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Abstract

Given the state of the economy, lack of competitive jobs and decreasing number of voluntary retirements, by the year 2018 many institutions of higher education may see five generations working side by side. This study examined three of the four generations working at the University of Texas at El Paso (UTEP): Baby Boomers, who are those employees born between the years of 1946 through 1964; Generation X, those employees born between the years of 1965 through 1980; and Millennials, currently the youngest working generation, born between the years 1981 through 2000. This research examines the literature on generational groups and their attitudes toward work. Veterans/Silents are those employees born between the years of 1914 through 1945. They were excluded from this study.

Study 1 (“Leavers”) examined the reasons why some generational Classified staff employees left UTEP between the fiscal years from 2005 to 2008, and if the reasons for their separation were correlated with generational tendencies, or career stage changes. This study also examined whether a generational cohort’s gender or ethnicity (Hispanic & Non-Hispanic) played a role in the decisions to leave employment. Study 2 (“Stayers”) examined why existing UTEP Classified Generation X and Millennial employees elected to remain employed, and if those reasons were related to their association with a particular generation group. Lastly, because institutional knowledge and business continuity are important issues, the study stressed the importance of what was lost when generational cohorts leave their employment sooner than expected.

From both the literature review and the results of the studies, it is clear that generational group membership significantly impacts the proportion of time worked at UTEP. However, there were no significant effects from either ethnicity, gender, or ending salary on length of service.
When the three groups (Boomers, Millennials and Generation X'ers) are compared, two sets of groups significantly differed from each other in terms of length of service. These were the Boomers and Millennials, and the Generation X’ers and Millennials.

Study 2 demonstrated that turnover and retention of staff were not necessarily related to generational affiliation or cohort association, but rather to other reasons, which were primarily job-related. Gen. X and Millennial employees were happy working at UTEP. They appreciated the benefits, enjoyed the academic setting, and planned to remain working at the institution for at least three more years, if not longer. As far as the study could determine, none of these reasons to stay or go were related to generational affiliation. The primary factor appeared rather to be the institution's implementation of effective and consistent management practices. Employee satisfaction also came from programs that engage employees, reward and recognize employees and improve communication. Additional factors were equitable compensation and family-friendly benefits.

The opportunities for future research regarding the relationship between generational cohort and job tenure or job satisfaction are endless. Future research should expand these studies to include additional employee categories in order to determine if the generational differences extend to other areas of employment, and whether they affect job satisfaction in other job classifications.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Given the current state of the economy and resultant decreasing number of voluntary retirements, it is likely that by the year 2018 many institutions of higher education will see not four, but possibly five generations working side by side. Today, individuals in college offices and departmental meetings nationwide, have the opportunity to witness the interaction of four different generational groups working together. This study examines those generational groups which are defined as follows. The Veterans/Silents (“Vets” or “Veterans”) are those people who were born between the years of 1914 through 1945. The Baby Boomers, (“Boomers”) are those people who were born between the years of 1946 through 1964. Generation X (“Gen. X”) are those who were born between the years of 1965 through 1980, and the Millennials are those people who were born between the years 1981 through 2000. However, due to limited inclusion in the study population, Vets will not be the focus of this study.

When people think and talk about generational differences in the workplace, there are multiple variations on how each of these generational groups functions together. In today’s workplace, generations impact one another in terms of attitudes, communication styles, behaviors, and more importantly their values. Those in higher education are no different than any other large organizations facing this issue. In 2003, Hammill stated that this is the first time in American history that such cross-generational employment has taken place (Hammill, 2003).

In 2004, the overall average employee turnover rate for all industries was eighteen percent, the top three of these were in retail, for profit service, and non-profit service with annual turnover rates of thirty-four percent, twenty-four percent, and twenty-two percent respectively (Dooney, 2006). UTEP’s annual turnover rate for full-time employees (A&P and Classified), excluding faculty and student employees was averaged eleven percent per year from 2008 to
2011 (Peña, 2012). What impact does generational differentiation have on an institution of higher education such as UTEP?

There is a cost for turnover, and it can have a huge impact on an organization. It is necessary to quantify the loss of institutional knowledge, continuity, and history. These costs are translated in the turnover, recruitment, replacement, and training costs that an organization like UTEP faces (SHRM, 2005).

**Institutional Setting**

The University of Texas at El Paso (UTEP) opened in 1914, and today has more than 22,000 students. UTEP offers more than eighty bachelors, more than eighty-five masters, and nineteen doctoral degrees (UTEP, 2011). UTEP is the country's only doctoral research intensive university with a student body that is predominantly Mexican-American. The majority of UTEP’s full-time Classified staff is Hispanic. It is important to note that 81% of the El Paso population is Hispanic, according to the U.S. Census Bureau (2011). The Carnegie Foundation ranks UTEP in the Doctoral/Research University-Intensive category, placing it among the top seven percent of all colleges and universities in the United States. UTEP was recently named one of seven emerging institutions by the Texas Legislature to pursue Tier I, doctoral research status (Carnegie, 2010).

Today, at the University of Texas at El Paso (UTEP), there are four classifications of employees: Faculty, Administrative & Professional (A&P), Classified, and Student. This study will focus on the Classified employee category. According to the Fair Labor and Standards Act of 1938, these employees are either considered “Exempt” or “Non-Exempt” depending on their receipt of overtime compensation. Note that the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (FLSA)
governs how employees are classified. Non-Exempt employees are entitled to overtime pay, whereas Exempt employees are not.

The research will focus on Classified employees at UTEP, specifically those employees who separated from UTEP between the fiscal years 2005 to 2008 and who are in the following categories as defined by the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS): Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) 3 (Other Professionals), EEO 4 (Clerical), and EEO 5 (Technical & Para-Professional). For employees leaving employment during the period under study, employee separation was used for the stated period for Classified employees in these EEO 6 job codes. Furthermore, generational and EEO 6 job code information were used to establish the population for separated employees during that period.

It is important to note the following generational and historical trends at UTEP:

Of a total generational population of 226, full-time Classified employees under the EEO 6, “Other Professionals” IPEDS classification experienced a 19% employee turnover rate among Gen. X’ers for this three year period (2005-2008). Of this group, thirty-six employees, or fifty-nine percent were female. The average age at time of separation was thirty-three years. Thirty-nine, or sixty-four percent, were Hispanic, and the average length of service for this group was a little under three and one-half years of service (.4 years = Low, and 12.6 yrs. = High). Ninety-eight percent left for voluntary reasons other than retirement.

For the EEO 6 code of “Clerical Support,” there were a total of 251 full-time Classified employees for this period. Between the Gen. X’ers and Millennials, there were a total of eighty-two separations for the period. Sixty-two, or seventy-six percent were female employees, and sixty-eight, or eighty-three percent were Hispanic. The average age at time of separation was
twenty-nine, and the average length of service for these two groups was less than two and one-half years. The employee turnover rate was an astonishing twenty-one percent.

Lastly, for the last EEO 6 code in this study, “Para-Professional and Technical” employees which numbered 212, fifteen Millennial employees separated during this period. Nine employees or sixty percent were female. Their average age at time of separation was twenty-five years of age. Fourteen of the fifteen employees, or ninety-three percent were Hispanic, and the average length of service for this group was a little under three years of service (.1 = Low, and 8.8 yrs. = High) and all fifteen employees left for voluntary reasons.

**STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM**

This study examined whether Gen. X’ers and Millennial employees would leave the workplace in greater numbers than Baby Boomers. The study will focused on those employees at the University of Texas at El Paso (UTEP). Some of the concerns that this research revealed were that while Boomers prepare for retirement, Gen. X'ers and many Millennials were not remaining employed long enough to learn or grow with their generational colleagues, specifically with the Boomers and remaining Veterans. As a result, there was a strong likelihood that the institutional knowledge, history, and business continuity possessed by the Veterans and Boomers would disappear due to the attrition of Gen. X'ers and Millennials. Each of these generations had different attributes that make them important in the workplace.

An additional purpose of this study was to determine whether the separation trends for Gen. X’ers and Millennials were determined by class, ethnicity and gender. This research would contribute significantly to understanding the generational differences in the retention of Hispanic generational employees at UTEP.
My study also examined the reasons why some generational Classified staff employees left UTEP between the fiscal years from 2005 to 2008.

Additionally, the study also examined, via a correlational research survey method, the reasons why a sample of other Classified employees elected to remain employed (Slavin, 2007, p.99).

There were also several questions that the current research would attempt to answer. They were as follows.

**Study 1:** My first study will attempt to answer the first two research questions below, as presented. The study would refer to this population as the “Leavers”.

- **Research Question 1:** Were there significant differences or trends of turnover based on the length of service for these generational groups; Gen. X and Millennial employees who voluntarily separated (“Leavers”) from their jobs, as compared to the other generational group, the Boomers?

- **Research Question 2:** Were the differences in turnover between the Gen. X and Millennial employees based on their salary, ethnicity and/or gender in comparison to the Boomers?

**Study 2:** The last research question was addressed by Study 2: The “Stayers”:

- **Research Question 3:** What were the reasons that Generation X and Millennial Classified exempt and non-exempt staff employees remain employed at UTEP, and is it related to their generational category?

The research would examine and provide data that tests the hypothesis that the Gen. X and Millennial employees were leaving UTEP with lower length of service than their predecessors in the earlier generational groups, the Veterans and Boomers. Lastly, the study
would examine and determine if salary, gender or ethnicity was a factor for these separating employees.

**Generational Definitions and Attributes**

Ryder (1965) defined “generation” as a group of people who are similar in age and have experienced the same historical events within the same period. Generations are not groups which people can elect to participate in, nor are most people aware of their association to a generation. Instead, generation is based on the shared position of an age-group in historical time (Mannheim, 1952).

The topic of generations has been covered extensively over the past few decades. Quite frankly, it is a topic that will continue to generate interest over the next several decades. In their landmark historical study, Strauss and Howe (1991) went as far back as the late sixteenth century to categorize and define a generation. The authors defined a “generation” as a cohort-group whose length is approximately the span of a phase of an individual’s life whose boundaries are fixed by peer personality (p. 60). The four generational types recur in a fixed order, and repeat every twenty-two years. Unlike other scholars in terms of defining the years that define cohort-groups, Strauss and Howe categorize Veterans/Silents as those born between the years 1925 to 1942; Baby Boomers as those born from 1943 to 1960; Gen. X as those born between the years 1961 to 1981; and Millennials as those born between the years 1982 to 2004. Following their sequential order, Gen. Z will be those born from 2004 to 2024.

According to the authors, the generations that preceded the Veterans/Silents were the Missionary Generation (1860 to 1882), the Lost Generation (1883 to 1900), and the G.I. Generation (1901 to 1924). The G.I. Generation is also known as the Greatest or Government-issued Generation. Strauss and Howe’s (1990) list of Generations included two important
elements: the length of the generational cohort-group, and its peer personality. They have defined a generation as serving a twenty-two year span. According to Strauss and Howe, generations are generally categorized into four types, these being Idealists, Reactive, Civic, and Adaptive.

Idealists are dominant, inner-fixated in nature, and grew up as indulged youth after a secular crisis, coming of age. A secular crisis is defined as a period when society focused on reordering the outer world of institutions and public behavior. Idealists emerge from this period as visionary elders looking over the next secular crisis. Of the current generational groups, Boomers best fit this description.

Reactives are categorized as recessive, growing-up as under protected and criticized youths during a spiritual awakening. Spiritual awakening is a time when society focused on changing the inner world of values and private behavior. Reactives mature into risk-taking, alienated rising adults. They are also known as pragmatic midlife leaders during a secular crisis, and maintain respect as reclusive elders. Generation X best fits this categorization.

Civics are known as dominant and grow up as increasingly protected youths after a spiritual awakening. They come of age after overcoming a secular crisis and sustain that image while building institutions as powerful midlifers. They emerge as busy elders attacked by the next spiritual awakening. The Greatest Generation and Millennials exhibit these traits.

Adaptives are also known as recessive, and grow up as overprotected and suffocated youth during a secular crisis. They mature into risk-averse, conforming rising adults. They become indecisive midlife arbitrator-leaders during a spiritual awakening, and maintain influence, but with less respect, as sensitive elders. This category best describes Veterans/Silents and Generation Z.
In a survey conducted by the Pew Research Center on the Millennials, Keeter and Taylor (2009, p.13) asked respondents from the four generations to identify a theme or trait that identified their generation. This information is contained below in Table 1.1.

Table 1.1: What Makes Your Generation Unique?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Millennials (n = 527)</th>
<th>Gen. X’ers (n = 193)</th>
<th>Boomers (n = 283)</th>
<th>Veterans/Silents (n = 205)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technology use</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>WWII &amp; Great Depression (14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music/Pop Culture</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>Work Ethic (11%)</td>
<td>Respect (14%)</td>
<td>Smarter (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal/Tolerant</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>Conservative/Traditional (7%)</td>
<td>Values/Morals (8%)</td>
<td>Honesty (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smarter</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>Smarter (6%)</td>
<td>Baby Boomers (6%)</td>
<td>Values/Morals (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothes</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Respect (5%)</td>
<td>Smarter (5%)</td>
<td>Work Ethic (10%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In order to get a better perspective of the four generational groups in the workplace, what follows is a brief description of each group. Strauss and Howe (1991) found three basic principles that applied to rising generational groups. First, each group solved a problem which faced the prior young generation whose style had become dysfunctional in the new period. Second, each generation had to correct the behavioral excess it perceived from the current mid-life generation, and third, each generation filled the social role that was vacated by the departing elder generation.
For purposes of this study, Higher Education is defined as an academic institution, either
two, or four-years that provide an education in a college or university environment where the
purpose of attendance is to acquire greater knowledge and contribute to society.

**Veterans/Silents**

The first generational group, the Veterans (“Vets”) (1991, p. 45) are those people who
were born between the years 1925 through 1942. This generational category is also known as the
Mature or the Silent Generation (Strauss & Howe, 1991). Some of the other terms used to define
this generational category as the “Traditionalists” (Hammill, 2005, Strauss & Howe, 1991),
“Postwar Generation,” The Seekers,” “Silent,” or “Mature Generation.” According to Zemke, et
al. (2000), this generation grew up idolizing Franklin Delano Roosevelt, General Douglas
MacArthur, Joe DiMaggio, and Dwight “Ike” Eisenhower. As with all generational groups, the
Veterans would remember such historical events as World War II and the Korean War, Anti-
Communism and McCarthyism, the Stock Market Crash of 1929, The Great Depression,
Roosevelt’s New Deal, Pearl Harbor, and the dropping of the Atomic bomb on Japan.
Researchers state that some of the traits that the people of this generation possess include, but are
not limited to consistency, discipline, law and order, hard work, loyalty, and a strong work ethic
(Zemke, et al., 2000). At UTEP, this generational group represents the smallest percentage of
Classified staff employees.

According to Strauss and Howe (1990), the Veterans/Silents included almost forty-nine
million members in 1990. Surviving members of that generation at that time represented nine
percent of the immigrant population. Their grandparents were the Missionaries. Their parents
were members of the Lost and G.I. generations, and their children were either Boomers or
Millennials. Their grandchildren will come from the Millennial and Gen. Z generations. Many
notable personalities were born during this generation: Martin Luther King, Jr., Sandra Day O’Connor, Clint Eastwood, Elvis Presley, Woody Allen, Barbara Streisand, and several of the Beatles. Ironically, though they offered many presidential candidates, no Veteran/Silent generation member was ever elected President of the United States, although Jimmy Carter and George H.W. Bush, both born in 1924, just one year too early to fit the Strauss and Howe definition of this generation, came very close.

According to the Straus and Howe (1990), the Veterans/Silents were, in their time, the earliest marrying and baby-generating generation in American history. Men married at an average age of twenty-three years, and women at twenty years. From the ages of twenty to forty years, Veteran/Silent families had the greatest rise in real per capita income and per-household wealth. From the 1950’s to the 1970’s, the Veteran/Silent generation had sex more frequently than generations before, but men and women born between the mid-1930’s and early 1940’s had the biggest jump in the divorce rate. While the Veterans/Silents were in the statehouses, the number of states with “no-fault” divorce legislation grew from zero to forty-five during the years 1969 to 1975. At the time, this generation also provided a greater increase in educational achievement for Veteran/Silent men than the previous generation. During the 1960’s, professionals from this generation accounted for an increase in the service professions (i.e., teaching, medicine, ministry, and government) and for the 1970’s growth in the advocacy groups. In retaining its conservative viewpoint on politics, the Veterans/Silents generation also appears to be preparing to duplicate its 2008 support for the Republican presidential nominee over the current incumbent Barack Obama in the upcoming 2012 general election. In comparing the generation gap, there is a twenty point difference between the candidate the Veterans/Silents
will support compared to the one supported by the much younger Millennials (Pew Research Center, 2011).

A significant area of generational study focuses on the aging workforce. Knickman and Snell (2002) found that the growth in the elderly population (defined as individuals aged 65 and older) could result in a drop in the number of young workers per older age group member if the current working and retirement patterns do not change (Figure 1).

Figure 1: Will the Old Overwhelm Us?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ratio of all 20-64 years old to elderly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2050</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Knickman and Snell (2002) further found that the care of the elderly could eventually adversely affect the U.S. economy. According to Peterson and others of the Concord Coalition (Peterson, 1996), in the coming years, the elderly population will jump from 35 million in 2000 to more than 80 million in 2050 (Figure 2).
The Veterans/Silents generational issues are also felt at many colleges and universities across the country. Doyle (2008) found that, in 1988, approximately twenty percent of the faculty members at public, comprehensive institutions were aged fifty-five to sixty-four years of age, with two percent over the age of sixty-five. By 2004, the percent of faculty aged fifty-five to sixty-four had increased to twenty-nine percent. This represented a forty-five percent increase for this age group in sixteen years (Figure 3).
In a Class of 2000 survey of high school seniors, for many Millennials the Veterans/Silents generations were seen as “grandparents” or were viewed as “heroes” by their much younger generational cohorts. For many of the younger generational group, Veterans/Silents were indeed serving as their great-grandparents (Strauss & Howe, 1991, p. 52). Many Millennials viewed people from this generation as a cross between Bill Cosby and the Golden Girls (p.53).

**Baby Boomers**

Baby Boomers were born between the years of 1946 through 1964. Other terms that denote this generational category are Boomers (Strauss & Howe, 1991) and Post World War II Babies. According to Zemke, et al. (2000), this generation grew up influenced by the likes of...
John F. Kennedy (JFK), Martin Luther King Jr., Captain Kangaroo, Elvis Presley, and Mahatma Gandhi, though those influencers were not necessarily themselves Boomers. Notable Boomers born during this period were Janis Joplin, Joe Namath, Donald Trump, David Letterman, Oprah Winfrey, Spike Lee, Steve Jobs, and Bill Gates. Boomers should recall the following historical events which helped define their generation: the Civil Rights Movement, JFK’s election and assassination, the boom of the TV Age, the introduction of the Polio vaccine, Sputnik, Apollo 11, the Cuban Missile Crisis, birth control, Robert Kennedy and Martin Luther King’s assassinations, Woodstock, and the Vietnam War. Boomers are known to be team-oriented, to possess both personal gratification and personal growth, and to live to work. They also participate in health and wellness activities (Zemke, et al., 2000).

Boomers can remember the building of the Berlin Wall, Apollo 11 moon landing, and the Watergate Crisis in the early 1970’s (Sujansky & Ferri-Reed, 2009). According to Strauss and Howe (1991), in 1990, the Boomers accounted for over seventy-nine million members. Surviving members of this group represented ten percent of the immigrant population at that time. The Lost Generation served as typical grandparents to the Boomers, whereas the G.I. and Veterans/Silents Generations often served as parental figures. Boomer children included both the Gen. X and Millennial groups. Their typical grandchildren were those of Gen. Z generation and beyond. Unlike the Veterans/Silents, three of the last four U.S. Presidents were Boomers: Bill Clinton, George W. Bush, and Barack Obama.

The authors also found the following generational facts. Four of five Boomer schoolchildren were cared for in their own homes. Only two percent were attended to by daycare. Unfortunately, also during this period, death rates for Boomer teenagers due to accidental death increased sharply, as did deaths from drunk driving and suicide. Illegitimate
births and teen unemployment either doubled or tripled. Crime rates also increased (1990, p. 305). Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) scores fell to lower levels for Boomers than for previous generations. In comparison with the 1950’s, the 1970’s actually resulted in only a three percent increase in sexual activity and premarital sex for Boomer men as compared to their Veterans/Silent predecessors. Boomer women, on the other hand, doubled the rate of premarital sex, from forty-one to eighty-one percent as compared to the Veterans/Silent generational grouping. Only one Boomer man in sixteen ever saw combat. Among the others, two-thirds attributed their avoidance of the Vietnam War to dodging according to Strauss and Howe (p. 306). In regards to the War, the average age of a soldier was nineteen, the lowest in American history at the time. Before 1970, Boomer opinion on the war was equally divided. It was only after the Kent State shootings in 1970 and other polarizing events that most of the college-attending Boomers began to oppose the war.

According to the authors, if it were not for employed women and dual income households, Boomer family incomes would have been well below what the Veterans/Silents earned at a similar period. A forty-year old Boomer man born in the early years of the generation, an early born cohort (known as “first wave”), earned about fifteen percent more than his G.I. Generation father did at a like age, whereas, a thirty-year old last wave Boomer fell about ten percent behind his Veterans/Silent father. Lastly, during this generation, many medical advances were realized than ever before, due to the efforts of the G.I. Generation, specifically in regards to prevention and treatment of childhood illnesses.

Because of the economic issues of 2008 and beyond, many older Boomers have had to extend their working careers longer than their Veterans/Silents predecessors in order to accommodate what they lost to the market fluctuations (Gandel, 2009). That is not necessarily a
bad thing; having older workers has had a positive effect on the economy as a whole. When more people are working, they spend more money, which in turn creates jobs. The downside, of course, is that while the Boomers are working longer, their presence in the workforce limits employment opportunities for the younger Millennials trying to enter the job market. According to research by the Center for Labor Market Studies at Northeastern University, employment rates for teenagers and other 20-somethings have fallen, whereas, rates for older Americans fifty-five years of age and older have risen (2009, p.2).

Posthuma and Campion (2008) found that it was important to study workplace age stereotypes because of the aging state of our current workforce. Older workers remain in the workforce longer, which in essence spurs positive economic activity. However, there is evidence to support that discrimination occurs against older workers. The authors attempted to show how ageist stereotypes were affecting age discrimination in the workplace. They found that despite the prevalence of age stereotyping, there has been less focus on preventing age discrimination than on either gender or race discrimination (p. 2). This is an important consideration, especially when the Veterans/Silent generational groups remain in the workplace, while the Boomers begin to leave, and then re-enter the workforce.

Carnevale (2005) found that between the years 2000 and 2020, there will be a shortage of 14 million post-secondary workers and 7 million non-college workers to perform the work needed by employers, if there is no change in the labor market. This statistic would affect the generations which enter the labor market after the Boomers leave or as they are getting ready to leave in that there are no jobs to move into (Figure 4).
Figure 4: Labor Force Growth is Not Expected to Keep Pace with Job Growth Through 2020

![Graph showing labor force and job growth from 2000 to 2020]


Generation X

Members of Generation X are those who were born between the years of 1965 through 1980, after the Baby Boom ended. Some other terms to denote this generational category are Thirteen Generation (Strauss & Howe, 1991), Sandwich Generation (Sujansky & Ferri-Reed, 2009), and Baby Busters (Zemke, 2000, Wendover, 2007). There is some debate as to when the dates for Generation X begin and end. Several researchers list this generation as commencing with those born from the early sixties and extending into the early eighties. For the purposes of this study, Generation X starts in 1965 and ends in 1980. Like the Veterans and Boomers, members of this generation have also experienced several historic events during their lifetimes: the Women’s Liberation movement; the Israeli Athletes massacred at the 1972 Munich Olympics; the onset of the AIDS crisis; Roe v. Wade; Watergate; introduction of birth control; Richard Nixon’s resignation; the Gas and Energy Crisis; John Lennon’s assassination; the Iran
Hostage Crisis; the fall of the Berlin Wall; and the election of Ronald Reagan. Members of Generation X looked to these famous persons during this period: Lyndon B. Johnson, Richard Nixon, Jimmy Carter, Ronald Reagan, Eddie Murphy, Tom Cruise, Bon Jovi, Mike Tyson, Michael Jordan, and Bruce Springsteen. Unlike the Veterans and Boomers, members of Generation X (Gen. X’ers) are said to have a personality all their own.

According to Zemke, et al. (2000), Gen. X’ers are known to be self-reliant, have a sense of family, expect balance between work and family, have a casual approach to things, are skeptical, and are extremely technologically savvy. Unlike the Boomers, this generation grew up in the Internet era. Many Gen. X’ers had the use of personal computers at home or at school during their high school years. In fact, according to Miller (2011, p.6) ninety-seven percent of young adult members of this generation regularly use the internet. Gen. X’ers have the keen knack for balancing work, family, and community (Miller). Finding time for many social, professional, and scholastic events is part of the norm for this generation.

Coupland (2012) over time has offered several explanations for the story behind his 1991 novel, Generation X. In one instance, in 2008, he stated that the title came from the work of Paul Fussell’s 1983 book Class. Fussell defined Generation X as more of a social hierarchy than a generation. In essence, Fussell defined Gen. X’ers as people who wanted to get away from life’s luxuries, as well as life’s vices.

In what was viewed as initially a negative view of Gen. X’ers, Coupland (1989) and others found other traits that he believed were unique to that generation. He characterized Gen. X’ers as those people who were always looking for the perfect career and always thought that there would be someone to bail them out when they got into trouble. Coupland found members of this generation believed that no career was ever creative or flexible enough to satisfy their
needs, or what they felt they were entitled to. They spent their lives knowing they could turn to the security and comfort of their parents when things did not go as planned. He found that Gen. X’ers would take longer to “cut the cord” (Coupland, VISTA, p82) than other generations of the same age. According to Coupland, Gen. X’ers would leave good jobs because they felt ignored. Sometimes they were simply perceived as individuals who would leave good jobs without good reason. They cited indifference to management as a reason for workplace dissatisfaction. In his article, Lynn Mason (p. 82) found that Gen. X’ers believed that they were experts at interpersonal skills and were good at marketing themselves.

Members of Generation X could easily be identified as having certain specific traits. They were seen as conservative in appearance, with credential-filled resumes. They were well-traveled, and had impressive though excessive educational credentials, and were always full of ideas (1989, p. 83). It was in his 1991 book that Coupland labeled Gen. X’ers as “slackers…frequenting coffee shops,” or “living with their parents” longer than normal. Since his writing, many scholars have sought to refute these stereotypes. One such writer was Jochim (1997) who provided real examples to dispel the myths. He was able to provide reasons why Gen. X’ers exhibited anything but those characteristics Coupland (1991) had written about. Gen. X’ers categorized themselves as ambitious, determined, and independent; this generation was quick to shed the labels set forth by others, including Coupland (Jochim 1997). This generation also possessed the purchasing power that many Madison Avenue executives valued (Hornblower, 1997).

X’ers represented the largest first-generation immigrant cohort to that point in American history (2000, p. 85).

The G.I. Generation served as typical grandparents to Gen. X’ers, whereas, parents to this generation were typically the Veterans/Silents and Boomers. Gen. X children included both Millennials and Gen. Z generational groups. Their typical grandchildren were those of a generation not yet defined, but according to the authors would fit the “Idealist” generational type, similar to the Boomers. Unlike the Boomer Generation, no Gen. X’er has yet been elected President.

Strauss and Howe (1991) also found the following generational facts. A Gen. X child during the 1980’s faced twice the risk of parental divorce than a Boomer child in the 1960’s, and three times the risk of a Veteran/Silent child in the 1950’s. During the same period, only fifty-six percent of all dependent children lived with two, once married parents, fourteen percent with at least one pre-married parents, eleven percent with a step-parent, and nineteen percent with one parent. Throughout the 1970’s, the number of “latchkey” children less than fourteen years of age left alone after school doubled.

In terms of schooling, Generation X was the first generation to have lower educational achievements than its elders. College completion rates fell from fifty-eight percent for the Boomers, to thirty-seven percent for the X’ers during this period (1990, p. 325). Unlike the Boomers, some Gen. X’ers preferred to serve in the military to that of civilian service as a way to earn a living. This generation also saw a rise in conservatism, brought in by the Ronald Reagan administration. Like the Boomers, Gen. X teens also realized increases in crime and death instances for causes such as accidents, murders, and suicides. Homicide was the dominant cause of youth mortality in the inner cities.
The 1970’s also brought a steep decline in the economic fortunes of Gen. X children. From the 1950’s through the 1970’s, the over sixty-five year age bracket showed higher poverty rates than ever before. Since the middle 1970’s, the under eighteen years of age (at the time) had the highest poverty rates. Between 1973 and 1988, the median income of households overseen by persons under the age of twenty-five fell by eighteen percent. During this same period, three out of four young men over the age of eighteen were still living at home, the highest such percentage since the Great Depression.

According to Strauss and Howe (1990, p. 327), this generation has also faced a shift in the federal fiscal burden from the old to the young. In 1990, according to a then House and Ways Committee policy, a young Generation X one-income couple with a baby, and $30,000 in income would have to pay five times as much in taxes as the retired G.I. couple with the same income from public and private retirement sources.

Political clout in Washington has also begun to swing to a new generation of politicians. As many generations before them, namely the G.I. Generation and Boomers, the Gen. X’ers have united in defining what government should be (Hennessey, 2011). The new Republican House members are ten years younger on average than the other members, and fifteen years younger than other members of the Senate. According to Hennessey (p. 6), the last true shift in the generational “changing of the guard” occurred in 1974 when the Boomer Class of ’75 took over. This new breed of primarily Democratic Gen. X’er legislators was raised under the conservative ideals of Ronald Reagan in the early to mid-1980’s, the formative years for this generation. These are the politicians who are shaping public policy as of this writing. By the year 2019, Gen. X’ers may have that opportunity to finally overtake the boardrooms and make the decisions they
have always craved, as many Boomers will be more interested in working part-time or serving as consultants (Fisher, 2009, Sujansky, 2009).

**Millennials**

The latest addition to the workplace is the Millennials. This generation included people who were born between the years 1981 through 2000. Millennials are also known by the terms Generation Y (Zemke, 2000, Wendover, 2007), Generation Why (Buono & Nurick, 2008), Echo-Boomers ((Zemke, 2000, Wendover, 2007, Sujansky & Ferri-Reed, 2009), NeXters (Zemke, 2000, Wendover, 2007), Digital Generation (Wendover, 2007), and NextGen (Zemke, 2000, Wendover, 2007). This generation, along with Generation X, grew up in the media and technology age. According to Zemke, et al. (2000), Millennials grew up with such notables as Princess Diana, Michael Jordan, Michael Jackson, Bill Gates, and Mother Teresa. This generation witnessed the Challenger disaster, the Baby Jessica rescue, the Exxon Valdez oil spill, the fall of the Berlin Wall, Desert Storm, the Rodney King beatings and L.A. riots, the Oklahoma City Federal Building bombing, the Columbine shootings, the O.J. Simpson trial, the Clinton-Lewinsky scandal, the Persian Gulf wars, introduction of the new Millennium, Hurricane Katrina and the Asian tsunami, and the events of September 11, 2001. Researchers have assessed Millennials as having the following traits: optimism, multi-task orientation, tenacity, and extremely technological savvy. The Millennials, due to their recent entry into the workplace, have been studied, analyzed, and observed more than any other generational group.

According to Strauss and Howe (2000), demographics facing the Millennials have changed. For example, since the middle of the Generation X era, the average age at which individuals are having children has climbed from a twentieth century low rate in 1974 to an all-time high in 1997. However, despite the rise in birth rates, the Millennials by number are smaller.
family units than other generations. As compared to previous generations, Millennials also have higher educated parents, and value family cohesiveness more than break-ups (2000, p. 80). Millennials in 2000 represented a small part of the immigrant population as compared to other generations. If the numbers continue to rise, the Millennials will have the largest second generation immigrant population. Millennial Latino immigrants have experienced rising birth rates, and because their fertility rates are also very high; the recent immigration influx has helped the Millennials birth boom, primarily in the 90’s (2000, p.85).

In a comparison of the differences between Millennials and Generational Organizations, in Table 1.2, Buono and Nurick (2008) provided a matrix comparing traits between the Millennial and the Company.
Table 1.2: Millennials: Generation Why? A Paradoxical Cohort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Companies’ Perspectives of Millennials</th>
<th>Millennials Actual Attributes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More Sophisticated</td>
<td>And less mature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worldly</td>
<td>Yet naïve, with a curious lack of common sense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curious and demanding</td>
<td>With short attention spans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accustomed to working in teams</td>
<td>Yet like the spotlight to be on them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-reliant</td>
<td>Yet typically in need of direction and guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanting to belong</td>
<td>Yet leery of large organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believe in the need for rules and policies</td>
<td>Just not the application to them in particular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expect to reward on performance</td>
<td>Expect to be rewarded for their preparatory efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wonder what it will take to get them to work longer hours</td>
<td>Wonder why they can’t get work done quicker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expect organizational members to listen</td>
<td>Expect organizations to listen to them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often view Gen. Y’ers as “pushy”</td>
<td>Question why older workers do not understand that times have changed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Strauss and Howe (1991) estimated the number of Millennial members at about seventy-six million, of which more than fifty million are alive today. Typical Millennial grandparents would be the Silent Generation, whereas, parental members would be delegated to the Boomer and Gen. X generations. Millennial children would be members of the Gen. Z generation, whereas their grandchildren would be of a generation yet to be named. Those grandchildren, according to Strauss and Howe (1991), would be those born after the year 2024. Millennials witnessed an attitude change when it came to education. Boomer and Generation X parents became more interested and involved in the quality of education in the schools. The poverty rate for children peaked during the early 1980’s and then gradually declined (1990). Small increases
were also realized in the divorce rate and child homicide. Positive trends were seen in the per capita savings rate for children up to the age of twelve years of age.

