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Employee turnover is a major problem for employers. The problem is particularly acute in the hospitality industry which is commonly known for its high levels of turnover. Despite efforts to reduce turnover in the industry, little progress has been made. Fun in the workplace has been identified as one way employers can improve employee engagement and reduce turnover.

This study examines the impact of multiple facets of fun at work, including celebrations at work, non-work related activities, socializing with coworkers, and manager support for fun. Experienced fun, work engagement, and constituent attachment are explored as mediators in the relationship between fun at work and voluntary turnover. The study surveyed 205 hourly employees working in 11 small to medium size hotels. Voluntary turnover was measured six months after survey completion. Celebrations at work activities were found to be related to the likelihood of lower employee turnover. Implications for management and future research directions are discussed.
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Introduction

Fun workplace environments have been promoted as a way to develop organizational cultures that support employee engagement, performance, and retention. The roots of the modern workplace fun movement can be found in the writings of Peters and Waterman (1982) and Deal and Kennedy (1982) who encouraged managers to develop corporate cultures that promoted play, humor, and fun. Following this advice, employers, such as Southwest Airlines, Google, and Ben and Jerry’s, have adopted fun workplace environments with great success (Bolton & Houlihan, 2009; Lamm & Meeks, 2009). Moreover, the philosophy of fun at work has been promoted widely in the popular press by books like Fish! (Lundin, Paul, & Christensen, 2000), where the authors promote fun at work as a key ingredient for energized and productive work environments. The purported benefits of fun at work are plentiful in the popular press, including increased retention, pride in work, creativity, and decreased employee burnout (Lundin et al.). Other authors suggest desirable benefits such as reduced anxiety, tardiness, and absenteeism (Abramis, 1989), as well as improved morale and customer service (Abner, 1997). Nearly every manager would like to enjoy the benefits listed above, providing an explanation for the continued interest in workplace fun to this day (Badawi, 2010; Clements, 2009; Daks, 2010; Mann, 2009; Syverson, 2010).

Despite popular writers’ interest in fun at work very little research on the subject exists, leaving many relationships between fun at work and outcomes at work unexplored. During the last ten years, workplace fun has been investigated using both quantitative and qualitative research methods. Using the popular literature as their starting point, one group of researchers
has approached fun from the perspective that it will predominantly have a positive effect on the workplace (Ford, McLaughlin, & Newstrom, 2003; Karl & Harland, 2005; Karl, Peluchette, Hall, & Harland, 2005; Karl & Peluchette, 2006a; Karl & Peluchette, 2006b; Peluchette & Karl, 2005). This group has examined employee attitudes toward fun and individual perceptions of workplace fun activities (Karl & Harland, 2005; Karl et al., 2005). Additionally, they have explored the impact of workplace fun on experienced fun (Karl & Peluchette, 2006a; Karl, Peluchette, & Harland, 2007), job satisfaction (Karl & Peluchette, 2006b; Karl et al., 2008), turnover intentions (Karl et al., 2008), and perceptions of customer service (Karl & Peluchette, 2006b). Separate from this research paradigm, other researchers have examined fun at work initiatives under a more critical light (Baptiste, 2009; Fleming, 2005; Fleming & Sturdy, 2009; Grugulis, Dundon, & Wilkinson, 2000; Redman & Mathews, 2002) while exploring the complexities involved in the process of shifting to fun workplace cultures. In the process, fun at work has been found to offer both benefits like stress relief (Redman & Mathews) as well as disadvantages like cynicism and resistance (Fleming, 2005). While this limited body of research has provided a greater understanding of the nature and effects of fun at work, many relationships remain unexplored.

Previous research in workplace fun has yielded three notable limitations. The first is related to the samples employed by the relatively small number of empirical studies on workplace fun. For instance, students have been the primary focus of many investigations (Karl & Peluchette, 2006a; Karl & Peluchette, 2006b; Peluchette & Karl, 2005), while human resource managers (Ford, McLaughlin, & Newstrom, 2003) and volunteers (Karl et al., 2008) have been the focus of others. Research has benefited from studies employing these samples, however, a great deal can be gained from conducting fun studies using employees within existing work
environments. The second limitation is related to the conceptualization of fun. Workplace fun has been conceptualized in multiple ways, representing multiple facets of the construct. For instance, some researchers focused on a single facet of fun at work (Karl et al., 2005; Karl et al., 2008; Peluchette & Karl, 2005). Whereas, others conceptualized fun as having multiple facets (Fluegge, 2008; McDowell, 2004), but subsequently combined them into one unitary measurement for analysis purposes. However, fun has never been conceptualized as having multiple facets that are measured separately in a single study. It is argued herein that different dimensions of fun should be examined separately as they may not be of equal importance. The third concern is that previous research has examined the impact of fun on a limited set of workplace outcomes such as job satisfaction (Peluchette & Karl, 2005), performance (Fluegge, 2008), turnover intentions (Karl, Peluchette, & Hall, 2008), and customer service perceptions (Karl & Peluchette, 2006b). The present study strives to address these three weaknesses.

First, the present study extends previous research of workplace fun by examining the impact of fun on entry-level service employees in the context of the hospitality industry. The hospitality industry is one that is challenged by motivation and employee retention concerns. In organizations such as hotels and restaurants, service employees play an important role in setting the mood for the service environment (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993). According to Ford and Heaton (2000), promoting fun at work can have a significant impact on employee attitudes which can positively impact customer attitudes. While these authors assert that fun is one of the most important things hospitality employees look for in a job, it is surprising how few workplace fun studies have been conducted in this industry.

Second, the present study also extends previous research by focusing on different aspects of workplace fun. Multiple facets of fun at work are examined, including fun activities, fun
social interactions, and manager support for fun. While these facets of fun have been previously studied, it is not entirely clear whether they have equivalent effects on the workplace or whether different sources have different effects. Moreover, fun activities are purported to have a positive impact on workplace outcomes (Ford et al., 2003), however, there are no published studies that test or demonstrate this to be the case. Further, while social interactions (Fluegge, 2008; McDowell, 2004) and manager support for fun (Karl & Peluchette, 2006) have been studied there are no published examples of where their separate effects on the workplace have been reported. Understanding the different effects of these varied aspects of fun becomes necessary when providing workforce managers with practical advice about introducing fun into the workplace to improve outcomes. Therefore, the present study examines these three dimensions of fun separately in a single study.

Finally, the present study extends previous research by examining the impact of fun on employee turnover, an outcome that has not been examined in previous fun research. While turnover is considered to be a disruptive and costly problem in many industries (Kacmer, Andrews, VanRooy, Steilberg, & Cerrone, 2006), it is particularly problematic in the hospitality industry, where annual turnover rates in hotels can run over 60% (Tracey & Hinkin, 2006). Fun at work is one of the most important reasons given by restaurant managers for why employees stay at their restaurants (Dermody, 2002), supporting the assertion that fun should be related to lower turnover in the hospitality industry. In addition to the relationship between workplace fun and employee turnover, the present study explores a number of mediators including experienced fun, work engagement, and constituent attachment.

This dissertation, which is comprised of five chapters, extends the arguments presented above and details the investigation focused on the impact of different forms of fun at work on
employee turnover among employees in the hospitality industry. The first chapter provides an overview and analysis of the fun at work research. The second chapter reviews employee turnover in the context of the hospitality industry along with the mediating variables experienced fun, work engagement, and constituent attachment. Additionally, the multidimensional framework for assessing the impact of these variables on turnover and the hypotheses representing the study’s relationships are presented. The third chapter describes the methodology for the investigation where the impact of three different sources of fun are assessed with a sample of 205 entry-level service workers from 11 hotels located in three different states. The fourth chapter presents the results from the investigation. The fifth, and final, chapter addresses the implications of this research and presents opportunities for future research.
Chapter 1

Fun at Work Research: Review and Analysis

As the introduction emphasizes, fun matters in the workplace, but there are limitations to the existing workplace fun research. The current chapter explores these issues in more detail, starting with a review of the research involving fun at work. Research investigating fun in the workplace can be categorized into three different but related areas. The first category involves studies investigating which activities are most prevalent and which of those activities employees prefer most. The second category involves studies that investigated employees’ attitudes toward fun in the workplace and explored a number of outcomes related to workplace fun. The third category involves studies that use qualitative research methods to investigate how fun has been implemented in the workplace. These categories will be used to organize the existing workplace fun research as it is reviewed during the course of this chapter. The chapter continues with an analysis of the limitations in the existing research and how they are addressed in the present study. Employee turnover is one important workplace outcome that may be affected by fun in the workplace. Therefore, the chapter concludes with a review of the turnover research.

Fun Activities

Ford et al. (2003) demonstrate that some fun activities are more prevalent in organizations than others. The authors use data from The Fun Work Environment Study (Esen, 2002), which measured the attitudes of 572 human resource managers who were members of the Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM). The survey was developed by consulting
the popular literature and anecdotal accounts to determine the methods organizations employ to promote fun. Ten general categories of fun activities were included in the questionnaire; respondents were asked to rate the frequency each was used by their organizations. The three categories of activities that received the highest mean scores, representing the most frequent use were: recognition of personal milestones, social events, and public celebrations. The three categories with the lowest mean scores were: friendly competitions among employees, opportunities for personal development, and entertainment. In addition to the prevalence of activities, the human resource managers indicated that fun at work was related to certain advantages, including improved employee enthusiasm, group cohesion, employee satisfaction, individual creativity, friendships at work, organizational citizenship, and reduced stress. Ford and colleagues conclude that fun at work appears as good as the assertions found in the popular press.

Karl and Harland (2005) demonstrate that some workplace activities are perceived as more fun than others. Similar to Ford et al. (2003), these authors identify nine categories of fun activities, gleaned from the pages of popular writings (Hemsath & Yerkes, 1997; Weinstein, 1996). The authors asked 180 graduate students to rate each category on a five-point scale and they found outings, food, and awards to be the highest rated activities. Games, gifts, and “let’s laugh at ourselves,” were the three categories that received the lowest scores and thus were considered the least fun. Further, Karl and Harland demonstrate that gender and age are related to ratings of fun activities. They found that women rate activities overall significantly higher than do men. They also found a significant age effect in that age was inversely related to the overall ratings of activities, indicating that younger respondents rated activities higher than did older ones.
Karl et al. (2005) illustrate that individuals’ attitudes toward fun are related to favorable ratings of the fun activities. Karl and colleagues conceptualize attitudes toward fun using Aldag and Sherony’s (2001) definition that includes the three attitudinal facets of salience, appropriateness, and consequences. According to this definition, salience is how important fun is to workers. Appropriateness relates to whether employees think fun is appropriate at work. Consequences are the perceived outcomes of fun at work. The 242 individuals who were surveyed by Karl et al. were employed as hairdressers, teachers, engineers, and attorneys in a variety of public, private, and nonprofit organizations. The authors found two of the facets of attitudes toward fun, salience and consequences of fun, to be significantly related to the overall ratings of fun activities. These findings indicate that workers who consider fun important and have positive consequences at work, also rate activities to be more fun. Additionally, they found employee attitudes towards fun are significantly related to trust in supervisors and trust in coworkers. In general, the authors were interested to find that the workers in their study held positive attitudes toward fun at work. Moreover, the study shows that employee relationships with supervisors and coworkers play a role when fun is introduced into the workplace.

**Attitudes Toward Fun, Experienced Fun, and Employee Outcomes**

McDowell (2004) demonstrates that fun is significantly related to affective organizational commitment, turnover intentions, and job satisfaction. She conceptualizes fun as a multifaceted construct using the Fun Work Climate Scale, which employed six items for each of the four dimensions of fun, including socializing with coworkers, celebrating at work, personal freedoms, and global fun. Socializing with coworkers can be defined as friendly social interactions among
coworkers; celebrating at work can be defined as activities and parties at work. Personal freedoms refers to autonomy and flexibility related to clothing, music, and other aspects of work. Global fun refers to manager support for fun and a general sense of fun at work. Personal freedoms was dropped from her final model due to lack of fit. McDowell surveyed 577 oil company employees and found the composite of the three remaining facets of fun to be significantly related to affective organizational commitment, turnover intentions, and job satisfaction. McDowell concludes that fun at work does have a positive impact on employees.

Peluchette and Karl (2005) illustrate that individuals’ attitudes toward fun are related to experienced fun and job satisfaction. Health care institutions are the setting for their study, since many health care institutions have implemented fun environments in an effort to improve productivity and employee and patient satisfaction. Their sample includes a mixture of graduate health care students, nurses, and physical therapists, resulting in 152 completed surveys. Attitudes towards fun were found to be significantly related to experienced fun and job satisfaction. Overall, Peluchette and Karl conclude that their study should be encouraging to health care administrators concerned with incorporating fun into the workplace, given its positive impact.

Karl and Peluchette (2006a) found that experienced fun moderated the relationship between emotional exhaustion and job satisfaction. Participants for the study were 142 health care workers employed as administrators and nurses who were also enrolled in undergraduate and graduate health care administration courses. Experienced fun played a moderating role such that the negative effect of emotional exhaustion was significantly lower for those experiencing high levels of fun than for those experiencing low levels of experienced fun. The authors also test the relationship between attitudes toward fun and experienced fun and found a significant
relationship, consistent with previous research (Peluchette & Karl, 2005). A significant finding in this study was the beneficial effect that experienced fun has for employees performing emotionally taxing jobs in health care.

Karl and Peluchette (2006b) demonstrate that experienced fun was related to job satisfaction and perceptions of customer service quality. The authors surveyed 275 undergraduate students who were simultaneously working part time in the service sector. They found experienced fun to have a strong relationship with job satisfaction. Further, experienced fun was significantly related to employee perceptions of all four dimensions of customer service including: reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and empathy. In addition to these direct effects, Karl and Peluchette found that salience, one of the three facets of attitudes toward fun, moderates the relationship between experienced fun and job satisfaction such that individuals who value fun and experience high levels of fun have higher levels of job satisfaction; whereas those who value fun but experience low levels of fun have significantly lower levels of job satisfaction. Karl and Peluchette conclude that experienced fun and employees’ attitudes toward the value of fun at work may be important human resource variables to be considered by service sector employers.

