



Happiness as a Strategic Organizational Capability An Integral Eight-Dimension Model for Sustainable Well-Being, Responsible Performance and Human Flourishing at Work

Dr. Ignacio Bonasa

President & Founder, University of Happiness and Well-Being

President & Founder, Liderarte Factoría de Talento

Humanistic Leadership Researcher, Author and International Speaker

Corresponding Author: Dr. Ignacio Bonasa

Article type	Conceptual research article and integrative literature review
Field	Management, organizational behavior and human-centered innovation
Language	English
Citation style	APA 7th edition
Originality	Original authorial synthesis; not previously published

<https://doi.org/10.64971/j.cph.eijtem.v13.i3.6.2026>

Abstract

Organizations increasingly speak about employee happiness, yet many interventions remain peripheral, fragmented, and disconnected from the conditions under which work is actually performed. This article reframes organizational happiness as a strategic capability rather than a temporary emotion, a collection of benefits, or an individual duty to remain positive. Through an integrative conceptual review of subjective well-being, eudaimonic psychology, self-determination theory, job demands-resources theory, psychological safety, meaningful work, thriving, humanistic management, and responsible technology, the paper develops an Eight-Dimension Organizational Happiness Model. The dimensions are body, cognition, emotion, transcendence and meaning, social relationships, professional life, financial well-being, and technology. The model proposes that sustainable happiness emerges from the dynamic alignment of these dimensions and from organizational systems that protect dignity, agency, fairness, learning, belonging, and recovery. The article distinguishes four levels of maturity, proposes a governance architecture, identifies ethical safeguards, develops a multi-layer measurement dashboard, and offers propositions for empirical research. Its principal contribution is to connect the lived wholeness of the person with the design of work, leadership behavior, compensation, digital systems, and institutional accountability. Happiness becomes strategically valuable when it is embedded in how organizations decide, organize, measure, and care—not when it is demanded as an emotional performance from employees. (Diener, 1984; Diener et al., 2018)

Keywords:

Organizational happiness; employee well-being; human flourishing; meaningful work; humanistic management; job design; psychological safety; responsible technology; financial well-being. (Edmondson, 1999; Edmondson & Lei, 2014)

1. Introduction

Happiness has entered the language of management because the traditional employment bargain is under strain. Workforces are navigating accelerated technological change, hybrid work, demographic transitions, economic uncertainty, skills obsolescence, and a growing expectation that organizations should contribute to lives worth living rather than merely purchase labor. At the same time, organizations confront burnout,

disengagement, unwanted turnover, loneliness, and declining trust. These conditions make well-being a strategic issue, but they also create the temptation to use happiness as a fashionable label without confronting the deeper architecture of work. (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007, 2017)

A narrow corporate interpretation equates happiness with positive mood, celebration, entertainment, or a menu of voluntary benefits. It produces wellness days, motivational talks, meditation applications, fruit baskets, or exercise challenges while leaving excessive demands, arbitrary decisions, poor management, insecurity, and moral conflict untouched. Such initiatives may be useful at the margins, but they become counterproductive when they suggest that employees should adapt emotionally to conditions the organization refuses to improve. The gap between declared care and lived reality eventually damages credibility.

A more rigorous approach begins with a different question. Instead of asking how an organization can make people happy, it asks what conditions allow human beings to function, relate, learn, contribute, and flourish sustainably while doing demanding work. This shift matters because happiness is not a product that management can deliver or a permanent feeling that employees can be required to display. It is an emergent quality of the relationship between the person, the work, the community, and the institution. (Seligman, 2011)

The present article defines organizational happiness as a dynamic state of sustainable functioning characterized by vitality, agency, positive and regulated emotion, meaningful contribution, belonging, development, material security, and a humane relationship with technology. It includes hedonic elements such as positive affect and satisfaction, but it also includes eudaimonic elements such as purpose, growth, virtue, and self-realization. It therefore differs from cheerfulness, engagement alone, or the absence of stress. (Diener, 1984; Diener et al., 2018)

The article makes three contributions. First, it integrates dispersed streams of well-being research into eight dimensions that reflect the whole person. Second, it translates those dimensions into organizational levers, responsibilities, and indicators. Third, it introduces ethical boundaries designed to prevent forced positivity, excessive surveillance, and the privatization of structural problems. The resulting framework is intended to support research and practice in management, organizational behavior, human resources, occupational health, and responsible digital transformation. (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007, 2017)

2. Conceptual Clarification: What Organizational Happiness Is—and Is Not

The word happiness carries conceptual ambiguity. In everyday language it may refer to pleasure, contentment, luck, satisfaction, or a meaningful life. Academic traditions distinguish between hedonic well-being, which emphasizes positive affect and satisfaction, and eudaimonic well-being, which emphasizes the realization of human capacities, autonomy, purpose, and growth. Both are important at work. A person may experience pleasant relationships yet feel professionally stagnant, or may find a role deeply meaningful while becoming physically depleted. A useful organizational theory must therefore resist one-dimensional definitions. (Diener, 1984; Diener et al., 2018)

Organizational happiness is not continuous positivity. Human beings experience fear, grief, frustration, anger, and doubt, and these emotions often contain information about injustice, risk, loss, or blocked goals. A healthy workplace allows difficult emotions to be expressed and interpreted without humiliation. It seeks emotional range and regulation rather than compulsory optimism. When organizations reward only positive speech, they weaken learning because people hide problems until they become crises. (Spreitzer et al., 2005)

Organizational happiness is also not equivalent to engagement. Engagement describes an energetic and absorbed relationship with work, yet a highly engaged person can overwork, neglect recovery, or remain loyal to an unhealthy system. Nor is happiness identical to job satisfaction, which may reflect low expectations or a favorable comparison rather than flourishing. The proposed construct is broader: it concerns the quality and sustainability of human functioning across multiple domains. (Seligman, 2011)

Finally, happiness is not exclusively an individual responsibility. Personality, habits, relationships, and personal choices matter, but the organization shapes autonomy, workload, recognition, pay, safety, inclusion, technology, and opportunities for learning. Treating well-being as a private resilience problem ignores the distribution of power. An ethical model therefore recognizes both personal agency and institutional responsibility. (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Ryan & Deci, 2017)

