

Corporate Offerings: Why Aren't Millennials Staying?

Wendy A. Campione
Northern Arizona University

One of the major challenges facing businesses today is the retention of Millennials. While employers have offered many “carrots”, there are also many employer-driven practices and industry norms that must be examined in light of Millennials’ poor retention rates. This study combines research findings on Millennials’ work attitudes, values, personality traits, and behavior with corporate offerings, workplace policies, and employer practices to determine Millennials’ job satisfaction. Findings reveal moderate positive effects of pay, paid leave, flex time, and co-worker support; highly significant positive effect of small establishment size; and highly significant negative effects of both extreme hours and irregular schedules worked, as well as union coverage.

INTRODUCTION

One of the major challenges facing businesses today is the retention of their newest recruits, the Millennials. Despite their compensation packages and workplace policies offerings, low retention rates of these newest employees translate into low rates of return on these corporate efforts. As much as employers wish to retain Millennials, however, some of their businesses practices and industry standards must also be critically examined. While employers have offered many “carrots”, there are also many employer-driven practices and industry norms that must be examined in light of Millennials’ poor retention rates. This study combines what research informs us about Millennials’ work attitudes, values, personality traits, and behavior with the availability of various corporate offerings, workplace policies, and employer practices to determine Millennials’ reactions to these, as measured by their job satisfaction.

A model of employee job satisfaction utilizing a 2007 sample of 1,400 twenty five year old Millennial employees from the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 97 is tested (BLS, 2007). The model forms the basis for the following research question: How do Millennials react to various corporate offerings, workplace policies, and employer practices in light of their youth and in light of their membership in the youngest workforce generation, the Millennials? Knowing more about Millennials’ reactions could potentially assist employers in both their recruitment and retention efforts.

BACKGROUND

Why Job Satisfaction? The Evidence

Too often employers who believe they have successfully recruited find, shortly down the road, that they have “lost” their employees – they have either quit or have disengaged. Millennials age 24-34 are retained on average less than three years (BLS, 2013). Lost productivity, rising absenteeism, low morale,

and high turnover: How can employers successfully mitigate these problems? Is there a link to job satisfaction?

In his seminal 1978 article “Job Satisfaction as an Economic Variable” Richard Freeman argues that answers to questions about how people feel towards their jobs are not meaningless (as many economists of the time argued), but rather convey useful information about economic life that should not be ignored. In his early study, job satisfaction was shown to be a major determinant of labor market mobility in part because it *reflects aspects of the workplace not captured by standard economic variables* (Freeman, 1978).

Job satisfaction is now considered a core indicator of workers’ evaluations of their jobs (Hodson, 2011; Hodson, 2004). As a concept, job satisfaction assumes that workers evaluate all aspects of their job situations, consider their alternatives, and through an internal calculus arrive at an overall evaluation of the quality of their jobs. Job satisfaction is a work attitude and as such is an evaluative (cognitive) and emotional (affective) reaction to job and work environment characteristics (Hulin & Judge, 2003).

Research provides evidence that job satisfaction is consistently and significantly correlated with retention (Tourangeau & Cranley, 2006; Coomber & Barriball, 2007). Given average Millennial tenure on the job, anything that has the potential to accurately assess and increase job satisfaction, could potentially raise Millennials’ tenure (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2013).

Several studies find low job satisfaction to be a determinant of quits (Clark, et al, 1998; Kristensen & Westergard-Nielsen, 2004) and intention to leave the workplace (Bockerman & Ilmakunnas, 2005). Longitudinal studies show Millennials’ job satisfaction to be higher and intention to leave lower than previous generations. However when Millennials become dissatisfied, they move more quickly and more certainly to quit their jobs and move on than previous generations (Twenge et al, 2010, Families & Work Institute, 2006). In this sense, low job satisfaction poses more immediate challenges to employers than might be at first glance.

Low job satisfaction negatively affects motivation and absenteeism (Keller, 1983; Tharenou, 1993). Looking specifically at the young and Millennials, job satisfaction and motivation are strongly impacted by intrinsic work values (Twenge et al, 2010; Cennamo & Gardner, 2008). Low intrinsic satisfaction has been shown to significantly reduce overall job satisfaction (Decker et al, 1997) and thus may lower Millennials’ job satisfaction.

Low job satisfaction negatively affects both the physical and mental health of employees and lowers productivity (Cooper, et al, 1996) resulting in some cases in counterproductive behavior (Rubin, 2004; Gattfredson & Holland, 1990). Little is known with regard to the effects of work and various work environments on Millennials’ health. This is not surprising given their newness to the labor force and their relatively short average tenure. However one form of counterproductive behavior is failure to contribute to team efforts. Millennials are known to be individualistic rather than team-oriented in the workplace (Kowske et al, 2010).

The Millennials

Members of a generation are born, start school, enter the workforce, have children, and retire at approximately the same time and age. Members are the same age when wars are waged, technological advances are made, and other social changes occur. The ebb and flow of the newer and older generations coupled with historical and social events drive social change, a process called demographic metabolism (Rydeur, 1965; Kowske et al, 2010).

When a new generation is born, social forces or agents of socialization, such as laws, mores, schools, and families acquaint the newcomers with society. Simultaneously newcomers form their own unique reactions to those socializing agents and the shared historical phenomena that occur at key developmental stages, especially young adulthood (Baltes et al, 1980). Shared experiences at key developmental points contribute to the unique characteristics, such as values, attitudes, and personality traits, which define and differentiate one generation from another Rydeur, 1965).

As newcomers entering the workforce, Millennials must learn about tasks and social expectations through socialization processes, as well as how to adapt to and negotiate their roles (De Vos et al, 2003).

They must learn how to gain others' acceptance of them as participating members in the workforce (Myers & Oetzel, 2003). Organizational socialization is interactive, involving newcomers' and old timers' evaluations and commitments to each other and to the organization (Myers, 2006). Newcomers also engage in evaluations, assessing not merely job-related tasks and responsibilities but also the organization and whether they like working with co-workers and supervisors (Scott & Myers, 2010).

Thus a good starting point for examination of Millennials' workforce behavior is to understand their work-related values, attitudes, and personality traits and how these impact their ability to learn job tasks, social expectations, and the organization; how these impact their adaptability to negotiate their roles in the workplace; and how these impact their assessments of their co-workers and supervisors.

