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ABSTRACT
There have been many studies of happiness in Western countries. In the early stages, scholars were primarily concerned with establishing the validity of measures of happiness and with exploring demographic correlates of happiness. More recent studies, still mostly in Western countries have started to focus on determinants of happiness as well as the identification of happiness policies (Biswas-Diener et al. 2012). Research studies in Western countries often result in findings based on Western customs, social norms, religious beliefs, and philosophical principles that cannot be used as a baseline for the rest of the world. Therefore, the present article explores the factors of transient level happiness management of employees of Information Technology Sector, Hyderabad of Telangana State.
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INTRODUCTION
Organizations are being urged to measure happiness because it is considered beneficial. Because assessments of organizational happiness are drawn from data on individual happiness, or from individual responses to items such as “is this happy organization,” research regarding organizational happiness rests almost completely on research regarding individual happiness. This may be data collected by survey and interview or data collected using neurological techniques. Useful discussions of the neuro scientific approach can be found in Appiah’s Experiments in Ethics (2008) and in the chapters on neuroscience and happiness in the World Happiness Reports issued from time to time under the auspices of the United Nations (Helliwell, Layard, & Sachs, 2015).

Measuring Happiness
Some general aspects of the measurement of happiness come before consideration of the types of instruments used. The absolute or relative nature of the measurement, the potential bias of self-reporting, differing definitions of happiness as pleasure, fulfilment, or virtue, and the appropriate level of accuracy guide the way in which happiness is analyzed.

First, the cardinal-ordinal question, whether the search is for an absolute measure of organizational happiness or for a relative measure; whether the intention or value of the assessment is to be found in comparing the result to a standard of complete happiness, as would be the case of using a scale of degrees and minutes to comparing the closeness with which the corner of a sheet of paper matched a standard 90º template, or to examine movement in the assessment, to see whether there is more or less happiness than there was at some other time or in some other organization. Examples of perfect happiness, unlike a perfect right angle, do not exist on earth, or if they do it is not possible to define them in terms of measurable criteria. Fortunately, as Amartya Sen (2011) shows in relation to justice, there is no need to identify the demands of perfect happiness before a comparative exercise can be carried out. Separate
concerns remain about the manner in which individual ordinal scores (such as those from Likert scales) can be added up, but that is a matter inherent to such scales and not specific to happiness measurement.

**Transient level Happiness Management**

Weiss and Cropanzano’s (1996) influential chapter introduced Affective Events Theory and drew the interest of researchers to current time affective work events and the short span emotions and moods that individual person might feel as a result. Happiness-related variables which are typically defined and considered as transient states that differ at the within-person level consist of state positive mood, the occurrence of flow, and distinct emotions such as delight, enjoyment, happiness, and satisfaction.

**REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

Aleksey A. Ilyukhin & Svetlana V. Ilyukhina (2018). Article entitled “Happiness Economics: The Role, Opinions and Evaluations by Young People” published in *The Manager* observed that happiness, as an equilibrium state of a person, is determined by a variety of factors, which encompass those dependent on the subjective assessments of an individual, but the main components of such an equilibrium are certainly the same for all; it is incorrect to separate material conditions from socio-psychological factors ensuring a comfortable equilibrium for a person and the maximum possible motivation in all spheres of life; material conditions and socio-psychological factors are the elements of a single system that, when interacting, create a synergy effect associated primarily with effective economic self-realization, especially among young people; material conditions for the youth create not only a comfortable standard of living, but also a sense of prestige, significance and confidence in economic activity; the younger generation, its economic motivation and activity will determine the pace of economic growth in the conditions of the transition to the sixth technological mode.

Seyyedeh Mahrokh Iranpour, Nasrollah Erfani & Mohammad Esmaiel Ebrahimi (2018). Article entitled “Explanation and Prediction of Quality of Life and Happiness Based on the Time Span of Students” published in *Iranian Journal of Psychiatric Nursing* found that the time horizons of students were not high, while their quality of life and their happiness were reported as high. Also, there was a significant relationship between the time perspective, quality of life and happiness among students. In addition, the time perspective and quality of life were able to explain and predict happiness of undergraduate students at the Islamic Azad University of Hamedan. Meanwhile, quality of life had a significant mediator role. In order to increase the happiness of students, it is suggested to encourage past positive perspectives and transcendental future, while improving quality of life.

