Employee Retention Factors and Their Health and Wellness Status among Category AAAA Construction Companies in Philippines

Engr. Lean Andrei T. Sanchez (dreisanchez01@gmail.com)

Master in Business and Administration, Tarlac State University, Philippines

Abstract: *This descriptive-correlational study explored the relationship between employee retention factors and their health and wellness status among category AAAA construction companies. A total of 45 out of 56 category AAAA construction companies throughout the Philippines participated in the study, in which 368 respondents with at least 1 year tenure answered the given online questionnaire. Pearson correlation coefficient was used to test the relationship between the variables and multiple regression analysis was used to check if employee retention factors can predict health and wellness status. Employees strongly agree with the current overall retention programs being implemented by their respective companies. Employees agree with the current level of health and wellness status. Hygiene factors are negatively associated with work-social life balance, while involvement factors are positively associated. Hygiene factors are positively associated with fitness, nutrition and physical health. Project and organizational environment factors are positively associated with workload and stress, while hygiene factors are negatively associated. Hygiene factors are negatively associated with overall health and wellness. The study concluded that some employee retention factors can significantly predict the health and wellness status of employees coming from category AAAA construction companies.*

Keywords: Construction, Employee Retention Factors, Health and Wellness, Multiple Regression Analysis

1. Introduction

Where are you? Look around. Everything you see is somehow related to someone building or constructing something to make our everyday living easier. Construction industry is referred to as an economic activity that involves the entire process from producing raw and manufactured building materials and components, and providing professional services such as design and project management, to executing the physical work on.

Human resource management (HRM) of construction companies around the world is very challenging, to say the least, and requires deep understanding on the nature of people and type of work that the construction industry demands. The need for flexibility on handling very diversified manpower is a must, since the type of employees change as technology advances and competition for innovation between companies continues to grow. Among the basic functions of HRM are recruitment and management of existing employees, which is a challenge to HRM personnel to attract people and make them stay (Collins, 2007). Studies show that employee retention is greatly affected by the factors that influence the employee's willingness to stay in the company. There were five factors that were identified, which influence employees to stay in the company, these factors are motivational factors, hygiene factors, project and organizational environment factors, involvement or sense of belongingness factors, and lastly, growth and recognition factors (Kumari, 2018).

These factors were based from three models from different authors. The 1st model is by Deery (2008), which stated that retention of employees is affected by different factors which he categorized into organizational and personal dimensions. His research work clearly stated that employee retention is dependent on factors like working hours, remuneration, career growth, education qualification, stress, and work-life balance. The 2nd model used as a reference is by Nabi, Syduzzaman and Munir (2016). The study simplified the employee satisfaction by considering is as a dependent variable from other independent variables such as training & motivation, performance appraisal & teamwork, employee participation and compensation, and absenteeism and turnover. Lastly, the model by Collins (2015), which uses the Herzberg's two-factor theory, which helped the researcher in determining the factors which can lead to employee satisfaction and the ones which can affect the intention of the employees to be loyal with the organization and have a longer tenure with the firm (Herzberg et al., 1999).

While Herzberg's two-factor or motivation-hygiene theory works as a universal standard for classifying mutually exclusive factors in the workplace that either causes job satisfaction or dissatisfaction, past studies show that some employee retention factors were not emphasized well in services industries. Kumari (2018) decided to further breakdown the retention factors, adding three additional groups of factors to give more emphasis in the study of services industries. Motivational factors include those factors that push the employee to strive, improve or work harder. Motivational factors still include factors such as job security, policies and culture adaptation, fringe benefits, remuneration, etc. Hygiene factors in the other hand include those factors that improves the quality of living of the employee. Hygiene factors still include stress reduction programs, flexibility of working hours, adequate leave and leave benefits, etc., but to give more emphasis to healthy work environment, open-communication policy, good welfare measures, and teamwork, Kumari (2018) decided to group these as project and organizational environment factors. Project and organizational environment factors are those factors that promote the workplace or environment to which employee works with. Involvement factors include items that involve self-importance and role playing of the employee at the company. Shorten feedback loop, respect and fair treatment at workplace, and company decision making, were grouped as involvement factors. Lastly, growth and recognition factors include those factors that improves and acknowledgement of the employee's achievements in the company. Training for different domain, opportunities to develop skills, and promotion were grouped as growth and recognition factors.

Aside from these factors, employees nowadays also tend to prioritize their health and wellness when choosing the right workplace and deciding either to stay or leave. From the health and wellness side of HRM, Postelnyak (2022) identified three basic factors of health and wellness namely, work-social life balance, fitness, nutrition, and physical health, and lastly, workload and stress. Work-social life balance factors are those activities that are being done by the employee outside their work, fully unrelated to their work or profession, like family, hobbies, and other social responsibilities. Fitness, nutrition and physical health factors pertain to the overall body health and status of the employee which include the condition of his body, food, and other health practices. On the other hand, workload and stress factors refer to the daily activities at tasks that the employee needs to encounter each day that may affect his health and wellness.