3. Theoretical Foundations

3.1 Subjective well-being and the hedonic tradition

Subjective well-being research provides a foundation for understanding how people evaluate their lives and experience positive and negative affect. Its contribution to organizational analysis is the recognition that lived experience matters in its own right, not only as a predictor of performance. Employees interpret policies through emotion and judgment; two formally similar jobs can therefore be experienced very differently. However, subjective reports should be treated as essential evidence rather than as a complete account, because adaptation and social comparison can normalize poor conditions. (Diener, 1984; Diener et al., 2018)

In practice, hedonic indicators are useful for identifying affective climates, satisfaction, and recovery. Their limitation is that they may privilege comfort over growth or justice. A worker may report short-term satisfaction in a role that offers little autonomy or development, while another may experience temporary strain during meaningful learning. The present model therefore incorporates hedonic well-being but places it within a broader architecture of human flourishing. (Diener, 1984; Diener et al., 2018)

3.2 Eudaimonic well-being and human development

Eudaimonic perspectives ask whether people are becoming capable of living well, acting with purpose, and realizing their potential. Ryff's dimensions of autonomy, environmental mastery, personal growth, positive relations, purpose in life, and self-acceptance offer particularly relevant elements for the workplace. They suggest that well-being depends not merely on feeling good but on being able to author one's life, develop competence, and participate in relationships of mutual recognition. (Ryff, 1989; Ryff, 2014)

This perspective explains why apparently generous benefit packages may fail to generate flourishing when work is meaningless, tightly controlled, or ethically incoherent. It also supports the inclusion of transcendence, professional development, and agency in the proposed model. (Rosso et al., 2010; Steger et al., 2012)

3.3 Self-determination theory

Self-determination theory identifies autonomy, competence, and relatedness as basic psychological needs. Organizational systems can support or frustrate each of them. Autonomy is influenced by discretion, participation, and freedom from unnecessary control. Competence is influenced by feedback, challenge, training, and the opportunity to see progress. Relatedness is influenced by belonging, trust, and the quality of interaction. These are not optional extras; they are mechanisms through which management practices become psychologically nourishing or depleting. (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Ryan & Deci, 2017)

The theory also distinguishes autonomous motivation from controlled motivation. People may perform under pressure, fear, or external reward, but such performance often carries costs in creativity, persistence, and well-being. Sustainable happiness requires a work system that supports internalization and meaningful choice. (Rosso et al., 2010; Steger et al., 2012)

3.4 Job demands-resources theory and conservation of resources

The job demands-resources framework explains how work characteristics contribute to strain or motivation. Demands such as workload, emotional labor, role conflict, and uncertainty consume energy; resources such as autonomy, support, feedback, and learning enable coping and growth. Conservation of resources theory adds that people seek to acquire and protect valued resources and become especially vulnerable when losses accumulate. This explains spirals in which fatigue reduces performance, performance problems increase monitoring, and monitoring further reduces autonomy and recovery. (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Ryan & Deci, 2017)

The implication is that happiness cannot be secured by adding resources while leaving extreme demands unchanged. An organization may offer coaching or wellness applications, but if staffing, scheduling, or role conflict remain harmful, the intervention treats symptoms rather than causes. (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007, 2017)

3.5 Psychological safety and relational climates

Psychological safety describes a shared belief that interpersonal risk-taking is possible without humiliation or retaliation. It is essential to learning, innovation, and ethical voice. Happiness is not possible in a climate where people must constantly protect themselves from ridicule, exclusion, or punishment. Safety does not imply low standards; it allows high standards to be pursued through candor and joint problem solving. (Edmondson, 1999; Edmondson & Lei, 2014)

Relational energy, high-quality connections, and perceived organizational support further show that relationships are resources. Brief interactions can either restore or drain energy. This justifies treating

social relationships as an independent dimension rather than assuming that they are captured by general culture. (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007, 2017)

3.6 Meaningful work and calling

Meaningful work research highlights significance, purpose, coherence, and the perception that one's efforts contribute to something worthwhile. Work becomes meaningful through task significance, identity, relationships, craftsmanship, service, and connection to values. Meaning cannot be manufactured solely through corporate narratives; it must be supported by actual decisions and by visibility of who benefits from the work. (Rosso et al., 2010; Steger et al., 2012)

The language of calling can inspire commitment but also expose people to exploitation when sacrifice is romanticized. A humanistic model therefore combines meaning with boundaries, fairness, and recovery. (Rosso et al., 2010; Steger et al., 2012)

3.7 Humanistic management and dignity

Humanistic management provides the ethical foundation of the framework. It treats persons as ends, recognizes their inherent dignity, and evaluates organizations by the quality of their contribution to human flourishing. This perspective does not reject efficiency or profit. It rejects the idea that people may be reduced to inputs whose value depends only on output. (Melé, 2003; Pirson, 2017)

Dignity changes the status of well-being. It becomes not only a productivity strategy but a legitimate obligation. Even when the financial return of a humane practice is uncertain, avoidable degradation remains unacceptable. (Melé, 2003; Pirson, 2017)

3.8 Technology, technostress, and human agency

Digital systems shape attention, pace, visibility, autonomy, and the boundaries of work. Technology can expand accessibility and remove drudgery, but it can also intensify interruption, surveillance, and de-skilling. Technostress research identifies overload, invasion, complexity, insecurity, and uncertainty as distinct pressures. Artificial intelligence adds concerns about opacity, bias, accountability, and the future meaning of professional expertise. (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Ryan & Deci, 2017)

A contemporary model of happiness must therefore include technology as a constitutive dimension. Digital tools do not merely support work; they reorganize the experience of work and the distribution of power. (Tarafdar et al., 2019; Kellogg et al., 2020)

4. Methodology: Integrative Conceptual Review and Theory Building

This study uses an integrative conceptual review rather than a systematic meta-analysis. The purpose is theory building: to connect mature but partially separated streams of research and translate them into a coherent management architecture. The process followed five stages. First, major constructs associated with positive functioning at work were identified. Second, their assumptions, levels of analysis, and dependent variables were compared. Third, overlapping elements were clustered while preserving conceptually distinct domains. Fourth, each domain was translated into organizational levers and observable indicators. Fifth, ethical failure modes were examined to ensure that the model could not be interpreted as a mandate for emotional conformity.

