

## THE INFLUENCE OF WORKPLACE FUN ON JOB OUTCOMES: A STUDY AMONG DIFFERENT GENERATIONS OF ACADEMICIANS

\*Rosliza Md Zani, Farah Merican Isahak Merican, Shakirah Mohd Saad, Siti Zaharah Safin

Faculty of Business Management,  
Universiti Teknologi MARA Kedah, Malaysia.

\*Corresponding author's email: [rosliza568@kedah.uitm.edu.my](mailto:rosliza568@kedah.uitm.edu.my)

*Submission date: 27 February 2017 Accepted date: 5 April 2017 Published date: 25 May 2017*

### ABSTRACT

Workplace fun can have positive individual and organizational implications. Academic studies have linked workplace fun with job satisfaction. The changing in workforce, as well as the flattening of organizations and a more casual work environment have led to a simplistic assumption that more fun is always better. Different generational cohorts namely Baby Boomers, Generation X and Millennials might have different views of workplace fun which affect their work outcome. This paper investigates how workplace fun of academicians in UiTM Kedah influences their job outcomes, which include job satisfaction, organizational commitment and task performance, and how different generations respond to workplace fun which in the end affects their job outcome. The Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) 21 was used to analyse the results. The findings revealed that all generational cohorts tested agreed that workplace fun did affect job outcome in general. However, Generation Y showed a slight difference where workplace fun does not have a significant relationship with job satisfaction. These results, their implications, and directions for future research are discussed.

**Keywords:** *workplace fun; baby boomers; generation x; generation y; job outcomes*

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Every individual in this world will go through some transitions from childhood to reach old age. Adulthood stage is the most important transition to every individual because that time all individuals will enter career life. Job does not only promise wages or salary as a reward but it also provides satisfaction and happiness to individual as the outcome. Due to that, each and every different person perceives satisfaction and happiness differently as they belong to different societies and grow up in different era.

Workplace fun and its outcomes might be affected by a large group of individual distinction elements, for example, age, sexual orientation, identity, knowledge, tradition, and more, but there has been little concentration on the individual to whom fun is being coordinated. Fun working environment happens when work and play are effectively intermixed to make a quiet, push free, and joyful environment (Owler, 2008). Fun at work environment is alluring and even vital for letting go of issues and stresses from ordinary working life. Fun accompanies liveliness and joy. It is essential for representatives to be beneficial at working environment and fun at working environment make representatives efficient.

Study carried out by Society for Human Resource Management [SHRM] (2017) revealed that majority of respondents (human resource professionals) embraced the recommendation that having some good times at work (workplace fun) is essential in a working environment atmosphere.

The objective of this research is to recognize the workplace fun of different generations that can influence on the job outcomes. Job outcomes in this research will look into job satisfaction, organizational commitment and task performance. There are three different generations being studied which are the Baby Boomers, Generation X and Generation Y. Through this research, we are going to identify whether the workplace fun of these generations have a different influence on their job outcomes which refer to job satisfaction, organizational commitment and task performance. Baby Boomers are the people born in 1941 to 1960; Generation X, are those who were born between 1961 and 1980; and Generation Y or known as Millennials involve people born in 1981 to 2000.

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

### 2.1 Workplace Fun

Fun in the working environment plays a significant role as we go through our daily hectic lives. Workplace fun is simple yet is an important approach to enlarge commitment, enhance enthusiasm, and increase efficiency. In spite of the fact that adding components of enjoyable to the working environment can be a successful approach to enhance the organizational environment, employer ought to take a forethought approach and be cautious about the consequences that come along with doing so. The environment of workplace fun in organization is important to ensure that organization's goal, mission or vision is attainable. Some organizations somehow think that the workplace fun environment can cause negative effect on job performance which can cause employee to lose focus. In respond to that, a research by Ford et al. (2003) explored potential negative side of workplace fun and found that respondents do not see any major downside to it, and in contrast they believe that a fun work environment may contribute to a decrease in employee anxiety and stress, accident rates, turnover, and absenteeism and even a slight decrease in the frequency of employee errors and incidents of sexual harassment. On balance, managers also believe that fun at work has no detrimental effect on productivity, equipment damage, or cost of operations but fun at work within proper guidelines and by mature employees is not deemed to be dysfunctional for the organization (Ford et al., 2003). This concludes that workplace fun can gain good productivity and also can give positive impact to company to be more successful in future.