In the Philippines, construction companies are labeled according to their net worth, manpower capacity and past projects. Construction companies are rated as category D, C, B, A, AA, AAA and AAAA. Category AAAA being the highest category given to any construction company has net worth of 1 billion pesos. Human resource management for category AAAA construction companies demands the human resource personnel to know not only the basic factors of local employee satisfaction but also the difference in health and wellness per profile of employees. This is because construction personnel differ not only in their project location but also the nature of the project itself that requires different types of employees. Employees measure the worth of a job on different factors like the category or size of the company they worked, the benefits, the environment they worked at, and other factors that may convince them to stay or push them in ultimately leaving their workplace (Ngonde, 2015).

Nowadays, construction companies tend to lose people, especially skilled individuals on their 1st to 2nd year in the company (Druker & Croucher, 2015), these gives the company a backlog on the work to be done because of the hiring and training process of the new employees. On the side of the employee, because of the inconsistency of policies and employee benefits from one company to another, they tend to hop from job to job until they can find a company that suits their needs, and this gives them no stable job and consistent actual training to hone their skills (Deery, 2008).

While there is no standard on what to prioritize and what are to be considered irrelevant to their work based on the profile of the employees, considering the amount of time needed for the human resource department to find an employee for a specific position, and the cost of training, it is beneficial for both the company and the employees if there are guidelines on employee benefits, and health and wellness programs that the employees are expected to have during their stay in a category AAAA construction company. Some of the basic health and wellness benefits like annual physical examination, healthcare card, hazard pay, and free dental services, are present on majority of construction companies. On the other hand, different practices are implemented for health and wellness programs from different companies, such as semi-annual biggest loser award, weekly office masses, mandatory day-offs and vacation leaves, and marathon events (Alcera, 2022).

Employee retention is a major factor in a company's smooth process and transactions while having a good health and wellness program for the employees maximizes their efficiency and prevents unforeseen delays due to health reasons. The relationship between employee retention and health and wellness of employees became more relevant especially after the pandemic of 2019. A study by Aldana (2023) on how wellness programs increase employee retention in the workplace associates the relationship between employee retention and wellness. Most employees choose employers based on the health and wellness programs available in the organization and many employees like their jobs when working for companies that offer health benefits (Aldana, 2023).

The researcher who is currently an area manager of a category AAAA realty and construction company, with more than 10 years of experience in construction work, has experienced both land development and housing part of construction, and has experience on both hiring and laying-off of employees, is interested to study employee retention factors and health and wellness at work of category AAAA construction companies in the Philippines. The study aimed to determine the factors influencing the retention of employees particularly the science and technology professionals, and their current health and wellness status at work, and to analyze the relationship between employee retention and health and wellness status at work. This undertaking wished to contribute to human resource management of construction companies on how they could motivate more the employees to become more productive and efficient and eventually choose to stay in their respective company.

2. Materials and Methods

The research design of the study is descriptive-correlational design that focused on gathering data for numerical analysis of employee profile, employee retention factors and health and wellness status of employees of among selected category AAAA construction companies in the Philippines. The data gathering of the study was purely done in the form of surveys using online questionnaires. The study also analyzed the relationship between the employee retention factors and the health and wellness status at work while assessing if employee retention factors are predictors for the health and wellness status of employees at work. The study covered all 51 construction companies throughout the Philippines as of January 23, 2023, which are currently categorized as AAAA by the Philippine Contractors Accreditation Board (PCAB). However, only 45 category AAAA construction companies have participated in the study and they were located specifically 39 in Luzon, while 3 are located in Visayas, and 3 in Mindanao. The study was distributed among employees who are currently employed by the Category AAAA construction company in the Philippines.

Random sampling design was used in the study giving each employee a chance to participate among the category AAAA construction companies. The professionals employed by a Category AAAA Construction Company ranges from a small number of 200 up to 22,000 personnel for the largest companies in the country resulted to an average of 11,100 employees. Using Raosoft software, this gave the present study a computed recommended sample size of 372 respondents, with 5% margin of error and a confidence level of 95%. However, it was reduced to a total of 368 (98.92%) because of the checked normality of the distribution of data. The ratio of registered Category AAAA construction companies for Luzon, Visayas and Mindanao is 45:3:3, which was close to the actual ratio of respondents, Luzon, 264, Visayas, 51, and Mindanao, 53. The respondents of the study are composed of employees who are currently employed on a Category AAAA construction company in the Philippines, and considered as a science and technology professional, such as engineers, architects, accountants, managers, marketing heads, human resource personnel, management personnel, etc. To have more reliable results, the data gathering was given to those employees who have stayed at least 1 year in the company, or should already be considered permanent or regular employee by the Department of Labor and Employment because of more than 6 months of tenure in the company.

