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University professional staff make valuable contributions essential to the overall success of a college or university. These individuals provide leadership and professional knowledge to university units, departments, and programs. Yet, this population is the least studied university employee (Rosser, 2004). The goals of this study were to examine the extent and relationship of workplace factors associated with job satisfaction and the intent to remain in a position for Generation Y university professional staff. Furthermore, it considered the extent and relationship of selected Generation Y demographics associated with job satisfaction.

A correlational quantitative methodology with a descriptive survey administered to a convenience sample was used to examine the relationship between study variables. Spector’s (1997) 1994 Job Satisfaction Survey and demographic questionnaire was administered to professional staff at 12 southeastern universities working in various positions (i.e., admissions, academic advising, residence life, judicial affairs, counseling and testing, career services, graduate studies, financial aid, TRIO programs, and student affairs). Ninety-seven staff responded, or 26%, 53 of whom were identified as Generation Y. The other participants were members of two distinct generations: Baby Boomers and Generation X.
Generation Y staff identified two workplace factors as significant to job satisfaction: promotion and contingent rewards. The Generation Y participants also identified eight workplace factors—pay, promotion, fringe benefits, supervision, contingent rewards, operating procedures, nature of work, and communication—as significant to employee retention. One demographic element, length of time in a current position, was found significant to Generation Y job satisfaction.

Although the primary research focus was Generation Y university professional staff, one particular non-Generation Y finding proved relevant to employee retention: nature of work was ranked as the primary factor associated with employee retention for all participants, suggesting that when university professional staff feel their work is meaningful, they are more likely to remain in a position. Thus, it is recommended that postsecondary leadership incorporate avenues that provide employees with meaningful and enjoyable work, roles, and responsibilities. By doing so, universities can be viewed as places of employment providing the necessary factors that attract, develop, and retain employees, in particular Generation Y university professional staff.
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Introduction

University professional staff members make valuable contributions essential to the overall success of a college or university.

These individuals provide leadership and professional knowledge to university units, departments, and programs. Positions at this level are responsible for identifying objectives, formulating strategy, directing programs, managing resources, and functioning effectively with a high degree of autonomy.

Individuals who hold these positions must provide administrative, professional, technical, and operational support by employing independent judgment, analytical skill, and professional expertise for the university and their respective areas. (University of California, n.d., “Personnel Policies for Staff Members,” para. 2)

Demographic trends in the United States have brought about an unprecedented multigenerational workforce (Harrison, 2007). Universities must find ways to obtain optimal performance from their employees, particularly those entering and replacing the current workforce. As the Baby Boomer generation retires and Generation X members transition into university senior-level positions, Generation Y members are attaining university professional staff positions.

Workplace factors associated with job satisfaction are essential to keeping these valued professionals and to increasing their intent to remain in their current positions. Universities lose more than simply a professional staff member when he or she leaves. These employees take with them knowledge, skills, operational understanding, vital
network connections, and established relationships related to the success of the departments, programs, fields of study, and the university.

As a demographic, Generation Y is the fastest growing generation and now floods workplace pipelines. Their unique attributes pose challenges to organizations with few Generation Y employees and with Baby Boomer and/or Generation X leaders. The literature has provided a substantial base of Generation Y research with little specifically addressing factors that influence job satisfaction in a university venue. Moreover, research is limited that has examined factors that influence the job satisfaction of Generation Y individuals holding university professional staff positions. Research to assist in further understanding workplace factors associated with this population’s job satisfaction and intent to remain in colleges and university positions closes a gap in the existing literature.

**Statement of the Problem**

Job satisfaction may relate to Generation Y staff members’ intent to remain in a current position. Turnover of Generation Y professionals can cause universities to incur surprising costs in actual dollars, loss of institutional memory, and a break in organizational relations. According to Judge and Church (2000), the topic of job satisfaction is the most widely investigated job attitude and is also an extensively researched subject in the field of industrial and organizational psychology. One issue specific to this study involves workplace factors that promote a satisfied workforce, in particular, Generation Y professional university staff employees.

Employees who lack job satisfaction may not perform at high levels, resulting in detrimental organizational factors. Employees who are not satisfied with their jobs may
consider leaving the organization, causing an increase in employee turnover and significant costs to an organization. In addition, dissatisfied employees can affect an organization’s operations, other employees’ morale, and the organization’s image. This research attempts to investigate the workplace factors associated with job satisfaction of Generation Y employees and their intent to remain in university professional staff positions.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study is to investigate the workplace factors associated with job satisfaction of Generation Y university professional staff. Understanding that which helps Generation Y professional staff make the decision to remain in a certain position allows the university to create programming to foster retention. It is understood that organizational turnover at any level is costly. Universities, units, and departments may decrease job dissatisfaction and turnover if these professionals are provided with the workplace factors associated with satisfaction.

The factors under investigation are extrinsic in nature. If one can understand the factors associated with job satisfaction, employee needs most likely can be met by universities, thereby increasing retention. The central research question for this quantitative correlational investigation asks: What workplace factors associated with job satisfaction of Generation Y university professional staff contribute to their intent to remain in a position?

While workplace factors associated with job satisfaction have been the subject of previous studies, a gap currently exists in understanding workplace factors and their significance to Generation Y university professional staff members. Research exists that
has addressed workplace factors associated with job satisfaction and demographics such as race and gender. However, an absence can be seen relative to literature considering demographics and workplace factors associated with job satisfaction of the Generation Y employees. Considerable studies have addressed workplace factors associated with job satisfaction in healthcare and corporate organizations, although studies that have addressed workplace factors associated with job satisfaction in a university setting are limited, and particularly scarce relating to university professional staff. Literature also is prevalent that has addressed workplace factors associated with the intent to remain in a position, albeit a gap exist in literature that has addressed workplace factors associated with the intent to remain in a university staff position.

When an employee leaves, the university suffers financially and operationally. These institutions also must consider the loss of vital network connections and established relationships. Providing new data related to understanding workplace factors and their association with job satisfaction for this population will help universities to create professional retention policies and programs. As financial difficulty occasionally is experienced, universities may not be able to reward employees. Understanding other factors and instituting supportive policies may help to reduce employee turnover, university expenses, and loss of institutional knowledge. This research builds upon traditional job satisfaction and motivation theories and focuses specifically on Generation Y university professional staff members. This study also provides new insight into the significance of workplace factors specific to Generation Y professionals.
Research Questions

University professional staff provide resources critical to the success of an institution. These individuals identify objectives, formulate strategy, direct programs, and manage resources. Their positions require effective leadership skills, professional knowledge, and accountability. As Baby Boomers and Generation X professionals retire and transition, Generation Y employees move into university professional staff positions. Universities must understand the workplace factors that influence this specific population. To that end, this research asks: What workplace factors associated with job satisfaction of Generation Y university professional staff contribute to their intent to remain in a position?

The following specific research questions guide this study:

RQ1: To what extent do workplace factors (pay, promotion, supervision, benefits, contingent rewards, operating procedures, coworkers, nature of work, and communication) associate with job satisfaction for Generation Y university professional staff?

RQ2: To what extent do selected variables (gender, type of institution, race/ethnicity, level of education, educational requirement of position held, and length of time in position) affect job satisfaction of Generation Y university professional staff?

RQ3: To what extent do workplace factors (pay, promotion, supervision, benefits, contingent rewards, operating procedures, coworkers, nature of work, and communication) affect Generation Y university professional staff retention?
Background of the Study

Employee turnover is damaging to organizational budgets. Kaye and Jordan-Evans (2001) estimated that the cost of replacing an employee varies from 70% to 200% of the departing employee’s salary. Turnover also damages organizational operations and productivity, as the organization loses knowledge, skills, and expertise vital to organizational success. Furthermore, critical and established relationships related to organizational success may be lost. Efforts exerted in reestablishing relationships are time consuming and may hinder organizational effectiveness.

Determining the reason employees leave an organization and what can be done to retain them is problematic for organizational leaders. Research has shown that job satisfaction is strongly associated with an employee’s intent to remain at an organization (MacIntosh & Doherty, 2010). According to Gregory (2009), a high rate of job satisfaction is directly related to a lower turnover rate. Other research (Kazi & Zadeh, 2011) has suggested that job dissatisfaction leads to job turnover. Based on prior research, one can assert that employees who are satisfied are more likely to remain in their organization.

Subsequent to the 2008-2009 recession, public and private sectors of the American higher education system have experienced unprecedented budget deficits (Barr & McClellan, 2011). Similar to other organizations, universities are creating strategies to alleviate additional budget insufficiencies and to increase revenue. One approach relevant to this study is to eliminate employee turnover and to create programming to cultivate and foster employee retention.
In the fall of 2011 university professional staff constituted nearly one fourth of university employees (Snyder & Dillow, 2012). These individuals serve as directors and coordinators and provide leadership to university offices such as admissions, financial aid, institutional research, registrar, human resources, student affairs and career and counseling services. They typically have low visibility with enormous responsibility and are defined as mid-level managers who are academic or non-academic support personnel within the structure of higher education organizations (Rosser, 2004). University professional staff members are critical to the overall success of an institution. Among the current workforce of university professional staff are multigenerational members including Baby Boomers, individuals born between 1943 and 1960; Generation X, individuals born between 1961 and 1981 (Strauss & Howe, 1991); and Generation Y, individuals born between 1978 and 1989 (Tulgan, 2009). Notably, Generation Y individuals employed in these positions are increasing due to the following: (a) individuals in the Baby Boomer generation are retiring, (b) Generation X individuals are being promoted and obtaining university senior-level positions, and (c) the Generation Y population is attaining educational levels appropriate for university professional staff positions.

As Generation Y is the newest workforce generation, university management would be wise in gaining some understanding and familiarity concerning characteristics and workplace preferences. Treuren and Anderson (2010) suggested that Generation Y employees are similar to previous generational cohorts and possess comparable employment expectations. In contrast, other research (Asghar, 2014; Collier, 2009) has posited that this generation is unequivocally different in their work attitudes compared to
the generations that preceded them. Commonalities of Generation Y employees include
the desire for immediate feedback, flexibility, and technology-enhanced work
environments (Broadbridge, Maxwell, & Ogden, 2007). Generation Y employees
dislike micro-managers and work environments that do not provide fair compensation
(Martin, 2005).

Moreover, in order to understand Generation Y characteristics and workplace
preferences, knowledge that which contributes to their employee satisfaction is
necessary. Rantz, Stueve, and McQuistion (2001) asserted that job satisfaction is critical
to the success of an organization and the personal wellbeing of employees. According to
Judge and Church (2000), job satisfaction is the most extensively investigated job
attitude in industrial and organizational psychology. Explanations for the extensive
examination of this construct are various and include its emotional, cognitive, and
behavioral components; its relationship with mental and physical health; and its
association with employee productivity, motivation, and retention (Bernstein & Nash,
2008). Job satisfaction has been in a defined different manner. Edwin Locke’s (1976)
commonly recognized definition is “a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting
from the approval of one’s job or job experiences” (p. 1304).

In addition to defining job satisfaction, an assessment of its meaning for
Generation Y employees should be considered. Methods such as employee focus
groups, interviews, and questionnaires have been used to measure job satisfaction. Most
knowledge is obtained and research conducted through questionnaires due to feasibility
and accuracy (Saari & Judge, 2004). Instruments generally measure two types of
satisfaction: (1) global, which refers to an employee’s overall feeling about the job, and
(2) facet, which refers to feelings about specific job aspects (Mueller & Kim, 2008). Several theories of motivation relating to a satisfied workforce can assist university leaders in understanding Generation Y propensities. In addition, theories explain workplace behavior and are relevant to work environments (Jex & Britt, 2008). The theories of motivation identified as relevant and significant to the current study include Need-based, Cognitive, Behavioral Approach, Self-Determination, and Job-based theories. These theories provide organizational leaders with a framework for motivating employees and increasing job satisfaction. Additionally, theories of motivation can assist organizational leaders with developing and implementing strategies to assist employee retention. Chapter II of the current study provides an extensive review of the identified theories.

Significant work has been performed concerning workplace factors, job satisfaction, and the intent to remain in a position within education, corporate business, and healthcare; however, very little work if any, has considered university professional staff, in particular, the Generation Y cohort. This study addresses this significant gap in the knowledge base.

Methodology

This study examines the workplace factors associated with job satisfaction and retention of Generation Y university professional staff. Therefore, in order to capture the essence of this research, a quantitative methodology was utilized and a descriptive survey with a correlational design was selected. This method was chosen due to nature of quantitative method in generalizing, predicting, and explaining the degree of association among two or more variables (Creswell, 2012).
Paul Spector’s 1994 Job Satisfaction Survey was utilized to identify the study’s nine workplace factors and to assess overall job satisfaction. The instrument’s workplace subscales were used to assess the satisfaction of each factor and the intent to remain in a current position. Demographic questions were used to assess the level of job satisfaction and the top three reasons for remaining in a current position. In addition, demographic questions were used to ascertain a profile of study participants. The survey instrument has been used and repeatedly tested with satisfactory reliability and validity results. The conceptual framework of the research is presented in Figure 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conceptualizing Variables</th>
<th>Workplace Factors Associated with the Job Satisfaction of Generation Y University Professional Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent Variables</td>
<td>Workplace Factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td>Dependent Variables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Age/generation</td>
<td>• Benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Gender</td>
<td>• Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Type of Institution</td>
<td>• Contingent Rewards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td>• Coworkers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Education</td>
<td>• Nature of Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Educational Requirement</td>
<td>• Operating Procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Position Held</td>
<td>• Pay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Length of Time in Position</td>
<td>• Promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Supervision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 1. Conceptual framework of current study.*

**Population and Sample**

The population selected for the research study was university professional staff categorized as administrative, managerial, professional, non-faculty, and non-support employed at universities located in Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee. The sampling frame consisted of
individuals who were Generation Y (individuals born between 1978 and 1989). Convenience sampling was used to ensure the target population was sampled.

**Data Collection Procedures**

This study utilized a web-based survey for data collection, which was administered through online survey software used for private academic survey distribution and data collection. Research participants received pertinent study information including the informed consent document, research topic, purpose, and access to the survey by email.

**Definition of Terms**

*Generation Y*: Individuals who are born between 1978 and 1989 (Tulgan, 2009).

