



## The Study of Working Engagement and Working Environment towards Job Happiness in the Malaysian Hotel Industry

Johanudin Lahap<sup>1</sup>, Nurul Asyiqin Muhamad Nazri<sup>2</sup>, Azila Azmi<sup>3</sup>, Saiful Bahri Mohd Kamal<sup>4</sup>,  
Khairil Anuar Bahari<sup>5</sup>, Noraslinda Mohd Said<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1,2,3,4,5,6</sup> Universiti Teknologi MARA Cawangan Pulau Pinang, Malaysia

**ABSTRACT:** This paper presents a study on work engagement and working environment towards job happiness among 3 to 5 stars hotel employees in Penang. The main purpose of the study is to broaden and deepen the understanding of job happiness among hotel employees especially within the hospitality industry in Malaysia. Working engagement can be defined as when an employee feels strongly engaged with the organization due to several reasons. The work place, surrounding, company system, policies, structure and procedure is called working environment. Job happiness is an essential aspect to any organization, because it impacting employee job performance, job satisfaction and job productivity. In this research stratified sampling was employ and of total number of 370 questionnaires were distributed via online, as a result 280 usable questionnaires were successfully gathered with the return rate of 75.6 percent. The raw data were analysed by using linear regressions. To conclude, it can be proposed that this research will benefit the practitioner, academician and researcher for the purpose of daily operation and future research. In conclusion, this study further confirmed that working engagement, working environment and job happiness was proven to have a strong relationship.

**KEYWORDS:** Hospitality and Tourism, Job Happiness, Working Engagement, Working Environment.

### INTRODUCTION

The study of work environment, work engagement and job happiness were known to be highly discussed theme by many scholars in the field of organizational behaviour. The consequences of neglecting employee job happiness are believed to decrease in productivity, wasted resources and creates toxic working environment (Morgan, 2014; Sadick & Kamardeen, 2020). Based on the review of the literature 48% of Malaysians workers experienced a chronic stress level. The Public Services Department (PSD) reported that high stress level will continue to haunt Malaysian employees (government or private sector) because it has negative effect to employees in the long run and it must be avoided at all cost (Rasli, Johari, Muslim & Romle, 2017). A happy employee prefers to work within a stress-free working environment and job happiness is known to be the core to employee job performance beside technology, work systems, reputation and the image of the company (Rego & Cunha, 2008; Merga & Fufa, 2019). In order to win the customer's heart, organizations need to adopt a strategy focussing on employee happiness (Sun & Bunchapattanasakda, 2019). The hotel industry is known to be competitive and labour intensive as Xiang, Scwartz, Gerdes and Uysal (2015) asserted that the of a hotel's performance is measured through the level of guest satisfaction and recent study by Guerreiro and Rita (2020) postulated that happy customers as a result become loyal customer, he added that in order to gain customer satisfaction and customer loyalty the organization must allocate some resources and concern towards employee needs and wants (well-being). Employees that is happy at work gained three benefits: a) high performance, b) job efficiency and c) job effectiveness (Golparvar & Abedini, 2014; Mensah & Ampofo, 2020). Other issue that arises in the Malaysian Hotel Industry is employee turnover and job happiness is known to be the remedy in retaining excellent employee (Rook, 2011; Rasheed, Okumus, Weng, Hameed & Nawaz, 2020; Hwang, Hong, Tai, Chen & Gouldthorp, 2020). Previous studies revealed that working engagement, working environment and job happiness is positively related (Rasli, et. al., 2017; Yilmaz, Psychogiou, Javaid, Ford and Dunn, 2019; Bastos & Barsade, 2020; Yap & Badri, 2020; Lozano & Auro, 2021). The study is conducted in order to extend and expand the understanding of job happiness issues especially within the hospitality industry in Malaysia.



## LITERATURE REVIEW

### 2.1 Work Engagement

Work engagement can be defined as employee level of commitment towards the organization (Ahmad, Zakaria, Omar & Amran, 2017; Zakaria, Ahmad and Alhady, 2020). Working engagement was found to correlate well with job satisfaction and job happiness (Rodríguez & Vergel, 2013; Saks, 2021). Employee's personal engagement towards the organization is the manifestation of someone feeling (enthusiastic and energetic) towards their job (Simone, Planta and Cicotto, 2010). This was further confirmed by Hui, Latif, Smith and Chen (2020) study that employees whom willingly dedicate their time, energy, idea and effort without any hesitancy is believed to have a very high level of engagement towards their organization. Engage employees was are known to produce high quality of work and they are capable of providing satisfaction to through their eagerness, politeness and obligation in performing a task (Sun & Bunchapattanasakda, 2019; Jamal and Budke, 2020). In a study conducted by Taohid, Sujai and Nughrah (2021) asserted that a highly engage employees were found to perform more to what they are supposed to do by providing extra efforts in executing their jobs. In contrast, a disengaged employees in contrast, work without emotional attachment to their work and to their organization. In addition, they seem to appear physically but mentally absent (Taohid, et. al, 2021). A study by Lozano and Auro (2021) have confirmed that working engagement, employee job performance and employee job satisfaction is positively correlated. Guerreiro and Rita (2020) suggested that employee commitment and contribution foster job happiness among hotel employees. Schaufeli, Bakker and Salanova (2006) proposed that work engagement can be described as a positive, fulfilling and job-related state of mind and they are systematically divided into three (3) different dimensions: a) dedication, b) absorption and c) vigour.

#### 2.1.1 Dedication, Vigour and Absorption

Dedication is defined as an employee determination towards the work they do and the tasks they perform (Saks, 2021). In other words, it refers to the employee's level of participation to his or her work. Furthermore, an employee that showed eagerness, high level of motivation, pride and feel important at work tend to perform better (Schaufeli, et. al, 2006). The second dimension of working engagement is 'Vigour'. Employee vigour is known as behavioural engagement, inspiring and energetic condition where an employee devotes themselves passionately to the work they do (Song, Hong and Jo, 2021). According to Schaufeli, Bakker and Salanova (2006) vigour is a situation where an employee demonstrates a high level of energy, extraordinary mental resilience and a high level of willingness to work with perseverance in a challenging environment. The third dimension of working engagement that is employee absorption can be defined the state of mind of an employee that excited to absorb and willingly to learn new knowledge as to improve performance (Sadick & Kamardeen, 2020). If someone is happy at work, they tend to absorb or learn faster with high concentration and they are happily engrossed to their work because of their previous experience, moment of difficulties and self-attachment to their work (Halim, Hassan, Basri, Yusof and Ahrari, 2021). Thus, the employee dedication, vigour and absorption were the essence to work engagement.

