Dialogues in Clinical Neuroscience & Mental Health

e-ISSN: 2585-2795 • p-ISSN: 2654-1432
DOI: 10.26386/obrela.v8i3.308
p. 85-96

The Emotional Balance Status (EBS) Questionnaire: Capturing Nutrition's Hidden Role in Decision-Making

Georgios Lountzis[1], Theodosios Palaskas[2], Georgios Tsimekis[3], Patty Tampourea[3]

[1] *PhD, Appointed Lecturer, Department of Economics and Regional Development, Panteion University of Social and Political Sciences, 136 Syngrou Avenue, 29 Aristotelous Str, Kallithea, 176 71GR*

[2] *Professor, Department of Economics and Regional Development, Panteion University of Social and Political Sciences, 136 Syngrou Avenue, 29 Aristotelous Str, Kallithea, 176 71GR*

[3] *PhD Candidate, Department of Economics and Regional Development, Panteion University of Social and Political Sciences, 136 Syngrou Avenue, 29 Aristotelous Str, Kallithea, 176 71GR*

Abstract

This study introduces and evaluates the Emotional Balance Status (EBS) Questionnaire, a novel instrument designed to explore the influence of lifestyle and emotional-hormonal dynamics on decision-making processes. Departing from classical rational decision theories, it emphasizes the neurobiological and hormonal foundations of decision-making, asserting that emotional states, influenced by hormones, that on their turn are influenced by lifestyle, habits and nutrition, significantly impact choices. The questionnaire, composed of 69 items divided across five thematic sections, was administered to a sample of 242 Greek managers and employees. Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) and Principal Component Analysis (PCA) revealed nine distinct components, of which six demonstrated acceptable reliability. These components link emotional balance, driven by internal and external lifestyle factors, to work-related, personal, and financial decisions. Findings highlight the independence of key variables and the potential for the questionnaire to be refined into a robust diagnostic and research tool. The results underscore the need to consider biochemical and lifestyle influences in understanding decision-making behaviors, offering opportunities for future inquiry in fields ranging from management to health psychology.

Keywords

Emotional Balance Status (EBS); Decision-Making; Lifestyle and behavior; Hromonal influences; Workplace psychology; Neuropsychology of decision-making; Applied psychometrics

Corresponding author: Georgios Lountzis, PhD, Appointed Lecturer, Department of Economics and Regional Development, Panteion University of Social and Political Sciences g.lountzis@panteion.gr

1. Introduction

In contrast to the rational hypothesis, not all human decisions are rational. In fact, in terms of human decision-making and choices, classical economic theory is no longer considered adequate (Lountzis, 2024) (Camerer, Loewenstein, & Prelec, 2005).

In addition, people's lifestyle choices can affect their health and endocrine responses, which may in turn shape their emotions through hormones and, subsequently, their decisions, alongside other factors. Across the European Union, public perception has identified smoking, eating habits and stress as the most influential behavioral factors affecting health (Kafatos, et al., 1999). Eating fast food is one of the risk factors related to obesity and can lead to a number of health and mental problems (Zerva & Zerdila, 2009). On the other hand, both frequent and acute exercise support the release of endorphins, which may contribute to positive feelings (Harber & Sutton, 1984), support the management of physical and mental stress, and increase the concentration of norepinephrine, a chemical that mediates the brain's response to stress, as supported by physiological research and contextual evidence from lifestyle studies (Dishman, Renner, White-Welkley, Burke, & Bunell, 2000) (Greiwe, Hickner, Shah, Cryer, & Holloszy, 1999) (Lountzis, 2024).

1.1 Decision-Making

Human decision-making is a complex process influenced by a variety of factors, both internal and external. Decisions are shaped by individual differences, personal beliefs, past experiences, and emotional or cognitive biases (Dietrich, 2010). Neuroscientific research shows that decision-making is closely linked to brain function, with emotions playing a significant role (Basten et al., 2010; Wang et al., 2020). These emotional responses are driven by neurotransmitters and hormones, which are regulated by biochemical processes in the body and influenced by factors like stress, lifestyle, and diet (Yilmazer, 2024; de Martino et al., 2006).

Decision-making is also shaped by both endogenous (personal) and exogenous (environmental) factors. Internal elements like cognitive processing speed and emotional state, as well as external factors like color, music, or room temperature, can all impact decisions (Blaskova et al., 2015; Schwartz & Cuadros, 2017). Additionally, the process can be hindered by time pressure, information overload, or "analysis-paralysis" (Kurien et al., 2014; Phillips-Wren & Adya, 2020). Social adaptability, influenced by personality traits and responses to environmental changes, further shapes the decision-making process (Tremblay et al., 2017; Reyna & Farley, 2006).

Preferences and biases, driven by cognitive limitations and subjective judgments, also play a crucial role in how decisions are made (Newell & Shanks, 2014). In summary, human decision-making is a multifaceted process involving a dynamic interaction of emotional, cognitive, and environmental factors (Lee, 2008; Carney & Mason, 2010).

1.2 The Impact of Hormones on Emotions

As discussed, emotions are strongly influenced by various hormones, which can be categorized into four main types: stress hormones, sex hormones, behavioral hormones, and metabolic hormones (Molnar & Gair, 2015).

Cortisol, known as the stress hormone, is regulated by the hypothalamus-pituitary-adrenal (HPA) axis and plays a key role in maintaining homeostasis. Stress is one of the primary triggers for cortisol release, and its levels can also be impacted by diet, especially foods high in fat and carbohydrates (Tardio et al., 2023). Imbalanced cortisol levels—whether too high or too low—can result in a range of issues, including anxiety, depression, weight changes, fatigue, and mood swings (Thau et al., 2023). Proper cortisol balance is essential for emotional stability (Joseph et al., 2021).

