

Review and Prospect of the Relationship between Employees' Work Well-being and Innovation Performance

Sicong Liu

Business School Jiangxi Normal University Nanchang, China

Keywords: innovation performance; work well-being; employee

Abstract: With the popularization and attention of positive psychology, there are more and more researches on the happiness of residents. Concurrently, the research on the relationship between job well-being and innovation performance of corporate employees has always been one of the research hotspots of academic concern and great differences. Through literature review, this paper systematically sorts out the research status and differences between employees' work well-being and innovation performance, and points out the direction of future research.

1. Introduction

The innovation performance of employees has important value and significance to the company. In recent years, more and more researchers believe that work well-being is an important factor affecting employees' work behavior and results. So researchers began to explore employee innovation performance from the perspective of job well-being. It is also widely believed that work well-being represents the level of experience of employees' positive emotions at work and has a positive impact on employee innovation performance. However, the existing research conclusions are not entirely in line with expectations. Although there is growing evidence that job well-being can have a positive impact on innovation performance, there are still some studies that believe that job well-being can have a significant negative impact on innovation performance. So what is the relationship between work well-being and innovation performance?

This paper attempts to provide a useful enlightenment for deepening and improving the relationship between the two, based on the research status and differences of the relationship between employee work well-being and innovation performance.

2. Overview of research on work well-being

The word "happiness" was first proposed by Wilson in 1960. Until 1987, Warr first proposed the concept of work happiness, focusing on the study of happiness in the work situation, which made scholars gradually have a strong interest in work happiness, and carried out a lot of research. At present, research work happiness is mainly studied from three perspectives: subjective happiness perspective, psychological happiness perspective and the integration perspective of two kinds of happiness. Because the foundations based on philosophy are different, when studying the happiness of work, the research from the perspective of subjective well-being and the research ideas from the perspective of psychological well-being are completely different, and there are many studies that are based on the study of happiness.

Based on the perspective of subjective well-being, based on the theory of happiness, focusing on the subjective and emotional experience of the individual in terms of work is the result of the individual's experience of material or spiritual content in the work. Warr (1987) believes that work well-being is a psychological well-being of employees' work quality and their overall work quality and responsibilities. American scholar Diener (1999) defines happiness as: an assessment of the overall quality of life of a person based on his or her own standards. This concept has been widely recognized by Chinese scholars. Chen Jianan et al (2013) believe that work well-being is the employee's cognitive and emotional experience of organizational welfare and organizational life.

Based on the perspective of psychological well-being, based on the theory of perfection, it

emphasizes the individual's potential and self-realization in the working situation, reflecting the process of the individual's experience of spiritual content in the work. Dagenais-Desmarais (2012) believes that work well-being is the subjective positive experience of individuals at work. Chinese scholar Chen Jianan et al. (2013) determined that work well-being is an overall assessment of the quality of an individual's work. Compared with the happiness of work based on happiness theory, he pays more attention to the realization and potential of personal value in the work process. Happiness is even only It is a by-product of these activities. Huang Liang (2013) believes that work well-being is an activity in which individuals engage in their own values at work. Efforts to pursue self-improvement and achieve full realization of their potential are the self-improvement and potential of employees.

Based on the perspective of integrated happiness, it also includes the subjective well-being and psychological well-being factors of the individual at work. And this kind of research is becoming mainstream, and it will be the main development direction of work happiness research. Comprehensive work well-being defines the employee's work well-being as the overall quality of the employee's experience and effectiveness. Warr (1987, 1990, 1994) Employees' overall quality assessment of work experience and its functions. Van Hom et al. (2004) believe that work well-being is a positive evaluation of the individual's work in all aspects of his work, including cognition, emotion, behavior, motivation and body and mind. Huang Liang (2014) believes that work well-being is the experience and effectiveness of individuals at work. Zou Qiong et al (2015) found that work well-being is a psychological experience and pleasure experience in which individuals achieve their goals and potentials. It is a dynamic process that requires sustained efforts and investment by organizations and individuals.

