Georgia State University
Digital Archive @ GSU

Public Management and Policy Dissertations | Department of Public Management and Policy

11-18-2005

Predicting the Effects of Extrinsic and Intrinsic Job Factors on Overall Job Satisfaction for Generation X and Baby Boomers in a Regional Healthcare Organization

Cheryl J. Curry
Georgia State University, cjcurry@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalarchive.gsu.edu/pmap_diss

Recommended Citation
Curry, Cheryl J., "Predicting the Effects of Extrinsic and Intrinsic Job Factors on Overall Job Satisfaction for Generation X and Baby Boomers in a Regional Healthcare Organization" (2005). *Public Management and Policy Dissertations.* Paper 27.

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of Public Management and Policy at Digital Archive @ GSU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Public Management and Policy Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Archive @ GSU. For more information, please contact digitalarchive@gsu.edu.

PERMISSION TO BORROW

In presenting this dissertation as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for an advanced degree from Georgia State University, I agree the Library of the University shall make it available for inspection and circulation in accordance with its regulations governing materials of this type. I agree that permission to quote from, to copy from, or to publish this dissertation may be granted by the author or, in his or her absence, the professor under whose direction it was written or, in his or her absence, by the Dean of the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies. Such quoting, copying, or publishing must be solely for scholarly purposes and must not involve potential financial gain. It is understood that any copying from or publication of the dissertation which involves potential gain will not be allowed without written permission of the author.

_____

Signature of the Author

NOTICE TO BORROWERS

All dissertations deposited in the Georgia State University Library must be used only in accordance with the stipulations prescribed by the author in the preceding statement.

The author of this dissertation is:

Cheryl J. Curry
5420 Dunwoody Mill Court
Atlanta, Georgia 30360

The director of this dissertation is:

Dr. Verna Willis
Andrew Young School of Policy Studies
Georgia State University
14 Marietta Street NW, Suite 637
Atlanta, Georgia 30302

Users of this dissertation not regularly enrolled as students at Georgia State University are required to attest acceptance of the preceding stipulations by signing below. Libraries borrowing this dissertation for the use of their patrons are required to see that each user records here the information requested.

Name of User	Address	Date	Type of use (Examination only or copying)

PREDICTING THE EFFECTS OF EXTRINSIC AND INTRINSIC JOB FACTORS ON OVERALL JOB SATISFACTION FOR GENERATION X AND BABY BOOMERS IN A REGIONAL HEALTHCARE ORGANIZATION

BY

Cheryl J. Curry

A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
of
Doctor of Philosophy
in the
Andrew Young School of Policy Studies
of
Georgia State University

GEORGIA STATE UNVERSITY
2007

Copywright by
Cheryl J. Curry
2007

ACCEPTANCE

This dissertation was prepared under the directions of the candidate's Dissertation Committee. It has been approved and accepted by all members of that committee, and it has been accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Human Resource Development in the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies of Georgia State University.

Dissertation Chair: Verna J. Willis

Committee: Gary L. May
Barbara A. Reilly
Charlotte G. Steeh

Electronic Version Approved:

Roy W. Bahl, Dean
Andrew Young School of Policy Studies
Georgia State University
August 2007

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank to my committee for enduring this long journey with me. Dr. Willis, my committee chair and academic touchstone, without your encouragement, patience, and guidance, I would certainly not have made my way back on the path to completion after many and long diversions. Dr. Willis, I extend my heartfelt appreciation. Dr. Reilly, thank you for helping me crystallize the idea for this research and finding the tools to make it happen. Dr. Steeh, thank you for sharing your genius in survey research methodology; your expertise and willingness to help was a lifesaver. Dr. May, because of your keen insight and suggestions this work is undoubtedly better than it ever would have been without you. You all have my utmost respect and sincerest appreciation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS iv

LIST OF TABLES ix

LIST OF FIGURES x

ABSTRACT xi

CHAPTER 1 1

Background *2*

Baby boomers begin to retire. *2*

Shortage of highly-skilled labor *3*

Shifting values *3*

Purpose of Study *4*

Significance of Study *5*

Theoretical. *5*

Practical *6*

Methodology *6*

Limitations of Study *7*

Key Definitions *7*

CHAPTER 2 10

Review of Literature *10*

Theories of Generations.....11

The problems with generations.....11

Generational cycle theory.....12

Research on Generations.....14

Work-family balance......15

Promotion. 17

Pay 17

*Use of technology***.**.....18

Education and learning.....19

Co-workers.....20

Job Satisfaction Theories.....22

Work motivation theories.....22

Two-factor theory of job satisfaction......23

Research on Job Satisfaction.....24

Summary and Indications of Literature 28

CHAPTER 3 30

Methodology 30

Data Collection.....30

Instrumentation.....31

Job descriptive index.....32

Reseacher-developed job facet scales *34*

Job in general scale and general information *34*

Hypotheses *35*

CHAPTER 4 38

Results *38*

Pretest *38*

Description of Sample *41*

Reliability *43*

Analyses *44*

Means and standard deviations of scales. *44*

Correlation of job facets with overall job satisfaction. *46*

Multiple regression analysis *47*

Crosstabulation analysis *50*

Summary of Results *53*

CHAPTER 5 ..... *55*

Discussion *55*

Disposition of hypotheses. *55*

Theoretical implications. *64*

Limitations and future research *65*

Conclusions.....*68*

REFERENCES 70

APPENDIX A: LETTER TO PARTICIPANTS 83

APPENDIX B: SURVEY 84

APPENDIX C: REMINDER MEMORANDUM 87

APPENDIX D: PRETEST 88

VITA 92

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

1. Strauss and Howe Generation Attributes...……... 13

2. Satisfaction Constructs for Job Facets..... 35

3. Reliability of Scales – Second Pretest …..……...……..... 40

4. Demographic Description of the Sample ……..... 42

5. Reliability of Scales ……..... 43

6. Means and Standard Deviations of Scales Adjusted for Number of Items..... 45

7. Correlation between Overall Job Satisfaction Job Facets……..... 46

8. Relationship of Overall Job Satisfaction and Job Facets for Generation X..... 47

9. Relationship of Overall Job Satisfaction Job Facets for Baby Boomers..... 48

10. Crosstabulation of Responses for Supervisor is "Bad"…….. 50

11. Crosstabulation of Responses for Pay is "Fair" ……..... 50

12. Crosstabulation of Responses for Work-Family Balance is "Excellent"…..... 51

13. Crosstabulation of Responses for Work-Family Balance is "Good" ……..... 51

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure Page

Figure 1: Four Recent U.S. Generational Cohorts.....9

ABSTRACT

PREDICTING THE EFFECTS OF EXTRINSIC AND INTRINSIC JOB FACTORS ON OVERALL JOB SATISFACTION FOR GENERATION X AND BABY BOOMERS IN A REGIONAL HEALTHCARE ORGANIZATION

BY

CHERYL J. CURRY

Committee Chair: Dr. Verna J. Willis

Major Department: Human Resources Development

This dissertation investigates the impact of intrinsic and extrinsic job factors on overall employee job satisfaction for two generation cohort groups, Baby Boomers and Generation X, in a small rural healthcare organization;. Eight job factors were selected for the study reflecting popular characteristics associated with the two groups. The job factors were classified as intrinsic or extrinsic using Hertzberg's two-factor theory. Intrinsic factors studied were; work itself, promotion, and recognition. Extrinsic factors studied were; pay, supervision, people, technology, and work-family balance. The Job Descriptive Index (JDI) scale was used to assess employee satisfaction with certain job factors; work itself, promotion, pay, supervision, and people. Scales similar to the JDI were created and used to measure satisfaction with technology, work-family balance, and recognition. The Job In General (JIG) scale was used to assess overall job satisfaction for each generation group. Multiple regression analysis was used to determine which of the job factors predicted of overall job satisfaction for each group.

Results of the study indicate that overall satisfaction is influenced a discreet combination of intrinsic and extrinsic factors for each group. Generation X's overall job satisfaction is predicted by extrinsic job factors, (work-family balance, and supervision) as well as intrinsic job factors, (work itself). Baby Boomers' overall job satisfaction is predicted by an intrinsic job factor, (recognition) as well as an extrinsic job factor (supervision). Smaller than optimal sample size reduces applicability of the results and imply the need for extended research in this area to confirm findings of this study.

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Owing to longer life spans and extended careers, persons from age 16 to 70 presently occupy the workplace at the same time, creating a situation whereby four distinct generations may be simultaneously in the employ of a solitary organization. The eldest group, called the Silent Generation, is comprised of persons born between 1925 and 1942. The presiding majority of the multi-generational workforce draws membership from the Baby Boomer group, persons born between 1943 and 1960, followed by Generation X, persons born between 1961 and 1981. The Millennial generation, persons born after 1981, complete today's multi-generational workforce. Members within each generation group have had their collective consciousness molded from the commonly shared world events and circumstances of their formative years. From these experiences, the groups have developed diverse sets of work and life values that must coexist amicably in organizations to promote a constructive and harmonious work environment. That these generation groups, specifically Baby Boomers and Generation X, have distinct and potentially antithetical work values that imply different job satisfiers for each group is the focus of this research. Dissecting a microcosm of this complex generational landscape will provide an understanding of the discrete work related characteristics that are featured in a multi-generation work environment and how to manage them in the larger scheme for the best overall results.

Background

The composition of the nation's labor force will change in such a way over the next two decades that it will create significant challenges for employers in terms of recruitment and retention of productive employees. Three factors that will contribute to changes in the labor force are: (1) retirement of Baby Boomers, (2) shortage of highly-skilled labor, and (3) shift in work values.

Baby boomers begin to retire. Baby Boomers, often referenced as the generational group with the largest membership in history, will begin retiring from the workforce in the next 5 years; while Generation X, distinguished as the cohort with the fewest members in recent history will become the dominant work force generation (Krug, 1998; O'Bannon, 2001; Zemke, Raines, & Filipczak, 2000). Predictions persist that the relative paucity of the succeeding Generation X cohort will render them a scarce, and consequently highly prized, commodity when retiring Baby Boomers exit the labor market (Finegold, Mohrman, & Spreitzer, 2002; Lloyd, 1996; O'Bannon, 2001; Rodriguez, Green, & Ree, 2003; Santos & Cox, 2000) Staffing and re-staffing positions vacated by Baby Boomers will be tremendously expensive for organizations. Estimates that companies can expect to absorb costs equal to 30% or more of job salary for training, recruiting, and lost productivity associated with replacing an employee have been reported (U.S. Department of Labor, 2005). In a survey of 206 companies, nearly 50% estimated turnover costs at $10,000 per employee and 20% projected that turnover expense per employee could be as high as $30,000 (Sunoo, 1998).

Shortage of highly-skilled labor. The American Management Association (2003) in a survey of business executives found that more than 30% of the leaders assessed the availability of skilled labor to be in short supply presently and 35% expect skilled labor to be scarce in the future. Job vacancy rates as high as 40% have been reported in healthcare organizations, particularly for direct care positions (i.e., nurses, physical therapists, etc.) and the shortage in this sector is expected to continue for the foreseeable future (Goodin, 2003; Jodi Schneider, 2003). Possibly exacerbating this situation is the prospect that Baby Boomers, particularly the most educated and highly skilled, are expected to exit the workforce quickly upon reaching retirement age since may they may be in the best financial situation to do so (Carnevale, 2005). Exodus of the Baby Boomers and their cache of organizational intelligence could leave employers with a formidable occupational skill and personnel deficit (Carter, 2004; Harris, 2005)

*Shifting values***.** Baby Boomers are often thought to place work as first priority sometimes sacrificing the joy and needs of family to achieve career advancement and status on the job (Krug, 1998; Santos & Cox, 2002; Watson, 2002). On the other hand, work-family balance, technology, and the ability to work independently are a few job factors that appear to be important for Generation X, which sharply contrasts to the "work is my life" mantra heralded supreme by Baby Boomers. Generation X does not seem to embrace the austere protestant work ethic that has defined the American work attitude in the past; they appear to be less loyal to organizations and more likely to change jobs if they are not satisfied (Dunn-Cane, Gonzalez, & Stewart, 1999;

Kupperschmidt, 2000; Lehman, 2003; Sellers, 2002). For example, in a poll conducted by The Catalyst Group, 66% of Generation X persons surveyed said that they would be likely to leave their current position if the work schedule was not satisfactory (Worklife Report, 2002), which seems markedly different from Baby Boomers who often stay with a single employer almost the whole of their work career regardless of perceived work inconveniences (Dendinger, Adams, & Jacobson, 2005; Harris, 2005). Shifts in work values such as those discussed here could have a huge impact on job satisfaction and strongly indicate the need for creative and effective organizational policies and practices to attract and retain loyal employees.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study is to examine the effect of intrinsic and extrinsic job factors on overall job satisfaction for Generation X and Baby Boomers in a healthcare environment. Identifying which factors act as job satisfiers for employees and implementing relevant associated initiatives to take advantage of these job satisfiers will assist in moderating consequences of disruptive organizational issues such as employee turnover and low productivity. Several research questions emerge as relevant in this train of thought.

1) What are the critical job satisfiers that are linked to overall job satisfaction for Generation X and Baby Boomers?
2) How are these satisfiers different between groups?

3) Are the satisfiers for Generation X and Baby Boomers consistent with popular characterizations of the two groups?

Research conducted in this study will attempt to answer these questions.

Significance of Study

Theoretical. The idea of "generations" is regularly set forth to delineate and categorize people, yet social scientists have given little depth of thought to the theoretical development of this area of interest (Pilcher, 1994). Karl Mannheim's essay on generations, first published in 1929, has long been the preamble for theoretical discussions on generations (C. C. Dunham, 1998; Pilcher, 1994; Roberts & Lang, 1985); and more recently, Strauss and Howe's theory of generational cycle has garnered noteworthy attention on the subject (Jurkiewicz & Bradley, 2002) however, the opportunity to enrich this theoretical topic has yet to be fully exhausted, ergo the significance of the present study, intended to add to the foundation of generational cohort theory, is sustained. Of particular interest in this research is whether generational groups exhibit distinct characteristics driven by discrete job satisfiers, and how these characteristics align with popular group descriptions, such as the unique peer personalities defined by Strauss and Howe. Also of interest, theoretically speaking, is distinguishing which characteristic type, intrinsic or extrinsic as defined in Herzberg's dual classification schema of motivation, influences job satisfaction for different generational groups.

Practical. Based on the popular profile of Baby Boomers, a highly fervent need for accomplishment and advancement contributes to a tendency toward "workaholic" behavior in this group. Conversely, for Generation X, work-family balance, good work technology, and the ability to work independently are considered vital to job satisfaction. That the job satisfiers are thought to be different for Baby Boomers and Generation X implies that organizational supports and initiatives must be multi-dimensional to satisfy employees from both groups when they are employed concurrently in a single organization. To address this condition, Human Resource professionals must be deliberate and skillful in the design and application of recruitment, development, and retention plans to keep a top-quality workforce in place. Practically speaking, this study is intended to identify job satisfiers that are most salient to overall job satisfaction for Generation X and Baby Boomers; information that can be used by Human Resource professionals to craft effective organizational policies, programs, and processes to help maintain a loyal and productive multi-generational work environment.