Testosterone, the predominant sex hormone in men, also influences emotional health. Imbalanced levels in men can lead to symptoms like weight gain, acne, aggressive behavior, mood swings, and depression (Kumar et al., 2010). In women, low testosterone can cause sadness, decreased libido, and difficulty concentrating (Davis & Wahlin-Jacobsen, 2015).

Progesterone, important for women's reproductive health, affects emotional well-being. Low levels can lead to symptoms such as fatigue, water retention, and mood disturbances (Mayo, 1997; Egwurugwu et al., 2013).

Oxytocin, a behavioral hormone, regulates social behaviors and emotional responses such as trust, anxiety, and sexual arousal (Hoge et al., 2008). Positive interactions like hugging or dancing can stimulate oxytocin release, enhancing feelings of well-being (Anninou, 2017).

Vasopressin, also known as the antidiuretic hormone (ADH), controls water retention and plays a role in social bonding and aggression (Caldwell et al., 2008). Low levels can lead to extreme thirst and urination, while high levels can be associated with serious health conditions. Substances like alcohol and caffeine can reduce vasopressin secretion (Armstrong, 2002).

Finally, insulin, which regulates blood glucose and metabolism, significantly impacts emotions. Low blood sugar can lead to symptoms such as anxiety, dizziness, and confusion, while high blood sugar—often seen in diabetes—can result in altered mental states and severe neurological issues (Badireddy & Mouri, 2023).

This theoretical framework challenges the traditional rationalist view of decision-making by emphasizing the complex interaction between emotions, hormones, and lifestyle choices. By integrating insights from neuroscience, psychology, and behavioral economics, it provides a deeper understanding of how emotional states—shaped by biochemical and environmental factors—affect judgment. Building on this foundation, the research presents the EBS questionnaire, a practical tool designed to capture these dynamics in real-world settings, particularly within the modern workplace.

2. Research Methodology

This article presents the findings of primary research conducted via a questionnaire. In addition to the scope of this article, quantitative data analysis was selected. In addition to the scope of this essay, quantitative data analysis has been chosen. Thus, data were obtained from a questionnaire table sample of managers (principals, supervisors) and employees via the created questionnaire to test the instrument's reliability and validity.

2.1 Research Formulation

The decision-making process is a complicated procedure that involves a variety of factors. Decisions can be influenced by the unconscious (Newell & Shanks, 2014) and the overall hormonal balance of individuals. Daily routines and lifestyle choices are sufficient to affect a person's emotional state. (Kafatos, et al., 1999) (Zerva & Zerdila, 2009). However, the rational theory of decision-making is no longer relevant (Kahneman, 2012) (Bear, Connors, & Paradiso, 2007) (Camerer, Loewenstein, & Prelec, 2005). According to previous studies, people's emotional states (Porath & Pearson, 2012) (Lovaglia & Houser, 1996) alter their brain chemical consistency, which in turn affects their decisions. Within that context, the study focuses on Greek companies. The questionnaire created for the purpose of this study was completed by Greek managers and staff.

2.2 Questionnaire Design

The questionnaire consists of five parts and includes 69 statements and questions. The respondent is asked to provide demographic data, such as age and gender, in part A (ten statements). The framework of the business or workplace is covered in Part B (19 statements), the habits of coworkers or teams are covered in Part C (five statements), the internal influence and decision-making process are covered in Part D (ten statements), and nutrition and habits are covered in Part E (25 statements). Each sentence, particularly in part D, explains a habit (exercise, nutrition).

The questionnaire is in Greek, as the research sample includes managers and employees from the Greek business market.

Part A, which describes the general profile of the respondents, requests demographic information, including gender, age, educational background, marital status, net monthly household income, children, weight, and height. This information can help with the calculation of Body Mass Index (BMI), which indicates obesity. More specifically, the calculation formula used was

$$BMI = \frac{Weight(kg)}{Height(cm)^2} \quad (1)$$

(BMI**:** Underweight □ 18.5, Normal = 18.5–24.9, Overweight = 25–29.9, Obesity □ 30). Part B covers questions/statements relating to the business for which the responder works. Employers should provide information on their type and industry of employment, years of experience, roles (managers or employees), and benefits provided for business trips, commuting time (Chatterjee, et al., 2020) (Lorenz, 2018) (Clark, Chatetterjee, Martin, & Davis, 2020), and special needs management (e.g., pregnant, diabetic, disabled personnel) (American Diabetes Associations, 2011) (Strasser, Wood, & Jacobson, 2008). Part C focuses on the respondent's employment environment and colleagues. They are questioned as to whether the environment has influenced their nutritional and food habits. (Mazzola, Moore, & Alexander, 2017). Part D assigns a score to the respondent's nutrition and habits on the basis of their emotional balance status (EBS). These include nutrition statements such as the consumption of homemade food, sugar products, caffeine, and beverages; processed tomato products; nonwhole-grain foods; fried prepared meals; and trans fat (fast food), tuna, yolks, seafood, and red meat. In terms of habits, the assertions pertain to the time spent on arts (theatre, music, writing/reading), as well as the time spent close to the ones they love. With respect to lifestyle, questions about nicotine and exercise were asked. Notably, at this stage, a respondent's overall score determines whether he or she falls into one of three categories of emotional balance status. (Low, Mid, High). Part E examined how someone's lifestyle has changed and how much this has influenced their choices in terms of risk, speed, and data analysis. The decisions fall into three categories: asset management, work-related decisions, and personal life decisions. Statements about the regulation of emotions were included in the questionnaire.

A 5-point Likert scale is used to represent the responses for Parts D and E. "Never" is denoted by Grade 1, and "Very Frequently" is denoted by Grade 5. Questions 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 9 feature an inverse formulation (resulting in inverse score calculations).

The tool was created to draw correlations between lifestyle and decision-making processes. Decisions are made on the basis of a variety of elements, including emotional state, rather than the traditional rational view. Hormones and the relevant chemical products of the decision-maker brain affect emotions and behavior. The primary idea behind questionnaire development is to study the relationship between diet and habits and the decisions made by managers and/or employees. The instrument was reviewed by ten people with diverse educational and professional backgrounds. The final version (rev.07) of the instrument was made available for pilot testing. The survey was completed on the 02nd of July 2021.

