

ปัจจัยสร้างสุขขององค์กรภาคเอกชนในประเทศไทย

ขวัญเมือง แก้วดำเกิง¹

จำเนียร ชุณหโสภาค²

ดวงเนตร ธรรมกุล³

บทคัดย่อ

การศึกษาค้นคว้าครั้งนี้มีวัตถุประสงค์เพื่อศึกษาปัจจัยสร้างสุขขององค์กรภาคเอกชน ประกอบด้วย ปัจจัยด้านการจัดการ ปัจจัยด้านบรรยากาศและสภาพแวดล้อมในที่ทำงาน ปัจจัยด้านกระบวนการสร้างสุข ปัจจัยด้านสุขภาพกายและสุขภาพใจ และปัจจัยด้านผลลัพธ์องค์กร กลุ่มตัวอย่าง ได้แก่ สถานประกอบการ(องค์กร) ที่เป็นเป้าหมายการดำเนินงานของสำนักสนับสนุนสุขภาพขององค์กร สำนักงานกองทุนสนับสนุนการสร้างเสริมสุขภาพ (สสส.) ทำการสุ่มอย่างเป็นระบบ (systematic random sampling) จากรายชื่อองค์กรผู้ใช้งานในฐานข้อมูลโปรแกรมตรวจสอบสุขภาพขององค์กรออนไลน์ ตัวอย่างมีจำนวน 320 องค์กร ทำการวิเคราะห์ข้อมูลด้วยสถิติบรรยาย ได้แก่ ค่าความถี่ ค่าร้อยละ ค่าเฉลี่ย ส่วนเบี่ยงเบนมาตรฐาน และการวิเคราะห์ค่าความแปรปรวนทางเดียว ผลการศึกษา พบว่าองค์กรกลุ่มตัวอย่างมีปัจจัยสร้างสุขด้านการจัดการสูงสุด มีค่าเฉลี่ยเท่ากับ 3.49 หรือระดับค่อนข้างสูง รองลงมาได้แก่ ปัจจัยด้านผลลัพธ์องค์กร มีค่าเฉลี่ยเท่ากับ 3.21 หรือระดับปานกลาง ปัจจัยด้านบรรยากาศและสภาพแวดล้อม มีค่าเฉลี่ยเท่ากับ 3.06 หรือระดับปานกลาง ปัจจัยด้านการจัดการกระบวนการสร้างสุข มีค่าเฉลี่ยเท่ากับ 2.82 หรือระดับปานกลาง และปัจจัยด้านสุขภาพกายและสุขภาพใจมีค่าเฉลี่ยเท่ากับ 2.68 หรือระดับปานกลาง ผลการศึกษาปัจจัยการสร้างสุขในแต่ละมิติ มีดังนี้ มิติที่ 1 สุขด้วยการจัดการ พบว่า ประเด็นเรื่องการจัดการสวัสดิการพนักงานตามกฎหมาย มีค่าเฉลี่ยสูงสุด มิติที่ 2 สุขด้วยบรรยากาศและสภาพแวดล้อม พบว่าประเด็นเรื่องการสร้างเสริมความปลอดภัยในการทำงาน มีค่าเฉลี่ยสูงสุด มิติที่ 3 สุขด้วยกระบวนการสร้างสุข พบว่าประเด็นเรื่องการให้ความสำคัญต่อเรื่องสุขภาพว่าเป็นทุนแบบหนึ่งมีค่าเฉลี่ยสูงสุด มิติที่ 4 สุขภาพกายและสุขภาพใจ พบว่าประเด็นเรื่องการลดอุบัติเหตุ/เจ็บป่วย/เสียชีวิตเนื่องจากการทำงานในสถานประกอบการ มีค่าเฉลี่ยสูงสุด มิติที่ 5 สุขด้วยผลลัพธ์องค์กร พบว่าประเด็นเรื่องความผูกพันในองค์กรมีค่าเฉลี่ยสูงสุด จากผลการศึกษาขององค์กรควรจัดความสมดุลของปัจจัยการสร้างสุขในองค์กรด้วยการเน้นกระบวนการสร้างสุขให้ส่งผลถึงสุขภาพกายและสุขภาพใจของบุคลากร และให้ความสำคัญเรื่องบรรยากาศและสภาพแวดล้อมร่วมกับการจัดการเพื่อสร้างผลลัพธ์ขององค์กรอย่างต่อเนื่องและยั่งยืน

คำสำคัญ: ปัจจัยสร้างสุขขององค์กร องค์กรภาคเอกชน

¹ ผู้รับผิดชอบบทความหลัก, คณะสาธารณสุขศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยมหิดล กรุงเทพมหานคร 10400.