The model is intentionally multidisciplinary. Psychological theory explains needs and experience; organizational behavior explains work design and relational climates; humanistic management provides an ethical foundation; occupational health introduces sustainability and recovery; and technology studies illuminate digital power. This breadth is necessary because organizational happiness is not produced by a single function. (Melé, 2003; Pirson, 2017)

The method also uses abductive reasoning. Existing theory informed the eight dimensions, while practical contradictions—such as organizations promoting well-being while rewarding chronic availability—were used to refine the model. The result is a set of propositions that can be tested through future quantitative, qualitative, and mixed-method research.

5. The Eight-Dimension Organizational Happiness Model

The model conceptualizes happiness as the dynamic alignment of eight dimensions. The dimensions are analytically distinct but practically interdependent. Weakness in one domain can undermine strengths in another. High meaning cannot indefinitely compensate for exhaustion; friendly teams cannot neutralize severe financial insecurity; sophisticated learning systems cannot produce flourishing under humiliating leadership; and advanced technology cannot be considered successful if it destroys agency and trust. (Rosso et al., 2010; Steger et al., 2012)

Dimension	Human question	Primary organizational levers	Illustrative indicators
Body	Can I sustain the physical and energetic demands of this work?	Workload, recovery, ergonomics, safety, scheduling, health support	Vitality, fatigue, absence, recovery, incidents
Cognition	Can I understand, focus, learn, and exercise judgment?	Role clarity, information design, learning, deep-work time, cognitive load	Focus, learning agility, error patterns, decision quality
Emotion	Can I feel and speak honestly without being overwhelmed or punished?	Manager behavior, recognition, conflict systems, psychological support	Safety, affect balance, exhaustion, hope, voice
Transcendence and meaning	Does my work connect with values and contribution beyond myself?	Purpose, ethical coherence, impact visibility, reflection	Meaningfulness, pride, values congruence, moral engagement
Social relationships	Do I belong, trust, and participate in mutual care?	Team norms, inclusion, mentoring, community, collaboration	Belonging, trust, network quality, incivility
Professional life	Can I grow, contribute, progress, and retain agency over my path?	Job design, feedback, mobility, career development, participation	Engagement, mastery, mobility, employability, intention to stay
Financial well-being	Can I live with reasonable security and perceive material fairness?	Pay, transparency, predictability, benefits, financial capability	Financial stress, pay equity, security, perceived fairness
Technology	Does technology expand my capability without eroding dignity or agency?	Digital boundaries, privacy, AI governance, humane design	Technostress, trust, adoption quality, digital recovery

5.1 Body: vitality, health, and sustainable rhythms

The body is the first condition of participation. Organizations often speak as if commitment could suspend biological limits, yet attention, patience, judgment, and emotional regulation depend on sleep, movement, nutrition, safety, and recovery. Chronic overload eventually appears in mistakes, conflict, absence, and withdrawal. A body-centered dimension therefore moves beyond health promotion to the design of rhythms.

Workload is not merely the number of tasks. It includes intensity, unpredictability, emotional demand, and the degree of control over timing. Sustainable systems use realistic staffing, protected breaks, recovery after peak periods, ergonomic environments, and norms that discourage unnecessary after-hours availability. They also recognize variation: the same schedule may affect caregivers, older workers, people with disabilities, or frontline employees differently.

The ethical principle is that recovery is not a reward for finishing work; it is a condition of doing work well over time. Organizations that celebrate heroic exhaustion create a culture in which damage becomes evidence of loyalty.

5.2 Cognition: clarity, attention, learning, and judgment

Cognitive well-being concerns the ability to know what matters, understand how decisions are made, concentrate, learn, and use judgment. Modern organizations frequently create cognitive poverty through excessive meetings, constant notifications, ambiguous priorities, and fragmented information. Employees are then blamed for low productivity even though the system makes sustained attention nearly impossible. Role clarity and priority discipline are therefore well-being practices. So are accessible knowledge, meaningful feedback, protected learning time, and permission to question obsolete procedures. In AI-

enabled workplaces, cognitive well-being also requires maintaining human judgment. When tools generate answers instantly, leaders must develop the capacity to verify, contextualize, and challenge rather than rewarding speed alone. (Rosso et al., 2010; Steger et al., 2012)

Learning contributes to happiness because it creates movement and possibility. Stagnation narrows identity; learning expands it. However, learning cultures must include psychological safety, because people do not reveal ignorance where uncertainty is punished. (Edmondson, 1999; Edmondson & Lei, 2014)

5.3 Emotion: safety, regulation, recognition, and hope

Emotions influence what people notice, remember, and choose. They are not noise around rational work; they are part of the information system of the organization. Fear may indicate threat, anger may indicate injustice, sadness may signal loss, and enthusiasm may mobilize exploration. Emotionally mature organizations neither suppress these signals nor allow them to govern without reflection.

Manager reactions are decisive. When a leader responds to bad news with curiosity, the organization learns. When the leader responds with humiliation, the organization hides. Recognition also matters, but it must be specific and credible. Generic praise cannot compensate for invisibility or unfair treatment.

Hope differs from optimism. Optimism expects good outcomes; hope combines valued goals with perceived pathways and agency. Leaders cultivate hope by telling the truth, identifying realistic routes forward, and demonstrating that effort can influence outcomes.

5.4 Transcendence and meaning: purpose, values, and contribution

Human beings seek coherence between what they do and what they consider worth serving. Transcendence names the movement beyond immediate self-interest toward service, craftsmanship, community, spirituality, legacy, or responsibility to future generations. It need not be religious; it is the experience that one's life participates in something larger.