Karl et al. (2007) demonstrate that personality is related to attitudes toward fun and experienced fun. Their sample consisted of 152 individuals, including health care workers enrolled in a graduate courses, nurses, and physical therapists. Extraversion, or “the extent to which an individual is outgoing, active, and high spirited” (Wanberg & Kammeyer-Mueller, 2000, p. 375), was found to be significantly related to attitudes toward fun and experienced fun. Emotional stability, or “the extent to which an individual displays anxiety, anger, hostility, self-consciousness, impulsiveness, vulnerability, and depression” (Wanberg & Kammeyer-Mueller, p. 375), was found to be significantly related to experienced fun. Agreeableness, or the extent to
which individuals are “courteous, flexible, trusting, good natured, cooperative, forgiving, empathetic, soft-hearted, and tolerant” (Wanberg & Kammeyer-Mueller, p. 375), was found by Karl et al. to be significantly related to attitudes toward fun. Therefore, the unique contributions made by Karl and colleagues were the findings that extraversion and agreeableness are related to attitudes toward fun and extraversion and emotional stability are related to experienced fun among health care workers.

Karl, Peluchette, and Hall (2008) demonstrate that experienced fun is related to job satisfaction and turnover intentions. Attracting and retaining volunteer workers is a challenge for nonprofit and public organizations. Karl and colleagues surveyed 99 volunteers working in seven organizations. Experienced fun was found to be significantly related to job satisfaction and inversely related to turnover intentions. The authors also explore whether age and gender are related to attitudes toward fun or experienced fun. They found no significant differences based upon age or gender. However, the finding that experienced fun was related to turnover intentions among volunteers was a significant contribution of this study.

Fluegge (2008) found that fun is related to employee performance and that this relationship is mediated by work engagement. A sample of 245 working undergraduate college students enrolled in a management course was used to test her model of fun at work. Fluegge conceptualizes fun as a multifaceted construct where she used the Fun Work Climate Scale (McDowell, 2004) to measure fun at work. While this scale measures four different facets of fun (socializing with coworkers, celebrating at work, personal freedoms, and global fun), Fluegge used the composite score of these facets in her analyses. She found that fun at work has a significant effect on task performance, organizational citizenship behavior, and creative performance. Moreover, fun at work was found to significantly impact positive affect and work
engagement. The relationship between fun and performance was partly mediated, where work engagement played a mediating role between fun and creative performance. Fluegge’s finding that fun at work is related to employee performance is a unique contribution of her study.

Lamm and Meeks (2009) illustrate that generational differences play a role in attitudes toward fun. Specifically, the authors explore the moderating role of generations on the relationship between attitudes toward fun and workplace outcomes including: job satisfaction, task performance, and organizational citizenship behavior. Of the 701 respondents to their survey, 301 were from Generation X (born between 1961 and 1980), 271 were from the Millennial Generation (born between 1981 and 2000), and 129 were from the Baby Boom Generation (born between 1941 and 1960). The authors found one main effect relationship where attitudes toward fun were significantly related to organizational citizenship behavior. As for generational differences, a few of the hypothesized moderating effects were found. For instance, they found Millennials to have a stronger relationship between fun and job satisfaction than Generation Xers. Similarly, they found Millennials to have a stronger relationship between fun and task performance than Generation Xers. The authors conclude that the relationship between fun at work and workplace outcomes is more complex than previously thought and that generational differences should be taken into consideration when investigating the impact of fun at work.

**Qualitative Studies**

Grugulis et al. (2000), in a qualitative case study, demonstrate that fun may sometimes have a negative impact on employees. The authors were concerned with the use of corporate
culture as a form of management control. While the use of corporate culture as a means to influence employees was not a new concept, Grugulis and colleagues were interested in the use of organized play to gain employee loyalty. They studied corporate culture in a British consulting firm through interviews, observation, and document analysis. They found the firm to be successful with a positive work environment where employees expressed a high level of satisfaction and commitment. However, negative aspects related to this managerial approach included active and passive employee resistance, a sense that the firm was patronizing to its members by predetermining the definition of fun, and a sense that the boundaries between employees’ work lives and personal lives were blurred. While earlier writings focus primarily on the benefits of fun work environments (Abner, 1997; Abramis, 1989), Grugulis et al. observed that there are both advantages and disadvantages to such environments.

Redman and Mathews (2002), in a qualitative case study, found that some employees resist fun at work. The authors investigate a “work hard, play hard” culture (Redman & Mathews, p. 56) implemented by a British retail service company among its 1050 employees, with intention of gaining their commitment to the company’s customer service philosophy. Redman and Mathews interviewed managers, conducted focus groups among front line employees, and reviewed company documents over a three year period. A number of benefits of the fun culture were identified including: relieved tensions, a sense of community, increased business, and an attractive workplace environment. However, they also identified some difficulties related to the initiative. Some managers struggled to develop a fun environment and some employees resisted the initiative by responding cynically. The authors concluded that the case for fun at work needs to be examined more carefully as there are both positive and negative consequences resulting from such initiatives.
Fleming (2005), in a qualitative case study, demonstrates that workplace fun may have positive and negative consequences. The setting for his study is an Australian call center with nearly 1000 employees with an existing culture of fun. The purpose of the study was to investigate how the company managed the fun culture and to determine how employees respond to it. Fleming employed interviews, observation, and document analysis during the eight month field study. Similar to Redman and Mathews (2002), Fleming found that some employees dislike the company-sponsored fun, considering it to be inauthentic and fake. Fleming concludes that the fun initiative may have alleviated some of the mundane effects of call center work, but the initiative blurred lines between work and non-work resulting in cynicism and resistance on the part of some employees. As a result, the author advocates for a more balanced approach to fun including more authentic forms of fun at work.

**Summary of Workplace Fun Research**

Thirty years have passed since Peters and Waterman (1982) and Deal and Kennedy (1982) advocated for the development of fun working environments for the sake of improved employee motivation, productivity, and loyalty. During the last decade, management research has focused on fun at work, bringing the topic into the spotlight and subjecting it to greater scrutiny than ever before. Rather than relying solely on the propositions and anecdotal evidence presented by the many popular authors, researchers investigating fun at work have scientifically measured the attitudes and perceptions of both managers and workers to help provide a clearer understanding of the nature and the consequences of this construct. In so doing, it is becoming
apparent that fun at work is an important aspect of the workplace and that it makes a difference in many workplace outcomes.

Three general findings have been demonstrated in previous research. First, fun activities are prevalent in the workplace and some activities are preferred over others. For instance, recognition of personal milestones, social events, and public celebrations were found by Ford et al. (2003) to be the most commonly employed activities. In terms of preferences, employees consistently rated food, contests, outings, and awards/prizes as the most preferred activities (Karl & Harland, 2005; Karl et al., 2005; Peluchette et al., 2005). Knowing that these activities have been shown to be popular, and that others are less popular, is beneficial to organizations seeking to implement fun activities at work.

Second, fun has been shown to impact a number of workplace outcomes. Positive relationships have been demonstrated between fun at work and the following constructs: affective organizational commitment, job satisfaction, experienced fun, perceptions of customer service quality, task performance, organizational citizenship behavior, and creative performance. Additionally, fun at work has been demonstrated to have a negative relationship between employee turnover intentions and emotional exhaustion. These findings provide support for implementing fun in the workplace.

The third finding is that fun must be implemented with caution. In addition to the favorable outcomes identified above, certain unfavorable outcomes have also been identified. Employees have been found to dislike the activities that management has initiated in an effort to promote fun. As a result, employees have resisted management’s efforts and thus have responded with cynicism. For these reasons, employers wishing to implement fun in the workplace must
weigh the negative consequences before introducing major changes and work to minimize the problems that may arise.

**Critique of Workplace Fun Research**

While much progress has been made, the existing fun at work research has a number of limitations that need to be addressed. Three of the foremost limitations include the samples that have been employed to investigate fun at work, the manner in which fun at work has been conceptualized and measured, and the lack of actual turnover research.

The first limitation of the existing fun at work research involves the samples that have been employed. While a variety of different samples have been utilized by the studies reviewed above, a number of them were comprised solely of graduate and undergraduate students (Karl & Harland, 2005; Karl & Peluchette, 2006b; Peluchette et al., 2005). These samples have limited industry context for studies involving workplace interventions, such as fun at work. The workplace fun studies that have engaged employees also raise concerns. One study that involved a sample comprised of workers was Karl et al. (2005). However, instead of a homogeneous sample of 242 workers, Karl and colleagues include hourly workers, salaried workers, professionals, unskilled laborers, and management employees in this study’s sample. The authors do not explain how they controlled for these important distinctions. McDowell (2004) also utilizes a sample comprised primarily of employees. Participants in McDowell’s study were employees working in a large American oil company. However, McDowell does not explicate whether only line employees were included in the study or whether both line employees and managers were included. Fun at work is implemented by management and is intended to provide
a positive work environment for employees. Workplace fun is understood best within the context of existing work environments with actual employees. According to Griffin (2007), context is the “set of circumstances” (p. 860) within which activities, events, and processes occur. Context can help explain important aspects of the focal construct (Cappelli & Shearer, 1991). Therefore, it is of theoretical and practical importance that research is conducted within context and that researchers control for worker categories while investigating the effects of fun at work.

The second limitation is that fun has been conceptualized in a myriad of different ways. For instance, conceptualizations of fun at work include employee attitudes toward fun (Lamm & Meeks, 2009; Peluchette & Karl, 2005), fun activities (Karl & Harland, 2005; Karl et al., 2005), experienced fun (Karl & Peluchette, 2006a; Peluchette & Karl, 2005), fun persons (McDowell, 2004), and fun work climate (Fluegge, 2008; McDowell, 2004). No single definition of or conceptualization of fun at work has been isolated. Instead, fun has been conceptualized as having a number of different dimensions. Moreover, fun at work has been conceptualized by researchers as both a unitary and a multidimensional construct.

That fun at work should be conceptualized and implemented as a multidimensional phenomenon is gaining strong support. The fun programs observed by Redman and Mathews (2002) and Fleming (2005) were driven primarily by structured fun activities, resulting in negative behaviors and resistance on the part of some employees within the organizations they studied. These negative effects led Fleming to conclude that a broader, more democratic approach would result in more authentic fun experiences and more meaningful involvement on the part of employees. Similarly, after a thorough review, Owler, Morrison, and Plester (2010) concluded that fun can be derived from multiple sources, including the experience of performing work tasks (the work itself), naturally occurring activities and interactions at work (organic fun),
and organized activities specifically designed to produce fun (structured fun). As a result, Owler and colleagues advise that research be conducted using this “multiple perspective” (p. 349) of fun. According to Lamm and Meeks (2009), “the lack of recognition of these construct dimensions and outcomes represent a fundamental weakness of the mainstream literature on workplace fun” (p. 614).

Two studies that have conceptualized fun as a multifaceted construct are McDowell (2004) and Fluegge (2008). These authors divide fun work climates into four facets: socializing with coworkers, celebrating at work, personal freedoms, and global fun. This multifaceted approach recognizes that fun may result from a variety of sources. However, the manner in which McDowell (2004) and Fluegge (2008) treat these facets suffers when all four measurements are combined together into one composite measurement of fun. In the process of combining the four facets of a fun working climate, they discount the individual contributions different sources of fun may contribute to the workplace. One weakness present in the fun in the workplace studies is the failure to explore fun at work in multiple dimensions, conceptualized separately in a single study.

The third limitation is related to the exclusion of employee turnover as an outcome in the existing fun at work research. Employee turnover is a serious human resource problem, resulting in significant costs to employers. Writing from an anecdotal perspective, some authors assert that reduced turnover behaviors are among the benefits that fun work environments can afford employers (Lundin et al., 2000; Zbar, 1999). However, the relationship between fun at work and actual turnover has rarely been the subject of workplace fun studies. As reviewed above, McDowell (2004) and Karl et al. (2008) found fun work climates and experienced fun (respectively) to be related to employee turnover intentions. Intent to leave is generally
considered a precursor to actual turnover (Lee & Mowday, 1987), thus helping to explain how the turnover process occurs (Maertz & Campion, 2004). There are no fun at work studies that include actual employee turnover as a workplace outcome. While the inclusion of turnover intentions has provided a better understanding of how fun may impact the turnover process, the absence of studies involving actual turnover leaves a void in the workplace fun literature. Given this void, authors like Owler et al. (2010) have recently called for additional research investigating the impact of fun at work on important outcomes at work including employee turnover.

**Review of Turnover Research**

Decades of research have produced hundreds of studies exploring the causes of turnover allowing for a number of meta-analyses (Cotton & Tuttle, 1986; Griffeth, Hom, & Gaertner, 2000; Hom & Griffeth, 1995). These reviews have found a number of consistent relationships. Griffeth et al. (2000) recently analyzed the extant turnover literature, including 500 correlations from 42 studies. What follows is a brief review of the most significant findings from Griffeth et al., including variables related to job satisfaction, job content, organization factors, and work environment factors.

Job satisfaction is one of the most extensively studied correlates of turnover (Mobley, Griffeth, Hand, & Meglino 1979). Consistently found to be negatively related to turnover (Cotton & Tuttle, 1986; Hom & Griffeth, 1995; Moblely et al., 1979; Muchinsky & Tuttle, 1979), Griffeth et al. (2000) found overall job satisfaction has the strongest relationship of all major variables in their study. Employee satisfaction with pay, supervision, and coworkers was also
found by Griffeth and colleagues to have negative relationships with turnover. Additionally, pay and promotional opportunities were both negatively related to actual turnover. In support of these findings, the importance of pay was underscored by a recent large-scale study by Hammida (2004) that found a strong relationship between low wages and high levels of turnover. Overall, these findings indicate that employees who are generally satisfied, receive adequate pay, and perceive promotional opportunities are less likely to leave their present jobs.

Job content also has an effect on employee turnover (Griffeth, et al., 2000). Specifically, job scope, job involvement, and work satisfaction were found by Griffeth and colleagues to all have significant negative relationships with turnover. Furthermore, routinization was found to have a significant and positive effect on turnover. The authors considered these job content factors more distal variables, thus explaining their more modest effects on turnover compared to proximal predictors such as job satisfaction. These research findings emphasize the important role that job-related factors play in the turnover process.