Some of the findings from the Pew Research study done by Keeter and Taylor on the Millennial Generation, revealed the following: since 1987, the percentage of Americans approving of interracial dating has improved dramatically, from forty-eight percent to eighty-three percent. Boomers were more supportive of interracial dating in 1987, than were members of the Silent Generation. Whereas, Gen. X’ers were more supportive than Boomers when the question was first asked. In all, the Millennial cohort has been the most supportive of them all (Keeter & Taylor, 2009).

The survey also found the Millennials are less likely to have served in the military. Despite being alive when two wars were in effect, only two percent of Millennials categorized themselves as military veterans as compared to six percent for Gen. X’ers, thirteen percent for Boomers, and twenty-four percent for the Veterans/Silent Generation, who were veterans at a comparable stage in their lives.

Millennials are on track to become the most educated generation in American history. In terms of education, this trend is a result of the demands of a modern knowledge-based economy. Today, millions of twenty-somethings are enrolling in graduate schools, colleges or community colleges, without ever working full-time consistently for an extended period of time. The reason for the uptick in education is the lack of jobs. Of the four generations at work today, Millennials in general do not see work ethic as one of their strongest attributes. About one in eight Millennials responded that they have “boomeranged” back to a parent’s home because of the recession (2009, p. 3).
In terms of technology, Millennials are labeled as the first “always connected” generation. More than eighty percent of respondents stated that they sleep with their cell phone on, ready to answer, text, e-mail, and communicate otherwise. Nearly two-thirds of these respondents admitted to texting while driving. Three quarters of them have created a social networking site, and one in five respondents had posted a video of themselves online. Nearly four in ten have a tattoo, and of those, about half of these have two to five tattoos, and eighteen percent have six or more tattoos. Nearly one in four have some sort of body piercing (2009, p. 1).

Financially, about nine in ten say that they will have enough money, or that they will eventually meet their long term financial goals. However, almost thirty-seven percent of the eighteen to twenty-nine years olds are unemployed, or out of work which, according to the authors, is the largest amount for this age group in thirty years. They are considered skeptical of their elders, and believe that the government should do more to solve their problems. One in four Millennials are unaffiliated with any religion, yet the responses do not indicate that they do not believe. They pray as much and as often as their elders at a similar age.

Keeter and Taylor (2009) also found that only about six-in-ten were raised by both parents, a smaller percentage than generations before. Millennials often place parenthood and marriage far above career and financial success, yet very few of them are “rushing to the altar.” Just one in five are married today, about half the number of their parents’ generation at the same age. About thirty-four percent of this group are parents themselves. In 2006, more than one-third of the eighteen to twenty-nine year old women who gave birth were unmarried. However, since the 1990’s, there has been a slight drop in single-parent households (Table 1.3).
Table 1.3: Among Children Who Live With a Single Mom, the Percentage Whose Mom Is…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Married</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Copyright. U.S. Census Bureau (2000)

Millennials generally respect their elders. The majority of the respondents stated that the older generations were superior to the Millennials in terms of moral values and work ethic. Six in ten stated that families had a responsibility to care for the elderly, if needed.

Politically, as mentioned earlier, the Millennials were President Barack Obama’s biggest supporters in the 2008 election by a huge majority. However, discontent with Washington political scene has created some concern and possible doubt about their support for Obama in the coming 2012 election. Millennials have consistently labeled themselves as Liberals and Democrats, however today they are much less supportive of President Obama, other politicians, and other special interest groups. When compared to their older Veterans/Silents generational cohort, the age gap in support of President Obama remains the same in 2012 (Pew Research Center, 2011).

According to the survey, most Millennials believe that their generation has a unique and distinctive identity. However, when asked the same question, nearly two-thirds of Veterans/Silents felt the same way, as did six in ten Boomers, and about half of the X’ers. Millennials believe that they are different because of their use of technology, whereas just twelve percent of Gen. X’ers thought that technology separated them from the other generations. Boomers cited work ethic as their dominant theme, whereas, the Veterans/Silents attributed the experience of the Great Depression and World War II as their identifying difference (2009, p.6).
According to Strauss and Howe (2000), Millennials by their nature possess certain traits that separated them from other generations. They were found to be special, sheltered, confident, team-oriented, achieving, pressured, and conventional. The authors found four major factors that influenced Millennial consumerism. These factors included the fact that parental influence over their children’s purchases had grown. These overinvolved parents were also known as helicopter parents. Their children’s influence over parental purchases had also grown. Marketing efforts were geared towards children, focusing on a smaller number of the bigger name brands, and children were re-defining the purpose and use of technology (p. 267).

Moving to the current decade (2010-2019), according to Strauss and Howe (2000), the Millennial life cycle would be as follows. The first Millennials would reach age thirty in 2012 (be U.S. Senate eligible). They would produce their first national leaders, emerge as the largest generation of eligible voters, and be eligible to run for President by the year 2017. They would also be at their peak for marriage and the birth of their first born children by that year.

For the next decade (2020-2029), the authors speculate that the first Millennials will reach the age of forty in 2022. Millennial officers will start retiring from the military. They will also dominate the teaching profession and occupy most seats on school boards before 2029. They will comprise approximately twenty percent of national leaders by 2025, and will reach their peak of culture and the arts before the decade ends (2000, p. 319).

In their fourth decade (2030 – 2039), the eldest Millennials will reach the age of fifty by 2032. They will dominate the statehouses and Congress, and may produce a genuine presidential candidate by that time. They will also become a force in corporate boardrooms, replacing their Generation X mentors. According to the authors, Millennials will also reach their peak in home-
buying, adding debt, and raising kids in that decade. They will continue to be active in the arts (p. 320).

During the years 2040 to 2049, the Millennials will reach age sixty in 2042. There should be a Millennial President by this decade if not sooner. They will also be well represented in Congress, in the Supreme Court, and corporate boardrooms. They will dominate the statehouses and Congress, and will certainly produce a genuine presidential candidate by that time. They will become grandparents, and by 2047, the eldest Millennial will reach the age of sixty-five (p. 321).

Lastly, between the decades of 2050 to 2089, the Millennials will start to fade away and usher in two additional generational groups: Gen. Z and an as yet un-named generation. The first Millennials will reach age eighty in 2062, ninety in 2072, and one-hundred years of age in 2082. From positions of power, they will see the decline in representation in Congress, State Government, and most corporate boardrooms. Finally, Strauss and Howe speculate that the last Millennial will probably die sometime around 2120 (2000, p. 323).

**Generation Z**

Generation Z would include people who were born between the years 2001 and beyond. Not having entered the workforce yet, they are not part of the current study, but will affect workplace dynamics when they begin entering the workforce in 2018. This generation is also known by the terms of Generation M, Net Gen, or the Internet Generation. This generation, along with the Millennials, grew up in the Internet and social media age. In following Strauss and Howe’s generational types, this generation would have Boomers as their grandparents and Gen. X’ers and Millennials as their parents. There is no other significant research on this generation at this time.
Hammill (2005), in an article in FDU Magazine, illustrated the characteristics and traits of the four generations in the workplace. This information is illustrated below.

### Table 1.4: Workplace Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work Ethic and Values</strong></td>
<td>Hard Work, Respect Authority, Sacrifice, Duty before fun, Adhere to rules</td>
<td>Workaholics, Work Efficiently, Crusading causes, Personal Fulfillment, Desire quality, Question authority</td>
<td>Eliminate the task, Self-Reliance, Want structure and direction, Skeptical</td>
<td>What’s next, Multitasking, Tenacity, Entrepreneurial, Tolerant, Goal Oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work is...</strong></td>
<td>An obligation</td>
<td>An exciting adventure, A difficult challenge</td>
<td>A contract</td>
<td>A means to an end, Fulfillment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership Style</strong></td>
<td>Directive, Command-and control</td>
<td>Consensual and Collegial</td>
<td>Everyone is the same, Challenge others, Ask why</td>
<td>*TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interactive Style</strong></td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Team player, Loves to have meetings</td>
<td>Entrepreneur</td>
<td>Participative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communications</strong></td>
<td>Formal, Memo</td>
<td>In person</td>
<td>Direct, Immediate</td>
<td>E-mail, Voice mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feedback &amp; Rewards</strong></td>
<td>No news is good news, Satisfaction is a job well done</td>
<td>Do not appreciate it, Money, Title recognition</td>
<td>Sorry to interrupt, but how am I doing?, Freedom is the best reward</td>
<td>Whenever I want it, at the push of a button, Meaningful work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Messages that Motivate</strong></td>
<td>Your experience is respected, You are valued, You are needed</td>
<td>Do it your way, Forget the rules</td>
<td>You will work with other bright, creative people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work &amp; Family Life</strong></td>
<td>Ne’er the twain shall meet, No balance; Work to live</td>
<td>Balance</td>
<td>Balance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In today’s higher educational setting, faculty members from each of the four generations are interacting with each generational group, receiving support or conversing with Classified staff representing all four generational groups, and student employees being mentored by all four generational groups. This phenomenon creates in higher education a setting where cross-generational dialogue and behaviors intersect nicely. By the year 2030, the Boomer generation will number close to nine million people which will yield a tremendous strain in health care services (Knickman & Snell, 2002).
Just how well does a cross-generational workforce work? Can Vets and X’ers work well together? What about Boomers and Millennials? Everyone has heard comments like, “I just do not understand the old man,” or “If you knew what I’ve been through,” or better yet, “They are just too young!” These comments represent only worst-case examples. The generations seem to blend well together in the workplace. For example, when Vets or Boomers need help with a complicated technical question, it will either be a Gen. X’er or Millennial who comes to their aid. Some Boomers and Vets have adapted to iPods and iPads. To the Gen. X’ers and Millennials, these tech-savvy Vets and Boomers are considered “cool.” When a Gen. X’er or Millennial needs to learn about work ethics and loyalty, they tend to ask Vets or Boomers. When discussing wars, Boomers and Vets knew World War II and Viet Nam. Some can remember when there were no cellular telephones, e-mail, video games, and personal computers, and can offer guidance and counsel to the younger generations.

In today’s world, the concept of “texting” has become commonplace for all generations in the workplace. Some would argue that the art of face-to-face communication has been lost. Today, when young people need to know what is going on with their friends, they access MySpace, Facebook or Twitter, or they use their cell phones. These Millennial communication tools have now become two icons of Millennial lifestyle (Hershatter & Epstein, 2010). Social networking sites offer instantaneous networking or blogging, twenty-four hours a day, three-hundred and sixty five days a year. MySpace was founded in 2003, Facebook was founded in 2004 by Mark Zuckerberg, and Twitter was founded in 2006 by Jack Dorsey. Aside from these social networking sites, many Gen. X’ers and Millennials, as well as a few Boomers, access information and research using Google or Wikipedia. Sujansky and Ferri-Ferri-Reed (2009, p. 60) equated Millennials to an old quote from Socrates by Plato: “Children now love luxury. They
have bad manners, contempt for authority, show disrespect for elders, and love chatter in place of exercise.”

Boomers today have become much more cynical as they approach their later years. Unlike previous generations, many Boomers will be forced to care for their aging parents, receive their Gen. X or Millennial children, and in some cases their grandchildren back home to live with them. Additionally, for many Boomers, the state of the economy will require them to return back to work, or work longer just to make ends meet. Savings shortfalls for this generation exist primarily because many did not save enough for retirement or because of the additional financial burdens involved in caring for elder and younger family members (Hargrave, 2008). This phenomenon has resulted in labeling this generation as the “caregiver” generation, the first of its kind.

For Boomers, there will be several factors that will definitely affect decisions to continue working. Some of these include the improved health and physicality many Boomers possess, recent changes to the Social Security system, low or depleted savings for many, and changes in many employer-based pension or retirement programs (Krepcio, 2007). Because of these issues, Boomers are staying employed longer than normal and as a result limiting the career advancement opportunities that many Gen. X’ers and Millennials cherish. Many organizations have taken to hiring “un-retired” former retirees as temporary employees, consultants, and part-time workers, leaving little room for new Generation X or Millennial hires.

Looking ahead, by the year 2030, the youngest Boomer will reach sixty-six years of age and will be ready to receive many of the retirement and medical benefits for which they worked their whole lives. They are currently the most educated generational group, with a graduation rate twice that of the Vets, according to a 1998 U.S. Department of Education study. With
Boomers remaining the ever adventurous generation, half a million people age fifty years and older have gone back to college (Riley, 1998). Coupled with the fact that this generation had been the healthiest generation to-date, this results in longer work years, and in some cases better health (Knickman & Snell, 2002). By the year 2050, the Boomers will grow to over eighty million, up from thirty-five million in the year 2000, which represents a 135% increase in this population (2002, p. 854). This could create a huge issue concerning medical and long-term care of Boomers.

In a May 2009 article in the Wall Street Journal, with unemployment statistics approaching close to ten percent, many Millennial graduates who cannot find work will be forced to take jobs with lower salaries, less prestigious positions, and may maintain their low salaries for more than ten years (Murray, 2009). However, these graduates are more likely than their previous generations to make career decisions that provide a balance between security and stability and a healthy work-life balance (GMAC 2007).

It is important to note that the future of tomorrow’s workforce depends on the hiring of Millennials. They not only represent the future of an organization, but also the opportunities of innovation, vigor, and energy levels not known today (Sujansky & Ferri-Reed, 2009). Certainly, any efforts to recruit and retain Millennials will involve working collaboratively with the organization’s Human Resources (HR) Department. The HR Department knows the financial impact in terms of turnover and re-training costs if Millennials leave in large numbers and in most cases can assist management with strategies aimed at making their organization not only a multi-generational, but also a “Millennial-friendly” environment (2009, p.212).

In all, there are significant organizational costs when it comes to employee turnover. Sometimes depending on the position, the replacement costs can easily equate about fifty percent
of the departing employee’s salary. Costs would be more for higher paid and skilled employees (SHRM, 2012; Ross, 2006). Along with lost productivity, organizations also have additional expenses related to training, recruiting, interviewing, and the loss of valuable skills and expertise, which for some organizations are priceless. Turnover will happen, and for some organizations it can be healthy; however, monitoring trends or patterns on management’s end should have a positive effect on the business. Along with monitoring turnover, an organization’s attention to retention has a far greater effect on the future growth and well-being of the organization.

Because there is a lack of empirical research involving staff turnover by generational groups in higher education, much of what is provided will be conducted on findings gathered at UTEP. This research will be based on several informational sources. First, research on generational differences in general will be used to establish the attributes, behaviors, and inter-relationships they possess and their interaction with multi-generational groups. Additional research regarding Gen. X’ers and Millennials will be an important element of this study in order to validate some of the data regarding certain employment-related metrics, i.e., cost of employee turnover, cost per hire, time to fill a position, and number of days a position is vacant. Though there is limited empirical research concerning this topic, specifically in higher education, there is much written about the two newest generations, the Gen. X’ers and Millennials. The current research and literature review will provide information on how the multi-generations differ, work together, or mentor the others in today’s workforce.

In addition, the study intends to explore whether Hispanic ethnicity is a factor in the attrition or retention of employees in the University. Lastly, the work will examine whether an employee’s gender within these generational groups plays a role in the employee’s separation or
retention patterns. Do Millennials and Gen. X’ers have a different work ethic than their predecessors? Is the general length of tenure shorter for Gen. X’ers and Millennials than for Boomers? Is this a trend that is common only in higher education? More importantly, how big is the risk for employers when you have a tenure that is not long enough to “bridge the gap” from the older, retiring generational groups, namely the Boomers and Veterans? What strategies must public agencies and other employers do to stem the trend of Gen. X and Millennial attrition in hopes of “bridging the gap” a few years sooner? More importantly, from a business perspective, what are the turnover and training costs to the University?

Should organizations like UTEP develop processes or strategies to address the potential talent drain of knowledge that leaves the workplace that Boomers possess? Collins (2011) found that the challenges facing organizations is to capture the explicit knowledge that these exiting employees possess. Boomers are not documenting their processes or knowledge (2011). Organizations will also face the lack of tacit knowledge, experience, and the details of how work was done. In order to limit the “brain drain” of these departing employees, organizations like UTEP identify these vulnerable positions beforehand then begin the process to prioritize documentation and strategies. Some clear-cut indications are instances where more than fifty percent of an organization’s employee population is over fifty-five years of age (2011, p.60). This issue is compounded with the possible fact that along with the Boomers leaving, both Generation X and Millennial employees are not staying long enough at their jobs to benefit from the documentation and information retention strategies these organizations are developing.

Institutions of higher education, or other organizations, must explore avenues to retain Generation X and Millennial employees long enough to provide an easy transition in the transfer
of knowledge to those who remain. Otherwise, employers potentially risk losing valuable business knowledge process and continuity.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

The topic of generational differences in the workplace is an emerging issue. As a result, there is substantial literature in books, newspapers, and magazines which detail the challenges employers have in today’s workplace, and some of these readings better fit in the category of non-scholarly research. At the same time, there is growing literature on this subject in the scholarly fields, where studies have been developed that actually measure the effects that age, or generational cohort, has on several workplace issues: turnover, tenure, and engagement. Due to the emerging nature of the research and ongoing discussion involving this topic, the current study relies upon passages from both scholarly and non-scholarly reports and research.

Generations

Extensive literature exists describing the four generational groups which are the subject of this study. Each group approaches the work setting with different perspectives and attitudes. According to the research, those perspectives and attitudes, when compatible, can actually improve the working environment. However, conflicting perspectives and attitudes can be detrimental to a positive working relationship.

There are different ways of calculating generational terms. Strauss and Howe (1991) believed that generations change every twenty-two years. However, Sujansky and Ferri-Reed (2009) stated that sociologists calculated the average time between a mother’s first child and her daughter’s first child. With that, a generation should average between thirty and thirty-six years in length.

Strauss and Howe (1991) found there were several defining events for each generation. They offered a simple formula in calculating generational membership. They asked readers to think of the oldest family ancestor or mentor they knew as a child, and the youngest heir (or
protégé) they expect to know when they are eighty years of age. That is the individual’s span of generational history. Strauss and Howe believed that a person’s span will be approximately two hundred and fourteen years. They noted this span roughly match the then-current duration of the history of the American nation, from 1776 to 1990 (1991, p. 426).

Several scholars and authors have attempted to study, and report on the dynamics of two or more generational groups working together. Several articles and books have been written on the subject. Some even detail which generations work better together than others. According to Wendover (2007), scholars have stated that the Veterans and Boomers have much more in common with each other than with the other generational groups. Looking at the attributes (and liabilities) of Vets and Boomers, there are many compatible attributes. For example, both generational groups have a strong work ethic, are generally loyal to their employer, and believe that through teamwork much can be accomplished. These are also individuals who average at least fifteen to twenty years in their jobs. In most cases, both groups grew up in a two-parent household, with at least one stay at home parent during childhood. These groups work well together in situations where they can share some of these similar traits: sharing, following the rules, and “paying your dues.” However, the challenge in managing/leading these generational groups arises in respecting their experiences and where they came from, while avoiding confrontations. In other words, leave them alone.

According to Zemke, et al. (2000), Veterans are also known to be reluctant to change, conflict adverse, or traditional in their viewpoints, whereas, Boomers are known to be too sensitive, self-centered, judgmental, and not very fiscally-oriented. With Gen. X’ers, the complaints are that they are impatient, have poor people skills, and are inexperienced and
cynical. The last group, the Millennials are known to need supervision, do not like to communicate “face-to-face,” and are also inexperienced, mostly due to their young age.

In Bartley, Ladd, Morris, and Lane’s, “Managing the Multigenerational Workplace” (2007) and also in Fogg’s “When Generations Collide” (2009), the authors stress the management of the various characteristics that these multi-generations possess and bring to the workplace. More importantly, they describe how these characteristics are managed. Other scholars have also addressed the multi-generational workforce. The authors found that if you contrast these groups, Gen. X and Millennials, the attributes they share that could be a benefit to the workplace is that they are more technologically savvy than the Vets and Boomers. They also enjoy a sense of “balance” between their work and personal lives.

Bell (2010), in his article on generational tensions, addressed many of the myths surrounding generational differences. He found in regards to the concept of learning that Boomers read to retain, Gen. X’ers read just enough, and Gen. Y or Millennials reach for the remote control, go to the Internet, or post on Facebook (2010, p. 8). Like many scholars on the topic of generational differences in the workplace, Bell states that the deeper issue is poor leadership. “People quit bosses, not companies” whether they are Boomers, Gen. X’ers, or Millennials (p. 8).

Sujansky and Ferri-Reed (2009) compared traits between the Gen. X’ers and Millennials for any similarities, or dysfunctions. They found that Gen. X’ers take pragmatic approaches to problem-solving, whereas Millennials approach problems with a high level of self-confidence. Gen. X children developed a strong sense of doing things on their own, whereas Millennials have grown up with ultra-protective parents. Gen. X’ers have a reputation for distrusting authority or rules, whereas, Millennials tend to re-write the rules they do not like. Lastly, in terms of
technology, though the Gen. X’ers are very technologically savvy, they have been slow to adapt to newer technology (2009, p.76).

There are many formulas which may help to create a positive and healthy multi-generational workforce. Zemke (2000) suggests that several companies with multi-generational workforces have found success by employing the “ACORN Imperatives.” The acronym, ACORN, is explained as follows: A = Accommodate employee differences; C = Create choices; O = Operate from a sophisticated management style; R = Respect competence and initiative; and N = Nourish retention. The representative companies were Chevy’s Fresh Mex, TGI Friday’s, Ben & Jerry’s Homemade, Inc., the West Group, and Lucent Technologies. Wendover (2007) cites the successes of Google and Microsoft as good examples of where multi-generational workforces excel, and are still today considered some of the top companies to work for in the U.S.

The global economic recession of 2008-2010 has affected all generations. For example, Boomers are debating whether or not they should retire. Gen. X’ers are worried about declining salaries and benefits, and Millennials are having trouble finding work. Because of the lack of good job opportunities, Millennials’ work expectations have changed (De Hauw and De Vos, 2010).

In a New York Times article on Millennials, Henig (2010) introduces a different way of defining young adulthood from the traditional sense, suggesting it is necessary to reevaluate previous attitudes. In her article, she cites the work of noted psychologist Jeffrey Arnett. Henig indicates that today, most Millennials remain untethered in both romance and home during their twenties, always looking for better options. They travel and avoid commitments. They often work for free, or on a temporary basis, not for the money, but for the experience. Forty percent of this group move back home with their parents at some point in their lives, go through an average
of seven jobs, and get married much later in their lives than other generational groups. The average Millennial woman marries at age twenty-six years, while Millennial men marry at the age of twenty-eight, according to 2009 statistics (2010, p. 2).

Sociologists have traditionally defined the “transition to adulthood” as being marked by five milestones: completing school, leaving home, being financially independent, marrying, and having a child. Arnett defines this stage, or phenomenon as “emerging adulthood”. He believes that this new stage in a young adult’s (between the age of 18-20) life comes from the cultural changes these young people have come across and what they are about to encounter. In 1960, seventy-seven percent of women and sixty-five percent of men had reached all five milestones by the time they reached thirty years of age. Among thirty year olds in the year 2000, however, fewer than half of the women and only one-third of the men had done so, according to data from the U.S. Census Bureau (Henig, 2010). Cultural influences may explain why Millennials remain unmarried, look ahead, travel, avoid commitments, move back home with their parents, and have short job tenures. The ironic twist is that what Arnett has defined as “Emerging Adults” in this generation, noted Yale psychologist Kenneth Keniston labeled as “youth” in 1970, with almost the same attributes then as today. In other words, 20-somethings may be 20-somethings regardless of their generational cohort.

According to Keeter and Taylor (2009), generational differences are the product of three different but overlapping processes: Life-cycle effect; Period effects; and Cohort effect. The Life-cycle effect involves the idea that age determines personality. In other words, young people are very different from older people today, but wait twenty years and those differences start to disappear as yesterday’s young people become today’s older generation. Period effects involve major events such as wars, social movements, economic downturns, medical, scientific, or
technological breakthroughs. These events affect all age groups simultaneously, but the degree of impact may differ according to where people are located in the life cycle. The Cohort effect presumes that period events and trends often leave particularly deep impressions on young adults because they are still developing their core values. These paths stay with them as they move through their respective life cycle.

In a 1969 Gallup survey taken during that tumultuous decade, seventy-four percent of Americans believed that there was a “generation gap” in society. When the same question was asked during tough economic times by the Pew Research Center in 2009, seventy-nine percent of Americans stated that there was a generation gap, representing an increase of four percent. A generation gap is generally defined as the periods separating generational groups. However, it can also refer to the attributes and styles of generation to another and the common differences between the two. Today, some of the reasons for the gap could be traced to issues regarding technology, immigration, economics, race relations, and our own personal satisfaction with life today (2009, p.7).

In an article on generational differences, Sessa, Kabacoff, Deal, and Brown (2007) found that leadership qualities were similar in some generational cohorts. All generational cohorts appreciated knowledge, listening, and helping others succeed, but the authors also pointed out some differences within the cohorts. For example, in discussing Veterans, which the authors term Matures, the authors highlight that group’s appreciation for delegation, focus, dedication, optimism, and honesty. According to Sessa, Kabacoff, Deal, and Brown (2007, p.68), as between the Matures (Veterans), early Boomers, late Gen. X’ers, and Millennials, there was more of a concern with listening as compared to some late Boomers and early X’ers.
The authors felt that additional research was needed in several areas. They expressed a need to define the differences among generations, to understand the impact of the differences, and finally to determine what differences were generational versus those that were maturity-related (p.71).

Deal, Peterson, and Gailor-Loflin (2001) found no empirical research that validated any generational cohort conflicts in the workplace. However, organizations were well aware of potential conflicts and were putting generational interventions into place in the workplace. Arsenault (2004) and Schuman and Scott (1989) also found that generational cohorts did indeed exist in the United States and that generational attributes were unique. Different generations recall different events and changes from childhood into the early adult years.

There was also very little empirical research to show that Gen. X’ers focused more on a balanced life style than other generational groups, contrary to what other researchers had found. Several authors found it difficult to truly compare work life situations with other generational groups. As a result, for this study it was difficult to make this conclusion (Burke, 1994; Joyner, 2000).

Rodriguez, Green, and Ree (2003), found that the Gen. X’ers and Boomers did have differences when it came to fulfillment, being flexible, and focusing on wealth. They found that the Gen. X’ers wanted tasks that were challenging and could be accomplished within one workday. The Boomers wanted the same tasks done, but over several days. The Gen. X’ers wanted to use flexible hours, whereas, the Boomers preferred a more structured work schedule. Lastly, the Gen. X’ers preferred a portable 401(k) retirement plans with a lump sum payout, whereas the Boomers wanted traditional retirement plans with benefits.
Generations will play an important role in the 2012 Presidential election. According to the Pew Research Center (2011), the age gap in voting, which in essence began with the 2004 election and helped Barack Obama to a victory in the 2008 election, does not seem to be subsiding. Since that victory, however, Obama’s support has slipped among all generations, including the Millennials who supported him in record numbers. Nevertheless, the age gap remains. At the time of the study’s publication, in a survey presuming Governor Mitt Romney as the Republican presidential nominee challenging President Obama in the November 2012 election, there was an even split for these candidates among all registered voters, (p. 3).

However, when broken down by generational cohort, Millennial voters favored Obama by a sixty-one to thirty-seven percent margin, whereas fifty-four percent of Veterans favored Romney while only forty-one percent would vote for Obama. The twenty point difference between Millennial and Veteran voters is the same between these generational groups as it was in the 2008 Presidential election.

The study also listed the top issues these generational groups will deem important in the 2012 election. Jobs were the most important issue among all generations surveyed. Almost two-thirds of the Millennials, Gen. X’ers, and Boomers responded that jobs will either be the most or second most important issue this election. Only fifty-two percent of the Veterans/Silents felt that jobs were an important issue. Both the Veterans/Silents and Boomers cited social security as a critical issue, whereas, Gen. X’ers cited the deficit, and Millennials cited the jobs as their most important issue (p. 8). However, in dealing with the needs of the common person, the Boomers, Gen. X’ers, and Millennials see the Democratic Party best meets their needs, by a wide margin.

In their work on generational differences, Cennamo and Gardner (2008) studied three generational groups that were in the workplace at the time: Boomers, Gen. X’ers, and Millennial.
In their study, the authors found differences as applied to work values, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and individuals' wishes to leave their organizations. The authors found that differences between generational groups were complicated by aging issues. The authors tested the following hypotheses: Boomers showed higher levels of extrinsic, status, altruism, and social work values than Gen. X and the Millennials; Gen. X’ers and Millennials showed higher levels of intrinsic and work values than the Boomers; and Millennials showed higher levels of intrinsic and work values than Gen. X’ers and Boomers. In their study, the authors found that Boomers, Gen. X’ers, and Millennials had some differences in work values, but fewer than predicted. Understanding generational differences at work is important in meeting diversity needs. It will be critical for future researchers to study generational differences in the workplace, but is more important to acknowledge the similarities between employees of different ages and skill levels.

Veterans/Silents

The term “Silent Generation” was first used in the November 5, 1951 Time cover story when it referred to the generation at the time “coming of age” whose members were born during the Great Depression and World War II, including those who fought in the Korean War (Holmes, 1951). This generation was labeled by the author as “withdrawn, cautious, unimaginative, indifferent, unadventurous, and silent.”

The Veterans/Silents, born during the eight years from 1925 to 1932, were the kids of the Great Depression, and the core “beatniks” of the 1950’s. Several of these children (cohort-groups) were the most popular, social, and political satirists during the post-World War II era, from the 1950’s to the early 1990’s. During the years from 1941 to 1942, Veterans were the
cohort-group of the *Brown v. Board of Education* school desegregation case of the mid 1950’s, the “black-power” activists of the late 1960’s and 1970’s, including the Reverend Jesse Jackson.

Holmes defined those born during the early 1940’s, a few years before the end of World War II as “goodbye babies.” These included many influential and decision-making personalities of the past few decades, including Jim Morrison, Bobby Fischer, Randy Newman, Oliver North, William Bennett, Geraldo Rivera, and the 2012 Republican Presidential hopeful, Newt Gingrich.

Most Veterans have had a favorable viewpoint of the Republican Party, believing that the Republicans have done a better job managing the budget deficit and addressing the issue of immigration than have Democrats. However, in recent years, their support of the party has waned. Still, this generational group has supported the Republican Party to a greater degree than have the Boomers and the Millennials who have also been staunch Republican supporters (Pew Research Center, 2011).

Veterans, as the eldest generational group currently employed, may fall victim to common stereotypes based solely on their age. As a result, many older workers are subject to lost opportunities in the workplace because of these stereotypes. In their study on age stereotyping, Posthuma and Campion (2008), were able to find relevant research that refuted many common stereotypes that plague older workers, which could affect Veterans/Silents on the job, and perhaps Boomers as well. In terms of poor performance stereotypes, older workers are thought to have lower job performance than others because of their age. People generally believe that older workers do not have the mental or physical attributes to handle stress. They may be seen as incompetent, or low performers (Duncan, 2001; Kite, Stockdale, Whitley, & Johnson, 2005; McCain & Giles, 2002; Rosen & Jerdee, 1976a). However, the authors found that despite the commonality of stereotypes of older employee poor performance, there is very little research to
show that performance declines as people get older (Ferris & King, 1992, Reio, Sanders-Rejo, & Reio, 1999). Rather, these studies showed that performance improves with age (Rosen & Jerdee, 1988).

In a study of 24,219 persons across several jobs, Posthuma and Campion (2008) also found that both age and longevity were positively connected with performance, and that the longevity was often a better predictor of performance than the age of the worker (Avolio, Waldman, & McDaniel, 1990). Posthuma and Campion (2008, p. 10) also found that employee age is often less important to performance than employee skill and health (McCann & Giles, 2002). According to the authors, differences in work performance between people within certain age groups are what matter when predicting work performance (Baum, 1983-1984; Sparrow & Davies, 1988), and competence is more important than age (Connor, Walsh, Litzelman, & Alvarez, 1978; Drehmer, Carlucci, Bordieri, & Pincus, 1992).

Another stereotype claimed that older workers provided low returns on investment in their training. These stereotypes were based on the assumption that these workers were more likely to leave, and that the return from the investment into their training would therefore be short-term in nature (Hedge, et al., 2006). There is little evidence to support the cost aspect of ageism. However, there is research to support that older workers may not be more of an expense, or need more training (Broadridge, 2001). There is some truth to the stereotype that older workers are more dependable, stable, honest, trustworthy, loyal, and are committed to work, and rarely miss work, or even quit (Broadridge, 2001; Chasteen, Schwarz, & Park, 2002; Crew, 1984; Levine, 1988; MacNeil, Ramos, & Magafas, 1996; Rosen & Jerdee, 1976a).

In terms of job applications, Posthuma and Campion (2008) found that age stereotypes about older employees are likely to surface when they apply for work and are viewed as not a fit
for the prospective employment (Perry, et al. 1996). This same research has found that age stereotyping is typically more prevalent in certain industries, for example, finance, insurance, retail, and information technology/systems (computing) (Arrowsmith & McGoldrick, 1996; Perry & Finkelstein, 1999). It’s not unusual for some employers to base an opinion regarding a person’s ability on appearance, especially if the individual is older. Employers may characterize these people as dependable, but may also believe that their efficiency and speed would be slower than those of younger people.

