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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to examine and analyze the influence of workplace happiness and innovative work behavior on job satisfaction mediated by work engagement on employees of a private university in Tenggarong, East Kalimantan during the Covid-19 pandemic. This research is quantitative with a sample of 100 people taken through proportional stratified random sampling. The data analysis technique used is descriptive statistical analysis and structural equation modeling (SEM).

The conclusion of this study is that there is a positive influence between workplace happiness and innovative work behavior on job satisfaction, there is a positive influence between workplace happiness and work engagement, there is a positive influence between work engagement and job satisfaction, and there is a positive influence between workplace happiness on job satisfaction mediated by work engagement.

Introduction

The COVID-19 pandemic has created a challenging environment for human resource management. Management must be able to venture into the unknown while seeking to help the workforce to adapt and cope with radical changes in both their work environment and social environment. For example, employees who previously worked indoors must be physically restricted and must be able to adapt remotely to their original work environment (Carnevale & Hatak, 2020). Employees must be able to get used to working remotely because they cannot avoid the demands of their responsibility (Chawla, MacGowan, Gabriel, & Podsakoff, 2020).

The existence of government regulations that refer to the limitation of employees’ physical presence at work during the pandemic has had a major impact on changing the work system that has been carried out so far. According to the preliminary research conducted by researchers to obtain the initial picture of job satisfaction of staff at a private university in Tenggarong, East Kalimantan, it is known that changes in the work system produce various effects. A number of respondents felt very happy and satisfied, but there are some others who did not feel comfortable to work remotely and preferred to be physically present during regular working hours. The respondents who gave a positive response show an accordance with the results of the study conducted by Matofani & Djastuti (2016) which stated that fun at work positively and significantly influences job satisfaction. On the other hand, the negative response found is also in accordance with the prior research carried out by Shagvaliyeva & Yazdanifard (2014) who stated that employees tend to have difficulty to adapt in the workplace with high level of flexibility to carry out daily work activities. Similarly, Zhang (2016) also explained that when the boundaries of a job are removed, employees tend to experience various disturbances (for example, family matters) which cause them to become unfocused at work, thereby reducing their level of job satisfaction.
Increased job satisfaction will result in good performance. If the employee feels satisfied while working, they will try to give their best performance; which results in an increase in the work results of the employee (Andora & Ermita, 2019). Feelings of satisfaction or dissatisfaction occur when employees experience a discrepancy between what they want from the job and what they experience in reality. It is felt after a person’s needs are met, or when their expectations or desires are fulfilled (Ali, 2016). Therefore, measuring their job satisfaction is important to determine whether they are happy or unhappy with their job. Factors that can affect job satisfaction include workplace happiness, innovative work behavior, and work engagement.

Literature Review

Job satisfaction is a positive feeling about the job, resulting from an evaluation of its characteristics. An individual with a high level of job satisfaction has positive feelings about his job, while someone with low job satisfaction has negative feelings about his job (Robbins & Judge, 2018:46). According to Edison et al., (2018:213), job satisfaction is a set of employee feelings about things that are pleasant or unpleasant in the job they are facing. High job satisfaction is a hallmark of a well-managed organization, and is basically the result of effective leadership.

Workplace happiness as a condition of positive emotions and activities that are subjectively perceived by individuals in assessing themselves as happy or unhappy individuals in doing work activities (Pryces-Jones, 2010). Diener & Diener (2008) defined workplace happiness as feeling enthusiastic about work, eager to come to work, having good relationships with co-workers, showing interdependence with other people or other fields at work, having good work performance, able to get along with other employees, willing to replace the work schedule of his partner when needed, working on several side projects that aim to improve the workplace and products, as well as giving services to his work. Innovative work behavior is a process to create activities, strategies, management techniques, and organizational structures that are different from before (McGuirk, Lenihan, & Hart, 2015). Innovative work behavior refers to whether a person is able to create new ideas that are truly original, can explore work results that still have opportunities to be developed, and can implement these ideas into work activities (Birdi, Leach, & Magadley, 2016). Innovative work behavior is a deliberate effort to develop organizational processes, as well as to introduce and implement new ideas to each job, organization, or group responsibilities so that it can be carried out according to the role of each section (Mommeni, Ebrahimpour, & Ajirloo, 2014).

Work engagement is a condition that illustrates well-being and is related to positive working conditions. It provides satisfaction and affective-motivation that can be used as one of the things to predict or see employees’ fatigue using the characteristics of enthusiasm, dedication, and absorption (Bakker et al., 2008). Kahn (1992) defined work engagement as self-utilization as a part of the organization to carry out what is assigned to them with reference to the responsibilities and attitudes of expressing themselves mentally, emotionally, cognitively, and physically. Work engagement can also be interpreted as a motivational concept that reflects the energy possessed by each employee that is channeled into the work they face. Individuals will increase their involvement in work according to their perception of meaningfulness, the security they feel, and its availability (Cook, 2008). According to Federman (2009), work engagement is a degree to which an employee is able to commit to an organization, and the results of that commitment are determined by how they work and the length of time they work.

