

More Alike Than Different: What Generations Value and How the Values Affect Employee Workplace Perceptions

Journal of Leadership &
Organizational Studies
2014, Vol. 21(3) 257–272
© The Authors 2014
Reprints and permissions:
sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav
DOI: 10.1177/1548051814529825
jlo.sagepub.com



Jennifer Mencl¹ and Scott W. Lester²

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to extend generations research by investigating similarities and differences regarding the importance generations place on the presence of various workplace characteristics. We hypothesized (1) that similarities in the importance of workplace factors between generations would be more prevalent than differences and (2) that the importance of the workplace factors would have consistently similar or different moderating effects among generations on the relationships between employee perceptions of the factors at their organizations and employee attitudes. As expected, results showed the generations were similar on 7 of the 10 work values examined. Findings also revealed similarities and differences between the generations for the factors as moderators, although more differences than similarities were present from these analyses. Implications of these findings as well as directions for future research are discussed.

Keywords

generations, work values, employee attitudes

Today's multigenerational workforce presents a number of opportunities and challenges for managers. With some employees choosing to work into their late 60s and 70s, four generational cohorts are currently working simultaneously. Three of these generations (i.e., Baby Boomers, Generation X, and Generation Y) have the opportunity to work with each other for another decade or more. Although this diversity of perspectives can assist companies in producing well thought-out decisions and increased responsiveness to customers, the diversity also presents complexities in the management of human resource policies and systems to meet employee needs if generations desire different things from their workplace environment.

In the past decade there has been much conjecture and some empirical work on generational differences, however, there is much left to learn (Parry & Urwin, 2011; Twenge, 2010). The current study seeks to replicate and expand upon research on generational differences by addressing two questions in particular: "Are the three prevalent generations in today's workforce actually more similar than different in what they desire in their workplace?" and "How do the similarities/differences in values influence the effects of employee perceptions of these organizational characteristics on attitudinal outcomes by generation?"

Researchers have expressed concern that little empirical research supports generational stereotypes associated with each cohort (e.g., Meriac, Woehr, & Banister, 2010; Macky,

Gardner, & Forsyth, 2008). Several studies have examined proposed generational differences for which findings support generational similarities. For example, Hansen and Leuty (2012) investigated various workplace values among Generation X, the Baby Boomers, and the Silent Generation (also known as Traditionalists), finding only three statistically significant differences out of a possible 20 between two or more generations. Similarly, Cennamo and Gardner (2008) found only two differences between generations for workplace values of the six values that were measured. Other research has compared actual generational differences with perceived generational differences and found that the number of actual generational differences was far fewer than the number of perceived differences (Lester, Standifer, Schultz, & Windsor, 2012). Given these findings, the first objective of the current study is to replicate and extend previous research findings that show similarities for the three youngest generations in the workforce—Generation Y, Generation X, and the Baby Boomers. The

¹University of Minnesota Duluth, Duluth, MN, USA

²University of Wisconsin–Eau Claire, Eau Claire, WI, USA

Corresponding Author:

Jennifer Mencl, Department of Management Studies, Labovitz School of Business and Economics, University of Minnesota Duluth, 1318 Kirby Drive, 365 LSBE, Duluth, MN 55812, USA.
Email: jmencl@d.umn.edu

current study also extends previous work by examining workplace characteristics associated with companies appearing on lists of “best places to work” rather than items that may be stereotypical by generation.

The second objective of the current study is to provide a better understanding of what these actual generational differences mean for employee outcomes. Previous research examining the effects of generation on employee attitudes, such as job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intention has shown few differences (Benson & Brown, 2011; Cennamo & Gardner, 2008; Costanza, Badger, Fraser, Severt, & Gade, 2012; Deal, Stawiski, Graves, Gentry, Weber, & Ruderman, 2013). We extend the exploration of the ways in which generation influences attitudinal outcomes through a person–organization (P-O) fit perspective and principles of value–percept theory that includes the moderating effect of each workplace value on the relationship between perceptions of the characteristic within the organization and each attitude. By examining the role of generations in this manner, the study provides a more complete perspective of managing employee attitudes beyond the existing literature.

We begin our discussion with a brief review of the generally accepted time periods associated with the three prominent generations in today’s workforce. We then provide rationale for which “best places to work” criteria we would expect to see differences and which criteria we would expect to see similarities across generations. After testing whether generations had an influence on employee attitudinal outcomes, we discuss the practical implications of the findings as well as directions for future research.

Literature Review and Hypotheses

Although some discrepancy exists among researchers with respect to generation cut-offs, Baby Boomers are generally viewed as individuals who were born between the years of 1946 and 1964. Generation X was born between the years of 1965 and 1978, and Generation Y was born between the years of 1979 and 2000 (Smola & Sutton, 2002). The belief is that the individuals who grow up during the same time period are influenced by social and historic events and contexts (e.g., the Korean War, The Vietnam War, the end of the Cold War, economic recessions) that shape their values and attitudes in a way that differentiates one generational cohort from another (Jurkiewicz & Brown, 1998; Parry & Urwin, 2011; Sessa, Kabacoff, Deal, & Brown, 2007). However, academic evidence regarding generational differences is mixed (Parry & Urwin, 2011), with much research showing more similarities between generations than differences as previously described. As noted above, such generational differences are more likely to be perceived than actual (Lester et al., 2012).

Characteristics of Interest (“Best Places to Work”)

Previous studies investigating generational differences have included a broad range of work-related items, such as perceptions of workplace factors and work values. A study by Benson and Brown (2011) examined nine organizational and work variables including job security, pay-level satisfaction, satisfaction with benefits, promotional opportunities, resource inadequacy, role ambiguity, role conflict, coworker support, and supervisor support. The Work Values Questionnaire and Work Values Scale were used by Cennamo and Gardner (2008) to measure extrinsic, intrinsic, altruistic, status, freedom, and social factors in the workplace. Hansen and Leuty (2012) used the Minnesota Importance Questionnaire in their research that measured 20 value facets categorized into the overarching values of achievement, comfort, status, altruism, safety, and autonomy. Smola and Sutton (2002) examined three work values that included desirability of work outcomes, pride in craftsmanship, and moral importance of work.

This study was designed with the intent of examining similarities and differences between generations using characteristics associated with “best places to work” lists (e.g., *Fortune*’s top 100 companies, *HR Magazine*’s 50 Best Small and Medium Companies). These specific characteristics were chosen for a data collection project being used to identify organizations in a community that were considered good places to work for “young professionals.” Although the practitioners involved in the project expected to see differences between generations for most factors, the project provided an avenue to extend previous academic research by showing actual differences versus similarities using “best places to work” characteristics across generations.

The 10 workplace factors selected from the “best places to work” lists included: teamwork and collaboration, flexible work arrangements, a challenging job, involvement in decision making, a financially rewarding job, work–life balance, a climate of diversity, continuous learning, career advancement, and immediate feedback and recognition. While the assumption is made that all of these characteristics are desirable regardless of employee age, we propose that the premium placed on a few of these characteristics will vary by generation. Next, we discuss the four items where we expect to see actual differences.