When looking at the Millennials in the workforce and trying to discern who they are, there are two basic starting perspectives: they are young and they are the youngest generation. Some of their behavior is based upon the fact that they are young – with all that that entails. And some of their behavior is based upon generational influences. With respect to workforce implications, their behavior is due in part to their youth – the combined effects of inexperience and hopeful expectations – much the same as youth in previous generations. But some behavior is specific to this generation and the evidence as to the workforce implications of this behavior is mixed and often confusing.

The confusion arises due to the potential confounding of age and cohort effects in empirical analyses. Much of the popular media and even corporate investigations into Millennials' behavior are cross-sectional analyses and as such they cannot isolate generational-only influences. To isolate generational influences requires longitudinal data and empirical methods (such as time-lag studies) to separate generational influences from age. Then it is possible to distinguish what Millennials do because they are young from what Millennials do as members of the Millennial generation.

Critical to understanding Millennials in the workplace is to understand their work values and attitudes. Focusing first on work ethic, Millennials place less value on work for its own sake (Smola & Sutton, 2002; Twenge et al, 2010) and express less interest in working hard, putting in overtime, and taking pride in their own work than previous generations did when young (Ciriello et al, 2008). However the Family and Work Institute (2006) time lag study found 23-27 year olds actually work more hours in 2002 than in 1977. This reflects the general trend towards working more hours in the U.S.

Work centrality, i.e. work as a central part of life, has declined across generations. Millennials are less work-centric and more family-centric (Families & Work Institute, 2006) and more focused on leisure (Twenge, 2010). Although younger employees typically have a strong desire to advance, this desire to advance has been decreasing across generations (less for Millennials). All of this may reflect the larger underlying trend towards valuing work less and for Millennials it may be caused by (or in spite of) the longer hours worked by them.

Despite the decline in work centrality and work ethic, intrinsic work values, the need to find meaning and interest in work, has not changed across generations over time. Every generation has placed a high value on intrinsic aspects of work. What may have changed is the *ability* to find meaning and interest in work. Negotiating your role and adapting to your environment plus persistence are abilities and traits required of new employees (De Vos et al, 2003). This may be difficult for Millennials given their risk-adverse nature and their near-entitlement perspective (Twenge & Campbell, 2009; Marston, 2010). Boredom has often been cited as a primary reason for their premature turnover (Alsop, 2008). Extrinsic work values, status, respect, and money, are however, more important to Millennials than to previous generations (Twenge et al, 2010). However, given that Millennials are focused on individual goals and success, these values reflect more of a lifestyle goal rather than career or organizational goals (Marston, 2007; 2010).

In addition to examination of work values, several time-lag studies have looked into generational differences in personality traits. These consistently show an increase in individualistic traits. Millennials score higher on positive individualistic traits such as self-esteem and assertiveness (Gentile et al, 2001; 2009; Twenge 2001) and on negative individualistic traits such as narcissism (Twenge & Campbell, 2008; Twenge & Foster, 2010). For Millennials, this increased self-esteem and assertiveness supports their belief in the right of individuals to succeed and contribute in the workplace regardless of their background

(such as years of experience on the job) and to treat people as individuals rather than members of groups. However, this may also contribute to their impatience and lack of perseverance.

When individualism reaches the level of narcissism, it could support a sense of entitlement (Twenge & Campbell, 2009). This contributes to their need for constant and immediate recognition. Combined with the finding that Millennials are also risk averse and as such have difficulty dealing with ambiguity and nuance, they often require a clear path to success with clearly defined rubrics and well-defined expectations and constant feedback from their supervisors (Myer & Sadaghiani, 2010; Gursoy et al, 2008).

In examining Millennials' work attitudes - job satisfaction, job hopping, and commitment to the organization - the best investigations, those which control for age, all show Millennials more satisfied with their jobs and more in need of job security than previous generations (Twenge et al, 2010; Families & Work Institute, 2006; Smola & Sutton, 2002). More specifically, Millennials score higher than previous generations on measures of overall job and company satisfaction, higher on measures of confidence in and need for job security, and higher on measures of satisfaction with recognition, advancement, and career development. They do not score higher than previous generations on turnover intentions and satisfaction with the work itself (Kowske et al, 2010; Twenge, 2010; Families & Work Institute, 2006).

Corporate Offerings

Given the costs of turnover, employers have gone to great and costly lengths to attract and retain employees, especially the youngest, the Millennials. Employers have developed, packaged, and branded themselves in a variety of ways to achieve these goals. Testing the traditional business job satisfaction model in light of what is known about Millennials' work values, attitudes, and personality traits, should yield useful information to employers and researchers alike. However, as much as employers wish to recruit and retain Millennials, some of their businesses practices and industry standards must also be examined. While employers have offered many "carrots", there are also many employer-driven "sticks" and industry norms that must be examined in light of these attitudes, values, and personality traits of Millennials.

The traditional business model of job satisfaction postulates the compensation package and job and work environment characteristics as primary correlates of employee job satisfaction.

DATA

The National Longitudinal Surveys (NLS) are a set of surveys designed to gather information at multiple points in time on labor market activities and other significant life events of several groups of men and women. The sample utilized here is drawn from one of these surveys, the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 97 (BLS, 2007). The NLSY97 is designed to document the transition from school to work and into adulthood. It consists of a nationally representative sample of approximately 9,000 youths who were born in the years 1980-1984 and were 12-16 years old as of December 31, 1996. Youth have been interviewed on an annual basis since then.

This study utilizes a cross-sectional sample of one thousand, four hundred 25 year old employees (not including self-employed) drawn from the NLSY97 for the year 2007. This year's data includes information on all traditional correlates of job satisfaction.

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

Table 1 lists the descriptive statistics for all variables utilized in the model of this study. The sample is nearly evenly split in terms of gender, with 49% of sample members male. Twenty seven percent of sample members are Hispanic; 16% married marital status, and most are relatively healthy on a scale of 1-5, 1=excellent, with a mean value of 2.16.