Hypothesis Development

The Influence of Workplace Happiness on Job Satisfaction

Workplace happiness is a feeling perceived by someone who can enjoy and admire the place where he works. Employees who feel happy at work can motivate themselves to produce something positive (Sonam & Vivek, 2019). Organizations that can intensively increase employee happiness can have an impact on employees as they are motivated to work hard (Salas-Vallina, Alegre, & Guerrero, 2018). Employees who feel happy at work are indicated by high psychological abilities, and they tend to have a high level of satisfaction with their work (Joo & Lee, 2016). Optimal organizational performance must be enhanced with an adequate increase in employee welfare, therefore the psychological capital of employees to feel happiness in the workplace can be fulfilled (Awada & Ismail, 2019). In the study carried out by Awada & Ismail (2019), it is mentioned that happy employees are more likely to be inspired to accommodate changes in the workplace as well as able to understand and achieve the roles and responsibilities expected. In addition, companies that serve the welfare of their employees can benefit by achieving an atmosphere characterized by respect, trust, ideas sharing, and good performance. Happy employees will give constructive opinions as long as they work in the organization because of the high appreciation and strong sense of togetherness. This will increase job satisfaction for every employee who works in the organization. The first hypothesis proposed is:

H1: There is a positive influence of workplace happiness on job satisfaction.

The Influence of Workplace Happiness on Work Engagement

Happiness is related to an individual’s quality of life, which leads to increased health, creativity, income, and workplace (Biswas-Diener & Dean, 2007). Workplace happiness is needed by employees because it is able to optimize the resulting performance, able to create positive feelings at work, and able to give employees a sense of satisfaction (Pryces-Jones, 2010). The feeling of happiness that employees have while working can provide distinct benefits for the organization, such as low absenteeism, high employee productivity, and so on (Robertson & Cooper, 2011).
Happiness is not only defined as a condition in which a person enjoys his life. This is because most organizations only focus on how to increase productivity by ignoring the employee involvement factor (Claypool, 2017). Organizations need employees who have good engagement with their work and organization so that employees feel comfortable to work in the organizational environment (Chinanti & Siswati, 2018). The feelings of happiness in employees can lead to work engagement because they feel meaningful and enjoyable while working, thereby employees will be fully involved with their work (Agustina, 2020). Employees who have high involvement will feel proud and rewarded for the work, enthusiasm, spirit, and productivity they have performed (Saiga & Yoshioka, 2021). Bakker & Leiter (2010) stated that currently, the expectation of modern organizations is to have employees who are able to take the initiatives, enthusiastic, always energetic, and are willing to work hard to achieve the best performance and quality.

The study from Isriadi & Zulkarnain (2012), Claypool (2017), Chinanti & Siswati (2018), and Agustina (2020) found that happiness has a significant influence on work engagement. The second hypothesis proposed is as follows:

H2: There is a positive influence of workplace happiness on work engagement.

The Influence of Innovative Work Behavior on Job Satisfaction

Widmann & Mulder (2018) stated that innovative work behavior can grow in a person if that person has knowledge, high learning abilities, and able to forget the old ways of working. As stated by Leal-Rodriguez et al. (2015), the rapid development of the times has resulted in the knowledge owned by a person to be obsolete. Consequently, organization must be able to grow new innovations at work as soon as possible. Employees who have innovative work behavior can change things for the better even though initially the innovations displayed by these employees are not supported by colleagues and the management in general (De Spiegelaere et al., 2014).

New innovative ideas can emerge from the proactive attitude of employees. This attitude can increase employees’ self-motivation to do the job well and able to find out the impact of the task on others (Suseno, Standing, & Gengatharen, 2019). Innovative work behavior can be demonstrated by the competence owned by a person in completing the tasks he is assigned to. When completing the task, he will include a number of innovative ideas, hence he will feel satisfied at work (Nasir, Halimatusskadiah, & Suryani, 2019). The desire and ability of employees to innovate ensures the flow of innovation within the organization (Yesil & Hurlak, 2013). Therefore, many researchers and studies believe in the importance of innovative behavior in the workplace in building organizational performance and survival (Suseno et al., 2019). The study from Ibrahim et al., (2015) and Nasir et al., (2019) found that innovative work behavior has a significant influence on job satisfaction. The third hypothesis proposed is:

H3: There is a positive influence of innovative work behavior on job satisfaction.

The Influence of Work Engagement on Job Satisfaction

Work engagement is a condition that describes individual well-being and is associated with positive working conditions as well as provides satisfaction and affective-motivation. It can be used as one of the things to predict or see employees’ fatigue with the characteristics of enthusiasm, dedication, and absorption (Bakker et al., 2008). Employee work engagement will be stable, even grow rapidly if employees are in an environment that adheres to company values and individual values. Employees who can focus on work engagement will have a better quality of responsibility for the work assigned to them (Cook, 2008). According to Anwar & Qadir (2017), job challenges are very dominant in influencing job satisfaction, while according to Yalabik et al., (2017), “satisfaction with the job itself” is the main driver of all work engagement indicators, namely enthusiasm, dedication, and absorption. “Satisfaction with conditions” is negatively related to employees’ absorption in their jobs. This means that employees with high workloads may not be absorbed in their work. However, Almehrzi & Singh (2016) stated that work engagement can be formed through policies made by the leaders by retaining talented employees in the organization. Work engagement can have a direct influence on the performance of the entire organization such as employee efficiency, increased satisfaction, high productivity, and low employee turnover (Rana & Chopra, 2019). The study carried out by Orgambidez-Ramos et al., (2014) found that work engagement can significantly influence job satisfaction. Employees with strong work engagement will be absorbed in the work they do, they feel needed by the organization, and eventually the job satisfaction felt by the employees will increase (Yalabik et al., 2017). The fourth hypothesis proposed is:

H4: There is a positive influence of work engagement on job satisfaction.

