Research Article

The Impact of Organizational Size on Employees' Quality of Life and Job Satisfaction in Thailand: Insights from the HAPPINOMETER Survey

Suporn Jaratsit[1]

Sirinan KIttisuksathit[2]

Article History

Received: October 3, 2024

Revised: June 6, 2025

Accepted: June 11, 2025

Abstract

Organizational management- in small, medium, or large organizations- comes with distinct advantages and challenges that directly impact employees' quality of life and job satisfaction. This study aims to analyze the quality of life and job satisfaction among employees in different organizational sizes, and examine job satisfaction factors that influence the quality of life in Thai organizations. The data were drawn from the 2021 HAPPINOMETER Happy Workplace Survey, involving 20,980 respondents from 365 organizations across the country.

The ANOVA results reveal that employees in medium-sized organizations reported lower quality of life and job satisfaction than those in small and large organizations. Key job satisfaction factors influencing quality of life included job challenges, communication, and size-specific elements- such as knowledge sharing in small organizations, job security in medium organizations, and employee listening in large organizations. These findings highlight the importance of adapting

[1] Institute for Population and Social Research, Mahidol University
E-mail: suporn.jar@mahidol.ac.th

[2] Institute for Population and Social Research, Mahidol University
E-mail: sirinan.kit@mahidol.ac.th

work environments and human resource management strategies to the specific context of organizational size in order to improve employees' quality of life and job satisfaction.

Keywords: *Organizational Size, Quality of Life, Job Satisfaction, HAPPINOMETER*

Introduction

Promoting employees' quality of life-recognized as a key driver of organizational performance, is essential. Research confirms a positive correlation between human resource and organizational performance (Combs et al., 2006; Elrehail et al., 2019), with employee satisfaction playing a central role. From the employee's perspective, quality of life is shaped by work environment and job functionality (Grant et al., 2007). Effective human resources (HR) and organizational management are therefore crucial to enhancing quality of life and job satisfaction, which in turn contributes to increased productivity (Elrehail et al., 2019).

Organizational size, typically based on number of employees, significantly influences work environments and management styles, which impact quality of life (Connolly et al., 2021). Small organizations often provide better psychosocial conditions (Barrett et al., 2009), while large organizations provide more resources, and career opportunities but may reduce autonomy due to hierarchical structures (Böckerman & Ilmakunnas, 2012; Idson & Oi, 1999). Studies also show that employees in micro-organizations exhibited fewer symptoms of anxiety and depression compared to those in large organizations (Encrenaz et al., 2018), while high workloads and time pressure in large organizations negatively affect quality of life (Garaigordobil, 2015). Although several studies have explored on small and large organizations, the dynamics of medium-sized organizations—combining informal culture with increasing complexity—remain underrepresented, particularly in Thailand. As Atkinson (2007) noted, a "one size fits all" model cannot enhance the quality of life across all organizational size.

According to Thailand's 2022 Industrial and Business Census, there are 2.6 million organizations classified under the Thailand Standard Industrial Classification (TSIC) as micro (1-5 employees), small (6-50 employees), medium (51-200 employees), and large (more than 200 employees). The census data reveals that 88.10 percent of organizations are micro-sized, employing 4.3 million people, while approximately 11.00 percent are small organizations, employing 3.8 million people. Medium organizations account for 0.70 percent (1.8 million employees), and large

organizations represent 0.20 percent (3 million employees) (National Statistical Office, 2022). Despite comprising only 0.90 percent of all organizations, medium and large organizations employ 37.22 percent of the workforce, highlighting their significant role in the economy despite the predominance of micro and small organizations. This classification highlights the diversity of work environments and management practices within Thai organizations, which significantly impact employees' quality of life and job satisfaction, ultimately impacting overall well-being.

While numerous international studies have explored the impact of organizational size on job satisfaction and quality of life, research in Thailand remains limited. Most Thai studies focus on SMEs amd emphasize productivity or engagement. A review of Thai academic databases (ThaiLIS, TCI) revealed a lack of large-scale empirical research on this issue. To addresses this gap, the current study analyzes data from over 20,000 employees in 365 organizations to examine how organizational size affects quality of life and job satisfaction. Findings aim to inform human resource development and support quality of life across organizational sizes.

Research Objectives

This study aims to investigate the quality of life among employees in small, medium, and large organizations and identify significant job satisfaction factors that influence quality of life across these different organizational sizes.

