



Araştırma Makalesi • Research Article

Comparison of Happiness at Work Levels of Health, Education and Security Sector Employees: The Effect of Perceived Organizational Support

Sağlık, Eğitim ve Güvenlik Sektörü Çalışanlarının İşte Mutluluk Düzeylerinin Karşılaştırılması: Algılanan Örgütsel Desteğin Etkisi

Ahmet Yıldız*

Abstract: This study aims to compare the happiness at work levels of employees in three different sectors: health, education and security, to determine the effect of perceived organizational support on happiness in all three sectors, and to investigate whether the happiness level of employees differs according to professional and demographic variables. The research was designed as a cross-sectional study. The Shortened Happiness at Work Scale and Perceived Organizational Support Scale were used as data collection tools. Ethical approval was obtained from the Batman University Ethics Committee (date: 04.01.2023; decision no: 2023/01-38). A total of 1114 employees participated in the study. In the study, the level of happiness at work was found to be significantly lower in the health sector than in the education and security sector. It was observed that perceived organizational support was a significant predictor of happiness in the workplace. In the study, it was also determined that employees with higher income, those working in the public sector and employees with less work experience had higher happiness levels. These results are important to understand the effects of sectoral differences and could contribute to the development of appropriate strategies in this context.

Keywords: Happiness at Work, Organizational Support, Health Employees, Education Employees, Security Employees

Öz: Bu çalışmanın amacı, üç farklı sektördeki çalışanların iş yerindeki mutluluk düzeylerini karşılaştırmak, algılanan kurumsal desteğin bu mutluluk üzerindeki etkisini belirlemek ve çalışanların mutluluk düzeyinin mesleki ve demografik değişkenlere göre farklılık gösterip göstermediğini araştırmaktır. Bu çalışmada kesitsel bir tasarım kullanılmıştır. Veri toplama araçları olarak Kısaltılmış İşte Mutluluk Ölçeği ve Algılanan Örgütsel Destek Ölçeği kullanılmıştır. Batman Üniversitesi Etik Kurulu'ndan etik onayı alındı (tarih: 04.01.2023; karar no: 2023/01-38). Çalışmaya sağlık sektöründen 507 (%45,5), eğitim sektöründen 384 (%35,5) ve güvenlik sektöründen 223 (%20) olmak üzere toplam 1114 çalışan katılım göstermiştir. Araştırmada t test, one way ANOVA, pearson korelasyon ve çoklu hiyerarşik regresyon analizleri yapılmıştır. Çalışmada işte mutluluk düzeyinin, sağlık sektöründe eğitim ve güvenlik sektörlerine göre anlamlı derecede düşük olduğu bulunmuştur. Algılanan kurumsal desteğin işyerinde mutluluğun anlamlı bir yordayıcısı olduğu belirlenmiştir. Ayrıca, daha yüksek gelire sahip olan, kamu sektöründe çalışan ve daha az iş deneyimine sahip olan çalışanların daha yüksek mutluluk düzeyine sahip olduğu

* Doç. Dr., Batman Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Fakültesi, Sağlık Yönetimi Bölümü

ORCID: 0000-0001-8744-0225 ahmet.yildiz@batman.edu.tr

Cite as/ Atıf: Yıldız, A. (2024). Comparison of happiness at work levels of health, education and security sector employees: the effect of perceived organizational support. *Anemon Muş Alparslan Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 12(2), 433-452 <http://dx.doi.org/10.18506/anemon.1416532>

Received/Geliş: 08 January/Ocak 2024

Accepted/Kabul: 25 July/Temmuz 2024

Published/Yayın: 30 August/Ağustos 2024

Bu makale CC BY-NC lisansı altında açık erişimli bir makedir.

e-ISSN: 2149-4622. © 2013-2024 Muş Alparslan Üniversitesi. TÜBİTAK ULAKBİM DergiPark ev sahipliğinde.

belirlenmiştir. Bu sonuçlar, sektörel farklılıkların etkilerini anlamak açısından önemli olup, bu bağlamda uygun stratejilerin geliştirilmesine katkıda bulunabilir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: İşte Mutluluk, Algılanan Örgütsel Destek, Sağlık Çalışanları, Eğitim Çalışanları, Güvenlik Çalışanları

Introduction

One of the primary issues of employees who spend a significant part of their lives at work is to be happy at work (Fitriana et al., 2022; Hungerbuehler et al., 2021). Considering that most people spend a significant amount of time working, the role of the workplace is extremely important (Bataineh, 2019). Happiness has many benefits and therefore, happiness at work has been the focus of attention of researchers (Salas-Vallina & Alegre, 2021). Evidence has shown that happiness at work is associated with employee health (Benevene et al., 2019), employee performance (Jalali & Heidari, 2016), job satisfaction (De Guzman et al., 2014) and customer satisfaction (Wolter et al., 2019). It has been stated that happy employees are twice as productive, six times more energetic, take less sick leave, and are willing to work longer in the organization compared to unhappy employees (Pryce-Jones & Lindsay, 2014). Happy employees can effectively complete their tasks and generate innovative ideas for their organizations (El-Sharkawy et al., 2023). Investing in happiness in organizations has positive results at both the individual and corporate levels. On an individual level, employees' energy levels increase and positive effects such as happiness, self-confidence, occupational performance and health are seen. Productivity increases at the corporate level and employee turnover rate and general organizational costs decrease (Feitor et al., 2023). Happy employees appear social, and friendly and can contribute more to contextual performance. With happy employees, business results are expected to grow positively, and it is also believed that happy employees will take fewer actions that jeopardize the success of the organization (Singh et al., 2023). In contradistinction, unhappiness may engender an absence of favourable repercussions in workplace conduct and organizational ramifications, exemplified by diminished productivity and substandard work quality. Furthermore, unhappiness has the potential to precipitate individual ramifications, notably mental illnesses or disorders, representing consequences that imperil mental health. This discontentment can further manifest in behavioural patterns such as voluntary job termination (Sender et al., 2021). Therefore, it can be said that maintaining happiness in the workplace is necessary to maintain success in the organization.

Perceived organizational support is considered as one of the factors that provide happiness at work (Novliadi & Anggraini, 2020; Singh et al., 2023). Perceived organizational support, which is defined as employee perceptions of how much an organization values employees' contributions and cares about their well-being, leads to positive attitudes and behaviors such as affective commitment, job satisfaction and engagement (Hamid et al., 2024). Perceived organizational support is strongly tied to employees' attributions of the organization's intentions behind their positive or negative treatment of the organization. Perceived organizational support initiates a process of social change in which employees feel an obligation to help the organization achieve its goals and expect greater rewards for their efforts. Furthermore, perceived organizational support satisfies socio-emotional needs, resulting in greater identification with and commitment to the organization, willingness to help the organization succeed, and higher psychological well-being (Kurtessis et al., 2017). Perceived organizational support leads employees to perform the tasks specified in their job descriptions (in-role performance) and to go beyond standard performance and engage in activities that contribute to the welfare of the organization (extra-role behavior). Perceived organizational support also reduces behaviors that harm the organization (Eisenberger et al., 2020). Organizations that can create a positive work environment will produce employees who are motivated and enjoy their work, which in turn can affect employee happiness levels (Kosasih & Basit, 2019).

Conceptual Framework

The concepts of perceived organizational support and the concept of happiness at work, which were the main variables of the research, were explained below.

Happiness at Work

Happiness is generally defined by how individuals experience and evaluate their lives (Bataneh, 2019). Often synonymous with subjective well-being, happiness is characterized by elevated levels of life satisfaction and a combination of heightened positive emotions alongside reduced negative emotions (Singh & Aggarwal, 2018). The conceptualization of happiness typically follows two fundamental perspectives: hedonic and eudaimonic. The hedonic perspective revolves around pleasant feelings and emotional equilibrium. In contrast, the eudaimonic perspective views happiness as engaging in activities aligned with one's inner goals for a fulfilling life, irrespective of emotional state (Salas-Vallina & Alegre, 2021).

Happiness at work is a broad concept that measures the work itself, work characteristics, and sense of belonging to the organization (Salas-Vallina et al., 2020). Happiness at work can be defined as a positive psychological state (Sender et al., 2021). Happiness at work arises from positive experiences at work and can be expressed as subjective good feelings about work experiences (Sudibjo & Manihuruk, 2022).

According to Fisher (2010), happiness at work has three dimensions. These are job satisfaction, affective organizational commitment and engagement.