Arash Ziapour, Alireza Khatony, Faranak Jafari & Neda Kianipour (2018). Article entitled “Correlation of Personality Traits with Happiness among University Students” published in *Journal of Clinical and Diagnostic Research* revealed that the mean±SD score for students’ happiness was average (3.38±0.25), and self-esteem and subjective well-being had the highest and lowest means, respectively. The findings of the present study were indicative of a significant positive relationship between the total personality traits and total happiness. Furthermore, extraversion was strongly correlated with happiness, while openness to experience had the lowest correlation with happiness. So, it can be concluded that the extraverts with emotional stability feel happier.

**OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY**

- To examine the factor of transient level happiness management of employee of Information Technology Sector in Hyderabad.
- To put forth certain suggestions based on the findings that have been arrived.

**RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

To fulfill the aforesaid objectives the data have been collected from two sources of data i.e. primary and secondary sources. The secondary data were collected from various journals, periodicals, magazines, books and unpublished documents. The primary data was collected directly from the sample respondents with pre - designed questionnaire.

**Research Approach**

A quantitative approach was followed in this exploratory study. The primary data was collected by using the questionnaire. Results were presented by means of Factor Analysis.

**Research Method and Sampling**

The participants selected for this study consisted of employees working in various Information Technology organisations in Hyderabad of Telangana. 1000 questionnaires were distributed among employees working in various Information Technology Organisations in Hyderabad of Telangana. Convenience sampling technique was deployed in sample selection. The respondents were solicited to complete the Happiness Management Questionnaire. The resultant response rate of useable questionnaires was 88% (880).
DATA ANALYSIS

Table 1: Correlation Matrix² Relating to Transient Level in Happiness Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State of job satisfaction</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>.323</td>
<td>.412</td>
<td>.496</td>
<td>.355</td>
<td>.459</td>
<td>.355</td>
<td>.763</td>
<td>.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Momentary affect</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.527</td>
<td>.336</td>
<td>.244</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flow state</td>
<td>.323</td>
<td>.527</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.357</td>
<td>.277</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Momentary mood at work</td>
<td>.412</td>
<td>.336</td>
<td>.357</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.277</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>.297</td>
<td>.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Engagement</td>
<td>.496</td>
<td>.244</td>
<td>.277</td>
<td>.277</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.509</td>
<td>.497</td>
<td>.461</td>
<td>.419</td>
<td>.447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Enjoyment</td>
<td>.355</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>.509</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.556</td>
<td>.555</td>
<td>.463</td>
<td>.343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion at work</td>
<td>.459</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>.497</td>
<td>.556</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.516</td>
<td>.501</td>
<td>.321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State intrinsic motivation</td>
<td>.355</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>.461</td>
<td>.555</td>
<td>.516</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.458</td>
<td>.276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Work Life</td>
<td>.763</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>.297</td>
<td>.419</td>
<td>.463</td>
<td>.501</td>
<td>.458</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work life Balance</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.447</td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>.321</td>
<td>.276</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (1-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Sample: Primary Data/ Structured Questionnaire)

Table 1 shows the Correlation Matrix² relating to Transient Level in Happiness Management. The first half of the table contains Pearson correlation coefficient between the pairs of questions, and the second half contains the one-tailed significance of select variable coefficients. The researcher scanned second half for the significant values and glanced the factors to identify which values are greater than 0.05. Then research scanned first half contains the correlation coefficients and observed the values to identify values which are greater than 0.9. If any value is more than 0.9 then it is understood there is a problem of similarity in the data and therefore those questions have to be reconsidered. But for the present study all correlation values are found to be below 0.9, so it is concluded that there is a significant correlation between every pair. There is a considerable difference among the questions, because majority of the values realized to be below 0.05. The determinant found at the bottom of the matrix should be greater than 0.00001. In the present table it is found that the determinant value is .024. Therefore multi-co linearity (one dimension values changes will impact on other dimension value i.e., suitable for comparisons) is not a hitch for this data. To conclude, all the questions correlate moderately well. After fulfilling these conditions, the researcher conducted KMO and Bartlett’s test.

KMO (Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin) and Bartlett’s test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) Test is a measure of how suited present data is for Factor Analysis. The test measures sampling adequacy for each variable in the
model and for the complete model. The statistic is a measure of the proportion of variance among variables that might be common variance. The lower the proportion, the more suited data is to Factor Analysis.

