



Validating and Standardization the Pryce-Jones (2010) Workplace Happiness Scale From Malaysian School Settings

Abdul Ghani Kanesan Abdullah, Ying-Leh Ling and Chen Siew Peng
School of Educational Studies, University Sains Malaysia, Penang, Malaysia.

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received: 22 September 2015;

Received in revised form:

28 October 2015;

Accepted: 03 November 2015;

Keywords

Validation,
Workplace happiness,
Malaysian school settings.

ABSTRACT

The goal of the present study is to conduct a comprehensive examination of reliability and validity of Malay language version of adjusted workplace happiness scales developed by Pryce-Jones (2010) in Malaysian school setting. Therefore a translated and adjusted version of established content and concurrent validity scale was used. Exploratory factor analysis in Malaysian secondary school teachers sample was conducted to examine convergent and discriminant validity of translated and adjusted version of the workplace happiness scales. Following this, the reliabilities and subscale intercorrelations were determined. Next, the reliabilities and nomological validity was evaluated. The overall pattern of results indicated that the Malay language adjusted workplace happiness scale version was reasonably reliable and valid in Malaysian school settings.

© 2015 Elixir All rights reserved.

Introduction

The topic related to happiness are always given prime emphasis by organizational researchers, nevertheless the pivoting adversity of the topic is primarily focused on the defining the exact perimeter of defining the meaning of the word "happiness" as it can be diversely approached and apprehended. Generally the terms of happiness is translated from the Greek word 'eudaimonia', which used to describe a good life (Joanne, Gavin, & Richard, 2004). Eventually, Hird (2003), Ryan, Huta and Deci (2008) stated that the idea of happiness more often known as subjective well-being. Well-being include constructs such as in terms of personal development, goals in life, positive relations with others, contributions and social integration (Eid & Larsen, 2008; Keys, 1988; Ryff, 1989; Ryff & Keys, 1995; Diener, Suh, Lucas & Smith, 1999; Keys & Magyar-Moe, 2003). Meanwhile, according to Peterson (2006) in scientific terms happiness is defined on at least three different terms that (1) positive emotions and pleasure, (2) commitments (engagement), and (3) meaningful life.

Relatively, Cynthia (2010) defines happiness in the workplace as pleasant judgments (positive attitude) or enjoyable experience (positive feelings, mood, emotion flow) in the workplace. In this perspective, Cynthia (2010) had discussed seven proxy of happiness workplace as organizational behavior research subject on an ongoing basis, namely (1) job satisfaction, (2) organizational commitment, (3) participation in the work, (4) bond in the work, (5) improvement and spirit, (6) intrinsic motivation flow, and (7) emotional work. Enjoying the success and failure actively to maximize performance and achieve their potential. This situation not only give pleasure to themselves but also affect the well-being (affected) and give energy (energized) to others in the neighborhood (Dutton & Edmunds 2007). Pryce-Jones (2010) explained that control is a prerequisite for welfare in the workplace. This means that the more powerful a person is, the more control a person is able to reach nearly her potential. Individual potential when collected will generate a great power that can drive organizational improvements. The above statement is consistent with the perspective of positive psychology that emphasizes the

subjective experience: well-being and satisfaction (the past), welfare and the 'flow' (at the time), and the hope and optimism (future) (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000).

For example, studies Pryce-Jones (2010), Achor (2010), Cynthia (2010), Erica (2009), Po-Keung (2008), Boonchong (2007), Seligman (2002) and Argyle (1987) underlined the importance of welfare the workplace is the cause of the increase in productivity, job performance, employee motivation, quality of work, creativity and innovative employees, organizational excellence, a sense of job satisfaction, obtain higher incomes, reduction of failure, decreased absenteeism, reduce stress, reduce accidents and various diseases careers.

Even though workplace happiness is proven empirically in the west, due to different culture in terms of how happiness at work place is perceived and interpreted by people in general and within school organizations in particular and this matter is not given prior attention by researchers in the context of school organizations particularly in Malaysia. Whereas, the scale utilised by the researchers to determine workplace happiness are found to be less supportive with local educational situation as the varied dimension that was introduced by western researchers. Yet an understanding of the Malaysian school work context that facilitates happiness at work place has important theoretical and practical implications. Theoretically, such knowledge would extend our understanding of the antecedents of happiness at school in particular are important. For the practitioner, it provides concrete suggestions about the work place that can be targeted to develop feelings of happiness at school. Thus, in response to this growing attention, the primary endeavor of this study is to validate and standardize the workplace happiness scale from Malaysian school setting.

