

Appendices

Appendix-I

Table 1.2- Literature Review Matrix

Sl. No.	Author (s)	Context	Method (s)	Contents
1.	Diener et al., (1999), "Subjective well being: Three Decades of Progress".	United States-in twin cities- Urbana & Champaign	Survey Sampling Method- large sample of respondent were chosen and hypothesis was drawn for longitudinal studies.	Discussion is given on Modern Theories of Subjective Well-being that stress, dispositional influence, adaptation and goals. The Paper also discusses psychological factors producing Subjective well-being.
2.	Diener, Ed; Lucas, E, Richard; Oishi, Shigehiro - "Subjective Well-Being: The Science of happiness and Life Satisfaction"	United States	Questionnaire is constructed to do a large scale survey where questions simple response option to evaluate the degree of happiness.	History of subjective well-being is discussed in terms of its evolution period, Growth of theories, and their correlation with the existing culture.
3.	Gandhi Kingdon & Knight, John (Dec, 2004), "Subjective well-being poverty versus income poverty and capabilities poverty?"	University of Oxford, United Kingdom	Survey Sampling Method is used to collect the data set containing socio-economic information from every household and community	A methodology was developed to use subjective well-being as an criterion for poverty and illustration is given on South African data set
4.	Smith, Conal; Exton, Carrie (2011), "Guidelines for Measuring Subjective Well-being", based on OECD	France	Guidelines are designed under OECD Better Life Initiative project 2011.	The Guidelines aims to measure societies progress depending on elements of well-being as income, health, housing, etc.
5.	Pruyne (December 2011) "Corporate Investment in Employees Well-being the Emerging Strategic Imperative"	United Kingdom	Survey Sampling Method is used to collect the data from various organizations of the U.K	Key trend influencing corporate attention to employee's well-being. Which includes health, emotion, social culture etc.
6.	Tay, Louis and Diener Ed. (2012), "Personality Process and Individual Difference: Needs and Subjective Well-Being Around the World"	University of Illinois, United States.	Survey Sampling Method- sample of 123 countries were taken to examine the correlation between fulfilment of need and Subjective well-being.	Study provide an examined report of association between the need fulfilment in terms of life satisfaction, negative feeling and positive feeling and subjective well-being of diverse country condition
7.	Schimmack, Ulrich. "The Structure of Subjective Wellbeing"	University of Toronto, Mississauga, Canada	Large sample of 1241 undergraduate students were taken to draw a correlation between Life satisfaction and Domain satisfaction between different personality traits.	Structural relationships between components of subjective well-being are examined. The components are divided into cognitive components & affective components.

Sl. No.	Author (s)	Context	Method (s)	Contents
8.	Samman, Emma (Dec, 2007), "Psychological and Subjective Well-being: A Proposal for Internationally Comparable Indicators"	University of Oxford, United Kingdom	Questionnaire on Self determination was prepared on the 4-point rating scale ranging from 'Not at all true' to 'Completely True'. The survey is conducted to measure psychological and subjective states of measure.	Some indicators of psychological well-being and happiness are anticipated. The main initiative of the article is to generate a pathway for further research to discover connection between these indicators.
9.	Hicks Stephen (2011). "The Measurement of Subjective well-being".	United Kingdom	Questionnaires were prepared to perform Integrated Household Survey	Development of Conceptual Framework for measuring Subjective well-being, in terms of Evaluative measure, Experience measure and Eudemonic.
10.	Australian, State of the Service Report (2005-06), "Employee Engagement, Health and Wellbeing "	Australia	Qualitative study is done on the Australian Public Service employees. The employees' belong to Executive & Senior Executive Service.	Employee engagement model used to show the clear relationship to measure the productivity & availability of organisation's capability.
11.	Kristoffersen (2010), "The Subjective Well-Being Scale: How Reasonable is the Cardinality Assumption"	The University of Western Australia, Australia	Quantitative mode of study is adopted, where discrete numeric subjective well-being scale is prepared and integers range between two extreme intervals.	The paper provides an empirical investigation into the reasonableness of imposing cardinality on subjective well-being data. The study is based on the Australian data of life satisfaction and mental health to draw inference about the cardinality of subjective well-being scale.
12.	Dolan, P. and Metcalfe, R. "Measuring Subjective Well-Being: Recommendations on Measures for use by National Governments".	United Kingdom	Questionnaire mode of study is used, where simple questions are asked about their happiness.	The paper aims to provide methodological overview of the measurement of subjective well-being in terms of Objective list (basic need), Preference satisfaction (what is best for one) and Mental state (pleasure or pain)
13.	Hoorn van, Andre (May 2009) "Measurement and Public Policy Uses of Subjective Well-Being"	Radbound University Nijmegen, Netherland	Measurement Scales are developed as- single item scale, multi-item scale, positive and negative affect schedule scale, satisfaction life scale and more advance scales as- Experience Sampling Method and Day Reconstruction Method to calculate people's happiness.	The present study introduces various scales to measures the subjective well-being and discover their application. Specific attention is given on the indicators of the questionnaires whether the respondents reply can be taped properly for shaping the public policy.

Sl. No.	Author (s)	Context	Method (s)	Contents
14.	Krueger, Schkade (1 st draft: August 2006, This draft: January 2007), “The Reliability of Subjective Well-Being Measures”	Princeton University & University of California, United State	Questionnaire method is used. A sample of 229 Women filled up DRM questionnaire for two Wednesdays. Latter, responses are compared to estimate correlation between life satisfaction and variables as income, education	Discussion on Experience Sampling Method, Day Reconstruction Method and Satisfaction with Life Scale to measure life satisfaction over an extended period of time. The measurement basically reveals that life satisfaction is non-systematic review life.
15.	Diener, Ed; Derrick, Wirtz ; Tov, William; Kim-Prieto, Chu; Choi, Dong-won; Oishi, Shigehiro; Biswas-Diener, R. “New well-being Measures: Short Scales to Assess Flourishing and Positive and Negative Feelings”	United States	Sample of 689 college students were taken. Questionnaire was prepared to Measure: 8item scale to measure Psychological Flourishing and new 12item Scale to calculate negative (6items) & positive (6items) feelings.	Two measures of well-being were introduced: Psychological Flourishing based on recent theories of psychology and social well-being and Second is the new scale for assessing the negative and positive feelings
16.	VanSchoor, H. Wijbrandt; Martine Kruijtbosch (Feb 27 th 1995), “Measuring Subjective Well-Being : Unfolding Affect Balance Scale”	University of Groningen, Netherland	Affect Balance Score Scale is developed and both positive and negative item scores are given separately ranging from 0 to 5. Both the positive and negative item scores are added and subtracting the negative sores from positive values.	Study on the independent quality of the Bradburn Affect Balance Scale over the factor analysis method where it is given that positive and negative affect items are unrelated, but negative affect scores can be subtracted to obtain affect balance scale score.
17.	Blore, Daniel. Jed (June 2008), “Subjective Wellbeing : An Assessment of Competing Theories”	Deakin University, Melbourn Campus, Australia	Questionnaire was given to 2,000 Australians randomly selected to represent geographic distribution aged 18 & above. Questionnaires include two dimension-Global Evaluation of Life satisfactions & Personal Wellbeing Index.	An evaluation is presented on three divergent theories-Homeostatic theory, Multi Discrepancies Theory, Affective-Cognitive Theory. The study shows the level of advancement in forming understanding of subjective well-being.
18.	Durayappah, Adoree (2010), “The 3P Model : A General Theory of Subjective Well-being”	University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, USA.	Review existing models as Liking, Wanting & Needing Model, Multi-Discrepancy Theory, Top-Down Bottom-Up factors, Mental Health Continuum etc. are discussed to set a temporal incorporation into 3P model.	Discussion on the importance of 3P model, which is build on the basis of temporal states of Past, Present and Prospect (Future). Each temporal state has separate long-term and short-term thoughts.

Sl. No.	Author (s)	Context	Method (s)	Contents
19.	Helliwell, F. John & Barrington-Leigh, P. Christopher (April 2010) "Measuring and Understanding Subjective well-being"	University of British Columbia, Canada	Qualitative mode of study was adopted, to understanding through subjective well-being for comparable evaluation of diverse features of SWB used for assessment of life and how SWB shows the quality of social capital and social identities as indicator for better life	Primary purpose of the study is to convince the economist that data collected on the basis of subjective well-being can also be used to examine the economic outcome. Communities' and nation are taken to illustrate the cross-sectional correlation between per capita incomes and subjective well-being.
20.	Helliwell, F. John (2002) "How's Life? Combining Individual and national Variables To Explain Subjective Well-Being"	University of British Columbia, Canada	Measure of subjective well-being is drawn from the three waves of the world value survey. (1) 1980-82, (2) 1990-91 & (3) 1995-97. Sample of 49 different countries are taken which lead to 87,806 observations.	Discussion is given on the international trends and differences in the subjective well-being over this 20th century. The data collected on individual and societal variable, created a wide interest among policy makers.
21.	Helliwell, F. John (2011) "How can Subjective Well-Being Be Improved"	University of British Columbia, Canada	Questionnaire prepared on Satisfaction With Life scale and Cantril's self-anchoring striving scale for mood assessment of respondents and life evaluation. It has been discovered that life evaluation is much more stable	The study mainly refers to some policy relevant issues of subjective well-being is studied and direct discussion on the policy-issues which finally used by the government to build up an improved companies and communities.
22.	Conceicao, Pedro; Bandura Romina "Measuring Subjective Well-Being : A Summary Review of the Literature"	New York	Two dimensions are discussed (1) Objective measure-single dimensional well-being which says well-being increases with increasing consumption. (2) Objective measure-multi dimensional includes GDP, social and environmental approach.	The study explores the growing literature on subjective well-being and precisely discusses the main clusters of well-being measures. It is also discussed that happiness can guide the policy makers by studying the factors as inflation, unemployment etc.
23.	Tesch-Romer, Clemes; Motel-Klingebiel, Andreas; Tomasik, J. Martin. (2007) "Gender Difference in Subjective Well-Being: Comparing Societies with Respect to Gender Equality."	Friedrich-Schiller-University, Germany	Sample of 57 countries are taken, where hypothesis test is done. Macro-level test is based on relationship between societal gender inequality and average gender difference. Micro-level test is based on the assumption that controlling individual action resources leads to decrease of gender difference in SWB	Explored the relationship between the gender equality and subjective well-being. Two different perspectives are discussed for explaining gender differences in the SWB, (1) Sex difference (2) Different living condition of both men and women.

Sl. No.	Author (s)	Context	Method (s)	Contents
24.	Jivraj, Stephen; Nazroo, James; Vanhoutte Bram; Chandola, Tarani (1824) “Age, Ageing and Subjective Wellbeing in Later Life”	Manchester University, United Kingdom	Data is collected from five waves of English Longitudinal study of ageing, where, sample of adults aged 50 or over is taken, year ranging from 2002-2011. Multi-level linear growth curve model were used to examine the cross sectional effects of subjective well-being on age and quality of life.	Examines the age related change in subjective well-being in latter life covering the evaluative, experience and eudemonic dimension of the subjective well-being. It has been discovered that the older people experience high level of subjective well-being than younger people.
25.	Diener, Ed; Chan, Y. Micaela (2011), “Happy People Live Longer : Subjective Well-Being Contribute to Health and Longevity”	University of Illinois and University of Texas, United States of America	Qualitative study method is used to study different concepts of subjective well-being and also demarcation was assessed between them. Huge meta-analysis reviews was done as- Report of meta-analysis of positive well-being and morality (2008) are studied and it has been found that positive affect is associated with health and longevity.	Review of some of the important components of subjective well-being is done such as life satisfaction absence of negative emotion, optimism and positive emotion which causes better health and longevity. Overall it has been concluded that influence of subjective well-being on health and morality is clear and compelling.
26.	Camfield, Laura (December 2006) “The Why and How of Understanding ‘Subjective’ well-being: Exploratory Work By The WeD Group in Four Developing Country” (2006)	University of Bath, United Kingdom	Qualitative method is used to set up components of subjective well-being in four developing countries- Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Peru and Thailand based on the assumption that people make conscious judgement about the life experience.	Discussion on participatory research study is given, which was carried out in developing countries and the findings were contrasted with happiest episodes of all the 4 countries to judge when and how people are affected by pleasant and unpleasant components.
27.	Sarracino, Francesco (2008), “Subjective Well-Being in Low Income Countries: positional, relational and social capital components”	Low Income Countries	Empirical research is taken to develop a holistic approach to evaluate the subjective well-being and economic growth.	The study aims to explore the relationship between the economics and subjective well-being in the context of underdeveloped countries.
28.	Galloway (2005) “Quality of Life and Well-being: Measuring the Benefits of Culture and Sport: Literature Review and Thinkpiece”	University of Glasgow, UK	Huge literature review is undertaken to find the existing gap in the study of QOL in the context of well-being and sports area.	Main aim of the study is to understand Quality of Life in the context of culture, arts and sport and the impact on the subjective well-being.

