University of San Diego

Digital USD

Dissertations

Theses and Dissertations

2019-05-19

Truth or Myth? Millennial Stereotypes, Self-Image, and Engagement in the Workplace

Stephanie Van Dellen
University of San Diego

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digital.sandiego.edu/dissertations>

Part of the [Organizational Behavior and Theory Commons](#)

Digital USD Citation

Van Dellen, Stephanie, "Truth or Myth? Millennial Stereotypes, Self-Image, and Engagement in the Workplace" (2019). *Dissertations*. 141.

<https://digital.sandiego.edu/dissertations/141>

This Dissertation: Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Digital USD. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital USD. For more information, please contact digital@sandiego.edu.

2019-05-19

Truth or Myth? Millennial Stereotypes, Self-Image, and Engagement in the Workplace

Stephanie Van Dellen

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digital.sandiego.edu/dissertations>

Part of the [Organizational Behavior and Theory Commons](#)

TRUTH OR MYTH?
MILLENNIAL STEREOTYPES, SELF-IMAGE, AND ENGAGEMENT IN THE
WORKPLACE

by

Stephanie A. Van Dellen

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

May 2019

Dissertation Committee

Afsaneh Nahavandi, PhD

Marcus Lam, PhD

Christopher B. Newman, PhD

University of San Diego

© Copyright by Stephanie A. Van Dellen, 2019

All Rights Reserved

DATE: April 23, 2019

ABSTRACT

There are approximately 58 million Millennials working for corporations in the United States. Millennials generally born between the years 1980 to 1995 are said to have been shaped by events such as the invention of the Internet and cell phones. Given that Millennials make up a large percentage of the active workforce, it is important to understand the perceived stereotypes of Millennials and how these generalizations may impact their engagement and effectiveness at work.

This research aims to better understand how managers perceive Millennial employees, how Millennials self-identify with their generational stereotypes, and how they differ from other generations. The dissertation further seeks to better understand the factors that engage Millennials at work. A total of 1,097 employees of two private, service-based organizations participated in the survey that collected information on stereotypes and engagement preferences. The results indicate managers hold nine of the common Millennial stereotypes (entitled, disloyal, lazy, creative, multi-taskers, passionate, wanting work/life balance, needy, and sensitive) while Millennials view themselves as passionate multi-taskers, who value work-life balance. Further, Millennials who identify as Millennials saw themselves as less creative and placed less value on work-life balance than Millennials who do not self-identify as Millennials. When compared to other generations, Millennials differ only in their responses to the following stereotypes: entitled, lazy, needy, creative, and passionate. Finally, the relationship between eleven engagement practices and stereotypes, controlling for role in the organization (manager vs. non-manager), generation, gender, and highest level of education, is presented in regression models. Key findings indicate the more an

individual self-identifies as a multi-tasker, the more likely they are to enjoy team competition and dress casually in the workplace. Also, those who self-identified as sensitive have a decreased desire for healthy team competition.

This study indicates not all Millennials see themselves as exhibiting the commonly held stereotypes and confirms previous studies that found managers hold specific stereotypes of Millennials. Additionally, building upon previous studies, this study's results suggest Millennials' self-identification is not as consistent as expected. Moreover, recognizing how an employee self-identifies with the stereotypes can aid managers in employing specific practices to increase engagement.

DEDICATION

I dedicate my dissertation to my Baby Boomer parents, Deborah and Dale Van Dellen, for raising me to believe that anything is possible. This achievement would not have been attainable without the opportunities they created and the unconditional love and support they provided.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I first and foremost want to extend my gratitude to the members of my dissertation committee for the countless hours they put into providing advice to help improve my work. Thank you Dr. Afsaneh Nahavandi for seeing me from start to finish in my doctoral journey. Your constant, unwavering support as my advisor and co-chair has positively impacted my time in this program. To my other co-chair, Dr. Marcus Lam, thank you for taking on the responsibility of assisting me with the statistical tests and interpretations. I thank you for your patience. I also acknowledge and appreciate the encouragement that Dr. Christopher B. Newman gave me throughout my doctoral journey and dissertation process.