Workplace Happiness Scale By Pryce-Jones (2010)

Variable-being at work in this study is based on the Prosperity Achievement Model (Pryce-Jones, 2010), which focused only five main components contribution, beliefs, climate, involvement, and confident.

This model is produced through a statistical method which is based on data obtained using questionnaires 'opener People Performance Questionnaire (PPQ)' built by Pryce-Jones (2010). The model consists of five factors or components which are

contribution, beliefs, climate, involvement, and confident that serve to achieve individual potential (Achieving your potential) and is surrounded by three other factors such as trust, recognition and pride as a backbone to support the the five components. According to Pryce-Jones (2010), prosperity is not alone but this prosperity that will drive the performance of work. Many people mistakenly believe that if we perform well, we will feel peace. In fact, the thing happens in reverse when carrying out the work that makes us staying prosperous. This is in line with both elements Eudaimonic well-being and Hedonic prosperity in Welfare Model of Tomer (2011).

Contribution

The contribution is the level of effort that we can do the job. Thus, the craft work leads to prosperity in the workplace. People who contribute more towards employment gain find more fun at work. This can be proven through studies Pryce-Jones (2010), which showed that people who feel good about work accounts for more than 25 percent of work compared with their colleagues who work less fun.

Beliefs

Beliefs told subordinate that effort or work that teachers do is on the right track and work in conformity with the teacher personally. The belief consists of four elements, namely (i) job motivation, (ii) trusts teachers are effective and efficient, (iii) resilient in the face of adversity, and (iv) perceive that teachers' work has a positive impact in the world (Pryce-Jones, 2010).

Climate

Climate formed by norms, values and behaviors specific to any organization, no matter big or small organizations (Pryce-Jones, 2010). There are many studies showing that climate / culture is very important to match the workplace because the workplace has an impact on the welfare and productivity of work.

Involvement

Involvement explains most of the attitudes, behaviors, and motivations that affect the overall contribution to the work of subordinate organizations. When the subordinate committed to working, they will be clear why they have to do a job and what their direction. It is encouraging them to keep trying until the achievement of the goals of the organization.

Confident

Without confidence, contribution, trust and participation would not exist. This is because confidence is very important to bring awareness of the work done. Without confidence, our motivation cannot be turned into action. Confidence influence what a person is doing and how they manage their workplaces.

Research Objectives

The goal of the present study is to conduct a comprehensive examination of reliability and validity of workplace happiness scales developed by Pryce-Jones (2010) in Malaysian school setting. First, the convergent and discriminant validity of the scales will be assessed. Following this, the subscale reliabilities and intercorrelations will be determined. The final objective is to assess the nomological validity of the scales.

Research Methodology

Method

Survey questionnaires were administered to the respondents in their work settings via post and including with each survey was a letter from the researchers indicating the general nature of the survey and assuring all respondents that their individual responses would remain anonymous. Several modification and adjustment was applied to the 25-item of workplace happiness scale developed by Pryce-Jones (2010) such as adding

'teacher' and 'school' in sentence when it is necessary to get the flavor of teaching background.

Table 1. Summary of Exploratory factor analysis for adjusted workplace happiness scale

	Item	1	2	3	4	5
Factor 1: Teachers' contribution						
15	How fair is the culture at work?	.74				
5	Can you raise issues that are important to you?	.74				
1	Do you agree that your stakeholders give you positive feedback?	.69				
20	Do you trust the vision of your organizations leaders?	.68				
4	How much does your boss respect you?	.67				
Factor 2: School climate						
12	How much do you feel your work has a positive impact on the world?		.80			
13	How much do you like your job?		.78			
22	Are you interested in your work?		.74			
16	How much do you like your colleagues?		.68			
Factor 3: Teachers' beliefs						
10	How efficiently are you able to get things done at work?			.82		
9	How effective do you think you are at your job?			.79		
17	How much in control do you feel over your day to day activities?			.72		
18	Do you agree that you often feel a strong burst of positive emotion at work?			.67		
11	Are you resilient when it comes to coping with difficult times?			.59		
Factor 4: Teachers' involvement						
23	How much do you wish to leave your current job?				.85	
3	Are you views ignored?				.82	
25	How much do you feel you are not living up to your potential?				.82	
2	Are you views ignored?				.72	
Factor 5: Teachers' confident						
24	How well does your job fit with your initial expectations of it?					.89
6	Would you recommend working at your organization to a friend?					.61
% Variance		40.32	9.67	7.15	6.77	4.11
Measure of sampling adequacy (KMO)		.90				
Barlett's Test of Sphericity		2610.50*				
% Total Variance		68.02				
Alpha Cronbach		.83	.87	.88	.85	.53
Alpha Cronbach value for 20 items is .87						

In order to have a good content validity and reliability, the content of adjusted scale were referred to the expert in the relevant fields of the research (Gay et al., 2006).