Sl. No.	Author (s)	Context	Method (s)	Contents
29.	Suh, M. Eunkook; Koo, Jaisun, "A Concise Measure of Subjective Well-being (COMOSWB): Scale Development and Validation"	Yonsie University, South Korea	A nine item subjective well-being scale is introduced where, 3 positive and negative emotion which shows high, medium and low level of arousal were created.	Measurement of satisfaction is given in three separate domains - life-personal, relational and collective. Comparative study is initiated with compared to the previous measure of subjective well-being as COMOSWB.
30.	Stevenson, Betsey; Wolfers, Justin (August 2008) "Economic Growth and Subjective Well-Being: Reassessing the Easterlin Paradox"	University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, USA	Discussion on measurement of subjective well-being and alternative measurement approaches to examine the link between income and well-being is given. Argument is also initiated to confirm that whether richer people are happier than their poorer counterpart.	Study suggests that there is no link between society's economic development and its average level of happiness. Discussion is given on the 2 view point that- focus on economic growth is best demanded for the society or maximizing subjective well-being within the society would increase happiness.
31.	Sacks, W. Daniel; Stevenson, Betsey; Wolfers, Justin (December 2012) "New Stylized Facts about Income and Subjective Well-Being"	United States	Comparative Analysis is done between Cross Country, Within Country and Comparison through time to evaluate whether the rising GDP were associated with the rising average individual well-being.	Five stylized facts are studied on the relationship between well-being and income. (1) Rich people report greater well-being than poor. (2) Richer countries report greater per capita well-being than poorer countries. (3) Economic growth relates to rising well-being. (4) No satisfaction where the relationship between income and well-being diminishes. (5) The magnitude of these relationships is approximately equal.
32.	Kahneman, Daniel; Krueger B. Alan (2006). "Development in Measurement of Subjective Well-Being".	Princeton University, New Jersey	A U-index is proposed which measures the proportion of time that people spend in an unpleasant state. The data is collected either by Experience Sampling Method or Day Reconstruction Method and classified which state of emotion is strongest.	Research discussion is presented on how individual response to subjective well-being varies with the varying circumstances. Paper also elaborates usefulness of subjective well-being to measure the individual perceptions.

Sl. No.	Author (s)	Context	Method (s)	Contents
33.	Pangallo, Antonio & Donaldson-Feilder, Emma. "The Business Case for Well-being and Engagement: Literature Review"	United-Kingdom	Review of large academic literature was reviewed and real life practitioners were concerned to gather evidence to support the case.	Focussed on the employee engagement and satisfaction with response to business outcome. The outcome is divided as Employee turnover, Absenteeism, Presenteeism, Productivity and Physical & Mental Health.
34.	Page K (October,2005) "Subjective Well-Being in the Workplace"	Deakin University, Melbourn Campus, Australia	Instrument on measurement of Subjective well-being were studied as Questionnaire mode, Core Affect (blend of joy & pain), Adaptation Level Theory (effect due to joy & sorrow), Homeostasis Theory (affected by psychological process around individual)	Focused to illustrate how different instruments of subjective well-being can be extended to apply on more specific domain of life. A new branch of SWB is created as Workplace Wellbeing (WWB) to measure the wellbeing in terms of job satisfaction
35.	Chang, Kirk & Lu, Luo (Mar,2007) "Characteristics of Organizational Culture, Stressors and Well-being- A case of Taiwanese organization"	UK & Taiwan	A qualitative methodology of focus group discussions was adopted	The study tries to explain the characteristics of the organizational culture and the relation with the stress causing elements of the organization
36.	Harter, K.James; Schmidt, L. Frank; Keyes, M.L.Corey (2003) "Well-Being in the Work place and its Relationship to Business Outcome- A review of the Gallup Studies"	USA	5 companies were taken to assess the relation between person-environment fit in context of turn-over, loyalty, profitability, productivity, and customer satisfaction.	The study characterizes the effect of organizational environment on workers quality of life and job performance
37.	National Social Marketing Centre "Business Success and Employee Well-being"	United Kingdom	Multi-method is used in terms case studies, literature reviews & seminar discussion and a hypothesis is formulated for employee's health & profitable business.	Three approaches were derived: Re-focus, Unite & Move to improve health & well-being. Study suggests that good business custom improve health and well-being resulting upright cycle of good business.
38.	Hussain, & Yousaf, (2011) "Organization Culture And Employees' Satisfaction: A Study In Private Sector Of Pakistan"	Pakistan	A sample of 200 private organization selected on random sampling basis.	The research paper is proposed the study of distinctiveness of the work environment existing in the work private sector and employee engagement.

Sl. No.	Author (s)	Context	Method (s)	Contents
39.	Young, V & Bhaumik, C (2011) "Health and Well-Being at Work: A survey of Employers"	London, United Kingdom	Survey method is used where; random stratified sampling is carried out at head office level. Total 2,250 employees were interviewed through questionnaire of 20minute length.	Study found overwhelming agreement that organization has the responsibility to encourage well-being practices. On the other hand contradicting issues is that wellbeing is found to be ranked fifth among the six priorities offered as wellbeing will outweigh company's cost.
40.	Chenoweth, D (2011) "Promoting Employee Well-Being: Wellness Strategies to improve health, performance and the bottom line"	USA	Case studies on various research programmes of different institutes were re-evaluated to re-define the impact of wellness programmes on the employees and as well as the role of HR professionals in and work behaviour management.	Employees health directly affects their health behaviour, work attendance and on the job performance. Thus, well-being programmes invariably leads to more engage and productive workforce and hence HR professionals can make a healthy work culture.
41.	Government of Australia "A Guide to Promoting Health and Well-Being in the Workplace"	Australia	Survey method is used by Medibank Private in 2005 & National Health Survey (NHS) in 2004-05 on Australian Workforce, related to their life style.	Six relevant factors were identified for safe & healthy workplace. These factors are can be beneficial to both employees and employers. Certain real life case studies were discussed to address health risks of the workforce.
42.	Bevan, S (April 2010) "The Business Case for Employees Health and Wellbeing"	United Kingdom	Review of various case studies were done by the Work Foundation, gathered from Investors in People & other external source includes publication and interviews of expert as IIP UK Visioning Group, Specialist Panel Members etc.	Many of the case studies reveal the conflicting thought about the emotions & health. Here, IIP has a major role in promoting the messages of workplace support to employers of all sectors. Seven business benefits were discussed which linked directly to business performance.
43.	OECD (2001) "The Well-Being of Nation: the role of human and social capital"	France	Qualitative mode of study is presented and the argument is given about the economic indicators which are not at par to measure the quality of life and multi-faced factors of well-being which forms the nation's happiness indicators.	Focus is given mainly on today's relationship amid human & economic wellbeing & GDP measures going sideways. The study also concludes that the report is concerned with government policies which lack inclusion of wellbeing.

Sl. No.	Author (s)	Context	Method (s)	Contents
44.	Bakker, AB & Oerlemans, W.G.M (9 th June 2010) "Subjective Well-Being in Organization"	Netherlands	Vast literature review is done to understand the relation between subjective well-being and work. Two, two dimensional figures are adopted two visualise the dynamics of subjective well-being and work.	Study illuminates the positive & negative forms of work and relative subjective well-being. The paper also explores the benefits of positive form of work both on employee's professional & personal life
45.	Rissa, K (2007) "Well-Being Creates Productivity "	Iisalmi, Finland	The study is form of book which provides the chapter wise explanation of employee's well-being and related components as productivity, work-career, challenges in work life etc.	Book provides guidelines for betterment of workplace influenced by Druvan project. The study is focused to develop a systematic working condition through finding the practical solution of problems at workplace.
46.	Standard Life Health Care Limited (2006) "Wellbeing at Work"	England	Study was carried out by an intervention group consisting of Unilever and control group made up of the general working population. The report under took the study of various survey targeted on the staff.	Study reveals negative factors leading to low performance within the workplace, exploring the variation of health risk factors within departments. Conclusion is drawn that better health & safety benefits not only employees but also company.
47.	CIPD " What's Happening with Well-Being at Work"	England	Real life case studies are reviewed of different organization about adoption of wellbeing practices and its impact on employees and organizational agenda.	Paper highlights the wellbeing factor related to employees and their immediate manager. The paper also provides a glimpse of some organization benefited from wellbeing practice.
49.	Kennedy, R. (1968) "National Accounts for Well-being: bringing real wealth onto the balance sheet"	United Kingdom	Report was prepared on the collection of data across 20 European & US countries. The questionnaire has 2 data sets – comparison based and to produce sub-component and component scores.	Report gives an essential guideline for measuring societal well-being in terms of personal & social criteria of different countries.
50.	Mayor of London(May 2012) "London Business Case for Employees Health and Well-being"	United Kingdom	A business case is presented based on survey estimation that in an around 250 employees losses around £4,800 per week. Thus, investing the impact of both government and employee of London	Five criterions are explored to implement a successful wellness programme at workplace. It has also been found that lower level workers are more likely to take absence and fall out of work.

Sl. No.	Author (s)	Context	Method (s)	Contents
51.	Waddell, G & Burton, A. K (2006) "Is Work Good for your Health & Wellbeing?"	United Kingdom	Pure qualitative study is done which mainly highlights the list of health issues related to workplace. The discussion also focuses on the balancing of work and well-being in terms of an individual's family life and workplace.	Work is generally good, provided job has security and personal satisfaction. The study reveals that there is a relationship between health and work whose impact varies according to age. People who are at socially disadvantaged position are found to be attaining less well-being and health fulfilment.
52.	Public Sector Management Office "Implementing a Workplace Health and Wellbeing Program"	Tasmania, Australia	Guidelines were produced by the Tasmania government based on various national and international resources to help to assist the agencies to meet the obligations to develop a workplace health & well-being programs.	Three key components of workplace wellness are developed by Price Waterhouse, to measure health & safety. A set of interdependent factors is created to explore multi-determinants of workers health, discussed within the organizations of Tasmania.
53.	Aked, J; Marks, N; Cordon, C & Thompson, S. "Five Ways to Wellbeing"	United Kingdom	Discussion is proposed on evidence based behavioural model supported by New Economic Foundation (NEF) for promoting well-being within the society of U.K which though richest lacks highest well-being.	Model has been created to explain the set of action for delivering well-being. The study gives an appeal by offering certain activities for improving personal well-being. Thus, aims to promote the positive thinking and implementing it in daily day-to-day routine.
54.	Lundstrom et al., (2002) "Organisational and Environmental Factors that affect Worker Health and Safety and Patient Outcome"	United States	Selected magnet hospitals are reviewed to categorize the organisational factors and how improving these factors can have the positive change among the well-being outcome of both workers and patients.	Article discussed about the various organisational factors as work safety climate, team work errors, burnouts, job satisfaction, staffing ratio etc., affecting the well-being of workers.
55.	Chandrasekar (2011) "Workplace Environment and Its Impact on Organisational Performance in Public Sector Organisations"	India	Questionnaire method is used to collect the primary data from 285 employees among three departments, viz., engineering building, administration building and Shop floor building. The sampling is done on the basis of stratified random sampling technique.	Paper provides an analysis of working environment of different public sector organisations. The research is done to focus on the level of performance due to the presence of specific working environment.