Consistent with the existing research on integrating two perspectives of happiness, this study defines the employee's job well-being as the overall quality of the employee's experience and effectiveness at work.

3. Overview of Innovation Performance Research

“An organization that relies solely on the prescribed role behavior will be a very fragile social system” (Katz, 1964). To this end, faced with the current fierce economic competition and changing business environment, organizations need individuals to innovate outside the standard work scope, and Creative Performance as a representation of individual innovation has also been brought The more attention is paid and becomes necessary for the organization to operate (Janssen et al., 2004).

At present, domestic and foreign scholars have three main definitions of the concept of innovation performance: process orientation (Mumford, 2000), result orientation (Amabile, 1996; Coombs, 1996), and the combination of process and outcome (Zhang et al., 2010; Yao Yanhong et al. 2013). Amabile et al. (1996) distinguish innovation performance from creativity and innovation behavior: creativity is only the starting point and foundation of innovation activities. Scott et al. (1994) believe that creativity is a potential ability of individuals. Personality traits, which only involve the creation of novel and useful ideas, do not necessarily translate into innovative behavioral processes or produce innovative results; Yao Yanhong et al. (2013) argue that innovative behavior is a series of behavioral processes that individuals take to achieve innovative outcomes; Woodman et al. (1993) and Liu Wenxing (2010) argue that the core of innovation performance lies in performance, including the generation of innovative ideas and the implementation of behaviors, as well as the realization of the final outcome, which is the unity of individual behavior and the resulting outcome. Therefore, in recent years, academic mainstream research on innovation performance has focused on it as an organic unit that covers processes and outcomes. Janssen (2004) and Han Yi et al. (2007) agree that innovation performance covers the willingness to generate innovation. Based on this, the entire process of taking action and resulting results.

In view of the research on the mechanism of the impact of work well-being on innovation performance and the mechanism of action of this influence, this study uses the concept definition of the combination of process and result to define employee innovation performance as: Innovative willingness, action, and resulting outcomes that are generated at the individual level and valuable to

the organization.

4. Research on the Relationship between Job Happiness and Innovation Performance

Although the theoretical community has an important influence on the employee's innovation performance, the research conclusions of the relationship between the two have great differences, and no consensus has been reached. (James, 2004; Amabile, 2005).

4.1 Higher employee work happiness positively affects employees' innovation performance

Through literature review, it is found that the improvement of work well-being has a significant positive impact on innovation performance. For example, among the individual factors that affect the innovation performance of employees, Shalley & Zhou (2004) believe that happy employees may have better innovation performance, and the improvement of work happiness will help improve the innovation performance of employees. The following is explained for the relationship between the two:

First, the improvement of work well-being will promote the improvement of nurses' attitudes and levels of service, and the relationship with others (Fang Caiping, 2010)

Second, work well-being will make employees more comfortable with the external work environment, and it is easier to draw correct and highly creative judgments (Ge Jinjin, 2012). Gasper (2004) puts it easier to identify that the environment is comfortable and open when employees have a high level of work well-being, which leads to more divergent thinking patterns, more extensive behaviors, and more innovative creations.

Third, the improvement of work well-being can deepen the emotional identity and dependence of employees in the organization, and encourage employees to add innovative thinking and action, and reinforce the intrinsic motivation level of innovation willingness (Mana, 2012; Shi Lili, 2016). Work well-being is influenced by personal internal identity and organizational self-esteem, and thus sprouts innovative behavioral tendencies that are beneficial to organizational development (Huang Liang, 2015)

Fourth, the individual bias of high work well-being experience is caused by the external difficulties and challenges identified as external factors, which are short-term difficulties that can be solved (Seligman, 2010). Wright & Walton (2003) Displaying this kind of cognition helps to alleviate the abandonment rate when employees face difficulties, enhance their initiality and endurance, and then focus on the work itself and demand breakthrough methods, ultimately showing more innovative behavior and higher innovation performance.

