

---

Open Access Article

**ROLE OF CHIEF HAPPINESS OFFICER (CHO) INTERVENTIONS TO IMPROVEMENT  
IN ENVIRONMENTAL FIT HAPPINESS**

**Dr. Saravana Praveen Kumar P**

Post-Doctoral Fellowship Scholar, Lincoln University College, Malaysia.  
[saravanapraveen@gmail.com](mailto:saravanapraveen@gmail.com)

**Prof. Dr. Amiya Bhaumik**

Lincoln University College, Malaysia.

**Dr. Janani Selvam**

Lincoln University College, Malaysia.

**Dr. Ashok Vajravelu**

University Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia, Malaysia.

**Abstract:** Gone are those days where financial aspects were the major and deciding factors for job holders. Happiness is the secret ingredient for today's stake holders of the company and has also become a challenging concern in the current working environment. Thereby creating happiness in the workplace builds passion towards the job and ensures productivity of the firm. Nowadays employee engagement activities are stuck in measuring the problems in workplace rather than improving the employee's work life. It tends to focus more on a downward approach rather than advancing upward. When an employee starts working in a company, at the initial stage commitment to the new working environment and excitement drives the employee to engage more in work but later on the interest declines and he/she starts to feel disengaged due to lack of meaning and change at work. Temporary initiatives will only serve as a backup for a short period of time and will not give a solid and permanent solution. The HR managers must accept that, engaging employees towards personal and professional goal is not a one-time process; it needs constant monitoring, understanding and identifying the causes for disengagement. To ensure that staff members enjoying their job is not an easy task for any organisation, therefore all actions of HR process effecting the employer-employee relationship could be redefined to guarantee a satisfied expertise of working and a joyful work environment. In any organisation an employee is the most important asset. Treating the employee's right and associating in them a sense of belongingness and togetherness with the organisation can go an extra mile by bringing the Chief Happiness Officer (CHO) into play. CHO also ensures a more committed and happier workforce in the organisation. Our proposal focuses on a CHO to take control over the situation as CHO believes happy employees make better employees by ensuring security of basic principles, listening to the employees, valuing the everyday work and allowing freedom to the work force etc.

Received: August 12, 2021 / Revised: September 08, 2021 / Accepted: September 30, 2021 / Published: October 16, 2021

About the authors : Dr. Saravana Praveen Kumar P

Corresponding author- Email: [saravanapraveen@gmail.com](mailto:saravanapraveen@gmail.com)

**Key words:** Happiness environment, Disengagement, Active engagement, Active disengagement, Fun at workplace, Chief Happiness officer.

**摘要：**那些将财务方面作为工作持有者的主要和决定因素的日子已经一去不复返了。幸福是当今公司利益相关者的秘诀，在当前的工作环境中也成为具有挑战性的问题。从而在工作场所创造幸福感会激发对工作的热情并确保公司的生产力。如今，员工敬业度活动仅限于衡量工作场所的问题，而不是改善员工的工作生活。它倾向于更多地关注向下的方法而不是向上推进。当员工开始在公司工作时，最初对新工作环境的承诺和兴奋会促使员工更多地投入工作，但后来兴趣下降，由于缺乏意义和变化，他/她开始感到无所事事在上班。临时举措只能作为短期的后备，并不能提供可靠和永久的解决方案。人力资源经理必须承认，让员工实现个人和职业目标不是一次性的过程；它需要不断监测、了解和查明脱离接触的原因。为了确保员工享受工作对任何组织来说都不是一件容易的事，因此可以重新定义影响雇主与雇员关系的人力资源流程的所有行为，以保证满意的工作专业知识和愉快的工作环境。在任何组织中，员工都是最重要的资产。通过让首席幸福官 (CHO) 发挥作用，对待员工的权利并在他们中建立归属感和与组织的团结感，可以更进一步。CHO 还确保组织中的员工队伍更加忠诚和快乐。我们的建议侧重于 CHO 来控制情况，因为 CHO 相信快乐的员工可以通过确保基本原则的安全性、倾听员工的意见、重视日常工作并允许劳动力自由等来培养更好的员工