The Influence of Workplace Happiness on Job Satisfaction Mediated by Work Engagement

Happiness is the most important goal seeks by everyone (Fisher, 2010). When a person can achieve the happiness he wants, he will maintain that happiness (Tomasulo & Pawelski, 2012). In general, happiness is related to how a person can judge what they are experiencing as a whole. Many people understand that the workplace is an important place for activities, and they are willing to spend a lot of time in the workplace (Bataineh, 2019). To be able to produce job satisfaction, every employee must be engaged in the organization. As stated by Widanti et al., (2019), work engagement will encourage employees to be willing to work optimally to achieve common goals in the organization. Organizations must be able to ensure that every employee is involved in their work by emphasizing on teams, communications, and rewards so that their employee satisfaction increases (Othman & Yusof, 2016). Employees with work engagement will experience satisfaction at work in the short term, and produce a loyal attitude to the organization in the long term (Vokic & Hernaus, 2015). Although work engagement cannot have a direct effect, organization must be able to increase the work engagement of its employees because it can bridge the gap between performance rewards, decision
making, and communication with job satisfaction and change of intention (Raza & Nadeem, 2018). Work engagement is closely related to employee performance because good work engagement can result in high job satisfaction (Kaufpáková, Vaculík, Procházka, & Schaufeli, 2018). The fifth hypothesis proposed is:

\[ H_5: \text{There is a positive influence of workplace happiness on job satisfaction mediated by work engagement.} \]

**Research and Methodology**

The population in this study are all private universities located in Tenggarong Regency, East Kalimantan Province, which include Universitas Kutai Kartanegara, STIE Tenggarong, Akademi Kebidanan Kutai Husada Tenggarong, and Sekolah Tinggi Teologi Tenggarong. The sampling technique used in this study is a stratified random sampling technique, because the number of each sub-population is not homogeneous. Therefore, the number of samples that have been determined must be divided based on the proportion of existing population members, and each member of the population has the opportunity to be a sample. The number of questionnaires distributed is 103 questionnaires, and there are 100 questionnaire that is returned and is completely filled. In this study, the researcher uses primary data collected by questionnaire. In the questionnaire distributed to respondents, the researcher uses measurements with a 5-point Likert scale. The hypothesis testing is carried out using Partial Least Squares (PLS) analysis with SmartPLS 3.0 software. The PLS analysis is used to determine the direct and indirect effect of exogenous variables on endogenous variables. Hypothesis testing is done with a 95% confidence level (\( \alpha = 0.05 \)).

**Result**

**Descriptive Analysis**

Descriptive statistics analysis is an analysis that serves to provide a general overview of initial data (Ghozali, 2018). Descriptive analysis is conducted to determine the characteristics of respondents based on gender, level of education, length of service, and position of the respondent. The results of the analysis indicate that most of the respondents are male (47%), aged 30-39 years old (49%), have the latest education of bachelor degree (63%), and have been working for 6-10 years (46%).

**Outer Model Evaluation**

The outer model testing in this study is aimed to ensure whether each indicator/item used has met the validity and reliability requirements (Ghozali & Latan, 2015). The test consists of 3 types. The first is convergent validity test, as convergent validity is good if the correlation value is more than 0.70. The test results in Table 1 show that all items/indicators contained in each latent variable (job satisfaction, work engagement, workplace happiness, and innovative work behavior) used in this study have a value above 0.7, thus it can be said that all items/indicators are valid. The second is discriminant validity test, with the criteria of AVE value that must be greater than 0.50. The results of the discriminant validity test in Table 2 show that all AVE square root values for each construct are greater than the correlation value between constructs and other constructs, thus all items/indicators have a good discriminant validity. In order to make sure that the items/indicators used are good, the researcher uses a cross loading value. The results of cross loading test in Table 3 indicate that each index value in one construct has a higher value than the other constructs. Therefore, it can be said that the value of discriminant validity is really good in condition. The third is composite reliability test, as the items/indicators is reliable if the Cronbach’s alpha is more than 0.7. The results of composite reliability test in Table 4 show that all Cronbach’s alpha and composite reliability values are above 0.7. Therefore, the variables used in this study is reliable so that it can be continued to evaluate the inner model.

**Inner Model Evaluation**

**(R-Square)**

The value of the determinant coefficient (R-Square) for each endogenous variable is as the predictive power of the structural model (Ghozali & Latan, 2015). In Table 5, it is known that the first R-Square value for the latent variable of job satisfaction is 0.920 (92%), which is greater than 0.75, thus it belongs to a strong model. This means that the 3 exogenous latent variables of workplace happiness, innovative work behavior, and work engagement can explain the endogenous latent variable of job satisfaction by 92%, while the remaining 8% are explained by other endogenous latent variables that are not used in this study. The second R-Square value for the latent endogenous variable of work engagement is 0.792 (79.2%), which is greater than 0.75, therefore it belongs to the strong model. This means that 1 exogenous latent variable of workplace happiness can explain the endogenous latent variable of work engagement by 79.2%, while the remaining 20.8% is explained by other endogenous latent variable that are not used in this study.

