

Stress Management through Work Fun Activities in IT Sector

Dr. Karamvir Sheokand

Assistant professor
IMSAR (MDU)

Neha Gupta

Research Scholar
IMSAR (MDU)

Abstract

Stress is prevalent in all the phases of life, whether personal or professional. Stress affects a person both positively and negatively but mostly negatively. It affects employees as well as organisations. It affects employees in the form of declining productivity, increased absenteeism, low morale, increased turnover and burnouts, reduced morale, less self-confidence, tiredness, health issues, etc. It affects organisations in the form of reducing productivity, increased HR costs, lesser profits, hostile work-environment, increased turnover rates, employee dissatisfaction, etc. Work fun activities help in lightening the working environment for the employees so that they enjoy working in the organisation. Different work fun activities are studied in this paper as to which activities are more preferred by employees and that how these activities can be categorised. We found out that work fun activities that help in reducing stress are most preferred by the employees in an organisation followed by activities co-operating in maintaining work-life balance, work place ethics and effectiveness of work place, so that the working conditions are favourable to keep the employees in the organisation for longer time periods.

Objectives

- To study the preferences of employees regarding work fun activities.
- To analyse the variation in preferences regarding work fun activities based on the nature of the job of employees.

Research Methodology

A representative sample of the population consisting of 101 units is selected to carry on study in this paper. The data is collected from the respondents about their preferences regarding work fun activities using a questionnaire based on likert scale. The statistical tools used to analyse the data are factor analysis and ANOVA to chalk out findings from the collected data.

Key words: Work fun, work fun activities, stress relieving activities, organisational productivity, employee retention

Introduction

The word “STRESS” has its origin from the word “Stringere” in Latin, which means to tighten. Stress is the physical, emotional and behavioural, strain and changes, felt by us in response to adapting to

the outside world pressure. According to Arnold (1960), "Stress is any condition that disturbs normal functioning". Stress is the outcome of our bodily responses to the imbalance between demands and resources which results in physical, emotional and behavioural changes in us. Some synonyms of word stress are anxiety, pressure, frustration, etc. Stress is a relatively new, complex and dynamic concept which is spreading worldwide irrespective of areas and sectors. But the employees feel excessively stressed and overworked due to increasing complexity in working environment caused by extended working hours, virtual working environments, ever-changing technologies, diversity, work-place politics, work teams and groups, global out-reach, etc. There are various factors in personal life or jobs that cause stress to employees like role conflict and ambiguity, monotonous work, rapid organisational changes, job insecurity, demanding boss, hostile working environment, long commutes, poor career planning and management, value and cultural differences, personal finances, lack of appraisal and recognition, poor inter personal relationships, etc. There are various symptoms and reactions, physical and emotional, which indicate that the employees are going through stress. For example high blood pressure, insomnia, wearisomeness, trembling, headaches, feeling helpless, haste, frustration, inability to concentrate, nervousness, short-tempered, etc. Stress can have both positive (Eustress) as well as negative (Distress) effects resulting in enhancing work performance, as well as, reducing it. The results of stress, whether constructive or destructive, depend on how the employees perceive it, as a problem or as a solution. When an employee thinks that he can successfully complete a task while managing all the related pressures, then stress works as a motivating factor and vice-a-versa. The organisation and management need to manage the level of stress among employees for effectiveness in work because stress has negative impacts on both the employee and the organisational performance. Stress impacts performance negatively in the form of increased absenteeism and turnover, low productivity, hostile work environment, organisational ineffectiveness, increased legal and financial damages, counter productive work behaviour, ill physical and mental health, job dissatisfaction, etc. Organisations, management and employees themselves can use various strategies to manage stress like stress control workshops and training, participation in decision-making and goal-setting, social recognition, ploughing anger and energy into something positive, meditation camps, Flexi-time, introducing work-fun activities, Relaxation, developing harmonious relationships, music and meditation, physical exercise, etc.