While turnover research has traditionally focused on work attitudes, job alternatives, and job-related factors as antecedents, more recently the focus has shifted to relational variables that are predicted to influence turnover (Maertz & Griffeth, 2004; Mossholder et al., 2005). From this relational perspective, authors argue that the relationships held by employees with coworkers, supervisors, and family members play important roles in the turnover/retention process. For instance, Maertz and Griffeth (2004) identified eight types of relational forces that are predicted to influence turnover behaviors, examples of which include affective forces, contractual forces, ethical forces, and constituent forces. Mossholder and colleagues (2005) explored the impact that coworker relationships have on turnover and found interpersonal citizenship behavior and network centrality to have significant negative relationships with turnover. The authors
concluded that employees who developed a greater number of ties with their coworkers became embedded within their work groups and thus were less likely to become dislodged from them. Attachment to coworkers is a relatively under-explored variable that may help to explain how the turnover process unfolds.

The extensive body of turnover research provides researchers and practitioners with a sound understanding of a number of variables that consistently predict employee turnover. While a great deal of progress has been made, the variables that have been identified still only explain a portion of the variability in leaving behavior (Lee & Mitchell, 1994; Mitchell, Holtom, Lee, Sablynski, & Erez, 2001), providing room for continued efforts to identify individual and organizational variables that influence turnover. Researchers argue that greater attention to contextual issues in the work environment is essential in providing a greater understanding of turnover behavior (Holtom, Mitchell, Lee, & Eberly, 2008). Given the significant costs associated with turnover, further exploration into other variables that may impact turnover is warranted. Moreover, since context is an important factor when studying turnover, investigating turnover within the context of the hospitality industry, where turnover can be particularly problematic, is appropriate.

**Turnover in the Hospitality Industry**

Employee turnover is a problem of particular significance in the hospitality industry. The industry has a well-earned reputation for high rates of turnover that are widely considered to be higher than those found in other industries (DiMicco & Giridharan, 1987; Iverson & Deery, 1997; Pizam & Thornburg, 2000; Wasmuth & Davis, 1983a). Considering the hospitality
industry’s size puts the turnover problem into perspective; eleven million people are employed in the areas of accommodations and food service, making the industry the fifth largest employer in the United States (U.S. Department of Labor, 2011). The restaurant sector alone employs over nine percent of the U.S. workforce (National Restaurant Association, 2011). While turnover rates vary dramatically depending on the sector and year, annual turnover rates among entry-level hospitality employees can frequently exceed 100 percent (Zuber, 2001). The industry’s turnover problem is further illustrated by data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics (U.S. Department of Labor, 2006) which demonstrates that employees in accommodations and food service were employed for 2.5 and 1.4 years respectively, compared to 4.0 years for workers overall.

Turnover is a costly problem for hospitality operators. Nearly thirty years ago, Wasmuth and Davis (1983a) considered the costs associated with administration, productivity, morale, and public relations and estimated the cost per hourly employee to be $2,100. More recently, Hinkin and Tracey (2000) estimated the cost of turnover among hotel front desk employees to range between $5,600 and $12,000 per incident. Furthermore, the impact of turnover in the hospitality industry may be particularly costly, given the relationships developed between employees and customers. For instance, high levels of turnover in service settings have been shown to result in significantly lower levels of customer satisfaction (Ulrich, Halbrook, Meder, Stuchlik, & Thorpe, 1991). The extent and expense of employee turnover provide support for the need to improve retention, particularly in a large industry like hospitality.

Despite the significant problems posed by turnover in the hospitality industry, only a limited number of studies focus on turnover among hourly employees. Many of these studies investigate turnover intentions (DiPietro & Milman, 2004; Ismert & Petrick, 2004; Iverson & Deery, 1997; Milman & Ricci, 2004); whereas only a few have investigated actual turnover
While the number of studies is limited, they do suggest several causes that are specific to hospitality. Through interviews with managers, Wasmuth and Davis (1983b) identify poor supervision, limited responsibility and autonomy, unpleasant working conditions, and repetitive tasks as key drivers of turnover. More recently, Hinkin and Tracey (2000) suggest that turnover is largely attributed to low pay for jobs that involve a great deal of customer interaction.

Turnover is prevalent in the hospitality industry and its costs are significant. Moreover, the major causes of turnover have been identified and strategies for reducing turnover have also been identified. In spite of what is known, little progress has been made toward reductions in turnover, justifying the need for further exploration into how turnover can be reduced.

The above review has demonstrated that organizations are using fun in the workplace, that employees respond positively to certain forms of fun, and that fun at work positively impacts a number of important outcomes in the workplace. These findings indicate that fun at work does matter and can make meaningful differences for employees at work. However, in spite of what has been learned about workplace fun, employee turnover continues to be a major problem that impacts employers. While turnover and its significant costs continue to be a problem, research has yet to explore the effect workplace fun has on actual employee turnover. The investigation of the relationship between fun at work and employee turnover is of both theoretical and practical importance.
Research Objectives

The present study addresses a number of the limitations identified in the review above and further explores the nature of fun in the workplace. First, the present study addresses the samples found in the workplace fun research by studying entry-level workers employed in the context of the hospitality industry. Second, workplace fun is conceptualized as a multi-faceted construct, exploring the effect of these various facets in one single study. Third, the present study explores the impact of fun at work on actual employee turnover. Further, the present study investigates whether different facets of fun have differential effects on employee turnover. Finally, the present study investigates the variables of experienced fun, work engagement, and constituent attachment as potential mediators between sources of workplace fun and employee turnover. Mediator variables help explain how the variable of interest impacts a particular dependent variable (Holmbeck, 1997), thus providing researchers and managers with valuable insight into these processes. The following chapter provides a description of the present study, including the relationship between workplace fun and employee turnover. A description of the study’s mediating variables as well as the study’s hypotheses are presented.
Chapter 2

The Effect of Fun at Work on Employee Turnover and Mediating processes

It was argued in Chapter 1 that fun in the workplace matters to employees and organizations and that employee turnover is a major human resource issue facing employers. The present study extends the fun at work literature in four important ways. First, the present study explores the effect of fun on actual turnover behavior. While previous research has explored the effect of fun on turnover intentions (Karl et al., 2008; McDowell, 2004); no studies have focused on actual employee turnover. Second, the present study explores whether different sources of fun exhibit different effects on employee turnover. Fun at work has been conceptualized as a multifaceted construct by previous authors (Fluegge, 2008; McDowell, 2004). However, the differential effects of these facets have not been explored. Third, the present study examines the impact of mediators and the relationship between workplace fun and employee turnover. Specifically, experienced fun, work engagement, and constituent attachment are considered to be mediators in this relationship. Fourth, the present study explores the effect of fun at work among entry-level employees within the context of the hospitality industry. As established in the previous chapter, employees working within this context have not previously been represented in workplace fun studies. Based on these extensions, this chapter provides the overall framework for the present study.

The Challenge of Employee Turnover

Turnover is a common and complex problem, often considered to be one of the most significant human resource problems facing organizations (Martin & Boye, 1998). During the
last century, researchers have investigated turnover from psychological, sociological, and economic perspectives in an effort to quantify the rates and costs of turnover and to determine causes and strategies to control it (Cotton & Tuttle, 1986; Hom, Caranikas-Walker, Prussia, & Griffeth, 1992; McEvoy & Cascio, 1985; Muchinsky & Morrow, 1980).

One of the reasons for the extensive focus on turnover is that it is costly, imposing both direct and indirect costs on organizations. While the previous chapter established that turnover has a financial impact on hospitality employers in particular, it has long been established that turnover is costly to employers in general. Direct costs are defined as those expenses related to recruitment, selection, and training and development (Staw, 1980) and have been estimated to be as high as $3,600 per turnover incident (White, 1995). Indirect costs relate to losses in the areas of productivity and employee morale. For instance, Kacmer et al. (2006) found entry-level employee turnover to have a significant negative effect on the productivity measures of customer wait time and food waste in the restaurant industry. Mueller and Price (1989) found evidence that turnover disrupts attitudes and morale. They found high rates of turnover to be significantly related to lower levels of both quality communications and behavioral commitment among groups of health care employees. Employee turnover is commonly thought of as a considerable burden to organizations (Staw), especially when both the direct and the indirect costs are taken into account. Given the significant costs related to turnover, efforts to decrease turnover are warranted.

Different types of turnover impact the overall turnover rates tracked by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. The most common distinction is between involuntary and voluntary turnover. Involuntary turnover involves terminations, layoffs, and retirements, which are events generally not initiated by the individual (Price, 1977). Further, voluntary turnover is defined as that which
is “…initiated by the individual” (p. 9). Voluntary turnover is the most common type and is potentially curbed by more effective management. These reasons illustrate that voluntary turnover is the most frequently studied form and therefore will be the focus of the present study.

Fun and Employee Turnover

The premise of this research is that fun at work will have a significant impact on employee turnover among entry-level employees in the hospitality industry. To examine this issue, the present study focuses on three different dimensions of fun at work, including fun activities, socializing with coworkers, and manager support for fun. Fun activities include food at work, contests, games, outings, social events, and employee recognition events, which are intended to make the workplace enjoyable for employees (Karl et al., 2005). Socializing with coworkers refers to social interactions with coworkers at work and outside of work and the friendships that are developed among coworkers (McDowell, 2004). Manager support for fun is the extent to which managers attempt to create fun work environments by encouraging and supporting efforts to have fun at work.

Fun at work may benefit employees by meeting a number of important needs and therefore reducing turnover. While employees work to meet the instrumental need of receiving a regular paycheck (National Restaurant Association, 1997), they work to meet social needs as well. For instance, Milman and Ricci (2004) found that hotel employees consider working with friends and family to be just as important as working for pay, when considering their present jobs. Moreover, spending the majority of their daily lives at work, most would prefer that the
time spent there be enjoyable. It is argued that fun at work satisfies many social needs of employees and thus will have a positive impact on employee retention.

Fun at work may have a significant impact on employee turnover in the hospitality industry because it may compensate for the often unfavorable terms and conditions of employment in the industry. For instance, work conditions in hospitality operations frequently involve low entry-level skills, low wages, low job security, few promotional opportunities, and little career development (Iverson & Deery, 1997). Further, work shifts are often erratic and irregular and work is often emotionally demanding (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993; DiPietro & Milman, 2004). Workplace fun may help to mitigate their effect, thus promoting lower levels of turnover. Low-wage jobs, such as those found in hospitality, are often highly substitutable with regard to terms and conditions of employment (Andersson, Holzer, & Lane, 2005; Steel, 2004), and job alternatives can typically be found in close proximity. For these reasons, employees may change jobs for even small pay increases (Andersson et al., 2005; Greengard, 1995). However, fun may be perceived as less substitutable across jobs and organizations and thus serve to reduce turnover.

Another reason why fun may impact turnover in hospitality is that the industry relies heavily on a young labor force that may especially value fun (Bonn & Forbringer, 1992). In a large study of food service employees, it was demonstrated that 40 percent of the industry’s workers were under 25 years old and that another 40 percent were between 25 and 40 years old (National Restaurant Association, 1997). The authors concluded that the industry is younger and more diverse than other industries. Members of Generation X (currently 30-50 year olds) and those of the Millennial Generation (currently 16-30 year olds) are considered to value fun workplaces more than their older counterparts. For instance, Zemke, Raines, and Filipczak
(2000) assert that Generation X employees want work to be fun and are interested in work-life balance. Millennials are also interested in fun in that they gravitate to friendly, casual work environments (Lowe, Levitt, & Wilson, 2008). The high concentration of Generation X and Millennial Generation employees in the hospitality industry would seemingly make the industry an ideal place to promote fun work environments in order to attract, motivate, and retain employees.

Furthermore, fun may be important because it may be one of the primary reasons why individuals seek employment in the hospitality industry in the first place. Milman and Ricci (2004) found work environment to be among the top characteristics that attracted hotel employees to their current jobs. In another study, Dermody (2002) found that restaurant operators cited the atmosphere and work environment within their workplaces as one of the top reasons employees decided to stay and work in restaurants. The managers in his study highlighted the importance of a pleasant work environment, fun work, and an upbeat atmosphere as key factors impacting turnover. These findings indicate that employees are attracted to the perceived fun and excitement of the hospitality industry. If employees’ perceptions of fun are met, employees may be more apt to remain with their employer. If they are not, they may be more likely to seek employment elsewhere and leave. Based on the arguments presented above, it is hypothesized that fun at work will have a negative relationship with employee turnover.

Hypothesis 1: Three dimensions of fun at work including, fun activities, socializing with coworkers, and manager support for fun will be negatively related to employee turnover.

In addition to examining the relationship between workplace fun and turnover, the present study explores whether the different dimensions of fun have different effects on turnover.
In one respect, coworker socializing is argued to have a greater impact on turnover than fun activities. While fun activities are sponsored and supported by the organization, socializing with coworkers is not prescribed by the organization. Previous studies (Fleming, 2005; Grugulis et al., 2000) have found that employees may resist organization-sponsored programs that are intended to be fun for employees. However, employees engage in social interactions of their own volition. As a result, socializing may be more genuine and valued. This more casual form of fun may represent a higher quality interaction than those formal activities. Authors like Pfeffer (1998) assert that peer relationships can be stronger and more influential than formal organizational influences. Furthermore, social interactions may be more influential than activities because they are more frequent and regular. Fun activities promoted by employers may have a lesser impact because they are discrete events. The genuine nature and the frequency with which employees engage socially will give social interactions a stronger effect on turnover than fun activities, thus justifying the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 2: Fun activities and socializing with coworkers both will have an impact on turnover; however, socializing with coworkers will have a greater impact than will fun activities.

Manager support for fun is also expected to have a greater impact on turnover than fun activities. Manager support for fun is argued to be more influential because it involves the development of a supportive work environment where fun may occur whether fun activities are prescribed or not. Such an environment may provide greater opportunities for fun and provide for increased high quality fun interactions. Moreover, Karl et al. (2005) demonstrated the importance of the manager-employee relationship when they found employee trust in supervisors to have a significant, positive effect on attitudes toward fun. Wasmuth and Davis
(1983c) identified poor quality supervision as one of the primary causes of turnover. Among the elements of quality supervision cited by Wasmuth and Davis are “…good listening skills and the ability to motivate employees by appealing to their sense of independence” (p. 66). By providing support for fun, managers are listening to employees and providing employees with a portion of the independence identified by Wasmuth and Davis. Based on the preceding argument, the following hypothesis is presented:

Hypothesis 3: Fun activities and manager support for fun will both have an impact on turnover; however, manager support for fun will have a greater impact on turnover than fun activities.