Sl. No.	Author (s)	Context	Method (s)	Contents
56.	Diener, E & Seligman, M.E.P (2004) “Beyond Money Towards an Economy of Well-Being ”	United States	Various behavioural model or the non-economic predictors of well-being are studied and discussed with relation to economic indicators of nation calculating well-being.	Study reveals discrepancies between economic & well-being indicators. Various cross-sectional studies were done to show the positive co-relation between individual’s income and well-being.
57.	The Australian Institute “A Manifesto for Wellbeing”	Australia	Qualitative mode of study is adopted where; well-being is redefined in terms of Australian society which is in the verge of its 21 st century.	A verbal declaration is given where government can intervene to improve national well-being. The paper also suggests by improving the national well-being a flourishing society can be created.
58.	Art Council England (2005) “The Art, Health & Wellbeing”	United Kingdom	The council takes into account all the regions of UK to study the societal direction towards wellbeing. The study is based on the survey undertaken by Office for National Statistics and partnership with Department of Health & DCMS.	The report presents a co-relation between art, health and illness. The study also measures the wellbeing based on varied regions of UK through diverse set of case studies to focus the impact of art towards improving health.
59.	Sheffield Hallam University, (2005) “Creating a healthy and engaged workforce ”	United Kingdom	Various activities are implemented under the supervision of professionals to help employees to be motivated and encouraged during work. Often sessions are organised to have one-to-one talk for various physical and psychological issues between counsellors and employees’	Importance is given upon the existence of well-being within the workplace. The study is presented in the booklet form, where various tips and case studies are discussed to bring initiatives and explores the opportunities to practice well-being.
60.	Winkelmann. R (Sep, 2006) “Unemployment, Social Capital and Subjective Well-Being”	University of Zurich Switzerland	Empirical strategy is followed to measure the subjective well-being of employed and unemployed persons. Scale is developed ranging from completely dissatisfied-completely satisfied. Regression analysis is used to test the hypothesis that social capital moderates the effect upon the unemployment.	The paper extracts the sample of individuals who are transmitted from stage of employment to unemployment. The paper identifies the various factors leads to loss of well-being due to unemployment. It is found that effect of social capital upon the determinants of well-being, to have conclusion that it has positive impact.

Sl. No.	Author (s)	Context	Method (s)	Contents
61.	Greeley, M (1994) "Measurement of Poverty and Poverty of Measurement"	University of Sussex, United Kingdom	Discussion is proposed by highlighting the income as a core factor for poverty reduction. Income is presented as only source of welfare.	Paper presents the argument against the well-being measure which is confused with poverty reduction measure.
62.	Ervasti, Heikki & Venetoklis, Takis (2006), "Unemployment and Subjective Well-Being: Does Money Make a Difference?"	Helsinki, Finland	Random probability sample is used, where the population aged 15 or more samples are drawn from 22 European countries. Personal interviews are conducted based on designed questionnaires on well-being related to status of employment and unemployment.	The paper analyse the impact of unemployment upon the subjective well-being through the study of (1) Deprivation Theory and (2) Incentive Theory. It has been found that neither of the theory is entirely correct as some well-being factor may get derived due to unemployment but getting the government incentive also leads to deliberate choice to remain unemployed.
63.	Helliwell, John F. & Huang, Haifang (Feb, 2011), "New Measures of the Costs of Unemployment: Evidence From The Subjective Well-Being of 2.3 Million Americans"	United States	Two surveys reports are used to measure subjective well-being- (1) Behavioural Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS) from Centre of Disease Control (CDC). (2) Gallup Daily Poll. T he report uses four-step life satisfaction measure from BRFSS and 11-step life ladder, a 5-step score of positive emotion, a 5-step score of negative emotion, and the 0-or-1 U-index from Gallup Poll survey.	A large sample size from the two major survey report is exploited to measure the subjective well-being of people of the US to obtain comparable estimates of the monetary and other costs of unemployment on the unemployed themselves, while simultaneously estimating the effects of local employment on the subjective well-being of the rest of the population.
64.	Shapiro, Adam & Keyes, C. L. M (October, 2007), "Marital Status and Social Well-Being: Are the Married Always Better Off?"	United States	Survey sampling method is used where adults aged 25-74 residing in 48 contiguous states and who have at least one telephone in their house were taken. The survey data is based upon Midlife in the United States (MIDUS). The participants went through telephonic interview for 45 minutes.	Study produces two types of variable-dependent and independent variable depending upon scale based questionnaire of 1(strongly disagree) and 7 (strongly agree). It has been found that, marital status up to some extent increases the social well-being than the unmarried individuals.

Sl. No.	Author (s)	Context	Method (s)	Contents
65.	Shields , Michael “Marriage, Children and Subjective well-Being”	Australia	Sample data is based on Household, Income and Labour Dynamics in Australia (HILDA). Households are selected first on the basis of Random Sample of 488 districts. Secondly within these 7682 households are selected, where 19,917 people are interviewed.	The paper examines various related issues with the marriage and how these issues affect well-being of an individual and each household activity at large. The paper further discuss, whether, the level of well-being tends to fall with separation or divorce and the impact over the children.
66.	Stutzer, Alois & Frey, B.S (October, 2005), “Does Marriage Make People Happy, Or Do Happy People Get Married?”	Australia	Study is based on data on subjective well-being from the German Socio-Economic Panel Study (GSOEP). People in the survey are asked a wide range of questions on a scale from 0 “completely dissatisfied” to 10 “completely satisfied”.	Observation of both single people and married people are taken to consider does the marriage leads to increasing level of well-being or people with high level of well-being prefers to get married. Three groups of people are evaluated-(1) going to get married, (2) already married and (3) will never marry, to make interpersonal comparison of the study.
67.	Carino & Jijo, (2005) “Poverty and Well-Being”	Indigenous people of western countries	Sample of indigenous people living in Australia, Canada, New Zealand and United States are taken & comparison is done with general population of the country based on Human Development Index (HDI) guideline	Focus is given on the indigenous people residing with different lifestyle and ravages caused by industrial development and globalization effect.
68.	Ravallion, M. (October 2009) “A Comparative Perspective on Poverty Reduction in Brazil, China and India”	Washington, D.C, U.S	Study is done by collecting the population data base from 1981-2005 of each country and assessment is done on how the policy reform affected poor people.	Comparative study is done on Brazil, China & India to find out the varying degree of reasons for poverty and the methods adopted to reform the policies to reduce poverty.
69.	Tichy, G. (September 2013) “Subjective well-being and socio-ecological transition”	Europe	Various determinants of life satisfaction as-social, economical, environmental, etc., are listed to provide a solution for greater well-being.	Paper tries to lay an analytical foundation for developing new strategy for socio-ecological transition to bridge the gap between policy makers and determinants of well-being.

Sl. No.	Author (s)	Context	Method (s)	Contents
70.	Costanza, R; Hart, M; Posner, S; Talberth, J. (January 2009) "Beyond GDP: The Need for New Measures of Progress"	United States, Boston University	Qualitative mood of study is conducted and discussion is presented on various economic indicators as HDI, GDP, with relation to well-being indicators	Paper focuses to search for better indicators of well-being as NGH, Living Planet Report & Happy planet Index, excluding the GDP, used to measure only economic quantity not Quality.
71.	Wartenberg, J. (May 2011) "Human Well-Being at the Heart of Economics"	United States	Critical review is prepared on the economic model of measuring well-being as many of the well-being measure are fails to maintain economic sustainability.	Discussion is done on the 2007 great depression on US and the worst impact on the well-being of the people's daily life.
72.	New Economic Foundation- NEF (2012) a registered charity. "The Happy Planet Index"	United Kingdom	Report developed on first global measure of sustainable development on the basis of life-expectancy and ecological foot prints for future generation.	The report provides a comparison of well-nations with nations having lack of well-being in terms of how well-nations are supporting their inhabitants a good life.
73.	Alkire, S & Sarwar, B.M(January 2009) "Multidimensional Measures of Poverty & Well-being"	United Kingdom	Case study method is adopted and 6 countries were taken to understand the multi-dimensional approach to alleviate poverty and increase well-being.	Paper emphasises the importance of multi-dimensional approach for measuring poverty. This takes a broader spectrum to know policies and flaws.
74.	Bonilla G. A & Gruat, J.V. (2003) "Social Protection: A Life Cycle Continuum Investment for Social Justice, Poverty Reduction and Sustainable Development"	Geneva, Switzerland	Qualitative method is adopted to prepare a conference report for ILO on social protection as an integral path to poverty eradication.	Poverty is redefined in terms of social protection v/s 'no' social protection and its status in the global era as it's an important need towards well-being.

Appendix-II

Table: 4.4-Designation Wise Distribution of Respondents

Designation	Units of NEEPCO							
	AGTP		KHEP		RHEP		HQ	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Attendant	1	3.3	1	1.3	2	2.2	x	
Electrician	1	3.3	1	1.3	4	4.4	1	1.0
Draftsman	3	10.0	1	1.3	1	1.1	x	
Deputy Manager	1	3.3	2	2.6	1	1.1	3	3.0
Executive Director	1	3.3	x	x	x	x	1	1.0
Exe. Supervisor	2	6.7	x	x	2	2.2	x	x
Fitter	1	3.3	x	x	3	3.3	x	x
JES	1	3.3	2	2.6	1	1.1	2	2.0
Jr. Accountant	1	3.3	x	x	x	x	x	x
Lab Assistant	1	3.3	x	x	1	1.1	x	x
Lab Attendant	1	3.3	2	2.6	x	x	x	x
Mechanist	1	3.3	1	1.3	1	1.1	x	x
Manager	2	6.7	4	4.0	1	1.1	x	x
Plumber	1	3.3	x	x	1	1.1	x	x
Security Officer	1	3.3	x	x	x	x	1	1.0
Sr. Accountant	2	6.7	x	x	1	1.1	4	4.0
Storekeeper	1	3.3	1	1.3	1	1.1	x	x
TAO	1	3.3	x	x	x	x	2	2.0
Electrician (Tech)	1	3.3	x	x	x	x	x	x
TO (HR)	1	3.3	x	x	x	x	x	x
TO (Geology)	1	3.3	x	x	x	x	x	x
TPO	1	3.3	x	x	x	x	2	2.0
Tracer	1	3.3	x	x	x	x	x	x
Volcaniser	1	3.3	1	1.3	1	1.1	x	x
Welder	1	3.3	1	1.3	1	1.1	x	x
AAO	x	x	x	x	1	1.1	3	3.0
Accountant	x	x	1	1.3	1	1.1	2	2.0
Accounts Officer	x	x	x	x	x	x	1	1.0
ALO	x	x	x	x	x	x	1	1.0
AA	x	x	x	x	x	x	2	2.0
Assistant	x	x	2	2.6	4	4.4	3	3.0
Assistant Manager	x	x	x	x	x	x	3	3.0
Caretaker	x	x	1	1.3	x	x	1	1.0
Chowkidar	x	x	1	1.3	1	1.1	2	2.0
Cook	x	x	1	1.3	1	1.1	1	1.0
DGM	x	x	x	x	1	1.1	4	4.0
DEO	x	x	x	x	x	x	1	1.0
Fireman	x	x	1	1.3	x	x	2	2.0
General Manager	x	x	x	x	1	1.1	3	3.0
Havildar	x	x	2	2.6	x	x	2	2.0
Hindi Officer	x	x	x	x	x	x	2	2.0
Driver (HV)	x	x	x	x	1	1.1	1	1.0