Cronbach's alpha was used to verify the instrument's reliability. The coefficient alpha is the most commonly used measure of questionnaire reliability. In this case, Cronbach's alpha is used to determine the validity of the Nutrition, Habits and Lifestyle, and Decision-Making questionnaires. Coefficient α values between 0.6 and 0.7 are considered good, whereas values above 0.9 indicate exceptional reliability (Ursachi, Horodnic , & Zait , 2015).

3. Statistical Analysis And Findings

3.1 Sample Description

Table 1 shows a sample of Greek companies/organizations of different sizes and sectors. We specifically asked managers/supervisors and their direct subordinates/employees to fill out a questionnaire honestly and spontaneously.

The questionnaires were distributed to Greek companies from the 20th of May 2021 until the 02nd of July 2021. The number of questionnaires returned was 242: 128 were managers (principals/supervisors), and 114 were employees.

3.2 Ethics and Research Reliability

Every responder was informed of the scope of the study as well as the length of the questionnaire. The participants' anonymity was protected because the questionnaire did not ask or reveal each participant's identity.

Table 1. Sample

Gender		Marital Status		Employment Sector	
Male	42.56%	Marriage	60.33%	Private	74.79%
Female	57.44%	Single	21.49%	Public	20.25%
Age		Cohabit	9.09%	Private & Public	4.96%
18-25	1.65%	Divorced	8.26%	**Position**	
26-34	17.36%	Widower/Widow	0.83%	Principal (Manager)	30.58%
35-44	43.80%	Number of Children		Supervisor (Manager)	22.31%
45-54	27.69%	0	36.78%	Employee	47.11%
55-64	8.26%	1	23.14%	**Management Experience (yrs)**	
65+	1.24%	2	34.30%	0	31.40%
		3	5.37%	<3yrs	12.81%
Education		4+	0.41%	3-6yrs	12.40%
Primary	0.41%	**Family Monthly Net Income (EUR)**		6-9yrs	5.37%
High Sch.	6.61%	<1000	14.05%	9-12yrs	8.26%
IEK	3.31%	1001-2000	40.08%	12-15yrs	9.09%
TEI	10.74%	2001-3000	19.01%	15-18yrs	4.96%
AEI	29.75%	>3000	26.86%	18-21yrs	5.79%
MSc/MD	43.39%	**Employment**		21-24yrs	2.07%
PhD	5.37%	Employee	82.23%	24-27yrs	3.72%
Other	0.41%	Freelancer	17.77%	>27yrs	3.72%

3.3 Data Collection And Analysis

As previously indicated, the questionnaire was selected as the most suitable tool for this research. The previously mentioned structure provides information about the respondents' diet, habits, and lifestyle, as well as how much these factors influence their decision-making process. The tool was created because there was no relevant research on that subject. Thus, an Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was conducted. EFA is a valuable method for determining the relationships between variables in complex concepts. It allows researchers to investigate topics that cannot be directly assessed by reducing many variables to a few interpretable underlying factors. The suitability of the data for factor analysis was first assessed.

3.3.1 Data suitability for factor analysis

After the data were collected, they were processed via IBM SPSS 26. Reliability tests and an EFA were carried out to check the instrument's consistency and coherence.

According to Table 2, the revised Cronbach's alpha for Part D is 0.509 (statement 6 is removed), and E is 0.910 (Ursachi, Horodnic , & Zait , 2015). In addition, the instrument was reviewed by ten people with different educational and experience backgrounds to ensure content validity.

Table 2. Cronbach's Alpha Results

Questionnaire	Cronbach a
Part D - NHL	0.509
Part E - DM & Internal Impact	0.910

Following the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) and Bartlett tests, an exploratory factor analysis was performed (Table 3). The KMO measure of sampling adequacy is a statistic that shows the proportion of variance in variables that could be explained by underlying factors. Values close to 1.0 suggest that a factor analysis may be useful for data. Otherwise, the EFA will not be useful. Bartlett's test of sphericity tests the hypothesis that "the correlation matrix is an identity matrix, which would indicate that variables are unrelated and therefore unsuitable for structure detection." If the significance level is <0.05, the data may benefit from factor analysis. (IBM, 2021). In accordance with Table 3, the adequacy of the sample and data suitability are confirmed (Williams, Brown, & Onsman, 2010).

Table 3. KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy		0.780
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	7001.216
	df	1711.000
	Sig.	0.000

3.3.2 Principal component analysis (PCA)

Principal component analysis (PCA) was performed following the data suitability test. The Measures of Sampling Adequacy (MSA) results show that five variables (statements) have values less than 0.5, whereas values greater than 0.5 are acceptable (An Gie & Sean , 2013). The MSA is a value that assesses the adequacy of the intercorrelations of a set of variables and each variable for an EFA. Three of them are related to commuting, whereas two are related to nutrition. In addition, all the communality values are greater than 0.5; therefore, there is no need to remove any variable from the instrument. {Communalities show the amount of variance in each variable that is accounted for (values > 0.5 are desired, values < 0.2 would exclude the variable) (Samuels, 2017)}.