Actual Differences and Similarities Expected

Diversity Climate. Baby Boomers grew up in a time when the male was often the sole or main breadwinner for the family and when the workplace was more heavily weighted toward a single race (Caucasians). In recent decades, we have seen significant shifts in the demographic makeup of the workforce. For example, with respect to women and minorities

in the workplace 50% of women aged 25 to 54 years were in the U.S. workforce in 1970 compared with 75% in 2005, and in 2005, 77% of African American women, 70% of Asian women, and 65% of Hispanic women were in the workforce in the United States (Mosisa & Hipple, 2006). In addition to increased gender and racial/ethnic diversity, globalization has affected the diversity of nationalities in the workforce. Younger employees have also grown up during a time in which gay, lesbian, and transgender issues have received a great deal of attention with respect to workplace diversity and gay marriage has been legalized. Furthermore, the passage of the Americans with Disabilities Act in 1990 is credited to have positively affected the number of individuals with disabilities in the workplace (Smola & Sutton, 2002). These shifts over time that have led to a greater diversification of the workforce have enabled Generation X and, even more so, Generation Y to interact and collaborate with a more diverse workplace than their predecessors. Research findings have shown Generation Y to be considerably more comfortable with diversity (78% of survey respondents) compared with the Baby Boomers (27% of respondents; Hewlett, Sherbin, & Sumberg, 2009). Thus, we expect Generation Y to place a higher importance on a diverse climate compared with other generations and the Baby Boomer generation to report the lowest rating.

Continuous Learning. By being in an environment that supports and fosters ongoing learning, individuals are able to pursue opportunities that ensure their continued employability. Younger generations have grown up in a context where job security was far from assured and downsizing became an accepted management practice (Gowing, Kraft, & Quick, 1998). Therefore, to maintain marketability, younger employees are more likely than older employees to participate in training programs to develop new skills. In addition, a recent review presents research that suggests younger employees are more motivated and willing to engage in continuous learning compared with older employees (Jain & Martindale, 2012). One explanation is that training is less important for the careers of Baby Boomers who have already received promotions to levels in the organizational hierarchy that have satisfied their need for growth. In contrast, members of Generations X and Y are more likely to be seeking promotions and value skill development, especially Generation Y (Wong, Gardiner, Lang, & Coulon, 2008). Another reason that older employees are less motivated to learn is that levels of cognitive processing naturally decline over time and cause learning to occur more slowly. As learning becomes more difficult, individuals are less likely to participate in training activities (Jain & Martindale, 2012). These circumstances taken collectively suggest younger generations will place greater value on a workplace that allows continuous learning compared with older generations, with the greatest importance identified by Generation Y.

Career Advancement. Previous research findings have shown that the number of promotions, as well as the speed of promotions, contribute to career satisfaction for all generations, yet the statistical effect size for career advancement was significantly greater for Generation Y compared with the other generations studied (Dries, Pepermans, & De Kerpel, 2008). Although perceptions of career success are driven by promotions, the importance of promotions becomes less important for employees as they near retirement. For example, members of the Baby Boomer generation who are near retirement age are less likely to be seeking career advancement opportunities compared to employees with decades of working years ahead of them. In addition, a stronger desire for growth arises in part from the perceived expectation associated with Generation Y of finding a perfect job early in their careers as opposed to norms associated with older generations in which individuals should pay their dues prior to any type of advancement (Arnett, 2004). Therefore, we expect career advancement to differ across generations, being valued most by Generation Y and least by the Baby Boomer generation.

Immediate Feedback and Recognition. Generation Y is sometimes referred to as the “me-generation” based on their desire for instant gratification and growing up in a culture in which everyone received a trophy. In addition, Generation Y grew up in a technologically driven environment that has made them accustomed to immediate access to information and instant communication with online connections (e.g., texting, social media outlets; Steele & Gordon, 2006). At work, this translates to a desire to receive detailed feedback from their supervisors on a frequent basis (Crumpacker & Crumpacker, 2007; Herman & Eckel, 2002; Westerman & Yamamura, 2007). Generation X has also been noted to want immediate feedback (Wong et al., 2008), although not as frequently as Generation Y (Glass, 2007; Martin, 2005). In contrast to younger generations, Baby Boomers do not generally share the same need for constant feedback (Glass, 2007). Thus, we expect Generation Y to value immediate feedback and recognition the most among the three generations, followed by Generation X, and then the Baby Boomers.

To summarize the four “best places to work” characteristics for which differences across generations are expected, we hypothesize the following:

Hypothesis 1a: The extent to which employees value diversity, continuous learning, career advancement, and immediate feedback and recognition will vary by generation, with the greatest importance noted by Generation Y and the least importance noted by Baby Boomers.

While we expect generational differences to exist on the aforementioned characteristics, we anticipate a greater number of similarities across the generations in terms of the

value placed on other work factors. In the subsequent paragraphs, we discuss the expectation of *no* differences existing between generations on the remaining six workplace characteristics that are summarized into four categories.

Work–Life Balance and Flexible Work Arrangements. As organizations require employees to work more hours and maintain schedules that fall outside the traditional “9 to 5” realm, flexible work arrangements have been a typical practice associated with work–life balance initiatives (Eikhof, Warhurst, & Haunschild, 2007). Generation X and Generation Y have been noted to place a high value on work–life balance (Cennamo & Gardner, 2008; Glass, 2007). And, although Baby Boomers are often known for their strong work ethic and placing a priority on work (Fogg, 2009), they also face nonwork demands such as elder-care responsibilities that make work–life balance a desirable workplace characteristic (Hill, Hawkins, Ferris, & Weitzman, 2001). Recent research comparing Baby Boomers with Generation Y shows similar results for the generations with respect to the importance of work–life balance and flexible work arrangements (Hewlett et al., 2009). Therefore, we expect all three generations to place a similar level of importance on the balance between work and nonwork aspects of their lives regardless of what constitutes one’s need for “balance” (e.g., time for hobbies, time to attend children’s activities, time with grandchildren, time to take care of aging parents). We also anticipate that the three generations will place a similar level of importance on having flexible work arrangements as a related aspect of achieving a good work–life balance.

Involvement in Decision Making and a Challenging Job. Decentralized decision-making practices in organizations are associated with employee involvement practices that are tied to high-performance work systems (Evans & Davis, 2005). Employee involvement programs, including management-driven initiatives, open-door policies, employee surveys, participative management, employee task forces, and self-managed work teams, all contribute to healthy organizations that realize positive levels of job satisfaction and low levels of turnover (Grawitch, Ledford, Ballard, Barber, 2009; Grawitch, Trares, & Kohler, 2007). When employees become increasingly involved in making decisions that affect the work they do, employees are more empowered (Butts, Vandenberg, DeJoy, Schaffer, & Wilson, 2009) and their jobs become more challenging and more enriched (Luna-Arocas & Camps, 2008).

Job enrichment through autonomy is a well-known predictor in Hackman and Oldham’s (1976) job characteristics model that has been empirically tested across generations for several decades. Meta-analyses published in the 1980s examining autonomy and participative decision-making, which involved Baby Boomers as study participants,

showed autonomy was the characteristic most strongly correlated to job satisfaction (Loher, Noe, Moeller, & Fitzgerald, 1985) and was significantly correlated to satisfaction, commitment, and job involvement (Spector, 1986). In recent research that includes Baby Boomers and Generation X as participants (mean age 34 years), the presence of the job characteristics, including autonomy, was positively related to intrinsic motivation and goal commitment (Piccolo & Colquitt, 2006). A study specific to Generation Y employees also showed autonomy contributing to the measure of job characteristics that significantly predicted job satisfaction (Kim, Knight, & Crutsinger, 2009). Based on existing literature, we propose that employees from all generations are likely to desire employee involvement in decision making and, as such, more challenging jobs.

Teamwork and Collaboration. Individuals, regardless of generation, hope to have colleagues who they can get along with and who will support them. Cennamo and Gardner (2008) found supporting evidence for this expectation as their “social” category of work values, which related to interactions with others at work, was the most strongly endorsed by Baby Boomers, Generation X, and Generation Y. Although the nature of experiences with teams may vary, all generations are aware that team-based organizations are a part of today’s work environment. Researchers attribute teamwork as a core value of Baby Boomers (e.g., Zemke, 2001). They also recognize that Generation X experienced the advent of widespread downsizing practices in their early careers, and along with that, the realization that in order to do more with less it would be important to function collaboratively. Generation Y employees have gone through school completing projects that were often organized around teams and knowing the value of being supported by those around them as their careers advance (e.g., Tulgan, 2011).