TABLE 1
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

Variable	Definition	Mean	Standard Deviation
Independent			
Comp & Benefits			
Rate of Pay	Wage	17.50	14.690
Medical	1 = Provided	0.32	0.448
Paid leave	1 = Provided	0.47	0.932
Job & Work Char			
Flex	1 = Available	0.39	0.448
Union	1 = Union	0.12	0.323
Extreme50	1 = Works \geq 50 hours	0.33	0.423
Emp Size	1 = Small, up to 49	2.13	0.531
Irregular	1 = Irregular schedule	0.51	0.892
Co-worker	1 = Receives support	0.81	0.624
Controls			
Ethnicity	1 = Hispanic	0.27	0.379
Gender	1 = Male	0.49	0.166
Marital St	1 = Married	0.16	0.381
Health	1 = Excellent (scale 1-5)	2.16	0.906
Dependent			
Job Satisfaction	1 = Dislike very much (scale 1-5)	4.03	1.040

On a scale of 1-5, 1=dislike very much, the mean value of job satisfaction is 4.03. In terms of compensation, the mean hourly wage is \$17.50; 32% have medical insurance provided; and 47% have paid leave days provided. In terms of job and work environment, 39% have a flex time option; 33% work 50 hours or more per week; and 51% work an irregular schedule. Twelve percent of these employees are unionized, working on average at a medium-sized establishment, 1=small (0-49 employees), with a mean value of 2.13; and 81% receive some co-worker support.

MODEL DEVELOPED AND TESTED

An individual-level logistic regression model is estimated:

$$Job\ Satisfaction = f(Absolute\ Wage, Medical\ Insurance, Paid\ Leave, Flex\ Time, Extreme\ Hours, Irregular\ Schedule, Establishment\ Size, Union\ Coverage, Co-Worker\ Support, Controls)$$

Given the ordinal nature of the dependent variable and the skewed distribution of responses, these measures are analyzed with ordered logistic regression. The ordered logistic regression model estimates a model chi-square (with *df* equal to the number of predictor variables in the model) that shows the reduction in the log likelihood compared with a model that contains only the intercept. It is an extension of the binary logistic regression and is often referred to as the cumulative logistic regression model.

The technique estimates a series of tau thresholds or cut points, giving the cumulative log odds of scoring at or below a given threshold of satisfaction. The number of thresholds is always one less than the number of categories on the dependent variable (since by definition, all responses are in the highest response category or lower). The slope parameters in ordered logit regression indicate changes in the cumulative distribution of responses at the cut points given unit increases in predictor variables; significance tests are conducted in the usual manner (slope parameter divided by the standard error).

VARIABLE CONSTRUCTION AND HYPOTHESES

Dependent

Job satisfaction has long been considered a core indicator of workers' evaluations of their jobs (Hodson, 2001; Hodson, 2004). The job satisfaction variable utilized here measures global job satisfaction (as opposed to a faceted job satisfaction measure). Job satisfaction is a work attitude and as such is an evaluative (cognitive) and emotional (affective) reaction to job and work environment characteristics (Hulin & Judge, 2003). A meta-analysis by Wanous et al (1997) concludes that single-item scales of job satisfaction are acceptable, offering the advantage of limiting demands on participants' time, an important factor in field work.

In the NLS data used here, workers respond to the question: how satisfied are you with your job overall? Response categories include: like very much; like fairly well; think it's OK; dislike somewhat; and dislike very much. As shown in the descriptive statistics section, the categories are re-ordered to facilitate interpretation of the results.

Explanatory Variables

Compensation and Job and Work Environment Characteristics Variables

A traditional business model of job satisfaction postulates the compensation package paid to the employee and job and work environment characteristics as primary correlates of employee job satisfaction. Integrating what has been stated in earlier sections here with regard to Millennials, several hypotheses are set forth with respect to *Millennials'* job satisfaction.

Employee compensation is represented by three variables here: rate of base pay, provision of medical insurance and paid leave. The variable "rate of base pay" is a measure of absolute rather than relative wage. Sell & Cleal (2011) suggest that increases in absolute wage increase job satisfaction, not necessarily because it makes you happier in the job, but rather a higher wage increases overall utility by increasing overall total expenditure opportunities. Further, recent cross sectional studies have shown that younger employees value status, as here represented by the extrinsic value "absolute wage". This may hold true somewhat more for these young *Millennial* workers, as longitudinal studies that control for age have additionally shown that Millennials value extrinsic factors such as money more than previous generations (Twenge et al, (2010). Work is instrumental to supporting a lifestyle they desire (Marston, 2007). *It is hypothesized that a higher absolute wage will positively affect Millennials' job satisfaction.*

A binary of "whether medical insurance is provided" to the employee is utilized. In discussions of relative benefit importance this captures what previous generation employees cite as the most sought after benefit; thus positively contributing to their job satisfaction (Decker et al, 2009). However young employees are less likely than older workers to have chronic or critical medical issues. Often having a shorter time horizon (Deloitte, 2009) they may also be willing to tradeoff medical insurance for some other aspect of compensation or work environment. With respect to Millennials, longitudinal studies have demonstrated that they are more risk-averse than previous generations (Twenge et al, (2010); Families & Work Institute, 2006). It is therefore hypothesized that this generation-specific trait will override Millennials' youth tendencies. *It is hypothesized therefore that provision of medical benefits will positively affect Millennials' job satisfaction.*

Paid leave time is often cited as a desired benefit. Unlike medical insurance, paid leave is often viewed by younger employees as a right rather than a benefit (Keefe & Medjuck, 1997). Longitudinal studies have found a significant decline in work centrality and an increase in the value of leisure time over all generations (Twenge, 2010). Given that Millennials have lower work centrality and higher leisure time value relative to previous generations, *it is hypothesized that paid leave will positively affect Millennial job satisfaction.*

Flexibility has been found to be highly ranked among employees (Bond et al, 2004). One form of workplace flexibility is flextime. Flextime is a scheduling arrangement that permits variation in an employee's start and departure times, variations in the length of the workday, and compressed workweeks. A binary variable captures "whether flex time is available".

The evidence is mixed as to the effectiveness of flex time and its effect on job satisfaction. In age-diverse samples, it was found to be the most effective workplace option to boost productivity and morale and reduce absenteeism across age and family income levels (Bond et al, 2004). In documenting the adaptive strategies of dual-earner couples, Haddock et al, (2006) report flexible work scheduling as a significant supportive workplace practice; Campione (2006) however found no correlation between flex time and job satisfaction associated with voluntary job change for middle aged women.