**关键词：**幸福环境，脱离，积极参与，积极脱离，工作场所乐趣，首席幸福官。

## Introduction

Boredom, lack of insight, disconnection in work due to stress and poor feedback system are the main causes of disengagement among employees. Plester and Hutchison (2016) deduces the obscurity and complication in the relationship between fun and workplace engagement where these principles is a growing subject matter for research that provides a wide array of ramifications for academicians and practitioners of Human Resource Management and an organisation conduct. Plester et al. (2015) found that fun is actually paradoxical and unclear which generates problems for each workers and

managers, whereas on the other side administration's approach toward motivating employees to be proactive and adaptable generates stress and anxieties and frustration. Improved assumptions related to involvement might in fact create workers even more anxious. Workplace fun is actually a complicated facility. Individuals have various ideas about what makes the fun. The same event can easily increase smiles in one and sneers to other. Conflicting impacts become part of the reason why workplace fun is paradoxical. Plester et al. (2015) interprets that the contrary beliefs of fun may cause false impressions that can

detrimentally affect morale and workplace connections. The report also provides a larger conceptualization of fun that gives prospective for additional productive and unified work environments and makes a higher tolerance for completing and paradoxical impressions of fun. Bolton and Houlihan (2009) signifies that the organisations are actually confronted with a complicated projection of what is actually and what is not fun for those included, and also there are actually hues of employee engagement with fun at work. The authors supply new understandings right into the instinct to manage play, laugh, and fun at job, and additionally individuals' responses to initiatives to include, shape and capitalize on the innovation, creativity and fun to become discovered in communal wit and social relationships in the work environment.

Hazelton (2014) stated that institutions desire involvement, empowerment and energy coming from their staff members. These arise from maintaining emotions. It is helpful to know additional about emotional states, specifically the advantages of Positive emotional states and just how we can easily attach with them for more significant personal and professional achievement. Plester and Hutchison (2016) make use of three different types of work environment fun: dealt with, natural and activity fun to examine the relation in between fun and work environment interaction. This report provides exploratory research finding that advise some certain connections in between the principles of fun and engagement. Tews et al. (2015) searches emphasized that certainly not all fun is actually equivalent in promoting embeddedness. Of the four sizes reviewed here, fun job responsibilities displayed one of the strongest effects. Fun activities displayed the weakest result, and the impacts for co-worker hanging out and manager

help for the fun were in between. These results illustrate that Millennials worth more laid-back and much less organized types of fun. The results from this research emphasize the relevance of contemplating and hope rationalizing exciting as multidimensional. It ought to be taken note that none of the measurements of fun were actually negatively pertaining to embeddedness. Although fun might not regularly have a strong positive influence on workplace end results, our findings advise that, usually, fun does certainly not have a bad influence.

### **Literature Review**

Happiness is generally considered as a sense of enjoyment of an individual's life as a whole (Szczygieł and Mikolajczak, 2017). Some of the research studies have explained the negative effect of stress on the well-being of people (Scherer, 1999). The stressed work environment is considered to be a threat to the well-being of employees in their happiness (Hair, et al., 2006). In the organizational context, job stress and happiness have been identified as positively and negatively correlated. Studies found out that there exists an inverse relationship between job stress and happiness of employees (Chiang et al. 2010). Employees lose their temper with customers when they are stressed, however, an emotionally intelligent employee can cope up with work stress which results in improved level of happiness (Yaacob, 2008). The happiness and wellbeing of employees increase when they successfully complete their work and are satisfied with their work (Jaccard et al. 1990). In an experimental study, it is observed that the employees who are happy are more productive than the employees who are less happy (Oswald, 2015).

The common issues in happiness research are to identify the factors that lead to happiness among individuals and how do we measure these factors and happiness. Research studies have arrived at several factors that might contribute to influencing happiness among those individuals who work or study in higher learning institutions. The results of the study identified positive emotions, relationship, engagement, meaning of job, and achievement as the factors that influence happiness. In particular, the factor, engagement is found to be significantly associated with employee happiness. Dimensions of employee engagement have been established in many previous research studies. One of the research studies conducted in a higher education institute identified three factors that are associated with employee engagement which include administrative process, leadership and job satisfaction (Baruch et al. 2010, Proctor, 2014 and Salas-Vallina, 2017).

Administrative process includes various administrative roles and responsibilities that support the main activities in the organization. These activities could be managing the budget, claims management, scholarship processing, performance evaluation and promotion, and work process and procedures. Administrative processes that facilitate the completion of a task will make employees to be engaged (Proctor, 2014). Leadership plays an important role in ensuring employee happiness. Leadership refers to leadership styles and actions of leaders that motivate their subordinates, setting goals and directions to the team members and being a role model for others (Salas-Vallina, 2017). Leaders have real concerns for their subordinates' well-being and make sure that their subordinates perform well in an organization. Job satisfaction is another factor that contributes to employee

engagement and happiness (Baruch et al, 2010). Job satisfaction refers to the positive emotion of employees towards their achievement, ability to do the assigned job, the flexibility of time to perform the job, the work environment and the allocation of jobs.