Mediating Processes

The present study explores mediators between the facets of fun at work and employee turnover. As discussed in Chapter 1, no existing studies have explored the relationship between fun and actual turnover. However, two studies have investigated the relationship between fun at work and employee turnover intentions (Karl et al., 2008; McDowell, 2004). The present study explores three variables as mediators between fun and turnover, including experienced fun, work engagement, and constituent attachment.

Peluchette and Karl (2005) define experienced fun as the level of fun that employees experience in the work environment. As the definition of experienced fun indicates, it is a consequence of actual fun in the workplace. Experienced fun is a resultant state caused by fun in the workplace, no matter what form fun may take. Evidence that experienced fun is related to turnover is found in Karl et al. (2008), where a negative relationship was found between
experienced fun and turnover intentions among volunteer workers in non-profit work environments. Following that the different sources of fun should be related to experienced fun and that experienced fun should relate to turnover, experienced fun is argued to mediate the relationship between the sources of fun and turnover.

Hypothesis 4: The relationship between fun at work and turnover will be mediated by experienced fun.

In recent years, the study of motivation has taken the form of work engagement, in an effort to understand “… the flows of worker energies toward given tasks” (Kahn, 1992, p. 322). The extent to which individuals engage themselves at work varies from individual to individual. Kahn (1990) describes this engagement as “the harnessing of organization member selves to their work roles: in engagement, people employ and express themselves physically, cognitively, and emotionally during role performances” (p. 694). Bakker & Demerouti (2008) explain that work engagement is “a positive fulfilling, work-related state of mind” (p. 209) that can be measured and developed by management in an effort to improve employee performance. Engagement has been argued to impact a host of favorable outcomes (Harter, Schmidt, & Hays, 2002; Koyuncu, Burke, & Fiksenbaum, 2006; Simpson, 2009). With regard to employee turnover, Harter et al. (2002) found a significant negative relationship between work engagement and turnover in their meta-analysis of 26 studies. In addition, Koyuncu et al. (2006) found lower intent to quit a significant consequence of work engagement in a study involving 286 female bank employees. Similarly, Saks (2006) and Schaufeli & Bakker (2004) both found the negative relationship between work engagement and turnover intentions in their studies involving 102 employees and 1698 employees respectively.
Fun at work is argued to impact employee engagement in a number of ways. When individuals laugh and have fun, they experience physiological arousal such as increased oxygen flow and the release of endorphins and adrenaline in the body (Jeffcoat & Gibson, 2006; Lamm & Meeks, 2009). These physiological effects can give workers energy and may improve their sense of well-being. In a study involving 300 individuals, including a combination of college students and employees, Glynn and Webster (1992) found a significant relationship between adult playfulness and task involvement. Similarly, Karl and Peluchette (2006a) found a significant relationship between attitudes toward fun and emotional exhaustion, a construct considered to be the opposite of engagement (Schaufeli, Salanova, Gonzalez-Roma, & Bakker, 2002) among 142 health care students. Finally, Fluegge (2008) found fun work environments to have a significant impact on work engagement among college students. If employees concentrate the energy generated by fun at work into their jobs, they will exhibit higher levels of work engagement. Because the dimensions of fun should impact engagement, engagement is argued to mediate the relationship between fun and employee turnover.

Hypothesis 5: The relationship between fun at work and turnover will be mediated by work engagement.

Finally, constituent attachment is also argued to mediate the fun - turnover relationship. Constituent attachment is defined by O’Reilly, Caldwell, and Barnett (1989) as “the degree to which an individual is psychologically linked to others in a group” (p. 22). According to these authors, social integration is primarily influenced by affective forces such as personal interactions with coworkers and satisfaction with coworkers. Constituent attachment is one of the eight forces that Maertz and Griffeth (2004) theorize to affect individual employee motivations to stay or leave. The authors posit that attachment to coworkers and groups within the
organization help attach employees to the organization, thus affecting turnover decisions. A negative relationship between social integration and turnover intentions was found by Wanberg and Kammeyer-Mueller (2000). Similarly, O’Reilly et al. (1989) found a significant relationship between social integration and employee turnover (operationalized as employee tenure) at the group level, such that higher integration was related to lower turnover. Further, Mossholder, Settoon, and Henagan (2005) demonstrated that having high quality social attachments among coworkers reduced employee turnover.

Fun at work should positively impact constituent attachment because fun at work increases opportunities for employees to interact and thus provide for greater ties between coworkers. Coworker relationships are developed through social interactions between workers. Newcomer socialization is an area that has focused a great deal of attention on worker social interactions. According to Reichers (1987), the more frequently workers interact with one another during this critical time for employees, the faster the socialization process occurs. Morrison (1993) investigated the impact of information seeking on newcomer socialization in a longitudinal study involving 135 accountants. She found a significant relationship between information seeking (both normative and social) and social integration of new employees. Similarly, Wanberg and Kammeyer-Mueller (2000) found a relationship between relationship building and social integration among two different samples of employees. When employees behave proactively by interacting through formal and informal activities for either instrumental or social purposes, they develop networks of friendship and support within the work environment (Ashford & Black, 1996). Since fun should promote constituent attachment, constituent attachment is argued to mediate the relationship between fun and turnover.
Hypothesis 6: The relationship between fun at work and turnover will be mediated by constituent attachment.

Figure 2-1 summarizes the theoretical relationships presented in this chapter. Specifically, it has been hypothesized that fun at work will promote employee retention and thus have a negative relationship with employee turnover. Additionally, it has been hypothesized that the different facets of fun will exhibit different effects on turnover. Namely, it is proposed that employee social interactions and manager support for fun will each have a greater impact on turnover than will fun activities. Finally, it is hypothesized that experienced fun, work engagement, and constituent attachment will mediate the relationship between fun at work and turnover.

The goal of this dissertation is to extend previous research on fun in the workplace by examining the extent to which it impacts turnover. Employee turnover is a major problem for managers in the hospitality industry that results in significant costs for employers. Despite the problem of turnover in the hospitality industry, there has been surprisingly little research on turnover among entry-level employees in the industry. Fun in the workplace is one contextual factor that has shown promise to reduce turnover, and this research strives to substantiate this claim. Fun at work may be particularly important to hospitality employees because it may be especially valued by the younger individuals who dominate the industry’s labor force and it may make the workplace more enjoyable. The next chapter describes the methodology for the present study where data were collected from 205 employees in 11 hotel properties.
Figure 2-1: The Impact of Fun in the Workplace on Employee Turnover
Chapter 3
Methodology

This chapter provides a description of the study, including the sample, the procedures used to collect data, the study measures, and the analysis methods used to analyze the data.

Sample and Context

The sample consisted of 205 hourly employees from 11 small to medium sized hotels located in Mississippi, New York, and Pennsylvania. The hotels ranged in size from 48 to 208 guest rooms, with the average size being 107 rooms. The sample was comprised of approximately 18 employees from each hotel. With regard to demographic characteristics, the sample was 73.2 percent female, 80 percent Caucasian, and the average age of participants was 37.8 years old. The average organizational tenure at the beginning of the study period was 3.9 years.

Procedure

Four hundred twenty-seven employees working in 12 hotels were invited to participate in the study. All hourly employees in the hotels were invited to participate in a study about their experiences on the job. The employees received a packet containing the survey itself, information about the study, instructions for survey completion, and an assurance of confidentiality. The survey included items relating to demographic characteristics, workplace fun, the mediators, and control variables. To ensure confidentiality, no personal information was
included on the survey form. However, each instrument was coded individually to permit subsequent tracking with turnover data. Employees who chose to participate completed the survey during work time, while attending employee meetings or during work breaks. Of the 427 surveys distributed, 219 were returned with usable data, yielding an initial participation rate of 51 percent. Turnover was ascertained by surveying managers approximately six months following initial survey administration to determine if the employees had left the hotel or whether they were still employed. A six month period was chosen because researchers like Mossholder et al. (2005) suggest that lengthy timeframes may not be suitable when dealing with perceptual variables. Turnover was unavailable from one hotel due to management turnover, thus eliminating six employees from the initial sample. Two surveys were eliminated due to missing data. Six involuntary leavers were excluded from the sample. Therefore, the final sample consisted of 205 employees from 11 hotels, resulting in a final participation rate of 48 percent. For the final sample of 205 employees, 59 employees were leavers and 146 were stayers, resulting in a turnover rate of 28.8 percent during the six month study period.

**Primary Study Measures**

*Fun activities.* Fun activities were assessed using a list of 12 categories of fun activities. Eight of the categories came from the Fun Work Environment Survey (Esen, 2002), examples of which include: “games at work” and “stress relieving activities.” Four additional categories were used from Karl et al. (2005), examples of which include: “food at work” and “theme days.” To assist employees with the understanding of each of the categories, examples of the activities were provided. Employees were asked to rate how frequently they experienced the activities in
each of these categories using a five point scale where 1 represented “never” and 5 represented “very frequently.”

Exploratory factor analysis was used to assess the factor structure of the 12 item fun activities scale and to determine if scale reliability could be improved by removing any low scoring items. The principal axis method was used to extract the factors. Since all of the items in the scale directly referenced fun activities that are widely found in many workplaces, it was reasonable to expect any underlying factors to be interrelated. In these cases an oblique rotation strategy is recommended (Field, 2009). The solution was rotated using Promax with Kaiser Normalization. The two criteria used to determine the number of factors in the solution were skree plots and Eigenvalues in excess of 1.0. Moreover, Costello and Osborne (2005) note that a solid factor is one that has a minimum of five items, each with factor loadings of .50 or higher.

The initial solution was a model with three factors that had Eigenvalues greater than 1.0. The initial model accounted for 50.4 percent of the total variance. The model’s Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy (MSA) was an acceptable .85 and the Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity was 825.85 ($p < .001$). Activity number nine, theme days, was found to cross load onto factors one and two (.49 and .54 respectively). This item was dropped given this cross loading and the factor loadings in excess of .32 (Costello & Osborne, 2005). Only one item, stress relieving activities, loaded onto factor three. Moreover, the skree plot indicated that only two strong factors existed. Therefore, the model was run a second time as a two factor model. The second model accounted for 43.17 percent of the total variance. The model’s MSA was an acceptable .83 and the Bartlett’s Test was 727.03 ($p < .001$). Item three, games at work, was cross loaded onto the two factors and was removed from the model.
The third solution resulted in two distinct factors that accounted for 44 percent of the total explained variance. The model’s MSA was .82 and the Bartlett’s Test was 639.45 ($p < .001$). Factor one had six items and was interpreted as celebrations at work, including food at work, friendly competitions, special events, holiday gifts, public celebrations, and recognition of personal milestones. Factor two had four items and was interpreted as non-work related and outside of work activities. This factor included outside social gatherings, community volunteerism, non-job related personal development, and stress-relieving activities. Table 3-1 presents the exploratory factor results including the factor loading for each item. The internal consistency reliability estimate for the celebrations at work measure was .81. The internal consistency reliability of the non-work related activities measure was .73. The full fun activities scale is presented in Appendix A.

*Socializing with coworkers.* Fun coworker social interactions were assessed using five items from McDowell’s (2004) socializing with coworkers scale. Examples from this scale include: “We treat each other as friends” and “We joke around with each other.” A five point frequency scale was used where 1 represented “never” and 5 represented “all the time.” The internal consistency reliability estimate for the measure was .83. The full socializing with coworkers scale is presented in Appendix B.

*Manager support for fun.* To assess manager support for fun, four items were adapted from Karl and Peluchette (2006). Sample items include: “My managers emphasize fun in the workplace” and “My managers encourage us to have fun on the job.” Employees were asked to rate the extent to which they agreed with the three statements using a five point scale where 1 represented “strongly disagree” and 5 represented “strongly agree.” The internal consistency
reliability estimate for the measure was .94. The full manager support for fun scale is presented in Appendix C.

*Experienced fun.* Experienced fun was measured using six items based on Karl and Peluchette’s (2006b) experienced fun scale. Sample items include: “Sometimes I feel more like I’m playing than working,” and “I really have fun when I’m working.” Employees were asked to rate the extent to which they agreed with these statements using a five point scale where 1 represented “strongly disagree” and 5 represented “strongly agree.” The internal consistency reliability estimate for the measure was .88. The full experienced fun scale is presented in Appendix D.

*Work engagement.* Work engagement was assessed using an 18 item scale developed by Rich, Lepino, and Crawford (2010) intended to capture the physical, emotional, and cognitive facets of engagement. The scale has six items for each dimension. Sample items from each dimension include: “I exert full effort on my job,” “I feel energetic at my job,” and “At work, my mind is focused on my job.” A five point response scale was used where 1 represented “strongly disagree” and 5 represented “strongly agree.” The internal consistency reliability estimate for the measure was .95. The full work engagement scale is presented in Appendix E.

*Constituent attachment.* To measure constituent attachment, a five item scale based on Maertz and Campion (2004) was used. Sample items include: “I want to continue working with my coworkers here” and “I feel I would lose valuable relationships with people here if I quit.” The internal consistency reliability estimate for the measure was .85. The full constituent attachment scale is presented in Appendix F.

*Voluntary turnover.* Lists of employee names were obtained from hotel management prior to the initial survey. Each employee was assigned a numeric code which was then attached
### Table 3-1

Exploratory Factor Analysis - Fun Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Celebrations at Work</th>
<th>Non-work Related Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recognition for personal milestones</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special events</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitions to promote productivity</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday gift exchanges</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public celebrations of work achievements</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food at work</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to engage in community volunteerism</td>
<td></td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-job related opportunities for personal development</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress relieving activities</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside social gatherings</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KMO-MSA = .82. Bartlett’s test = 639.45, p < .001. Total variance explained = 44.0%.

Principal axis factoring, Promax rotation, with Kaiser Normalization.
to their individual survey. The code was then used to identify each employee that participated in the survey. Voluntary turnover was measured by surveying the managers six months after the initial employee survey. Managers were asked to determine the current employment status of each employee who participated in the study, including whether those who departed left on a voluntary or involuntary basis. The full manager survey is presented in Appendix G.

Control Variables

Four control variables are included in the analysis, including employee age, gender, ethnicity, and the hotel at which the employees worked. The hotel that each employee worked at was controlled for using a dummy variable where the employee was designated a 1 if they belonged to the hotel and a 0 if they did not belong to the hotel.