Job satisfaction is a form of positive or pleasant mood that develops through the assessment of an individual's work experience (Zhu, 2012). It emerges as individuals reference their beliefs, values, and goals concerning their job, guiding their behavioural inclinations. This concept encompasses the evaluation of various work-related factors, such as salary and associated entitlements, relationships with colleagues, management and leadership styles, working conditions, the nature of the work, opportunities for career development, job security, and personal growth (Satuf et al., 2018).

Affective organizational commitment can be defined as the belief in the goals set by the organization and working as a part of the organization to achieve these goals. This concept includes the following three characteristics: a firm belief and acceptance of the goals and values of the organization; a willingness to make significant efforts on behalf of the organization; and the desire to want to remain part of the organization (Bataneh, 2019). Commitment to the goals and values of the organization based on personal identity formation and emotional attachment to the organization is recognized as part of happiness in the workplace and is highly correlated with other positive attitudes in the workplace (Fisher, 2010).

Work engagement is characterized as a positive and fulfilling mental state associated with one's work, encompassing dimensions of vigour, dedication, and absorption. Vigour involves a high level of energy, mental flexibility, and the willingness to exert effort in one's tasks. Dedication is characterized by a profound sense of care for one's work, coupled with enthusiasm, inspiration, pride, and a willingness to take on challenges. The final dimension, absorption, entails a complete focus on and joyful dedication to one's work (Schaufeli et al., 2002). Engaged employees typically exhibit positive emotions like happiness and enthusiasm, contributing to enhanced well-being in the workplace and the dissemination of positive energy to colleagues. It is anticipated that individuals demonstrating higher levels of work engagement are likely to exhibit superior performance as well (Cesário & Chambel, 2017).

Perceived Organizational Support

Perceived organizational support refers to employees' belief that the organization is genuinely concerned about their well-being and values their contributions (Sudibjo & Manihuruk, 2022). This perception is shaped by employees' encounters with the organization's policies and procedures, the provision of resources, interactions with organizational representatives (e.g., managers), and their overall sense of the organization's commitment to employee well-being (Novliadi & Anggraini, 2020). Employees, who are the most important resource of the organization, always seek the support of their organizations for their social and emotional needs (Ahmed & Nawaz, 2015). Employees develop positive beliefs towards the organization in response to supportive policies (Akgunduz et al., 2023). The

results of previous studies have shown that perceived organizational support could be associated with happiness in the workplace (Novliadi & Anggraini, 2020), engagement (Meyers et al., 2019; Yongxing et al., 2017) and job satisfaction (Sudibjo & Manihuruk, 2022).

Employers often value employee commitment and loyalty. Employees who show emotional commitment to the organization provide advantages such as increased performance, decreased absenteeism, and decreased likelihood of quitting their jobs. In turn, employees are often concerned with the organization's commitment to them. Being valued by the organization can bring advantages such as approval and respect, wages and promotion, access to information and other types of assistance needed to do their job better (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Employees with a strong perception of organizational support exhibit behaviours that benefit the organization (Akgunduz et al., 2023).

Present Study

This study has three objectives. The first was to measure and compare the level of happiness of employees in the health, education and security sectors at work. Within the scope of this purpose, the level of job satisfaction, affective organizational commitment and engagement of the employees, which are the sub-dimensions of happiness in the workplace, were also compared. The second objective of the study was to investigate the effect of perceived organizational support levels of employees in three different sectors (health, education and security) on happiness at work. The third objective of the study was to investigate whether the happiness levels of employees at work differ according to occupational and demographic variables (age, gender, education, seniority (experience), sector (public-private), and income). In this context, answers to the following questions were sought in the research.

1- Is there a significant difference between the happiness levels of health, education and security sector employees at work?

To increase and maintain the happiness level of the employees, it is necessary to measure and evaluate the happiness level of the employees. This study measured and compared the happiness levels of health, education and security sector employees. Happy and satisfied employees in these sectors can have a positive impact on the general health, education and safety of society. Therefore, it can be said that evaluating and improving the happiness levels of employees in these sectors is of great importance for the welfare and progress of society. There are different studies assessing the level of happiness of employees in the workplace in the health sector (Feitor et al., 2023; Özer et al., 2023), education sector (Benevene et al., 2019; Jalali & Heidari, 2016) and security sector (Chung et al., 2022). However, no study has been found in which the happiness levels of health, education and security sector employees are discussed and compared. It is thought that this study will contribute to fill this gap in the literature.

2- Does perceived organizational support affect happiness at work?

One of the most well-known concepts in workplace behavior is the “social exchange theory”, which states that interactions between two parties should involve interdependence. Consistent with social exchange theory, social exchange begins with perceived organizational support, where employees feel an obligation to help the organization achieve its goals and expect that their efforts to advance the organization's interests will be reciprocated with greater rewards, creating a norm of reciprocity (Özdemir, 2022). Social exchange theory involves the exchange of social and psychological resources, tangible or intangible, between individuals or groups (Göktaş Kulualp & Sarı, 2019). According to the reciprocity norms of social exchange theory, when employees perceive that the organization provides them with support and cares about their well-being, this may increase their liking for the organization and increase their workplace happiness (Hamid et al., 2024). Another theory associated with perceived organizational support is the “organizational support theory” (Eisenberger et al., 2020). The theory of perceived organizational support addresses the relationship between organization and employee from the perspective of employees. According to organizational support theory, employees develop a general perception of the extent to which the organization values their contributions and cares about their well-being. A positive perception is associated with affective organizational commitment, job satisfaction and job performance (Kurtessis et al., 2017). There is evidence that perceived organizational support by employees increases happiness at work (Novliadi & Anggraini, 2020; Singh et al., 2023). However,

it can be said that the studies on this subject are limited. In addition, among the existing studies, no research examines the research subject by considering the employees of the health, education and security sectors together. It is believed that the findings of this study will serve to address and bridge the existing gap in the literature. In addition, the results of the study could contribute to the establishment of better management strategies and policies to develop improvements and support programs in related sectors.

3- Do the levels of happiness at work of health, education and security sector employees differ according to their occupational and demographic characteristics?

Employees' levels of happiness at work may differ according to occupational and demographic variables. When the studies on this subject are examined, different results are found. For example, in a study conducted by Khosrojerdi et al. (2018) on nurses, a significant relationship was found between age and happiness level. In a study conducted by Uzun et al. (2020) on teachers, it was determined that the happiness level of employees did not differ significantly according to age. Accordingly, it can be said that more studies are needed on this subject. In addition, in this study, employees from three different sectors (health, education and security sector employees) were evaluated together. In this context, it is thought that the research findings will make a significant contribution to the literature.

Methods

Procedure

This study is a cross-sectional study. The study was carried out online between 5 May 2023 and 5 June 2023. The research questions were delivered to the target participants through different social media platforms (WhatsApp, Instagram, Facebook) through questionnaires prepared using Google Forms. Employees working in the relevant sectors were reached through social media and a survey link was sent to the participants. Employees who could be reached were asked to send the same link to their friends and acquaintances. The participants were recruited using the snowball method. Ethical approval was obtained from the Batman University Ethics Committee (date: 04.01.2023; decision no: 2023/01-38).

Participants

The study was conducted on health, education and security sector employees working in a province in the Southeastern Anatolia Region of Turkey. The reason for conducting this study in only one province of Turkey is the significant regional variations in working conditions, salaries, and urban living standards across different regions. Health, education and security sector employees play a critical role in the functioning and security of society. While the health sector responds to the health needs of individuals, the education sector educates future generations and the security sector ensures the general safety of the society. Therefore, evaluating the happiness levels of employees in these sectors is important both to increase the well-being of employees and to make the functioning of these critical sectors more effective. A total of 1114 employees, 507 (45.5%) from the health sector, 384 (34.5%) from the education sector and 223 (20%) from the security sector, voluntarily participated in this study.

Data Collection Tools

Shortened Happiness at Work Scale (SHAW): The SHAW scale, developed by Salas-Vallina and Alegre (2021) and validated in Turkish by Bilginoğlu (2020), comprises 3 dimensions and 9 items: job satisfaction (3 items), affective organizational commitment (3 items), and engagement (3 items). Alternatively, SHAW can be employed as a single-dimensional measure. Utilizing a 7-point Likert-type scale, higher scores on the SHAW indicate greater workplace happiness. In the present study, the overall Cronbach's alpha for the scale was 0.91, with dimensions yielding values of 0.91 for job satisfaction, 0.90 for affective organizational commitment, and 0.84 for engagement. Exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses were conducted to evaluate the structural validity of the scale. The analyses revealed that the scale consisted of three factors (job satisfaction, affective organizational commitment, and

engagement) with eigenvalues greater than 1 and factor loadings between 0.77-0.86. The 3 factors together explain 81.7% of the total variance. As a result of confirmatory factor analysis, $\chi^2/df=2.509$; GFI=0.983; AGFI=0.970; RMSA=0.037; CFI=0.970 were found. Accordingly, it can be said that SHAW has good fit indices (Meydan & Şeşen, 2009).

