



CORPORATE HAPPINESS MANAGEMENT: WITH REFERENCE TO SELECT MANUFACTURING UNITS IN VIJAYAWADA OF ANDHRA PRADESH

Dr.Ch.Vijaya Lakshmi

Assistant Professor, Andhra Loyola Institute of Engineering and Technology, Vijayawada, Andhra Pradesh, India

Dr.V.Tulasi Das

Associate Professor, Dept. of HRM, Acharya Nagarjuna University, Guntur, Andhra Pradesh, India

ABSTRACT

Human Resources are treated as one of the major resources in the functioning and development of any organisation. Without the contribution of human resources the organisations cannot survive. To have the long run stability, better productivity, to gain the profits and to achieve the objectives and goals the organisations must give priority to the employees. Satisfaction of the employees makes the corporate people happy. A happy worker in the healthiest work environment creates wonders. Quality of work life, work life balance, stress, job satisfaction, compensation, relationships, positive emotions, engagement motivation and accomplishment plays a major role in making the employees very happy. Even though there are many hurdles a satisfied employee enjoys the work environment and feels more responsible to achieve the objectives of the organisations. Keeping this in view the researchers wish to through a light on to study the “Corporate Happiness Management: With reference to select Manufacturing Units in Vijayawada of Andhra Pradesh”. This paper describes the factors influencing happiness at work place in select manufacturing units in Vijayawada of A.P. The opinions and attitudes of employees shall be analyzed using statistical tools. The findings are discussed within the context of future research and application.

KEY WORDS: *Contribution, Survive, Productivity, Satisfaction, Work Environment, Engagement,*

INTRODUCTION

Success is not the key to happiness; happiness is the key to success....

—Albert Schweitzer

Every organisation success depends on the employees' happiness and satisfaction. 'Organisation' refers to a social group designed to achieve a certain goals. Organisations involve creating a structure of relationships among people (human resources) working for the desired goals. Managing of all resources in the organisation is very easy task to the management but, it is tough to manage the human resources. Satisfaction of individuals towards the work shows serious and measurable impact on the productivity. A highly satisfied employee enjoys the work place which leads to better productivity. But whereas the low satisfied employee performance is not that much and also has negative impact on the productivity. Companies like Google have invested more in employee support and employee satisfaction has risen as a result. For Google, it rose by 37 per cent; under scientifically controlled conditions, making workers happier really pays off.”(Andrew Oswald)

Now-a-days retaining of talented and skill employee in the organisation is very difficult task to the management. To make employees happy, to achieve the objectives and goals the organisations have to maintain healthy and happy environment. The organisations have always strive to be work hard to satisfy the employees because a dissatisfied employee spoils the team or group which leads to less productivity. So the organisations are giving more priority to satisfy the employees to use their capabilities and skills by taking some measures like providing stress free environment, job satisfaction, high pay, rest rooms and other monetary and non monetary benefits. Employee Quality of Work Life, Work Life Balance, morale and participative management styles followed by the management in decision making process shows impact on the attitudes and behaviours of the employees towards the productivity. Organisations are trying to create an environment where the employees are at most happy.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Pan and Zhou (2015) suggested that happiness at work should be widely measured by means of two constructs, a global happiness approach and the positive affect and negative affect scale. Later, Salas-Vallina, López-Cabrales, et al. (2017) took up the baton and conceptualized and measured happiness at work (HAW) among knowledge-intensive workers, through engagement, job satisfaction and affective organizational commitment.

A virtuous organization will seek to enhance the flourishing of its members, including their happiness. Integrity, trust, courage, some form of caring empathy or compassion, along with zeal and optimism have been identified as aspects of organizational virtue (Cameron & Spreitzer, 2012; Hartman, 2013), and employee perceptions of empathy, warmth, and conscientiousness have been found to be positively correlated with factors such as emotional attachment and employee satisfaction, well-known attributes of happiness (Gotsis & Grimani, 2015).