Literature Review

The HAPPINOMETER survey integrates the Happy 8 framework developed by the Thai Health Promotion Foundation, comprising eight dimensions-Happy Body, Happy Relax, Happy Heart, Happy Soul, Happy Family, Happy Society, Happy Brain, and Happy Money- that represent core aspects of employee happiness and well-being. This framework has been applied in both public and private organizations in Thailand (Kaewkerd et al., 2017; Laoteng & Jadesadalug, 2014; Laping & Suveatwatanakul, 2021), with studies confirming that related activities can enhance happiness, commitment, productivity, and reducing turnover.

Quality of life refers to physical, functional, social, and emotional well-being (Fallowfield, 2009). In the workplace context, the quality of life for employees represents a broad concept that includes various aspects of an individual's work life and environment. Given that employees spend a considerable amount of time at work (Ficarra et al., 2020), the work environment plays a crucial

role in shaping mental, emotional, and physical health. Requena (2003) identified that HR management, ownership types, and work schedules all influence job satisfaction and quality of life. Organizational size also contributes significantly. Smaller organizations often provide informal management, greater flexibility, and stronger interpersonal relationships, which can positively influence quality of life (Forth et al., 2006; Penrose, 1995). In contrast, larger organizations offer more resources and career development opportunities but may reduce employee autonomy due to hierarchical structures (Connolly et al., 2021; Idson & Oi, 1999). Effective HR practices are essential in such contexts to support quality of life (Kooij & Boon, 2017). In Thailand, Chaiprasit and Santidhirakul (2011) emphasized that happiness in SMEs is strongly linked to work environments, though smaller organizations may offer fewer financial rewards (Chaiprasit & Santidhirakul, 2011; Forth et al., 2006; Li, 2016).

Herzberg's two-factor theory (Herzberg et al., 1959) remains a classic model for explaining job satisfaction, distinguishing between motivators and hygiene factors (Dugguh & Ayaga, 2014). However, modern frameworks provide broader perspectives. Hackman and Oldham's job characteristics model (1976) identifies five key job dimensions influencing motivation, while Affective Events Theory (AET) (Weiss & Cropanzano,1996) emphasizes the emotional impact of workplace events. Recent empirical studies have also highlighted the roles of organizational culture, supportive communication, and flexible work arrangements, all of which contribute to employee quality of life and satisfaction (Mendoza-Ocasal et al., 2021). These contemporary perspectives suggest that job satisfaction is a multifaceted construct influenced by structural, emotional, and contextual factors.

According to the Thailand Standard Industrial Classification (TSIC) and The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development: OECD standards (2023), organizations are categorized as micro (1-5 employees), small (6-50 employees), medium (51-200 employees), and large (over 200 employees). This classification is critical in examining how organizational size affects management, resource, work environments-factors, and ultimately employee quality of life and job satisfaction in the context of Thailand.

Research Methodology

This study uses secondary data from the 2021 HAPPINOMETER Happy Workplace Survey, conducted from November 2020 to April 2021. The HAPPINOMETER developed by the Institute for Population and Social Research, Mahidol University, and the Thai Health Promotion Foundation,

includes 11 dimensions covering quality of life and job satisfaction. The instrument underwent expert review for content validity and showed excellent internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha = 0.94) based on 2020 national survey data, supporting its reliability and relevance.

The quality of life analysis focuses on eight dimensions comprising 36 indicators. These include Dimension 1, Happy Body, includes five indicators: breakfast, exercise, smoking, alcohol consumption, and health satisfaction. Dimension 2, Happy Relax, encompasses five indicators: rest, relaxing activities, stress management, life expectations, and coping with life challenges. Dimension 3, Happy Heart, comprises five indicators: generosity, kindness, creating shared value (CSV), volunteerism, and corporate social responsibility (CSR). Dimension 4, Happy Soul, consists of five indicators: donations, religious activities, forgiveness, remorse, and gratitude. Dimension 5, Happy Family, includes three indicators: time spent, participation in family activities, and family satisfaction. Dimension 6, Happy Society, comprises six indicators: neighborhood relationships, social compliance, safety and security, community support, peace, and social happiness. Dimension 7, Happy Brain, consists of three indicators related to the development of work skills. Dimension 8, Happy Money, includes four indicators: debt, debt repayment, savings, and compensation versus income. job satisfaction was assessed through 16 items focusing on the work environment, including job challenges (J1), career path (J2), job security (J3), employee listening (J4), labor laws (J5), promotion (J6), accuracy of wage payments (J7), timely wage payments (J8), appropriate compensation (J9), healthcare provision (J10), working environment (J11), satisfaction with benefits (J12), teamwork (J13), familial workplace atmosphere (J14), communication (J15) and knowledge sharing (J16).