Recent research that examined perceived and actual generational differences provides additional support for similar ratings across generations for the importance of teamwork and collaboration. Lester et al. (2012) found that while there were significant *perceived* differences in the value each generation placed on teamwork (i.e., generations tended to underestimate the value that members of different generations placed on a workplace characterized by teamwork and collaboration) there were no *actual* differences in the desire for teamwork. We expect to replicate the finding in this previous study regarding the actual preferences for teamwork that were similar across generations.

A Financially Rewarding Job. The final characteristic included from the “best places to work” lists is the value placed on a financially rewarding job. Generation-specific research that examined the contribution of salary perceptions to career

success showed nearly identical effect sizes for Generation Y ($\eta_p^2 = .74$), Generation X ($\eta_p^2 = .71$), and the Baby Boomers ($\eta_p^2 = .71$; Dries et al., 2008). Although employees may have different expectations regarding their absolute compensation, employees in general want to feel as though they are adequately rewarded by the organization (Pfeffer & Veiga, 1999). As such, we expect that the importance placed on having a financially rewarding job will be rated similarly across generations.

Collectively, we expect the workplace characteristics examined in this study to demonstrate more similarities than differences across the three generations with respect to the perceived degree of importance. We offer the following hypothesis regarding the proposed similarities:

Hypothesis 1b: The extent to which employees value work–life balance, flexible work arrangements, involvement in decision making, a challenging job, teamwork, and a financially rewarding job will not vary by generation.

The Role of Generational Differences on Attitudinal Outcomes

P-O fit scholars would contend that employee perceptions regarding the extent to which their workplace values are met are more important than solely examining the importance placed on these various work factors. P-O fit refers to the extent to which what a person values in the workplace is consistent with the person's perceptions of how well that aspect is provided by the employer (Kristof, 1996). Research shows that the level of congruency between what is valued and what is provided is positively related to various employee attitudes, including job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intention (Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, & Johnson, 2005).

Although published findings regarding generations and P-O fit are scarce, a study of organizations in New Zealand showed similarities for the effects of values–supplies discrepancies between generations on four work aspects: intrinsic fit, altruism fit, social fit, and freedom fit (Cennamo & Gardner, 2008). The same study revealed two differences in the discrepancy scores between generations: one difference existed between Generation X and the Baby Boomers for extrinsic fit, and the other difference was present between Generation Y and Baby Boomers for status fit. Drawing on these findings, the second purpose of this article was to further explore values across generations by investigating the effects of those values on employee perceptions and attitudes. In doing so, we examine employee attitudes that are common to both the P-O fit and generations literatures, which include job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intention.

To more fully understand the combined effects of values and perceptions of workplace characteristics present in employees' organizations, we apply value–percept theory (Locke, 1976). According to value–percept theory, the discrepancy between what a person wants and what a person receives influences job satisfaction, and this relationship is moderated by the importance the person places on the particular item. Therefore, we propose that perceptions of workplace factors will influence employee attitudes, and the relationships will be moderated by the importance of the related items. In addition, based on the generation research summarized above and the previous hypotheses, we expect the moderation effects to vary by generation for the importance items in which a statistically significant difference is found. For all other items, the moderating effect of importance should be similar across generations:

Hypothesis 2: The relationship between the level of work factor fulfillment from an organization and the employee's attitudinal responses will be greater when the importance of that factor is high versus low. These moderating effects will be consistent with the generational similarities and differences in the importance items as specified in Hypotheses 1a and 1b.

Method

Procedure

A Midwestern community's local Chamber of Commerce members were contacted with a request to allow their employees to participate in a data collection project for the Chamber. The intent of the project was to identify organizations in the community that were considered good places to work for "young professionals." The project included an employee survey involving a variety of questions regarding work-related items that all the organizations' employees received. The eight Chamber members that agreed to the request represented government, health care, manufacturing, technology, real estate, and nonprofit organizations.

The current study's lead author, who was referred to throughout the project as the "data collection coordinator," designed the survey and managed the data collection process. The organizational representatives responsible for the survey communications distributed the participation request to their respective employees. The project was designed to draw inferences about young professionals in the community, but all employees were encouraged to complete the survey in order to provide complete comparative data for organizational leaders.

Messages were sent internally so that the organizations maintained control of employee contact information. The initial message included a link to an online version of the survey as well as information that a hard-copy version was

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics by Generation.

	Generation Y	Generation X	Baby Boomers
<i>N</i>	88	144	273
Gender (%)			
Male	24	35	32
Female	76	65	69
Mean age in years (<i>SD</i>)	26.99 (3.03)	38.50 (3.88)	53.75 (4.53)
Mean tenure in years in the organization (<i>SD</i>)	3.01 (2.44)	7.68 (5.77)	15.94 (5.77)
Employment status (%)			
Full-time	81	84	82
Part-time	19	16	18

available on request. In places where employees did not have regular access to e-mail, messages with the hard-copy survey version were distributed.

To ensure that employee responses were anonymous, the data collection coordinator hosted the online survey, and all completed hard copies of the survey were sent directly to the coordinator in self-addressed postage-paid envelopes. Employees were also informed that their responses would be combined with responses of other employees in reports so that no one would be singled out or identified.

In addition to the items asking subjects to assess the importance they placed on each work-related factor, the survey included a series of related questions about the employees' perceptions of the work factors in their organizations. These questions were used to determine how well the organizations provided study participants with each work-related factor that was rated for its importance, which is consistent with previous research (Cennamo & Gardner, 2008). Scales were selected from published organizational research based on alignment with one or more importance items and reliability statistics. The scales included diversity climate (Pugh, Dietz, Brief, & Wiley, 2008), employee involvement climate (Riordan, Vandenberg, & Richardson, 2005), work design (Morgeson & Humphrey, 2006), work-life balance (Hill et al., 2001; Virick, Lilly, & Casper, 2007), and pay and benefits satisfaction (Heneman & Schwab, 1985). Finally, in order to establish the extent to which the importance items and perceptions of the work-related factors were related to employee attitudes, the survey included measures of job satisfaction (Mitchell, Holtom, Lee, Sablinski, & Erez, 2001), organizational commitment (Allen & Meyer, 1990), and turnover intention (Dupre & Day, 2007).

Sample

In total, 653 employees aged 18 years or older responded to the survey. Age was associated with the year born to classify respondents into generations using Smola and Sutton's (2002) categories. Of the total respondents, 135 were deleted from the data set due to missing data for the "age"

demographic variable. An additional 13 cases representing the Silent Generation (born in 1945 or before) were omitted from the data set due to the small group sample size, resulting in a final sample size of 505 for data analysis. The remaining three generations included Generation Y (born 1979-1994; $n = 88$, 17% of the sample), Generation X (born 1965-1978; $n = 144$, 29% of the sample), and Baby Boomers (born 1946-1964; $n = 273$, 54% of the sample). Demographic information by generation is provided in Table 1.

Measures

Importance of Work-Related Factors (Values). Respondents were given a list of various work-related factors noted to be important to Generations X and Y (Cennamo & Gardner, 2008; Smola & Sutton, 2002) as well as factors related to best places to work (Fulmer, Gerhart, & Scott, 2003; Joo & Mclean, 2006). The list included 10 items: (1) an organization that values diversity, (2) teamwork in the workplace, (3) flexible work arrangements, (4) getting immediate feedback and recognition from my supervisor, (5) work-life balance, (6) having a job that challenges me, (7) a company that provides continual training and development opportunities, (8) that I am involved in decision-making processes that affect my work, (9) being financially rewarded for the work I do, and (10) career advancement opportunities within the company. Participants were instructed to indicate the degree to which each item was important on a scale from 1 (*not important at all*) to 7 (*a must have*), regardless of what the person's organization currently offered.