In the professional work environment, happiness is a specific frame of mind that helps people perform optimally and make use of their full potential. People should be attentive to increase and decrease in the course of their general performance, either when working alone or with other people, in order to achieve happiness at work (Pryce, 2010). A non-problematic and smoothly functioning work environment does not necessarily guarantee happiness in the professional context. Rather, happiness is about being satisfied even though the workplace has some negative characteristics. Because these negativities will motivate individuals to eliminate them, these challenges can make individuals even happier (Kjerulf, 2014).

Coleman claims that people who are not happy at their workplace tend to call it a "job," whereas those who are happy in their professional environment prefer to describe it as a "calling" (Coleman, 2015). Kjerulf says that only 10% of happiness at work depends on the job itself, whereas 90% depends on the individual (Kjerulf, 2014). Happy and healthy individuals reflect happiness in everything they do and say. Individuals who wake up in a fresh, inspired, and happy mood are capable of having their brain run at full speed and capacity, which allows them to be more productive and do better work (Seetubtim, 2015).

The job itself is not the only determinant of happiness at work. Rather, happiness is also determined by individuals themselves. Workers would never be as happy as they believe they would be if their workplace were free of all problems. To the contrary, such a workplace might seem incredibly boring (Kjerulf, 2014). Variables believed to affect job satisfaction include work environment, pay, work, co-workers, having satisfactory work apparatuses, resources, instruction chances, associations with member workers, supervision, corporation strategy and support, salary, promotion and progress, promotion, supervision, etc. (Azim, Haque, & Chowdhury, 2013; Rehman, Saif, Khan, Nawaz, & ur Rehman, 2013).

A happy and satisfied worker do their jobs much better (Karaman & Altınođlu, 2007) and significantly affect the success of organization (Kinzl et al., 2005). Therefore, job satisfaction refers to how well a worker's hopes at work are in tune with products (Rehman et al., 2013).

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The review of literature on the Corporate Happiness Management shows that different researchers examined the concept focusing on different dimensions like management of the organisation, technology, organisation excellence, participative management, grievance handling system, industrial safety, collective bargaining, learning and growth opportunities, career growth and development, promotion of human dignity, collaborative work, autonomy and opportunity to show their ability or talent, job satisfaction/ stress apart from the traditional dimensions like wage and allowances, accommodation, medical facilities, production incentives, canteen facilities, job security, working conditions and work environment, welfare facilities etc. It is a way of thinking about people, work and organization and creates a sense of fulfilment in the minds of the employees and contributes toward greater job satisfaction, improving productivity, adoptability and overall effectiveness of an organization. To examine the happiness of the corporate, select manufacturing units were taken up into consideration for the study.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1. To study the socio economic profile of the respondents to understand the level of awareness on corporate happiness management.
2. To examine the factors influencing Corporate Happiness Management
3. To put forth certain suggestions based on the findings that have been arrived.

HYPOTHESES

H₀: There is no significant difference in the opinions of the respondents towards the influencing factors of Corporate Happiness Management based on the demographical factors.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

In pursuance of the above mentioned objectives, the following methodology was adopted for this study. The study is an empirical one based on both primary and secondary data. The secondary data have been drawn from the various sources like journals, books and research articles and unpublished publications. The primary data was collected directly from the sample respondents with pre - designed questionnaire.

To collect the data the researcher has designed a questionnaire consisting of 10 questions including corporate influencing factors like, Salary and pay structure, Working conditions, Job satisfaction, Career growth and development, Quality of Work Life, Work Life Balance, Worker's participation in Management, Stress, Relationship with Superiors and peers, and Grievance handling procedure.

Based on the convenience sampling method the researcher has selected 225 employees from various manufacturing organizations and distributed a questionnaire in and around Capital City of Vijayawada, Andhra Pradesh. All the respondents have returned the questionnaires and 25 were unfilled. The sample size is limited to 200.