Perceived Organizational Support Scale (POSS): Originally developed by Eisenberger et al. (1986) and later shortened to 10 items by Armstrong-Stassen & Ursel (2009), the Turkish validation and reliability study for the abbreviated version was conducted by Türe Yılmaz & Yıldırım (2018). Two items in the scale were reverse-coded. Employing a 5-point Likert-type scale, the POSS encompasses a single dimension, with higher scores indicating increased perceived organizational support. In this study, Cronbach's alpha for the scale was calculated as 0.90, reflecting a high level of internal consistency. According to the results of the exploratory factor analysis, it was determined that the POSS scale consisted of a single dimension with an eigenvalue greater than 1 and the factor loadings of the scale items were between 0.63-0.81. A single factor explains 55.1% of the total variance. In addition, $\chi^2/df=1.662$; RMSA=0.023; CFI=0.999; GFI=0.997; AGFI=0.991 were found in confirmatory factor analysis. Accordingly, it can be said that POSS has good fit indices and its one-factor structure is confirmed (Meydan & Şeşen, 2009).

Data Analysis

The study data were analyzed using the SPSS-21 software. The occupational and demographic characteristics of the participants and their responses to the scale questions were examined with mean, standard deviation, frequency and percentage values. To test whether the participants' happiness at work, job satisfaction, affective organizational commitment, engagement and perceived organizational support scores differ according to occupational and demographic variables, the significance test of the difference between the two averages and one-way ANOVA tests were performed. Tukey test was performed as a Post Hoc test. In the study, perceived happiness at work, job satisfaction, affective organizational commitment and engagement were considered as dependent variables, while perceived organizational support was considered as an independent variable. Pearson correlation analysis was performed to test the relationship between the independent variable and the dependent variables, and hierarchical multiple regression analysis was performed to test the effect of dependent variables on dependent variables. The suitability of the variables to the normal distribution was evaluated by looking at the kurtosis and skewness values, and it was determined that these values were between -0.75 and 0.80 and the normality assumption was met.

Results

Approximately half of the participants (45.5%) were healthcare professionals. The mean age of the participants was 31.4 years and more than half (55.3%) were male. Considering the educational status, it was seen that associate and undergraduate graduates (69%) were predominant. A significant part of the participants (72.69%) work in public institutions. Slightly more than half of the participants (51.4%) receive salaries between 15.000-25.000 Turkish Lira (TL). The mean duration of work experience was 7.44 years (Table 1).

Table 1. Occupational and Demographic Characteristics of the Participants (N=1114)

		n	%
Occupation	Health employee	507	45,5
	Education employee	384	34,5
	Security employee	223	20,0
Age (Mean±SD - 31,4±7,90)	≤30	628	56,4
	>30	486	43,6
Gender	Female	498	44,7
	Male	616	55,3
Education	High school	108	9,7
	Associate degree-Undergraduate	769	69,0
	Postgraduate	237	21,3
Sector	Public	809	72,6
	Private	305	27,4
Work experience (Mean±SD - 7,44±6,73)	≤5	584	52,4
	>5	530	47,6
Income (Turkish Lira)*	≤15000	336	30,2
	15000 - 25000	573	51,4
	>25000	205	18,4

* It reflects the income status at the time of conducting the study. Salaries differ in the current period depending on inflation and salary increases.

In the study, the happiness level of healthcare professionals at work (4.17 ± 1.17) was lower than the happiness level of the employees in the education (4.80 ± 1.17) and security (4.72 ± 0.98) sectors ($p < 0.01$). Similarly, it was observed that healthcare professionals had lower scores in all sub-dimensions of happiness at work ($p < 0.001$). The job satisfaction level of the healthcare professionals was 4.34 ± 1.57 , the affective organizational commitment level was 4.56 ± 1.37 , and the level of engagement was 4.72 ± 1.23 . These averages were as follows respectively: 5.12 ± 1.58 , 4.56 ± 1.37 , and 4.72 ± 1.23 in the education sector employees, they were 4.61 ± 1.21 , 4.60 ± 1.13 , and 4.72 ± 0.98 in the security sector employees. The perceived organizational support level of healthcare professionals (2.87 ± 0.92) was lower than the perceived organizational support level of education (3.20 ± 0.90) and security (3.12 ± 0.91) sector employees ($p < 0.01$; Table 2).

Table 2. Comparison of Happiness at Work, Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment, Engagement and Perceived Organizational Support Scores of Participants by Occupation

	A. Health Sector Employees (n=507)	B. Education Sector Employees (n=384)	C. Security Sector Employees (n=223)	All Employees (N=1114)	F ^b /p	Sig. Diff. ^c
	Mean±SD ^a	Mean±SD ^a	Mean±SD ^a	Mean±SD ^a		
Happiness at Work	4,17±1,17	4,80±1,17	4,72±0,98	4,50±1,17	F=37,85; p<0,01	A-B, A-C
Job Satisfaction	4,34±1,57	5,12±1,58	4,96±1,41	4,73±1,59	F=30,06; p<0,01	A-B, A-C
Affective Organizational Commitment	4,01±1,35	4,56±1,37	4,61±1,21	4,31±1,36	F=25,22; p<0,01	A-B, A-C
Engagement	4,17±1,23	4,72±1,23	4,60±1,13	4,45±1,24	F=25,13; p<0,01	A-B, A-C
Perceived Organizational Support	2,87±0,92	3,20±0,90	3,12±0,91	3,03±0,92	F=14,91; p<0,01	A-B, A-C

^a Standard Deviation, ^b F: One Way ANOVA, ^c Significant Difference

The findings indicating that whether employees' happiness at work, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, engagement and perceived organizational scores differ according to occupational and demographic variables are presented in Table 3. When all the employees in the study were considered together, the perceived organizational support level scores of the participants aged 30 and under, public sector employees, associate degree-undergraduate graduates, those with 5 years or less of work experience and those with high income were found to be high with happiness at work, job satisfaction, affective organizational commitment and engagement ($p < 0.05$). When examined by gender, the level of happiness at work, job satisfaction and engagement of women were found to be higher than that of men ($p < 0.05$). Considering the sectors, while there was a significant difference ($p < 0.05$) in all variables (happiness at work, job satisfaction, affective organizational commitment, engagement and perceived organizational support) according to age in the education sector, no significant difference was found in the health and security sectors ($p > 0.05$). While there was a significant difference in all variables according to income in the health and education sectors ($p < 0.05$), there was no significant difference in security sector employees ($p > 0.05$). Those who worked in all three sectors (health, education and security) for 5 years or less had higher scores of happiness at work, job satisfaction, affective organizational commitment, engagement and perceived organizational support than those who worked in the public sector for 5 years or more ($p < 0.05$).