อีเมล: phkke@mahidol.ac.th

² สถาบันวิจัยและพัฒนา มหาวิทยาลัยรามคำแหง กรุงเทพมหานคร 10140. อีเมล: nain_j@yahoo.com

³ วิทยาลัยพยาบาลบรมราชชนนีนนทบุรี 11000. อีเมล: doungnetre@yahoo.com

Workplace Happiness Factors in Private Organizations in Thailand

Kwanmuang Kaeodumkoeng¹

Jumnian Junhasobhaga²

Doungnetre Thummakul³

ABSTRACT

This study aims to explore workplace happiness factors in private organizations comprised of management, atmosphere and environment in workplace, happiness promotion process, physical and mental health and organizational result. The research used data collected through systematic random sampling from the targets of the Healthy Organization Promotion Section, the Thai Health Promotion Foundation who completed self-administered surveys using the Happy Workplace Index online program. Three hundred twenty organizations were surveyed and analyzed to obtain frequencies, percentages, mean, standardization and one-way ANOVA. The results were as follows: (1) The mean for happiness in workplace management factors was 3.49. The highest mean score was for the welfare management system as promulgated in the law such as employee protection policies as promulgated in labor law and work returns management system as prescribed by labor law. (2) The mean of atmosphere and environmental factors was 3.06. The highest mean score was for workplace safety promotion such as organizational leadership and good work environment promotion. (3) The mean of happiness promoting process factors was 2.82. The highest mean score was organizational awareness of happiness as a type of capital such as participation in happiness promotion activities and communication channels for organizational happiness promotion. (4) The mean of physical and mental factors was 2.68. The highest mean score was for accidents at work such as percentage of employee leave due to accidents at work and organizational health care systems for employees. (5) The mean results of organizational factors were 3.21. The highest mean score was for relationships in organization such as total productivity and labor productivity. From the results, organizations should balance the factors at the workplace and emphasize the processes that affect the physical and mental health of employees. Priority concerns should be on both the atmosphere and environment in the workplace and management for sufficient results.

Keywords: Workplace Happiness Factors, Private Organization

¹ Corresponding author, Faculty of Public Health, Mahidol University, Bangkok 10400.

E-mail: phkke@mahidol.ac.th

² Research and Development Institute, Ramkhamhaeng University, Bangkok 10240.

E-mail: nain_j@yahoo.com

³ Praboromarajchanok institute, Nonthaburi 11000. E-mail: doungnetre@yahoo.com

Introduction

The workplace is an important setting in which any lifestyle behaviors can be addressed. These may be a complement of health promotion strategies that are being used, such as policy change, creation of a supportive environment or health education. The Healthy Organization Promotion Section, under the support of the Thai Health Promotion Foundation (TPF), has been promoted the happy workplace concept for private organizations since 2007 (Wasantanaratana, 2010). The World Health Organization defined a healthy workplace is one in which workers and managers collaborate to use a continual improvement process to protect and promote the health, safety and well-being of workers and the sustainability of the workplace. Healthy Workplace Framework (Burton, 2010), suggested the four ways that an employer working in collaboration with employees can influence the health status. These four ways are: (1) physical work environment (2) psychosocial work environment (3) personal health resources in the workplace and (4) enterprise community involvement. The Healthy Organization Promotion Section has used the framework and concept of organizational development to communicate with their staff. Organizational development is a process of continuous diagnosis, action planning, implementation, and evaluation (Cummings, 2004). Several research reported the key factors that related to happy workplace promotion, such as organizational climate, organizational capacity, and management, environment, and results of organization (Florin et al., 2000; Bambra et al., 2009; Tagiuri, 2008; Aaron et al., 2011; Pasiphol, 2012; Biggio et al., 2013).

The Company Health Check, a measure of workplace health promotion programs, consists of four major steps. The major steps are setting up of policy and culture, organizing and setting up of structures, developing and implementing strategies, and evaluating results. These steps can be presented as a problem-solving cycle for health topics such as nutrition, exercise, smoking and stress (Muylaert et al., 2007).