Work fun is increasingly gaining attention of organisations

and managers these days as it is supposed to be very important for a harmonious, congenial and favourable working environment in an organisation. Making work fun leads to increase in enthusiasm among employees regarding their work and organisation, which will positively impact their productivity as well as organisational productivity. Adding fun to work is helpful in relieving employees of any kind of stress they might be facing and make them enjoy working in their organisations and looking forward to come to work. The informal activities added alongside work helps in developing mutual trust and friendships among employees at work place, and leads to an environment of cohesiveness and congeniality in the organisation. A healthy work environment results in reduction of conflicts and grievances at work place, and whatever minor issues arise can be sorted out by mutual communication and understanding. In such kind of organisations employees respect each other as individuals and that leads to a rise in happiness and contentment among employees. Employees working in a fun environment feel satisfied about their work and the organisation they are working for, thereby developing a sense of commitment and organisational citizenship, which is beneficial for both the employees and the organisation in the long run as it leads to lower turnover rates and burnouts for organisation as well as better career planning and development for employees. Employees, when relieved of stress, feel creative and find newer, easier and faster ways of doing the same work thereby saving valuable capital and human resources. This kind of work environment enhances employee satisfaction and motivation and their overall productivity and efficiency. In these kinds of organisations employees are excited to come to work and there is a lack of absenteeism because employees feel appreciated and respected and do not complain about boredom and dullness at workplace. Employees consider such organisations, by and large, fun to work at and are happy to work for them. Such feelings among employees help organisations in attracting and retaining talented employees, resulting in increased organisational profitability and development of competitive advantages.

Though adding fun to work provides with a lot of benefits, there are some cons to it too. Some managers are of the point of view that workplaces are to work and not for having fun and that adding fun to work is not necessarily beneficial because there are no proofs of positive impacts on an organisation that can be attributed solely to adding fun to work. According to them, too much happiness can be exhausting and can damage the professional relationships at work place. They based their resistance to fun on factors like, time and financial constraints, lack of employee enthusiasm and participation, lack of creativity in

designing fun activities, no support and participation from superiors in the fear of looking silly, or of losing control and respect among subordinates, fear of hurting sentiments or causing distractions for employees, negatively impacting organisational productivity and work culture because employees are too busy with having fun at work, or the fear that employees may damage the organisational property in their pursuit of having fun, etc.

These cons can be dealt with and converted in pros by being careful and cautious while introducing fun to the work environment and keeping a vigil eye so that it does not go out of hand and hurt employees as well as the organisation. Managers can make sure that employees do not prefer fun over work and do not spend a major portion of their time in having fun rather than working. Also, cheap remarks, racism, sexual harassment, practical jokes, mean pranks, foul language, etc. should be discouraged and prohibited and even punished if necessary, and a strict eye must be kept so that people do not harass each other under the disguise of having fun. Employees should not be allowed to damage or destroy any of the organisation's property while having fun and all such kind of activities should be reprimanded.

Though, some managers try to avoid adding fun to work based on any of the above or any other reason, a majority of organisations are looking forward to adding fun to work and are finding new ways and activities that they can use to lighten up the work environment in their organisation so that they can help their employees in reaching to their full potential by working in a tassel free and stress free organisation. For example, letting employees enjoy some music, or have breaks and rest between long working hours, or providing them with free food and beverages, outdoor projects, or a nice and homey workplace setting, etc. helps in calming their anxiety and affect their creativity and productivity. Similarly a smile, or a joke, or a silly dress up day relieves them of some of the boredom of their daily routine work. A friendly competition or game among employees, volunteer work, game rooms and activities, family involvement, flexi-work, etc. helps the employees in maintaining a balance between work and life and healthy working relations with colleagues; and rewards and recognition, employee awards, other performance related rewards, etc. enhance employee satisfaction and motivation.

Fun Activities:

Employees preferences regarding work fun activities depends on a range of factors like their gender, age-group, nature of job, job tenure, educational qualifications, size of work force, outlook towards work fun, etc. People with

different demographic and professional profiles prefer different kind of activities for adding fun to work.

In this paper, these activities (from a study by R. C. Ford et. al.) clubbed under 17 different heads are considered as activities that add fun to work for employees for studying and analysing their preferences:

- Recognition of Personal Milestones [RPM] (it includes celebrating events like Birthdays, hiring anniversaries, personal achievements, etc.)

- Social Recognition and Rewards [SRR] (including rewards like employee of the month, star of the team, public applause for performance, recognition programs, etc.)

- Joy of Helping Others [JHO] (it includes activities like Volunteer Work, Corporate Social Responsibility Programs, organising Blood donation camps, disaster relief funds, philanthropic work, humanistic work practices, etc.)

- Stress Release Activities [SRA] (including relaxation activities like Meditation rooms, music rooms, gyms, relaxation rooms, massages, power naps, etc.)