Workplace fun is an ambiguous idea that incorporates a wide assortment of fun exercises, get-togethers, festivities, socialization, and well-disposed rivalry. Fluegge (2008) characterizes workplace fun as "any social, interpersonal, or errand exercises at work of a fun loving or clever nature which furnish a person with entertainment, happiness, or joy." Fluegge (2008) and McDowell (2005) examined the aspects of working environment fun, for example, celebrating at work, individual flexibility, and associating with colleagues. Han, Kim & Jeong (2016) also argued that workplace fun is essential. They defined workplace fun as "playful social, interpersonal, recreational, or task activities intended to provide amusement, enjoyment, or pleasure" as such, workplace fun has been conceptualized as inherently involving some types of activities. Workplace fun activities must be related with work. Example of category of activities include such as birthday or hiring anniversaries of workers, social event such as family day or picnic, exercise or sale contest in company and other activities that showcase positive impact in organization. This indicates that the organization can put some fun elements into the work sphere by "any means" to make "any work" enjoyable (Han et al., 2016).

Workplace fun makes work more enjoyable and in return rewards the organization as a whole. Gropper & Kleiner (1992) concluded that making work more enjoyable helps to motivate, stimulate and encourage individuals to communicate, while reducing boredom, fatigue, and conflict. Meanwhile, workplace fun environment also builds good relationship among workers especially between departments and other departments in the same organization. In addition workplace fun also can improve quality and also quantity of gatherings by workers in organization.

## 2.2 Workplace Fun and Different Generations

Baby Boomers were those born between 1946 and 1964. It has had the biggest effect on American culture because of its size — approximately 78 million and the period amid which it became an adult. Baby Boomer workers are said to be actually aggressive and see work place fun as counterproductive to their aggressive edge (Zemke, Raines, & Filipczak, 2000). For Baby-Boomers, work reflects great things in life and work has for been the most positive place to be. Work has been a place for them to feel confidently enjoyed. They tend to stay in every employment for around 10 years. Work has given a feeling of guarantee and a place to learn and develop. It is likely that the Baby Boomers' state of mind to have fun at work is giving them motivation. When they positively take chances to appreciate work, any way to encourage fun is seen pleasant to have.

Generation Xers or Gen X refers to the gathering of individuals conceived between the years of 1965 and 1980. This era accomplices are putting a high significance on keeping up their work-life equalization and always looking for a harmony between family, life and work (Gursoy, Maier & Chi, 2008; Hill et al., 2014). Henceforth, they rank their families and individual time critically to a level where they will most drastically averse to give up their recreation hours to go for work. Quite a bit of them are not willing to work at the weekends as these are the days they will coexist with their families. They are frequently demonstrating their requests when they face issues that may have consequences for their lives (Cole et al., 2002).

In organizations, Gen X worker requires adjustments between work and play and tend to regard fun, casualness, and imagination as essentials. In the event that X generations are dynamic by nature and independent, they may likewise be doubtful and suspicious about administration managing fun at work spirits. It is likely that they need a solid feeling of proprietorship and control over the sorts of fun at work that they will have. Being cooperative people, they may likewise incline towards fun that actually happens out of a feeling of group fellowship. As it were, they will be extremely sensitive to whether fun is genuine or not. While a fun time for Gen X's own purpose might be valued, however fun for someone else's advantages is not.

The Generation Ys or also known as the Millennials, starts as ahead of schedule as 1977 and as late as 1981 and consummation as right on time as 1994 and as late as 2002 (Erickson, 2008; Karefalk, Petterssen & Zhu, 2007; Hagevik, 1999). Understanding Millennials is the initial step to make a domain that is interested in new thoughts and where all workers, regardless of their age, can appreciate the workplace. The initial step is to see how to select Millennials representatives that fit your organization. "In an aggressive selecting environment, managers must comprehend and adjust to these patterns to guarantee that they are seen as an attractive spot to seek after a profession," (Yeaton, 2008).

According to Wendover & Gargiulo (2005), the Millennials respects fun in the workplace not as an advantage, but rather a necessity. An essential finding said Millennials expect fun at work. They question when they have to start from the bottom and work their way up. The characteristics of these Millennials proved that "enjoyment" at work for this era, might be a tiny bit more mind complex. Their estimation of fun at work is pictured by proclaims that we see in the papers where "fun" organization are the ones that provide pool tables in the break room, or massage chair and others. Given such representations, we could be pardoned for imagining that the Millennials simply need to have a great time constantly. Nonetheless, on the off chance that we recognize that the Millennials have to a lesser extent a solid feeling of limits amongst work and life, then the arrangement of these sorts of provision give clear sense. They don't need their lives to be excessively strict, in this way; they esteem the parts of fun. They need the chance to play at work.