Following Table – 2 shows the results of the KMO and Bartlett’s test.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communalities</th>
<th>Transient Level in Happiness Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State of job satisfaction</td>
<td>.734*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flow state</td>
<td>-.093 -.453 .756*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Engagement</td>
<td>-.257 -.045 -.043 -.050 .864*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion at work</td>
<td>-.094 .069 -.046 .009 -.134 .257 .906*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State intrinsic motivation</td>
<td>.084 .039 -.113 .020 -.145 -.271 -.190 .877*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Work Life</td>
<td>-.667 .087 .003 .010 .097 -.195 -.105 -.176 .751*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work life Balance</td>
<td>.018 -.089 .036 .039 -.291 -.091 -.087 -.021 .018 .851*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table - 3: Anti-image Correlation Matrix relating to Transient Level in Happiness Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State of job satisfaction</td>
<td>.734*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flow state</td>
<td>-.093 -.453 .756*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Engagement</td>
<td>-.257 -.045 -.043 -.050 .864*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion at work</td>
<td>-.094 .069 -.046 .009 -.134 .257 .906*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State intrinsic motivation</td>
<td>.084 .039 -.113 .020 -.145 -.271 -.190 .877*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Work Life</td>
<td>-.667 .087 .003 .010 .097 -.195 -.105 -.176 .751*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work life Balance</td>
<td>.018 -.089 .036 .039 -.291 -.091 -.087 -.021 .018 .851*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Primary Data/Structured Questionnaire)

Table - 3 shows KMO, Bartlett’s test of sphericity and anti-image correlation matrix. As per Kaiser’s (1974) recommendations 0.00 to 0.49 unacceptable, 0.50 to 0.59 miserable, 0.60 to 0.69 mediocre, 0.70 to 0.79 middling, 0.80 to 0.89 meritorious, 0.90 to 1.00 marvelous. In the table KMO values for individual factors are formed on the diagonal of the anti-image correlation matrix. After the observation it is identified that for all factors the values are above 0.5. Thus, all the factors should be considered for Communalities analysis. The off diagonal values represent the partial correlations between factors. Therefore, off diagonal elements been scanned to ensure that they are lesser than diagonal values and found off diagonal values are lesser than diagonal values.

**Communalities:**
Initial communalities estimates the differences among each factor accounted for, from all variables. Extraction communalities values are estimates of the differences in each factor accounted for the variables in the factor solution. Below Table - 4 shows the particulars of communalities of Transient Level in Happiness Management.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communalities</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Extraction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State of job satisfaction</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flow state</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Engagement</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Enjoyment</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion at work</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of intrinsic motivation</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Work Life</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work life Balance</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.597</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Primary Data/Structured Questionnaire)
The above Table 4 gives the communalities of initial and extraction. Principal component analysis deals with the initial hypothesis that all factors are common; so in the table, values for the initial communalities are 1 for all the factors. The value in the column titled extraction shows the common difference in the data structure. For, Quality of Work Life 80.7 per cent of variance observed is common difference. There is second dimension for observing these communalities is in terms of the ratio of difference explained by the underlying variables.

To understand about the exact level of difference among factors is initially assumed as all communalities are ‘1’. But after the analysis the differentiated values for each variable are found. State of job satisfaction has 79.8 per cent, Momentary affect has 75.3 per cent, Flow state has 67.0 per cent, Momentary mood at work has 56.1 per cent, State of Engagement have 61.5 per cent, Task Enjoyment has 63.3 per cent, Emotion at work state has 62.2 per cent, State of intrinsic motivation has 55.7 per cent, and Work life Balance has 59.7 per cent. Above variables shows the variance in structure. It is shown in Total Variance Explained table which is following.

Table 5: Total Variance Explained - Transient Level in Happiness Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Initial Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
<th>Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% of Variance</td>
<td>Cumulative %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.091</td>
<td>40.911</td>
<td>40.911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.453</td>
<td>14.530</td>
<td>55.441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.768</td>
<td>7.684</td>
<td>73.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.619</td>
<td>6.192</td>
<td>79.992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.496</td>
<td>4.957</td>
<td>84.949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.469</td>
<td>4.693</td>
<td>89.642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.462</td>
<td>4.618</td>
<td>94.260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.380</td>
<td>3.799</td>
<td>98.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>1.942</td>
<td>100.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10.675</td>
<td>14.530</td>
<td>40.911</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

(Source: Primary Data/Structured Questionnaire)

The above Table 5 shows that Eigen values related with each factor displays the difference explained by that particular linear factor. This table also shows the Eigen values in terms of the percentage of difference explain. So factor 1 represents 40.911, factor 2 represents 14.530 per cent and factor 3 represents 10.675 per cent of total difference; from the data it is understood that these three variables represent relatively major amount of difference of 66.116. Finally it is concluded that the initial three variables explain relatively major part of difference whereas subsequent variables explain only small part of difference. There are three variables among all with Eigen value greater than 1. The Eigen values related with these variables are again shown and the percentages of difference explained in the columns are labeled extraction sums of squared loadings.