### 2.2 Working Environment

Previous work on the study of working environment revealed that employees' efficiency, effectiveness, productivity and job commitment can be achieved successfully when the organization is able to provide a conducive working condition (Raziq & Maulabakhsh, 2015; Ezeanyim, Ufoaroh., Therasas and Ajakpo, 2019; Janib, Rasdi, Omar, Alias, Zaremohzzabeh and Ahrari, 2021) as it has a positive effect towards employee performance and productivity (Spector & Higham, 2019; Bisht & Mahajan, 2021). Organizations that fail to understand the importance of working environment are considered weak and it is very difficult for them to compete in a long run (Aiken, Clarke, & Sloane, 2002; Shinkle, 2021). Organization is highly recommended to pay attention towards employee's working environment, because in previous literature suggested that company profit is highly associated with working environment (Janib, et al, 2021). Work performance and the job context are two separate dimension and they co-exist. Work performance is defined as job characteristics (the work process and of how the job is performed and completed), while the job context consists of physical working condition and the social working condition (Raziq & Maulabakhsh, 2015; Merga & Fufa, 2019). Organization is advised to be able to explain the difference between work performance and job context as these two terms is commonly misunderstood by managers. Ignoring the difference as a result lead to inferiority and low job performance (Janib, et. al., 2021). The working environment includes employee's working hours, job safety & security, co-worker's relationship, esteem needs and finally the top management commitment (Ezeanyim et. al., 2019).



Herzberg Two Factor Theory explains that job antecedents affect job satisfaction among employees. The theory consists of two dimensions and they are divided into: a) hygiene factors [working condition, the quality and level of supervision, organizational policy and administration, interpersonal relations, job security and wages] and b) motivational factors [the nature of the work, the work achievement, recognition, responsibility granted to them, career advancement and growth] (Herzberg, Mausner and Synderman, 1959). Previous research posited that motivational factors increases employees' level of internal happiness, while the hygiene factors increase employees' external happiness (Halim, et. al., 2021). Recent study by Guan (2020) further supported that the working environment components that was stated by Herzberg et. al. (1959) are still the main contributors to job happiness until today. Reports by jobstreet.com submitted that the working environment has the ability to promote job happiness especially in countries such as Hong Kong, Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand and Vietnam (Jobstreet.com, 2019). 'Quality of work life' and 'workplace happiness' are proven and known to have a positive relationship (Rasli, et al., 2017). Yap and Badri (2020) in their study have found that the working environment is one of the main antecedents to employee job happiness. In other works, by Jamal and Budke (2020) suggested that organizational culture, which is assumed to be part of the working environment, can also foster job happiness among employees. In addition, an article by NBC News reported that job safety & security, peer relationship and self-esteem contribute to job happiness (NBC News, 2018). Despite of that a toxic workplace is believed to have contributed to job discontent, low productivity, stress, loss of confidence and anxiety (Mahzan & Nordin, 2021).

### 2.2.1 Working Hours and Job Safety & Security

Working hours is another dimension of working environment (Raziq & Maulabakhsh, 2015). The State Statistical Office (2009) had gathered the elements of working hours through collective research findings and came up with a set of questions. The questionnaire is then employed in this study and it consists of working hours, workload and work-life balance (Yoon, Ryu, Kim, Kang and Choi, 2018). The research findings revealed that the majority of respondents responded that they are working more than the hours they supposed to do as a result they experienced fatigue, loss of concentration, low productivity and loss of motivation. Within Herzberg Two Factor Theory, working hours are categorized under the hygiene factor [external factor for job happiness] (Harter, Schmidt and Hayes, 2002; Mahzan & Nordin, 2021). Job safety and security is also categorized under the hygiene factor in Herzberg Two Factor Theory (Ezeanyim, et. al. 2019), they include salary, fringe benefits, bonus, overtime pay, job designation and physical working conditions (SSO, 2009). Those antecedents were known to corelated well with job happiness (Saks, 2021).

### 2.2.2 Relationship with Co-Worker and Esteem Needs

Formal and informal interaction among employees within the organization is seen to be important in achieving organizational goals and objectives. Employee interaction is within the scopes of working environment (Raziq & Maulabakhsh, 2015). According to Herzberg Two Factor Theory, relationships among co-workers is another element in 'hygiene factors' and it was known to contribute to employee's job happiness (Salazar & Rita, 2010). Relationships among co-workers is also referred as a situation where the employees within the organization communicate and acknowledge each other effectively and efficiently to achieve common goals (Murad & Khrabsheh, 2019). Based on the previous studies supported that positive relationship among co-workers does contribute to employees' job happiness (Rasli, et al., 2017). A person or a group of people that prefer to work in silos (reluctant to work as a team) and prefer to work in their clan (informal group) were found to have a negative impact towards the organization (Frye, Kang, Huh and Lee, 2020) as they do not want to be part of the team member, thus diminish the spirit of teamwork. Esteem needs and a variety and self-development activities (education and non-education) also fosters job happiness, as if the employee is offered a variety of job activities and ongoing opportunities to learn new skills on a regular basis, as a result the employee's self-esteem will elevate (Yilmaz, et. al, 2019; Bastos & Barsade, 2020). Al Rawahi, Sellgren, Altouby, Al Wahibi and Brommels (2020) recommended that within the Herzberg Two Factor Theory, esteem needs is the collective element of achievements, works, recognitions and opportunities for personal growth and advancement (motivational factor).

### 2.2.3 Top Management

The final element within the dimensions of working environment is the involvement of top management. In Herzberg Two Factor Theory, top management falls under the hygiene factors (Hui, et. al, 2020). The basic traits of a good and effective managers are: managers availability when they are wanted, the ability to identify employee's strength and weaknesses, be able to inspire creative thinking, superior knowledge, be able to manipulate, assimilate and dissect information (data) and finally robust ability to communicate vertically and horizontally well (Palanisamy, et. al, 2020). Another term that is commonly used for top management is leadership (Ramli & Zawawi, 2020). Leadership refers to any activities of a leader seeking for cooperation from his/her employees



towards achieving organizational objectives and goals (Shinkle, et. al., 2021). Previous studies have confirmed that leadership positively influence employee’s job happiness (Rasli, et al., 2017; Sadick & Kamardeen, 2020; Halim et. al., 2021). One study revealed that leadership is earned for over a period of time (experience) and it could not be simply achieved without experience, painstaking effort and hardwork by someone (Saddick and Kamardeen, 2020). The sense of camaraderie is another element that foster job happiness among employee (Halim, et. al., 2021).