Meanwhile organizational commitment scale which was measured through Porter, Steers, Mowday, and Boulian's (1974) through 15-item scale was utilized.

Participants

The data for this study were collected from 300 trained teachers in randomly selected from 50 Secondary Schools across the three States of Northern Peninsular Malaysia, namely Penang, Kedah and Perlis. The pre-requisite for teacher participation as respondents in this study was that the teachers must have worked for at least 5 years. The sample consists of 58 percent female respondents, 42 percent male respondents, while an overall of 89 percent respondents with working experience of more than eight years.

Data Analysis

There are four main objectives of the analysis. The first objective was done by conducting separate exploratory factor analysis and examining the results. The convergent validity was then evaluated by examining whether, (a) the hypothesized 5 factor adequately accounted for the data and (b) each item had a statistically significant loading of substantial size on the hypothesized factor. The reliability of each workplace happiness dimensions was evaluated by calculating the internal consistency by reliability Alpha Cronbach for each dimension. The second objective of the analysis was done by analyzing the reliabilities and intercorrelations among the five dimensions. The third objective was done by analyzing internal consistency estimates of reliability of the scales. Finally the last objective was to empirically examining whether the subscale scores correlated with other variables in their nomological net in the manner expected.

Research Findings

Assessment of Validity and Reliability

Convergent Validity

After several attempts of factor analysis, 5 items were dropped due to unfitness and finally the findings from exploratory factor analysis found that the presence of 5 factors and describes approximate of 68.02 percent of overall variance for the research samples. In addition to this, the chi-square states values of Bartlett Sphericity Test was 2610.50, with value of Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin test was .90, and the Eigen value was found to exceed value of 1. All these are indicators that hypothesized 5-factor model accounted for the co-variation among 20-items very well in an absolute sense. In addition, five items were deleted due to unfitness.

Reliability

The reliability indices for the reduced 20-item scale are shown in Table 2. The Cronbach Alpha alphas are ranging from .83 to a high of .93, which is above level of .70 as recommended by Nunnally (1988). Thus taken together, these results suggest that the reduced 20-item scale is reliable and estimate exceeded Nunnally's recommended level.

Table 2. Score mean, standard deviation, cronbach alpha and intercorrelation between subscales

	Mean	Standard Deviation	Cronbach Alpha	SG	IS	KPG	PG	KYG
SG	3.73	.35	0.85	-				
IS	4.24	.33	0.83	.37*	-			
KPG	3.93	.29	0.81	.31*	.31*	-		
PG	3.57	.54	0.87	.31*	.34*	.29*	-	
KYG	3.59	.46	0.89	.20*	.21*	.01	-	-

* Significant at the level of $p < .05$.

Note:

SG-Teachers' contribution, IS-School climate, KPG-Teachers' belief, PG-Teachers' involvement, KYG-Teachers' confidence

Discriminant Validity

Although the five workplace happiness factors are conceptually distinct but for some good reasons some of workplace happiness dimensions to be correlated with each other. The results indicated that every one of the construct/factors intercorrelations shown in Table 3 was significantly less than .37 and the average construct intercorrelation was only ranging .01 to .37. The results showed that in every single instance, the square of the interconstruct correlations was always less than the average variance in the items explained by the construct.

This is strong evidence of discriminant validity of the workplace happiness dimensions as measured by the reduced versions of the scale.

Assessment of Nomological Validity

To test the nomological validity, teachers' commitment which theoretically should be related to workplace happiness variables were empirically examined. The results of these analyses are summarized in Table 3, there is evidence of the nomological validity of each scale (the correlation r values are ranging from .17 to .58 and significant at $p < .05$).