Table 3. Comparison of Happiness at Work, Job Satisfaction, Affective Organizational Commitment, Engagement and Perceived Organizational Support Scores of Participants According to Occupational and Demographic Variables

		Happiness at Work		Job Satisfaction		Affective Organizational Commitment		Engagement		Perceived Organizational Support		
Age (Year)	n	Mean±SD ^a	F ^b /t ^c ; p; Sig. Diff. ^d	Mean±SD ^a	F ^b /t ^c ; p; Sig. Diff. ^d	Mean±SD ^a	F ^b /t ^c ; p; Sig. Diff. ^d	Mean±SD ^a	F ^b /t ^c ; p; Sig. Diff. ^d	Mean±SD ^a	F ^b /t ^c ; p; Sig. Diff. ^d	
Health Sector Employees	≤30	306	4,23±1,21	t=1,39	4,39±1,53	t=0,86	4,07±1,35	t=1,17	4,24±1,28	t=1,60	2,93±0,92	t=1,53
	>30	201	4,08±1,11	p=0,16	4,27±1,50	p=0,39	3,92±1,36	p=0,24	4,06±1,13	p=0,11	2,80±0,93	p=0,13
Education Sector Employees	≤30	177	5,07±1,12	t=4,33	5,41±1,46	t=3,35	4,80±1,29	t=3,27	5,01±1,17	t=4,34	3,32±0,91	t=2,56
	>30	207	4,57±1,17	p<0,01	4,87±1,65	p=0,01*	4,35±1,40	p=0,01*	4,48±1,23	p<0,01	3,09±0,88	p=0,01*
Security Sector Employees	≤30	145	4,79±0,87	t=1,35	5,09±1,29	t=1,82	4,61±1,13	t=0,16	4,66±1,05	t=1,18	3,14±0,85	t=0,35
	>30	78	4,60±1,17	p=0,18	4,73±1,58	p=0,07	4,60±1,34	p=0,95	4,48±1,27	p=0,24	3,09±1,01	p=0,72
All Employees	≤30	628	4,60±1,17	t=3,18	4,84±1,57	t=2,49	4,40±1,32	t=2,28	4,56±1,24	t=3,36	3,09±0,91	t=2,12
	>30	486	4,37±1,17	p<0,01	4,60±1,60	p=0,01*	4,21±1,40	p=0,02*	4,31±1,21	p=0,01*	2,97±0,93	p=0,03*
Gender												
Health Sector Employees	Female	202	4,33±1,11	t=2,46	4,56±1,50	t=2,56	4,14±1,32	t=1,78	4,29±1,19	t=1,79	2,96±0,91	t=1,63
	Male	305	4,07±1,20	p=0,01*	4,19±1,61	p=0,01*	3,92±1,37	p=0,07	4,09±1,25	p=0,07	2,82±0,93	p=0,10
Education Sector Employees	Female	191	4,90±1,16	t=1,73	5,32±1,54	t=2,48	4,53±1,38	t=-0,46	4,87±1,24	t=2,29	3,22±0,95	t=0,41
	Male	193	4,70±1,18	p=0,08	4,92±1,60	p=0,01*	4,59±1,36	p=0,65	4,58±1,20	p=0,02*	3,18±0,85	p=0,68
Security Sector Employees	Female	105	4,78±1,03	t=0,80	5,05±1,40	t=0,94	4,70±1,24	t=1,09	4,58±1,26	t=-0,25	3,13±0,94	t=0,02
	Male	118	4,67±0,94	p=0,42	4,88±1,41	p=0,35	4,52±1,17	p=0,27	4,62±1,01	p=0,80	3,12±0,88	p=0,98
All Employees	Female	498	4,64±1,14	t=3,73	4,95±1,53	t=4,23	4,41±1,34	t=1,95	4,57±1,25	t=3,06	3,09±0,94	t=1,82
	Male	616	4,38±1,19	p<0,01	4,55±1,61	p<0,01	4,25±1,37	p=0,05	4,35±1,21	p<0,01	2,99±0,91	p=0,07
Education												
Health Sector Employees	A. High school	55	4,09±1,20	F=8,72	4,31±1,69	F=12,73	3,87±1,42	F=4,83	4,09±1,15	F=2,30	2,75±0,90	F=4,18
	B. Associate degree-Undergraduate	316	4,33±1,17	p<0,01	4,58±1,56	p<0,01	4,15±1,36	p<0,01	4,26±1,23	p=0,10	2,97±0,94	p=0,02*
	C. Postgraduate	136	3,84±1,11	AF: B-C	3,78±1,43	AF: B-C	3,74±1,28	AF: B-C	4,00±1,23		2,71±0,85	AF: B-C
Education Sector Employees	A. High school	-	-		-		-		-		-	
	B. Associate degree-Undergraduate	288	4,83±1,17	t=0,85	5,11±1,61	t=-0,10	4,62±1,36	t=1,51	4,76±1,21	t=0,90	3,18±0,91	t=-0,77
	C. Postgraduate	96	4,71±1,18	p=0,39	5,13±1,50	p=0,92	4,38±1,38	p=0,13	4,63±1,29	p=0,37	3,26±0,87	p=0,44
Security Sector Employees	A. High school	53	4,58±0,96	t=-1,12	4,66±1,33	t=-1,74	4,50±1,34	t=-0,63	4,58±1,08	t=-0,08	3,02±0,82	t=-0,94
	B. Associate degree-Undergraduate	165	4,75±0,99	p=0,26	5,04±1,42	p=0,08	4,62±1,16	p=0,53	4,85±1,38	p=0,92	3,15±0,92	p=0,35
	C. Postgraduate	5	-		-		-		-		-	
All Employees	A. High school	108	4,33±1,11	F=11,20	4,48±1,53	F=11,22	4,18±1,41	F=8,39	4,33±1,14	F=4,19	2,88±0,87	F=3,60
	B. Associate degree-Undergraduate	769	4,61±1,16	p<0,01	4,88±1,57	p<0,01	4,43±1,34	p<0,01	4,52±1,23	p=0,01*	3,08±0,93	p=0,03*
	C. Postgraduate	237	4,22±1,22	AF: B-C	4,37±1,61	AF: A-B, B-C	4,03±1,37	AF: B-C	4,27±1,29	AF: B-C	2,95±0,91	AF: A-B
Sector												

Health Employees	Public	349	4,34±1,15	t=4,83	4,56±1,55	t=4,69	4,17±1,36	t=4,13	4,29±1,21	t=3,20	3,00±0,93	t=4,50
	Private	158	3,81±1,14	p<0,01	3,86±1,53	p<0,01	3,64±1,28	p<0,01	3,91±1,24	p<0,01	2,61±0,84	p<0,01
Education Employees	Public	334	4,94±1,07	t=6,56	5,29±1,47	t=5,79	4,71±1,28	t=6,01	4,83±1,17	t=4,32	3,28±0,88	t=4,65
	Private	50	3,84±1,35	p<0,01	3,96±1,83	p<0,01	3,52±1,47	p<0,01	4,04±1,40	p<0,01	2,66±0,89	p<0,01
Security Employees	Public	126	5,02±0,88	t=5,40	5,31±1,27	t=4,42	4,87±1,17	t=3,86	4,86±1,05	t=4,12	3,30±0,89	t=3,40
	Private	97	4,34±0,99	p<0,01	4,50±1,45	p<0,01	4,26±1,18	p<0,01	4,25±1,15	p<0,01	2,89±0,88	p=0,01*
All Employees	Public	809	4,69±1,12	t=9,38	4,98±1,52	t=8,68	4,51±1,33	t=7,69	4,60±1,20	t=6,85	3,16±0,91	t=7,49
	Private	305	3,98±1,16	p<0,01	4,08±1,58	p<0,01	3,82±1,31	p<0,01	4,04±1,24	p<0,01	2,71±0,87	p<0,01
Work experience (Year)												
Health Sector Employees	≤5	268	4,34±1,19	t=3,48	4,56±1,60	t=3,030	4,15±1,32	t=2,56	4,32±1,31	t=2,89	3,02±0,90	t=3,75
	>5	239	3,98±1,12	p<0,01	4,10±1,51	p<0,01	3,85±1,37	p=0,01*	4,00±1,11	p<0,01	2,71±0,92	p<0,01
Education Sector Employees	≤5	232	5,08±1,05	t=4,49	5,49±1,37	t=4,31	4,83±1,25	t=3,63	4,94±1,16	t=3,15	3,36±0,87	t=3,27
	>5	152	4,56±1,21	p<0,01	4,80±1,68	p<0,01	4,33±1,42	p<0,01	4,54±1,26	p<0,01	3,06±0,91	p=0,01*
Security Sector Employees	≤5	139	4,94±0,82	t=4,40	5,20±1,25	t=3,31	4,78±1,07	t=2,85	4,83±1,02	t=4,16	3,24±0,89	t=2,49
	>5	84	4,36±1,12	p<0,01	4,57±1,57	p=0,01*	4,32±1,36	p<0,01*	4,21±1,21	p<0,01	2,93±0,91	p=0,01*
All Employees	≤5	584	4,71±1,12	t=6,37	4,99±1,51	t=5,78	4,51±1,29	t=4,95	4,63±1,23	t=5,20	3,17±0,90	t=5,30
	>5	530	4,27±1,19	p<0,01	4,45±1,62	p<0,01	4,11±1,41	p<0,01	4,25±1,21	p<0,01	2,88±0,93	p<0,01
Income (TL⁵)												
Health Sector Employees	A. ≤15000	180	3,88±1,08	F=19,49	3,98±1,55	F=13,07	3,73±1,21	F=16,09	3,94±1,09	F=12,25	2,77±0,83	F=2,16
	B. 15000 - 25000	218	4,13±1,21	p<0,01	4,33±1,59	p<0,01	3,94±1,36	p<0,01	4,13±1,30	p<0,01	2,96±0,94	p=0,12
	C. >25000	109	4,74±1,07	A-C, B-C	4,94±1,43	AF: A-C, B-C	4,62±1,39	A-C, B-C	4,65±1,16	A-C, B-C	2,89±1,02	
Education Sector Employees	A. ≤15000	118	4,33±1,12	F=23,90	4,57±1,59	F=13,82	4,05±1,22	F=15,52	4,37±1,13	F=25,52	3,01±0,75	F=4,620
	B. 15000 - 25000	224	4,89±1,13	p<0,01	5,27±1,53	p<0,01	4,70±1,38	p<0,01	4,70±1,19	p<0,01	3,25±0,92	p=0,01*
	C. >25000	42	5,66±0,92	AF: A-B, A-C, B-C	5,88±1,38	AF: A-B, A-C, B-C	5,23±1,23	AF: A-B, A-C, B-C	5,86±1,06	AF: A-B, A-C, B-C	3,46±1,11	AF: A-C
Security Sector Employees	A. ≤15000	38	4,57±1,08	F=0,77	4,86±1,57	F=0,25	4,35±1,35	F=1,88	4,49±1,22	F=0,76	3,14±0,96	F=0,02
	B. 15000 - 25000	131	4,72±0,98	P=,045	4,97±1,38	p=0,88	4,62±1,19	p=0,88	4,57±1,11	p=0,55	3,11±0,91	p=0,98
	C. >25000	54	4,83±0,93		5,01±1,37		4,75±1,15		4,74±		3,14±0,86	
All Employees	A. ≤15000	336	4,12±1,12	F=35,73	4,29±1,60	F=22,44	3,91±1,25	F=29,17	4,15±1,14	F=25,57	2,89±0,83	F=6,53
	B. 15000 - 25000	573	4,56±1,18	p<0,01	4,84±1,57	p<0,01	4,39±1,37	p<0,01	4,45±1,24	p<0,01	3,11±0,93	p<0,01
	C. >25000	205	4,95±1,07	AF: A-B, A-C, B-C	5,15±1,45	AF: A-B, A-C, B-C	4,78±1,32	AF: A-B, A-C, B-C	4,92±1,23	AF: A-B, A-C, B-C	3,07±1,02	AF: A-B, A-C