Before statistical methods like ordinary least squares (OLS) regression can be employed, the classical assumptions of parametric data must be met first. Specifically, the assumptions of normality, homogeneity of variance, and independence must be established before analyses can proceed. Normality was assessed by analyzing histograms and normal probability plots of residuals from each of the independent variables. Significant departures from normality were not detected. Constancy of variance was assessed by analyzing scatterplots of standardized residuals against standardized predicted values from each of the independent variables. No significant instances of heteroskedacity were detected.

Independence was assessed by analyzing Durbin-Watson statistics for each of the independent variables. No significant deviations from 2.0 were detected. While the unit of analysis for the study is the individual, the study’s data was collected at 11 different hotels. To
assess whether responses were impacted by the organization within which the employees worked, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted where the hotel was the independent variable and the study’s independent variables and mediator variables were the response variables. Significant results were obtained for celebrations at work \( (F = 12.59, p < .001) \), non-work related activities \( (F = 3.02, p < .001) \), social interactions \( (F = 1.67, p < .10) \), manager support for fun \( (F = 2.87, p < .01) \), and experienced fun \( (F = 2.68, p < .01) \). These results indicate that the difference in variance between hotels is greater than the variance within the hotels for these variables. Given this finding, the assumption of independence is not met since responses for a number of variables are dependent upon the hotel in which the employee works. While OLS models are considered to be robust to violations of normality and constancy of variance, they are not robust to violations of independence (Bliese, 2002). Therefore, the non-independence of the study’s data must be addressed.

Three approaches to analyzing hierarchical data like that found in the present study are possible (Hofmann, 1997). The first option is to analyze the data at the individual level while assigning each individual a score that corresponds to its higher level unit (i.e., hotel). The second option offered by Hofmann is aggregating the individual data to the higher level and analyzing the data at the higher level of analysis. The third option is to adopt a hierarchical linear modeling (HLM) approach where residuals from both the lower and the higher level are modeled. According to Hofmann, the benefit of HLM is that “… one can model both individual predictors at the individual level and group level variance in individual outcomes while utilizing individual predictors at the individual level and group predictors at the group level” (p. 726). Of the three options presented, HLM is the preferred approach given the benefits noted above and its ability to overcome shortcomings inherent in the first two approaches.
One requirement of hierarchical linear modeling is that of sufficient sample sizes at all levels for the study to have an adequate level of statistical power. In particular, the sample size at the highest level within the study is of primary concern when considering this study design (Snijders, 2005). Recommendations regarding the minimum number of Level 2 groups vary from a minimum 20 (Field, 2009) to 30 (Hofmann, 1997). Given that the present study has only 11 Level 2 groups, the use of HLM as an analysis method is inappropriate with this data set.

The second option that calls for the data to be aggregated to the group level would also be inappropriate. Eleven groups of data would fall far below the minimum of 30 specified by the central limit theorem (Field, 2009). To further test whether aggregation to the higher level would be appropriate, intraclass correlations were calculated for the four facets of fun and the three mediator variables. The intraclass correlation 1 (ICC1) is considered to be an indicator of within group agreement (James, 1982), where values in excess of .12 indicate the presence of a group property (Bliese, 2000). The intraclass correlation 2 is a measure of whether groups can be reliably differentiated for each variable of interest, where values in excess of .70 are necessary for reliable differentiation (James, 1982). Significant results were found for celebrations at work (ICC1 = .38; ICC2 = .92). Non-significant results were found for non-work related activities, social interactions, manager support for fun, experienced fun, work engagement, and constituent attachment. These results further indicate that aggregation would be an inappropriate strategy. Given that options two and three are not viable alternatives with the present data set, the most appropriate strategy is to choose option one where the data is analyzed at the individual level while controlling for the hotel groups. Therefore, this approach was taken in the present study.
Analytic Strategy

Multiple regression was employed for testing research hypotheses when the mediator variables were the response variables. Binary logistic regression was employed for testing the research hypotheses when the dependent variable was the dichotomous employee turnover variable. As described in Chapter 2 and depicted in Figure 2-1, the present study involves mediated relationships between fun at work and turnover. Mediation is the premise that a variable intervenes between an independent variable and a dependent variable, indicating that the relationship between the predictor and criterion variables is indirect (Iacobucci, 2008; James & Brett, 1984). There are a variety of statistical methods by which mediated relationships can be assessed (Preacher & Hayes, 2004).

The classic test for mediation was recommended by Baron and Kenny (1986) where multiple regression equations are estimated between the independent, dependent, and mediator variables. To test for mediations, Baron and Kenny recommend the estimation of three regression equations, which are as follows: a) regress the dependent variable on the independent variable, b) regress the mediator on the independent variable, and c) regress the dependent variable on the mediating variable, controlling for the independent variable. Using this “causal steps approach” (Hayes, 2009), mediation is shown if four conditions are demonstrated. First the relationship between the independent variable and the proposed mediator variable is significant. Second, the relationship between the independent variable and the dependent variable is significant. Third, the relationship between the mediator and the dependent variable is significant while controlling for the independent variable. Fourth, the relationship between the independent and the dependent variable is reduced or becomes zero between steps b and c, when the proposed
mediator is in the model. The causal steps recommended by Baron and Kenny remain the fundamental framework for mediation research.

While the conceptual framework for mediation analysis established by Baron and Kenny (1986) is still recognized, concerns have been raised about the statistical methods they suggest (MacKinnon, Lockwood, Hoffman, West, & Sheets, 2002; Preacher & Hayes, 2004). Therefore, more rigorous statistical methods have been sought by researchers. One such method is the Sobel test, which provides a single test statistic to test for the existence of an indirect relationship (Preacher & Hayes, 2004; Shrout & Bolger, 2002).

Bootstrapping is another method that has been recommended for mediation tests (Hayes, 2009; Preacher & Hayes, 2004). Shrout and Bolger (2002) were the first to recommend bootstrapping as a technique for testing mediation, an approach that overcame the low statistical power of other approaches. Bootstrapping has become an accepted and preferred approach to statistically assessing indirect effects (Hayes, 2009; Mallinckrodt, Abraham, Wei, & Russell, 2006; Preacher & Hayes, 2008). Bootstrapping is a nonparametric statistical method that employs a resampling procedure to estimate effect sizes (Preacher & Hayes, 2004). Sampling with replacement is repeated a large number of times with the minimum being 1000 (Hayes, 2009). A percentile-based bootstrap confidence interval is produced with which one can determine whether the indirect effect is not zero within the bounds of the confidence interval (Hayes, 2009). Further, bootstrapping can be used in cases where the dependent variable is dichotomous and thus is applied in the present study to assess the indirect effects of fun at work on turnover intentions and voluntary turnover.

Bootstrapping is a computationally heavy method given that resampling takes place a thousand times or more in a single analysis. To employ this method, a macro was used that was
specifically designed to test mediation using bootstrapping in the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). PROCESS is a macro that was written by Hayes (n.d.) that accommodates multiple mediator variables and dichotomous dependent variables. Therefore, PROCESS was utilized to assess experienced fun, work engagement, and constituent attachment as mediators between the three facets of fun and turnover.
Chapter 4

Results

This chapter presents the results from the data analyses conducted in the study. Table 4-1 presents the study’s means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations for each of the study variables, while controlling for hotel location.

Tests of Hypotheses

Hypotheses 1 through 3 examined the direct effects of the three facets of fun on employee turnover. Table 4-2 presents the logistic regression results to assess the first three hypotheses, including the beta values, odds ratios, Wald statistics, and standard errors. For the overall model, the $R^2$ was .36.

Hypothesis 1, which predicted that the three facets of fun at work would be negatively related to employee turnover, was partially supported. As hypothesized, celebrations at work ($b = -1.06, p < .05$) were found to have a significant negative relationship with turnover. Moreover, the odds ratio indicated that for one unit increase in celebrations at work, the change in the odds of turnover decreased by .35. Non-work related activities ($b = .88, p < .05$) were found to be significantly related to turnover. However, contrary to Hypothesis 1, the relationship was positive. The odds ratio indicated that for one unit increase in non-work related activities, the change in the odds of turnover increased by 2.40. Socializing with coworkers ($b = -.02, p > .10$) was not significantly related to turnover. Manager support for fun ($b = .33, p < .05$) was found to
Table 4-1  
Means, Standard Deviations, and Interorrelations Between Study Variables, Controlling for Hotel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Age</td>
<td>37.80</td>
<td>14.03</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ethnicity&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Gender&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Celebrations at Work</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Non-work Activities</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.78&lt;sup&gt;**&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Socializing with Coworkers</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.34&lt;sup&gt;**&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.23&lt;sup&gt;**&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Manager Support</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.33&lt;sup&gt;**&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.36&lt;sup&gt;**&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.31&lt;sup&gt;**&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Experienced Fun</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.35&lt;sup&gt;**&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.37&lt;sup&gt;**&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.45&lt;sup&gt;**&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.62&lt;sup&gt;**&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Work Engagement</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.15&lt;sup&gt;*&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.22&lt;sup&gt;**&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.25&lt;sup&gt;**&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.18&lt;sup&gt;**&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.34&lt;sup&gt;**&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.52&lt;sup&gt;**&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Constituent Attachment</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.23&lt;sup&gt;**&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.25&lt;sup&gt;**&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.54&lt;sup&gt;**&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.41&lt;sup&gt;**&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.59&lt;sup&gt;**&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.52&lt;sup&gt;**&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Turnover</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>-.37&lt;sup&gt;**&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N = 205. *p < .05, **p < .01. <sup>a</sup>1 = Male, 0 = Female. <sup>b</sup>1 = White, 0 = Other. <sup>c</sup>1 = Turnover, 0 = Non-turnover.
Table 4-2  
Logistic Regressions of Turnover on Fun at Work  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>$b$</th>
<th>$Exp(b)$</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>$SE_b$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.07**</td>
<td>.93**</td>
<td>22.79</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender$^a$</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity$^b$</td>
<td>-.57</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrations at Work</td>
<td>-1.06*</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Work Related Activities</td>
<td>.88*</td>
<td>2.40*</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socializing with Coworkers</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Support for Fun</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>1.39*</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model $R^2$ .36

Note: $n = 205$. *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$. $b = \log$ odds, $Exp(b) = \text{odds ratio}$, $R^2 = \text{Nagelkerke } R^2$. Hosmer and Lemeshow Test = 3.69, $p > .10$. Gender: $^a1 = \text{Male}, 0 = \text{Female}$. $^b1 = \text{White}, 0 = \text{Other}$. 
be significantly related to turnover. However, like non-work related activities, manager support was positively related, contrary to the predicted relationship. The odds ratio indicated that for one unit increase in manager support, the change in the odds of turnover increased by 1.39.

Hypothesis 2 predicted that socializing with coworkers would have a greater negative impact on turnover than would fun activities. Hypothesis 2 was not supported as socializing with coworkers ($b = -.02, p > .10$) was not significantly related to turnover, precluding any further comparison.

Hypothesis 3 predicted that manager support for fun would have a greater negative impact on turnover than would fun activities. Hypothesis 3 was not supported as manager support for fun ($b = .33, p < .05$) was found to have a significant positive relationship with turnover, rather than the hypothesized negative relationship, precluding any further comparison.

Hypotheses 4 through 6 assessed experienced fun, work engagement, and constituent attachment as mediators between the three facets of fun and employee turnover. Tables 4-3, 4-4, and 4-5 present the statistics necessary to assess mediation, including regression coefficients, Sobel statistics, bootstrap confidence intervals, and model $R^2$ statistics. Separate models were estimated with one independent variable, one mediator variable, and one dependent variable. That is, experienced fun, work engagement, and constituent attachment were each assessed individually as mediators between celebrations at work, non-work related activities, socializing with coworkers, and manager support for fun and the dependent variable, employee turnover. To produce the percentile-based confidence intervals (CI), 1000 bootstrap samples were requested for each mediation model. If zero is not found within the upper and lower bounds of the confidence interval, then the indirect effect can be considered not zero, within the specified level of confidence (Hayes, 2009).
As highlighted in the previous chapter, the following four criteria were used to test the relationship for mediation, as detailed by Kenny, Kashy, and Bolger (1998). One, the facets of fun should be negatively related to turnover. Two, the facets of fun should be positively related to the three proposed mediators, including experienced fun, work engagement, and constituent attachment. Three, the three proposed mediators should be negatively related to turnover, while controlling for the facets of fun. And finally, when step 3 is assessed, the effect of fun on turnover should be significantly reduced or become zero for mediation to be demonstrated.

Hypothesis 4 predicted that experienced fun would mediate the relationship between the three facets of fun at work and turnover. The statistics to assess experienced fun as a mediator between fun at work and turnover are presented in Table 4-3.

Experienced fun was not found to mediate the relationship between celebrations at work and turnover. In Step 1, celebrations at work had a significant negative relationship with turnover \((b = -1.06, p < .01)\). In Step 2, celebrations at work were positively related to experienced fun \((b = .47, p < .001)\). However, in Step 3, experienced fun was not related to turnover while controlling for celebrations at work \((b = .07, p > .10)\), precluding the necessity of testing Step 4. Moreover, the Sobel statistic \((b = .03, p > .10)\) was not significant and zero was found within the bootstrap confidence interval \((LL = -.16, UL = .21, p > .10)\).