Job stress is an interesting factor in organizational research. Job stress is referred to as the "inability of workforces to cope the job pressure due to hole of job demands and employees competencies to justify the job needs" (Holmlund-Rytkönen and Strandvik, 2005). Researchers are continuously looking for those factors which either induce stress or reduce the effects of stress (Abbas and Raja, 2015). Many individuals are unable to cope up with the work requirement and develop unseen and unwanted stress which changes their attitude toward work (Gaillard, 2001), (Maslach et al. 2001). Individuals who undergo less stress may have increased level of well-being (Ruiz-Aranda et al. 2014).

Another research study found that when individuals exhibit positive emotions, their psychological and intellectual abilities improve making them satisfied with life, more happy and come up with innovative ideas (Fredrickson, 1998). The impact of job stress is consistent with employee perception of whether they can manage their emotions (Asiegbu, 2016). For instance, a research study found that if employees are able to understand and manage their own emotions and others' emotions, it will reduce their job stress and subsequently it will lead to an increase in the employee well-being. Job stress is found to reduce employee well-being like happiness or life satisfaction. Job stress is found more in service industries, particularly in telecommunication sector where employees are highly stressed as they need to

tackle customers in abundance. This results in lesser happiness and life satisfaction. Carver and Scheier (1992) explain as to how people make use of a particular situation can have a remarkable impact on their well-being by employing their model of self-regulation. The ability to use and manage emotions based on the situation will help individuals to reduce their stress (Matthews et al, 2017). Research results explain that emotionally intelligent people are more adaptable towards work environments as compared to those individuals who are not emotionally intelligent. When individuals do not adapt to their work environment, this leads to negative life outcomes (Augusto-Landa et al, 2008). “Emotional intelligence is a skill to understand, recognize, use, express and manage of emotions in ourself and others” (Goleman, 2001), (Ismail et al. 2016). Intrapersonal intelligence is an ability to be in harmony with one’s own feelings. Interpersonal intelligence is the talent to get things done by others. Good managers possess these skills in addition to their analytical and design talent (Caldarola, 2014). Emotional intelligence is a primary predictor of employee well-being in term of life satisfaction and happiness. Emotional intelligence provides realistic evidence to improve an individual’s work abilities in which have positive influence on work performance (Choi, 2012).

### **Statement of the Research Problem**

The Chief Happiness Officer (CHO) is one of the most significant authorities who produce the happiness among the employees at work place as well as ensure the benefits for an organization and the employees to overcome their non-commitment obstacles. Though the concept of ‘CHO’ introduced and implemented many foreign countries except in the business

zones of India. Hence it is identified very rarely in India and also need has arisen to explore the importance of CHO in Indian organizations. So here it becomes necessary to study the Happiness factors through the role of CHO.

### **Objectives of the Study**

- To identify the unhappiness factors at work place.
- To find out the factors that boosting the happiness of actively engaged employees, partially engaged and disengaged employees.
- To identify the significant role of Chief Happiness Officer (CHO) at work place to implement an effective employee engagement model to assess the employee and organisational benefits.

### **Limitation**

The main constraint of the study is the time period involved and lack of knowledge about the practical implications of the role of Chief Happiness Officer (CHO).

### **Research Design**

The kind of investigation layout utilized in this analysis is descriptive in nature. The descriptive research seeks to illustrate or define a subject, frequently by generating an profile of a problems group, people, or events, through the collection of data and the tabulation of the frequencies on study variables or even their interaction; the research study discloses who, what, when, where, or even just how much; the research study involves a univariate inquiry or even speculation/hypothesis in which the study asks about or conditions something regarding the dimension, kind, distribution, or existence of a variable. The significant function of descriptive

research is an explanation of condition of undertakings as it exists presently.

### **Data Collection Method**

In this study structured questionnaire were used to collect the primary data from the employees. Final study was conducted with 202 employees in Kanchipuram district of Tamil Nadu. There are there parts in the final questionnaire. The first part consists of the demographic questions regarding region, gender, type of family, marital status, age, and educational qualification and income levels. The second part includes the employee engagement model based questions determining the factors for unhappiness, boosting happiness among actively engaged, partially engaged and disengaged employees which includes five-point Likert-type statements (The range is 1 to 5 where 5 represents strongly agree and 1 represents to strongly disagree) which were based on the attributes. The Cronbach's alpha score achieved for the study was  $\alpha = 0.850$  which indicates that the internal consistency of the scale is high.