Additionally, I would be remiss if I did not acknowledge the contributions of Account Control Technology Holdings, Inc. Thank you to the Talent Management Team, specifically Fabian Grijalva, Amanda Rominger, and Shawna Ford, who distributed the survey. Thank you to the owners of Account Control Technology Holdings, Inc. for granting me access to the organization. I appreciate all 1,079 people who participated in this survey for taking the time to add to our knowledge on generational stereotypes and engagement practices.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	viii
LIST OF TABLES	xiii
INTRODUCTION	1
Background.....	1
Purpose and Scope of Study	3
CHAPTER 1: LITERATURE REVIEW	7
Context.....	7
Generational Research	8
Generations in the American Workplace.....	10
Baby Boomers.....	11
Generation X.....	13
Millennials	14
Generation Z	19
Issues with Generational Research	22
Stereotypes.....	23
Millennial Stereotypes	24
Engagement.....	26
Kahn's Engagement Model.....	28

Psychological Meaningfulness.....	28
Psychological Safety.....	29
Psychological Availability.....	30
Applying Kahn’s Model to Millennials.....	33
Psychological Meaningfulness.....	33
Psychological Safety.....	35
Psychological Availability.....	37
Application & Critiques of Kahn’s Model.....	40
Utrecht Work Engagement Scale.....	42
Application of Model and Critique.....	43
Gallup Work Engagement Survey.....	43
Application of Model and Critique.....	44
Engagement and Work-Related Motivation.....	45
Critiques of Engagement.....	46
Pilot Study.....	47
Conclusion.....	48
Research Questions.....	49
Hypotheses.....	49
CHAPTER 2: METHODS.....	51
Participants.....	51
Sample.....	52

Non-Manager Sample	53
Generation.....	53
Education	54
Race.....	55
Gender.....	56
Managers Sample.....	57
Generation.....	57
Education	57
Race.....	58
Gender.....	59
Measures	59
Procedures.....	62
Analyses.....	63
CHAPTER 3: FINDINGS	65
Managers' Stereotypes of Millennials	65
Managers' Perceptions by Gender	69
Managerial Scale.....	73
Millennials' Self-Image	74
Millennials' Self-Image by Gender	78
Scale of Millennials' Self-Image	81
Managers' Perceptions and Millennials' Self-Image.....	89

Comparing Millennials with Other Generations.....	92
Entitled.....	98
Lazy.....	98
Needy	99
Creative.....	99
Passionate.....	100
Millennial Stereotypes and Engagement Practices	107
Clear Expectations	109
Schedule Flexibility	110
Voice in Decision Making	112
Recognition.....	114
Relationship with Manager	117
Encouragement	119
Feedback	121
Physical Health	123
Learning Opportunities	125
Casual Dress.....	127
Competition on Team Projects.....	128
CHAPTER 4: DISCUSSION.....	133
Managers' Stereotypes of Millennials	134
Millennials' Self-Image	136
Comparing Millennials with Other Generations.....	140

Millennial Stereotypes and Engagement Practices	141
Contributions	144
Limitations	145
Future Research	147
REFERENCES	150
APPENDIX A: Survey Questions	161
APPENDIX B: Request to Complete Survey Sent to Employees	174
APPENDIX C: Possible Engagement Practices	175
APPENDIX D: Utrecht Work Engagement Scale	176

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Generational Workplace Values and Attitudes.....	18
Table 2. Dimensions of Psychological Conditions	31
Table 3. Summary of Kahn’s (1990) Dimensions and Recommendations.....	40
Table 4. Questions from Gallup’s Q12 Survey.....	45
Table 5. Generations of Non-Manager Participants	53
Table 6. Highest Level of Education Achieved by Non-Manager Participants	55
Table 7. Percentages of Races Represented in Non-Manager Participants	56
Table 8. Generations of Manager Participants.....	57
Table 9. Highest Level of Education Achieved by Manager Participants.....	58
Table 10. Percentages of Races Represented in Manager Participants	59
Table 11. Summary Statistics of Managers’ Perceptions of Millennial Stereotypes.....	66
Table 12. Pairwise Correlations of Managers’ Perceptions of Typical Millennial Stereotypes.....	66
Table 13. Pairwise Correlations of Male Managers’ Perceptions of Typical Millennial Stereotypes	71
Table 14. Pairwise Correlations of Female Managers’ Perceptions of Typical Millennial Stereotypes.....	72
Table 15. Scale of Manager’s Perceptions of Millennial Stereotypes	74
Table 16. Descriptive Statistics of Millennials’ Self-Image of Stereotypes.....	75
Table 17. Correlations of Millennials’ Self-Image of Stereotypes.....	77
Table 18. Correlations of Male Millennials’ Self-Image of Stereotypes.....	78
Table 19. Correlations of Female Millennials’ Self-Image of Stereotypes	79
Table 20. Scale of Millennials’ Self-Image of Stereotypes	82