A stratified sampling method was used, with the design and sample size developed in consultation with National Statistical Office (NSO) of Thailand. Organizations were selected from the 2017 industrial census, targeting about 400 organizations across 17 industrial sectors, (20-25 per sector). The final sample included 365 organizations, representing both industry type and organizational size.

The number of employee respondents per organization was determined by the NSO: 15-30 employees for small, approximately 60 employees for medium, and 100-120 employees for large organizations. HR department coordinated respondent selecting to ensure diversity across departments and job levels. Data were collected through both paper and online surveys.

Although small organizations are more numuerous in Thailand, the sampling strategy followed NSO guidelines by focusing on employee numbers rather than organization numbers. As

small organizations employ significantly fewer employees per establishment than larger ones. This approach ensured the sample reflected national labor force distribution and allowed valid comparisons across organizational sizes.

Table 1 Distribution of employee respondents by organizational size

Organizational size	Number of organizations	Number of employees	Percentage of sample (%)
Small (1-50 employees)	206	2,257	10.76%
Medium (51 -500 employees)	118	9,723	46.34%
Large (more than 500 employees)	41	9,000	42.90%
Total	365	20,980	100.00%

Table 1 presents the sample distribution by organizational size. The majority of respondents were from medium-sized organizations (46.34%), followed by large (42.90%) and small organizations (10.76%). This distribution reflects the sample design, which allocated respondents according to organization size, ensuring representation across different organizational types and workforce sizes.

Ethical approval was obtained from the Institutional Review Board of the Institute for Population and Social Research (IPSR-IRB). These measures ensured the ethical handling of the data, thereby maintaining the trust and respect of all involved.

Results

This section presents the study's results, starting with demographic characteristics and socioeconomic status of employees across small, medium, and large organizations, as summarized in Table 2. The findings offer insights into the distribution of employees' age, gender, educational background, and income level, which provide a foundation for understanding variations in quality of life and job satisfaction. These descriptive statistics set the stage for further analyses, including the association between organizational size and quality of life dimensions, and the identification of significant predictors of employees' quality of life.

Table 2 Demographic characteristics and socioeconomic status by organizational size

Variable	All (n=20,980)	Small (n = 2,257)	Medium (n = 9,723)	Large (n = 9,000)
Sex				
Male (%)	37.25	39.73	38.32	35.47
Female (%)	61.60	58.93	60.60	63.35
LGBTQ+ (%)	1.15	1.34	1.08	1.18
Mean age (years)	38.23	37.99	37.62	38.94
Generation				
Baby boomers (1946-1964). (%)	4.21	4.45	3.75	4.64
Generation X (1695-1979). (%)	31.40	30.56	29.43	33.71
Generation Y (1980-1995). (%)	55.52	53.65	57.23	54.14
Generation Z (1996-2010). (%)	8.88	11.34	9.60	7.51
Educational level				
High school or below (%)	40.23	34.21	40.98	40.91
University degree (%)	43.97	51.98	45.24	40.59
Postgraduate degree (%)	15.73	13.81	13.67	18.44
Others (%)	0.07		0.10	0.06
Monthly income				
Less than 20,001 baht (%)	49.90	56.24	53.71	43.56
20,001 – 30,000 baht (%)	21.43	19.58	22.27	20.94
30,001 – 40,000 baht (%)	11.45	11.00	9.69	13.68
40,001 – 50,000 baht (%)	6.98	5.50	6.13	8.41
50,001 – 100,000 baht (%)	8.58	6.48	7.07	10.99
More than 100,000 baht (%)	1.66	1.21	1.13	2.42

Table 2 describes the characteristics of employees by organizational size. Most respondents were female (61.60%), while males constituted 37.25%, and LGBTQ+ individuals represented 1.15%. The average age of employees was 38.23 years.The most considerable proportion was Generation Y (55.52%), followed by Generation X (31.40%). Approximately 8.88% of employees were from

Generation Z, and 4.21% were Baby Boomers. Regarding monthly income, nearly half (49.90%) of the employees earned less than 20,000 baht, 39.86% earned between 20,000 and 50,000 baht, and 10.24% earned more than 50,000 baht. Regarding organizational size, 46.34% of employees worked in medium organizations, 42.90% in large organizations, and 10.76% in small organizations.