In short, with regards to workplace fun, Lamm & Meeks (2009) argued that workplace fun might be perceptually counterproductive to Baby Boomer's view of competitive edge. Boomers gratify themselves with achieving and winning challenges. They are accustomed to challenges, and pressures

thus the notion of fun in work contradicts their work ethics and nature. They enjoy pressure to perform (Howe & Strauss, 2009).

### **2.3 Workplace Fun and Job Outcomes: Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment and Task Performance**

Job satisfaction is an employee's feeling of pleasure and accomplishment at work. It is most specifically connected to efficiency and individual prosperity. Job satisfaction has passionate, intellectual, and behavioural parts (Bernstein & Nash, 2008). Job satisfaction is the accumulation of feeling and convictions that individuals have about their present place of employment.

Having said that, confirmation on the positive relationship between working environment humours or fun and representatives' employment satisfaction has been demonstrated in many studies. A study done in Missouri Baptist Hospital demonstrated that the quantity of workers who communicated "great satisfaction" had expanded from 25% to 75% after the healing facility ingrained the fun theory to representatives (Lundin et al., 2002). Thus, subsequent to presenting a merrier and glad work environment society in Banner Thunderbird Medical Center over the previous years, the middle got an 80 percent endorsement rating which considered as "world class" from its representatives. When an organization give an upbeat workplace and friendly air to employees, relationship grows better and work ethics improve. This kind of relationship bring about the fulfilment of one's need for affiliation. McClelland's Need theory clearly stated that people are in need for affiliation to be happy and satisfied.

Ching (2010) considered relationship between workplace fun and job satisfaction with the moderating effects of attitudes toward fun. They have uncovered states of mind toward fun straightforwardly change the quality of the relationship between working environment fun and level of occupation fulfilment. In their research, workplace fun was found to be positively related to job satisfaction as positive feeling that is highly correlated with what influences one's feeling towards a job. Positive feeling spreads to other stimuli providing opportunities for employees to experience fun in workplace. Such feeling benefits the organization as it lowers staffing cost because job satisfaction is related to turnover intention (Yin-Fah et al., 2010).

Commitment is a term widely used to define engagement or contribution that limits the rights of activity associated with people, organizations, or thoughts. Commitment sets up a submitted and faithful workforce which then upgrades firm production through less opportunistic conduct with respect to workers (Green, 2008). Katzenbach (2000) describes commitment as stimulated workforce with high performance (those that perform superior to anything industry standards) and whose enthusiastic responsibility empowers them to make and convey items or services that constitute a competitive advantage.

Affective commitment, which reflects the degree to which employees identify with, are involved in, and enjoy membership in the organization (Allen & Meyer, 1990), is one of the most important attitudes driving individual behavior in the workplace (Meyer et al., 2002). When employees are emotionally attached to the organization, they are more likely to exert extra effort toward meeting organizational goals and to desire to continue working with it. In fact, a meta-analysis by Meyer et al. (2002) demonstrated that affective commitment is a robust antecedent of both employee performance and employee turnover. For the same reasons that it is believed that fun would have a favourable impact on employee turnover and performance, it is also believed that fun activities and manager support for fun should lead to greater levels of affective commitment. In support of this argument, McDowell (2005) demonstrated that fun is positively related to commitment.

Task performance involves the achievement of obligations and assignments that are determined as a part of the set of working responsibilities (Murphy, 1989). According to (Borman & Motowidlo, 1997; Werner, 2000), task performance refers to behaviors that are directly involved in producing

goods or service, or activities that provide indirect support for the organization's core technical processes. These behaviors directly related to the formal organization reward system.

Fun may have a significant impact on employee performance for three reasons. First, fun may represent a positive job resource, in line with the job demands-resources model, which proposes that greater job resources lead to fewer job demands and greater employee well-being (Demerouti et al., 2001). Fun may be a resource for some employees, particularly in hospitality industry because it fosters social relationships that provide social support to overcome the stress of service work and enables individuals to engage themselves in their work and be more productive. Second, fun may serve as an individual recovery mechanism and therefore promote sustained effort (Sonntag, 2003). Fun may allow employees to take momentary time off from their tasks, recharge, and thus be more engaged when on task. Finally, in the context of fun activities, fun could facilitate goal achievement (Murphy, Dacin, & Ford, 2004).