Discussion and Implications

The results of the exploratory factor analyses of the scale provide adequate evidence of the convergent and discriminant validity of the Malaysian school setting work place happiness scale. All the item loaded on their hypothesized factors, accounted for substantial proportion of the variance in their indicators. Taken together, these findings demonstrate that the scale possess an adequate level of convergent and discriminant validity. The scale were also found to be relatively reliable.

From the view of the research implication, it was found that eventhough the variable of workplace happiness has to explore from the school context. Similarly, the research instruments used for school based happiness, were the translated and adapted version from Pryce-Jones (2010) were originally devised for profit based organization.

Table 3. Summary of nomological validity assessments (Correlation between workplace happiness and organizational commitment)

Variable	Commitments
SG	.58*
IS	.56*
KPG	.51*
PG	.27*
KYG	.24*

* Significant at the level of $p < .05$.
 Note:
 SG-Teachers' contribution, IS-School climate, KPG-Teachers' belief, PG-Teachers' involvement, KYG-Teachers' confidence

Thus, it is crucially important and appropriate in timing for researching teams in Malaysia to merge the expertise and effort to build a more reliable and suitable instruments that is comprehensive and reflects the local culture.

Finally, an empirical examination of nomological validity of the adapted version of Pryce-Jones (2010) of the scale showed that appear to measure what it claim to be measuring. Hence conclusively, the overall pattern of the results indicates that the workplace happiness scale version was reasonably reliable and valid from the setting of the Malaysian schools.

Bibliography

Achor, S. (2010). *The happiness advantage: The seven principles that fuel success and performance at work*. New York: Virgin Books.

Argyle, M. (1987). *The experience of happiness*. London: Methuen.

Boonchong, C. (2007). Happy Workplace. *Journal of Society and development*, 9(2), 61-93.

Cynthia, D. F. (2002). Antecedents and consequences of real-time affective reactions at work. *Motive Emotion*, 26, 3-30.

Diener, E., Suh, E. M., Lucas, R. E., & Smith, H. L. (1999). Subjective well-being: Three decades of progress. *Psychological Bulletin*, 125, 276-302.

Dutton, V. M., Edmunds, L. D. (2007). A model of workplace happiness. *Selection & Development Review*, 23 (1).

Eid, M., & Larsen, S. J. (2008). *The science of subjective wellbeing*. New York: Guilford Publications.

Erica, L. C. (2009). *Happiness at work: Using positive psychology interventions to increase worker well-being*. Unpublished thesis. Saint Mary's University.

Gay, L. R., Geoffrey, E. M., & Airasian, P. (2006). *Educational Research: Competencies for analysis and applications*. New Jersey: Merrill Prentice Hall, 8, 562-565.

Hird, S. (2003). What is wellbeing? A brief review of the current literature and concepts. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 61(2), 121-140.

Joanne, H., Gavin, & Richard, O. M. (2004). The virtuous organization: The value of Happiness in the workplace. *Organizational Dynamics*, 33(4), 379-392.

Keys, C. (1988). Social wellbeing. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 61, 121-140.

Keys, C., & Magyar-Moe, J. (2003). *Flourishing: Positive psychology and the life well-lived*. Washington D.C: American Psychological Association.

Peterson, C. (2006). *A Primer in Psychology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Po-Keung, I. P. (2008). Developing a concept of workplace well-being for greater China. *Social Indicators Research*, 91(1), 59-77.

Porter, L. W., Steers, R. M., Mowday, R. T., & Boulian, P. V. (1974). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59, 603-609.

Pryce-Jones, J. (2010). *Happiness at work: Maximizing your psychological capital success*. United Kingdom, Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Ryan, R. M., Huta, V., & Deci, E. L. (2008). Living well: a self-determination theory perspective on eudaimonia. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 9, 139-170.

Ryff, C. D. (1989). Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning of psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57, 1069-1081.

Ryff, C. D., & Keys, C. (1995). The structure of psychological well-being revisited. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69, 719-727.

Seligman, M. E. P. (2002). *Authentic happiness: Using the new positive psychology to realize your potential for lasting fulfillment*. New York: Free Press.

Seligman, M. E. P., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). Positive psychology: An introduction. *American Psychologist*, 53(1), 5-14.

Tomer, J. T. (2011). Enduring happiness: Integrating the hedonic and eudaimonic approaches. *The Journal of Socio-Economics*, 40, 530-537.

Acknowledgement

This research is sponsored by RUI Grant (1001/PGURU/816278) of Universiti Sains Malaysia, Penang, Malaysia.