ICP - HESOS

PROCEEDINGS BOOK

of

International Conference on Psychology
in Health, Educational, Social, and Organization Settings
Universitas Airlangga, Surabaya, 2 1 - 2 3 November 2 0 1 3

"Psychology in Changing Global Contexts"

Faculty of Psychology
Universitas Airlangga

PROCEEDINGS BOOK
International Conference on Psychology in Health, Education, Social and Organizational Settings (ICP-HESOS)
"Psychology in Changing Global Contexts"

Board of Reviewers:
Prof. Dr. Fendy Suhariadi, MT
Prof. Dr. Suryanto, M.Si.
Dr. Seger Handoyo, M.Si. (Chief)
Dr. Dewi Retno Suminar, M.Si
Dr. Hamidah, M.Si.
Veronika Supratiknya, MS.Ed.
Endang R. Surjaningrum, S.Psi., M.Appl,Psy.

Chief Editor:
Herison Purba, S.Psi., M.Sc.

Cover Design:
Vito Daryfauzi

Cover Picture:
google.com

Layout:

Nur Rachmah A. P.	Dita Ayu
Musrifatul Jannah	Nido Dipo
Evryanti Rasari	Lukman Faizin
Kamelia Widyati	Annisa S
Aini Nadhifah	Dwika Puspita
Vinny josephine	Ribka Mutiara

Publisher:
Unit Penelitian dan Publikasi (UP3)
Psychology Faculty Universitas Airlangga

First Edition:
2013, 1015 pages. 15 X 21 cm
ISBN: 978-979-99555-7-9

Printed by:
Psychology Faculty Universitas Airlangga
Printed in: Surabaya, Indonesia

The Difference of Meaning of Work Between Chinese and Indonesia Employees and Its Effect on Work Engagement and Workaholism

Rui YANG[1]; Jianhong MA; Chuncao YANG
E-mail : [1]florayang87@gmail.com
School of Psychology and Behavioral Sciences,
Zhejiang University, China

Frikson Christian, Karina Indra, and Risma Tiara
Faculty of Psychology Surabaya University, Indonesia

Sus Budiharto, Retno Kumolohadi, and Sitti Hadjar Nurul Istiqamah
Faculty of Psychology and Socio-cultural Sciences, Islamic University of Indonesia, Indonesia

Abstract.

This study was designed to investigate the overall situation of work engagement and workaholism between Chinese and Indonesian employees, and explore the meaning of work. For the different cultural background, the research hypothesis that the Chinese and Indonesia employees view the meaning of work differently, hence their work engagement and workaholic are different. This study surveyed 185 Chinese employees and 193 Indonesia employees with the work engagement scale, workaholism scale, and the meaning of work scale. The data was collected and analyzed by SPSS 16.0. After the analysis of independent T-test, correlation analysis, regression analysis and so on, and the results are: (1) Work engagement and workaholism of Indonesia employees are significantly higher than Chinese employees (56.08, 64.32, p<0.001). (2) The Indonesian employees views work more as a calling than Chinese employees(24.11, 26.37, p<0.001). (3)The Chinese employees view work more as a job than Indonesian employees (21.01, 22.76, p<0.001). (4)Chinese employees' job orientation can negatively predict the workaholism(Beta= -0.26, $F_{(1,183)}$ =13.28, P<0.001, R^2=0.07). But the Indonesia sample's job orientation can positively predicted workaholism (Beta= 30, $F_{(1,191)}$ =19.34, P<0.001, R^2=0.09) . (5) The calling orientation can positively predict work engagement both in Chinese and Indonesian employees.

Keywords: *meaning of work, work engagement, workaholism,*

INTRODUCTION

"Work is about a search for daily meaning as well as daily bread, for recognition as well as cash, for astonishment rather than torpor, in short for a sort of life rather than a Monday to Friday sort of dying" (Terkel, 1972).

Man's search for meaning is the primary motivation in his life (Frankl, 1984).

The cultural background

The research is based on the different cultural background of Indonesia and China. For these two countries have totally different culture and traditions, the employee well-beings such as work engagement, workaholism were thought to be different. And so was the meaning of work which is considered as one of the indexes of work centrality.

There are over 300 ethnic groups in Indonesia(Kuoni, Far East-A world of difference), 200 million of those are of native Indonesian ancestry. The majority (about 88%) of the population follows Islam. In fact Indonesia is the nation with largest Muslim population. The culture of Indonesia has been shaped by long interaction between original indigenous customs and multiple foreign influences. Most Indonesian people are very good at arts, dance and music compared with Chinese people.