*Job Satisfaction*: The way in which employees feel about their jobs and different aspects of the jobs (Spector, 1997).

*Job Satisfaction Survey*: A job satisfaction instrument used to access nine facets of job satisfaction, as well as overall satisfaction (Spector, 1997).

*Southeastern Association of Educational Opportunity Program Personnel (SAEOPP)*: A non-profit organization of eight states with members are involved in equal educational opportunity for disadvantaged individuals, while advancing the ideals of student access, persistence, and completion of postsecondary education. SAEOPP member states are Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee (saeopp.org, n.d.).

*Southeastern Region States*: States located in the southeastern region of the United States including Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee (saeopp.org, n.d.).
**University Professional Staff**: Individuals employed at institutions of higher education who are usually classified as non-faculty, non-support staff, and who provide leadership or oversight to a major university unit, department, or program (Rosser, 2004).

**TRIO Programs**: Federal outreach and student services programs designed to identify and provide services for individuals from disadvantaged backgrounds. TRIO includes eight programs targeted to serve and assist low-income individuals, first-generation college students, and those with disabilities to progress through the academic pipeline from middle school to post baccalaureate programs. TRIO also includes a training program for directors and staff of TRIO projects (United States Department of Education, n.d.).

**Assumptions, Limitations, and Delimitations**

**Assumptions**

For the purpose of the study, the following assumptions were made:

1. The study instrument is valid and reliable.
2. Respondents answer all questions accurately and truthfully.

**Limitations**

For the purpose of this study, the following limitations were identified:

1. The variables used to describe job satisfaction are limited and do not cover the totality of job satisfaction.
2. This study utilizes a web-based survey. Web-based surveys limit participation to individuals with a valid address and computer access.
3. The interpretation of the survey items may differ for each respondent.
Delimitations

For the purpose of the study, the following delimitations were made:

1. The study is confined to one geographical region (Southeastern).
2. The study is confined to universities housing federally funded TRIO Programs.

Summary of Chapters

This quantitative correlation study is guided by three research questions designed to examine whether a relationship exists between workplace factors and job satisfaction of Generation Y university professional staff. In addition, this research investigates the workplace factors that most influence the retention of Generation Y university professional employees. Paul Spector’s 1994 Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) serves as the study instrument.

Chapter II presents a review of current literature related to this study that focuses on Generation Y characteristics and workplace desires, professional preferences and motivation, and job satisfaction factors. Also included is information addressing job satisfaction constructs. Chapter III describes the methodology, research design, and procedures used in this investigation. Chapter IV details the data analyses and provides both a written and graphic summary of the results. Chapter V provides the interpretation and discussion of the results as they relate to the existing body of research related to this topic.
CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to investigate the environmental and workplace factors associated with job satisfaction of Generation Y university staff. Understanding that which helps Generation Y staff make the decision to remain in a certain position allows universities to create programming to foster retention. Universities, benefit financially when retention is achieved, as organizational turnover at any level is costly (Griffeth, Hom, & Gaertner, 2000). The central research question being addressed in this quantitative correlational investigation was: What workplace factors associated with job satisfaction of the Generation Y university professional staff contribute to their intent to remain in a position?

This chapter presents the research related to the importance of job satisfaction to a university. Relevant definitions, theories, and instruments used to measure job satisfaction are included, along with a review of associated workplace factors. The chapter provides a description of the Generation Y cohort, characteristics, and desired workplace factors. Generational research and desired workplace factors related to Baby Boomers and Generation X are included. Also included is a description of the University professional staff employee—their roles and responsibilities. The review concludes with the chapter summary.

The Importance of Job Satisfaction to a University

Studies have found relationships between job satisfaction with work environment (Sharafizad, Paull, & Omaria, 2011); between job satisfaction and productivity (Chitwood, 2010); and between job satisfaction and employee turnover (Davis, 2013).
Prior research has associated job dissatisfaction with an employee’s intent to leave an organization (Egan, Yang, & Barlett, 2004; Lambert, Hogan, & Barton, 2001; MacIntosh & Doherty, 2010; Schwepker, 2001; Silverthorne, 2004). Satisfied employees are less likely to seek a new job with a new employer. A high rate of job satisfaction is directly related to a lower turnover rate (Gregory, 2009).

The 2008-2009 recession greatly affected the American higher education system in both the public and private sectors (Barr & McClellan, 2011). As Goldstein (2005) stated, “The economics of all institutions are linked with the national economy which is increasingly connected to the world economy” (p. 14). According to Mitchell and Leachman (2015), contributors to university budget deficits include fixed costs, increased expenditures, declining enrollment, and reduction in state and federal funding. Employee turnover creates other expenditures that negatively affect organizational budgets (Lucus, 2013).

The estimated cost of replacing an employee varies from 70% to 200% of the departing employee’s salary (Kaye & Jordan-Evans, 2001). The costs of directly measured causes of turnover fall into three categories: (a) direct replacement costs (expenses related to recruiting, interviewing, and training each new employee); (b) indirect costs (costs related to workload, morale, and productivity); and (c) lost opportunity costs (costs related to the time, energy, and attention taken from other organizational needs) (Reh, n.d.). According to Droege and Hoobler (2003), another factor to consider when an employee leaves a position is the loss of organizational knowledge. The loss poses challenges for new employees with no historical basis for decision making and who must divert time on task to time for learning (Lucus, 2013).
McCain, O’Reilly, and Pfeiffer (1983) suggested that employee turnover may be a characteristic of the system in which it occurs. Employee turnover may reflect the conditions of the system. Institutions of higher education make up one of the major employment sectors in the United States, employing approximately 3.8 million people (Snyder & Dillow, 2012). Universities hire individuals to fill various positions including teaching and research, administration, student support, technical support, and facilities management. As in organization, universities must guard against employee turnover by creating programming to cultivate and foster employee retention.

**What is Job Satisfaction?**

Industrial and organizational psychology researchers have reported that job satisfaction is the most extensively investigated job attitude (Judge & Church, 2000). However, researchers have defined job satisfaction in many different ways (Weir, 2013). Hoppock (1935, as cited in Rast & Touraini, 2012) provided the earliest definition of the construct as “any combination of psychological, physiological and environmental circumstances that cause a person truthfully to say, I am satisfied with the job” (p. 92).

A commonly accepted definition of job satisfaction was presented by Edwin Locke (1976), who defined job it as “a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experiences” (p. 1304). According to Spector (1997), “job satisfaction is simply how people feel about their jobs and different aspects of their jobs” (p. 2). Hulin and Judge (2003) suggested that job satisfaction relates to multidimensional psychological responses (emotional, cognitive, and behavioral) to one’s job. Bernstein and Nash (2008) also related job satisfaction to emotional, cognitive, and behavioral responses.
Theoretical Background

Several theories of motivation incorporate some elements related to developing a satisfied workforce (Rainlall, 2004) and attempt to define motivation and to explain its connection to job satisfaction, job performance, absenteeism, turnover, and counterproductive behaviors (Jex & Britt, 2008). In general, motivation theories can be quite useful to managers and organizations if understood and applied correctly. The theories can provide a framework for motivating employees and, thereby, increasing job satisfaction. Without them, organizations would have to depend on instinct and employee behavior. Motivation theories also can assist organizations with developing and implementing strategies to increase employee productivity and retention. As motivation and job satisfaction are strongly interconnected, a discussion of key theories of motivation relevant to the current study were identified and are discussed.

The term motivation has origin in the Latin word movere, which means to move (Nartey, 2012). Motivation addresses the question: “What makes people do what they do?” Kanfer (1990) suggested that motivation is a hypothetical construct, i.e., something one cannot see or feel but can observe its effects or impacts. Pinder (2008) related the types of activities, specific paths taken, the amount of energy expanded, and persistence toward work related activities as defining elements of motivation. Theorists and researchers also have ascribed multiple definitions to motivation. Miller, 1962 (as cited in Butler & McManus, 2014) defined motivation as “the study of all those pushes and prods -- biological, social, and psychological -- that defeats our laziness and moves us, either eagerly or reluctantly to action” (p. 58). Steers, Mowday, and Shapiro (2004) defined motivation as “factors or events that energize, channel, and sustain
human behavior over time” (p. 379). Cherry (n.d.) also defined motivation “as the process that initiates, guides, and maintains goal-oriented behaviors” (para. 4).

According to Nevid (2012), “motivation refers to factors that activate, direct, and sustain goal-directed behavior.” Jex and Britt (2008) argued that conclusions can be drawn by observing the influence of motivation on employee behaviors.

Psychologists have proposed numerous theories of motivation. However, many were not developed to explain workplace behavior and do not have relevance to work environments (Jex, 2008). Those relevant and significant to the current study include Need-based, Cognitive process, Behavioral, Self-determination, and Job-based theories.

Need-Based Theory

Maslow, Alderfer, and McClelland are recognized need-based theorists. Maslow is well known for his *Hierarchy of Needs*, articulated in 1940, which identified five need levels as the forces that drive or motivate human behavior. According to Maslow, individuals will not move on to the next level until sufficient amounts of lower levels of need are met. The theory provided meaningful perceptions concerning human nature and the foundation for more theories of motivation (Jex & Britt, 2008).

Urwiler and Frolick (2008) used Maslow’s hierarchy as the foundation for their research on competitive organizations that utilize information technology (IT). The researchers developed an IT Value Hierarchy to assess employee needs and to create a sense of understanding among organizational leaders. Each level of the IT Value Hierarchy modeled Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs. According to Urwiler and Frolick, IT employees are inherent drivers of corporate enterprise success.
The results of the study provided organizations with information to identify levels of need for IT employees and to develop those needs.

According to Robbins (1998), Alderfer’s 1969 ERG Theory of Motivation attempted to address the perceived shortcomings in Maslow’s theory by aligning the needs hierarchy with empirical research. It is regarded as a more valid version of the needs hierarchy. Alderfer combined Maslow’s five need levels into three and generated the Existence, Relatedness, and Growth (ERG) theory of motivation. Existence combines Maslow’s physiological with the safety/security needs. Relatedness parallels Maslow’s social/belongingness level, and growth signifies his esteem and self-actualization levels. Alderfer’s theory does not support hierarchical movement. Individuals may be in more than one level at a time and may regress. One of the strengths of Alderfer theory is its job-specific focus (Arnolds & Boshoff, 2002).

Arnolds and Boshoff (2002) investigated the influence of need satisfaction, as suggested by ERG theory of motivation, with managers and non-management employees from manufacturing, trade, and service sectors in South Africa. One thousand questionnaires were disseminated, resulting in a 20.7 usable return rate. Empirical results revealed that growth needs and advancement opportunities motivate unit-level managers. Peer, existence, and monetary compensation factors motivate non-managers. Results of the study indicated that the individual personalities of non-management employees can influence the relationship between need satisfaction and work behavior; therefore, organizations must make an effort to understand employees at a more intimate level. Further findings revealed enhanced job performance when non-
management employee work groups develop. They promote acceptance and give employees the feeling of being treated fairly.

Arnolds and Boshoff (2002) also found that managers are immensely important to the growth and survival of organizations and their needs should not be neglected. Increased need satisfaction can mean improved retention of managers. Findings of their study indicated that manager motivation relates to challenging working environments, creativity, self-fulfillment, advancement, and autonomy. Their research findings contradicted certain general beliefs about motivation related to non-management employees. For example, lower-order needs, such as fringe benefits, do not motivate non-management employees.

In 1961, McClelland’s Needs theory contended that individuals are motivated by three basic drivers: achievement, affiliation, and power. The theory is considered more useful than both Maslow’s and Alderfer’s theories in organizations (Jex, 2008). This theory explained and distinguished the difference between these with goal-directed behavior and the characteristics of those worth a high need for achievement. Individuals worth a high need for achievement may avoid risk, have a need for feedback, and may be goal directed.

Raeisi, Hadadi, Faraji, and Salehian (2012) elaborated on McClelland’s theory by suggesting that organizations and administrative authorities should implement appropriate methods to support employee needs according to their motivators. The researchers randomly selected 241 physical education teachers in West Azerbaijan province and examined the motivational needs based on McClelland’s Motivational
Theory. Results showed that the need for success, achievement, and power are a priority for participants.

**Cognitive Process Theories**

Equity Theory, Expectancy Theory, and Goal-Setting Theory are cognitive process theories of motivation. John Stacy Adam’s Equity Theory has been a part of classical management literature since 1963 (Bell & Martin, 2012).

**Equity theory.** Equity Theory is a type of social exchange theory that focuses on social interactions, exchanges, fairness, and outcomes. The premise is that individuals give what they get or what they feel they are receiving (Jex & Britt, 2008). Research (Huseman, Hatfield, & Miles, 1987; Shore, 2004) has supported the Equity Theory, specifically in the area of fairness perceptions in the workplace.

Schappe (1998) highlighted the importance of perceived fair treatment and related that its effect on job satisfaction should not be ignored. Madsen, Miller, and John (2005) identified fair treatment as a factor that promotes job satisfaction. Rai (2012) related that job satisfaction is a reflection of fair and respectable treatment. By examining the influence of organizational justice on job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover, Rai’s findings suggested that organizations desiring to improve job satisfaction should give attention to developing programs, polices, and leadership that promotes fairness.

**Expectancy theory.** This theory was derived from the much earlier work of Lewin’s (1938) and Tolman’s (1959) and was later expounded upon by Vroom. Vroom’s 1964 expectancy theory differed from equity’s theory, in that it provided cognitive variables that reflect individual differences in work motivation (Lunenburg,
Expectancy theory is one of the most widely used theories in organizational psychology, serves as a basis for other theories, and has received support from numerous studies addressing financial incentives (Jex & Britt, 2008). Expectancy theory operates under conditions, formulas, and the belief that an outcome will be reached due to a given behavior or level of performance. A positive work behavior will result in a positive outcome such as increased salary, promotion, and other benefits. The theory stated that individual motivation is based on one’s expectancy beliefs; individuals’ expectations guide their efforts and actions. Employees who believe their actions will result in a raise (positive outcome) would possibly work harder than if they believe that hard work is not rewarded.