The Happy Workplace Index checklist has been developed in 2011. The checklist is a tool to measure organizational happiness. This tool presents the basis for happiness improvement by focusing attention on Management, Atmosphere and Environment in workplace, Happiness Promotion Process, Physical and Mental Health and Organizational

Result. The indexes can reflect the conditions that support happiness in the organization. The Happy Workplace Index (HWI) is one in which HR and managers collaborate to use a continual improvement process to promoting happy workplace (Kaeodumkoeng et al., 2011; Thummakul et al., 2012).

Health is affected by both individual and organizational influences. Thus, when an organization wants to set up a program concerning voluntary health practices, it should be interlinked with management system and organization contexts. In the SMEs study found that small and medium size organizations are differences about recruitment and selection. Small organizations lack the amount of resources and hierarchical administrative systems that can help them managing both exploration and exploitation (Lubatkin et al., 2006). From an HRM perspective there are also differences between Small and larger organizations. According to Kok et al. (2003) the differences lies in the formalization of HRM. SMEs operate in an informal and flexible way in comparison with larger organizations (Combee, 2010; Bacon & Hoque, 2005; Kok et al., 2003).

The previous studies didn't explore the factors that promoting happy workplace, the targets of the Healthy Organization Promotion Section, under the support of the Thai Health Promotion Foundation. It had a lack of data to support the planning and strategy selection of happy workplace. The purposes of this research were to explore the workplace happiness factors for utilize process development and to compare the workplace happiness factors between size of organization.

Methods

This descriptive research used data collected from a self-administered in the happy workplace index online program until 30 June 2013. The data of each organization was completed by HR who had justified and collected from their staff. The sample size was determined from 1,892 organizations by a table of Krejcie & Morgan (1970). The sample size was 320. The systematic random sampling was used. There were 320 completed of organizations collected and analyzed to obtain frequencies, percentages, mean, standardization and one-way ANOVA were employed to analyze the data.

Instrument

Respondents recorded on online program (The Happy Workplace Index Project, 2013). The self-administered questionnaire contained two parts; the first part was organization characteristics (e.g., number of employee, type of organization). The second part was HWI checklist consisting of 5 dimensions of happy workplace promoting factors which are management 6 items, atmosphere and environment 9 items, happy promotion process 7 items, physical and mental health 11 items, and result of the organization 4 items total was 37 items. HWI Checklist Online Program measure on rubric scores 5 level of the PDCA cycle (Sokovic et al., 2010).

The questionnaire was developed based on a literature review before being validated by five happy workplace experts and was discussed in two workshops participated by happiness promotion personnel in organizations. A pilot study indicated the Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.87. The reliability test indicated that all scales had good levels of internal consistency; management ($\alpha=0.85$), atmosphere and environment ($\alpha=0.81$), happy promotion process ($\alpha=0.83$), physical and mental health ($\alpha=0.89$), and result of organization ($\alpha=0.88$).

Data were analyzed by using the computer statistical analysis software and HWI online program. Differences mean score of Happy Workplace Index between any sizes were examined by using one-way ANOVA. The sample data was normally distributed and variances of different samples were homogeneous. A p-value < 0.05 was considered as the criterion of statistical significance.

Ethical Approval

The research proposal was reviewed and approved by the Ethics Committee for Human Research, Faculty of Public Health, Mahidol University, Bangkok Thailand: MUPH2011-014.

Results

Characteristics of Samples

A total of 320 organizations were analyzed. It was found that one-third of the respondents (36.60%) were extra-large organizations while 28.10% had large, 24.10% had medium, and 12.20% had small organizations. More than half of them (69.70%) were industry and over one-third (28.10%) were services sector; whereas 2.20% of respondents were NGO (Table 1).

Table 1 Number and percentage of organization characteristics

Organization characteristics	Number	Percentage
Size*		
Small	39	12.20
Medium	77	24.10
Large	90	28.10
Extra-large	114	36.60
Types of organization		
Industry	223	69.70
Services	90	28.10
NGO	7	2.20

* Small = 5-50 Employees, Medium = 51-200 Employees, Large = 201-500 Employees, Extra-large = 501+ Employees

Workplace Happiness Factors

1. Happy Workplace Management

The finding revealed that the workplace happiness factors in management dimension which consist of 6 indicators was nearly high ($M = 3.49$, $SD=1.23$). When analyst each of them, it was found that the highest mean score was welfare management system as promulgated in the law ($M = 4.00$, $SD=0.97$) such as employee protection policy as promulgated in labor law ($M = 3.66$, $SD=1.15$), and work returns management

system as prescribed by labor law ($M = 3.62$, $SD=1.13$). The lowest mean score was career development based on employee performance ($M = 3.08$, $SD=1.39$).