**2.3 Job Happiness**

Employee’s turnover rates continue to rise in many organizations around the world and it inevitable, this is due to several problems such as employee dissatisfaction, abuse of power by the managers, inappropriate treatment by the company, sexual harassment and unfair compensation, previous studies have reported that in many circumstances the majority of service organization tend to focus on profit, however, neglecting employee welfare (Al Ali, Ameen, Isaac, Habtoor, Mohamed and Al Rajawi, 2018; Lozano & Auro, 2021). The hospitality industry was known to experience a high percentage of employee turnover (Rasheed, et. al., 2020). It was suggested that to get the best out of the employees, managers were strongly advised to make sure that their employee is happy at all time and a good manager should possess a good sense of humour and this type of manager is known to be the favourite among employees (Yilmaz, et. al., 2019). A classic literature by Berry and Parasuraman (1991) stressed that in order to make sure that the customer is happy and delighted the organization have to make sure that their employees are happy too, in other words a happy employee makes happy customer. The concept of well-being is identical with the word happiness (Satuf, Monteiro, Pereira, Esgalhado, Afonso & Loureiro, 2018). Job happiness is also defined as employee responds positively and delighted to what they have to perform at work (Chairasit & Santidhiraku, 201; Rasli, et al., 2017). Overall, happiness at work is the combination of positive emotions at work, constructive vibe, affection and mood that the employees enjoy when executing their job. When an employee is happy and has reached their highest potential in their career and personal life, it was believed that personal self-actualization is achieved (Sousa & Porto, 2015; Asadullah, Ul Haq, Wahba, Hashmi, Kim and Hwang, 2021). To conclude, past studies have revealed that job happiness has the ability to be used as an effective instrument to bridge the gap between variables in managing human resources.

**3. METHODOLOGY**

In this study a quantitative approach is adopted and a stratified sampling is used as a sampling method. A total number of 370 questionnaires were deployed with the return rate of 78.6% ranging from 3 to 5 stars hotel in Penang Malaysia. Penang is chosen as the sample location due the number of hotels that is sufficient to support this study. Penang also known to be among the best tourist destination for domestic and international tourist in Malaysia and Southeast Asia. A pre-test, pilot test, reliability and validity analysis were conducted to test the consistency of each item (questions) and a simple linear regression analysis is adopted to test the relationships between the identified variables. The questionnaire was divided into four (4) important section. Section A: a construct on job happiness (10 items) by Demo and Paschoal (2016), Section B: a construct on work engagement (15 items) by Schaufeli et al, (2006), Section C: a construct on working environment (14 items) developed by State Statistical Office (2009) and Section D is the demographic information of the respondents.

**Table 3.1:** A Construct on Job Happiness by Demo & Paschoal (2016)

No	Section A (Items)
1	1. My job makes me feel happy.
2	2. My job makes me feel excited.
3	3. My work made me feel enthusiastic.
4	4. My work made me feel proud.
5	5. I achieve my potential.
6	6. I develop abilities that I consider important.
7	7. I engage in activities that express my skills.
8	8. I overcome challenges.
9	9. I achieve results that I regard as valuable.
10	10. I do what I really like doing.



**Table 3.2:** A Construct on Job Happiness by Schaufeli et. al, (2006)

No	Section B (Items)
1	At my work, I feel bursting with energy
2	I find the work that I do full of meaning and purpose
3	Time flies when I am working
4	At my job, I feel strong and vigorous.
5	I am enthusiastic about my job
6	When I am working, I forget everything else around me
7	My job inspires me
8	When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work.
9	I feel happy when I am working intensely.
10	I am proud of the work that I do.
11	I am immersed in my work.
12	I can continue working for very long periods at a time.
13	To me, my job is challenging.
14	It is difficult to detach myself from my job.
15	At my work, I always persevere, even when things do not go well.

**Table 3.3:** The Construct for Work Engagement (State Statistical Office, 2009)

No	Section C (Items)
1	The management skills of the immediate supervisors/managers are good.
2	The management skills of the Executive Body are good.
3	The overall management skills of top management in the hotel are good in general.
4	I am a competent employee in general.
5	I am content with the training opportunities in general.
6	Overall, my esteem needs are fulfilled.
7	I am content with the physical working conditions as a whole. (Physical working place)
8	I am content with the current remuneration in the hotel as a whole. (salary & overtime)
9	I am content with my current job safety and security conditions in general.
10	My co-workers and I have a good sense of teamwork.
11	I have good relationships with my co-workers in general.
12	I am content with the workload pressure in general. (i.e., working hours & hours & number of tasks to be done).
13	There is a good balance between personal and professional life for me.
14	I am content with my current working hours in general.

**4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS**

**Table 4.1:** Demographics: Gender

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Female	154	55.0	55.0
	Male	126	45.0	100.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>280</b>	<b>100.0</b>	





The total number of respondents who have agreed to participate in this study is 280 and they were from 3 to 5 stars hotel in Penang. In this study female respondents represents 55% (154 persons) out of the total number of respondents, while the male respondents are at 45% (126 persons).

**4.1.2 Age**

**Table 4.2** (Age)

		Frequency	Cumulative Percentage
Valid	18 - 20	9	3.2
	21 - 30	194	72.5
	31 - 40	69	97.1
	41 - 50	6	99.3
	Above 50	2	100.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>280</b>	

There are five age group that was identified in this study. The first group represents respondents from the age of 18 to 20 years old with a total of 9 persons at 3.2%. The second group includes respondents from 21 to 30 years old with a total of 194 persons at 69.3% and it shows that this age group dominated the total number of respondents in this research. Moving into the third group of age of 31 to 40, they represent 24.6% (69 persons). The age group above 41 to 50 years old represents 2.1% with 6 persons while the last group that has the smallest number of respondents accounts to 0.7% (2 persons). The group age of 50 years old and above was found to be the lowest number of respondents in this study.