^a Standard Deviation, ^b F: One Way ANOVA, ^c t: independent sample t test, ^d Sig. Dif.: Significant Difference, ^e Turkish Lira

*p<0,05

In the study, a moderate, positive and statistically significant relationship was found between the perceived level of organizational support and the levels of happiness, job satisfaction, affective organizational commitment and engagement in health, education and security sector employees ($p < 0.01$). It was observed that the correlation coefficient in health sector employees was $r = 0.53$ between perceived organizational support and happiness at work; it was $r = 0.41$ between perceived organizational support and job satisfaction; it was $r = 0.38$ between perceived organizational support and affective organizational commitment; and it was $r = 0.53$ between perceived organizational support and engagement. It was determined that the correlation coefficients between perceived organizational support and happiness at work, job satisfaction, affective organizational commitment and engagement in the education sector employees were -0.56 ; 0.40 ; 0.40 and 0.55 , respectively. In security sector employees, these coefficients were 0.055 ; 0.38 ; 0.40 and 0.53 , respectively (Table 4).

The results of multiple hierarchical regression analysis conducted to determine the effect of perceived organizational support on happiness, job satisfaction, affective organizational commitment and engagement in the workplace were provided in Table 5. Age, gender, education, experience, sector (public-private) and income variables were added to step 1 as control variables. The perceived organizational support variable was added to step 2 as the main predictor.

In the study, it was observed that perceived organizational support in health, education, and security sectors was a significant predictor of happiness at work, job satisfaction, affective organizational commitment, and engagement ($p < 0.01$). Adding perceived organizational support to the model significantly increases the total variance in happiness at work, job satisfaction, affective organizational commitment, and engagement. In the presence of control variables, perceived organizational support in health sector employees accounted for 40% of the total variance of happiness at work ($R^2 = 0.40$; $\Delta R^2 = 0.19$; $p < 0.01$), 38% of the total variance of job satisfaction ($R^2 = 0.38$; $\Delta R^2 = 0.20$; $p < 0.01$), 27% of the total variance of affective organizational commitment ($R^2 = 0.27$; $\Delta R^2 = 0.11$; $p < 0.01$), and 22% of the total variance of engagement ($R^2 = 0.22$; $\Delta R^2 = 0.10$; $p < 0.01$). Perceived organizational support in the presence of control variables in education sector employees explained 43% of the total variance of happiness at work ($R^2 = 0.43$; $\Delta R^2 = 0.17$; $p < 0.01$), 40% of the total variance of job satisfaction ($R^2 = 0.40$; $\Delta R^2 = 0.20$; $p < 0.01$), 26% of the total variance of affective organizational commitment ($R^2 = 0.26$; $\Delta R^2 = 0.08$; $p < 0.01$), and 31% of the total variance of engagement ($R^2 = 0.31$; $\Delta R^2 = 0.08$; $p < 0.01$). Perceived organizational support in the presence of control variables in security sector employees explained 42% of the total variance of happiness at work ($R^2 = 0.42$; $\Delta R^2 = 0.16$; $p < 0.01$), 37% of the total variance of job satisfaction ($R^2 = 0.37$; $\Delta R^2 = 0.20$; $p < 0.01$), 20% of the total variance of affective organizational commitment ($R^2 = 0.20$; $\Delta R^2 = 0.03$; $p < 0.01$), and 26% of the total variance of engagement ($R^2 = 0.26$; $\Delta R^2 = 0.09$; $p < 0.01$). In the study, it was also determined that income, sector (public-private) and work experience variables were significant predictors of happiness at work in health, education and security sector employees ($p < 0.05$; Table 5).

Table 4. Correlation Coefficients with Kurtosis, Skewness and Cronbach Alpha Values Regarding Happiness at Work, Job Satisfaction, Affective Organizational Commitment, Engagement and Perceived Organizational Support Variables

Variables	Descriptive statistics			Correlation coefficients				
	Skewness	Kurtosis	α	1	2	3	4	5
Health Sector								
Employees								
1. Happiness at Work	-0,15	-0,49	0,91	1				
2. Job Satisfaction	-0,09	-0,75	0,90	0,87*	1			
3. Affective Organizational Commitment	0,03	-0,18	0,91	0,84*	0,59*	1		
4. Engagement	-0,09	-0,21	0,85	0,82*	0,57*	0,55*	1	
5. Perceived Organizational Support	-0,02	-0,56	0,90	0,53*	0,53*	0,41*	0,38*	1
Education Sector								
Employees								
1. Happiness at Work	-0,48	-0,51	0,91	1				
2. Job Satisfaction	-0,59	-0,54	0,90	0,86*	1			
3. Affective Organizational Commitment	-0,11	-0,40	0,92	0,83*	0,55*	1		
4. Engagement	-0,12	-0,45	0,81	0,82*	0,56*	0,56*	1	
5. Perceived Organizational Support	-0,08	-0,36	0,89	0,55*	0,56*	0,40*	0,40*	1
Security Sector								
Employees								
1. Happiness at Work	-0,59	0,80	0,86	1				
2. Job Satisfaction	-0,48	-0,13	0,89	0,79*	1			
3. Affective Organizational Commitment	-0,18	0,06	0,90	0,80*	0,35*	1		
4. Engagement	-0,32	0,57	0,80	0,81*	0,46*	0,50*	1	
5. Perceived Organizational Support	-0,08	-0,36	0,91	0,53*	0,55*	0,38*	0,40*	1

* $p < 0,01$

Table 5. Hierarchical Multiple Linear Regression Analysis Results to Determine the Effect of Perceived Organizational Support on Happiness at Work, Job Satisfaction, Affective Organizational Commitment and Engagement