Descript by stage of development, as follow (1) none of the system, (2) the system is generated, (3) implementing, (4) evaluation, and (5) improve. It was found that 34.70% had improved welfare management system as promulgated in the law while 16.60% hadn't the reward system and 16.30% hadn't complete the system of career development based on employee performance (Table 2).

Table 2 Workplace Happiness Factors: Happy Workplace Management

Workplace Happiness Factors	Scores (Number and Percentage)					M	SD
	1	2	3	4	5		
Dimension 1 Happiness with Management (M: Management)							
1) Work Returns Management System as Prescribed by Labor Law	4 (1.30)	47 (14.70)	122 (38.10)	40 (12.50)	107 (33.40)	3.62	1.13
2) Employee Protection Policy as Promulgated in Labor Law	2 (0.60)	62 (19.40)	77 (24.10)	81 (25.30)	98 (30.60)	3.66	1.15
3) Accepted Performance Evaluation System	18 (5.60)	95 (29.70)	64 (20.00)	36 (11.30)	107 (33.40)	3.37	1.36
4) Welfare Management System as Promulgated in the Law	4 (1.30)	26 (8.10)	46 (14.40)	133 (41.60)	111 (34.70)	4.00	0.97
5) Reward System	53 (16.60)	63 (19.70)	27 (8.40)	112 (35.00)	65 (20.30)	3.23	1.41
6) Career Development Based on Employee performance	52 (16.30)	75 (23.40)	50 (15.60)	80 (25.00)	63 (19.70)	3.08	1.39
Total						3.49	1.23

2. Atmosphere & Environment

The workplace happiness factors in atmosphere and environment dimension which consist of 9 indicators was medium ($M = 3.06$, $SD=1.21$). When analyst each of them, it was found that the highest mean score was workplace safety promotion ($M = 3.70$, $SD=1.17$) such as organization leadership ($M = 3.44$, $SD=1.32$), and good work environment promotion ($M = 3.37$, $SD=1.19$). The lowest mean score was taking good care for employee family happiness ($M = 2.42$, $SD=1.21$).

Descript by stage of development, it was found that 37.80% had improved workplace safety promotion and 31.30% had improved organization leadership while 23.80% hadn't complete the system of taking good care for employee family happiness and 15.60% hadn't complete the system of assistance for disabled employees in returning job (Table 3).

Table 3 Workplace Happiness Factors: Atmosphere & Environment

Workplace Happiness Factors	Scores (Number and Percentage)					<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
	1	2	3	4	5		
Dimension 2 Happiness with Atmosphere and Environment in the Workplace							
(A: Atmosphere & Environment)							
7) Organization Leadership	15 (4.70)	93 (29.10)	48 (15.00)	64 (20.00)	100 (31.30)	3.44	1.32
8) Executives are a Good Model in Happiness Promotion	16 (5.00)	121 (37.80)	77 (24.10)	45 (14.10)	61 (19.10)	3.04	1.22
9) Working Atmosphere Supporting Employees' Happiness (e.g. interpersonal relationship, etc.)	22 (6.90)	60 (18.80)	134 (41.90)	30 (9.40)	74 (23.10)	3.23	1.20
10) Good Work Environment Promotion (e.g. efficient arrangement of workplace)	13 (4.10)	63 (19.70)	120 (37.50)	40 (12.50)	84 (26.30)	3.37	1.19
11) Workplace Safety Promotion	4 (1.30)	51 (15.90)	104 (32.50)	40 (12.50)	121 (37.80)	3.70	1.17
12) Organization Ethics Promotion	31 (9.70)	137 (42.80)	75 (23.40)	31 (9.70)	46 (14.40)	2.76	1.20
13) Taking Good Care for Employee Family Happiness	76 (23.80)	120 (37.50)	73 (22.80)	17 (5.30)	34 (10.60)	2.42	1.21
14) Participation in Social and Environmental Development	36 (11.30)	56 (17.50)	144 (45.00)	28 (8.80)	56 (17.50)	3.04	1.19
15) Assistance for Disabled Employees in Returning Job	50 (15.60)	131 (40.90)	74 (23.10)	32 (10.00)	33 (10.30)	2.58	1.17
Total						3.06	1.21

3. Happiness Promoting Process

The workplace happiness factors in happiness promoting process dimension which consist of 7 indicators was medium ($M = 2.82$, $SD=1.33$). When analyst each of them, it was found that the highest mean score was organization awareness of happiness as a type of capital ($M = 3.57$, $SD=1.24$) such as participation in organization happiness

promotion activity ($M = 3.24, SD=1.43$), and communication channel for organization happiness promotion ($M = 2.80, SD=1.24$). The lowest mean score was committee/people in charge of organization happiness policy ($M = 2.24, SD=1.40$).