Estes and Polnick (2012) added to the literature by analyzing Vroom’s Expectancy Theory to predict the impact of tenure on the scholarship productivity of tenured faculty. “Analyses were conducted to determine if a significant difference existed between twenty-four pre-tenure and post-tenured faculty productivity” (p. 5). Research findings supported the researchers’ predictions of a post-tenure research productivity decline when compared to pre-tenure years. Chen, Gupta, and Hoshower (2006) utilized expectancy theory to examine factors that motivate business faculty productivity. Findings suggested that non-tenured faculty tend to be motivated by extrinsic reward (i.e., the possibility of tenure), while tenured faculty tend to have intrinsic motivation. Similarly, findings from the Hu and Gill (2000) study supported expectancy theory by indicating that research productivity peaks during tenure review and declines post-tenure.
**Goal-setting theory.** The premise of the Goal-Setting Theory is goals motivate individuals. This theory is the most researched and best established of the cognitive process theories (Ambrose & Kulik, 1999; Latham & Locke, 1991; Locke & Latham, 1990; Locke & Latham, 2006). Several studies, however, have presented limitations related to outcomes and contended that goal setting may not be effective in certain circumstances (Ordonez, Schweitzer, Galinsky, & Bazerman, 2009; Schweitzer, Ordonez, & Douma, 2004). Goal setting narrows one’s focus and can cause tunnel vision. In addition, the number of goals individuals set may present conflicts, and goal setting may be more beneficial in simple tasks as compared to those that are more multifaceted.

**Behavioral Theories**

The behavioral approach to motivation suggested that behavior is a function of or influenced by consequences (Jex & Britt, 2008). Individuals in organizations attempt to exhibit behaviors that cultivate positive outcomes and to avoid behaviors that produce negative results. Studies have highlighted rewards and feedback as the major principles used when influencing workplace behavior (Breif & Weiss, 2002; Westover & Taylor, 2010). A common form of workplace reward is compensation (Jex & Britt, 2008). Ahsan, Abdullah, Fie, and Alam (2009) associated job satisfaction with monetary compensation. Jehanzeb, Rasheed, Rasheed, and Aamir (2012) examined the impact of financial rewards in both public and private banks and found that both financial and non-financial rewards have a positive and significant effect on job satisfaction. Randolph and Johnson (2005), however, found that professional growth is more significantly related than financial rewards to job satisfaction for rehabilitation professionals.
Feedback is another common form of workplace reward most frequently studied in relation to learning and teaching (Hattie & Timperly, 2007). Feedback provides motivational and diagnostic value to employees when administered properly and in a timely manner (Jex & Britt, 2008). Other studies (De Stobbeleir, Ashford, & Buyens, 2011; Moon & Sproull, 2008; Spar & Sonnentag, 2008) have suggested that feedback promotes increased job satisfaction, creativity, and productivity. Katsikea, Theodosiou, Perdikis, and Kehagias (2011) investigated the relationship between job characteristics and work outcomes in export sales managers and found that feedback enhances job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Chen (2008) found increased job feedback as the most effective means of improving satisfaction attitude of Information system personnel.

**Self-Determination Theory**

Unlike the behavioral approach to motivation focusing on behaviors that promote positive or negative outcomes, self-determination theory (SDT) argued that individuals possess three core psychological needs (competence, relatedness, and autonomy) that guide individual growth, functioning, wellbeing, and satisfaction (Deci & Ryan, 2008). Deci and Ryan (2008) described SDT as an empirically-based theory of human motivation, development, and wellness with initial work dating back to the 1970s. Greguras and Diefendorff (2009) added to the limited research using SDT in an organizational context. Results indicated that employee attitudes and performance heighten when psychological needs for autonomy, relatedness, and competence are fulfilled. The extension of SDT to an organizational context highlighted that factors
facilitating the satisfaction of individuals’ needs impact employee motivation, performance, job satisfaction, and other work-related criteria (Gagné & Deci, 2005).

Based on previous research (Baard, Deci, & Ryan, 2004; Black & Deci, 2000; Stone, Deci, & Ryan, 2009), SDT works best in situations or places of employment in which individuals can gain enjoyment from the task or job. Roca and Gagné (2008) examined the applicability of the SDT to the continued used of e-learning in the workplace. Data were collected from employees of four international agencies, and findings suggested that employees are more willing to continue using an e-learning system when they feel autonomous, competent, and connected. SDT may not apply to a similar extent with environments, jobs, or leaders who do not provide individuals with autonomy and support (Oostlander et al., 2013).

**Job-Based Theory**

Job-based theories of motivation “propose that the key to understanding motivation lies in the content of employees’ jobs” (Jex & Britt, 2008, p. 256). Job-based theories and need-based theories are closely related; however, job-based theories appear to be developed and more practical for the workplace than to the need-based theories. Herzberg’s Motivation-Hygiene Theory (1959), also known as the Two-Factor Theory, has been recognized as a practical approach for motivating employees (Tan & Waheed, 2011). Herzberg examined the perceptions of 200 engineers and accountants from over nine companies in the United States. Herzberg’s theory suggested content of the jobs performed by individuals as a key motivator. Herzberg added that the work environment could be divided into two categories: hygiene factors and motivators. He used the term hygiene factors, as they are not motivators but are needed to keep
employees satisfied akin to personal hygiene helping to keep one healthy. Hygiene factors include pay, fringe benefits, and relationships with coworkers. Motivators include level of challenges, level of autonomy or discretion, intrinsic interest, and opportunities for creativity.

Wong and Heng (2009) added to the literature utilizing Herzberg’s theory to determine whether certain factors related to job satisfaction of Malaysian faculty members. The major sources of job satisfaction were policy, administration, and salary. The major sources of dissatisfaction were personal achievement, personal growth, interpersonal relations, recognition, responsibility, supervision, the work itself, and the overall working conditions. Rad and De Moraes (2009) also utilized Herzberg’s theory when determining factors affecting employees’ job satisfaction among public hospital staff. Nine hundred and fifty employees at Isfahan University Hospitals were randomly selected as participants of the study, with 814 (85%) returning usable surveys; however, responses from only middle manager employees are relevant to the current study. For this group, acceptable pay, promotion, and good working conditions were the top three motivators for job satisfaction. A major finding of the study indicated that job dissatisfaction for managers relates to lack of respect and recognition. Although some organizations believe good pay is the number one desire of employees, this study revealed that the perceptions of managers serve as a motivator for employees. Favorably, Herzberg’s Motivation-Hygiene Theory provides specific work-related factors of motivation (Jex & Britt, 2008). These factors can provide organizational leadership and employees with direction and insight for success, satisfactions, and
performance. However, a lack of empirical research and support has been related to criticisms (Lundberg, Gudmundson, & Andersson, 2009).

The Job Characteristics Theory of Motivation (JCTM) addressed the deficiencies in Herzberg’s Motivation-Hygiene Theory (Jex & Britt, 2008) and has evolved over several years. This theory proposed that there is a link between job characteristics and job satisfaction. Hackman and Oldman (1980) identified skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, and feedback as essential job dimensions that lead to employee motivation and job satisfaction. JCTM has been the subject of empirical studies such as Fried and Ferris (1987), yet very few have tested the Job Characteristics model as a whole (Champoux, 1991). The Foss, Minbaeva, Pedersen, and Reinhold (2009) study helped to bridge the gap in the literature by focusing on the impact of job design on employee motivation in order to share knowledge.

Foss et al. (2009) developed and tested six hypotheses related to job characteristics, knowledge sharing, and employee motivation. Data were collected from machine engineers with academic degrees employed at a firm located in Copenhagen, Denmark. Questionnaires were pretested with academicians, managers, and other company representatives for clarity. Invitations were disseminated electronically to 505 employees and 186 (33%) returned surveys were deemed usable. Correlation analyses were utilized and results revealed that job autonomy, task identity, and feedback increase employee motivation and have a positive impact on knowledge sharing.

**Job Satisfaction Instruments**

Employee focus groups, interviews, and questionnaires are methods utilized to measure job satisfaction (Saari & Judge, 2004). Most research has been conducted
through questionnaires for feasibility and accuracy (Spector, 1997). Job satisfaction instruments generally measure two types of satisfaction. The first and most studied is global satisfaction, which refers to employees’ overall feelings about their jobs. Facet satisfaction is the second refers to feelings about specific job aspects (Mueller & Kim, 2008). Spector (1997) suggested using an existing job satisfaction scale, as these scales cover the major factors related to satisfaction and provide norms for generalizations. Such scales also are the least difficult measuring job satisfaction because they not only generally cover the major factors of satisfaction but also provide norms for generalizations. “They also provide acceptable levels of reliability, evidence for construct validity, and they decrease feasibility, concerns, such as time and cost” (Spector, 1997, p. 6).

Very few studies have provided a systematic review of job satisfaction instruments, and scant literature has examined the reliability and validity of job satisfaction instruments. Van Saane, Sluiter, Verbeek, and Frings-Dresen (2003) addressed both deficiencies in the literature by examining evaluative tools in hospital environments. They reviewed and described 29 job satisfaction instruments and assessed the reliability and validity of each. Van Saane et al. divided the selected instruments into three categories: multidimensional instruments for jobs in general, multidimensional instruments for specific jobs, and global multi-item job satisfaction instruments. Seven met the quality criteria for reliability and validity. Of the seven reliable surveys, two instruments, the Job Satisfaction Survey and The Job in General Scale, have relevance to the current study and are discussed in the following sections.
Job Satisfaction Survey

In 1994, Paul Spector created The Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS), which was originally developed for the social service sector (Van Saane et al., 2003). The JSS is a 36-item scale that measures nine facets of job satisfaction and overall satisfaction including (1) salary, (2) promotion, (3) supervision, (4) fringe benefits, (5) contingent rewards, (6) operating procedures, (7) coworkers, (8) nature of work, and (9) communication (Spector, 1997). The response format is a six-point Likert scale ranging from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree.” According to Spector (1997), each of the nine subscales yields a separate facet score, and the total of all items produces a total score. Researchers (Astrauskaite, Vaitkevicius, & Perminas, 2011; Liu, Wang, & Lu, 2010; Terranova & Henning, 2011) have used the JSS in various employment sectors including athletic trainers, health center employees, and secondary school teachers.

The Job in General Scale

The Job in General Scale (JIG) is a global job satisfaction instrument that can be used in any sector. It contains 18 items and is part of the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) (Van Saane et al., 2003). The JIG uses a three format response: Agree (Yes), Aren’t Sure (?), or Disagree (No). Ironson, Smith, Brannick, Gibson, and Paul (1989) noted that the JIG correlates with other global measures of job satisfaction. Researchers have assumed that the JIG subscales make an equal contribution to overall job satisfaction (Spector, 1997). The JIG inventory has been used with various populations including health professionals (McIntyre & McIntyre, 2010); university public relations interns (Beebe, Blaylock, & Sweetser, 2009); and women in construction (Dabke, Salem, Genaidy, & Daraiseh, 2008). The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) did not
meet the Van Saane et al. (2003) quality criteria for reliability and validity. However, this instrument is very popular instrument among other researchers due to the coefficient alpha findings (Martins & Proenca, 2012); therefore, the following discussion is included.

**Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire**

The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) is available in both a 100-item long version and a 20-item short form. Twenty job facets are assessed in the long form that contains five items per facet and the short form that contains one per facet. The MSQ assesses extrinsic and intrinsic satisfaction. According to Spector (1997), the 20 facets of the MSQ are more specific than most other satisfaction surveys. The MSQ response format is a five-point Likert scale ranging from “very dissatisfied with this aspect of my job” to “very satisfied with this aspect of my job.” Researchers have used the MSQ to investigate the job satisfaction of academic staff (Toker, 2011); nurses (Abusharikha, Saca, & Hazboun, 2009); and community mental health employees (Nelson, Johnson, & Bebbington, 2009).

Many job satisfaction instruments exist; however, only a few meet the high level of reliability and construct validity (Van Saane et al., 2003). When assessing job satisfaction, it is imperative that researchers utilize reliable and valid instruments as well as a measure of the satisfaction variables one wishes to assess. If a researcher cannot find an existing instrument, one must develop a new instrument or modify an existing instrument.
Influences on Job Satisfaction

Individual factors such as mood, disposition, and personal thoughts are important influences on job satisfaction. According to Judge, Heller, and Mount (2002), the work of earlier researchers such as Hoppock, (1935), with a few exceptions Smith (1955) and Weitz, (1952), found a strong correlation between workers’ emotional temperament and their levels of job satisfaction. Emotional factors correlating with job satisfaction were dormant until a renewed interest ignited in the 1980s (Arvey, Bouchard, Segal, & Abraham, 1989; Staw, Bell, & Clausen, 1986; Staw & Ross, 1985). Additional research has supported the argument that ties job satisfaction to temperament (House, Shane, & Herold, 1996; Ilies & Judge, 2002). More recent research (Downey, 2008; Judge & Klinger, 2007) has provided continuous support for the belief that job satisfaction is an emotional work related reaction.

Organizational constraints also influence job satisfaction. Examples of organizational constraints include other individuals, physical and mental work environments, and organization policies and procedures (Liu, Nauta, Li, & Fan, 2010). According to Spector (1997), high levels of organizational constraints are related to employee job dissatisfaction. Some organizational constraints are difficult to adjust or change; however, Syptak, Marsland, and Ulmer (1999) asserted that organizations can increase job satisfaction by providing job factors that reduce organizational constraints. Those factors include: (a) making sure company policies are clear and fair; (b) offering comparable salaries and benefits; (c) providing opportunities for interpersonal and social relations, as well as, work-life balance practices; (d) keeping up-to-date facilities and
equipment; (e) offering employee autonomy; (f) advancement opportunities; and (g) acknowledging employee success (para. 4).

The nature of job satisfaction presents challenges to workplace applications, as employees have different or needs. Unfortunately, a single job aspect most likely will not affect an employee’s job satisfaction. However, it is important for organizations to not only understand the impacts of job satisfaction on employee retention, but also the leadership must be knowledgeable of workplace factors. In addition, organizations should develop and implement policies and procedures shown to increase employee retention.

