

**WORKPLACE HAPPINESS ANALYSIS IN INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SECTOR AT
CHENNAI**

Mr.K.B.Inian, Research Scholar, Dept of Social Work, Madras Christian College & Assistant Professor,
Madras School of Social Work

Mr.E.Joseph Eric Dunston, Assistant Professor, Madras School of Social Work

Dr.D.Prince Annadurai, Associate Professor, Dept of Social Work, Madras Christian College

Abstract

A happy employee considers the interests of the company as his own and puts in extra efforts to achieve outcomes. Happiness is not superficial and an individual who is happy can find something positive in a hopeless situation as well. A happy employee will put in extra efforts to accomplish the tasks assigned to him even under challenging circumstances (Gupta, 2012). Furthermore, while unhappy employees may get irritated and lose temper at the slightest hindrance, happy individuals are more optimistic and easier to deal with (Forgas, 1999). Researchers have also found that happiness increases production, improves decision making ability, improves client relations, decreases absenteeism, enhances teamwork and improves the commitment towards work. Therefore, organisations must ensure an appropriate work environment for their employees so that they take full interest in their jobs, which in turn will enhance their efficiency, social life and lessen their job stress and in the long run benefit the organisation. The present study thus intends to examine the workplace happiness of employees in the information technology sector.

Keywords: Happy Employee, Production, Decision Making Ability, Client Relations, Teamwork and Commitment

Introduction and Problem

It is a universal fact that the human resources are the backbone of an organisation and are the prime cause of organisational success and failure. Employees are considered to be a powerful tool that can transform an organisation and retention of a good talent pool is one of the biggest strategic challenges that an organisation faces. The quality of the employees working in an organisation is pivotal in ensuring that the long-term organisational goals are met and the organisation is able to leverage a competitive advantage. In order to attain the goals of the organisation, the employees should be skilled, committed, knowledgeable, able and devoted, but all this requires that the employee is happy and has a good quality of work life.

A happy employee considers the interests of the company as his own and puts in extra efforts to achieve outcomes. Happiness is not superficial and an individual who is happy can find something positive in a hopeless situation as well. A happy employee will put in extra efforts to accomplish the tasks assigned to him even under challenging circumstances (Gupta, 2012). Furthermore, while unhappy employees may get irritated and lose temper at the slightest hindrance, happy individuals are more optimistic and easier to deal with (Forgas, 1999). Researchers have also found that happiness increases production, improves decision making ability, improves client relations, decreases absenteeism, enhances teamwork and improves the commitment towards work. Therefore, organisations must ensure an appropriate work environment for their employees so that they take full interest in their jobs, which in turn will enhance their efficiency, social life and lessen their job stress and in the long run benefit the organisation. Because of all the benefits that happiness has in the organisational context, happiness at work has gained popularity as a variable for research (Gupta, 2012).

In spite of the phenomenal growth in the public and private sectors, employees still face many problems such as interpersonal conflict, communication breakdowns, bullying, harassment,

discrimination, poor job fit, fickle job promotion policies, favouritism, lack of appreciation, no or poor mechanism for grievance redressal, improper working conditions, low job security, low career insight, inappropriate and unfair compensation, no freedom of speech, stealing work credit, etc. These are some of the reasons why employees remain unhappy at work and complain of a low quality of work life (Jofreh, Yasini, Dehsorkhi & Hayat, 2013). According to Ngcamu (2017), the major causes of unhappiness at work include lack of organisational support, work overload, unclear roles, poor organisational culture, limited opportunities for career growth, no strategies for improving the overall wellbeing of employees, untrained senior managers, among others. The goals of an organisation and the performance of its employees can be improved if the organisation devises and implements strategies to improve its employee's happiness and overall wellbeing at work.

A healthy work environment ensures that an employee remains engrossed in work; is satisfied with his job, his performance is up to the mark and that he/ she contributes to the overall productivity of the organisation. There are a number of factors that have an impact on the happiness of employees at work which include flow and intrinsic motivation; supportive and unsupportive organisational experiences; and work repulsive feelings, among others (Singh & Aggarwal, 2017). Therefore, it is important to pay attention to the happiness and overall well-being of employees at work to ensure that they remain satisfied, committed and perform well. For this to happen it is important to study the facets of workplace happiness as it affects the performance of individuals at work.

Organizations nowadays function in dynamic environments and are constantly undergoing change -in terms of their structure, content and process of work. In such a dynamic and uncertain environment, a capable and skilled human resource is essential in order to attain organisational success. The success of an organisation is dependent on how the employees are performing within the organisation. Job performance is not only a function of qualification and competence but also of motivation, wellbeing and happiness. How well an employee performs at work place depends on a number of internal and external factors including the work conditions, organisational support, role clarity, job autonomy, work repulsive feelings, motivation, wellbeing and the quality of work life being provided. The happiness and overall wellbeing of an employee not only has a significant impact on the work place performance but also on how he/she interacts within and outside the organisation and in cases where the employee is unhappy, it can lead to negative consequences for the organisation like high turnover, low job satisfaction, absenteeism, etc. Thus, there is a need to study the happiness of employees at workplace. While many studies have been conducted to study the impact of different organisational variables on job performance, meager research has been conducted to study the impact workplace happiness has on job performance of employees and yet little research has been conducted in sectors like manufacturing, health, banking and education. Hence, the current study is a modest endeavor to fill in the gaps in the research on the subject in this direction.