Methodology

Job satisfaction surveys consisting of items from the Job Descriptive Index (JDI), the Job In General Scale (JIG), several items designed by the researcher to assess satisfaction with certain job facets, plus demographic questions were compiled into a survey that was used as instrumentation for this study. The JDI and JIG scales are renowned and have been well tested over the years as tools for evaluating job satisfaction (Spector, 1997). To ensure that the researcher designed items were acceptable for use in

the study, pretests were conducted to check internal reliability and refine usability as needed. The final surveys were distributed to 244 employees of a rural healthcare organization in the southeastern United States. Participants were male and female employees from diverse racial groups working in various job disciplines representing a range of ages and income levels. Simple t-test, multiple regression, and crosstabulation techniques were utilized to analyze survey data.

Limitations of Study

Several limitations of this study are noted: (1) Attempts were made to obtain a larger sample, however the final sample size was smaller than is preferred for application of multiple regression analysis. (2) Though the selected organization is a typical healthcare establishment, lack of diversity with regard to demographic profile (i.e., heavy concentration of female participants, all rural versus cross-section including urban and suburban, etc.) dilutes external validity of the results. (3) Scales for recognition, work-family balance, and technology job facets were designed by the researcher in a format similar to the oft-used Job Descriptive Index (JDI) and yielded measurements within an acceptable range for internal reliability on the pretest; however, lack of abundant empirical use of the researcher-designed scales is considered a shortcoming. (4) Inability to inarguably define birth year ranges for generational group membership introduces additional weakness in the study.

Key Definitions

The following definitions will be useful for this study.

Baby Boomers - Persons born between 1943-1960

Generation X - Persons born between 1961-1981.

Extrinsic or Hygiene Factors - Factors related to job context; examples are company policy, supervision, relationship with supervisor, work conditions, salary, relationship with peers, personal life, and status. For the purposes of this research, extrinsic factors include the following; pay, coworkers, supervision, work-family balance, and technology.

Intrinsic or Motivator Factors - Factors related to job content, such as achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility, advancement, and growth. For the purposes of this research, the intrinsic factors include the following; work, promotion, and recognition.

Generation - A generation can be defined as an "identifiable group (cohort) that shares birth years, age location and significant life events at critical development stages (times)" p. 66 (Kupperschmidt, 2000).

Categorization of generations into cohorts defined by common values and characteristics has been extremely popular since Baby Boomers came of age in the 1960s. While the attributes, and to some degree the group names, associated with generational cohorts of the last century are relatively consistent, consensus on the exact birth year ranges for each group is somewhat less consistent. To provide uniformity for this study, a brief summary of the four recent U.S. generations and their associated birth year ranges as they are referred to in this research are presented in Figure 1.

Four U.S. Generations

Silent Generation
- Birth Year Range: 1925-1942
- Defining Events: Economic growth, Cold War, Nuclear Power
- Key Influences: WWII and The Great Depression
- Characteristics: Practical, loyal, respects authority

Baby Boom Generation
- Birth Year Range: 1943-1960
- Defining Events: Prosperity, Civil Rights Movement, Vietnam War
- Key Influences: Television, Materialism, Telephone
- Characteristics: Driven by work and professional achievement

Generation X
- Birth Year Range: 1961-1981
- Defining Events: Recession, Iran Hostage Crisis, Watergate
- Key Influences: Television, Personal Computers, Internet, Video Games
- Characteristics: Independent, informal, family-oriented

Millennial Generation
- Birth Year Range: 1982-2003
- Defining events: Globalization
- Key Influences: Shock/Reality TV, Internet, Compact Discs, Mobile Phones
- Characteristics: Confident, civic minded, technology savvy

Figure 1: Four Recent U.S. Generational Cohorts
Adapted from Strauss, W., & Howe, N. (1991). The Cycle of Generations. *American Demographics, 13*(4), 24-52.

CHAPTER 2

Review of Literature

This research focuses on job satisfaction for Baby Boomers and Generation X with two key theoretical underpinnings—generational theory (e.g., Strauss and Howe's Cycle of Generations) and job satisfaction theory (e.g., Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory). Generational groups exhibit marked dissimilarity from each other over the course of a lifespan that is not fully attributable to the aging and maturity process (Mannheim, 1929/1952; Strauss & Howe, 1991a). This contrast may imply that one generation group will be motivated by different job satisfiers than the other (Dendinger et al., 2005; Strauss & Howe, 1991a). Knowledge, therefore, of how these differences manifest in terms of overall job satisfaction is critical, because of their potential influence on important organizational elements such as training (Bartlett, 2001), turnover (Lambert, Hogan, & Barton, 2001), and organizational commitment (Camp, 1994)

These important organizational elements inevitably affect bottom line organizational goals such as cost containment and productivity. The following review of literature describes the state of research in three areas relative to the research topic: (1) generations theory, (2) generational characteristics, and (3) job satisfaction. Summarized briefly are theories of generations proffered by Karl Mannheim and more recently by the team of Strauss and Howe. Research studies on the characteristics of generations, specifically the so-called Baby Boomers and Generation X, are examined, followed by a discussion on job satisfaction theory, with primary focus on Herzberg's two-factor theory of job satisfaction and related research.

Theories of Generations

The problems with generations. Karl Mannheim's thoughts on generation units, presented in his essay titled, The Problem of Generations, provided early seedling for a theory of generation. Mannheim's composition, considered by some as the seminal work on the socio-historical stratification of generations, (Corsten, 1999; C. C. Dunham, 1998; Kubicek & Wagner, 2002; Pilcher, 1994; Roberts & Lang, 1985; Scott, 2000), proposes that persons born during the same time period such that their lifecycles coincide and they experience the same defining events in history, share a stratified consciousness that binds them together as a generational unit (1928/1952). Historical exposure to shared experiences is critical to the development of a generational cohort. In other words, the mere act of being born during the same time period does not automatically assign persons to the collective consciousness that distinguishes a generation; instead, sharing common social experiences is the chief criteria for membership in the generational cohort. Interaction of human beings in the social structure creates the distinctiveness that separates generational effects from age effects (Mannheim, 1928/1952).

While Mannheim's work is hailed as a highly influential sociological effort toward a theory of generations, shortcomings have been noted. Pilcher (1994) pointed out that "one of the limitations of Mannheim's work is that it does not contain an empirical model or any guidelines as to how the investigation of generational phenomena is to proceed, aside from stressing that recognition of social and cultural factors in the production of social generations should be paramount in terms of their investigation" (p. 492). Another

criticism of Mannheim's work is the lack of operational definitions. Mannheim uses a diverse and complex blending of qualitative experience with quantitative components of age and chronology to generically define generations but does not specifically characterize or categorize generational cohorts, making it difficult to operationalize the concept for research (Scott, 2000).

*Generational cycle theory***.** Strauss and Howe's (1991a) richly defined model, called generational cycle theory, offers a retrospective socio-historical view of generation cohort development. In the review of Strauss and Howe's work on generations, the following definitions are useful.

> *Generation or Generational Cohort* – group whose length approximates the span of a phase of life and whose boundaries are fixed by peer personality.
>
> *Peer Personality* – "generational persona recognized and determined by (1) common age location; (2) common beliefs and behaviors; and (3) perceived membership in a common generation." (p. 430)

Strauss and Howe published their comprehensive book on generations in 1991 drawing from a plethora of resources dating back to the beginning of recorded history. They navigated back through time to uncover patterns of past generations that provide insight into recurring generational characteristics. Strauss and Howe (1991b) observed the presence of four distinct generational peer personalities, which they called civic, adaptive, idealist, and reactive. These peer personalities are purported to have

reincarnated on a cyclical basis in the same sequence since 1584. According to Strauss and Howe, each generation, past and new, exhibits the core characteristics of one of these peer personalities and follows a pattern of development based on age location (1991b) during their lifespan. Strauss and Howe's unique peer personalities and associated attributes related to current generations are presented in Table 1 below.

Table 1

Strauss and Howe's Generation Attributes

Generation	Peer Personality	Positive Attributes	Negative Attributes
Silent Generation	Adaptive	Caring Open-Minded Expert	Indecisive Guilt-Ridden Neurotic
Baby Boomers	Idealist	Principled Resolute Creative	Ruthless Selfish Arrogant
Generation X	Reactive	Savvy Perceptive Practical	Amoral Pecuniary Uncultured
Millennials	Civic	Rational Selfless Competent	Overbold Unreflective Insensitive

Adapted from Strauss, W., & Howe, N. (1991). *Generations: The history of America's future, 1584 to 2069*. New York: Quill.

Strauss and Howe's generational cycle theory states that *reactive* peer personalities, such as Generation X, exhibit values and behaviors consistent with alienation and pragmatism, while i*dealists* peer personalities, such as Baby Boomers, are moralistic and visionary. Strauss and Howe's assertion that each generation has its own

personality discrete from age characteristics is in concert with Mannheim's opinion that biological age progression does not fully account for generational effect.

The model presented by Strauss and Howe provides a framework and context based on historical position of the generation group and makes predictions about their associated personality and behavior, an aspect not explicit in Mannheim's theoretical writings on the subject of generations theory (DeMartini, 1985; Pilcher, 1994; Scott, 2000). Even so, a search of major academic databases generated few research studies involving Strauss and Howe's generational cycle theory, though a number of book reviews and commentaries were found to be generally supportive of their works (Bowman, 1991; Griffin, 2002; Higham, 1993; Jurkiewicz & Bradley, 2002). Strauss and Howe move forward the quest for a theory of generations. However, the absence of research studies confirming the theory strongly implies the need for further study to assess whether generations do indeed exhibit the unique characteristics of the so-called *peer personalities* and that these characteristics are predictable and repetitive in emerging generation groups. Strauss and Howe lead the way in an absorbing journey through history with their in-depth description and analysis of the past generational influences and behaviors. However, the true prognostic value of this theory is diminished if it serves only in retrospect.

Research on Generations

Some studies on generational characteristics have focused on job and life factors that are salient to Generation X and Baby Boomers and whether those factors are

significantly different by comparison. Some of the key areas investigated in research studies with respect to Generation X and Baby Boomers are values (Burke, 1994; Eskilson & Wiley, 1999; Smola & Sutton, 2002); view of the future (Arnett, 2000); motivation;(Jurkiewicz & Brown, 1998) training (Bova & Kroth, 2001); organizational commitment and willingness to turnover (Finegold et al., 2002); organizational ethics (Faber, 2001); leadership behavior preferences (Rodriguez et al., 2003); technology (Shah, Kwak, & Holbert, 2001), and attitude measurement(Manolis & Levin, 1997).

Work-family balance. That work-family balance is so vitally important to Generation X is highlighted in the results of research conducted by Burke (1994). Analysis of questionnaire responses from 216 business students revealed that Generation X rated a balanced lifestyle and challenging work among the most important job factors while company perks and community status were among the least important. Research studies have shown that when Generation X members were asked to contemplate what would make their lives satisfied, they consistently pointed to family and personal relationships as the ultimate source of happiness (Arnett, 2000; Eskilson & Wiley, 1999). In a study conducted by Arnett (2000) using interviews and questionnaires to explore participants' views of the future, Generation X declared that being in a satisfying personal relationship, expressly marriage, was of paramount importance to the fulfillment of their future goals. Arnett also noted that Generation X participants expressed great confidence that they would do better than their parents in holding up the institution of marriage, owing perhaps to the first hand view of their parents' (who were primarily

Baby Boomers) failed unions which produced the highest divorce rate in history during the childhood years of Generation X. This sentiment of family importance for Generation X is accentuated in research conducted by Eskilson and Wiley (1999) to investigate the aspirations and expectations of Generation X college students. The researchers questioned 462 Generation X college students regarding their values and goals. Students rated "having a warm and caring relationship with another adult" and "having a comfortable relationship with original family" among their top personal goals.

Further supporting that work-family balance is highly valued by Generation X are findings from several research studies including work by Smola and Sutton (2002) that investigated work values in a cross-country survey of 350 individuals. Using a 174-item questionnaire, researchers found that Generation X was less likely to agree with the notion that "work should be one of the most important parts of a person's life," while Baby Boomers were more apt to strongly agree with the idea that work should be of highest priority in one's life. The researchers also found that Generation X reported a strong desire to balance work and personal goals. Another study by Finegold, et al. (2002) examined age as a predictor of job commitment and willingness to turnover through factor analysis of survey responses from 3,000 plus technical employees in six organizations. Satisfaction with work-life balance was more strongly linked to job commitment for Generation X-aged employees than for Baby Boomer-aged employees. Finegold et al. (2002) also reported that Generation X as had a stronger negative relationship between willingness to change jobs and certain job facets, specifically,

technical skill development and individual pay for performance, than did Baby Boomers. However, the researchers warned against overstating these distinctions, noting that the statistical significance of the differences were relatively small. Other research lends support to the notion that Generation X favors options that allow for greater flexibility in their work schedule which might be useful in achieving better work family balance. Rodriguez, Green, and Ree (2003) analyzed quantitative data from 805 survey participants and reported that Generation X preferred work with flexible hours versus Baby Boomers who preferred work with regular hours.

Promotion. Equivocal findings related to Generation X and Baby Boomer's desire for promotion have been reported. Smola and Sutton (2002) found that Generation X expressed greater desire for advancement than Baby Boomers; likewise, Montana and Lenaghan (1999) reported in their survey of top motivators, that Generation X ranked chance for promotion higher than did Baby Boomers. On the other hand, another study found Generation X and Baby Boomers to be of similar mind with regard to desire for advancement. Jurkiewicz (2000) compared the importance of 15 job factors, including chance for promotion, for Generation X and Baby Boomer groups. Employees (n = 241) from five organizations were asked to rank the job factors from 1 (most important) to 15 (least important). No significant differences were found in how Generation X and Baby Boomers ranked chance for promotion.

Pay. Generation X versus Baby Boomer comparisons concerning relative pay importance have generated varied results and conclusions. Smola and Sutton (2002)

found that the difference in responses for Generation X and Baby Boomers with regard to the importance of pay as a standard for evaluating work value was not significant. Similarly, there were no generational differences observed for the relationship between pay and motivation in studies conducted by Jurkiewicz and Brown (Jurkiewicz & Brown, 1998) and Montana and Lenaghan (1999). However, somewhat contrasting results were reported by Finegold, Mohrman, and Spreitzer in their 2002 study where they found a stronger relationship between pay and willingness to change jobs for Generation X as compared to Baby Boomers.

*Use of technology***.** Surprisingly few research studies delved into the impact of technology with regard to Generation X, considering that the cohort is commonly accepted as the first PC literate generation. Research that has been conducted in this area implies that some generational differences do exist, particularly related to Internet use. Shah, Kwak, and Holbert (2001) used secondary analysis of data from a 1999 lifestyle survey to explore technology preferences among generational cohort groups. They found that the use of the Internet for exchange of information and financial management was a significant predictor of life satisfaction for Generation X, but not for Baby Boomers. Rodriguez, Green, and Ree (2003) investigated preferred behaviors around five generational themes of fulfillment, technology, flexibility, monetary benefits, and work environment. Twenty-five forced-choice paired statements were presented on the survey of 805 managers. Participants were asked to select which method they preferred to use to get certain information by choosing from statements such as the following:

Surf the Internet to find the best prices on computer equipment.

or

Use the telephone to find the best prices on computer equipment.

Through MANOVA analysis, the researchers found significant differences between Generation X and Baby Boomer responses related to technology. Consistent with results reported by Shah et al. (2001), Generation X subjects preferred using the Internet to find and purchase items, while Baby Boomers preferred using the telephone for the same activities.