Perceptions of Work Factors in the Organization. Eight measures were used as variables for participants' perceptions of various work factors in their current organizations: diversity climate, social support, feedback and recognition, work-life balance, training and development, decision-making involvement, pay and raise satisfaction, and promotion opportunity (perception measures for flexible work arrangements and having a job that challenges me were not included on the survey since these items were closely related to work-life balance and decision-making

Table 2. Means and Standard Deviations for the Importance Items by Generation.

Variable	Generation Y (<i>n</i> = 86)		Generation X (<i>n</i> = 142)		Baby Boomers (<i>n</i> = 270)	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
An organization that values diversity	5.69	1.17	5.04	1.51	5.43	1.27
Teamwork in the workplace	6.34	0.90	6.17	1.01	6.27	0.82
Flexible work arrangements (e.g., flextime, job sharing, compressed work week)	6.00	1.27	5.88	1.06	5.82	1.04
Getting immediate feedback and recognition from my supervisor	5.73	1.05	5.43	1.11	5.48	1.00
Work–life balance	6.30	1.03	6.17	0.93	6.14	0.88
Having a job that challenges me	6.08	0.83	5.95	0.91	5.97	0.92
A company that provides continual training and development opportunities	6.18	0.97	5.95	1.02	5.95	0.95
That I am involved in decision-making processes that affect my work	6.15	0.93	6.03	1.03	6.16	0.94
Being financially rewarded for the work I do	6.14	0.95	6.12	0.99	6.09	0.87
Career advancement opportunities within the company	6.19	1.06	5.98	0.98	5.83	0.93

involvement measures, respectively). Survey items were selected based on face validity to create scales for the variables, and then the set of items for each variable was entered into exploratory factor analyses to ensure that the items loaded on a single factor. For example, five items of diversity climate were selected for the workplace perception measure (related importance item: an organization that values diversity); all five survey items loaded on one factor. The complete listing of scales and items are provided in the appendix. Items were measured on 5-point scales, and reliabilities ranged from $\alpha = .84$ to $.94$.

Job Satisfaction. Three items from Mitchell et al. (2001) were used to measure job satisfaction: “all in all, I am satisfied with my job,” “in general, I don’t like my job” (reverse coded), and “in general, I like working here.” Responses ranged from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). Reliability of the measure was $\alpha = .90$.

Organizational Commitment. Affective, normative, and continuance dimensions of organizational commitment were measured using Allen and Meyer’s (1990) scales, which consisted of eight items per variable measured on a 5-point Likert-type scale (1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*). Sample items include “I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization” (affective), “if I got another offer for a better job elsewhere I would not feel it was right to leave my organization” (normative), and “I am not afraid of what might happen if I quit my job without having a another one lined up” (continuance; reverse scored). Reliabilities of the scales were affective $\alpha = .89$, normative $\alpha = .80$, and continuance $\alpha = .76$.

Turnover Intention. Three items were used to measure turnover intention (Dupre & Day, 2007): “I will stay with this company for as long as I can” (reverse scored), “I will leave this company if I receive another job offer,” and “I plan to leave this organization within the next year.” The items were measured using a 5-point Likert-type scale (1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*), and high scores indicate a greater likelihood to leave the organization compared with low scores. Scale reliability was $\alpha = .79$.

Results

The means and standard deviations for each of the importance items by generation are provided in Table 2. Table 3 shows the means, standard deviations, and correlations for all variables measured.

A descriptive discriminant analysis (DDA) was conducted to determine whether generational differences among the importance items were present and to identify the items where differences were present. Using DDA to analyze the perceived importance items collectively minimizes the risk for Type I error (Sherry, 2006). Since the number of DDA functions is equivalent to the number of groups minus one, the analysis resulted in two discriminant functions. Function 1 explained 7.4% of the variance in the data, which was statistically significant, Wilks’s $\lambda = .926$; $\chi^2(20) = 37.79$; $p < .01$. Function 2 explained 3.2% of the variance in the data, which was statistically significant at a marginal level, Wilks’s $\lambda = .968$; $\chi^2(9) = 16.08$; $p = .07$. The effect sizes showed that the importance items contributed to group differences more strongly for Function 1 than Function 2. Both functions were deemed sufficient for further interpretation.

Table 3. Variable Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations.

Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25
1. Generation	2.37	0.76	—																								
2. Gender	1.69	0.46	-.04	—																							
3. Imp: Diversity	5.36	1.34	-.02	.23**	—																						
4. Imp: Teamwork	6.25	0.89	-.01	.14**	.51**	—																					
5. Imp: Flexible work arrangements	5.88	1.09	-.06	.13**	.37**	.44**	—																				
6. Imp: Immediate feedback and recognition	5.51	1.04	-.07	.04	.38**	.42**	.35**	—																			
7. Imp: Work-life balance	6.18	0.92	-.06	.01	.34**	.52**	.49**	.43**	—																		
8. Imp: Challenge	5.98	0.90	-.03	.07	.36**	.51**	.41**	.45**	.55**	—																	
9. Imp: Training and development	5.97	0.97	-.06	.10*	.37**	.53**	.44**	.53**	.49**	.62**	—																
10. Imp: Decision making	6.12	0.91	.03	.03	.33**	.43**	.42**	.46**	.48**	.57**	.58**	—															
11. Imp: Financial rewards	6.11	0.92	-.02	-.06	.18**	.39**	.46**	.40**	.51**	.42**	.42**	.43**	—														
12. Imp: Career advancement	5.93	0.98	-.14**	-.04	.23**	.38**	.39**	.48**	.44**	.52**	.59**	.53**	.61**	—													
13. Diversity climate	3.79	0.75	-.21**	-.06	.18**	.22**	.15**	.13**	.15**	.14**	.13**	.06	.05	.07	—												
14. Social support	4.08	0.66	-.09*	.05	.19**	.18**	.10**	.02	.06	.08	.06	.04	.01	.00	.55**	—											
15. Work-life balance	3.71	0.82	-.06	.10*	.04	.11*	.00	.07	-.04	.08	-.01	.01	-.04	-.02	.27**	.29**	—										
16. Feedback and recognition	3.35	0.93	-.09*	.07	.21**	.17**	.14**	.12**	.11*	.13**	.10	.06	.04	.03	.61**	.61**	.30**	—									
17. Training and development	3.68	0.94	-.15**	.02	.19**	.18**	.16**	.12**	.07	.13**	.09	.06	.10	.07	.53**	.46**	.30**	.61**	—								
18. Decision making involvement	4.08	0.73	.02	-.03	.19**	.19**	.12**	.06	.14	.17**	.09	.17**	.05	.03	.49**	.54**	.28**	.58**	.46**	—							
19. Pay and raise satisfaction	3.42	0.93	.12**	.04	.08	.09	.05	.04	.04	.07	.01	.11*	-.15**	-.13**	.23**	.28**	.18**	.35**	.27**	.34**	—						
20. Promotion opportunities	2.79	1.16	-.17**	-.08	.14**	.15**	.10*	.14**	.13**	.16**	.06	.11*	.10	.08	.51**	.40**	.21**	.65**	.49**	.46**	.32**	—					
21. Job satisfaction	4.18	0.75	.06	.11*	.16**	.18**	.11*	.11*	.02	.12**	.08	.09	.04	-.03	.42**	.56**	.44**	.53**	.47**	.57**	.36**	.33**	—				
22. Affective OC	3.55	0.76	.03	.09	.19**	.18**	.13**	.09	.06	.13**	.10*	.14**	-.02	.00	.50**	.61**	.30**	.62**	.53**	.56**	.42**	.44**	.73**	—			
23. Normative OC	3.10	0.59	.07	.03	.03	.13**	-.02	.10*	.07	.05	.04	.03	-.03	.01	.24**	.24**	.16**	.21**	.23**	.14**	.15**	.15**	.35**	.42**	—		
24. Continuance OC	3.48	0.69	.07	.12**	-.05	.02	.00	.01	-.02	-.06	-.05	.05	.04	.04	-.11*	-.12**	-.06	-.18**	-.18**	-.17**	-.02	-.14**	-.07	-.09	.16**	—	
25. Turnover intention	1.98	0.87	-.16**	-.16**	-.08	-.11*	-.03	.00	.01	-.01	.01	-.05	.03	.11*	-.32**	-.40**	-.40**	-.36**	-.34**	-.36**	-.44**	-.19**	-.65**	-.59**	-.44**	-.08	—

Note. Imp: = importance item; OC = organizational commitment.