Chinese culture is one of the world's oldest cultures, and with 56 different nationalities. So the cultures are also very colorful and different. But the Han Chinese is the largest group. The hard-working is widely considered to be the significant label of Chinese people. For the large pressure and competition, the younger generations are now still work very hard to earn a living.

Work engagement

Work engagement is a concept from positive psychology, as the opposite of burnout (Maslach and Leiter, 1997, 2008). It can be defined as "a positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind" and characterized by high scores on vigor, dedication and absorption (Schaufeli, Salanova, González-Romá, & Bakker, 2002). "Vigor" refers to energy and mental resilience while working. Employees are willing to invest effort in their work and persistent in the face of difficulties. "Dedication" is characterized by high work involvement

and high levels of enthusiasm, inspiration, pride, and challenge. Absorption is characterized by being fully concentrated and happily engrossed in one's work. Note that these definitions focus on employees' experience of work activity, and not the predictors or outcomes of these experiences.

Schaufeli and Bakker (Chapter 2) review the definitions of work engagement in the business context and in academia as a basis for considering the instruments assessing engagement. The most often used instrument to measure engagement is the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2003, 2009; Schaufeli et al., 2002), which includes three subscales: vigor, dedication, and absorption.

Work engagement has positive consequences, which is a concept relevant for employee well-being and work behavior. Employees enjoy work as engagement is a positive experience in itself (Schaufeli et al., 2002). It helps individuals derive benefits from stressful work (Britt, Adler, & Bartone, 2001): personal initiative (Sonnentag, 2003), mental and physical health (Schaufeli & Salanova, 2007), high job and life satisfaction (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004, Schaufeli et al., 2008) and high productivity (Bakker & Demerouti, 2008). Furthermore, work engagement is positively related to organizational commitment (Demerouti et al., 2001; Schaufeli et al., 2008) and is expected to affect employee performance (Kahn, 1990).

Such positive outcomes of work engagement for organizations rise increased interest in its causes (Rich et al., 2010). Some previous research focused on establishing the static antecedents of work engagement and investigated personality characteristics (e.g., Langelaan, Bakker, van Doornen, & Schaufeli, 2008) and job demands/resources (e.g., Mauno, Kinnunen, & Ruokolainen, 2007). Some scholars examined the relationships between mindfulness, authentic functioning, and work engagement, both statically (cross-sectionally) and dynamically. Kahn (1992) argued that personal engagement in work is a function of being psychologically present at work.

Workaholism

Workaholism is a term coined by Oates many years ago (1971). ". . . the compulsion or the uncontrollable need to work incessantly" .To date, it has been popularly used in our daily life and be written anecdotally and clinically (Fassel, 1990; Killinger, 1991; Oates, 1971; Schaef & Fassel, 1988). However, the conceptual fog regarding the definition and measurement of workaholism is just beginning to clear (Scott, Moore, & Miceli, 1997), and several measures of workaholism have emerged.

Various conceptualizations and definitions of workaholism have been proposed. At the heart of these definitions lies the idea that workaholics are people who work excessively hard, which agrees with the popular definition of workaholism (Burke, 2001a). Scott, Moore, and Miceli (1997) mentioned three features of

workaholism. The first of these is that workaholics ". . . spend a great deal of time in work activities when given the discretion to do so, which results in their giving up important social, family or recreational activities because of work" (p. 292). The second feature of their conceptualization is that workaholics persistently and frequently think about work when they are not at work. The third element in Scott et al.'s (1997) definition is that workaholics work beyond what is reasonably expected to meet organizational or economic requirements.

In Spence and Robbins's concept, workaholism concludes 3 elements, work involvement, Feeling driven to work because of internal pressures and Work enjoyment, the so-called"workaholic-triad"(Spence and Robbins ,1992). Hence, They divided workaholics into three parts: Ture Workaholics, who get high scores on Perfectionism, Nondelegation of Responsibility, Health Complaint and Work Stress; Work Enthusiasts, who involve and enjoy a lot in work without outer pressure; Enthusiast Workaholics, who get high scores on all three components.