Education and learning. Generation X's desire for informal education and skill development versus formal education is consistently exposed in prior research. According to results reported in a study conducted by Eskilson and Wiley (1999), mastery of a skill, rather than formal education, was rated highly by Generation X and perceived as a necessity for the future. Finegold, Mohrman, and Spreitzer (2002), in their study reported that Generation X-aged employees were significantly more likely to express a willingness to "job hop" if they were not satisfied with skill development in an organization than were their Baby Boomer counterparts.

Furthermore, research shows that Generation X favor a flexible informal learning environment that allows for hands on interaction. Arnett (2000) revealed that Generation X did not view formal education (e.g., college) as a necessity or guarantee of future success; a point further supported by the fact that college degrees earned by Generation X fall short of Baby Boomers proportionately when compared at the same time in life

(Mitchell, 1998; O'Bannon, 2001). Underscoring findings by Arnett (2000) are results reported by Bova and Kroth (2001) in a study of educational preference for Generation X. Action learning, which is a less rigidly structured learning process whereby groups of individuals convene to learn from each other's experiences, was found to be the most preferred for Generation X. Formal earning was reported as the least favored learning environment by Generation X in the study.

Co-workers. Multi-generational interaction in the workplace has gained considerable attention as four generations, (Silent Generation, Baby Boomers, Generation X, and Millennials), share the workplace (Harris, 2005; S. L. Hatfield, 2002). When generational groups interact on a regular basis, conflicting values are more readily exposed often leading to inter-generational tension and ineffective work relations (Dunn-Cane et al., 1999; Kupperschmidt, 2000; Santos & Cox, 2000; Santos & Cox, 2002). Santos and Cox researched inter-generational tension in a study of 413 multi-generational nurses. An occupational stress survey was used to evaluate stress, strain, and coping for participants, then compared by generation to determine if occupational stress was significantly different for the groups. Semi-structured focus group sessions were also conducted to clarify sources of tension. Results revealed that Generation X not only had significantly lower stress scores than Baby Boomers but expressed more positive perceptions of their Baby Boomer coworkers than the reverse (Santos & Cox, 2002).

In summary, the literature yields a number of potential job satisfiers that may influence overall job satisfaction for Generation X and for Baby Boomers. Generation X

employees, in comparison to Baby Boomers, appear less likely to view work as the most important part of their life (O'Bannon, 2001; Smola & Sutton, 2002), more likely to pursue work-life balance as a priority (Arnett, 2000; Burke, 1994; Eskilson & Wiley, 1999; Faber, 2001; Finegold et al., 2002; Smola & Sutton, 2002), and more likely to be motivated by opportunities for promotion and pay (Finegold et al., 2002; Smola & Sutton, 2002). Additionally, Generation X shows preference for informal educational methods such as action learning (Bova & Kroth, 2001) and on-the-job training (Eskilson & Wiley, 1999; Finegold et al., 2002), exhibits greater affinity for use of the Internet for work and personal tasks (Rodriguez et al., 2003; Shah et al., 2001), expresses a stronger desire for flexible work arrangements (Rodriguez et al., 2003), and exhibits less stress than Baby Boomers in multi-generational work settings (Santos & Cox, 2000). Baby Boomers on the other hand, seem to regard work as central to their lives (O'Bannon, 2001; Smola & Sutton, 2002); be more loyal to organizations and less inclined to job hop when work conditions are imperfect(Igbaria & Guimaraes, 1999); place high value on recognition (Cherrington & Wixom, 1983; Dendinger et al., 2005); sometimes show a preference for printed resources (i.e., newspaper) or telephone over the Internet for certain work and personal tasks (Shah et al., 2001), and are well-educated, having obtained college degrees in greater numbers compared to other generations (Mitchell, 1998).

Job Satisfaction Theories

Job satisfaction falls under the canopy of work motivation theory which is further divided into two major categories, content motivation theory, and process motivation theory. Process theories of motivation deal with the manner in which variables interact with job characteristics to produce job satisfaction. Content theories of motivation focus on understanding factors that influence job satisfaction and provide the theoretical keystone for this study.

Work motivation theories. Three theories occupy the bulk of mindshare related to content motivation theory; (1) Hierarchy of needs theory presented by Abraham Maslow, (2) Existence, Relatedness, and Growth (ERG) theory by Clayton Alderfer, and (3) The two-factor theory of job satisfaction proposed by Frederick Herzberg. Maslow's hierarchy of needs theory, the inaugural work in the area of content motivation theory, contends that human behavior is influenced by the state of various biological and cultural needs (1943). Maslow proposed that the hierarchy of human needs ranged from low to high in the following order; physiological, security, social, self-esteem, and self-actualization; whereby lower order needs must be satisfied before higher order needs can be addressed (1943). Alderfer's Existence, Relatedness, and Growth (ERG) theory is another well-known content motivation. ERG theory contends that human needs are fulfilled in hierarchical order beginning with physiological or existence needs, followed by interpersonal or relatedness needs, and finally personal growth needs. As needs on the lower level are met, movement commences upward on the need ladder. Need frustration

occurs when need desires are not met at one step on the need hierarchy ladder. When this situation occurs, emphasis and attention revert to the immediate prior lower level step for which need desires were met, before another attempt is made to fulfill the need at the next higher level (Alderfer, 1969).

In 1959, amid the works of Maslow and Alderfer, the two-factor theory of job satisfaction was introduced by Frederick Herzberg and colleagues Bernard Mausner, and Barbara Snyderman. The basic tenet of the theory is that job satisfaction is moderated by one set of work factors and job dissatisfaction by another set. The simplicity of the theory renders it easy for practical application and conducive for research in many areas related to work motivation. As it is the case that the two-factor theory provides theoretical underpinnings for this research, it is appropriate to expound on the theory in some detail and discuss some of the prior research in which the theoretical principles have been empirically examined.

Two-factor theory of job satisfaction. The two-factor theory of job satisfaction submitted by Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman in 1959 is one of the most widely referenced and often studied content motivation theories. Two-factor theory holds that two different sets of needs are implicated in motivating human beings—biological and growth. Needs emanating from the biological side are driven by man's animalistic nature. For example, humans require food for sustenance; a person endeavors to make money to buy food, in which case money becomes the specific need driven from the basic biological requirement for sustenance. Growth needs emanate from humankind's unique

ability to achieve and grow mentally. According to Herzberg, growth needs can be fulfilled through achieving goals or experiencing a sense of accomplishment such as through recognition, responsibility, and advancement.

The two-factor theory was developed from a study of 203 engineers and accountants. Critical incident method was utilized, whereby subjects were asked to describe situations where they felt exceptionally good or exceptionally bad about their job. Results of the study revealed two categories of job impacting factors which were termed "motivators" and "hygienes." Motivators, characterized as intrinsic in nature, include job content factors such as achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility, advancement, and growth. Hygienes, considered extrinsic in nature, include job context factors not specific to the work itself such as company policy, supervision, relationship with supervisor, work conditions, salary, peer relationships, personal life, and status. According to the theory, the presence of motivators (intrinsic factors) positively influences overall job satisfaction; conversely, the absence of hygienes (extrinsic factors) contributes to overall job dissatisfaction. It is alleged however, that the presence of extrinsic factors does not necessarily contribute to overall job satisfaction.

Research on Job Satisfaction

Herzberg's two-factor theory has generated enormous interest and inquiry from researchers, both supporting and challenging the theory. Research supporting Hertzberg's two-factor theory has been reported in numerous studies examining job satisfaction among educators (Iiacqua, Schumacher, & Li, 1991; Gaziel, 1986; Knoop 1994); in

multicultural settings (Adigun & Stephenson, 1992; Park, Lovrich, & Soden, 1988); as a measure of quality improvement programs (Utley, Westbrook, & Turner, 1997); among government workers (Leach & Westbrook, 2000); and for older engineers (Lord, 2002).

Iiacqua, Schumacher, and Li (1995) used survey data from college faculty to test Herzberg's theory and determine the relationship between demographic variables and job satisfaction. Survey questions were posed to solicit demographic information and ascertain job satisfaction with various intrinsic and extrinsic factors. Iiacqua, Schumacher, and Li found that demographic variables in the study, such as age, gender, and education, were not linked to job satisfaction. Also, the researchers concluded that intrinsic factors were positively related to job satisfaction and extrinsic factors were aligned with job dissatisfaction and certain factors, such as evaluation of administration, tended to reflect both intrinsic and extrinsic values.

Knoop (1994) investigated the relationship between work values and job satisfaction among secondary school teachers. Hatfield, Robinson, and Huseman's Job Perception Scale (1985) was paired with an instrument modeled after Smith, Kendall and Hulin's Job Descriptive Index(1969) to measure overall job satisfaction and job facet satisfaction respectively. Through factor analysis, five sets of work values were identified; intrinsic work-related, intrinsic work outcomes, extrinsic job related, extrinsic job outcome and extrinsic people-related. Multiple regression analysis was used to identify which variables in the work value groups were predictors of overall job satisfaction. Variables in the study that were akin to Herzberg intrinsic satisfiers, such as

achievement, responsibility, and recognition, were more positively associated with job satisfaction thereby supporting Herzberg's contention that intrinsic factors drive job satisfaction.

In a study of technical employees from several organizations, Utley, Westbrook, and Turner (1997) found that intrinsic factors and high overall satisfaction were more likely present in companies with successful quality management programs, while companies with no quality management programs tended to have more extrinsic factors present and higher dissatisfaction. Results of this study were consistent with the two-factor theory premise that intrinsic factors are associated with job satisfaction and hygienes (extrinsic factors), are associated with job dissatisfaction.

Several studies provide partial support for Herzberg's two-factor theory, many sustaining the theory precept that intrinsic factors are linked to job satisfaction and often denying the theory tenet that extrinsic factors are the sole moderators of job dissatisfaction (Adigun & Stephenson, 1992; Ewen, Smith, Hulin, & Locke, 1966; Maidani, 1991). Ewen, et al (1966), with a sample of 793 male employees from industrial and business organizations, utilized the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) to assess satisfaction with work itself, pay, and promotion. When correlated with overall satisfaction measures using the General Motors Faces Scale, the researchers found that intrinsic factors were strongly linked to overall job satisfaction as suggested by Herzberg. However, in conflict with Herzberg, they also found that some intrinsic factors such as the work itself and promotion were more strongly linked to overall dissatisfaction than extrinsic factors.

In a comparative study of private and public sector employees, Maidani (1991) incorporated Herzberg's theory to evaluate job satisfaction for the two groups. Results indicated that for both sectors, intrinsic factors were linked to satisfaction, which is in concert with Herzberg's assertions. Contradictory to the two-factor theory, Maidani found that extrinsic factors were also a source of job satisfaction for both private and public sector employees. In another study, equivocal findings were reported in a study conducted by Adigun and Stephenson (1992) examining sources of job satisfaction among British and Nigerian workers. They found that extrinsic job factors were more important to Nigerians while intrinsic factors were more important to job satisfaction for British workers. While the results provide partial support for the two-factor theory in some regard, the researchers cautioned against the generalization of Herzberg theory from one culture to another.

Though popular and frequently used as the theoretical basis for research on job satisfaction and in practical applications related to employee job satisfaction, the two-factor theory is not without criticism. To evaluate job satisfaction, Herzberg and colleagues used the critical incident method, in which interviews were conducted to ascertain how employees felt about a particular recent job situation. Concerns have been raised that this method too narrowly limits consideration of relevant job factors by only including recent job events and excluding intermediate term events that might be relevant (House & Wigdor, 1967; Joseph Schneider & Locke, 1971). Furthermore, even though Herzberg cataloged more than 3,500 job-related events, still the list can not be considered

complete. The nearly infinite number of job-impacting variables makes it impractical to consider every factor combination. Recent research and thought leadership has contemplated job factors and preferences not previously emphasized by Herzberg such as work-family balance (Ezra & Deckman, 1996; Hall & Richter, 1988; Igbaria & Guimaraes, 1999; Saltzstein, Ting, & Saltzstein, 2001; Scandura & Lankau, 1997)learning preferences (Bartlett, 2001; Bova & Kroth, 2001; Finegold et al., 2002; Glisson & Durick, 1988), and use of technology (Shah et al., 2001) (Hiroshi & Madeline, 2005; Johanna & Victoria, 2003; Rodriguez et al., 2003; Spotts, Bowman, & Mertz, 1997). Reservations have also been noted about the generalizability of the results since subjects of the study were primarily engineers (House & Wigdor, 1967) It may not be altogether reasonable to expect that factors influencing job satisfaction among engineers would translate perfectly to all job disciplines. Even with these concerns raised, the two-factor theory still has significant value in guiding the study of job satisfaction if limitations are appropriately acknowledged (Gordon, Pryor, & Harris, 1974; Phillipchuk & Whittaker, 1996; Tietjen & Myers, 1998; Utley et al., 1997).

Summary and Indications of Literature

Accepting that there are general characteristic differences among generational cohorts, it is conceivable that job values would vary by generation groups as well. For instance, research studies imply that work-family balance and technology are important job satisfiers for Generation X, while recognition is believed to be a more salient job satisfier for Baby Boomers. As these two groups presently co-exist in the same labor

market, it is critical that organizations understand which job factors drive satisfaction for each of the groups, so that appropriate supports and initiatives can be implemented to ensure the most productive and harmonious work environment. Strauss and Howe's generational cycle model distinguishes the character and personality of Generation X and Baby Boomers in such a way that potentially important job factors for each respective group can be extrapolated for intense examination and practical application in organizations. Herzberg's two-factor theory of job satisfaction offers a simple means of classifying these job factors to facilitate empirical research of their impact on job satisfaction by generation group. Aligning Strauss and Howe's generational cycle and Herzberg's two-factor theory provides a unique standpoint from which to launch an investigation of job satisfaction for Generation X and Baby Boomers.

CHAPTER 3

Methodology

This study was undertaken to examine the predictive effects of extrinsic and intrinsic job facets on overall job satisfaction for Generation X and Baby Boomers. Survey methodology was used to collect data from employees of a small rural healthcare organization in the southeastern United States. The Job Descriptive Index (JDI) (Smith et al., 1969) plus several items constructed by the researcher were used to assess satisfaction with individual job facets. Overall job satisfaction was measured using the Job In General Scale (JIG), also by Smith et al., (1969). Participants' generation group affiliation was determined from respondents' self-reported year of birth. Other demographic data such as race, gender, income, and job category were also collected by the survey. Reviews of the data collection process and of the data analysis methods are presented in this chapter along with a description of participants, instrumentation, and variables.

Data Collection

Subjects for the study were employees of a regional healthcare organization in the southeastern United States. Employees were reasonably diverse with respect to demographic factors such as age, race, and income; however, employees of the organizations, and consequently survey participants, were mainly female. Based on self-reported birth year, a fairly evenly balance of Generation X and Baby Boomer employees were represented in the organization, as well as some of employees from the Millennial and Silent Generations; the latter two groups were only noted peripherally as they were

not the focus of this study. Participants held job functions typical of a healthcare organization, including medical staff such as nurses and physical therapists, as well as support personnel in areas such as administration, maintenance, and foodservice.

With approval from the organization's Human Resource Director, survey packets were distributed via company mail to all 244 employees working at the healthcare facility. The survey packet contained a letter from the researcher inviting the employee to participate in the voluntary survey (see Appendix A), the survey (see Appendix B), and a self-addressed pre-stamped envelope to return the completed survey. To protect the confidentiality of the participations, they were not required to provide their name or any other identifying information on the survey. Completed surveys were sent directly to the researcher, bypassing direct organizational scrutiny that might impair confidentiality and reduce candid input. Prior to the close of the survey period, a reminder memorandum (see Appendix C) was sent to all 244 employees thanking them if they had already returned the survey and urging those who had not completed the survey to do so.