- Humour and Entertainment [H&E] (includes sharing cartoons, jokes in newsletters, emails, skits, plays, book clubs, light and happy work environment, hobby and skill classes, etc.)

- Social Events and Festivities [SEF] (includes planning activities like picnics, parties, social gatherings, Diwali, Holi, New Year celebrations, get together, etc.)

- Games and Friendly Competitions [GFC] (including organising events like athletic meets, sports days, cricket matches, marathons, badminton, musical events, talent hunt, dancing and singing competitions, etc.)

- Informal Activities [InA] (it includes having group lunches, after hour outings, costume parties, trips and tours, casual dress day at work, etc.)

- Flexi-Work [FxW](making working conditions flexible by time adjustment, place adjustment, work from home, online working, etc. for work life balance)

- Family Involvement [FIn] (involving employee families by activities like family get together, paid family vacations, cute baby contests, family parties, etc.)

- Participation in Management [PIM] (increasing employee participation in management by participation in decision making, board meetings, vision, mission and goal setting, targets and standards setting, etc.)

- Equality at Work Place [EWP] (managing diversity issues

by equal importance to all cultures, castes, gender, age, experience, respecting individual differences, equality in pay, roles etc.)

-Work place layout, Location and Facilities [WLF] (making workplace comfortable by availability of electricity, clean air, humidity, temperature, comfortable sitting, transport facilities, medical facilities, office location, etc.)

-Effective and efficient Managerial Support (Leadership, communication, motivation) [EMS].

-Work Place Transparency [WPT] (making work place transparent by transparency in selection, hiring, performance appraisals, pay scales, promotions, systems, etc.)

-Free food and beverages [FFB] (canteens, food courts, cafes, etc.)

-Outdoor and Foreign country Projects [OFP] (giving employees' opportunities to visit other countries, projects on scenic locations, etc.)

Data Analysis:

The data for the underlying study is collected from a representative sample of the population universe. A sample size of 101 units is selected at random from the population and the required data is collected with the help of a questionnaire based on a five point likert scale. An unbalanced scale is used to collect data keeping in mind the importance of adding fun to work, making it favourable towards adding fun to work with four points being most important, very important, fairly important and important and one point being unimportant as unfavourable one. The table no. 1 gives details about the demographic composition of the respondents.

Table No 1: Demographic composition of sample population

| Particulars | | Frequency(absolute) | Percentage (%) |
|---------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|----------------|
| Gender | Male | 61 | 60.4 |
| | Female | 40 | 39.6 |
| Age group (in years) | Up to 25 | 49 | 48.5 |
| | 26-30 | 33 | 32.7 |
| | 31-40 | 16 | 15.8 |
| | 41-50 | 2 | 2.0 |
| | Above 50 | 1 | 1.0 |
| Family Status | Single | 66 | 65.3 |
| | Married (2 people) | 20 | 19.8 |
| | Family (more than 2) | 15 | 14.9 |
| Educational Qualifications | Diploma | 4 | 4.0 |
| | Graduation | 67 | 66.3 |
| | Post-graduation | 27 | 26.7 |
| | Any other | 3 | 3.0 |
| Length of Service (in Years) | 0-1 | 22 | 21.8 |
| | 1-5 | 52 | 51.5 |
| | 5-10 | 11 | 10.9 |
| | 10-20 | 14 | 13.9 |
| | More than 20 | 2 | 2.0 |
| Nature of Job | Technical | 65 | 64.4 |
| | Managerial | 17 | 16.8 |
| | Administrative | 8 | 7.9 |
| | Others | 11 | 10.9 |

Table No. 2: KMO and Bartlett's Test

| | |
|--|---------|
| Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy. | 0.738 |
| Approx. Chi-Square | 807.478 |
| Bartlett's Test of Sphericity Df | 136 |
| Sig. | 0.000 |

Table no. 2 consists of the KMO and Bartlett's measure of the sample. The KMO measure, i.e., Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure is the measure of sampling adequacy. It helps in determining whether the responses of the sample are adequate for performing factor analysis or not. According to Kaiser (1974) if KMO is less than 0.5 the sample is not acceptable, the sample is mediocre when the value is between 0.5-0.7, acceptable with values ranging from 0.7-0.9 and the sample is excellent if the value of KMO is higher than 0.9. Here in this sample the KMO value is 0.738 (Table no. 3) making the sample acceptable for further testing.