### 3. METHODOLOGY

Questionnaires are used for the purpose of collecting the data. The population of academicians at UiTM Kedah is 312, thus leading to a sample size of 169 (Krejcie & Morgan, 1970). The questionnaires were distributed to these academicians who come from various generations. The questionnaires consist of five parts; the demographic profile of respondents in Section A, Workplace Fun in Section B, Job Satisfaction in Section C, Organizational Commitment in Section D and finally Task Performance in Section E. The questionnaires used Likert scale method except for Demographic Section.

In this study, the researcher had decided to use Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) 21 software. Frequency distribution, descriptive analysis, correlation and regression analyses were used to generate findings and test the hypothesis.

### 4. FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

#### 4.1 Profile of the Respondents

Table 4.1 shows the demographic profile for Gen X and Y. Unfortunately, from all the respondents selected, none of them were Baby Boomers. Hence, the results were analysed for Generation X and Y only. The frequency and percentage for item are listed according to the questionnaires. 169 questionnaires were distributed and analysed (100% response rate).

**Table 1 Respondents' demographic profile**

Item		Frequency	Percentage (%)
1. Gender	Male	67	40
	Female	102	60
2. Generational Cohort	Baby Boomers	-	-
	Generation X	92	54
	Generation Y	77	46
3. Employment Status	Permanent	144	85
	Contract	13	8
	Part Time	12	7
4. Employment Position	Professor & Assoc.Prof	3	1.8
	Senior Lecturer	60	35.5
	Lecturer	106	62.7

Based on Table 1, the results show that most of the respondents are female which comprised of 102 lecturers (60%) and the male 67 people which makes up of 40%. Out of 169 respondents, none were Baby Boomers. 92 of them were from Gen X (54%) and the remaining 77 respondents (46%) were

from Gen Y. The lecturers in UiTM Kedah has various employment status as shown in the table. 144 of them were permanent lecturers (85%) which form the biggest number compared to other status. 13 respondents (8%) were contract lecturers and 12 (7%) were part timers. With regards to employment position, majority (62.7%) were holding a position as a lecturer, 65.5% were senior lecturers and only 1.8% were the Professor and Associate Professors.

## 4.2 Descriptive Analysis

The main purpose of the descriptive analysis is for the researcher to calculate the mean and standard deviation which give clearer views on the responses from respondents.

Since in the study, 5 Likert scale was used, a mean value approaching to 5 indicates that most of the responses are more towards the scale of 5. A low standard deviation indicates that the data points tend to be close to the mean (also called the expected value) of the set, while a high standard deviation indicates that the data points are spread out over a wider range of values.

**Table 2 Descriptive statistics of generation X and Y**

Variables	GENERATION X		GENERATION Y	
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean	Std. Deviation
Workplace Fun	3.3820	.70999	3.3534	.51206
Job Satisfaction	4.2826	.60912	4.3290	.53937
Organizational Commitment	3.5514	.46861	3.6165	.43611
Task Performance	4.3022	.54872	4.1870	.54031

From the table above (Table 2), it shows the mean and standard deviation for Generation X and Y for the variables in the study. Mean values for all variables for both generations are in the range of 3.3 to 4.3 which indicate that most of the respondents agree with the statements in the questionnaires. As for standard deviation values, the high variation of responses from Generation X was from workplace fun variable with the value of 0.70999, while for Generation Y, task performance has the highest standard deviation value of 0.54031. Overall standard deviation values show that there was a moderate variation of responses for all variables for both generations.

## 4.3 Correlation Analysis

Correlation analysis is conducted to know whether each of the variable is correlated to one another. Nonetheless, it is important to show the strength of linear relationship between the independent and dependent variables. The higher the correlation value, the stronger the relationship between the variables. Table 3 and Table 4 show the results for correlation analysis for this study according to generational cohorts.

**Table 3 Correlation analysis of generation X**

		WPX	JSX	OCX	TPX
WPX	Pearson Correlation	1			
	Sig. (2-tailed)				
	N	92			
JSX	Pearson Correlation	.347**	1		
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001			
	N	92	92		
OCX	Pearson Correlation	.498**	.346**	1	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.001		

	N	92	92	92	
TPX	Pearson Correlation	.236*	.312**	.284**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.023	.003	.006	
	N	92	92	92	92

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

From Table 3 above, the correlation value between workplace fun and job satisfaction for Generation X is 0.347, workplace fun with organizational commitment is 0.498, and workplace fun and task performance is 0.236. This shows that for Generation X, relationships exist between the independent and dependent variables but only with weak to moderate relationships. All variables have significant relationships. Thus, hypotheses 2a, 2b and 2c are accepted.