Instrumentation

For this study, a single consolidated survey was compiled which included the abridged Job Descriptive Index, the abridged Job In General scale, several researcher-designed job facet satisfaction scales, and a general information section. The Job Description Index (JDI) was used to measure satisfaction with five job facets; work itself, pay, promotional opportunities, supervision, and co-workers. Items constructed in the format of the JDI were developed by the researcher to examine satisfaction with three job

facets not included on the JDI; namely, work-family balance, recognition, and technology. To measure employees' overall job satisfaction, the Job In General (JIG) scale was included as part of the survey instrument. A general information section was included to collect employee demographic data and additional comments.

Job descriptive index. After more than three decades, the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) remains one of the most popular research tools to measure employee satisfaction with five common job facets; (1) Work on Present Job, (2) Present Pay, (3) Opportunities for Promotion, (4) Supervision, and (5) Co-Workers. The index consists of scales for each job facet area where respondents are asked to think about their job and then decide how well each of a given list of words or phrases describes a particular facet of their job. Respondents choose "Yes" if the words or phrase describes the job facet in their current work environment; "No" if it does not; or "Undecided" if they cannot decide. Answers are coded as positive, negative, or neutral based on the context and wording of the item. Positive answers are assigned a value of 3, negative answers are assigned a value of 0, and neutral answers are assigned a value of 1. Both "Yes" and "No" responses may be either positive or negative based on the context of the item presented. For example, respondents may be asked if they think the people they work with are boring. For this item, if the answer is "Yes," the item response would be coded as negative and assigned a value of 0. If the answer "No," the item response would be coded as positive and assigned a value of 3. Similarly, respondents may be asked if they think the people they work with are helpful. If the answer "Yes," the item response

would be coded as positive and assigned a value of 3. If the answer "No," the item response would be coded as negative and assigned a value of 0. In either of the two examples above, if the respondent answers "Undecided," a point value of 1 is assigned. Once responses are coded as positive, negative or neutral, point values are assigned and totaled for each scale to obtain a satisfaction score for the job facet. The total scale score for each job facet can range from a high of 15 to a low of 0. High scores indicate satisfaction with the job facet and lower scores are presumed to indicate a state of lesser satisfaction.

Reliability of the JDI has been well supported over the years (R. B. Dunham & Smith, 1977; Ironson, Smith, Brannick, & Gibson, 1989; Jung, Dalessio, & Johnson, 1986; Kinicki, McKee-Ryan, Schriesheim, & Carson, 2002; B. Schneider & Dachler, 1978; Spector, 1997). Schneider and Dachler (1978) investigated the stability of the JDI in a study of 847 utility employees. High stability coefficients were reported using Campbell and Fiske's multitrait-multimethod matrix for analysis of the data. The authors concluded that the JDI is a stable tool for measuring facets of job satisfaction. In another study conducted by Johnson, Smith, and Tucker, (2002), data from two groups of 50 people were used to examine discriminant and convergent validity of the JDI using analyses of variance, the outcome of which revealed acceptable reliability and validity results for the JDI. Kinicki et al. (1989) found acceptable estimates of internal consistency and test-retest reliability as well as confirmed convergent and discriminant validity for the JDI through meta analysis of previous empirical studies.

Reseacher-developed job facet scales. In the literature extrinsic factors such as technology and work-family balance were often depicted as being highly favored by Generation X, while recognition and achievement were often portrayed as motivators for Baby Boomers. These job facets are not included in the JDI and, given that they were potentially salient to the overall job satisfaction of the groups being studied, scales were crafted to assess satisfaction with these job facets. Scales modeled after the JDI were designed by this study's researcher to assess employee satisfaction with three job facets: technology, work-family balance, and recognition. Items on the scales were formatted, presented, and tallied in the same manner as the JDI to obtain job facet satisfaction scores. To confirm internal reliability of the researcher-designed scales, pre-tests were conducted in which alphas of .71 or higher were found for all scales. Details of pretest construction, administration, and analysis are presented in Chapter 4.

*Job in general scale and general information***.** Because it is possible that a person might be satisfied with one or more of the job facets and still be overall dissatisfied with the job in general (or vice versa) totaling the different job facet scale scores to come up with an overall job satisfaction score is not recommended (Ironson et al., 1989; Smith et al., 1969; Spector, 1997). To determine overall job satisfaction, the Job In General (JIG) scale was constructed by Ironson, Smith, Brannick, and Gibson (1989). The instrument consists of a single scale with 8 items related specifically to the employee's overall job satisfaction with their job in general. Items on the scale are formatted, presented, and tallied in the same manner as the JDI to obtain an overall job

satisfaction score. Similarly, results have been reported supporting the validity of the JIG scale. Ironson et al. (1989) used traditional and item response theory procedures to analyze data from three samples (n = 1,149; n =3,566; and n= 4,490) to test the reliability of the JIG. Results revealed an alpha of .91 and above for the scale in successive samples, thus confirming reliability. Convergent and discriminant validity were also confirmed in the research.

A general information section was included as part of the compiled survey instrument to collect demographic data and additional employee comments. Respondents were asked to provide their year of birth (which was used for generation group membership), as well as identify their race, gender, income range, and job function. A free form comments section was included to collect additional thoughts employees wanted to share about their job.

Hypotheses

This study investigates the predictive effects of intrinsic and extrinsic job factors on overall job satisfaction for Generation X as compared to Baby Boomers. The effects of eight predictive variables on one dependent variable, overall job satisfaction, were examined in this study. Predictive variables were classified as intrinsic or extrinsic according to Hertzberg's two-factor theory. For clarity, the definition and type classification for each job facet is presented in Table 2.

Table 2

Satisfaction Constructs for Job Facets

Job Facet	Satisfaction Construct	Type
Work itself	Concerned with the employee's satisfaction with the work itself. Aspects of this facet include opportunities for creativity and task variety, allowing an individual to increase his or her knowledge, and changes in responsibility, amount of work, autonomy, job enrichment, and job complexity.(Smith et al., 1969)	Intrinsic
Pay	Addresses attitude toward pay and is based on the perceived difference between actual pay and expected pay. Expected pay is based on both the value of the perceived inputs and outputs of the job and of other employees holding similar jobs or possessing similar qualifications. Also influenced by the personal situation of the employee, the economy and the amount of pay an employee has received previously.(Smith et al., 1969)	Extrinsic
Promotion	Refers to the employee's satisfaction with the organization's promotion policy and the administration of the same. Promotion is thought to be a function of the frequency, importance, and desirability of promotions.(Smith et al., 1969)	Intrinsic
Supervision	Reflects the employee's satisfaction with his or her supervisors(s). In general the more considerate and employee-centered supervisors are the greater the levels of employee satisfaction with supervisors. Furthermore, the greater the supervisor's perceived competence on the job, the greater the levels of satisfaction.(Smith et al., 1969)	Extrinsic
People	Concerns people on the present job (also called co-worker) and assesses the level of employee satisfaction with his or her fellow employees. The degree of satisfaction with co-workers is thought to be determined by the work-related interaction among co-workers and the mutual liking or admiration of fellow employees. (Smith et al., 1969)	Extrinsic
Technology	Addresses the employees satisfaction with technology made available to individuals by the organization to perform their job. Technology in the work environment typically refers to access advanced technology such as computers and internet as well as telephone systems, fax machines, and copiers.	Extrinsic
Work-Family Balance	Refers to satisfaction with the balance of time and quality of effort devoted to an employee's work and family life. The ability to balance work and family is generally related to the demands of the job, the employee's commitment to the organization, and the family-friendly policies and culture supported by the organization. (Bourg & Segal, 1999; Ezra & Deckman, 1996; Saltzstein et al., 2001; Scandura & Lankau, 1997)	Extrinsic
Recognition	Refers to accolades, praise, and acknowledgement bestowed upon an employee by their supervisor or management team for a job well done. Recognition may be verbal, written, and could be, but not necessarily, accompanied by a small token of appreciation such as a certificate, plaque, or special benefit (i.e., employee of the month parking space).	Intrinsic

The hypotheses and associated statistical procedures follow.

H_o1: Overall job satisfaction for Generation X is not significantly different from overall job satisfaction for Baby Boomers.

The *t* test was used to compare the groups in this study. The simple test is appropriate to determine if any statistically significant difference exists between the conditions (Huck & Cormier, 1996; Pedhazur, 1997).

H_o2: Overall job satisfaction among Generation X employees will be more positively linked to their satisfaction with extrinsic job factors such as work-family balance, pay, and technology.

To investigate the effects of the job facets on overall job satisfaction for Generation X, multiple regression analysis was used.

H_o3: Overall job satisfaction among Baby Boomers employees will be more positively linked to their satisfaction with intrinsic job factors such as the work itself, promotion, and recognition.

To evaluate the impact of the job facets on overall job satisfaction for Baby Boomers, multiple regression analysis was used.

Multiple regression analysis is well suited for probing the combined or individual predictive nature of one or more predictor variables (i.e., work itself, pay, promotion, supervision, coworkers, recognition, work-family balance, and technology) on a dependent variable (i.e., overall job satisfaction) in quantitative research (Pedhazur, 1997).

CHAPTER 4

Results

This study was undertaken to examine the effects of intrinsic and extrinsic job facets on overall job satisfaction for Generation X and Baby Boomers. Questionnaire responses were collected from employees of a regional healthcare organization in the southeastern United States to investigate this area of interest. The Job Descriptive Index (JDI) by Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969) along with several scales constructed by the researcher were used to assess satisfaction with individual job facets. Overall job satisfaction was measured using the Job In General Scale (JIG) by also by Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969). This chapter discusses pretest results for the researcher-designed scales and presents analysis of results from the research study.

Pretest

Eight job dimensions emerged from the literature as potentially relevant to overall job satisfaction for Generation X and Baby Boomers. They are namely; work itself, supervision, people, pay, promotion, technology, work-family balance, and recognition. In accordance with Herzberg's two-factor theory, these job facets can be classified as one of two types of motivators; (1) extrinsic, driven by forces external to the employee and (2) intrinsic, related to the employee's internal fulfillment. The JDI includes well-tested scales to measure employee satisfaction with work itself, supervision, people, pay, and promotion however, satisfaction scales for technology, work-family balance, and recognition are not included the index. To address the void, scales measuring satisfaction

with recognition, technology, and work-family balance were constructed by the researcher in the vernacular of the JDI. The researcher-developed signed scales consisting of five items written in the same format as the JDI and using the same or similar descriptive words and phases as appropriate. To test reliability of the researcher-developed scales, a survey instrument was complied and pre-tested. The survey instrument for the pretest was comprised of the JDI scales plus the scales created by the researcher. Demographic questions and open-ended questions to solicit additional feedback on usability of the survey format were also included. The pretest survey instrument was organized as follows:

Part I - Job Evaluation

(1) Five JDI scales measuring satisfaction with the work itself, people, supervision, pay, and promotion.

(2) Three JDI-like scales created by the researcher to measure satisfaction with recognition, technology, and work-family balance. (To calibrate the meaning of the key terms used , an open-ended question was included asking respondents to share what came to mind when thinking about each of the key terms in each scale, i.e., recognition, technology, work-family.)

(3) JIG scale measuring overall employee satisfaction.

Part II - General Information

This section contained questions to ascertain demographic data such as gender, income, race, etc. An item was included for respondents to report their year of birth, which was used to determine generation group membership. Open-ended questions

asking respondents to share additional information about their job as well as make comments about the survey content and format were also included.

See Appendix D for a sample copy of the pretest survey instrument including the researcher-designed scales.

The pretest was administered to volunteer employees of a small medical practice during a regular staff meeting. Thirty-two employees completed the pretest survey. Cronbach's alpha coefficient was computed for the eight job scales (five JDI and three researcher-developed) to determine reliability. Cronbach's alpha coefficient measures ranged from .11 to .89 for the eight scales tested. Of the researcher-developed scales, only the recognition scale measured in the reliable range (α =.89). Technology and work-family balance scales had Cronbach's alpha coefficient measures of less than .50. Comments from the pretest indicated that participants interpreted the meaning of the key terms similarly. For instance, when asked what came to mind when thinking of technology, the most common responses across all pretest participants were "computers" and "the internet." Additional comments solicited about the job were largely related to pay being inadequate. Of the observations noted on the content and layout of the survey, three respondents expressed dissatisfaction with the "yes," "no," "undecided" format; other comments were that the survey was "very well [laid] out" and "covered most of job related thoughts of employees."

Based on the low reliability results for technology and work-family balance scales on the initial pretest, a second pretest survey was compiled and conducted. All JDI scales were carried over in tact to the second pretest. The recognition scale created by the

researcher measured reliable on the initial pretest and was thus retained unchanged in the second pretest. Technology and work-family balance scales were expanded to ten item scales versus five items in the initial pretest to provide more content from which to assess satisfaction. The two-part format, with the job evaluation scales in part one and general information items in part two, was retained for the second pretest. The second pretest was administered by the researcher to healthcare employees who were part of a local community group. Twenty-seven participants completed the survey for the second pretest. Cronbach's alpha coefficient was calculated to determine the reliability of the eight scales on the second pretest. The values for these measures ranged from .71 to .87 as reported in Table 3. The second pretest survey was used as the instrument for the study.

Table 3

Reliability of Scales – Second Pretest (n=27)

Scale	Number of items	Cronbach's alpha coefficient
Extrinsic job facets		
Pay	5	.73
Co-workers	5	.83
Technology	10	.81
Work-family balance	10	.79
Supervision	5	.80
Intrinsic job facets		
Recognition	5	.87
Work itself	5	.71
Promotion	5	.79

Description of Sample

Surveys were sent to 244 employees, from which 128 were returned yielding a 54% response rate. Based on self-reported birth year, 14 respondents were classified as

Silent or Millennial generations and were removed from the data set since they were not the objects of this study. Fourteen surveys were incomplete and could not be used to compute scales scores needed for analysis. The remaining 100 respondents became the sample used in the analysis.

Based on self-reported birth year, 51% of the respondents were classified as Generation X and 49% categorized as Baby Boomers. Approximately 80% of both groups are females (the population of the organization was majority female). Sixty percent of respondents identified themselves as white and 30% identified themselves as African American or Black in each group and the remaining 10% identified themselves in other minority groups. Respondents identified their jobs in one of two tracks; medical related such as nurse, or non-medical such as an administrative clerk. More than half of the Generation X respondents, (53%) reported that their job was a medical related position as compared to 41% of Baby Boomers. Income options provided on the questionnaire were collapsed from six to four categories. Twelve percent of Generation X reported income less than $15,000 as compared to 10% of Baby Boomers. Almost a fifth of Generation X respondents identified their income level as between $15,000 - $34,999, while more than a third (31%) of Baby Boomers fell in the $15,000 - $34,999 income category. Over half (57%) of Generation X reported their income to be between $35,000 and $74,999, while only 41% of the Baby Boomers reported their income in that range. Less than 10% of respondents from each group indicated that their income was more than $75,000. Table 4 shows the full demographic breakdown for each group.