Table 21. Descriptive Statistics of Millennials' Self-Image by Self-Identification as Millennials.....	83
Table 22. Independent Sample Test of Millennials' Self-Image by Self-Identification as Millennials	85
Table 23. ANOVA of Millennials' Self-Image by Self-Identification as Millennials	87
Table 24. Descriptive Statistics of Managers' Perceptions and Millennial's Self-Image	89
Table 25. Independent Sample Test of Managers' Perceptions and Millennials' Self-Image.....	90
Table 26. Descriptive Statistics of Non-Managers' Self-Image with Millennial Stereotypes.....	93
Table 27. Homogeneity of Variances for Self-Image with Millennial Stereotypes	95
Table 28. ANOVA Results of Self-Image Based on Generation.....	96
Table 29. Post-Hoc Test of Least Squares Differences for ANOVA of Self-Image and Generations	101
Table 30. Summary Statistics of Engagement Practices	108
Table 31. Summary of Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Needing Clear Expectations	110
Table 32. Summary of Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Schedule Flexibility	111
Table 33. Summary of Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Voice in Decision Making.....	114
Table 34. Summary of Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Being Recognized for Work Accomplishments.....	116
Table 35. Summary of Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Wanting Manager to Care About Me as a Person.....	118
Table 36. Summary of Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Wanting Encouragement	120

Table 37. Summary of Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Getting Monthly Feedback	122
Table 38. Summary of Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Getting Opportunities to Promote Physical Health.....	124
Table 39. Summary of Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Interest in Learning Something New	126
Table 40. Summary of Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Casual Dress to Express Individuality	128
Table 41. Summary of Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Enjoying Healthy Competition on Team Projects.....	131
Table 42. Stereotypes and Demographic Variables that Predicted Engagement Practices	143

INTRODUCTION

It is estimated that there are about 58 million Millennials currently working for corporations in the United States (Toossi, 2008). Thus, if we do not seek to understand and support their needs in the workplace, there could be issues of lower engagement that would lead to higher turnover and burnout rates. While the Millennial Generation has become a popular topic of conversation in American society, most of what is known about the generation is based on anecdotes and observations of practitioners and is largely based on stereotypes. Although this generation is the predominant generation in the workplace (U.S. Census Bureau, 2018), most of what we know about them regarding what motivates them at work and how to best manage them is therefore not based on any systematic research. In order to address this gap, this study aimed to collect systematic data about Millennials by surveying all employees working for two privately-held organizations based in the United States. The research sought to better understand the self-image of the Millennial Generation and the stereotypes that are typically held about members of the generation, while also determining if specific engagement practices would allow employers to get their Millennial employees to bring their best selves to work. The results of this study can help human resource practitioners and managers gain a better understanding of Millennial needs in the workplace in hopes of providing stimulating and engaging environments.

Background

Millennials are generally born between the years 1980 and 1995 and life events such as the invention of the Internet and cell phones have shaped the way they

communicate and absorb information. The September 11th attack and economic downturn of 2008 have also influenced their perception of their personal and global futures. In the United States, Millennials are considered the most ethnically diverse generation and they have become generalized and stereotyped as needy (Marano, 2004), entitled, disloyal, creative, multi-taskers, sensitive, social (Perry, Hanvongese, & Casoninic, 2013), passionate, wanting work/life balance (Crumpacker & Crumpacker, 2007; Perry, Hanvongese, & Casoninic, 2013), and lazy (Crumpacker & Crumpacker, 2007; Deal, Altman, & Rogelberg, 2010; Perry, Hanvongese, & Casoninic, 2013). While anecdotal and case studies of the generation abound, there is still limited formal research about this generation.

This research contributes to engagement scholarship by taking a concept that is fairly practitioner-focused and applying academic rigor through a formal research study. By examining the perceived stereotypes against self-perception, a better understanding of how the Millennial Generation actual views themselves is achieved. While much has been said about who the Millennials are and what they want from work, it is not clear the validity of those observations and opinions. This quantitative dissertation focuses on the Millennial Generation by comparing what we already know through anecdotal evidence, practitioner literature, and the academic literature to question if Millennials really want different experiences in the workplace. This study is important because it looks at the societal stereotypes of Millennials and compares those stereotypes to their self-image. It also identifies how the Millennials' self-image informs the engagement practices they

prefer in organizations. This is relevant for managers and human resources professionals who seek to increase engagement of Millennials.