**4.1.3 Marital Status**

**Table 4.3** (Marital Status)

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percentage
Valid	Divorced	1	.4	.4
	Married	109	38.9	39.3
	Separated	1	.4	39.6
	Single	169	60.4	60.4
	<b>Total</b>	<b>280</b>	<b>100.0</b>	

In this analysis, single person records the highest number of respondents represents 60.4 percent from the total number of respondents followed by married couples which accounts to 38.9 percent. Separated and divorce respondents each represents 4 percent each.

**4.1.4 Hotels Star Rating**

**Table 4.4** (Hotel Star Rating)

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percentage
Valid	3 - Star	93	33.2	33.2
	4 - Star	129	46.1	79.3
	5 - Star	58	20.7	100.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>280</b>	<b>100.0</b>	

Total respondents from 5-star hotels represents 20.7% signifies the lowest rate of return and the respondents that has the experience staying in the 4-star hotel was found to be the majority in the sample selection represents 46.1 percent. The percentage of guest that has the experience stays at 3-star hotels in this sample is 33.2 percent.



**4.1.5 Years of Working**

**Table 4.5** (Years of Working)

		Frequency	Percent	Cum %
Valid	1 - 5 years	92	32.9	32.9
	6 - 10 years	107	38.2	71.1
	Less than 1 year	38	13.6	84.6
	More than 10 years	43	15.4	100.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>280</b>	<b>100.0</b>	

The highest number of hotel employees that participated in the study comes from those who have been working for 6 to 10 years, consisting of 107 employees at 38.2%. Hotel employee that works for less than a year accounts to 13.6 percent (38 persons). Hotel employees who have been working for 1 to 5 years is 32.9%. The remaining 43 hotel employees are those who have been working in the hotel for more than 10 years represents 15.4%.

**4.1.6 Monthly Income**

**Table 4.6** (Monthly Income)

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percentage
Valid	Above RM 10,000	1	.4	.4
	RM 1,000 - RM 2,000	194	69.3	69.6
	RM 2,001 - RM 4,000	67	23.9	93.6
	RM 4,001 - RM 6,000	13	4.6	98.2
	RM 6,001 - RM 8,000	4	1.4	99.6
	RM 8,001 - RM 10,000	1	.4	100.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>280</b>	<b>100.0</b>	

Hotel employee that earns between MYR 1,000 to MYR 2,000 signifies the highest number of respondents with 69.3%. Meanwhile, respondents that earns MYR 8,001 to MYR 10,000 recorded the lowest number of respondents represents 1.4% and 1 person that earns more than MYR 10,000 recorded 0.4% from the total sample. The second highest number of respondents comes from the employee that earns MYR 2,001 to MYR 4,000 represents 23.9%. Respondents from the group income of MYR 4,001 to MYR 6,000 and MYR 6,001 to RM 8,000 each represents 4.6% and 1.4%.

**4.2 Working Engagement**

**4.2.1 Vigor**

**Table 4.7** (Vigor)

	N		Mean	Std Deviation
		Valid Missing		
V1	280	0	3.800	1.0486
V2	280	0	3.761	1.0523
V3	280	0	3.054	1.0780
V4	280	0	4.068	.9977
V5	280	0	3.871	.9224

The highest mean score among for the V5 is 4.068 with standard deviation score of 0.9977 while V3 mean is 3.054 with standard deviation of 1.0780. All of the items of Vigor score range from 3 to 5 for mode, indicating that they are either neutral, agree or very



agree to questions they have been asked. Only one item that is V3 recorded the lowest of 3 while the rest of the items score at 4 for median. Judging from the results, it can be postulated that V3 depicts the lowest score for means and standard deviation for 5 items.

**4.2.2 Dedication**

**Table 4.8** (Dedication)

	N		Mean	Std Deviation
		Valid Missing		
D1	280	0	3.793	1.0300
D2	280	0	3.721	1.2067
D3	279	1	3.796	1.2311
D4	280	0	4.289	1.0465
D5	280	0	3.861	1.1509

The highest mean score among the dedication items is the D4 at 4.289 with standard deviation score of 1.0465 this is in contrast D2 with 3.721 mean with standard deviation of 1.2067. All of the items of dedication score range from 4 to 5 for mode, indicating that they either agree or very agree to the questions they have been asked. In the median score however, only one item that is D4 scored the highest point of 5 while the rest of the items score at 4. From the results, it can be concluded that D4 represents the highest score of the 5 items offered in this variable (dedication).

**4.2.3 Absorption**

**Table 4.9** (Absorption)

	N		Mean	Std. Deviation
		Valid Missing		
A1	280	0	4.325	1.0220
A2	279	1	3.749	1.1418
A3	280	0	3.350	1.0536
A4	279	1	3.907	1.0519
A5	280	0	3.818	1.0904

The highest mean score among the absorption items is the A1 at 4.325 with standard deviation score of 1.022 while the vice versa results from A3 as 3.35 mean with standard deviation of 1.0536. All of the items of absorption score range from 4 to 5 for mode, indicating that they either agree or very agree that these items are the elements of absorption. The median score however, only one item that is A1 has the highest of 5 while the rest of the items score at 4. Judging from the results, it can be concluded that A1 portrays the best among all of the 5 items when it comes to absorption as the employees feel that time flies when they are working.

**4.3 Working Environment**

**4.3.1 Working Hours**

**Table 4.1** (Working Hours)

	N		Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance	Cronbach Alpha
		Valid Missing				
WH1	280	0	3.668	1.0162		1.033
WH2	280	0	3.032	1.0451		1.092
WH3	280	0	3.221	1.0748		1.155

The highest mean score among the working hours items is the WH1 at 3.668 with standard deviation score of 1.0162 while the vice versa results from WH2 as 3.032 mean with standard deviation of 1.0451. All of the items of working hours score range from 3 to 4 for mode, indicating that they are either neutral or agree that these items are the elements of working hours. The median score however, only one item that is WH1 has the highest of 4 while the rest of the items score at 3. Judging from the results, it can be





concluded that WH1 portrays the best among all of the 3 items when it comes to working hours as the employees feel content with the workload pressure in general, (i.e., working hours & amount of tasks to be done).