DATA ANALYSIS**Table-1: Demographic factor Analysis of the Respondents**

| | Frequency | Percentage | | Frequency | Percentage |
|-----------------------------------|-----------|------------|-------------------------------|-----------|------------|
| Age (in years) | | | Experience (in years) | | |
| 21-30 | 21 | 10.5 | 0-5 | 17 | 8.5 |
| 31-40 | 38 | 19.0 | 5-10 | 17 | 8.5 |
| 41-50 | 83 | 41.5 | 10-15 | 91 | 45.5 |
| 51-60 | 58 | 29.0 | Above 15 | 75 | 37.5 |
| Educational Qualifications | | | | | |
| Illiterate | 11 | 5.5 | Diploma | 101 | 50.5 |
| Below Intermediate | 22 | 11.0 | Graduation | 66 | 33.0 |

(Source: Primary Data/ Structured Questionnaire)

From above **Table-1** it is observed that majority of the respondents nearly 41.5 per cent are belongs to the age group of 41-50 years. 45.5 per cent of the respondents are having the experience of 10-15 years and nearly 50.5 percent of the

respondents are having diploma as educational qualification. This indicates that all the respondents are educated and having more work experience.

Table-2: KMO and Bartlett's Test

| KMO and Bartlett's Test | | |
|--|--------------------|----------|
| Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy. | | .799 |
| Bartlett's Test of Sphericity | Approx. Chi-Square | 2211.365 |
| | df | 45 |
| | Sig. | .000 |

(Source: Primary Data/ Structured Questionnaire)

Kaiser Meyer Olkin (KMO) and Bartlett's Test measures the strength of relationship among the studied variables. The KMO measures the sampling adequacy. From **Table-2** it is observed that KMO Measure of Sampling Adequacy is 0.799,

which is acceptable. Bartlett's test is another indication of the strength of the relationship among variables. Small values .000 (less than 0.05) of the significance level indicate that a factor analysis may be useful with the data.

Table-3: Communalities

| | Initial | Extraction |
|--|---------|------------|
| Working Environment | 1.000 | .856 |
| Job Satisfaction | 1.000 | .798 |
| Chances of career Growth | 1.000 | .816 |
| Quality of work Life | 1.000 | .626 |
| Work Life balance | 1.000 | .760 |
| Stress | 1.000 | .767 |
| Workers Participation in management | 1.000 | .674 |
| Relationship with Superiors and Peers | 1.000 | .689 |
| Grievance Handling Procedure | 1.000 | .690 |
| Salary and Compensation | 1.000 | .833 |
| Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. | | |

(Source: Primary Data/ Structured Questionnaire)

Table-3 shows communalities of extraction. Principal component analysis works on the initial assumption that all variances are common; therefore in the initial the communalities all are 1. The communalities in the column labeled extraction reflect the common variance in the data structure. To know about the exact level of variance among variables it is initially assumed as all communalities are '1'. Then found the differentiated values for each variable which indicates how much of the variance i.e. the communality value that over 85.6% of the variance is accounted for "Working Environment", 79.8 % of the variance is accounted for "Job

Satisfaction", 81.6 % of variance is accounted for "Chances of Career Growth", 62.6% of variance is accounted for "Quality of work Life" , 76% of variance is accounted for "Work Life balance", 76.7 % of variance is accounted for "Stress", 67.4 % of variance is accounted for "Workers Participation in Management", 68.9 % of variance is accounted for "Relationship with Superiors and Peers", 69.3 % of variance is accounted for "Grievance Handling Procedure" and 83.3 % of variance is accounted for "Salary and Compensation".