Bartlett's test of sphericity also helps in determining that whether the collected data is suitable for performing factor analysis or not. Bartlett's test indicates the strength of relationships among variables by testing the hypothesis that whether correlation matrix is an identity matrix or not making them unsuitable or suitable for structure detection. Factor analysis can be done on a sample with Bartlett value of less than 0.5. Here, the value is 0.00 (Table no. 2) making the sample suitable for performing factor analysis.

Table No. 3: Total Variance Explained

| Component | Initial Eigenvalues | | | Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings | | | Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings | | |
|-----------|---------------------|---------------|--------------|-------------------------------------|---------------|--------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|--------------|
| | Total | % of Variance | Cumulative % | Total | % of Variance | Cumulative % | Total | % of Variance | Cumulative % |
| 1 | 5.986 | 35.211 | 35.211 | 5.986 | 35.211 | 35.211 | 3.364 | 19.787 | 19.787 |
| 2 | 1.745 | 10.263 | 45.475 | 1.745 | 10.263 | 45.475 | 2.249 | 13.227 | 33.014 |
| 3 | 1.447 | 8.513 | 53.987 | 1.447 | 8.513 | 53.987 | 2.106 | 12.386 | 45.400 |
| 4 | 1.313 | 7.725 | 61.712 | 1.313 | 7.725 | 61.712 | 1.909 | 11.228 | 56.628 |
| 5 | 1.072 | 6.305 | 68.017 | 1.072 | 6.305 | 68.017 | 1.677 | 9.866 | 66.494 |
| 6 | 1.015 | 5.969 | 73.986 | 1.015 | 5.969 | 73.986 | 1.274 | 7.492 | 73.986 |
| 7 | .773 | 4.546 | 78.532 | | | | | | |
| 8 | .713 | 4.194 | 82.727 | | | | | | |
| 9 | .579 | 3.405 | 86.132 | | | | | | |
| 10 | .505 | 2.973 | 89.104 | | | | | | |
| 11 | .459 | 2.702 | 91.807 | | | | | | |
| 12 | .339 | 1.992 | 93.799 | | | | | | |
| 13 | .314 | 1.850 | 95.648 | | | | | | |
| 14 | .245 | 1.442 | 97.091 | | | | | | |
| 15 | .205 | 1.206 | 98.297 | | | | | | |
| 16 | .159 | .937 | 99.234 | | | | | | |
| 17 | .130 | .766 | 100.000 | | | | | | |

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

The Total Variance is explained in Table no. 3. The table has been divided into 3 parts, i.e., initial eigen values, extraction sums of squared loadings and rotation sums of squared loadings. The initial eigen values reflect the number of items whose sum should be equal to the number of factors which are extracted to perform factor analysis.

The extraction sums of squared loadings are the factors that can be extracted to perform factor analysis. These factors explain the total variance among variables. Acc. to table no. 3, the first factor explains 35.21 %, 2nd factor 10.26%, 3rd 8.51%, 4th factor 7.72%, 5th 6.30% and 6th factor explain 5.97% of the variance.

Table No. 4: Rotated Component Matrix^a

| | Component | | | | | |
|--|-----------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Recognition of Personal milestones | | | | .828 | | |
| Social Recognition and rewards | | | | .810 | | |
| Joy of Helping others | .514 | | | | | |
| Stress release activities | .660 | | | | | |
| Humor and Entertainment | .774 | | | | | |
| Social events and festivities | | .619 | | | | |
| Games and friendly competitions | .772 | | | | | |
| Informal activities | .755 | | | | | |
| Flexi-work | | | | | | .897 |
| Family involvement | | .576 | | | | |
| Participation in management | .529 | | | | | |
| Equality in work place | | | .792 | | | |
| Work place layout, location and facilities | | | .803 | | | |
| Effective Leadership, communication, motivation and managerial support | | .694 | | | | |
| Workplace transparency | | .696 | | | | |
| Free food and beverages | | | | | .785 | |
| Outdoor and foreign country projects | | | | | .843 | |

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

a. Rotation converged in 10 iterations.

The table no. 4 shows the loadings (extracted values of variables) that the 17 variables have on the extracted 6 factors. The contribution of factors with higher absolute values is more than those with lower absolute values. All the variables are divided into aforesaid six factors according to the value of loadings with factor no. 1 being the most important among the six followed by 2nd, 3rd and so on. The factor which has highest loading of a variable includes that variable and the values of that variable for the remaining five factors are ignored and therefore are kept

blank. The value of loadings should be higher than 0.5 to be categorised in a factor. The values with less than 0.5 will be ignored for ease of study. Since factor 6 has only one factor loading it is combined with factor 2 to simplify further analysis and interpretation.