Table 4

Demographic Description of the Sample

	Total $n = 100$		Generation X $n = 51$		Baby Boomer $n = 49$	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Gender						
Male	21	21.0	9	17.6	12	24.5
Female	78	78.0	42	82.4	36	73.5
Income						
Less than $15,000	11	11.0	6	11.8	5	10.2
$15,000 - $34,999	24	24.0	9	17.6	15	30.6
$35,000 - $74,999	49	49.0	29	56.9	20	40.8
Over $75,000	8	8.0	4	7.8	4	8.1
Race						
White	61	61.0	30	58.8	31	63.3
Black	31	31.0	14	27.5	17	34.7
Asian	2	2.0	2	3.9	0	0.0
Hispanic	1	1.0	1	2.0	0	0.0
American Indian	1	1.0	1	2.0	0	0.0
Multi-racial	2	2.0	1	2.0	1	2.0
Birth year						
1943-1950	11	11.0			11	22.4
1951-1955	21	21.0			21	42.9
1956-1960	17	17.0			17	34.7
1961-1965	18	18.0	18	35.3		
1966-1970	13	13.0	13	23.5		
1971-1975	12	12.0	12	23.5		
1976-1980	8	8.0	8	15.7		
Job Category						
Medical	47	47.0	27	52.9	20	40.8
Non-medical	53	53.0	24	47.1	29	59.2

Reliability

The overall job satisfaction score and the satisfaction scores for the eight job facets were computed from the items on the survey. Cronbach's alpha coefficient was used to determine the reliability of these scales. The values for this measure ranged from .73 to .86 as reported in Table 5.

Table 5

Reliability of Scales

Scale	Number of items	Cronbach's alpha coefficient
Extrinsic job facets		
Pay	5	.73
Co-workers	5	.80
Technology	10	.86
Work-family balance	10	.85
Supervision	5	.83
Intrinsic job facets		
Recognition	5	.84
Work itself	5	.76
Promotion	5	.78
Overall Job Satisfaction	8	.79

Analyses

Scales measuring eight job facets (intrinsic and extrinsic) and an overall job satisfaction were calculated from the items and used in the analyses of the research questions. The descriptive statistics for these scales and the correlation of the job facets with overall job satisfaction are reported below followed by results of the analyses.

Means and standard deviations of scales. As seen in Table 6, promotion (M = 6.63) and pay (M = 7.37) were rated lowest in the total sample. Technology and work-family balance scales contained 10 items versus 5 items for all other facet scales so mean ratings were adjusted (divided by two) for easier comparison. When adjusted according to the number all items, technology (M = 9.69) and work-family balance (M = 9.58) were rated similar to recognition (M = 9.04) for the total sample. Ratings on the co-workers (M = 12.11), supervision (M = 10.11), and the work itself (M = 12.88) scales were the highest for the total sample.

As reported in Table 6, job facets with the lowest ratings within each group were promotion (Generation X, *M* = 6.51; Baby Boomers, *M* = 6.76) and pay (Generation X, *M* = 7.29; Baby Boomers, *M* = 7.45). Mean scale ratings for recognition (Generation X, *M* = 9.00; Baby Boomers, *M* = 9.08) were similar for both groups. Supervision (Generation X, *M* = 10.67; Baby Boomers, *M* = 9.53) and technology (Generation X, *M* = 9.93; Baby Boomers, *M* = 9.35) scale ratings were slightly higher in each case for Generation X than for Baby Boomers. Work-family balance rating for Generation X (*M* = 9.34) ranked fifth compared to third for the Baby Boomer group (*M* = 9.85). Average scale rating for co-workers (Generation X, *M* = 11.73; Baby Boomers, *M* = 12.51) ranked second within each generation group. The work itself scale rating was highest of all facets for both generation groups (Generation X, *M* = 12.57; Baby Boomers, *M* = 13.20). All means and standard deviations of scales are reported in Table 6.

Table 6

Means and Standard Deviations of Scales Adjusted for Number of Items

		Total $n = 100$		Generation X $n = 51$		Baby Boomer $n = 49$	
	Range	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Extrinsic job facets							
Pay	0-15	7.37	4.63	7.29	5.28	7.45	3.90
Co-workers	0-15	12.11	3.87	11.73	4.16	12.51	3.54
Technology*	0-30	9.65	3.93	9.93	4.11	9.35	3.76
Work-family balance*	0-30	9.58	4.10	9.33	4.33	9.85	3.86
Supervision	0-15	10.11	5.05	10.67	4.95	9.53	5.14
Intrinsic job facets							
Recognition	0-15	9.04	5.35	9.00	5.50	9.08	5.24
Work itself	0-15	12.88	3.46	12.57	3.88	13.20	2.96
Promotion	0-15	6.63	4.62	6.51	4.81	6.76	4.47
Overall Job Satisfaction	0-24	18.73	5.33	18.98	5.31	18.47	5.39

*Adjusted for number of items

Correlation of job facets with overall job satisfaction. Responses from members of Generation X showed moderate to high positive correlations between overall job satisfaction and work-family balance (r = .60), supervision (r = .59), and work itself (r = .76). Moderate to high positive correlations were found in the Baby Boomer group between overall job satisfaction and supervision (r = .59) and recognition (r = .61). All correlations between overall job satisfaction and the eight intrinsic and extrinsic job facets are reported in Table 7.

Table 7

Correlation between Overall Job Satisfaction and the Intrinsic and Extrinsic Job Facets

	Correlation with Overall Job Satisfaction (*r*)	
	Generation X *n* = 51	Baby Boomer *n* = 49
Extrinsic facets		
Pay	.33*	.23
Co-workers	.24	.09
Technology	.45*	.45*
Work-family balance	.60*	.42*
Supervision	.59*	.59*
Intrinsic facets		
Recognition	.40*	.61*
Work itself	.76*	.37*
Promotion	.43*	.45*

* $p < .05$

Multiple regression analysis. The following hypotheses were analyzed using multiple regression techniques.

Hypothesis 1

Overall job satisfaction for Generation X is not significantly different from overall job satisfaction for Baby Boomers.

The *t* test was used to compare overall job satisfaction between generation groups. No significant difference was found ($df = 98$, $t = .48$, $p = .63$). Means (reported in Table 6) of 18.98 for Generation X and 18.47 for Baby Boomers were not significantly different from each other.

Hypothesis 2

Overall job satisfaction among Generation X employees will be predicted by their satisfaction with extrinsic job facets such as work-family balance, pay, people, supervision, and technology.

Only Generation X employees were included in the stepwise multiple regression analysis for hypothesis 2. A significant equation was created ($F = 37.12$, $p < .01$). Three variables explained 70% of the unadjusted variance of overall job satisfaction for Generation X. One intrinsic job facet, work itself, contributed the largest amount of variance (58%), while two extrinsic job facets, work-family balance, and supervision, accounted for 12% of the variance of total job satisfaction. The results of the analysis related to hypothesis 2 are reported in Table 8.

Table 8

Relationship of Overall Job Satisfaction and Intrinsic and Extrinsic Job Facets for Generation X (n = 51)

Variable in the Equation	*B*	*BETA*	*t*	*p*	R^2 *Change*
Constant	4.14		2.79	<.01	
Work itself	.73	.53	5.56	<.01	.58
Work-family balance	.17	.28	3.12	<.01	.09
Supervision	.23	.21	2.27	<.03	.03
				R^2	.70
				Adjusted R^2	.68

Hypothesis 3

> Overall job satisfaction among Baby Boomer employees will be predicted by satisfaction with intrinsic job facets such as the work itself, promotion, and recognition.

To investigate the effects of the job facets on overall job satisfaction, stepwise multiple regression analysis was performed including Baby Boomer employees only. A significant equation was developed ($F = 20.95$, $p < .01$). Two variables explained 48% of the unadjusted variance of overall job satisfaction for Baby Boomers. The intrinsic job facet

recognition contributed the largest amount of variance (37%), while one extrinsic job facet, supervision, accounted for another 11% of the variance. Results of the analysis for hypothesis 3 are reported in Table 9.

Table 9

Relationship of Overall Job Satisfaction and Intrinsic and Extrinsic Job Facets for Baby Boomers (n =49)

Variable in the	*B*	*BETA*	*t*	*p*	R^2 *Change*
Constant	10.79		8.18	<.01	
Recognition	.43	.42	3.35	<.01	.37
Supervision	.40	.38	3.08	<.01	.11
				R^2	.48
				Adjusted R^2	.45

Ancillary analysis was undertaken using multiple regression and crosstabulation techniques to explore the impact of demographic factors and investigate the reaction of generation groups to each survey item.

Another set of multiple regression analyses was performed to determine if demographic variables, i.e., race, gender, income level, and job category, had significant impact on overall job satisfaction within or across generation groups. First, for each group, demographics variables (race, income, pay, and job category) were entered in a multiple regression equation followed by the eight job facet variables. Sample size for each generation group was reduced by the number of respondents who did not answer questions regarding race and income and were thus unable to be categorized for this exercise. Analysis of the resulting sample (Generation X (*n =47*) and Baby Boomers (*n=43*)) showed that demographic variables were not significant predictors of overall job

satisfaction for either generation group. Predictors of overall job satisfaction for each group were consistent with findings from the initial multiple regression analysis.

A second multiple regression analysis was performed to investigate the effect of demographic variables against the total adjusted sample (*n =90)* (reduced by the number of respondents who did not answer questions regarding race and income). Demographic variables were entered in the multiple regression equation followed by job facet variables and a dummy variable for generation group. The dummy variable coefficient was not significant suggesting no effect for demographics variables on overall job satisfaction for the total adjusted sample net of other variables.

Crosstabulation analysis. Crosstabulation analysis by generation group for each of the fifty survey items related to the eight job facets was conducted to determine if generation groups were emphasizing different or similar dimensions of job facets. There was no significant difference in how Generation X and Baby Boomer responded to forty-five (90%) of the survey items. Differences between group responses were found for five survey items. Crosstabulation results for the five items showing significant differences in group responses are presented in the following paragraphs.

When asked whether their supervision was "bad," Generation X and Baby Boomers responded significantly different, χ^2 (2, N = 100) = 7.50, $p < .05$. Percentages and counts for crosstabulation of this item are reported in Table 10.

Table 10

Crosstabulation of Responses for Supervisor is "Bad" by Generation

	Crosstabulation by Generation	
Supervisor is "Bad"	Generation X	Baby Boomer
Yes	15.7%	6.1%
	(8)	(3)
Undecided	7.8%	26.5%
	(4)	(13)
No	76.5%	67.3%
	(39)	(33)

Note: Observed count displayed in parentheses

On the question of whether pay was "fair," Generation X and Baby Boomer responses were significantly different, χ^2 (2, N = 100) = 7.50, $p < .05$. Percentages and counts for crosstabulation of this item are reported in Table 11.

Table 11

Crosstabulation of Responses for Pay is"Fair" by Generation

	Crosstabulation by Generation	
Pay is "Fair"	Generation X	Baby Boomer
Yes	45.1%	63.3%
	(23)	(31)
Undecided	17.6%	22.4%
	(9)	(11)
No	37.3%	14.3%
	(19)	(7)

Note: Observed count displayed in parentheses

When asked if work-family balance was "excellent," Generation X and Baby Boomer responses were significantly different, χ^2 (2, N = 100) = 6.12, $p < .05$. Percentages and counts for crosstabulation of this item are reported in Table 12.

Table 12

Crosstabulation of Responses for Work-Family Balance is"Excellent" by Generation

	Crosstabulation by Generation	
Work- Family Balance is "Excellent"	Generation X	Baby Boomer
Yes	33.3%	36.7%
	(17)	(18)
Undecided	9.8%	26.5%
	(5)	(13)
No	56.9%	36.7%
	(29)	(18)

Note: Observed count displayed in parentheses

On the question of whether work-family balance was "good," Generation X and Baby Boomer responses were significantly different, χ^2 (2, N = 100) = 6.07, $p < .05$. Observed counts and percentages for crosstabulation of this item are reported in Table 13.

Table 13

Crosstabulation of Responses for Work-Family Balance is "Good" by Generation

	Crosstabulation by Generation	
Work-Family Balance is "Good"	Generation X	Baby Boomer
Yes	58.8%	57.1%
	(30)	(28)
Undecided	3.9%	18.4%
	(2)	(9)
No	37.3%	24.5%
	(19)	(12)

Note: Observed count displayed in parentheses

It is noted that a significant Chi Square was calculated for Generation X and Baby Boomer responses to the question of whether work-family balance was "bad," χ^2 (2, N =

100) = 7.50, $p < .05$. More than 20% of cells had expected counts less than 5, which exceeds the threshold commonly allowed for reliable Chi Square computation in crosstabulation analysis.

Summary of Results

Scales were created to measure satisfaction with three job facets, recognition, work-family balance, and technology. Pretests were conducted using the newly developed scales and were found to be reliable as indicated by Cronbach's alpha measure of internal consistency. The new scales plus five job facet scales from the JDI (people, work itself, pay, promotion, and supervision) became the survey instrument used for this study.

Responses from 100 employees of a regional healthcare organization who completed the survey and identified themselves as members of Generation X or Baby Boomer were used.

No differences were found between the groups on overall job satisfaction. The types of job facet and the amount of variance that they explain in overall job satisfaction were different for the two groups. Generation X overall job satisfaction was explained by three variables—one intrinsic job factor (the work itself) and two extrinsic job facets (work-family balance and supervision). The three variables explained 68% of the variance of Generation X overall job satisfaction. Forty-five percent of the variance for Baby Boomers' overall job satisfaction was explained by two variables—the intrinsic job factor recognition and the extrinsic job factor supervision.

Additional analysis was conducted to explore the impact of periphery factors such as demographics, and to assess differences in how the groups reacted to items on the survey. Pursuant to this effort, additional regression analyses were performed to determine how demographics factors (i.e., age, gender, race, income, and job category) influenced ratings and satisfaction predictors for the total sample and for each group. Results showed that the amount of variance accounted for by demographic variables was not significant for the total sample or for either of the generation groups separately. Additionally, crosstabulation analysis was conducted for all items on the survey to determine if the groups were reacting similarly to the questions. Significant differences were found in responses to five items from three scales (supervision, pay, and work-family balance) out of the fifty total items that made up 8 scales on the survey.

CHAPTER 5

Discussion

Arguably, there are at least three conditions that will contribute appreciably to transformation of the U.S. workforce in the two next decades: (1) loss of intellectual capital as large numbers of Baby Boomers retire taking with them valuable job knowledge, (2) shortage of highly-skilled labor in some areas (e.g., healthcare), and (3) shift in work values from the rigid protestant work ethic toward a more liberal work-family balanced approach. These factors could create significant challenges for employers in terms of recruitment and retention of productive employees to meet the demands of a successful organization. Leveraging job satisfiers that address the needs and demands of the emerging workforce could be an effective means of countering these potentially negative circumstances. Prominent in the discussion of the changing labor market is the impact of generational preferences and differences related to the predominately incumbent Baby Boomers and eminently emerging Generation X. This study was undertaken to examine overall job satisfaction and the predictive nature of certain job facets on overall job satisfaction for these groups, the conclusion of which will be used to extend the current theoretical base on generations and to suggest practical organizational strategies to offset the disadvantageous effects of the aforementioned negative conditions.