The PCA results resulted in a reduction in the total variables to 17 components (Table 4). The actual eigenvalues are compared to random order eigenvalues via parallel analysis (which is a way to determine how many components or factors to maintain from PCA). Factors are kept when the actual eigenvalues exceed the random ordered eigenvalues (O'Conor, 2000). According to Table 5, the number of components is reduced to 9:

Table 4. Total Variance Explained – Components Selection

Total Variance Explained						
Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	9.185	15.568	15.568	9.185	15.568	15.568
2	4.627	7.842	23.411	4.627	7.842	23.411
3	3.668	6.218	29.628	3.668	6.218	29.628
4	3.088	5.234	34.863	3.088	5.234	34.863
5	2.489	4.218	39.081	2.489	4.218	39.081
6	2.184	3.702	42.783	2.184	3.702	42.783
7	1.851	3.137	45.919	1.851	3.137	45.919
8	1.721	2.916	48.835	1.721	2.916	48.835
9	1.666	2.824	51.660	1.666	2.824	51.660
10	1.534	2.600	54.260	1.534	2.600	54.260
11	1.456	2.467	56.727	1.456	2.467	56.727
12	1.407	2.385	59.112	1.407	2.385	59.112
13	1.305	2.212	61.324	1.305	2.212	61.324
14	1.187	2.011	63.335	1.187	2.011	63.335
15	1.152	1.953	65.288	1.152	1.953	65.288
16	1.086	1.841	67.129	1.086	1.841	67.129
17	1.011	1.714	68.843	1.011	1.714	68.843
18	0.979	1.660	70.503			
19	0.949	1.608	72.110			
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
59	0.067	0.114	100.000			
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.						

Table 5. Components Selection

Component Number	Actual eigenvalue from PCA	Random order from parallel analysis	Decision
1	9.185	2.129	Accept
2	4.627	2.023	Accept
3	3.668	1.946	Accept
4	3.088	1.868	Accept
5	2.489	1.81	Accept
6	2.184	1.753	Accept
7	1.851	1.703	Accept
8	1.721	1.653	Accept
9	1.666	1.612	Accept
10	1.534	1.566	Reject
11	1.456	1.522	Reject
12	1.407	1.484	Reject
13	1.305	1.444	Reject
14	1.187	1.405	Reject
15	1.152	1.37	Reject
16	1.086	1.332	Reject
17	1.011	1.299	Reject

Thus, the recalculation of PCA with 9 components provides the following results:

Q23 and Q39 should be eliminated because their communality values are less than 0.2 (Samuels, 2017). The oblique rotation (which reorients the factors so that they are closer to clusters of vectors representing manifest variables, hence simplifying the mathematical description of the manifest variables) correlates the variables into nine components, as shown in Table 6.

Each group of factors/variables that belong to one of the 9 components can be labeled. The analysis and comprehension of these elements may lead to the relevant identification of the common theme. (Ul Hadi, Abdullah, & Sentosa, 2016). In addition, the Cronbach's alpha was recalculated for each component (Table 7).

Table 6. Correlation of Variables

Component	Items
1	q54, q55, q56, q57, q58, q59, q60, q61, q62, q63, q64
2	q40, q49, q50, q51, q52, q53
3	q24, q25, q26, q27, q28
4	q29, q30, q31, q43, q44, q46, q47, q48
5	q12, q13, q14, q15, q45
6	q33, q35, q36, q37, q38
7	q10, q34, q66, q67, q68
8	q11, q16, q18, q20, q22, q42
9	q17, q19, q21, q41

Table 7. Labeling the Components

Component	Label	Cronbach a	Reliability*
1	Decision-Making Process	0.938	Accept, Excellent
2	Art Habits	0.775	Accept, Good
3	Business and Personnel Needs	0.819	Accept, Good
4	Nutrition, Habits & Lifestyle	0.625	Acceptable
5	Experience	0.614	Acceptable
6	Nutrition	0.347	Unacceptable
7	Internal Impact	0.676	Acceptable
8	Business Transportation	Negative	Unacceptable
9	Commuting	Negative	Unacceptable

* (Ursachi, Horodnic , & Zait , 2015)

According to Table 7, the values for components 6, 8, and 9 are not acceptable. Furthermore, the intercorrelations among the nine components are extremely low (Table 8). Thus, these variables can be regarded as independent. This insight opens up the possibility of future inquiry into the potential relationships that may include these components.

Table 8. Labeling the Components

Component Correlation Matrix									
Component	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1	1.000	-0.009	0.185	0.071	-0.159	0.005	0.131	-0.040	-0.013
2	-0.009	1.000	0.023	-0.129	-0.070	0.120	-0.062	-0.006	-0.059
3	0.185	0.023	1.000	0.088	-0.117	-0.033	0.066	0.094	0.096
4	0.071	-0.129	0.088	1.000	0.055	0.052	0.024	0.013	-0.037
5	-0.159	-0.070	-0.117	0.055	1.000	-0.062	-0.069	-0.097	-0.022
6	0.005	0.120	-0.033	0.052	-0.062	1.000	0.003	0.059	-0.109
7	0.131	-0.062	0.066	0.024	-0.069	0.003	1.000	0.001	0.034
8	-0.040	-0.006	0.094	0.013	-0.097	0.059	0.001	1.000	0.005
9	-0.013	-0.059	0.096	-0.037	-0.022	-0.109	0.034	0.005	1.000

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Oblimin with Kaiser Normalization.

4. Results

The Cronbach reliability test (a=0.910) demonstrated strong reliability for the decision-making/internal influence subscale (Part E). The subscale of nutrition and habits (Part D) that assesses emotional balance status has marginally acceptable reliability (a=0.509). In terms of validity, the instrument was assessed for both content and language, so the content validity was verified. The structural validity and coherence of the instrument were assessed using Factor Analysis (PCA). Therefore, the questionnaire's components and items show no strong intercorrelations. Some of the elements in Part E of the instrument have high reliability and validity.

The factor analysis reduces the instrument's 59 elements (excluding part A—demographics) to nine components. The groups formed as a result of this approach demonstrated that the questionnaire's components shared a common thematic base. Furthermore, 6 of the 9 factors have adequate reliability, indicating that the questions/statements in each component are appropriate for the study's objectives.

According to Table 8, the factors (excluding the 6th, 8^{th,} and 9th components) are deemed as independent variables. This fact allows for the investigation of various combinations of elements and potential links, as well as the impact they may have on one another. Additional research could be undertaken.