Lastly, the authors developed fourteen recommendations for future research on this topic. These include managerial practices, alternative contexts, employee evaluations, training, and interaction to name a few (2008, p. 20-21). Seven recommendations for practice were also suggested (p. 23-24).

Timmerman (2005), in a study of 1,012 respondents to a survey by the Mature Market Institute for Veterans/Silents who were born between 1933 and 1945 who had declared a savings or “nest egg” of $100,000 or more in financial assets found that, as compared to the Boomers, Veterans felt good about where they stood, retirement-wise. Most people in this generation were able to collect their full social security benefits at the age of sixty-five. Younger generational employees would need to wait for the time when they could collect their partial or entire benefit amount. Secondly, the premiums for Medicare Part B had been relatively inexpensive, whereas, younger generations would be faced with higher premiums for private medical insurance coverage. Lastly, most retirees were able to enjoy retiree health benefits from their employers, as compared to what new retirees (Boomers) are experiencing today.

Timmerman found that regardless of what benefits they enjoyed, some members of the Veterans generation were not as quite well off as expected. Their earnings from investments
were over-inflated, and retirement expenses were higher than anticipated. Expenses for healthcare were unexpected, and they had few safeguards to protect them from overspending (2005, p. 32). Other seniors found their retirement lifestyle better than expected. They had fixed sources of income which were important, but money was available from other sources. To them, leaving an inheritance was not viewed as important and earned income was not a factor.

**Baby Boomers**

According to Howe and Strauss (2002), the Baby Boomer generation is considered to be the most “pro-war” generation of the four included in this study. Polls have shown the Boomers to be at least ten percentage points more likely than their younger colleagues (or Veterans) to support the use of force.

In regards to Boomers and social security, Krepcio (2007) writes that if this generation is expecting that the younger generations (Gen. X’ers and Millennials) will carry the burden to support retirement benefits, they are mistaken. In 1960, five workers supported every social security beneficiary. In 2007, there were only three, and by the year 2031, there will only be a little more than two workers per beneficiary. That is the year when the youngest of the Boomers will turn sixty-five. The retirement of Boomers will likely reduce the growth in the labor force in the U.S. Krepcio further states that according to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, the number of people aged twenty-five to fifty-four will decrease, and continue to do so for the next two decades (p. 155). Lastly, Krepcio writes that if the Boomers are depending on the nation’s employers to continue to fund retirement and health coverage, they are also mistaken. American businesses are now reconsidering their obligation to fund these programs. A few examples of the many companies who have recently changed their retirement and health plans are United, GM, and Verizon.
In an article in *University Business* (Angelo, 2008), the Boomers are represented as the most educated generation in American history. Angelo stated that education was the way out of the blue collar and industrial classes and into better positions of prosperity for this generation. During the period of this study, real estate developers and higher education administrators saw this generational group as the next large population of potential students, and in some cases, collegial neighbors or tenants.

In a 2005 article for the American Society of Training and Development (ASTD), Carnevale writes that a reasonable growth in employment rates of fifteen percent over the coming decades and an ever increasing need for a higher skill sets should result in a significant labor shortage of at least twenty million workers in high level jobs. The expected shortage of talent will likely peak in the year 2020 in a net deficit of close to fourteen million college-attending workers. Furthermore, according to the Employment Policy Foundation, if the retirement age were lowered to 1962 levels, the shortage of skilled workers would decrease by a third (2005, p. 38). Carnevale further states that a more liberal immigration policy, increasing the number of immigrants by thirty percent annually to about 1.3 million, would reduce the shortage of a lower-level of worker by one third (p. 38).

Today’s Boomers, like their Millennial and Gen. X counterparts, have embraced and in some cases mastered the **iPod**, **iPad**, and Smartphones, as well as other new technological gadgets (Miller, 2009). The way business sees Boomers in terms of consumerism has changed drastically over time. It seems that this generation has begun to re-identify itself. Boomers, unlike their Veteran parents, have gone back to college, started a second career after quitting or losing a job, have started a new family, and in some cases, well after the age of sixty-five years have no plans to retire anytime soon (Miller, 2009).
Hargrave (2008) lists three life-changing realities that will affect how Boomers contemplate continued work and retirement over the coming years. One is the caring for aging parents. Primarily due to advances in medicine, parents of Boomers are living longer today than parents of previous generations. This generation has been labeled the first “care-giving” generation. Hargrave also notes that their adult children are returning home to live with Boomer parents more and more. In some cases, these adult children arrive with their children in tow. For several reasons, Boomers are finding that in order to survive economically they must return to work after retirement. Rising costs of healthcare and other expenses have necessitated these events.

During the 2008 housing and banking economic crisis, recent economic worries have also forced many Boomers to continue working. Gandel (2009) found that if Boomers will have to work longer and harder than they had planned. Investment firm T. Rowe Price calculated that because of the economic downturn, the oldest Boomers will have to delay their retirement plans by nearly nine years just to recoup what they lost in the market during the 2008 economic crisis.

In her article, Collins (2011) strongly addresses the issue of Boomers exiting the workplace either currently or in the future and the knowledge they will leave behind. Companies and other organizations are struggling to find ways to curb the tide and capture the knowledge before it leaves. Collins provides five steps that these organizations must take in order to retain the intellectual knowledge Boomers will take with them when they leave the workplace. Collins recommends that these organizations begin the processes of collecting, organizing, validating, storing, and transferring tacit and explicit knowledge between employees and management.

Knickman and Snell (2002) state by the year 2030, the youngest Boomer will reach sixty-six years of age, whereas the oldest will be eighty-four. This represents the year all Baby
Boomers will be retirement age or older. There will be approximately sixty-one million in this generational group. The Veterans, or Silents, by that time will number close to nine million people. Their research cites four significant challenges that Baby Boomer retirement presents. Social security payments will increase, as will medical insurance costs. Issues would arise with uncovered medical expenses and prescription care, and long-term care costs would also increase.

Steinhorn’s, *The Greater Generation* suggested that the Boomers have done enough to separate themselves from previous generations, specifically their parents’ G.I. or Greater Generation, in areas such as social behavior, and justice, individual choices, and private personal issues.

Landau (2010) found that by the year 2030, the number of adults sixty-five years age and older will skyrocket to seventy-two million, from just forty million in 2010. Social Security is expected to undergo big changes. In the year 2000, five workers supported each retiree, and in 2030, there will be fewer than three workers for each retiree. A financial planner named in the article expects Social Security benefits to decrease and change to another, more secure system. Landau finds that the U.S. will create some 14.6 million new payroll jobs by 2018, but unfortunately, there will only be 9.1 million new workers to fill them, a shortfall of over five million people (p. 19). Boomers comprise the majority of the workforce today. However, Jeanne Meister, co-author of the 2010 Workplace states that by the year 2015, the Millennials will overtake Boomers in the workplace. Gen. X’ers will comprise a smaller piece of the equation that they do today. Meister (2010) believes that by the year 2020, when five generations are working together, Boomers will not even represent a quarter of working Americans.

Carnevale (2005) further found that between the years 2000 and 2020, there will be a shortage of 14 million post-secondary workers and 7 million non-college workers. This statistic
will affect the generations present in the workplace after the Boomers leave, or as they are getting ready to leave the labor market. He further wrote that a reasonable growth in employment rates of fifteen percent over the coming decades, with an ever increasing need for increased skill sets, should result in a significant labor shortage of at least twenty million workers, in these high level jobs.

**Generation X**

The term “Generation X” was actually coined by Douglas Coupland in his 1991 novel of that name. The novel followed three friends in the early 1990’s in Southern California and their experiences during the economic crisis of that time.

Unlike their Baby Boomer counterparts, Miller (2011) states that Gen. X’ers have the highest levels of educational attainment as compared to the Boomers. At the prime of their work lives, despite general consensus stating this generation favored more a balance between work and family life, research has shown that Gen. X’ers actually work longer hours at the workplace, with more commuting hours, than both their older and younger counterparts (Miller, p. 2).

Miller (2011, pp. 3-4) further states that though Gen. X’ers do work longer hours in the workplace, they are very family-oriented, participate in social and school events related to their children, and are associated with many political and social causes. The only other generational members with a comparable level of social and family involvement are the Millennials.

Miller (2011) states that Gen. X’ers have a high satisfaction level with their jobs and an even higher happiness and satisfaction level with their lives at home. They seem to have the perfect balance of work, life, family, social engagement, and leisure. For this generation, life is good! In another article, the average earning power of a 2008 Gen. X dual income earning couple was close to $78,000. The average income for a Boomer dual income earning couple was close
to $95,000. According to Miller, despite the disparity in income, the Gen. X generation was nowhere close to maximizing their earning potential (2009).

Additionally, Sujansky and Ferri-Reed (2009) found that Gen. X’ers were generally disliked by their Boomer and Millennial generational brethren. However, these X’ers also brought much needed change to this society. This generation, saw the introduction of the personal computer, the fashion trends of the 1970’s and 80’s, Music Television (MTV), teen movies, and cable network television. Generation X was also politely known as the “Sandwich Generation,” stuck between their Boomer parents and “up-and-coming” Millennial siblings or co-workers. Members of Generation X were further known as the “first children of divorce.” The divorce rate in the United States doubled between 1963 and 1974 (the Gen. X period), whereas in 1963, the divorce rate was 9.6 per 1,000 marriages, but in 1974, the rate was 19.3 per 1,000 marriages. (2009, p. 64).

Tulgan (1997) writes in his book, The Manager’s Pocket Guide to Generation X, that employees in this generational group are extremely cautious when investing in relationships with employers. They have similar caution when investing in large organizations. The author points out that for Gen. X’ers applying for jobs, in most cases, the label “job-hopper” is actually a compliment as it tends to relate to this generation’s ability to handle short-term projects and possess the immediate skills to tackle any issues, especially in today’s economy (1996, p. 17). When welcoming new Gen. X employees, references to “joining the family” and “paying their dues” have tended to cause negative feelings in that generational cohort. Gen. X’ers may not like to be categorized or labeled with any other generational style, thus they may have some negative connotations associated with such labels. Tulgan also states that Gen. X’ers look to work as more
than just a job and a paycheck; instead they look to building relationships and establishing a
sense of security for themselves, as well as a balance between work and life.

Unlike their Millennial generational colleagues, the Gen. X’ers were more affected by the
events of Sept. 11 than other generational groups. According to Strauss and Howe (2002), their
habits, finances, and career choices were deeply affected by these events. While the actual event
may have been a milestone for the Millennials, the X’ers may have suffered more because not
only were more Gen. X lives lost in the 9/11 attacks than other generations, but financially most
members of this generation were already close to the prime of their professional lives, and
subsequently had more to lose than did the younger generation.

Miller (2009) also states that the Gen. X’ers, as a group, are significantly smaller in
numbers than the Boomer and Millennial generations. This leaves many marketing executives
from Madison Avenue and Wall Street to wonder how to make the most of this generation’s
buying power which could never equal that of the Boomers. But how do Gen. X’ers see
themselves financially? In a June 2008 survey conducted by the American Association of Retired
Persons (AARP) only fifty-four percent of Gen. X respondents rate themselves as financially
independent. Twenty-nine percent were knowledgeable about their taxes; twenty-four percent
were knowledgeable about buying a home; and only fourteen percent knew how to invest their
money outside of their company’s retirement program.

Hennessey (2011), in an article in the Chicago Tribune, indicated that a wave of Gen. X
politicians is starting to take hold in Washington today. She found that after the 2010
congressional elections, of the eighty-seven new Republican House members elected, more than
half of those were in their 30’s and 40’s. The author found that this new generation of politicians
is quietly replacing their Boomer elders in Washington. The average age of the GOP (Grand Old
Party) freshmen at the time was forty-seven years of age. This means many of these politicians cast their first presidential vote for Ronald Reagan in 1984, the year he was re-elected.

Coupland (1989) found that Gen. X’ers have several traits that make them unique from their predecessors, the Veterans/Silents and the Boomers. The Gen. X’ers he studied were very different than the Boomers and did not appreciate any comparisons to that generation. He found that differences occurred in dealings with family, jobs, supervision, and self-identification. In essence, Coupland wrote that the Gen. X’ers were a group unto themselves.

Jochim (1997) challenges the Gen. X myths set out by Coupland. Jochim refutes Coupland’s presumptions that Gen. X’ers were slackers who were unwilling to work. She disputes the proposition that they did not care about their futures or themselves, or were frustrated and cynical individuals who hung out at coffee shops all day, and lived at home with their parents. She does so by citing several examples proving where these stereotypes were incorrect. Hornblower (1997) also challenges Coupland’s perception of X’ers as “slackers”. She cites efforts by large corporations to direct products or marketing strategies towards the Gen. X’ers based on their purchasing power. She also found that regardless as the way in which other generations saw them, Gen. X’ers saw themselves as ambitious, determined, and independent, and fully comfortable with these labels.

Fisher (2009) states that by the year 2019, the Gen. X’ers long ignored by the older Boomers will finally be in charge and will make some big changes according to Janet Reid, a managing partner at Global Lead, a corporate consulting firm (2009, p.1). Their exodus will open the doors to the Gen. X’ers. The article finds that Boomers, currently a large force in the labor market, will ease out of the market as they become more interested in pursuing part-time or consulting roles than dominating the management ranks according to Sujansky (2009).
Gordinier, in his 2011 book, *X Saves the World: How Generation X Got the Shaft but Can Still Keep Everything From Sucking*, argues that regardless of what history will say about Gen. X’ers, they have indeed changed the world. He cites such achievements as Google, YouTube, Amazon, and even MySpace which are internet and social networking mediums used by many generations, including the Millennials (p. 3).

**Millennials**

If any generational group has similarities with the Boomers, it is the Millennials. This may be due in part to the fact that Boomer parents raised the majority of the Millennials. Kupperschmidt (2000), like many other non-scholarly authors, found that although generational values and attitudes differed, many generational traits and behaviors were shaped by the preceding generation.

Sujansky and Ferri-Reed (2009) listed several traits the two generations shared. The Boomers desired success, while Millennials expected it. The Boomers ushered in the Civil Rights Movement and social change, whereas the Millennials grew up where culture and diversity were valued and welcomed. Lastly, in regards to money; the Boomers pioneered the two-income household where family income grew and served as a standard for the Millennials in terms of an expectation. The authors also credit President John F. Kennedy for challenging the country to do more in his famous 1960 inaugural address. The Peace Corps was created in 1961, and the *Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA)* was created in 1964. These initiatives eventually spurred many Boomers into public service, both home and abroad. Their actions inspired many Millennials to do much of the same. These continued efforts on the parts of Millennials included, but were not limited to volunteerism, community service, and efforts to protect the environment (2009, p. 136).
According to Small (2008), Millennials are rather adept at multitasking and visualizing, and prefer that to face-to-face interactions. Hershatter and Epstein (2010) further state that if Millennials are to be known as valued knowledge workers, they must learn not only what information to gather, but also how to verify and understand it. This means it is not enough to have the ability simply to scan or access information which may be something that this generational group takes for granted.

According to Howe and Strauss (2000, pp. 112-113), ever since the first Millennials could walk, the federal government has been over-protective of this group. The Government ensured that cars, products, homes, schools, and airwaves were safe for the Millennials. No other generation at the time had had such protections.

According to a 2007 Global MBA survey, Millennials like to work in organizations with a centralized decision making structure, with clearly defined responsibilities, and formalized procedures. These working generational employees like to align themselves with strategic planning and the company’s mission. They are optimistic about their company’s future and value teamwork and community.

Buono and Nurick (2008), in their article on addressing generational outreach at the workplace, offered the following facts about the Millennial generational cohort. Millennials represent the most racially and ethnically diverse generation in American history. Only sixty-one percent of this generation identified themselves as Caucasian (Strauss & Howe, 2006). Millennials also are considered extremely independent, due to their having been raised by two working parents, experiencing daycare, having been single parented, or having lived in divorced households. Millennials also represent the most technologically-advanced generation in our midst. They are known as Generation Why? primarily because of their tendency to question
everything, their curiosity, and their demand for answers. They are always looking for results, wanting to know why they did not get the top grade or receive praise. The authors found that organizations typically face a challenge when getting their Millennial employees to work longer hours. Instead of accepting the work as other generations might, Millennials question why it takes others so long to complete their work. Like Gen. X’ers, Millennials value their personal time (Buono & Nurick, 2008). According to a 2007 JA Worldwide/Doloitte teen survey, a majority of younger Millennials feel prepared to make ethical business decisions. Almost fifty percent of those surveyed feel an overwhelming need to succeed at school “at all costs.” (2008, p. 3).

According to a study by William Blair and Associates, cited by Macsai in Business Week, Millennials and parents of young Millennials spend $200 billion annually. Much of this is attributed to Millennials acclimation to technology to a greater degree than their older Boomer and Gen. X colleagues (Miller, 2009). Millennials spend an enormous amount of time per day on the internet or social media sites. They often talk or text on their smart phones and watch television. Miller (2009) further states that following Millennial findings, forty-five percent consider themselves non-white; twenty-percent have at least twenty-five friends on their social networking sites; fifty-nine percent spend at least an hour a day talking on their cell phones, eighty-four percent believe getting a degree is important; and fifty-one percent believe in serving the community. Assessments by the U.S. Department of Education showed that Millennials at the end of high school did not know more than previous generations.

Post September 11, 2001, Strauss and Howe (2002) did find the Millennials more exposed to security and scrutiny than other generations. Though security measures in general have existed for some time, the attacks of September 11 certainly changed how people traveled.
The primary witnesses to these changes were the Millennials. This generation was more deeply affected by the effects of the Columbine shootings, and were the first generation to significantly experience the increased air travel security efforts which followed the attacks of September 11.

Sujansky and Ferri-Reed (2009) contend that Millennials do not stay around as long as Gen. X’ers, Boomers, or Veterans (Silents) in terms of job tenure. Many Millennials average two to five years in one job. The cost of replacing any employee is enormous. A generational group that leaves the job every two to five years multiplies those costs. When that employee leaves, there is a turnover cost. That cost is determined by the number of employees separated divided by the total number of employees who left during the period. Along with the costs associated with hiring employees, training the replacement also has to be figured in as a cost to the organization. The cost is calculated by taking fifty percent of what the employee’s salary was at time of separation and multiplying that rate times the number of employees who left. For example, suppose an employee at an organization earns $50,000 per year. The employee resigns. The cost of turnover at fifty percent of their salary is $25,000 per year for this employee’s position. Multiply that times the number of employees who leave an organization and the cost to employers could be enormous.

These patterns are extremely important in the recruitment and retention of Millennials, in that this generation, unlike generations before, can be very picky about the places they go and the jobs they select. The authors provide alternative methods aimed at curbing Millennial turnover. Some examples of these are flexible work schedules, work from home, or tele-commuting. These strategies fit this generation’s life style. Collaborative work styles also seem to fit Millennials well. Working together in groups, teams, and receiving frequent feedback are stated as preferred methods of Millennial work patterns. Sujansky and Ferri-Reed (p. 52) found that one way
employers can quickly lose Millennials is to provide feedback on an annual basis (as most organizations do), or late in terms of evaluating their performance. Most Boomers would not see any issue with this, but with Millennials, it is a different story.

In her work regarding leadership, Downing (2006) found that Boomers seek to improve society through their children, the Millennials. Like many other scholars, Downing (p. 4) also agrees that as compared to other generation, the Millennials were the most nurtured. Raised by protective, or “helicopter” parents, this generation grew up with many of life’s privileges. Consequently, these Millennials carry a tremendous pressure to succeed, and in most cases are held to a higher standard than were their generational predecessors. They were trained to always excel at levels greater than their Boomer parents.

In January 2010, the Pew Research Center conducted a telephone survey of 2,020 adults. This survey also included an oversampling of eighteen to twenty-nine year old respondents within the Millennials age groups. The survey results were supplemented by other Pew Research Center findings on Millennials covering multiple areas. Keeter and Taylor (2009), in their article, “The Millennials,” identified several traits that this generation possesses. First, they are the most ethnically and racially diverse cohort of young persons. Among the ages from thirteen to twenty-nine, almost nineteen percent are Hispanic, fourteen percent are Black, four percent are Asian, three percent are of mixed race, and almost sixty percent are white, a record low. Millennials are more receptive to immigrants than are their elders. Nearly six in ten believe that immigrants strengthen the country, according to a 2009 Pew Research survey, whereas, only forty-three percent of adults thirty years of age and older agree. Secondly, they are beginning their careers as the most progressive age group in modern history. In the 2008 election, Millennials voted for Barack Obama over John McCain by a margin of sixty-six to thirty-two percent, whereas, adults
over age thirty were split in their vote, fifty to forty-nine percent. This was the largest gap ever seen in a presidential election between voters under and over the age of thirty. Additionally, Millennials are the first generation in history to deem behaviors such as tweeting and texting, along with social networking sites: Facebook, YouTube, Google, and Wikipedia, not as technological breakthroughs, but rather as everyday tasks in today’s society. They are also the least religious observant youths since religious behavior was surveyed as research. Lastly, this generation is more inclined to trust in institutions than are their predecessor generations, the Boomers and Gen. X’ers.

Amour (2005), in an article in *USA Today*, found that Millennials will be the fastest growing segment of the workforce, an increase from fourteen percent of the workforce to over twenty-one percent to nearly thirty-two million workers back in 2001. The numbers for this generation have grown since that time. As many other scholars surveying this generational group have stated before, Amour found that the Millennials have been the most pampered, nurtured, and programmed generation from the time they were toddlers. Other traits that Millennials possess include their financial smarts. They are adept at balancing work and life, do not have the job longevity of older workers, enjoy dressing casually in the workplace, and also enjoy the perks of flex-time and time-off.

Papp (2009) found that communities and organizations which want to reach the Millennials will have to explore implementing social networking and online virtual environments. The author found that these mediums constitute a large part of what colleges and universities are doing in terms of re-defining classroom instruction. Much of this technology is also in place in the corporate world when it comes to recruiting employees, advertising, and conferencing. Today, many of the campus tours college and university provide are virtual in
nature. Millennials see this type of technology as a necessity while earlier generations may see it as simply gaming.

In their book, *Millennials Rising*, Strauss and Howe (2000) found seven distinguishing traits that separated the Millennials from other generations. They found Millennials to be categorized as special, sheltered, confident, team-oriented, achieving, pressured, and conventional (p. 43). The authors also found several assertions that by public opinion would appear to be true, but in reality were not. Older generations perceived that Millennial children and young people were getting more supervision, spending more time with their parents, and still did things with their families. Child abuse was on the decline, and parents were disciplining their kids differently than parents had in the past (p. 134). Back in 2000, Strauss and Howe also found that in comparison with the like-aged Gen. X’er kids, three to twelve year old Millennial children spent less time playing unorganized sports, less time watching television, less time eating and communicating during meal times, and less time attending church. Meanwhile, school time, household chores, personal hygiene, traveling, playing organized sports, studying and reading, and just hanging out all experienced increases in time allocation (p. 170). Their book also listed the differences that Millennials possessed in such areas as conduct, community, music, and commerce and how they differed between generational groups.

**Cuspers**

Lancaster and Stillman (2002) defined “Cuspers” as those individuals who fall between two generational groups. The Veterans/Boomer Cuspers were those people who were born from 1940 to 1945. These Cuspers are old enough to relate to the values and work ethic of the Veterans, yet are young enough to get involved in causes that the Boomers hold near and dear. This group of Cuspers may also remember days when radio was their only medium, yet were
glued to the television when Elvis danced. Another trait of these Cuspers was that they were too young to fight in the nation’s wars with the early and middle segments of the Veterans, but were there to experience and see the nation in turmoil in the sixties and early seventies.

The Boomer/Gen. X Cuspers were those who were born from 1960 to 1965. This group were too young to protest in the streets in the sixties or enjoy the wild years of the seventies, but were old enough to remember Watergate. They even got through life without using a personal computer (2002, p. 37). Lancaster and Stillman (2002) further claim in their Cusper analysis that this group could remember playing Twister or Monopoly, but also mastered the games of Donkey Kong and Pac Man.

The Gen X/Millennial Cuspers were those individuals born from 1975 to 1980. On their Gen. X’er side, they endured the skepticism and doubt that this generation experienced early on. Yet, applying their Millennial attributes, they experienced the confidence of a growing economy and optimism. This group took after their Gen. X’er brothers and sisters and took technology to a new level.

According to the authors, Cuspers fill a gap in describing a generation. They are those who carry the attributes and attitudes of two generations, often complimenting a work team staffed by one or more generations. Some of the strengths that Cuspers possess are that they often mediate, translate, and mentor between the two sides. The authors believe that, in some cases, Cuspers can make the best managers in that they share a commonality between an older and younger generational group and can serve as strategic leaders between generational groups. Lastly, for many, they serve as a voice for the voiceless (p. 40).

**Higher Education and/or Public Sector**

One element of this study involves the effect of generational outcomes as it pertains to Classified staff at an institution of higher education. In particular, the study compares employees
by generational group who voluntarily separated from employment at a university, and the length of their service. Additionally, the study surveys those employees who elected to remain, specifically those within the Generation X and Millennial cohorts. Are the differences between generations solely based on generational traits, or are they related to something else, and are these factors unique to higher education? The non-scholarly literature contained in this section focuses on generational issues within the higher education environment.

However, though employee transition and retirement may be a good thing, it can also adversely affect colleges and universities. In Doyle’s (2008) study, the impact of retiring faculty leaving their positions, or in other cases remaining on to teach has been critical to faculty hiring officials in terms of workforce planning, instruction, and research. In 1988, eleven percent of the U.S. population was over sixty-five years of age. By the year 2000, the number was a little over twelve percent. The average age of university and college faculty increased from forty-six years of age back in 1988 to fifty in 2004. Today, all universities and colleges are dealing with aging faculty who occupy the majority of teaching and research positions. For various reasons, not many of them are leaving. Some cite the downturn in the economy, a desire to continue working, and other factors as to why they postpone retirement. In any case, their continued presence on campus can deter recruitment initiatives. The impact to higher educational institutions is that when faculty members reach retirement age, but remain on the payroll, they are holding on to seats which new, in-coming, and younger faculty would generally take. This forces many institutions to look at methods to free these spots to allow for a semi-normal transition.

Additional research has been done regarding generational retirement issues involving Veterans and Boomers. In Dendinger, Adams, and Jacobson’s (2005) article, they addressed reasons why Veterans, Baby Boomers, or other retiring employees felt the need to continue
working, or stay connected. In higher education, specifically in the University of Texas System, institutions allow tenured faculty to phase-in retirement while maintaining a part-time course load. This is beneficial to both the university and the faculty member in that it allows both parties to achieve certain professional and personal goals, while maintaining the consistent delivery of services to both students and colleagues.

Some research exists examining the generation differences as they pertain to public sector employers. Jukiewicz (2000) addresses the cultural traits exhibited by Gen. X employees in the public sector. This article was also important in comparing the differences between the private and public sector employees when it came to this generation.

According to the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES), in 2009 about 3.3 million students were expected to have graduated from high school. In 1977, 3.1 Boomers graduated from high school. As for college, between 1997 and 2007, the number of full-time students increased by thirty-four percent compared to a fifteen percent increase in part-time students. However, even with this increase in numbers, only one-third of Millennials will obtain a college degree (Levinson, 2010).

In a recent article in USA Today, Baig (2012) found that Apple is bringing its “apps” technology to the classroom. Using the popular iPad2, textbooks can now be downloaded and read electronically. These digital textbooks can include video and animation. Apple has also created similar applications for its Macintosh brand of personal computing. Students today can access lectures through a variety of Apple products, such as the iPod, iPhone, and iTouch platforms. Apple’s iTunes U is also broadening its video and lecture series for use on the iPad. These developments are not only new to higher education, but are also entering the K-12 markets
as well. Apple hopes that students find these new virtual textbooks more engaging than their physical counterparts.

**WORKFORCE ENGAGEMENT AND INSTITUTIONAL KNOWLEDGE**

Multiple generations working side by side in the workplace not only affect the make-up of an organization, but also how these same organizations address engagement, values, sustainment, tenure, and the retention and transfer of institutional knowledge. More importantly, the scholarly and non-scholarly research in this section will attempt to not only address generational workplace matters, but also the more important question of whether these issues are truly related to generational attributes versus employees moving through career stages in their lives.

In regards to higher education, how colleges and universities handle their commitment to (cultural) change will either positively address or ignore this generational dilemma within the workplace. Failure to do so could result in a steady increase in employee turnover and the potential loss and transfer of institutional knowledge. Fogg (2009) writes that in terms of generational workplace issues, these same institutions must address the flexibility, technology, diversity, and work-life balance in order to succeed. In Fogg’s article, one marketing executive and former college vice-president warns that “a major leadership gap is coming” (p. 26).

Another factor affecting workplace dynamics is the fact that the role of women in the workplace has changed drastically over the past few decades. Where once women were limited in their employment opportunities and salary, and often had to decide between work and home, these obstacles are no longer rampant in the workplace. Some may say that the two most recent generations in the workplace, Generation X and the Millennials, may have had a small impact on redefining these values. In Elman’s (2008) article “Blending Generations; Women in Business,”
she addressed the roles women of different generations have in the workplace and their interaction with other generations.

Hershatter and Epstein (2010) found that Boomers and Millennials are more apt to work well together than are Gen. X’ers and Boomers or Gen. X’ers and Millennials. The existence of generational differences in the workplace was further studied by Smola and Sutton (2002, p. 379) who examined the differences in values between generations (Westerman and Yamamura, 2006). They strongly concluded that work values were more influenced by generational experiences than by age and maturation.

Smola and Sutton’s (2002) longitudinal study of work values was also pivotal in defining whether there were any differences in these values as they apply to generations as they aged. The authors compared levels of desired work outcomes, pride in workmanship, and moral fortitude for the Boomers and the Gen. X populations as surveyed in 1999 with those found in 1974. Smola and Sutton (2002) used the same Boomer, Gen. X, and Millennial categories in the study. Overall, their primary research question focused on whether an individual’s work values were influenced by generational experiences or changed over time due to aging (2002, p. 366). As with Ng and Feldman’s 2008 and 2010 studies, the authors also developed three questions as to how they would conduct their research. Their first question asked whether there were generational differences in work values among today’s employees. Secondly, they wanted to know whether the work values of today’s workers were different than those in 1974. Lastly, they asked whether work values remained constant or changed as workers grew older. As part of the longitudinal study, survey data was collected from respondents across the country in 1999 and were compared to the results of a study completed by a different author in 1974. Smola and Sutton (2002), in developing their organizational context, contrasted the two time periods by
identifying the historical events, economy and prosperity, and the social perspectives of those eras. The 1974 original survey by Cherington, et al. (1974) contained 191 questions about worker attitudes toward their jobs, their companies, their communities, and work overall, along with several other factors. The authors’ samples were gathered from fifty-three U.S. companies, primarily in the manufacturing sectors, but several other service industries were also included in the 1974 study. The participants were predominantly operations employees, but a small percentage of management and support staff were also included (2002, p. 369). Cherington, et al. (1979) divided participants by age groups: seventeen to twenty-six years of age, twenty-seven to forty years of age, and forty-one to sixty-five years of age. Both genders were well represented in these age groups. The total sample size for this survey was about 3,000 employees.

In Smola and Sutton’s 1999 study, 176 questions were used, which excluded some items from the Cherington, et al. (1979) survey, and added some new questions which were, in some cases, more politically-correct. Thirty-seven of the questions were related to demographics, eighteen addresses entrepreneurship, three focused on learning, two concerned women in the workplace, and three covered volunteerism and community involvement. The remaining 113 questions were taken from the original 1974 survey in an effort to match the original survey as closely as possible. The authors used a seven-item and ten-item Likert scale (2002, p. 370). In an effort to replicate the 1974 survey, they studied the same industries. In order to replicate the diverse geographic areas from the original study, the authors surveyed distance learning students in an MBA and Executive MBA program from a large major university in the southeastern region of the U.S. The initial sample size was about 450, and the researchers believed the majority of these students represented the various industries available and were employed full-time at their respective companies. Unlike the 1974 survey, which was predominantly focused on
the manufacturing industry, several government and military employees were represented in the later survey. Over a four-week period, 362 completed questionnaires were received, yielding a small response rate of eight percent. After reviewing for validity and bias, the final sample size was closer to 335.

Smola and Sutton’s (2002) first research question asked whether there were generational differences in work values among today’s employees. The 1999 survey included only a small number of Pre-Veteran and Millennial respondents, and there was little participation from the Veterans era; this resulted in some limitations in the study. The study yielded that there was a significant difference between Boomers and Gen. X’ers when it came to outcomes, whereas the Millennial population expressed a desire to be more promotable within the organization. In both reviews, the older the worker, the lower was the desire for promotion. In terms of pride in craftsmanship, there was no significant difference between Boomers and Gen. X’ers in this area. In regards to the moral importance of work, there were significant differences between Boomers and Gen. X’ers in this area. Gen. X’ers felt more strongly that hard work made for a better person, whereas Boomers felt that hard work was an important part of a person’s life (2002, p. 376). The Millennials, if given the opportunity to inherit a lot of money, would quit their jobs while the Boomers and Gen. X’ers might not. The authors found Gen. X’ers had work values which were significantly different than those of Boomers. Gen. X’ers felt strongly that hard work was an indication of an individual’s worth, regardless of who was around. At the same time, they sought a balance between work and life.

The second research question asked whether the work values of today’s workers were different than those in 1974. In terms of work outcomes, the researchers could not evaluate this category statistically. In terms of having a sense of pride in their craftsmanship, as to whether
employees would work better while their supervisor was around, the older respondents in 1999 agreed with this statement, more so than did the older group in 1974. The authors found that both groups in 1999 rated themselves lower than the groups had in 1974, but only if they believed that hard work would make them a better person. Smola and Sutton (2002) found that there have been many changes in management styles and practices since 1974, and it has been argued that these changes were more of a result of life events and the times, rather than age or maturity. In looking at the same managers twenty-five years later, it is understandable that they would have different values due to aging. The study did find significant differences. With the exception of a few, the patterns suggested a decline in work values in the period between both studies (p. 378).