Disposition of hypotheses. Three hypotheses were tested in the research to cull information about overall job satisfaction and individual job satisfiers for Generation X and Baby Boomers. For hypothesis 1 it was expected that there would be no significant

difference in overall satisfaction between Generation X and Baby Boomers. Results of this study affirm hypothesis 1 in that no significant difference was found in overall job satisfaction for Generation X and Baby Boomers. Hypothesis 2 proposed that overall job satisfaction for Generation X would be linked to extrinsic job factors and hypothesis 3 posited that overall job satisfaction for Baby Boomers would be connected to intrinsic job factors. Results revealed somewhat equivocal findings with regard to hypothesis 2 and hypothesis 3 in that satisfiers predicting overall job satisfaction were different for the two groups. However, the line of distinction was not clearly drawn between intrinsic and extrinsic factors as proposed nor were the predictive factors mutually exclusive to the groups. In hypothesis 2, extrinsic factors, specifically; work-family balance, pay, supervision, coworkers, and technology were posited as more salient to overall job satisfaction for Generation X. Indeed Generation X's overall job satisfaction was predicted by two of the extrinsic job factors, work-family balance and supervision; however the fact that one intrinsic factor, the work itself, was revealed as the most reliable predictor of overall satisfaction for Generation X was not anticipated.

In hypothesis 3, intrinsic job satisfiers, namely; the work itself, recognition, and promotion, were put forth as having more influence on overall job satisfaction for Baby Boomers. Results indicated that overall job satisfaction for Baby Boomers was predicted by at least one intrinsic job factor, recognition, and it was also predicted by an extrinsic job factor, supervision. Finding that an extrinsic job factor predicts job satisfaction for Baby Boomers was inconsistent with hypothesis 3, which anticipated that intrinsic factors would be most influential to overall satisfaction for this group. In summary, the findings

of this study indicate that there is no difference in the overall satisfaction level of Generation X and Baby Boomers; however, different job facet combinations do play a role in predicting overall satisfaction for the two groups. Neither group's satisfaction is influenced solely by one type of job facet (extrinsic or intrinsic), but rather job satisfaction for each generation group is impacted by a combination of both types of job facets and also, the job facets predicting satisfaction are not necessarily exclusive to one group.

Job facet satisfaction. Work itself, pay, supervision, co-workers, and promotion are work facets that are routinely included in studies on job satisfaction and have thus far garnered a fair body of research defining their role in job satisfaction. Unique to this study on job satisfaction is the inclusion of job facets specifically, technology, work-family balance, and recognition, that have recently emerged in the discussion of work motivators as related to Generation X and Baby Boomers and have a less developed base of research related to their influence on job satisfaction. Lack of research about the impact of these nascent job facets on overall work satisfaction means there is little empirical data from which to draw theoretical conclusions and generate practical implications. Furthermore, behavioral or attitudinal instrumentation to measure satisfaction with these new dimensions have not been validated and presented for wide-scale use in the social science research community. To address these gaps and advance this study, in which it was posited that work-family balance and technology satisfaction would be predictors of overall job satisfaction for Generation X and that recognition would be a predictor of overall job satisfaction for Baby Boomers, it was necessary to

create an instrument to measure satisfaction with these job facets (i.e., work-family balance, technology, and recognition). Scales similar to the JDI by Smith, Kendall and Hulin were designed to assess satisfaction with work-family balance, technology, and recognition. These newly crafted scales tested reliable in a pretest and later in the actual study, making them potentially useful tools to measure employee satisfaction with work-family balance, technology, and recognition on the job in future research related to job satisfaction.

Work-family balance was explored because it has been suggested by some as a highly salient job factor for Generation X and was thought to be less important to Baby Boomers (Dendinger et al., 2005; Finegold et al., 2002; Smola & Sutton, 2002). It was revealed in this study that work-family balance was indeed a predictor of overall satisfaction for Generation X employees of the regional medical facility being studied, and not a predictor of job satisfaction for Baby Boomers, outcomes that match the popular characterization for these groups. Crosstabulation results also showed that Generation X and Baby Boomers respond differently to certain questions about their work-family balance. More Baby Boomers viewed their work-family balance as good (or excellent) and fewer Baby Boomers felt that their work-family balance was bad when compared to Generation X. These findings support the popular opinion that Generation X is enormously work-family focused. Since Baby Boomers are supposedly driven by achievement and accomplishment, these results offer little surprise with regard to the group's lack of emphasis on work-family balance relative to their Generation X peers.

Furthermore, in the discussion on work-family balance, it is perhaps relevant to consider that lifecycle stage may have an impact on employees' views about work-family balance. Because of their relative young age compared to Baby Boomers, many Generation X employees, may not have long years of experience in balancing work and family. Additionally, it is likely that Generation X, at this point in their lifecycle, is dealing with very demanding life challenges such as the inaugural adjustment to spousal relationships, rearing of young children, establishing career, and securing financial stability. It is easy to see how life challenges such as these might influence the value placed on satisfaction with work-family balance. Certainly, it is possible that Baby Boomers could be experiencing some of these same demanding life challenges and may also be tackling different issues of equal or greater complexity such as caring for aging parents, retirement, and degradation of their own personal health. In any case, it seems plausible that Baby Boomers, by virtue of their relatively extended tenure in the work place, have experienced and survived many work-family balance trials. Enduring challenges to work-family balance time and again may lead to acknowledgement that imbalances are inevitable and tolerable. Acceptance of this reality by Baby Boomers because of there more copious life experience could contribute to a de-valuation of this job factor as a key driver of overall job satisfaction within this group.

The work itself was not a predictor of overall job satisfaction for Baby Boomers in this study as anticipated; paradoxically, work itself was found to be the most reliable predictor of overall job satisfaction for Generation X. These findings differ from prior research that oft depict Baby Boomers as placing high value on work (Arnett, 2004;

Burke, 1994; Cherrington, Conde, & England, 1979; Dendinger et al., 2005; Finegold et al., 2002; Jurkiewicz & Brown, 1998; Smola & Sutton, 2002) and conversely portray Generation X as resistant to putting work as a priority in their lives over family (Arnett, 2004; Finegold et al., 2002; Smola & Sutton, 2002). So, why are these results apparently incongruous with what has been observed before? Perhaps one factor that sheds light on this paradoxical finding is that most of the Generation X employees in this study reported that they held medical positions (i.e., nurse, physical therapist, etc.) in comparison to their Baby Boomer cohorts who most often reported that they held non-medical positions (i.e., administrator, accountant, etc) . It is conceivable that persons who perform healing job functions (i.e., nurse) that have a direct hands-on impact on the improved health and welfare of human beings might be more likely to find the work itself rewarding regardless of the how they feel overall about the organization. Doing a job that specifically contributes to saving or improving another human being's life may appeal to one's desire to be benevolent and charitable, an aspect of work satisfaction that may not be straightforwardly addressed in non-healing occupations such as an accountant.

Overall job satisfaction for Baby Boomers was predicted by recognition and supervision in this study. If one is inclined to accept the portrayal of Baby Boomers as a group suffused with the desire for achievement and status, finding that recognition is a predictor of overall job satisfaction for this group is not particularly startling. Somewhat surprising however, is that supervision, an extrinsic factor, turned out to be a predictor of overall job satisfaction for Baby Boomers. As we examine these outcomes more closely, the interplay of recognition and supervision presents interesting insights. Given that

supervisors are the most likely direct and indirect sources of recognition for an employee, it is reasonable to expect that recognition satisfaction would have some connection to supervisors and supervision. Following this line of reasoning, supervisors and supervision, characteristically an extrinsic factor, may be considered a constituent of recognition satisfaction, an intrinsic factor. Understanding the potential interaction of extrinsic and intrinsic components within a single job facet such as recognition and supervision is an important dimension of job satisfaction that should be further explored.

Technology did not materialize as a strong predictor of overall job satisfaction for Generation X however; there was a positive relationship between technology and overall job satisfaction for both Generation X and Baby Boomers. It is possible that the technological divide thought to hover ominously between Generation X and Baby Boomers is gradually closing. Baby Boomers are staying in the workforce longer than previous generations, a circumstance that requires them to become technology proficient in order to maintain employment in the rapidly evolving technology-based economy. It is feasible that the "forever young" mentality of Baby Boomers and their inexorable quest to achieve would compel them to overcome a skill deficit, such as lack of technological prowess, especially if it marks them as "old" and "unaccomplished," terms which would appear, generally speaking, to be an affront to many Baby Boomers. After all, the mainframe computers of the late 1960's and the first personal computer (PC), introduced by IBM in 1974 were products of Baby Boomer inventiveness and ingenuity, so it is not outside the realm of possibility that this generation would find the means to stay abreast of the technology evolution that they might not so immodestly claim to have started.

Also potentially relevant in this study, related to the value of technology as a job satisfier, is that participants were located in a rural area. Persons in rural communities are less active technology consumers (i.e., internet users) than are persons in urban and suburban communities (Pew Internet & American Life Project, 2006), lending some creditability to the notion that type of community may influence the potency of technology as a highly predictive job satisfier. Certain high-tech enablers, such as high speed data services, that are almost ubiquitously deployed by communications carriers in densely populated metropolitan areas are less available in sparsely populated rural areas, a condition which might be a mitigating factor in determining the use of technology in general and the resulting impact on job satisfaction for rural community dwellers. One might also ask if it is possible that the personality of persons choosing small town residency is different from those electing an urban or suburban lifestyle such that the differences could influence their use of technology and consequently the import of the facet on job satisfaction.

Low but significant relationship between pay and overall job satisfaction for Generation X was discovered which is in concert with the hypothesis of this study that overall job satisfaction for Generation X would be influenced by extrinsic factors; there was no significant relationship between pay and overall job satisfaction for Baby Boomers. Lack of a strong relationship between pay satisfaction and overall job satisfaction for either generation group is not especially remarkable since it corroborates prior research suggesting that pay alone does not necessarily increase job satisfaction (Finegold et al., 2002; Gaertner & Robinson, 1999; Igalens & Roussel, 1999; Miceli &

Jung, 1991; Miceli & Mulvey, 2000; Murphy, 2004; Williams, Malos, & Palmer, 2002). However, one observation from the item analysis related to pay was curious. Greater numbers of Baby Boomers responded that their pay was fair in spite of the fact they were reportedly the lowest paid of the two generation groups. Baby Boomers more often held non-medical positions such as, accounting clerk, food service worker, etc. which according to the U.S. Department of Labor (2005) command lower wages on average than professional medical positions (i.e., nurse, physical therapist, etc) in a healthcare setting. The fact that lower paid employees within the same job category (non-medical) could view their wages as fair while employees in a different job category (medical) being paid higher wages could view their pay as unfair, reinforces the premises that it is not the amount of pay overall but rather the relative comparison of work effort and pay within the same group or job category that drives assessment of pay fairness and pay satisfaction.

Promotion was not a predictor of overall satisfaction for either group in this study; however, there was a mild positive correlation between promotion and overall job satisfaction for both groups. Lack of abundant employment options typical of small rural communities might be a mitigating factor in this situation. When employees realize that opportunities for promotion in their own organization are few and further recognize that the opportunities outside of the organization in their community are also limited, expectations for promotion may be pragmatically dulled, thereby reducing this facet as a highly predictive criteria for job satisfaction within the employee's current job environment. In circumstances where opportunities for promotion are moderated not

solely by organizational forces (i.e., management preferences, company policies, etc) but also by forces outside the organization such as few employer options, employees might have to consider assertive alternatives such as relocation or career retraining to improve chances for advancement.

Of all the job factors examined, the weakest relationship was found between co-workers and overall job satisfaction for both groups. Interestingly, mean scores for co-worker satisfaction were second highest of all factors for each group (mean scale scores for work itself was highest for both groups), indicating that employees were generally very satisfied with their co-workers regardless of what they felt about their job and the organization. The workplace may be viewed by many employees as a place to socialize with friends (coworkers), to celebrate and commiserate life experiences. Few would deny that positive interaction with other people is an important element of human development and happiness, a fact that may ultimately drive employee satisfaction with co-workers in addition to or in spite of overall satisfaction with the job they perform.

*Theoretical implications***.** Theoretically, results of this study lend partial support to Howe and Strauss' contention that generations have unique peer personalities. It was revealed that the two generation groups are motivated by a different set of job factors, which implies a variation in characteristics important to defining a unique peer personality for each group. Though this study was not designed to make statistical inferences about how Strauss and Howe's generational attributes for peer personalities map to specific job factors, some observations can be made. Strauss and Howe assert that Reactive peer personalities, i.e., Generation X, exhibit pragmatic values and

behaviors. One could argue that work-family balance, which was revealed as predictor of job satisfaction for Generation X in this study, is a pragmatic approach to managing one's life which provides some support for Strauss and Howe's characterization of Reactive generational groups. Additionally, Strauss and Howe describe the Idealists peer personality, to which they assign Baby Boomers, as arrogant and selfish. In the broad view, one could suggest that the desire for recognition, so coveted by Baby Boomers as indicated in this study, shares a common vein with high regard for self and arrogance.

Several intrinsic factors were found to be predictors of overall job satisfaction supporting Herzberg's contention that satisfaction with intrinsic factors are essential to overall job satisfaction. On the other hand, a number of extrinsic job factors were also found to be predictors of overall job satisfaction, denying one of the dual tenets of Herzberg's motivation theory that extrinsic factors are not necessarily job satisfiers but rather job dissatisfiers. While it was not the intent of this research to examine the drivers of dissatisfaction, clearly there is a need for more intricate inspection of dissatisfaction as it relates to job factors such as technology, recognition, and work-family balance that were not included in Herzberg's original research.

*Limitations and future research***.** Several practical limitations of this research study should be identified. Though attempts were made to obtain a larger participant pool, ultimately the sample of convenience selected for this study was smaller than desired. Conclusions drawn here must be tempered with the fact that the sample size falls below the optimal level for analysis using multiple regression techniques. The power of the analyses can be substantially increased with a larger of number participants in

subsequent similar investigations. It is strongly recommended that the study be replicated with a larger sample size for future research. Also, insufficient participant diversity in several areas limits generalizability of the results of this study. Employees were primarily female from a single organization, in one industry, located in a rural Southeastern community, which narrows the scope of this research considerably. Broadening of the sample to be more representative of the general U.S. workforce population nationwide should be considered a requisite for future research in this area.

Scales for work-family balance, recognition, and technology were created specifically for this research. Internal reliability of the scales was acceptable in the pretest and the actual study opening the door for these scales to be used in future research. However, with any new instrumentation, lack of historical reliability in repeated use should be considered a shortcoming. To strengthen credibility long-term, additional empirical use of the researcher-crafted scales is needed.

Inability to definitively demarcate birth year ranges that identify generational groups introduces additional frailty in this study. Two points are worth noting related to this issue. First, logic dictates that generational characteristics do not spontaneously appear on the first day of the birth year range and abruptly cease on the last day of the birth year range. Almost certainly, there are individuals born at the beginning or end of a proposed generational birth year range that exhibit generational behaviors similar to those displayed by members assigned to adjacent generational groups. The overlap of characteristics for generation members at the cusp of the birth year ranges that define their group seem worth exploration. Secondly, in this study birth

year ranges used to designate generation group membership were primarily taken from Strauss and Howe's generational cycle research, however, it is noted that there is some variation in birth year ranges used to define generation groups throughout the literature. Results of this study using Strauss and Howe generational birth year ranges as the selection criteria could yield different results using birth year ranges for generations that are advocated by others. Both points mentioned above highlight the need for more rigorous and exacting selection criteria to determine generation group membership.