There are also concepts equal workahlism to work addiction. According to Robinson (1989),"work addiction" has been reported to more adequately describe the seriousness of the disorder, and workaholism and work addiction are used interchangeably in the literature. Although the term has been variously defined in the literature, work addiction is defined in this article as a progressive, fatal disorder in which a person is addicted to the process of working, the result of which leads to family disintegration and increased unmanageableness of work habits and all others areas of life (Fassel, 1990; Robinson, 1989).

Robinson (1989) suggested that it takes multiple criteria to diagnose work addiction—a general approach to life that consumes one's time, energy, and thoughts. The major difference between addictive work habits and healthy work habits is the degree to which excessive work interferes with physical health, personal happiness, or intimate and social relationships.

As to the outcomes of workaholism, many researchers consider workaholism as a negative condition and lead to negative results. Lots of previous research have shown that workaholism may lead to poor social relationships outside work, dissatisfaction with life and job (Bonebright, Clay, & Ankenmann, 2000, Burke & MacDermid, 1999) and health problems(Burke,2000). However, some researchers found there are positive associations between workaholism and job satisfaction (Burke, 1999; Shimazu & Schaufeli, 2009). Machlowitz (1980) conducted a qualitative interview study of 100 workaholics and found them to be very satisfied and productive.

And there are several factors leading to workaholism: personality, value, family environment, organization culture and behavioral reinforcements.

Work engagement and workaholism share the

behavioral component(working excessively hard), but they are different in work motivation. Engaged employees work hard because the pleasure they get from the work itself; for them, work is fun. However, workaholics are being pushed toward work. They couldn't enjoy themselves in work. Although some researchers argue that workaholism can be positive, such as "fulfilled" workaholics (Machlowitz, 1980), achievementoriented workaholics (Scott, Moore, and Miceli, 1997) and "happy hard workers" (Buelens and Poelmans, 2004), in this paper we take the definition of Robinson that workaholism is a kind of addiction and it's negative. We here propose to discriminate between workaholism (being intrinsically bad) and work engagement (being intrinsically good).

Meaning of Work

The origin of the concept of meaning can be traced back to the work of Victor Frankl(Bellah et al.,1985; Frankl,1988; Wrzesniewski, Dutton&Debebe, 2003).Meaningfulness consists of, (1) the meaning of work (Wrzesniewski et al., 1997) and (2)psychological meaningfulness (Kahn, 1990;May et al.,2004; Spreitzer, 1995). Bellah et al. (1985) define the meaning of work as the general level of importance an individual attaches to the subjective experience of work at a given time stamp. This general level of importance of work in the life of an individual manifests in three distinct dimensions: the individual views work either as a job, a career or a calling (Bellah et al., 1985; Wrzesniewski et al., 1997).

Individuals who view work as a job are ensnared by the allure of the material rewards they receive from work. These individuals view work as a means to an end. Little satisfaction is derived from work-related activities. However, the material rewards gained are utilized to acquire resources needed to express ambitions outside of an occupational context (Parry, 2006; Wrzesniewski et al., 1997; Wrzesniewski et al., 2003). As opposed to this, a person who views work as a career is concerned with occupational advancement rather than just monetary rewards (Parry, 2006; Peterson et al., 2009; Wrzesniewski et al., 1997). Here meaning is derived from the increased level of perceived power, influence and higher social status that advancement holds. Increased power and social status manifest in increased self-esteem (Wrzesniewski et al., 1997). Satisfaction and engagement depend on continuous advancement (Peterson et al., 2009). Frustration, disengagement and dissatisfaction occur when advancement slows (Lopper, 2007; Wrzesniewski et al., 1997). Research suggests that individuals who view work as a career are happier than those who view work as a job but less so than those who view work as a calling (Dik & Duffy, 2008; Peterson et al.,2009).

Viewing work as a calling is an end in itself (Peterson et al., 2009; Wrzesniewski et al., 1997; Wrzesniewski et al., 2003). Viewing work as a calling implies a feeling that one was placed on earth to engage in these specific work-related tasks (Parry, 2006). Those who view work as a calling engage in work as a result of the fulfillment they derive from engaging in these activities as opposed to financial gains (work as a job) and career advancement(work as a career) (Wrzesniewski et al., 1997). These individuals perceive their work and not remuneration, to be their purpose in life (Bellah et al., 1985).