To test the normality of the distribution of data, the study tested the collected data for skewness and kurtosis in Jamovi, and it was found out that the kurtosis of the data is more than +7.0, which means that the data was not normal in distribution. Four randomly selected responses suggested by Jamovi were removed and resulted to skewness scores between -2 to +2 which is within the acceptable range of a normal data set. Likewise, the resulted kurtosis showed an outcome between -7 to +7, which is also within the acceptable range of data set to be considered normal (Hair et. al., 2010, Byrne, 2010). The skewness and kurtosis test

results are presented on Appendix B. With this, from the target 372 employees, there were only 368 respondents considered in the study after considering the normality of the distribution of the data.

Data were collected using online questionnaires. The first part of the questionnaire collects the data of employee profile such as years of service, current position in the company and nature of work. Under the years of service, respondents chose which tenure length they belong to, starting from 1-5 years, 6-10 years, 11-15 years, 16-20 years, 21-25 years, 26-30 years, 31-35 years and lastly, 36-40 years. The current position in the company includes being on entry level or intermediate, and middle management level. The nature of work determines the job description or actual work responsibilities of the employees whether on-site or office-based. The second part of the questionnaire focused on the employee retention factors. The questionnaire adapted the survey questions from the study of Kumari (2018) that included assessment of employee retention factors. Revisions were made on the tenses of each question in order to direct the answers of the respondents to their actual experiences and regulations in their current company. These factors were categorized as motivational factors, hygiene factors, project and organizational environment factors, involvement or sense of belongingness factors, and lastly, growth and recognition factors. Each item was rated using Likert scale, 1 being strongly disagree and 5 being strongly agree. The last part of the questionnaire consists of measures on health and wellness status of the employees at work. The study adapted the work for employee wellness questionnaire by Postelnyak (2022) which is consisting of three elements namely; work-social life balance, fitness, nutrition and physical health, and lastly, workload and stress. This was also rated using the Likert scale of 1 being strongly disagree and 5 being strongly agree. The questionnaire that the study used has been tested using the reliability test for Cronbach's alpha value. The value of Cronbach alpha obtained was 0.864 which states that the scale of reliability is good (Kumari, 2018). The greater the value of Cronbach alpha, the higher is the consistency within the set of items in the questionnaire.

The study used the mean score to describe each category of employee retention factor and health and wellness status of employees at work. For the employee profile, frequency count was used for each range or group. To test the hypothesis on employee retention factors as predictors of health and wellness status, multiple linear regression analysis was used. However, Pearson's correlation coefficient was also tested to ensure that employee retention and health and wellness are related, as shown in Appendix C. Based on the correlation matrix, employee retention factor is significantly related to work-social life balance (ρ= .021), fitness, nutrition, and physical health (ρ=<.001) and workload & stress (ρ=<.001). However, overall employee retention factor is not significantly related with health and wellness status (ρ = .824). Nevertheless, hygiene factors (ρ = .015), project & organizational environment factors (ρ = .031), and involvement factors (ρ = .011) are significantly associated with the overall health and wellness.

The Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) values of employee retention factors as predictors of health and wellness were also checked to ensure that multicollinearity was not an issue. Based on the results, all VIF values were less than +2, see Appendix D for VIF values. The Q-Q plot diagram was also drawn in order to check the linearity of the results. Based on the results, the diagram showed roughly a linear line; see Appendix E for the Q-Q plot diagrams.

3. Results

Profile of Employees: The results of the survey show that most, 39%, of the respondents for category AAAA construction companies are employed of one to five years. The distribution for employees for the other years of tenure groups are fairly similar ranging from 5% to 20% per category, which means that longer-tenured employees tend to be smaller in number.

The current position of the respondents represents their current ranking in their respective category AAAA construction companies. The entry and intermediate levels are those employees who are currently labeled as staff, associates, representatives, coordinators, specialists, or analysts. These respondents represent 65.22% of the total data collected or 240 respondents. While the middle management level are those employees who are already labeled as director, manager, regional manager, senior manager, project manager, supervisor or team leader, regardless of their tenure to the company. These respondents represent the remaining 34.78% or 128 respondents.

The nature of work represents the place of designation and where does majority of the work of employee takes place. Results shows that 219 respondents or 59.51% primarily do their work on the field or actual site while 149 respondents or 40.49% of the actual data comes from the employees who do paper works in the office and other cleric works for a smooth sailing process of the projects.

Employee Retention Factors: The overall employee retention factors represent the five factors namely, motivational, hygiene, project & organizational environment, involvement, and growth & recognition factors.

Table 1 summarizes the overall employee retention factors of the employees working in a category AAAA construction company in the Philippines. The overall mean score for the employee retention factors is 4.54 which is also labeled as "strongly agree" and justifies the level of contentment of the employees when it comes to staying in their respective construction companies.

Hygiene factors are the sole employee retention factor that is labeled as "agree" having a mean score of 4.17. This only shows that hygiene is still important for employees of category AAAA construction companies but is less significant when compared to the other factors of employee retention. Hygiene is not the primary focus of construction companies, especially in the actual construction sites. It can also be noted that the highest mean score given was in the motivational factors of employee retention with 4.68 rate.