5. Conclusions And Discussion

The initial goal of this study was to create an instrument that might provide information regarding someone's emotional balance status through nutrition and habits and the impact on decisions made.

The results of the statistical analysis indicate that the decision-making scores, habits, and nutrition items can be used to assess the respondents' emotional balance status and how it influences their decisions in various areas of life (personal, professional, and asset management). Furthermore, the questionnaire may be a helpful instrument for examining how the benefits a business provides to employees may affect their decision-making.

This questionnaire's subscales can be used to determine an individual's emotional balance status on the basis of their nutritional choices, lifestyle (such as exercising or spending free time), and decisions about all aspects of their lives, such as their personal life, workplace, and possessions.

This questionnaire may provide a good opportunity for further research. The instrument could be processed and improved to be a very strong statistically reliable tool for lifestyle and decision-making processes.

References

American Diabetes Associations. (2011). Diabetes and Employment. *Diabetes Care, 34*(1), S82-S86. doi:https://doi.org/10.2337/dc14-S112

An Gie, Y., & Sean , P. (2013). A Beginner's Guide to Factor Analysis: Focusing on Exploratory Factor Analysis. *Tutorials in Quantitative Methods for Psychology, 9*(2), 79-94.

Andrews, R., Herlihy, O., Livingstone, D., Andrew, R., & Walker, B. (2002). Abnormal Cortisol Metabolism and Tissue Sensitivity to Cortisol in Patients with Glucose Intolerance. *The Journal of Clinical Endocrinology & Metabolism, 87*(12), 5587-5593. doi:10.1210/jc.2002-020048

Anninou, V. (2017). How to activate your brain's 4 main neurotransmitters that affect your happiness. Retrieved from https://violetta-anninos.gr/el/articles/168

Armstrong, L. E. (2002). Caffeine, Body Fluid-Electrolyte Balance, and Exercise Performance. *International Journal of Sport Nutrition and Exercise Metabolism, 12*, 189-206.

Basten, U., Biele, G., Heekeren, H., & Fiebach, C. (2010). How the brain integrates costs and benefits during decision making. *PNAS, 107*(50), 21767-21772. doi:https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0908104107

Bear, M. F., Connors, B. W., & Paradiso, M. A. (2007). *Neuroscience: Exploring the Brain* (Third ed.). Philadelphia, Pennsylvania (USA): Lippincott Williams & Wilkins.

Becker, B., & Gerhart, B. (2017). The Impact of Human Resource Management on Organizational Performance: Progress and Prospects. *Academy of Management Journal, 39*(4). doi:https://doi.org/10.2307/256712

Bera, P. (2016, March 23). How colors in business dashboards affect users' decision making. *Communications of the ACM, 59*(4), 50-57. doi:https://doi.org/10.1145/2818993

Berg, J. M., & Tymoczkio, J. L. (2002). *Biochemistry* (5th Edition ed.). New York: W H Freeman.

Blakemore, S.-J., & Robbins, T. (2012, August 28). Decision-making in the adolescent brain. *Nature Neuroscience, 15*, 1184-1191. doi:https://doi.org/10.1038/nn.3177

Blaskova, M., Bizik, M., & Jankal, R. (2015). Model of Decision Making in Motivating Employees and Managers. *Engineering Economics, 26*(5), 517-529.

Brehmer, B., & Hagafors, R. (181-195). Use of experts in complex decision making: A paradigm for the study of staff work. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 38*(2), 38.

Brighten, D. J. (2016). 9 Ways to Improve Low Progesterone & Boost Fertility. drbrighten.com.

Caldwell, H. K., & Young, W. S. (2006). Oxytocin and vasopressin: Genetics and behavioral implications. In A. Lajtha, & R. Lim (Eds.), *Handbook of Neurochemistry and Molecular Neurobiology: Neuroactive Proteins and Peptides* (pp. 573-607). Berlin, Germany: Springer.

Camerer, C., Loewenstein, G., & Prelec, D. (2005). Neuroeconomics: How Neuroscience Can Inform Economics. *Journal of Economic Literature, XLIII*, 9-64. doi:https://doi.org/10.1257/0022051053737843

Carney, D., & Mason, M. (2010). Decision making and testosterone: When the ends justify the means. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 46*(4), 668-671. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2010.02.003

Carson, D., Garner, J., Hyde, S., Libove, R., Berquist, S., Hornbeak, K., . . . Parker, K. (2015). Arginine Vasopressin Is a Blood-Based Biomarker of Social Functioning in Children with Autism. *PLoS One,*

10(7). doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0132224

Carter, C. S. (2007). Sex differences in oxytocin and vasopressin: Implications for autism spectrum disorders? *Behavioral Brain Research, 176*(1), 170-186. doi:10.1016/j.bbr.2006.08.025

Chatterjee, K., Chng, S., Clark, B., Davis, A., De Vos, J., Ettema, D., . . . Reardon, L. (2020). Commuting and wellbeing: a critical overview of the literature with implications for policy and future research. *Transport Reviews, 40*(1), 5-34. doi:https://doi.org/10.1080/01441647.2019.1649317

Cherney, K. (2020). 8 Testosterone-Boosting Foods. healthline.com.

Clark, B., Chatetterjee, K., Martin, A., & Davis, A. (2020). How commuting affects subjective wellbeing. *Transportation, 47*, 2777-2805. doi:doi.org/10.1007/s11116-019-09983-9

Coricelli, G., Dolan, R., & Sirigu, A. (2007, June). Brain, emotion and decision making: the paradigmatic example of regret. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 11*(6), 258-265. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2007.04.00

de Martino, B., Kumaran, D., Seymour, B., & Dolan, R. (2006, August 04). Frames, Biases, and Rational Decision-Making in the Human Brain. *Science, 313*(5787), 684-687. doi:https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1128356

de Vesser, L., van der Knaap, L., van de Loo, A., van der Weerd, C., Ohl, F., & van den Bos, R. (2010, May 06). Trait anxiety affects decision-making differently in healthy men and women: Toward gender-specific endophenotypes of anxiety. *Neuropsychologia, 48*(6), 1598-1606. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2010.01.027

Derntl, B., Pintzinger, N., Kryspin-Exner, I., & Schöpf, V. (2014, November 05). The impact of sex hormone concentrations on decision-making in females and males. *Frontiers in Neiroscience, 8*. doi:https://doi.org/10.3389/fnins.2014.00352

Di Renzo, G., Giardina, I., Clerici, G., Brillo, E., & Gerli, S. (2016). Progesterone in Normal and pathological pregnacy. *Hormone Molecular Biology and Clinical Investigation, 27*(1), 35-48.