Review of literature

Happiness as a subject of investigation has gained much attention in the field of organizational studies due to its profound impact on overall employee performance besides its importance in everyday life (Singh & Aggarwal, 2017). Happiness has attracted the consideration of philosophers since the beginning of written history (McMahon, 2006), but has only recently come to the fore in psychology research (Fisher, 2010). With the interest of research, the word happiness attained the status of a buzz word in academic spheres and corporate houses used the same in their taglines to lure their customers (Steger, Frazier, Oishi & Kaler, 2006; Veenhoven, 2002). During the 1980's the number of studies being conducted on happiness, wellbeing and life satisfaction started growing and 780 articles about the same were published annually (Myers & Diener, 1995). The interest in the study of well-being, life satisfaction and happiness is fairly new but the theories of happiness are age old. Similarly, according to a Roman philosopher, Cicero, "there is no fool who is happy, and no wise man who is not" (Seligman,

2011). Throughout history, philosophers and researchers have given contradicting and conflicting ideas about happiness. Usually, happiness is categorized by people as feeling good (Alipour, Pedram, Abedi & Rostami, 2012). However, such a definition of happiness is too narrow a conceptualization (Clark, Frijters & Shields, 2008). According to Di Tella and Mac Culloch (2006), happiness is not limited to doing and feeling good, it is much deeper. Happiness comes from identifying virtues, cultivating them and then living life according to those virtues.

Methodology

150 sample respondents from information technology companies in Chennai have been chosen adopting simple random sampling technique. The data were collected using a structured questionnaire and they were sorted out in a manner suitable for analyses. The study possesses itself with the limitation of having the results for specific location.

Analysis and Discussion

SCRIMINANT FUNCTION ANALYSIS

150 respondents have been divided into two groups .i.e. Low level and the high level of happiness in workplace. The difference of opinion of the respondents in one group from the other is studied with the help of discriminant function analysis. For the purpose of the study, the following variables were selected.

1. Gender
2. Age
3. Marital status
4. Family Size
5. Educational qualification
6. Occupation
7. Income

Discriminant function analysis involved classification problem also to ascertain the efficiency of the discriminant function analysis and all the variables which satisfy the entry and removal criteria were entered into the function. Normally the criterion used to select the variables for inclusion in the function is minimum F to enter into the equation (i.e.) F statistic calculated for the qualified variable to enter into the function is fixed as ≥ 1 . Similarly any variable entered in the equation will be removed from the function if F statistic for the variable calculated is < 1 . The two groups are defined as

- Group 1 - Low level
Group 2 - High level

The mean and standard deviation for these groups and for the entire samples are given for each variable considered in the analysis.

Table 1: Group Means (Between Low and High Groups)

S. No.	Factor	Low (63)		High (87)		Total (150)	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
1	Gender	1.51	.50	1.32	.46	1.39	.49
2	Age	2.32	1.12	1.95	1.07	2.09	1.18
3	Marital Status	1.68	.60	1.76	.42	1.73	.50
4	Family Size	1.62	.66	1.67	.81	1.65	.76
5	Education	1.46	.80	2.25	1.14	1.95	1.09
6	Occupation	2.15	1.09	2.80	.75	2.55	.95
7	Income	1.35	.73	1.35	.53	1.35	.62

The overall stepwise D.F.A results after all significant discriminators have been included in the estimation of discriminated function are given in the following table.

Table 2: Summary table between Low Level and High Level Groups Tests of Equality of Group Means

Variables	Wilks' Lambda	F	P.Value	S/NS
Gender	.95	23.34	.00	S
Age	.97	17.73	.00	S
Marital Status	.94	13.64	.00	S
Education	.87	91.63	.00	S
Occupation	.89	78.11	.00	S
Family Earnings	.87	87.73	.00	S

*Significant at 1% level

The summary table indicates that variable gender entered in step one. The variables such as Gender, Age, Marital status, Educational Qualification, Occupation, Family Earnings per month are significant at one per cent significance level. All the variables are significant discriminators based on their Wilk’s Lambda and F-value. The multivariate aspect of this model is given in the following table.

Table 3: Canonical Discriminant Function (Between Low and High Groups)

Canonical correlation	Wilk's Lamda	Chi –square	p-value	S/NS
0.67	.58	359.26	.00**	S

The canonical correlation in the discriminant group can be accounted for by this model, Wilk's Lamda and Chi-square value suggest that D.F is significant at one percent level.

The variables given above are identified finally by the D.F.A as the eligible discriminating variables. Based on the selected variables the corresponding D.F coefficients are calculated. They are given in the following table.