Table 3 Association between organizational size and quality of life (n = 20,980)

Quality of life dimensions	Small (Mean ± SD)	Medium (Mean ± SD)	Large (Mean ± SD)	P value
Happy body	59.63 ± 17.00	59.64 ± 16.01	61.38 ± 16.06	0.000***
Happy relax	56.69 ± 15.85	54.75 ± 15.07	55.83 ± 15.44	0.000***
Happy heart	68.95 ± 16.49	66.40 ± 15.56	68.75 ± 15.17	0.000***
Happy soul	69.84 ± 16.02	68.40 ± 14.99	70.43 ± 14.89	0.000***
Happy family	65.29 ± 21.50	62.62 ± 21.49	63.87 ± 21.78	0.000***
Happy society	60.98 ± 16.17	59.10 ± 15.22	60.76 ± 14.91	0.000***
Happy brain	65.82 ± 18.05	63.17 ± 17.18	65.75 ± 17.39	0.000***
Happy money	52.94 ± 20.46	53.28 ± 20.03	53.33 ± 20.46	0.720
Overall quality of life	62.52±12.14	60.92±11.28	62.51±11.48	0.000***

Note: *** statistical significance at p≤0.001

The analysis of variance (ANOVA) revealed significant differences in the average scores and standard deviations across the eight dimensions of quality of life among the three organizational sizes, as presented in Table 3. Among these dimensions, the “Happy Soul” dimension received the highest scores for all organizational sizes, with large organizations scoring 70.43%, small organizations at 69.84%, and medium organizations at 68.40%. The “Happy Heart” dimension ranked second, with scores across all sizes ranging from 66.40% to 68.95%. Notably, medium organizations exhibited the lowest scores in seven out of eight dimensions, except “Happy Money”, which showed no statistically significant difference across the three organizational sizes. The post hoc test confirmed that employees in medium organizations had significantly lower scores in the seven dimensions (Body, Relax, Heart, Soul, Family, Society, and Brain) than those in small and large organizations (p = 0.000). Additionally, the overall quality of life score was significantly lower in medium size organizations at 60.92% compared to small and large organizations.

Table 4 Association between organizational size and Herzberg's satisfaction dimensions (n = 20,980)

Job satisfaction dimensions	Small (Mean ± SD)	Medium (Mean ± SD)	Large (Mean ± SD)	P value
Motivator (5 factors)	59.55 ± 19.14	56.69 ± 18.45	59.32 ± 18.59	0.000***
Hygiene (11 factors)	71.29 ± 16.19	68.28 ± 15.84	70.77 ± 15.41	0.000***

Note: *** statistical significance at p≤0.001

Based on Herzberg's two-factor model, job satisfaction differed significantly across organizational sizes (Table 4). For the hygiene component, satisfaction was highest satisfaction in small organizations (71.29%), followed by large (70.77%) and medium (68.28%). A similar pattern appear in the motivator component, with small organizations scoring highest (59.55%), and medium organizations lowest (56.69%). Overall, hygiene component received slightly higher score than motivators across all groups.

Table 5 Post-hoc analysis results for quality of life and job satisfaction

Organizational sizes	Quality of life score (Mean difference)	P value	Job satisfaction score (Mean difference)	P value
Small vs. Medium	1.60	0.000***	2.96	0.000***
Small vs. Large	0.01	0.976	0.43	0.234
Medium vs. Large	-1.59	0.000***	-2.53	0.000***
Average score				
Small	62.52		71.29	
Medium	60.92		68.28	
Large	62.51		70.77	

Note: **statistical significance at p≤0.01, *** statistical significance at p≤0.001

Table 4 presents the post-hoc analysis results comparing quality of life and job satisfaction across different organizational sizes. Significant differences in overall quality of life were observed between medium organizations and the other two groups (small and large). Small and large

organizations exhibited similar quality of life scores (62.52 and 62.51, respectively), with no significant difference between these two groups (p=0.976). In contrast, medium organizations had a lower score (60.92), indicating a significantly lower quality of life than small and large organizations (p=0.000). Small organizations reported the highest score of job satisfaction at 71.29, followed by large organizations at 70.77, while medium organizations scored 68.28. Medium organizations had significantly lower job satisfaction scores than small and large organizations (p = 0.000). Thus, the analysis presented in Tables 3 and 4 indicates that medium organizations have statistically significantly lower quality of life and job satisfaction than small and large organizations.