With respect to Millennials it has been found that they feel rewarded by work arrangements that offer them more flexibility (Martin, 2005; Hershatter & Epstein, 2010) and that their priority is work-life balance (Carless and Wintle, 2007; Cennamo & Gardner, 2008). Millennials are less work-centric and more family-centric than previous generations (Families & Work Institute, 2006). As such *it is hypothesized that flex time will positively affect Millennials' job satisfaction.*

Next a binary “whether worked 50 hours or more” is created. The literature suggests that a measure of “extreme hours worked” affects job satisfaction and delineates the threshold at 50 or more hours per week. Long working hours can be evidence both for workers having a challenging job and for workers just having too much work (based upon their preferences) (Kristensen, et al 2004; Hewlett & Luce, 2006). According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1.7 million people consider their job and their work hours extreme due to globalization, technological connections, corporate expectations, and their own type A personalities.

Regardless of the reason for the intensity, some have argued that a new “normalized intensity” exists (McCann et al, 2008). With respect to this study’s sample of Millennials, as opposed to the more age-diverse BLS sample, Millennials may be more willing to work longer hours, the “new normalized intensity”, to increase their earnings to establish their lifestyle (as opposed to their careers) (Hewlett & Luce, 2006).

However, longitudinal studies find a decline in work ethic over generations, with more recent generations expressing less interest in working hard, putting in overtime, and taking pride in their work (Families & Work Institute, 2006). Further it has also been found that 23-27 year olds actually worked more hours in 2002 than in 1977. Does this reflect a discrepancy between Millennials’ work attitudes and their behavior or does it reflect the reality that most of the new normal intensity is employer-driven? Could Millennials’ negative attitude to overtime and long hours reflect the reality of overtime and excess hours on top of already long hours? All may reflect a larger underlying trend towards valuing work less and for Millennials it may be caused by (or in spite of) the longer work hours worked by many (Families & Work Institute, 2006).

Millennials like money, but factoring their increased value of leisure and decline in work ethic, they may only go so far to acquire income. Whereas their predecessors may have disliked working long hours and did in fact push for more balance (passing of the Family Medical Leave Act for example), they never really embraced their discontent to act upon it. They endured. Millennials are not afraid to express their discontent –ultimately this discontent will cause them to leave. *It is hypothesized that working extreme hours will negatively affect Millennials' job satisfaction.*

In 2005, over 3 million full-time U. S. workers worked something other than a regular daytime schedule, with two-thirds of them working a rotating or irregular shift (Williams, 2008). One in five U. S. employees works nonstandard times, during the evening, at night, or on rotating shifts (Gornick et al, 2009). Interestingly, 49% of all U.S. workers prefer a different shift including 43% who work day shift who would prefer a non-day shift (McMenamin, 2007). However the use of alternative shift arrangements may be determined by the demands of the employer rather than employee preferences. Although working hours have to some extent become indivisible through regulations such as FLSA, long hours over multiple shifts each day means that some employers have made hours divisible according to their own needs to maximize customer service and minimize labor costs.

Problems do arise from irregular schedules – changing hours, changing among day, evening, and night shifts. For the employee this means that there is no pattern of reliability in his or her work week. Findings show that employees find these “irregular” work week environments less satisfactory (Tausig & Fenwick, 2001). With respect to young Millennials there are two possible reactions to irregular schedules.

First they may be more willing to work irregular shifts and hours to establish their lifestyle and/or increase their earnings (Hewlett & Luce, 2006). Second, similar to their reaction to excessive hours, they may balk at these schedules which may interfere with their much desired wish for balance between work and leisure and their increased value of leisure time. *It is hypothesized that “irregular schedule” will negatively affect Millennial job satisfaction.*

Evidence suggests that job satisfaction tends to be lower in larger establishments due to their more impersonal and bureaucratic nature (Clark, 1996; Hodson, 2001) and less satisfactory management-employee relations (Tansel & Gazioglu, 2006). Larger employers can however provide more varied pay and promotional opportunities as well as the latest technology. Despite these offerings, the evidenced dissatisfaction in larger establishments may actually mask the true underlying reasons such as lack of career development, failure to ignite passion, and less feedback (Singleton-Jackson et al, 2011; Mayhew, 2014).

Intrinsic work values, those of challenge, autonomy, and support, allow employees to find meaning and interest in work and contribute to intrinsic job satisfaction. This study uses the variable “establishment size” to proxy intrinsic satisfaction. Previous research has demonstrated that intrinsic satisfaction is a significant contributor to overall job satisfaction (Decker et al, 1997). With respect to Millennials, evidence suggests intrinsic work values are just as important to them as to previous generations in their youth (Twenge et al, 2010).

Millennials prefer organizations with central decision making, clearly defined responsibilities, and formalized procedures (similar to rubrics they received in school) (Hershatler & Epstein, 2010); all of which would be seemingly desirable to executives and suggest a match to larger organizations. Millennials are however also prone to want to choose the specific tasks they will perform and the conditions under which they do them. They need supervisor direction and feedback more than previous generations and at the same time desire autonomy and freedom from continuous supervisor scrutiny (Graduate Management Admissions Council, 2007; Twenge, 2010). This description may suggest a match with smaller more flexible organizations.

Longitudinal studies have also shown changes in personality traits, with an increase in individualistic traits over time across generations. The upside of strong individualism in Millennials is that they recognize the right and ability of individuals to succeed and contribute regardless of their background and that they treat people as individuals rather than members of groups. The downside to increased individualism observed in Millennials is when it reaches the level of narcissism and feelings of entitlement (Twenge & Foster, 2010; Twenge et al, (2010)). This may mean that Millennials want more now and are not willing to wait and go through traditional channels for promotions and project assignments (such as internal labor market job ladders). This description may suggest a match with smaller more flexible organizations. *It is hypothesized that small size of establishment will positively affect Millennial job satisfaction.*

Union influence in the workplace has declined within the U.S. over last 50 years. Nearly 15 million U.S. workers are covered under union contracts (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2013). Unions traditionally provide professional and social network contacts as well as sources of information and potential grievance recognition and resolution (Bluestone & Rose, 1997). Union influence also represents the establishment and enforcement of seniority systems. Given Millennials strong sense of individualism mentioned above, Millennials may not consider union influence a positive one. *It is hypothesized that establishment union coverage will negatively affect Millennial job satisfaction.*

As Millennials enter the workplace they must not only learn about the job-related tasks required of them, but also how to adapt to and negotiate their roles and gain others’ acceptance of them (De Vos et al, 2003; Myers & Oetzel, 2003). They must evaluate the organization and whether they like working with co-workers and supervisors (Scott & Myers, 2010).