**(f-Square)**

In Table 6, it is known that the value of the first f-Square for the endogenous latent variable of job satisfaction is 0.237, which is smaller than 0.35, therefore it belongs to the model that has a medium effect. Therefore, among the three exogenous latent variables (workplace happiness, innovative work behavior, and work engagement), work engagement produces the largest value that can explain the endogenous latent variable of job satisfaction of 0.237. The value of the second f-Square for the endogenous latent variable of work engagement is 3.815, which is greater than 0.35, therefore it belongs to the model that has a large effect. This means
that one exogenous latent variable of workplace happiness can produce the largest value that can explain the endogenous latent variable of work engagement of 3.815

**Q-Square**

The value of predictive relevance (Q-Square) is often called predictive sample reuse. This technique can represent the synthesis of cross-validation and fitting functions with predictions from observed variables and estimates of construct parameters (Ghozali & Latan, 2015). In Table 7, the first Q-Square value for the endogenous latent variable of job satisfaction is 0.510, which is greater than 0.35, therefore it belongs to the model that has a strong influence. Therefore, the model with the three exogenous latent variables (workplace happiness, innovative work behavior, and work engagement) has good predictive relevance in explaining the endogenous latent variable of job satisfaction, which is 0.510. The value of the second Q-Square for the endogenous latent variable of work engagement is 0.489, which is greater than 0.35, therefore it belongs to the model that has a strong influence. Therefore, the model with one exogenous latent variable of workplace happiness has good predictive relevance in explaining the endogenous latent variable of work engagement, which is 0.489.

![Figure 1: Measurement Results of Outer Model](image)

| Variable                  | Item | Loading | Details | Variable                  | Item | Loading | Details |
|---------------------------|------|---------|---------|---------------------------|------|---------|---------|
| Job Satisfaction          | Y1.1 | 0.758   | Valid   | Workplace Happiness       | X1.1 | 0.784   | Valid   |
|                           | Y1.2 | 0.809   | Valid   |                           | X1.2 | 0.837   | Valid   |
|                           | Y1.3 | 0.777   | Valid   |                           | X1.3 | 0.838   | Valid   |
|                           | Y1.4 | 0.712   | Valid   |                           | X1.4 | 0.833   | Valid   |
|                           | Y1.5 | 0.785   | Valid   |                           | X1.5 | 0.818   | Valid   |
|                           | Y1.6 | 0.823   | Valid   | Innovative Work Behavior  | X2.1 | 0.862   | Valid   |
|                           | Y1.7 | 0.771   | Valid   |                           | X2.2 | 0.845   | Valid   |
|                           | Y1.8 | 0.797   | Valid   |                           | X2.3 | 0.840   | Valid   |
|                           | Y1.9 | 0.752   | Valid   |                           | X2.4 | 0.849   | Valid   |
|                           | Y1.10| 0.812   | Valid   |                           | X2.5 | 0.820   | Valid   |
|                           | Y1.11| 0.783   | Valid   |                           | X2.6 | 0.841   | Valid   |
|                           | Y1.12| 0.753   | Valid   |                           | X2.7 | 0.846   | Valid   |
|                           | Y1.13| 0.735   | Valid   |                           | X2.8 | 0.811   | Valid   |
|                           | Y1.14| 0.793   | Valid   |                           |      |         |         |
|                           | Y1.15| 0.750   | Valid   |                           |      |         |         |
|                           | Y1.16| 0.730   | Valid   |                           |      |         |         |
| Work Engagement           | Y2.1 | 0.791   | Valid   |                           |      |         |         |
|                           | Y2.2 | 0.845   | Valid   |                           |      |         |         |
|                           | Y2.3 | 0.807   | Valid   |                           |      |         |         |
|                           | Y2.4 | 0.791   | Valid   |                           |      |         |         |
|                           | Y2.5 | 0.836   | Valid   |                           |      |         |         |
|                           | Y2.6 | 0.824   | Valid   |                           |      |         |         |
Table 2: Discriminant Validity

|                    | Innovative Work Behavior | Job Satisfaction | Work Engagement | Workplace Happiness |
|--------------------|--------------------------|------------------|-----------------|---------------------|
| Innovative Work Behavior | 0.839*                   |                  |                 |                     |
| Job Satisfaction    | 0.934                    | 0.772*           |                 |                     |
| Work Engagement     | 0.943                    | 0.943            | 0.816*          | 0.822*              |
| Workplace Happiness | 0.888                    | 0.906            | 0.890           |                     |