Table 4: Discriminant Function Coefficient (Between Low Level and High Level)

	Function
	1
Gender	.23
Age	-.42
Marital Status	.46
Family Size	.09
Education	.25
Occupation	.27
Income	-.85

Unstandardized coefficients

Table 5: Table Relative Discriminating Index (Between Low Level Group and High Level Group)

	Group I Mean X ₁	Group II Mean X ₂	Unstandardised coefficient	I _j =ABS (K _j Mean (X _{j0} .X _{ji}))	R _j =I _j /sum I _j *100
Gender	1.51	1.32	.23	0.18	-16.64
Age	2.32	1.95	-.42	0.37	-33.00
Marital Status	1.68	1.76	.40	-0.07	6.90
Education	1.46	2.25	.21	-0.79	70.48
Occupation	2.15	2.80	.28	-0.64	56.98
Income	1.90	2.74	.52	-0.83	73.81
					100

For each variable the respective D.F coefficient its mean for each group and R_j are given. R_j called relative discriminating index is calculated from the discriminant function coefficient and group means. R_j tells how much each variable is contributing (%) to the function. By looking at this column it is understood that education is the discriminating variable and the Age the least discriminating variable.

The second question is answered by reclassifying the already grouped individuals into low or high level using the D.F (Z) defined in the equation. This classification is called predictor group

membership. In short the efficiency of the D.F is called predictor group membership. In a nutshell, the efficiency of the D.F. is how correctly it predicts the respondents into distinct groups.

Table 6: Classification Results (Between Low Level Group and High Level Group)

Actual group	No. of cases	Predicted group membership	
		Group I	Group II
Group I	63	77. %	23%
Group II	87	18%	82%

Per cent of grouped case correctly classified: 80.2 per cent

The above table gives the results of the reclassification. The function using the variables selected in the analysis classified 80.2 per cent of the cases correctly in the respective groups. It is found that the Discriminant function analysis was applied to the respondents on low user and high user. The following factors significantly discriminate the two users. They are Gender, Age, Marital status, Education, Occupation, Income (one per cent level of significance).

Conclusion

In the contemporary times, the tough competition has made it essential for organizations to groom employees so as to gain a competitive advantage and ensure that superior quality products and services are delivered. To achieve organizational success, it is essential that the employees are satisfied and perform well, which largely depends on the well-being and happiness of the employees at work. On the whole employees under study are contended with the state of happiness at their workplaces, but the overall mean score of happiness is not very high. The findings indicate that the highly rated aspects of workplace happiness are flow and intrinsic motivation and supportive organizational experiences. The employees have rated work repulsive feelings and unsupportive organization experiences slightly less in comparison to the other dimensions of workplace happiness. These are areas of dissatisfaction and therefore, measures need to be undertaken in order to improve these factors and to ensure an employee's satisfactory performance and wellbeing at work.

References

- Gupta, V. (2012). Importance of being happy at work. *International Journal on Research and Development: A Management Review*, 1(1), 9-14.
- Forgas, J. P. (1999). Feeling and speaking: Mood effects on verbal communication strategies. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 25(7), 850-863.
- Jofreh, M., Yasini, A., Dehsorkhi, H. F., & Hayat, A. (2013). The relationship between EFL teachers' quality of work life and job motivation. *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research*, 13(3), 338-346.
- Ngcamu, B. S. (2017). Quality of work life dimensions in universities: A systematic review. *Global Journal of Health Science*, 9(10), 118-126.
- Singh, S., & Aggarwal, Y. (2017). Happiness at work scale: Construction and psychometric validation of a measure using mixed method approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 19(5), 1439-1463.
- McMahon, D. M. (2006). *Happiness: A history*. New York: Grove Press
- Fisher, C. D. (2010). Happiness at work. *International journal of management reviews*, 12(4), 384-412.
- Steger, M. F., Frazier, P., Oishi, S., & Kaler, M. (2006). The meaning in life questionnaire: Assessing the presence of and search for meaning in life. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 53, 80-93
- Veenhoven, R. (2002). World Database of Happiness, Correlational Findings, subject code H.5.2.1.1. Erasmus University Rotterdam, Faculty of Social Sciences, Netherlands. Retrieved December 13, 2018, from <http://www.eur.nl/fsw/research/happiness>, html.
- Seligman, M. E. P. (2011). *Flourish: A visionary new understanding of happiness and well-being*. New York: Free Press.
- Myers, D. G., & Diener, E. (1995). Who is happy? *Psychological Science*, 6, 10-19
- Alipour, A., Pedram, A., Abedi, M. R., & Rostami, Z. (2012). What is Happiness?. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 3(12), 660-667
- Clark, A. E., Frijters, P., & Shields, M. A. (2008). Relative income, happiness, and utility: An explanation for the Easterlin paradox and other puzzles. *Journal of Economic literature*, 46(1), 95-144.
- Di Tella, R., & MacCulloch, R. (2006). Some uses of happiness data in economics. *Journal of economic perspectives*, 20(1), 25-46.