**Table 4 Correlation analysis of generation Y**

		WPY	JSY	OCY	TPY
WPY	Pearson Correlation	1			
	Sig. (2-tailed)				
	N	77			
JSY	Pearson Correlation	.171	1		
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.137			
	N	77	77		
OCY	Pearson Correlation	.595**	.099	1	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.394		
	N	77	77	77	
TPY	Pearson Correlation	.233*	.382**	.193	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.042	.001	.093	
	N	77	77	77	77

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Meanwhile, Table 4 shows the correlation analysis results for Generation Y. There are almost similar results with Generation X. For Generation Y, the correlation analysis result for workplace fun and job satisfaction shows weak correlation with a value of 0.171. Besides that, the relationship of workplace fun and organizational commitment has a correlation value of 0.595 which indicates a moderate correlation; and there is a weak correlation for workplace fun and task performance with a value of 0.233. From the results, the relationship between workplace fun and job satisfaction is not significant, while the other variables show significant relationships. Hence, Hypotheses 3a is rejected, and hypotheses 3b and 3c are accepted.

#### 4.4 Regression Analysis

Regression analysis is used to investigate and determine the relationship between the independent variable and dependent variable.

**Table 5 Model summary of generation X**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.347 <sup>a</sup>	.120	.110	.57453	1.471
2	.498 <sup>a</sup>	.248	.240	.40862	1.461
3	.236 <sup>a</sup>	.056	.045	.53612	1.733

- 1 a. Predictors: (Constant), WPX  
b. Dependent Variable: JSX
- 2 a. Predictors: (Constant), WPX  
b. Dependent Variable: OCX
- 3 a. Predictors: (Constant), WPX  
b. Dependent Variable: TPX

Table 5 shows that the coefficient of determination which is  $R^2$  for workplace fun and job satisfaction is 0.120 and the percentage is 12%. This explains that workplace fun of Gen X has 12% of influence on job satisfaction. Meanwhile, the  $R^2$  value is highest for workplace fun and organizational commitment with 0.248 which is 24.8%. This indicates that workplace fun has 24.8% of influence on organizational commitment. The  $R^2$  value is the least for the workplace fun and task performance which is 0.056 and the percentages is 5.6%. This means that workplace fun only contributes 5.6% of influence on task performance.

**Table 6 Model Summary of generation Y**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.171 <sup>a</sup>	.029	.016	.53493	1.777
2	.595 <sup>a</sup>	.354	.346	.35281	1.752
3	.233 <sup>a</sup>	.054	.042	.52895	1.864

- 1 a. Predictors: (Constant), WPY  
b. Dependent Variable: JSY
- 2 a. Predictors: (Constant), WPY  
b. Dependent Variable: OCY
- 3 a. Predictors: (Constant), WPY  
b. Dependent Variable: TPY

Table 6 shows the results for model summary of Generation Y. The coefficient of determination which is  $R^2$  for workplace fun of Gen Y and job satisfaction is 0.029 and the percentage is 2.9%. This explains that workplace fun only has 2.9% of influence on job satisfaction. Not only that, it also shows that the relationship between workplace fun of Gen Y is the least towards job satisfaction. On the other hand, the  $R^2$  value is the highest for workplace fun and organizational commitment which is 0.354 (35.4%). This indicates that workplace fun influences the organizational commitment by 35.4% which also means the highest influence. The  $R^2$  value for the workplace fun of Gen Y and task performance is 0.054 and the percentages is only 5.4%. This means that workplace fun only influences task performance by 5.4%.

$\beta$  is important to indicate the most important variable that affects the dependent variables. Based on Table 7, it shows the  $\beta$  value for workplace fun of Gen X does have greater influences on dependent variable of organizational commitment with 0.329. In addition, the second highest  $\beta$  value is for the



relationship between workplace fun of Gen X towards the job satisfaction with 0.297. Lastly,  $\beta$  value is the least for the relationship workplace fun of Gen X towards the task performance with 0.183. The P-value or significance value is  $< 0.05$  to identify which of the variable is significant. For table 4.10, it shows all of the variables are significant with the values of 0.001, 0.00, and 0.23 respectively.