### 4.3.2 Job Safety & Security

**Table 4.11** (Job Safety & Security)

	N		Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance	Cronbach Alpha
		Valid Missing				
JSS1	280	0	4.039	1.0652		1.135
JSS2	280	0	3.454	1.1318		1.281
JSS3	279	1	3.595	1.1079		1.227

The highest mean score among the job safety and security items is the JSS1 at 4.039 with standard deviation score of 1.0652 while the vice versa results from JSS2 as 3.454 mean with standard deviation of 1.1318. All of the items of job safety and security score range from 4 to 5 for mode, indicating that they either agree or very agree to these items are the elements of job safety and security. The median scores this time, applies exactly the same to all of the items for job safety and security at 4. Judging from the results, it can be concluded that JSS1 portrays the best among all of the 3 items when it comes to job safety and security as in the employees feel content with the physical working conditions as a whole, (e.g., physical working place).

### 4.3.3 Relationship with Co-Workers

**Table 4.12** (Relationship with Co-Workers)

	N		Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance	Cronbach Alpha
		Valid Missing				
RW1	280	0	4.136	.9482		.899
RW2	280	0	4.168	.9562		.914

The highest mean score among the relationship with co-workers' items is the RW2 at 4.168 with standard deviation score of 0.9562 while the lowest results from RW1 as 4.136 mean with standard deviation of 0.9482. Both items of relationship with coworkers score range from 4 to 5 for mode, indicating that they are either agree or very agree to these items are the elements of relationship with co-workers. The median scores this time, applies exactly the same to all of the items for relationship with coworkers of 4. Judging from the results, it can be concluded that RW2 portrays the better when it comes to relationships with coworkers as in the employees have good relationships between their co-workers in general.

### 4.3.4 Esteem Needs

**Table 4.13** (Esteem Needs)

	N		Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance	Cronbach Alpha
		Valid Missing				
EN1	280	0	3.804	1.0057		1.011
EN2	277	3	3.491	1.0788		1.164
EN3	280	0	3.568	1.0519		1.106

The highest mean score among the esteem needs items is the EN1 at 3.804 with standard deviation score of 1.0057 while the vice versa results from EN2 as 3.491 mean with standard deviation of 1.0788. All of the items of esteem need score 4, indicating that they agree to these items are the elements of esteem needs. The median score again, applies exactly the same to all of the items for esteem needs at 4. Judging from the results, it can be concluded that EN11 portrays the best among all of the 3 items when it comes to esteem needs as in the employees feel they are competent employees in general.



4.3.5 Top Management

Table 4.14 (Top Management)

	N		Mean	Std. Error of Mean	Median	Mode				
		d Missing								
TM1	280	0	3.950	.0710			4.000	5.0	1.1873	1.410
TM2	280	0	3.675	.0767			4.000	4.0	1.2832	1.647
TM3	279	1	3.663	.0764			4.000	4.0	1.2756	1.627

The highest mean score among the top management items is the TM1 at 3.950 with standard deviation score of 1.1873 while the vice versa results from TM3 as 3.663 mean with standard deviation of 1.2756. All of the items of top management score range from 4 to 5 for mode, indicating that they either agree or very agree to these items are the elements of top management. The median scores this time, applies exactly the same to all of the items for top management at 4. Judging from the results, it can be concluded that TM1 portrays the best among all of the 3 items when it comes to top management as the employees feel the management skills of the immediate supervisors/managers are good.

4.4 Job Happiness

Table 4.15 (Job Happiness)

	N		Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance
		Valid Missing			
Happy	280	0	3.971	1.1197	1.254
Excited	280	0	3.607	1.2193	1.487
Enthusiastic	280	0	3.568	1.2192	1.486
Proud	280	0	3.771	1.2776	1.632
Ach_Potential	280	0	3.864	.6416	.412
Abilities_Imp	280	0	4.332	.8167	.667
Actv_Skill	280	0	4.579	.6620	.438
Over_Challenges	280	0	3.975	.6900	.476
Results_Value	280	0	3.950	.8744	.765
Like_Doing	280	0	4.014	1.1577	1.340

The highest mean score among the job happiness items is the Actv\_Skill at 4.579 with standard deviation score of 0.6620 while the vice versa comes from Enthusiastic as 3.568 mean with standard deviation of 1.2193. All of the items of job happiness score range from 4 to 5 for mode, indicating that they agree and very agree that these items are the elements of job happiness. The median score however, only one item that is Actv\_Skill has the highest of 5 while the rest of the items score at 4. Judging from the results, it can be concluded that Actv\_Skill portrays the best among all of the 14 items when it comes to job happiness as the employees engage in activities that express their skills. The rest of the items seem to fit in the category the employees agree and very agree that they belong in the job happiness element.

4.5 Linear Regression & Correlation Analysis

4.5.1 H1: There is a relationship between work engagements towards job happiness

Table 4.16

Model Summary									
Model	R	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics					
				R Square	Change F	Change df1	Change		
1	.928a	.860	.860	.30076	.860	1713.602	1	278	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), Work Engagement



Table 4.17 (Anova)

ANOVA <sup>a</sup>						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	155.005	1	155.005	1713.602	.000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	25.147	278	.090		
	Total	180.151	279			
a. Dependent Variable: Job Happiness						
b. Predictors: (Constant), Work Engagement						

Table 4.18

Coefficients <sup>a</sup>										
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		t	Sig.	g. 95.0% Confidence Interval for B		Correlations		
		B	Std. Error			Beta	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Zero-order	Partial
1	(Constant)	.904	.076	11.882	.000	.754	1.054			
	Work Engagement	.803	.019	41.396	.000	.765	.841	.928	.928	.928
a. Dependent Variable: Job Happiness										

For the first proposed hypothesis of H1, all 15 items of work engagement were computed into one score to determine its overall significance towards job happiness. The p-value is 0.000 while  $\alpha$ -value is 0.05. This indicates that p-value <  $\alpha$ -value thus, the proposed hypothesis is significant, to which there is a relationship between work engagement towards job happiness. According to the R<sup>2</sup>'s score, or as it is also known as the coefficient of determination, 86% variation of job happiness is explained by the variation of work engagement. Meanwhile R, the correlation coefficient scores at 0.928, shows that work engagement and job happiness have a strong positive relationship. Moving onto the coefficient analysis, apparently the score of B is 0.803, by summary of work engagement. B indicates the slope of the regression line and it predicts how much the dependent variable will change if the independent variable increases. From the table above, it shows that if the work engagement score increases by 1, the job happiness score will increase by 0.803.