Purpose and Scope of Study

This research seeks to increase our understanding of Millennials in the workplace and the factors that engage them in their work. To that end, the research was guided by the following questions:

1. To what extent do managers hold the typical stereotypes of Millennials?
2. To what extent do Millennials' self-images reflect those stereotypes?
 - 2a. Is this self-perception unique to this generation? (i.e., other generations do not see themselves the same way)
3. How do the Millennial stereotypes influence desired engagement practices at work?

The results can help determine whether engagement practices need to differ based on generational needs, as well as how stereotypes of Millennials fit an individual's self-image. This is important because there is a divide between practitioner and academic views about whether a generational difference occurs. Since articles by academics try to prove generational differences do not exist and newspapers and books by practitioners offer that the differences do exist, there is confusion. As a result, this research seeks to discover more about the usefulness of generational stereotypes, self-identification, and engagement practices. Engagement practices derived from the literature that theoretically are supposed to help increase engagement amongst Millennials were tested with employees from two organizations. Both organizations operate in the services industry

and are owned by the same parent company. Thus, the design of this research allows for comparison between generations in the services industry.

The first two research questions focus on stereotypes; the third links those stereotypes to engagement to see whether different generations express the need for different engagement practices. Based on a small pilot study and the existing literature about characteristics of the Millennial generation, the research on workplace engagement, and the supposed unique engagement needs of Millennials, this study:

- First, assesses the degree to which people who work with Millennials, actually hold consistent identifiable stereotypes of the generation.
- Second, assesses whether Millennials' self-image is unique and consistent with those stereotypes,
- And finally, using engagement practices derived from the literature and identification with generational stereotypes, considers differences across generations related to preferences for such practices.

While there is some controversy over the age ranges for generations, there are currently four generations in the American workplace. Generations are formed by the shared events that people born around the same time experience as they age (Ryder, 1965; Edmunds & Turner, 2005; D'Amato & Herzfeldt, 2008). It is believed that these shared events create shared values for each generation (Strauss & Howe, 1991; Glass, 2007; D'Amato & Herzfeldt, 2008). For the purpose of this research, the most commonly used years of birth will be used to provide comparison and consistency. Thus, the Baby Boomer Generation defined in this work was born between 1945 and 1964. Generation X

was born between 1965 and 1979. The Millennial Generation was born between 1980 and 1995, and Generation Z was born between 1996 and 2010. The Baby Boomer generation represents about 75 million people in the United States. The post-World War II generation gets its name from the increase in births rates after the war (Beutell & Wittig-Berman, 2008). As the smallest generation in terms of births, Generation X is more known by a letter than by a name, which also identifies an aspect of the generation (Crumpacker & Crumpacker, 2007). The Millennial generation got its name from Howe and Strauss (1992), and while much has been said about what the generation values, very little is based on empirical evidence. The youngest of the generations included in this research is Generation Z. While little is known about this generation compared to other generations, it is included in this research since the oldest members of this generation are twenty-two years old and are working for organizations in America.

This dissertation includes four chapters. The first chapter presents the literature review and the theoretical framework for this research. It takes a detailed look into the literature about generational research, stereotypes, and engagement in the workplace. Each concept is explored to determine gaps in knowledge and opportunities for this research to provide new understanding of how the Millennial generation is perceived at work, what they want from work, and how their self-image fits with stereotypes of the generation. Current studies and practitioner insights are explored to create a greater understanding of the topics the research builds upon. Additionally, the pilot study that helped inform the direction of this work is presented.

Chapter two presents the research methodology including participant demographics and organizations in this study. It also details the research design and provides information about the survey deployed. Chapter three provides the findings for the three research questions using descriptive statistics, t-tests, ANOVAs, and multiple regressions. Chapter four considers limitations, contributions, and areas of future research.

CHAPTER 1:

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter will first discuss research about generational differences with a specific focus on workplace differences. Generations included in this section include Baby Boomer, Generation X, Millennials, and Generations Z. The topic of generational differences is a common discussion and words like “Millennial” have become part of the vernacular. From taking quizzes on social media to help determine our “fit” with our generation to managers trying to determine how to design work for younger generations, these types of interests and insights seek to answer if generations are a useful concept. While the U.S. Census Bureau collects data on age, it also classifies people into generations based on date of birth to determine how many people are in the workplace from each generation (U.S. Census Bureau, 2015). Additionally, insights into the values and behaviors that shape generations will be identified. Since much of generational research is based on stereotypes, the concept of stereotypes will be explored and its influence on the workplace also will be discussed. Next, engagement theories including Kahn’s Engagement Model, the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale, and Gallup’s Workplace Engagement are explored to understand how engagement is being measured and where it is derived from. Finally, determinations of gaps in the literature and opportunities for the research to add to theory are presented.