Perceiving work as a calling has benefits for the individual, the group and the organization, including zest, life satisfaction and organizational commitment(Cameron et al.,2003; Peterson et al., 2009; Wrzesniewski et al., 2003). Individuals within similar occupations, tenures and remuneration can view work differently. However, individuals within social occupation (e.g. counsellors, ministers, priests, social workers and psychologists) are more likely to experience their work as a calling rather than as a career or a job (Wrzesniewski et al., 1997).

Purpose of study

On the previous study, scholars considered work engagement and workaholism as two different employee well-beings. (Wilmar B. Schaufeli , *Workaholism, Burnout, and Work Engagement, Three of a Kind or Three Different Kinds of Employee Well-being?*). Although they have many overlapping parts, as work engagement and workaholism share the behavioral component (working excessively hard), but they are different in work motivation. Engaged employees work hard because the pleasure they get from the work itself; for them, work is fun. However, workaholics couldn't enjoy themselves in work.

At the beginning of the paper, I cited a sentence which is "Man's search for meaning is the primary motivation in his life" (Frankl, 1984). So meaningsearching can be considered as a strong motivation of work. People view meaning of work differently, and so their motivations of work will be different. This kind of difference may lead different kinds of employee well-being, which is work engagement or workaholism.

So, the first objective of our research is to examine whether there are some differences on meaning of work between employees from China and Indonesia, since two countries have quite different national culture and spiritual life.

The second objective is to examine workaholism and work engagement in both countries. Cross-cultural generalizability of findings is important as no less than 75% of the research on workaholism employed samples from the United States (McMillan, O'Driscoll, Marsh, & Brady, 2001). So it is meaningful to collect samples from China and Indonesia.

If meaning of work differs from country to country, our third objective is to explore its effects on workaholism and work engagement.

So the hypotheses are as follows:

H1: There exist different kinds of views on meaning of work between Chinese and Indonesia employees.

H2: The level of work engagement is different between Chinese and Indonesia employees.

H3: The level of workaholism is different between Chinese and Indonesia employees.

H4: In the country the employees view work more as a job, the employees are less addicted to work.

H5: In the country the employees view work more as a calling, the employees are more engaged in work.

Methods

Participants

This study surveyed 185 Chinese employees and 193 Indonesia employees. The Chinese samples are all collected online, ranged from 21 years old to 53 years old, and in which 57.8% are male, 42.2% are female, the demographic variables are in the Table 1. Through the table, the majority participants are below 30 years old (79.5%); most participants have a degree of undergraduate (54.1%); most participants are normal employees (75.7%).

The Indonesia samples are all collected in 3 companies by the way of distributing the scales in the companies. And the participants ranged from 20 years old to 56 years old, in which 58 employees are female and 101 are male, which are 36.4% and 63.5% respectively, and the rest have no response. On the education level, 60 employees are graduates, 87 employees are high school graduates, 6 employees have diplomas, and 5 are postgraduates. On the work experience, 34 employees have worked for more than 10 years, 13 employees have worked more than 5 years but less than 10 years, and 66 employees have worked less than 5 years, which are respectively 30%, 11.5% and 58.4%, and the rest have no response.

Measurements

Work engagement. It was assessed with the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale(UWES; Schaufeli et al.,2002a).The items of the UWES are grouped into three subscales that reflect the underlying dimensions of engagement: Vigor (VI) (six items; e.g., 'When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work'); Dedication (DE) (five items; e.g., 'I am enthusiastic about my job'), and Absorption (AB) (six items; e.g., 'When I am working, I forget everything else around me'). In this research, the scale is transformed into 5 point Likert scale, and the Cronbach's alpha coefficient for the whole data is 0.93.

Workaholism. The Work Addiction Risk Test (WART) was designed to measure "workaholism." The previous study (P. Bryan Robinson,2013) examines the underlying dimensions of the WART and investigated the accuracy of the WART scores to discriminate between workaholics and a control group. The results suggest that workaholism, as measured by the WART, includes five dimensions: (a) Compulsive Tendencies, (b) Control, (c) Impaired Communication/Self-Absorption, (d) Inability to Delegate, and (e) Self-Worth were developed from the factor analysis. A discriminant analysis that used the subscale scores as the

TABLE 1

Characteristics of participants (n = 185 Chinese sample)