Table 3: Cross Loading Value

|                | Innovative Work Behavior | Job Satisfaction | Work Engagement | Workplace Happiness |
|----------------|--------------------------|------------------|-----------------|---------------------|
| X1.1           | 0.706                    | 0.726            | 0.711           | 0.784               |
| X1.2           | 0.757                    | 0.779            | 0.737           | 0.837               |
| X1.3           | 0.699                    | 0.735            | 0.722           | 0.838               |
| X1.4           | 0.724                    | 0.733            | 0.696           | 0.833               |
| X1.5           | 0.758                    | 0.749            | 0.787           | 0.818               |
| X2.1           | 0.862                    | 0.789            | 0.820           | 0.745               |
| X2.2           | 0.845                    | 0.778            | 0.786           | 0.761               |
| X2.3           | 0.840                    | 0.796            | 0.824           | 0.772               |
| X2.4           | 0.849                    | 0.765            | 0.780           | 0.736               |
| X2.5           | 0.820                    | 0.771            | 0.808           | 0.756               |
| X2.6           | 0.841                    | 0.803            | 0.798           | 0.766               |
| X2.7           | 0.846                    | 0.768            | 0.762           | 0.700               |
| X2.8           | 0.811                    | 0.798            | 0.752           | 0.720               |
| Y1.1           | 0.769                    | 0.778            | 0.765           | 0.724               |
| Y1.10          | 0.765                    | 0.812            | 0.784           | 0.708               |
| Y1.11          | 0.730                    | 0.783            | 0.700           | 0.730               |
| Y1.12          | 0.651                    | 0.753            | 0.680           | 0.631               |
| Y1.13          | 0.669                    | 0.735            | 0.679           | 0.667               |
| Y1.14          | 0.720                    | 0.793            | 0.739           | 0.710               |
| Y1.15          | 0.680                    | 0.750            | 0.672           | 0.649               |
| Y1.16          | 0.617                    | 0.730            | 0.639           | 0.655               |
| Y1.2           | 0.777                    | 0.809            | 0.805           | 0.765               |
| Y1.3           | 0.744                    | 0.777            | 0.794           | 0.735               |
| Y1.4           | 0.698                    | 0.712            | 0.700           | 0.680               |
| Y1.5           | 0.747                    | 0.785            | 0.753           | 0.790               |
| Y1.6           | 0.761                    | 0.823            | 0.809           | 0.690               |
| Y1.7           | 0.712                    | 0.771            | 0.678           | 0.672               |
| Y1.8           | 0.759                    | 0.797            | 0.725           | 0.686               |
| Y1.9           | 0.709                    | 0.752            | 0.689           | 0.681               |
| Y2.1           | 0.746                    | 0.719            | 0.791           | 0.668               |
| Y2.2           | 0.805                    | 0.817            | 0.845           | 0.796               |
| Y2.3           | 0.742                    | 0.749            | 0.807           | 0.680               |
| Y2.4           | 0.776                    | 0.763            | 0.791           | 0.761               |
| Y2.5           | 0.777                    | 0.783            | 0.836           | 0.759               |
| Y2.6           | 0.768                    | 0.782            | 0.824           | 0.681               |

Table 4: Results of Composite Reliability Test

|                | Cronbach's Alpha | rho_A | Composite Reliability | Average Variance Extracted (AVE) |
|----------------|------------------|-------|-----------------------|---------------------------------|
| Innovative Work Behavior | 0.940            | 0.940 | 0.950                 | 0.704                           |
| Job Satisfaction       | 0.955            | 0.956 | 0.959                 | 0.596                           |
| Work Engagement        | 0.899            | 0.901 | 0.923                 | 0.666                           |
| Workplace Happiness    | 0.880            | 0.880 | 0.912                 | 0.676                           |
Table 5: Results of Determinant Coefficient Test (R-Square)

|                        | R Square | R Square Adjusted |
|------------------------|----------|-------------------|
| Job Satisfaction       | 0.920    | 0.917             |
| Work Engagement        | 0.792    | 0.790             |

Table 6: Test Results of Effect Size (f-Square)

| Innovative Work Behavior | Job Satisfaction | Work Engagement | Workplace Happiness |
|--------------------------|------------------|-----------------|---------------------|
|                         | 0.106            |                 |                     |
| Job Satisfaction         |                  |                 |                     |
| Work Engagement          | 0.237            |                 |                     |
| Workplace Happiness      | 0.150            | 3.815           |                     |

Table 7: Results of Predictive Relevance Test (Q-Square)

|                        | SSO   | SSE   | Q² (=1-SSE/SSO) |
|------------------------|-------|-------|-----------------|
| Innovative Work Behavior| 800.000 | 800.000 |                  |
| Job Satisfaction       | 1,600.000 | 798.176 | 0.510           |
| Work Engagement        | 600.000   | 306.567 | 0.489           |
| Workplace Happiness    | 500.000   | 500.000 |                  |

Hypothesis Test

The path coefficient analysis process is carried out by looking at the t-statistics value and p-value. The direction of the path coefficient that describes the relationship between latent variables can be seen from the influence value of each original sample, which can produce positive or negative values. The criteria of the test are that the t-statistic value of > 1.96 and p-value of < 0.05 is significant at 5% alpha, which means that the hypothesis is accepted at 5% alpha. On the contrary, the t-statistics value of < 1.96 and p-value of > 0.05 is not significant at 5% alpha, which means that the hypothesis is rejected at 5% alpha (Ghozali & Latan, 2015). The results of the hypothesis test are presented on Table 8.

Table 8: Results of Path Coefficients Test

|                        | Original Sample (O) | Sample Mean (M) | Standard Deviation (STDEV) | T Statistics (|O/STDEV|) | P Values | Results |
|------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|-----------------|----------|---------|
| Innovative Work Behavior -> Job Satisfaction | 0.292               | 0.317           | 0.124                      | 2.353           | 0.019    | H₁ accepted |
| Work Engagement -> Job Satisfaction     | 0.442               | 0.448           | 0.135                      | 3.265           | 0.001    | H₂ accepted |
| Workplace Happiness -> Job Satisfaction | 0.254               | 0.222           | 0.106                      | 2.386           | 0.017    | H₃ accepted |
| Workplace Happiness -> Work Engagement  | 0.890               | 0.890           | 0.033                      | 26.769          | 0.000    | H₄ accepted |

The Influence of Workplace Happiness on Job Satisfaction

Based on Table 8, it can be known that the original sample value (β) is 0.254 which has a positive value with the t-statistics value of 2.386 > 1.96 and p-value of 0.017 < 0.05. These results indicate that the first hypothesis (H₁) is accepted, or there is a positive influence of workplace happiness on job satisfaction.