Descript by stage of development, it was found that 25.60% had improved participation in organization happiness promotion activity and 24.70% had improved organization awareness of happiness as a type of capital while 42.20% hadn't complete the committee/people in charge of organization happiness policy and 38.40% hadn't the guideline of organization happiness evaluation (Table 4).

Table 4 Workplace Happiness Factors: Happiness Promoting Process

Workplace Happiness Factors	Scores (Number and Percentage)					M	SD
	1	2	3	4	5		
Dimension 3 Happiness with Process of Happy Workplace (P: Process)							
16) Committee/people in charge of Organization Happiness Policy	135 (42.20)	75 (23.40)	50 (15.60)	17 (5.30)	43 (13.40)	2.24	1.40
17) Communication Channel for Organization Happiness Promotion	44 (13.80)	99 (30.90)	105 (32.80)	20 (6.30)	52 (16.30)	2.80	1.24
18) Organization Happiness Learning	68 (21.30)	95 (29.70)	60 (18.80)	44 (13.80)	53 (16.60)	2.75	1.37
19) Organization Resource Supports	24 (7.50)	132 (41.30)	98 (30.60)	21 (6.60)	45 (14.10)	2.78	1.14
20) Organization Awareness of Happiness as a type of Capital	32 (10.00)	31 (9.70)	58 (18.10)	120 (37.50)	79 (24.70)	3.57	1.24
21) Participation in Organization Happiness Promotion Activity	43 (13.40)	86 (26.90)	23 (7.20)	86 (26.90)	82 (25.60)	3.24	1.43
22) Quality of Organization Happiness Evaluation	123 (38.40)	78 (24.40)	35 (10.90)	39 (12.20)	45 (14.10)	2.39	1.45
Total						2.82	1.33

4. Physical and Mental Health

The workplace happiness factors in physical and mental health dimension which consist of 11 indicators was medium ($M = 2.68, SD=1.34$). When analyst each of them, it was found that the highest mean score was accidents/sickness/deaths at work ($M = 3.88, SD=1.05$) such as percentage of employees' leaves due to accidents

at work ($M = 3.74$, $SD=1.24$), and organization health care system for employees ($M = 3.64$, $SD=1.20$). The lowest mean score was employees' stress level ($M = 1.92$, $SD=1.40$).

Descript by stage of development, it was found that 31.30% had improved percentage of employees' leaves due to accidents at work and 30.90% had improved organization health care system for employees while 66.30% hadn't improved the employees' stress level and 59.10% hadn't surveyed of the sense of belonging of employees in organization (Table 5).

Table 5 Workplace Happiness Factors: Physical and Mental Health

Workplace Happiness Factors	Scores (Number and Percentage)					<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
	1	2	3	4	5		
Dimension 4 Happiness with Health of Physical and Mental (H: Health)							
23) Risk Health Behaviors (Smoking and Drinking)	94 (29.40)	108 (33.80)	61 (19.10)	30 (9.40)	27 (8.40)	2.34	1.23
24) Activity for Good Participation and Relationship in Family	129 (40.30)	69 (21.60)	67 (20.90)	22 (6.90)	33 (10.30)	2.25	1.33
25) Accidents/Sickness/Deaths at Work	12 (3.80)	28 (8.80)	42 (13.10)	144 (45.00)	94 (29.40)	3.88	1.05
26) Percentage of Employees' Leaves Due to Accidents at Work	27 (8.40)	33 (10.30)	36 (11.30)	124 (38.80)	100 (31.30)	3.74	1.24
27) Doing Physical Exercise	82 (25.60)	110 (34.40)	56 (17.50)	33 (10.30)	39 (12.20)	2.49	1.31
28) Percentage of Employees' Body Mass Index (BMI) at Normal Level	148 (46.30)	44 (13.80)	54 (16.90)	47 (14.70)	27 (8.40)	2.25	1.39
29) Employees' Happiness Level in Organization	179 (55.90)	14 (4.40)	22 (6.90)	72 (22.50)	33 (10.30)	2.27	1.55
30) Employees' Work Satisfaction Level	133 (41.60)	14 (4.40)	39 (12.20)	81 (25.30)	53 (16.60)	2.71	1.60
31) Employees' Stress Level	212 (66.30)	15 (4.70)	26 (8.10)	42 (13.10)	25 (7.80)	1.92	1.40
32) Sense of Belonging of Employees in organization	189 (59.10)	26 (8.10)	24 (7.50)	53 (16.60)	28 (8.80)	2.08	1.46
33) Organization Health Care System for Employees.	17 (5.30)	43 (13.40)	77 (24.10)	84 (26.30)	99 (30.90)	3.64	1.20
Total						2.68	1.34