4.5.2 H2: There is a relationship between working environment towards job happiness

Table 4.19

Model Summary										
Model	R			R Square Adjusted	Change Statistics					
				R Square Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	F Change	df1			
1	.916a	.838	.838	.32383	.838	1439.932	1	278	.000	
a. Predictors: (Constant), Working Environment										



Table 4.20

ANOVA <sup>a</sup>						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	150.999	1	150.999	1439.932	.0
	Residual	29.153	278	.105		
	Total	180.151	279			
a. Dependent Variable: Job Happiness						
b. Predictors: (Constant), Working Environment						

Table 4.21

Coefficients <sup>a</sup>										
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients B	Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	Sig.		95.0% Confidence Interval for B		Correlations	
							Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Zero-order	Partial
1	(Constant)	1.153		15.060	.0	1.002	1.304			
	Working Environment	.765	.916	37.946	.0	.725	.804	.916	.916	.916
a. Dependent Variable: Job Happiness										

For the second proposed hypothesis of H2, all 14 items of working environments were computed into one score to determine its overall significance towards job happiness. The p-value is 0.000 while  $\alpha$ -value is 0.05. This indicates that p-value <  $\alpha$ -value thus, the proposed hypothesis is significant, to which there is a relationship between working environments towards job happiness. According to the R<sup>2</sup>'s score, or as it is also known as the coefficient of determination, 83.8% variation of job happiness is explained by the variation of working environments. Meanwhile R, the correlation coefficient scores at 0.916, shows that working environments and job happiness also have a strong positive relationship. Moving onto the coefficient analysis, apparently the score of B is 0.765, by summary of working environments. B indicates the slope of the regression line and it predicts how much the dependent variable will change if the independent variable increases. From the table above, it shows that if the working environment score increases by 1, the job happiness score will increase by 0.765.

4.6 Summary of the Hypotheses Analysis

Table 4.22

No	Hypotheses	Regression Significance	R <sup>2</sup>	R	$\beta$	Results
H1	Work Engagement towards Job Happiness - (Overall)	p-value < $\alpha$ -value	86%	-	-	0.928 / 0.803 Supported
H1a	a) Vigor towards job happiness	p-value < $\alpha$ -value	82.4%	-	-	0.908 / 0.810 Supported
H1b	b) Dedication towards job happiness	p-value < $\alpha$ -value	85.8%	-	-	0.927 / 0.714 Supported



H1c	c) Absorption towards job happiness	p-value < $\alpha$ -value	70%	-	-	0.837 / 0.703 Supported
<b>H2</b>	<b>Working environment towards job happiness - (Overall)</b>	<b>p-value &lt; <math>\alpha</math>-value</b>	<b>83.8%</b>	-	-	<b>0.916 / 0.765 Supported</b>
H2a	a) Working hour towards job happiness	p-value < $\alpha$ -value	69.7%	-	-	0.835 / 0.675 Supported
H2b	b) Job safety and security towards job happiness	p-value < $\alpha$ -value	73.9%	-	-	0.860 / 0.661 Supported
H2c	c) Relationship with co-workers towards job happiness	p-value < $\alpha$ -value	54.7%	-	-	0.739 / 0.638 Supported
H2d	d) Esteem needs towards job happiness	p-value < $\alpha$ -value	75.3%	-	-	0.868 / 0.716 Supported
H2e	e) Top management towards job happiness	p-value < $\alpha$ -value	80.3%	-	-	0.896 / 0.598 Supported

**#H<sup>1</sup>:** There is a positive relationship between work engagements and job happiness. Based on the analysis, it was found that the work engagement and job happiness share a significant relationship in a positive manner, with the results of  $\beta = 0.803$ ,  $p < 0.05$ . Thus, this hypothesis is supported. In relation to the finding, a study conducted by Asadullah, et. al., (2021) have discovered that work engagement significantly contributes to employee job happiness.

**#H<sup>2</sup>:** There is a positive relationship between working environment and job happiness. Based on the analysis it was found that working environment and job happiness also share a significant relationship in a positive manner, with the results of  $\beta = 0.765$ ,  $p < 0.05$ . Therefore, the second hypothesis is also supported. Yap and Badri (2020) study also share the same findings where working environment being one of the important antecedents to employee job happiness.

**4.7 Discussions**

In a study conducted by Guan (2021) posited that employees who achieved the significant level of job happiness tend to be effective, productive and motivated. Notwithstanding, it is clear that employee job happiness is considered to be important, aspect in organization. Some recommendations from this study appear to be important, firstly, the organization should consider to nurture a positive character among employees so that they can attain job happiness as this is based on the study conducted. When the employees have a positive mind-set and feelings, they tend to be more productive and contented at the workplace (Fogaça & Coelho, 2016). In order to develop positive work engagement among employees, the employers should consider the antecedents of vigor, dedication and absorption in their daily operation. Through continuous training and long-life learning, the employees could understand what it means to be an engaged employee and how it can assist them to perform better. Excellent top management characteristics are an exemplary to assist in developing highly committed employees. Hotel organizations are suggested to consider reconstructing their organizational practices as it will benefit the employees and the organization in a long term. The working environment plays a crucial part in creating employee’s job happiness among hotel employees. A good practice such as benchmarking is good to a service organization as this will uplift the quality and morale of employees. The strategies suggested has the capacity to assist hospitality organization to unleash the potential within the employees. The sense of self-belonging should be created through a positive relationship between employee to employee and employee to employer (vertical and horizontal relationship), appreciating the employee and assisting them to perform better is a key to organization success. When the employee is delighted, it will benefit the organization in two ways, first towards the company profit and second the reputation of the organization. Notwithstanding, happy employees create greater long-term customer’s relationships, customer’s satisfaction and as a result creating a customer that is loyal to organization.

**5. CONCLUSION**

To sum up, this study has successfully answered two (2) main research question. The first limitation that the researcher has to undergo was the research time frame, given the period of 6 months, the researcher was not able to obtain a bigger sample as reaching out for 3-to-5-star hotel employees was tough and it was not an easy task. Besides that, mobility and monetary were also the





limitation considering that the researcher unable to meet the respondents personally to send and collect the questionnaire, therefore, online questionnaire is used. Nevertheless, the two main hypotheses proposed have shown that there is a high degree of relationship between work engagement, working environments and job happiness. Hence, it can be reiterated that the hotel organizations should not only pay attention to gain higher profit, but they should also dedicate their effort, time and resources to employee's welfare and wellbeing.