Designation	Units of NEEPCO							
	AGTP		KHEP		RHEP		HQ	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Junior Engineer-I	x	x	1	1.3	x	x	3	3.0
JSS	x	x	x	x	x	x	1	1.0
Lab. Supervisor	x	x	1	1.3	x	x	1	1.0
Lib. Supervisor	x	x	x	x	x	x	1	1.0
Driver (LV)	x	x	x	x	1	1.1	1	1.0
Mali	x	x	x	x	1	1.1	1	1.0
Naik	x	x	1	1.3	x	x	1	1.0
Medical Officer	x	x	x	x	x	x	1	1.0
Personal Officer	x	x	x	x	1	1.1	1	1.0
Messenger	x	x	x	x	1	1.1	1	1.0
Receptionist	x	x	x	x	x	x	1	1.0
Security Guard	x	x	1	1.3	x	x	1	1.0
Security Supervisor	x	x	x	x	x	x	1	1.0
Senior Khalasi	x	x	x	x	x	x	1	1.0
Sr. Draftsman	x	x	3	3.8	1	1.1	1	1.0
SES	x	x	x	x	1	1.1	2	2.0
SHT	x	x	1	1.3	1	1.1	2	2.0
SLS	x	x	x	x	x	x	3	3.0
Manager	x	x	x	x	2	2.2	10	10.0
Sr. Manager	x	x	1	1.3	3	3.3	6	6.0
Sr. Messenger	x	x	1	1.3	1	1.1	1	1.0
Stenographer	x	x	1	1.3	2	2.2	1	1.0
Store Supervisor	x	x	1	1.3	2	2.2	1	1.0
Supervisor (PR)	x	x	x	x	x	x	1	1.0
Trainee (Civil)	x	x	x	x	x	x	1	1.0
Trainee (Electrical)	x	x	x	x	x	x	1	1.0
Trainee(Mechanical)	x	x	x	x	x	x	1	1.0
Trainee (HR)	x	x	x	x	x	x	3	3.0
ASA	x	x	1	1.3	1	1.1	x	x
ASO	x	x	1	1.3	x	x	x	x
Assistant Chemist	x	x	1	1.3	x	x	x	x
AStO	x	x	1	1.3	x	x	x	x
Assistant Attendant	x	x	1	1.3	x	x	x	x
APO	x	x	1	1.3	x	x	x	x
Blacksmith	x	x	1	1.3	x	x	x	x
Chemist	x	x	1	1.3	1	1.1	x	x
Cook Helper	x	x	1	1.3	x	x	x	x
Fitter	x	x	2	2.6	1	1.1	x	x
Field Assistant	x	x	3	3.8	x	x	x	x
Hindi Translator	x	x	1	1.3	x	x	x	x
Handyman	x	x	1	1.3	1	1.1	x	x
Khalasi	x	x	2	2.6	1	1.1	x	x
Lineman	x	x	2	2.6	4	4.4	x	x
Manager	x	x	x	x	1	1.1	x	x
Meter Reader	x	x	1	1.3	1	1.1	x	x
Operator	x	x	3	3.8	1	1.1	x	x

Designation	Units of NEEPCO							
	AGTP		KHEP		RHEP		HQ	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Photocopier	x	x	1	1.3	x	x	x	x
Sr. Chemist	x	x	1	1.3	x	x	x	x
Sr. Librarian	x	x	1	1.3	x	x	x	x
Sr. Sister	x	x	1	1.3	x	x	x	x
Stuff Nurse	x	x	1	1.3	x	x	x	x
Head Supervisor	x	x	1	1.3	1	1.1	x	x
Survey Supervisor	x	x	1	1.3	x	x	x	x
Sweeper	x	x	1	1.3	2	2.2	x	x
System Analyst	x	x	1	1.3	1	1.1	x	x
Tracer	x	x	1	1.3	1	1.1	x	x
Assistant Manager	x	x	6	7.7	4	4.4	x	x
Assistant Engineer	x	x	x	x	1	1.1	x	x
ADO	x	x	x	x	1	1.1	x	x
ACS	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
ARO	x	x	x	x	1	1.1	x	x
Carpenter	x	x	x	x	1	1.1	x	x
Crusher	x	x	x	x	1	1.1	x	x
Cleaner	x	x	x	x	1	1.1	x	x
Dresser	x	x	x	x	1	1.1	x	x
Driller	x	x	x	x	1	1.1	x	x
FFS	x	x	x	x	1	1.1	x	x
Executive Engineer	x	x	x	x	1	1.1	x	x
Foreman	x	x	x	x	1	1.1	x	x
JHT	x	x	x	x	1	1.1	x	x
Librarian	x	x	x	x	1	1.1	x	x
Masion	x	x	x	x	1	1.1	x	x
Plumber	x	x	x	x	1	1.1	x	x
Senior Plumber	x	x	x	x	1	1.1	x	x
Private Secretary	x	x	x	x	1	1.1	x	x
SMO	x	x	x	x	1	1.1	x	x
Wireman	x	x	x	x	1	1.1	x	x
Total	30	100.0	78	100.0	90	100.0	100	100.0

Note: f=Frequency & %=Percentage, TAO=Trainee Accounts Officer, TO=Trainee Officer, TPO=Trainee Personal Officer, AAO=Assistant Accounts Officer, ALO=Assistant Law Officer, AA=Assistant Accountant, DGM=Deputy General Manager, DEO=Data Entry Operator, HV=Heavy Vehicle, LV=Light Vehicle, SES=Senior Executive Supervisor, SHT= Senior Hindi Translator, JHT=Junior Hindi Translator, SLS=Senior Laboratory Supervisor, PR=Personal Relation, HR=Human Resource, JSS=Junior Security Supervisor, ASA=Assistant System Analyst, ASO=Assistant Survey Officer, ASO=Assistant Store Officer, APO=Assistant Personal Officer, ADO=Assistant Documentation Officer, ACS= Assistant Company Secretary, ARO=Assistant Research Officer, FFS=Fire Fighting Supervisor, SMO=Senior Medical Officer, JES=Junior Executive Supervisor

Appendix-III

Table- 5.9: Department Wise Assessment of Employees' Perception on SWB

Physical Well-Being					Psychological Well-Being				
Dept.	L (15-30)	M (31-45)	H (46-60)	VH (61-75)	Dept.	L (13-26)	M (27-39)	H (40-52)	VH (53-65)
CW	x*	x*	x*	68*	CW	x*	x*	48*	x*
				(100%)					(100%)
CP&MW	x*	x*	x*	3*	CP&MW	x*	x*	2*	1*
				(100%)					(66.7%)
Engg.	x*	x*	13*	13*	Engg.	x*	3*	15*	8*
			(50.0%)	(50%)				(11.5%)	(57.7%)
Fin.	x*	x*	15*	15*	Fin.	x*	x*	17*	13*
			(50.0%)	(50%)					(56.7%)
HR	x*	1*	51*	63*	HR	x*	3*	65*	37*
		(0.9)	(44.3%)	(54.8)				(2.6%)	(56.5%)
IR	x*	x*	3*	3*	IR	x*	1*	2*	3*
			(50.0%)	(50%)				(16.7%)	(33.3%)
L&A	x*	x*	x*	1*	L&A	x*	x*	x*	1*
				(100%)					
Law	x*	x*	x*	2*	Law	x*	x*	1*	1*
				(100%)					(50%)
Med.	x*	x*	4*	2*	Med.	x*	x*	4*	2*
			(66.7%)	(33.3%)					(66.7%)
Scrtly	x*	x*	9*	13*	Scrtly	x*	1*	14*	7*
			(40.9%)	(59.1%)				(4.5%)	(63.7%)
Tech	x*	x*	32*	46*	Tech	x*	2*	46*	31*
			(40.5%)	(48.2%)				(2.5%)	(58.3%)
V,F&S	x*	x*	5*	2*	V,F&S	x*	x*	4*	3*
			(71.4%)	(28.6%)					(57.1%)
Social Well-Being					Spiritual Well-Being				
Dept.	L (15-30)	M (31-45)	H (46-60)	VH (61-75)	Dept.	L (13-26)	M (27-39)	H (40-52)	VH (53-65)
CW	x*	x*	x*	1*	CW	x*	x*	x*	25*
				(100%)					
CP&MW	x*	x*	x*	3*	CP&MW	x*	x*	x*	25*
				(100%)					
Engg.	x*	2*	12*	12*	Engg.	2*	3*	8*	13*
		(7.7%)	(46.1%)	(46.2%)			(7.7%)	(11.5%)	(30.8%)
Fin.	x*	1*	13*	17*	Fin.	x*	3*	10*	15*
		(3.3%)	(43.4%)	(53.3%)			(6.7%)	(10%)	(33.3%)
HR	x*	3*	50*	61*	HR	1*	8*	42*	64*
		(2.6%)	(43.9%)	(53.5%)			(0.9%)	(6.9%)	(36.5%)
IR	x*	x*	1*	5*	IR	x*	1*	2*	3*
			(16.7%)	(83.3%)				(16.7%)	(16.6%)
L&A	x*	x*	x*	57*	L&A	x*	x*	x*	25*
				(100%)					
Law	x*	x*	x*	2*	Law	x*	x*	x*	25*
				(100%)					
Med.	x*	1*	2*	3*	Med.	x*	1*	2*	3*
		(16.7%)	(33.5%)	(50%)				(16.7%)	(33.3%)

Social Well-Being					Spiritual Well-Being				
Scrtcy	x*	3*	7*	11*	Scrtcy	x*	2*	6*	14*
		(13.6%)	(36.4%)	(50%)			(9.1%)	(27.3%)	(63.6%)
Tech	x*	3*	21*	55*	Tech	x*	8*	29*	42*
		(3.8%)	(27%)	(69.2%)			(10.1%)	(36.7%)	(53.2%)
V,F&S	x*	x*	3*	3*	V,F&S	x*	1*	2*	4*
			(42.9%)	(57.1%)			(14.3%)	(28.6%)	(57.1%)

Note: Dept=Department, CW=Commercial Wing, CP&MW=Corporate Planning & Monitoring Wing, Engg.= Engineering, L&A=Land & Acquisition, V,F&S= Vigilance, Fire & Safety, HR= Human Resource, IR= Industrial Relations, Fin.= Finance, Med.= Medical, Tech= Technical, Scrtcy= Security L=Low, M= Moderate, H= High, VH= Very High, *Calculated frequency & percentage on frequency within brackets

Table- 5.13: One-Sample T- Test (based on components of holistic model)

Test Value = 0						
Components of Holistic Model	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper
PhWB	190.533	297	.000	61.02685	60.3965	61.6572
PsyWB	151.879	297	.000	50.60403	49.9483	51.2597
SoWB	132.576	295	.000	53.66554	52.8689	54.4622
SpWB	94.890	297	.000	20.92617	20.4922	21.3602
Overall 2P+2S	205.430	295	.000	186.21959	184.4356	188.036

Table- 5.14: One-Sample Test (based on selected units)

Test Value = 0							
Units	Components of Holistic Model	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper
AGTP	PhWB	97.018	29	.000	60.40000	59.1267	61.6733
	PsyWB	50.889	29	.000	49.56667	47.5746	51.5587
	SoWB	52.313	29	.000	48.33333	46.4437	50.2230
	SpWB	25.155	29	.000	17.46667	16.0465	18.8868
KHEP	PhWB	106.429	99	.000	60.46000	59.3328	61.5872
	PsyWB	81.241	99	.000	51.01000	49.7641	52.2559
	SoWB	77.166	98	.000	54.37374	52.9754	55.7721
	SpWB	54.537	99	.000	21.82000	21.0261	22.6139
RHEP	PhWB	112.748	77	.000	58.94872	57.9076	59.9898
	PsyWB	84.313	77	.000	50.43590	49.2447	51.6271
	SoWB	74.346	76	.000	52.45455	51.0493	53.8598
	SpWB	57.049	77	.000	19.87179	19.1782	20.5654
HQ	PhWB	105.847	89	.000	63.66667	62.4715	64.8618
	PsyWB	84.217	89	.000	50.64444	49.4496	51.8393
	SoWB	74.755	89	.000	55.70000	54.2195	57.1805
	SpWB	64.152	89	.000	22.00000	21.3186	22.6814