* $p \leq .05$. ** $p \leq .01$.

Table 4. Standardized Discriminant Function and Structure Coefficients.

Scale	Function coefficient	Structure coefficient (r_s)	Variance (r_s^2 , %)
Function 1			
An organization that values diversity	-.227	-.131	1.72
Teamwork in the workplace	-.208	-.042	.18
Flexible work arrangements (e.g., flextime, job sharing, compressed work week)	.332	.247	.10
Getting immediate feedback and recognition from my supervisor	.162	.212	4.49
Work-life balance	.366	.243	5.90
Having a job that challenges me	-.057	.113	1.28
A company that provides continual training and development opportunities	.045	.203	4.12
That I am involved in decision-making processes that affect my work	-.779	-.191	3.65
Being financially rewarded for the work I do	-.511	.102	1.04
Career advancement opportunities within the company	1.099	.598	35.76
Function 2			
An organization that values diversity	.978	.920	84.64
Teamwork in the workplace	-.092	.353	12.46
Flexible work arrangements (e.g., flextime, job sharing, compressed work week)	-.177	.153	2.34
Getting immediate feedback and recognition from my supervisor	.279	.492	24.21
Work-life balance	.009	.217	4.71
Having a job that challenges me	-.112	.244	5.95
A company that provides continual training and development opportunities	-.105	.295	8.70
That I am involved in decision-making processes that affect my work	.026	.283	8.01
Being financially rewarded for the work I do	-.252	.020	.04
Career advancement opportunities within the company	.285	.276	7.62

The eigenvalues for each function indicate the extent to which the function discriminated between groups. In the current sample, the eigenvalues are relatively low ($\lambda_1 = .045$, $\lambda_2 = .033$), indicating that neither function discriminated well between groups. However, further evaluation of the results, including structure coefficients, standardized function coefficients, and the group centroids, provides specific information regarding where differences exist. A structure coefficient represents the bivariate correlation between the item and the function. The squared structure coefficient is the percent of variance the item accounts for in the discriminant function score. The standardized function coefficients are akin to beta coefficients in regression, providing the relative contribution of each item to the discriminant variables created in DDA.

Examination of these values, which are summarized in Table 4, reveals that *career advancement opportunities* was the only item to considerably contribute to Function 1. The standardized function coefficient of *that I am involved in decision-making processes that affect my work* is high whereas its structure coefficient is low. This inconsistency indicates that the item is likely a suppressor variable that is

influencing the discriminant variable through another item. Since the standardized function coefficient of *career advancement opportunities within the company* is greater than 1.0, these two items are closely related. The relationship between the two items is not surprising given that individuals who want to be involved in decision making are likely to desire career advancement opportunities as well. However, in terms of the results, the overinflated contribution of the decision-making item to the variable indicates that the only item for Function 1 in which group differences exist is the importance of career advancement.

The items contributing to Function 2, listed in order of importance, included *an organization that values diversity*, *getting immediate feedback and recognition from my supervisor*, and *teamwork in the workplace*. Function 2 statistics show the standardized function coefficient for teamwork in the workplace is close to zero, which indicates that the item does not contribute sufficiently to the discriminant variable. Therefore, although the item contributes somewhat to group differences as determined by the variance explained by the item, the effect of the item on the group centroids is minimal.

The group centroids are the means of the discriminant variables for each generation, which tell us the extent to which the groups possess the characteristics that comprise the functions. For Function 1, Generation Y had the highest group centroid ($M = .293$), which is followed by Generation X ($M = .188$) and the Baby Boomers ($M = -.192$). These results indicate that career advancement is more important for Generation Y than for Generation X, and there is an even greater difference between Generation Y and the Baby Boomers. On Function 2, Generation Y had the highest group centroid ($M = .309$) whereas the Baby Boomers was the next highest ($M = .027$) and Generation X had the lowest ($M = -.239$). This finding suggests that Generation Y values diversity and immediate feedback and recognition the most, and Generation X values these work-related factors the least.

Taken together, the DDA results revealed significant generational differences for the importance of career advancement that contributed to Function 1 and marginally significant generational differences for diversity and immediate feedback and recognition that contributed to Function 2. Although Hypothesis 1a was supported for three of the four criteria for which differences were expected, career advancement was the only item that resulted in the expected pattern of differences with Generation Y as the highest and the Baby Boomers as the lowest. Therefore, Hypothesis 1a received partial support. Hypothesis 1b was strongly supported in terms of the characteristics where there were no generational differences.

Given the results of Hypothesis 1, we would expect to see similar variations in the moderation effect of importance on the relationships between perceptions of work factors and attitudinal outcomes specified by Hypothesis 2. Specifically, differences in the moderation effects by generation should be present for the career advancement, diversity, and feedback and recognition importance items. Moderation was investigated using stepwise hierarchical regression analyses in which the continuous predictor variables were centered prior to creating the interaction terms (Baron & Kenny, 1986), and gender was used as a control in the first step of the model. The data set was also split by group to make comparisons between the generations for each moderating effect. The results from the third step of the analyses in which the interaction term is entered into the model are summarized in Table 5.

The results reveal different patterns between the generations regarding the ways in which perceptions of work factors in one's workplace may influence attitudinal outcomes regardless of generational differences of the importance placed on the work-related items. First, for the items for which we would expect to see generational differences, only the *importance of career advancement opportunities within the company* displayed meaningful differences among moderating effects across generations. The importance item did not moderate the relationship between

promotion opportunity and the attitudinal outcomes for Generation Y, two relationships were significantly moderated for the Baby Boomers, and four relationships were significantly moderated for Generation X. The diversity importance item moderated one relationship between diversity climate and an outcome variable for Generation Y (continuance organizational commitment) and one relationship for the Baby Boomers (normative organizational commitment, at a marginal level). No differences in the moderating effects for the generations were found for the *getting immediate feedback and recognition from my supervisor* importance item.

In contrast, we did not expect generational differences to be present among moderating effects for the other importance items. However, different trends in the moderation effects emerged for the importance item related to *training and development opportunities* across the three generations and *being involved in decision-making processes* that differentiated the Baby Boomers from the other two generations. Findings also showed a different moderating effect for the importance of *work-life balance* item. For Generation Y, the item moderated the relationship between perceived work-life balance within the organization and continuance organizational commitment, and for the Baby Boomers the item marginally moderated the effect on affective organizational commitment; no moderating effect was found for Generation X. Given the results, we conclude Hypothesis 2 is somewhat supported, but we find as much meaningfulness in the nonsignificant findings as the statistically significant findings. Our interpretations of the results are discussed in greater detail in the next section.

Discussion

The current study contributes to organizational literature by replicating and extending previous research concerning generational values. Consistent with extant research, the present study's findings demonstrated that generations share more similarities than differences regarding the extent to which work factors are important (e.g., Cennamo & Gardner, 2008; Hansen & Leuty, 2012; Lester et al., 2012). The only three value differences found included career advancement opportunities, diversity climate, and immediate recognition and feedback.