	Happiness at Work				Job Satisfaction				Affective Organizational Commitment				Engagement			
	B	β	t	p	B	β	t	p	B	β	t	p	B	β	t	p
Health Sector Employees																
Step 1	$F(8-506)=17,01, p<0,01, R=0,46, R^2=0,21$				$F(8-506)=13,64, p<0,01, R=0,42, R^2=0,18$				$F(8-506)=12,14, p<0,01, R=0,40, R^2=0,16$				$F(8-506)=8,87, p<0,01, R=0,35, R^2=0,12$			
Age	0,02	0,15	2,08	0,04*	0,03	0,14	1,88	0,06	0,03	0,14	1,92	0,06	0,02	0,09	1,24	0,22
Gender (Male) ¹	-0,03	-0,01	-0,34	0,74	-0,08	-0,02	-0,55	0,58	0,01	0,00	0,10	0,92	-0,04	-0,02	-0,33	0,74
Education (Associate degree- Undergraduate) ²	0,19	0,08	1,14	0,25	0,17	0,05	0,76	0,45	0,25	0,09	1,30	0,20	0,14	0,05	0,76	0,45
Education (Postgraduate) ²	-0,01	0,00	-0,06	0,96	-0,29	-0,08	-1,21	0,23	0,13	0,04	0,63	0,53	0,13	0,05	0,67	0,51
Sector (Private) ³	-0,74	-0,29	-6,64	<0,01	-0,88	-0,26	-5,75	<0,01	-0,76	-0,26	-5,72	<0,01	-0,58	-0,22	-4,71	<0,01
Work Experience	-0,06	-0,35	-4,90	<0,01	-0,08	-0,32	-4,34	<0,01	-0,06	-0,30	-4,07	<0,01	-0,05	-0,27	-3,55	<0,01
Income (15k-25k) ⁴	0,17	0,07	1,58	0,11	0,20	0,06	1,33	0,19	0,15	0,06	1,17	0,24	0,17	0,07	1,39	0,17
Income (>25k) ⁴	0,93	0,33	6,76	<0,01	0,97	0,25	5,13	<0,01	1,01	0,31	6,18	<0,01	0,81	0,27	5,33	<0,01
Step 2	$F(9-506)=38,25, p<0,01, R=0,64, R^2=0,40, \Delta R^2=0,19$				$F(9-506)=33,92, p<0,01, R=0,62, R^2=0,38, \Delta R^2=0,20$				$F(9-506)=21,21, p<0,01, R=0,53, R^2=0,27, \Delta R^2=0,11$				$F(9-506)=16,08, p<0,01, R=0,47, R^2=0,22, \Delta R^2=0,10$			
Perceived Organizational Support	0,59	0,46	12,80	<0,01	0,80	0,47	12,69	<0,01	0,52	0,35	8,87	<0,01	0,44	0,33	8,04	<0,01
Education Sector Employees																
Step 1	$F(7-383)=18,96, p<0,01, R=0,51, R^2=0,26$				$F(7-383)=13,327 p<0,01, R=0,45, R^2=0,20$				$F(7-383)=11,87, p<0,01, R=0,42, R^2=0,18$				$F(7-383)=15,64, p<0,01, R=0,47, R^2=0,23$			
Age	-0,01	-0,10	-1,08	0,28	0,01	0,05	0,48	0,63	-0,02	-0,10	-1,02	0,31	-0,03	-0,23	-2,47	0,01*
Gender (Male) ¹	-0,05	-0,02	-0,50	0,62	-0,22	-0,07	-1,51	0,13	0,19	0,07	1,43	0,15	-0,12	-0,05	-1,06	0,29
Education (Postgraduate) ^{5a}	0,16	0,05	0,95	0,34	0,22	0,04	0,89	0,37	0,00	0,00	0,02	0,99	0,27	0,07	1,46	0,14
Sektör (Özel) ³	-0,87	-0,25	-5,39	<0,01	-1,04	-0,22	-4,60	<0,01	-1,03	-0,25	-5,19	<0,01	-0,53	-0,15	-3,07	<0,01
Sector (Private) ³	-0,02	-0,14	-1,56	0,02*	-0,06	-0,26	-2,68	0,01*	-0,01	-0,05	-0,52	0,60	0,00	-0,02	-0,25	0,81
Work Experience	0,56	0,24	4,65	<0,01	0,75	0,23	4,39	<0,01	0,62	0,22	4,12	<0,01	0,33	0,13	2,51	0,01*
Income (15k-25k) ⁴	1,39	0,37	7,29	<0,01	1,41	0,28	5,25	<0,01	1,22	0,28	5,19	<0,01	1,54	0,39	7,53	<0,01
Step 2	$F(8-383)=35,80, p<0,01, R=0,66, R^2=0,43, \Delta R^2=0,17$				$F(8-383)=31,45, p<0,01, R=0,63, R^2=0,40, \Delta R^2=0,20$				$F(8-383)=6,67, p<0,01, R=0,51, R^2=0,26, \Delta R^2=0,08$				$F(8-383)=20,91, p<0,01, R=0,55, R^2=0,31, \Delta R^2=0,08$			

Perceived Organizational Support																
	0,57	0,44	10,67	<0,01	0,83	0,47	11,27	<0,01	0,45	0,30	6,42	<0,01	0,41	0,30	6,71	<0,01
Security Sector Employees																
Step 1	$F(8-222)=9,48, p<0,01, R=0,51, R^2=0,26$				$F(8-222)=5,59, p<0,01, R=0,42, R^2=0,17$				$F(8-222)=5,68, p<0,01, R=0,42, R^2=0,17$				$F(8-222)=5,64, p<0,01, R=0,42, R^2=0,17$			
Age	0,05	0,37	3,42	<0,01	0,03	0,15	1,26	0,21	0,07	0,40	3,46	<0,01	0,06	0,36	3,17	<0,01
Gender (Male) ¹	-0,07	-0,03	-0,56	0,58	-0,10	-0,04	-0,59	0,56	-0,17	-0,07	-1,11	0,27	0,08	0,03	0,53	0,60
Education (Associate degree-Undergraduate) ²	0,26	0,11	1,46	0,15	0,50	0,15	1,83	0,07	0,29	0,10	1,25	0,21	0,00	0,00	0,00	1,00
Education (Postgraduate) ²	0,20	0,07	0,84	0,40	0,22	0,05	0,59	0,56	0,44	0,12	1,39	0,17	-0,04	-0,01	-0,14	0,89
Sector (Private) ³	-0,69	-0,35	-5,68	<0,01	-0,82	-0,29	-4,48	<0,01	-0,65	-0,27	-4,15	<0,01	-0,59	-0,26	-4,02	<0,01
Work Experience	-0,10	-0,58	-5,39	<0,01	-0,09	-0,36	-3,15	<0,01	-0,11	-0,50	-4,42	<0,01	-0,10	-0,53	-4,65	<0,01
Income (15k-25k) ⁴	0,35	0,17	2,03	0,04*	0,22	0,08	0,87	0,39	0,53	0,22	2,40	0,02*	0,28	0,12	1,36	0,17
Income (>25k) ⁴	0,41	0,18	2,12	0,04*	0,20	0,06	0,68	0,50	0,63	0,23	2,53	0,01*	0,40	0,15	1,69	0,09
Step 2	$F(9-222)=17,06, p<0,01, R=0,65, R^2=0,42, \Delta R^2=0,16$				$F(9-222)=14,31, p<0,01, R=0,61, R^2=0,37, \Delta R^2=0,20$				$F(9-222)=6,03, p<0,01, R=0,45, R^2=0,20, \Delta R^2=0,03$				$F(9-222)=8,36, p<0,01, R=0,51, R^2=0,26, \Delta R^2=0,09$			
Perceived Organizational Support																
	0,46	0,42	7,59	<0,01	0,74	0,48	8,35	<0,01	0,24	0,18	2,74	0,01*	0,39	0,31	5,00	<0,01

Referans Categories: ¹ Female, ² High School, ³ Public, ⁴ ≤15k, ⁵ Associate degree-Undergraduate

^a Since there are no high school graduates among the education sector employees, associate degree-undergraduate graduates were taken as reference for postgraduate graduates.

* $p<0,05$

Discussion

This study was conducted to compare the level of happiness at work in health, education and security sector employees, to investigate the effect of perceived organizational support on happiness at work, and to investigate whether happiness at work differs according to occupational and demographic variables. In this study, the level of happiness at work in healthcare professionals was found to be significantly lower than those in education and security sector employees. Similarly, the level of job satisfaction, affective organizational commitment and engagement, which were the sub-dimensions of happiness at work, was found to be lower in health sector employees than those in education and security sector employees. These results indicate that the difficulties faced by employees in the health sector at work and the working conditions in this sector may negatively affect their happiness levels. The health sector has been associated with factors such as intense workload, time pressure, emotional and physical burnout, workplace violence, stress and anxiety (De Hert, 2020; Ghahramani et al., 2021; Gray et al., 2019; Shoja et al., 2020) and it was thought that these factors may affect the level of job satisfaction, affective organizational commitment and engagement of employees. Studies revealed that mental problems in healthcare professionals increased even more during the COVID-19 pandemic period (Al Maqbali et al., 2021; Salari et al., 2020). This may negatively affect the level of happiness at work in healthcare professionals.