Experienced fun was not found to mediate the relationship between non-work related activities and turnover. In Step 1, non-work related activities were related to turnover \((b = .88, p < .05)\). In Step 2, non-work related activities were related to experienced fun \((b = .44, p < .001)\). However, in Step 3, experienced fun was not related to turnover, while controlling for non-work related activities, precluding the necessity of testing Step 4. Moreover, the Sobel statistic \((b =
Table 4.3
Mediated Logistic Regression Analyses with Experienced Fun

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>(b)</th>
<th>(SE_b)</th>
<th>(t/z)</th>
<th>Sobel</th>
<th>LL(^c)</th>
<th>UL(^d)</th>
<th>(R^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.07***</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender(^a)</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity(^b)</td>
<td>-.57</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1 Celebrations at Work</td>
<td>-1.06*</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1 Non-Work Related Activities</td>
<td>.88*</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1 Socializing with Coworkers</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1 Manager Support for Fun</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model 1 Mediation of Celebrations at Work & Turnover Relationship

| Step 2 Celebrations at Work to Experienced Fun | .47*** | .08 | 5.95 | .27 |
| Step 3 Experienced Fun to Turnover (controlling Celebrations at Work) | .07 | .23 | .29 | .32\(^e\) |
| Step 4 Celebrations to Turnover (controlling Experienced Fun) | -.22 | .27 | -.81 | .03 | -.16 | .21 | .32\(^e\) |

Model 2 Mediation of Non-Work Activities & Turnover Relationship

| Step 2 Non-Work Related Activities to Experienced Fun | .44*** | .08 | 5.39 | .25 |
| Step 3 Experienced Fun to Turnover (controlling Non-Work Related Act.) | -.08 | .23 | -.35 | .32\(^e\) |
| Step 4 Non-Work Rel. Act. to Turnover (controlling Experienced Fun) | .22 | .28 | .79 | .04 | -.21 | .15 | .32\(^e\) |

Model 3 Mediation of Social Interactions & Turnover Relationship

| Step 2 Social Interactions to Turnover | .45*** | .07 | 6.30 | .28 |
| Step 3 Experienced Fun to Turnover (controlling Social Interactions) | .03 | .23 | .13 | .31\(^e\) |
| Step 4 Social with Coworkers to Turnover (controlling Experienced Fun) | -.10 | .25 | -.40 | .01 | -.17 | .18 | .31\(^e\) |

Model 4 Mediation of Manager Support & Turnover Relationship

| Step 2 Manager Support to Experienced Fun | .48*** | .05 | 10.56 | .45 |
| Step 3 Experienced Fun to Turnover (controlling Manager Support) | -.32 | .28 | -1.16 | .32\(^e\) |
| Step 4 Manager Support to Turnover (controlling Experienced Fun) | .40** | .23 | 1.76 | -.16 | -.43 | .10 | .32\(^e\) |

Note: \(n = 205\). Significance levels reflect one-tailed tests: * \(p < .05\), ** \(p < .01\), *** \(p < .001\). Gender: \(^a\)1 = Male, 0 = Female. Ethnicity: \(^b\)1 = White, 0 = Other. Unstandardized regression coefficients are reported. Bootstrap sample size = 1000. LL\(^c\) = 90% lower level confidence interval. UL\(^d\) = 90% upper level confidence interval. \(^e\)Nagelkerke \(R^2\).
-04, \( p > .10 \) was not significant and zero was found within the bootstrap confidence interval (LL = -0.21, UL = 0.15, \( p > .10 \)).

   Experienced fun was not found to mediate the relationship between socializing with coworkers and turnover. In Step 1, socializing with coworkers were not found to be related to turnover (\( b = -0.02, \ p > .10 \)). Since no direct relationship was found, it was not necessary to test the remaining steps.

   Experienced fun was not found to mediate the relationship between manager support and turnover. In Step 1, manager support was found to be positively related to turnover (\( b = 0.33, \ p < .05 \)). In Step 2, manager support was positively related to experienced fun (\( b = 0.48, \ p < .001 \)). However, in Step 3, experienced fun was not related to turnover, while controlling for manager support (\( b = -0.32, \ p > .10 \)), precluding the necessity to test Step 4. Moreover, the Sobel statistic was not significant (\( b = -0.16, \ p > .10 \)) and zero was found within the bootstrap confidence interval (LL = -0.44, UL = 0.10, \( p > .10 \)). Given all of these findings, Hypothesis 4 was not supported.

   Hypothesis 5 predicted that work engagement would mediate the relationship between fun at work and turnover. The statistics to assess work engagement as a mediator between fun at work and turnover are presented in Table 4-4.

   Work engagement did not mediate the relationship between celebrations at work and turnover. In Step 1, celebrations at work were negatively related to turnover (\( b = -1.06, \ p < .01 \)). In Step 2, celebrations at work were positively related to work engagement (\( b = 0.21, \ p < .001 \)). However, in Step 3, work engagement was not related to turnover, while controlling for celebrations at work (\( b = 0.16, \ p > .10 \)), precluding the necessity to test Step 4. Moreover, the
Table 4-4
Mediated Logistic Regression Analyses with Work Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>(b)</th>
<th>(SEb)</th>
<th>(t/z)</th>
<th>Sobel</th>
<th>LL(^c)</th>
<th>UL(^d)</th>
<th>(R^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.07***</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender(^a)</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity(^b)</td>
<td>-.57</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1 Celebrations at Work</td>
<td>-1.06*</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1 Non-Work Related Activities</td>
<td>.88*</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1 Social Interactions</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1 Manager Support for Fun</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model 1 Mediation of Celebrations at Work & Turnover Relationship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 2 Celebrations to Work Engagement</th>
<th>.21***</th>
<th>.06</th>
<th>3.66</th>
<th>.15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 3 Work Engagement to Turnover (controlling Celebrations at Work)</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.32(^e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 4 Celebrations to Turnover (controlling Work Engagement)</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>-.88</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model 2 Mediation of Non-Work Activities & Turnover Relationship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 2 Non-Work Related Activities to Work Engagement</th>
<th>.21***</th>
<th>.06</th>
<th>3.61</th>
<th>.15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 3 Work Engagement to Turnover (controlling Non-Work Related Act.)</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.31(^e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 4 Non-Work Rel. Act. to Turnover (controlling Work Engagement)</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model 3 Mediation of Social Interactions & Turnover Relationship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 2 Social Interactions to Work Engagement</th>
<th>.13*</th>
<th>.05</th>
<th>2.31</th>
<th>.12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 3 Work Engagement to Turnover (controlling Socializing with Coworkers)</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.31(^e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 4 Social Interactions to Turnover (controlling Work Engagement)</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-.44</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model 4 Mediation of Manager Support & Turnover Relationship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 2 Manager Support to Work Engagement</th>
<th>.18***</th>
<th>.04</th>
<th>4.73</th>
<th>.19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 3 Work Engagement to Turnover (controlling Manager Support)</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.32(^e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 4 Manager Support to Turnover (controlling Work Engagement)</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: \(n = 205\). Significance levels reflect one-tailed tests: *\(p < .05\), **\(p < .01\), ***\(p < .001\). Gender: \(^a1 = \text{Male}, 0 = \text{Female}\). Ethnicity: \(^b1 = \text{White}, 0 = \text{Other}\). Unstandardized regression coefficients are reported. Bootstrap sample size = 1000. LL\(^c\) = 90\% lower level confidence interval. UL\(^d\) = 90\% upper level confidence interval. \(^e\)Nagelkerke \(R^2\).
Sobel statistic ($b = .03, p > .10$) was not significant and zero was found within the bootstrap confidence interval (LL = -.12, UL = .19, $p > .10$).

Work engagement did not mediate the relationship between non-work related activities and turnover. In Step 1, non-work related activities were positively related to turnover ($b = .88, p < .01$). In Step 2, non-work related activities were positively related to work engagement ($b = .21, p < .01$). However, in Step 3, work engagement was not related to turnover, while controlling for non-work related activities ($b = .02, p > .10$), precluding the necessity to test Step 4. Moreover, the Sobel statistic ($b = .01, p > .10$) was not significant and zero was found within the bootstrap confidence interval (LL = -.16, UL = .14, $p > .10$).

Work engagement was not found to mediate the relationship between socializing with coworkers and turnover. In Step 1, socializing with coworkers was not found to be related to turnover ($b = -.02, p > .10$). Since there was no direct relationship, it was not necessary to test the remaining steps.

Work engagement did not mediate the relationship between manager support and turnover. Given the total of these findings, Hypothesis 5 was not supported. In step 1, manager support was positively related to turnover ($b = .33, p < .05$). In Step 2, manager support was positively related to work engagement ($b = .18, p < .001$). However, in Step 3, work engagement was not related to turnover, while controlling for manager support ($b = .25, p > .10$), precluding the necessity to test Step 4. Moreover, the Sobel statistic was not significant ($b = -.01, p > .10$) and zero was found within the bootstrap confidence interval (LL = -.15, UL = .10, $p > .10$).

Hypothesis 6 predicted that constituent attachment would mediate the relationship between fun at work and turnover. The statistics to assess constituent attachment as a mediator between fun at work and turnover are presented in Table 4-5.
Table 4-5
Mediated Logistic Regression Analyses with Constituent Attachment Controlling for Hotel Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$b$</th>
<th>$SEb$</th>
<th>$t/z$</th>
<th>Sobel</th>
<th>LL$^{c}$</th>
<th>UL$^{d}$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.07***</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender$^a$</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity$^b$</td>
<td>-.57</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1 Celebrations at Work</td>
<td>-1.06*</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1 Non-Work Related Activities</td>
<td>.88*</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1 Social Interactions</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1 Manager Support for Fun</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model 1 Mediation of Celebrations at Work & Turnover Relationship

| Step 2 Celebrations to Constituent Attachment | .37*** | .08   | 4.66  |       | .16     |          |       |
| Step 3 Constituent Attachment to Turnover (controlling Celebrations at Work) | .06  | .23   | .24   |       | .32$^e$ |          |       |
| Step 4 Celebrations to Turnover (controlling Constituent Attachment) | -.21  | .26   | -.80  | .02   | -.14    | .20     | .32$^e$ |

Model 2 Mediation of Non-Work Activities & Turnover Relationship

| Step 2 Non-Work Related Activities to Constituent Attachment | .32*** | .08   | 3.89  |       | .12     |          |       |
| Step 3 Constituent Attachment to Turnover (controlling Non-Work Related Act.) | -.06  | .22   | -.26  |       | .31$^e$ |          |       |
| Step 4 Non-Work Rel. Act. to Turnover (controlling Constituent Attachment) | .20  | .27   | .76   | -.02  | -.17    | .12     | .31$^e$ |

Model 3 Mediation of Social Interactions & Turnover Relationship

| Step 2 Social Interactions to Constituent Attachment | .57*** | .06   | 8.90  |       | .33     |          |       |
| Step 3 Constituent Attachment to Turnover (controlling Social Interactions) | .06  | .26   | .23   |       | .31$^e$ |          |       |
| Step 4 Social Interactions to Turnover (controlling Constituent Attachment) | -.12  | .28   | -.45  | .04   | -.21    | .34     | .31$^e$ |

Model 4 Mediation of Manager Support & Turnover Relationship

| Step 2 Manager Support to Constituent Attachment | .31*** | .05   | 6.02  |       | .21     |          |       |
| Step 3 Constituent Attachment to Turnover (controlling Manager Support) | -.19  | .24   | -.77  |       | .32$^e$ |          |       |
| Step 4 Manager Support to Turnover (controlling Constituent Attachment) | .31  | .20   | 1.54  | -.06  | -.24    | .09     | .32$^e$ |

Note: $n=205$. Significance levels reflect one-tailed tests: $^*p < .05$, $^**p < .01$, $^***p < .001$. Gender: $^a$1 = Male, 0 = Female. Ethnicity: $^b$1 = White, 0 = Other. Unstandardized regression coefficients are reported. Bootstrap sample size = 1000. LL$^{c}$= 90% lower level confidence interval. UL$^{d}$ = 90% upper level confidence interval. $^e$Nagelkerke $R^2$. 
Constituent attachment did not mediate the relationship between celebrations at work and turnover. In Step 1, celebrations at work were negatively related to turnover \((b = -1.06, p < .01)\). In Step 2, celebrations at work were positively related to constituent attachment \((b = .37, p < .001)\). However, in Step 3, constituent attachment was not related to turnover, while controlling for celebrations at work \((b = .02, p > .10)\), precluding the necessity to test Step 4. Moreover, the Sobel statistic was not significant \((b = .06, p > .10)\) and zero was found within the bootstrap confidence interval \((LL = -.14, UL = .20, p > .10)\).

Constituent attachment did not mediate the relationship between non-work related activities and turnover. In Step 1, non-work related activities were positively related to turnover \((b = .88, p < .01)\). In Step 2, non-work related activities were positively related to constituent attachment \((b = .32, p < .001)\). However, in Step 3, constituent attachment was not related to turnover, while controlling for non-work related activities \((b = -.06, p > .10)\), precluding the necessity to test Step 4. Moreover, the Sobel statistic was not significant \((b = -.02, p > .10)\) and zero was found within the bootstrap confidence interval \((LL = -.17, UL = .12, p > .10)\).

Constituent attachment was not found to mediate the relationship between socializing with coworkers and turnover. In Step 1 socializing with coworkers was not found to be related to turnover \((b = -.02, p > .10)\). Since no direct relationship was found for this variable, it was not necessary to test the remaining steps.

Constituent attachment did not mediate the relationship between manager support and turnover. In Step 1, manager support was positively related to turnover \((b = .33, p < .01)\). In Step 2, manager support was positively related to constituent attachment \((b = .31, p < .01)\). However, in Step 3, constituent attachment was not related to turnover, while controlling for manager support \((b = -.19, p > .10)\), precluding the necessity to test Step 4. Moreover, the Sobel statistic
was not significant \( (b = -0.06, p > .10) \) and zero was found within the bootstrap confidence interval \( (LL = -0.24, UL = 0.09, p > .10) \). Given the total of these findings, Hypothesis 6 was not supported. The results from the mediation analyses are summarized in Figure 4-1, 4-2, and 4-3.

Combined, these results indicate that the different dimensions of fun have different effects on turnover among entry level hospitality workers. However, experienced fun, work engagement, and constituent attachment were not found to mediate the relationships between the different dimensions of fun at work and turnover.

In a post hoc analysis of the data, the relationship between fun at work and turnover was further assessed to determine if there were any differences in the fun – turnover relationship based upon age. The mean age of the study participants was 37.8 years old \( (SD = 14.03) \). Given that the mean employee age was higher in this sample compared to the mean age previously found in the restaurant sector (National Restaurant Association, 1997), further assessment of age was warranted. The sample was split between employees under 30 \( (n = 72) \) and those over 30 \( (n = 133) \) years of age. Individuals in the workplace under age 30 are considered to be members of the Millennial Generation or “Generation Y” (Lamm & Meeks, 2009). Millennial Generation employees are the latest generation to enter the workforce and are considered to value work environments that are friendly, casual, and fun as well as have an interest in opportunities for training and development (Lowe et al., 2008). Further, differences have been found between attitudes toward fun and workplace outcomes for Millennials compared to older generations, such as Generation X (individuals 30 to 40 years of age) (Lamm & Meeks, 2009). Therefore, age 30 was chosen as the cutoff point for dividing the sample by age.