Item	Category	Frequency	%
Gender	Male	107	57.8
	Female	78	42.2
Age	Below 30	147	79.5
	30-40	26	14.1
	Above 40	12	6.5
Work experience	Below 1 year	33	17.8
	1-3 years	57	30.8
	3-5 years	50	27.0
	5-10 years	23	12.4
	Above 10 years	22	11.9
Education level	High school and below	12	6.5
	Junior college	21	11.4
	Undergraduate	100	54.1
	Postgraduate	47	25.4
	PHD and above	5	2.7
Job position	Normal employee	140	75.7
	Junior manager	28	15.1
	Middle level manager	12	6.5
	Senior manager	5	2.7
City and area	Town or village	14	7.6
	Middle and small city	66	35.7
	Large city	73	39.5
	The most largest 3 cities	32	17.3
Religion	No religion	130	70.3
	Buddhism	9	4.9
	Other	6	3.2
Marital status	Single	61	33.0
	Unmarried but not single	48	25.9
	Married	76	41.1

independent variables and group membership (workaholic or control group) as the dependent variable indicated that the first three subscales provided the greatest distinction between the groups, with a 88.5% correct classification rate. A discriminant analysis that used the total WART score as the independent variable and group membership as the dependent variable had an 86.4% correct classification rate. In this research, the WART is 5 point Likert , and the Cronbach's alpha coefficient for the whole data is 0.85.

Meaning of work. The Work-Life Questionnaire (WLQ) (Wrzesniewski et al., 1997) was utilized in order to determine the levels of meaning of work. According to Wrzesniewski et al. (1997), the WLQ is a self-report measure that aims to classify an individual's orientation to work into three main categories, namely, (1) work as a job, (2) work as a career and (3) work as a calling. The questionnaire is divided into two parts. The first part contains a set of three paragraphs representing the three main meanings of work, in which the respondent is encouraged to rate his or her level of association with each paragraph on a scale of 1 (very much like me) to 4 (not at all like me). The second part consists of a set of 18 items to substantiate the respondent's position on the first part of the questionnaire (e.g. 'My primary reason for working is financial.') The items are also rated on a Likert scale varying from 1 (very much like me) to 4 (not at all like me). In this research, the Cronbach's alpha coefficient for the calling orientation is 0.70, for the job orientation is 0.55, it's not so high but for the number of the items is small, so it's acceptable.

Statistical analysis

The statistical analysis was carried out with the SPSS program (SPSS Inc., 2009). Descriptive

statistics were used to analyze the data. Cronbach's alphas were used to determine the reliability of the measuring instruments. Pearson correlation coefficients were used to specify the relationships between the variables. The cut-off point for statistical significance was set at $p < 0.01$. Effect sizes were used to decide on the practical significance of findings (Steyn, 1999).

RESULT

Descriptive statistics and correlative analysis

The descriptive statistics (means, standard deviations) and correlative statistics (Pearson's correlations) are reported in Table 2. These statistics are analyzed upon the whole data of combination of Chinese and Indonesia employees.

Firstly, table 2 shows the Mean and SD of the total points of work engagement, workaholism, calling orientation, career orientation and job orientation. The mean score of work engagement is 60.30 for 17 items, and it indicates the relatively high level of work engagement for the Chinese and Indonesia employees. The mean score of workaholism is 75.40 for 25 items, and it is lower than work engagement.

Secondly, table 2 shows that the correlation between work engagement and calling orientation is positive significant, the correlation between work engagement and career orientation is positive significant, the correlation between calling orientation and workaholism is positive significant, the correlation between career orientation and workaholism is positive significant, the correlation between work engagement and workaholism is positive significant, and the correlation between job orientation and work engagement is negative significant.

Differential analysis between the two countries

TABLE 2

Descriptive and Correlative Statistics (whole data)

Item	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5
1.Work engagement	60.30	12.37	-				
2.Calling(mow)	25.27	4.64	0.59**	-			
3.Career(mow)	10.05	1.93	0.26**	0.31**	-		
4.Job(mow)	21.87	3.86	-0.35**	-0.31**	0.08	-	
5.workaholism	75.40	10.71	0.21**	0.21**	0.19**	-0.06	-

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

The main purpose of the study is to investigate the differences of meaning of work and employees' well-being as work engagement and workaholism between Chinese and Indonesia employees. So after doing the descriptive analysis, we did the differential analysis. The results are in Table 3.

Table 3 indicates that the differences of work engagement and workaholism between Chinese employees and Indonesia employees are strongly significant, which shows that the Indonesia employees are more engaged in work than Chinese employees (56.08, 64.32, p<0.001); but at the same time, the workaholism Indonesia employees experience is also significant higher than Chinese employees (73.65,77.09,

p<0.001).