Table-4: Total Variance Explained

| Total Variance Explained | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|----------------------|---------------|--------------|-------------------------------------|---------------|--------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|--------------|
| Component | Initial Eigen values | | | Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings | | | Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings | | |
| | Total | % of Variance | Cumulative % | Total | % of Variance | Cumulative % | Total | % of Variance | Cumulative % |
| 1 | 6.142 | 61.423 | 61.423 | 6.142 | 61.423 | 61.423 | 5.587 | 55.866 | 55.866 |
| 2 | 1.167 | 11.671 | 73.095 | 1.167 | 11.671 | 73.095 | 1.723 | 17.228 | 73.095 |
| 3 | .799 | 7.992 | 81.087 | | | | | | |
| 4 | .737 | 7.365 | 88.452 | | | | | | |
| 5 | .496 | 4.964 | 93.416 | | | | | | |
| 6 | .305 | 3.053 | 96.469 | | | | | | |
| 7 | .158 | 1.578 | 98.047 | | | | | | |
| 8 | .126 | 1.262 | 99.309 | | | | | | |
| 9 | .051 | .510 | 99.819 | | | | | | |
| 10 | .018 | .181 | 100.000 | | | | | | |

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

(Source: Primary Data/ Structured Questionnaire)

The above **Table-4** reveals that Eigen values associated with each factor represent the variance explained by that particular linear component. It also displays the Eigen values in terms of the percentage of variance explain. So factor 1 explains 61.423 and factor 2 explains 11.671 per cent of total variance; it should be clear that these two factors explains relatively large amount of variance of 73.095. It should be clear that the first two factors explain relatively large amount of variance whereas subsequent factors explain only small amounts of variance. There are two factors among all with

Eigen value greater than 1. The Eigen values associated with these factors are again displayed and the percentage of variance explained in the column is labelled as extraction sums of squared loadings.

From the above **Table-4** it is identified that only first two factors in Factors Influencing Corporate Happiness Management are highly changeable aspect in the organization and the remaining were of not that much. Because it only exceeds Eigen value more than 1.

Table-5: Rotated Component Matrix^a

| Rotated Component Matrix ^a | | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|------|
| | Component | |
| | 1 | 2 |
| Chances of Career Growth | .901 | |
| Stress | .864 | |
| Work Life Balance | .850 | |
| Grievance Handling Procedure | .829 | |
| Salary and Compensation | .820 | |
| Working Environment | .809 | |
| Job Satisfaction | .795 | |
| Quality of work Life | .780 | |
| Relationship with Superiors and Peers | | .830 |
| Workers Participation in management | | .651 |

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

a. Rotation converged in 3 iterations.

(Source: Primary Data/ Structured Questionnaire)

Table-5 shows Rotated Component Matrix^a. On the basis of Varimax with Kaiser Normalization, two factors emerged. These two factors are constituted of all those variables that have factor loadings greater than or at least equal to 0.5. Thus, the first factor consists of eight dimensions like Chances of Career Growth, Stress, Work Life Balance, Grievance Handling Procedure, Salary and Compensation, Working Environment, Job Satisfaction and

Quality of work Life these eight dimensions are combined together to get one factor and it is conceptualized as "Employee Happiness". Further for second component there are two dimensions like Relationship with Superiors and Peers, and Workers Participation in management dimensions combined together to get one extracted factor and it is conceptualized as "Employee Involvement".