In addition, generational differences were found with respect to the ways that values affected the relationships between perceived fulfillment of work factors and attitudinal outcomes. These differences were most evident with respect to career advancement opportunities within the company, training and development opportunities, and being involved in decision-making processes affecting one's work. By examining relationships between the variables using value-percept theory and a P-O fit perspective, the research provides a novel lens in which to extend organizational research on generations.

Table 5. Moderation Results from Hierarchical Regression Analyses for the Interaction of Perceived Work Factors and Importance Items on Attitudinal Outcomes by Generation.

Workplace perception × Importance item	Dependent variable	Generation Y	Generation X	Baby Boomers
Diversity climate ×	JS	-.01	.00	-.03
An organization that values diversity	AOC	.03	.02	-.03
	NOC	.07	-.11	.10 [†]
	COC	.33**	-.02	-.03
	T/O I	-.16	.02	-.07
Social support ×	JS	.16	-.08	.02
Teamwork in the workplace	AOC	.03	.00	.03
	NOC	-.22 [†]	.04	-.11 [†]
	COC	-.01	-.06	-.03
	T/O I	-.16	.09	-.05
Feedback and recognition ×	JS	.08	.04	.08
Getting immediate feedback and recognition from my supervisor	AOC	.05	-.02	.04
	NOC	.02	.05	-.06
	COC	-.07	-.05	.07
	T/O I	-.13	-.05	-.04
Work-life balance ×	JS	.13	-.02	.05
Work-life balance	AOC	-.02	.06	.11 [†]
	NOC	.03	.12	-.05
	COC	.30*	-.04	.03
	T/O I	-.05	.07	.06
Training and development ×	JS	-.09	.16*	.16**
A company that provides continual training and development opportunities	AOC	-.18 [†]	.18*	.15**
	NOC	-.07	.02	.10
	COC	.25 [†]	.18*	-.03
	T/O I	-.05	-.20*	-.16**
Decision-making involvement ×	JS	.03	.11	.16**
That I am involved in decision-making processes that affect my work	AOC	-.06	-.01	.14**
	NOC	-.09	.06	.09
	COC	.13	-.09	-.05
	T/O I	.02	-.06	-.18**
Pay and raise satisfaction ×	JS	.01	-.05	-.01
Being financially rewarded for the work I do	AOC	-.02	.04	-.01
	NOC	-.22 [†]	.13	-.02
	COC	-.13	-.01	-.06
	T/O I	.09	-.04	-.04
Promotion opportunity ×	JS	.08	.22**	.14*
Career advancement opportunities within the company	AOC	-.01	.14 [†]	.13*
	NOC	.00	.10	.05
	COC	.13	.22*	.00
	T/O I	-.03	-.26**	-.06

Note. Values are beta coefficients for Step 3 of each regression model (moderation effect). JS = job satisfaction; AOC = affective organizational commitment; NOC = normative organizational commitment; COC = continuance organizational commitment; T/O I = turnover intention.

[†] $p \leq .10$. * $p \leq .05$. ** $p \leq .01$.

Overall, the findings suggest that the most significant generational difference lies with career advancement opportunities that are more strongly valued by Generation Y compared with Generation X and the Baby Boomer generation.

Career advancement was not only valued to a greater extent by Generation Y, but the moderating effects of the career advancement value item were different as well. Interestingly, however, importance was not a moderator of the relationship

between employee perceptions of promotion opportunities and any of the attitudinal outcomes for Generation Y. Instead, statistically significant moderating effects were found for the career advancement value for Generation X and the Baby Boomer generation.

Furthermore, the training and development value and the decision-making value were statistically significant moderators of the respective measures of the employee perceptions and their attitudes for Generation X (training and development item) and Baby Boomers (both value items) whereas no moderating effect was found for Generation Y for these values. These findings suggest that even when no differences are found with respect to the degree of importance placed on work factors, employee perceptions of the factors present in the workplace may still affect how employees think and feel about their jobs and organizations. Importantly, the differences remain less apparent than the similarities between the generations across the items, which further confirms the basic premise of the research.

In addition to supporting the notion that generational similarities may outnumber generational differences, this investigation extended the generational literature in two important ways. First, although similarities did outnumber differences, this study provided additional insight on where generational differences do exist. Specifically, this study builds on Lester et al. (2012) by examining additional and sometimes more narrowly defined characteristics associated with "best places to work." Extensions from the current study include the finding of generational differences on two characteristics not previously examined (i.e., diversity climate and career advancement) and using a narrowly defined characteristic of immediate feedback and recognition rather than recognition more broadly. Previously, Lester et al. (2012) found no actual generational differences on the value attributed to recognition, whereas *immediate* feedback and recognition did prove to be different across generations and most valued by Generation Y in the current investigation. Furthermore, although Generation Y and the Baby Boomers differed in the value they placed on continuous learning in Lester et al.'s (2012) sample, our sample did not demonstrate significant differences in the value placed on continuous learning. These mixed results on continuous learning highlight the need to further examine contextual variables that may enhance or diminish the presence of actual generational differences.

The second important extension of the generations literature provided by this study is the examination of how the importance placed on workplace characteristics by generations moderates the relationship between perceived fulfillment of these desired characteristics (by the organization) and the employee's attitudinal outcomes. Previous research has examined generational differences on work values (e.g., Smola & Sutton, 2002), on perceptions of workplace factors (e.g., Lester et al., 2012), and on employee attitudes

(e.g., Benson & Brown, 2011), but combining these items using value-percept theory had not yet been explored. The moderation results suggest that generational differences and similarities may be complex and may warrant the investigation of interactions between predictor variables.

Strengths and Limitations

Several strengths are present in the research. First, the hypotheses were examined using a large sample size ($N = 505$), which increased the statistical power to detect the present effects. Second, because participants worked in various types of organizations the results are generalizable across organizations. Third, all scale measures had high levels of reliabilities, which increases the accuracy of the results. Fourth, we controlled for gender in the regression analyses, to be consistent with previous research and remove any effects of gender on the outcomes (Cennamo & Gardner, 2008). Although controls are not options in DDA, we conducted multivariate analysis of variance tests with and without gender as a covariate to check for any potential effects of gender on values; the results were not affected by the inclusion of gender as a covariate. Finally, participants were informed that the survey measured perceptions of their organizations and did not know that classifications would be made based on generation. Therefore, the potential for bias with respect to generational differences was minimized.

The limitations of the research include unequal group sizes and organizational climate/perception measures that may not have aligned perfectly with an importance item (e.g., perceived social support was related to the teamwork value). Because unequal sample sizes may affect the results of the DDA, we reviewed the normality of the distribution of the discriminant functions by group (Sherry, 2006). Normality was determined by values within the range of -2 to 2 . Function 1 displayed slight nonnormality because of a relatively high-kurtotic distribution (4.14) for Generation Y, and Function 2 displayed nonnormality because of slightly high-kurtotic distributions for Generation Y (2.29) and Generation X (2.64). Therefore, findings should be interpreted with caution, and we recommend that future research use group sample sizes that are more equal and considerably large. Researchers examining the role of generational differences on workplace outcomes are also encouraged to include measures that directly relate to importance items.

Implications for Management and Directions for Future Research

One important implication of the current findings is that managers need be educated about and inform their direct reports about actual generational differences as well as

generational similarities rather than making assumptions about differences. Our research results showed differences in career advancement, diversity, and immediate feedback and recognition importance items. Notably, although we had expected a generational difference in continuous learning, we found no difference. This result may be due in part to the recent recession that has caused employees to postpone retirement. In addition, Hewlett et al. (2009) reported that 47% of Baby Boomers they surveyed felt they were in mid-career stages, presumably seeking additional advancement opportunities. Therefore, managers should be careful not to discount the importance of training and development as a work characteristic for Baby Boomers because continuous learning is similarly important to the Baby Boomer generation as it is for Generations Y and X.