5. Results of organization

The workplace happiness factors in results of organization dimension which consist of 4 indicators was medium ($M = 3.21$, $SD=1.32$). When analyst each of them, it was found that the highest mean score was relationships in organization ($M = 3.31$, $SD=1.34$). such as total productivity of organization ($M = 3.29$, $SD=1.24$), and labor productivity of organization ($M = 3.25$, $SD=1.24$). The lowest mean score was employees' turnover rate ($M = 2.98$, $SD=1.45$).

Descript by stage of development, it was found that 33.10% had improved relationships in organization while 24.70% had employees' turnover rate higher than 5% (Table 6).

Table 6 Workplace Happiness Factors: Results of organization

Workplace Happiness Factors	Scores (Number and Percentage)					M	SD
	1	2	3	4	5		
Dimension 5 Happiness with Result of the Organization (R: Result)							
34) Relationships in Organization (Strong relationship and Unity of everyone 'Willingly Participating in Organization Activities)	18 (5.60)	94 (29.40)	85 (26.60)	17 (5.30)	106 (33.10)	3.31	1.34
35) Employees' Turnover Rate	79 (24.70)	46 (14.40)	55 (17.20)	84 (26.30)	56 (17.50)	2.98	1.45
36) Labor Productivity of organization	43 (13.40)	40 (12.50)	77 (24.10)	115 (35.90)	45 (14.10)	3.25	1.24
37) Total Productivity of organization	42 (13.10)	37 (11.60)	78 (24.40)	112 (35.00)	51 (15.90)	3.29	1.24
Total						3.21	1.32

6. Workplace Happiness Factors classifies by size.

The findings indicated that out of the 320 enterprises surveyed, 39 were small, 77 were medium-sized, 90 were large, and 114 were extra-large. Extra-large corporations scored 65.72 on average on the Happy Workplace Index with organization management receiving the highest rating of 75.88 and physical and mental health receiving the lowest rating of 56.63. On the other hand, small enterprises scored an average of 55.19 on the index with organizational results receiving the highest rating

of 65.51 and happiness promoting processes receiving the lowest rating of 47.54. It can therefore be concluded from the findings that larger organizations are more successful in creating factors promoting a happy workplace. However, they may pay relatively less attention to the factors enhancing physical and mental health (Table 7).

Table 7 Happy Workplace Index score classifies by size

Happy Workplace Index	Mean Scores of Happy Workplace Index			
	Small (39)	Medium (77)	Large (90)	Extra-large (114)
Dimension 1 Happy Workplace Management	59.40	66.75	69.56	75.88
Dimension 2 Atmosphere and Environment	52.19	56.30	60.22	68.64
Dimension 3 Happiness Promoting Process	47.54	52.65	55.59	62.96
Dimension 4 Physical and Mental Health	51.28	50.34	54.08	56.63
Dimension 5 Results of Organization	65.51	63.25	63.78	64.47
HWI Total	55.19	57.86	60.64	65.72

An analysis of the workplace happiness factors showed that the average scores ranged from 55.19 to 65.72, and the standard deviations fell between 12.34 and 16.23. Interestingly, extra-large corporations scored higher than large, medium-sized, and small enterprises. The one-way ANOVA confirmed statistically significant differences between the organizations at $p=0.001$ ($F=7.797$; $p=0.000$), as shown in Table 8. When the multiple comparison analysis was performed, it was found that extra-large corporations were statistically different from small enterprises and from medium-sized enterprises.

Table 8 A comparative of variance between Happy Workplace Index (HWI) classifies by size.

Size & HWI	N	M	SD	Source of Variance	SS	df	MS	F	P	Post hoc
Small	39	55.19	12.34	Between Group	339.747	305	1.114	7.797	0.000	1-4
Medium	77	57.86	15.75	Within Group	2.000	14	0.143			2-4
Large	90	60.64	16.23	Total	341.747	319				
Extra-large	114	65.72	14.94							
Total	320	61.12	15.63	Levene's Test: F= 1.204, df1= 3, df2= 316, p= 0.309						

Discussion

A happy workplace can be created in several ways, but organizations that focus on internal factors in promoting happiness among employees will be able to achieve more sustainable development. In this regard, the critical success factor is inspiration from leaders, while other supporting variables such as teamwork and employee participation are also important.