Lastly, the third question questioned whether work values remained constant or changed as workers grew older. In terms of work outcomes, similar to the second question, the researchers could not evaluate this category statistically. In terms of having a sense of pride in their craftsmanship, as to whether employees would work better while their supervisor was around, there were fewer agreements in 1999 than there had been in 1974. In terms of the moral importance of work, in three of five areas surveyed there were significant differences. Similar to the second research question, the authors also found that both groups in 1999 rated themselves lower than the groups had in 1974, if they believed that hard work would make them a better person (2002, p. 378). Over time, older generations have always lamented the work values and ethics of today’s younger generations. This brought up the question whether this lack in ethics or values was related to a generational trait, or had changed over time. The studies found that worker values change as they mature. The results of the study also found that instead of embracing and supporting the company and the job, the patterns yielded a different outcome; these workers had a less favorable view of work than they had had before. One factor that could
have contributed to this belief was the company’s lack of loyalty and support for the worker. What this may have suggested was that, over time, societal changes could change a person’s view of work more so than could maturity.

Overall, these findings suggest that work values were more influenced by generational events and experiences than by age or maturity (p. 379). Today, no longer is a company, or work the sole motivator in one’s life for several reasons. Changes in values were found, even within a cohort and even as they aged. The same pattern could be found in comparing work values of Boomers and Gen. X’ers, and the trend will continue with Millennials and generations to follow. The authors close with the suggestion that in order for companies to be successful, they must adapt their policies and practices to respond to these changes. Employees are now looking for different things from their employers. First, they want to be treated as valued members of the organization, rather than just “numbers.” Secondly, companies must do a better job of meeting their employees’ needs for better balance between work and life. If they do not, these companies will not receive the same sort of organizational commitment from their employees as they had in years past (p. 380).

In their book, *When Generations Collide*, Lancaster and Stillman (2002) made mention of a survey they distributed to people regarding generational issues. In their BridgeWorks Survey, when asked whether their respective generation was viewed positively by other generational groups, thirty percent of Boomers and twenty-four percent of Traditionals/Veterans answered in the negative, whereas sixty percent of Gen. X’ers felt that their generation was not seen positively. As to when generations were redefining retirement, the authors used an example in the State of California where retired state employees could return on a part-time basis to serve as mentors. This was done in an effort to transfer knowledge or skills to those younger, not yet
retired state employees remaining onboard (p. 127). This is similar to the University of Texas System’s “Phased Retirement” program for tenured faculty. The two plans operate in the same way. It is a good way to gracefully transition long-term faculty into part-time mentoring or teaching roles, thus opening the doors for a new wave of younger faculty. The program within the University of Texas System is not available to staff at this time.

At the time of the BridgeWorks Survey, a report by the Human Resources and Risk Management Department of the University of California at Davis estimated that by 2005, employment projections would show the number of Boomers retiring would outpace the number of available replacement workers (2002, p.156). Retaining the generational employee is more critical now than at any time in the past. Retaining these employees is about fifty-percent the responsibility of the employer. When retention efforts go awry, the employees left over are the ones who will fill the void and cover the costs. What scholars have found is that money is not always the secret ingredient in retention. In most cases it is a combination of several factors: financial, personal, and cultural, which yields an environment which creates a sense of belonging, loyalty, and opportunity. From what has been learned so far, retention issues may have a generational theme at their core (p. 245).

According to Zemke, et al. (2000), generational groups vary greatly in their viewpoints, their skeptical or hopeful outlook, the way in which they view authority (they are either unimpressed or polite), whether they are reluctant or inclusive regarding relationships, and their leadership skills (they focus on either competence or teamwork). Although different in essence, these groups, working together, are the future of the workforce. With all the negative commentary about how they cannot work together in ways other than those involving technology, there are some things that they do well as a whole. They welcome challenges,
believe that they can “have a life” outside work, and believe that management should be considered a partner (Wendover, 2007).

Other examples of our aging workforce and its value to an organization were evidenced in the writings of Fisher (1996) and Wofford (2008). According to both authors, Baby Boomers have been long-standing proven, consistent, and loyal employees in the workplace. According to the authors, these Boomer employees offered much more in terms of these traits and qualities than their younger generational counterparts. As a result, they would be better hires in both the public and private sectors, if the opportunity arose.

The second generational conflict that has emerged in the workplace, involves the Gen. X’ers and the Millennials. Thielfoldt and Scheef (2004) address the differences these two newest generations possess. Millennials have the fastest growing segment, and the authors present the stark differences between the two They also suggest mentoring tips for each group, depending on who is managing or being managed as ways to strengthen workplace relationships, rather than to incite potential workplace issues.

Chen and Choi (2007), in a study of hospitality workers, found that Boomers valued personal growth more than did Gen. X’ers and Millennials, and found that Millennials valued the work environment more than did Boomers and Gen. X’ers. However, in another study, they found all three generations equally valuing comfort, security, and professional growth.

In Asnoorian and Samuel’s (2003) article on generations, the authors described the differences between the Baby Boomers and Generation X employees in public schools and how, regardless of their generational differences, they worked together. The authors also focused on what strengths these generations bring to the work place despite their differences, which is crucial in any work environment. The article also addressed the different belief systems each
generation espoused. For example, Boomers are classified as the generation that “lives to work,” whereas, the Gen. X’ers see themselves as those who “work to live”.

In Ratan’s (1993) article on the Boomers and Gen. X’ers, the author addressed the tension that these two generations have experience with each other and remedies for their workplace dynamic, primarily involving communication, appearance, and office politics.

In his study on employee retention and turnover, Cassidy (2009) found that Millennials exhibit a higher voluntary turnover rate than Gen. X’ers and Boomers, but exhibit a lower turnover intention, or the thought, or idea of leaving the organization. Whereas, Millennials and Gen. X’ers reported higher turnover intentions than did Boomers (Dudley, 2009).

During recent pre-recession times, Kowske (2010) found that Millennials reported marginally higher job satisfaction than older generations. In regards to personality traits, research by Twenge and Campbell (2001) found that Millennials in college are statistically different from previous generations (i.e., Boomers and Gen. X’ers) and tend to display such positive traits as self-esteem and assertiveness; however, they are also somewhat narcissistic.

Though companies have considered treating employee generational populations differently by offering unique communication choices, training, and benefit options, Deal (2010) argues against it, stating that there is little evidence that proves these options improve employee relations or retention. She believe that by providing employees with interesting jobs, competitive salaries, and opportunities to learn and advance, employees of all generations will respond positively.

A grade school in Maryland, designed a game intended to encourage multiple generations to work together. The object of the game was for teachers to work alongside other colleagues who teach different subjects. The participants included Boomers, Gen. X’ers, and Millennials.
They were asked to evaluate the working habits and styles of these different generational groups (Flannery, 2008). The findings seem to indicate that there were differences between the teacher groups. After recognizing these differences and working with them for a while, participants recognized what they needed to do and began to work together.

In regards to generational cohort differences, Craig and Bennett (1997) suggested that work values would differ among the generations and would have an impact in the workplace in the shaping of beliefs, values, goals, and attitudes, and leadership. However, like generational work conflicts, there was little empirical research to point out any differences.

The Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM, 2012) has several metrics to gauge the expense involved in replacing employees. The effective reduction and minimization of these costs are important in an organization’s business plans. Business leaders, through their human resource professionals, are tasked with understanding the organization’s data, interpreting these metrics, identifying trends, explaining variances, and understanding the reasons for both internal and external turnover. There are costs involved in turnover, and understanding failure to understand what these metrics mean could cost an organization millions of dollars in replacement, training, and time in filling unanticipated vacancies (p. 3).

In another SHRM Brief (2005), they found a strong relationship between high turnover and low financial performance for organizations (Huselid, 1995). It is well known that when employees leave, they take with them their knowledge, skills, and abilities that helped contribute to the goals, objectives, profits, and performance of the organization (2005, p. 1). Blake (2006), in an article in *WebPro News*, detailed the real world costs facing employers when retention is not a priority. There are several definitions of turnover. Turnover is often categorized as Internal, External, Voluntary or Involuntary. Internal turnover is when employee leave their current
position and take on another position within the same organization. External turnover occurs when employees leave the organization entirely. This type of turnover is typically tracked and analyzed, and measured against other organizational metrics to determine if an organization is below, at, or above industry standards. Involuntary turnover occurs when employment is terminated by someone other than the employee. Voluntary turnover is a separation action initiated by the employee (SHRM, 2008).

The Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM) estimated that it costs $3,500 to replace one $8.00 per hour employee when all costs are taken into account, including recruiting, interviewing, hiring, training, lost productivity, and other costs. SHRM’s estimate was the lowest calculation of the seventeen nationally known companies who track metrics regularly. Other sources estimate that it costs an organization thirty to fifty percent of the annual salary for an entry level position, 125% for middle managers, and up to 400% for specialized, high level employees.

For example, a departing middle management employee whose average salary is forty thousand dollars would cost the organization fifty thousand dollars in replacement costs ($40,000 x 125%). If these organizations lose five to ten similar employees a year, the turnover costs would range from $250,000 to $500,000 (2006, p. 1). Other costs included in determining turnover costs are orientation and administrative costs, customer service issues, and more importantly, the lost expertise, skills, and knowledge of the departing employee. These costs are the reason retention efforts are critical to any organization.

Bliss (2006) agreed that the turnover costs could easily reach 150% of an employee’s annual compensation rate. The costs are much higher, 200% to 250% of an employee’s annual compensation, if he or she is in a managerial or sales position. He also details a list of cost
related to turnover that are spread out between separation, recruitment, training, lost productivity, and new hire costs. This was a turnover cost calculation similar in nature to the one which was researched and studied by W. Cascio in 1991 (SHRM, 2005). Cascio (1991), in developing his template for calculating turnover costs, added a new element involving the performance variance between the employee who left and the one who was hired.

Bliss (2006) also found that the costs related to an employee leaving include the cost of placing someone if the role while it is vacant, as well as the costs related to lost productivity, conducting exit interviews, severance pay, benefits continuation, and training. These are just a few of the calculations that can help determine the real costs of turnover (2006, p. 1). Bliss placed some level of importance on the lost productivity costs. These are instances when a new employee is learning a new job, and its policies and procedures. The employee is not fully productive at that point. Some of the costs related to these factors include, but are not limited to, the costs for co-worker and supervisor lost productivity, cost of mistakes made, lost departmental productivity, project completions, and lost productivity of the employee’s manager or department head. These may seem trivial when taken individually, but as a whole, they are costs that an organization needs to address when employee turnover is rampant.

In calculating Turnover costs, an organization has to also include the costs for exit interviews, the administrative functions related to the separation, and any subsequent increase in the organization’s unemployment compensation tax rate (Pinkovitz, Moskal, & Green, 2001-2006). The authors included the costs for attracting applicants, interviewing, testing, pre-employment expenses, medical exams, and the acquisition and dissemination of information. Pinkovitz, et al. (2001-2006, p. 2) found that typically separation, replacement, and training costs were all “net” costs; however vacancy costs (the length of time a position remains vacant) and
the performance factor could result in either a net cost or savings. One set of figures that is
difficult to quantify is the tangible costs related to turnover. These include increased workload,
stress and tension, effects on morale, and decreased productivity. These costs are genuine, just
difficult to quantify in terms of actual value.

The Rainmaker Group (2011), in their study of the Real Costs of Employee Turnover,
found that on average, it takes about eight weeks to recruit and hire a new employee. As stated
by others (Collins, 2011; Huselid, 1995), another serious cost to organizations when they lose
employees is the loss of institutional knowledge (2011, p.2). The article finds that many
employees become experts in their jobs, so when they leave, the knowledge follows. Those
departing are no longer available to mentor other employees, and as a result leave a void, and a
cost. That is another cost which is difficult to quantify. In the same article, a Harvard University
study reported that eighty percent of employee turnover could be attributed to mistakes made
during the hiring process. Surprisingly, they found that up to eighty percent of an organization’s
turnover can be blamed on bad hiring. The problem, according to this study and the consensus of
many experts, is in the selection process. The wrong people are being hired for the wrong jobs.

Crenshaw (2010) found that workers from the Greatest Generation (pre-1914) who stayed
in their positions longer than the norm did so because of practicality and tenacity, more so than
for loyalty. In reality, these employees were still always looking for the next big thing, but in
essence were grateful for the jobs they had, and did not take anything for granted.

In a 2010 study regarding generational differences in the workplace, Parry and Urwin
reviewed theory and evidence regarding scholarly and research on this subject from two
perspectives: the sociological and the academic. At the most, their finding yielded mixed
reviews. There have been many studies which have been unable to distinguish whether work-
related differences are either generational, or age-based. Rhodes (1983) found that age-related issues at work could be thought of as cohort or age/period effects in that both age/period effects are developmental in nature and could be a result of normal aging. These effects are different from cohort effects which, unlike age/period effects, are more related to an environment or experiences. Rhodes believed that if these work-related differences were due to age, younger persons should therefore become like their elders as they aged. However, if these differences or changes were related to cohort or generational effects, attitudes and differences between the cohorts should remain stable. Rhodes’ work set the foundation in studying age-effects in the workplace.

In terms of cohort analysis, Mason and Wolfinger (2001) defined a “cohort” as a series of individuals entering the system at the same time, who are believed to have similarities as a result of shared experiences that set them apart from other groups (2010, p. 8). They believed that any difference between cohort groups were due to a series of relationships between age-related, period, and cohort effects. Many scholars, including Rhodes (1983) and Mason, et al. (2001), tend to use the terms cohort and generation interchangeably. However, there are some subtle differences between the two terms, in that “generations” can begin with a social, political, or economic event, a change in demography, resources, or even social characteristics.

It is critical to identify the specific “cut-off” levels which define a particular generation. The words “cohort” and “generation” may be synonymous if the group exhibits both separate and specific values and attitudes because of the commonality of a particular social, economic, or political event as compared to other cohorts. Such a definition would include the generational categories of Veterans, Boomers, Gen. X’ers, Millennials, and the respective time periods covered by each generational group for purposes of this study. Kotler and Keller (2006) stated
that a generation is strongly influenced by the times in which it “grew up.” This would include the movies, music, politics, and the events that made up that period. Members of a cohort share the same major culture, political, and economic experiences (2006, pp. 235-236). In essence, they look and act the same.

As the research investigated generational differences in work values, Denecker, et al. (2008) found that the discord in defining generations occurred as a result of a few key conceptual and methodological issues. First, there were difficulties separating the effects of age from cohorts using cross-sectional data (Tuma and Hannan, 1984). Secondly, even when the researchers used panel data, it was difficult to sort out the age-period-cohort problems as age, cohort, and history (Blossfeld, et al., 1989). Lastly, it was possible that identities were more varied within these cohorts than across cohorts (Giele and Elder, 1988). It is worth noting that despite the interest in generational work values, little empirical research had been done between 1983 and the late 1990’s (Parry and Urwin, 2010).

The authors list several cross-sectional studies which addressed the generational issue. Cennamo and Gardner’s (2008) work found significant generational differences for work values involving status and freedom, but omitted extrinsic, social, and altruistic values. They found that the younger generation places more importance on status than the older generation, while the Millennials valued freedom-related rights more than Gen. X or the Boomers. The authors believe that the first of these findings may actually be the result of the career stage of the older group, in that status was not as important. Their second finding supported the stereotypical image of the Millennials embracing autonomy and work-life balance, an attribute also common to Gen. X (2010, p. 16).
Chen and Choi (2008), in their cross-sectional study, looked at workers in the hospitality industry. What they found in their survey was that the Boomers viewed altruism and intellect higher than did Gen. X’ers or the Millennials. Gen. X’ers ranked security and independence higher than did Boomers or Millennials, and the Millennials ranked economic return higher than did the Boomers or Gen. X’ers. The authors also found that Boomers, in general, scored personal growth higher than did both the Gen. X’ers and Millennials. Millennials expressed a greater appreciation for work environment than did X’ers or the Boomers. Millennials, according to Chen and Choi (2008), were not as concerned with personal growth, intellect, and achievement as they were with economic returns.

In two other cross-sectional studies; Applebaum, et al., (2005) and Parker and Chusmir (1990) studied the factors and differences between the generational groups. For example, Applebaum, et al. (2005) found that Boomers and Gen. X’ers both had salary and a promising future as their most motivating factors. Whereas, the Parker and Chusmir (1990) study failed to find any difference between generations regarding their views on the importance of work values. They did find that Boomers placed a high priority on a comfortable and exciting life, and sought social recognition at work, whereas, the Veterans placed a higher value on peace and tranquility at work. Parry and Urwin (2010) found that the empirical evidence was mixed in that they found as many studies in support of generational differences, as not as supportive when it came to workplace issues. The differences they found were not consistent. Indeed several scholars found differences that contradicted the on-going and common stereotypes of Boomers, Gen. X’ers, and Millennials.

For some time, there has been much disagreement regarding the characteristics and composition of a generation. For example, Giancola (2006) argued about what time periods
constituted a generation. He found that there was little consensus on when the Boomer generation began, with several scholars debating whether it was 1943 or 1946. Some other scholars believe that a fifth generation should have been added as part of the Veterans cohort. Furthermore, those who are born at the beginning or end of a generation, a group known as “Cuspers,” do not clearly belong in either generation. Giancola (2006) further believe that Boomers should have been spilt into two separate generational groups. Like the others, Parry and Urwin (2010) also believe that additional empirical research is needed, specifically when it comes to deciphering the effects of age, career stage, cohort, and period (p. 30).

In her meta-analysis on age-related differences in work attitudes and behavior, Rhodes (1983) found that there had been no comprehensive efforts to examine the research on the effects age has on workplace attitudes and behaviors. Her theoretical framework for examining these differences focused on three effects, which included Age, Period, and Cohort effects. Age effects addressed role changes and biological aging; whereas Cohort effects were those persons born at the same time and age. Lastly, Period effects were changes to the work and non-work environments. Rhodes (1983) found that several factors could have been responsible for age differences in the work attitudes and behaviors, in that as a person aged, they would expect their attitudes to be similar to others at a similar age. In order to study the effects of age differences, several methods of data analysis were required to separate the effects. These were cross-sectional, longitudinal, and time lag studies (1983, p.331). Rhodes was able to find that that there was sufficient evidence to show that job satisfaction was positively associated with age in an eight bivariate study involving twenty-two samples (Aldag and Brief, 1975). In another study of public sector employees, Aldag and Brief found that there were no significant relationships between age and overall job satisfaction (1975, p. 331).
In reviewing the literature regarding the relationship between age and turnover, the works of Mobley, Griffeth, Hand, and Meglino (1979), as well as Porter and Steers (1973) were used by Rhodes (1983) as her primary source on this subject. In total, twenty-eight studies examined the relationship between age and turnover. There was strong support for a negative relationship between age and turnover, despite the fact that several studies defined turnover in different ways. Rhodes was able to show that age was consistently and positively related to overall job satisfaction, motivation, and commitment, and negatively related to employee turnover. As employees age, they are less likely to leave an organization (1983, p. 355). This is an important factor in determining whether certain generational groups have greater tendencies to stay employed for longer periods than others, unless it is related to something other than generational differences.

In a similar meta-analysis study, Costanza, et al. (2012) also quantified the research on generational differences in work-related attitudes and outcomes. The authors used the same generational cohorts to identify the groups as had Straus and Howe (1991) in the early nineties. The authors defined a generational cohort as individuals who shared common experiences at similar ages. The thought behind that theory was that the common experiences shared by many of one particular age cohort, at a particular point in time, created similarities (2012, p. 2). There have been several meta-analyses conducted on gender and racial diversity; however, there has been limited quantitative research on generational differences in work related outcomes. In defining generations, several scholars in the article cited the work of Strauss and Howe (1991).

In recent studies, generations have been defined as “identifiable group that shares birth years, age, location, and significant life events as critical development stages” (Kupperschmidt, 2000). Costanza, et al., found that one area that generated the most attention as it pertained to
generational differences was workplace issues. D’Amato and Hertzfeldt (2008), studying late Gen. X’ers and late Boomers in organizational commitment, theorized that older generations would yield higher commitment levels than younger generations. They found that Boomers had significantly greater commitment levels than did Gen. X’ers. As mentioned earlier, Kowske (2010) had a stronger indicator in work attitudes between Boomers, Gen. X’ers, and Millennials by monitoring for age and time. Little support was found for differences among generations in regards to satisfaction and turnover. Additional research by Cennamo and Gardner (2008) found that societal trends and other tangible generational research supported their argument, whereas D’Amato and Hertzfeldt (2008) based their arguments on age differences. There is little theoretical support regarding the hypothesis about generational differences and its work-related outcomes. The biggest challenge for researchers in studying generational differences are the differences attributed to generational cohorts versus those truly related to age or time period effects. Furthermore, organizational loyalty, experience, length of service, and technological breakthroughs are often associated with age and generation, and could also be logical explanations for the differences (Costanza, et. al., 2012).

Hundreds of articles have been written on generational issues, both of the scholarly and non-scholarly nature. Costanza, et al., in their meta-analysis, sought to find the most relevant scholarly research articles, studies, nooks, and dissertations. Their search began with 329 published and unpublished empirically-based studies in work-attitude areas. These were eventually screened down to ninety-five pieces. To qualify, the research had to empirically and quantitatively test hypotheses regarding generational differences. Secondly, the articles had to examine one area of the author’s interests. Third, the studies had to examine work outcomes, and lastly there had to be a sufficient number of articles within each outcome in order to include it in
the study. Of the ninety-five articles, twenty were eventually selected that met the criteria for the meta-analysis, with at least one work outcome related to job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and intention to stay. The authors used Schmidt and Le’s (2004) software to conduct the meta-analysis and compute credibility intervals, performing separate meta-analyses for each of six possible generational tandems: Traditionals (Veterans) – Boomers; Traditionals – Gen. X; Traditionals – Millennials; Boomers – Gen. X; Boomers – Millennials, and Gen. X – Millennials (Costanza, et. al., 2012). The results of the meta-analysis did not support the idea that there were systematic or significant differences among generations related to work outcomes. Their results, like those of Sackett, et al. (2003) and others, found little evidence supporting the findings and differences that were related to generational affiliation. Questions were also raised about the value of organizational interventions used to study these generational/workplace differences and support the conclusions raised by Parry and Urwin (2010).

A review of the study’s results yielded three weak, but distinct patterns. First, the authors found that older workers were slightly more satisfied with their jobs than were younger generations. Though these results were conflicting, they did suggest that age and length of service, not generational affiliation, could explain the differences observed in job satisfaction. Secondly, while there were small to moderate differences among generations related to organizational commitment, these affiliations varied as to whether the individuals were or were not committed at all. The results further suggested that generational affiliation was a mixed predictor of organizational commitment, whereas other variables may be more of a factor. Lastly, older generations were less likely to leave their jobs than younger generations (Costanza, et. al, 2012). Previous research in the area of intent to leave employment had shown that though chronological age tended to be adversely related to turnover, it added minimal predictive value
other than education, engagement, and length of service. Other attitudinal factors such as job satisfaction and organizational commitment were more strongly related to turnover than was age (Arnold and Feldman, 1982). There was little support for the premise of differences between people based solely on generational affiliation and work outcomes. This issue is one of the main theoretical questions in the current study: Are the reasons employees leave or stay in their jobs related to generational traits or attitudes, or are they related to other factors?

Ng and Feldman’s (2008) study of the relationship between age and voluntary turnover was one of two meta-analyses they did regarding the relationship of age to work-related attributes. The 2008 study primarily focused on voluntary turnover (excluding retirements) and how age may, or may not have had an effect. Similar age empirical studies had been conducted before by Healy, et al. (1995), Mobley, et al. (1979), Cotton and Tuttle (1986), and Rhodes (1983). These authors established four key psychological changes that accompanied aging: Emotions, Social Relationships, Needs, and Self-concepts. They found that as people age, there are certain changes that they experience along the way. Because older works were more likely to experience these changes than younger workers, it was suggested that older workers were less likely than younger worker to voluntary leave (2008, p.285). Holton and Russell (1999), in a study of college graduates, found that one year after graduation, younger alumni had already worked at an average 1.4 organizations, and that number rose to 2.1 three years after graduation. Iverson and Pullman (2000) found that younger employees were more likely to resign and to start looking for new opportunities than older workers.

In their study, Ng and Feldman (2008) comprised three research questions to examine the relationship between age and voluntary turnover. First, they asked whether age was adversely related to voluntary turnover. Job security is an important need for older workers. As a result, it
is understood that older workers were less likely to voluntary resign due to their inability to find another job. For them, security is an important reason to remain where they are at. In their findings, age negatively related to voluntary turnover. Their second question asked if gender and race have a negative effect on the relationship between age and voluntary turnover. While the study already revealed that older workers were less likely to voluntary resign, older women and non-Caucasian workers were even less likely to leave their jobs. Some of this may be related to perceived discrimination issues and difficulties in finding new employment. Though their findings did not find a moderator under gender, it did so under race. The third question asked if organizational tenure balanced the negative relationship between age and voluntary turnover. Since older workers were less likely to voluntary resign, those workers with extended length of service were also less likely to leave employment due to potential loss of financial incentives and job security. They did find some support for organizational tenure being a moderator, however, but only for those workers with longer lengths of service. Lastly, they asked if the education level affected a negative relationship between age and voluntary turnover. It was found that older workers with little formal education were more likely to have some difficulty in finding suitable employment if they voluntary resigned. On the other hand, this same population with a higher degree of formal education, could leave, secure they would find and accept better job offers outside their organization (2008, p. 288). The study’s results also indicated a negative relationship between age and voluntary turnover only if the formal education of the respondents in the sample was low. The authors, in their summary of this study, did find that age was strongly related to turnover. Secondly, they found that the relationship between age and turnover was higher for such factors as race, and in cases where tenure is high, and education is low.
In their second study regarding the relationship between age and work attitudes, Ng and Feldman (2010) established fourteen task-based attitudes. These included: job satisfaction, work satisfaction, pay satisfaction, satisfaction with promotions, work motivation, job involvement, job control, job demand, role ambiguity, role conflict, role overload, emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced work accomplishment. The authors placed these attitudes under three primary groupings: job, people, and organizational. In their work, they cited Rhodes’ (1983) study of age effects on job attitudes. Despite the fact that her study was more than twenty-five years old at the time of their work, Ng and Feldman (2010) found several similarities to Rhodes’ results. Rhodes (1983) was one of the first researchers to show that age was related to a variety of work outcomes, though it was qualitative in nature. She limited her study to only ten job attitudes, and excluded people-based attitudes. Ng and Feldman used thirty-five attitudes in their study. Rhodes (1983) reviewed each of the age-job attitude relationships separately, as compared to Ng and Feldman’s examination of a broader set of job attitudes. Finally, the varied results of the age-job attitude relationships could have been the result of different research samples.

Analyzing the results regarding gender, race, education, and tenure from their 2008 study, the authors found that older workers tended to have more favorable job attitudes than younger workers. They used three of the four first study’s research questions. First, they asked whether the relationship between age and job attitudes would be moderated by organizational tenure. The study found that this relationship was stronger in samples with higher than average organizational tenure. As a result, the difference between age and job satisfaction depended on the length of service level. The relationship was indeed stronger when tenure was higher, thus it was found to be a moderator. Secondly, they asked whether or not the relationship between age
and job attitudes would be moderated by race and gender. The study found that this relationship was stronger in samples with a higher representation of women. The relationship, as it pertained to race, was more positive for minorities than for Caucasians. Lastly, they asked whether or not the relationship between age and job attitudes would be moderated by education level. It was found that the relationships were more favorable for workers without a college education. Secondly, the relationship between age and role conflict was more negative in samples where there was a higher population of employees without a college education (2010, p. 702). Ng and Feldman surmised that management must be equally concerned with older workers’ job attitudes. As their results indicated, older workers usually have more positive job attitudes than younger workers. As a result, these attitudes may indirectly help older workers’ job performance (Harrison, et al., 2006).

Park and Gursoy (2012), studying the generational effects on U.S. hotel employees, found that, as regards the relationship between work engagement, satisfaction and turnover, Millennials differed from Gen. X’ers and Boomers. The authors’ questions focused on the implications if loyal employees from one generational cohort were more satisfied with their jobs than those of another generation, presuming both groups were fully engaged in work. The study’s findings could aid researchers everywhere in changing their focus from a comparison between generations to one that measures the dynamics of the generational effects across the board. Secondly, the answers could assist management in focusing on the satisfaction and retention of employees of different generational cohorts. These management principles had been suggested many times in the day-to-day management of generational cohorts in the workplace.

Work engagement has three dimensions which have been widely recognized and validated: vigor, dedication, and absorption (Demerouti, et al., 2001). When workers are
engaged, they are willing to work harder and thus are more productive. As a result, according to some additional research, work engagement is advanced by several job resources, such as innovation, social climate, skill variety, supervisor support, and autonomy (Bakker and Demerouti, 2007; Hakanen, Bakker, and Schaufeli, 2006; & Schaufeli and Salanova, 2007). Other resources, such as personal resources also positively influenced engagement (Park and Gursoy, 2012). Twenge (2010) found that Millennials were more satisfied with their jobs than were older generations, but similar in their intentions of leaving the organization.

Kowske (2010), on the other hand, found different and significant effect sizes for job satisfaction and turnover intentions between Millennials and Gen. X’ers. This means that the impact of specific work-related behavioral measures may differ depending on the generation with which they are being utilized. The authors found that when younger employees lose their motivation to be engaged in their work because they find their jobs less meaningful and rewarding, they lose spirit and morale. They also lose their motivation to stay with the organization more so than do older generations. However, when they are engaged, they will stay and be more satisfied, and would not consider leaving the organization. This lack of engagement and job satisfaction may be among the reasons Millennials do not stay employed as long as Gen. X’ers or Boomers. Of course these may be general reasons most employees would cite as a reason to leave an organization.

Vigor positively influenced employee retention among all generations; it was Millennials who felt stronger intentions to leave their organizations than older generations when vigor was lacking. Secondly, when Millennials employees lose their sense of value, enthusiasm, and challenge while working, their intent to leave is higher than that of Boomer employees (Park and Gursoy, 2012). When Millennials are less engaged in their jobs, they are more likely to leave.
However, when they find peace and meaning, and they are engaged, they are less likely to leave work, than their engaged Gen. X and Boomer counterparts. In summary, engaging employees, especially the Millennials, is more likely to yield higher job satisfaction, and eventual retention.

When it comes to employee turnover, there are many questions regarding which employees are likely to leave an organization, and when. In a study that spanned thirty-four years and covered almost 43 thousand persons, Healy, et al. (1995) attempted to address the relationship between age and employee turnover. March and Simon (1958) found that economic conditions were a better predictor of employee turnover than age. Hullin (1991), on the other hand, believed that the most accepted reason for turnover was job dissatisfaction. The current research on this topic is based upon agreement with that principle.

Related to the relationship between age and turnover, Healy, et al., (1995) also found that in narrative studies (Rhodes, 1983; Mobley, et. al, 1979) and a meta-analysis (Cotton and Tuttle, 1986) that age was negatively related to turnover. The authors found chronological age and job tenure were often linked together. Job tenure was seen as the most common link between age and turnover, but with the caveat that the difference in age at any level of job tenure could be limited. The authors concluded their study by finding that age itself was not a sufficient predictor of when an employee would voluntary leave their job (1995, p. 341). Furthermore, their research also found that both age and tenure had little or no effect on voluntary turnover, as was the case with age and job performance.

Twenge (2010) found that one of the biggest challenges in generational research was the lack if a “workable time machine” (p. 202). She believed most studies focused on work values were cross-sectional, in that data was collected about workers of different ages at one point in time. Any differences could be the result of age or career stage changes, or to the generational
cohort (Schaie, 1965). The best design for measuring generational differences is a time-lag study. These studies examine people at the same ages, but at different stages in time. Time-period effects are considered the weakest, as attitudes and values are formed early and retained. Time-lag studies are rare, and at the same time difficult in that they require similar samples of individuals at the same ages who are asked the same questions in different years (2010, p. 202).

Most of the literature on generational differences related to work values is varied. In Twenge’s (2010) study, respondents came from Australia, Belgium, Europe, New Zealand, and the U.S. Most of her studies examined variables which fell into one of five categories: work ethic, work centrality, leisure, job satisfaction, and intention to leave. Using time-lag studies in an effort to separate generations from age and career-stage differences, she found that Gen. X’ers and Millennials exhibited a lower work ethic than their Boomer counterparts. However, there are common generational trends toward some of the leisure values for both Gen. X’ers and Millennials. The younger generational groups tended to enjoy more time off, and showed less of a difference when it came to work ethic (2010, p. 204). Millennials were substantially less likely than Boomers to have a job that gave them a greater opportunity to help others. However, when it came to finding a job that benefitted society, there were no differences between the three generational groups. It is interesting to note in Twenge’s (2010) study that the Millennials were not higher than other generational groups when it came to altruistic work values.