### **Primary Data Collection**

Managerial decisions reliability depends on the quality of data. The data quality may be conveyed in relations to its representative function of the fact which could be ensured due to the utilization of a proper data collection procedure. Data could be gathered from primary or secondary sources. Primary data describe details collected firsthand by the analyst on the variables of interest for the certain objective of the research. Primary Data are useful for present studies as well as for potential future studies. Therefore, it ought to be actually collected along with due care. Some instances of resources of primary data are actually people, marketing

study, boards of respondents specifically set up by the analyst and from whom, the point of views may be looked for on specific concerns coming from time to time, or even some unobtrusive resources like a trash can. The internet can also work as a primary data source when questionnaires are provided or circulated through it.

Face to face interview is one of the methods of primary data collection apart from telephonic interview, interview in computerized; observation of people and activities with or without videotaping or audio recording; and a selection of other motivational procedures like projective tests. Questioning, providing questionnaires, and observing phenomena and people are the three main data collection strategies in survey investigation. The success of survey methods relies on the relevant the questionnaire used. Structured questionnaire are used comprises of a collection of effectively created questions to probing and get actions from the participants.

### **Sampling Design and Determination of Sample Size**

Probability samples that are restricted are called random samples. The study is micro in attribute and data were collected from 201 employees. Every initiative was taken to ensure that all the places were covered in Chennai, Tamil Nadu.

If the sample size is very large, at that point error in decision making will certainly be much less. It will be a pricey exercise to do sampling from a large sample, which is a lot more than the necessity. In sampling, the appropriate sample size reduces the inaccuracy in decision making, as well. Just before performing sampling, it is a basic method to identify the

sample size for a desired accuracy on the population variance.  $N = (Z_{\infty/2\sigma} / D)^2$

**Results and Discussions**

The below table containing mean and SD score of demographic profile of the selected respondents, the highest mean value of the age group of the respondents is 2.23, hence highest age group among the selected samples were between 26 to 45 years followed by that highest mean value of the gender wise classification of the respondents is 1.8, therefore highest gender wise classification among the selected samples were female gender. The highest mean value of based on educational qualification of the respondents is 2.533, hence highest educational qualification of the selected samples were drawn post graduate degree followed by the highest mean value on work experience of the respondents is 2.167, hence highest work experience (in years) of the selected samples were less than 5 years.

**Table 1 –Demographic Profile**

Demographic Profile	Mean	Std. Deviation
Gender	1.8	0.407
Age	2.233	0.89763
Educational qualification	2.533	0.68145
Work experience	2.167	1.53316
Current salary	2.667	1.44636
Marital status	1.467	0.57135
Children	1.067	0.47946
Current Designation	2.6	0.67466
Frequency in switching organisations	2.933	1.46059
Reason for switching over to another organisation	3.067	1.2299

Source: Questionnaire through Google Forms

The highest mean value of based on current salary, marital status, children and current designation of the respondents are 2.667, 1.467, 1.067 and 2.6 respectively, hence highest current salary, marital status, children and current designation of the selected samples were drawn 40K-60K, Married, having children and senior level, respectively. The highest mean value of based on unhappiness factors at work place: frequency in switching organizations and unhappiness factors at work place: reason for switching over to another organisation of the respondents are 2.933 and 3.067 respectively, hence highest unhappiness factors at work place: frequency in switching organizations and unhappiness factors at work place: reason for switching over to another organisation of the selected samples were drawn once in 5 years and Not recognized or promoted, respectively.

**Table 2 – Regression Coefficient between Factors boosting the happiness of disengaged employees and Frequency of switching organizations**

Factors boosting the happiness of actively engaged employees	Frequency of switching organisations				
	Yearly	Once in	Once in	Once in	Not
Monitoring employees attitude towards their preference when executing fun based activities	1.774	0.31	2.59	5.56	0.01
Employees should actively get involved in fun activity programs	0.575	0.185*	0.63**	3.113	0.053*

Management should keep employees engaged during the socialized events	0.002*	0.04*	0.003	0.004*	0.0097
Management should take steps to identify and resolve contradiction and intra-group conflicts regarding fun based activities	-1.21	0.344*	-1.821	-3.523	0.039
Identify the like-minded people in order to achieve group cohesion	0.107*	0.259	0.134*	-0.412	0.708*
Trust in management builds the relationship between workplace fun and job satisfaction	-1.692	0.346	-2.558	4.88*	0.016
<b>R Square</b>	<b>0.621</b>	<b>0.756</b>	<b>0.885</b>	<b>0.745</b>	<b>0.639</b>