Note: PhWB= Physical Well-Being, PsyWB= Psychological Well-Being, SoWB= Social Well-Being & SpWB= Spiritual Well-Being

Table- 5.15: One-Sample Test (based on age)

Age	Components of Holistic Model	Test Value = 0					
		t		Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		Lower	Upper			Lower	Upper
18-30	PhWB	67.263	36	.000	61.43243	59.5801	63.2847
	PsyWB	52.117	36	.000	52.18919	50.1583	54.2201
	SoWB	51.351	36	.000	55.32432	53.1393	57.5093
	SpWB	30.003	36	.000	21.05405	19.6309	22.4772
30-40	PhWB	119.590	99	.000	60.30000	59.2995	61.3005
	PsyWB	91.761	99	.000	50.03000	48.9482	51.1118
	SoWB	75.257	98	.000	51.87879	50.5108	53.2468
	SpWB	51.188	99	.000	20.30000	19.5131	21.0869
40-50	PhWB	111.213	114	.000	61.13043	60.0415	62.2193
	PsyWB	93.638	114	.000	50.83478	49.7593	51.9102
	SoWB	77.252	113	.000	53.90351	52.5211	55.2859
	SpWB	59.395	114	.000	20.90435	20.2071	21.6016
50-60	PhWB	75.824	45	.000	62.02174	60.3743	63.6692
	PsyWB	58.082	45	.000	50.00000	48.2662	51.7338
	SoWB	70.547	45	.000	55.58696	54.0000	57.1739
	SpWB	54.210	45	.000	22.23913	21.4129	23.0654

Note: PhWB= Physical Well-Being, PsyWB= Psychological Well-Being, SoWB= Social Well-Being & SpWB= Spiritual Well-Being

Table- 5.16: One-Sample Test (based on gender)

Gender	Components of Holistic Model	Test Value = 0					
		t		Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		Lower	Upper			Lower	Upper
Male	PhWB	180.541	244	.000	61.02449	60.3587	61.6903
	PsyWB	140.163	244	.000	50.55918	49.8487	51.2697
	SoWB	121.491	242	.000	53.49794	52.6305	54.3653
	SpWB	85.117	244	.000	20.72653	20.2469	21.2062
Female	PhWB	67.554	52	.000	61.03774	59.2247	62.8508
	PsyWB	58.999	52	.000	50.81132	49.0832	52.5395
	SoWB	53.370	52	.000	54.43396	52.3873	56.4806
	SpWB	43.206	52	.000	21.84906	20.8343	22.8638

Note: PhWB= Physical Well-Being, PsyWB= Psychological Well-Being, SoWB= Social Well-Being & SpWB= Spiritual Well-Being

Table- 5.17: One-Sample Test (based on grade)

Grade	Components of Holistic Model	Test Value = 0					
		t		Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		Lower	Upper			Lower	Upper
E	PhWB	140.470	101	.000	61.86275	60.9891	62.7364
	PsyWB	93.939	101	.000	51.50980	50.4221	52.5975
	SoWB	92.515	101	.000	54.58824	53.4177	55.7587
	SpWB	66.310	101	.000	21.75490	21.1041	22.4057
S	PhWB	75.222	57	.000	58.20690	56.6574	59.7564
	PsyWB	64.118	57	.000	48.43103	46.9185	49.9436
	SoWB	48.815	56	.000	50.54386	48.4697	52.6181
	SpWB	34.628	57	.000	19.65517	18.5186	20.7918

Test Value = 0							
Grade	Components of Holistic Model	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper
		W	PhWB	125.898	137	.000	61.59420
	PsyWB	104.505	137	.000	50.84783	49.8857	51.8100
	SoWB	91.158	136	.000	54.27737	53.0999	55.4548
	SpWB	64.653	137	.000	20.84783	20.2102	21.4855

Note: PhWB= Physical Well-Being, PsyWB= Psychological Well-Being, SoWB= Social Well-Being & SpWB= Spiritual Well-Being, E= Executive, S= Supervisors, W= Workmen

Table- 5.18: One-Sample Test (based on departments)

Test Value = 0							
Dept.	Components of Holistic Model	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper
		Corporate Planning & Monitoring	PhWB	32.500	2	.001	65.00000
PsyWB	14.932		2	.004	48.00000	34.1689	61.8311
SoWB	30.533		2	.001	56.66667	48.6813	64.6521
Engineering	PhWB	66.828	25	.000	59.23077	57.4054	61.0562
	PsyWB	35.502	25	.000	48.76923	45.9400	51.5985
	SoWB	37.080	25	.000	50.38462	47.5861	53.1832
	SpWB	20.203	25	.000	19.57692	17.5812	21.5727
Finance	PhWB	64.218	29	.000	61.26667	59.3154	63.2179
	PsyWB	54.648	29	.000	51.10000	49.1876	53.0124
	SoWB	40.906	29	.000	54.06667	51.3634	56.7699
	SpWB	24.677	29	.000	20.33333	18.6481	22.0185
Human Resource	PhWB	112.198	114	.000	61.11304	60.0340	62.1921
	PsyWB	90.339	114	.000	50.94783	49.8306	52.0650
	SoWB	87.761	113	.000	53.77193	52.5580	54.9858
	SpWB	64.994	114	.000	21.36522	20.7140	22.0164
Industrial Relations	PhWB	35.557	5	.000	60.66667	56.2807	65.0526
	PsyWB	18.031	5	.000	51.00000	43.7293	58.2707
	SoWB	25.140	5	.000	55.33333	49.6755	60.9912
	SpWB	10.541	5	.000	20.00000	15.1227	24.8773
Law	PhWB	15.000	1	.042	52.50000	8.0283	96.9717
	PsyWB	37.000	1	.017	55.50000	36.4407	74.5593
Medical	PhWB	45.453	5	.000	59.16667	55.8205	62.5128
	PsyWB	29.942	5	.000	47.50000	43.4220	51.5780
	SoWB	17.575	5	.000	50.66667	43.2559	58.0774
	SpWB	12.441	5	.000	21.16667	16.7933	25.5400
Security	PhWB	54.827	21	.000	60.63636	58.3364	62.9363
	PsyWB	49.847	21	.000	49.36364	47.3042	51.4231
	SoWB	24.679	21	.000	51.54545	47.2019	55.8890
	SpWB	31.224	21	.000	21.68182	20.2377	23.1259
Technical	PhWB	94.694	78	.000	61.63291	60.3371	62.9287
	PsyWB	82.812	78	.000	51.12658	49.8975	52.3557
	SoWB	72.030	77	.000	54.96154	53.4421	56.4809
	SpWB	51.585	78	.000	20.50633	19.7149	21.2977

Test Value = 0								
Dept.	Components of Holistic Model	t		Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference		95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	
		Vigilance, Fire & Safety	PhWB	25.005	6	.000	57.85714	52.1954
PsyWB	23.361		6	.000	50.42857	45.1465	55.7107	
SoWB	25.360		6	.000	53.28571	48.1443	58.4271	
SpWB	16.465		6	.000	20.14286	17.1494	23.1363	

Note: Dept.= Department(s) PhWB= Physical Well-Being, PsyWB= Psychological Well-Being, SoWB= Social Well-Being & SpWB= Spiritual Well-Being,

Table- 5.19: One-Sample Test (based on marital status)

Test Value = 0								
Marital Status	Components of Holistic Model	t		Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference		95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	
		UM	PhWB	58.601	26	.000	60.59259	58.4672
PsyWB	41.808		26	.000	51.70370	49.1617	54.2457	
SoWB	47.343		26	.000	54.66667	52.2931	57.0402	
SpWB	21.712		26	.000	20.25926	18.3413	22.1772	
M	PhWB	181.069	268	.000	61.12268	60.4581	61.7873	
	PsyWB	146.143	268	.000	50.43494	49.7555	51.1144	
	SoWB	123.728	266	.000	53.56180	52.7095	54.4141	
	SpWB	92.933	268	.000	20.98513	20.5405	21.4297	

Note: UM=Unmarried, M= Married , PhWB= Physical Well-Being, PsyWB= Psychological Well-Being, SoWB= Social Well-Being & SpWB= Spiritual Well-Being

Table- 5.20: One-Sample Test (based on work experience)

Test Value = 0								
WE (in yrs)	Components of Holistic Model	t		Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference		95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	
		0-3	PhWB	43.888	15	.000	60.87500	57.9185
PsyWB	40.256		15	.000	53.00000	50.1938	55.8062	
SoWB	40.420		15	.000	55.31250	52.3957	58.2293	
SpWB	23.832		15	.000	20.62500	18.7804	22.4696	
4-7	PhWB	83.535	39	.000	60.80000	59.3278	62.2722	
	PsyWB	54.861	39	.000	50.57500	48.7103	52.4397	
	SoWB	42.180	38	.000	51.84615	49.3578	54.3345	
	SpWB	25.628	39	.000	20.10000	18.5136	21.6864	
8-11	PhWB	101.701	80	.000	60.92593	59.7337	62.1181	
	PsyWB	82.561	80	.000	50.93827	49.7104	52.1661	
	SoWB	73.179	80	.000	53.50617	52.0511	54.9612	
	SpWB	47.743	80	.000	20.67901	19.8171	21.5410	
12 & more	PhWB	132.816	160	.000	61.14907	60.2398	62.0583	
	PsyWB	108.749	160	.000	50.20497	49.2932	51.1167	
	SoWB	96.583	159	.000	54.02500	52.9203	55.1297	
	SpWB	78.483	160	.000	21.28571	20.7501	21.8213	

Note: WE= Work Experience PhWB= Physical Well-Being, PsyWB= Psychological Well-Being, SoWB= Social Well-Being & SpWB= Spiritual Well-Being

Table: 5.23- Analysis of Variance on- Age Wise Influence of SWB upon OE and OC of NEEPCO

Unit	Age	Partitioned Options	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig
AGTP	18-30	BG	90.750	2	45.375	.043	.960
		WG	1058.000	1	1058.000		
		Total	1148.750	3			
	30-40	BG	2639.500	18	146.639	1.939	.275
		WG	302.500	4	75.625		
		Total	2942.000	22			
40-50	BG	224.667	2	112.333	x	x	
	WG	.000	0				
	Total	224.667	2				
KHEP	18-30	BG	124.750	2	62.375	7.797	.245
		WG	8.000	1	8.000		
		Total	132.750	3			
	30-40	BG	4968.409	24	207.107	1.618	.246
		WG	1023.833	8	127.979		
		Total	5992.242	32			
	40-50	BG	2866.717	17	168.630	1.455	.258
		WG	1390.750	12	115.896		
		Total	4257.467	29			
	50-60	BG	888.900	8	111.112	6.173	.302
		WG	18.000	1	18.000		
		Total	906.900	9			
RHEP	18-30	BG	421.879	8	52.735	1.190	.534
		WG	88.667	2	44.333		
		Total	510.545	10			
	30-40	BG	4328.841	15	288.589	1.532	.312
		WG	1130.250	6	188.375		
		Total	5459.091	21			
	40-50	BG	8704.264	24	362.678	1.954	.085
		WG	2969.833	16	185.615		
		Total	11674.098	40			
	50-60	BG	1000.438	10	100.044	.615	.760
		WG	813.500	5	162.700		
		Total	1813.938	15			
HQ	18-30	BG	5792.000	15	386.133	2.640	.309
		WG	292.500	2	146.250		
		Total	6084.500	17			
	30-40	BG	5316.452	17	312.732	8.053	.055
		WG	116.500	3	38.833		
		Total	5432.952	20			
	40-50	BG	9894.350	26	380.552	4.454	.004
		WG	1110.750	13	85.442		
		Total	11005.100	39			
	50-60	BG	2456.283	17	144.487	8.336	.112
		WG	34.667	2	17.333		
		Total	2490.950	19			
<i>Note: BG= Between Group, WG= Within Group, df= Degree of Freedom, F= Fisher Test, Sig.= Significance</i>							