Table-6: One Way ANOVA When Age of the Respondents is taken into consideration

| | | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|-----|---------------------------------------|----------------|-----------------------|-----------|--------------------|----------|-------------|
| H01 | Working Environment | Between Groups | 6.682 | 3 | 2.227 | 4.414 | .005 |
| | | Within Groups | 98.898 | 196 | .505 | | |
| | | Total | 105.580 | 199 | | | |
| H02 | Job Satisfaction | Between Groups | 4.545 | 3 | 1.515 | 3.061 | .029 |
| | | Within Groups | 97.010 | 196 | .495 | | |
| | | Total | 101.555 | 199 | | | |
| H03 | Chances of Career Growth | Between Groups | 3.442 | 3 | 1.147 | 1.998 | .116 |
| | | Within Groups | 112.558 | 196 | .574 | | |
| | | Total | 116.000 | 199 | | | |
| H04 | Quality of work Life | Between Groups | 6.086 | 3 | 2.029 | 2.625 | .052 |
| | | Within Groups | 151.494 | 196 | .773 | | |
| | | Total | 157.580 | 199 | | | |
| H05 | Work Life Balance | Between Groups | 8.935 | 3 | 2.978 | 4.632 | .004 |
| | | Within Groups | 126.020 | 196 | .643 | | |
| | | Total | 134.955 | 199 | | | |
| H06 | Stress | Between Groups | 3.843 | 3 | 1.281 | 2.552 | .057 |
| | | Within Groups | 98.377 | 196 | .502 | | |
| | | Total | 102.220 | 199 | | | |
| H07 | Workers Participation in Management | Between Groups | 6.603 | 3 | 2.201 | .766 | .514 |
| | | Within Groups | 562.897 | 196 | 2.872 | | |
| | | Total | 569.500 | 199 | | | |
| H08 | Relationship with Superiors and Peers | Between Groups | .278 | 3 | .093 | .025 | .995 |
| | | Within Groups | 740.442 | 196 | 3.778 | | |
| | | Total | 740.720 | 199 | | | |
| H09 | Grievance Handling Procedure | Between Groups | 8.732 | 3 | 2.911 | 4.028 | .008 |
| | | Within Groups | 141.623 | 196 | .723 | | |
| | | Total | 150.355 | 199 | | | |
| H10 | Salary and Compensation | Between Groups | 6.307 | 3 | 2.102 | 4.270 | .006 |
| | | Within Groups | 96.488 | 196 | .492 | | |
| | | Total | 102.795 | 199 | | | |

(Source: Primary Data/ Structured Questionnaire)

Table-6 shows that One Way ANOVA When Age of the Respondents is taken into consideration. This analysis reveals that H01 (Working Environment), H02 (Job Satisfaction), H05 (Work Life Balance), H09 (Grievance Handling Procedure), H10 (Salary and Compensation), are significant at 5% level. And other variables like H03 (Chances of Career Growth), H04 (Quality of work Life), H06 (Stress),

H07 (Workers Participation in Management) and H08 (Relationship with Superiors and Peers) are not significant. There is no significant difference in perceptions of the respondents regarding "Influencing Factors of Corporate Happiness Management" while age is taken into consideration. Therefore, null hypothesis is rejected.

Table-7: One Way ANOVA When Experience of the Respondents is taken into consideration

| | | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|-----|--------------------------|----------------|-----------------------|-----------|--------------------|----------|-------------|
| H01 | Working Environment | Between Groups | 5.187 | 3 | 1.729 | 3.376 | .019 |
| | | Within Groups | 100.393 | 196 | .512 | | |
| | | Total | 105.580 | 199 | | | |
| H02 | Job Satisfaction | Between Groups | 3.968 | 3 | 1.323 | 2.656 | .050 |
| | | Within Groups | 97.587 | 196 | .498 | | |
| | | Total | 101.555 | 199 | | | |
| H03 | Chances of Career Growth | Between Groups | 6.271 | 3 | 2.090 | 3.734 | .012 |
| | | Within Groups | 109.729 | 196 | .560 | | |
| | | Total | 116.000 | 199 | | | |
| H04 | Quality of Work Life | Between Groups | 6.378 | 3 | 2.126 | 2.756 | .044 |
| | | Within Groups | 151.202 | 196 | .771 | | |
| | | Total | 157.580 | 199 | | | |
| H05 | Work Life Balance | Between Groups | 5.989 | 3 | 1.996 | 3.034 | .030 |
| | | Within Groups | 128.966 | 196 | .658 | | |
| | | Total | 134.955 | 199 | | | |
| H06 | Stress | Between Groups | 2.330 | 3 | .777 | 1.524 | .210 |
| | | Within Groups | 99.890 | 196 | .510 | | |
| | | Total | 102.220 | 199 | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|---------------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|-------|-------------|
| H07 | Workers Participation in Management | Between Groups Within Groups Total | 3.836 565.664 569.500 | 3 196 199 | 1.279 2.886 | .443 | .723 |
| H08 | Relationship with Superiors and Peers | Between Groups Within Groups Total | 2.441 738.279 740.720 | 3 196 199 | .814 3.767 | .216 | .885 |
| H09 | Grievance Handling Procedure | Between Groups Within Groups Total | 11.271 139.084 150.355 | 3 196 199 | 3.757 .710 | 5.294 | .002 |
| H10 | Salary and Compensation | Between Groups Within Groups Total | 3.779 99.016 102.795 | 3 196 199 | 1.260 .505 | 2.494 | .061 |