Source: Questionnaire through Google Forms

Multiple regression analysis is carried out to understand the impact of factors that boost the happiness of disengaged employees on the frequency of switching organizations. The results indicate that the switching behaviour of employees within a year of joining the organization is significantly and positively influenced by the factors, 'keeping the employees engaged during the socialized events' and 'identifying the like-minded people in order to achieve group cohesion' ( $R^2 = 0.621$ ). Thus, if the employees are engaged during the social events and if like-minded people are chosen to carry out various activities, the chances of employees being retained beyond one year of service will improve. The organization switching

behaviour of employees once in 2 or 3 years is significantly and positively affected by the factors, 'involvement of employees in fun based activities' and 'identifying and resolving contradictions and intra-group conflicts that arise out of fun based activities' ( $R^2 = 0.756$ ). Employees are likely to switch an organization once in 2 or 3 years if there is no fun at work and if the management is not taking initiatives to manage conflicts among the groups and between groups. Organization switching behaviour once in 5 years is found to be significantly and positively influenced by the factors, 'employees should actively get involved in fun activity programs' and 'identify the like-minded people in order to achieve group cohesion' ( $R^2 = 0.885$ ). Based on the analysis, it is also inferred that the employees switching from one organization to the other once in 7 to 10 years were influenced by the factors that the 'management should keep employees engaged during the socialized events' and 'build trust by enhancing workplace fun and job satisfaction' ( $R^2 = 0.745$ ). Employees are not likely to switch from one organization to the other if they 'actively get involved in fun activity programs' and if the 'management is identifying like-minded people in order to achieve group cohesion' ( $R^2 = 0.639$ ). It could be seen from the above table that these two factors significantly and positively influence the switching behaviour of employees. Among all the identified factors that boost the happiness of actively engaged employees, the factor 'monitoring employees' attitude towards their preference when executing fun based activities' alone is not seen to have an impact on the organization switching behaviour of employees.

**Table 3 – 't' coefficient for reason for switching over to another organisation**

Reason for switching over to another organisation	Agree	Disagree
Once promotion/hike is obtained	- 0.11 9	0.42 9
Change in role/industry	0.94 7	0.57 1
Not recognized/promoted	0.83 2**	0.69
Poor compensation	- 0.50 3	0.55 5
Boredom	- 0.08 8	- 0.27 8
Excess work load	0.36	1.65 7
Lack of fun at workplace	- 0.35 8**	- 1.20 6
Desire to work under a transactional leader	- 0.28 2	- 0.90 7
Lack of creativity in given tasks	0.41 3**	0.32 9
Poor management	- 0.53 7	0.43 8
Stress/physical illness	0.07 3	0.52 9
Too much focus on fun activities	0.33 2	0.42 6

Source: Questionnaire through Google Forms

Independent sample ‘t’ test was conducted to identify the major factors that contribute to organization switching behaviour of employees. The results indicated that the highly viewed reason for switching over to another organisation by the agreed factors are

‘not recognized or promoted’, ‘lack of fun at workplace’ and ‘lack of creativity in given tasks’, since their ‘t’ scores are 0.832, -0.358 and 0.413, respectively. Hence, these factors are likely to influence the Chief Happiness Officer (CHO) spread smile on a happiness model with a curve that sets everything straight.

**Table 4 - Mean and SD Score on the Proposal of Chief Happiness Officer (CHO) to set up the happiness model at workplace**

Proposal of Chief Happiness Officer (CHO) to set up the happiness model at workplace	Mean	Std. Deviation	Rank
To build confidence and to understand the importance of team spirit	4.466 7	0.81931	1
CHO should reduce boredom, conflicts with peer groups and make employees feel at home	4.433 3	0.67891	3
CHO should know different strategies/approaches to achieve the goal	4.45	0.77013	2
CHO identifies efficient employees and retains their talent	4.4	0.72397	4

Source: Questionnaire through Google Forms

From table 4, it is inferred that with regard to the proposal of chief happiness

officer (CHO) to set up the happiness model at workplace that benefit employees, the factor that the CHO 'To build confidence and to understand the importance of team spirit' is ranked first (4.4667) followed by 'CHO should know different strategies/approaches to achieve the goal' is ranked second (4.45) and 'CHO should reduce boredom, conflicts with peer groups and make employees feel at home' is ranked third (4.43). The last ranked factor is 'CHO identifies efficient employees and retains their talent' (4.4).