Organizations support meaning by making impact visible, allowing moral voice, connecting tasks with beneficiaries, and aligning decisions with stated values. Purpose becomes credible when it influences investments, customer choices, treatment of suppliers, and behavior under pressure. A purpose that disappears when costly is a marketing device, not an organizing principle. (Rosso et al., 2010; Steger et al., 2012)

Meaning must never be used to demand unlimited sacrifice. The more noble the mission, the greater the temptation to exploit dedication. Sustainable meaning therefore requires boundaries, fair reward, and permission to rest. (Rosso et al., 2010; Steger et al., 2012)

5.5 Social relationships: belonging, trust, and mutual recognition

Work is a social world. Belonging reduces the energy spent on self-protection and increases the willingness to ask, share, and experiment. Exclusion, incivility, and relational ambiguity have the opposite effect. They occupy attention and make ordinary tasks more demanding. (Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Colquitt et al., 2007)

Relational quality is not produced by occasional team-building events alone. It is built through meeting practices, conflict norms, inclusion in decisions, mentoring, peer support, and the distribution of voice. Hybrid work increases the need for intentional relational design because informal connection no longer occurs automatically.

Trust requires both benevolence and reliability. People must believe that others care and that commitments will be honored. An organization that communicates warmth but repeatedly breaks promises creates sentiment without trust. (Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Colquitt et al., 2007)

5.6 Professional life: autonomy, mastery, progress, and employability

Professional happiness reflects the experience of being able to contribute, grow, and shape one's path. Jobs become depleting when employees cannot see progress, use their strengths, or understand how development decisions are made. Transparent expectations, meaningful autonomy, challenging goals, and developmental feedback are therefore central. (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Ryan & Deci, 2017)

Career systems should not define success only as hierarchical promotion. Lateral movement, project leadership, expertise, mentoring, and portfolio careers can provide growth. Employability is especially important in unstable environments. Organizations that help people build portable capability demonstrate respect for the person beyond the current role.

Autonomy does not mean isolation or absence of standards. It means having meaningful discretion within clear boundaries and being treated as capable of judgment. (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Ryan & Deci, 2017)

5.7 Financial well-being: security, fairness, and material dignity

Happiness discourse becomes ethically thin when it ignores money. Financial stress affects sleep, concentration, relationships, and freedom of choice. While income does not guarantee flourishing, persistent insecurity can obstruct it. Organizations therefore have a responsibility to examine adequacy, equity, transparency, and predictability. (Seligman, 2011)

Financial well-being includes fair pay, understandable benefits, reliable scheduling, timely payment, and access to responsible financial education. It also includes procedural justice: people need to understand how compensation and opportunity are determined. Secrecy creates suspicion even when absolute pay is competitive. (Judge et al., 2010; Kahneman & Deaton, 2010)

The dimension is especially important for lower-paid and contingent workers, who are often offered symbolic well-being initiatives while facing the greatest material vulnerability.

5.8 Technology: digital well-being, privacy, and human agency

Technology mediates almost every other dimension. Communication platforms shape attention and relationships; analytics shape evaluation; automation reshapes professional identity; and digital access affects inclusion. The central question is whether technology expands human capability or converts people into objects of continuous measurement. (Tarafdar et al., 2019; Kellogg et al., 2020)

A humane technology strategy limits unnecessary notifications, protects recovery time, minimizes intrusive monitoring, explains automated decisions, and provides appeal channels. Employees should participate in implementation because they possess knowledge about workflow and unintended consequences. (Tarafdar et al., 2019; Kellogg et al., 2020)

Artificial intelligence introduces a further responsibility: preserving meaningful human agency. Even accurate systems can be harmful if no one can challenge them, understand their criteria, or take responsibility for their effects. (Rosso et al., 2010; Steger et al., 2012)

6. Interaction Effects and the Logic of Alignment

The eight dimensions should not be interpreted as independent checklist items. They interact through reinforcing and compensatory mechanisms. Social support can buffer demands, meaningful work can sustain effort, and financial security can create cognitive space. Yet compensation has limits. No amount of purpose can indefinitely neutralize sleep deprivation, and no collaborative culture can fully offset arbitrary pay or surveillance. (Rosso et al., 2010; Steger et al., 2012)

Alignment refers to the degree to which the dimensions support rather than contradict one another. An organization is misaligned when it promotes learning but punishes mistakes, celebrates purpose but rewards only short-term output, offers flexibility but stigmatizes its use, or introduces AI to empower employees while using it primarily to monitor them. These contradictions are psychologically costly because they force employees to choose between official narratives and lived evidence. (Spreitzer et al., 2005)

This leads to a central proposition: the coherence among dimensions may be more important than the maximum score of any single dimension. A modest but consistent system can generate more trust than an organization with exceptional benefits and severe cultural contradictions. (Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Colquitt et al., 2007)

7. Organizational Happiness as a Dynamic Capability

A capability is a repeatable ability supported by routines, skills, governance, and learning. Happiness becomes an organizational capability when the institution can sense threats to well-being, interpret their causes, mobilize cross-functional responses, and learn from results. A collection of programs does not meet this standard because it may disappear with a sponsor or remain unrelated to the operating model. (Spreitzer et al., 2005)

The sensing function combines surveys, dialogue, operational indicators, and local observation. The interpreting function distinguishes personal variation from structural patterns and examines inequality across groups. The responding function allocates authority and resources to redesign work, policies, or technology. The learning function evaluates consequences and adapts. These four functions turn concern into institutional competence. (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Ryan & Deci, 2017)

Cross-functional ownership is essential. Human resources cannot redesign staffing alone; occupational health cannot correct unfair promotion; technology teams cannot determine ethical boundaries without stakeholder input; and managers cannot solve financial insecurity through empathy. The capability therefore depends on coordinated governance. (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007, 2017)

Capability	Core question	Evidence of maturity
Sense	What is happening to people across the eight dimensions?	Multiple data sources; attention to weak signals and group differences
Interpret	What structural and relational mechanisms explain the pattern?	Root-cause analysis; employee participation; ethical framing
Respond	What must change in work, leadership, policy, or technology?	Named owners, resources, timelines, and authority
Learn	What changed, for whom, and with what unintended consequences?	Longitudinal review, transparent learning, adaptation

8. A Four-Level Maturity Model

1. Reactive maturity. The organization responds after burnout cases, complaints, absence spikes, or reputational events. Support is mainly remedial and individual. Data are fragmented and responsibility is unclear. (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007, 2017)
2. Programmatic maturity. Multiple initiatives exist, often in benefits, health, or engagement. Participation and satisfaction are measured, but work design and leadership accountability remain weakly connected.
3. Integrated maturity. Well-being is linked to strategy, risk, leadership standards, inclusion, compensation, technology, and change management. Structural causes are examined before individual remedies are prescribed. (Tarafdar et al., 2019; Kellogg et al., 2020)
4. Regenerative maturity. Human flourishing is a design principle. The organization learns continuously, seeks positive effects on families and communities, and evaluates whether value creation strengthens rather than consumes human and social capacity. (Seligman, 2011)

Maturity should not be treated as a certification label. It is a developmental map. Organizations may be advanced in some dimensions and reactive in others. The purpose is to identify contradictions and the next credible step.