## REFERENCES

1. Ahmad, S.S, Zakaria, A., Omar, M.N. & Amran, N.S. (2017). Examining The Factors Contributing towards Customer's Satisfaction at XYZ Hotel, Sungai Petani. *International Journal of Accounting Finance and Business*. 2(5), 99- 107.
2. Aiken, L., Clarke, S., & Sloane, D. (2002). Hospital Staffing, Organizational Support and Quality of Care: Cross National Findings. *International Journal for Quality in Health Care*. 50(5), 87-94.
3. Al-Ali, W., Ameen, A., Issac, O., Habtoor, N., Mohammed, N., & Alrajawi, I. (2018). Investigate the Influence of Underlying Happiness Factors on the Job Performance on the Oil and Gas Industry in UAE. *International Journal of Management and Human Science*. 2(4), 1-12.
4. Alrawahi, S., Sellgren, F.S., Altouby, S., Alwahaibi, N. & Brommels, M. (2020). The Application of Herzberg Two Factor Theory of Motivation to Job Satisfaction in Clinical Laboratories in Omani Hospitals. *Heliyon*. 6(2020), 1-9.
5. Asadullah, A.M., Ul Haq, Z.M., Wahba, K., Hashmi, S., Kim, H. & Hwang, J. (2021). Gender Differences and Employee Performance: Evidence from the Restaurant Industry. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*. 48(2021), 248-255.
6. Bastos, W. Barsade, G.S. (2020). A New Look At Employee Happiness: How Employees Perception of a Job as Offering Experiences Versus Objects to Customers Influences Job-Related Happiness. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*. 161(2020), 176-187.
7. Berry, L.L. & Parasuraman, A. (1991). *Competing Through Quality*. New York, Free Press.
8. Bisht, S.N. & Mahajan, A. (2021). Shared Stressors and Core Self-Evaluations: A Trait Activation Perspective on Employee Performance. *Journal of Business Research*. 131(2021), 103-111.
9. Guerreiro, J. & Rita, P. (2020). How to Predict Explicit Recommendations in Online Reviews using Text Mining and Sentiment Analysis. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*. 43(2020), 269-272.
10. Chairpravit, K., & Santidhiraku, O. (2011). Happiness at Work of Employees in Small and Medium-sized Enterprises, Thailand. *Procedia-Social and Behavioural Sciences*. 25, 189–200.
11. Demo, G., & Paschoal, T. 2016. Well-being at Work Scale: Exploratory and Confirmatory Validation in the USA. *Paideia*. 26(63), 35–43.
12. Ezeanyim, E., Ufoaroh., Therasas, E. & Ajakpo. (2019). The Impact of Job Satisfaction on Job Performance in Selected Public Enterprise in Awka, Anambra State. *Global Journal of Management and Business Research*. 9(7), 1-12.
13. Fisher, C. D. (2010). Happiness at Work. *International Journal of Management Reviews*. 12(4), 384–390
14. Fogaça, N., & Coelho, F. A. (2016). Is "Happy Worker" More Productive. *Management Studies*. 4(4), 149–160. Gavin, J. H., &
15. Mason, R. O. (2004). The virtuous organization: The value of happiness in the workplace. *Organizational Dynamics*. 33(4), 379– 392.
16. Frye, W.D., Kang, S., Huh, C. & Lee, M.J. (2020). What Factors Influence Generation Y's Retention in The Hospitality Industry?: An Internal Marketing Approach. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*. 85 (2020) 102352.
17. Golparvar, M. & Abedini, H. (2014). A comprehensive study on relationship between meaning and spirituality at work with job happiness, positive affect and job satisfaction. *Management Science Letters*. 4(2014), 255-268.
18. Guan, M. (2021). Association between perception of the work environment and job burnout based on MMIC Models among 679 knowledge workers. *Sage Journals*. 11(1), 1-16.
19. Hwang, M.Y., Hong, J.C., Tai, K.H., Chen, J.T. and Gouldthorp, T. (2020). The Relationship Between the Online Social Anxiety, Perceived Information Overload and Fatigue and Job Engagement of Civil Servant LINE Users. *Government Information Quarterly*. 37(2020), 101423.



