A. 2010. Learning and development. In J. Breadwell & T. Claydon (Eds.). *Human Resource Management. A Contemporary Approach*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.

Collins, M.H, Hair, J., & Rocco, T. 2009. The older-worker-younger-supervisor dyad: a test of the reverse pygmalion effect. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 20(1): 21–41.

Costanza, D.P., Badger, J.M., Fraser, R.L., Severt, J.B., & Gade P.A. 2012. Generational differences in work-related attitudes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Business and Psychology* 27(4): 375–394.

Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. 2001. The job demands-resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3): 499–512.

Flores, E., Xu, X., & Lu, Y. (2020). Human Capital 4.0: A workforce competence typology for Industry 4.0. *Journal of Manufacturing Technology Management*, 31(4), 687-703.

Fotiadis, A., Abdulrahman, K., & Spyridou, A. (2019). The mediating roles of psychological autonomy, competence and relatedness on work-life balance and well-being. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 1267.

France D. R., Leahy M. and Parsons M. 2009. Attracting, Developing and Retaining Talent. *Research-Technology Management*, 52(6): 33–44.

Garavan, T.N., & McGuire, D. 2001. Competencies and workplace learning: some reflections on the rhetoric and the reality. *Workplace Learning*, 13(3/4): 144–163.



Glass, A. 2007. Understanding Generational Differences for Competitive Success. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 39: 98–103.

Hajek, A., & König, H. H. (2019). The role of optimism, self-esteem, and self-efficacy in moderating the relation between health comparisons and subjective well-being: Results of a nationally representative longitudinal study among older adults. *British Journal of Health Psychology*, 24(3), 547-570.

Harju, L. & Hakanen, J. 2016. An employee who was not there: a study of job boredom in white-collar work. *Personnel Review*, 45(2): 374–391.

Harter, J., Schmidt, F., & Keyes, C. 2002. Well-being in the workplace and its relationship to business outcomes: a review of the Gallup studies. In C. Keyes and J. Haidt (Eds.) *Flourishing, Positive Psychology and the Life Well-Lived*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Society.

Hauff, S., Felfe, J., & Klug, K. (2022). High-performance work practices, employee well-being, and supportive leadership: spillover mechanisms and boundary conditions between HRM and leadership behavior. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 33(10), 2109-2137.

Hendricks, J.M., & Cope, V.C. 2012. Generational diversity: What nurse managers need to know. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 69(3): 717–725.

Hetland, H., Saksvik, I.B., Albertsen, H., Berntsen, L.S. & Henriksen, A. 2012. "All work and no play..." Overcommitment and personality among university and college students. *College Student Journal*, 46(3): 470–482.

Ilmarinen J., Tuomi K., & Seitsamo J. (2005). New dimension of work ability. *International Congress Series*, 1280: 3–7.

Ivanova, T.Y. & Osin, E.N. 2016. Is workaholism always harmful? Work engagement moderates the negative effects of workaholism on wellbeing. *International Journal Of Psychology*, 51(1): 758–758.

James, J.B., McKechnie, S., & Swanberg, J. 2011. Predicting employee engagement in an age-diverse retail workforce. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 32: 173–196.

- Jones Johnson, G., & Johnson, W.R. 2000. Perceived overqualification and dimensions of job satisfaction: a longitudinal analysis. *The Journal of Psychology*, 134(5): 537–555.
- Johnson, J.A., & Lopes, J. 2008. The intergenerational workforce revisited. *Organization Development Journal*, 26(1): 31–36.
- Krekel, C., Ward, G., & De Neve, J. E. (2019). *Employee wellbeing, productivity, and firm performance*. Saïd Business School WP, 4.
- Kultalahti, S., & Viitala, R. 2015. Generation Y – challenging clients for HRM?. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 30(1): 101–114.
- Kupperschmidt, B.R. 2006. Addressing multigenerational conflict: mutual respect and carefronting as strategy. *OJIN: The Online Journal of Issues in Nursing* 11(2): manuscript 3.
- Kupperschmidt, B.R. 2000. Multigeneration employees: strategies for effective management. *The Health Care Manager* 19(1): 65–76.
- Lauermann, F., & König, J. (2016). Teachers’ professional competence and wellbeing: Understanding the links between general pedagogical knowledge, self-efficacy and burnout. *Learning and Instruction*, 45, 9-19.
- Paloniemi, S. 2006. Experience, competence and workplace learning. *Journal of Workplace learning*, 18(7/8): 439–450.
- Park, J., & Gursoy, D. 2012. Generation effects on work engagement among U.S. hotel employees. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 31: 1195–1202.
- Payne, A. 2004. The role of multichannel integration in customer relationship management. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 33(6): 527– 38.
- Pitt-Catsoupes, M., & Matz-Costa, C. 2008. The multi-generational workforce: Workplace flexibility and engagement. *Community, Work & Family*, 11(2): 215–229.