Context

While there is some controversy over the age ranges for generations, there are currently four generations in the American workplace. Generations are formed by the

shared events that people born around the same time experience as they age (Ryder, 1965; Edmunds & Turner, 2005; D'Amato & Herzfeldt, 2008). It is believed that these shared events create shared values for each generation (Strauss & Howe, 1991; Glass, 2007; D'Amato & Herzfeldt, 2008). For the purpose of this research the most commonly used years of birth will be used to provide comparison and consistency. Thus, the Baby Boomer Generation defined in this work was born between 1945 and 1964. Generation X was born between 1965 and 1979. The Millennial Generation was born between 1980 and 1995, and Generation Z was born between 1996 and 2010. The Baby Boomer generation represents about 75 million people in the United States. The post-World War II generation gets its name from the increase in birth rates after the war (Beutell & Wittig-Berman, 2008). As the smallest generation in terms of births, Generation X is more known by a letter than by a name, which also identifies an aspect of the generation (Crumpacker & Crumpacker, 2007). The Millennial Generation got its name from Howe and Strauss (1992), and while much has been said about what the generation values, very little is based on empirical evidence. The youngest of the generations included in this research is Generation Z. While little is known about this generation compared to other generations, it is included in this research since the oldest members of this generation are twenty-two years old and are working for organizations in America.

Generational Research

The idea of generational cohorts originally comes from the work of Mannheim (1952) who identified differences between people based on historical events. Mannheim (1952) believed that a lack of opportunities experienced by groups of people born in the

same time created similar experiences and behaviors. As a result, others have also agreed that generations are shaped by the shared events that people born around the same time experience as they develop and grow (Ryder, 1965; Edmunds & Turner, 2005; D'Amato & Herzfeldt, 2008). It is believed that these events create shared values for each generation (Strauss & Howe, 1991; Glass, 2007; D'Amato & Herzfeldt, 2008). As a result, the shared values are enacted as behaviors and attitudes that we can identify and predict (Strauss & Howe, 1991; Glass, 2007). Grouping people into generations and predicting their behaviors can be useful for practitioners to develop ideas on how to best work and interact with people from a specific generation.

Most of the research on generations is focused on people living in the United States, thus more agreement has been reached on where one generation stops and another begins (D'Amato & Herzfeldt, 2008). While some research has been done to show the global impact of generations (Deal & Levenson, 2006), the underlying assumption that generations are shaped by life events (Strauss & Howe, 1991; Glass, 2007; D'Amato & Herzfeldt, 2008) contradicts this claim, since life events would differ based on where one is raised. However, shared life events also limits the generalizability to people in just one country. For the purpose of this research, the four following generations studied will use the following birth years:

- The Baby Boomer Generation was born between 1945 and 1964,
- Generation X was born between 1965 and 1979,
- The Millennial Generation was born between 1980 and 1995,
- Generation Z was born between 1996 and 2010.

Scholars and practitioners have studied each generation to determine the values motivating workplace behaviors. All four generations will be briefly explained to illustrate the values that are typically ascribed to them.

Generations in the American Workplace

Starting with the oldest generation in the American workplace and working towards the youngest generation, each generation is explored to understand its shared values and life events. For the Baby Boomers, Generation X, and Millennials, more information regarding their workplace behaviors is also offered. Particular attention to Millennials helps identify the stereotypes the research in this dissertation builds upon.

While these age ranges are most commonly used by scholars and practitioners, there is still some disagreement about the age ranges that should be used and their predictive ability. For example, some will say that the Millennial Generation is comprised of those born until 2000 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2015). While this research and review of the literature takes into account the different ranges, it will utilize the ones that are most well used and logically make the most sense based on life events (Alsop, 2008; Crumpacker & Crumpacker, 2007). For example, the generation that follows the Millennials is being called Generation Z, yet also goes by iGen, since it has always been raised with technology (Williams, 2015). The year 1995 cut off between these two generations, although somewhat arbitrary, supports the underlying claim that those born around the same time experience life events similarly and thus shape their perceptions and values. Growing up and starting to experience technology that has always been present would create a variation in behavior and interaction with technology (Williams,

2015). Once again, this argument strengthens the claim that each of the generational ranges used in this study have been given considerable thought in order to develop brackets that are going to be most useful in capturing potential similarities. In the next section, each of the generations in the American workplace will be explained to provide more insight into how the generations are said to differ.