**Job Satisfaction and Employee Retention**

Determining the reason employees leave an organization and understanding the manner in which to retain them are difficult tasks for human resource managers and organizations (Branham, 2005). Kazi and Zadeh, (2011) have suggested that job dissatisfaction leads to job turnover. Literature exists on identifying factors that cause employees to quit (Griffeth et al., 2000), but little is known about the factors that compel employees to stay (Steel, Griffeth, & Hom, 2002). A study by Hausknecht, Rodda, and Howard (2009) addressed this gap in the literature by developing a content model to discern the reason employees remain with their employer. A total of 30,556 employees within a large leisure and hospitality company participated in the study, to include hourly, supervisory, managerial, and salaried employees. Participants worked in one of the 21 properties located throughout the United States. Each human resource department compiled a team of survey coordinators for online survey oversight and administration. The researchers used a qualitative data analysis software program to
code the following 12 reason-for-retention factors: Advancement Opportunities, Constituent Attachments, Extrinsic Rewards, Flexible Work Arrangements, Investments, Job Satisfaction, Lack of Alternatives, Location, Non-work Influences, Organizational Commitment, Organizational Justice, and Organizational Prestige. Ratings were made on a five-point scale: 1 – Needs Improvement, 2 – Marginal, 3 – Successful, 4 – Highly Successful, and 5 – Outstanding Results. The overall response rate was 87.7%, with 71.2% deemed usable.

Hausknecht et al. (2009) tested two hypotheses using univariate analysis of variance (ANOVA) to determine whether statistically significant differences exist between performance category or job levels. A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used to assess the overall effects of job performance and job level on the 12 factors. Study findings supported the concept that retention profiles differ between employees; i.e., employees who have advancement opportunities, organizational prestige, and job satisfaction are more likely to remain in their position compared to those who do not. Study findings also suggested that employees who perceive no advancement opportunities selected extrinsic rewards such as pay as significant retention factors.

**Generations Defined**

In order to better understand the discussion of Generation Y, it is important to define the term “generation” and to provide a brief review on other generations relevant the current study, i.e., Baby Boomers and Generation X. Differing opinions exist as to defining generations (Giancola, 2006). Traditionally, the term “generation” has been defined “as the average period between the birth of parents and the birth of their
offspring” (American Heritage College Dictionary, 1997, p. 567). According to Straus and Howe (2000), no exact number of years defines a generation; the length may vary up to 22 years, and the span is roughly the length of a phase of life. This terminology, however, provides a biological perspective and, others have argued is too wide a span due to new technologies and shifting societal values (McCrindle, 2010).

Global trends and developments shape and define generations today. The 1960s generation was the first global generation, the emergence of which had world-wide significance (Edmunds & Turner, 2005). Globalization added to the definition of generation by including “a group of people born in the same era, shaped by the same times and influenced by the same social markers” (McCrindle & Wolfinger, 2009, p. 2). McCrindle (2010), noted that a generation refers to a cohort of individuals born within a similar span of time who share a comparable age and who experienced similar events. The current study utilized McCrindle’s definition.

**Baby Boomers**

“The baby boom began in 1946 and continued through 1964; during this time 76 million people were born” (Dohm, 2000, p. 17). Baby Boomer parents were members of the GI and early Silent generations. Strauss and Howe (1991) defined Baby Boomers as “individuals born 1943 -1960” (p. 299). “Baby Boomers tend to value education and many have relied on educational attainment to support their high need for professional identity” (Sandeen, 2008, p. 15). Related to the workplace, the Baby Boomers are highly career-focused and expect to have prominent positions with high salaries. Organizational loyalty and commitment are important to this generation, and they view
frequent job changes as negative (Lancaster & Stillman, 2002). Their preferred mode of workplace communication is face-to-face (Lancaster & Stillman, 2002).

**Generation X**

Tulgan (1997) defined Generation X as “individuals born 1963-1977” (p. 55). In a social context this generation experienced severe United States economic recessions (Sandeen, 2008), which resulted in concern with long-term economic plans and pessimistic views of organizational loyalty (Lancaster & Stillman, 2002). In contrast to the Baby Boomers, Generation X views changing jobs as necessary and beneficial. Generation X prefers family and leisure time over long work week schedules (Smith, 2008). In the workplace, they appreciate feedback and professional development opportunities (Lancaster & Stillman, 2002).

**Generation Y**

Tulgan’s narrower definition and defined Generation Y as individuals born from 1978 to 1989 who range in age from 26 to 37.

**Generation Y Characteristics**

**Generation Y Terms**

Much like the differences in the exact years used to define Generation Y, the terms used to name the generation also vary. Experts have labeled this generation with terms such as Millennials, Nexters, Generation WWW, Digital Generation, Generation E, Echo Boomers, and N-Gens, but they most often are referred to as Generation Y (Martin, 2005). The term Generation Y was given because it comes after Generation X (Main, 2013). *Advertising Age* (as cited in Main, 2013) was the first to coin the term Generation Y; however, the term did not age well, and “Millennials” initially became as the key label.

According to Main (2013), this generation also is known as the Peter Pan or Boomerang Generation, due to of the propensity to move back in with parents due to economic constraints. The name Echo Boomers stemmed from the global increase in births between the 1980s to the 1990s and given the size of the specific generation in relation to the Baby Boomers (Gibson, 2013). Other labels of Generation Y include Dot.com Generation, KIPPER (Kids in Parents Pockets Eroding Retirement Savings), Generation Me, and Digital Natives. According to McCrindle (2010), the label that has prevailed is Generation Y. The current study utilized the term Generation Y.

**Workplace Expectations**

The Generation Y population numbers approximately 79.8 million in the United States and outsizes the 74.9 million Baby Boomer generation (Fry, 2015). According to
Puybaraud (2010), Generation Y is the fastest growing segment of the workforce, expanding from 14% to 21% over a four-year span to nearly 32 million workers. Although the exact number of years and the labels are inconsistent when describing Generation Y, a few workplace related common characteristics and expectations exist. When discussing Generation Y, Kaplan (as cited in Armour, 2005) stated that “Generation Y is much less likely to respond to the traditional command and control type of management workforce” (Armour, para. 6). This generation has grown up questioning their parents and are now questioning their employers. Generation Y presents aggravating characteristics for the older generational managers who operate under a “do it and do it now” approach (para. 6).

Gibson (2013) suggested that Generation Y individuals are confident and ambitious. They also are achievement-oriented, believe in their own self-worth, and are not fearful of trying new and unfamiliar things. In addition, they believe that there are no limits to what they can achieve. Many are unafraid to explore different areas of employment, geographical locations, and venues if levels of employment desires are unmet. Martin (2005) provided insightful information related to Generation Y in the workplace and found they are independent, entrepreneurial thinkers who relish responsibility. They demand immediate feedback and expect consistent attention to their accomplishments. In addition, Martin found that Generation Y employees thrive on work that is challenging and creative. They love a flexible workplace environment and seek workplaces that provide liberty for them to do their jobs. They dislike micro managers and are successful under managers who attempt to meet their expectations and are committed to their well-being and success. They desire to work with highly
motivated individuals. Additionally, they rank financial compensation as extremely important.

Generation Y participates in team sports, play groups, and other group centered activities and receives rewards for merely participating. In workplace environments they appreciate being part of the team and value the opportunity for input. Inclusion, acceptance, and continuous feedback cultivate their workplace loyalty and commitment (Dorsey, n.d.; Kane, n.d.). In contrast, a study cited in USA Today (March 15, 2012) suggests that Generation Y may individuals may place a stronger emphasis on extrinsic values such as money, fame, and image. They may focus less upon intrinsic values such as self-acceptance, group affiliation, and community (Healy, 2012). Generation Y members possess a high level of knowledge about and dependence on technology. Technology and have grown up surrounded by technological devices and instruments. To this generation, technology is an essential aspect of their lives (Martin, 2005). In workplace environments, they choose quick modes of electronic communication by using email, social networks, or text messaging as opposed to the traditional means, i.e., walking down the hall to speak to a colleague. According to Tulgan and Martin (2001), this generation is comfortable with virtual problem solving and task completion.

Broadbridge et al. (2007) summarized the Generation Y employment expectations as (a) job and hour flexibility, (b) fast tracked and higher entry level positions with possibility of internal promotion, (c) performance-related salary and bonuses, (d) work-life balance, (e) good working environments, (f) fair compensation, and (g) training opportunities. By understanding the characteristics and workplace expectations of Generation Y employees and their desired workplace factors,
organizations can create programming that effectively recruits, develops, and retains this population.

**Comparisons to Other Generations**

Currently, three major generations are found in the workplace: the Baby Boomers, Generation X, and Generation Y (Treuren & Anderson, 2010). Generational diversity in the workplace can present challenges; therefore, understanding the similarities, differences, and desired workplace factors that increase job satisfaction and employee retention of the largest employee sector is vital. Substantial Generation Y literature has suggested that this population is unequivocally different in its work attitude compared to the generations that preceded it (Collier, 2009; Huntley, 2006; McCrindle, 2006). In addition, much of the existing literature has presented the problems of Generation Y in the workplace and has proposed ways in which to avoid them (Cassie, 2006). A minimal amount of literature has presented a more positive view of this generation by providing the benefits of the Generation Y employee workforce (Howe & Strauss, 2000). Also, few studies have provided formal evidence suggesting that Generation Y actually exists as a distinctive group with different employment attitudes.

Treuren and Anderson (2010) sought to fill this gap and presented a comparative analysis of workplace behaviors, attitudes, and expectations of the Baby Boomers, Generation X, and the Generation Y cohorts. Three hypotheses were presented that address the research question: Are Generation Y employment preferences different than Generation X and the Baby Boomers? Via e-mail, they invited 18,500 domestic, international, undergraduate, and postgraduate students to complete an online survey. A
total of 583 usable responses were received, representing a 3.2% rate. The survey asked several questions about employment expectations and characteristics of desired jobs. Nine employer attributes were listed and respondents were asked to rank them in order of preference from highest to lowest priority. Employer attributes ranked high salary, flexible work arrangements, travel opportunities, job satisfaction, and interest; ongoing training and development; sociable work culture; work-life balanced; opportunities for advancement with the company; and opportunities for advancement beyond the company.

The non-parametric equivalent of the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) test was used to identify significance between several independent groups. The Kruskal-Wallis test was used to establish whether the independent groups are genuinely different or merely due to the sample drawn from the population. The Bonferroni correction-adjusted Mann-Whitney test was used for post hoc testing and non-hierarchical clustering also was used. Results revealed that the three cohorts had statistically similar rankings for all but two employment conditions. Flexible work arrangements and work-life balance were less important for Generation Y than Generation X and Baby Boomer respondents. Results also indicated that the Baby Boomer respondents desire employment flexibility, work-life balance, and work satisfaction more highly than Generation X and Generation Y. In addition, Generation Y had less desire for interesting work, work-life balance, or employment flexibility than Generation X or the Baby Boomers. Finally, no statistically significant difference was noted in age-cohort proportions between clusters. In summary, Generation Y did not appear as a distinct,
separate cohort or possess different employment expectations than any generation preceding them.

Treuren and Anderson asked questions about intended behavior rather than actual behavior, presenting a limitation to the study. Additional research should examine actual workplace behaviors and preferences. Another limitation of the study was the low response rate. Future research is needed that includes a larger sample size. In addition, the participant demographics were atypical of their cohort, presenting another limitation of the study. Future research is needed that includes a more heterogeneous participant pool.

**University Professional Staff**

University professional staff members are individuals who perform many functions extremely important to the overall operations within institutions of higher education. In addition, their administrative roles support the goals and mission of the university. These employees usually are not classified as faculty, but rather as a non-exempt, non-contractual group of mid-level administrative staff. Rosser (2004) defined university staff members as mid-level managers who are academic or non-academic support personnel within the structure of higher education organizations. They serve as directors and coordinators of university offices such as admissions, institutional research, registrar, computing and technology, human resources, alumni affairs, student affairs, career services, and counseling services. Many university professional staff members have low visibility within their universities, yet their duties may include managing departmental budgets; determining student admissions to the university; hiring and training support staff; and providing overall support to the administrators, faculty,
and students. According to Snyder and Dillow (2012), approximately 2.6 million individuals were employed in colleges and universities in the fall 2011. Nearly 22% were considered to be professional staff members. Although university professional staff members constitute nearly one fourth of university employees, they are the least studied group in higher education.

Ahsan, Abdullah, Fie, and Alam (2009) sought to address this gap in literature by investigating the relationship between job stress and job satisfaction among university staff employed at a public university in Malaysia. The researchers developed and tested seven hypotheses inferring that a negative relationship between job stress and job satisfaction exist. From 300 employees selected for participation using the non-probability sampling technique, 203 (67.6%) completed the questionnaire during personal interviews. A three part instrument was developed to measure job stress and job satisfaction, and to ascertain demographic information. Job stress was measured by the Job Stress Questionnaire (JSQ). Four dimensions were measured using a six-point Likert scale ranging from 1 – Strongly Disagree to 6 – Strongly Agree. Job satisfaction was measured using the Job Descriptive Index (JDI), which included a six point Likert scale ranging from 1 – Least Satisfied to 6 – Very Satisfied. Demographic questions included race, gender, age, marital status, and level of education. Various statistical methods were employed for data analysis, including cross-sectional, description, and regression analysis. The researchers verified internal reliability of the items by computing Cronbach’s alpha and the constructs were deemed to have adequate reliability. Multiple linear regression analysis was used to test the seven hypotheses, and results showed relationship with others, high workloads, homework interface, and role
ambiguity significant relative to job stress. Results also indicated a negative relationship between job stress and job satisfaction.

The Ahsan et al. (2009) study revealed the importance of a university understanding the needs of its employees and seeking to meet those needs. In addition, universities must provide continuous feedback and a healthy working environment. Finally, universities must seek to offer programs that motivate employees. Limitations of the study included the small sample size, the use of only one public university, and the limited variables used for measurement.

**Summary**

Employee turnover for any organization is costly, and institutions of higher education are no different. In light of the most recent economic downturn and declining enrollments, universities must seek avenues to avoid any additional financial hardship. The decision to remain with an organization is largely determined by the employee’s level of satisfaction within the organization. Job satisfaction has been linked to workplace factors such as fairness, respect, compensation, feedback, and a sense of feeling valued. As the Baby Boomer generation retires and Generation X members are promoted to university upper-level positions, Generation Y members are filling many university professional staff roles. It is imperative that university executives know and understand Generation Y characteristics and their desired workplace factors.