Secondly, to test whether Indonesia and Chinese employees view work differently, a T-Test was carried out on the three orientations of meaning of work. Table 3 shows that on calling orientation, Indonesia employees' score is significant higher than Chinese(24.11, 26.37, p<0.001); on job orientation, Indonesia employees' score is significant lower than Chinese (21.01,22,76,p<0.001). This indicates that Indonesia employees view work more as a calling than Chinese employees, while Chinese employees view work more as a job than Indonesia employees.

TABLE 3

Differential analysis

Item	Category	M	SD	T-Test		
				t	Df.	Sig.
Work engagement	China	56.08	14.86	-6.77	268.81	0.00
	Indo	64.32	7.47			
calling	China	24.11	4.87	-4.86	360.74	0.00
	Indo	26.37	4.13			
Career	China	9.86	1.86	-1.81	376	0.07
	Indo	10.22	1.98			
Job	China	22.76	4.08	4.53	376	0.00
	Indo	21.01	3.43			
Workaholism	China	73.65	11.55	-3.16	376	0.00
	Indo	77.09	9.56			

Regression analysis

From the differential analysis, we found that the Chinese employees view work more as a job and Indonesia employees view work more as a calling. So in the Chinese sample, can we conclude that the job orientation of meaning of work make them less addicted in work? And can we conclude that in Indonesia employees, the higher calling orientation lead to the higher level of work engagement. On these purposes, we did the regression analysis, and the results are in table 4.

In the regression analysis, we made Chinese sample's calling orientation as an independent variable, and its work engagement as a dependent variable; and we made Indonesia sample's calling orientation as an independent variable, and its work engagement as a dependent variable. The results showed that both in Chinese and Indonesia sample, the calling orientation predicted work engagement statistically significantly ($F_{(1,183)} = 108.25$, $P<0.001$, $R^2=0.37$) ($F_{(1,191)} = 61.70$, $P<0.001$, $R^2=0.24$).

TABLE 4

Regression analysis

Model	Unstandardised coefficients		Standardized coefficients	F	R	R^2
	B	Std.E	Beta			
Calling(China)to WE	0.20	0.02	0.61	108.25***	0.61	0.37
Constant	12.90	1.11				
Calling(Indo)to WE	0.27	0.04	0.49	61.70***	0.49	0.24
Constant	8.81	2.25				
Job(China)to Workaholism	-0.09	0.03	-0.26	13.28***	0.26	0.07
Constant	29.53	1.88				
Job(Indo)to Workaholism	0.11	0.03	0.30	19.34***	0.30	0.09
Constant	12.64	1.92				

***p<0.001

Secondly, we carried out a regression analysis with Chinese/Indonesia employees' job orientation as independent variable, and their workaholism as dependent variables respectively, for on the whole data, the relationship between job orientation and workaholism is not clear. The results shows that the Chinese sample's job orientation can negatively predicted workaholism (Beta= -0.26, $F_{(1,183)} = 13.28$, P<0.001, $R^2=0.07$). But the Indonesia sample's job orientation can positively predicted workaholism (Beta= 30, $F_{(1,191)} = 19.34$, P<0.001, $R^2=0.09$). That indicates the more Chinese people view work as a job, they are less addicted to work. But the more Indonesia people view work as a job, they are more addicted to work. That can partly explain the results that while Chinese employees view work more as a job, they enjoy less workaholism.

DISCUSSION

The first aim of the study is to investigate the different sense-making (MOW) on work between the two countries. For we know the cultural background between China and Indonesia are largely different from each other. The most people in Indonesia have religious believes, while the most people in China have no religious believes. The Indonesia people are leading a more colorful life based on the interview for they have many religious festivals. Further more, the developing speed of China's economy is very high and people in China are urging for money to buy houses, to get married and to make a better life. So we assume that employees in these two countries view work differently. There are three work-views in this research, job, career and calling. Individuals who view work as a job are ensnared by the allure of the material rewards they receive from work, a person who views work as a career is concerned with

occupational advancement rather than just monetary rewards, and individuals view work as a calling perceive their work and not remuneration, to be their purpose in life.