9. Governance Architecture and Distribution of Responsibility

Governance protects happiness from becoming a temporary campaign. The board or senior leadership team should define the ethical ambition and review material risks. A cross-functional council should integrate data and priorities. Line managers should be accountable for local work conditions. Employees should have meaningful participation in diagnosis and co-design, including independent channels to report harm. (Rosso et al., 2010; Steger et al., 2012)

Responsibilities should be distributed according to control. Executives control strategic trade-offs; operations controls staffing and pace; finance influences pay and resource allocation; technology controls digital architecture; human resources influences talent systems; managers shape daily experience; and employees contribute voice and mutual care. Shared responsibility does not mean diluted responsibility. Each decision must still have an accountable owner. (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007, 2017)

Transparency is part of governance. Organizations should communicate what they have learned, what they will change, and what they cannot yet change. Honest limitation often creates more trust than exaggerated claims of excellence. (Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Colquitt et al., 2007)

10. Measurement: A Multi-Layer Dashboard

No single happiness score can represent the complexity of organizational life. Measurement should combine inputs, experience, behavior, outcomes, and distribution. Inputs show whether enabling conditions exist. Experience captures how work is lived. Behavior reveals patterns of voice, collaboration, learning, and recovery. Outcomes connect well-being with safety, retention, quality, innovation, and customer trust. Distribution shows who benefits and who is excluded. (Spreitzer et al., 2005)

Validated scales should be used where possible, but quantitative data require interpretation. Averages can conceal vulnerable groups, correlations can be mistaken for causes, and frequent surveys can create fatigue. Qualitative interviews, open comments, ethnographic observation, and case analysis reveal mechanisms that scores cannot.

Measurement must also respect privacy. The purpose is organizational learning, not individual surveillance. Data should be proportionate, transparent, and aggregated wherever possible. Employees should know what is collected, why, and who can act on it. (Spreitzer et al., 2005)

Layer	Examples	Primary question
Inputs	Staffing, pay practices, manager training, access to support, digital policies	Are enabling conditions present?
Experience	Vitality, safety, autonomy, meaning, belonging, fairness, technostress	How is work actually lived?
Behavior	Voice, collaboration, learning, recovery, mobility, participation	What recurring patterns are emerging?
Outcomes	Retention, absence, safety, errors, innovation, customer quality	What consequences are associated?
Distribution	Differences by role, contract, gender, age, location, disability	Who benefits, who bears cost, and where are inequities?

11. Ethical Risks and Safeguards

The pursuit of happiness can become unethical when it silences criticism, invades privacy, or shifts responsibility to the individual. Forced positivity communicates that discomfort is a personal defect. Resilience training becomes harmful when it teaches employees to tolerate preventable damage. Gamified platforms can turn health into competition and produce new forms of monitoring.

A second risk is moral licensing. Organizations may believe that visible well-being programs compensate for unfair pay, precarious contracts, or harmful products. The model rejects this logic. Benefits do not cancel structural injustice. (Judge et al., 2010; Kahneman & Deaton, 2010)

Three safeguards are essential. Voluntariness means personal interventions are genuinely optional. Structural primacy means the organization examines workload, power, fairness, and design before prescribing coping. Dignity and privacy mean data collection is minimal, transparent, and protected. A fourth safeguard—voice—ensures that employees can contest both conditions and the interpretation of data. (Melé, 2003; Pirson, 2017)

12. Practical Implementation Roadmap

5. Map the current system. Inventory policies, programs, decision rights, data, and contradictions across the eight dimensions.
6. Listen broadly and safely. Combine surveys with interviews, focus groups, and frontline observation. Protect anonymity and include vulnerable groups.
7. Identify structural priorities. Select two or three causes with high human impact and realistic organizational leverage rather than launching a broad communication campaign.
8. Co-design interventions. Involve the people affected, define expected mechanisms, and anticipate unintended consequences.
9. Assign ownership and resources. Every action requires a responsible leader, timeline, budget, and review date.
10. Measure experience and outcomes. Use baseline and follow-up data, but interpret changes with qualitative evidence.
11. Repair contradictions. Align incentives, manager expectations, technology, and public messages with the desired conditions. (Tarafdar et al., 2019; Kellogg et al., 2020)
12. Institutionalize learning. Publish internal lessons, adapt, and repeat the cycle rather than declaring completion.

A ninety-day first cycle is often sufficient to demonstrate seriousness. The first thirty days map and listen; the next thirty interpret and prioritize; the final thirty launch limited experiments. The objective is not immediate perfection but visible coherence between evidence, decision, and action.

13. Implications for Leadership and Management Practice

Leaders should understand that their behavior is one layer of a wider system. Empathy is important, but a compassionate manager cannot indefinitely compensate for impossible targets. Conversely, sound policies

can be undermined by humiliating daily interaction. Effective leadership therefore connects human presence with structural action.

Managers should replace the question ‘Are people happy?’ with more diagnostic questions: Where is energy being lost? Which voices are absent? What contradiction are employees navigating? Which demand could be removed? What resource would change the experience most? These questions produce action rather than superficial reassurance.