Table 6 Descriptive statistics of job satisfaction factors and overall job satisfaction score by organizational size (n = 20,980)

Job Satisfaction	Medium (n =9,723)		Small (n = 2,257)		Large (n = 9,000)		Overall Job satisfaction	
	mean	S.D.	mean	S.D.	mean	S.D.	mean	S.D.
J1	61.75	22.68	63.98	23.20	63.26	22.57	62.64	22.71
J2	49.24	25.31	52.80	25.68	50.74	25.82	50.26	25.59
J3	63.81	23.03	63.70	24.96	67.87	22.95	65.54	23.30
J4	55.28	24.98	60.61	24.79	57.86	24.73	56.96	24.92
J5	66.91	22.80	69.79	23.15	70.45	22.04	68.74	22.58
J6	53.35	25.74	56.68	25.86	56.84	25.18	55.21	25.57
J7	82.91	22.81	85.31	22.20	87.34	19.94	85.07	21.66
J8	87.33	21.39	88.40	19.86	90.34	18.53	88.73	20.10
J9	58.25	24.30	61.45	24.38	61.22	24.42	59.87	24.41
J10	61.82	24.29	63.33	25.11	64.93	24.01	63.31	24.30
J11	61.38	22.03	65.67	22.44	63.90	21.92	62.92	22.08
J12	57.96	24.24	62.23	24.27	61.70	23.91	60.03	24.18
J13	69.02	22.44	72.32	22.70	71.66	21.70	70.51	22.19
J14	67.69	23.17	71.99	23.24	67.86	23.03	68.23	23.16
J15	73.45	20.25	76.20	19.97	73.93	19.75	73.95	20.02

Table 6 Descriptive statistics of job satisfaction factors and overall job satisfaction score by organizational size (n = 20,980) (continue)

Job Satisfaction	Medium (n =9,723)		Small (n = 2,257)		Large (n = 9,000)		Overall Job satisfaction	
J16	64.40	22.26	67.47	22.56	65.11	21.68	65.04	22.06
Total	68.28	15.84	71.29	16.19	70.77	15.41	69.67	15.75

Note: J1 = job challenges, J2 = career path, J3 = job security, J4 = employee listening, J5 = labor laws, J6 = promotion, J7 = accuracy of wage payments, J8 = timely wage payment, J9 = appropriate compensation, J10 = healthcare provision, J11 = working environment, J12 = satisfaction with benefits, J13 = teamwork, J14 = familial workplace atmosphere, J15 = communication, J16 = knowledge sharing

Table 6 presents the descriptive statistics for each of the 16 items measuring job satisfaction, disaggregated by organizational size, as well as the overall average score. Across all organizational sizes, the highest mean scores were observed for J8 (timely wage payment), J7 (accuracy of wage payments), and J15 (communication), indicating relatively high levels of satisfaction in these areas. In contrast, lower mean scores were found for J2 (career path) and J6 (promotion), reflecting potential areas for development in career advancement and growth opportunities. When comparing organizational sizes, small organizations reported the highest overall job satisfaction score followed by large and medium organizations. These results align with earlier findings, suggesting that employees in medium-sized organizations tend to report lower satisfaction across most dimensions. The overall job satisfaction score was 69.67 (SD = 15.75), indicating moderate levels of employee satisfaction.

Table 7 Relationships between job satisfaction factors and quality of life

Job satisfaction factors	Medium			Small			Large		
	B	Beta	P value	B	Beta	P value	B	Beta	P value
Constant	20.56		0.000***	27.38		0.000***	30.17		0.000***
J1	2.05	.17	0.000***	0.09	.17	0.000***	.10	.20	0.000***
J2	.087	.08	0.000***	0.01	.02	0.300	.02	.04	0.001***

Table 7 Relationships between job satisfaction factors and quality of life (continue)

Job satisfaction	Medium			Small			Large		
factors	B	Beta	P value	B	Beta	P value	B	Beta	P value
J3	1.24	.10	0.000***	.05	.10	0.000***	.05	.10	0.000***
J4	1.03	.09	0.000***	.05	.11	0.000***	.05	.10	0.000***
J5	.82	.067	0.000***	.05	.09	0.000***	.03	.06	0.000***
J6	.42	.04	0.000***	.00	.01	0.707	.02	.04	0.000***
J7	.25	.02	0.038	.03	.06	0.002**	.03	.04	0.000***
J8	.02	.00	0.853	.01	.02	0.431	-.00	-.00	0.828
J9	.40	.03	0.001***	.04	.08	0.000***	.04	.08	0.000***
J10	.67	.06	0.000***	.00	.01	0.737	.01	.02	0.152
J11	1.24	.10	0.000***	.03	.06	0.036*	.05	.09	0.000***
J12	.41	.04	0.004**	.01	.01	0.688	.02	.03	0.011*
J13	-.41	-.03	0.004**	-.02	-.03	0.207	-.00	-.01	0.669
J14	.06	.01	0.705	.02	.03	0.209	-.00	-.01	.0699
J15	1.93	.14	0.000***	.08	.13	0.000***	.08	.14	0.000***
J16	.53	.04	0.000***	.06	.12	0.000***	.02	.04	0.000***
F-test	435.65			115.60			440.38		
R^2	0.418			0.452			0.440		
P value	0.000***			0.000***			0.000***		