The last variable “co-worker support” is measured using a question which asks whether the employee has “someone at work to talk to about work-related issues”. Co-worker support has been defined in the literature as the extent to which employees believe their co-workers are willing to provide them with

work-related assistance (Wang et al, 2005; Bono & Judge, 2003; Susskind et al, 2003). Unlike supervisor support, co-worker support is predominantly free of hierarchical differences (Chuang et al, 2012).

Evidence suggests that employees who perceive more co-worker support obtain more job resources such as consideration, emotional support, useful information, and guidance and that this support motivates employees to persist in meeting requirements of their jobs, enhancing service performance and customer orientation (Tsai & Wu, 2006); Ducharme & Martin, 2000). Employee-perceived co-worker support can reduce employees' withdrawal intentions and actual turnover (Iverson, 1999). Given Millennials' substantial need for support and guidance to achieve their individual career development and success, *it is hypothesized that co-worker support will positively affect Millennial job satisfaction.*

Control Variables

Individual demographic variables are included as controls: race, gender, marital status, and general health.

RESULTS

To aid in the interpretation of the results presented here in Table 2, this study reports both the parameter estimates b_k and the exponential parameter estimates (e^{b_k}). The exponential parameter estimate is a measure of the factor change in the odds of the outcome produced by a one unit increase in the value of an independent variable; here that means the increase in the odds of being in the highest job satisfaction group for a one point increase in the explanatory variable. Units implied by raw coefficients of a logistic regression model (log-odds) are not intuitively interpretable (Long, 1997). Also the factor change measure of the effect on odds has the additional benefit of being independent from the settings of the independent variables, unlike predicted probabilities and most marginal effects (Sell and Cleal, 2011).

The global chi square statistic indicates that the model logit regression is highly significant (Chi square statistic=97.258; $p<.01$).

It was expected that given the increase in extrinsic values of Millennials relative to previous generations, the variable pay would substantially affect job satisfaction. However although pay positively contributes to job satisfaction, it does so only moderately ($b=0.121$; $p<.10$). Perhaps higher pay feeds Millennials' narcissistic tendencies and perhaps reinforces their confidence and self-esteem. But relative to other factors, its influence is smaller. As has been suggested in the literature, high pay may be used to distract from more serious negative aspects of the job and work environment.

Both paid leave ($b=0.204$; $p<.10$) and flex time ($b=0.410$; $p<.10$) are significant. As hypothesized they positively affect job satisfaction but as with the finding for pay, they do so only moderately. Given Millennials' increased value of leisure and the importance of balance between work and leisure, both were expected to substantially affect job satisfaction. Perhaps this indicates that these workplace offerings are viewed by Millennials as band aids to fix some of the more substantial industry or employer-imposed practices that Millennials find offensive and unpalatable.

Both extreme hours ($b= -0.510$; $p<.01$) and irregular schedules ($b= -0.311$; $p<.01$) are found to be highly significant and to reduce Millennials' job satisfaction, as hypothesized. Each of these makes it difficult for Millennials to find and maintain balance in their lives. Even if Millennials are working long hours and irregular schedules to earn more money or to keep their jobs or both, both seemingly important outcomes to Millennials, these realities do not translate into satisfaction and are soundly rejected by Millennials as the means to achieve their goals.

Although unions have historically been seen as sources of help to employees, it was hypothesized here that union influence would negatively affect Millennials' job satisfaction. Millennials' significant individualism and confidence lead them to reject strict seniority rules and to downgrade the importance of experience on the job, tenets of union operations. What was surprising was the strength of the negative influence of unions on Millennials' satisfaction ($b= -0.327$; $p<.05$). Unlike their parents and grandparents, Millennials' have little history with unions and unions' diminishing presence and offerings (such as formal apprenticeships) do nothing to initiate Millennials into the fold.

TABLE 2 RESULTS FROM ORDERED LOGIT REGRESSION		
Variable	b_k	e^b_k
Rate of Pay	0.121*	1.129
Medical	-0.152	1.121
Paid leave	0.204*	1.226
Flex	0.410*	1.507
Union	-0.327**	0.721
Extreme50	-0.510***	0.600
Emp Size	0.256***	1.292
Irregular	-0.311***	0.733
Co-worker	0.133*	0.875
Ethnicity	0.210	1.234
Gender	-0.174	0.840
Marital St	0.196*	1.271
Health	-0.324*	0.723
Global Chi-Square Statistic	97.258***	
<i>Note:</i> e^b_k is the exponentiated parameter estimate and represents the factor change in the odds of the outcome produced by a one unit increase in the value of the independent variable. * $p < .10$; ** $p < .05$; *** $p < .01$.		

Both variables that represent potential human workplace support to Millennials, establishment size and co-worker support are significant and as hypothesized positively contribute to job satisfaction. However the magnitude of the effect of establishment size is substantially greater than that of co-worker support. Given the importance of individualized supervisor support to Millennials, evidence has suggested that small establishments are more likely to address this need. The results here show that small establishment size is a highly significant positive contributor to job satisfaction ($b=0.256$; $p < .01$).

Co-worker support on the other hand, is a moderately positive significant contributor to job satisfaction ($b=0.133$; $p < .10$). In the past, co-worker support has been found to be a significant source of help and direction for new employees. Millennials however often view their co-workers and team members as friends. If so, then the functionality of co-worker support as source of help and mentor guidance may be diluted. Also if as discussed above, supervisor support is not only necessary but must be linked to an individualized plan of success and development for the Millennial, then co-worker or team member support is no substitute or equivalent.

CONCLUSION

It would appear that the most important factors affecting Millennials' job satisfaction are those that negatively impact satisfaction, those that push Millennials out rather than positive factors that lure them in. And although employers have become quite creative in some of their offerings to recruit Millennials, they have often failed to retain them.

Offering higher pay (or even promotional opportunities with pay raises, emphasis on the pay raises) may attract Millennials initially but their weaker significance relative to other factors implies that these will not be enough to keep them. Along with these offerings many employers want to appeal to Millennials' desire for flexibility (flex time) and leisure time (such as paid vacation time). Millennials have strongly stated in corporate surveys (Deloitte, 2009) and in academic studies (Twenge, 2010) that freedom to do their work in the manner in which they desire is very highly rated. Addressing their need for downtime takes into account their high value of leisure and balance. But again although moderately significant, these offerings do not appear to tip the scale for Millennials.

Highly significant are what Millennials perceive as negative aspects of their jobs and work environment. Whether employer-driven practices, industry standards, or internal labor market practices, anything that Millennials deem unfair, unreasonable, or unmanageable causes them to leave.