This chapter presented studies that examined job satisfaction as it relates to Baby Boomers, Generation X, and Generation Y. Also presented were studies of university professional staff members and theories of motivation related to workplace environments. Some pointed to the importance of job satisfaction and the need to
include workplace factors that promote employee retention of the up and coming Generation Y population. This chapter presented studies examining job satisfaction, literature on Generation Y and university professional staff members, as well as theories of motivation related to workplace environments. The importance of job satisfaction and the need for organizations to include workplace factors that promote employee retention of Generation Y university staff members also was included.

Chapter III contains a review of the methods used to address the research question. Justification for a quantitative correlational research design is provided. The chapter also includes a discussion on the research design, sample population, data collection, instrumentation, validity and relatability, feasibility and appropriateness, and data analysis.
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

Introduction

Due to demographic trends in the United States, universities are experiencing an unprecedented multigenerational workforce (Harrison, 2007). As the Baby Boomer generation retires and Generation X members transition to upper-level positions, Generation Ys move into university professional staff positions. These staff make valuable contributions essential to the overall success of a college or university and provide leadership and administrative and technical support for faculty, staff, and students. This study utilized a quantitative correlational design to investigate the workplace factors associated with job satisfaction, as well as the intent to remain in a position. Furthermore, Generation Y demographics differences associated with job satisfaction were examined.

Understanding that which helps Generation Y professional staff in making the decision to remain in a position allows universities to create programming to foster retention. Employee retention benefits universities financially, as organizational turnover at any level is costly (Griffeth et al., 2000). The central research question for this quantitative correlational study was: What workplace factors associated with job satisfaction of Generation Y university professional staff contribute to their intent to remain a position?

This chapter presents the methodology of the study, the research questions, and the research design. Details of the population and sample studied, the instrument used, and the procedures for data collection follow. Also included are data analysis
procedures and ethical considerations of the study. The chapter concludes with a summary.

Research Questions

Creswell (2012) related that the type of research conducted requires different approaches based on the guiding research question. The researcher stated that quantitative research questions “ask specific, narrow questions to obtain measureable and observable data on variables” (p. 14) and “descriptive, relationship, and comparison questions are popular forms in quantitative research” (p. 124). The central research question for this quantitative correlational investigation was: What workplace factors associated with job satisfaction of Generation Y university professional staff contribute to their intent to remain a position?

Three specific research questions guided this study:

RQ1: To what extent do workplace factors (pay, promotion, supervision, benefits, contingent rewards, operating procedures, coworkers, nature of work, and communication) associate with job satisfaction for Generation Y university professional staff?

RQ2: To what extent do selected variables (gender, type of institution, race/ethnicity, level of education, educational requirement of position held, and length of time in position) affect job satisfaction of Generation Y university professional staff?

RQ3: To what extent do workplace factors (pay, promotion, supervision, benefits, contingent rewards, operating procedures, coworkers, nature of work, and communication) affect the retention of Generation Y university professional staff?
**Research Design**

A strong research design is essential to both quantitative and qualitative research. Quantitative methodology was used for this study, as it describes a problem; collects numeric data; compares groups; and takes an objective, unbiased approach (Creswell, 2012). An advantage of quantitative methods is their ability to use smaller groups of individuals to make inferences about larger groups (Swanson & Holton, 2005). Different types of quantitative designs include descriptive, correlational, causal-comparative, and experimental. A correlational design with a descriptive survey was selected for the current study.

Creswell (2012) indicated that a correlational design is the preferred method of investigation with which to examine the relationship between two or more variables using the statistical procedure of correlational analysis. Creswell further asserted that the quantitative correlational research design does not prove a relationship but rather it “generalizes results, makes a prediction, and explains the degree of association among two or more variables” (p. 358). In correlational research designs, researchers do not attempt to control or manipulate the variables as in an experiment; they relate two or more scores for each unit of analysis.

In order to identify whether a relationship exists among the study variables, data were collected from university professional staff categorized as administrative, managerial, professional, non-faculty, and non-support. The use of survey instruments to collect data is a key feature of many quantitative studies (Harwell, 2011). Surveys were utilized to collect data and to examine whether a relationship exists among workplace factors, job satisfaction, and Generation Y university professional staff intent.
to remain in a current university position. In order to identify whether demographics (gender, type of institution, race/ethnicity, level of education, educational requirement of position held, and length of time in position) affect the relationship among study variables, i.e., workplace factors, job satisfaction, and the intent to remain in a position, data analyses and comparisons were made.

**Appropriateness of Design**

Creswell (2012) stated that quantitative methods are especially appropriate when “the problem is identifying factors that influence an outcome, the utility of an intervention, or understanding the best predictors of outcomes” (p. 13) and that “qualitative research methodologies are appropriate for exploration of a central phenomenon” (p. 16). Therefore, a qualitative study would have been ineffective, as the focus of the study was to identify a relationship between the variable through statistical analysis of the proposed data collection. Creswell also stated that “quantitative approaches use more closed-ended approaches, whereas qualitative approaches use more open-ended approaches” (p. 19).

The researcher of the current study used statistical analysis to analyze data. Qualitative research may be better suited for situational interactions in which observation would uncover nuances in those interactions. Quantitative studies ask direct questions and use statistical analysis to uncover relationships. Qualitative researchers analyze study participants’ words or images, as opposed to performing statistical procedures. Therefore, a qualitative study would have been less appropriate due to data analysis procedures. A quantitative correlational design with a descriptive survey was
appropriate and preferred over a qualitative method approach due to the nature of the current study.

**Population**

The population selected for the research study was university professional staff categorized as administrative, managerial, professional, non-faculty, and non-support employed at universities located in Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee. Convenience sampling was used to ensure the target population was sampled.

**Sample**

The sample selection consisted of Generation Y university professional staff who met the following specifications for the study: (a) born between 1978 and 1989; (b) worked in a university located in the southeastern region; (c) categorized as administrative, managerial, professional, non-faculty, non-support; and (d) willing to participate.

**Sampling Procedure**

Convenience sampling was the method utilized for selection of Generation Y university professional staff participants. “In convenience sampling the researcher selects participant because they are willing and available to be studied” (Creswell, 2012, p. 145). The disadvantage of convenience sampling is the researcher’s inability to know whether those responding are representative of the study’s population; “however the sample can provide useful information for answering questions and hypotheses” (Creswell, p. 146).
University professional staff were identified in various departments (i.e., admissions, academic advising, residence life, judicial affairs, counseling and testing, career services, graduate studies, financial aid, TRIO programs, and student affairs) at the researcher’s university; and TRIO staff members employed at universities within the southeastern region were contacted to identify comparable participants. These individuals at the researcher’s institution were selected due to the feasibility of obtaining access to them.

**Instrumentation**

A survey design uses questionnaires or structured interviews to collect data from a sample with the purpose of generalizing the results to a population (Fowler, 2014). “A survey design provides a quantitative or numeric description of trend, attitudes, or opinions of a population by studying a sample of that population” (Creswell, 2012, p. 376). The survey instrument is widely recognized as a tool with which to gather information. Surveys also allow researchers to capture perceived behavior that can be measured against one or more variables. An evaluation of previously used and validated surveys was conducted. When searching for constructs to measure the variables to be studied, Spector’s (1997) 1994 Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) was selected for the current study. Paul Spector created the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS), which was originally developed for the social service sector (Van Saane et al., 2003). The Job Satisfaction Survey (see Appendix B) is a 36-item scale that measures nine facets of job satisfaction and overall satisfaction including (1) salary, (2) promotion, (3) supervision, (4) fringe benefits, (5) contingent rewards, (6) operating procedures, (7) coworkers, (8) nature of work, and (9) communication (Spector, 1997).
The instrument’s workplace subscales were used to assess the satisfaction of each workplace factor and the intent to remain in a current position. The response format was a six-point Likert scale ranging from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree.” According to Spector (1997), each of the nine subscales yields a separate facet score, and the total of all items produces a total score. Permission was granted to use and modify the Job Satisfaction Survey for research purposes. In addition to the 36-item JSS scale, participants were asked to respond to 13 demographic questions (see Appendix, A), used to assess the level of job satisfaction and the top three reasons for remaining in a current position. Demographic questions also were utilized to ascertain a profile of study participants and included (1) age, (2) gender, (3) race/ethnicity, (4) level of education, (5) educational required for the position held, (6) length of time at the university, (7) length of time in the position, (8) top three reasons for remaining in the current position, (9) level of job satisfaction, (10) the likelihood of remaining in the position, (11) whether the institution was predominately White or Historically Black, (12) whether the institution was public or private, and (13) the for-profit or not-for-profit status of the institution. The response formats for the demographic questions were multiple choice, open response, and rank ordered.

**Data Collection Procedures**

Web-based surveys are instruments used for collecting data available on the computer (Creswell, 2012). The advantages of internet surveys include “the potential access to larger populations, low cost associated with data collection, the potential for high speed returns, and the ability to gather extensive data quickly” (Fowler, 2014, p. 73). Disadvantages of internet surveys “include the need for a comprehensive listing of
email addresses, the inability to identify respondents, and sample selection limitation, i.e., sample is limited to individuals with internet access (Fowler, 2014, p. 73).

For survey administration, this study utilized Qualtrics, online survey software used for private academic survey distribution and data collection. Qualtrics is designed to increase feasibility for the participants and to assist researchers in accessing the population and collecting the responses. Research participants received the survey through email, which included an introduction to the topic, purpose, and target population for the survey. The email also included the informed consent document, eligibility requirements, and study participation information, i.e., voluntary and anonymous. In addition, participants were asked to forward the email to 25 individuals who met the study criteria employed at their university.

The subjects were given 10 days to complete the survey. A reminder was sent after one week requesting that the individuals remind those to whom they had sent the survey. After 10 days the survey was no longer accessible. Response data were downloaded from Qualtrics and imported into the SPSS software application.

**Data Analysis Procedures**

Statistical analysis was performed using the IBM Statistical Package for Social Science version 23 (SPSS). The SPSS software is appropriate for summarizing data with descriptive statistics and for performing inferential statistical analysis. The demographic questions’ responses were analyzed through descriptive statistics including frequency; percentage; measure of central tendencies (mean, median, mode); and standard deviation. “The objective in correlational research is to describe the degree of association between two or more variables” (Creswell, 2012, p. 356). In the current
study, more than one independent variable was studied to explain the variability in dependent variables; as a result, a correlational coefficient was selected for data analysis.

Pearson correlations were conducted to determine whether relationships exist among study variables. *T*-tests were utilized to test demographic differences (race, level of education, education required for the position, classification of the institution, status of the institution, category of the institution) of Generation Y university professional staff and their association with overall job satisfaction. A significance level of 0.05 was determined as appropriate for all tests.

**Ethical Considerations**

Risks were not anticipated in the current study. The online tool and research methods, in particular the voluntary, anonymous, and confidential nature of the study, were used to reduce any potential harm associated with participation, although, participation was not required. Respondents were given the option to stop and abandon the survey at any time. The current study complied with Western Kentucky University’s Institutional Review Board requirements. Data and analyses of results were stored in a secured filing system.

**Summary**

This study utilized a quantitative correlational design to investigate the workplace factors associated with job satisfaction of Generation Y university professional staff and the intent to remain in a position. This methodology approach was selected to identify whether a relationship exists among the study variables. Three research questions guided the study. The population included university professional staff categorized as administrative, managerial, professional, non-faculty, and non-
support employed at universities located in Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee. Convenience sampling was used for the selection of Generation Y university professional staff participants.

Spector’s (1997) 1994 JSS survey instrument was utilized to collect study data. Thirteen demographic questions were included for additional data collection. Surveys were disseminated electronically through Qualtrics online survey software. Descriptive statistics were calculated to summarize data, and correlational analyses were conducted to determine whether relationships exist among study variables. The study’s methods addressed ethical considerations.

Chapter IV presents the results of the current study and the data analysis of the results. Detailed procedural information for collecting and analyzing data are included. Applicable information in the form of tables and narratives are provided. Chapter V provides a summary of the study, implications, conclusions, and recommendations. Appendices include communication, instruments, and vital information used for the study.
CHAPTER IV: RESULTS

Introduction

This correlational study examined the extent and relationship of workplace factors associated with job satisfaction and the intent to remain is a position for Generation Y university professional staff. Furthermore, it considered the extent and relationship of selected Generation Y demographics associated with job satisfaction. The literature reviewed has suggested that job dissatisfaction is linked to employee turnover. The Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) and demographic questionnaire was administered to 364 university professional staff employed at 12 southeastern universities working in various positions i.e., admissions, academic advising, residence life, judicial affairs, counseling and testing, career services, graduate studies, financial aid, TRIO programs, and student affairs. The survey instrument can be found in Appendix A.

The study’s three research questions focused on one specific target population: Generation Y university professional staff. Studies addressing Generation X and Baby Boomers are substantial, whereas a gap exists in literature that has addressed Generation Y, particularly in the areas of job satisfaction and employee retention. As Generation Y individuals are flooding the current workforce pipelines, the researcher focused on Generation Y. Although the study’s response rate was favorable at 26.6%, many respondents represented other generation groups, i.e., Baby Boomer and Generation X, other than Generation Y. Thus, the researcher included notable non-Generation Y information in preliminary data analyses and two pertinent findings relating to job satisfaction and employee retention. However, all subsequent analyses and discussion remain more narrowly focused on the three central research questions.
and the generation group of interest. This chapter reports detailed descriptions of data collection, sample demographics, and results of study research questions and concludes with the summary of results.

Survey demographic data were used to provide a profile of study participant characteristics. Furthermore, Generation Y participants and other distinct generations were identified. Descriptive data were ascertained of participants’ central workplace factors, levels of job satisfaction, and employee retention. Demographic questions included the following:

- Age
- Gender
- Race/ethnicity
- Level of education
- Education required for the position held
- Length of time employed at a university
- Length of time employed in current position
- Top three reasons for remaining in current position
- Level of job satisfaction
- The Likelihood of remaining in current position
- The Identification of the university employed (Predominately White or Historically Black)
- The Classification of the university employed (public or private)
- The Status of the university employed (profit or not-for-profit)
Sample Demographic Results

Of the 98 university professional staff who responded to the survey, one did not complete it. Responses provided descriptive data on study participants \((N = 97)\). One respondent did not provide age information. Two respondents reported multiple race categories and were not included in race demographic data. This study defined Generation Y as individuals ages 26 to 37. In order to utilize complete responses, the researcher included participant ages 22 to 25 in the Generation Y demographic data, as well as for Generation X and Baby Boomers. Of the total participants, most were Generation Y, female, and white. Table 1 reports demographic data of study participants by generation group, gender, and race.