To address the inadequacies associated with the variability and overlap in birth year ranges used to define generational groups, a couple of alternatives may be useful for future consideration. One, stratification of generations into sub-groups of core years (years in the middle of the designated birth year range) and cusp years (years on either end of the birth range flanking the core years) similar to categories suggested by Kupperschmidt (2000) allows more intense examination of group peculiarities. Specifically, it enables researchers to extract hybrid generational influences that are potentially introduced by cusp-year group members who might be absorbing behaviors from neighboring generation groups and allows for more precise extrapolation of characteristics associated with the nucleus of group. Another alternative to consider in relieving the effects of using birth-year range as the sole means of generational membership would be to create a weighted multidimensional criterion including such factors as, but not limited to; (1) generation group in which the person sees themselves belonging, (2) relative position in birth year range (i.e., early, middle, end), (3) actual birth date. The deficiencies of using a single non-discriminant selection criterion, such as

birth year range, to determine generation membership may be mitigated with a multidimensional criterion approach; however it will require appropriate scientific diligence to develop a reliable and practical template to be applied. It is advisable that future research on generations contemplate alternatives such as those described above to reduce the impact of variations in birth year ranges and isolate characteristics that potentially overlap adjoining generation groups.

Finally, it is recommended that other generation groups (i.e., Silent and Millennial) be examined in to provide a more comprehensive view of job satisfaction in the multigenerational labor market. In the case of this study, responses from Silent and Millennial Generations were excluded because they were not the target of the research. However, the extension of work careers for seniors (those presently 65 years or older) and the fast growth of young adult employees (those presently 28 years or younger) make these groups relevant in the work force and beckons for their inclusion in the investigation of employee job satisfaction related to generational cohorts.

Conclusions

Healthcare employees in the rural regional facility examined in this study are generally satisfied with their job irrespective of generational affiliation. Although a number of factors are positively related to overall job satisfaction, several rise to the top as the most reliable predictors of satisfaction for each generational group. Generation X's overall job satisfaction is predicted by extrinsic job factors, (work-family balance, and supervision) as well as intrinsic job factors, (work itself). Baby Boomers' overall job satisfaction is predicted by an intrinsic job factor, (recognition) as well as an extrinsic job

factor (supervision). It is recommended that practitioners be mindful of the particular factors that affect job satisfaction for the Generation X and Baby Boomers, when creating and implementing organization policies and practices in order to maintain the most productive and committed workforce. Work-family balance, which is highly prized by Generation X, indicates the need for family friendly policies, such as flexible work schedules, childcare accommodations, and non-traditional job arrangements (i.e., job share and telecommuting). Acknowledgement of work well done, an apparent cornerstone of job satisfaction for Baby Boomers, implies the need for prominent fair recognition and appreciation initiatives. Supervision, which was revealed as a common job satisfier for Generation X and Baby Boomers, points to the need for strong supervisory training for managers in a multigenerational workforce.

Maintaining productive qualified employees in the workplace is paramount to organizations if they are to succeed in an increasingly competitive and global economy. These challenges are especially potent in the healthcare industry, which is experiencing critical shortages of highly skilled labor that underscore the need for effective practices and policies to attract and retain employees. Creating a work environment that positively influences job satisfaction is a useful implement for employers who earnestly seek to optimize investment in their most valuable organizational asset, human capital.

REFERENCES

Adigun, I. O., & Stephenson, G. M. (1992). Sources of job motivation and satisfaction among British and Nigerian employees. *Journal of Social Psychology, 132*(3), 369.

Alderfer, C. P. (1969). An empirical test of a new theory of human needs. *Organizational Behavior & Human Decision Processes, 4*(2), 142-175.

American Management Association. (2003). AMA 2003 Job Outlook Survey. Retrieved July, 2003 from http://www.amanet.org/research/summ.htm

Arnett, J. J. (2000). High hopes in a grim world. *Youth & Society, 31*(3), 267-286.

Arnett, J. J. (2004). Emerging Adulthood. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 51*(12), B4-B4.

Bartlett, K. R. (2001). The relationship between training and organizational commitment: A study in the health care field. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 12*(4), 335-352.

Bourg, C., & Segal, M. W. (1999). The impact of family supportive policies and practices on organizational commitment to the Army. *Armed Forces & Society, 25*(4), 633-652.

Bova, B., & Kroth, M. (2001). Workplace learning and generation x. *Journal of Workplace Learning: Employee Counselling Today, 13*(2), 57-65.

Bowman, J. (1991). Another Grand Theory Comes of Age. *TLS, the Times Literary Supplement*(4592), 14.

Burke, R. J. (1994). Generation X: Measures, sex and age differences. *Psychological Reports, 74*, 555-562.

Camp, S. D. (1994). Assessing the effects of organizational commitment and job satisfaction on turnover: An event history approach. *Prison Journal, 74*(3), 279-294.

Carnevale, T. (2005). The Coming Labor and Skills Shortage. *T+D, 59*(1), 37-41.

Carter, C. (2004). When your gurus walk out the door *KM Review, 7*(3), 16-19.

Cherrington, D. J., Conde, S. J., & England, J. L. (1979). Age and work value. *Academy of Management Journal, 22*(3), 617-623.

Cherrington, D. J., & Wixom, B. J., Jr. (1983). Recognition Is Still a Top Motivator. *The Personnel Administrator, 28*(5), 87.

Corsten, M. (1999). The time of generations. *Time & Society, 8*(2), 249-273.

DeMartini, J. R. (1985). Change agents and generational relationships: A reevaluation of Mannheim's problem of generations, *Social Forces* (Vol. 64, pp. 1-16): University of North Carolina Press.

Dendinger, V. M., Adams, G. A., & Jacobson, J. D. (2005). Reasons for working and their relationship to retirement attitudes, job satisfaction and occupational self-efficacy of bridge employees. *International Journal of Aging & Human Development, 61*(1), 21-35.

Dunham, C. C. (1998). Generation units and the life course: A sociological perspective on youth and the anti-war movement. *Journal of Political & Military Sociology, 26*(2), 137-155.

Dunham, R. B., & Smith, F. J. (1977). Validation of the index of organizational reactions with the JDI, the MSQ, faces scales. *Academy of Management Journal, 20*(3), 420.

Dunn-Cane, K., Gonzalez, J., & Stewart, H. (1999). Managing the new generation. *Association of Operating Room Nurses. AORN Journal, 69*(5), 930.

Eskilson, A., & Wiley, M. G. (1999). Solving for the X: Aspirations and expectations of college students. *Journal of Youth & Adolescence, 28*(1), 51.

Ewen, R. B., Smith, P. C., Hulin, C. L., & Locke, E. A. (1966). An empirical test of the Herzberg two-factor theory. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 6*, 544-550.

Ezra, M., & Deckman, M. (1996). Balancing work and family responsibilities: flextime and childcare in the federal government. *Public Administration Review, 56*(2), 174-179.

Faber, B. D. (2001). Gen/Ethics? organizational ethics and student and instructor conflicts in workplace training. *Technical Communication Quarterly, 10*(3), 291-319.

Finegold, D., Mohrman, S., & Spreitzer, G. M. (2002). Age effects on the predictors of technical workers' commitment and willingness to turnover. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 23*(5), 655-674.

Gaertner, S., & Robinson, J. M. (1999). Structural determinants of job satisfaction and organizational commitment in turnover models. *Human Resource Management Review, 9*(4), 479-494.

Glisson, C., & Durick, M. (1988). Predictors of job satisfaction and organizational commitment in human service organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 33*(1), 61-80.

Goodin, H. J. (2003). The nursing shortage in the United States of America: an integrative review of the literature. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 43*(4), 335-342.

Gordon, M. E., Pryor, N. M., & Harris, B. V. (1974). An examination of scaling bias in Herzberg's theory of job satisfaction., *Organizational Behavior & Human Performance* (Vol. 11, pp. 106): Academic Press Inc.

Griffin, M. D. (2002). Millennials Rising: The Next Great Generation. *The Journal of Consumer Marketing, 19*(2/3), 282.

Hall, D. T., & Richter, J. (1988). Balancing work life and home life: What can organizations do to help? *Academy of Management Executive, 2*(3), 213-223.

Harris, P. (2005). Boomer vs. Echo Boomer: The Work War? *T+D, 59*(5), 44-49.

Hatfield, J., Robinson, R., & Huseman, R. (1985). An empirical evaluation of a test for assessing job satisfaction. *Psychological Reports, 56*, 39-45.

Hatfield, S. L. (2002). Understanding the Four Generations to Enhance Workplace Management. *AFP Exchange, 22*(4), 72.

Higham, R. (1993). Books for the Western library -- Generations: The History of America's Future, 1584-2069 by William Strauss and Neil Howe. *Journal of the West, 32*(3), 106.

Hiroshi, O., & Madeline, Z. (2005). Gender Differences in Information Technology Usage: A U.S.-Japan Comparison. *Sociological Perspectives, 48*(1), 105.

House, R. J., & Wigdor, L. A. (1967). Herzberg's dual-factor theory of job satisfaction and motivation: A review of the evidence and a criticism2. *Personnel Psychology, 20*(4), 369-389.

Huck, S. W., & Cormier, W. H. (1996). *Reading Statistics and Research* (Second ed.). New York: HarperCollins College Publishers.

Igalens, J., & Roussel, P. (1999). A study of the relationships between compensation package, work motivation and job satisfaction. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 20*(7), 1003.

Igbaria, M., & Guimaraes, T. (1999). Exploring differences in employee turnover intentions and its determinants among telecommuters and non-telecommuters. *Journal of Management Information Systems, 16*(1), 147-164.

Iiacqua, J. A., Schumacher, P., & Li, H. C. (1995). Factors contributing to job satisfaction in higher education., *Education* (Vol. 116, pp. 51): Project Innovation.

Ironson, G. H., Smith, P. C., Brannick, M. T., & Gibson, W. M. (1989). Construction of a Job in General scale: A comparison of global, composite, and specific measures. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 74*(2), 193-200.

Johanna, L. U., & Victoria, M. R. (2003). The Impact of Technology on the "Older" Nurse. *Home Healthcare Nurse, 21*(10), 691.

Jung, K. G., Dalessio, A., & Johnson, S. M. (1986). Stability of the factor structure of the Job Descriptive Index. *Academy Of Management Journal, 29*(3), 609.

Jurkiewicz, C. L. (2000). Generation X and the public employee. *Public Personnel Management, 29*(1), 55-74.

Jurkiewicz, C. L., & Bradley, D. B. (2002). Generational Ethics: Age Cohort and Healthcare Executives' Values. *HEC Forum, 14*(2), 148.

Jurkiewicz, C. L., & Brown, R. G. (1998). GenXers vs. Boomers vs. Matures. *Review of Public Personnel Administration, 18*(4), 18.

Kinicki, A. J., McKee-Ryan, F. M., Schriesheim, C. A., & Carson, K. P. (2002). Assessing the construct validity of the Job Descriptive Index: A review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(1), 14-32.

Knoop, R. (1994). Work values and job satisfaction. *Journal of Psychology, 128*(6), 683-690.

Krug, J. (1998). Understanding Generation X. *Journal of Management in Engineering, 14*(6), 18-19.

Kubicek, H., & Wagner, R. M. (2002). Community networks in a generational perspective. *Information Communication & Society, 5*(3), 291.

Kupperschmidt, B. R. (2000). Multigeneration employees: Strategies for effective management. *The Health Care Manager, 19*(1), 65.

Lambert, E. G., Hogan, N. L., & Barton, S. M. (2001). The impact of job satisfaction on turnover intent: a test of a structural measurement model using a national sample of workers. *Social Science Journal, 38*(2), 233-250.

Leach, F. J., & Westbrook, J. D. (2000). Motivation and job satisfaction in one government research and development environment. *Engineering Management Journal, 12*(4), 3.

Lehman, D. (2003). Taking a fresh approach to finding and retaining today's talent pool. *Plants, Sites and Parks, 30*(3), 30.

Lloyd, J. (1996). Retaining generation X employees. *Journal of Management in Engineering, 12*(6), 5.

Lord, R. L. (2002). Traditional motivation theories and older engineers. *Engineering Management Journal, 14*(3), 3.

Maidani, E. A. (1991). Comparative study of Herzberg's two-factor theory of job satisfaction among public and private sectors. *Public Personnel Management, 20*(4), 441-448.

Mannheim, K. (Ed.). (1928/1952). *The problems of generations* London: Routedge & Paul.

Mannheim, K. (Ed.). (1929/1952). *The problems of generations* London: Routedge & Paul.

Manolis, C., & Levin, A. (1997). A generation X scale: Creation and validation. *Educational & Psychological Measurement, 57*(4), 666-684.

Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation *Psychological Review, 50*, 370-396.

Miceli, M. P., & Jung, I. (1991). Predictors and outcomes of reactions to pay-for-performance plans. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76*(4), 508.

Miceli, M. P., & Mulvey, P. W. (2000). Consequences of satisfaction with pay systems: Two field studies. *Industrial Relations, 39*(1), 62-87.

Mitchell, S. (1998). *American Generations: Who they are . How they live. What they think.* (2nd ed.). Ithaca, NY: New Strategist Publications, Inc.

Murphy, B. (2004). Nursing Home Administrators' Level of Job Satisfaction. *Journal of Healthcare Management, 49*(5), 336-345.

O'Bannon, G. (2001). Managing Our Future: The Generation X Factor. *Public Personnel Management, 30*(1), 95-109.

Park, C., Lovrich, N. P., & Soden, D. L. (1988). Testing Herzberg's motivation theory in a comparative study. *Review of Public Personnel Administration, 8*(3), 40.

Pedhazur, E. J. (1997). *Multiple Regression in Behavioral Research: Explanation and Prediction*. Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.

Pew Internet & American Life Project. (2006). Report: Demographics. Retrieved January 3, 2007, from http://www.pewinternet.org/PPF/c/2/topics.asp

Phillipchuk, J., & Whittaker, J. (1996). An inquiry into the continuing relevance of Herzberg's motivation theory. *Engineering Management Journal, 8*(1), 15.

Pilcher, J. (1994). Mannheim's sociology of generations: An undervalued legacy. *British Journal of Sociology, 45*(3), 481.

Roberts, C. W., & Lang, K. (1985). Generations and ideological change: Some observations, *Public Opinion Quarterly* (Vol. 49, pp. 460-473): American Association for Public Opinion Research.

Rodriguez, R. O., Green, M. T., & Ree, M. J. (2003). Leading Generation X: Do the old rules apply? *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 9*(4), 67.

Saltzstein, A. L., Ting, Y., & Saltzstein, G. H. (2001). Work-family balance and job satisfaction: The impact of family-friendly policies on attitudes of federal government employees. *Public Administration Review, 61*(4), 452-467.

Santos, S. R., & Cox, K. (2000). Workplace adjustment and intergenerational differences between matures, boomers, and Xers. *Nursing Economics, 18*(1), 7.

Santos, S. R., & Cox, K. S. (2002). Generational tension among nurses. *American Journal of Nursing, 102*(1), 11.

Scandura, T. A., & Lankau, M. J. (1997). Relationships of gender, family responsibility and flexible work hours to organizational commitment and job satisfaction. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 18*(4), 377-391.

Schneider, B., & Dachler, H. P. (1978). A Note on the Stability of the Job Descriptive Index. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 63*(5), 650.

Schneider, J. (2003, 2003/07/28/7/28/2003-8/4/2003). Getting nurses back on board. *U.S. News & World Report, 135,* 82.

Schneider, J., & Locke, E. A. (1971). A critique of Herzberg's incident classification system and a suggested revision., *Organizational Behavior & Human Performance* (Vol. 6, pp. 441): Academic Press Inc.

Scott, J. (2000). Is it a different world to when you were growing up? Generational effects on social representations and child-rearing values. *British Journal of Sociology, 51*(2), 355-376.