Baby Boomers

The Baby Boomer Generation represents about 75 million people in the United States. The post–World War II generation gets its name from the increase in births after the war (Beutell & Wittig-Berman, 2008). There are multiple key events that shaped the Baby Boomer Generation including the assassinations of President John F. Kennedy and Martin Luther King, Jr. Additionally, the civil rights movement and the women’s movement offered more people access through their struggles and protest (Beutell & Witting-Berman, 2008; Crumpacker & Crumpacker, 2007). Beyond the social unrest, there were moments of triumph such as Americans walking on the moon that demonstrated America’s competitive nature to beat the Russians to the moon and space. However, there was also the Vietnam War that drafted many men to fight that also influenced Baby Boomers’ world perspective (Beutell & Witting-Berman, 2008; Crumpacker & Crumpacker, 2007). Howe and Strauss (2007) claim that the key life events that Baby Boomers experienced influenced the generation to participate in civic demonstrations while seeking self-reflection for deeper meaning in their lives. Additionally, many Baby Boomers raised Millennial children; as a result, it is thought that Millennials gained their interest in civics from their parents (Howe & Strauss, 2007).

At work, Baby Boomers are highly competitive and driven to achieve success (Twenge, 2010). They have a tendency to micromanage employees they consider “lazy” by constantly checking over the employees’ work (Twenge, 2010). However, it has also been said that Baby Boomers strive towards achieving consensus in decision-making processes (Crumpacker & Crumpacker, 2007). Perhaps these two behaviors seem at odd. How can one micromanage others, yet seek consensus?

As apt networkers, Baby Boomers have a tendency to put their careers first before family and social obligations (Crumpacker & Crumpacker, 2007). Additionally, Baby Boomers associate power with authority and find the use of titles, promotions, and compensation to be their ideal form of rewards (Crumpacker & Crumpacker, 2007). Reinforcing what has been said and stereotyped about the Baby Boomer generation, Twenge (2010) found in an empirical study that the Baby Boomers have the strongest work ethic while also place the least amount of emphasis on leisure compared to Generation X and Millennials. Baby Boomers and Millennials not only have a shared interest in civic engagement, but also in making sure all voices are valued and are a part of the decision-making process (Crumpacker & Crumpacker, 2007). Thus, these studies suggest that Baby Boomers value participatory decision-making.

Some researchers have expressed concern that Baby Boomers are experiencing discrimination in the workplace and in hiring decisions (Cox, Young, Guardia, & Bohmann, 2017) because Baby Boomers are seen as “older employees” and the stereotypes of both are similar (Perry, Havongse, & Casoinic, 2013; Wrenn & Maurer, 2004). The similar stereotypes include being resistant to change, incompetent with

technology, and less friendly (Perry et al., 2013). These researchers believe because Baby Boomers are the oldest generation in the workforce, they have taken on these stereotypes (Cox et al., 2017; Perry et al., 2013). Thus, this raises questions about how stereotypes of generations change and develop as the generation ages. Is this simply because of age or have they always resisted change and technology? Crumpacker and Crumpacker (2007) believe that Baby Boomers seek success and are very tolerant, which would seem to contradict them being seen as resistant. This raises concerns about the usefulness and development of generational stereotypes and the self-image of those bunched in the stereotypes versus how they actually view themselves.

Generation X

As the smallest generation in terms of births, Generation X is said to be made up of about 48 million people (Levine, 2018). Generation X also has other names, although Generation X is the most commonly used. Some of the other names for this group include the Invisible Generation (Mitchell, McLean, & Turner, 2005), and the MTV Generation (Reisenwitz & Iyer, 2009). Compared to previous generations, Generation X grew up in smaller families where divorce was more prevalent and where they learned from a young age to be independent and self-reliant (Crumpacker & Crumpacker, 2007). They also grew up at a time when corporate America was weakened by many layoffs due to the financial crisis in the 1980s (Crumpacker & Crumpacker, 2007; Reisenwitz & Iyer, 2009). As a result, the fiercely independent Generation X developed mistrust for institutions, including families, due to many being raised in families of divorce (Crumpacker & Crumpacker, 2007; Reisenwitz & Iyer, 2009). Generation X prefers

agency to loyalty (Howe & Strauss, 2007). In contrast with the previous generation, Generation X is considered to have made less of an impression in civic life. Generation X prefers to volunteer where they can work one-on-one with people rather than appeal to the institution by voting or lobbying to change laws (Howe & Strauss, 2007). This same value is demonstrated in the workplace where Generation X employees are more likely to want to work independently than in teams (Howe & Strauss, 2007).