Factors	Mean	Equivalent Adjectival Rating
Motivational Factors	4.68	Strongly Agree
Hygiene Factors	4.17	Agree
Project & Organizational Environment Factors	4.63	Strongly Agree
Involvement Factors	4.61	Strongly Agree
Growth & Recognition Factors	4.62	Strongly Agree
Composite Mean	**4.54**	**Strongly Agree**

<center>Table 1</center>

Health and Wellness Status: For the health and wellness status, Table 2 summarizes the composite mean for each variable of health and wellness status. Work-social life balance is 4.11, fitness, nutrition and physical health is 3.89, while workload and stress has a mean score of 4.09.

Variable	Mean	Equivalent Adjectival Rating
Work-social life balance	4.11	Agree
Fitness, nutrition and physical health	3.89	Agree
Workload and stress	4.09	Agree
Composite Mean	**4.03**	**Agree**

<center>Table 2</center>

Employee Retention Factors are Predictors of Health and Wellness: Using Jamovi as statistical tool to calculate the model fit measure for work-social life balance, the results show that the 17.60% of the variance is explained by the five predictors, collectively, $F_{(5,362)}=15.5$, $\rho = < .001$. Based on the results, multiple regression analysis was found valid and significant measure with $\rho = < .001$ from the overall model test. Table 3 shows the summary of the model coefficients and multiple regression analysis with work-social life balance as outcome.

Model	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Overall Model Test			
				F	df1	df2	ρ
1	0.420	0.176	0.165	15.5	5	362	< 0.001
Predictor				Estimate	se	t	ρ
Intercept				1.8748	0.6950	2.697	0.007
Motivational Factors				0.0611	0.1626	0.376	0.707
Hygiene Factors				-0.3102	0.0402	-7.7199	<0.001
Project & Organizational Environment				0.2511	0.1660	1.512	0.131
Involvement Factors				0.3514	0.1510	2.328	0.020
Growth and Recognition Factors				0.0989	0.1562	0.633	0.527

<center>Table 3</center>

The findings of the study show that the work-social life balance score is equal to 1.874 + 0.0611(motivational factor) – 0.3102(hygiene factor) + 0.2511(project & organizational environment) + 0.3515(involvement factor) + 0.0989(growth & recognition factor) per one unit of increase each factor. From the results, involvement factors (b = .3515, t =2.328, p = .02) is positively associated with work-social life balance, while hygiene factors (b = -.3102, t =-7.719, p = < .001) is negatively associated with work-social life balance. On the other hand, motivational factors, project & organizational environment factors, and growth & recognition factors are not significantly associated with the work-social life balance.

Using Jamovi as statistical tool to calculate the model fit measure for fitness, nutrition and physical health, the results show that the 13.90% of the variance is explained by the five predictors, collectively, $F(5,362)=11.7$, $p = < .001$. Based on the results, multiple regression analysis was found valid and significant measure with $p = < .001$ from the overall model test. Table 4 shows the summary of the model coefficients and multiple regression analysis with fitness, nutrition and physical health as outcome.

Model	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Overall Model Test			
				F	df1	df2	ρ
1	0.373	0.139	0.128	11.7	5	362	< 0.001
Predictor				Estimate	se	t	ρ
Intercept				3.6732	0.7626	4.816	< 0.001
Motivational Factors				-0.1527	0.1784	-0.856	0.393
Hygiene Factors				0.3270	0.0441	7.417	< 0.001
Project & Organizational Environment				-0.1402	0.1822	-0.770	0.442
Involvement Factors				0.1056	0.1656	0.637	0.524
Growth and Recognition Factors				-0.0582	0.1714	-0.339	0.734

Table 4

The findings of the study show that the fitness, nutrition and physical health score is equal to 3.6732 - 0.1527(motivational factors) + 0.3270(hygiene factors) - 0.1402(project & organizational environment) + 0.1056(involvement factors) - 0.0582(growth & recognition factors) per one unit of increase each factor. From the results, hygiene factors (b = .3270, t =7.417, p = < .001) is positively associated with fitness, nutrition and physical health. On the other hand, all other employee retention factors such as, motivational factors, project & organizational environment factors, involvement factors and growth & recognition factors are not significantly associated with the fitness, nutrition, and physical health.

Using Jamovi as statistical tool to calculate the model fit measure for workload and stress, the results show that the 16.90% of the variance is explained by the five predictors, collectively, $F(5,362)=14.8$, $p = < .001$. Based on the results, multiple regression analysis was found valid and significant measure with $p = < 0.001$ from the overall model test. Table 5 shows the summary of the model coefficients and multiple regression analysis with workload and stress as outcome.