### **Discussion**

Happiness is an emotion and the state of being happy. Happy people are the ones who experience positive emotions like joy, interest and pride very frequently and negative emotions like sadness, anxiety and anger very rarely (Lyubomirsky, 2005). Happiness is always associated with positive way of life and work which is seen in terms of satisfaction with one's own life, better health conditions, high performance in work and commitment. Chan and Mak (2016) ascertain that trust and job satisfaction among employees in an organization could be ascertained through workplace fun, since organization should promote more fun activities for employee to participate. Employees who feel very much involved in an organization are willing to put more effort in discharging their duties. An engaged employee is found to be emotionally close with the organization, very passionate about his job and cares about the growth of the organization (Seijts and Crim, 2006). Deeply engaged employees of an organization, have a sense of positive and intense feelings and put their best effort for the growth of the organization. Macey and Schneider (Macey and Schneider, 2008) explained employee engagement as a desirable condition among employees that includes their attributes

like having an organizational purpose, involvement, commitment, passion, enthusiasm, focused effort and energy, in terms of attitude as well as behavioural components. Engagement with work involves employees' positive attitude towards work while employee engagement is all about the employees' positive vibes towards the organization. Environmental uncertainty is an important actor changing today's organizational structure and behaviour from traditional to organic (Daft, 2013). In this organic and changing organizational climate, the main anxiety of employees is the increased job stress. Organizations are becoming powerless to guarantee job safety and in turn cannot expect faithful and inspiring employees. Job stress is also an outcome of competitive work places where employees are expected to continuously innovate. Today's organizations spend millions on job stress. (Greenberg et al, 2003). Emotionally intelligent employees can cope with stress and maintain their happiness and life satisfaction level. If the emotional intelligence of employees is less they may not be able to cope with job expectations and are likely to have job related stress. This may impact an individual's personal life, make them feel less satisfied and they are likely to have low level of happiness from life (McCormick and Barnett, 2011).

### **Conclusion**

The results of the research study presents that trust-in-management resolves the relationship between fun in workplace and staff member job satisfaction. Apart from this, employees that experience a high level of fun in the workplace have a greater effect on workplace fun, trust-in-management and Job satisfaction. Frenking (2016) strongly believes "A Feel Good Manager" mission is to mold the society,

demonstrate the values of the team member and to engage each team member to contribute and work together to the general society. It is actually a global concentrate on the workplace environment and individual worker joy and should be entirely sustained due to the whole senior management team. The effectiveness of these useful designs is actually displayed in both terrific customer service scores and likewise in overall company ratings. The report also mentioned that discussed know-how and continuous interaction of various teams within the firm is an excellent instance of practical firm culture and Feel Good Management in action.

## References

- Bolton, S. C. & Houlihan, M. (2009). "Are we having fun yet? A consideration of workplace fun and engagement", *Employee Relations*, Vol. 31 Issue: 6, pp.556-568
- Chan, S.C.H & Mak, W. (2016) "Have you experienced fun in the workplace?: An empirical study of workplace fun, trust-in-management and job satisfaction", *Journal of Chinese Human Resource Management*, Vol. 7 Issue: 1, pp.27-38
- Frenking, S. (2016) "Feel Good Management as valuable tool to shape workplace culture and drive employee happiness", *Strategic HR Review*, Vol. 15 Issue: 1, pp.14-19.
- Hazelton, S. (2014). "Positive emotions boost employee engagement: Making work fun brings individual and organizational success", *Human Resource Management International Digest*, Vol. 22 Issue: 1, pp.34-37.
- Plester, B & Hutchison, A. (2016) "Fun times: the relationship between fun and workplace engagement", *Employee Relations*, Vol. 38 Issue: 3, pp.332-350.
- Plester, B., Thomas, H.C. & Winqvist, J. (2015). "The fun paradox", *Employee Relations*, Vol. 37 Issue: 3, pp.380-398.
- Tews, M.J., Michel, J.W. and Bartlett, A. (2012), "The Fundamental role of workplace fun in applicant attraction", *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, Vol. 19 No. 1, pp. 105-114.
- Lyubomirsky, S., Sheldon, K. M., Schkade, D.: *Pursuing happiness: The architecture of sustainable change*. *Review of general psychology*, 9(2), 111 (2005). 2
- Oswald, A. J., Proto, E., Sgroi, D.: *Happiness and productivity*. *Journal of Labor Economics*, 33(4), 789-822 (2015).
- Cooper, R., Bedford, T.: *Transformative Education for Gross National Happiness: A Teacher Action Research Project in Bhutan*. In *The Palgrave International Handbook of Action Research* (pp. 265-278). Palgrave Macmillan US (2017).
- Aziz, R., Mustaffa, S., Samah, N. A., Yusof, R.: *Personality and happiness among academicians in Malaysia*. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 116, 4209-4212 (2014).
- Kern, M. L., Waters, L. E., Adler, A., White, M. A.: *A multidimensional approach to measuring well-being in students: Application of the PERMA framework*. *The journal of positive psychology*, 10(3), 262-271 (2015).
- Seijts, G. H., Crim, D.: *What engages employees the most or, the ten C's of*