The Influence of Workplace Happiness on Work Engagement

Based on Table 8, it can be known that the original sample value (β) is 0.890 which has a positive value with the t-statistics value of 26.769 > 1.96 and p-value of 0.000 < 0.05. These results indicate that the second hypothesis (H₂) is accepted, or there is a positive influence of workplace happiness on work engagement.

The Influence of Innovative Work Behavior on Job Satisfaction

Based on Table 8, it can be known that the original sample value (β) is 0.292 which has a positive value with the t-statistics value of 2.353 > 1.96 and p-value of 0.019 < 0.05. These results indicate that the third hypothesis (H₃) is accepted, or there is a positive influence of innovative work behavior on job satisfaction.
The Influence of Work Engagement on Job Satisfaction

Based on Table 8, it can be known that the original sample value ($\beta$) is 0.442 which has a positive value with the t-statistics value of 3.265 > 1.96 and p-value of 0.001 < 0.05. These results indicate that the fourth hypothesis (H4) is accepted, or there is a positive influence of work engagement on job satisfaction.

| Table 9: Results of Specific Indirect Effect Test |
|-----------------------------------------------|
| Original Sample (O) | Sample Mean (M) | Standard Deviation (STDEV) | T Statistics (O/STDEV) | P Values | Results |
| Workplace Happiness -> Work Engagement -> Job Satisfaction | 0.394 | 0.400 | 0.127 | 3.100 | 0.002 | Hs accepted |

The Influence of Workplace Happiness on Job Satisfaction Mediated by Work Engagement

Based on Table 9, it can be known that the original sample value ($\beta$) is 0.394 which has a positive value with the t-statistics value of 3.100 > 1.96 and p-value of 0.002 < 0.05. These results indicate that the fifth hypothesis (H5) is accepted, or there is a positive influence of workplace happiness on job satisfaction mediated by work engagement.

Discussion

The Influence of Workplace Happiness on Job Satisfaction

The results of the hypothesis test show that there is a positive influence of workplace happiness on job satisfaction at the private universities in Tenggarong Regency, East Kalimantan, during the COVID-19 pandemic. It can be seen from the value of original sample ($\beta$) of 0.702 which has a positive value with the t-statistics value of 7.915 > 1.96 and p-value of 0.000 < 0.05, thus the first hypothesis (H1) is accepted. This means that the increase in workplace happiness can increase job satisfaction, and conversely, a decrease in workplace happiness can reduce job satisfaction.

Workplace happiness is a feeling possessed by someone who can enjoy and admire the place where he works. Employees who feel happy at work can motivate themselves to produce something positive (Sonam & Vivek, 2019). Organizations that can increase employee happiness intensively can motivate their employees to work hard (Salas-Vallina et al., 2018). Employees who feel happy will be willing to devote the time they have to work activities, have high creativity, and will be committed to overcome any obstacles when helping their colleagues and carrying out tasks from superiors (Bakotić, 2016). Employees who feel happy tend to spend more time at work because they enjoy what they do (Roy & Konwar, 2020).

Employees who feel happy at work are indicated by high psychological abilities; as they tend to have a high level of satisfaction with their work (Joo & Lee, 2016). For this reason, employees must be able to make the work they do into something important as well as able to build and maintain good relationships in the work environment in order to show optimal performance (Angrai, 2018).

Optimal organizational performance must be supported by an adequate increase in employee welfare, therefore employee psychological capital to feel happiness in the workplace can be fulfilled (Awada & Ismail, 2019). Happiness at work is closely related to employee job satisfaction because it can produce work with good quality and overall success in an organization, thus it can have a good impact on employee knowledge, creativity, and work performance (Gyeltshen & Beri, 2019).

The results of this study support the study from Awada & Ismail (2019) who stated that happy employees are more likely to be inspired to accommodate changes in the workplace, as well as able to understand and achieve the roles and responsibilities expected of them. In addition, companies that serve the welfare of their employees can benefit by achieving an atmosphere characterized by respect, trust, ideas sharing, and good performance. Happy employees will give constructive opinions as long as they work in the organization because of the high appreciation and strong sense of togetherness. This will increase job satisfaction for every employee who works in an organization.

The Influence of Workplace Happiness on Work Engagement

The results of the hypothesis test show that there is a positive influence of workplace happiness on work engagement at the private universities in Tenggarong Regency, East Kalimantan, during the COVID-19 pandemic. It can be seen from the value of original sample ($\beta$) of 0.963 which has a positive value with the t-statistics value of 79.544 > 1.96 and p-value of 0.000 < 0.05, thus the second hypothesis (H2) is accepted. This means that the increase in workplace happiness can increase work engagement, and conversely, a decrease in workplace happiness can reduce work engagement.