In the workplace, Generation X is less focused on titles and more concerned about how their managers will earn respect from subordinates (Jurkiewicz, 2000). Additionally, the generation prefers to work in environments with constant change instead of monotonous routines (Jurkiewicz, 2000). As a result, the generation took its independent values and became entrepreneurs more than any other generation prior (Howe & Stauss, 2007). While there are plenty of Generation X entrepreneurs, their reasons for launching new ventures are different than Millennials. Generation X wants to work alone and be their own boss, whereas Millennials want to create something new that aids their work-life balance (Howe & Stauss, 2007). According to Tulgan (2009), Generation X is more engaged in their work when their managers reward their innovation and publicly announce their success, which illustrates how Generation X's values are present in organizations and how managers can encourage Generation X employees to bring their best selves to work each day.

Millennials

The term "Millennials" was created by Howe and Strauss (1992) to refer to Americans born between the years 1980 to 1995. Researchers believe that the Millennial

Generation is shaped by the events that took place in their early lives, which informed their attitudes and values towards work (Glass, 2007). However, there is little research about how Millennials actually perceive themselves and whether their perceptions are different from the common stereotypes that are used to describe them.

According to Levine and Dean (2012) there are six key events that have shaped the lives of the Millennial Generation. The most important event is the launch of the World Wide Web, which changed the way they found and absorbed information. The second most important is the economy, including the downturn of 2008 and gas prices rising over four dollars a gallon, which informed their opinions of their personal futures. The third most important event in the lives of Millennials is the September 11th attack, which caused a fear of terrorist attacks and global uncertainty. The fourth key event is President Obama's nomination and election, since the multi-ethnic Millennials now see roles that were typically dominated by white males as available to more people (Levine and Dean, 2012). The fourth important life event is the mass use of cell phones. Whether Millennials are alone or with friends, they are depicted as always being on their phones, texting and utilizing the latest and greatest technology. The final key event that shaped the Millennial generation is the launch of Yahoo!, which is similar to the launch of the World Wide Web with the exception that it helped pool resources into one site to easily search and find information (Levine & Dean, 2012). While these life events are said to shape the generation's beliefs and values, there is a lack of empirical research to support these broad statements. While one of these events might have profoundly affected one person, it might not have held much influence on another. Although, this research does

seek to find similarities in groups of people, and thus does not necessarily look for or account for individual differences.

It is estimated that there are about 58 million Millennials currently working for corporations in the United States (Toossi, 2008). Millennials are considered the most ethnically diverse generation when compared to previous generations (Levine & Dean, 2012) and are often characterized by their frequent use of technology and social media (Crossman, 2016; Sujansky & Ferri-Reed, 2009; Levine & Dean, 2012). Additionally, when compared to previous generations in the workplace, Millennials place a higher value on group tasks and positive feedback (Crumpacker & Crumpacker, 2007; Alsop, 2008). According to Sujansky and Ferri-Reed (2009), Millennials want to work for companies that are making meaningful change in the world where they can grow and learn quickly while being treated as an equal even at entry level. Also, Millennials want to see their career progression in the form of career pathing or career laddering (Sujansky and Ferri-Reed, 2009). If Millennials do not see opportunities to advance at the organization, they are more likely to seek advancement elsewhere. Compared to previous generations, it is not surprising that Millennials have been labeled as “job hoppers” (Alsop, 2008).

Moreover, Millennials expect the organizations they work for to cater to their needs and sense of time, which means they expect to be allowed to complete the required work in a nontraditional way (Alsop, 2008). Other generations may stereotype Millennials’ work habits as lazy or lacking in work ethic (Deal, Altman, & Rogelberg, 2010), but it could be suggested that the way Millennials look at completing work is so

different that it is not necessarily laziness but rather creativity (Sujansky & Ferri-Reed, 2009). Creativity with their work comes in the form of multi-tasking and working from non-traditional workspaces (e.g. at home or from a coffee shop). Additionally, because Millennials are creative with their time they like to adjust work hours for personal needs and commitments (Harrington, Van Deusen, Fraone, & Morelock, 2015). Lancaster and Stillman (2003) offer that Millennials work to live, thus they want time with their families and personal passions, and as a result, Millennials are more likely to enjoy working remotely where there is a blending of technology, work, and personal life. Cennamo and Gardner (2008) believe that Millennials are more likely to prioritize autonomy at work. Also, Millennials need feedback, specifically praise and positive reinforcement in order for them to stay motivated in the workplace (Alsop, 2008). Whereas, Dries, Pepermans, and De Kerpel (2008) state that finding personal significance in their work is more important to Millennials. However, there does seem to be agreement that the Millennial Generation does not take criticism well, and harsh criticism commonly leads to tears (Alsop 2008; Marano, 2004). Growing up, participation was valued over results. Alsop (2008) even calls Millennials the “Trophy Kids” since in school and sports they were all given an award for their efforts, regardless of whether they came in first place.