Note: *Statistical significance at p≤0.05, **statistical significance at p≤0.01, *** statistical significance at p≤0.001

J1 = job challenges, J2 = career path, J3 = job security, J4 = employee listening, J5 = labor laws, J6 = promotion, J7 = accuracy of wage payments, J8 = timely wage payment, J9 = appropriate compensation, J10 = healthcare provision, J11 = working environment, J12 = satisfaction with benefits, J13 = teamwork, J14 = familial workplace atmosphere, J15 = communication, J16 = knowledge sharing

The simple linear regression results in Table 7 demonstrate the relationship between job satisfaction factors (16 independent variables) and quality of life (the dependent variable). For

medium organizations, the coefficient value (R^2) was 0.418, indicating that job satisfaction factors explained 41.80 %of the variance in quality of life (F = 435.65, p ≤ 0.001). Among these factors, job challenges (J1) had the highest significant predictive value for quality of life (β = 0.17, p ≤ 0.000). Communication (J15) and job security (J3) were the second and third highest significant predictors (β = 0.14, p ≤ 0.000 and β = 0.10, p ≤ 0.000, respectively). Other factors, such as career path (J2), employee listening (J4), labor laws (J5), promotion (J6), accuracy of wage payments (J7), healthcare provision (J10), working environment (J11), satisfaction with benefits (J12), and knowledge sharing (J16) also significantly affected quality of life. In contrast, timely wage payments (J8), appropriate compensation (J9), and familial workplace atmosphere (J14) were not statistically significant factors.

In the model for small organizations, job satisfaction factors explain 45.20 percent of the variance in quality of life. Significant predictors included job challenges (J1), job security (J3), employee listening (J4), labor laws (J5), accuracy of wage payments (J7), appropriate compensation (J9), working environment (J11), communication (J15), and knowledge sharing (J16).

The model for large organizations revealed a coefficient value (R^2) of 0.44, indicating that job satisfaction factors explained 44.00 percent of the variance in quality of life. Significant predictors included job challenges (J1), career path (J2), job security (J3), employee listening (J4), labor laws (J5), promotion (J6), accuracy of wage payments (J7), appropriate compensation (J9), working environment (J11), satisfaction with benefits (J12), communication (J15), and knowledge sharing (J16).

Conclusion and Discussion

The objectives of this study were to investigate the quality of life among employees in small, medium, and large organizations and examine the relationship between job satisfaction and quality of life, focusing on 16 key job satisfaction factors that predict quality of life across these organizational sizes. The results revealed that the average age of respondents was 38.2 years, with a significant proportion of the workforce in Thailand belonging to Generation Y (those born between 1981 and 1996). These findings confirm the differences in quality of life- based on organizational size, with medium organizations exhibiting the lowest scores. These results are consistent with the studies conducted by Penrose (1995) and Requena (2003), which significantly contribute to our understanding of employees' quality of life across various organizational contexts. Consequently, the study emphasizes the need for targeted interventions to enhance the quality of life in medium organizations.

Given the large sample size used in this study (N = 20,980), the results may be sensitive to detecting statistically significant differences even when the actual differences are small. To account for this, the interpretation of findings includes significance levels (p-values) and practical relevance as indicated by mean differences and effect sizes where applicable. This approach allows for a more balanced understanding of the results in both statistical and real-world contexts.

The analysis of the eight dimensions revealed that seven dimensions significantly influenced the quality of life, with the “Happy Money” dimension consistently scoring the lowest across all organizational sizes. Small organizations scored lowest in this dimension, reflecting employees’ financial challenges (Forth et al., 2006). This finding highlights the urgent need to address employees’ financial concerns. Organizations should consider enhancing financial literacy among employees to mitigate these issues, which is an essential step toward improving overall employees’ quality of life. However, it is important to acknowledge that increasing salaries or direct financial compensation may not be a feasible for many organizations, particularly in times of economic uncertainty or limited financial capacity. Given these constraints, organizations can consider alternative strategies to support employees’ financial well-being without incurring substantial costs. Such approaches include providing financial literacy programs, promoting savings behaviors, organizing peer-sharing sessions on personal budgeting, or facilitating access to external financial support systems such as cooperative savings schemes or government assistance programs.