Millennials are clearly rejecting the "norm" established by earlier generations; some say especially the baby boomers, that working long hours is a necessary part of career advancement and proof of organizational commitment. Their negative response to extreme hours would seem to imply that working these long hours is not really their preference per se, but rather either a necessity to achieve workable income (perhaps from multiple jobs) or a requirement of their employer or perhaps both.

Equally highly negative is their response to irregular schedules. Most are employer-driven to meet customer needs and/or to strategically reduce labor time costs. For a generation which highly values balance between work and leisure and leisure itself more than previous generations, the disruption caused by irregular schedules and the inability of Millennials to moderate this disruption means that employers will see low satisfaction and all the additional negative correlates earlier discussed (absenteeism, counterproductive behavior, etc.).

Interestingly union coverage within the establishment in which they work appears to be soundly rejected by Millennials as well. This may be reflective of the strong individualism of this generation. Millennials believe that everyone should be judged on their own merits, as an individual not as a member of a group. Combined with their high levels of confidence and self-esteem, they may discount market standards such as years of labor market experience and tenure in the job. Labor unions may represent to them rigid rules of seniority and outdated means of evaluating performance. Also given their individualism, the idea of collective anything, whether grievance support or pay negotiations, does not address their need for one-on-one support (supervisor mostly) and personal career goals attainment. Or for some, as youth, they may simply reject the old ways out of hand.

Millennials strongly prefer smaller establishments perhaps reflecting not only their need for one-on-one support but the actual realization of it in smaller establishments. Oftentimes smaller establishments can more intimately assess the "fit" of the individual with the organization in the initial recruitment phase. They many times also need individuals to perform multiple job tasks, which may perhaps give these Millennials a sense of personal and career development, of more responsibility, and a stronger sense of the organizational vision, all of which they seem to want. Millennials seem to be rejecting the luxury offerings of large establishments, seeing instead the bureaucratic and impersonal environment as unappealing.

Regardless of establishment size, co-worker support usually functions as a critical part of the work environment. It can provide daily help and direction on the job and can serve to orient these young workers to the organizational culture. Although a positive influence on job satisfaction, it was only moderately significant here. Because Millennials often perceive their co-worker peers as friends, this perception may dilute the importance of the mentor role of co-workers and their ability to pass on organizational knowledge and properly orient these newer employees.

IMPLICATIONS

Baby boomers often advise Millennials to persist and be patient – the rewards for their efforts, money, status, and respect, will come. Although Millennials like pay and perks, they ultimately cannot be bought with these. However given the individualistic characteristics of Millennials, their self-esteem,

confidence, and narcissism combined with their risk-aversion and inability to handle uncertainty and nuance, Millennials may be ill-prepared for the realities and perhaps the harshness of the workplace. The very abilities that allowed baby boomers to survive and thrive in a work setting – negotiating their roles, adapting to less-than-perfect circumstances, persisting when unknown challenges appear – are not strong suits of Millennials and can explain their quickness to quit and leave.

However it could also be argued that Millennials' attitudes seem to get to the heart of the conflict baby boomers lived or in the worse light, the inner hypocrisy they lived. Those “rewards” that seemingly smoothed over and eased the pain of long hours and difficult conditions came at great personal cost. Divorce, stress, mental and physical ailments that Millennials may have observed, may have also served to orient Millennials to focus on the “price of” and the “means to” money, status, and respect; the costs to themselves, their families, and to society.

Millennials, as youth of every generation, are serving as agents of change. They reject “the realities” of the workplace, the unpalatable employer practices, the lack of supervisor support and guidance, and the lack of meaning and importance of their work as underlings. Unlike baby boomers they will not stay and take it. Millennials are, in their own way, re-defining what constitutes work ethic and its demonstration; work centrality and its relative importance; and the value of leisure and its place in life. They are protesting with their feet and often not just walking away from their jobs, but also from their educational training and heretofore chosen career.

Millennials pose unique challenges for employers, unique in part because they are different from the previous dominant force, the baby boomers. Given the above evidence, companies must pretty much re-think everything: their recruitment process and offerings, internships, mentoring programs, supervisor selection and training, evaluation and rewards systems, and even operations procedures. All of these must reflect what we know of Millennials and the challenges that they pose to the standard practices of companies and industries.

These challenges clearly go beyond the fact that Millennials are young and to some degree rebellious as all youth. Their core beliefs and personalities are questioning employer practices that baby boomers may not have liked but which they stoically accepted as part of the status quo. They also clearly need internships and mentoring to be more than task-oriented, as many who quit and leave are in fact technically qualified. Much of the mentoring effort must either derive from the immediate supervisor or designated co-workers with, if not direct authority, at least a meaningful channel to someone in position to resolve on-going issues.

A large part of the problem is that oftentimes immediate supervisors are individuals who excel in technical aspects of the job and in some cases have the required on-the-job years of experience, but often lack managerial skills, training, and experience in dealing with the issues of new employees. Given the importance of the immediate supervisor in the minds of Millennials and their need for more personalized development plans, managerial training should be required of all immediate supervisors.

If Millennials are agents of change in the workplace, then change workplaces must. One could argue that Millennials need to change – but their biggest complaints seem to emanate from practices that even the stoic baby boomers disliked. Maybe it is time for employers to carefully assess their practices – and if they are not willing or able to change them, then they must at least prepare their young Millennials for the reality and have support for them.

There is no escape from the fact that not only will Millennials constitute the largest percentage of the U.S. workforce, but also the absolute greatest number of workers in U.S. labor force history. Whatever your perspective on Millennials – good or bad – they are here to stay. Will they change as they age? Yes, but some of their particular or peculiar characteristics and behaviors will reflect more lasting generational changes that will persist.