Sellers, J. A. (2002). Pharmacy and Generation X. *American Journal of Health-System Pharmacy, 59*(9), 832.

Shah, D. V., Kwak, N., & Holbert, R. L. (2001). Connecting and disconnecting with civic life: patterns of internet use and the production of social capital. *Political Communication, 18*(2), 141-162.

Shaw, J. D. (1999). Job satisfaction and turnover intentions: the moderating role of positive affect. *Journal of Social Psychology, 139*(2), 242-244.

Smith, P. C., Kendall, L. M., & Hulin, C. L. (1969). *The Measurement of Satisfaction in Work and Retirement*. Chicago: Rand McNally & Company.

Smola, K. W., & Sutton, C. D. (2002). Generational differences: revisiting generational work values for the new millennium. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 23*(4), 363-382.

Spector, P. E. (1997). *Job Satisfaction: Applications Assessment, Causes, and Consequences*. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications.

Spotts, T. H., Bowman, M. A., & Mertz, C. (1997). Gender and use of instructional technologies: A study of university faculty. *Higher Education, 34*(4), 421-436.

Strauss, W., & Howe, N. (1991a). The Cycle of Generations. *American Demographics, 13*(4), 24-52.

Strauss, W., & Howe, N. (1991b). *Generations: the History of America's Future, 1584 to 2069*. New York: Quill.

Sunoo, B. P. (1998). Employee turnover is expensive. *Workforce, 77*(7), 19-23.

Tietjen, M. A., & Myers, R. M. (1998). Motivation and job satisfaction. *Management Decision, 36*(4), 226.

U.S. Department of Labor. (2005). May 2005 National Industry-Specific Occupational Employment and Wage Estimates. Retrieved June, 2006, from http://www.bls.gov/oes/current/oessrci.htm#62

Utley, D. R., Westbrook, J., & Turner, S. (1997). The relationship between Herzberg's two-factor theory and quality improvement implementation. *Engineering Management Journal, 9*(3), 5.

Watson, D. S. (2002). Wanted: A few good nurses. *Association of Operating Room Nurses. AORN Journal, 76*(1), 8.

Williams, M. L., Malos, S. B., & Palmer, D. K. (2002). Benefit system and benefit level satisfaction: An expanded model of antecedents and consequences. *Journal of Management, 28*(2), 195-215.

Worklife Report. (2002). *Generation X professionals: assumptions and realities* (Article No. 0834292X): IR Research Publications.

Zemke, R., Raines, C., & Filipczak, B. (2000). *Generations at Work: Managing the Clash of Veterans, Boomers, Xers, Nexters in your Workplace*. New York: AMACON.

APPENDIX A: LETTER TO PARTICIPANTS

September 24, 2005

Dear Valued Employee:

Thank you for agreeing to participate in a voluntary job satisfaction survey regarding your present job. The survey is designed to gather information from all employees about their work experience on the job. Your participation will be extremely helpful to me personally as I am a conducting research on job satisfaction as part of a study at Georgia State University. Equally as important, your management would like to hear your opinions to help improve the organization.

As the researcher, I will be responsible for analyzing the data and compiling the aggregate results. Your specific answers will be completely confidential; however I will compile a non-identifying summary of your views, in combination with those of others, to assist your management team in improving the organization for your benefit.

Please take a few minutes to complete this survey. Simply circle or write your answers in the space provided and return the completed survey as directed.

Thank you for your ideas and help with this survey.

Sincerely,

Cheryl J. Curry
Graduate Student
Georgia State University
School of Policy Studies

APPENDIX B: SURVEY

Date: _____

Job Satisfaction Survey

Part I: Job Evaluation

In each of the questions below you will be asked to think about certain aspects of your present job. You will be given a list of words or phrases to review and asked to determine how well each describes that aspect of your present job. For the descriptive words or phrases, please circle:

1 for "Yes" if it describes that aspect of your current job
2 for "No" if it does not describe it
3 for "Undecided" if you cannot decide

Start Here

1. YOUR WORK
Think of the work you do at present. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe your work?

Circle "Yes," "No" or "Undecided" for EACH word or phrase.

	Yes	No	Un-decided
Satisfying	1	2	3
Gives a sense of accomplishment	1	2	3
Challenging	1	2	3
Dull	1	2	3
Uninteresting	1	2	3

2. PAY
Think of the pay you get now. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe your present pay?

Circle "Yes," "No" or "Undecided" for EACH word or phrase.

	Yes	No	Un-decided
Income adequate for normal expenses	1	2	3
Fair	1	2	3
Insecure	1	2	3
Well paid	1	2	3
Underpaid	1	2	3

3. RECOGNITION
Think of the recognition you receive now? How well does each of the following words or phrases describe the recognition?

Circle "Yes," "No" or "Undecided" for EACH word or phrase.

	Yes	No	Un-decided
Fulfilling	1	2	3
Gives sense of pride	1	2	3
Recognition when deserved	1	2	3
Little or no recognition	1	2	3
Poor	1	2	3

4. PEOPLE
Think of the people that you work with now or the people you meet in connection with your work. How well does each to the following words or phrases describe these people?

Circle "Yes," "No" or "Undecided" for EACH word or phrase.

	Yes	No	Un-decided
Boring	1	2	3
Helpful	1	2	3
Responsible	1	2	3
Intelligent	1	2	3
Lazy	1	2	3

5. **OFFICE TECHNOLOGY**
Think if the office technology you use on the job, i.e., computers, internet, telephones, software programs, etc. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe the technology?

Circle "Yes," "No" or "Undecided" for EACH word for phrase.

	Yes	No	Un-decided
Adequate to the job done	1	2	3
Bad	1	2	3
Acceptable	1	2	3
Excellent	1	2	3
Too complicated	1	2	3
Good	1	2	3
Simple	1	2	3
Fair	1	2	3
Ideal	1	2	3
Superior	1	2	3
Inadequate	1	2	3
Poor	1	2	3

6. **SUPERVISION**
Think of your supervisor and the kind of supervision that you get on your job. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe your supervision?

Circle "Yes", "No" or "Undecided" for EACH word or phrase.

	Yes	No	Un-decided
Praises good work	1	2	3
Tactful	1	2	3
Up-to-date	1	2	3
Annoying	1	2	3
Bad	1	2	3

7. **WORK-FAMILY BALANCE**
Think of the work-family balance you have now. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe your work-family balance?

Circle "Yes," "No" or "Undecided" for EACH word or phrase.

	Yes	No	Un-decided
Well-balanced	1	2	3
Fair	1	2	3
Bad	1	2	3
Excellent	1	2	3
Overloaded with work	1	2	3
Good	1	2	3
Ideal	1	2	3
Challenging	1	2	3
Acceptable	1	2	3
Poor	1	2	3
Rotten	1	2	3
Comfortable	1	2	3

8. **PROMOTION**
Think of the opportunities for promotion that you have now. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe your opportunities for promotion?

Circle "Yes", "No" or "Undecided" for EACH word or phrase.

	Yes	No	Un-decided
Good opportunities for promotion	1	2	3
Promotion on ability	1	2	3
Dead-end job	1	2	3
Good chance for promotion	1	2	3
Unfair promotion policy	1	2	3

JOB IN GENERAL

Think of your job in general. All in all, what is your job like most of the time?
Circle "Yes", "No" or "Undecided" for EACH word or phrase.

	Yes	No	Undecided
Good	1	2	3
Undesirable	1	2	3
Better than most	1	2	3
Disagreeable	1	2	3
Makes me content	1	2	3
Excellent	1	2	3
Enjoyable	1	2	3
Poor	1	2	3

Part II: General Information

For each question, place an "X" in front of the correct answer or write in the answer where appropriate.

1. **GENDER**
   What is your gender?

   _____Male

   _____Female

2. **YEAR OF BIRTH**
   In which year were you born?

   19_____

3. **INCOME**
   In which of the following groups did your total income fall last year before taxes?

   _____Less than $15,000

   _____$15,000 - 24,999

   _____$25,000 - 34,999

   _____$35,000 - 49,999

   _____$50,000 - 74,999

   _____$75,000 - $99,999

   _____$100,000 - $300,000

   _____$300,000 and above

4. **EDUCATION**
   What is the highest level of educational attainment you have achieved:

   _____ Some school

   _____ Some high school

   _____ High School Graduate

   _____ Associate Degree

   _____ Bachelors Degree

   _____ Masters Degree

   _____ Doctorate or higher

5. **JOB**
   In which of the following categories does your current job with this organization fall?

   _____Physician

   _____Administration

   _____Nurse

   _____Clerical

   _____Food Service

   _____Medical Professional

   _____Housekeeping/Maintenance

   _____Other, please specify _____

6. **RACE**
   With which racial/ethnic group do you most strongly identify?

   _____White

   _____Black or African-American

   _____Asian, Pacific Islander

   _____Hispanic

   _____American Indian, Eskimo, Aleut

   _____Multiracial

   _____Other, please specify _____

Part III: Comments

Please provide any comments you wish regarding your job: (Use back of sheet if needed)

_____

_____

_____

_____

End

APPENDIX C: REMINDER MEMORANDUM

Memorandum

To: All Employees

From: Cheryl J. Curry, Georgia State University

Date: September 12, 200X

Re: JOB SATISFACTION SURVEY

If you have already completed the job satisfaction survey, I would like to express my sincerest appreciation for your participation.

If you have not completed the employee job satisfaction survey, you still have time!! The survey close date is September XX.

Please take a few minutes to complete your survey and return it today!

Sincerely,

Cheryl J. Curry

APPENDIX D: PRETEST

Version HC-P-01

Job Satisfaction Survey (PRETEST)

Date: _____ Company Code: _____

Part I: Job Evaluation

In each of the questions below you will be asked to think about certain aspects of your present job. You will be given a list of words or phrases to review and asked to determine how well each describes that aspect of your present job. For the descriptive words or phrases, please circle:

1 for "Yes" if it describes that aspect of your current job
2 for "No" if it does not describe it
3 for "Undecided" if you cannot decide

Start Here

1. Think of the work you do at present. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe your work?

	Yes	No	Un-decided
Satisfying	1	2	3
Gives a sense of accomplishment	1	2	3
Challenging	1	2	3
Dull	1	2	3
Uninteresting	1	2	3

2. Think of the pay you get now. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe your present pay?

	Yes	No	Un-decided
Income adequate for normal expenses	1	2	3
Fair	1	2	3
Insecure	1	2	3
Well paid	1	2	3
Underpaid	1	2	3

3. Think of the recognition you receive now? How well does each of the following words or phrases describe the recognition?

	Yes	No	Un-decided
Fulfilling	1	2	3
Gives sense of pride	1	2	3
Recognition when deserved	1	2	3
Little or no recognition	1	2	3
Poor	1	2	3

4. Think of the people that you work with now or the people you meet in connection with your work. How well does each to the following words or phrases describe these people?

	Yes	No	Un-decided
Boring	1	2	3
Helpful	1	2	3
Responsible	1	2	3
Intelligent	1	2	3
Lazy	1	2	3

Continue to the next page

5. Think of the acknowledgement you get for a job well done. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe the acknowledgement?

	Yes	No	Un-decided
Gratifying	1	2	3
Gives sense of pride	1	2	3
Inadequate	1	2	3
Poor	1	2	3
Seldom acknowledged	1	2	3

6. Think if the technology you use on the job now. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe the technology?

	Yes	No	Un-decided
Adequate	1	2	3
Out-dated	1	2	3
Fair	1	2	3
Excellent	1	2	3
Too complicated	1	2	3

What type of technology comes to mind when you think of technology you use in your current job?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

7. Think of your supervisor and the kind of supervision that you get on your job. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe your supervision?

	Yes	No	Un-decided
Praises good work	1	2	3
Tactful	1	2	3
Up-to-date	1	2	3
Annoying	1	2	3
Bad	1	2	3

8. Think of the work schedule flexibility you have now. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe your work schedule flexibility?

	Yes	No	Un-decided
Adequate	1	2	3
Fair	1	2	3
Poor	1	2	3
Excellent	1	2	3
Totally inflexible	1	2	3

9. Think of the work-family balance you have now. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe your work-family balance?

	Yes	No	Un-decided
Well balanced	1	2	3
Fair	1	2	3
Poor	1	2	3
Excellent	1	2	3
Overloaded with work	1	2	3

What comes to mind when you think of the work-family balance in the question above?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

10. Think of the opportunities for promotion that you have now. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe your opportunities for promotion?

	Yes	No	Un-decided
Good opportunities for promotion	1	2	3
Promotion on ability	1	2	3
Dead-end job	1	2	3
Good chance for promotion	1	2	3
Unfair promotion policy	1	2	3

Continue to the next page

11. Think of the work tools you use now. How well does each of the following words or phases describe the work tools?

	Yes	No	Un-decided
Adequate ……..	1	2	3
Obsolete ……..	1	2	3
Decent ……..	1	2	3
Excellent ……..	1	2	3
Too complex ……	1	2	3

What type of tools comes to mind when you think of the work tools you use in your current job?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

12. Think of your job in general. All in all, what is it like most of the time? For each of the following words or phrases, circle, Yes, No, or Undecided.

	Yes	No	Un-decided
Good	1	2	3
Undesirable	1	2	3
Better than most	1	2	3
Disagreeable	1	2	3
Makes me content	1	2	3
Excellent	1	2	3
Enjoyable	1	2	3
Poor	1	2	3

Part II: General Information

For each question, place an "X" in front of the correct answer or write in the answer where appropriate.

1. What is your gender?

_____Male

_____Female

2. With which of the following generational groups do you most identify? Please mark only ONE.

_____Generation X

_____Baby Boomers

_____Silent or Mature Generation

_____Generation Y or Millennial Generation

_____Undecided

3. In which year were you born?

19_____

4. In which of the following categories does your current job with this organization fall? Please mark only ONE.

_____Physician

_____Nurse

_____Medical professional

_____Administrative/Clerical

_____Other, please specify _____

Continue to the next page

5. In which of the following groups did your total income fall last year before taxes?

_____Less than $15,000
_____ $15,000 - 24,999
_____$25,000 - 34,999
_____$35,000 - 49,999
_____$50,000 - 74,999
_____$75,000 - $99,999
_____$100,000 - $300,000
_____$300,000 and above

6. With which racial/ethnic group do you most strongly identify?

_____White
_____Black or African American
_____Asian, Pacific Islander
_____Hispanic
_____American Indian, Eskimo, Aleut
_____Multiracial
_____Other please specify _____

Please add any additional comments regarding your job that you would like to share:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Please add any comments regarding the layout and content of this survey:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Thank you for providing your valuable input to this survey!

VITA

Cheryl J. Curry received her undergraduate degree in Mathematics and Psychology from Alabama State University. She attended the University of Alabama where she received her Master of Business Administration with a concentration in Finance and Marketing. While completing her PhD in Human Resources Development at Georgia State University, she assisted Dr Verna J. Willis in teaching a course on women and leadership. Additionally, she has consulted with numerous non-profit organizations on how to build and sustain organizational health.

Cheryl has done work in the area of employee development in the financial sector at a large Atlanta-based bank as well as for several Fortune 500 technology companies, including BellSouth and Lucent where she held sales and technical management roles. C.J. l has also worked with small companies (less than 400 employees) and start-up organization (less than 150 employees) with primary focus in three areas; (1) developing and executing sales strategies to increase revenue and profitability, (2) creating and implementing organizational efficiency processes and policies, and (3) developing business strategies and service offerings. Her areas of interests are work motivation, employee development, leadership effectiveness, and organizational development.