Table: 5.24- Analysis of Variance on- Gender Wise Influence of SWB upon OE and OC of NEEPCO

Unit	Gender	Partitioned Options	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig
AGTP	Male	BG	2607.607	21	124.172	.524	.874
		WG	1422.500	6	237.083		
		Total	4030.107	27			
AGTP	Female	BG	288.000	1	288.000	x	x
		WG	.000	0			
		Total	288.000	1			
KHEP	Female	BG	6745.800	32	210.806	1.574	.088
		WG	5221.700	39	133.890		
		Total	11967.500	71			
KHEP	Male	BG	570.800	4	142.700	x	x
		WG	.000	0			
		Total	570.800	4			
RHEP	Female	BG	9940.518	30	331.351	2.848	.002
		WG	4072.512	35	116.357		
		Total	14013.030	65			
RHEP	Male	BG	3579.125	16	223.695	.629	.745
		WG	2261.833	7	323.119		
		Total	5840.958	23			
HQ	Female	BG	13527.047	33	409.911	2.920	.001
		WG	6037.083	43	140.397		
		Total	19564.130	76			
HQ	Male	BG	5825.652	14	416.118	3.202	.064
		WG	909.667	7	129.952		
		Total	6735.318	21			
<i>Note: BG= Between Group, WG= Within Group, df= Degree of Freedom, F= Fisher Test, Sig.= Significance</i>							

Table: 5.25- Analysis of Variance on- Grade Wise Influence of SWB upon OE and OC of NEEPCO

Unit	Grade	Partitioned Options	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig
AGTP	E	BG	894.900	7	127.843	3.551	.237
		WG	72.000	2	36.000		
		Total	966.900	9			
AGTP	S	BG	206.000	5	41.200	x	x
		WG	.000	0			
		Total	206.000	5			
AGTP	W	BG	1446.929	12	120.577	1.993	.508
		WG	60.500	1	60.500		
		Total	1507.429	13			
KHEP	E	BG	1387.533	13	106.733	2.447	.140
		WG	261.667	6	43.611		
		Total	1649.200	19			
KHEP	S	BG	281.159	5	56.232	.718	.638
		WG	391.750	5	78.350		
		Total	627.909	10			
KHEP	W	BG	6623.645	28	236.559	1.121	.412
		WG	3587.3333	17	211.020		
		Total	10210.978	45			

Unit	Grade	Partitioned Options	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig
RHEP	E	BG	4836.591	16	302.287	4.775	.046
		WG	316.500	5	63.300		
		Total	5153.091	21			
	S	BG	6941.233	12	578.436	2.117	.365
		WG	546.500	2	273.250		
		Total	7487.733	14			
W	BG	3680.259	24	153.344	1.598	.117	
	WG	2686.533	28	95.948			
	Total	6366.792	52				
HQ	E	BG	4292.863	25	171.715	1.921	.057
		WG	2145.217	24	89.384		
		Total	6435.080	49			
	S	BG	1639.540	16	383.721	4.133	.024
		WG	742.700	8	92.837		
		Total	6882.240	24			
	W	BG	6832.000	17	401.882	4.499	.036
		WG	536.000	6	89.333		
		Total	7368.000	23			
<i>Note: BG= Between Group, WG= Within Group, df= Degree of Freedom, F= Fisher Test, Sig.= Significance</i>							

Table: 5.26- Analysis of Variance on-Department Wise Influence of SWB upon OE and OC of NEEPCO

Unit	Dept.	Partitioned Options	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig
AGTP	Engg.	BG	1570.917	11	142.811	x	x
		WG	.000	0			
		Total	1570.917	11			
	Fin.	BG	795.333	5	159.067	x	x
		WG	.000	0			
		Total	795.000	5			
	HR	BG	1318.227	8	164.778	1.481	.464
		WG	222.500	2	111.250		
		Total	1540.727	10			
KHEP	Engg.	BG	664.667	2	332.333	x	x
		WG	.000	0			
		Total	664.667	2			
	Fin.	BG	468.167	1	468.167	104.037	.062
		WG	4.500	1	4.500		
		Total	472.667	2			
	HR	BG	2845.458	19	149.761	.906	.616
		WG	661.167	4	165.292		
		Total	3506.625	23			
	IR	BG	84.500	1	84.500	x	x
		WG	.000	0			
		Total	84.500	1			
	Med.	BG	352.667	2	176.333	x	x
		WG	.000	0			
Total		352.667	2				
Scrtly	BG	1237.875	6	206.313	25.789	.150	
	WG	8.000	1	8.000			
	Total	1245.875	7				
Tech	BG	3779.550	18	209.975	1.745	.174	
	WG	1323.917	11	120.356			
	Total	5103.467	29				

Unit	Grade	Partitioned Options	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig
KHEP	V,F&S	BG	364.750	3	121.583	x	x
		WG	.000	0			
		Total	364.750	3			
RHEP	Engg.	BG	50.000	1	50.000	x	x
		WG	.000	0			
		Total	50.000	1			
	Fin.	BG	1059.500	4	264.875	.287	.865
		WG	924.500	1			
		Total	1984.000	5			
	HR	BG	3894.750	20	194.378	.602	.844
		WG	3557.250	11			
		Total	7452.000	31			
	IR	BG	128.000	1	128.000	x	x
		WG	.000	0			
		Total	128.000	1			
	Scrty	BG	480.500	1	480.500	x	x
		WG	.000	0			
Total		480.500	1				
Tech	BG	3697.547	23	160.763	1.803	.098	
	WG	1694.500	19				
	Total	5392.047	42				
V,F&S	BG	512.000	1	512.000	x	x	
	WG	.000	0				
	Total	512.000	1				
HQ	CP&MW	BG	128.667	2	64.333	x	x
		WG	.000	0			
		Total	128.667	2			
	Engg.	BG	3946.222	7	563.746	.870	.681
		WG	648.000	1			
		Total	4594.222	8			
	Fin.	BG	3046.933	13	234.379	.814	.712
		WG	288.000	1			
		Total	3334.933	14			
	HR	BG	9127.493	27	338.055	5.230	.000
		WG	1228.167	19			
		Total	10355.660	46			
	IR	BG	264.500	1	264.500	x	x
		WG	.000	0			
Total		264.500	1				
Law	BG	50.000	1	50.000	x	x	
	WG	.000	0				
	Total	50.000	1				
Med.	BG	4.500	1	4.500	x	x	
	WG	.000	0				
	Total	4.500	1				
Scrty	BG	1338.250	9	148.649	.715	.704	
	WG	416.000	2				
	Total	1754.250	11				
Tech	BG	1589.000	4	397.300	x	x	
	WG	.000	0				
	Total	1589.000	4				

Note: Dept.= Department Engg.= Engineering, Fin.= Finance, HR= Human Resource, IR= Industrial Relation, Med.=Medical, Scrty= Security, Tech= Technical, V,F&S= Vigilance, Fire & Safety, CP&MW= Corporate Planning & Monitoring Wing, BG= Between Group, WG= Within Group, df= Degree of Freedom, F= Fisher Test, Sig.= Significance

Table: 5.27- Analysis of Variance on-Experience Wise Influence of SWB upon OE and OC of NEEPCO

Unit	WE (in years)	Partitioned Options	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig
AGTP	0-3	BG	18.000	2	9.000	x	x
		WG	.000	0			
		Total	18.000	2			
	4-7	BG	815.636	9	90.626	.086	.992
WG		1058.000	1	1058.000			
Total		1873.636	10				
8-11	BG	1788.417	9	198.713	1.739	.418	
	WG	228.500	2	114.250			
	Total	2016.917	11				
12 & more	BG	49.000	3	16.333	x	x	
	WG	.000	0				
	Total	49.000	3				
KHEP	0-3	BG	2499.056	6	416.509	4.419	.196
		WG	188.500	2	94.250		
		Total	2687.556	8			
	4-7	BG	4610.172	21	219.532	2.769	.085
		WG	555.000	7	79.286		
		Total	5165.172	28			
12 & more	BG	2687.877	21	127.994	1.294	.303	
	WG	1582.333	16	98.896			
	Total	4270.211	37				
RHEP	0-3	BG	38.000	2	19.000	x	x
		WG	.000	0			
		Total	38.000	2			
	4-7	BG	433.249	6	72.238	x	x
		WG	.000	0			
		Total	433.249	6			
	8-11	BG	4812.890	15	320.859	1.477	.282
		WG	1955.750	9	217.306		
Total		6768.640	24				
12 & more	BG	8243.048	27	305.298	1.902	.050	
	WG	4334.333	27	160.531			
	Total	12577.382	54				
HQ	0-3	BG	1668.000	8	208.500	x	x
		WG	.000	0			
		Total	1668.000	8			
	4-7	BG	4107.000	8	513.375	2.331	.262
		WG	660.667	3	220.222		
		Total	4767.667	11			
	8-11	BG	2671.733	14	190.838	x	x
		WG	.000	0			
		Total	2671.733	14			
	12 & more	BG	13970.829	33	423.358	3.967	.000
		WG	3094.917	29	106.721		
		Total	17065.746	62			

Note: BG= Between Group, WG= Within Group, df= Degree of Freedom, WE= Work Experience, F= Fisher Test, Sig.= Significance

Table 5.28: Age-Wise Concordance of Subjective Wellbeing Factors

Unit(s)	Age	N	Component of Holistic Model (CHM) df=3			Antecedent Factors (AF) df=1		
			Kcc	χ^2	Sig.	Kcc	χ^2	Sig.
AGTP	18-30	4	.929	11.15	.011	.083	.333	.564
	30-40	23	.824	56.85	.000	.002	.053	.819
	40-50	3	1.000	9.000	.029	.111	.333	.564
KHEP	18-30	4	.925	11.10	.011	1.000	4.000	.046
	30-40	33	.785	77.71	.000	.024	.806	.369
	40-50	30	.838	75.42	.000	.055	1.690	.194
	50-60	10	.808	24.24	.000	.011	.111	.739
RHEP	18-30	11	.892	29.43	.000	.036	.400	.527
	30-40	22	.920	60.70	.000	.106	2.333	.127
	40-50	41	.836	102.80	.000	.053	2.189	.139
	50-60	16	.849	40.77	.000	.000	.000	1.000
HQ	18-30	18	.746	40.28	.000	.125	2.250	.134
	30-40	21	.821	51.70	.000	.009	.200	.655
	40-50	40	.842	101.07	.000	.231	9.256	.002
	50-60	20	.921	55.28	.000	.026	.529	.467

Note: Kcc = Kendall's W Coefficient of Concordance, χ^2 = Chi-Square, Sig. =Significance, N= Total Size of Data Set, df = Degree of Freedom