REFERENCES

Alsop, R., (2008). *The trophy kids grow up: How the Millennial generation is shaping up in the workplace*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Ballard, D.I., & Seibold, D.R., (2003). Communicating and organizing in time: A meso-level model of organizational temporality. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 16(3), 380-415.
- Baltes, P.B., Reese, H.W., Lipsitt, L.P., (1980). Life-span developmental psychology. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 31, 65-110.
- Barker, J.R., (1993). Tightening the iron cage: Concertive control in self-managing teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 38, 408-437.
- Bluestone, B., & Rose, S. (1997). Unraveling an economic enigma: overworked and underemployed. *The American Prospect*, March/April, 58-68.
- Bockerman, P., & Ilmakunnas, P. (2005). Job disamenities, job satisfaction and on-the-job search: Is there a nexus? *Labor and Demography* 05001001. Econ WPA.
- Bond, J. T., Galinsky, E., & Hill, J. E. (2004). *When work works: Summary of Families and Work Institute Research findings*. New York: Families and Work Institute.
- Bono, J. E., & Judge, T. A. (2003). Self-concordance at work: Toward understanding the motivational effects of transformational leaders. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 46, 554-571.
- Campione, W.A. (2006). Voluntary job change versus employer promotion: Do women fare better on their own? *Applied Business and Economics*, 6 (2), 54-72.
- Carless, S. A., & Wintle, J. (2007). Applicant attraction: The role of recruiter function, work-life balance policies and career salience. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 15, 394-404.
- Cennamo, L., & Gardner, D., (2008). Generational differences in work values, outcomes, and person-organisation values fit. *Journal of Managerial Psychology* 23(8), 891-906.
- Chatman, G., O'Leary-Kelly, A., Wolf, S., Klein, H., Gardner, P., (2001). The influence of demographic heterogeneity on the emergence and consequences of cooperative norms in work teams. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44, 956-974.
- Chuang, A., Judge, T.A., & Liaw, Y.J., (2012). Transformational leadership and customer service: A moderated mediation model of negative affectivity and emotional regulation. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 21(1), 28-56.
- Ciriello, V.M., Dempsey, P.G., Maikala, R.V., & O'Brien, N.V., (2008). Secular changes in psychophysically determined maximum acceptable weights and forces over 20 years for male industrial workers. *Ergonomics*, 51, 593-601.
- Clark, A.E., (1996). Job satisfaction in Britain. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 34(2), 189-217.
- Clark, A.E., Georgellis, Y., & Sanfey, P. (1998). Job satisfaction wages and quits: Evidence from German panel data. *Research in Labour Economics*, 17, 95-122.
- Coomber, B., & Barriball, K. (2007). Impact of job satisfaction components on intent to leave and turnover for hospital-based nurses: A review of the research literature. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 44, 297-314.
- Cooper, C., Liukkonen, P., & Cartwright, S. (1996). *Stress prevention in the workplace: Assess the costs and benefits to organizations. European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Work Environment Factors*. Dublin, Ireland.
- Decker, F. H., Harris-Kojetin, L. D., & Bercovitz, A. (2009). Intrinsic job satisfaction, overall satisfaction, and intention to leave the job among nursing assistants in nursing homes. *The Gerontologist*, 49 (5), 596-610.
- Deloitte. (2009). State of the media democracy survey (3rd ed.). Retrieved from: <http://deloitte.com/us/realitycheck>.
- De Vos, A., Buyen, D., Schalk, R., (2003). Psychological contract development during organizational socialization: Adaptation to reality and the role of reciprocity. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 24, 537-559.
- Dries, N., Pepermans, R., De Kerpel, E., (2008). Exploring four generations' belief about career: Is "satisfied: the new "successful"? *Journal of managerial Psychology*, 23, 907-928.
- Ducharme, L. J., & Martin J. K., (2000). Unrewarding work, coworker support and job satisfaction: A test of the buffering hypothesis. *Work and Occupations*, 27, 223-243.

- Families and Work Institute., (2006). Generation and gender in the workplace. *American Business Collaboration*. <http://familiesandwork.org/site/research/reports/main.html>.
- Freeman, R. B. (1978). Job satisfaction as an economic variable. *American Economic Association*, 68(2), 135-141.
- Gattfredson, G.D., & Holland, J.L., (1990). A longitudinal test of the influence of congruence: Job satisfaction, competency utilization, and counterproductive behavior. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 37, 389-398.
- Gentile, D.A., Anderson, C.A., Yukawa, S., Ithori, N., Saleem, M., Ming, L.K., et al., (2009). The effects of prosocial games on prosocial behaviors: International evidence from correlational, experimental, and longitudinal studies. *Personal Social Psychology B*, 35, 752-763.
- Graduate Management Admission Council, (2007). Global MBA graduate survey. Retrieved from: <http://www.gmac.com/community/media/p217.aspx>.
- Gornick, J.C., Presser, H.B., & Batzdorf, C., (2009). *The American Prospect*. Retrieved from: <http://www.prospect.org/cs/articles?article=outsidethe9to5>.
- Gursoy, D., Maier, T.A., Chi, C.C. , (2008). Generational differences: an examination of work values and generational gaps in hospitality workforce. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 27(3), 448-458.
- Haas, J., (1977). , Learning real feelings: A study of high steel ironworkers' reactions to fear and danger. *Sociology of Work and Occupations*, 4(2), 147-170.
- Haddock, S. A., Zimmerman, T. S., Lyness, K. P., & Ziemba, S. J., (2006). Practices of dual-earner couples successfully balancing work and family. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, 27, 207-234.
- Hershatler, A., & Epstein, M., (2010). Millennials and the world of work: An organization and management perspective. *Journal of Business Psychology*, 25, 211-223.
- Hewlett, S.A. & Luce, C.B., (2006). Extreme hours – The dangerous allure of the 70 hour workweek. *Harvard Business Review* 84.12, 49-59.
- Hodson, R., (2001). *Dignity at Work*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hodson, R., (2004). Demography or respect? Work group demography versus organizational dynamics as determinants of meaning and satisfaction at work. *British Journal of Sociology* 53, 291-317.
- Hulin, C.L., & Judge, T.A., (2003). Job attitudes: A theoretical and empirical review. In W.C. Borman, D.R. Ilgen, & R.J. Klimoski (Eds.), *Handbook of psychology* (Vol. 12, pp.255-276). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Iverson, R.D., (1999). An event history analysis of employee turnover: The case of hospital employees in Australia. *Human Resource Management Review*, 9, 397-418.
- Judge, T.A., Thoresen, C.J., Bono, J.B., & Patton, G.K., (2001). The job satisfaction-job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127, 376-407.
- Keefe, J.M. & Medjuck, S., (1997). The contribution of long term economic costs to predicting strain among employed women caregivers. *Journal of Women and Aging* 9.3, 3-25.
- Keller, R.T., (1983). Predicting absenteeism from prior absenteeism, attitudinal factors and non-attitudinal factors. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68, 536-540.
- Kirby, E., & Krone, K.,)2002). The policy exists but you can't really use it: Communication and the structuration of work-family policies. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 30(1), 50-77.
- Kowske, B.J., Rasch, R., Wiley, J., (2010). Millennials' (lack of) attitude problem: An empirical examination of generational effects on work attitudes. *Journal of Business Psychology* 25, 265-279.
- Kristensen, N., & Westergard-Nielsen, N., (2004). Does low job satisfaction lead to job mobility? IZA Disc. Paper No. 1026.
- Kristensen, T.S., Bjorner, J.B., Christensen, K.B., & Borg, W., (2004). The distinction between work pace and working hours in the measurement of quantitative demands at work. *Work and Stress*, 18(4), 305-322.