The results show that there exist significant differences between the two countries on meaning of work. On calling orientation, Indonesia employees are significantly higher than Chinese employees. On job orientation, Indonesia employees are significantly lower than Chinese employees. On career orientation, there is no significant difference. The results can be understood for these two countries are very different in culture, history, economy, religions and demography. It's not this research's purpose to investigate the reasons for it. But the Hypothesis 1 is verified and accepted.

The second aim of this study is to investigate the difference of employee well-beings between these two countries, and in this paper they are work engagement and workaholism. In this paper, we used WART to test workaholism and equals it with work addiction. So after the literature review, we can see that work engagement is a positive work state, while workaholism is a totally negative employee well-being like a kind of addiction. The results show that there exist significant differences on work engagement and workaholism between the two countries. The Indonesia employees are more engaged in work and they are also enjoying higher lever on workaholism than Chinese employees. The reasons for this result may be multiple. Chinese people are in a severe competition to earn a living nowadays, so may be this is the reason that they cannot enjoy work as much as Indonesia employees. Most Indonesia employees have religious believes, this may help them to enjoy work and live more than Chinese employees. Hypothesis 2 and 3 are verified.

Since we know the Indonesia and Chinese employees view work differently, and meaning searching can be considered as a strong motivation of work and life, so their motivation of work is different. The different motivations may lead to different work status as work engagement and workaholism. So the third aim of this study is to investigate the relationships between meaning of work and work engagement, workaholism. The results of correlative analysis show that there exists positive correlation between calling orientation and work engagement on the whole data. After we did the regression analysis, we found that calling orientation

of Chinese and Indonesia samples can both positively predict work engagement. Then we can conclude that the more people view work as a calling, the more they are engaged in work. And it can explain that while Indonesia employees view work more as a calling than Chinese employees, they are more engaged than Chinese employees to a large extent. So the Hypothesis 4 is verified.

Since the correlation between job orientation and workaholism on the whole data is not clear, we did the regression analysis in 2 steps. The first is Chinese sample and the second is the Indonesia sample. And the results show that in Chinese sample the employees' job orientation can negatively predict workaholism. This can be understood. Workaholics often work excessively and they can not let themselves be separate with their work. If a person views his work just as a tool for earning money, he will not so addicted to work. It explains that the more Chinese employees view work as a job, the less they are addicted to work. However, in Indonesia sample, the result shows that their job orientation can positively predict workaholism, which is opposite from Chinese sample. This can not meet our hypothesis, but there can be many reasons for this result. Firstly, the ways we do the survey are very different in these two countries, and in Indonesia the data are just from a few companies which made the results not so reliable. Secondly, it may be related with the different cultural and economic background in Indonesia. So the people in Indonesia who view work just as a job may also be very addicted to work and spend a lot of time on work. The further research should be done on this point. The hypothesis 5 can partly verified and explained that while the Chinese employees view work more as a job, they are less addicted to work.

There are many limitations existed in this research. The major limitation is the asymmetry of the samples and incomplete samplings in these two countries. But the sample size is considerable, so the results are in some extent reliable. The second limitation is that the research is cross-sectional, so no causal relationships could be identified. And since there are limited interview before distributing the scales, the background study of the research is not so in-depth. The following research may solve these problems and be more scientific.

REFERENCE

B.D. Rosso et al. On the meaning of work: A theoretical integration and review Research in Organizational Behavior 30 (2010) 91–127

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2008). Towards a model of work engagement. *Career Development International, 13,* 209-223.

Bakker, A. B., Schaufeli, W. B., Leiter, M. P., & Taris, T. W. (2008). Work engagement: An emerging concept in occupational health psychology. *Work &Stress, 22,* 187–200.

Bonebright, C. A., Clay, D. L., & Ankenmann, R. D. (2000). The relationship of workaholism with work-life conflict, life satisfaction, and purpose in life. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 47,* 469-477.

Burke, R. J. (1999). It s not how hard you work but how you work hard: Evaluating workaholism components. *International Journal of Stress Management, 6,* 225-239.

Calvin, J. (1574). Sermons of M. John Calvin upon the Epistle of Saint Paul to the Galatians. London: Lucas Harison and George Bishop.

Childs, J. M. (1995). Ethics in business: Faith at work. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press.consequences of workaholism. *Human Relations, 50,* 287–314.

Curlin, F. A., Dugdale, L. S., Lantos, J. D., & Chin, M. H. (2007). Do religious physicians disproportionately care for the underserved? *Analysis of Family Medicine, 5*(4), 353–360.