Table 1

*Generation Group, Gender, and Race*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation Group</th>
<th>(N)</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation Y</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>97</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>(N)</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>79.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>97</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most participants held a master’s degree, while few held an associate’s degree and high school diploma. Table 2 reports demographic data of educational levels of participants. A bachelor’s degree and a master’s degree were equally required as the minimum educational level for current positions held by study participants. Table 3 reports demographic data of study participants by requirements of positions held.

Table 2

**Educational Level of Participants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Level of Participants</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School Diploma/GED</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Degree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>54.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Degree</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate Degree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>97</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3

Requirements of Positions Held by Study Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirements of Position Held</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School Diploma/GED</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate’s Degree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Degree</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate Degree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One respondent did not report the classification of the institution. Nearly all study participants worked at four-year public, Predominately-White, not-for profit institutions. Table 4 reports demographic description data of institutions of employment by classification (2 Year versus 4 Year), category (Predominately-White [PWI] versus Historically Black [HBCU]), and status (For-Profit [FP] versus Not-For-Profit [NFP]).

Table 4

Institution Descriptions by Classification, Category, and Status

| Institution Classification | 2 Year Public | 4 Year Public | 4 Year Private | Total | \(N=97\) |
|----------------------------|--------------|---------------|----------------|-------|
| Institution Category       | FP           | NFP           |                |       |         |
|                            | 13           | 79            | 5              | 97    |         |
| Institution Status         | PWI          | HBCU          |                |       |         |
|                            | 96           | 1             |                | 97    |         |
The majority of study participants were employed at their university and in their current position for one to five years, 48% and 73% respectively. A few were employed for 16 to 20 years at their university and current position, three and two participants respectively. Tables 5 and 6 report demographic data of study participants by time employed at their institution and in their current position.

Table 5

Length of Time at University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Time at University</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-28 years</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6

Length of Time in Current Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Time in Position</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>74.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-28 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Descriptive Statistics for Level of Job Satisfaction

The level of job satisfaction was self-reported and measured using a Likert-type scale question with a range of 1 to 10, with $1 = \text{Most Satisfied}$ and $10 = \text{Least Satisfied}$. The question asked: "On a scale from (1 being most satisfied and 10 been least satisfied) what is your level of job satisfaction?" This item was reverse coded so that the higher score would indicate a higher level of satisfaction i.e., $1 – \text{Least Satisfied}$ and $10 – \text{Most Satisfied}$. This question was analyzed by distinct generation groups and total respondents. The level of job satisfaction was ranked fairly average, $M = 5.31$, $SD = 2.6$. The level of job satisfaction was higher for Baby Boomers than for Generation X and Generation Y. Of the three distinct generations, Generation X reported the lowest level of satisfaction. Table 7 reports the means and standard deviations of job satisfaction by generation groups.

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.32</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation Y</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean and Standard Deviation of Likelihood of Remaining in Position by Generations

The likelihood of remaining in a position was self-reported and measured on an interval measurement scale with a range of 1 to 4. The question asked: "How likely are you to remain in your current position?" Response choices were coded as $1 = \text{Very}
Likely, 2 = Somewhat Likely, 3 = Not Very Likely, and 4 = Not At All Likely. This item was reverse coded so that the higher score would indicate a greater likelihood of remaining in a current position. This question was measured participants by distinct generations and total respondents. Ninety-six responses were analyzed. For all participants the likelihood for remaining in a current position was fairly low, $M = 1.75$, $SD = .881$. Generation Y participants appeared to be more likely to remain in their current position than Generation X and Baby Boomers. Table 8 reports the means and standard deviation of the likelihood of remaining in a current position by distinct generations.

**Table 8**

*Mean and Standard Deviation of Likelihood of Remaining in Current Position by Generation Group*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation Group</th>
<th>$N$</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation Y</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Top Three Reasons for Remaining in Current Position**

The top three reasons for remaining in a current position were self-reported and measured on a rank ordered scale with a range of 1 to 3. The question asked: “From the list, please rank in order the top three reasons (1 = top, then 2, then 3) you would remain in current position.” Response choices were the Job Satisfaction Survey workplace factors of Pay, Promotion, Supervision, Benefits, Contingent Rewards,
Operating Procedures, Coworkers, Nature of Work, and Communication. For the study’s three distinct generations, Nature of Work and Fringe Benefits ranked among the top three. For Baby Boomers and Generation Y, Pay ranked among the top three; and for Generation X, Coworkers ranked among the top three. Table 9 reports the top three most important workplace factors for remaining in a current position by generation group percentage.

Table 9

*Three Most Important Workplace Factors for Remaining in Current Position by Percentage of Generation Group*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Satisfaction Survey Workplace Factors</th>
<th>Baby Boomers</th>
<th>Generation X</th>
<th>Generation Y</th>
<th>Total Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>63.1% 12</td>
<td>33.3% 8</td>
<td>52.8% 28</td>
<td>50.5% 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>0% 0</td>
<td>20.8% 5</td>
<td>24.5% 13</td>
<td>18.5% 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>10.5% 2</td>
<td>29.1% 7</td>
<td>15.0% 8</td>
<td>18.5% 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>52.6% 10</td>
<td>54.1% 13</td>
<td>66.0% 35</td>
<td>59.7% 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent Rewards</td>
<td>21.0% 4</td>
<td>16.6% 4</td>
<td>9.43% 5</td>
<td>13.4% 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures</td>
<td>5.2% 1</td>
<td>8.3% 2</td>
<td>7.55% 4</td>
<td>7.2% 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coworkers</td>
<td>47.3% 9</td>
<td>41.6% 10</td>
<td>43.4% 23</td>
<td>43.3% 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Work</td>
<td>89.4% 17</td>
<td>91.6% 22</td>
<td>79.2% 42</td>
<td>84.5% 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>10.5% 2</td>
<td>4.1% 1</td>
<td>1.89% 1</td>
<td>4.1% 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Instrument Information**

Spector’s (1997) 1994 Job Satisfaction Survey presents nine workplace factors: Pay, Promotion, Supervision, Fringe Benefits, Contingent Rewards, Operating Procedures, Coworkers, Nature of Work, and Communication. The instrument measures (1) overall job satisfaction (a total of survey items) and (2) workplace factor satisfaction (a total of the instrument’s four-item per each factor subscales) based on a scale of 1 – Strongly Disagree, 2 – Moderately Disagree, 3 – Slightly Disagree, 4 – Slightly Agree, 5 – Moderately Agree, and 6 – Strongly Agree. The instrument’s workplace factor subscales were used to assess the significance of each factor on job satisfaction and the intent to remain in a current position for Generation Y staff. The instrument’s overall job satisfaction scores were used to provide descriptive data. Two self-reported demographic questions were used to assess the level of job satisfaction and the top three reasons for remaining in a current position for all study participants.

**Cronbach’s Alpha for Job Satisfaction Survey Subscales and Overall Job Satisfaction Survey Scores**

Cronbach’s alphas were calculated to examine the reliability and internal consistency of the nine JSS subscales, as well as Overall Job Satisfaction using the full study sample. The alpha coefficients are presented in Table 10. Eight subscales were reliable (ranging from acceptable to excellent) based on the alpha coefficient guidelines suggested by George and Mallery (2003): > .9 – Excellent, > .8 – Good, > .7 – Acceptable, > .6 – Questionable, > .5 – Poor, and .5 – Unacceptable. It should be noted that an alpha of .8 is a reasonable goal; Operating Procedures had a poor alpha of .58.
Table 10

*Cronbach’s Internal Consistency Values for Workplace Factor Satisfaction Subscales and Overall Scale*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workplace Factor Satisfaction Subscales and Overall Scale</th>
<th>Items Included In Scale</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>16, 25, 34, 43</td>
<td>.798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>17, 26, 35, 48</td>
<td>.791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>18, 27, 36, 45</td>
<td>.924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>19, 28, 37, 44</td>
<td>.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent rewards</td>
<td>20, 29, 38, 47</td>
<td>.766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Procedures</td>
<td>21, 30, 39, 46</td>
<td>.578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coworkers</td>
<td>22, 31, 40, 49</td>
<td>.858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Work</td>
<td>23, 32, 42, 50</td>
<td>.796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>24, 33, 41, 51</td>
<td>.842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Scale</td>
<td>16-51</td>
<td>.934</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Descriptive Statistics for Workplace Factor Satisfaction Subscales**

Each workplace factors satisfaction subscale was measured on an interval measurement scale with a range of 4 to 24. Some subscale items were written in each direction, positive and negative; thus, some items were reverse coded so that higher scores represented higher satisfaction. The scores were rated marginally high on average, with averages ranging from 11.58 to 20.74. Study participants reported higher satisfaction with Nature of Work, followed by Supervision and Coworkers, while the least workplace factor satisfaction score was Promotion. Table 11 reports the Means
The instrument’s workplace factor satisfaction subscales also were measured by distinct study generation group. Results demonstrated that Baby Boomers are fairly satisfied with workplace factors, largely Nature of Work, Coworkers, and Supervision, but felt less satisfied with Pay. For Generation X, greatest satisfaction was Nature of Work, followed by Supervision and Coworkers, but less satisfaction was with Promotion. Generation Y appeared to be less satisfied with workplace Promotion and
most satisfied with workplace Nature of Work followed by Supervision, and Fringe Benefits. Table 12 reports means and standard deviation workplace factor satisfaction subscales by generation group.

Table 12

*Mean and Standard Deviation of Job Satisfaction Survey Workplace Factor Satisfaction Subscales by Generation Group*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workplace Factor Satisfaction Subscales</th>
<th>Generation Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baby Boomers $N = 19$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>11.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>12.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>16.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent Rewards</td>
<td>16.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures</td>
<td>12.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coworkers</td>
<td>20.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Work</td>
<td>21.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>16.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Descriptive Statistics for Overall Job Satisfaction Survey Scores**

Overall job satisfaction scores were obtained by computing the 36-item total score. All 97 participants completed the Job Satisfaction Survey questionnaire. The possibility of the overall job satisfaction scores ranged from 36 to 216 and were
classified into three categories: 26 to 108 = dissatisfaction, 108 to 144 = ambivalence, and 144 to 216 = satisfaction. Again, some items were reverse scored so that higher scores indicated higher satisfaction while lower scores indicated less satisfaction. The Overall Job Satisfaction scores ranged between 83 and 214, the mean was 144.38, and the standard deviation was 28.6.

Baby Boomers’ overall job satisfaction scores were slightly higher than Generation Y. Of the three distinct generation groups, Generation Xs overall job satisfaction scores were the lowest. Table 13 reports means and standard deviation for Job Satisfaction Survey total scores by generation groups.

Table 13

*Mean and Standard Deviation of Overall Job Satisfaction Survey Scores*

*by Generation Group*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>147.89</td>
<td>24.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>137.13</td>
<td>27.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation Y</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>145.79</td>
<td>30.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>144.38</td>
<td>28.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis and Findings for Research Question One**

The first research questions was: To what extent do workplace factors (pay, promotion, supervision, benefits, contingent rewards, operating procedures, coworkers, nature of work, and communication) associate with job satisfaction for Generation Y university professional staff? Pearson correlation was utilized to analyze the relationship between the JSS Pay, Promotion, Supervision, Benefits, Contingent Rewards, Operating Procedures, Coworkers, Nature of Work, and Communication
scales and job satisfaction, as measured by the demographic question 13: “On a scale from (1 being most satisfied and 10 been least satisfied) what is your level of job satisfaction?” Item 13 was reverse coded; thus, the higher score indicated a higher level of job satisfaction and the lower score indicated a lower level of job satisfaction. Fifty-one Generation Y responses were deemed complete and usable for data analyses.

As Table 14 indicates, the Promotion and Contingent Rewards scales were significantly positively correlated with Generation Y job satisfaction. A positive relationship suggested that, as satisfaction with Promotion and Contingent Rewards increased, levels of job satisfaction increased as well. No other correlations between JSS scales and job satisfaction were statistically significant.

Table 14

Pearson Correlation on Job Satisfaction Survey Workplace Factor Satisfaction

Subscales and Level of Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JSS Subscales</th>
<th>Level of Job Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>0.30*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent rewards</td>
<td>0.28*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Procedures</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coworkers</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Work</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p < .05
Analysis and Findings for Research Question Two

The second research questions was: To what extent do selected variables (gender, type of institution, race/ethnicity, level of education, educational requirement of position held, and length of time in position) affect job satisfaction of Generation Y university professional staff? Demographic questions 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9, along with demographic question 13 described previously, were used for data analyses. Number of respondents varied per variable. A t-test was utilized to analyze the differences on the self-reported Level of Job Satisfaction by race. No significant difference was found between Whites and African Americans on job satisfaction.

Table 15 reports mean and standard deviation.

Table 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 8 asked: “What is your highest level of education?” Categories were high school diploma/GED, Associate degree, Bachelor’s degree, Master’s degree, and Doctoral degree. Categories were grouped by Bachelor’s degree or Graduate degree, as Generation Y respondents selected the categories of Bachelor’s, Master’s and Doctorate. The master’s degree and doctorate degree responses were combined, resulting in two demographic differences on level of education. A t-test was utilized to analyze the differences on the self-reported level of job satisfaction and highest level of education.
No significant difference was found between highest levels of education and job satisfaction. Table 16 reports these data.