Dietrich, C. (2010). Decision Making: Factors that Influence Decision Making, Heuristics Used, and Decision Outcomes. *Inquiries Journal, 2*(2). Retrieved from http://www.inquiriesjournal.com/articles/180/decision-making-factors-that-influence-decision-making-heuristics-used-and-decision-outcomes

Dishman, R. K., Renner, K. J., White-Welkley, J. E., Burke, K. A., & Bunell, B. N. (2000). Treadmill exercise training augments brain norepinephrine response to familiar and novel stress. *Brain Research Bulletin, 52*(5), 337-342. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/S0361-9230(00)00271-9

Egwurugwu, J. N., Ifedi , C. U., Uchefuna , R. C., Ezeokafor , E. N., & Alagwu , E. A. (2013). Effects of zinc on male sex hormones and semen quality in rats. *Niger J Physiol, 28*(1), 17-22.

Epel, E., McEwen, T Seeman, K Matthews, G Cast, McEwen, B., Seeman, T., Matthews, K., Castellazzo, G., . . . Ickovics, J. (2000). Stress and body shape: stress-induced cortisol secretion is consistently greater among women with central fat. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 623-32. doi:10.1097/00006842-200009000-00005

Galan, N. (2019, April 23). *What to know about blood sugar spikes.* Retrieved from https://www.medicalnewstoday.com/articles/317215

Gladwell, M. (2006). *Blink: The Power of Thinking Without Thinking* (1 ed.). UK: Penguin Books Ltd.

Grandjean, A. C., Reimers, K. J., Bannick , K. E., & Haven, M. C. (2000). The Effect of Caffeinated, Non-Caffeinated, Caloric and Non-Caloric Beverages on Hydration. *Journal of the American College of Nutrition, 19*(5), 591-600.

Gréhaigne, J.-F., Godbout , P., & Bouthie, D. (2001). The Teaching and Learning of Decision Making in Team Sports. *Quest, 53*(1), 59-76.

Greiwe, J. S., Hickner, R. C., Shah, S. D., Cryer, P. E., & Holloszy, J. O. (1999). Norepinephrine response to exercise at the same relative intensity before and after endurance exercise training. *Joural of Apllied Physiology, 86*(2). doi:https://doi.org/10.1152/jappl.1999.86.2.531

Harber, V. J., & Sutton, J. R. (1984). Endorphins and Exercise. *Sports Medicine, 1*, 154-171. doi:https://doi.org/10.2165/00007256-198401020-00004. PMID: 6091217

Harris-Perry, M., & Perry, J. (2015, August 13). *From New Orleans to Ferguson, a Decade of Asserting Black Lives Matter*. Retrieved from The Nation: https://www.thenation.com/article/archive/from-new-orleans-to-ferguson-a-decade-of-asserting-black-lives-matter/

Henderson, J., & Nutt, P. (1980, April 01). The Influence of Decision Style on Decision Making Behavior. *Management Science, 26*(4), 371-386. doi:https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.26.4.371

Holt-Lunstad, J., Birmingham, W., & Light, K. (2008). Influence of a "warm touch" support enhancement intervention among married couples on ambulatory blood pressure, oxytocin, alpha amylase, and cortisol. *Psychosomatic Medicine, 70*(9), 975-85. doi:10.1097/PSY.0b013e318187aef7

IBM. (2021). *SPSS Statistics: KMO and Bartlett's Test*. Retrieved from https://www.ibm.com/docs/en/spss-statistics/23.0.0?topic=detection-kmo-bartletts-test

Johnson, R. (2010). Officer Attitudes and Management Influences on Police Work Productivity. *American Journal of Criminal Justice, 36*, 293-306. doi:10.1007/s12103-010-9090-2

Kable, J., & Glimcher, P. (2009). The Neurobiology of Decision: Consensus and Controversy. *Neuron, 63*(6), 733-745. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2009.09.003

Kafatos, A., Manios, Y., Markatji, I., Giachetti, I., Vaz de Almeida, M., & Magnus Engstrom, L. (1999). Regional, demographic and national influences on attitudes and beliefs with regard to physical activity, body weight and health in a nationally representative sample in the European Union. *Public Health Nutrition, 2*(1a), 87-95. doi:https://doi.org/10.1017/s1368980099000130. PMID: 10933628

Kahneman, D. (2012). *Thinking Fast ans Slow.* London: Penguin Books Ltd.

Kaimal, G., Ray, K., & Muniz , J. (2016). Reduction of Cortisol Levels and Participants' Responses Following Art Making. *Journal of the American Art Therapy Association, 33*(2), 74-80. doi:10.1080/07421656.2016.1166832

Kudielka, B., Hellhammer, D., & Wüst, S. (2009). Why do we respond so differently? Reviewing determinants of human salivary cortisol responses to challenge. *Psychoneuroendocrinology, 34*(1), 2-18. doi:10.1016/j.psyneuen.2008.10.004

Laube, C., & van den Bos, W. (2016, November 21). Hormones and Affect in Adolescent Decision Making. *Recent Developments in Neuroscience Research on Human Motivation, 19*, 259-281. doi:https://doi.org/10.1108/S0749-742320160000019013

Lee, D. (2008, March 26). Game theory and neural basis of social decision making. *Nature Neuroscience, 11*, 404-409. doi:https://doi.org/10.1038/nn2065

Lee, D., Tajar, A., Pye, S., Boonen, S., Vanderschueren, D., Bouillon, R., . . . EMAS study group. (2012). Association of hypogonadism with vitamin D status: the European Male Aging Study. *European Journal of Endocrinology, 166*(1), 77-85. doi:10.1530/EJE-11-0743

Lim, M. M., & Young, L. J. (2004). Vasopressin-dependent neural circuits underlying pair bond formation in the monogamous prairie vole. *Neuroscience, 125*(1), 35-45.