Senior leaders should also resist overpromising. Happiness is partly influenced by events beyond organizational control. The credible promise is not permanent happiness but a fair, learning-oriented, and humane environment that supports people through difficulty. (Spreitzer et al., 2005)

14. Research Propositions and Future Empirical Agenda

- P1: Alignment across the eight dimensions will predict sustainable well-being more strongly than investment in isolated benefits.
- P2: Psychological safety and perceived fairness will moderate the relationship between well-being initiatives and organizational trust. (Edmondson, 1999; Edmondson & Lei, 2014)
- P3: Manager behavior will mediate the translation of formal well-being policies into lived employee experience.
- P4: Financial well-being will explain unique variance in cognitive functioning and retention, particularly among lower-paid workers. (Judge et al., 2010; Kahneman & Deaton, 2010)
- P5: Digital well-being and perceived human agency will become increasingly important predictors of engagement in AI-enabled workplaces. (Tarafdar et al., 2019; Kellogg et al., 2020)
- P6: Meaningful work will improve persistence only when accompanied by recovery and fair exchange; otherwise it may increase self-exploitation. (Rosso et al., 2010; Steger et al., 2012)
- P7: Integrated and regenerative maturity will be associated with greater stability of well-being during disruption.
- P8: Contradictions between declared values and operating practices will predict cynicism more strongly than low program availability.

Future research should develop and validate a multidimensional measurement instrument, examine interaction effects, and test longitudinal relationships. Comparative studies across countries and sectors are necessary because meanings of autonomy, community, and financial security vary. Research should include frontline, contingent, and informal workers rather than concentrating only on professional employees. (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Ryan & Deci, 2017)

Mixed methods are particularly appropriate. Quantitative models can test structure and association, while qualitative work can reveal how people interpret interventions and where contradictions emerge. Longitudinal case studies can examine whether organizations truly develop capability or merely cycle through programs.

15. Discussion

The primary contribution of the Eight-Dimension Model is integration. It treats the employee not as a fragmented resource but as a whole person who brings a body, mind, emotional life, relationships, values, professional aspirations, financial responsibilities, and a digital environment into work. This does not mean the organization controls every domain. It means organizational decisions have consequences across them and should be evaluated accordingly. (Tarafdar et al., 2019; Kellogg et al., 2020)

The model also reframes the relationship between happiness and performance. Sustainable happiness can support attention, cooperation, learning, and responsible persistence, but the ethical argument does not depend entirely on financial return. Human dignity provides an independent basis. A mature organization seeks performance with people rather than performance extracted from people. (Melé, 2003; Pirson, 2017)

The inclusion of finance and technology addresses two omissions in many well-being frameworks. Material insecurity and digital power are not peripheral to contemporary work. They shape freedom, attention, trust, and identity. Ignoring them risks creating a model suited only to privileged workers in stable roles. (Tarafdar et al., 2019; Kellogg et al., 2020)

Finally, the framework resists the commercialization of happiness as a product. It locates well-being in design, governance, and relationship. This makes the work more demanding because it requires changing how the organization operates, not merely how it communicates.

16. Limitations

The framework is conceptual and requires empirical validation. The eight dimensions may overlap, and their relative importance may vary across cultures, sectors, and life stages. The model should therefore be treated as a flexible architecture rather than a rigid universal checklist.

The term happiness may also generate skepticism in settings where it is associated with superficial positivity. Researchers and practitioners may choose the language of flourishing or sustainable well-being while preserving the underlying construct. Future work should compare these labels and examine their effects on acceptance. (Seligman, 2011)

Finally, organizational action cannot replace public policy, healthcare, social protection, or personal relationships. The model identifies the organization's legitimate sphere of influence without claiming that work should become the total source of a good life. (Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Colquitt et al., 2007)

17. Conclusion

Organizational happiness is the capability to create conditions in which people can sustain vitality, think clearly, experience and express emotion safely, connect work with meaning, belong, grow professionally, live with reasonable material security, and use technology without losing agency. It is not delivered through slogans or demanded as an attitude. (Rosso et al., 2010; Steger et al., 2012)

The Eight-Dimension Organizational Happiness Model offers a theoretical and practical map for this work. Its deepest implication is that organizations contribute to happiness when they remove unnecessary harm, align values with systems, distribute power responsibly, and treat people as whole human beings. Happiness then becomes neither an indulgence nor a manipulation, but a disciplined expression of humanistic management. (Melé, 2003; Pirson, 2017)

15. Positioning the Eight-Dimension Model Against Established Frameworks

The scientific value of a new model depends not on the number of dimensions it contains, but on whether it explains a relevant phenomenon more coherently than existing alternatives. The Eight-Dimension Organizational Happiness Model is not presented as a replacement for established theories. It is an integrative meso-level architecture that translates several robust psychological insights into domains that can be governed by organizations. Its distinctive contribution lies in connecting subjective experience, work design, material security, ethical purpose and technological mediation within one diagnostic system. PERMA provides a widely used vocabulary of positive emotion, engagement, relationships, meaning and accomplishment. Its strength is accessibility and its recognition that flourishing is plural rather than reducible to pleasure. However, PERMA was not originally designed as an organizational operating model. It gives limited explicit attention to bodily recovery, financial conditions, distributive justice and digital environments. The Eight-Dimension Model preserves the plurality of flourishing while placing these structural conditions inside the framework rather than treating them as contextual variables (Seligman, 2011; Donaldson et al., 2022).

Ryff's model of psychological well-being emphasizes autonomy, environmental mastery, personal growth, positive relations, purpose in life and self-acceptance. It offers a deeper eudaimonic account than satisfaction-based approaches and strongly informs the present model. Nevertheless, its primary level of analysis is the person. The Eight-Dimension Model asks an additional question: which organizational systems enable or frustrate those forms of well-being? It therefore links personal growth to career architecture, autonomy to job design, positive relations to team norms, and purpose to institutional coherence (Ryff, 1989, 2014).

Self-determination theory offers one of the strongest explanatory cores for workplace motivation because autonomy, competence and relatedness are repeatedly associated with internalization, vitality and higher-quality motivation. The proposed model incorporates these needs across several dimensions rather than representing them as separate categories. Autonomy and competence are central to professional life and cognition; relatedness anchors the social dimension; and need frustration helps explain emotional depletion. The model adds bodily, financial, transcendent and technological conditions that influence whether those needs can be sustained over time (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Van den Broeck et al., 2016).