In addition, managers should seek to gain insight into what constitutes the importance of similarly rated “best places to work” factors in order to design effective related workplace practices to meet employee needs. For example, preferences for training and development methods will likely vary across the generations, as younger employees grew up using fast-paced technology and older employees are accustomed to face-to-face learning settings.

Furthermore, the findings suggest that managers should also seek to understand how well the organization provides important work-related factors from the employees’ perspectives. We strongly recommend to organizational leaders and managers that they use tools such as employee surveys to collect information from their employees on a regular and ongoing basis in order to tailor their human resource management practices more specifically to their existing employees. Gaining this type of insight will allow organizations to provide resources to managers and other employees to support employees on the factors noted to be important to them (e.g., training on how to provide immediate feedback or to mentor younger employees). Organizations can also benchmark other organizations’ practices that may have demonstrated success such as Ernst & Young’s “Feedback Zone,” an online system that allows employees to submit and request feedback at any time, which is tailored to the desire of their Generation Y employees to receive immediate feedback (Hite, 2008).

Taking proactive steps to communicate academic research findings to managers and employees can help eliminate unfounded generational stereotypes and can assist a multigenerational workforce in its efforts to collaborate and build synergies. In the case of the current research, each organization that participated in the research project received tailored report showing the similarities and differences between generations within the organization for the importance items measured. The research findings were also presented in the community in which the data were collected; the study’s data collection coordinator gave presentations to two practitioner-oriented professional

organizations, and an academic colleague referenced the study in a Chamber of Commerce panel discussion.

Another suggestion for managers is to make sure that they do not assume all employees within a generational cohort value the same things. Managers still need to pay attention to individual difference variables such as gender, personality, and motivational needs when determining the best way to respond in interpersonal situations.

The current research findings support previous research suggesting that the importance placed on a variety of workplace characteristics may be more similar across generations than different, although generations may differ on their workplace attitudes. The findings provide additional support for researchers to further examine the ways that generations are similar in order to facilitate connections between members of generations that have traditionally been perceived as quite different (e.g., Hewlett et al., 2009).

Future research on generations needs to further investigate the “So What?” question in order to determine if and to what extent values and related variables affect workplace outcomes of interest. This study looked at attitudinal outcomes, and future research could better provide additional insights by investigating behavioral outcomes. Other workplace values or more specific aspects of the workplace characteristics should also be examined. For example, future research could explore specific aspects of diversity that are important to reveal more discrete differences and similarities across generations. Finally, although the three generations examined in this study are most prominently represented in today’s workplace, it is important to recognize that a new generation will soon be joining the workforce. This next generation, initially labeled as “Generation Z” may bring new intricacies to managing a multigenerational workforce and should be included in future research samples. Our hope is that the findings of this study will spark continued study of an ever-changing work population.

Appendix

Variables Measuring Perceptions of Work Factors in the Organizations

Diversity Climate: $\alpha = .84$

1. My organization makes it easy for people from diverse backgrounds to fit in and be accepted.
2. Where I work, employees are developed and advanced without regard to the gender or the racial, religious, or cultural background of the individuals.
3. Managers demonstrate through their actions that they want to hire and retain a diverse workforce.
4. I feel that my immediate manager does a good job of managing people with diverse backgrounds (in terms of age, sex, race, religion, or culture).

Social Support: $\alpha = .87$

Items from the work design measure.

1. I have the opportunity to develop close friendships in my job.
2. I have the chance in my job to get to know other people.
3. I have the opportunity to meet with others in my work.
4. My supervisor is concerned about the welfare of the people that work for him/her.
5. People I work with take a personal interest in me.
6. People I work with are friendly.

Feedback and Recognition: $\alpha = .90$

Items 1 to 3 from work design measure, and items 4 to 6 from employee involvement climate measure.

1. I receive a great deal of information from my manager and coworkers about my job performance.
2. Other people in the organization, such as managers and coworkers, provide information about the effectiveness (e.g., quality and quantity) of my job performance.
3. I receive feedback on my performance from other people in my organization (such as my manager or coworkers).
4. I am satisfied with the amount of recognition I receive when I do a good job.
5. Generally, I feel this company rewards employees who make an extra effort.
6. There is a strong link between how well I perform my job and the likelihood of receiving high-performance appraisal ratings.

Work-Life Balance: $\alpha = .86$

1. I am easily able to balance the demands of my work and personal/family life.
2. I have sufficient time away from my job to maintain adequate work and personal/family life balance.
3. When I take a vacation, I am able to separate myself from my work and enjoy myself.
4. All in all, I am successful in balancing my work and personal/family life.
5. I often feel drained when I go home from work because of work pressures and problems. (reverse scored).

Training and Development: $\alpha = .88$

Items from the employee involvement climate measure.

1. I receive sufficient training to do my job.
2. Education and training are integral parts of this company's culture.
3. I have had sufficient/adequate job-related training.

4. If I felt that I needed more job-related training, the company would provide it.

Decision-Making Involvement: $\alpha = .94$

Items 1 to 3 from the employee involvement climate measure, and items 4 to 9 from the work design measure.

1. I have sufficient authority to fulfill my job responsibilities.
2. I have enough input in deciding how to accomplish my work.
3. I have enough freedom over how I do my job.
4. My job gives me a chance to use my personal initiative or judgment in carrying out the work.
5. My job allows me to make a lot of decisions on my own.
6. My job provides me with significant autonomy in making decisions.
7. My job allows me to make decisions about what methods I use to complete my work.
8. My job gives me considerable opportunity for independence and freedom in how I do the work.
9. My job allows me to decide on my own how to go about doing my work.

Pay and Raise Satisfaction: $\alpha = .94$

Items from the pay and benefits satisfaction measure.

1. My take-home pay
2. My most recent raise
3. My current salary
4. The raises I have typically received in the past
5. My overall level of pay
6. The size of my current salary

Promotion Opportunities

Item from the employee involvement climate measure.

1. If I perform well, I am more likely to be promoted.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

References

- Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63, 1-18.