The relationship between manager support for fun and turnover was different for employees older than 30 compared to those younger than 30. Using logistic regression, turnover
Figure 4-1: The Impact of Fun in the Workplace on Employee Turnover: Experienced Fun as a Mediator

* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001. CI = 90% Confidence Interval.
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Figure: The Impact of Fun in the Workplace on Employee Turnover: Work Engagement as a Mediator
**Figure: The Impact of Fun in the Workplace on Employee Turnover: Constituent Attachment as a Mediator**

*\( *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001. CI = 90\% \text{ Confidence Interval.} *\)
was regressed separately onto the four dimensions of fun for those under 30 and those over 30. The logistic regression results are presented in Table 4-6. Celebrations at work were negatively related to turnover for those over 30 ($b = -1.76, p < .05$) and for those under 30 ($b = -1.50, p < .10$), consistent with results for the overall sample. Non-work related activities were positively related to turnover for those over 30 ($b = 1.13, p < .05$) and for those under 30 ($b = 1.86, p < .05$), consistent with results for the overall sample. Socializing with coworkers was not related to turnover for those over 30 ($b = 0.00, p > .10$) or for those under 30 ($b = -.47, p > .10$), consistent with the results for the overall sample. However, manager support for fun was significantly related to turnover for those over 30 ($b = .76, p < .01$) but not for those under 30 ($b = .11, p > .10$).

Post hoc analyses were conducted to assess the extent to which the individual fun activities were related to turnover. When the fun activities were analyzed using exploratory factor analysis, two factors resulted where celebrations at work ($b = -1.06, p < .05$) were found to be negatively related to turnover and non-work related activities ($b = .88, p < .05$) were positively related to turnover. To further assess the nature of the impact of fun activities on turnover, logistic regression was used to regress turnover onto the 12 individual fun activities, the control variables, socializing with coworkers, and manager support for fun. For all employees, special events ($b = -.58, p < .05$) and holiday gift exchanges ($b = -.52, p < .05$) were negatively related to lower turnover. For all employees, games at work ($b = .94, p < .01$) and outside social gatherings ($b = .45, p < .10$) were positively related to higher turnover. For employees under 30, special events ($b = -1.21, p < .05$), public celebrations of work achievements ($b = -1.93, p < .10$), and theme days ($b = -3.36, p < .10$) were all negatively related
Table 4-6
Logistic Regressions of Voluntary Turnover on Fun at Work with Sample Divided by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Over 30</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Under 30</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Exp(b)</td>
<td>SE_b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Exp(b)</td>
<td>SE_b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td>.83*</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender(^a)</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>-.70</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity(^b)</td>
<td>2.66**</td>
<td>14.33**</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>-.48</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrations at Work</td>
<td>-1.80**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>-1.50*</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Work Related Activities</td>
<td>1.12**</td>
<td>3.06**</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>1.82**</td>
<td>6.15**</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socializing with Coworkers</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>-.56</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Support for Fun</td>
<td>.73**</td>
<td>2.08**</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model \(R^2 = .33\) \(n = 133\)
Hosmer-Lemeshow = 23.43***

Model \(R^2 = .48\) \(n = 72\)
Hosmer-Lemeshow = 4.63

\(*p < .10, ** p < .05, *** p < .01. b = \text{log odds}, Exp(b) = \text{odds ratio}, R^2 = \text{Nagelkerke } R^2.\)

Gender: \(^a1 = \text{Male, 0 = Female.}\) \(^b1 = \text{White, 0 = Non-White.}\)
to lower turnover. For employees under 30, games at work \( (b = 4.99, p < .05) \) and opportunities to engage in community volunteerism \( (b = 2.37, p < .10) \) were both positively related to higher turnover. For employees over 30, holiday gift exchanges \( (b = -.84, p < .05) \) was negatively related to lower turnover whereas games at work \( (b = .93, p < .05) \) and non-job related opportunities for personal development \( (b = 1.18, p < .10) \) were both positively related to higher turnover.

In this chapter, the three facets of fun at work were found to have mixed results in their relationships with employee turnover. Fun activities were found to be partially related to lower turnover. Specifically, celebrations at work were negatively related to turnover, whereas, non-work related fun activities were positively related to turnover. However, socializing with coworkers and manager support for fun were not found to be negatively related to turnover. Moreover, experienced fun, work engagement, and constituent attachment were not found to mediate the relationships between the facets of fun at work and employee turnover. What follows in the next chapter is a discussion of the study’s results, implications for practice, limitations to the present study, and implications for future research.
Chapter 5

Discussion

Fun in the workplace has become an established approach used by organizations to involve, engage, and empower employees (Bolton & Houlihan, 2009). Authors who promote fun in the workplace assert that it results in positive outcomes for both employees and the organizations that employ them (Lamm & Meeks, 2009). Thus it is argued that for employees, an exciting and enjoyable work experience is far preferable to a dull and onerous work experience. Similarly, according to this school of thought, employers are expected to benefit from improved employee performance, increased creativity, and favorable recruitment and retention (Jeffcoat & Gibson, 2006). However, despite the widespread adoption of fun in the workplace as a management technique, the links between fun at work and its intended beneficial outcomes are only beginning to be fully established. Based on the perspective that fun at work has positive outcomes for organizations and the need for further empirical evidence of these effects, the present study explored the impact of multiple forms of fun at work on employee turnover.

The present study contributes to the body of fun at work research in a number of ways. First, the study involves a sample of hotel employees working within the context of the hospitality industry. Second, workplace fun is conceptualized as having multiple facets, including fun activities, socializing with coworkers, and manager support for fun, which were all measured separately within the study. Third, the study explores the impact of these facets of fun on voluntary turnover among entry level workers. Fourth, the study explores the processes by which workplace fun impacts turnover by testing experienced fun, work engagement, and constituent attachment as mediators in this relationship. In addition to the above contributions, the study provides unique contributions to the turnover research and the hospitality industry
turnover research in particular, by exploring another unique variable that may impact this management problem.

The present study proposes that fun in the workplace significantly influences important outcomes at work. Specifically, it argues that increased instances of the various forms of fun would relate to lower levels of employee turnover. While fun activities, socializing with coworkers, and manager support for fun were all expected to have negative relationships with turnover, it is argued that socializing with coworkers and manager support would each have a greater impact than would fun activities. Further, it is proposed that a number of mediators will help explain the process by which fun at work affects employee turnover. Specifically, it is argued that workplace fun will result in experienced fun, work engagement, and constituent attachment, each of which would then impact employee turnover. It would be beneficial to managers and researchers to understand the extent to which workplace fun impacts turnover as well as the processes by which it impacts turnover behaviors. Given these proposed relationships, what follows is a discussion of the results from the study.

The present study demonstrates that different sources of fun result in different outcomes in the workplace, one of the intended purposes of the study. In particular, the study demonstrates that fun activities related to celebrations at work are related to lower levels of turnover among entry level workers in the hospitality industry. This is an important finding given that turnover represents a major problem facing managers in this labor-intensive industry. Moreover, the study demonstrates that there are differences between younger employees and older employees as it relates to fun activities and manager behaviors. This finding can be beneficial to hospitality managers given that the industry’s workforce is dominated by younger workers. Another significant finding is that sources of fun may not always produce beneficial outcomes in the
workplace, but rather may result in detrimental outcomes. Since non-work related activities and manager support for fun were found to be positively related to turnover, hospitality managers must carefully choose the activities they select to implement and the behaviors they use to support fun activities in the workplace.

One of the most interesting findings in the study is that the two different dimensions of fun activities have differential effects on turnover. Specifically, celebrations at work are negatively related to turnover, while non-work related activities are found to have a positive relationship with turnover. This result demonstrates that not all fun activities are beneficial, calling into question the assumption that all fun activities result in positive workplace outcomes. Another interesting result was that employees under 30 years old enjoyed three out of the twelve activities, whereas employees over 30 years old found only one activity related to lower turnover. Findings like these demonstrate that not all employees like all fun activities and that different activities appeal to different groups of employees. Moreover, these results provide support for the assertion that Millennial Generation employees prefer fun in the workplace over employees from previous generations.

Of the two dimensions of fun activities, celebrations at work activities were found to have a significant negative relationship with employee turnover, demonstrating that celebratory activities produce beneficial outcomes in the workplace. Celebrations at work activities included competitions to promote productivity, special events (e.g., holiday parties), holiday gift exchanges, public celebrations of work achievements, and recognition of personal milestones. A significant portion of the activities included in celebrations at work involved activities related to employee performance and productivity. Activities that recognize employees’ personal and professional accomplishments are commonly used by employers to motivate employees and
reinforce positive behaviors (Robbins & Judge, 2012). Moreover, higher levels of performance have been found to be related to lower levels of turnover (Dreher, 1982). The present results are consistent with and support this perspective, where publicly celebrating employee achievements and performance is significantly related to lower turnover.

Non-work related activities were demonstrated to have a significant positive relationship with employee turnover, contrary to the predicted relationship. Activities in this dimension of fun activities include outside social gatherings (e.g., company sponsored athletic teams), opportunities to engage in community volunteerism, non-job related opportunities for personal development (e.g., book clubs), and stress relieving activities (e.g., massages, exercise facilities). The finding that activities that are intended to be fun by management may be related to both positive outcomes and negative outcomes at work is consistent with past findings. According to Owler et al. (2010), “…as we have seen from ethnographic studies, when fun is specifically created at work, it can have both positive and not so positive results” (p. 349). Baldry and Hallier (2010) reason that these mixed results may occur because “…for some workers, the intrusion of management into determining what is deemed fun may be seen as an illegitimate and unwelcome reformulation of the effort-wage bargain” (p. 166). For employees in the present study, the non-work related activities may have been considered to be an intrusion by management that was seen as unwelcome, therefore resulting in a positive relationship with turnover.

Post hoc analyses were conducted to further explore whether age had an impact on the relationship between workplace fun and turnover. The sample was split between employees under 30 years of age and employees over 30 years of age. Turnover was then regressed onto the 12 different fun activities using logistic regression. Games at work had a significant positive relationship with turnover and were the only significant activity shared by the two groups of
employees. Employees under 30 years had three activities that were related to lower levels of turnover, including special events, public celebrations of work achievements, and theme days. Whereas for employees over 30 years, only holiday gift exchanges, was related to lower turnover. These post hoc results are consistent with previous research that indicates that generational differences moderate the relationship between fun at work and outcomes in the workplace (Lamm & Meeks, 2009). In the present study, the finding that a larger number of individual activities were related to lower turnover for younger employees compared to older employees supports the assertion that fun activities may be more important to younger employees compared to their older counterparts (Zemke et al., 2000).

The most surprising result was that manager support for fun was positively related to turnover, in contrast to the negative relationship that was predicted. The positive relationship between manager support for fun and turnover demonstrates that employees may respond negatively to managerial attempts to promote and implement fun in the workplace. The results above related to fun activities demonstrate that it is important to carefully consider which activities to implement. That manager behaviors can be linked to higher turnover demonstrates that it is also very important that attention and care be given to how fun in the workplace is implemented. Manager support for fun was reported as occurring between rarely and sometimes by the employees in the study. If managers infrequently exhibit support for fun behaviors, this may send a message to employees that managers do not value fun at work. Since manager support for fun occurred infrequently, perhaps employees considered manager support behaviors insincere or inconsistent with their common task-related behaviors. These behaviors may clash with other behaviors exhibited by managers. This result is consistent with the perspective held by Baldry and Hallier (2010) who assert that employees frequently view management’s attempts to
promote fun work environments as hollow. Many employees see through these manager behaviors according to Baldry and Hallier, and thus may respond with resentment, reluctant compliance, or mimicry. While previous research has shown that manager behaviors can help facilitate fun in the work place (Karl et al., 2005), still more needs to be learned about which types of manager behaviors may be beneficial and which may be detrimental to desired workplace outcomes.

Age differences in the manager support for fun – turnover relationship were explored in the post hoc analyses. Interestingly, when turnover was regressed onto the three facets of fun, manager support was found to be related to increased turnover for employees over 30 years old, but was not related to turnover for employees under 30 years old. These results indicate that the older employees in the study had a stronger negative response to these manager behaviors than did the younger employees. Therefore, older employees in the study may have considered these behaviors to be inappropriate, whereas, younger employees were not negatively affected by the manager support for fun behaviors. This result is similar to the results related to activities above, where a greater number of activities were related to lower turnover for younger employees than for older ones. In the present sample, younger employees appear to respond more positively to fun activities and are more accepting of manager support for fun behaviors than older employees. This is further evidence that differences exist between Millennial Generation employees and older employees when it comes to fun in the workplace.

Another surprising result was that none of the proposed mediators were found to mediate the relationships between the three facets of fun and turnover, contrary to the expected results. To demonstrate a mediated relationship, first a direct relationship must be established between the independent variable and the dependent variable (Kenny et al., 1998). Step two in mediation
involves determining if there is a significant relationship between the independent variable and the proposed mediator (Kenny et al.). Step three in mediation involves testing for a relationship between the proposed mediator variable and the dependent variable while controlling for the independent variable (Kenny et al.). The final step involves determining if the previously significant effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable is either reduced or non-significant after step three. If all four steps can be demonstrated, then it can be said that mediation has occurred. Socializing with coworkers did not have a significant relationship with turnover in the first step and thus the proposed mediators were not assessed for this facet of fun. However, mediation tests were assessed for celebrations at work, non-work related activities, and manager support for fun, given their significant relationships with turnover. For each of these three dimensions of fun, significant relationships were found at step two. At step three, there were no significant relationships found between the proposed mediators (experienced fun, work engagement, and constituent attachment) and turnover, while controlling for the independent variables (celebrations at work, non-work related activities, and manager support for fun). Despite the absence of mediating relationships in the present study, future researchers should continue to explore and assess potential mediator variables.

Experienced fun, work engagement, and constituent attachment were not found to be mediators in the fun at work – turnover relationship, however continued efforts to assess the process by which workplace fun impacts turnover. Recently, Owler et al. (2010) told researchers that future fun at work research must address both how and when fun impacts recruitment, engagement, and retention. Implicit in this charge is the need to continue to assess potential mediators to provide evidence of how fun impacts employee turnover and other variables. To this end, other variables that have a demonstrated relationship with lower levels of turnover
should be considered as potential mediators. For instance, one such variable is perceived organizational support which involves employees’ beliefs regarding organizational concern for their well-being (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986). Another potential variable to consider is affective organizational commitment, or the emotional attachment employees have to the organization, its goals, and its values (Meyer & Allen, 1997). Positive affect or the extent to which a person feels enthusiastic, active, and alert (Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988) may also be a potential mediating variable worthy of assessment. Finally, job satisfaction or the “positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experiences” (Locke, 1976, p. 1300) should also be explored as a potential mediator between fun at work and employee turnover. While no mediating relationships were established in the present study, continued assessment of these and other variables should be considered.