**Table 7 Coefficients of generation X**

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	3.277	.293		11.181	.000		
	WPX	.297	.085	.347	3.505	.001	1.000	1.000
2	(Constant)	2.440	.208		11.705	.000		
	WPX	.329	.060	.498	5.448	.000	1.000	1.000
3	(Constant)	3.684	.273		13.472	.000		
	WPX	.183	.079	.236	2.308	.023	1.000	1.000

1 a. Dependent Variable: JSX

2 a. Dependent Variable: OCX

3 a. Dependent Variable: TPX

**Table 8 Coefficients of generation Y**

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	3.724	.406		9.163	.000		
	WPY	.180	.120	.171	1.505	.137	1.000	1.000
2	(Constant)	1.917	.268		7.150	.000		
	WPY	.507	.079	.595	6.413	.000	1.000	1.000
3	(Constant)	3.363	.402		8.368	.000		
	WPY	.246	.118	.233	2.074	.042	1.000	1.000

1 a. Dependent Variable: JSY

2 a. Dependent Variable: OCY

3 a. Dependent Variable: TPY

Table 8 shows that the  $\beta$  value for workplace fun of Gen Y also has greater influences on dependent variable of organizational commitment with 0.507. In addition, the second highest  $\beta$  value is for the relationship between workplace fun of Gen Y towards task performance with 0.246. Lastly,  $\beta$  value is the least for the relationship workplace fun of Gen Y towards the job satisfaction with 0.180.

The P-value or significance value is  $< 0.05$  to identify which of the variable is significant. From the table, it shows that two of the variables are significant with the values of 0.00 and 0.42 for organizational commitment and task performance respectively, while the significance value for workplace fun of Gen Y towards the job satisfaction is insignificant.

## 5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on correlation analysis of Generation X, it shows that workplace fun has a moderate relationship with organizational commitment with a value of 0.498. This result is consistent with the

study by Choi, Kwon & Kim (2013) who revealed that experienced workplace fun significantly increases employees' task performance and organizational commitment. This might be due to the fact that workplace fun makes employees feel happy, thus increases the feeling of being attached to the organization. Due to this, they are more willing to commit themselves to the organization.

As for the relationship between workplace fun and task performance, the correlation analysis result shows weak relationship with a value of 0.23. This result shows that there is a positive and also significant relationship between workplace fun and task performance of Generation X. This result is similar to Lamm & Meeks (2009) who found that workplace fun has a relationship with task performance. Fluegge-Woolf (2014) also found a positive link between humor and motivation (fun) on a drawing task, and the results suggested that humorous individuals are more likely to show a positive orientation and motivation toward tasks. Supported by Karl & Peluchette (2006), accomplished fun prompts more prominent employment fulfilment and the relationship was more considerable for people putting a high esteem on working environment fun. Employees who are having fun at work may feel happy and motivated thus increasing the quality in performing their task. The last hypotheses tested for Generation X is the relationship between workplace fun and job satisfaction. The correlation analysis shows that workplace fun and job satisfaction also has a weak relationship. Even though there was a weak relationship, it still shows positive relationship with a value of 0.347. As also found by Choi et al. (2013), employees who experience more fun at work were found to have more positive attitude and affective state toward their job (i.e. better job satisfaction). The result was also supported by Alias, Rasdi & Samah (2013) that job satisfaction results from Xers employees' perception regarding their jobs and the level to which there was a good fit between the employee and the organization. A good fit between employee and organization here might refer to how comfortable employees are in the current organization considering the joy and fun they have there. Same goes to a study done in Missouri Baptist Hospital that demonstrated the quantity of workers who communicated "great satisfaction" has expanded from 25% to 75% after the healing facility ingrained the fun theory to representatives (Lundin et al., 2002).

From the above results, it can be inferred that Generation X value fun more at the workplace. This is because Gen X has witnessed their Boomers parents' hardships, thus making them sceptical and cautious, vowing to never work hard while placing one's destiny in the hands of an organization (Reynolds, 2005). This indicates that they not only cherish balanced lifestyle but also boldly rebel against any misguided work ethics (Lancaster & Stillman, 2002). This results are in line with their characteristics of valuing fun, informality and creativity more. They use leisure and recreations to escape difficult challenges (work).

The correlation analysis for Generation Y between workplace fun and organizational commitment shows a moderate relationship with a value of 0.595. This means, the objective of this research study that analyses the relationship between workplace fun with organizational commitment was achieved. The result is consistent with Fojt (1995) who found a positive relationship between workplace fun and organizational commitment of Generation Y. Other than that, the results is also similar to Choi et al. (2013) who found positive effects of experienced workplace fun on organizational commitment for Generation Y. This result might be due to the fact that Millennials or Gen Y respects fun in the workplace not as an advantage, but rather a necessity. When fun is present, they will give more commitment at their workplace.