The Job Demands-Resources model explains how demands and resources generate strain or engagement. It is especially valuable because it directs attention toward work characteristics rather than personality. The Eight-Dimension Model complements JD-R by specifying the substantive human domains in which demands and resources are experienced. Digital interruption is located within technology and cognition; emotional labor within emotion; insecurity within finance; values conflict within transcendence and meaning. This

added specificity can support more precise diagnosis without abandoning the dynamic logic of demands and resources (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017).

The model also differs from conventional employee-experience frameworks. Those frameworks often map touchpoints across an employment journey, whereas the Eight-Dimension Model evaluates the quality and coherence of the human conditions created at those touchpoints. An onboarding process may be smooth but still communicate surveillance, status inequality or a lack of meaningful purpose. The proposed model is therefore evaluative and ethical, not only descriptive.

Framework	Primary contribution	Main limitation for organizational diagnosis	Added value of the Eight-Dimension Model
PERMA	Accessible multidimensional account of flourishing	Limited explicit treatment of structural, financial and technological conditions	Adds material, bodily, technological and governance levers
Ryff PWB	Deep eudaimonic account of human development	Primarily individual level	Translates domains into organizational systems and responsibilities
Self-Determination Theory	Explains need satisfaction and autonomous motivation	Does not provide a complete organizational well-being dashboard	Locates needs across eight manageable domains
JD-R	Explains strain and engagement through demands and resources	Broad categories may be diagnostically underspecified	Identifies concrete domains where demands and resources arise
PERMA+4 / workplace flourishing	Broadens positive functioning in work contexts	Often measurement-centered rather than governance-centered	Adds maturity, accountability and ethical safeguards
Employee experience	Maps employment touchpoints	May optimize experience without questioning dignity or justice	Evaluates the human quality and coherence of systems

16. Strengthened Review Method and Model-Development Logic

The article followed a theory-synthesis method rather than a systematic review intended to estimate an effect size. To make that distinction transparent, the model-development process can be reconstructed in six steps. First, foundational theories were selected when they offered a well-established explanation of happiness, well-being, motivation, strain, meaning or dignity. Second, constructs were mapped according to their primary object: bodily functioning, cognitive functioning, affective functioning, relational experience, professional agency, material security, moral meaning or technological mediation. Third, overlapping constructs were consolidated. For example, engagement was treated as an emergent state influenced by several dimensions rather than as an independent dimension.

Fourth, each conceptual domain was tested for organizational actionability. A domain was retained only when organizations could plausibly influence it through work design, leadership, policy, resource allocation or technology governance. Fifth, the dimensions were tested for non-reducibility. Financial well-being was retained because perceived economic insecurity cannot be fully reduced to emotion; technology was retained because digital systems increasingly shape autonomy, attention and surveillance across all other domains. Sixth, the integrated model was examined for ethical completeness, ensuring that it did not treat well-being solely as a means to productivity.

The literature base should be understood as purposive and interdisciplinary. It includes seminal and high-impact work from organizational behavior, positive psychology, occupational health, business ethics and information systems. Priority was given to meta-analyses, major reviews, validated theoretical models and foundational texts. The model remains open to revision through empirical testing, cross-cultural comparison and participatory validation with employees.

17. Mechanisms Linking the Eight Dimensions to Organizational Outcomes

The model does not assume a direct or automatic relationship between happiness and performance. Four mechanisms are proposed. The first is resource preservation. When people have sufficient recovery, clarity, support and security, fewer cognitive and emotional resources are consumed by threat management. The second is motivational quality. Autonomy, competence, meaning and fairness increase the likelihood that effort is internally endorsed rather than produced only through pressure. The third is relational coordination. Trust and psychological safety improve the speed and quality with which information moves across interdependent work. The fourth is adaptive capacity. Learning, vitality and voice help organizations detect weak signals and revise routines before problems become crises.

These mechanisms also clarify boundary conditions. Well-being will not generate stronger performance when goals are incoherent, capabilities are absent or market conditions make the business model unviable. Nor should harmful practices be justified by claiming that some employees report high satisfaction. The model predicts sustainable value only where human flourishing is aligned with competent strategy and responsible execution.

18. Refined Research Propositions and Empirical Design

P1 - Configuration proposition. A balanced configuration across the eight dimensions will explain longitudinal well-being more effectively than the isolated intensity of any single dimension.

P2 - Structural credibility proposition. The relationship between well-being initiatives and organizational trust will be moderated by perceived procedural and distributive justice, such that benefits will have weak or negative effects when structural unfairness remains high.

P3 - Managerial translation proposition. Line-manager behavior will mediate the relationship between formal well-being policies and employees' lived experience of autonomy, safety and belonging.

P4 - Digital agency proposition. Perceived human agency will mediate the relationship between AI-enabled work systems and employee engagement; transparency and appeal mechanisms will strengthen this mediation.

P5 - Meaning coherence proposition. Purpose communication will predict meaningful work only when employees perceive consistency between declared values, resource allocation and senior-leadership decisions.

P6 - Buffering proposition. Financial security and social support will buffer the effect of periods of high job demands on emotional exhaustion, but will not fully compensate for chronic overload.

P7 - Maturity proposition. Organizations at integrated and regenerative maturity levels will show lower volatility in well-being and trust during disruption than reactive or programmatic organizations.

P8 - Inclusion proposition. The positive relationship between average organizational happiness and retention will weaken when substantial between-group inequalities are present.

A rigorous empirical program could proceed in three phases. Phase one would validate the dimensional structure using exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis across sectors. Phase two would use multilevel modeling to distinguish individual, team and organizational effects. Phase three would employ longitudinal or quasi-experimental designs to test whether changes in work systems precede changes in well-being and performance. Qualitative interviews should accompany these studies to capture cultural meanings and unintended consequences that standardized scales may miss.