- Marston, C., (2009). *Myths about Millennials: Understand the myths to retain Millennials*. Retrieved from: http://humanresources.about.com/od/managementtips/a/millennial_myth.htm.
- Marston, C., (2007). *Motivating the "What's in it for me?" workforce: Manage across the generational divide and increase profits*. Hoboken: Wiley.
- Martin, C.A., (2005). From high maintenance to high productivity: What managers need to know about Generation Y. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 37, 39-44.
- Mayhew, B., (2015). How to motivate Millennials? *Huff Post Business*, May. Retrieved from: www.huffingtonpost.com/bruce-mayhew/how-to-motivate-millennia_b_5113539.html.
- McMenamin, T., (2007). A time to work: Recent trends in shift work and flexible schedules. *Monthly Labor Review*, 130(12), 3-15.
- Myers, K.K., & Oetzel, J.G., 2003. Exploring the dimensions of organizational assimilation: Creating and validating a measure. *Communication Quarterly*, 51, 438-457.
- Myers, K.K., (2006). Assimilation and mutual acceptance. In J. Greenhaus & G. Callanan (Eds.). *Encyclopedia of career development* (pp. 31-32). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Myers, K.K., & Sadaghiani, K., (2010). Millennials in the workplace: A communication perspective on Millennials' organizational relationships and performance. *Journal of Business Psychology* 25, 225-238.
- Rubin, B.A., (2004). An understructured conception of Dignity at Work. *Contemporary Sociology*, 33(1), 8-10.
- Rydeur, N.B., (1965). The cohort as a concept in the study of social change. *American Sociological Review*, 30, 843-861.
- Scott, C.W., & Myers, K.K., (2010). Towards an integrative theoretical perspective of membership negotiations: Socialization, assimilation, and duality of structure. *Communication Theory*, 30, 79-105.
- Sell, L. & Cleal, B., (2011). Job satisfaction, work environment, and rewards: Motivational theory revisited. *LABOUR* 25 (1), 1-23.
- Sessa, V.I., Kabacoff, R.I., Deal, J., Brown, H., (2007). Generational differences in leader values and leadership behavior. *The Psychologist-Manager Journal*, 10, 47-74.
- Singleton-Jackson, J.A., Jackson, D., & Reinhardt, J. (2011). Academic entitlement: Exploring definitions and dimensions of entitled students. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Social Sciences*, 5(9), 229-236.
- Sirias, D., Karp, H.B., Brotherton, T., (2007). Comparing the levels of individualism/collectivism between baby boomers and generation X. *Management Research News*, 30, 749-761.
- Smola, K.W., & Sutton, C.D., (2002). Generational differences: revisiting generational work values for the new millennium. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23, 363-382.
- Susskind, A. M., Kacmar, K. M., & Borchgrevink, C. P., (2003). Customer service providers' attitudes relating to customer service and customer satisfaction in the customer-server exchange. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 179-187.
- Sverke, M., Hellgren, J., & Naswall, K., (2002). No security: A meta-analysis and review of job insecurity and its consequences. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 7, 242-264.
- Tansel, A. & Gazioglu, S., (2006). Job satisfaction in Britain: Individual and job related factors. *Applied Economics*, 8, 1163-1171.
- Tausig, M. & Fenwick, R., (2001). Unbinding time: Alternative work schedules and work-life balance. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, 22, 101-119.
- Tett, R.P., & Meyer, J.P., (1993). Job satisfaction, organizational commitment, turnover intention and turnover: Path analyses based on meta-analytic findings. *Personnel Psychology*, 46, 259-293.
- Tharenou, P., (1993). A test of reciprocal causality for absenteeism. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 14, 169-190.
- Tourangeau, A.E. & Cranley, L.A., (2006). Nurse intention to remain employed: Understanding and strengthening determinants. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 55(4), 497-509.

- Twenge, J.M., (2001). Changes in women's assertiveness in response to status and roles: a cross-temporal meta-analysis, 1931-1993. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81, 133-145.
- Twenge, J.M., & Campbell, S.M., (2008). Generational differences in psychological traits and their impact on the workplace. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 23, 862-877.
- Twenge, J.M., & Campbell, S.M., (2009). *The narcissism epidemic: Living in the age of entitlement*. New York: Free Press.
- Twenge, J.M. & Foster, J.D., (2010). Birth cohort increases in narcissistic personality traits among American college students, 1982-2009. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 1, 99-106.
- Twenge, J.M., (2010). A review of empirical evidence on generational differences in work attitudes. *Journal of Business and Psychology* 25(2), 201-210.
- Twenge, J.M., Campbell, S.M., & Hoffman, B.J., (2010). Generational differences in work values: leisure and extrinsic values increasing, social and intrinsic values decreasing. *Journal of Management (NY)* 36(5), 1117.
- U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, (2007). *National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 97*. Ohio State University.
- U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, (2013). *Economic news release: Employee tenure summary*. Retrieved from: <http://data.bls.gov/cgi-bin/print.pl/news.release/tenure.nr0.htm>.
- Wang, H. U. I., Law, K. S., Hackett, R. D., Wang, D., & Chen Z. X., (2005). Leader-member exchange as a mediator of the relationship between transformational leadership and followers' performance and organizational citizenship behavior. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 48, 420-432.
- Wanous, J.P., Reichers, A.E., & Hudy, M.J., (1997). Overall job satisfaction: How good are single item measures? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 247-252.
- Williams, C., (2008). Work-life balance of shift workers. *Perspectives*. Retrieved from: <http://www.statca.gc/pub/75-001-x/2008108/pdf/10677-eng.pdf>.
- Wong, M., Gardiner, E., Lang, W., & Coulon, L., (2008). Generational differences in personality and motivation: Do they exist and what are the implications for the workplace? *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 23, 878-890.