20. Halim, N.A., Hassan, A., Basri, R., Yusof, A. & Ahrari, S. (2021). Job Satisfaction as Mediator between Leadership Styles and Organizational Commitment of Teachers in Malaysia. *Asian Journal of University Education*. 17(7), 61-71.
21. Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L. & Hayes, T. L. (2002). Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 87(2), 268-280.
22. Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Syndermann, B. (1959). *The Motivation to Work*. New York. Wiley.
23. Hui, A., Latif, A., Smith, H.K. & Chen, T. (2020). Exploring the Impacts of Organizational Structure, Policy and Practice on the Health Inequalities of Marginalized Communities: Illustrative Cases from the UK Healthcare System. *Health Policy*. 124(2020), 298-302.
24. Jamal, T., & Budke, C. (2020). Tourism in a World with Pandemics: local-global responsibility and action. *Journal of Tourism Future*. 6(2), 181-188.
25. Janib, J., Rasdi, R.M., Omar, Z., Alias, S.N., Zaremohzzabeh, Z. & Ahrari, S. (2021). The Relationship between Workload and Performance of Research University Academics in Malaysia: The Mediating Effects of Career Commitment and Job Satisfaction. *Asian Journal of University Education*. 17(2), 85-99.
26. JobStreet.com (2019). Employee Job Happiness Index. Retrieved 31/08/2021
27. Simone, S.D., Planta, A. & Cicotto, G. (2018). The Role of Job Satisfaction, Work Engagement, Self-Efficacy and Agentic Capacities on Nurses' Turnover Intention and Patient Satisfaction. *Applied Nursing Research*. 39(2018), 130-140.
28. Lozano, M. & Auro, S.A. (2021). Happiness and life expectancy by main occupational position among older worker. Who will live longer and happy? *SSM-Population Health*. 13(2021), 1-9.
29. Mahzan, F.A. & Nordin, M.N. (2021). The Relationship between Transformational Leadership Practiced and the Level of Job Satisfaction among Lecturers in MARA Professional College, Malaysia. *Asian Journal of University Education*. 17(3), 154-161.
30. Mensah, I. & Ampofo, T.E. (2020). Effects of Managers' Environment Attitudes on Waste Management Practices in Small Hotels in Acra. *International Hospitality Review*. 35(1), 109-125.
31. Merga, H. & Fufa, T. (2019). Impacts of Working Environment and Benefits Packages on the Health Professionals' Job Satisfaction and Selected Public Health Facilities in Eastern Ethiopia: Using Principal Component Analysis. *Health Services Research*. (2019), 2-8.
32. Morgan, J. (2014). *The Top 10 Factors for On-The-Job Employee Happiness*. *Forbes*. 13-15. Retrieved from <https://www.forbes.com/sites/jacobmorgan/2014/12/15/the-top-10-factors-for-on-the-job-employee-happiness/#50c16ce25afa>.
33. Murad, M.A. & Khrabsheh, A.L. (2019). Turnover Culture and Crisis Management: Insights from Malaysia Hotel Industry. *Academy of Strategic Management Journal*. 18(2), 1-14.
34. NBC News. (2018). How to Be Happier at Work, According to Scientific Studies, 2-5.
35. Palanisamy, R., Norman, A.A. & Kiah, M.L. (2020). Compliance with Bring Your Own Device Security Policies in Organizations: A Systematic Literature Review. *Computers and Security*. 98 (2020), 2-16.
36. Ramli, N. & Zawawi, M. (2021). The Covid-19 Pandemic and Its Repercussions on the Malaysian Tourism Industry. *Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Management*. 9(3), 135-145.
37. Raziq, A. & Maulabakhsh, R. (2015). Impact of working environment on job satisfaction. *Procedia Economics and Finance*. 23(2015), 717-725.
38. Rego, A., & Cunha, M. P. e. (2008). Authentizotic climates and employee happiness: Pathways to individual performance? *Journal of Business Research*. 61(7), 739-752.
39. Rodríguez-Muñoz, A., & Sanz-Vergel, A. I. (2013). Happiness and well-being at work: A special issue introduction. *Revista de Psicología Del Trabajo Y de Las Organizaciones*. 29(3), 95-97.
40. Rook, S. (2011). Industry insight - Science In a nutshell. *Industry Insight - Hospitality*, 1-11. Retrieved from [www.agcas.org.uk](http://www.agcas.org.uk)
41. Rasli, M.A., Johari, N.A., Muslim, N.A. & Romle, A.R. (2017). Fun at Workplace of Employees in Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises (SME). *World Applied Sciences Journal*. 35(10), 2264-2268.



42. Rasheed, I.M, Okumus, F., Weng, Q., Hameed, Z. & Nawaz, S.M. (2020). Career Adaptability and Employee Turnover Intentions: The Role of Perceived Career Opportunities and Orientation to Happiness in the Hospitality Industry. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*. 44(2020), 98-107.
43. Sadick, M.A. & Kamardeen, I. (2020). Enhancing Employees' Performance and Well-Being with Nature Exposure Embedded Office Workplace Design. *Journal of Building Engineering*. 32(2020), 1-15.
44. Saks, M.A. (2021). Caring Human Resources Management and Employee Engagement. *Human Resources Review*. (n.a). Salazar,
45. Satuf, C., Monteiro, S., Pereira, H., Esgalhado, G., Afonso, M.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.
46. Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B. & Salanova, M. (2006). The Measurement of Work Engagement with a Short Questionnaire: A Cross-National Study. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*. 66(4), 701-716.
47. Shinkle, A.G., Hodgkinson, P.G. & Gary, S.M. (2021). Government Policy Changes and Organizational Goal Setting: Extensions to the Behavioral Theory of the Firm. *Journal of Business Research*. 129(2021), 406-417.
48. Song, H.D., Hong, A.H. & Jo, Y. (2021). Development and validation of the Korean Employee Engagement Scale. *Human Resource International*. 14(3), 1-25.
49. Sousa, J. M. de, & Porto, J. B. (2015). Happiness at Work: Organizational Values and Person-Organization Fit Impact. *Paidéia (Ribeirão Preto)*. 25(61), 211-220.
50. Spector, S. & Higham, E.S.J. (2019). Space Tourism Research. *Annals of Tourism Research*. 79(2019), 2-8.
51. State Statistical Office (SSO) (2009). Employee Satisfaction Survey 2009.
52. Sun, L. & Bunchapattanasakda, C. (2019). Employee Engagement: A Literature Review. *International Journal of Human Resource Studies*. 9(1), 63-80.
53. Taohid, M.G.R., Sujai, R.A.D. & Nugraha, N.M. (2021). Does Work Discipline Affected by the Working Environment and Work Motivation. *Economic, Ecology. Socium*. 1(2021), 13-21.
54. Xiang, Z., Schwartz, Z., Gerdes, J. H., & Uysal, M. (2015). What can big data and text analytics tell us about hotel guest experience and satisfaction? *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 44: 120-130.
55. Yap, W.M. & Badri, S.K. (2020). What makes millennials happy in their workplace? *Asian Academy of Management Journal*. 25(1), 103-121.
56. Yilmaz, M., Psychogiou, L., Javaid, M., Ford, T. and Dunn, D.B. (2019). Making the Worst of Good Job: Induced Dampening Appraisals Blunt Happiness an Increase Sadness in Adolescents during Pleasant Memory Recall. *Behavior Research and Therapy*. 122(2019), 2-6.
57. Yoon, Y., Ryu, J., Kim, H., Kang, W.C. & Choi, J.K. (2018). Working Hours and Depressive Symptoms: The Role of Job Stress Factors. *Annals of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*. 30(46), 2-9.
58. Zakaria, A. Ahmad, S.S. & Alhady, S.M. (2020). Engaged Employees or Happy Employees? What Say You. *FBM Insights*. 1(2020), 44-46.

---

Cite this Article: Johanudin Lahap, Nurul Asyiqin Muhamad Nazri, Azila Azmi, Saiful Bahri Mohd Kamal, Khairil Anuar Bahari, Noraslinda Mohd Said (2022). The Study of Working Engagement and Working Environment towards Job Happiness in the Malaysian Hotel Industry. *International Journal of Current Science Research and Review*, 5(7), 2698-2713