4.2 Lower employee work well-being can also promote the improvement of innovation performance

Based on existing research, the level of work well-being is low or even negative, which can positively affect employees' innovative behavior and performance levels. Zhou&George (2001) believes that the reason for its establishment is that employees analyze the state of the organization based on the judgment of the existing work happiness, and the judgment of the individual's work well-being can affect the investment and duration of the employee's work innovation. Martin (1993, 1996) proposes that if the employee Wang Zuo has a high level of well-being, he tends to think that his work goal has been completed, and the innovation activities in organizational citizenship behavior will naturally decrease. Correspondingly, if Wang Wang's work happiness level is low, then The tendency is that the individual's efforts do not match the organizational requirements, and then decide to improve or change the direction of work, content mode, traditional thinking, work perspective, work details, execution, etc., and constantly seek new and effective work ideas and countermeasures through self-correction. Innovate behavior and enhance innovation performance.

5. Prospects for the Relationship between Employees' Work Well-being and Innovation Performance

Through literature review, scholars have revealed the connotation of work happiness from different perspectives, and based on different theories, the relationship between work happiness and innovation performance has been studied, and many achievements have been made. Despite this, there is still a lot of research space to explore.

First, the dimensions of the dimensions of work well-being and the dimensional structure need to be further clarified. At present, most of the work happiness research is based on a certain sense of happiness, which is inevitably one-sided. From the perspective of research trends, it is difficult to comprehensively and systematically reflect employees' work well-being in a sense of happiness. Constructing an effective conceptual model of employee work well-being needs to further improve the integration of two kinds of happiness perspectives.

Second, there is a need to focus on identifying individual and environmental adjustment variables that affect the relationship between job well-being and employee innovation performance. The existing research on the relationship between job well-being and employee innovation performance shows that work well-being may have positive or negative impact on employee innovation performance. The nature of influence depends to a large extent on individual characteristics. (eg personality traits) and the environment in which it is located (eg task characteristics) The current research on both is increasing. However, research on the variables that influence the relationship between job well-being and employee innovation performance is still lacking, which is not conducive to an in-depth analysis of the diversity of work happiness impact on employee innovation performance. Future research needs to focus on discovering these regulatory variables, which help to gain a deeper understanding of the impact of work well-being on employee innovation performance under what circumstances are positive and under what circumstances it is negative.

Third, it is necessary to pay attention to the mediating role of individual psychological variables based on workplace and organizational scenarios that affect the relationship between job well-being and employee innovation performance. At present, the research on the mediators of the impact of work well-being on employee innovation performance is mainly related to cognition-related factors, such as divergent thinking, cognitive flexibility, and long-distance association. Most of these factors are derived from experimental research in psychology. Workplace and organizational contexts are not sufficiently linked, and the validity of their findings in the workplace and organizational context deserves further clarification. Therefore, future research should focus on exploring the mediating role and mechanism of individual psychological variables based on workplace and organizational scenarios between job well-being and employee innovation performance. Their clarification will make work happiness and employee innovation performance. The study of relationships can more effectively capture the characteristics of workplace and organizational contexts, and thus provide a deeper understanding of the unique characteristics of job well-being that affects employee innovation performance in workplace and organizational contexts.

References

- [1] Amabile, TM., Barsade, S. G., Mueller, J.S., Staw, B.M., Affect and Creativity at Work [J]. Administrative Science Quarterly, 2005,
- [2] Bamber E.M&Iyer V. M. Bigger auditors' professional and organizational identification: consistency or conflict?[J] ,Auditing, 2002,(21):21- 38.
- [3] Chiu C C, Owens B P, Tesluk P E. Initiating and utilizing shared leadership in teams: The role of leader humility, team proactive personality, and team performance capability[J]. Journal of Applied Psychology, 2016,101(12):1705-1720.
- [4] Guo Shumei, Liu Yueping. An Empirical Study on the Relationship between Teachers' Income and Subjective Well-being in Local Colleges——Taking Huzhou Teachers College as an

Example[J]. Future and development,2017,41(06):74-77.