Table 16

*Means and Standard Deviations of Generation Y Level of Job Satisfaction by Level of Education*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Degree</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 9 asked: “What are the minimal educational requirements for your current position?” Categories were high school diploma/GED, Associate’s degree, Bachelor’s degree, Master’s degree, and Doctoral degree. Categories were grouped by Bachelor’s degree or less and Master’s degree or higher due to the minimal number of responses on the categories of high school/GED, Associate’s degree and Doctorate degree. A t-test was utilized to analyze the association of minimal level of education for current position and job satisfaction of Generation Y staff. A t-test was utilized to analyze the differences on the self-reported level of job satisfaction and educational level required for the current position held. No significant difference was found between education requirements for position held and job satisfaction. Table 17 reports these data.
Table 17

Mean and Standard Deviation of Generation Y Level of Job Satisfaction by Educational Requirement for Current Position Held

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Requirement</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree or Less</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Degree</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Pearson correlation was utilized to examine the relationship between the length of time in position and Generation Y self-reported job satisfaction. The correlation coefficient between length of time in position and self-reported job satisfaction (-0.396) was significant, with a p-value of 0.004. This correlation indicated that as length of time in position increased, self-reported job satisfaction decreased.

No further comparative analyses of self-reported level of job satisfaction were performed on Generation Y due to the disproportionate number of respondents in the categories for the following variables: gender, institution classification, institutional category, and institutional status.

Analysis and Findings for Research Question Three

The third research questions was: To what extent do workplace factors (Pay, Promotion, Supervision, Benefits, Contingent Rewards, Operating Procedures, Coworkers, Nature of Work, and Communication) affect Generation Y university professional staff retention? Pearson correlation was utilized to analyze the relationship between the Job Satisfaction Survey subscales and employee retention. Each subscale and demographic question 14 asked: “How likely are you to remain in your current position?” and were used for data analyses. The item 14 scale of 1 – Very Likely, 2 –
Somewhat Likely, 3 – Not Very Likely, and 4 – Not At All Likely was reverse coded so that higher scores indicated the higher likelihood in remaining of a current position. The results of the correlation with the Job Satisfaction subscales and the intent to remain in a current position for Generation Y staff are reported in Table 18. All correlations, other than Coworkers, were found to be significant.

Table 18

*Pearson Correlation between Workplace Factor Satisfaction Subscales and Intent to Remain in Current Position*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JSS Subscales</th>
<th>Intent to Remain in Current Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>.430*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>.413*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>.369*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>.283*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent rewards</td>
<td>.608*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Procedures</td>
<td>.423*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coworkers</td>
<td>.254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Work</td>
<td>.498*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>.591*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>.177</strong>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *p < .05

Summary

This chapter presented the findings relative to three research questions: (1) To what extent do workplace factors associate with job satisfaction for Generation Y university professional staff?; (2) To what extent do selected demographic variables
affect job satisfaction of Generation Y university professional staff?; and (3) To what extent do workplace factors affect Generation Y retention? Furthermore, workplace factors relative to on-Generation Y university professional job satisfaction and employee retention, and consistent with Generation Y findings, were presented. Regarding Research Question One, two workplace factors, Promotion and Contingent Rewards, were found significant to Generation Y job satisfaction. The findings for Research Question Two presented one significant relationship related to Generation Y demographics: length of time in current position and job satisfaction. Relative to Research Question Three, the eight workplace factors of Pay, Promotion, Supervision, Fringe Benefits, Contingent Rewards, Operating Procedures, Nature of Work, and Communication were found significantly related to Generation Y university professional staff intentions to remain in the current position. Regarding distinct generation workplace factors, Nature of Work ranked highest for Baby Boomers, Generation X, and Generation Y. These findings are discussed in Chapter V, to include implications and suggestions for future research.
CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

This study examined workplace factors associated with job satisfaction and the intent to remain in a position for Generation Y university professional staff. This study considered three research questions guided the study: (1) To what extent do workplace factors (pay, promotion, supervision, benefits, contingent rewards, operating procedures, co-workers, nature of work, and communication) associate with job satisfaction for Generation Y university professional staff?; (2) To what extent do selected variables (gender, type of institution, race/ethnicity, level of education, educational requirement of position held, and length of time in position) affect job satisfaction of Generation Y university professional staff?; and (3) To what extent do workplace factors (pay, promotion, supervision, benefits, contingent rewards, operating procedures, co-workers, nature of work, and communication) affect Generation Y university professional staff retention?

The data provided information on workplace factors deemed important to three distinct generations and employee retention. This chapter discusses findings relative to the research questions. Implications and suggestions for future research are discussed as well.

Overview of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate the extent and relationship of workplace factors associated with job satisfaction and employee retention of Generation Y university professional staff. The study also investigated the extent and relationship of selected Generation Y characteristics and job satisfaction. The sample consisted of
97 university professional staff employed at universities located in Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee. The key sample of interest consisted of those who were Generation Y (individuals born between 1978 and 1989). The study utilized convenience sampling, and a quantitative methodology with correlational design was utilized to capture the essence of this research. Spector’s (1997) 1994 Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) and a demographic questionnaire were used to measure the association of workplace factors on job satisfaction and the intent to remain in a current position.

**Review of the Findings**

The study’s three research questions were designed for the primary focus of this research, Generation Y university professional staff. However, non-Generation Y university staff responses were utilized in data analyses, and two pertinent findings were revealed relating to job satisfaction and employee retention. Therefore, a brief review of non-Generation Y findings is included for consideration.

Of the 97 study participants, 19 were identified as Baby Boomers, 24 as Generation X, and 53 as Generation Y. All were asked to complete the Job Satisfaction Survey, which yielded a total satisfaction score and various workplace factor satisfaction scale scores. Findings suggested that satisfaction with the workplace factor, Nature of Work, yielded the greatest satisfaction score among each generation group. In addition, participants were asked to rank in order the top three reasons for remaining in a current position among workplace factors that included Pay, Promotion, Supervision, Benefits, Contingent Rewards, Operating Procedures, Coworkers, Nature of Work, and Communication. Results suggested that Nature of Work and Benefits were important
workplace factors relating to Baby Boomer and Generation X employees’ intent to remain in a position. Pay ranked in the top three for Baby Boomers and Generation Y participants, while Generation X selected Coworkers as one of the top three reasons for remaining in a position.

The study’s findings suggested that, of the nine workplace factors associated with job satisfaction, one was significant to Generation Y: Promotion. Findings of the study determined no significant relationship between the study’s selected demographic variables and Generation Y job satisfaction. Study findings also demonstrated, that of the nine workplace factors associated with job satisfaction, eight (Pay, Promotion, Fringe Benefits, Contingent Rewards, Supervision, Operating Procedures, Nature Of Work, and Communication) were significantly related to Generation Y intent to remain in a current position. A discussion of findings for the study’s three research questions follows.

**Findings for Research Question One**

The first research question investigated the extent and relationship of nine workplace factors (Pay, Promotion, Supervision, Benefits, Contingent Rewards, Operating Procedures, Coworkers, Nature of Work, and Communication) with job satisfaction for Generation Y university professional staff. The findings suggested that of the nine factors, Promotion and Contingent Rewards were significantly related to Generation Y job satisfaction. Similarly, Rad and DeMoraes (2009) found a relationship between Promotion and job satisfaction. Findings of the current study indicated that the idea of promotion is not restricted to raising someone to a higher position but can present itself in other forms, including the opportunity to represent a unit or department.
by serving on university committees and participating in university decision-making boards. In addition, opportunities to collaborate, engage, and enhance the university’s infrastructures can be viewed as and reflect promotion. Therefore, when university departments are limited in the number of upper-level positions and have budget restraints, university management could offer other avenues to build their professional portfolios to influence job satisfaction of Generation Y employees in university environments.

Broadbridge et al. (2007) summarized seven Generation Y employee expectations, including the “possibility” of internal promotion. The current study’s findings suggested that Generation Y employees associate promotion opportunities or the “chance” of being promoted with job satisfaction. This finding proposed that Generation Y employees who perceive promotion opportunities within their department are satisfied, while those who do not perceive opportunities for promotion are dissatisfied. By including a departmental and university-wide organizational structure that supports promotion opportunities and the chances of internal promotion, employee satisfaction may be enhanced.

The study’s findings also supported Expectancy Theory, which operates under the belief that an outcome will be reached due to a given behavior or level of performance; e.g., a positive work behavior will result in a positive outcome such as promotion. The findings of this study suggested that promotion is significant to a satisfied Generation Y employee; therefore, one could assume that offering promotion opportunities will enhance Generation Y employee productivity. Current study findings supported research by Rad and De Moraes (2009), who suggested a relationship between
job satisfaction and recognition exists. Although contingent rewards can manifest in several ways, contingent rewards for this study were viewed as rewards, appreciation, and recognition. Study findings suggested that university unit leaders should create a workplace environment conducive of celebrating and recognizing employees, particularly Generation Y individuals.

**Findings for Research Question Two**

The second research question investigated the extent and relationship of selected variables (gender, race/ethnicity, level of education, educational requirement of position held, length of time at a university, length of time in position, and type of institution) with job satisfaction of Generation Y university professional staff. The findings study suggested that one significant relationship exists between selected Generation Y demographics and job satisfaction: length of time in current position. The significance of this relationship was negative, suggesting that the longer Generation Y staff remain in a current position, levels of job satisfaction decrease. This finding could have been interpreted in various ways. One interpretation supported the current study’s finding on promotion and job satisfaction for Generation Y employees. If Generation Y employees feel as though they should be promoted quickly, the number of years in a current position would matter to job satisfaction levels. University leaders should consider this generation’s proclivities and make workplace provisions accordingly.

As presented in Chapter IV, the study’s sample size reflected an unbalanced representation on demographic categories. This suggested that a larger sample size with equal representation on demographic categories may have yielded different findings. Conversely, it was discovered that very little literature, to the researcher’s knowledge,
has addressed the relationship between Generation Y differences and job satisfaction. This study included Generation Y differences and although findings did not demonstrate significant relationships, inferences could be made; e.g., 70% of Generation Y participants possessed a Master’s degree or higher. In addition, 40% of the positions held required a master’s degree. One could conclude that degree attainment was important to Generation Y employees and position attainment; to that end, universities should offer opportunities for Generation Y employees to further their education by participating in educational enhancement programs designed as credential-bearing programs of study. Assisting employees with enhancing their educational portfolios also may be linked with promotion, which findings of this study determined significant to Generation Y employee job satisfaction.

The study’s finding supported Treuren and Anderson (2010), who indicated that Generation Y does not possess different employment expectations than generations proceeding them. This suggested that, regardless of the demographic distinctions, organizational leaders will benefit by gaining an understanding of workplace factors that influence employee job satisfaction and by creating environments that cultivate Generation Y employee satisfaction.

**Findings for Research Question Three**

The third research question investigated the relationship of nine workplace factors associated with job satisfaction with the intent to remain in a position for Generation Y university professional staff. The findings suggested that, of the nine factors, eight (Pay, Promotion, Fringe Benefits, Contingent Rewards, Operating Procedures, Supervision, Nature of Work, and Communication) were significant to
Generation Y staff and their intent to remain in a current position. Findings demonstrated a significant relationship between pay and job employee retention. The findings attributed pay to salaries, raises, and comparable pay; not necessarily high salaries, but comparable for the work accomplished and the time and effort dedicated to task completion. Due to economic hardship, many university budgets are unable to provide raises and salary increases; however, university managers can offer flexible work arrangements to lessen the perception of being “overworked and underpaid.” Unit leaders also can provide opportunities for group work task completion, which can lessen work overload due to shared responsibility. Strategies supporting these findings also supported the premise of the Equity Theory that suggested individuals give that which they get or they feel they are receiving (Jex & Britt, 2008). Although university budgets may not always be able to raise employee salaries, managers can provide equitable workplace responsibilities.

Promotion also can be seen as a form of pay and was significant to Generation Y employee retention. When one is promoted, additional pay often is expected. However, promotion can result in a title change, with less day-to-day responsibilities due to the authority to designate. Findings from this study suggested that promotion is more than upward position obtainment; therefore, universities must create additional forms of promotion to increase Generation Y employee retention. Similarly, Ali and Ahmed (2009) findings showed a significant relationship between fringe benefits and contingent rewards on intent to remain in a position. Some common fringe benefits include insurance coverage, educational assistance, and retirement plans. Findings of this study suggested that fringe benefits should be comparable to other organizations. University
human resource managers should review the benefits offered by other organizations and universities and seek to provide comparable and competitive benefit packages. If universities are unable to compete with other organizations, they should offer benefits deemed attractive to Generation Y employees, such as memberships to professional organizations, travel opportunities, and free or discounted pricing on up-to-date technology equipment as well as software and accessories.

Findings of the current study described supervision in terms of leaders who are caring, competent, fair, and likable, suggesting that Generation Y professional staff are more likely to remain in a current position if leadership reflects the defined characteristics. Generation Y employees may pose challenges to supervisors they dislike and feel are incompetent. Kane (n.d.) suggested that inclusion, acceptance, and continuous feedback cultivate Generation Y workplace loyalty and commitment. University leadership should intentionally include, accept, and display acts of kindness and care to all employees, particularly Generation Y. By doing so, favorable employee retention results may occur.

Contingent rewards can manifest in the form of recognition and appreciation for competent work. Similar to the findings of the current study, Gibson (2013) suggested that Generation Y individuals are achievement oriented and desire recognition and acknowledgments. Findings of the current study suggested organizations that appreciate, recognize, and reward employees for their work influence Generation Y employee retention; therefore, university departments should create opportunities to recognize and celebrate employee achievement. Rewards can include public and private recognition, alternative work venues, and flexible schedules. In addition, findings of the
current study supported McClelland’s Needs Theory and the findings of Raeisi et al. (2012) findings by suggesting that organizations and administrative authorities should implement appropriate methods to support employee needs. If Generation Y employees need recognition and rewards, university management should attempt to meet those needs by implementing workplace recognition incentives, thereby influencing retention.

Operating procedures can be viewed as organizational policies, rules, and procedures. Findings of the current study suggested that Generation Y employees prefer workplace environments that provide clear rules and expectations while allowing employees autonomy. One interpretation of this finding suggested Generation Y employees need policies that lack ambiguity and vagueness, but rather, need policies and procedures that are detailed, comprehensive, and easily assessable. Due to this generation’s affinity to technology, it would be wise for university leaders to incorporate organizational expectations and operating procedures through electronic means.