Model	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Overall Model Test			
				F	df1	df2	ρ
1	0.412	0.169	0.158	14.8	5	362	< 0.001
Predictor				Estimate	se	t	ρ
Intercept				2.8619	0.7106	4.027	< 0.001
Motivational Factors				-0.0492	0.1662	-0.296	0.768
Hygiene Factors				-0.3146	0.0411	-7.657	< 0.001
Project & Organizational Environment				0.3442	0.1698	2.027	0.043
Involvement Factors				0.2731	0.1544	1.769	0.078
Growth and Recognition Factors				-0.0187	0.1597	-0.117	0.907

Table 5

The findings of the study show that the workload and stress score is equal to 2.8619 - 0.0492(motivational factors) - 0.3146(hygiene factors) + 0.3442(project & organizational environment) + 0.2731(involvement factors) – 0.0187(growth and recognition factors) per one unit of increase each factor. From the results,

The Review of Contemporary Scientific and Academic Studies
An International Multidisciplinary Online Journal
www.thercsas.com

ISSN: 2583-1380   Vol. 3 | Issue No. 8 | August 2023   Impact Factor: 4.736 (SJIF)

project and organizational environment factors (b = .3442, t =2.027, p = .043) is positively associated with workload and stress. On the other hand, hygiene factors (b = -.3146, t =-7.657, p = < .001) is surprisingly negatively associated with workload and stress. All other employee retention factors such as, motivational factors, involvement factors and growth & recognition factors are not significantly associated with the workload and stress.

Using Jamovi as statistical tool to calculate the model fit measure for the overall health and wellness status of employees, the results clearly shows that only 4.55% of the variance is explained by the five predictors, collectively, $F(5,362)=3.45$, p = .005. Based on the results, multiple regression analysis was found valid and significant measure with p = .005, from the overall model test. Table 6 shows the summary of the model coefficients and multiple regression analysis with the overall health and wellness as outcome.

Model	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Overall Model Test			
				F	df1	df2	ρ
1	0.213	0.0455	0.0323	3.45	5	362	0.005
Predictor				**Estimate**	**se**	**t**	**ρ**
Intercept				2.80329	0.5993	4.6778	< 0.001
Motivational Factors				-0.04691	0.1402	-0.3346	0.738
Hygiene Factors				-0.09925	0.0346	-2.8645	0.004
Project & Organizational Environment				0.15168	0.1432	1.0595	0.290
Involvement Factors				0.24339	0.1302	1.8699	0.062
Growth and Recognition Factors				0.00734	0.1347	0.0545	0.957

Table 6

The findings of the study show that the overall health and wellness score is equal to - 0.0469(motivational factor) 2.80329 - 0.0993(hygiene factor) + 0.1517(project and organizational environment factor) + 0.2434(involvement factor) + 0.0073(growth & recognition factor) per one unit of increase each factor. From the results, hygiene factors (b = -.0993, t =-2.8645, p = .004) is negatively associated with the overall health and wellness status of employee. All other employee retention factors such as, motivational factors, involvement factors, project & organizational environment factors, and growth & recognition factors, are not significantly associated with the overall health and wellness.

4. Discussion

Profile of Employees: The result for tenure of employees can be attributed to the constant hiring of new employees for construction companies especially for big companies such as category AAAA (Griner, 2019). Since projects of category AAAA construction companies tend to be mega-projects with multi-million budgets and a very strict timeline of construction, a lot of new employees cannot endure the pressure and responsibility of handling large projects. This results to a very high turn-over rate for newly hired personnels and constant massive hiring for the construction companies (Wu, et., al., 2018). For the current position in the company, it is evident that majority of the respondents are in the entry or intermediate level when it comes to rank, which is almost twice the amount of middle management employees. The ideal setup for any companies is that there are many entry and intermediate level employees, while there are only few or limited number of higher positions available (Ngonde, 2015). To maintain the chain of command from superior to other employees, vacancy for higher positions is rarely available, this may give additional motivation for the employees to strive better than their co-workers in order to have a good shot for promotion. Lastly, for the nature of work, it is evident that majority of the respondents work on-site or in the actual construction of the projects that supports the fact that there are multiple on-site personnel such as engineer, architects and quality control officers needed in one project, while multiple projects are being handled by a single office-based employee such as accounts, human resource personnel, or purchasing manager (Lingard, 2004).

Employee Retention Factors: Though the mean score is still agreeable and acceptable by the employees, it seems to be the least concern of the company which is evident on actual construction sites since the workplace is most likely dangerous, dirty and sometimes hazardous depending on the project being done by the company. This was supported by actual benefits being given by the company to maintain productivity such as overtime pays, accomplishment incentives, target completion rewards, profit-sharing concepts, free

allowances, and the likes. Construction companies tend to compensate well when it comes to professional employees since they serve as the core gears for running the whole construction process, leading the manpower, equipment and materials needed the correct way of executing properly the project methodology.

Health and Wellness Status: Work-social life balance was being acknowledged the most by the employees among all the aspects of health and wellness status which shows that employees tend to view their job and social life as fairly balanced and acceptable in their current career path. It is also notable that the workload and stress are well agreed by the employees which indicates that the workload given to employees and the stress that they encounter during their working hours is fairly normal and acceptable (Arante, 2011). In the aspect of fitness, nutrition and physical health, it is still agreeable for most respondents which shows that the overall physical health and food intake of employees are within the tolerable range for working individuals.