Happiness is related to an individual’s quality of life which leads to increased health, creativity, income, and workplace (Biswas-Diener & Dean, 2007). Workplace happiness is needed by employees because it is able to optimize their resulting performance, able
to create positive feelings at work, and able to give employees a sense of satisfaction (Pryces-Jones, 2010). The feelings of happiness employees have while working can provide distinct benefits for the organization such as low absenteeism, high employee productivity, and so on (Robertson & Cooper, 2011).

Happiness can be owned by employees when their psychological well-being is fulfilled, so that employee functions in the organization can increase work commitment and involvement (Field & Buitendach, 2011). Basically, workplace happiness is an encouragement from within employees that continues to grow, while engagement is a force that binds employees to the organization. Increasing these two elements can produce a positive contribution to organizational performance (Istiadi & Zulkarnain, 2012).

Happiness is not only defined as a condition in which a person enjoys his life. This is because most organizations only focus on how to increase productivity by ignoring the factor of employee involvement (Claypool, 2017). Organizations need employees who have good engagement with their work and organization so that they can feel at home to work in the organizational environment (Chinanti & Siswati, 2018).

Feelings of happiness in employees can lead to work engagement because they experience meaningful and enjoyable feelings while working, so that employees will be fully involved with their work (Agustina, 2020). Employees who have high engagement will feel proud and appreciated for the work, enthusiasm, spirit, and productivity they have done (Saiga & Yoshioka, 2021).

Bakker & Leiter (2010) stated that the current expectation of modern organizations is to have employees who are able to take the initiative, enthusiastic, always energetic, and are willing to work hard to achieve the best performance and quality. Employees who are dedicated and energetic are needed by organizations, especially employees with strong engagement when carrying out their assigned tasks. Employees with a high level of work engagement will be emotionally attached to the organization; hence they will have higher productivity, increased loyalty, and low absenteeism (Shukla, Adhikari, & Singh, 2015). Employee work engagement will be stable and even grow rapidly if employees are in an environment that adheres to both company and individual values.

Employees who can focus on work engagement will have better quality of responsibility towards the work assigned to them (Cook, 2008).

This result supports the study from Isiadi & Zulkarnain (2012), Claypool (2017), Chinanti & Siswati (2018), and Agustina (2020) who found that happiness has a significant influence on work engagement.

**The Influence of Innovative Work Behavior on Job Satisfaction**

The results of the hypothesis test show that there is a positive influence of innovative work behavior on job satisfaction at the private universities in Tenggarong Regency, East Kalimantan, during the COVID-19 pandemic. It can be seen from the value of original sample ($β$) of 0.124 which has a positive value with the t-statistics value of 2.027 > 1.96 and p-value of 0.043 < 0.05, thus the third hypothesis (H3) is accepted. This means that the increase in innovative work behavior can increase job satisfaction, and conversely, a decrease in innovative work behavior can reduce job satisfaction.

Widmann & Mulder (2018) stated that innovative work behavior can grow in a person if the person has knowledge, high learning abilities, and can forget the old ways of working. As stated by Leal-Rodriguez et al., (2015), the rapid development of times has make the knowledge owned by a person to be obsolete. For this reason, the organization must be able to boost new innovations at work as soon as possible. Employees who have innovative work behavior can change things for the better, although initially the innovations displayed by these employees are not supported by colleagues and knowledge management in general (De Spiegelaere et al., 2014).

Strong relationships between employees, superiors, and co-workers can provide additional resources and support that can facilitate innovative work behavior and increase the success of innovation implementation (Sulistiawan, Herachwati, Permatasari, & Alfirdaus, 2017). Employees who prefer to work with a solid boss in leading the organization and try to motivate their employees will have better performance achievement compared to others (Hrnjic, Pilav-velic, Djudelija, & Jahic, 2018).

New innovative ideas can emerge from the proactive attitude of employees. This attitude can increase the employee’s self-motivation to do the job well and find out the effect of the task on others (Suseno et al., 2019). Innovative work behavior can be demonstrated by a competence a person owned in completing the tasks assigned to him. In completing these tasks, this person will include a number of innovative ideas for him to feel satisfied at work (Nasir et al., 2019).

Innovative behavior is not only an employee’s innate nature, but it can also be stimulated by job satisfaction (Niu, 2014). Innovative work behavior carried out by employees are often encounters obstacles during its implementation such as lack of trust, time, social networks, and flexibility (Yesil & Hurlak, 2013). The increase in innovative work behavior can increase employee job satisfaction (Ibrahim et al., 2015).

Employees’ desire and ability to innovate ensure the flow of innovation within the organization (Yesil & Hurlak, 2013). Therefore, many researchers and studies believe in the importance of innovative behavior in the workplace in building organizational performance and survival (Suseno et al., 2019).
This result supports the study from Ibrahim et al. (2015) and Nasir et al. (2019) who found that innovative work behavior has a significant influence on job satisfaction.

**The Influence of Work Engagement on Job Satisfaction**

The results of the hypothesis test show that there is a positive influence of work engagement on job satisfaction at the private universities in Tenggarong Regency, East Kalimantan, during the COVID-19 pandemic. It can be seen from the value of original sample (β) of 0.729 which has a positive value with the t-statistics value of 7.873 > 1.96 and p-value of 0.000 < 0.05, thus the fourth hypothesis (H4) is accepted. This means that the increase in work engagement can increase job satisfaction, and conversely, a decrease in work engagement can reduce job satisfaction.