Developed by happiness creation experts based on human resources databases and employee surveys, the Happy Workplace Index, encompassing happy workplace management, atmosphere and environments within the workplace, happiness promoting processes, physical and mental health, and organizational results forms the conceptual framework for the present study (Tagiuri, 2008; Kaeodumkoeng et al., 2011;

Nielson, 2013). The index accords with the principles of the Company Health Check (Muylaert et al., 2007), which require the integration of results evaluation and the examination of factors relating to policy and culture, structural formation and organization, strategy development and implementation, and organizational development (Cummings, 2004; Goldgruber et al., 2010).

This research clearly shows that larger enterprises are better equipped with factors that promote happiness among employees than are smaller ones. A possible reason for this finding is that such companies may benefit from their management, creation of atmosphere and environments, and happiness creation activities that are more systematic and responsive to the problems and needs of the employees. As a result, their employees are in better physical and mental condition, and thereby perform more effectively with optimal results for the company (Makmee et al., 2012). This is the ultimate goal of businesses pointed out in previous research (Florin et al., 2000; Biggio et al., 2013).

In addition, the results pertaining to happiness in private enterprises reveals that slightly over 25% of the companies require immediate action and these together with companies with unclear measures for creating happiness constitute almost 44.70% of the sample. The factors to be emphasized include physical and mental health (e.g.

stress, sense of belonging, and the body mass index [BMI]), happiness promoting processes, committees in charge of organizational happiness supervision, and quality of organizational happiness evaluation.

Finally, on average, larger establishments score higher than smaller ones in terms of happiness factors probably because of their more efficient management through systems such as ISO, TQM, TPM, and kaizen; more comprehensive welfare provisions; clearer visions, organization structures, and plans; and available resources (Egan et al., 2009; Nielson, 2013). Despite this competitive advantage, such companies often pay little attention to the physical and mental health of the employees, as reflected by their high BMI, which is likely to result in chronic illnesses and poor job performance (Kanjanachitra et al., 2008; Aaron et al., 2011).

The multiple comparison analysis was found that extra-large organizations were statistically different from small organizations and from medium-sized organizations. It is consistent with the finding of Lubatkin et al. (2006) that small organizations lack the amount of resources and hierarchical administrative systems, and the finding of Kaeodumkoeng et al. (2010) that organizational size had a small direct and indirect effect to health. Therefore, the development of happy workplace program should be concerned with the context and size of organization.

It is worth noting, however, that it is not impossible for smaller firms to become happy workplaces. A major problem confronting them is that while such companies are strong with respect to employee participation in the happiness creation process, they may lack an efficient system that keeps the process going continuously.

Recommendations

Based on the findings, recommendations are made as follows. First, organizations should carry out their development of happiness factors by giving consideration to physical and mental health, atmosphere and environments in the workplace, and the creation of management systems that continually optimize organizational results. Second, more emphasis should be placed on factors relating to physical health. In spite of their better happiness management owing to more efficient systems, larger firms

pay relatively little attention to physical health. Consequently, the employees are likely to experience physical problems as they age, resulting in higher absenteeism rates and lower job performance. Finally, happiness factors should be surveyed and reported regularly according to a predetermined plan in order to respond in a timely manner to possible circumstances that affect employees' quality of life and job performance as well as their physical and mental health.

Acknowledgements

The present study was supported by the Healthy Organization Promotion Section, the Thai Health Promotion Foundation (TPF), and the department of Health Education and Health Behavioral Sciences, Faculty of Public Health, Mahidol University.