Lorenz, O. (2018). Does commuting matter to subjective well-being? *Journal of Transport Geography, 66*, 180-199. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtrangeo.2017.11.019

Lountzis, G. (2024). Self-care practices in decision-making: How nutrition and habits may affect decision in business. *European Journal of Environment and Public Health, 8*(1), 1-10. doi:10.29333/ejeph/14128

Lovaglia, M., & Houser, J. (1996). Emotional Reactions and Status in Groups. *American Sociological Association, 61*(5), 867-883. doi:https://doi.org/10.2307/2096458

Lunenburg, F. (2010). The Decision Making Process. *National Forum of Educational Administration and Supervision Journal, 27*(4), 1-12.

Mayo, J. L. (1997). A Natiral Approach to Menopause. *Applied Nutritional Science Reports, 5*(7).

Mazzola, J., Moore, J., & Alexander, K. (2017). Is work keeping us from acting healthy? How workplace barriers and facilitators impact nutrition and exercise behaviors. *Stress Health, 33*(5), 479-489. doi:https://doi.org/10.1002/smi.2731. Epub 2016 Nov 27. PMID: 27891758

Milkman, K. L., Chugh, D., & Bazerman, M. H. (2009). How Can Decision Making Be Improved? *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 4*(4). doi:https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6924.2009.0114

Molnar, C., & Gair, J. (2015). *Concepts of Biology-1st Canadian Edition*. BCcampus. Retrieved from https://opentextbc.ca/biology/

Newell, B., & Shanks, D. (2014). Unconscious influences on decision making: A critical review. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 37*(1), 1-19.

Newsome, j. (1979). Vasopressin: Deficiency, Excess and the Syndrome of Inappropriate Antidiuretic Hormone Secretion. *Nephron, 23*, 125-129.

NHS. (2018). *Hyperglycemiaglycaemia (high blood sugar)*. Retrieved from https://www.nhs.uk/conditions/high-blood-sugar-hyperglycaemia/

NIDDK. (2008). Hypoglycaemia. National Insitute of Health. Retrieved from https://web.archive.org/web/20150703213935/http://www.niddk.nih.gov/health-information/health-topics/Diabetes/hypoglycemia/Documents/hypoglycemia_508.pdf

Noe, R. A. (1996). Is career management related to employee development and performance? *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 17*(2), 119-133. doi:10.1002/(SICI)1099-1379(199603)17:2<119::AID-JOB736>3.0.CO;2-O

O'Conor, B. (2000). SPSS and SAS programs for determining the number of components using parallel analysis and Velicer's MAP test. *Behavior Research Methods, Instrumentation, and Computers, 32*, 396-402. doi:doi.org/10.3758/BF03200807

Parlesak, A., Pohl, C., Bode, J., & Bode, C. (2004). Water Metabolism in Rats Subjected to Chronic Alcohol Administration. *Nephron Physiol*(97), 9-15.

Porath, C., & Pearson, C. (2012). Emotional and Behavioral Responses to Workplace Incivility and the Impact of Hierarchical Status. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 42*(S1), E326-E357. doi: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2012.01020.x

Reyna, V., & Farley, F. (2006). Risk and Rationality in Adolescent Decision Making: Implications for Theory, Practice, and Public Policy. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest, 7*(1), 1-44.

Samuels, P. (2017). *Advice on Exploratory Factor Analysis. Technical Report*. Birmingham City University: ResearchGate. Retrieved from https://www.open-access.bcu.ac.uk/6076/

Sher, L. (2005). Type D personality: the heart, stress, and cortisol. *QJM: An International Journal of Medicine, 98*(5), 323-329. doi:10.1093/qjmed/hci064

Strasser, P., Wood, F., & Jacobson, S. (2008). Educating Supervisors of Employees with Diabetes. *AAOHN Journal, 56*(6), 262-267. doi:https://doi.org/10.3928/08910162-20080601-01. PMID: 18604922

Tremblay, S., Shakira, K., & Platt, M. (2017, April). Social Decision-Making and the Brain: A Comparative Perspective. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 21*(4), 265-276. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2017.01.007

Ul Hadi, N., Abdullah, N., & Sentosa, I. (2016). An Easy Approach to Exploratory Factor Analysis: Marketing Perspective. *Journal of Educational and Social Research, 6*(1), 215-223. doi:10.5901/jesr.2016.v6n1p215

Ursachi, G., Horodnic , I., & Zait , A. (2015). How reliable are measurement scales? External factors with indirect influence on reliability estimators. *Procedia Economics and Finance, 20*, 679-686.

Voet, D., & Voet, J. (2010). *Biochemistry* (4th Edition ed.). New York: Wiley.

Wehr, E., Pilz, S., Boehm, B., März, W., & Obermayer-Pietsch, B. (2010). Association of vitamin D status with serum androgen levels in men. *Clinical Endocrinology, 73*(2), 243-8. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2265.2009.03777.x

Williams, B., Brown, T., & Onsman, A. (2010). Exploratory Factor Analysis: A five-step guide for novices. *Journal of Emergency Primary Health Care (JEPHC), 8*(3). doi:doi.org/10.33151/ajp.8.3.93

Zerva, S., & Zerdila, M. (2009). Obesity: A chronic disease. *8*(1), 6-15.