19. Managerial Implications: From Well-Being Portfolio to Operating Model

The practical implication is not that every organization must launch eight simultaneous programs. It is that decision makers should examine the full system before selecting priorities. A company experiencing burnout may be tempted to provide mindfulness training. The diagnostic may instead reveal contradictory priorities, insufficient staffing, punitive management and constant digital interruption. The humanized response begins by listening to lived experience and then changing the conditions that repeatedly produce harm.

Senior teams can use the model as an annual strategic review. Each dimension should have an accountable executive sponsor, a small set of outcome indicators and a narrative explanation of progress. Employee representatives should participate in interpretation because data without voice can misdiagnose the cause of distress. Importantly, leaders should publish not only improvements but unresolved tensions. Credibility grows when organizations acknowledge where economic, operational and human objectives are genuinely difficult to reconcile.

The model also changes the role of human resources. HR becomes an integrator of evidence and organizational learning rather than the sole owner of happiness. Operations owns workload and staffing;

finance influences security and fairness; technology governs digital agency; strategy protects purpose coherence; leaders create emotional and relational climates. Happiness is strategic precisely because it crosses functional boundaries.

20. Final Integrative Discussion

The Eight-Dimension Model advances a simple but demanding thesis: human beings cannot be sustainably well in organizations that fragment their reality. A worker is simultaneously embodied, cognitive, emotional, relational, professional, economic, moral and technological. Organizational systems touch every one of these layers, even when leaders claim that happiness is private. The relevant choice is therefore not whether the organization influences happiness, but whether it does so consciously, competently and ethically.

The model should not be used to promise permanent happiness. Such a promise would be psychologically naive and ethically coercive. Its aim is more credible: to create the conditions in which people can experience vitality, agency, belonging, meaning and security while confronting the legitimate difficulties of collective work. In this sense, happiness is not an ornamental benefit. It is a quality of the relationship between person, work and institution.

References:

- Albrecht, S. L. (Ed.). (2010). Handbook of employee engagement. Edward Elgar.
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands-resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(3), 309-328.
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). Job demands-resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 22(3), 273-285.
- Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117(3), 497-529.
- Cameron, K. S., & Spreitzer, G. M. (Eds.). (2012). *The Oxford handbook of positive organizational scholarship*. Oxford University Press.
- Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O. L. H., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 425-445.
- Colquitt, J. A., Scott, B. A., & LePine, J. A. (2007). Trust, trustworthiness, and trust propensity: A meta-analytic test. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(4), 909-927.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The what and why of goal pursuits. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), 227-268.
- Diener, E. (1984). Subjective well-being. *Psychological Bulletin*, 95(3), 542-575.
- Diener, E., Oishi, S., & Tay, L. (2018). Advances in subjective well-being research. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 2, 253-260.
- Donaldson, S. I., van Zyl, L. E., & Donaldson, S. I. (2022). PERMA+4: A framework for work-related wellbeing, performance and positive organizational psychology 2.0. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 817244.
- Edmondson, A. C. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44(2), 350-383.
- Edmondson, A. C., & Lei, Z. (2014). Psychological safety: The history, renaissance, and future of an interpersonal construct. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 1, 23-43.
- Grant, A. M. (2008). The significance of task significance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(1), 108-124.
- Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 16(2), 250-279.
- Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., & Hayes, T. L. (2002). Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(2), 268-279.
- Judge, T. A., Piccolo, R. F., Podsakoff, N. P., Shaw, J. C., & Rich, B. L. (2010). The relationship between pay and job satisfaction. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 77(2), 157-167.
- Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(4), 692-724.
- Kahneman, D., & Deaton, A. (2010). High income improves evaluation of life but not emotional well-being. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 107(38), 16489-16493.
- Kellogg, K. C., Valentine, M. A., & Christin, A. (2020). Algorithms at work: The new contested terrain of control. *Academy of Management Annals*, 14(1), 366-410.
- Melé, D. (2003). The challenge of humanistic management. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 44, 77-88.
- Nielsen, K., & Miraglia, M. (2017). What works for whom in which circumstances? *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 90(2), 278-297.
- Pirson, M. (2017). *Humanistic management: Protecting dignity and promoting well-being*. Cambridge University Press.
- Ragins, B. R., & Dutton, J. E. (Eds.). (2007). *Exploring positive relationships at work*. Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Rosso, B. D., Dekas, K. H., & Wrzesniewski, A. (2010). On the meaning of work. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 30, 91-127.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2017). *Self-determination theory*. Guilford Press.
- Ryff, C. D. (1989). Happiness is everything, or is it? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57(6), 1069-1081.
- Ryff, C. D. (2014). Psychological well-being revisited. *Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics*, 83(1), 10-28.
- Seligman, M. E. P. (2011). *Flourish*. Free Press.
- Spreitzer, G., Sutcliffe, K., Dutton, J., Sonenshein, S., & Grant, A. M. (2005). A socially embedded model of thriving at work. *Organization Science*, 16(5), 537-549.
- Steger, M. F., Dik, B. J., & Duffy, R. D. (2012). Measuring meaningful work. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 20(3), 322-337.
- Tarafdar, M., Cooper, C. L., & Stich, J. F. (2019). The technostress trifecta. *Information Systems Journal*, 29(1), 6-42.

Van den Broeck, A., Ferris, D. L., Chang, C.-H., & Rosen, C. C. (2016). A review of self-determination theory's basic psychological needs at work. *Journal of Management*, 42(5), 1195-1229.

Warr, P. (2007). *Work, happiness, and unhappiness*. Lawrence Erlbaum.

World Health Organization. (2022). *WHO guidelines on mental health at work*. World Health Organization.

Wrzesniewski, A., McCauley, C., Rozin, P., & Schwartz, B. (1997). Jobs, careers, and callings. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 31(1), 21-33.

How do I cite this article?

Dr. Ignacio Bonasa et.al, Happiness as a Strategic Organizational Capability An Integral Eight-Dimension Model for Sustainable Well-Being, Responsible Performance and Human Flourishing at Work, *Excel International Journal of Technology, Engineering and Management*, 2026; Volume -13, Issue-3_Page_51-65. DOI Link: <https://doi.org/10.64971/j.cph.eijtem.v13.i3.6.2026>



This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license
(<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>)