Next, the relationship between workplace fun and task performance. The result shows a positive and significant relationship with a correlation value of 0.42. Lamm & Meeks (2009) state that, the relationship between workplace fun and task performance was significantly more positive for Millennials when compared to Xers. This is evident from the result where the relationship between these two variables shows higher value for Gen Y (0.42) compared to Gen X (0.23). Ford et al. (2003) in their study reported that 74% human resource managers agreed that workplace fun had positive impact on quality of employee productivity and 59% agreed that fun brings positive impact on speed

of learning new tasks. To perform task efficiently, employees need to be motivated. One of the ways to motivate Gen Y is by allowing them to have fun and work as to them, fun is necessary, and they are taking it as an advantage. Because of this, when fun is allowed, they feel happy to perform tasks.

On the other hand, the correlation result between workplace fun of Generation Y and job satisfaction shows a very weak relationship (0.171), and not significant. One of the supports is a study by Appelbaum, Serena, & Shapiro (2004) who revealed that the relationship between job satisfaction and age is neither consistent nor conclusive. This means that there is no clear relationship between workplace fun of Generation Y and their job satisfaction. This might be due to the characteristics of these Millennials (Gen Y) proved that that "enjoyment" at work for this era, might be a tiny bit more mind complex. Their estimation of fun at work is pictured by proclaims that we see in the papers where "fun" organization are the ones that provide pool tables in the break room, or massage chair and others (Wendover & Gargiulo, 2005). Given such representations, it could be concluded that Millennials/Gen Y simply need to be given clear understanding of what fun is in order to make them satisfied in their job.

For future workplace fun related researches, it is recommended to consider these generational cohorts as the mediator in investigating its relationship with job outcome. There are studies conducted on workplace fun of different generations in other countries, but none was conducted in Malaysian context.

In this study, the dependent variable selected was job outcomes which consist of organizational commitment, task performance and job satisfaction. In analysing job outcomes, there are many more elements can be studied on, among others the organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB). It is suggested that future studies to include more elements of job outcomes.

This current study is only using academicians as the respondents. The results gathered did not portray the general view of influence of workplace fun on job outcomes. It is also recommended to conduct a study in a different industry to compare the results.

## References

- Alias, M., Mohd Rasdi, R., Ismail, M., & Abu Samah, B. (2013). Predictors of workplace deviant behaviour: HRD agenda for Malaysian support personnel. *European Journal of Training and Development*, 37(2), 161-182.
- Allen, N. J. & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology* 63, 1-18.
- Appelbaum, S. H., Serena, M., & Shapiro, B. T. (2004). Generation X and the boomers: Organizational myths and literary realities. *Management Research News*, 27(11/12), 1-28.
- Bernstein, D. A., & Nash, P. W. (2008). *Essentials of psychology* (4th ed.). Boston, USA: Cengage Learning.
- Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1997). Task performance and contextual performance: The meaning for personnel selection research. *Human Performance*, 10(2), 99-109.
- Ching, C. Y. & In, Y. H. (2010). Workplace fun and job satisfaction: the moderating effects of attitudes toward fun (Doctoral dissertation, Hong Kong Baptist University, Hong Kong). Retrieved from <http://libproject.hkbu.edu.hk/trsimage/hp/08001472.pdf>.
- Choi, G. C., Kwon, J., & Kim, W. (2013). Effects of workplace fun on employee behaviours: Focused on generation y in the hospitality industry. *Scholarworks@UMassAmherst*. Retrieved from

[http://scholarworks.umass.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1096&context=gradconf\\_hospitality](http://scholarworks.umass.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1096&context=gradconf_hospitality)