Current study findings also suggested that nature of work was significant to Generation Y employee retention. Similarly, Lumley, Coetzee, Tladinyane, and Ferreira (2011) found a relationship between nature of work and employee retention. The current study translated nature of work to enjoying tasks performed, taking pride in the work, and believing job outcomes are meaningful. Findings suggested that Generation Y employees’ value workplace environments that cultivate employee strengths by creating opportunities designed to engage employees in desired work tasks and responsibilities. This finding could be interpreted in the following manner: Generation Y employees need opportunities to engage in work-related tasks deemed enjoyable, including university-wide as well as local community organized initiatives. Such
opportunities increase Generation Y employee retention. Also, similar to Lumley et al.
(2011), findings found a relationship between communication and employee retention
and suggested that communication is deemed as clear, available, easily accessed,
consistent, and continuous information. One interpretation of this finding indicated that
Generation Y employees desire to know what occurring within their department and on
their campus. In addition, they want to know its impact on them professionally and
personally. When feasible, university administrators should inform employees of future
changes or deviations in current operations. In addition, leaders would benefit by
providing clear, consistent, and comprehensive information related to such changes.

Various modes of workplace communications include electronic and face-to-
face. Martin (2005) suggested that, in workplace environments, Generation Y
employees prefer quick modes of electronic communication; the current study findings
supported Martin’s claim. University administrators should utilize forms of
communication deemed effective for Generation Y employees. By doing so,
communication significant to Generation Y employees is offered and employee retention
is achieved.

Implications

This study provided support for previous research related to workplace factors,
job satisfaction, and employee retention. Conclusions cannot be based on one study;
however, elements of this research provided insight into Generation Y university
professional staff. Although the sample size was somewhat small, the data revealed
significant findings on workplace factors associated with job satisfaction and employee
retention. This may have implications for university administrators, human resource
officials, and higher education leadership teams in regard to recruiting, developing, and retaining Generation Y employees.

Some researchers have suggested that job dissatisfaction and employee turnover may be the characteristics of the system in which it occurs (McCain et al., 1983). Employee turnover at any level is costly. In the current study, Generation Y staff identified promotion as the workplace factor significantly related to job satisfaction. Building an infrastructure designed to provide internal promotion opportunities is critical. Professional university staff often feel underappreciated, devalued, and disregarded, particularly when upper-level positions are available. Generation Y professional staff, although in general are confident in their abilities, may hesitate pursuing job advancement opportunities for fear of rejection and non-consideration. To that end, university management should consider intentionally promoting internally, which includes inviting Generation Y employees in succession planning discussions and preparing them for advancement by mentoring and entrusting them with additional responsibilities.

Gibson (2013) suggested that Generation Y employees are unafraid to explore different areas of employment, geographical locations, and venues when levels of employment desires are unmet. Results of the current study suggested that the eight workplace factors of pay, promotion, supervision, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, operating procedures, nature of work, and communication are vital to Generation Y employee retention. Due to economic hardships, university officials may feel unable to offer opportunities for promotion or competitive fringe benefits; however, results of this study offer innovative and efficient provisions of these factors. Promotion, fringe
benefits, and contingent rewards can manifest in non-financial incentives including opportunities to collaborate and engage in university decision-making infrastructures, membership in professional organizations, and recognition for work achievement. By implementing such provisions, Generation Y employees feel valued, universities lessen expenditures, and employee retention is achieved.

Results of the current study also offer university administrators and leadership teams suggestions that capitalize and improve university-wide operating procedures and communications. Generation Y employees in general have been nurtured and provided “this-is-what-you-do” expectations. In addition, they have been included in decision making, part of the team oriented groups for most of their lives. They deem it “normal” to be given clear, comprehensive instructions and to be informed of any work related changes or undertakings. To that end, university leaders should create effective and efficient modes of communication and operating procedures. These strategies can offer management the ability to improve Generation Y employee retention.

The current study offers and reminds postsecondary leaders of a profound yet often forgotten quote and workplace necessity: “If you do what you love, you’ll never work a day in your life” (Marc Anthony, n.d.). Nature of work was identified as the most important factor of the study’s three distinct generations. As previously described, nature of work was simply enjoying what one does and feeling the work is meaningful. When university staff of any generation feels that what they do matters, the likelihood of remaining in a position increases. As such, postsecondary leadership must incorporate avenues that provide employees with meaningful and enjoyable work task, roles, and responsibilities. By doing so, universities can be viewed as workplaces to provide the
necessary factors that attract, develop, and retain employees, in particular Generation Y university professional staff.

**Future Research**

The current study selected a specific group of university employees and workplace variables in order to explore their relationship with job satisfaction and the intent to remain in a current position. Based on results, opportunities exist for additional research that would afford university leaders additional knowledge concerning workplace factors and their significance to job satisfaction and employee retention. The following research is suggested:

1. An expansion of the sample size and diversification of the sample composition is suggested. This would allow for more substantial findings and would increase generalizations.

2. The development or utilization of a different existing survey is recommended that includes different workplace factors related to job satisfaction and a distinction of workplace units, departments, organizational structure, and position roles and responsibilities. The inclusion of such items may reveal additional influences on job satisfaction and the intent to remain in a current position beyond the items used in the current study.

3. Future research also should include different workplace variables of interest identified in previous research. These could include professional development opportunities, technology-driven work environments, and flexible work arrangements. The different variables may be deemed as more important factors for job satisfaction and intent to remain in a current
position for Generation Y and other university staff and may offer university leaders with additional factors deemed necessary to a satisfied workforce.

4. A different research design is recommended for future research. Several significant results of this study beg the question, “Why?” In order to gain a better understanding of the “why” behind the data, future researchers may choose to utilize additional qualitative elements in their methodology. By utilizing a qualitative approach, open-ended responses could provide distinctions concerning factors that influence job satisfaction and the intent to remain in a position for the selected population.

5. A replication of the current study, including generation comparisons is recommended. Such comparisons may reveal generational nuances on job satisfaction and the intent to remain in a current position that the current and narrower study failed to capture.

**Conclusion**

An understanding of workplace factors and their relationship to job satisfaction and employee retention is important to organizational leaders such as university administrators. This study identified promotion as a significant workplace factor to Generation Y professional staff job satisfaction. The study also identified the eight factors of pay, promotion, supervision, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, operating procedures, nature of work, and communication as significantly related to Generation Y employee retention.

The results of this study suggest that, of the nine workplace factors, nature of work is the most important to university professional staff members regardless of their
This information would assist university leaders at any level in creating environments conducive to meaningful and enjoyable work characteristics, thereby influencing job satisfaction and increasing employee retention.
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APPENDIX A: JOB SATISFACTION SURVEY AND QUESTIONNAIRE

Demographic Information

Directions: Please answer each question as accurately as possible by selecting the correct answer or filling in the space provided.

1. What is your age?___________________________________

2. What is your gender?
   a. Male
   b. Female

3. How would classify your institution?
   a. Predominately White
   b. Historically Black University/College

4. Is your institution considered a
   a. 4-year public
   b. 4-year private
   c. 2-year public
   d. 2-year private
   e. Other, Please Specify______________________________

5. Is your institution
   a. For-profit
   b. Not for-profit

6. Your Race/Ethnic background is
   a. White
   b. Black or African American
   c. American Indian and Alaska Native
   d. Asian
   e. Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander
   f. Hispanic or Latino
   g. Two or more races
   h. Other, Please Specify________________________________

7. What is your highest level of education?
   a. High School Diploma/GED
   b. Associate degree
   c. Bachelor’s degree
   d. Master’s degree
   e. Doctorate degree
8. What is the minimal Educational requirement for your current position?
   a. High School Diploma/GED
   b. Associate degree
   c. Bachelor’s degree
   d. Master’s degree
   e. Doctorate degree

9. How long have you worked at your institution?
   ________________________________

10. How long have you been in your current position?
    _______________________________

11. How likely are you to remain in your current position?
    a. Most likely
    b. Somewhat likely
    c. Not very likely
    d. Not at all likely

12. From the list below please rank in order the top 3 reasons (1= top reason, then 2, then 3) you would remain in your current position.
    a. Pay___
    b. Promotion___
    c. Supervision___
    d. Benefits___
    e. Contingent rewards___
    f. Operating procedures___
    g. Coworkers___
    h. Nature of work___
    i. Communication___

13. On a scale from 1 to 10, (1 being most satisfied and 10 been least satisfied), what is your level of job satisfaction? ___________
## Job Satisfaction Questionnaire

**TITLE:** AN EXAMINATION OF WORKPLACE FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH JOB SATISFACTION OF GENERATION Y UNIVERSITY PROFESSIONAL STAFF

**INSTRUCTIONS:** PLEASE SELECT THE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH QUESTION THAT COMES CLOSEST TO REFLECTING YOUR OPINION ABOUT THE UNIVERSITY IN WHICH YOU WORK.

1 = Strongly Disagree  2 = Moderately Disagree  3 = Slightly Disagree  
4 = Slightly Agree  5 = Moderately Agree  6 = Strongly Agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>1 = Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 = Moderately Disagree</th>
<th>3 = Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>4 = Slightly Agree</th>
<th>5 = Moderately Agree</th>
<th>6 = Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. There is really too little chance for promotion on my job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. My supervisor is quite competent in doing his/her job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I am not satisfied with the benefits I receive.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. When I do a good job, I receive the recognition for it that I should receive.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Many of our rules and procedures make doing a good job difficult.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I like the people I work with.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I sometimes feel my job is meaningless.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Communications seem good within this university.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Raises are too few and far between.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Those who do well on the job stand a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. My supervisor is unfair to me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. The benefits we receive are as good as most other organizations offer.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. I do not feel that the work I do is appreciated.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. My efforts to do good job are seldom blocked by red tape.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. I find I have to work harder at my job because of the incompetence of people I work with.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. I like doing the things I do at work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. The goals of the organization are not clear to me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. I feel unappreciated by the organization when I think about what they pay me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. People get ahead as fast here as they do at other places.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. My supervisor shows too little interest in the feeling of subordinates.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. The benefit package we have is equitable.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. There are few rewards for those who work here.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. I have too much to do at work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. I enjoy my coworkers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. I often feel that I do not know what is going on with the organization.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. I feel a sense of pride in doing my job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>I feel satisfied with my chances for salary increases.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>There are benefits we do not have which we should have.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>I like my supervisor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>I have too much paperwork.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>I don’t feel my efforts are rewarded the way they should be.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>I am satisfied with my chances of promotion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>There is too much bickering and fighting at work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>My job is enjoyable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>Work assignments are not fully explained.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C: RECRUITMENT LETTER TO COLLEAGUES

Invitation letter to colleagues asking them to recruit from their professional affiliates and networks.

July 27, 2015

Dear _______________________

I would like to inform you about a research study that may be of interest to you and ask you to consider participating. One of my colleagues is conducting a research study on workplace factors that are associated with job satisfaction of university professional staff. This research is to fulfil her dissertation requirement. You have been selected as a possible participant because of your current employment position. Your participation will take approximately 15-30 minutes. Any information that is obtained in connection with this study will remain confidential. The survey link is below the Informed Consent. If you should have questions concerning the research please feel free to contact her with questions by email: Martha.sales@wku.edu.

Thank you for your time, consideration, and participation.

Sincerely,

Martha
APPENDIX D: Consent Form

INFORMED CONSENT DOCUMENT

Project Title: An Examination of Workplace Factors associated with Job Satisfaction of Generation Y University Professional Staff

Investigator: Martha J. Sales, WKU TRIO Programs, 270-745-3757

You are being asked to participate in a project conducted through Western Kentucky University. This university requires that you give your agreement to participate in this project.

A basic explanation of the purpose of the project, the procedures to be used, the potential benefits and possible risks of participation are written below. You may ask any questions you have to help you understand the project. Please read this explanation and contact the researcher with any questions you may have. You should keep a copy of this form for your records.

1. Nature and Purpose of the Project: As a graduate student in the Department of Educational Leadership at Western Kentucky University, I am conducting research to fulfill a dissertation program study requirement. This research is investigating the workplace factors that are associated with job satisfaction of Generation Y university professional staff members and their intent to remain in their position. You have been selected as a possible participant because you are currently employed at a university and because your position is categorized as administrative, managerial, professional, non-faculty staff member.

2. Explanation of Procedures: If you participate, you will be asked to complete an online survey, which ask for you to respond to ten demographic questions and 36 Likert-Scale job satisfaction questions. The survey instrument utilized for this study is the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS). The JSS assesses nine factors of job satisfaction, as well as overall job satisfaction. The survey will be administered one time. The expected participation time is approximately 40-50 minutes. The survey can be completed from any venue in which you can access your email account.

3. Discomfort and Risks: There are no foreseeable risks associated with this research project and the probability and magnitude of harm or discomfort anticipated in the research is very minimal.

4. Benefits: You will/may not benefit directly from participation in the study, it is hoped that the knowledge gained through will help others at a later time.

5. Confidentiality: The records of this study will be kept anonymous as no personal information is captured. It is asked that you refrain from including personally identifiable data.

6. Refusal/Withdrawal: Refusal to participate in this study will have no effect on any future services you may be entitled to from the University. Anyone who agrees to participate in this study is free to withdraw from the study at any time with no penalty.
PERSONS TO CONTACT WITH QUESTIONS: The investigator will be available to answer any questions concerning this research, now or in the future. You may contact the investigator, Martha Sales by email at Martha.sales@wku.edu prior to starting this survey and after the survey is completed. You understand also that it is not possible to identify all potential risks in an experimental procedure, and you believe that reasonable safeguards have been taken to minimize both the known and potential but unknown risks. If you have questions about your rights as a research subject, you may call THE WESTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD, Mr. Paul Mooney, Human Protections Administrator TELEPHONE: (270) 745-2129

STATEMENT OF CONSENT: By agreeing to the following options you are implying your consent to the eligibility requirement.

I am over the age of 21. I have read all of the above information, asked questions and have received satisfactory answers in areas I did not understand.

Participants will not be granted access to the survey unless they confirmed the three statements above. By clicking the SUBMIT button to enter the survey, you are implying your consent to the eligibility requirements and indicating your willingness to voluntarily take part in this study. Your continued cooperation with the following research implies your consent.

Thank you for your assistance

SUBMIT