Employee Retention Factors are predictors of Health and Wellness: The result of the analysis suggests that, the more employees get involved with the company, the more likely (b= .3515) they manifest a better work-social life balance. This is because the respect and fair treatment given by the company gives employees positive perspective to their work and leads to a better productivity on their work and social life (Lingard, 2004). The leaves, after-work activities, and leave benefits provided by the company also balances their workload and their personal lives. Moreover, the company adapting local policies and cultures of employees by the company makes the workers feel more involved and at home on their workplace, lessening the burden and pressure of their work (Wu, et. al, 2022).

On the other hand, there is an increase in work-social life balance when there is a decrease in the hygiene factors (b= -.3102) of the company. Activities such as tree planting, providing a day-care center for their children and other corporate activities such as stress reduction programs, good welfare measures and mandated higher education for higher positions in the company, may have negative or less impact to their work and social life balance. Additionally, mandating employees to dress in a certain level of professionalism may burden employees in such a way that they feel discomfort when they are not used in the hygiene programs that the company imposes. The employees' work-social life balance is being affected by having to wear whatever they like is being disrupted by the mandate of the company to wear what they need to wear during work.

The result of the analysis shows that when employees have better hygiene programs at work, this leads to a good (b= .3270) fitness, nutrition and physical health. This is evident to the physical health of workers that join stress reduction programs, such as biggest loser, occasional marathons sponsored by the company, and other activities that promote better health. Proper hygiene in the workplace and on-site, such as personal cleanliness, organized workplace, and proper food intake for employees, improves the overall fitness, nutrition and physical health of the employees as well (Shazwan, et. al., 2017).

The results show that the project environment of employees on-site and the organizational environment in the office positively (b= .3442) affects the workload and stress of the workers. Having a flexible schedule of working hours greatly affect the stress of the workers in a positive way, good teamwork and workplace relationships reduces the workload through smoother transactions and processing (Wu, et. al., 2022). Likewise, open communication between co-workers and even immediate superiors; lessen the stress and anxiety of workers under a construction company.

On the other hand, employees show an increase in workload and stress when there is a decrease (b= -.3146) in the hygiene factors of the company. The stress reduction programs, good welfare and social corporate responsibilities of the company may have been viewed by the respondents as additional tasks from work and makes their time for personal activities less (Lingard, 2014). Rules of companies that require employees to a certain degree of manner, dress code and conduct may have been seen by the employees as additional work that requires effort and, in a way, adds additional workload and stress.

The results show that many employees tend to see a good or high-level hygiene implementation as additional burden for them to do their work. The on-site employees, where the work is usually under the scorching heat of sun, and sweat is always running through their skin, promoting hygiene of any kind was seen by employees as negatively impacting their productivity and outcome at work (Arganosa and Binghay, 2022). Furthermore, stress reduction programs can hinder the productivity of employees on their job because of the additional time they spent on these programs, fatigue can be felt by employees aside from being stressed.

Provided transportation in the companies can also be a problem to some employees since these transportation facilities are often strict on the time and may even extend the time of travel depending on the route it takes for the employees onboard.

5. Conclusion

The tenure of the employees of construction companies show that majority of the respondents come from the range of 1-5 years. Majority of employees from construction companies are coming from the Entry level and Intermediate Level. Most construction company employees work on-site in the actual construction of the projects being handled by the company.

The motivational factors of employee retention show that the employees care more about their career growth in the company. Professionals coming from category AAAA construction companies value the long-term stay in a large company, rather than those immediate incentives, and awards. Employees were more motivated with the stability of the company, than any other aspects of the company. Employees tend to agree with the current stress reduction programs and good welfare measures of their company, but shows need for further improvements especially on day care facilities, which had the lowest score among the hygiene factors. The hygiene factors show that employees care less for the provided amenities of the company. Employees feel less stress and pressured when the company provides appropriate flexibility on working hours and schedule of employees. Especially for on-site workers, the productivity of the employee is more important than the time they spend at work. Employees strongly agree with the current project and organizational environment of their workplace. Employees feel involved and have sense of belongingness to their companies because of the given fair treatment among workers, programs for developing their skills, and policies based on cultures of the employees. Employees tend to have full trust in the system of the company for career growth, rewards and recognition. Good standard on performance appraisal system of category AAAA construction companies was formed. Employees strongly agree with the current overall employee retention programs being implemented by their companies, which make them stay in their current job.