In this study, Twenge cited the work of Jurkiewicz’s (2000) cross-sectional study of generational differences. This study was taken among public sector employees in the U.S. This intrinsic and extrinsic study found that Boomers were more likely than Gen. X’ers to value new learning opportunities. Whereas, in the same study, there were no differences between these generations when it came to prestige, status, and money. In terms of social or affiliation values,
there were no clear distinctions found between these generations. In terms of job satisfaction and intention to leave, the results of the study found the Millennials having a higher job satisfaction level than Gen. X’ers were less like to leave their jobs. When it came to “job hopping”, contrary to most studies, Gen. X’ers and Millennials had a higher desire to stay with the same job for the majority of their adult lives, which mirrored the sentiments of the Boomers as well (2010, p. 206). This is very different from what other previous studies have said about these two generations, in terms of loyalty and organizational commitment. The study further found that Millennials were actually more satisfied with their jobs and did indeed want more job security than older generations. Her study and other empirical evidence suggested that the Millennials, and some Gen. X’ers, were somewhat difficult to motivate because Millennials especially found work as not as important to their lives, and applied greater value to the small things in life.

In another meta-analysis regarding employee turnover, Griffeth, et al. (2002) updated previous studies by Hom and Griffeth (1995), as well as Cotton and Tuttle’s (1986) study. This study, unlike the first one investigated, varied moderators of antecedent-turnover correlations. In order to update the original study, the authors searched for all published articles focusing on predictor-turnover relationships in the nineties. The criteria for inclusion had to meet the following conditions: assessment of actual turnover; a predictive design collecting predictive measures before the turnover occurred; and turnover measured at the individual level (2000, p. 464). Their results from the updated meta-analysis found for the personal characteristic element that women quit at the same rate as men. The authors found no relationship between race and turnover, although other studies have found the opposite (Cox & Blake, 1991; Hom & Griffeth, 1995). It is to be noted that racial effects could have been dependent on the type of racial minority member.
As for satisfaction with the overall job and job facets, Griffeth, et al. (2000) found similar predictive validity for job satisfaction and facet satisfaction. Work satisfaction yielded the higher relationship to turnover among all kinds of satisfaction elements. As for other dimensions of work experience, fair treatment by the employer had a higher level of acceptance and success in retaining workers, than did its reverse (p. 479). Strong signals in the employee withdrawal process served as the best predictors of turnover. These predictors included job satisfaction, organizational commitment, job search and alternate options. Further, job search opportunities also served as a predictor, as did intentions to leave, and withdrawing completely. It was found that when people were preparing to leave a job, they withdrew before they actually left. This withdrawal resulted in the eventual separation of the employee. The authors concluded that in most cases, management intervention could possibly deter turnover, but without it, employee turnover was the most definite resulting action (2000, p. 486).

In his study on Gen. X’ers, O’Bannon (2001) posed the following research questions: 1. What history did Gen. X’ers and Boomers bring to the workplace, and how would that history foster a positive work relationship? 2. What factors contributed to the lack of communication between these groups, and where did they originate? 3. What positive aspects or trends did the Gen. X’ers bring to the workplace? and 4. What skills could Boomer supervisors use to communicate more effectively with Gen. X’ers? These questions attempted to resolve the workplace issues between Gen. X’ers and Boomers (2001, p. 96). In response to the first question, some of the histories that both generations brought to workplace included technological advances, the rise of the divorce rate from the mid-sixties to the late seventies, social issues, and material successes. In response to second question, the author found the non-acceptance of Gen. X’ers by Boomers in the workplace, lack of loyalty by Gen. X’ers, failing to understand that
Gen. X’ers did indeed want a balance between work and life, and differences in their respective value systems all contributed to the lack of communication. In regards to the question about the positive aspects and trends that Gen. X’ers bring to the workplace, O’Bannon (2001, p. 101) found that this generation was more tolerant regarding racial and cultural issues than were Boomers and were very interested in family-friendly benefits (i.e., subsidized child care, tuition plans, and paid time off). Lastly, in response to their fourth question regarding the skills that Boomers could use to better manage Gen. X’ers, the author suggested building an institutional climate that welcomes and values Gen. X’ers, respects the Gen. X’ers experience with technology, supports their style of thinking, learning and communicating, and respects who they are. He suggested allowing this generational group to set its own priorities, make decisions, and not be afraid to make mistakes.

In the same study, and in a Gallup telephone survey (Thompson, 1998) of people who were sixteen years of age and older, worked at least thirty-five hours per week, in companies with more than one-hundred employees, fifty-four percent of the respondents were Boomers, thirty percent were Gen. X’ers, and sixteen percent were fifty-five years of age or older. Younger workers viewed training as the key to advancement within an organization. Almost sixty-percent of Gen. X’ers, then aged 16-32, believed their training would prepare them for future opportunities, compared to forty-five percent of Boomers. O’Bannon (2001) found “significant baggage” which both the Boomers and Gen. X’ers brought to the workplace, and described how important it was to resolve these issues for the sake of workplace harmony and productivity.

There have been a multitude of articles and research focusing on employee turnover. Many of these studies have identified such common workplace factors as job satisfaction and commitment, and demographic variables such as length of service, marital status, and age as
leading predictors of turnover (Arnold and Feldman, 1982). In their study of the determinants of job turnover, the authors used a sample of six hundred and fifty-four employees in the accounting profession. There had at that time been several models that scholars examined for years in terms of the cause of employee turnover. One model cited in this analysis was that of Mobley, et. al, (1978), who hypothesized that individual differences yielded to job satisfaction and alternatives, which in turn yielded to the idea of quitting, to the intent to look for other jobs, and finally leaving all together (1982, p. 351).

Their work examined a number of other theoretical issues that were relevant in employee turnover studies. For example, they considered the relationship between the intent to change jobs and actual turnover behavior. Secondly, they explored the inter-relationships of the intent to search for new opportunities, the intent to change positions, the existence of options, and the actual behavior regarding turnover. Lastly, Arnold and Feldman (1982) studied the origin of the factors of the intent to look for opportunities, and actual intentions to leave. Their results indicated that turnover was largely influenced by age, job tenure, job satisfaction, commitment, perceived job security, and the intent to search for alternative options. Turnover behavior was found to be more closely associated with intentions to look for other opportunities, than to change jobs. The intent to look around was found to be a good indicator of leaving if age, job satisfaction, and commitment combined were also factored in. However, the most powerful model of predictive turnover behavior contained the following elements: length of service, job satisfaction, job security, and the opportunity to search for alternatives (1982, p. 359). These findings further clarified some of the real reasons employees leave their jobs. As with the scholarly research works of Rhodes (1983), Park and Gursoy (2012), and Healy, et. al (1995), all
believed that turnover was not related to age, but rather to other issues involving job satisfaction, tenure, and engagement.

In terms of work commitment and ethic, Meriac, et al. (2010) conducted a study examining the differences among three generational groups: Boomers, Gen. X’ers, and Millennials. The belief was that generational cohorts held different perceptions of each other, which may have resulted in conflict and misunderstandings in the workplace. In defining work ethic, the authors theorized that it was multidimensional, pertained to work activities in general, was not specific to a job, was learned, referred to attitudes and beliefs, not behaviors, was a construct related to behavior, and was secular, not religious (2010, p. 316). There had been little previous empirical research directly assessing these differences. The study ranged over a twelve year period from 1998 to 2008 and included approximately 1,860 students attending business school at a large southeastern university. The participants in the study completed the Multidimensional Work Ethic Profile or MWEP (Miller, et al, 2002). The survey measured seven elements of work ethic: self-reliance, morality/ethics, leisure, hard work, centrality or work, wasted time, and delay in gratification. Overall, the findings indicated that there was no clear distinction between the three generational cohorts as pertained to work ethic. This was especially true as between the Gen. X’ers and Millennials. However, the Boomers reported higher levels of work ethic across all dimensions.

In a 2002 *Time Magazine* article, Chatzky (2002) found that Gen. X’ers would not stay at the same place of employment for more than five years and in most cases may have moved after the three year mark. In a 1998 survey by Sibson Consulting, also known as Sibson and Company, showed that fifty-five percent of employees at the time either planned to quit or considered leaving their jobs before hitting the three year mark.
Rodriguez, et. al. (2003) identified several themes for leadership behavior among both the Boomer and Gen. X generations. Those themes included fulfillment, flexibility, technology, salary and benefits, and work environment. The participants were from a very large telecommunications company employing close to 7,300 employees at the time. The types of employees who participated ranged from the manager to vice-presidential level. The final sample totaled a little over eight hundred participants and was distributed as a hardcopy survey. The results of the study showed significant difference for all themes between the Gen. X’ers and Boomers. In terms of fulfillment, Gen. X’ers preferred daily challenging tasks, whereas Boomers preferred challenging tasks running the course of a few days. In terms of technology, Gen. X’ers preferred using the web, whereas the Boomers preferred using the phone. For flexibility, Boomers preferred regularly scheduled hours while Gen. X’ers preferred flexible working hours. In terms of salary and benefits, Boomers preferred a job with retirement benefits, whereas Gen. X’ers preferred a portable 401k with a lump sum distribution. In regards to work environment, Boomers in the study placed a higher priority on this theme than did Gen. X’ers.

In her dissertation, Eaton (2008) investigated generational differences in job satisfaction in a bureaucratic organization. She examined the relationship between four generational cohorts and the nine facets of job satisfaction which were developed by Spector (1997), in looking at how they relate in a bureaucratic environment. The nine job satisfaction facets included pay, promotion, supervision, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, operating procedures, co-workers, nature of the work, and communication. One thousand forty individuals were selected for this study. They were employed in a federal organization located in the Midwest. Of the employees surveyed, 430 completed the survey, a forty-one percent response rate. Eleven percent of the respondents were Millennial employees; twenty-five percent were X’ers; sixty percent were
Boomers; and four percent were Traditionals/Veterans. Sixty percent of the respondents were female, and in terms of length of service, twenty-two percent had worked for the government between twenty-six and thirty years. Lastly, more than seventy-three percent of the respondents were between the nine to thirteen level of the GS scale, and the majority had attended a four year college.

Eaton (2008) found that the Attraction-Selection-Attrition or ASA (Schneider, 1987) theory that the government practiced would not be as attractive to some age cohorts due to the unwelcome bureaucratic culture. Attraction, in the model, focused on a person’s preference for an organization and was based on the individual’s own characteristics as related to those of the potential work organization. Selection represented the formal and informal procedures used to recruit and hire people with the attributes the organization sought. Lastly, attrition refers to the idea that people will leave an organization if they do not “fit in” (Schneider, 1987). In terms of a comparison with the four generational cohorts within a bureaucratic organization, Eaton’s research found the Traditionals, also known as Veterans, were more committed to the command-control leadership style of hierarchical organizations (Martin and Tulgan, 2002). It is a style which would suit the Traditionals/Veterans very well because of their fundamental characteristics. Boomers value positions of status, and would welcome the “chain of command” aspect of structure within a bureaucracy (Kupperschmidt, 2000). Gen. X’ers tended to reject authority and leadership in a bureaucratic structure (Loughlin & Barling, 2001) as did the Millennials (Martin and Tulgan, 2002).

In terms of satisfaction with pay, the Traditionals/Veterans would be satisfied with the manner in which pay is handled in the government, whereas the Boomers and Gen. X’ers would not. Ironically, since the government has now placed a greater emphasis on Millennial recruiting
and salary structures, the Millennials would be satisfied with their pay (Eaton, 2008). In terms of satisfaction with promotions, the Traditionals/Veterans would express a high level of satisfaction with the manner in which they are promoted. As in other cases, Boomers and Gen. X’ers would not be as satisfied, primarily due to lack of advancement opportunities and the time needed to “move up the ladder.” Lastly, Millennials would be satisfied with their promotional opportunities (p. 31). In terms of satisfaction with supervision; the Traditionals/Veterans would express a high level of satisfaction with supervision, as would Boomers. Gen. X’ers would not be as positive regarding supervision, especially as compared to the Millennials who would be satisfied with supervision. As for the other satisfaction levels, Traditionals/Veterans and Boomers had higher levels of satisfaction with benefits, rewards, operating conditions, the nature of the work and communication than did Gen. X’ers and Millennials in these areas. As for the level of satisfaction related to co-workers, Traditionals/Veterans, Boomers, and Millennials had higher satisfaction levels than did the Gen. X’ers (pp. 28-52). Eaton (2008) believed that the government should be concerned with the lack of interest that younger employees had toward government employment.

Her results found that there were additional generational differences when it came to satisfaction with pay and operating conditions. She initially believed that Traditionals/Veterans and Millennials would have more satisfaction with pay, promotion, and rewards than would Boomers; however after she concluded her research, she found they did not. Her second argument in the study was that the Millennials, Boomers, and Traditionals/Veterans would have a higher satisfaction than Gen. X’ers in the areas of supervision and co-workers. On the contrary, Gen. X’ers had the highest rating in satisfaction in supervision than the other generations (2008, p. 76). Finally, Eaton suggested that the Boomers and Traditionals/Veterans would have higher
satisfaction levels with benefits, operating conditions, nature of work, communication, and satisfaction overall than would Gen. X’ers and Millennials. Again, Eaton’s hypotheses was not supported by the research results.

**INSTITUTIONAL AND INTELLECTUAL KNOWLEDGE TRANSFERS**

The area that draws the most interest in this study is the transfer, or lack thereof, of institutional knowledge between cohorts, whether they are categorized by generational group or not. However, as time passes, and more and more members of the older generations are retiring or beginning to make plans to retire. What do they take with them in terms of history, knowledge, and culture when they leave? One of the topics raised in the current study asks the questions; *What Happens When Generational Employees (Gen. X and Millennials) Leave Higher Education? What do we lose, and what do they leave behind?* This question is very important in that, without a plan or program to transfer University business processes, institutional policies and practices, and historical knowledge to someone else, institutions may be faced with severe business continuity and knowledge issues as more people leave the organization. Unless organizations address this issue, a loss of the institutional knowledge will occur when a large number of employees retire (Adam, 2008). These same organizations experience a slow-down in growth and in their ability to be innovative (loss of experience), and in some cases they become less efficient as they start to train new employees (DeLong, 2004).

Boomers, a generation of about seventy-six million people, are preparing to retire in the coming years. Some Cuspers whose birth years fall between the Veterans and Boomers have already done so, hitting the initial social security benefit retirement age of sixty-two years of age (Adam, 2008). In January 2006, the first Boomer turned sixty, and just two years ago, more than 26 million U.S. employees were fifty-years of age or older (Salopek, 2007). The Gen. X’ers, the
next and smallest generation, including only 46 million individuals, is realizing a shortage of
candidates to fill the positions vacated by Boomers. The Bureau of Labor Statistics forecasted a
shortfall of 10 million skilled workers in the U.S. in 2010 (Johnson, 2008).

To put this issue into perspective, the federal government’s numbers are actually worse.
About ninety-percent of senior managers in the government are eligible to retire in the next ten
years (Knight, 2007). The figures for state government administrators are equally high. The U.S.
Department of Defense had previously projected that seventy-five percent of their civilian
workforce would retire between 2002 and 2008 (DeLong, 2004). At the National Aeronautics
and Space Administration (NASA), engineers over sixty years of age outnumber engineers under
the age of thirty years, by nearly three to one (DeLong, 2004). In the year 2000, then U.S.
Senator George Voinovich reported to the President that more than half of the federal workforce
would be eligible to retire within four years of that date (Leibowitz, 2004; Light, 2000).

In the late sixties and seventies, NASA had just landed on the moon, and space travel had
begun to peak again after several years of inactivity. People have wondered why the U.S. has not
been able to duplicate those stellar space years. The reason is simple. NASA experienced a
downsizing and cost-cutting period during the nineties. As a result, NASA engineers were
couraged to retire, and they took all of their years of experience with them. Today, when
discussions have turned to returning to the moon, NASA has suggested that it will have to re-
engineer the entire program again. Essentially, NASA has forgotten how to get there (DeLong,
2004). The same fate also applies to the U.S. nuclear weapons industry; leaders were concerned
about losing the knowledge needed to design, operate, and test these weapons, all due to the
retirement of their senior engineers. No new weapons have been developed or tested since 1992,
leading many to believe that the current new wave of nuclear engineers may have been a “little wet behind the ears” when it came to experience (DeLong, 2004).

In San Diego County, when faced with the loss of 900 of their estimated 17,000 member workforce in 2002, city leaders developed a leadership training program before the population of retirees grew too large (Green, 2002). In Virginia, Henrico County officials took a similar approach in that they promoted internal career development paths for existing employees who remained after the company experienced its first wave of retirements (Fleming, 2004).

In a 2007 survey conducted by the Novations Group in Boston, titled *Boomers Should Pass on Knowledge*, Human Resources executives found that forty-four percent of the respondents have no plans to create a process to transfer knowledge and experience from Boomers to other employees, and only four percent have actually done so (2007). There are many similarly situated institutions. At the University of Texas at El Paso, for example, there is no such plan. What will these organizations do when faced with the potential loss of such important knowledge and history?

In an effort to address the loss of institutional knowledge, the U.S. Office of Personnel Management (OPM) recommended that governmental agencies focus on identifying leadership competencies among their existing employees in an effort to create a pipeline of new leaders branching towards positions that were vacant. This would also serve to encourage commitment, ethics, and integrity among its new leaders (Thibodaux & Rouse, 2005; Carter, 2004). Thibodaux (2005) defines knowledge solutions as those focused on capturing the knowledge, skills, and experiences of departing employees and transferring that to those employees who remain.

Nonaka (1998) found that there are two types of knowledge. Explicit knowledge is the formal, systematic type that could be easily documented, explained or otherwise shared with
others. This is similar to the type of knowledge you get from policies, instruction manuals and historical records. The other type of knowledge as defined by Nonaka (1998) is tacit knowledge. This type of knowledge is the opposite of explicit knowledge. This type is generally ingrained in the individual and is somewhat difficult to share with others, except through experience. Tacit knowledge includes such types as an employee’s beliefs and values. For others, it can be the experience gained by doing a task or job so long that the person does it without needing to read, listen, or take any other action to learn something new. In other words, they can do their job in their sleep. The problem for many is that when senior employees consider leaving or retiring, tacit knowledge is hard to document or share with those left behind (Rhoads, O’Sullivan, and Stankosky, 2007). Others have expanded on Nonaka’s (1998) description of both explicit and tacit knowledge, to include the additional types of technical, cognitive, and semantic knowledge. Technical knowledge relates to skills learned from experience, which can be transferred to others through observation and practice. Cognitive knowledge, on the other hand, is the type that is ingrained mentally, taken from life and work experiences in decision making. Lastly, semantic knowledge refers to an employee’s understanding their field of expertise which has become part of their personality, but could be transferred through formal education and training (Taylor, 2007).

For small organizations, the risk of losing knowledge as a result of Boomer retirements could be identified by exercising a workforce assessment, documenting and identifying critical knowledge held by existing employees. What some successful organizations have done is to enlist the assistance of existing and departing retirees to serve as mentors, instead of simply showing them the way out the door. These retention methods have proven to be successful in curtailing the loss of institutional knowledge by the retiring Veterans and Boomers and
transferring it to the waiting Gen. X’ers and Millennials (Kaye and Cohen, 2008). The transfer and transition of tacit knowledge to new employees is easier, less costly, and better accepted by employees (Murphy, 2003).

In a 2006 study of knowledge retention in the U.S. electric power industry as they pertained to employee turnover and other human resources issues, Ashworth (2006) also found that due to the large number of pending retirements by Veterans and Boomers, valuable and skilled knowledge of these workers would be difficult to replace. As is the case in many other large industrial companies, in the five years after this study was done, up to one-half of the workforce would be eligible to retire, resulting in a stage of rapid recruitment of able and skilled workers (p. 1662). His study was geared towards finding ways to minimize the effects of the loss of institutional knowledge from those leaving and find ways to work on retaining the knowledge before it left. The survey he administered was specifically sent to industry executives of the electric power industry, primarily focused on the aging workforce issue and other related human resources matters. Seventy-six to ninety-three percent of the employees in these industries comprised the study’s population. The survey had aging workforce issues as a primary concern, and was on the agenda for future strategic planning on the author’s part. Fifty-two percent of respondents stated that those who were still working, but were contemplating retirement, elected to stay working for a variety of reasons including supplemental income and retaining medical insurance coverage (2006, p. 1667). Ashworth found that through the results of the survey and the Multiple Correspondence Analysis (MCA), the aging workforce was a critical, current HR issue for the electric power industry due to the potential loss of knowledge that may result from employee retirements. The author also found that the transfer of knowledge can happen through observation of work units, communications between employees, reviewing work documents,
implementing alternate routines or practices, and adopting technology (p. 1674). Management can make significant inroads in enabling the retention of knowledge, by developing systems such as those mentioned above, even in light of pending older worker turnover.

From a knowledge-based view, organizations are the repositories of various types of knowledge which are dependent upon the people in these organizations (Ranft & Lord, 1998). What makes an organization more competitive, or stronger than others, is the level of the knowledge its people possess. The authors also introduced a new type of knowledge; embedded knowledge. Embedded knowledge is that which resides primarily in the specialized relationships among individuals and groups, and in the norms, attitudes, information flows, and decision making that shape how individuals work with each other (Badaracco, 1991). Ranft and Lord (1998) developed five hypotheses to test and examine the effects of key employee retention. The authors asked, what was the relationship between the retention of key personnel and the association of the transfer of knowledge to the organization? The answer was simple. The results of the study positively stated that the retention of key employees resulted in a greater acquisition of knowledge-based resources for the organization (1998, p. 6).

During an organizational acquisition, the transfer of institutional knowledge is critical to continued business process continuity, specifically for the acquiring organization. Javernick-Will (2009) in her study of organizational learning, found that the not only was the acquisition of knowledge an important element for business, the retention of the institutional knowledge and intellectual capital was even greater. In acknowledging and recognizing the importance of institutional knowledge, the bigger problem, and the most important question is how organizations acquire this knowledge. Knowledge acquisition is defined as the organization’s ability to acquire externally generated knowledge that is critical their operations. Acquiring such
knowledge requires that the information is available and that the organization actively searches for the information (Peterson, et al., 2008; Grant, 1996). Scholars have not been able to address how companies acquire institutional knowledge, or compare acquisition sources based on knowledge type, or even compared differences between company types. Javernick-Will (2009) used a qualitative study approach to examine how these organizations acquired such knowledge (p. 786). For her study, she interviewed participants within fifteen companies among the real estate, construction, and engineering fields. One hundred thirteen respondents were eventually selected for the qualitative survey, where interviews were the predominant method of data collection. The results of the data collection and analysis yielded fourteen categories used to acquire institutional knowledge. These sources included: contractual and non-contractual relationships, acquisitions of people and companies, strategic and non-strategic direct sources, and public sources (p. 787). What was relevant to this study was that the category on institutional knowledge acquisition was the non-strategic direct source. The methods defined in this category were those which were more common to today’s organizations. In this specific category, the acquisition of knowledge comes from employees who have prior personal experience in their field, which is a result of past experiences from other employers (2009, p. 789). Aside from direct non-strategic direct sources, Javernick-Will (2009) also listed normative and cultural-cognitive knowledge as other means of acquiring institutional knowledge.

There are very few metrics known in the field that are used to measure intellectual capital and knowledge. However, Liebowitz and Suen (2000) attempted to do so, primarily addressing those that reflect the knowledge levels and the types of added knowledge that an individual receives. There are some existing metrics that measure intellectual capital, one in particular that was referenced in the study by the ICM Group Study where they were able to measure items
such as value extraction, consumer capital, structural capital, value creation, and Human Capital Metric (HCM, 1998). The Human Capital Metric used data elements such as average years of service, number of employees, revenues and profits by employee, average age of employees, and percentages of employees with college degrees to name a few. Ross, et al., (1998) also developed a similar metric to measure intellectual capital that focused on human capital, to wit, competence, attitude, and intellectual agility. Lastly, Malone, et al. (1997) developed five intellectual capital measures as part of a study. One of the five elements addressed the “human focus” along with financial, customer, process, and developmental focuses (p. 58). Moving forward, the author suggests new metrics that could better measure intellectual capital, one of which focuses on the dissemination, and sharing of knowledge (p. 62).

In a study regarding the Cost of IT Staff Turnover, Lattimer (2002) found that hiring Information Technology (IT) staff was a constant challenge for institutions of higher education (IHE). Apart from an up and down again supply of qualified IT employees, many IHE find themselves at the starting gate, where other private sector employers are several lengths ahead. Many times, these IHE end up losing these IT employees due to salary or advancement opportunities which are often low, and “capped-out.” Other studies have shown that the replacement costs for IT and other professional types could easily equate to half a year’s salary to hire a replacement. Aside from the direct replacement costs, there are indirect costs, or in other words a loss or diminishment of productivity (2002, p. 3).

The author breaks down the turnover process into three phases: separation, acquisition, and knowledge transfer and training. There has been much written about separation and acquisition. For the purposes of this study it is necessary to focus on knowledge transfer and training. After a candidate has been selected, the process of training and development begins.
Aside from the direct costs of orientation and training and the indirect costs of lost productivity, the institutional knowledge that the employee earns is what they gain from experiences. As is the case in many other organizations, it is rare that one actually archives this knowledge for future employees (p. 8). For higher education, retaining the institutional memory and productivity are important factors in the recruitment and retention of employees. In some IT areas, this could be potentially harmful to productivity and continuity. As has been mentioned in this study and others, retention must be given a greater level of importance and urgency. The type of employee hired by an IHE has a significant impact on the institution’s strategy and productivity, specifically in areas such as instruction, research, and service (p. 10). Knowledge is what all IHE’s are known for and what they inspire, and the retention of this intellectual capital and institutional knowledge in the end does add value to the success of the organization.

In an article in *Compliance Week*, Kelly (2010) addresses two threats that are facing compliance, accounting, and finance organizations. First, they examine the turnover within their own departments and the possibility that their most skilled employees may be looking for other opportunities in areas where the requirements for these positions are at or above this available pool of qualified workers. Secondly, the greater threat is the loss of institutional knowledge these employees take with them when they leave, which can be very, very difficult to quantify and replace. While many managers worry about the level of turnover, the more important statistic should be the level and capacity of knowledge the people leaving possess. It is certainly permissible for an organization to lose the wrong people; it is when they lose the right ones that it hurts.

As for Millennials, how does an organization retain their knowledge? Shepherd (2012), in his article in *Workforce Management*, found that most employers fret about losing the valuable
Boomers when they leave, where instead they should be focused on the retention of their youngest employees, the Millennials. It is true that most employees “job hop” more often when they are younger, and depending on the skill of these employees, companies lose. In a Bureau of Labor Statistics report, the average Generation X and Millennial worker will have 10.8 jobs from age eighteen to forty-two years of age. The author suggests that for this generation, interviews, mentoring programs, and written reports are the most common methods of retaining their knowledge. Furthermore, organizations must use technology in efforts to train and retain these employees. *YouTube*, and other social networking mediums are generally the most acceptable and recognized technologies according to Shepherd (2012).

An article in GenTrends (2012) addressed knowledge transfer, indicating there are some short-term fixes that can be used, but the most critical are the long-term solutions. These steps consist of initially capturing the knowledge, and then verifying that the knowledge captured is valid and relevant, storing the knowledge, and lastly, providing the knowledge to those who need it, especially utilizing skills and mediums that some of your younger employees possess (p. 2).

In an effort to reduce the level of institutional knowledge that companies lose annually, alternate methods are available to potentially curtail the loss. One of these is a robust training program which is geared to different generations based on the medium and the audience involved. Ware, et al. (2007) found that certain generations have preferred learning styles as compared to others. For example, Boomers have long been associated with receiving their training in the traditional classroom, utilizing lecture, and instructor-led formats. Boomers use these formats to transfer their institutional knowledge and experiences to the younger generations (p. 59). Gen. X’ers, on the other hand, are more open to varied styles of training, and learning. It would not be uncommon for Gen. X’ers to enjoy classroom instruction, but also mediums that
include technology. Millennials could be happy with several options of training mediums. These could include the traditional methods embraced by Boomers, but also the technological avenues shared by Gen. X’ers. Most Millennials have been known to also appreciate the collaborative, interactive, and social networking mediums that this generation prefers in regards to their learning styles. The authors suggest that for organizations to be successful in training multi-generations in their workplace, their approach must involve a “blended” format which utilizes several methods of delivery, including those that would appeal to all generations and potentially address the retention of institutional knowledge and human capital (p. 59).

Other successful methods that organizations can use to potentially stem the loss of valued employees and the loss of institutional knowledge is through job sharing. In an article in Institute of Management and Administration's (IOMA), Managing Benefits Plans, having two employees sharing a full-time job or a part-time position not only allows for continued productivity and service, but also has an effect in retaining valued employees (2006) and their institutional knowledge. What this program does offer is options. These programs also serve as a retention tool for older workers, by allowing them to pass on the experience and knowledge they have acquired to their successors. Indeed, in most cases it is cheaper for organizations to explore these options than trying to hire someone new externally. Though it has been a slow process to initiate, there are some expectations that with time, such a plan will gain wider acceptance from employers. In the 2005 Family and Work Institute’s National Study of Employers, it was estimated that forty-six percent of organizations with fifty employees or more permit some form of job sharing, and only thirteen percent allow all or most employees to do so (p. 15). Similar to increased retention, communication, and engagement, job sharing offers organizations options in
their quest to retain their best employees, and more importantly, their desire to contain the institutional knowledge and intellectual capital they possess.

**CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK**

My research asks the questions; what happened if Gen. X and Millennial generational groups left the workplace sooner than their Boomer predecessors. More importantly, what happened to those older generational groups, the Baby Boomers, which were left behind? Are the latest generational groups, Gen. X’ers and Millennials, truly leaving their employment earlier than the prior two generational groups, and if so, why? What impact does this phenomenon have on higher education for an institution like UTEP? What happens to the employees left behind? This study will examine if the quick exodus of these Gen. X and Millennial employees is generation-related, affected by common traits or attributes of these generational groups.

It is the purpose of this study to show that Gen. X and Millennial generations leave employment at a higher rate than their Boomer predecessors. It also intends to determine whether the average length of service at UTEP, or any other employer is consistent with what scholars have surmised about the behavior of generational cohorts. Studies show that Veterans and Boomers average anywhere between fifteen to twenty years of service at their jobs (Wendover, 2007). Many Veterans and Boomers are also re-entering the workplace after retirement, or postponing their retirement (Hargrave, 2008). This phenomenon is limiting the job opportunities for the Millennials, while increasing those for the Boomers (Gandel, 2009). The average age of faculty in universities and colleges increased from forty-six years of age in 1988 to fifty years of age in 2004 (Doyle, 2008). At UTEP, for example, many tenured and tenure-track faculty are not leaving their jobs upon reaching retirement age. This may be related to the economy today.
With the current state of the American economy, why are so many Gen. X’ers and Millennials willing to leave the comfort and security of a job? Gaining a better understanding of these generations requires a closer look at what makes them different. For example, the Gen. X’ers desire a better balance between work and family, a trait, and value many of this generation and the next hold very dear (Zemke, et al., 2000). For the Gen. X’ers, departure from employment could also be related to the idea that work is not as important to them as it was for the Boomers, or Veterans (Strauss & Howe, 1991). It may simply be that they do not really like to be compared to either Boomers or Millennials. In terms of “job-hopping,” it was once viewed as a negative mark on an employee’s resume. For a Gen. X’er, it has become part of a cultural attribute or style (Tulgan, 1997). Although they have a lower average of years on the job than the older generations, from the year 2019 forward, this generation will begin to have its say on how things are done. They will rule the boardrooms and political arenas of this country, finally moving out of the Boomers’ shadows (Fisher, 2009).

In regards to the Millennials, studies show that they will eventually become the most educated and most pampered generation of our time (Keeter & Taylor, 2009). Like Gen. X’ers, steady work is not that important to Millennials. As a result, they are either going to school or working part-time. Of those who graduate, many are forced to take jobs with low salaries and limited growth potential (Murray, 2009). This could be the result of the lack of job opportunities due to the re-entry of Boomers into the workplace, or the prolonged stay of retirement-aged Boomers and Veterans. This would of course explain the higher than usual unemployment rate for a large percentage of eighteen to twenty-nine year olds (2009, p. 1). Millennials average anywhere between two to five years in the job (Sujansky & Ferri-Reed, 2009). Of those who leave work voluntarily, oftentimes the jobs they leave are just “pit-stops” in their professional
career. Millennials can average seven jobs during their twenties (Cassidy, 2009; Henig, 2010). It is extremely critical for organizations to recognize that this generational group will be a force to be reckoned with. By the year 2015 and beyond, the Millennials will comprise the majority of the workforce (Landau, 2010), overtaking the Boomers, and Gen. X’ers. It remains to be seen whether their tendency towards limited-duration employment will extend into their later years.

It is critical to know how to handle these generational separations when Gen. X and Millennials leave the workplace at such a rapid rate. How can organizations keep them working a little longer, especially knowing that most Veterans are going to leave the workplace eventually. There may be several strategies to explore, including flexible work arrangements, work from home, telecommuting, family-friendly benefits, educational incentives, and frequent feedback sessions (Sujansky & Ferri-Reed, 2009). Most of these strategies are relatively inexpensive to implement. If employers do not address the retention issues firsthand, then the turnover and other related costs associated with their separation will be enormous.

Organizations must prepare to develop strategies to prevent the loss of institutional knowledge or business continuity. Collins (2009) found several strategies to address the loss of institutional knowledge and business continuity issues. Much of this involved documentation and recognizing where these gaps existed. He also recommended developing a plan to transfer the knowledge. This is something that many organizations, including UTEP, are not doing enough.