Table 5.31: Department-Wise Concordance of Subjective Wellbeing Factors

Unit(s)	Dept.	N	Component of Holistic Model (CHM) df=3			Antecedent Factors (AF) df=1		
			Kcc	χ^2	Sig.	Kcc	χ^2	Sig.
AGTP	Draftsman	3	.911	8.200	.042	.000	.000	1.000
	Executive Supervisor	2	.900	5.400	.145	x	x	x
	Manager	2	1.000	6.000	.112	1.000	2.000	.157
	SA	2	.900	5.400	.145	1.000	2.000	.157
KHEP	Assistant Manager	6	.833	15.000	.002	.111	.667	.414
	Deputy Manager	2	1.000	6.000	.112	.000	.000	1.000
	Havildar	2	.900	5.400	.145	.000	.000	1.000
	Khalasi	2	.900	5.400	.145	1.000	2.000	.157
	Manager	4	.825	9.900	.019	.000	.000	1.000
RHEP	AA	3	1.000	9.000	.029	.000	.000	1.000
	Assistant Manager	4	.925	11.10	.011	.000	.000	1.000
	Attendant	2	.974	5.84	.120	.000	.000	1.000
	Fitter	3	.733	6.600	.086	.111	.333	.564
	Khalasi	2	.658	3.947	.267	.000	.000	1.000
	Lineman	4	.865	10.38	.016	.000	.000	1.000
	Manager	2	.900	5.400	.145	1.000	2.000	.157
	Messenger	2	1.000	6.000	.112	.000	.000	1.000
	Senior Manager	3	.911	8.200	.042	.000	.000	1.000
	Senior Plumber	2	1.000	6.000	.112	.000	.000	1.000
HQ	Sweeper-I	2	1.000	6.000	.112	.000	.000	1.000
	AAO	3	1.000	9.000	.029	1.000	3.000	.083
	Account.	2	.974	5.842	.120	.500	1.000	.317
	AA	2	1.000	6.000	.113	.000	.000	1.000
Assistant	2	.900	5.400	.145	.667	2.000	.157	

Unit(s)	Dept.	N	Component of Holistic Model (CHM) df=3			Antecedent Factors (AF) df=1		
			Kcc	χ^2	Sig.	Kcc	χ^2	Sig.
HQ	Assistant Manager	3	.724	6.51	.089	1.000	3.000	.083
	Chowkidar	2	.875	5.250	.154	.000	.000	1.000
	DGM	4	.865	10.38	.016	.250	1.000	.317
	Deputy Manager	3	1.000	9.000	.029	.111	.333	.564
	General Manager	3	1.000	9.000	.029	1.000	3.000	.083
	Havildar	2	.900	5.400	.145	.000	.000	1.000
	Hindi Officer	2	1.000	6.000	.112	.000	.000	1.000
	Junior Engineer	2	.816	4.895	.180	.000	.000	1.000
	JES	2	1.000	6.000	.112	1.000	2.000	.157
	Manager	10	.856	25.68	.000	.160	1.600	.206
	SA	4	.891	10.69	.014	.000	.000	1.000
	SSE	2	1.000	6.000	.112	1.000	2.000	.157
	SHT	2	1.000	6.000	.112	.000	.000	1.000
	Senior Manager	7	.918	19.28	.000	.095	.667	.414
TAO	2	.900	5.400	.145	1.000	2.000	.157	
TPO	2	.900	5.400	.145	.500	1.000	.317	

Note: SA= Senior Accountant, AA= Assistant Accountant, AAO= Assistant Accounts Officer, Account.= Accountant, DGM= Deputy General Manager, JES= Junior Executive Supervisor, SSE= Senior Executive Supervisor, SHT= Senior Hindi Translator, TAO= Trainee Accounts Officer, TPO= Trainee Personal Officer, Kcc = Kendall's W Coefficient of Concordance, χ^2 = Chi-Square, Sig. =Significance, N= Total Size of Data Set, df = Degree of Freedom

Table 5.32: Experience-Wise Concordance of Subjective Wellbeing Factors

Unit(s)	WE (in years)	N	Component of Holistic Model (CHM) df=3			Antecedent Factors (AF) df=1		
			Kcc	χ^2	Sig.	Kcc	χ^2	Sig.
AGTP	0-3	3	.911	8.200	.042	.333	1.000	.317
	4-7	11	.867	28.61	.000	.036	.400	.527
	8-11	12	.803	28.91	.013	.008	.091	.763
	12&more	4	.900	10.80	.000	.083	.333	.564
KHEP	0-3	9	.911	24.60	.000	.111	1.000	.317
	4-7	29	.774	67.31	.029	.020	.571	.450
	8-11	38	.809	92.22	.000	.007	.257	.612
	12&more	3	1.000	9.000	.000	.111	.333	.564
RHEP	0-3	7	.973	20.42	.000	.381	2.667	.102
	4-7	25	.907	68.03	.000	.002	.043	.835
	8-11	55	.825	136.08	.000	.050	2.769	.096
	12&more	9	.731	19.73	.000	.222	2.000	.157
HQ	4-7	12	.749	26.94	.000	.063	.818	.366
	8-11	15	.829	37.30	.000	.111	1.667	.197
	12&more	63	.864	163.22	.000	.039	2.483	.115

Note: Kcc = Kendall's W Coefficient of Concordance, χ^2 = Chi-Square, Sig. =Significance, N= Total Size of Data Set, df = Degree of Freedom

Appendix-IV

Table- 6.1: Impact of Organisational Environment on the Physical Well-Being

Units	G			Value	Significance
AGTP	E	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.866	.163
			Contingency Coefficient	.889	.163
		N of valid Cases		10	
	S	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	1.000	.242
			Contingency Coefficient	.894	.242
		N of valid Cases		6	
W	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.795	.519	
		Contingency Coefficient	.922	.519	
	N of valid Cases		14		
KHEP	E	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.738	.096
			Contingency Coefficient	.911	.096
		N of valid Cases		20	
	S	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.866	.476
			Contingency Coefficient	.917	.476
		N of valid Cases		12	
W	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.705	.034	
		Contingency Coefficient	.946	.034	
	N of valid Cases		46		
RHEP	E	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.918	.094
			Contingency Coefficient	.940	.094
		N of valid Cases		15	
	S	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.918	.334
			Contingency Coefficient	.940	.334
		N of valid Cases		15	
W	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.653	.051	
		Contingency Coefficient	.937	.051	
	N of valid Cases		53		
HQ	E	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.627	.335
			Contingency Coefficient	.925	.335
		N of valid Cases		50	
	S	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.683	.577
			Contingency Coefficient	.915	.577
		N of valid Cases		25	
W	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.706	.632	
		Contingency Coefficient	.926	.632	
	N of valid Cases		25		

Note: G= Grade, E= Executives, S= Supervisors, W= Workmen, N=Total number of data set

Table- 6.2: Impact of Organisational Environment on the Psychological Well-Being

Units	G			Value	Significance
AGTP	E	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.866	.347
			Contingency Coefficient	.905	.347
		N of valid Cases		10	
	S	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	1.000	.242
			Contingency Coefficient	.849	.242
		N of valid Cases		6	
W	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.811	.423	
		Contingency Coefficient	.925	.423	
	N of valid Cases		14		

Units	G			Value	Significance
KHEP	E	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.752	.407
			Contingency Coefficient	.914	.407
		N of valid Cases		20	
	S	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.951	.126
			Contingency Coefficient	.929	.126
		N of valid Cases		12	
W	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.665	.400	
		Contingency Coefficient	.945	.400	
	N of valid Cases		46		
RHEP	E	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.854	.249
			Contingency Coefficient	.947	.249
		N of valid Cases		22	
	S	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.939	.246
			Contingency Coefficient	.928	.246
		N of valid Cases		15	
W	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.644	.249	
		Contingency Coefficient	.945	.249	
	N of valid Cases		53		
HQ	E	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.579	.938
			Contingency Coefficient	.922	.938
		N of valid Cases		50	
	S	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.747	.250
			Contingency Coefficient	.933	.250
		N of valid Cases		25	
W	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.701	.655	
		Contingency Coefficient	.912	.655	
	N of valid Cases		25		

Note: G= Grade, E= Executives, S= Supervisors, W= Workmen, N=Total number of data set

Table- 6.3: Impact of Organisational Environment on the Social Well-Being

Units	G			Value	Significance
AGTP	E	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.775	.466
			Contingency Coefficient	.866	.466
		N of valid Cases		10	
	S	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	1.000	.224
			Contingency Coefficient	.913	.224
		N of valid Cases		6	
W	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.824	.357	
		Contingency Coefficient	.909	.357	
	N of valid Cases		14		
KHEP	E	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.693	.590
			Contingency Coefficient	.901	.590
		N of valid Cases		20	
	S	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	1.000	.077
			Contingency Coefficient	.894	.077
		N of valid Cases		11	
W	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.688	.105	
		Contingency Coefficient	.951	.105	
	N of valid Cases		46		
RHEP	E	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.766	.266
			Contingency Coefficient	.924	.266
		N of valid Cases		22	
	S	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.924	.274
			Contingency Coefficient	.955	.274
		N of valid Cases		15	
W	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.649	.061	
		Contingency Coefficient	.940	.061	
	N of valid Cases		53		

Units	G			Value	Significance
HQ	E	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.613	.539
			Contingency Coefficient	.922	.539
		N of valid Cases		50	
	S	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.736	.348
			Contingency Coefficient	.931	.348
		N of valid Cases		25	
W	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.813	.113	
		Contingency Coefficient	.942	.113	
	N of valid Cases		24		

Note: G= Grade, E= Executives, S= Supervisors, W= Workmen, N=Total number of data set

Table- 6.4: Impact of Organisational Environment on the Spiritual Well-Being

Units	G			Value	Significance
AGTP	E	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.842	.211
			Contingency Coefficient	.900	.211
		N of valid Cases		10	
	S	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	1.000	.224
			Contingency Coefficient	.913	.224
		N of valid Cases		6	
W	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.861	.188	
		Contingency Coefficient	.916	.188	
	N of valid Cases		14		
KHEP	E	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.688	.363
			Contingency Coefficient	.877	.363
		N of valid Cases		20	
	S	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.928	.212
			Contingency Coefficient	.915	.212
		N of valid Cases		12	
W	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.644	.679	
		Contingency Coefficient	.906	.679	
	N of valid Cases		46		
RHEP	E	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.845	.041
			Contingency Coefficient	.900	.041
		N of valid Cases		22	
	S	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.917	.362
			Contingency Coefficient	.914	.362
		N of valid Cases		15	
W	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.699	.005	
		Contingency Coefficient	.903	.005	
	N of valid Cases		53		
HQ	E	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.627	.366
			Contingency Coefficient	.883	.366
		N of valid Cases		50	
	S	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.745	.156
			Contingency Coefficient	.892	.156
		N of valid Cases		25	
W	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.813	.069	
		Contingency Coefficient	.876	.069	
	N of valid Cases		25		

Note: G= Grade, E= Executives, S= Supervisors, W= Workmen, N=Total number of data set

Table- 6.5: Impact of Organisational Culture on the Physical Well-Being

Units	G			Value	Significance
AGTP	E	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.876	.321
			Contingency Coefficient	.891	.321
		N of valid Cases		10	
	S	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.901	.244
			Contingency Coefficient	.874	.244
		N of valid Cases		6	
W	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.877	.292	
		Contingency Coefficient	.935	.292	
	N of valid Cases		14		
KHEP	E	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.814	.427
			Contingency Coefficient	.925	.427
		N of valid Cases		20	
	S	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.919	.229
			Contingency Coefficient	.925	.229
		N of valid Cases		12	
W	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.656	.113	
		Contingency Coefficient	.938	.113	
	N of valid Cases		46		
RHEP	E	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.773	.104
			Contingency Coefficient	.909	.104
		N of valid Cases		22	
	S	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.764	.545
			Contingency Coefficient	.907	.545
		N of valid Cases		15	
W	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.590	.159	
		Contingency Coefficient	.921	.159	
	N of valid Cases		53		
HQ	E	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.615	.266
			Contingency Coefficient	.922	.266
		N of valid Cases		50	
	S	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.729	.186
			Contingency Coefficient	.924	.186
		N of valid Cases		25	
W	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.833	.403	
		Contingency Coefficient	.945	.403	
	N of valid Cases		25		

Note: G= Grade, E= Executives, S= Supervisors, W= Workmen, N=Total number of data set