Employees are fairly contented with their work-social life balance at a category AAAA construction company. Employees feel that the amount of workload and time of working in their job, are still acceptable to them with their current job position. Employees view their nutrition and physical health as still acceptable for construction company workers, since their work doesn't necessarily need to skip meals or prohibit them from eating during working hours. Furthermore, employees also feel that too much exposure to computer and sunlight during working hours worsens their eyesight. The employees agree to have suitable amount of workload and feels the just the right magnitude of stress for their work. The feeling of burn-out is decreased when they have someone to speak with. The employees agree on the current programs, benefits, and system of their respective construction companies related to health and wellness. There are certain items that need to be improved by the company, and there are items that are less important for the workers when it comes to their health and wellness, but overall, the employees agree to their current health and wellness status from the strategy implemented by their respective category AAAA construction companies.

Hygiene factors are negatively associated with work-social life balance, while involvement factors are positively associated with work-social life balance. The more employees get involved, the more likely they manifest a better work-social life balance, while promoting more intensive hygiene rules may lead to poorer work-Social life balance. Hygiene factors are positively associated with fitness, nutrition and physical health, and can predict the fitness, nutrition and physical health of employees. Employees that have better hygiene programs at work leads to a better fitness, nutrition and physical health. Hygiene factors are negatively associated with workload and stress, while project & organizational environment factors are positively associated with workload and stress. The project environment on-site and organizational environment at the office of employees positively affects their workload and stress, while more intensive hygiene programs promote more workload and stress for the employees. Hygiene factors are negatively associated with the overall health and wellness, and can predict the overall health and wellness status of employees. While motivational factors, project & organizational environment factors, involvement factors and growth & recognition factors are not significantly associated with the overall health and wellness status of employees.

References

Alcera, R.L. (2022). *Health, Wellness Practices, and Work Performance Variable of Employees in the University of Eastern Philippines System.* University of Eastern Philippines. Catarman, Northern Samar.

Aldana, S. (2023). *How Wellness Programs Increase Employee Retention in the Workplace.* Arizona State University. Tempe, Arizona.

Antoncic, B., & Hisrich, R. (2000). *Entrepreneurship modeling in transition economies: A comparison of Slovenia and the United States*. Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship. 5(1), 21-40

Arante, B. (2011). *The Occupational Safety and Health Program of Construction Companies Contracted by Educational Institutions.* University of Mindanao. Davao City, Philippines.

Arganosa, N.M., & Binghay, V. (2022). *The Effects of a Corporate Wellness Program on the Physical, Occupational, Socio-Emotional and Spiritual Wellness of Filipino Workers.* University of the Philippines. Los Banos, Philippines.

Bastida, L. (2019). *Wellness Practices of Employees in a State University: Bases for the Lagsik-Abtik Wellness Plan.* Bukidnon State University College of Education. Malaybay City, Bukidnon, Philippines.

Byrne, B.M (2010). *Structural Equation Modeling with Amos: Basic Concepts, Applications, and Programming.* Taylor and Francis Group, New York.

Collins, C.J. (2007). The Interactive effects of Recruitment Practices and Product Job Seeker's employer knowledge and application behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology.* Vol. 92, 180-190.

Deery, M. (2008). Talent Management, Work-life Balance and Retention Strategies. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management.* Vol. 2(7). 792-806.

Druker, J., & Croucher, R. (2015). *Human Resource Management in European Construction Companies.* University of Greenwich Business School. London.

Edralin, D. (2010). *Human Resource Management Practices: Drivers for Stimulating Corporate Entrepreneurship in Large Companies in the Philippines*. De La Salle University. Philippines.

Figueroa, D. (2022). Work from Home Experience and Work-life Balance of Accounting Business Process Outsourcing Employees. *Journal of Algebraic Statistics.* Vol. 13 (3). 3560 – 3565. Tarlac State University, Philippines.

Fuller, T. (2012). *Employee Health on the 21st Century: An Investigation of Exercise Incentives on Four Medium-Sized Western Australian Organizations.* University of Notre Dame. Australia.

Griner, C. (2019). *Small Construction Business Owners' Strategies for Employee Retention.* Walden University. Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Hair, J.F., Black, W.C., Babin, B.J., & Anderson, R.E. (2010). *Multivariate Data Analysis.* 7th Edition, Pearson, New York.

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B. & Snyderman, B. (1999). *The Motivation to work.* Wiley, New York.

Ismail H., & Warrak A., (2019). *The Impact of Employee Well-being on Employee Retention.* 8(12). 33-37. Higher Institute of Business Administration. Damascus, Syria.

James, G., Witten, D., Hastie, T., & Tibshirani, R. (2013). *An Introduction to Statistical Learning: with Applications in R*. Springer, New York.

Kaluarachchi, Y., Nartallo, P., & Emuze, F., (2022). *How the Construction Industry can improve the Health and Well-being of their workers in a post COVID19 era*. Manchester Metropolitan University. United Kingdom.

Krekel, Dr. C., Ward, G., & De Neve, J.E. (2019). *Employee Well-being, Productivity, and Firm Performance: Evidence and Case Studies.* London, United Kingdom.

Kumari, N. (2018). *Factors Influencing the Retention of Employees in the IT Services Industry in Bengaluru.* ICFAI University Jharkhand. Bengaluru, India.