In the study, it was observed that perceived organizational support in all three sectors (health, education, security) increased the level of happiness at work, job satisfaction, affective organizational commitment and engagement in the workplace. This finding coincides with the results of previous studies (Meyers et al., 2019; Novliadi & Anggraini, 2020; Sudibjo & Manihuruk, 2022; Yongxing et al., 2017). For instance, in a meta-analysis study by Ahmed & Navaz (2015), it was stated that perceived organizational support had a significant effect on job satisfaction, organizational commitment and engagement. Accordingly, it can be said that the organization's valuing of employees' work-related efforts and responsibility, acting in accordance with employees' personal goals and values, showing interest in employees, being proud of employees' achievements, and making the job interesting for employees have a significant impact on employees' job satisfaction, organizational commitment and engagement, and thus increase happiness at work. Perceived organizational support can also contribute positively to employee performance by increasing employee happiness at work. Results of existing literature have shown that happiness at work increases employee productivity and performance (Jalali & Heidari, 2016; Pryce-Jones & Lindsay, 2014). The fact that perceived organizational support is effective in increasing the happiness of employees reveals the importance of perceived organizational support in terms of providing better service in these sectors where a significant part of the society receives services such as health, education and security.

In the study, those with higher income levels in health, education and security sectors had higher levels of happiness at work than those with lower income levels and public sector employees had higher levels of happiness at work than private sector employees. In addition, it was observed that these variables were significant predictors of happiness at work. These results are consistent with the results of existing studies (Angner et al., 2011; Knabe & Rätzel, 2010; Pacek et al., 2019). Employees with a high level of income may often feel more financially secure. Also, those with higher income levels are often found in higher positions, which could mean higher status and career satisfaction at work. This can affect happiness. Those working in the public sector in Turkey generally have better working conditions and job rights. Fewer working hours, time off benefits, job security, and social security can increase happiness at work.

In the study, it was determined that the work experience variable was a significant predictor of happiness. It was observed that those with less work experience had a higher level of happiness at work than those with more work experience. When the literature was examined on this subject, it was determined that different results were obtained. For instance, in a study conducted by Filipkowski & Derbis (2023), a positive correlation was found between work experience and job satisfaction, which is a dimension of happiness. In a study conducted by Romão et al. (2022), no significant relationship was

found between work experience and happiness. As the duration of working in an organization increases, the level of burnout may increase. Experienced employees may face higher expectations, and with increased work experience, stress and workload could also increase, which may reduce the level of happiness of employees. In contrast, those who work in the organization for a long time can get a better position in the organization they work for, and they can adapt better to their colleagues and work culture. They can also have more say in the organization and participate more in the decisions taken. This can positively affect the level of happiness at work. Therefore, it could be said that work experience has different effects on happiness and more research is needed on this subject.

Limitations

This study was conducted on health, education and security employees working in a province in the Southeastern Anatolia region of Turkey. Therefore, generalization for employees in other regions or different sectors may be limited. This study is a cross-sectional study and cannot observe the changes over time. Participants self-assessed their level of happiness at work. These assessments can be subjective, and their immediate emotional state at the time of completing the questionnaire could influence the results. These limitations should be taken into account during the interpretation of the results of the study, and the limitations on these issues should be tried to be eliminated in future studies.

Conclusion

This study shows that employees in the health, education and security sectors have different levels of happiness at work. The lower level of happiness at work in the health sector emphasizes the need to develop strategies to increase the level of job satisfaction, affective organizational commitment and engagement of employees in this sector.

The research shows that perceived organizational support in all three sectors increases levels of happiness, job satisfaction, affective organizational commitment, and engagement in the workplace. Therefore, efforts should be made to increase the perceived organizational support of employees. Strategies such as open communication, encouraging participation, fair business practices, personal/professional development support, work-life balance, appreciation and leadership roles can be used to increase the perceived organizational support by employees. The study shows that those with higher income levels have higher levels of happiness at work. This result emphasizes that income level is an important factor in employees' happiness at work. Employers could increase happiness at work by offering appropriate salaries and benefits to meet employees' financial needs and ensure their financial security. In this study, it was determined that private-sector employees were more unhappy. Legal regulations could be made on job security and working conditions of private sector employees.

These results could guide the determination of policies and practices to be taken to increase and maintain happiness at work. In addition, these results could contribute to a more comprehensive and effective understanding of happiness at work and provide the basis for future research.

References

- Ahmed, I., & Nawaz, M. M. (2015). Antecedents and outcomes of perceived organizational support: A literature survey approach. *Journal of Management Development*, 34(7), 867–880. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMD-09-2013-0115>
- Akgunduz, Y., Bardakoglu, O., & Kizilcalioglu, G. (2023). Happiness, job stress, job dedication and perceived organizational support: a mediating model. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Insights*, 6(2), 654–673. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JHTI-07-2021-0189>
- Al Maqbali, M., Al Sinani, M., & Al-Lenjawi, B. (2021). Prevalence of stress, depression, anxiety and sleep disturbance among nurses during the COVID-19 pandemic: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, 141, 110343. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpsychores.2020.110343>

- Angner, E., Hullett, S., & Allison, J. J. (2011). “I’ll die with the hammer in my hand”: John Henryism as a predictor of happiness. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 32(3), 357–366. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joep.2011.01.002>
- Armstrong-Stassen, M., & Ursel, N. D. (2009). Perceived organizational support, career satisfaction, and the retention of older workers. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 82(1), 201–220. <https://doi.org/10.1348/096317908X288838>
- Bataineh, K. adnan. (2019). Impact of Work-Life Balance, Happiness at Work, on Employee Performance. *International Business Research*, 12(2), 99-112. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ibr.v12n2p99>
- Benevene, P., De Stasio, S., Fiorilli, C., Buonomo, I., Ragni, B., Briegas, J. J. M., & Barni, D. (2019). Effect of teachers’ happiness on teachers’ health. The mediating role of happiness at work. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 2449. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02449>
- Bilginoğlu, E., & Yozgat, U. (2020). İşyerinde Mutluluk Ölçeği Türkçe Formunun Geçerlilik ve Güvenilirlik Çalışması The Validity and Reliability of the Happiness at Work Scale - Turkish Form. *Journal of Yasar University*, 15(Special Issue), 201–204.
- Cesário, F., & Chambel, M. J. (2017). Linking Organizational Commitment and Work Engagement to Employee Performance. *Knowledge and Process Management*, 24(2), 152–158. <https://doi.org/10.1002/kpm.1542>
- Chung, Y. W., Dong, X. T., & Yun, J. K. (2022). A study on the mediating effects of anxiety and happiness for workplace loneliness and behavioral outcomes of Korean police officers. *Policing*, 45(6), 924–938. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PIJPSM-03-2022-0041>
- De Guzman, A. B., Largo, E., Mandap, L., & Muñoz, V. M. (2014). The Mediating Effect of Happiness on the Job Satisfaction of Aging Filipino Workers: A Structural Equation Model (SEM). *Educational Gerontology*, 40(10), 767–782. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03601277.2014.882108>
- De Hert, S. (2020). Burnout in healthcare workers: Prevalence, impact and preventative strategies. *Local and Regional Anesthesia*, 13, 171–183. <https://doi.org/10.2147/LRA.S240564>
- Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived Organizational Support. In *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3). 500-507. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.71.3.500>
- Eisenberger, R., Rhoades Shanock, L., & Wen, X. (2020). Perceived organizational support: Why caring about employees counts. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 7, 101-124. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-012119-044917>
- El-Sharkawy, S. A., Nafea, M. S., & Hassan, E. E.-D. H. (2023). HRM and organizational learning in knowledge economy: investigating the impact of happiness at work (HAW) on organizational learning capability (OLC). *Future Business Journal*, 9(10), 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s43093-023-00188-2>
- Feitor, S., Martins, T., & Borges, E. (2023). Shorted Happiness at Work Scale: Psychometric Properties of the Portuguese Version in a Sample of Nurses. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 20(1), 658. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph20010658>
- Filipkowski, J., & Derbis, R. (2023). Are we happy with our work in globalization? Globalization experience, achievement motivation, and job seniority as predictors of work satisfaction in a group of office workers. *Globalization and Health*, 19(1), 43. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12992-023-00941-w>