Table- 6.6: Impact of Organisational Culture on the Psychological Well-Being

Units	G			Value	Significance
AGTP	E	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.873	.311
			Contingency Coefficient	.918	.311
		N of valid Cases		10	
	S	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.866	.324
			Contingency Coefficient	.866	.324
		N of valid Cases		6	
W	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.892	.214	
		Contingency Coefficient	.937	.214	
	N of valid Cases		14		
KHEP	E	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.873	.079
			Contingency Coefficient	.945	.079
		N of valid Cases		20	
	S	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.873	.441
		Contingency Coefficient	.918	.441	
		N of valid Cases		12	

Units	G			Value	Significance
KHEP	W	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.690	.026
			Contingency Coefficient	.946	.026
		N of valid Cases		46	
RHEP	E	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.823	.506
			Contingency Coefficient	.939	.506
		N of valid Cases		22	
	S	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.737	.435
			Contingency Coefficient	.890	.435
		N of valid Cases		15	
W	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.631	.468	
		Contingency Coefficient	.930	.468	
	N of valid Cases		53		
HQ	E	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.625	.151
			Contingency Coefficient	.932	.151
		N of valid Cases		50	
	S	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.761	.155
			Contingency Coefficient	.935	.155
		N of valid Cases		25	
W	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.810	.618	
		Contingency Coefficient	.931	.618	
	N of valid Cases		25		

Note: G= Grade, E= Executives, S= Supervisors, W= Workmen, N=Total number of data set

Table- 67: Impact of Organisational Culture on the Social Well-Being

Units	G			Value	Significance
AGTP	E	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.955	.109
			Contingency Coefficient	.906	.109
		N of valid Cases		10	
	S	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	1.000	.242
			Contingency Coefficient	.894	.242
		N of valid Cases		6	
W	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.854	.426	
		Contingency Coefficient	.915	.426	
	N of valid Cases		14		
KHEP	E	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.843	.223
			Contingency Coefficient	.936	.223
		N of valid Cases		20	
	S	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.878	.375
			Contingency Coefficient	.869	.375
		N of valid Cases		11	
W	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.901	.059	
		Contingency Coefficient	.959	.059	
	N of valid Cases		24		
RHEP	E	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.749	.180
			Contingency Coefficient	.921	.180
		N of valid Cases		22	
	S	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.930	.277
			Contingency Coefficient	.935	.277
		N of valid Cases		15	
W	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.579	.555	
		Contingency Coefficient	.918	.555	
	N of valid Cases		53		

Units	G			Value	Significance
HQ	E	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.608	.374
			Contingency Coefficient	.920	.374
		N of valid Cases		50	
	S	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.754	.201
			Contingency Coefficient	.934	.201
		N of valid Cases		25	
W	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.901	.059	
		Contingency Coefficient	.959	.059	
	N of valid Cases		24		

Note: G= Grade, E= Executives, S= Supervisors, W= Workmen, N=Total number of data set

Table- 6.8: Impact of Organisational Culture on the Spiritual Well-Being

Units	G			Value	Significance
AGTP	E	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.892	.250
			Contingency Coefficient	.909	.250
		N of valid Cases		10	
	S	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	1.000	.242
			Contingency Coefficient	.894	.242
		N of valid Cases		6	
W	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.830	.563	
		Contingency Coefficient	.910	.563	
	N of valid Cases		14		
KHEP	E	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.793	.570
			Contingency Coefficient	.903	.570
		N of valid Cases		12	
	S	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	1.000	.051
			Contingency Coefficient	.926	.051
		N of valid Cases		12	
W	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.584	.902	
		Contingency Coefficient	.889	.902	
	N of valid Cases		46		
RHEP	E	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.708	.469
			Contingency Coefficient	.866	.469
		N of valid Cases		22	
	S	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.710	.579
			Contingency Coefficient	.867	.579
		N of valid Cases		15	
W	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.529	.720	
		Contingency Coefficient	.846	.720	
	N of valid Cases		53		
HQ	E	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.518	.993
			Contingency Coefficient	.841	.993
		N of valid Cases		50	
	S	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.740	.179
			Contingency Coefficient	.891	.179
		N of valid Cases		25	
W	Nominal by Nominal	Cramer's V	.769	.799	
		Contingency Coefficient	.864	.799	
	N of valid Cases		25		

Note: G= Grade, E= Executives, S= Supervisors, W= Workmen, N=Total number of data set

Appendix-V

Table 7.1 Group Statistics

OE	PhWB		PsyWB		SoWB		SpWB		Valid N
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
35.00	57	x	53	x	58	x	25	x	1
38.00	52	x	33	x	33	x	9	x	1
40.00	55	x	60	x	49	x	20	x	1
41.00	65	x	39	x	29	x	15	x	1
45.00	59	6.96	54	6.44	52	9.20	18	6.09	5
46.00	55	x	46	x	33	X	13	x	1
48.00	57	x	53	x	50	x	20	x	1
49.00	60	8.34	48.75	2.98	53.75	6.70	19.25	2.87	4
50.00	61.83	6.08	46.16	7.08	54.50	4.63	21.83	2.56	6
51.00	58.53	5.98	47.92	5.76	50.15	6.55	19.07	2.43	13
52.00	58.71	6.98	47.64	4.66	49.42	8.75	19.07	4.08	14
53.00	59.62	6.17	50.62	5.38	52.18	6.79	20.25	3.47	16
54.00	60.53	6.94	49.38	4.85	54.61	5.22	23.0	2.18	13
55.00	61.23	4.91	48.76	5.57	50	9.37	21.38	3.20	13
56.00	58.71	4.75	50	3.82	51.28	2.28	20.28	3.63	7
57.00	61.81	4.62	50.45	4.50	53.81	4.49	20.45	5.37	11
58.00	62.50	3.84	49.18	6.37	54.31	6.65	19.43	4.83	16
59.00	59.83	4.50	49.50	4.21	51.55	7.08	20.94	3.35	18
60.00	59	3.58	49.70	5.19	49.9	7.12	19.29	3.87	24
61.00	63.22	4.54	49.22	5.84	57.11	3.77	20.9	3.68	18
62.00	60.60	5.10	50.55	4.72	54.80	4.59	22.45	2.35	20
63.00	63.40	4.85	49.40	5.29	56.90	4.43	20.60	3.53	10
64.00	59.83	10.90	51.66	4.84	55	5.29	22.16	2.78	6
65.00	61.93	4.72	53.33	5.40	55.73	5.65	22.33	2.58	15
66.00	63.95	4.55	53.50	5.92	56.31	6.34	21.22	3.86	22
67.00	62.11	5.47	52.64	5.32	57	3.29	23.58	2.06	17
68.00	64.10	4.06	54.30	6.66	55.30	7.98	21.00	4.80	10
69.00	59.20	10.18	53.40	5.59	59	6.12	22.80	4.38	5
70.00	62.80	6.30	59.20	4.26	60.60	5.89	24.80	0.44	5
71.00	58	x	56	x	63	x	20	x	1
73.00	67	x	59	x	61	x	25	x	1
Total	61.02	5.54	50.58	5.76	53.66	6.96	20.94	3.80	296

Note: OE= Organisational Environment, PhWB= Physical Well-Being, PsyWB= Psychological well-Being, SoWB= Social Well-Being, SpWB= Spiritual Well-Being, SD = Standard Deviation, N= Number of cases with non-missing values

Table 7.2 Tests of Equality of Group Means

Components of Subjective Wellbeing	Wilk's Lambda	F	df 1	df 2	Sig.
Physical Wellbeing	.871	1.307	30	265	.139
Psychological Wellbeing	.778	2.526	30	265	.000
Social Wellbeing	.725	3.350	30	265	.000
Spiritual Wellbeing	.739	2.300	30	265	.000

Note: df= Degree of Freedom, F= F statistics, Sig.=Significance

Table 7.3 Wilk's Lambda

Test of Function (s)	Wilk's Lambda	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
1 through 4	.471	209.101	120	.000
2 through 4	.689	103.368	87	.111
3 through 4	.821	54.625	56	.527
4	.915	24.603	27	.597

Note: df= Degree of Freedom, Sig.=Significance

Table 7.4 Group Statistics

OC	PhWB		PsyWB		SoWB		SpWB		Valid N
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
41.00	52	x	33	x	33	x	9	x	1
42.00	54	1.41	45	1.41	39	8.48	15	2.82	2
45.00	57.33	6.80	46.66	10.78	40.33	9.81	13.66	5.13	3
48.00	64	x	46	x	54	x	15	x	1
49.00	60.71	5.64	49.57	3.59	53.42	6.29	20.85	3.53	7
50.00	57	2.82	53	0	54.50	3.53	22.50	3.53	2
51.00	58.83	3.54	53.16	8.42	54	8.89	19	2.82	6
52.00	58.75	5.08	47.50	4.87	50.25	6.19	19.83	4.38	12
53.00	57.12	8.07	49.37	4.98	46.75	6.69	20.62	3.37	8
54.00	59.81	6.95	46.72	6.35	51.90	6.00	20.81	2.92	11
55.00	58.59	5.84	49.13	6.37	50.86	7.24	19.95	3.40	22
56.00	57.85	5.33	53	3.78	50.85	5.20	21.42	3.95	7
57.00	64.27	4.21	51.61	5.83	54.05	7.44	20.72	3.87	18
58.00	61.63	5.37	49.86	5.18	54.72	5.47	20.59	4.55	22
59.00	60.06	4.89	51	4.37	51.26	8.47	20.73	3.63	15
60.00	62.25	5.05	51.92	5.15	56	5.83	21.64	3.40	28
61.00	58.94	6.92	52.23	5.44	56.64	4.06	23.41	1.90	17
62.00	61.35	4.76	49.23	4.95	52.82	5.72	20.23	3.91	17
63.00	61.20	5.80	49.80	3.87	54.40	5.80	20.93	3.65	15
64.00	60.92	4.84	50.85	4.25	53.85	6.60	20.57	3.81	14
65.00	61.83	4.54	49.16	7.66	54.83	5.44	21.50	2.93	12
66.00	63.20	4.03	51.26	6.11	55.06	5.58	21.46	3.52	15
67.00	62.40	4.76	53.20	5.30	54.90	8.30	21	4.29	10
68.00	59.91	5.48	48.66	6.56	55.33	6.65	21.25	4.67	12
69.00	66.88	1.90	54.22	5.28	57.88	6.58	23.55	2.24	9
70.00	65	4.24	59	0	63.50	0.70	22.50	3.53	2
71.00	65.25	2.98	56	4.24	61.75	1.50	22.50	2.88	4
72.00	69	x	54	x	54	x	25	x	1
73.00	63	5.65	56.50	3.53	57	5.65	25	0	2
75.00	68	x	50	x	53	x	20	x	1
Total	61.02	5.54	50.58	5.76	53.66	6.96	20.94	3.80	296

Note: OC= Organisational Culture, PhWB= Physical Well-Being, PsyWB= Psychological well-Being, SoWB= Social Well-Being, SpWB= Spiritual Well-Being, SD = Standard Deviation, N= Number of cases with non-missing values

Table 7.5 Tests of Equality of Group Means

Components of Subjective Wellbeing	Wilk's Lambda	F	df 1	df 2	Sig.
Physical Wellbeing	.816	2.065	29	266	.002
Psychological Wellbeing	.824	1.953	29	266	.003
Social Wellbeing	.759	2.920	29	266	.000
Spiritual Wellbeing	.823	1.971	29	266	.003

Note: df= Degree of Freedom, F= F statistics, Sig.=Significance

Table 7.6 Wilk's Lambda

Test of Function (s)	Wilk's Lambda	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
1 through 4	.517	183.143	116	.000
2 through 4	.742	83.041	84	.509
3 through 4	.856	43.083	54	.857
4	.947	15.039	26	.957

Note: df= Degree of Freedom, Sig.=Significance