Latoja, M., & Lim, D. (2011). *Career Guide: Construction.* Career Guides for Selected Industries.

Lingard, H. (2004). *The Work-Life Experience of Office and Site-Based employees in the Australian Construction Industry.* RMIT University. Melbourne, Australia.

Lucas, G. (2019). *The Human Resource Management Practices of Selected Philippine Contractors Accreditation Board (PCAB) Licensed Construction Companies in Quezon City*. Polytechnic University of the Philippines. 3(3), 1-18.

Maslow, A. (1943). *Motivation and Personality. A Theory of Human Motivation.* Brooklyn, New York.

Marshal, C. (2020). *Analysis of a Comprehensive Wellness Program's Impact on Job Satisfaction in the workplace.* East Carolina University. Greenville, North Carlina, USA.

Nabi, N., Syduzzman, M., & Munir, S. (2016). *The Impact of Human Resource Management Practices on Job References: A Case Study of Dhaka Bank* Pvt. Ltd., Bangladesh. 219-267

Neyestani, B. (2014). *Human Resource Development on Employee's Performance and Productivity in Selected Construction Companies.* University of the East, Philippines.

Ngonde, D. (2015). *Job Satisfaction among workers in the Construction Industry.* University of Tanzania. Dar es Salaam, Tanzania.

Othman, I., Idrus, A., & Napiah, M. (2012). *Human Resource Management in the Construction of Sustainable Development Project: Towards Successful Completion.* Perak, Malaysia.

Patil, S. (2022). *Employee Retention through Employee Health and Wellness being Programs.* Sandip Institute of Technology and Research Center. Nashik, India.

Pavico, L. (2022). The Relationship of Intrapreneurship Practices in the Workplace and the Company's Competitive Advantage. *Journal of Algebraic Statistics. Vol. 13 (3). 1022-1029.* Tarlac State University, Philippines.

Pereja, J., Batoon, J., & Rafer J., (2021). *Perceived Effectiveness of Wellness Program to Increase Employee's Motivation amidst Pandemic.* Colegio de San Juan de Letran. Calamba, Laguna.

Postelnyak, M. (2022). *Employee Engagement: Employee Wellness Survey, Questions and Best Practices.* https://www.contactmonkey.com/blog/employees-health-wellness-survey

Preez, H. (2010). *The Impact of a Corporate Wellness Programme on Employee Wellness, Motivation and Absenteeism.* University of Pretoria. Pretoria, South Afrrica.

Radujkovic, M. (2013). Impact of Human Resource Management on the Business result of Croatian Construction Companies. *Journal on Organization, Technology, and Management in Construction.* 5(1), 12-19

Ramos, W. (2018). Organizational Change and Dimensions of Learning Organization in Manufacturing Firms. *Review of Integrative Business and Economics Research. Vol. 7(3). 62-75.* Tarlac State University, Philippines.

Ruffino, H. (2022). *Performance Appraisal Quality, Performance Measures and Job Satisfaction of Universal Bank Employees.* Tarlac State University. Tarlac City, Philippines.

Selmer, J., & De Leon, C. (2002). *Pinoy-style HRM: Human Resource Management in the Philippines.* Asia Pacific Business Review, 8(1), 127-144

Shazwan, M., Quintin, J., Osman, N., Suhaida, S., & Ma'arof, M. (2017). *The Importance of Cleanliness in a proper Construction Site Management in Malaysia: Contractor's Perspective.* INTI International University. Negeri Sembilan, Malaysia.

Susilowati, F., & Chrishnawati, Y. (2021). *Strategic Approach in Human Resource Management at Construction Companies in Indonesia.* Tidar University. Indonesia.

Swaroopa, D., & Sudhir, B. (2019). *A study on Employee Retention Strategies and Factors with Special Reference to IT Industry. Department of Management Studies.* S.V. University. Andra Pradesh, India.

Tonelada, C., Silaran, F., & Bildan, MC., (2018). Sanitary Conditions of Food Vending Sites and Food Handling Practices of Street Food Vendors: Implication for Food Hygiene and Safety. *International Journal of Education and Research. Vol. 6 (3).* Tarlac State University, Philippines.

Toyado, D. (2021). *Health and Safety in the Construction Industry in Catanduanes, Philippines.* College of Engineering, Catanduanes State University. Virac, Catanduanes, Philippines.

Uzoamaka, O.E., Nwosu, C.C., & Okoro, A. (2021). *Analysis of Human Resources Management Practices and Challenges in Construction Companies in Nigeria.* 5(3). 2-11. Nnamdi Azikiwe University. Awka Anambra State, Nigeria

Vulpen, E.V. (2019). *7 Human Resource Management Basics Every HR Professional Should Know.* https://www.aihr.com/blog/human-resource-basics/

Wu, G., Wu, Y., Li, H., and Dan, C. (2018). *Job Burnout, Work-family conflict, and Project Performance for Construction Professionals: The Moderating Role of Organizational Support.* Beijing Normal University. Beijing, China.