From the above Table 5 it is identified that only first three factors in Transient Level in Happiness Management are highly impacting aspect in the happiness management and the residual were of not that much. Because it only exceeds Eigen value more than 1. Following Table 6 brings the details of Pattern Matrix of Transient Level in Happiness Management.

Table 6: Pattern Matrix - Transient Level in Happiness Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern Matrix</th>
<th>Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work life Balance</td>
<td>.773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Enjoyment</td>
<td>.761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Engagement</td>
<td>.687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of intrinsic motivation</td>
<td>.680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion at work</td>
<td>.668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Momentary affect</td>
<td>.862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flow state</td>
<td>.793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Momentary mood at work</td>
<td>.678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Work Life</td>
<td>-.772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of job satisfaction</td>
<td>-.768</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Oblimin with Kaiser Normalization.

a. Rotation converged in 14 iterations.
The last segment of the factor analysis outcome is a Component Correlation Matrix – Transient Level in Happiness Management between the variables. This matrix consists of the correlation coefficients among the variables. From the Table-7 it is observed that all these variables are interrelated with each other to some extent. The fact that these correlations exist tells that the constructs calculated can be interrelated. If the constructs are independent then the component correlation matrix should have been an identity matrix. Therefore, from this final matrix it appears that the independence of the variables cannot be hypothesized.

**FINDINGS**

- Total 10 factors are considered for the study and from the analysis it is found that all the ten factors (State of job satisfaction, Momentary affect, Flow state, Momentary mood at work, State Engagement, Task Enjoyment, Emotion at work, State intrinsic motivation, Quality of Work Life, Work life Balance) are significantly impacting happiness management at transient level in select units.
- Among ten factors “Momentary affect” found to be highly impacting factor for transient level happiness management. Task Enjoyment has moderate impact and Emotion at work has less impact in transient level happiness management while comparing with other factors.
- Aforesaid factors are categorised into 3 groups. Factor1 includes Work life Balance, Task Enjoyment, State of Engagement, State of intrinsic motivation and Emotion at work. Factor2 includes Momentary affect, Flow state and Momentary mood at work. Factor3 includes Quality of Work Life and State of job satisfaction.

**SUGGESTIONS**

- Happiness-related constructs which are usually defined and measured as transient states that vary at the within-person level include state positive mood, the experience of flow, and discrete emotions such as joy, pleasure, happiness, and contentment. From the analysis it is found that in transient level happiness management flow state found to be the most significant component. Flow states may occur when individuals are working on tasks that are above their own average on both challenge and skill requirements. When this occurs, the person is not only enjoying the moment, but is also stretching his or her capabilities with the likelihood of learning new skills and increasing self-esteem and personal complexity.
- In IT sector usually there will be a group of employees working on a single project and all the employees’ skills are not equal. Therefore managers should access each employee competencies and match project skill requirement so that employee can learn new skills and stretch upon his/her existing skills, which make them happy.

**CONCLUSION**

The research is conducted to identify the factors of transient level happiness management. After reviewing past studies on happiness management total 10 factors are considered for the study and found all 10 factors are significant in the study area. Among ten factors “Momentary affect” found to be highly impacting factor for transient level happiness management. Most of the IT sector front line employees are between age group of 20-30, this age group has high impact of momentary effect that be either positive or negative. Therefore organisations must be careful while handling this age group. From the perceptions of employees it is found that these 10 factors are categorised into 3 groups. Factor1 includes Work life Balance, Task Enjoyment, State of Engagement, State of intrinsic motivation and Emotion at work. Factor2 includes Momentary affect, Flow state and Momentary

**Table-7: Component Correlation Matrix – Transient Level in Happiness Management**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component Correlation Matrix</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td>-.286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-.187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-.286</td>
<td>-.187</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Oblimin with Kaiser Normalization.

(Source: Primary Data/Structured Questionnaire)
mood at work. Factor3 includes Quality of Work Life and State of job satisfaction.

Future Scope of the Study
In the present research only ten factors of transient level happiness management considered for the study in future researcher can identify new factors to explore transient level happiness management more effectively.
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