- Cole, D. C., Mondloch, M. V., Hogg-Johnson, S., & Early Claimant Cohort Prognostic Modelling Group. (2002). Listening to injured workers: How recovery expectations predict outcomes—a prospective study. *Canadian Medical Association Journal*, 166(6), 749-754.
- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The job demands-resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 499-512.
- Erickson, T. J. (2008). *Plugged In: The Generation Y Guide to Thriving at Work*. Harvard Business Press: Boston, MA.
- Fluegge, E. R. (2008). Who put the fun in functional? Fun at work and its effects on job performance (Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, USA). Retrieved from <http://ufdc.ufl.edu/UFE0021955/00001>.
- Fluegge-Woolf, E. R. (2014). Play hard, work hard: Fun at work and job performance. *Management Research Review*, 37(8), 682-705.
- Fojt, M. (1995). Making reengineering human. *The Journal of Services Marketing*, 9(3), 51.
- Ford, R. C., McLaughlin, F. S., & Newstrom, J. W. (2003). Questions and answers about fun at work. *People and Strategy*, 26(4), 18.
- Green, F. (2008). Leeway for the loyal: A model of employee discretion. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 46(1), 1-32.
- Gropper, C. M., & Kleiner, B. H. (1992). Making work play. *Work Study*, 41(7), 14-16.
- Gursoy, D., Maier, T. A., & Chi, C. G. (2008). Generational differences: An examination of work values and generational gaps in the hospitality workforce. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 27(3), 448-458.
- Hagevik, S. (1999). From Ozzie and Harriet to the Simpsons: Generations in the workplace. *Journal of Environmental Health*, 61(9), 39.
- Han, H., Kim, W., & Jeong, C. (2016). Workplace fun for better team performance: Focus on frontline hotel employees. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 28(7), 1391-1416.
- Hill, E. J., Erickson, J. J., Fellows, K. J., Martinengo, G., & Allen, S. M. (2014). Work and family over the life course: Do older workers differ? *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, 35(1), 1-13.
- Howe, N. & Strauss, W. (2009). *Millennials rising: The next great generation*. USA: Vintage.
- Karefalk, A., Pettersson, M., & Zhu, Y. (2007). How to Motivate Generation Y with Different Cultural Backgrounds: A Cross-Cultural Comparison between China and Sweden. (Doctoral dissertation, Kristianstad University, Sweden). Retrieved from <http://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:230955/FULLTEXT01.pdf>.

- Karl, K., & Peluchette, J. (2006). How does workplace fun impact employee perceptions of customer service quality? *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 13(2), 2-13.
- Katzenbach, J. R. (2000). *Peak performance: Aligning the hearts and minds of your employees*. Harvard Business Press.
- Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30(3), 607-610.
- Lamm, E., & Meeks, M. D. (2009). Workplace fun: The moderating effects of generational differences. *Employee Relations*, 31(6), 613-631.
- Lancaster, L. C. & Stillman, D. (2002). *When generations collide: Who they are. Why they clash. How to solve the generational puzzle at work*. New York City: HarperCollins Publishers.
- Lundin, S., Christensen, J., Paul, H., & Strand, P. (2002). *Fish! tales: Real-life stories to help transform your workplace and your life*. New York, NY: Hyperion.
- McDowell, T. (2005). *Fun at work: Scale development, confirmatory factor analysis, and links to organizational outcomes*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Alliant International University, San Diego, CA).
- Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L., & Topolnytsky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 61, 20-52.
- Murphy, K. R. (1989). Is the relationship between cognitive ability and job performance stable over time? *Human Performance*, 2(3), 183-200.
- Murphy, W. H., Dacin, P. A. & Ford, N. M. (2004). Sales contest effectiveness: An examination of sales contest design preferences of field sales forces. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 32, 127-143.
- Owler, K. (2008), Fun at work, *New Zealand Management*, 55(3), 40-2.
- Reynolds, L. A. (2005). Communicating total rewards to the generations, *Benefits Quarterly*, 21(2), 13-17.
- Sonnentag, S. (2003). Recovery, work engagement, and proactive behavior: A new look at the interface between non-work and work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 518-28.
- Society for Human Resource Management, (2017). Employee relations: Creating a work positive environment. Retrieved from <https://www.shrm.org/>.
- Wendover, R., & Gargiulo, T. (2005). *On Cloud Nine: Weathering generational challenges in the workplace*. NY: Amacom.
- Werner, J. M. (2000). Implications of OCB and contextual performance for human resource management. *Human Resource Management Review*, 10(1), 3-24.
- Yeaton, K. (2008). Recruiting and managing the 'why?' generation: Gen Y. *The CPA Journal*, 78(4), 68-72.

Yin-Fah, B. C., Foon, Y. S., Chee-Leong, L., & Osman, S. (2010). An exploratory study on turnover intention among private sector employees. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5(8), 57.

Zemke, R., Raines, C., & Filipczak, B. (2000). *Generations at work: Managing the clash of Veterans, Boomers, Xers, and Nexters in your workplace*. New York, NY: Amacom.