(Source: Primary Data/ Structured Questionnaire)

Table-7 shows that One Way ANOVA When Experience of the Respondents is taken into consideration. This analysis reveals that H01 (Working Environment), H02 (Job Satisfaction), H03 (Chances of Career Growth), H04 (Quality of work Life) H05 (Work Life Balance), H09 (Grievance Handling Procedure), are significant at 5% level. And other variables like H06 (Stress), H07 (Workers Participation in

Management), H08 (Relationship with Superiors and Peers) and H10 (Salary and Compensation) are not significant. There is no significant difference in perceptions of the respondents regarding “Influencing Factors of Corporate Happiness Management” while experience is taken into consideration. Therefore, null hypothesis is rejected.

Table-8: One Way ANOVA When Education of the Respondents is taken into consideration

| | | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|-----|---------------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|-------|-------------|
| H01 | Working Environment | Between Groups Within Groups Total | 3.182 102.398 105.580 | 4 195 199 | .795 .525 | 1.515 | .199 |
| H02 | Job Satisfaction | Between Groups Within Groups Total | 1.673 99.882 101.555 | 4 195 199 | .418 .512 | .817 | .516 |
| H03 | Chances of Career Growth | Between Groups Within Groups Total | 8.906 107.094 116.000 | 4 195 199 | 2.226 .549 | 4.054 | .004 |
| H04 | Quality of work Life | Between Groups Within Groups Total | 10.170 147.410 157.580 | 4 195 199 | 2.542 .756 | 3.363 | .011 |
| H05 | Work Life balance | Between Groups Within Groups Total | 12.600 122.355 134.955 | 4 195 199 | 3.150 .627 | 5.020 | .001 |
| H06 | Stress | Between Groups Within Groups Total | 4.231 97.989 102.220 | 4 195 199 | 1.058 .503 | 2.105 | .082 |
| H07 | Workers Participation in management | Between Groups Within Groups Total | 7.838 561.662 569.500 | 4 195 199 | 1.960 2.880 | .680 | .606 |
| H08 | Relationship with Superiors and Peers | Between Groups Within Groups Total | 2.798 737.922 740.720 | 4 195 199 | .699 3.784 | .185 | .946 |
| H09 | Grievance Handling Procedure | Between Groups Within Groups Total | 8.514 141.841 150.355 | 4 195 199 | 2.129 .727 | 2.926 | .022 |
| H10 | Salary and Compensation | Between Groups Within Groups Total | 2.800 99.995 102.795 | 4 195 199 | .700 .513 | 1.365 | .247 |

(Source: Primary Data/ Structured Questionnaire)

Table-8 shows that One Way ANOVA When Educational qualification of the respondents is taken into consideration. This analysis reveals that H03 (Chances of Career Growth), H04 (Quality of work Life) H05 (Work Life Balance), and H09 (Grievance Handling Procedure) are significant at 5% level. And other variables like H01 (Working Environment), H02 (Job Satisfaction), H06 (Stress), H07

(Workers Participation in Management), H08 (Relationship with Superiors and Peers) and H10 (Salary and Compensation) are not significant. There is no significant difference in perceptions of the respondents regarding “Influencing Factors of Corporate Happiness Management” while qualification is taken into consideration. Therefore, null hypothesis is rejected.