- employee engagement. *Ivey Business Journal*, 70(4), 1-5 (2006).
- Macey, W. H., Schneider, B.: The meaning of the employee engagement. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1(1), 3–30 (2008).
  - Baruch, Y., Swartz, M., Sirkis, S., Mirecki, I., Barak, Y.: Staff happiness and work satisfaction in a tertiary psychiatric centre. *Occupational medicine*, 63(6), 442-444 (2013). Author, F.: Article title. *Journal* 2(5), 99–110 (2016).
  - Proctor, C. R.: Effective organizational communication affects employee attitude, happiness, and job satisfaction (Doctoral dissertation, Southern Utah University. Department of Communication. 2014.) (2014).
  - Salas-Vallina, A., Salas-Vallina, A., Fernandez, R., Fernandez, R.: The HRM-performance relationship revisited: Inspirational motivation, participative decision making and happiness at work (HAW). *Employee Relations*, 39(5), 626-642 (2017).
  - Wong, C. S., & Law, K. S. 2002. The effects of leader and follower emotional intelligence on performance and attitude: An exploratory study. *The leadership quarterly*, 13(3): 243-274.
  - Cohen S., Kamarak T. and Mermelstein R. 1983. A global measure of perceived stress. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 24: 385-396.
  - Lyubomirsky S. and Lepper H. 1999. A measure of subjective happiness: preliminary reliability and construct validation. *Social Indicators Research*, 46: 137-155.
  - Diener, E.D., Emmons, R.A., Larsen, R.J. and Griffin, S. 1985. The satisfaction with life scale. *Journal of personality assessment*, 49(1): 71-75.
  - Daft, R. 2013. *Understanding the theory and design of organizations*. (11th ed.). South Western: SW. Cengage Learning.
  - Greenberg, P.E., Kessler, R.C., Birnbaum, H.G., Leong, S.A., Lowe, S.W., Berglund, P.A. and Corey-Lisle, P.K., 2003. The Economic burden of depression in the United States: How did it change between 1990 and 2000? *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 64(12): 1465-1475.
  - Abbas, M. and Raja, U. 2015. Impact of psychological capital on innovative performance and job stress. In 15th International Business Research Conference.
  - Gaillard, A. W. K. (2001). Stress, workload, and fatigue as three biobehavioral states: A general overview. In P.A. Hancock, & P.A. Desmond (Eds.), *Stress, Workload, and Fatigue*. Mahwah, NJ: L. Erlbaum.
  - Maslach, C., Shaufeli, W., & Leiter, M.P. (2001). Job burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 397-422.
  - Holmlund-Rytkönen, M., & Strandvik, T. (2005). Stress in business relationships. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, 20(1), 12-22.
  - Karimi, L., Cheng, C., Bartram, T., Leggat, S.G. and Sarkeshik, S. 2014. The effects of emotional intelligence and stress-related presenteeism on nurses' well-being. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*.