- Arnett, J. J. (2004). *Emerging adulthood: The winding road from the late teens through the twenties*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 1173-1182.
- Benson, J., & Brown, M. (2011). Generations at work: Are there differences and do they matter? *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 22, 1843-1865.
- Butts, M. M., Vandenberg, R. J., DeJoy, D. M., Schaffer, B. S., & Wilson, M. G. (2009). Individual reactions to high involvement work processes: Investigating the role of empowerment and perceived organizational support. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 14, 122-136.
- Cennamo, L., & Gardner, D. (2008). Generational differences in work values, outcomes and person-organisation values fit. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 23, 891-906.
- Costanza, D. P., Badger, J. M., Fraser, R. L., Severt, J. B., & Gade, P. A. (2012). Generational differences in work-related attitudes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Business Psychology*, 27, 375-394.
- Crumpacker, M., & Crumpacker, J. M. (2007). Succession planning and generational stereotypes: Should HR consider age-based values and attitudes a relevant factor or a passing fad? *Public Personnel Management*, 36, 349-369.
- Deal, J. J., Stawiski, S., Graves, L., Gentry, W. A., Weber, T. J., & Ruderman, M. (2013). Motivation at work: Which matters more, generation or managerial level. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 65, 1-16.
- Dries, N., Pepermans, R., & De Kerpel, E. (2008). Exploring four generations' beliefs about career: Is "satisfied" the new "successful"? *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 23, 907-928.
- Dupre, K. E., & Day, A. L. (2007). The effects of supportive management and job quality on the turnover intentions and health of military personnel. *Human Resource Management*, 46, 185-201.
- Eikhof, D. R., Warhurst, C., & Haunschild, A. (2007). Introduction: What work? What life? What balance? Critical reflections on the work-life balance debate. *Employee Relations*, 29, 325-333.
- Evans, W. R., & Davis, W. D. (2005). High-performance work systems and organizational performance: The mediating role of internal social structure. *Journal of Management*, 31, 758-775.
- Fogg, P. (2009). When generations collide. *Education Digest*, 74, 25-30.
- Fulmer, I. S., Gerhart, B., & Scott, K. S. (2003). Are the 100 best better? An empirical investigation of the relationship between being a "great place to work" and firm performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 56, 965-993.
- Glass, A. (2007). Understanding generational differences for competitive success. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 39, 98-103.
- Gowing, M., Kraft, J., & Quick, J. (1998). *The new organizational reality: Downsizing, restructuring, and revitalization*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Grawitch, M. J., Ledford, G. E., Ballard, D. W., & Barber, L. K. (2009). Leading the healthy workforce: The integral role of employee involvement. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 61, 122-135.
- Grawitch, M. J., Trares, S., & Kohler, J. M. (2007). Healthy workplace practices and employee outcomes. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 14, 275-293.
- Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 16, 250-279.
- Hansen, J. I. C., & Leuty, M. E. (2012). Work values across generations. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 20, 34-52.
- Heneman III, H. G., & Schwab, D. P. (1985). Pay satisfaction: Its multidimensional nature and measurement. *International Journal of Psychology*, 20, 129-141.
- Herman, A., & Eckel, R. (2002). The new American worker: What Generation 'Y' brings to the workplace. *Work Matters*, May, 1-2.
- Hewlett, S. A., Sherbin, L., & Sumberg, K. (2009). How Gen Y & Boomers will reshape your agenda. *Harvard Business Review*, 87(7-8), 71-76.
- Hill, E. J., Hawkins, A. J., Ferris, M., & Weitzman, M. (2001). Finding an extra day a week: The positive influence of perceived job flexibility on work and family life balance. *Family Relations*, 50, 49-58.
- Hite, B. (2008, October 13). Employers rethink how they give feedback. *The Wall Street Journal*. Retrieved from <http://online.wsj.com/news/articles/SB122385967800027549>
- Jain, S., & Martindale, T. (2012, October). *Facilitating continuous learning: Review of research on individual learning capabilities and organizational learning environments*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the AECT International Convention, Louisville, KY.
- Joo, B. K., & Mclean, G. N. (2006). Best employer studies: A conceptual model from a literature review and a case study. *Human Resource Development Review*, 5, 228-257.
- Jurkiewicz, C. L., & Brown, R. G. (1998). GenXers vs. Boomers vs. Matures: Generational comparisons of public employee motivation. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 18, 18-37.
- Kim, H., Knight, D. K., & Crutsinger, C. (2009). Generation Y employees' retail work experience: The mediating effect of job characteristics. *Journal of Business Research*, 62, 548-556.
- Kristof, A. L. (1996). Person-organization fit: An integrative review of its conceptualizations, measurement, and implications. *Personnel Psychology*, 49, 1-49.
- Kristof-Brown, A. L., Zimmerman, R. D., & Johnson, E. C. (2005). Consequences of individuals' fit at work: A meta-analysis of person-job, person-organization, person-group, and person-supervisor fit. *Personnel Psychology*, 58, 281-342.
- Lester, S. W., Standifer, R. L., Schultz, N. J., & Windsor, J. M. (2012). Actual versus perceived generational differences at work: An empirical examination. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 19, 341-354.
- Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 1297-1349). Chicago, IL: Rand-McNally.
- Loher, B. T., Noe, R. A., Moeller, N. L., & Fitzgerald, M. P. (1985). A meta-analysis of the relation of job characteristics to job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 70, 280-289.

- Luna-Arocas, R., & Camps, J. (2008). A model of high performance work practices and turnover intentions. *Personnel Review*, 37, 26-46.
- Macky, K., Gardner, D., & Forsyth, S. (2008). Generational differences at work: Introduction and overview. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 23, 857-861.
- 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.
- Meriac, J. P., Woehr, D. J., & Banister, C. (2010). Generational differences in work ethic: An examination of measurement equivalence across three cohorts. *Journal of Business Psychology*, 25, 315-324.
- Mitchell, T. R., Holtom, B. C., Lee, T. W., Sablinsky, C. J., & Erez, M. (2001). Why people stay: Using job embeddedness to predict voluntary turnover. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44, 1102-1121.
- Morgeson, F. P., & Humphrey, S. E. (2006). The Work Design Questionnaire (WDQ): Developing and validating a comprehensive measure for assessing job design and the nature of work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91, 1321-1339.
- Mosisa, A., & Hipple, S. (2006). Trends in labor force participation in the United States. *Monthly Labor Review*, 129(10), 35-57.
- Parry, E., & Urwin, P. (2011). Generational differences in work values: A review of theory and evidence. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 13, 79-96.
- Pfeffer, J., & Veiga, J. F. (1999). Putting people first for organizational success. *Academy of Management Executive*, 13, 37-48.
- Piccolo, R. F., & Colquitt, J. A. (2006). Transformational leadership and job behaviors: The mediating role of core job characteristics. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49, 327-340.
- Pugh, S. D., Dietz, J., Brief, A. P., & Wiley, J. W. (2008). Looking inside and out: The impact of employee and community demographic composition on organizational diversity climate. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93, 1422-1428.
- Riordan, C. M., Vandenberg, R. J., & Richardson, H. A. (2005). Employee involvement climate and organizational effectiveness. *Human Resource Management*, 44, 471-488.
- Sessa, V. I., Kabacoff, R. I., Deal, J., & Brown, H. (2007). Generational differences in leader values and leadership behaviors. *Psychologist-Manager Journal*, 10, 47-74.
- Sherry, A. (2006). Discriminant analysis in counseling psychology research. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 34, 661-683.
- Smola, K. W., & Sutton, C. D. (2002). Generational differences: Revisiting generational work values for the new millennium. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23, 363-382.
- Spector, P. E. (1986). Perceived control by employees: A meta-analysis of studies concerning autonomy and participation at work. *Human Relations*, 39, 1005-1016.
- Steele, M. J., & Gordon, V. N. (2006). *Advising in a multigenerational workplace*. Retrieved from <http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Clearinghouse/View-Articles/Generational-issues-in-the-workplace.aspx>
- Tulgan, B. (2011). Generation Y: All grown up and now emerging as new leaders. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 5(3), 77-81.
- Twenge, J. M. (2010). A review of empirical evidence on generational differences in work attitudes. *Journal of Business Psychology*, 25, 201-210.
- Virick, M., Lilly, J. D., & Casper, W. J. (2007). Doing more with less: An analysis of work life balance among layoff survivors. *Career Development International*, 12, 463-480.
- Westerman, J. W., & Yamamura, J. H. (2007). Generational preferences for work environment fit: Effects on employee outcomes. *Career Development International Journal*, 12, 150-161.
- 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.
- Zemke, R. (2001). Here come the millennials. *Training*, 38(7), 44-49.

Author Biographies

Jennifer Mencl is an Associate Professor of Organizational Behavior at the University of Minnesota Duluth. Her research interests include learning and development, empathy, and ethical decision-making. She has published in journals such as the *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, *Journal of Human Resources Education*, and *Journal of Business Ethics*.

Scott W. Lester is a Professor of Management at University of Wisconsin – Eau Claire. His research interests include dyadic trust, the multi-generational workforce, and work-life balance. Scott has published in journals such as the *Academy of Management Journal*, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *Journal of Management*, and *Journal of Organizational Behavior*.