The lower scores observed in medium organizations across all eight dimensions suggest that these organizations need to prioritize improvements in these areas to enhance employees’ overall quality of life. This underscores the importance of promoting work-life balance and committing human resources to enhancing quality of life. Specifically, promoting work-life balance could be particularly beneficial, given that the “Happy Relax” score was the second lowest among all organizational sizes. Furthermore, the study found that job satisfaction was the lowest in medium organizations, with statistically significant differences between organizational sizes.

The eight job satisfaction factors, including job challenges, job security, employee listening, labor laws, appropriate compensation, working environment, communication, and knowledge sharing, significantly impacted quality of life across all organizational sizes. Additionally, in small organizations, the accuracy of wage payments emerged as another significant factor. Small organizations’ high job satisfaction levels can be attributed to informal management practices, such as direct and personal communication between employees and management and flexible employee

relationships that facilitate negotiation (Atkinson, 2007; Barrett et al., 2009). In large organizations, more significant factors influencing quality of life include career path, promotion, accuracy of wage payments, and satisfaction with benefits. These factors are important due to the emphasis on human resource development (Barrett et al., 2009) and formal structure (Idson & Oi, 1999).

Interestingly, for medium organizations, significant factors affecting quality of life included career path, promotion, healthcare provision, satisfaction with benefits, and teamwork. However, teamwork emerged as a critical factor that negatively impacted the quality of life in medium organizations. This suggests that medium organizations operating between informal and formal working systems may face challenges supporting all dimensions of employee quality of life, as reflected in the lower scores reported across well-being domains. Further research is recommended to explore possible organizational factors, such as policy or resource allocation, that may influence these outcomes.

Recommendations

This study has several limitations. It relied on self-reported data from the HAPPINOMETER, which reflects subjective perceptions that may be influenced by external life events, potentially introducing bias. Future research should consider longitudinal designs to better track changes in quality of life and job satisfaction over time.

Future research should also explore the role of organizational culture across different organizational sizes, as cultural dynamics may significantly influence employees' quality of life. Additionally, the eight dimensions of the HAPPINOMETER offer an opportunity for more targeted analysis. For example, examining indicators under the "Happy Relax" dimension could provide insights into mental health risks, an increasingly critical issue in Thai society.

References

Atkinson, C. (2007). Building high performance employment relationships in small firms. *Employee Relations, 29*(5), 506-519. https://doi.org/10.1108/01425450710776317

Barrett, R., Claydon, T., & Rainnie, A. (2009). *The paradox of happy workers in small firms: Exploring new explanations for an old issue.* ILEAR. https://www.ilera-directory.org/15thworldcongress/files -/papers/Track_1/Wed_W3_RAINNIE.pdf

Böckerman, P., & Ilmakunnas, P. (2012). The job satisfaction-productivity nexus: A study using matched survey and register data. *ILR Review, 65*(2), 244-262. https://doi.org/10.1177/001979391206500203

Chaiprasit, K., & Santidhirakul, O. (2011). Happiness at work of employees in small and medium-sized enterprises, Thailand. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 25(* 1) , 189-200. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.10.540

Combs, J. G., Liu, Y., Hall, A., & Ketchen, D. (2006). How much do high-performance work practices matter? A meta-analysis of their effects on organizational performance. *Personnel Psychology, 59*(3), 501-528. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2006.00045.x

Connolly, F. F., Seva, I. J., & Garling, T. (2021). The bigger the better? Business size and small-business owners' subjective well-being. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 22*(3-4), 1071-1088. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-020-00264-2

Dugguh, A. I., & Ayaga, D. (2014). Job satisfaction theories: Traceability to employee performance in organizations. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management, 16*(5), 11-18.

Elrehail, H., Harazneh, I., Abuhjeeleh, M., Alzghoul, A., Alnajdawi, S., & Ibrahim, H. M. H. (2019). Employee satisfaction, human resource management practices and competitive advantage: The case of Northern Cyprus. *European Journal of Management and Business Economics, 29*(2), 125–149. https://doi.org/10.1108/EJMBE-01-2019-0001

Encrenaz, G., Laberon, S., Lagabrielle, C., Debruyne, G., Pouyaud, J., & Rascle, N. (2018). Psychosocial risks in small enterprises: The mediating role of perceived working conditions in the relationship between enterprise size and workers' anxious or depressive episodes. *International Journal of Occupational Safety and Ergonomics, 25*(3), 485-494.