Work engagement is a condition that describes well-being and is associated with positive working conditions which provides satisfaction and affective-motivation, which can be used to predict or see employees’ fatigue. The characteristics of work engagement include enthusiasm, dedication, and absorption (Bakker et al., 2008). Employee work engagement will be stable, even grow rapidly if employees are in an environment that adheres to the company values and individual values. Employees who can focus on work engagement will have better quality of responsibility towards the jobs they assigned to (Cook, 2008).

Work engagement makes employees to feel challenged to work even harder in completing a job that they find enjoyable (Schaufeli, 2012). The core elements of work engagement are vigor and dedication, while absorption characterizes employees who are engaged in their work. Absorption can be observed when employees feel that they can work with full concentration, are engrossed in their work, and feel that time is passing quickly; hence they find it difficult to get away from work (Orgambidez-Ramos et al., 2014).

According to Anwar & Qadir (2017), job challenges are very dominant in influencing job satisfaction, while Yalabik et al. (2017) stated that “satisfaction with the job itself” is the main driver of all work engagement indicators, namely vigor, dedication, and absorption. “Satisfaction with conditions” is negatively related to employees’ absorption in their jobs. This means that employees with high workloads may not be absorbed in their work. However, according to Almehrzi & Singh (2016), work engagement can be formed through policies made by the leaders by retaining talented employees in the organization. Work engagement can have a direct influence on the performance of the entire organization such as employee efficiency, increased satisfaction, high productivity, and low employee turnover (Rana & Chopra, 2019).

The results of this study support the research carried out by Orgambidez-Ramos et al. (2014) which found that work engagement can significantly influence job satisfaction. Employees with strong work engagement will be absorbed in the work they do and feel needed by the organization, therefore eventually the job satisfaction felt by the employee will increase (Yalabik et al., 2017).

**The Influence of Workplace Happiness on Job Satisfaction Mediated by Work Engagement**

The results of the hypothesis test show that there is a positive influence of workplace happiness on job satisfaction mediated by work engagement at the private universities in Tenggarong Regency, East Kalimantan, during the COVID-19 pandemic. It can be seen from the value of original sample (β) of 0.702 which has a positive value with the t-statistics value of 7.915 > 1.96 and p-value of 0.000 < 0.05, thus the fifth hypothesis (H5) is accepted. This means that the increase in workplace happiness can increase job satisfaction through work engagement, and conversely, a decrease in workplace happiness can reduce job satisfaction through work engagement.

Happiness is the most important goal that everyone seeks (Fisher, 2010). When a person can achieve the happiness he desires, then he will maintain that happiness (Tomasulo & Pawelski, 2012). In general, happiness is related to how a person can judge what they are experiencing as a whole. Many people understand that the workplace is an important place for activities and are willing to spend a lot of time in the workplace (Bataineh, 2019). To be able to produce job satisfaction, every employee must be engaged in the organization. As stated by Widanti et al. (2019), work engagement will encourage employees to work optimally to achieve common goals in the organization.

According to Geldenhuys et al. (2014), work engagement is one of the efforts developed by managers to enhance human resource that can provide positive performance improvements (e.g. job satisfaction, retention, productivity, etc.). When there is an increase in organizational performance, it will lead to a positive attitude among employees at the individual level, thereby the employee engagement will then affect the entire organization (Dajani, 2015).

Organizations must be able to ensure that every employee is involved in their work by emphasizing on teams, communication, and rewards, so that their employee satisfaction increases (Othman & Yusof, 2016). Employees who have work engagement will feel satisfaction at work in the short term, and will produce a loyal attitude to the organization in the long term (Vokic & Hernaus, 2015).

This result supports the study from Raza & Nadeem (2018) who stated that even if work engagement cannot provide direct influence, organization must always enhance work engagement of their employees because it will be able to bridge between performance rewards, decision making, and communication with job satisfaction and turnover intention. Work engagement is closely related to employee performance because good work engagement can result in high job satisfaction (Kašpárková et al., 2018).
Conclusions

The results that can be concluded from the discussion in the previous part are explained as follows:

i. There is a positive influence of workplace happiness on job satisfaction at the private universities in Tenggarong Regency, East Kalimantan, during the COVID-19 pandemic. This means that the increase in workplace happiness can increase job satisfaction, and conversely, a decrease in workplace happiness can reduce job satisfaction.

ii. There is a positive influence of workplace happiness on work engagement at the private universities in Tenggarong Regency, East Kalimantan, during the COVID-19 pandemic. This means that the increase in workplace happiness can increase work engagement, and conversely, a decrease in workplace happiness can reduce work engagement.

iii. There is a positive influence of innovative work behavior on job satisfaction at the private universities in Tenggarong Regency, East Kalimantan, during the COVID-19 pandemic. This means that the increase in innovative work behavior can increase job satisfaction, and conversely, a decrease in innovative work behavior can reduce job satisfaction.

iv. There is a positive influence of work engagement on job satisfaction at the private universities in Tenggarong Regency, East Kalimantan, during the COVID-19 pandemic. This means that the increase in work engagement can increase job satisfaction, and conversely, a decrease in work engagement can reduce job satisfaction.

v. There is a positive influence of workplace happiness on job satisfaction mediated by work engagement at the private universities in Tenggarong Regency, East Kalimantan, during the COVID-19 pandemic. This means that the increase in workplace happiness can increase job satisfaction through work engagement, and conversely, a decrease in workplace happiness can reduce job satisfaction through work engagement.
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