Rotation is used to reduce the number of factors having high variable loadings. Rotation does not change the results but helps in quick, easy and accurate interpretation of results. According to the table no. 4, the five factors can be classified as following based on the variables loading on

them:

1st factor is stress coping activities.

2nd factor is work life balance and work place ethics

3rd factor is effective work place

4th factor is recognition needs

5th factor is refreshing activities.

Table no. 5: ANOVA

| | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|------|
| REGR factor score 1 for analysis 1 | Between Groups | 3.978 | 3 | 1.326 | 1.340 | .266 |
| | Within Groups | 96.022 | 97 | .990 | | |
| | Total | 100.000 | 100 | | | |
| REGR factor score 2 for analysis 1 | Between Groups | 4.740 | 3 | 1.580 | 1.609 | .192 |
| | Within Groups | 95.260 | 97 | .982 | | |
| | Total | 100.000 | 100 | | | |
| REGR factor score 3 for analysis 1 | Between Groups | 1.848 | 3 | .616 | .609 | .611 |
| | Within Groups | 98.152 | 97 | 1.012 | | |
| | Total | 100.000 | 100 | | | |
| REGR factor score 4 for analysis 1 | Between Groups | 13.399 | 3 | 4.466 | 5.003 | .003 |
| | Within Groups | 86.601 | 97 | .893 | | |
| | Total | 100.000 | 100 | | | |
| REGR factor score 5 for analysis 1 | Between Groups | 9.133 | 3 | 3.044 | 3.250 | .025 |
| | Within Groups | 90.867 | 97 | .937 | | |
| | Total | 100.000 | 100 | | | |

Table no. 5 consists of the results of carrying ANOVA test on the factor scores of the extracted 5 factors based on the nature of job (technical, managerial, administrative and others) of the respondents. ANOVA stands for Analysis Of Variance. ANOVA test helps in determining that whether the variance between two groups is significant or not regarding one or more characteristics. ANOVA also helps in studying the cause and effect relationship between two variables where one variable (independent) cause variation

in other (dependent) variable. Acc. to table no. 5, REGR factor score for factor 4 and 5 are significant as the significance value is less than 0.05 for these two factors being 0.003 and 0.025. That means there is significant difference between mean values of different groups regarding these two factors, i. e., employees' preferences towards work fun activities variate regarding these two factors, recognition needs and refreshing activities, on the basis of nature of their job.

Table No. 6: Multiple Comparisons

Tukey HSD

| Dependent Variable | (I) nature of job of the respondent | (J) nature of job of the respondent | Mean Difference (I-J) | Std. Error | Sig. | 95% Confidence Interval | |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------|------|-------------------------|-------------|
| | | | | | | Lower Bound | Upper Bound |
| REGR factor score 4 for analysis 1 | technical | managerial | -.44710803 | .25739563 | .310 | -1.1199739 | .2257578 |
| | | administrative | -1.27324194* | .35402599 | .003 | -2.1987122 | -.3477717 |
| | | Other | .03854393 | .30805564 | .999 | -.7667538 | .8438417 |
| | managerial | technical | .44710803 | .25739563 | .310 | -.2257578 | 1.1199739 |
| | | administrative | -.82613391 | .40511277 | .181 | -1.8851517 | .2328839 |
| | | Other | .48565196 | .36562307 | .547 | -.4701346 | 1.4414385 |
| | administrative | technical | 1.27324194* | .35402599 | .003 | .3477717 | 2.1987122 |
| | | managerial | .82613391 | .40511277 | .181 | -.2328839 | 1.8851517 |
| | | Other | 1.31178588* | .43904683 | .018 | .1640600 | 2.4595118 |
| | other | technical | -.03854393 | .30805564 | .999 | -.8438417 | .7667538 |
| | | managerial | -.48565196 | .36562307 | .547 | -1.4414385 | .4701346 |
| | | administrative | -1.31178588* | .43904683 | .018 | -2.4595118 | -.1640600 |
| REGR factor score 5 for analysis 1 | technical | managerial | -.20195666 | .26365938 | .870 | -.8911968 | .4872835 |
| | | administrative | -1.11981432* | .36264125 | .014 | -2.0678060 | -.1718226 |
| | | Other | -.24545751 | .31555220 | .864 | -1.0703523 | .5794373 |
| | managerial | technical | .20195666 | .26365938 | .870 | -.4872835 | .8911968 |
| | | administrative | -.91785766 | .41497123 | .127 | -2.0026468 | .1669315 |
| | | Other | -.04350085 | .37452055 | .999 | -1.0225466 | .9355449 |
| | administrative | technical | 1.11981432* | .36264125 | .014 | .1718226 | 2.0678060 |
| | | managerial | .91785766 | .41497123 | .127 | -.1669315 | 2.0026468 |
| | | Other | .87435681 | .44973109 | .217 | -.3012991 | 2.0500127 |
| | other | technical | .24545751 | .31555220 | .864 | -.5794373 | 1.0703523 |
| | | managerial | .04350085 | .37452055 | .999 | -.9355449 | 1.0225466 |
| | | administrative | -.87435681 | .44973109 | .217 | -2.0500127 | .3012991 |