Qiao, H., Schaufeli, W.B., & Taris, T.T. 2013. Does equity mediate the effects of job demands and job resources on work outcomes? An extension of the job demands-resources model. **Career Development International**, 18(4): 357–376.

Rasool, S. F., Wang, M., Tang, M., Saeed, A., & Iqbal, J. (2021). How toxic workplace environment effects the employee engagement: The mediating role of organizational support and employee wellbeing. **International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health**, 18(5), 2294.

Raudenbush, S. W., & Bryk, A. S. 2002. **Hierarchical linear models: Applications and data analysis methods**. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage publications.

Robertson, I., & Flint-Taylor, J. 2009. Leadership, Psychological Well-Being, and organizational Outcomes. In Cartwright, S. & Cooper, C. (Eds), **The Oxford Handbook of Organizational Well-Being**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rycken, D.S., & Salganik, L.H. 2003. **Key competences for a successful life and a well-functioning society**. Germany: Hogrefe & Huber Publishers.

Salanova, M., Bakker, A., & Llorens, S. 2006. Flow at work:evidence for an upward spiral of personal and organizational resources. **Journal of Happiness Studies**, 7: 1–22.

Salanova, M., & Schaufeli, W.B. 2008. A cross-national study of work engagement as a mediator between job resources and proactive behaviour. **The International Journal of Human Resource Management**, 19(1): 116–131.

Sawitri, D., Suswati, E., & Huda, K. 2016. The impact of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, organization citizenship behavior (OCB) on employee’s performance. **International Journal of Innovation**, 9(2): 24–45.

Schaufeli, W.B., & Bakker, A.B. 2004. Job demands, job resources, and their relation with burnout and engagement: a multi-sample study. **Journal of Organizational Behavior**, 25(3): 293–315.

Schaufeli, W.B., Bakker, A.B. & Salanova, M. 2006. The measurement of work engagement with a short questionnaire: A cross-national study. **Educational and Psychological Measurement**, 66(4): 701–716.

- Seppälä, P., Mauno, S., Feldt, T., Hakanen, J., Kinnunen, U., Tolvanen, A. et al. 2009. The construct validity of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale: Multisample and longitudinal evidence. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 10: 459–481
- Siegrist, J., 2001. A theory of occupational stress, in Dunham. J. (Ed.), *Stress in the workplace: Past, present and future*. London: Whurr Publishers.
- Siegrist, J. 1996. Adverse health effects of high effort-low reward conditions at work. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 1: 27–43.
- Smola, K., & Sutton, C.D. 2002. Generational differences: revisiting generational work values for the new millennium. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23(4): 363–382.
- Sonnentag, S. 2003. Recovery, work engagement, and proactive behaviour: A new look at the interface between work and non-work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88: 518–528.
- Spence J. T. & Robbins A. S. 1992. Workaholism: definition, measurement, and preliminary results. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 58(1): 160–178.
- Stevanin, S., Palese, A., Bressan, V., Vehviläinen-Julkunen, K., & Kvist, T. 2018. Workplace-related generational characteristics of nurses: A mixed-method systematic review. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 74(6): 1245–1263.
- Sullivan, S.E., Forret, M.L., Carraher, S.M., & Mainiero, L.A. 2009. Using the kaleidoscope career model to examine generational differences in work attitudes. *Career Development International*, 14(3): 284–302.
- Szymkowiak, A., Melovi, B., Dabić, M., Jeganathan, K., & Kundi, G. S. (2021). Information technology and Gen Z: The role of teachers, the internet, and technology in the education of young people. *Technology in Society*, 65, 101565
- Tremblay, M.A., & Messervey, D. 2011. The Job Demands-Resources model: Further evidence for the buffering effect of personal resources. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 37(2): 1–10.

Van Beek, I., Taris, T.W., Schaufeli, W.B., & Brenninkmeijer, V. 2012. Heavy work investments: its motivational make-up and outcomes. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 29(1): 46–62.

Van den Heuvel, M., Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Hetland, J., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2020). How do employees adapt to organizational change? The role of meaning-making and work engagement. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology*, 23, e56.

Van Horn, J.E., Taris, T.W., Schaufeli, W.B., & Schreurs, P.J.G. (2004). The structure of occupational well-being: A study among Dutch teachers. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 77:365–375.

Wanka, A., Kolland, F. and Psihoda S. 2015. Job strain and coping among ageing Baby Boomers. *Zeitschrift für Gerontologie und Geriatrie*, 48(6): 511–516.

Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W. 2009. Work engagement and financial returns: a diary study on the role of job and personal resources. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 82: 183–200.

Yao, J., Qiu, X., Yang, L., Han, X., & Li, Y. (2022). The relationship between work engagement and job performance: psychological capital as a moderating factor. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13.