APENDIX A: EBS QUESTIONNAIRE

EMOTIONAL BALANCE STATUS QUESTIONNAIRE		
QUESTION		AVAILABLE ANSWERS
PART A		
1	Gender	male,female ,other
2	Age	18-25,26-34,35-44,45-54,55-64,65+
3	Education	Elementary Education,High School,Vocational,Tech.Education,B-Sc,MSc,PhD,Other
4	Marital Status	Married,Single,Widowed,Divorced,Cohabitation
5	Children	0,1,2,3,4,4+
6	Monthly Household net Income (in Euro)	<€1000,€1001-2000,€2001-3000,>€3000
6.1	What percentage of your income is earned from private sector	10%,20%,30%,40%,50%,60%,70%,80%,90%,100%
6.2	What percentage of your income is earned from public sector	10%,20%,30%,40%,50%,60%,70%,80%,90%,100%
7	Weight in kilos(kg)	free input
8	Height in centimeters (cm)	free input
PART B		
9	Employment	Employee,Freelancer
10	Sector of employment	Private,Public,Both
11	Total Years of Professional Experience (any type)	free input
12	Total Years of Employment in managing position	free input
13	Total Years of Employment at current Employer	free input
14	Position within business/organisation	Employee,Supervisor,Manager
15	In the case of business travel, the company/organization I work for compensates me adequately.	Not applicable,Strongly Disagree,Disagree,Neutral,Agree,Strongly Agree
16	Total average time (in hours) spent daily commuting to and from my place of residence and workplace.	free input
16.1.a	I commute by car	1,2,3,4,5
16.1.b	I commute by bicycle/scooter	1,2,3,4,5
16.1.c	I commute on foot	1,2,3,4,5
16.1.d	I commute by motorcycle/scooter	1,2,3,4,5
16.1.e	I commute by public transportation	1,2,3,4,5
16.1.f	I commute using another means/method	1,2,3,4,5
17.a	Special needs management for Diabetics	Not applicable,Strongly Disagree,Disagree,Neutral,Agree,Strongly Agree
17.b	For Pregnants	Not applicable,Strongly Disagree,Disagree,Neutral,Agree,Strongly Agree
17.c	For Breastfeeding Mother	Not applicable,Strongly Disagree,Disagree,Neutral,Agree,Strongly Agree
17.d	For PwD	Not applicable,Strongly Disagree,Disagree,Neutral,Agree,Strongly Agree
17.e	Other	Not applicable,Strongly Disagree,Disagree,Neutral,Agree,Strongly Agree

PART C		
18	Do you follow a specific dietary plan?	Yes,No
18.1.a	With the guidance of a specialist (dietitian, nutritionist)	Not applicable,Since I got Managing duties,Last Year,Last 6 months,Over a year
18.1.b	Based on personal research and interest from books, websites, and articles	Not applicable,Since I got Managing duties,Last Year,Last 6 months,Over a year
19	Do you have similar dietary habits to your colleagues?	1,2,3,4,5
20	How often are you influenced by your colleagues in your food choices?	1,2,3,4,5
PART D		
21	How often do you consume home-cooked meals per week?	1,2,3,4,5
22	How often do you consume products containing sugar per week?	1,2,3,4,5
23	How often do you consume alcohol, caffeine, processed juices, and canned tomato products per week?	1,2,3,4,5
24	How often do you consume non-whole grain foods and/or fried foods per week?	1,2,3,4,5
25	How often do you consume foods containing trans (saturated) fats (e.g., fast food) during the week?	1,2,3,4,5
26	How often do you consume foods such as tuna, egg yolks, seafood, or beef per week?	1,2,3,4,5
27	How often do you dedicate time during the week to some form of art (theater, music, writing, painting)?	1,2,3,4,5
28	How often do you have physical contact (hugs) with loved ones per week?	1,2,3,4,5
29	How often do you use nicotine products per week?	1,2,3,4,5
30	How often do you use nicotine products per week?	1,2,3,4,5
PART E		
31	Have you adopted any lifestyle changes since you started working?	1,2,3,4,5
31.a	If yes, since when?	1 year,2-5 years,6-10 years,>10 years
32	If yes, in what areas?	
32.a	In physical exercise	1,2,3,4,5
32.b	In my diet	1,2,3,4,5
32.c	In my habits	1,2,3,4,5
32.c.1	Habits such as going to the theater	1,2,3,4,5
32.c.2	Listening to music	1,2,3,4,5
32.c.3	Reading/writing	1,2,3,4,5
32.c.4	Painting	1,2,3,4,5
32.c.5	Using social media	1,2,3,4,5
33	Have the above habits/activities (32.a–32.c.5) influenced your decision-making process?	1,2,3,4,5
33.a	In how I process data/information before making a decision at work	1,2,3,4,5
33.b	In the speed at which I make decisions at work	1,2,3,4,5
33.c	In the level of risk I take when making decisions at work	1,2,3,4,5
33.d	In how I process data/information before making decisions in my personal life and relationships	1,2,3,4,5

33.e	In the speed at which I make decisions in my personal life and relationships	1,2,3,4,5
33.f	In the level of risk I take when making decisions in my personal life and relationships	1,2,3,4,5
33.g	In how I process data/information before making decisions regarding asset management	1,2,3,4,5
33.h	In the speed at which I make decisions regarding asset management	1,2,3,4,5
33.i	In the level of risk I take when making decisions regarding asset management	1,2,3,4,5
33.j	In the balance between emotion and logic in my decisions	1,2,3,4,5
33.k	In my ability to change a decision when it doesn't lead to the desired outcome, even if doing so comes at a cost	1,2,3,4,5
34.a	My lifestyle change has influenced the way I think when I want to feel more positive emotions (such as joy or fun)	1,2,3,4,5
34.b	The way I think when I want to feel less negative emotions (such as sadness or anger)	1,2,3,4,5
34.c	The way I deal with situations that cause me stress or anxiety	1,2,3,4,5