Organizations will not win the war of eliminating Gen. X and Millennial employee turnover, but they can certainly win the battle by addressing key strategies for recruiting and retaining these generations a little longer than the current norm. Organizations must prepare by bridging the gap between the departing Veterans and soon to be departing Boomers, and the remaining Gen. X and Millennial employees, establishing business and operational strategies that
allow an organization like UTEP to continue on. And in my opinion, change is good, but too much change could be detrimental.
Some of the literature may suggest that generational habits or attributes may affect tenure in an organization. However, there’s other literature that states the opposite, that tenure and work habits are not generation-driven, but rather by other things. The traits and attributes of Gen. X and Millennial generational groups drive their desire to voluntarily separate from employment earlier than Veteran and Boomer generational groups (Figure 5). Their departure not only leaves a gap in the retention of institutional knowledge and business continuity, but also results in a significant expense in employee turnover and training costs. Scholars have stated that institutional knowledge and knowledge transfer is a major concern for most organizations due to the rising number of retirements between the Veterans and Boomer generational groups. However, for my study, I can hypothesize that both generational gender and ethnicity do not appear to play any role in an employee’s length of service.
Chapter 3: Methodology

Overview of Study 1 & Study 2

As discussed in the Introduction and in the Statement of the Problem, the research questions that this study attempted to answer were as follows: Were there significant differences or trends based on the length of service for the Generation X and Millennial Classified employees who voluntarily separated, or left their employment (“Leavers”), as compared to Baby Boomers? Secondly, could the differences between these generational groups be based on their salary, ethnicity and/or gender? Lastly, what were the reasons that these Classified exempt and non-exempt employees remain employed at UTEP, and were those reasons related to their generational category?

In developing this analysis, the three generational groups relevant to this study, Boomers, Gen. X’ers, and Millennials, were one independent variable (IV1); their EEO 6 job code was the second independent variable (IV2), age at separation is IV3, and IV4 was reason for leaving employment. Ending salary, Gender (male and female) and ethnicity (Hispanic or Non-Hispanic) were the covariates for the ANCOVA study. The dependent variable (DV) was the employee’s tenure, or length of service in years.

Faculty and student employee positions were specifically excluded from this study, due to the complex nature of their employment.

Study 1

The purpose of Study 1 was to test the hypothesis that Gen. X’ers and Millennial employees leave work earlier than Boomers. The study would determine if there were significant differences in length of service among the Boomers, the Gen. X, and the Millennial generational groups (Creswell, 2009).
The study examined the length of service these Boomers, Gen. X and Millennial Classified employees had during the fiscal years from 2005 to 2008. As these employees were no longer part of the UTEP system, there was no feasible manner to personally contact them via telephone or e-mail, either through an electronic survey or other qualitative method. The preferred method for surveying these employees would have been personal interviews, but for the reason mentioned above, this was neither practical, nor reasonable. Those who left employment during this period were not surveyed due to the inability to contact them. However, information as to why they left UTEP was available through records of the reasons they gave for leaving or what their former department indicated their reasons to be.

The study further examined whether gender or ethnicity (Hispanic and Non-Hispanic) for these Gen. X and Millennial employees played a role in their decision to leave UTEP as compared to those of the Baby Boomer generational group.

One of the key hypotheses [?] of the current research was that the Boomer generational group left work at lower numbers than other groups when it came to length of service than the Gen. X or Millennial employees. Research had shown that these Gen. X and Millennial employees generally averaged two to seven years of service in their jobs.

Participants

The research population were the Classified Boomer, Gen. X and Millennial employees who had worked at UTEP between the years of 2005 to 2008. The sample consisted of Classified employees under the most common job codes for these employees at UTEP in terms of size and the number of job vacancies. These Classified employees were extracted by their respective generational group and the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) EEO 6 job codes. IPEDS defined the EEO 6 codes as those falling under three distinct categories. Job code
3, “Other Professionals,” was the primary function or occupational activity category used to classify persons employed for the primary purpose or performing academic support, student service, and institutional support, whose assignments would require either a baccalaureate or higher degree or experience of such kind and duration as to provide a comparable background. Job code 4, “Clerical Support,” was the primary function or occupational activity category used to classify persons whose assignments typically were associated with clerical activities or are specifically of a secretarial nature. Job code 5, “Para-Professional/Technical,” was the primary function or occupational activity category used to classify persons whose assignments require specialized knowledge or skills which may be acquired through experience, apprenticeship, on-the-job-training, or academic work in occupationally specific programs that resulted in a 2-year degree or other certificate or diploma. As mentioned, Professional and Classified employees under the Executive, Building and Trades, Law Enforcement, Student, and Faculty occupations were not included in this study.

The sample that was being used in this part of the study represented positions which could normally be recruited and hired through the local and regional labor markets. This sample also represented the groups that experienced the higher levels of employee turnover annually. This sample was analyzed using length of service, salary, gender, and ethnicity by generational group in the event there were any significant trends to support the study’s hypothesis that Gen. X and Millennial employees left work faster than do Baby Boomers.

The research population for the first study numbered 259 employees. For the purposes of the first study, this group was termed the “Leavers.” These employees came from the Classified Staff category and included the Boomer, Gen. X and Millennial generational groups. The sample
was comprised of members of this employee population who had worked at UTEP between the fiscal years of 2005 to 2008 and voluntarily separated from that employment.

Generational breakdown information for the Leavers population is found in Table 3.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generations</th>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Boomers</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Gen. X’ers</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Furthermore, Study 1 also attempted to answer if the differences between Gen. X and Millennials could be based on their salary, ethnicity and/or gender in comparison to the Baby Boomers. Several cross-tabulation tables were developed to establish our population. The generational variable (Boomers, Generation X, and Millennial) was the primary factor. The Researcher first looked at the generational groups by ethnicity and gender. This information is contained in Tables 3.2 and 3.3.

Table 3.2: Gender Cross-Tabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generations</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boomers</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3: Ethnicity Cross-Tabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generations</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Non-Hispanic</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boomers</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Similar cross-tabulation analyses were also conducted for other variables as the EEO-6 IPEDS Job codes from which the employees were drawn. These statistics are noted in Table 3.4.

Table 3.4: EE0-6 Job Code Cross-Tabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generations</th>
<th>Other Professionals (3)</th>
<th>Clerical Support (4)</th>
<th>Para-Professional &amp; Technical (5)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boomers</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Instruments**

The collection of separation data was collected within the Human Resource Services Department using a myriad of data sources. These included employee letters of resignation, exit interview comments, and departmental documents regarding employee separations.

Demographic and employment-related information regarding the employees who separated from UTEP between 2005 and 2008 was provided by the University’s Business Information System (BIS) or DEFINE, a financial and human resources related data base and Legacy system owned by the University of Texas at Austin (UT), which is leased to UTEP.

**STUDY 2**

The purpose of Study 2 was to investigate the reasons that these Gen. X and Millennial Classified exempt and non-exempt staff employees elected to remain employed at UTEP. The answer to this research question was found in the responses generated from a web-based electronic survey. The questions in the survey not only gathered demographic information about these “Stayers,” but also sought information regarding these employees’ relationships with their supervisors and co-workers, their attitudes about their work environment, their affiliation with their community, and their intentions about remaining or leaving UTEP.
The questionnaire survey was administered and distributed via the UTEP e-mail system where the participants were guided via a web link to an internet site, Qualtrics.com, where the survey was located. The survey was geared to Generation X and Millennial employees under the Classified (Other professional, clerical support and Para-professional) job categories who were employed at UTEP during the study period: 2005 to 2012.

The purpose of the survey was to examine the results as to why these employees have elected to remain at UTEP. It also questioned whether they might consider leaving UTEP. The survey also examined these results based on various factors: current length of service in years, birth period (used to determine generational group), gender, ethnicity, and job group.

This study used the most appropriate method to assess participants’ demographic information, their reasons for remaining at UTEP, and whether they would consider leaving work and for what reasons. Because the Researcher was an HR Executive at UTEP, personal interviews could have been uncomfortable for the Respondents. The electronic survey via e-mail and Qualtrics was the best and most efficient method to obtain this information from the Gen. X and Millennial employees who were the subject of this survey. Employee e-mail addresses via which the survey was distributed to Classified Gen. X and Millennial employees were provided by the UTEP Information Technology Department. Biographical information, including name and other identifying information were not used to cross-match survey responses to existing Classified Gen. X and Millennial employees.

Participants

Study 2 addressed those employees who have elected to remain employed at UTEP during the same period, 2005 to 2012, and were also under the “Other Professionals, Clerical Support, and Para-Professional/Technical” categories. The research population for the second
study numbered 397 employees. The population for this study included employees who worked at UTEP since 2005 and were still employed as of May 2012. For purposes of this study, these employees were named the “Stayers.”

As with the first study, these employees were extracted by their respective generational group and the IPEDS EE0-6 codes: “3”=Other Professionals, “4”=Clerical Support, and “5”=Technical & Para-professional. Along with job code, the sample also included employees born after 1965 up to 1994 (eligible to work). As with the “Leavers”, this study also excluded employees from the executive, faculty, building and maintenance, and law enforcement. The Veterans/Silents and Boomers generational groups were excluded from this study in order to see the effect of the Generation X and Millennial employees on retention and the sharing of institutional knowledge. The extracted sample omitted data elements including name, address, and home and office telephone numbers in order to protect the participants’ identities and ensure anonymity and confidentiality to all study participants.

**Instruments**

The survey consisted of eight major sections regarding the respondent’s (employee’s) decision to remain employed at UTEP, or desire to leave work. They were: 1. Job; 2. Supervisor; 3. Work Environment; 4. Working at UTEP; 5. El Paso; 6. Compensation and Benefits; 7. Institutional Knowledge; 8. Demographic information (Birth and hire year, gender, ethnicity, length of service, current position at UTEP). With the exception of a few open-form questions, all of the remaining questions were closed-form using a Likert scale. The current survey instrument required the respondent to provide an answer for each question. There was one open-form question that asked the respondents to describe their jobs at UTEP in their own words. The online survey questions are included as Appendix A. Note that an additional question was added
to the actual online version of the survey in order to create a more welcoming atmosphere for survey participants. The question asked simply whether participants are generally satisfied with their work experiences at UTEP.

The questionnaire included an opening paragraph or cover letter (Appendix B) explaining the purpose of the study, and the potential benefit in determining if generational groups, gender, ethnicity, and rate of salary differ in terms of an employee’s length of service. Lastly, a consent form (Appendix C) enabling the respondents to participate in the study accompanied the opening paragraph/cover letter.

The survey was distributed to the e-mail addresses of 397 UTEP employees who were born from 1965 to the present and work in selected and segmented categories which were the IPEDS EEO-6 job codes. The survey allowed a two-week period for respondents to reply. This population of employees represented the people with the traits that were important to this study (Houston, 1997). The study was anonymous in nature. Three reminder messages were sent out via e-mail to non-respondents during the survey period, and a Thank You message was sent out to all respondents via e-mail on the closing date.

The tool used for data collection was the survey. The survey instrument was the application program, Qualtrics. This survey program has been available for use since 1997 and can be used for free for small projects. A researcher could pay a monthly or annual fee for the expanded version (Creswell, 2009). Survey respondents received the survey web link via their UTEP e-mail addresses through the UTEP e-mail system.
Chapter 4: Data Analysis

This chapter provides information on the research questions and associated results for each study. For this study, there were two independent quantitative analyses that were performed. They are presented in two parts. The first focused on the “Leavers” and included two respective research questions. An ANCOVA analysis was used to determine the results. The second focused on the “Stayers” and included the third research question for which a survey was conducted. The survey analysis is also included in this chapter.

**RESULTS: STUDY 1**

**Research Question 1 (RQ1):** Are there significant differences or trends based on the length of service for the Gen. X and Millennial Classified employees who voluntarily separated, or left their employment (“Leavers”), as compared to the Baby Boomers? Are the younger generational groups (Gen. X & Millennials) leaving their employment earlier than the prior generational group (Boomers)?

**Research Question 2 (RQ2):** Were there significant differences in length of service based on their salary, ethnicity and/or gender among generational groups?

Study 1 examined the Boomer, Generation X, and Millennial employees who voluntarily separated from UTEP and their length of service prior to separation for the period from 2005 to 2008. These employees were known as the “Leavers” for the first study and were extracted by their respective IPEDS EEO-6 job categories. The purpose of this study was to compare two of the generational groups (Gen. X & Millennial) against the older generational type, the Baby Boomers. The first study also examined whether and how ending salary, gender or ethnicity (Hispanic & Non-Hispanic) played a role in the study participants’ decisions to leave UTEP. For the Classified employees who did not remain employed, the “Leavers”, an additional purpose of
the study was also to determine whether the separation trends between the Baby Boomers, Gen. X, & the Millennials are influenced by their ending salary, job code, ethnicity, or gender.

It was clear that the length of service for the Boomers would be greater or longer in years than the Generation X or Millennial employees, based solely on the participants’ ages. Therefore, it was important to calculate the proportion of workable time, in years, for Generation X, Millennial and Boomers employees. Workable time for this study was defined as the number of years that the employee was capable of working. It was calculated by subtracting eighteen years of age (as the minimum workable age) from the employee’s age at time of separation. In order to calculate the proportion of time worked for UTEP, the number of years worked at UTEP was divided by workable time (the age of the employee at time of separation minus the baseline of eighteen years of age). The result of this formula yielded a new variable in “revised tenure” (length of service).

\[
\text{Revised tenure} = \frac{\text{No. of years @ UTEP}}{\text{Age at time of Separation} - 18 \text{ yrs. Of Age (“Workable time”)}}
\]

The results for the study sample of 259 employees is listed in Table 4.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generations Variable</th>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Boomers</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>X’ers</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1 = Boomer, 2 = Generation X, and 3 = Millennials.

An ANCOVA analysis was conducted in SPSS using “Revised Tenure” as the dependent variable, “Generations” as the independent variable, and Gender, Ethnicity and Salary as the covariates. The covariates were used to control for possible variations in tenure (length of service) based on Gender, Ethnicity or Salary. There was interest in the effects of these specific
variables on the dependent variable as was indicated in the second research question (RQ2). A significant effect was tested at the .05 level. The results of the analysis are indicated in Table 4.2.
Table 4.2: Test of Between Subjects Effects – Revised Tenure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type II Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>1.058*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>3.348</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>.782</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.782</td>
<td>12.386</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.899</td>
<td>.344</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>1.718</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>.227</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.227</td>
<td>3.597</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generations</td>
<td>.772</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.386</td>
<td>6.109</td>
<td>.003*</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>15.982</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34.814</td>
<td>259</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>17.039</td>
<td>258</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: a. R Squared = .062 (Adjusted R Squared = .044). Dependent variable = Revised (Recoded) Tenure. *p ≤ .05

Therefore, in response to the first research question, regarding significant differences or trends based on the revised tenure (length of service) for the Boomers, Gen. X and Millennial Classified employees who voluntarily separated, or left their employment, the results of this first study showed that there was a significant effect of Generations on the proportion of time worked for UTEP, \(F(2, 253) = 6.11, p = .003\). A post-hoc analysis was conducted to compare the generational groups to each other. The generational groups that significantly differed from each other in terms of length of service were the Boomers and Millennials, \(p = .011\), and the Generation X’ers and Millennials, \(p = .003\). See Table 4.3.

Table 4.3: Post-Hoc Multiple Comparisons between Generational Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generations (i)</th>
<th>Generations (j)</th>
<th>Mean Difference (i) – (j)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval - Lower Bound</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval - Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boomers</td>
<td>X’ers</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-.097</td>
<td>.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td>-.148</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>-.269</td>
<td>-.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X’ers</td>
<td>Boomers</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-.091</td>
<td>.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td>-.144</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>-.248</td>
<td>-.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td>Boomers</td>
<td>.148*</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X’ers</td>
<td>.144*</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.248</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N = 259. Recoded Tenure is the dependent variable. Based on estimated marginal means. Adjustment for multiple comparisons: Bonferroni. * = The mean difference is significant at the .05 level. *p ≤ .05
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The second research question asked whether there were significant differences in length of service among employees based on their salary, ethnicity and gender. The results of the ANCOVA showed that there were no significant effects of ethnicity or gender, \( ps > .05 \). Salary also did not have a significant effect, although it appeared to be marginal \( (p = .059) \). The means and standard deviations for the study are is found below in Table 4.4.

**Table 4.4: Descriptive Statistics - Mean and Standard Deviation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generations The “Leavers”</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boomers</td>
<td>.2317</td>
<td>.24347</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X’ers</td>
<td>.2401</td>
<td>.23713</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td>.3635</td>
<td>.30568</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.2620</td>
<td>.25699</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Dependent variable = Revised (Recoded) Tenure. Generations refers to the variables: Boomers, Gen. X’ers, and Millennials.

In response to the second research question, there were no significant effects of ethnicity, gender, or ending salary on revised tenure (length of service).

For those Boomer, Generation X and Millennial employees who left UTEP during this period, the narrative synopsis below highlights some very interesting and compelling information about the turnover trends of these generational groups at UTEP. Below is some descriptive information regarding the Classified employees who had left UTEP by EEO-6 job code, generational groups (Boomer, Gen. X, and Millennials), salary, gender, and ethnicity.

Of the total generational population of 259 full-time Classified employees under the Generational categories, the Boomers accounted for twenty-three percent \((n=60)\) of the classified voluntary separations for the three year period from 2005-2008. Forty-percent of these employees were within the Clerical Support job code. Of this group, forty-three employees, or seventy-two percent were female. The average age at time of separation was fifty years of age, and the average salary amount at time of separation was $31,031. Thirty-eight, or sixty-three
percent of the employees in this generational group were Hispanic. The average length of service for this group was a little under seven and one-half years (.1=Low, and 39 years=High) of service. Thirty-three percent left to pursue another job, and only ten employees, or seventeen percent retired.

Generation X accounted for the majority of voluntary separations for this period. They accounted for fifty-eight percent \((n=149)\) of the total separations. Forty-percent of these employees were within the Other Professionals job code. Of this group, ninety-six employees, or sixty-four percent were female. The average age at time of separation was thirty-three years of age. One-hundred and fifteen, or seventy-seven percent of the employees in this generational group were Hispanic. The average salary amount at time of separation was $29,917. The average length of service for this group was a little under three and one-half years (.1=Low, and 16.8 years=High) of service. The primary reason for leaving was to pursue another job, which accounted for forty-eight percent, or seventy-two employees.

The Millennials represented the smallest population of the three generational cohorts. They accounted for nineteen-percent of the separations, or fifty employees in this period \((n=50)\). Sixty-nine percent or thirty-four employees were within the Clerical Support job code. Of this group, thirty-four employees, or sixty-eight percent were female. The average age at time of separation was twenty-five years of age. Eighty-percent or forty employees were Hispanic, and the average salary amount at time of separation was $22,615. The average length of service for this group was a little over two years (.1=Low, and 8.8 years=High) of service. Like the two other groups, the primary reason for the Millennials leaving the job was to pursue another one, which accounted for forty-one percent, or twenty-one employees.
Of the entire population sample, members of Generation X accounted for the majority of voluntary separations for this period. They accounted for fifty-eight percent \((n=149)\) of the total separations. The job code which had the highest separation rate was the Clerical Support job group. These employees accounted for forty-four percent \((n=115)\) of the population. Sixty-seven percent \((n=172)\) of the population were female, and seventy-five percent were Hispanic \((n=193)\).

The average age at time of separation for this population was a little over thirty-five years of age, and the average annual salary at time of separation was $28,751. The average length of service for this group was a little over four years (.1=Low, and 39.7 years=High) of service. Forty-three percent \((n=113)\) left to pursue another job. Employees leaving for personal, other, or no reasons accounted for thirty-one percent \((n=81)\) of the population for this period.

The final cross-tabulation noted in Table 4.5 describes the breakdown of reason of leaving by generational group.

Table 4.5: Reason for Leaving Cross-Tabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generations</th>
<th>Other Job</th>
<th>No Reason</th>
<th>Other or Personal Reasons</th>
<th>Relocation</th>
<th>Retirement</th>
<th>Attend School</th>
<th>Dissatisfied with Job or Pay</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boomers</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. X</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: \(N = 259\). Reasons provided by voluntary separating employee’s resignation letter, home department communication, exit interview comments, or noted as no-reason. Other and Personal Reasons were combined for this analysis.

RESULTS: STUDY 2

Research Question 3 (RQ3): What are the reasons that Gen. X & Millennial Classified exempt and non-exempt staff employees remain employed at UTEP, and is their remaining employed related to their generational category?
The second study focused on Classified Generation X and Millennial employees who have been employed by UTEP between the years 2005-2008, and those who were employed by UTEP as of May 2012. These employees are known as the “Stayers.” The purpose of this study was to survey these existing employees within the same EEO-6 job groups as to why these employees elect to remain employed at UTEP, and whether they would consider leaving UTEP. If they would consider leaving, the survey questions when, and for what reasons. The survey also examined the reasons why a sample of these employees elected to remain employed, via a descriptive research survey method (Slavin, 2007, p.99). This research may contribute significantly to understanding the generational differences in the retention of Hispanic generational employees at UTEP.

**Survey Response Rate**

In order to achieve a high level of confidence and a respectable margin of error, it was vital to determine an adequate sample size. With a population of 397 employees, achieving a five-percent margin of error, a ninety-five percent confidence level, and with a fifty-percent response distribution requires a sample size of 196. This study has a sample size of approximately 148. The response rate is the number of respondents who answered divided by the number of people contacted (Dillman, et al., 2009). It is the proportion of respondents who returned the survey questionnaire. During the two-week survey period, 115 responses were received within the first week of the period, at an initial response rate of twenty-nine percent. The second week of the period brought an additional thirty-three responses to yield an overall total of 148 responses, or a final response rate of thirty-seven percent. As for the completion rate, 200 of the 397 surveys were initiated, but only 148 were completed, for a completion rate of sixty-nine percent. There were several non-responses on a few survey questions from the
respondents. There were between forty-five to fifty participants who did not complete the survey. For whatever reason, these participants did not want to participate, and instead elected to “opt-out” at the commencement of the survey. The final response rate for this survey was 37%. It is possible to surmise that the actual response results were lower than expected for any number of reasons, including the following. The survey took place at the beginning of the fall academic semester when respondents might have been overwhelmed with work related to their employment. Some employees may have been reluctant to respond based on a concern regarding confidentiality. Others may simply not have been interested in participating. In order to increase the response rate for this study, three reminders were sent to respondents who had not answered the survey.

Using Sauro’s (2012) the “Percent Agree” technique, the information taken from the survey will be presented by section. For most responses to a specific survey question, aside from a narrative explanation, a corresponding table will be included. The table will contain the responses to the question, including the number of responses per question, percentage, the mean score for each response, and for each question, and the total number of respondents (“n”) per generational cohort and question all together per question. As a whole, n in most of the responses averaged from 134 to 136 responses per question statement. However, n for Generation X averaged between eighty-eight to ninety responses per question statement, and n for the Millennials averaged forty-six employees. The actual response rate per survey question or statement, or n, are noted in each of the respective corresponding tables. This analysis does not address the questions/stories in the survey, only the ones which were pertinent to this study.
Survey Respondent Demographics:

**Gender:**
Sixty-two percent, or fifty-five Generation X employees were female. Sixty-five percent, or thirty employees of the Millennial cohort were also of the feminine gender (Table 4.6).

**Age:**
Eighty-nine Generation X employees, 100% of the Generation X respondents, were over thirty years of age. Thirty-five Millennial employees, 75% of that portion of the respondents, were under thirty years of age (Table 4.6).

**Ethnicity:**
Eighty-seven percent, or seventy-eight Generation X employees classified themselves as Hispanic, versus the Non-Hispanic descriptor. For the Millennials, eighty-nine percent, or forty-one of the employees categorized themselves as also Hispanic (Table 4.6).

**Educational level:**
Within the Generation X cohort, eighty-eight percent of the respondents, or seventy-nine employees had some college, a bachelor’s degree, some post-graduate work, or a post-graduate degree. With the Millennials, forty-five employees, or ninety-eight percent had the same level of education as their Generational X colleagues. This seems to indicate that the respondents from these generational groups and job classes are an educated assembly of employees (Table 4.6).

**Place of Birth:**
Fifty-nine percent, or fifty-three employees of the Generation X group selected El Paso, Texas as their place of birth, compared to twenty-four percent, or twenty-two employees of this cohort who were born outside the United States. As for the Millennials, sixty-three percent, or
twenty-nine employees were also born in El Paso. As for those born outside the United States, this group numbered twenty-percent, or nine respondents (Table 4.7).

**Living in El Paso:**
Generation X employees accounted for sixty-three percent, or fifty-seven respondents who have lived in El Paso for more than twenty-five years. Whereas, as for the Millennials, fifty-two nine percent, or twenty-one employees stated that they have lived in El Paso from twenty years to more than twenty-five years (Table 4.7).

**Relationship status:**
Sixty-three percent, or fifty-seven Generation X employees declared themselves as being married. Within this same group, only twenty-one percent, or nineteen employees, considered themselves as in a single status. The majority of Millennial employees, on the other hand, identified as single, specifically fifty-percent, or twenty-two respondents. Thirty-nine percent, or seventeen employees within this group identified themselves as being married (Table 4.7).
Table 4.6: Demographic Information - Part I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gen. X</td>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>34 (38.20)</td>
<td>16 (34.78)</td>
<td>50 (37.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>55 (61.80)</td>
<td>30 (65.22)</td>
<td>85 (62.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 25 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (6.52)</td>
<td>3 (2.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 29 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32 (69.57)</td>
<td>32 (23.70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 39 years</td>
<td>54 (60.67)</td>
<td>11 (23.91)</td>
<td>65 (48.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 49 years</td>
<td>35 (39.33)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>35 (25.93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>78 (86.67)</td>
<td>41 (89.13)</td>
<td>119 (87.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>12 (13.33)</td>
<td>5 (10.87)</td>
<td>17 (12.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational background</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some High School</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate</td>
<td>4 (4.44)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>4 (2.94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>14 (15.56)</td>
<td>4 (8.70)</td>
<td>18 (13.24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-year College/Technical School</td>
<td>7 (7.78)</td>
<td>1 (2.17)</td>
<td>8 (5.88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-year College</td>
<td>28 (31.11)</td>
<td>19 (41.30)</td>
<td>47 (34.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some post-graduate work</td>
<td>13 (14.44)</td>
<td>11 (23.91)</td>
<td>24 (17.65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-graduate degree</td>
<td>24 (26.67)</td>
<td>11 (23.91)</td>
<td>35 (25.74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Peña Study: Millennial cohort period = 1981-2000
Table 4.7: Demographic Information - Part II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gen. X</td>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paso</td>
<td>53 (58.89)</td>
<td>29 (63.04)</td>
<td>82 (60.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>1 (1.11)</td>
<td>1 (2.17)</td>
<td>2 (1.47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other cities in Texas</td>
<td>2 (2.22)</td>
<td>2 (4.35)</td>
<td>4 (2.94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsewhere within the U.S.</td>
<td>12 (13.33)</td>
<td>5 (10.87)</td>
<td>17 (12.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside the U.S.</td>
<td>22 (24.44)</td>
<td>9 (19.57)</td>
<td>31 (22.79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Living in El Paso or the surrounding area</th>
<th>1965 - 1980</th>
<th>1981 - 1994*</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gen. X</td>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (2.17)</td>
<td>1 (.074)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5 years</td>
<td>6 (6.67)</td>
<td>3 (6.52)</td>
<td>9 (6.62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10 years</td>
<td>2 (2.22)</td>
<td>4 (8.70)</td>
<td>6 (4.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15 years</td>
<td>13 (14.44)</td>
<td>6 (13.04)</td>
<td>19 (13.97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20 years</td>
<td>6 (6.67)</td>
<td>3 (6.52)</td>
<td>9 (6.62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 25 years</td>
<td>6 (6.67)</td>
<td>10 (21.74)</td>
<td>16 (11.76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 25 years</td>
<td>57 (63.33)</td>
<td>19 (41.30)</td>
<td>76 (55.88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gen. X</td>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>57 (63.33)</td>
<td>17 (38.64)</td>
<td>74 (55.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with a Significant Other</td>
<td>4 (4.44)</td>
<td>5 (11.36)</td>
<td>9 (6.72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>19 (21.11)</td>
<td>22 (50.00)</td>
<td>41 (30.60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>10 (11.11)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>10 (7.46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Peña Study: Millennial cohort period = 1981-2000
**Current position at UTEP:**

Since the study focused only on the IPEDS EE0-6 job codes/groups: 3, 4, and 5 for this population, it purposely excluded several other job codes from the survey. These job codes represented the majority of the classified para-professional and technical occupations at UTEP which were generally recruited locally, and were not faculty positions. One of the questions asked of the respondents related to the role in which they see themselves. They were given a choice to choose between the three job groups, where a brief definition of the group was provided.

For the Generation X employees, forty-six percent, or forty-one employees identified themselves as “Other Professionals.” Twenty-six percent, or twenty-three employees categorized themselves under the “Clerical Support” class, and twenty-seven percent, or twenty-four employees considered themselves belonging to the “Para-Professional/Technical” job class. Under the “Other Professionals” category, fifty-seven percent, or twenty-six Millennials were noted. Twenty-one percent, or ten Millennial employees identified themselves under the “Clerical Support” class. Lastly, seventeen percent, or eight employees within this cohort classified themselves under the “Para-Professional/Technical” grouping. Four respondents selected “Other” as their choice and were not included in these counts (Table 4.8).

**Salary:**

Seventy-three percent, or sixty-six employees within the Generation X group earned from $25,000 up to $55,000 per year as a salary working at UTEP. Eighty-six percent, or thirty-nine employees within the Millennial cohort, indicated that their salary at UTEP was below $25,000 and upwards to $40,000 per year. Only fifteen percent, or seven Millennial employees earned between $40,000 and $55,000 per year (Table 4.8).
Table 4.8: Demographic Information - Part III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current position or job at UTEP</th>
<th>1965 - 1980</th>
<th>1981 - 1994*</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gen. X</td>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Professionals (Support/Service)**</td>
<td>41 (45.56)</td>
<td>26 (56.52)</td>
<td>67 (49.26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical and/or Secretarial Support ***</td>
<td>23 (25.56)</td>
<td>10 (21.74)</td>
<td>33 (24.26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Para-Professional (Degreed Professions) and Technical (Technology)****</td>
<td>24 (26.67)</td>
<td>8 (17.39)</td>
<td>32 (23.53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (as noted by respondent)</td>
<td>2 (2.22)</td>
<td>2 (4.35)</td>
<td>4 (2.94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 or less</td>
<td>13 (14.44)</td>
<td>13 (28.26)</td>
<td>26 (19.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,001 to $40,000</td>
<td>46 (51.11)</td>
<td>26 (56.52)</td>
<td>72 (52.94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,001 to $55,000</td>
<td>20 (22.22)</td>
<td>7 (15.22)</td>
<td>27 (19.85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$55,001 to $75,000</td>
<td>10 (11.11)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>10 (7.35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,001 or more</td>
<td>1 (1.11)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (.074)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Peña Study: Millennial cohort period = 1981-2000
** Persons employed for the primary purpose of performing academic support, student service, and institutional support, whose assignments would require either a baccalaureate degree or higher or experience of such kind and amount as to provide a comparable background.
*** Persons whose primary assignments typically are associated with clerical activities or are specifically secretarial in nature.
**** Persons whose assignments require specialized knowledge or skills which may be acquired through experience, apprenticeship, on-the-job training, or academic work in occupationally specific programs that result in a 2-year degree or other certificate or diploma.

**Years employed at UTEP:**

Seventy-six percent, or sixty-eight Generation X employees have been at UTEP between two and fifteen years, with the majority of this group split between five to seven years and eleven to fifteen years of service. With the younger Millennials, eighty-seven percent, or forty employees have less than two and up to seven years of service at UTEP. The largest range of
service for this group was between five to seven years of service. This cohort is also the youngest working group of the four generations currently working at UTEP (Table 4.9).

**Supervisory status:**

Of the Generation X group, representing the majority of total survey respondents, nineteen percent, or seventeen employees indicated that they serve in a supervisory capacity. Whereas, for the younger Millennials, at the opposite extreme, only four employees, or nine percent were serving in a supervisory capacity (Table 4.9).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years employed at UTEP</th>
<th>1965 - 1980</th>
<th>1981 - 1994*</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gen. X</td>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 2 years</td>
<td>9 (10.11)</td>
<td>8 (17.39)</td>
<td>17 (12.59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 4 years</td>
<td>12 (13.48)</td>
<td>16 (34.78)</td>
<td>28 (20.74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 7 years</td>
<td>21 (23.60)</td>
<td>15 (32.61)</td>
<td>36 (26.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - 10 years</td>
<td>14 (15.73)</td>
<td>4 (8.70)</td>
<td>18 (13.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15 years</td>
<td>21 (23.60)</td>
<td>3 (6.52)</td>
<td>24 (17.78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20 years</td>
<td>5 (5.62)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>5 (3.70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25 years</td>
<td>6 (6.74)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>6 (4.44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 years or more</td>
<td>1 (1.12)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (.074)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position as a Supervisor of staff employees</th>
<th>1965 - 1980</th>
<th>1981 - 1994*</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17 (19.10)</td>
<td>4 (8.70)</td>
<td>21 (15.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>72 (80.90)</td>
<td>42 (91.30)</td>
<td>114 (84.44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Peña Study: Millennial cohort period = 1981-2000

The next series of statements addresses several survey questions which asked the respondents to select their choice among several work or personal related response options using a “Likert” scale rating system where “Strongly Agree” (“1”) was the highest rating, and
“Strongly Disagree” (“5”) was the lowest. The respondents could also select “Neither Agree or Disagree” (“3”) if they could not select between the four other responses.

I am Satisfied with my working experience at UTEP:

Both the Generation X and Millennial generational groups rated very high in their responses to this statement. Eighty-percent, or seventy-two Generation X employees either agreed, or strongly agreed that they were satisfied working at UTEP. Similarly, the Millennials also accounted for a high rating. A seventy-four percent rating, or thirty-four employees either agreed or strongly agreed that they were also satisfied working at UTEP. Only a small number of employees from both groups disagreed with this statement (Table 4.10).