FINDINGS

- From the analysis of influencing factors of Corporate Happiness Management it is found that Working Environment is having the highest loading factor and Quality of Work Life is having the lowest loading factor.
- Majority of the respondents are satisfied with the job, working environment, salary and compensation and grievance handling procedure followed by the management and they are able to balance their personal life with the work life.
- The respondents feel that in their organisation Chances are more for their Career Growth this makes them to be happy in the work environment.
- Respondents are dissatisfied with factors like stress at work place, Relationship with Superiors and Peers, and Workers Participation in Management.

SUGGESTIONS

- Respondents are feeling more stress at Work Place it shows a negative impact on the productivity, so the management has to take more care to reduce the stress levels of the all the employees by introducing Music Therapy, Yoga, and Games which gives better relief to reduce the stress levels of the employees at work place.
- Workers Participation in Management brings belongingness in the employees. So the management should involve employees while taking the decisions.
- Strong and healthy relationship with Superiors and Peers makes employees to feel free and happy at work place. So that there will not be any disturbance at work place. The management has to take care in improving the employees relations by planning meetings, get together, and refreshment programs.

CONCLUSION

Corporate Happiness Management comes from the Individuals' Happiness and satisfaction. A happiest worker treats work as a play and creates wonders in the work place in increasing the productivity. One side of the coin employees give more priority to the Salary and Compensation, Job Satisfaction, Chances of Career Growth, Working Environment, Quality of work Life, Work Life Balance, Stress and to the other side of the coin they give priority to the relations in the organisation, Participation in management, and Grievance Handling Procedure etc., . If the management treats all the employees as their own belongingness of the employees' towards the work increases and they will

always try to keep the management happy even though they are dissatisfied in some situations. Always the management should encourage and create a congenial environment to the employees to utilise their skills and abilities to achieve the objectives and goals of the organisation. If managers in the organisations want to be good and happy he must create a happy team.

Scope for Further Research

The present study is limited to selected manufacturing units in and around Capital City of Andhra Pradesh. In future researchers can compare between several types of industrial units, banks and hospitals etc. The present study covered 200 employees from selected manufacturing units, in future researchers can involve more number of employees to yield good results

REFERENCES

1. Cameron, K. S., & Spreitzer, G. M. (Eds.). (2012). *Oxford handbook of positive organizational scholarship*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
2. Caza, A., & Cameron, K. S. (2013). *An introduction to happiness and organizations*. In I. Boniwell, S. A. David, & A. C. Ayers (Eds.), *Oxford handbook of happiness* (pp. 722–726). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
3. Coleman, B., (2015), "Self-care and Happiness in the Workplace", *Enhancing The Practice of Learning and Teaching*, Vol:6, Issue:2.
4. Gotsis, G., & Grimani, K. (2015). *Virtue theory and organizational behavior: An integrative framework*. *Journal of Management Development*, 34(10), 1288–1309
5. J. Pan, W. Zhou (2015) , *How do employees construe their career success: An improved measure of subjective career success*, *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 23 (1) , pp. 45-58
6. Kjerulf, A., (2014), *Happy Hour is 9 to 5*, Pine Tribe Ltd.
7. Pryce-Jones, J. (2010), "Happiness at Work: Maximizing your Psychological Capital for Success", United Kingdom, Wiley-Blackwell.
8. Salas-Vallina, J. Alegre, R. Fernandez (2017), *Happiness at work and organisational citizenship behaviour: Is organisational learning a missing link?* *International Journal of Manpower*, 38 (3) pp. 470-488
9. Seetubtim, M. (2015). "Why You Should Focus on Happiness, Not Productivity", http://www.huffingtonpost.com/mo-seetubtim/why-you-should-focus-h_b_7703896.html, Jul 02, 2015
10. Warr, P. (2007), "Learning About Employee Happiness". *Rev. Psicol., Organ. Trab.* Vol.7, No.2, pp. 133-140