Davidson, J. C., & Caddell, D. P. (1994). Religion and the meaning of work. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 33*(2), 135–147.

Fassel, D. (1990). Working ourselves to death: The high costs of workaholism, the rewards of recovery. San Francisco, CA: Harper Collins.

Grant, D., O'Neil, K., & Stephens, L. (2004). Spirituality in the workplace: New empirical directions in the study of the sacred. *Sociology of Religion, 65*(3), 265–283.

Grant, D., O'Neil, K., & Stephens, L. (2004). Spirituality in the workplace: New empirical directions in the study of the sacred. *Sociology of Religion, 65*(3), 265–283.

Killinger, B. (1991). Workaholics: The respectable addicts. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Luther,M. (1520). Treatise on good works (W. A. Lambert, Trans.). In Atkinson, J. (Ed.). The Christian in Society I (Vol. 44). Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

Machlowitz, M. (1980). Workaholics: Living with them, working with them. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (1997). The truth about burnout: How organizations cause personal stress and what to do about it. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Maslach, C., & Leiter, M.P. (2008). Early predictors of job burnout and engagement. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93,* 498–512.

McMillan, L. H. W., O'Driscoll, M. P., Marsh, N. V., & Brady, E. C. (2001). Understanding workaholism: Data synthesis, theoretical critique, and future design strategies. *International Journal of Stress Management, 8,* 69-91.

McMillan, L.H.W., O'Driscoll, M.P., Marsh, N.V., & Brady, E.C. (2001). Understanding workaholism: Data synthesis, theoretical critique, and future design strategies. *International Journal of Stress Management, 8,* 69–91.

Michael F. Steger, Hadassah Littman-Ovadia, Michal Miller,Lauren Menger, Sebastiaan Rothmann, Engaging in Work Even When It Is Meaningless Positive Affective Disposition and Meaningful Work Interact in Relation to Work Engagement, *Journal of Career Assessment.* May 2013 vol. 21 no. 2 ,348-361

Oates, W. E. (1971). *Confessions of a workaholic.* Nashville: Abingdon.

preliminary results. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 58,* 160-178.

Schaef, A. W., & Fassel, D. (1988).The addictive organization. San Francisco, CA: Harper & Row.

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

Schaufeli, W. B., & Salanova, M. (2007). Work engagement: An emerging psychological concept and its implications for organizations. In S. W. Gilliland, D. D. Steiner, and D. P. Skarlicki (Eds), *Research in Social Issues in Management (Volume 5): Managing Social and Ethical issues in Organizations* (pp. 135-177). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.

Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., González-Romá, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 3,* 71-92.

Schaufeli, W. B., Shimazu, A., & Taris, T. W. (2009). Being driven to work excessively hard: The evaluation of a two-factor measure of workaholism in the Netherlands and Japan. *Cross-Cultural Research, 43,* 320-348.

Schaufeli, W. B., Taris, T. W., & Bakker, A. (2006). Dr. Jekyll or Mr. Hyde? On the differences between work engagement and workaholism. In R. J. Burke (Ed), *Research companion to working time and work addiction* (pp. 193-217). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

Scott, K.S., Moore, K.S., & Miceli, M.P. (1997). An exploration of the meaning and

Scott, T. L. (2002). Choices, constraints, and calling: Conservative Protestant women and the meaning of work in the U. S. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, 22, 1–38.

Shimazu, A., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2009). Is workaholism good or bad for employee well-being? The distinctiveness of workaholism and work engagement among Japanese employees. *Industrial Health, 47,* 495-502.

Sonnentag, S. (2003). Recovery, work engagement, and proactive behavior: a new look at the interface between nonwork and work. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88,* 518-528.

Spence, J.T., & Robbins, A.S. (1992). Workaholism: Definition, measurement, and

Sullivan, S. C. (2006). The work-faith connection for low-income mothers: A research note. *Sociology of Religion,* 67(1), 99–108

Tatjana Schnella, Thomas Högea & Edith Pollet, The Journal of Positive Psychology (2013): Predicting meaning in work: Theory, data, implications.

Wrzesniewski, A. (2003). Finding positive meaning in work. In K. S. Cameron, J. E. Dutton, & R. E. Quinn (Eds.), Positive organizational scholarship. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.

Wuthnow, R. (2004). Saving America? Faith-based services and the future of civil society Princeton: Princeton University Press.