- Fredrickson, B.L. 1998. What good are positive emotions? *Review of General Psychology*, 2: 300-319.
- Asiegbu, J.E. 2016. The Analysis of the Components of Emotional Intelligence at Workplace: The Case of the Nigerian Telecommunication Industry (Master's thesis, Eastern Mediterranean University (EMU)-DoğuAkdeniz Üniversitesi (DAÜ)).
- McCormick, J., & Barnett, K. (2011). Teachers' attributions for stress and their relationships with burnout. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 25(3), 278–293.
- Choi, S., Cheong, K.J., & Feinberg, R.A. (2012). Moderating effects of supervisor support, monetary rewards, and career paths on the relationship between job burnout and turnover intentions in the context of call centers. *Managing Service Quality*, 22(5), 492–516.
- Ismail, Yao, Yeo, Lai-Kuan. and Soon-Yew 2016. Occupational stress features, emotional intelligence and job satisfaction: an empirical study in private institutions of higher learning. *Scientific e-journal of Management Science*, 16 (5): 5-33.
- Scheier, M.F. and Carver, C.S. 1992. Effects of optimism on psychological and physical well-being: Theoretical overview and empirical update. *Cognitive therapy and research*, 16(2): 201-228.
- Beehr, T.A. and Newman, J.E. 1978. Job stress, employee health, and organizational effectiveness: a facet analysis, model, and literature review<sup>1</sup>. *Personnel psychology*, 31(4): 665-699.
- Matthews, G., Zeidner, M. and Roberts, R.D. 2017. Emotional Intelligence, Health, and Stress. *The Handbook of Stress and Health: A Guide to Research and Practice*, 312-326.
- Augusto-Landa, J.M., Lopez-Zafra, E., Berrios-Martos, M.P. and Aguilar-Luzon, M.C. 2008. The relationship between emotional intelligence, occupational stress and health in nurses: A questionnaire survey. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 45: 888-901.
- Goleman, D. (2001). Emotional intelligence: Issues in paradigm building. In C. Cherniss and D. Goleman (Ed's.), *The emotionally intelligence workplace* (pp. 13-26).
- San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. Mayer, J. D., Caruso, D. R., & Salovey, P. 1999. Emotional intelligence meets traditional standards for an intelligence. *Intelligence*, 27(4): 267-298.
- Caldarola, R.A. 2014. The Intersection of Emotional Intelligence and Corporate Financial Decision Making. *Journal of Corporate Accounting & Finance*, 25(2): 67-72.
- Lu, C.S. and Kuo, S.Y. 2016. The effect of job stress on self-reported safety behaviour in container terminal operations: The moderating role of emotional intelligence. *Transportation research part F: traffic psychology and behaviour*, 37: 10-26.
- Ruiz-Aranda, D., Extremera, N. and Pineda-Galán, C. 2014. Emotional intelligence, life satisfaction and subjective happiness in female student health professionals: the mediating effect of perceived stress. *Journal of psychiatric*

- and mental health nursing, 21(2): 106-113.
- Fergusson, D.M., McLeod, G.F.H., Horwood, L.J., Swain, N.R., Chapple, S. and Poulton, R. 2015. Life satisfaction and mental health problems (18 to 35 years). *Psychological medicine*, 45(11): 2427-2436.
  - Pressman, S. D., & Cohen, S. 2005. Does positive affect influence health?. *Psychological bulletin*, 131(6): 925. 28.
  - Ferguson, M., Carlson, D., & Kacmar, K. M. 2015. Flexing work boundaries: The spillover and crossover of workplace support. *Personnel Psychology*, 68(3): 581-614.
  - Szczygieł, D. and Mikolajczak, M. 2017. Why are people high in emotional intelligence happier? They make the most of their positive emotions. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 117: 177-181.
  - Suh, E., Diener, E. and Fujita, F. 1996. Events and subjective well-being: Only recent events matter. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70: 1091-1102.
  - Schiffrin, H. and Nelson, K. 2010. Stressed and Happy? Investigating the Relationship between Happiness and Perceived Stress. *Journal of Happiness Study*, 11: 33-39.
  - Scherer, K. R. 1999. Appraisal theory.
  - Chiang, F. F., Birtch, T. A., & Kwan, H. K. 2010. The moderating roles of job control and work-life balance practices on employee stress in the hotel and catering industry. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 29(1): 25-32.
  - Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., Anderson, R. E., & Tatham, R. L. 2006. *Multivariate statistics*. Upper Saddle River.
  - Yaacob, M.R. 2008. *SPSS for business and social science students: Version 14 for windows*. PustakaAman Press Sdn. Bhd.
  - Jaccard, J., Wan, C. K., & Turrisi, R. 1990. The detection and interpretation of interaction effects between continuous variables in multiple regression. *Multivariate behavioral research*, 25(4): 467-478.
  - Bar-On, R. (1997). *The emotional quotient inventory (EQ-i): technical manual*. Toronto, Canada: MultiHealth Systems, Inc.
  - Thompson, A. M., & Chad, K. E. (2002). The relationship of social physique anxiety to risk for developing an eating disorder in young females. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 31, 183-189.
  - Fariselli, L., Ghini, M., & Freeman, J. (2008). Age and emotional intelligence: white paper. (Online) Available: [http://www.6seconds.org/sei/media/WP\\_EQ\\_and\\_Age.pdf](http://www.6seconds.org/sei/media/WP_EQ_and_Age.pdf) (January 8, 2008), 1-10.
  - Üngür, G., & Karagözoğlu, C. (2013). The relationship between emotional intelligence, social physique anxiety and life satisfaction in physical education and sports students. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 3(13), 115-119.
  - Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition and Personality*, 9(3), 185-211.

- 
- Tao,H., & Jiang, C. (2017). The Influence of Emotional Intelligence and Prototype Location on Scientific Problem Solving under Stress International Journal of Humanities and Social Science, 7(11), 59-67.