Given the surprising results that none of the proposed mediators were found to be related to turnover, the role these variables play needs to be further explored. Perhaps it is that experienced fun, work engagement, and constituent attachment do not play intervening roles in the workplace fun – turnover relationship. Further exploration of the proposed mediators in this relationship may be warranted as the effect of the variables may have been diminished during the six month period that intervened between the measurement of the mediator variables and turnover. A shorter time period could be used to assess these relationships. Moreover, the relationship could be further assessed by exploring other measures of turnover behaviors, like absenteeism. One encouraging result was the significant positive relationships between the facets of fun and the proposed mediators. Perhaps these variables play mediating roles between fun and other outcomes in the workplace, such as organizational citizenship behaviors (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986) and employee productivity and performance. Given the demonstrated
relationship between the facets of fun and the proposed mediators, further exploration to assess the role these variables play in the overall model of fun at work is appropriate.

Socializing with coworkers did not have a significant relationship with employee turnover, despite the study’s prediction of a negative relationship. On average, employees in the study reported socializing with each other between sometimes and frequently, whereas celebrations at work and manager support for fun occurred between rarely and sometimes. Non-work related activities were reported to occur between never and rarely. While socializing with coworkers occurred with the greatest frequency of all of the sources of fun, it had no impact on turnover. However, socializing with coworkers was found to have significant positive relationships with experienced fun, work engagement, and constituent attachment. These three proposed mediators are important workplace outcomes and the finding that socializing with coworkers is positively related to them indicates that socializing is an important facet of fun at work even though it may not be related to turnover. These results demonstrate that social interactions among employees occur more frequently than fun activities and they do so without manager promotion or support of these interactions. Moreover, these social interactions are related to important outcomes in the workplace that managers view as beneficial, therefore, more needs to be learned about the role that these interactions play in these and other workplace outcomes.

**Implications for Practice**

In the present study, activities related to celebrations at work were found to have a significant negative relationship with lower turnover. This result is of interest to managers
intending to employ fun activities at work. Since fun activities are considered to be the focal point of establishing fun work environments (Baldry & Hallier, 2010; Karl et al., 2010), management can be encouraged by the fact that celebrations at work are related to positive outcomes like increased retention. Qualitative studies like that of Redman and Mathews (2002) reveal that managers can struggle when implementing fun activities at work. Given the difficulties management may face implementing fun, knowing that time-honored activities, such as competitions to promote productivity, holiday parties, public celebrations of work achievements, and recognition of personal milestones, can produce significant beneficial outcomes should instill greater confidence in managers when planning and promoting these activities. Particularly in work environments where turnover is especially problematic, activities related to celebrations at work should be considered as one of the strategies adopted by management to further control turnover.

Not all activities intended to be fun result in positive outcomes in the workplace. For instance, non-work related activities like outside social gatherings and community volunteerism were related to higher levels of turnover in the present study. According to Fleming (2005), when fun activities compromise employee dignity, integrity, and respect, they are likely to result in negative consequences. Instead, Fleming suggests that fun activities that evolve out of self-management and autonomy are going to be less problematic for employees and will be more likely to result in positive workplace results. For Fleming, it is important to consider how fun activities are identified as well as which activities are chosen. Forcing employees to engage in activities that are not directly related to their jobs and involving behaviors that they do not enjoy is going to be counterproductive. Instead, managers should allow employees to develop fun activities that the employees themselves find enjoyable. This form of employee ownership will
make the activities more meaningful and thus assist in producing the fun environments intended by management. Accordingly, when management must plan and organize activities, they may want to determine what employees consider to be fun first and then implement those activities that have a broad appeal to help achieve the purposes they intend to accomplish. Once implemented, managers should monitor employee feedback to determine if employees are responding positively to the chosen activities. Adjustments can then be made to prevent the activities from resulting in unintended and undesired outcomes.

For younger employees, more of the specific activities were found to be related to lower turnover than for older employees in the present study. This finding has implications for management in that workplaces with larger percentages of younger employees may be in the best position to benefit from the implementation of certain fun activities. Therefore, workplaces with large proportions of younger employees may experience benefits from implementing these types of fun activities. In the present study, special events, public celebrations of work achievements, and theme days were found to be related to lower employee turnover for younger employees. When the workplace has a mix of both younger and older employees, then the democratic strategy suggested by Fleming (2005) may be particularly appropriate, allowing employees to choose which activities they prefer to participate in based upon their demographic mindset. Managers can use workplace fun committees or suggestion boxes to identify those fun activities that both younger and older employees prefer before implementing activities.

Manager behaviors related to support for fun were related to detrimental results in the present study. This result is consistent with other studies indicating that the employee – manager relationship is an instrumental part of developing successful fun at work environments (Karl et al., 2005), particularly those behaviors that engender a relationship of trust between employees
and managers. Moreover, restaurant employees have reported that manager behaviors were one of the major reasons that influenced them to leave their job and the industry (National Restaurant Association, 1997). Since management does not want to behave in such a manner that promotes negative consequences in the workplace like employee turnover, efforts need to be made to determine what the appropriate behaviors should be. According to Karl et al., trust in supervisors had a positive impact on employee attitudes toward fun, therefore, manager behaviors that develop and sustain trust with employees may be fundamental to developing and sustaining fun work environments that result in positive outcomes. Moreover, no discussions in the fun at work literature address training managers to develop the behaviors necessary to implement fun at work. Perhaps the implicit assumption that workplace fun is easy to implement (Owler et al., 2010) has prevented such management development to occur. However, like any significant human resource intervention, planning should take place to ensure the proper results and managers should be prepared to implement the plans to achieve intended results.

Limitations

The results of the study should be interpreted in the context of a number of limitations. First, the study employed a convenience sample comprised of hotel employees working in eleven different hotels. While utilizing a convenience sample was necessary to access employee attitudes about workplace fun, such nonprobability sampling does not guarantee that the sample is representative of the population (Leedy, 1979). This approach limits the generalizability of the study’s results. Future research should be designed to capture a random sample, one that is representative of the population within the limits of sampling error (Cook & Campbell, 1979).
Second, of the 427 employees invited to participate in the survey, usable data was obtained from 205 employees who chose to participate, resulting in a response rate of 48 percent. This response rate is well within the accepted norm for social science studies where the average rate of 55.6% has been found (Baruch, 1999). However, there exists a potential for non-response bias given that responses were not received from 50 percent of the sample. It is possible that those who did not respond perceived the study variables differently or left their employment at a different rate than those who did participate.

Third, the study did not control for the departments where employees worked. The typical hotel has a number of different departments, including housekeeping, front desk, maintenance, and food service. Certain departments, like the front desk and the dining room, involve jobs that require high levels of guest contact. Departments with less guest contact, like housekeeping and maintenance, may have greater freedom for fun and may be more likely to engage in fun activities. Moreover, Ford et al. (2003) identified professionalism at work as one of the disadvantages of fun in the workplace. Departments may vary based on what may be considered professional behavior at work. Given these fundamental differences, the study may have benefited from controlling for employee work area.

Fourth, the present study was based predominantly on correlative relationships. None of the variables included in the study were manipulated by the researcher. However, the study does rely on data from multiple sources including employee self-reported data and turnover data reported by the employers, therefore reducing bias that is introduced when only a single method is utilized (Cook & Campbell, 1979). Moreover, the dependent variable was collected six months after the independent and mediator variables, thus improving the internal validity of the study. Future research should use experimental or quasi-experimental designs.
Future Research

When Deal and Kennedy (1982) asserted that employers should promote work environments where employees “work hard and play hard,” they introduced a new era where play and fun were promoted as means to promoting benefits for both employees and employers. To explore these intended benefits, research exploring the effect of fun in the workplace has increased, with a number of empirical studies being conducted over the last decade (Esen, 2002; Fluegge, 2008; Karl & Harland, 2005; Karl & Peluchette, 2006a; Karl & Peluchette, 2006b; Karl et al., 2005, Karl et al., 2007; Karl et al., 2008; McDowell, 2004; Peluchette & Karl, 2005).

While a great deal has been learned about the nature and effect of fun in the workplace during this time, more exploration is necessary.

No comprehensive framework has been published that organizes the existing knowledge about fun at work. For instance, in their study involving human resource managers, Ford et al. (2003) asserted that at that time, there was “no serious empirical or theoretical work on the nature or consequences of fun in organizations” (p. 18). While significant progress has been made toward filling the gap in empirical research, the field has not made as much progress toward the development of a theoretical fun at work framework. Such a framework would help guide future research and continued theory development in the field.

Further research needs to explore the linkages between specific fun activities and the intended outcomes held by management. Can certain fun activities be used to accomplish specific management objectives? To date, fun researchers have treated fun at work as a constellation of activities and facets that they have related to desirable outcomes in the workplace. A more fully-developed and structured taxonomy is in order. A framework that models managerial motivations for fun was recently offered by Bolton and Houlihan (2009),
where they contrasted management strategy and the focus of fun activities. The present study explored three different facets of fun and the impact on employee turnover. Perhaps limited results were obtained because employers in this study never intended fun at work to impact the outcome of reducing employee turnover. Following frameworks like Bolton and Houlihan’s, future researchers can further develop a taxonomy that relates the different activities and forms of fun with specific strategic outcomes at work.

Future research should explore how fun impacts workers in different work contexts. The present study explored the impact of fun on employees in the context of the hotel industry. The study’s findings indicate that fun activities were not frequently employed by employers in the study’s sample. Is this because hotel managers have not adopted fun at work as a strategy for motivating and retaining employees? Perhaps another explanation is that hotel jobs, given their public contact and customer service focus are not conducive of many fun activities employed in other industries. Previous research has explored the application of fun in call centers (Fleming & Sturdy, 2009; Houlihan, 2002), consulting agencies (Grugulis et al., 2000), and health care (Karl et al, 2007; Karl & Peluchette, 2006a; Peluchette & Karl, 2005). Further exploration of the application of and tolerance for workplace fun within specific industries may indicate that the application and effect of fun may vary from industry to industry.

The present study contributes to the literature by exploring the effect of four different dimensions of fun at work on voluntary turnover. Moreover, the present study explored these relationships within the context of the hospitality industry by surveying entry level workers and measuring actual turnover. Employers should be encouraged to know that activities related to celebrations at work were found to be negatively related to employee turnover. While there may be a variety of reasons for implementing these activities, their relationship to lower turnover is a
noteworthy benefit. Experienced fun, work engagement, and constituent attachment were not found to play mediating roles between fun at work and turnover. Therefore, future research should explore other variables as potential mediators to better understand the processes by which fun at work impacts outcomes such as turnover. Employee turnover continues to be a problem for the hospitality industry. Continued assessment of management approaches such as fun at work is necessary to better understand their impact on turnover and to identify those approaches that can help reduce voluntary turnover.
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### Appendix A

**Fun Activities Scale**

**Activities at Work**

How often do the following activities happen at work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>All the time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Food at work (bringing in food to share with others, eating together)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Competitions to promote productivity (prizes for attendance, sales contests)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Games at work (fantasy sports, card games, board games)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Special events (holiday parties, picnics, ice cream socials)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Outside social gatherings (company-sponsored athletic teams, movie nights)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Opportunities to engage in community volunteerism (participation in community service groups)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Holiday gift exchanges (“white elephant” and “secret friend” exchanges)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Public celebrations of work achievements (awards banquet, “employee of the month”)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Theme days (casual Fridays, bring your child to work)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Recognition of personal milestones (birthdays, weddings, birth of a child, anniversaries of employment)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Non-job-related opportunities for personal development (book clubs, photography classes, art classes)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Stress relieving activities (massages, exercise facilities, fitness classes)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

Socializing with Coworkers Scale

Coworker Relationships

How often do you and your coworkers engage in the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>All the time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. We socialize at work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. We socialize outside of work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. We treat each other as friends</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. We share stories with each other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. We joke around with each other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

Manager Support for Fun Scale

Manager Behaviors

To what extent do your managers engage in the following practices?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>All the time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My managers emphasize employee fun in the workplace</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. My managers encourage us to have fun on the job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My managers try to make our work fun</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. My managers care about employees having fun</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix D

**Experienced Fun Scale**

**General Thoughts about Work**

To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. This is a fun place to work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sometimes I feel more like I'm playing than working on the job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I always have fun at work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Working in this job is a lot of fun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I really have fun when I am working</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I have more fun at this job than I’ve had at other ones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix E

### Work Engagement Scale

#### General Thoughts about Work

To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I work with intensity on my job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I exert my full effort to my job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I devote a lot of energy to my job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I try my hardest to perform well on my job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I strive as hard as I can to complete my job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I exert a lot of energy on my job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I am enthusiastic in my job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I feel energetic at my job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I am interested in my job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I am proud of my job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I feel positive about my job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I am excited about my job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. At work, my mind is focused on my job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. At work, I pay a lot of attention to my job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. At work, I focus a great deal of attention on my job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. At work, I am absorbed by my job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. At work, I concentrate on my job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. At work, I devote a lot of attention to my job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F

Constituent Attachment Scale

General Thoughts about Work

To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I want to continue working with my coworkers here</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I would lose valuable friendships if I quit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I would lose valuable working relationships with the people here if I quit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I enjoy working here because of the people I work with</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I want to continue working here because I like my coworkers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G

Manager Survey

FIRST NAME LAST NAME

1. Date of Hire
   When did the employee begin employment? ________________________________

2. Employment Status
   a. Is this employee still employed?
      ☐ Yes
      ☐ No
   b. If the employee is no longer employed, indicate the date of separation.
      __________________________________
   c. If the employee is no longer employed, indicate the reason for leaving.
      ☐ Termination for poor performance
      ☐ No call/no show
      ☐ New job elsewhere
      ☐ Relocation
      ☐ Retired
      ☐ Going back to school
      ☐ Don’t know
      ☐ Other _______________________________ (please specify)
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