Do you expect to remain working at UTEP for the next three years?

Seventy-two percent, or eighty-two employees within the Generation X cohort did expect to remain employed working at UTEP for the next three years. Whereas, fifty-two percent, or twenty-four Millennial employees believed that they would be at UTEP for the next three years. However, within this cohort, twenty-four percent, or eleven employees neither agreed nor disagreed with this statement, and fifteen percent, or seven employees did not believe that they would be at UTEP in the next three years. Whereas, the Generation X employees had very low ratings that they would leave within the stated period (Table 4.10).
Table 4.10: Satisfaction at UTEP & plans to remain at UTEP for next 3 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1965 - 1980</th>
<th>1981 - 1994*</th>
<th>Mean M</th>
<th>Total n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gen. X</td>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with my</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>Mean M</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>working experience here</td>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>24 (26.67)</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>35 (25.74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at UTEP</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>48 (53.33)</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>71 (52.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>11 (12.22)</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>17 (12.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>23 (50)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3 (6.52)</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>9 (6.62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>3 (6.52)</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>4 (2.94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean (M)</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Do you expect to remain  | n (%)       | Mean M | Total n (%) |
| working at UTEP for the  | Strongly    | 26 (29.21) | 40 (29.63)  |
| next three years         | Agree       | 38 (42.70) | 48 (35.56)  |
|                          | Neither     | 13 (14.61) | 24 (17.78)  |
|                          | Agree       | 11 (23.91) | 1.46       | 13 (9.63)   |
|                          | Disagree    | 7 (15.22)  | 1.54       |             |
|                          | Strongly    | 4 (8.70)   | 1.4        | 10 (7.41)   |
|                          | Mean (M)    | 2.19       | 2.5        |             |
|                          | Total       | 89         | 46         | 135         |

*Peña Study: Millennial cohort period = 1981-2000

The respondents were asked via an open-ended question to state the reasons that they would remain working at UTEP. There were one-hundred and twenty-two responses provided to this question, and three to four main themes for each category. The primary reasons why employees would want to leave UTEP were low pay, lack of job or promotional opportunities, no advancement options within their jobs, office politics, requesting a change in management, and lastly the ability to find better benefits outside UTEP.

As for the reasons why employees would remain at UTEP, their responses were also very similar in nature. The majority of the respondents indicated the following reasons for remaining in their employment: they enjoy working at UTEP; they enjoy their respective work
environment; they have great benefits, especially the educational assistance programs; the economy; job stability. Several respondents indicated they appreciated the academic setting, and the ability to interact with students as reasons that they would continue to work at UTEP.

**Your job and your decision to remain employed at UTEP.**

When asked about their job working at UTEP, eighty-three percent, or seventy-four Generation X employees either agreed, or strongly agreed that they were secure in their job. Similarly, the Millennial employees in the survey also responded affirmatively that they felt the same way. Eighty-percent or thirty-seven of the Millennials also either agreed, or strongly agreed (Table 4.11).

When asked if whether they were given the resources to be effective in the ir jobs; seventy-one percent of the Generation X employees and sixty-five percent of the Millennials either agreed or strongly agreed with that statement. However, almost ten-percent of the Generation X, and twenty-percent of the Millennial population either disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement (Table 4.11).

When asked if they understood the requirements for advancement in their careers at UTEP; only sixty-five percent, or fifty-nine of the Generation X employees and fifty-seven percent, or twenty-six of the Millennials either agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. Similar to the response related to resources, both the Generation X and Millennials disagreed with this statement, hovering between thirteen to fifteen-percent of the responses (Table 4.11).
Table 4.11: Job security and decision to remain working at UTEP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>24 (26.67)</td>
<td>7 (15.22)</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>31 (22.79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>50 (55.56)</td>
<td>30 (65.22)</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>80 (58.82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>13 (14.44)</td>
<td>5 (10.87)</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>18 (13.24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3 (3.33)</td>
<td>4 (8.70)</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>7 (5.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I believe that I am provided the resources I need to be effective in my job.</th>
<th>1965 - 1980 Gen. X</th>
<th>1981 - 1994* Millennials</th>
<th>Mean $M$</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>19 (21.59)</td>
<td>7 (15.22)</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>26 (19.40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>43 (48.86)</td>
<td>23 (50)</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>66 (49.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>14 (15.91)</td>
<td>3 (6.52)</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>17 (12.69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>9 (10.23)</td>
<td>4 (8.70)</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>3 (3.41)</td>
<td>9 (19.57)</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>12 (8.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean ($M$)</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I believe I understand the requirements for advancement in my career.</th>
<th>1965 - 1980 Gen. X</th>
<th>1981 - 1994* Millennials</th>
<th>Mean $M$</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>20 (22.22)</td>
<td>10 (21.74)</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>30 (22.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>39 (43.33)</td>
<td>16 (34.78)</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>55 (40.44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>15 (16.67)</td>
<td>10 (21.74)</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>25 (18.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>12 (13.33)</td>
<td>7 (15.22)</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>19 (13.97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>4 (4.44)</td>
<td>3 (6.52)</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>7 (5.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean ($M$)</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Peña Study: Millennial cohort period = 1981-2000

**Satisfaction with the relationship with their Supervisor or Manager.**

When respondents were asked whether they were satisfied with the person who supervised them, seventy-five percent, or sixty-seven Generation X employees, either agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. The Millennial employees who responded also either agreed
or strongly agreed that they were also satisfied with the person who supervised them. Seventy-three percent, or thirty-four Millennial employees responded this way. (Table 4.12)

When asked whether their supervisor or manager regularly solicits their suggestions or ideas, seventy-two percent or sixty-four Generation X employees either agreed or strongly agreed that their supervisor or manager solicited ideas from them on a regular basis. Similarly, seventy-five percent, or thirty-four of the Millennial employees who responded also believed that their supervisor listened to their ideas. Only fifteen-percent of these Millennials had no opinion either way (Table 4.12).

Lastly, under this topic, when asked if they received frequent recognition or praise from their supervisor or manager, only fifty-seven, or sixty-three of the Generation X employees either agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. However, twenty-seven percent, or twenty-four of the employees in this cohort either disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement. The Millennials did not fare much better. Fifty-seven percent, or twenty-six employees agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. Like their older generational cohort, twenty-two percent had no opinion, and another twenty-two percent, or ten employees, did not agree with the statement as well (Table 4.12).
### Table 4.12: Satisfaction with the relationship with Supervisor or Manager

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with the person who supervises my work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>34 (38.20)</td>
<td>14 (30.43)</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>48 (35.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>33 (37.08)</td>
<td>20 (43.48)</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>53 (39.26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>13 (14.61)</td>
<td>5 (10.87)</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>18 (13.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>6 (6.74)</td>
<td>5 (10.87)</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>11 (8.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>3 (3.37)</td>
<td>2 (4.35)</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>5 (3.70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (M)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor regularly solicits my suggestions and ideas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>30 (33.71)</td>
<td>16 (34.78)</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>46 (34.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>34 (38.20)</td>
<td>18 (39.13)</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>52 (38.52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>12 (13.48)</td>
<td>7 (15.22)</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>19 (14.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>9 (10.11)</td>
<td>3 (6.52)</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>12 (8.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>4 (4.49)</td>
<td>2 (4.35)</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>6 (4.44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (M)</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I receive frequent recognition and praise from my Supervisor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>27 (30.34)</td>
<td>9 (19.57)</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>36 (26.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>30 (33.71)</td>
<td>17 (36.96)</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>47 (34.81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>15 (16.85)</td>
<td>10 (21.74)</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>25 (18.52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>9 (10.11)</td>
<td>3 (6.52)</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>12 (8.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>8 (8.99)</td>
<td>7 (15.22)</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>15 (11.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (M)</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Peña Study: Millennial cohort period = 1981-2000*
Co-workers and your work environment

When respondents were asked whether they liked the people they worked with, both generational groups overwhelmingly either agreed or strongly agreed that they did. For Generation X, eighty-nine percent, or eighty employees agreed with this statement. Eighty-six percent, or thirty-nine Millennial employees also either agreed or strongly agreed that they liked the people they work with (Table 4.13).

When asked if whether they had a good working environment, as with to the previous statement, both generational groups rated the same in high marks. Seventy-eight percent or seventy Generation X employees either agreed or strongly agreed that they had a good working environment. The Millennial employees also rated high in this area; eighty-percent, or thirty-seven employees either agreed or strongly agreed as well (Table 4.13).

Similar to the statement regarding their communications and relationship with their supervisor or manager, when the respondents were asked if their department provided them with career development and growth as an employee, the results were mixed between cohorts. Only fifty-percent, or half of the Generation X respondents either agreed or strongly agreed on departmental advancement opportunities within their group. Twenty-five percent, or twenty-two employees felt otherwise. Twenty-six percent, or twenty-three employees had no opinion on the matter.

The Millennials had even a lower approval rating. Only forty-seven percent or twenty-two respondents either agreed or strongly agreed that their department was proactively looking over their career development opportunities. Thirty-seven percent, or seventeen Millennial employees also agreed that their department wasn’t doing enough. Together, both generations had reservations that their department provided them with positive career development or growth opportunities (Table 4.13).
Table 4.13: Co-workers and work environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like the people I work with.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>29 (32.22)</td>
<td>18 (39.13)</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>47 (34.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>51 (56.67)</td>
<td>21 (45.65)</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>72 (52.94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>8 (8.89)</td>
<td>3 (6.52)</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>11 (8.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2 (2.22)</td>
<td>4 (8.70)</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>6 (4.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a good working environment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>28 (31.11)</td>
<td>18 (39.13)</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>46 (33.82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>42 (46.67)</td>
<td>19 (41.30)</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>61 (44.85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>13 (14.44)</td>
<td>6 (13.04)</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>19 (13.97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>6 (6.67)</td>
<td>3 (6.52)</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>9 (6.62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1 (1.11)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (0.74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (M)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My co-workers and I work well as a team.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>29 (32.22)</td>
<td>16 (34.78)</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>45 (33.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>49 (54.44)</td>
<td>22 (47.83)</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>71 (52.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>8 (8.89)</td>
<td>4 (8.70)</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>12 (8.82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3 (3.33)</td>
<td>3 (6.52)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>6 (4.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1 (1.11)</td>
<td>1 (2.17)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2 (1.47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (M)</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My department provides me with positive career development and growth.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>18 (20)</td>
<td>10 (21.74)</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>28 (20.59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>27 (30)</td>
<td>12 (26.09)</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>39 (28.68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>23 (25.56)</td>
<td>7 (15.22)</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>30 (22.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>16 (17.78)</td>
<td>10 (21.74)</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>26 (19.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>6 (6.67)</td>
<td>7 (15.22)</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>13 (9.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (M)</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Peña Study: Millennial cohort period = 1981-2000

General perceptions about working at UTEP.

When asked if leaving their current job at UTEP would compromise their financial and social status, more than fifty percent, or forty-seven employees of the Generation X cohort either
agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. Twenty-three percent, or eleven employees had no opinion. However, twenty-three percent, or twenty-one respondents, either disagreed or strongly disagreed that leaving UTEP would not hurt them socially or financially. Their younger cohorts, the Millennials, both agreed and strongly agreed that leaving UTEP would definitely compromise their status. Similar to Generation X respondents, more than twenty-five percent had no opinion whether it would or would not affect their social or financial status (Table 4.14).

The respondents were asked to either agree or disagree on whether they felt a strong desire to provide for their families. As most responses to this statement would be high in favor of, it was more interesting to know how many had no opinion, either disagreed or strongly disagreed. Ninety-two percent or eighty-three Generation X employees either agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. Only seven percent, or six employees, had no opinion, and only one-percent strongly disagreed. For the Millennial respondents, eighty-four percent, or thirty-eight employees, felt a strong desire to provide for their young families. However, unlike the Generation X respondents, nine-percent of this population had no opinion on this statement, and six-percent either disagreed or strongly disagreed. This analysis provided an interesting paradox between those who valued family obligations and those who did not (Table 4.14).

Lastly, on the topic of the respondents’ perceptions about working at UTEP, both Generation X and Millennial employees were asked if they planned to search for another job within the next couple of years. This statement followed along the same theme as the statement if they planned to continue working at UTEP for the next three years. Only forty-five percent or forty-one Generation X employees either agreed or strongly agreed with this statement, confirming that they would search for another job. Twenty-six percent or twenty-four Generation X respondents either disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement, and twenty-eight
percent had no opinion on the matter. The Millennials were very similar to their older cohorts in their responses. Sixty-two percent, or twenty-eight employees also confirmed that they would search for another job. Only eighteen percent, or eight employees were happy where they were in their current job. Twenty-percent of this group neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement. The question remained as to whether the job they would look for would be internal at UTEP or outside the University (Table 4.14).
Table 4.14: General perceptions about working at UTEP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gen. X</td>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would compromise my financial and social status if I left my current job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>22 (24.44)</td>
<td>17 (37.78)</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>39 (28.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>26 (28.89)</td>
<td>9 (20)</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>35 (25.93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>21 (23.33)</td>
<td>12 (26.67)</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>33 (24.44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>11 (12.22)</td>
<td>4 (8.89)</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>15 (11.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>10 (11.11)</td>
<td>3 (6.67)</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>13 (9.63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (M)</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a strong desire to provide for my family.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>66 (73.33)</td>
<td>28 (62.22)</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>94 (69.63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>17 (18.89)</td>
<td>10 (22.22)</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>27 (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>6 (6.67)</td>
<td>4 (8.89)</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>10 (7.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>2 (4.44)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 (1.48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1 (1.11)</td>
<td>1 (2.22)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2 (1.48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (M)</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I plan to search for another job within the next couple of years.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>19 (21.11)</td>
<td>17 (37.78)</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>36 (26.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>22 (24.44)</td>
<td>11 (24.22)</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>33 (24.44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>25 (27.78)</td>
<td>9 (20)</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>34 (25.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>11 (12.22)</td>
<td>3 (6.67)</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>14 (10.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>13 (14.44)</td>
<td>5 (11.11)</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>18 (13.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (M)</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* My Study: Millennial cohort period = 1981-2000
General perceptions about the El Paso community.
The next series of statements asked respondents their general perceptions about the El Paso community, the community where they live and work.

When asked if they (employees) were satisfied with the place where they live, both generational cohorts had a strong majority either agreeing or strongly agreeing with the statement about living in El Paso. The Generation X group alone had eighty-eight percent, or seventy-nine respondents agreeing with the statement. Sixty-six percent, or thirty Millennial employees both agreed and strongly agreed with the statement. However, unlike the Generation X group, seventeen percent of this population disagreed with the statement, and fifteen percent had no opinion either way, which was higher than the Gen. X’ers in both categories (Table 4.15).

On the statement whether the community was a good match for them, seventy-six percent, or sixty-eight employees of the Generation X cohort either agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. The Millennials, similar to the previous question, only had sixty-seven percent, or thirty-one employees concurring with the statement. Relative to having the community as a good match, thirteen percent either disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement (Table 4.15).

When asked if they considered the community where they lived as home, both generational groups had seventy-seven percent of their respondents either agree or strongly agree with this statement. These responses were very similar to the previous statement regarding whether the community was a good match for them (Table 4.15).
Table 4.15: General perceptions about being a part of the El Paso community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am very satisfied with the place where I live.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree 32 (35.56)</td>
<td>13 (28.26)</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>45 (33.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree 47 (52.22)</td>
<td>17 (36.96)</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>64 (47.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree 5 (5.56)</td>
<td>7 (15.22)</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>12 (8.82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree 5 (5.56)</td>
<td>8 (17.39)</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>13 (9.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree 1 (1.11)</td>
<td>1 (2.17)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2 (1.47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (M)</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| The community is a good match for me. | Strongly Agree 27 (30.34) | 13 (28.26) | 1.33 | 40 (29.63) |
| | Agree 41 (46.07) | 18 (39.13) | 1.31 | 59 (47.06) |
| | Neither Agree nor Disagree 17 (19.10) | 9 (19.57) | 1.35 | 26 (19.26) |
| | Disagree 4 (4.49) | 5 (10.87) | 1.56 | 9 (6.67) |
| | Strongly Disagree 0 (0) | 1 (2.17) | 2 | 1 (.074) |
| Mean (M) | 1.98 | 2.2 | - | - |
| Total | 89 | 46 | - | 135 |

| I think of the community where I live as home. | Strongly Agree 28 (31.11) | 15 (32.61) | 1.35 | 43 (31.62) |
| | Agree 41 (45.56) | 21 (45.65) | 1.34 | 62 (45.59) |
| | Neither Agree nor Disagree 17 (18.89) | 6 (13.04) | 1.26 | 23 (16.91) |
| | Disagree 4 (4.44) | 2 (4.35) | 1.33 | 6 (4.41) |
| | Strongly Disagree 0 (0) | 2 (4.35) | 2 | 2 (1.47) |
| Mean (M) | 1.97 | 2.02 | - | - |
| Total | 90 | 46 | - | 136 |

*Peña Study: Millennial cohort period = 1981-2000*

When the respondents were asked if the area where they lived offered any leisure activities that they enjoyed, only fifty-two percent or forty-six Generation X employees either agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. Furthermore, only fifty-percent or twenty-three of the Millennial cohort felt the same way. This was not an overwhelming response from either side. Twenty-two percent and twenty-six percent of the Gen. X’ers and Millennial groups
respectively, either disagreed, or strongly disagreed with this statement. These responses were not surprising at all considering some of the traits of these cohorts (Table 4.16).

Lastly, in regards as to whether respondents felt that leaving this community would be difficult for them, twenty-seven percent, or twenty-four Generation X employees either disagreed, or strongly disagreed with this statement, and twenty-nine percent of the Millennials followed along with the Gen. X’ers. Only forty-eight percent of the Gen. X’ers and fifty-two percent of the Millennials responded that they leaving the community would be difficult. These responses very closely mirror the answers to the above aforementioned statement (Table 4.16).

Table 4.16: General perceptions about being a part of the El Paso community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gen. X</td>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The area where I live offers leisure activities that I enjoy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>14 (15.56)</td>
<td>11 (23.91)</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>25 (18.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>32 (35.56)</td>
<td>12 (26.09)</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>44 (32.35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>25 (27.78)</td>
<td>11 (23.91)</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>36 (26.47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>17 (18.89)</td>
<td>10 (21.74)</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>27 (19.85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2 (2.22)</td>
<td>2 (4.35)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4 (2.94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (M)</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaving this community would be difficult for me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>20 (22.22)</td>
<td>10 (21.74)</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>30 (22.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>23 (25.56)</td>
<td>14 (30.43)</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>37 (27.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>23 (25.56)</td>
<td>9 (19.57)</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>32 (23.53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>17 (18.89)</td>
<td>9 (19.57)</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>26 (19.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>7 (7.78)</td>
<td>4 (8.70)</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>11 (8.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (M)</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Peña Study: Millennial cohort period = 1981-2000
Compensation and Benefits:

The next series of statements asked respondents about their compensation and benefits as employees of UTEP. The first question combines both issues, but the next two statements were asked separately, and the responses were very different.

When asked if they were satisfied with their compensation and benefits while working at UTEP, only fifty-two percent, or forty-seven employees within the Generation X group either agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. A strong thirty-two percent, or twenty-nine employees within this same group either disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. It is possible to hypothesize that since pay and benefits were combined within this statement, and the respondents in both groups may have strong feelings about their pay, this may have affected the results of these responses. The Millennials did not fare much better. Only fifty-one percent or twenty-three employees either agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. Like the Gen. X’ers, thirty-seven percent, or seventeen of the younger Millennials also disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement (Table 4.17).

In relation as to whether they were paid fairly for their work, close to sixty-percent, or an average of thirty-six employees from both generational groups disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement. Only a paltry twenty-eight percent of the Gen. X’ers and twenty-six percent of the Millennials either agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. These responses were of no surprise at all. The Researcher expected that the responses to this statement would not be positive, and that prediction was correct (Table 4.17).

When asked if they were satisfied with their health care benefits at UTEP, a strong eighty-two percent, or seventy-four employees either agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. Similar to the Gen. X’ers, the Millennial employees responded in the same positive way. Severity-eight employees or thirty-six employees were satisfied with their health care
benefits. The satisfaction rating was definitely higher with Generation X than with the Millennials. This possibly signifies a greater need and value for the benefit by the Gen. X’ers at this stage in their lives. The respondents were also asked to express their satisfaction for the educational opportunity benefits at UTEP. As with the health care benefits, a high seventy-eight percent, or seventy Generation X employees were very satisfied with the educational benefits at UTEP. Similarly, a stronger eighty-four percent, or thirty-nine Millennial employees also expressed their high satisfaction with benefits as well (Table 4.17).

When asked if their job offered family-friendly programs, only forty-percent, or thirty-nine Generation X employees either agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. Surprisingly, forty-seven percent, or forty-two employees of this group had no opinion either way. Like the Gen. X’ers, the Millennials only had fifty-four percent of their cohort supporting the statement, but like their older cohorts, thirty-three percent, or fifteen respondents offered neither agreed or disagreed with the statement (Table 4.17).

Lastly, on this topic of compensation and benefits, the respondents were asked if they were preparing for or saving for retirement. Of these groups, sixty-eight percent, or sixty-two Generation X employees either agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. A lower twenty-percent of this population had no opinion. Surprisingly, sixty-three percent, or twenty-nine of the Millennial employee group also agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. What is surprising is that the younger Millennials still have another thirty-one years before the oldest Millennial is eligible to retire at today’s social security minimum retirement age of sixty-two years. For the Generation X cohort, the high ratings were not unexpected. This generation will have its first eligible retirement-aged employee in the next fifteen years at today’s social security minimum retirement age of sixty-two years (Table 4.18).
Table 4.17: Compensation and benefits while working at UTEP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gen. X</td>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with my compensation and benefits.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>11 (12.22)</td>
<td>6 (13.33)</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>17 (12.59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>36 (40)</td>
<td>17 (37.78)</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>53 (39.26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>14 (15.56)</td>
<td>5 (11.11)</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>19 (14.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>24 (26.67)</td>
<td>11 (24.44)</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>35 (25.93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>5 (5.56)</td>
<td>6 (13.33)</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>11 (8.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (M)</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am paid fairly for my work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>4 (22)</td>
<td>2 (4.35)</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>6 (4.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>22 (24.44)</td>
<td>10 (21.74)</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>32 (23.53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>20 (22.22)</td>
<td>6 (13.04)</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>26 (19.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>33 (36.67)</td>
<td>14 (30.43)</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>47 (34.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>11 (12.22)</td>
<td>14 (30.43)</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>25 (18.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (M)</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with my Health Care benefits.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>25 (27.78)</td>
<td>11 (23.91)</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>36 (26.47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>49 (54.44)</td>
<td>25 (54.35)</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>74 (54.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>8 (8.89)</td>
<td>7 (15.22)</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>15 (11.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>6 (6.67)</td>
<td>3 (6.52)</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>9 (6.62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2 (2.22)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 (1.47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (M)</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Peña Study: Millennial cohort period = 1981-2000
Table 4.18: Compensation and benefits while working at UTEP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gen. X</td>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with my educational opportunity benefits.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>32 (35.56)</td>
<td>19 (41.30)</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>51 (37.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>38 (42.22)</td>
<td>20 (43.38)</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>58 (42.65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>9 (10)</td>
<td>4 (8.70)</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>13 (9.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>9 (10)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9 (6.62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2 (2.22)</td>
<td>3 (6.52)</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>5 (3.68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (M)</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My job offers good family-friendly programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>9 (10)</td>
<td>8 (17.39)</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>17 (12.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>30 (33.33)</td>
<td>17 (36.96)</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>47 (34.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>42 (46.67)</td>
<td>15 (32.61)</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>57 (41.91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>4 (4.44)</td>
<td>2 (4.35)</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>6 (4.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>5 (5.56)</td>
<td>4 (8.70)</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>9 (6.62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (M)</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am preparing and/or saving for retirement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>22 (24.44)</td>
<td>7 (15.22)</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>29 (21.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>40 (44.44)</td>
<td>22 (47.83)</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>62 (45.59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>18 (20)</td>
<td>10 (21.74)</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>28 (20.59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>7 (7.78)</td>
<td>4 (8.70)</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>11 (8.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>3 (3.33)</td>
<td>3 (6.52)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>6 (4.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (M)</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* My Study: Millennial cohort period = 1981-2000

**Institutional Knowledge:**

The next series of statements asked respondents about the value of their institutional knowledge, business process and continuity, and other skills that they have acquired while working at UTEP, and what outcomes (including gains or losses) would UTEP realize, if they left. The last statement in relation to this topic of institutional knowledge, addresses the loss of an employee’s knowledge and skills.
Respondents were asked if their supervisor or manager would have a difficult time replacing them were they to leave their jobs today. Within the Generation X group, sixty-nine percent, or sixty-two employees either agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. Whereas, twenty-percent of this population did not believe that their management team would have any difficulty in finding their replacements. As for the Millennials, seventy-percent, or thirty-two employees also strongly agreed or strongly agreed that replacing them would be difficult. Only nine percent of this group did not believe that management would struggle in finding suitable replacements (Table 4.19).

Furthermore, when asked whether, if they were to leave their jobs today, their supervisor or manager (employer) would have a difficult time finding someone with similar knowledge and skills because of what they have learned working at UTEP, sixty-nine percent of the Gen. X’ers either agree or strongly agree that management would have a difficult time finding someone with similar skills and knowledge as the departing incumbent. On the other side, fifteen-percent of this population believed that management could successfully find a replacement with similar skills and knowledge. The Millennials also followed very closely to the Gen. X’ers in terms of ratings. From sixty-one percent to seventy-percent of this cohort believed that management would experience difficulty in replacing their employees with similar knowledge and skills. However, a similar fifteen-percent of this population also believed that management would not have a difficult time finding someone who could replace their employees (Table 4.19).
Table 4.19: Institutional Knowledge and Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If I were to leave my job today, I believe that my supervisor/manager would have a difficult time replacing me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>23 (25.56)</td>
<td>14 (30.43)</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>37 (27.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>29 (32.22)</td>
<td>16 (34.78)</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>45 (33.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>20 (22.22)</td>
<td>12 (26.09)</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>32 (23.53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>14 (15.56)</td>
<td>3 (6.52)</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>17 (12.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>4 (4.44)</td>
<td>1 (2.17)</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>5 (3.68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (M)</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because of what I have learned working at UTEP, if I were to leave my job today, I believe my employer would have difficulty finding someone with similar knowledge.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>27 (30)</td>
<td>10 (21.74)</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>37 (27.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>35 (38.89)</td>
<td>22 (47.83)</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>57 (41.91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>18 (20)</td>
<td>10 (21.74)</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>28 (20.59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>6 (6.67)</td>
<td>3 (6.52)</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>9 (6.62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>4 (4.44)</td>
<td>1 (2.17)</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>5 (3.68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (M)</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because of what I have learned working at UTEP, if I were to leave my job today, I believe my employer would have difficulty finding someone with similar skills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>20 (22.47)</td>
<td>10 (21.74)</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>30 (22.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>37 (41.57)</td>
<td>18 (39.13)</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>55 (40.74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>18 (20.22)</td>
<td>11 (23.91)</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>29 (21.48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>10 (11.24)</td>
<td>6 (13.04)</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>16 (11.85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>4 (4.49)</td>
<td>1 (2.17)</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>5 (3.70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (M)</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Peña Study: Millennial cohort period = 1981-2000

Lastly, in order to measure the value, or validity of the survey to the respondents, the question was asked whether or not the topic of generational differences and the survey in general, were important to them (Table 4.20). In both groups, over ninety-three percent of the respondents felt that this topic and survey was from moderately important to very important. Only four to seven-percent of the population felt it had either little or no importance to them.
This value conveys that the survey was an important instrument in measuring certain attributes. It is important to note that aside from only one division within UTEP, there has been no campus-initiated or campus-wide culture or employee satisfaction survey directed at any particular employee group, excluding faculty in the past eleven years.

Table 4.20: How important this survey and topic are to you

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How important is the topic of this survey to you?</th>
<th>1965 - 1980 Gen. X n (%)</th>
<th>1981 - 1994* Millennials n (%)</th>
<th>Mean $M$</th>
<th>Total n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Important</td>
<td>28 (31.11)</td>
<td>17 (37.78)</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>45 (33.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>33 (36.67)</td>
<td>18 (40)</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>51 (37.78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Important</td>
<td>23 (25.56)</td>
<td>8 (17.78)</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>31 (22.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of Little Importance</td>
<td>5 (5.56)</td>
<td>1 (2.22)</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>6 (4.44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unimportant</td>
<td>1 (1.11)</td>
<td>1 (2.22)</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2 (1.48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean ($M$)</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Peña Study: Millennial cohort period = 1981-2000

This chapter has provided the results which were taken from both studies of this research project; Study 1 and Study 2. The first quantitative study, Study 1, focused on a population of generational UTEP employees (“Leavers”) who voluntarily separated from 2005 to 2008. The study used both an ANOVA and ANCOVA analysis to determine if there was any significant effect between the revised lengths of service for these employees by their respective generational grouping. The same study also addressed if any covariates such as age or gender had any significant effect on a generational employee’s length of service.

The second quantitative study and analysis focused on those generational classified employees still working at UTEP (“Stayers”) from 2005 to May 2012. The research involved the
reasons that they have elected to remain employed, or consider leaving. The study also measured
the value of their institutional knowledge while working at UTEP and their perception of the loss
the University would suffer if they left. This study utilized an online survey where the
respondents of the survey were selected to participate based on their EE0-6 job code and
generational class (Generation X and Millennial). The survey was administered over a two-week
period in late August through mid-September 2012. The population of the survey numbered 397
participants, of which 200 employees initially responded and 148 completed it. The completion
mean (“n”) was sixty-nine percent, and the actual response rate was thirty-seven percent.
Chapter 5: Discussion

**Review of the Research Problem**

The first research problem examined and provided information to support the initial hypothesis that, on average, employees in the Generation X and Millennial generational groups voluntarily left their employment at UTEP two to six years from their initial date of employment. A second issue in the first study surmised that these two generations were leaving with lower tenure or length of service than their older predecessors, the Boomers. The current study also examined whether ethnicity and gender within generational groups played a role in an employees’ departure. A final study focused on the existing generational employees and their reasons for remaining employed. Were the reasons generational, or were they related to their normal career progression as the employees matured? For those who left, what value did they have to the organization in terms of their institutional knowledge? Could an organization continue to replace them without experiencing a loss of business continuity, or processes?

**Conclusions**

Trends in employee turnover at UTEP, as well as trends in retention, could be related to generational attributes. These trends appeared primarily between the two youngest cohorts, the Generation X and Millennial employees. The first study presupposed that the reason that Generation X and Millennial employees left UTEP was because of the general characteristics attributed to members of these generations. These include no loyalty, job-hopping, low tenure in the job, and several other reasons. The first two research questions asked if there were significant differences or trends based on the length of service for the Gen. X and Millennial Classified employees who voluntarily separated, or left their employment, as compared to the Baby Boomers, and whether the younger generational groups (Gen. X & Millennials) were leaving their employment earlier than the prior generational group, the Boomers?
Since the Boomers were older in years and had had more time at their jobs than their younger cohorts, a comparison between Boomers and the younger generations would have been somewhat predictable and uninteresting. In order to focus on a more comparable relationship, the research focused instead on “workable” time. That is the duration of years that the Boomers were eligible to work, or were able to work, after the age of eighteen. This approach allowed the study to compare the proportion of work time in years for Boomers as compared to the work time and tenure for the Generation X and Millennial employees.

This revised approach necessitated a new question. Was the “workable” time significantly greater for the Boomers than the Generation X and Millennial employees simply because they had spent more time at UTEP? The findings did show a significant statistical difference between Boomers, Generation X, and the Millennials when it comes to revised tenure (length of service) outside UTEP.

The second research question asked whether the differences between Generation X and Millennial employees were based on their salary, ethnicity and/or gender in comparison to the Boomers as it related to job tenure. The findings yielded that there were no significant effects by either salary, ethnicity or gender between generational groups regarding length of service. These analyses were able to reveal that the employees who left UTEP, whether Generation X or Millennial, did not leave because of an attribute related to their participation in a generational cohort, but rather for other reasons. The two smallest generational cohorts in the study, Boomers and Millennials had some predetermined advantages and disadvantages. For example, the Boomer generational cohort would be expected to have longer tenure than did Generation X’ers and Millennials, simply because of the fact in that they are older in age and over time had built up significant amounts of tenure. Whereas, the Millennials, as the youngest group working, had
less time on the job, simply because they were younger in age. The analysis done to compare the three generational groups in relation to job tenure revealed that the generational groups that had a significant effect upon each other based on length of service were the Boomers and Millennials, and Generation X’ers and Millennials.

The third and final research question addressed the reasons Gen. X & Millennial Classified exempt and non-exempt staff employees choose to remain employed at UTEP. It went on to ask whether their reasons either to stay or leave were related to their generational category. The first study supposed that research would support the short tenure patterns of Generation X and Millennial employees. The hypothesis was that their perceived brief tenure patterns were a result of these generational associations or attributes. The survey was to be the vehicle used to prove or disprove the hypothesis, and resolve this last research question. The results of the study were somewhat the opposite. In summarizing the demographic results from both Generation X and Millennial respondents, the majority of the respondents were Gen. X’ers, and this generation comprised the largest group in the sample. They were primarily of Hispanic origins, were born in El Paso, or the surrounding area, and had spent a considerable time in the El Paso area. This was an important point as it established that the respondents have a strong connection to the community.