References

- Aaron, G. A., Sommerfeld, D. H., & Willging, C. E. (2011). The soft underbelly of system change: The role of leadership and organization climate in turnover during statewide behavioral health reform. *Psychological Services, 8*, 269–281.
- Bacon, N., & Hoque, K. (2005). HRM in the SME sector: Valuable employees and coercive networks. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 16*, 11–12.
- Bambra, C., Gibson, M., Sowden, A. J., Wright, K., Whitehead, M., & Petticrew, M. (2009). Working for health ? Evidence from systematic reviews on the effects on health and health inequalities of organizational changes to the psychosocial work environment. *Journal of Preventive Medicine, 48*, 454–461.
- Biggio, G., & Cortese, C. G. (2013). Well-being in the workplace through intervention between individual characteristics and organizational context. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies on Health and Well-being, 8*, 6–9.
- Burton, J. (2010). *Healthy workplace framework and model: Background and supporting literature and practices*. WHO Headquarters, Geneva, Switzerland.
- Combee, G. (2010). *Human resource management in small size ambidextrous organizations*. university of twente. Retrieved from http://essay.utwente.nl/60160/1/MA_thesis_G_Combee.pdf

- Cummings, T. (2004). "Organizational development and change". In J. Boonstra (ed.), *Dynamics of organizational change and learning*. West Sussex: Wiley.
- Egan, M., Bambra, C., Petticrew, M., & Whitehead, M. (2009). Reviewing evidence on complex social interventions: Appraising implementation in systemic reviews of the health effects of organizational-level workplace interventions. *Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health*, 63, 4-11.
- Florin, P., Mitchell, R., Stevenson, J., & Klein, I. (2000). "Predicting Intermediate Outcomes for Prevention Coalitions: A developmental perspective". *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 23, 341-346.
- Goldgruber, J., & Ahrens, D. (2010). Effectiveness of workplace health promotion and primary prevention interventions: review. *Journal of Public Health*, 18, 75-88.
- Kaeodumkoeng, K., Thummakul, D., Makmee, P., Sinjindawong, S., & Prasertsin, U. (2011). *The result of Happy Workplace Index development*. Bangkok: The Happy Workplace Index Checklist Project.
- Kaeodumkoeng, K., Wongwanich, S., & Pasiphol, S. (2010). Social Network and School Health Index System as Interventions Enhancing Students' Well-Being in Health Promoting Schools. *Journal of Research Methodology*, 23, 179-196.
- Kanjanachitra, C., Tangchontip, K., Kittisuksatit, S., Rakamnueykit, P., & Jarassit, S. (2008). *Quality of life of Thai workers in industry and service sectors*. Bangkok: Institute for Population and Social Research. Mahidol University, Thailand.
- Kok, J., Uhlaner, L. M., & Thurik, A. R. (2003). *Human resource management with small firms; Facts and explanations*. Rotterdam: Erasmus Research Institute of Management.
- Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *psychological measurement. Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30, 607-610.
- Lubatkin, M. H., Simsek, Z., Ling, Y., & Veiga, J. F. (2006). Ambidexterity and performance in small to medium sized firms: The Pivotal Role of Top Management Team behavioral Integration. *Journal of Management*, 32, 646-672.

- Makmee, P., Kaeodumkoeng, K., Sinjindawong, S., Thummakul, D., & Prasertsin, U. (2012). Development of Happy Workplace Index in private organization by size of organizations in context of Thailand. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Thought*, 2, 395–401.
- Muylaert, K., Beeck, R., & Broek, K. (2007). *Company health check: An instrument to promote health at the workplace*. Retrieved from http://www.enwhp.org/fileadmin/downloads/7th_Initiative_MoveEU/Review_and_Catalogue_CHC.pdf
- Nielson, K. (2013). How can we make organizational interventions work? Employees and line managers crafting interventions. *Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, Work & Stress, Human Relations*, 66, 1029–1050.
- Pasiphol, S. (2012). TPBS's happiness and quality workplace: A development of indicators and causal relationship model. *Journal of Research Methodology*, 25, 143–151.
- Sokovic, M., Pavletic, D., & Pipan, K. K. (2010). Quality improvement methodologies – PDCA cycle, RADAR matrix, DMAIC and DFSS. *Journal of Achievements in Materials and Manufacturing Engineering*, 43, 476–483.
- Tagiuri, R. (2008). “The concept of organizational climate.” In R. W. Glanz, K. Lewis, F. M., Rimer, B. K., & K. Viswanath (Eds.), *Health behavior and health education. Theory, research, and practice*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey–Bass Inc.
- The Happy Workplace Index Project. (2013). *The Happy Workplace Index online program*. Retrieved from <http://www.happyworkplaceindex.com>
- Thummakul, D., Kaeodumkoeng, K., Prasertsin, U., Sinjindawong, S., & Makmee, P. (2012). The development of Happy Workplace Index. *International Journal of Business and Management Studies*, 1, 527–536.
- Wasantanaratana, C. (2010). *Happy workplace electric and electronics group*. Bangkok: The Federation of Thai Industries.