Fallowfield, L. (2009). *What is quality of life?* Hayward Medical Coomunications.

Ficarra, L., Rubino, M. J., & Morote, E. S. (2020). Does organizational culture affect employee happiness? *Journal for Leadership and Instruction, 19*(2), 38-47.

Forth J., Bewley, H., & Bryson, A. (2006). *Small and medium sized enterprises: Findings from the 2004 workplace employment relations survey*. Department of Trade and Industry.

Garaigordobil, M. (2015). Predictor variables of happiness and its connection with risk and protective factors for health. *Frontiers in Psychology, 6,* 1-10.

Grant, A. M., Christianson, M. K., & Price, R. H. (2007). Happiness, health, or relationships? Managerial practices and employee well-being tradeoffs. Academy *of Management Perspectives, 21*(3), 51–63.

Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, *16*(2), 250–279.

Herzberg, F., Maunser, B., & Snyderman, B. (1959). *The motivation to wor*k. John Wiley and Sons Inc.,

Idson, T., & Oi, W. (1999). Workers are more productive in large firms. *American Economic Review, 89*(2), 104-108.

Kaewkerd, W., Sadangharn, P., & Ingard, A. (2017). Kān̄damnœ̄n ngān̄ phūa sān̄g khwām̄suk læ khwām̄ phūk̄phan khǭng phanakngān̄ nai ʻongkǭn suk phāwa tonbǣp [Approach of happiness and employee engagement in happy workplace organization model]. *KKBS Journal of Business Administration and Accountancy, 1*(2), 13-29.

Kooij, A. M., & Boon, C. (2017). Perceptions of HR practices, person–organisation fit, and affective commitment: The moderating role of career stage. *Human Resource Management Journal, 28*(1), 61-75. https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12164

Laoteng, S., & Jadesadalug, V. (2014). ʻItthiphon khǭng kitc̄hakam sān̄g suk nai ʻongkǭn tām̄ nǣothān̄g khwām̄suk pǣt prakān̄ thī mī tǭ khwām̄suk nai kā rot ngān̄ prasitthiphāp kān̄thamngān̄ læ khwām̄tangc̄hai nai kān̄ lā ǭk khǭng phanakngān̄ bǭrisat ʻēkkachon [The influence of happiness activities in the organization by happy 8 model toward happiness at work, productivity of work and intention to resign of workers in a private company]. *Veridian E-Journal, Silpakorn University, 7*(2), 988-1006.

Laping, T., & Suveatwatanakul, C. (2021). ʻItthiphon khǭng khwām̄suk nai kān̄tham ngān̄ tǭ khwām̄ thumthē mī c̄hai nai ngān̄ khǭng phanakngān̄ tǭnrap bon khrūangbin run THAI Quality and Value (TQV)] The influence of happiness in work that affect employee engagement of Thai airway's flight attendant (TQV). *Srinakharinwirot Business Journal, 11*(2), 35-48.

Li, X. (2016). *Impact of firm characteristics on wages: Industry wage differentials and firm size-wage effects in Sweden* [Master's thesis, Umeå University]. Digitala Vetenskapliga Arkivet. https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:944802/FULLTEXT01.pdf

Mendoza-Ocasal, D., Castillo-Jiménez, R., Navarro, E., & Ramírez, J. (2021). Measuring workplace happiness as a key factor for the strategic management of organizations. *Polish Journal of Management Studies*, *24*(2), 292-306. https://doi.org/10.17512/pjms.2021.24.2.18.

National Statistical Office. (2022). *Sammano thurakit læ utsahakam Phoso songphanharoihoksipha khomun phunthan* [The 2022 business and industrial census basic information]. National Statistical Office.

Penrose, E. (1995). *The theory of the growth of the firm* (3rd ed). Oxford University Press.

Requena, R. (2003). Social capital, satisfaction and quality of life in the workplace. *Social Indicators Research, 61*, 331-360.

The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development [OECD]. (2023). *OECD SME and entrepreneurship outlook 2023*. OECD. https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/2023/06/oecd-sme-and-entrepreneurship-outlook-2023_c5ac21d0.html

Weiss, H. M., & Cropanzano, R. (1996). Affective events theory: A theoretical discussion of the structure, causes and consequences of affective experiences at work. In B. M. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior: An annual series of analytical essays and critical reviews* (pp. 1-74). JAI Press.