Additional demographic data indicated that the majority of respondents were married. The question asking about the employment status of the employee’s partner, or significant other, was the survey question that generated the fewest responses, Intimacy of the questions may have contributed to the low response rate, but the majority of respondents from both groups indicated that their spouses also worked. In regards to education, the majority of the sample possessed a
bachelor’s degree, and for some, a graduate degree. It is possible to then conclude that this was a well-educated population.

On the subject of job identification, the majority of respondents identified themselves as “Other Professionals” under the EE0-6 IPEDS job code category. Depending on the generational cohort, they earned an average annual salary from $25,000 to $55,000. In most cases, this is a decent salary range for the El Paso community. In terms of length of service, Gen. X’ers had the longer tenure based on the number of years that they had already invested at UTEP. The Millennial length of service was low, as had been expected. However, they are also the youngest group of employees employed at this time. Within the next two decades, Millennial employees will outnumber Gen. X’ers and will have by then earned a respectable level of job tenure.

The survey generated interesting results regarding the respondents’ opinions as to whether they liked working at UTEP, and whether and why they intend to stay or leave. Additional questions related to working at UTEP, supervisors, pay and benefits, El Paso, and what value the respondents placed on their institutional knowledge. These questions also provided some interesting responses. Both generational groups really enjoyed working at UTEP. Eighty-percent of Gen. X’ers and seventy-percent of the Millennials indicated their satisfaction in working at UTEP. Both groups enjoyed the people they worked with and their work environment. One of the initial hypotheses was that both generation groups would be quick to leave UTEP for greener pastures. However, the truth is very different. In general, the respondents indicated that they would leave UTEP, but not because of any generational attribute, or stereotype. Rather, they might leave for reasons related to low pay, lack of job or promotional opportunities, no advancement options within their jobs, office politics, requesting a change in management, and lastly the ability to find better benefits outside UTEP.
The reasons they gave for remaining employed were very encouraging in that these were all the aspects that managers appreciate in terms of retention. Generally, the respondents enjoyed working at UTEP, enjoyed their respective work environment, felt they had great benefits, an excellent educational assistance program, and some stability in their jobs. The latter response was particularly important given the current state of the economy. Several respondents appreciated the academic setting and the ability to interact with students. These were some of the basic rewards that were intrinsic to most employees regardless of generational affiliation.

When asked if they intended to remain working at UTEP, the generational groups responded quite differently. The majority (73%) of the Generation X employees indicated that they planned to remain employed, whereas the Millennials were only slightly more than fifty-percent confident that they would do so. This was consistent with their feelings regarding the support they thought they might receive from their department for advancement opportunities. In fact, both generational groups felt that their departments could do more. The majority valued their jobs at UTEP, and knew that their responsibilities to their families were primary in remaining employed. Of course, the current state of the economy may have caused many to rethink voluntarily leaving UTEP. However, both generations had ambitions to test the job market in a few years. When asked if they planned to be at UTEP in the next three years, both groups did not believe that they would. For some, that state of the economy was not a driving factor, but rather they had other reasons to consider other opportunities.

One big concern initially raised in the study was whether the area or community was a deterrent to retention. The survey responses indicate that the majority of the respondents were satisfied where they live now. This was true for both those in El Paso and those living in the surrounding community. Both groups connected with their communities, and considered El Paso
their home. However, even having indicated El Paso is their home, both generational groups felt that the leisure activities within the area were of a concern. For the Millennials, leaving El Paso would be an option if given the opportunity; whereas a smaller number of Gen. X’ers would do the same. As expected, there was one area that served as a common issue between both groups as a major concern. Both groups expressed deep dissatisfaction with their pay. When asked if they were also dissatisfied with their benefits as a separate component, the respondents were very satisfied with many aspects of their benefit plans, including educational opportunities, family-friendly benefits, and retirement planning.

Another possible reason some individuals remained employed at UTEP, “Stayers,” would be the lack of suitable alternative employment. This may be a direct result of the current state of the economy and high unemployment rates in the El Paso area, which, at the time of this writing, remains among the highest in the State of Texas. This factor may have made many Stayers re-think a decision to leave UTEP.

Lastly, as for the value of institutional knowledge, business continuity, and business processes, the majority of both groups believed that what they have learned at UTEP was very important and had value. Further, they maintain that this value, or institutional knowledge, would be a critical issue if not addressed by management. Both generational groups believed that their supervisors and managers would be hard pressed to find replacement employees with similar skills or knowledge. UTEP, at this time does not have either a tacit or explicit formal plan to transfer knowledge.

In summary, the results of the survey indicate that these Generation X and Millennials employees at UTEP intend to continue working at least for the next three years. They will remain because they enjoy their jobs, the working environment, and the benefits. This seems to be an
overwhelming theme for many in both generational groups. These groups also feel a strong sense of community. This is an important factor in retaining staff. If employees are connected to their community, and feel a sense of “home,” this reduces the likelihood of their leaving. However, as expected, there were several areas that were of a concern to both generational groups, namely pay and lack of advancement opportunities. These were items that served as reasons for both turnover and retention.

Additional research may be necessary is the issue of institutional knowledge. Clearly, both groups felt that their leadership would have a hard time replacing them, given their current skills and abilities. Aside from a few articles on the subject, there are no known metrics to address what an organization loses or gains when employees leave their employment. For the majority of UTEP departments, there appear to be no formal institutional knowledge transfer plans, or succession plans in place which could minimize the amount of business knowledge that would be gone with the loss of Generation X, Millennial and Generation Z employees.

Several scholars maintain that work values and work habits were indeed generational in nature. One example is the work of Smola & Sutton (2002). In their study with Boomers, Generation X’ers, and Millennials, they found that work values were more related to generational affiliation than age or maturation. They believed that in order to be cognizant of generational issues and be successful at the same time, organizations had to be reactive to and ready for change (2002). Chen & Choi (2007), in their study on generational differences, also found that Boomers appreciated personal growth and advancement more than did Generation X and Millennial employees. This seems intuitive as most Boomers were already set into their careers at the time of that study. Kowske (2010) also found that Generation X and Millennial employees embraced work engagement and believed it to be one of the primary reasons to
remain satisfied in their jobs, something which would prevent them from considering leaving an organization. Twenge (2010) found higher job satisfaction levels and reasons to leave an organization could be generational in nature depending on the generational group. In her study, when it came to dispelling the myth that Generation X and Millennial employees were “job hoppers,” she found a stronger need by these cohorts to stay with the same job for the majority of their adult lives. This demonstrated a completely different attribute than was evident in past studies which had reported just the opposite phenomenon.

In her study of public sector employees in the federal system, Eaton (2008) found many of the work-related issues facing Boomers, Generation X’ers, and Millennials were consistent with other generational issues addressed earlier. The work-related topics included pay, promotion, supervision, benefits, rewards, operating processes, co-workers, the work itself, and communication. In one element of her study, Generation X and Millennial employees only aligned themselves with similarities in supervisory styles. Results were mixed in other areas such as promotion and rewards. In other cases, the Boomers and Veterans were more associated with different elements than were Generation X and Millennial employees (Eaton, 2008).

However, there are many more scholars who found that changes to employee attributes, work habits, and values were in fact not related to generational affiliation, but rather to the normal career or age progressions of employees. Rhodes (1983) was one of the pioneers in these studies of age-effects in the workplace. She found that job satisfaction was more associated with age, as were motivation, and commitment, and not related to turnover. Cennamo and Gardner (2008) also found that for some employees, work values could be attributed to career stages rather than generational affiliations. In their review of other scholarly literature surrounding generations, Parry and Urwin (2010) could not find much evidence to support generational
differences when it came to workplace issues. Kowske (2010) also found little support for generational differences as they related to satisfaction and turnover. Costanza, et al., (2012) also found that the biggest problems facing researchers on this subject involved connecting the differences related to generations with those that were age-based or time-generated. Sackett, et al. (2003) found little research supporting the work-related outcomes as generational in nature. Though conflicted, these authors (Sackett, et al., 2003) were also able to suggest that age and tenure, not an employee’s generational affiliation, could explain the differences in job satisfaction. Age and tenure appeared to be a barometer for organizational commitment as well.

In their study on the relationship between age and voluntary employee turnover, Ng and Feldman (2008) found that age was strongly related to turnover. Other scholars such as Healy, et al. (1995), Hullin (1991), Arnold and Feldman (1982), and Cotton and Tuttle (1986) could not equate issues such as job satisfaction, engagement, commitment, age, and tenure to generational affiliation as well.

In closing, this research, both through the literature review and in practice, indicates that the turnover and retention of staff are not related to generational affiliation or cohort association, but rather to other reasons, which are primarily job-related. The majority of the “Leavers” in the first study left UTEP to accept another jobs, or for other reasons unknown to the Researcher. The reasons that they left UTEP might have been related to low pay, inadequate benefits, poor supervisor/manager communications, or lack of career advancement. Based on the survey responses, the “Stayers” are happy working here at UTEP. They love the benefits, and the majority of the respondents plan to remain working for at least three more years, if not longer.

None of these reasons to stay or go were related to the original issues which focused on their generational affiliation and generational attitudes. This hypothesis was incorrect in its
supposition that both turnover and retention could be related to generation affiliation or association. The research indicates that the key to the effective retention of generational employees will not depend on policies related specifically to Boomer, Generation X, Millennial, or Generation Z employee retention. Rather, a solution must be based on implementing effective and consistent management practices. Some of these practices include but are not limited to programs that engage employees, reward and recognize employees, and provide marketable compensation and family-friendly benefits.

**SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH**

There are many avenues for continued research, not only on the topic of generational differences in the workplace, but also on the issue of the retention of institutional knowledge. If the generational issue does not provide enough substance to continue with future research, there are related subjects which could add value to the research. There are also excellent opportunities for researchers to look at conducting a cross-longitudinal study, using the same survey questions which were asked in Study 2. A possible recommendation would be to conduct the study again in three to five years. Additional research opportunities exist in the analysis of different types of employee groups, such as the Faculty, Professional staff, or Other employee categories. I believe this would prove to be a good compliment to the research that was conducted for the three types of Classified employees in Study 2. Additional research specifically in the statistical analyses involving gender, or ethnicity and what results or differences were revealed could be of great value if questions in these areas were ever raised. The data for these analyses are available and ready to be studied. Lastly, expanded research in the areas of embeddedness, specifically among employee groups not previously referenced in either study, would be merited as a means to determine longevity and intent to resign.
LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

One limitation for future research is the lack of consistent time-lag study on generational work attributes and patterns, specifically regarding employee turnover and retention. The current study was more cross-sectional in nature. Smola and Sutton (2002) studied work habits of generational employees in 1974 and again in 1999, but they were twenty-five years apart. Twenge (2010) advocated using time-lag studies as the preferred research method. It is clear that the group that will require additional research over time will be the Generation X cohort to study the turnover and retention habits of this generational group as they progress through the later career stages. Certainly, there would be benefits to looking at a cross-longitudinal study, repeating survey questions raised in Study Two in three to five years.

For studies related to separated employees, a hindrance to research was the inability to access personal contact information for those who have left UTEP. This prevented interviews or survey questions similar to those raised in the online survey of the “Stayers.” The ability to contact these employees and ask the questions raised in the Study 2 survey would have been beneficial to this research study. Another issue with the “Leavers” was the validity and reliability of the data provided to UTEP’s Human Resource Services Department, the information provided as part of the employee’s separation. Determining the reliability and validity of information provided by employees who separated and self-reported their reasons for leaving is another limitation. Another research limitation is the lack of empirical research on generational turnover and retention as it applies to public sector employees, primarily those in higher education. There is also a lack of the same empirical research on the effects of the loss of institutional knowledge, or the lack of knowledge transfers in the same public sector entities.

An additional limitation on the topic of institutional knowledge is the lack of metrics to measure the value of an employee’s institutional knowledge, and the cost element of replacing
this knowledge, or the time in doing so for functional separations, rather than dysfunctional separations. Additionally, a more traditional approach in conducting this study, rather than the ones used herein, may have provided different results in terms of organizational theory.

**Summary**

As previously mentioned, the topic of generational differences in the workplace is an emerging issue. As a result, there has been substantial non-scholarly discussion in books, newspapers and magazines which detail the challenges employers have in today’s workplace. There has also been emerging scholarly literature on this subject, where studies have been developed that actually measure the effects age or generational cohort has on several workplace issues: turnover, tenure and engagement. As a result of the emerging nature of the research and ongoing discussion involving this topic, this study relied upon passages from both scholarly and no-scholarly reports and research for its research and conclusions.

Organizations must continue to gauge the climate of their organizations. They can no longer take for granted that their employees will remain employed for the same length of time as members of earlier generational groups. Though the UTEP Generation X and Millennial respondents enjoyed their work, environment, and the benefits, one group, the Millennials, would not commit resoundingly on remaining employed longer than the next three years. For both groups, and UTEP Boomers as well, compensation will remain an issue that could lead to turnover and low morale if organizations do not effectively address this matter.

Though the research does not support the premise that employees left due to generational attributes, it did provide enough information for an employer like UTEP to listen and act proactively. Continued attention to family-friendly benefits (i.e., telecommuting, domestic partner benefits, flexible benefit plans, dependent education benefits, etc.) and compensation will
be a necessity as organizations continue to attract, recruit, and retain younger generational employees. Of course, these changes cannot be solely related to generational issues. Deal (2010) argues that there is little evidence that proves these options improve employee relations or retention. She believes that when provided with interesting jobs, competitive salaries, and opportunities to learn and advance, employees of all generations will respond positively.

Generation X & Millennial employees will leave behind a large gap in the institutional knowledge, continuity, and history that the earlier generational groups provided. This knowledge will be difficult to replace. There is no formal or informal practice of knowledge transfer at any level at UTEP. This is true of other similarly situated organizations as well. As a result, these organizations will experience gaps in institutional knowledge. Hopefully, continued scholarly research on this topic will bring this issue to the forefront and lead to effective implementation of a plan to preserve institutional knowledge.

From both the literature review and the results of the studies, it is clear that generational group membership significantly impacts the proportion of time worked at UTEP. However, there were no significant effects from either ethnicity, gender, or ending salary on length of service. When the three groups (Boomers, Millennials and Generation X’ers) are compared, two sets of groups significantly differed from each other in terms of length of service. These were the Boomers and Millennials, and the Generation X’ers and Millennials.

Study 2 demonstrated that turnover and retention of staff were not necessarily related to generational affiliation or cohort association, but rather to other reasons, which were primarily job-related. Gen. X and Millennial employees were happy working at UTEP. They appreciated the benefits, enjoyed the academic setting, and planned to remain working at the institution for at least three more years, if not longer. As far as the study could determine, none of these reasons to
stay or go were related to generational affiliation. The primary factor appeared rather to be the institution’s implementation of effective and consistent management practices. Employee satisfaction also came from programs that engage employees, reward and recognize employees and improve communication. Additional factors were equitable compensation and family-friendly benefits.

The opportunities for future research regarding the relationship between generational cohort and job tenure or job satisfaction are endless. Future research should expand these studies to include additional employee categories in order to determine if the generational differences extend to other areas of employment, and whether they affect job satisfaction in other job classifications.
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Appendix A: Questionnaire for Qualtrics on Generational Differences

1. Do you expect to remain working at UTEP for the next three years?
   Definitely   Very Probably   Probably   Possibly   Probably Not   Very Probably Not

2. What are the reasons you would remain at UTEP?
   [Insert Text Box]

The following series of statements ask about your job and your decision to remain working at UTEP. Please select one response for each statement listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3. I believe I am secure in my current job
4. I believe I have really settled into my position.
5. I believe that I am provided the resources I need to be effective in my job.
6. I believe I understand the requirements for advancement in my career.
7. I believe our evaluation process measures my job performance effectively.

The following series of statements ask about your satisfaction with the relationship between you and your Supervisor or Manager. Please select one response for each statement below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

8. I am satisfied with the person who supervises my work.
9. My supervisor makes good use of my skills and abilities.
10. My supervisor regularly solicits my suggestions and ideas.
11. My supervisor is a good role model of the University’s values.
12. My supervisor communicates frequently with me.
13. I receive good support from my immediate supervisor.

The following series of statements ask about your co-workers and your work environment. Please select one response for each statement listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

15. I like the people I work with.
16. I believe I am a good match with my employer.
17. I have a good working environment.
18. My co-workers and I work well as a team.
19. My co-workers and I are very similar in our values and attitudes.
20. My department provides me with positive career development and growth.
21. My department recognizes diversity and culture in my workplace.

The following series of statements ask about your general perceptions about working at UTEP. Please select one response for each statement listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22. I would compromise my financial and social status if I left my current job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. If I were to leave this job, I would miss my work friends.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. If I were to leave this job, I would miss my daily routine.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I have a strong desire to provide for my family.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I am looking for a job within another department or with a different employer or anticipate doing so during the next year.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I often think about quitting my job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. I plan to search for another job within the next couple of years.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following series of statements ask about your general perceptions about being a part of the El Paso community. Please select one response for each statement listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29. I am very satisfied with the place where I live.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. The weather where I live is suitable for me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. The community is a good match for me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. I think of the community where I live as home.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. The area where I live offers leisure activities that I enjoy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. My family roots are in this community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. I am active in a church in this community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Leaving this community would be difficult for me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following series of statements ask about your compensation and benefits while working at UTEP. Please select one response for each statement listed below.

Strongly Agree    Agree    Undecided    Disagree    Strongly Disagree

37. I am satisfied with my compensation and benefits.
38. I am paid fairly for my work.
39. I am satisfied with my Health Care benefits.
40. I am satisfied with my educational opportunity benefits.
41. My job offers good family-friendly programs.
42. I am preparing and/or saving for retirement.
43. There are no other comparable or better jobs or benefits available.

The following series of statements ask about your institutional knowledge and value while working at UTEP.

44. If I were to leave my job today, I believe that my supervisor/manager would have a difficult time replacing me.

Strongly Agree    Agree    Undecided    Disagree    Strongly Disagree

45. Because of what I have learned working at UTEP, if I were to leave my job today, I believe my employer would have difficulty finding someone with similar knowledge.

Strongly Agree    Agree    Undecided    Disagree    Strongly Disagree

46. Because of what I have learned working at UTEP, if I were to leave my job today, I believe my employer would have difficulty finding someone with similar technological skills.

Strongly Agree    Agree    Undecided    Disagree    Strongly Disagree

47. What I know and do in my job is unique, so the job I do could not be easily taken over by my co-workers or my supervisor.

Strongly Agree    Agree    Undecided    Disagree    Strongly Disagree

This question asks about how important this survey, and topic has been.

48. How important is the topic of this survey to you?
Very Important    Important    Moderately Important    Of Little Importance    Unimportant
The following series of questions ask about some general demographic information about you.

49. What’s period best reflects the year of your birth? (BYear)
   A. Prior to 1945
   B. 1946 - 1964
   C. 1965 - 1980
   D. 1981 - 1994

50. What is your age? (Age)
   A. Under 25 years
   B. 25-29 years
   C. 30-39 years
   D. 40-49 years
   E. 50-59 years
   F. 60-69 years
   G. 70 or older

51. What is your place of birth? (PBirth)
   A. El Paso/Cd. Juarez Area
   B. New Mexico
   C. Other cities in Texas
   D. Outside Texas & New Mexico
   E. Outside the United States.

52. How long have you lived in El Paso? (ELP)
   A. Less than 1 year
   B. 2 - 5 years
   C. 6 – 10 years
   D. 11– 15 years
   E. 16 – 20 years
   F. 21 – 25 years
   G. More than 25 years

53. What is your gender? (MF)
   A. Male
   B. Female

54. What is your ethnic background? (Ethnic)
   A. Hispanic
   B. Non-Hispanic
55. **What is your educational background? (Educ)**
   A. Some High School
   B. High School Graduate
   C. Some College
   D. Two-year College/Technical School
   E. Four-year College
   F. Some post-graduate work

56. **What is your relationship status? (Status)**
   A. Married
   B. Living with a Significant Other
   C. Single
   D. Divorced
   E. Widowed

57. **Do you have a spouse or significant other that works outside the home? (Select one) (Other Work)**
   A. Employed for wages
   B. Self-employed
   C. Out of work for more than 1 year
   D. Out of work for less than 1 year
   E. A homemaker
   F. A student
   G. Retired
   H. Unable to work

58. **Please indicate your current position or job at UTEP.**
   1. **(Job)**
      A. Other Professionals (Support/Services)
      B. Clerical and/or Secretarial Support
      C. Para-Professional and Technical
      D. Other (please explain)

[Insert Text Box]

59. **What is your annual salary? (Salary)**
   A. $25,000 or less
   B. $25,001 to $40,000
   C. $40,001 to $55,000

---

1 Primary function or occupational activity category used to classify persons whose assignments require specialized knowledge or skills which may be acquired through experience, apprenticeship, on-the-job-training, or academic work in occupationally specific programs that result in a 2-year degree or other certificate or diploma.
D. $55,001 to $75,000  
E. $75,001 or more

60. How many years have you been employed at UTEP? (Yrs. Svc.)
   A. Less than 2 years  
   B. 2 – 4 years  
   C. 5 – 7 years  
   D. 8 – 10 years  
   E. 11 – 15 years  
   F. 16 – 20 years  
   G. 21 – 25 years  
   H. More than 25 years

61. Are you a supervisor of staff employees (is it your job to approve merit increases or sign performance evaluations)? (Supv.)
   A. Yes  
   B. No
Appendix B: Cover Letter (Message) to Survey Participants

July 1, 2012

Dear UTEP Classified Employee,

I am a doctoral student in the Educational Leadership and Foundations Program working on my dissertation at the University of Texas at El Paso (UTEP). I have received authorization to conduct a short survey of UTEP Classified Staff employees employed during the 2005 to 2008 fiscal years, and those still employed as of May 2012, in the following occupations: Other Professionals, Clerical Support, and Technical or Para-Professional. I am trying to understand why some UTEP Classified employees elect to remain employed at UTEP, and if they would consider leaving UTEP, when and for what reasons?

Please know that information regarding your UTEP e-mail address, biographical, and employment-related information during that period to the present was accessed through the existing UTEP business information systems: BIS/DEFINE and HRMS. The results of this survey will be anonymous and confidential. This survey is only for educational research purposes, and there is no obligation for you to complete the survey. The information will be kept in a secure file accessible only by me, as the Researcher, and my dissertation chair. Completing this survey is voluntary, and refusing to participate will not cause a penalty.

Should you have any questions regarding this survey and your participation in it, or have any concerns regarding your participation, please contact my dissertation chair: Dr. Arturo Pacheco, Educational Leadership and Foundations, (915) 747-7607 or via email at apacheco@utep.edu.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Andrew M. Peña, Sr.
Educational Leadership & Foundations
Doctoral Candidate
Appendix C: Survey Informed Consent Form

University of Texas at El Paso (UTEP) Institutional Review Board
Informed Consent Form for Research Involving Human Subjects

---

Protocol Title: When Generational Employees Leave Higher Education
Principal Investigator: Andrew M. Peña
UTEP College of Education – Educational Leadership & Foundations

1. Introduction
You are being asked to take part voluntarily in the research project described below. Please take your time making a decision and feel free to discuss it with your friends and family. Before agreeing to take part in this research study, it is important that you read the consent form that describes the study. Please contact the Principal Investigator if you need him to explain any words or information that you do not clearly understand.

2. Why is this study being done?
You have been asked to take part in a research study of current UTEP Classified Staff employees employed during 2005-2008 and currently employed as of May 2012 in certain specific occupations. You are being asked to be in the study because you are a current UTEP employee and/or were employed by UTEP during the years 2005-2008 in one of the following occupations: Other Professionals, Clerical Support, Technical, or Para-Professional.

Approximately 500 to 700 subjects will be enrolling in this study. Your participation in this study will require approximately 20-25 minutes of your time for the purpose of filling out an on-line survey.

3. What is involved in the study?
If you agree to take part in this study, the study’s Principal Investigator will analyze the results of an on line survey which you will submit anonymously.

4. What are the risks and discomforts of the study?
This study is being conducted exclusively on line through the use of an electronically-submitted form. There are no known risks associated with this research.

5. Are there benefits to taking part in this study?
There will be no direct benefits to you for taking part in this study. This research may help us to understand factors affecting employee retention and enable us to identify factors which increase job satisfaction.
6. What other options are there?
You have the option not to take part in this study. There will be no penalties involved if you choose not to take part in this study.

7. Who is paying for this study?
There is no funding for this study.

8. What are my costs?
There are no costs to you for participation in this study.

9. Will I be paid to participate in this study?
You will not be paid for taking part in this research study.

10. What if I want to withdraw, or am asked to withdraw from this study?
Taking part in this study is voluntary. You have the right to choose not to take part in this study. If you do not take part in the study, there will be no penalty. If you choose to take part, you have the right to stop at any time. However, we encourage you to contact the study’s Principal Investigator to indicate why you are leaving the study.

11. Who do I call if I have questions or problems?
If you have questions regarding this survey and your participation in it, please contact the Principal Investigator or Dr. Arturo Pacheco, Educational Leadership and Foundations, at (915) 747-7607 or via email at apacheco@utep.edu.

If you have questions or concerns about your participation as a research subject, please contact the UTEP Institutional Review Board (IRB) at (915-747-8841) or irb.orsp@utep.edu.

12. What about confidentiality?
This is an anonymous study. All records will be submitted electronically and without reference to any identifying characteristics other than those specifically requested in the survey questions themselves.

13. Authorization Statement
I acknowledge that I am over 18 years of age. I have read and understood each page of this paper about the study and agree to participation in this study. I know that being in this study is voluntary. I know I can stop being in this study without penalty. I can print a copy of this consent form now and can get information on results of the study later if I wish.

Completion of the survey is deemed consent to participate. By clicking on the words “Start Survey” below, I acknowledge that I have read and understood the above and consent to participate in this study.
Appendix D: Survey Informed Consent Form

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT EL PASO
Office of the Vice President for Research and Sponsored Projects
Institutional Review Board
El Paso, Texas 79968-0587
phone: 915 747-8841 fax: 915 747-5931
FWA No: 00001224

DATE: August 9, 2012

TO: Andrew Pena, Ed.D.
FROM: University of Texas at El Paso IRB

STUDY TITLE: [337903-1] Gen. X and Millennial Generational Differences in Higher Education
IRB REFERENCE #: 337903-1
SUBMISSION TYPE: New Project

ACTION: DETERMINATION OF EXEMPT STATUS
DECISION DATE: August 9, 2012

Thank you for your submission of New Project materials for this research study. University of Texas at El Paso IRB has determined this project is EXEMPT FROM IRB REVIEW according to federal regulation 45 CFR 46.101 (b)(4).

Exempt protocols do not need to be renewed. Please note that it is the Principal Investigator's responsibility to resubmit the proposal for review if there are any modifications made to the originally submitted proposal. This review is required in order to determine if "Exemption" status remains.

We will put a copy of this correspondence on file in our office.

If you have any questions, please contact Athena Fester at (915) 747-8841 or afester@utep.edu. Please include your study title and reference number in all correspondence with this office.

cc:
Curriculum Vitae

Andrew M. Peña, Sr., MBA, ABD
7921 Morley
El Paso, Texas 79925
(915) 525-0777
ampena@elp.rr.com

Curriculum Vitae

Andrew M. Peña, Sr. was born in El Paso, Texas and graduated from Ysleta High School. He then studied initially at the University of Texas at El Paso for two years. After two years he attended Our Lady of the Lake University in San Antonio, Texas where he graduated with a Bachelor’s degree in business administration, with a concentration in management. He decided to pursue his master’s degree in business administration at St. Mary’s University in San Antonio where he also graduated. His concentration was in human resources management. Andrew will be graduating this December 2012 with his doctorate degree in Educational Administration from the University of Texas at El Paso.

Andrew’s professional experience has been as a human resources executive with extensive experience in the public and private sectors.

His core competencies are as follows: Ability to foster a cooperative work environment. Strong customer service orientation. Strong analytical and critical thinking skills and the ability to analyze, summarize, and effectively present data. Ability to analyze problems and develop creative solutions to complex human resource issues. Advanced verbal and written communication skills. Ability to present effectively to small and large groups. Knowledge of
project management principles, practices, techniques, and tools. Advanced knowledge and understanding of human resources management principles, practices, and standards, as it applied to public and private organizations. Knowledge of the University’s organization structure, staffing patterns, and job design. Demonstrated excellent professional human resources leadership skills. Knowledge of financial & business analysis techniques. Employee development and performance management skills. Skills in budget preparation and fiscal management. Excellent interpersonal skills and the ability to deal credibly and effectively with senior institutional leadership. Skills in examining and re-engineering operations and procedures, formulating policy, and developing and implementing new strategies and procedures. Ability to supervise and train departmental employees, to include organizing, prioritizing, and scheduling work assignments. Knowledge of organizational classifications. Knowledge of information systems used in human resources applications. Skill in organizing resources and establishing priorities, and ability to lead and direct HR resources leading to a large ERP (PeopleSoft) conversion and implementation for UTEP.

Andrew’s currently employed as the Director of Human Resources for The University of Texas at El Paso and has been since 2001. In his role, he’s directed twenty-nine (28) departmental employees, including three associate, one assistant director, and one manager. Operate an annual budget of near $1,000,000. Highlights include: Collaborated to successfully implement a streamlined performance evaluation instrument based on the Balanced Scorecard. In 2003, successfully implemented a Reduction-in-Force (RIF) and Voluntary Retirement Incentive (VRI) program required by mandatory state budget reductions. At the time, realized a fifty-percent VRI rate and other labor reduction, mandated budget reductions totaling over
$1,000,000 were met; successfully launched an employee discount and health and wellness program to University employees. Developed and enhanced value added on-line services and services available on the University’s human resources web-site in line with the University’s Strategic Plan and customer needs. Served as the University’s HR (HCM) Functional Lead for the University’s PeopleSoft 9.1 implementation and conversion from 2010-Present, along with six other UT System institutions.

As the Human Resources Manager for the Toro Company in El Paso, Texas from 1993 to 2001, Andrew worked for this internationally known manufacturer of commercial and residential lawn care products. The Toro Company operated manufacturing and distribution facilities in El Paso, Texas and Cuidad Juarez, Chihuahua area of over 1,000 employees. He managed eleven (11) departmental employees with an annual budget of $780,000. His work highlights included: Obtaining an $110,000 training grant (“Smart Jobs”) from the State of Texas, Department of Economic Development; Improved Company regular and transient work force absentee rates; and Implemented in-house “coaching” and “mentoring” programs with management team.

Andrew worked as the Director for Human Resources for a brief time in 1994 to 1995 for DSI/Turnkey in El Paso, Texas. DSI/Turnkey was a locally owned and operated employee leasing organization with over forty clients and 1,100 employees. He was also a Human Resources/Compensation Analyst for the El Paso Electric Company in El Paso, Texas from 1992 to 1993. El Paso Electric is a private electric utility based in El Paso and Southern New Mexico with at the time, 1,200 professional, non-professional, and bargaining-unit and technical employees.
Andrew also served as the Director for Human Resources for Rio Vista Rehabilitation Hospital in El Paso, Texas from 1988 to 1992. Rio Vista (now defunct) was an 80-bed free-standing physical rehabilitation hospital with 350 employees owned by the Tenet Corporation. This was also a start-up operation.

Andrew also served as the Personnel Manager for Electro-Wire Products in El Paso, Texas from 1988 to 1992 in a start-up capacity. Electro-Wire was a twin-plant manufacturing facility with at the time, 200 employees which produced automotive wire harness assemblies for the Ford and Chrysler automotive markets. He also was the Industrial Relations Administrator for Border Steel Mills, Inc. from 198 to 1985. Border Steel is a privately-owned steel mill with 1,200 professional, non-professional, bargaining-unit and technical employees.

Andrew is certified as a Senior Professional in Human Resources (SPHR) by the Society for Human Resources Management (SHRM), Human Resources Certification Institute since 1992. He’s also has a certificate in Public Speaking/Human Relations from the Dale Carnegie Institute in 1991. Andrew also successfully completed the Training and Development Certificate Program in 1997 and the Para-Legal Certificate Course in 1998 from the University of Texas at El Paso’s Professional & Public Programs. He also successfully completed a Coaching and Mentoring Program from Linkage, Inc. in May 2000, and the Western Association of College & University Business Officers (WACUBO) Business Management Institute in Santa Barbara, California from 2002 to 2004. He’s also completed a Leadership Development Program from the Center for Creative Leadership in August 2006 and the CUPA-HR Association Leadership Program from July 2007 to July 2011.
Andrew is a member of the St. Mary’s University of Texas Alumni Association – Member since, as well as the UTEP Alumni Association. In 1993 he served as the Chairman for "HIRE EL PASO" (Marketplace) (n/k/a, Workforce Solutions Expo) for the Greater El Paso Chamber of Commerce. He’s been a former officer and member of the local El Paso Society for Human Resource Management and is a current national member of the Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM) since 1984. From 1994 to 2000, he was appointed by then Governor Ann Richards, to serve as the Public Commissioner for the State Committee of Examiners in the Fitting & Dispensing of Hearing Instruments for the State of Texas. He was also a member of the City of El Paso’s City of El Paso’s Civil Service Commission from March 2004 to April 2006. Andrew’s a 1999 Graduate of the Greater El Paso Chamber of Commerce, Leadership El Paso Program; Class XXI. He’s a recipient of the Toro Company’s Circle of Excellence Award Recipient in 1999. He was named the Volunteer of the Year in 2000 by the Northeast Greater El Paso YMCA. He’s a Graduate of UTEP Aware - Class XI in 2002. He’s also served as President for the Rio Grande CUPA-HR Chapter from 2007 to 2008. And most recently, served as the Western CUPA-HR Board, HR Program Coordinator from May 2008 to June 2011.
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