- Fisher, C. D. (2010). Happiness at Work. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 12(4), 384–412. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2370.2009.00270.x>
- Fitriana, N., Hutagalung, F. D., Awang, Z., & Zaid, S. M. (2022). Happiness at work: A cross-cultural validation of happiness at work scale. *PLoS One*, 17(1), e0261617. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0261617>
- Ghahramani, S., Lankarani, K. B., Yousefi, M., Heydari, K., Shahabi, S., & Azmand, S. (2021). A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Burnout Among Healthcare Workers During COVID-19. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, 12, 58849. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsy.2021.758849>
- Gray, P., Senabe, S., Naicker, N., Kgalamono, S., Yassi, A., & Spiegel, J. M. (2019). Workplace-based organizational interventions promoting mental health and happiness among healthcare workers: A realist review. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 16(22), 4396. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16224396>
- Hamid, Z., & Kundi, Y. M. (2024). Discretionary HR practices and happiness at work (HAW): a sequential mediation model of perceived organizational support and meaning of work. In *Evidence-based HRM: a Global Forum for Empirical Scholarship*. Emerald Publishing Limited. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EBHRM-05-2023-0111>
- Hungerbuehler, I., Daley, K., Cavanagh, K., Claro, H. G., & Kapps, M. (2021). Chatbot-based assessment of employees' mental health: Design process and pilot implementation. *JMIR Formative Research*, 5(4), e21678. <https://doi.org/10.2196/21678>
- Jalali, Z., & Heidari, A. (2016). The Relationship between Happiness, Subjective Well-Being, Creativity and Job Performance of Primary School Teachers in Ramhormoz City. *International Education Studies*, 9(6), 45-52. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v9n6p45>
- Knabe, A., & Rätzl, S. (2010). Income, happiness, and the disutility of labour. *Economics Letters*, 107(1), 77–79. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econlet.2009.12.032>
- Khosrojerdi, Z., Tagharrobi, Z., Sooki, Z., & Sharifi, K. (2018). Predictors of happiness among Iranian nurses. *International Journal of Nursing Sciences*, 5(3), 281-286. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnss.2018.06.008>
- Kosasih, A., & Basit, A. (2019, June). Happiness at workplace: Job satisfaction and organizational support. In *Proceeding: International Conference on Business, Education, Innovation & Social Sciences ICBEISS* (pp. 117-126).
- Kurtessis, J. N., Eisenberger, R., Ford, M. T., Buffardi, L. C., Stewart, K. A., & Adis, C. S. (2017). Perceived organizational support: A meta-analytic evaluation of organizational support theory. *Journal of management*, 43(6), 1854-1884. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206315575554>
- Meydan, C. H., & Şeşen, H. (2011). *Yapısal eşitlik modellemesi AMOS uygulamaları*. Detay Yayıncılık.
- Meyers, M. C., Adams, B. G., Sekaja, L., Buzea, C., Cazan, A. M., Gotea, M., Stefenel, D., & van Woerkom, M. (2019). Perceived Organizational Support for the Use of Employees' Strengths and Employee Well-Being: A Cross-Country Comparison. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 20(6), 1825–1841. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-018-0026-8>
- Novliadi, F., & Anggraini, R. (2020). *Happiness at Work Viewed from Job Satisfaction and Perceived Organizational Support*. 4, 1815–1820. <https://doi.org/10.5220/0010102318151820>
- Özdemir, B. (2022). Perceived organizational support and happiness at work: The role of psychological capital. *Journal of Management and Economics Research*, 20(1), 414-430.

- Özer, Ö., Özkan, O., Özmen, S., & Çiraklı, Ü. (2023). Investigation of the perception of occupational safety, work stress and happiness in healthcare workers. *Journal of Health Management*, 25(4), 813-819. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09720634221078413>
- Pacek, A., Radcliff, B., & Brockway, M. (2019). Well-Being and the Democratic State: How the Public Sector Promotes Human Happiness. *Social Indicators Research*, 143(3), 1147–1159. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-018-2017-x>
- Pryce-Jones, J., & Lindsay, J. (2014). What happiness at work is and how to use it. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 46(3), 130–134. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ICT-10-2013-0072>
- Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: A review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 698–714. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.4.698>
- Romão, S., Ribeiro, N., Gomes, D. R., & Singh, S. (2022). The Impact of Leaders' Coaching Skills on Employees' Happiness and Turnover Intention. *Administrative Sciences*, 12(3), 84. <https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci12030084>
- Salari, N., Khazaie, H., Hosseinian-Far, A., Khaledi-Paveh, B., Kazeminia, M., Mohammadi, M., Shohaimi, S., Daneshkhah, A., & Eskandari, S. (2020). The prevalence of stress, anxiety and depression within front-line healthcare workers caring for COVID-19 patients: a systematic review and meta-regression. *Human Resources for Health*, 18(1), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12960-020-00544-1>
- Salas-Vallina, A., & Alegre, J. (2021). Happiness at work: Developing a shorter measure. *Journal of Management and Organization*, 27(3), 460–480. <https://doi.org/10.1017/jmo.2018.24>
- Salas-Vallina, A., Simone, C., & Fernández-Guerrero, R. (2020). The human side of leadership: Inspirational leadership effects on follower characteristics and happiness at work (HAW). *Journal of Business Research*, 107, 162–171. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2018.10.044>
- Satuf, C., Monteiro, S., Pereira, H., Esgalhado, G., Marina Afonso, R., & Loureiro, M. (2018). The protective effect of job satisfaction in health, happiness, well-being and self-esteem. *International Journal of Occupational Safety and Ergonomics*, 24(2), 181–189. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10803548.2016.1216365>
- Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., Bakker, A. B., & Gonzales-Roma, V. (2002). The Measurement of Engagement and Burnout: A two sample confirmatory Factor Analytic Approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 3(1), 71–92. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1015630930326>
- Sender, G., Carvalho, F., & Guedes, G. (2021). The Happy Level: A New Approach to Measure Happiness at Work Using Mixed Methods. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 20, 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069211002413>
- Shoja, E., Aghamohammadi, V., Bazyar, H., Moghaddam, H. R., Nasiri, K., Dashti, M., Choupani, A., Garaee, M., Aliasgharzadeh, S., & Asgari, A. (2020). Covid-19 effects on the workload of Iranian healthcare workers. *BMC Public Health*, 20(1), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-020-09743-w>
- Singh, S., & Aggarwal, Y. (2018). Happiness at Work Scale: Construction and Psychometric Validation of a Measure Using Mixed Method Approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 19(5), 1439–1463. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-017-9882-x>
- Singh, S., Taruna, & Bharti, J. S. (2023). Effect of Perception of Organizational Support on Organizational Citizenship Behaviour: The Mediating Role of Employee Happiness. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10672-023-09455-4>
- Sudibjo, N., & Manihuruk, A. M. (2022). How Do Happiness at Work and Perceived Organizational Support Affect Teachers' Mental Health Through Job Satisfaction During the COVID-19

-
- Pandemic? *Psychology Research and Behavior Management*, 15, 939-951. <https://doi.org/10.2147/PRBM.S361881>
- Türe, A., & Yıldırım, A. (2018). The validity and reliability of scale of perceived organizational support for nursing. *Journal of Health and Nursing Management*, 5(1), 9-18. <https://doi.org/10.5222/shyd.2018.009>
- Uzun, G., Kurtulus, H. Y., Aydın, C. B., & Zeren, S. G. (2020). Predictors of happiness among teachers and school counselors: Job satisfaction and loneliness in the workplace. *The Journal of Academic Social Science Studies Year*, 13(82), 113-130. <https://doi.org/10.29228/JASSS.43468>
- Wolter, J. S., Bock, D., Mackey, J., Xu, P., & Smith, J. S. (2019). Employee satisfaction trajectories and their effect on customer satisfaction and repatronage intentions. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 47(5), 815-836. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-019-00655-9>
- Yongxing, G., Hongfei, D., Baoguo, X., & Lei, M. (2017). Work engagement and job performance: The moderating role of perceived organizational support. *Anales de Psicologia*, 33(3), 708-713. <https://doi.org/10.6018/analesps.33.3.238571>
- Zhu, Y. (2012). A review of job satisfaction. Canadian Center of Science and Education. In *Asian Social Science* 9(1), 293-298. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ass.v9n1p293>