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Table no. 6 compares the mean values for different nature of jobs and shows the variation in employees' preferences regarding recognition needs and refreshing activities based on the nature of their job. Here we can see that, administrative staff variates from technical and other staff regarding recognition needs and from only technical staff regarding refreshing activities, their values being significant (less than 0.05) at 5% significance level.

Findings:

In this study the seventeen work fun activities are categorised under five heads using factor analysis to find out about employee preferences. We found out that the most preferred fun activities for employees that make an organisation fun to work at are stress relieving activities

consisting of Joy of Helping others, Stress release activities, Humor and Entertainment, Games and friendly competitions, Informal activities and Participation in management. The second important set of activities are work-life balance and work place ethics related set of activities consisting of Social events and festivities, Flexi-work, Family involvement, Effective Leadership, communication, motivation and managerial support and Workplace transparency. Next comes the set of activities that makes the workplace more effective to work at consisting of Equality in work place and Work place layout, location and facilities. It may also be noted that these are the activities that are most preferred by the employees irrespective of their demographic profiles (Karamvir Sheokand, Neha Gupta, 2018). Then come the fourth set of

activities namely recognition needs of employees consisting of Recognition of Personal milestones and Social Recognition and rewards. The last one are the refreshing activities consisting of Free food and beverages and Outdoor and foreign country projects which are also least preferred by the employees (Karamvir Sheokand, Neha Gupta, 2018). We also found out that employees' preferences changed on the basis of the nature of their jobs regarding recognition and refreshing activities. The preferences of administrative staff varied from technical staff regarding recognition needs and refreshing activities and from other staff regarding recognition needs only.

Conclusion:

In conclusion we can say that work fun activities play an important role in relieving employees of stress and stress relieving activities are the most preferred activities by the employees to make the organisation fun to work at and to help them stay in the organisations for longer time periods. Stress affects the performances of both the employees and the organisations, negatively. Staying in stress for longer time periods is not healthy for employees and put them under the state of unhappiness. And similarly for organisations it can lessen their profitability and life cycle. Work fun activities helps employing in maintaining good and harmonious relations in the organisation because of the employee friendly environment and also helps in developing organisational citizenship behaviour among employees which make their stays longer in the organisations and help in reducing burnouts and turnover. Employees having fun at work are less likely to be stressed while working then employees having no fun at all. Well satisfied employees work harder and with more zeal to satisfy the customers to increase profitability and maintain organisational image. That's why organisations these days are focussing on adding fun to work so that they can attract new talent as well as retain the already acquired talent in the organisation to have competitive advantage over competition and to increase its customer base by enhancing customer satisfaction by relieving its employees of stress and unhappiness at work.

References:

- Armstrong, M.; Baron, A.; (1998) Performance Management: The new realities, Institute of Personnel and Development, London.
- Bakker, A. B.; Demerouti, E.; (2007). The Job Demands Resources model: state of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, Vol. 22, Issue 3. Pp.309-328.
- Baldonado, A. M. (2015) Workplace Fun: Learning from Google, Southwest Airlines, and Facebook. *International Journal of Research in Business Studies and Management* Volume 2, Issue 12. PP 15-18 ISSN 2394-5923 (Print) and ISSN 2394-5931 (Online)
- Beehr, T. A.; Newman, J. E.; (1978) Job Stress, Employee Health and Organizational Effectiveness: A Facet Analysis, Model and Literature Review. *Personnel Psychology*, 31. Pp. 665-699.
- Burke, R. J.; (1993) Work-family stress, conflict, coping and burnout in police officers. *Stress and Health*. Volume 9, Issue 3. Pp. 171-180.
- Chand, P.; Sethi, A. S.; (1997). Organizational Factors in Development of Work Stress. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*. Vol. 32, No. 4. Pp. 453-462.
- Everett, A. (2011). Benefits and Challenges of Fun in the Workplace.
- Fevre, M. L.; Matheny, J.; Kolt, G. S.; (2003) Eustress, distress, and interpretation in occupational stress. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, Vol. 18, Issue 7. Pp. 726-744.
- Fluegge, E.R. (2008). Who put the fun in functional? Fun at work and its effects on job performance. PhD thesis, Proquest UMI., 3322919.
- Ford, R.C., McLaughlin, F.S. and Newstrom, J.W. (2003). Questions and answers about fun at work. *HR. Human Resource Planning*, 26(4), 18-33.
- Greenwich, C. (2001). Fun and Gains: Motivate and Energize Staff with Workplace Games, Contests and Activities. UK: McGraw-Hill.
- Gupta, S.; (2015) Job Stress in IT Age: A Study of Indian Female Bankers. *International Journal of Computer Science and Technology*. Vol. 6, Issue 1, Spl- 1. Pp. 42-46.
- Gurchiek, K. Millennial job seekers just wanna have fun.
- Halkos, G.; Bousinakis, D.; (2010). The effect of stress and satisfaction on productivity. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*. Vol. 59, Issue 5. Pp. 415-431.
- Howe, N. and Strauss, W. (2000). Millennials rising: The next great generation. Vintage Books, New York, NY.
- Hussain, T.; Asif, S.; (2012) Is Employees' Turnover Intention Driven By Organizational Commitment And Perceived Organizational Support? *Journal of Quality and Technology Management*. Volume

VIII, Issue II. Pp. 1-10.

- Jamaludin, M. F., Ahmad, A. M., Mohammad, A. and Shobri, N. M. (2016). A Study on the Relationship between Fun at Work and Work Engagement. Springer Science+Business Media.
- Karl, K. and Harland, L. (2005). What's fun and what's not: An examination of age, gender differences, and attitudes towards fun activities at work. Proceedings of the Midwest Academy of Management 2005 meeting, Chicago, IL.
- Karl, K.A., Peluchette, J.V., Hall L.M. and Harland, L. (2005). Attitudes toward workplace fun: a three sector comparison. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 12(2), 1.
- Karl, K.A. and Peluchette, J.V. (2006). Does workplace fun buffer the impact of emotional exhaustion on job dissatisfaction? : A study of health care workers. *Journal of Behavioral and Applied Management*, 7(2), 128.
- Karl, K.A., Peluchette, J.V. and Harland, L. (2007). Is fun for everyone? Personality differences in healthcare providers' attitude toward fun. *Journal of Health and Human Services Administration*, 29(4), 409-47.
- Karl, K.A., Peluchette, J.V. and Hall L.M. (2008). Give them something to smile about: A marketing strategy for recruiting and retaining volunteers. *Journal of Non-profit and Public Sector Marketing*, 20(1), 71.
- Kemery, E. R.; Mossholder, K. W.; Bedeian, A. G.; (1987) Role stress, physical symptomatology, and turnover intentions: A causal analysis of three alternative specifications. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, Volume 8, Issue 1. Pp. 11–23.
- Kotteeswari, M.; Sharief, S. T.; (2014) Job Stress and Its Impact on Employee's Performance: A Study With Reference To Employees Working in BPOs. *International Journal of Business and Administration Research Review*, Vol.2, Issue 4. Pp. 18-25.
- Kumari, G.; Joshi, G.; Pandey, K. M.; (2014). Job Stress in Software Companies: A Case Study of HCL Bangalore, India. *Global Journal of Computer Science and Technology (C)*. Volume 14, Issue 7, Version 1.0. Pp. 22-30.
- Lamm, E. and Meeks, M.D. (2009). Workplace fun: The moderating effects of generational differences. *Employee Relations*, 31(6), 613-631.
- Lazarus, R. S.; Folkman, S.; (1984). Stress, appraisal, and coping. New York, NY: Springer Publishing Company.
- Lu, Y.; Hu, X. M.; Huang, X.L.; Zhuang, X. D.; Guo, P.; Feng, L. F.; Hu, W.; Chen, L.; Zou, H.; Hao, Y. T.; (2017) The relationship between job satisfaction, work stress, work-family conflict and turnover intention among physicians in Guangdong, China: a cross-sectional study. *BMJ Open* 2017;7:e014894.
- Lundin, S., Christensen, J., Paul, H. and Strand, P. (2002). *Fish! Tales: Real-Life Stories to Help Transform Your Workplace and Your Life*. New York, NY: Hyperion.
- Mariotti, J. (1999). A company that plays together, stays together. *Industry Week*, 248(6), 63.
- McDowell, T. (2004). Fun at work: scale development, confirmatory factor analysis, and links to organizational outcomes. PhD thesis, Proquest UMI, 3155834.
- McGhee, P. (2000). The key to stress management, retention, and profitability? More workplace fun. *HR Focus*, 77(9), 5-6
- Measley, N. (2015). [Benefits of fun in the workplace](#).
- Meyer, H. (1999). Fun for everyone. *The Journal of Business Strategy*, 20(2), 13.
- Mücelidila, B.; and Erdil, O. (2016). Finding Fun in Work: The effect of workplace fun on taking charge and job engagement.
- Musyoka, M.; Ogutu, M.; Awino, Z. B.; (2012). Employee Stress and Performance of Companies Listed in the Nairobi Securities Exchange. *DBA Africa Management Review*, 2012, Vol. 3, No 1. Pp. 115-129.
- Okeke, M. N.; Echo, O.; Oboreh, J. C.; (2016). Effects of Stress on Employee Productivity. *International Journal of Accounting Research (IJAR)* Vol. 2, No. 11.
- Pareek, A.; (1999). Managing stress and coping. In: D.M.Pestonjee, U.Pareek and A.Agarwal (Eds), *Studies in Stress and its Management*. New Delhi, Oxford and IBH.
- Pestonjee, D. M.; (1992) Stress and Coping: The Indian Experience. SAGE Publications.

- Plester, B. (2009). "Crossing the line: boundaries of workplace humour and fun". *Employee Relations*, 31, 6. 584-599.
- Ramsey, R. (2001). Fun at work: Lessons from the fish market. *Supervision*, 62(4), 7-9.
- Robbins, S. P.; (2005) *Organisational Behaviour*. Prentice Hall of India Pvt. Ltd. New Delhi. 11th Edition.
- Selye, H.; (1956). *The stress of life*, Mc-Graw Hill, New York.
- Sethi, A.; and Schuler, R.; (1984) *Handbook of Organizational Stress Coping Strategies*. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.
- Sheokand, K. and Gupta, N.; (2018). Employees Preferences for Work Fun Activities: A Gender Based Study. In *Assemblage- An Anthology of Business and Management Research*. Haryana School of Business. ISBN 978-93-85504-66-2. Pp. 257-271.
- Spicer, A. and Cederström, C. (2015). The research we have ignored about happiness at work.
- Strand, P. (2000). Angling for workplace fun. *Incentive*, 174(10), 135.
- Tews, M. J.; Michel, J. W. and Allen, D. G.; (2014). Fun and friends: The impact of workplace fun and constituent attachment on turnover in a hospitality context.
- Weiss, J. (2002). Loyal employees or the revolving door? *Executive Excellence*, 19(6), 17.
- Wooten, P. (1993). Making humor work: Results of the JNJ humor study. *Journal of Nursing Jocularly*, 3(4), 46-47.
- Ying In, C. and Hiu Ching, Y. (2010). Workplace Fun and Job Satisfaction: The Moderating Effects of Attitudes toward Fun.
- <http://www.wranx.com/why-having-fun-at-work-is-important/> July 18, 2017
- <https://www.americanexpress.com/us/small-business/openforum/articles/attitude-changes-everything-why-fun-at-work-can-mean-success-in-business/> July 18, 2017
- <http://www.wikihow.cmom/Have-Fun-at-Work/> July 18, 2017
- <https://yourstory.com/2017/06/having-fun-at-work/> July 18, 2017
- https://www.slideshare.net/sanjay_asati/fun-work/ July 18, 2017
- <http://www.lifehack.org/articles/work/10-ways-make-your-office-fun-work.html> July 18, 2017
- <https://www.agcareers.com/newsletters/creating.html> July 18, 2017