Additionally, as the Millennial Generation overtakes previous generations as the largest generation in the workforce, there is a need for more research to understand how work can be made meaningful for Millennials. Additional information and comparisons between the generations can be seen in the Table 1 which depicts the first three

generations described above and is adapted from the work of Crumpacker and Crumpacker (2007). Additionally, Perry, Hanvongse, and Casoinic (2013) looked at three generations (excluding Generation Z) through a literature review of 64 practitioner articles and 37 academic articles. Their analysis resulted in agreement on stereotypes for each generation. Building upon their research, this study plans to take some of their stereotypes (entitled, disloyal, multi-taskers, passionate, sensitive, social, creative, lazy, flexibility, and self-centered) for Millennials and test for the extent the stereotypes are unique to Millennials and the degree to which Millennials identify with these stereotypes. Most of the research presented is others' views of Millennials. The lack of self-identification warrants further examination.

Table 1

Generational Workplace Values and Attitudes

	Baby Boomers (1945 to 1964)	Generation X (1965 to 1979)	Millennials (1980 to 1995)
Dominant Values	Tolerance Achievement Power/Authority	Self-direction Achievement Self-Indulgence	Self-Direction Self-Indulgence
Stereotypes	Workaholics Political Self-Centered	Cynical Lazy Selfish	Spoiled Loves Technology Lazy
Worth Ethic	Efficient Logical Strive for Success	Task-Oriented Self-Reliant Independent	Multitasking Group Oriented Needs Explanation
Communication	In-Person Face-to-Face One-on-One	Direct Only as Needed Email	Technology Reliant Email Text Social Media
Feedback	Promotions and Titles	Direct	Instantaneous Positive Feedback

	Pay Compensation	Wants to be Told How They Did	Seeks Praise
Authority	Questions Authority	Skeptical of Authority	Wants Shared Authority Wants a Reason to Follow
Work Life Balance	Work Always Takes Priority	Strives for Work Life Balance	Wants Work Life Balance, but if Given the Choice will Choose Family and Friends
Rewards	Wants Promotions, Titles, Money	Wants Autonomy and Flexibility	Wants Opportunity to Provide Input Wants Praise and Recognition

Note. Adapted from Crumpacker, M., & Crumpacker, J. M. (2007). Succession planning and generational stereotypes: Should HR consider age-based values and attitudes a relevant factor or a passing fad? *Public Personal Management*, 36(4), 349-369, and ValueOptions. (2016). *Workplace influence*. Retrieved from http://www.valueoptions.com/spotlight_YIW/workplace.htm.

Generation Z

The youngest of the generations in this research is Generation Z. This generation is also known as iGen, due to the Internet being invented in 1995 and because its members were young teenagers when the Apple iPhone was invented (Strauss & Howe, 1991; Twenge, 2017; Williams, 2015). The generation consists of those born between 1996 and 2010 (Williams, 2015). Since the oldest members of Generation Z could be twenty-two years old and members of the workforce, they are included in this research. While research is limited on this generation, especially as it relates to their workplace behaviors, there are some studies that have been done to better understand their values.

Twenge (2017) believes that the generation is in no rush to mature and typically acts much younger than their age might suggest. Additionally, Twenge (2017) adds that Generation Z members are not very religious, are typically insecure, yet they are inclusive of others' beliefs and differences. Jean Twenge's research has always focused on comparing generations in order to better understand what makes each generational cohort unique (Twenge, 2017). She started looking at her own generation, Generation X, then spent quite a bit of time researching Millennials over the last couple decades, and now is publishing her findings on Generation Z. Twenge's book focuses on analyzing findings from just one longitudinal study comparing responses each year from a group of adolescents. Additionally, she drew from four databases (Monitoring the Future, The Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System, American Freshman Survey, and the General Social Survey) (Twenge, 2017). While the data used in her book does span different sources and different collection periods (some for high school students and some for college freshman) it does not yet account for behaviors in the workplace. The participants' responses are then compared by Twenge to previous generations. The data Twenge is using does take self-assessment into account instead of what others say about the generation (Twenge, 2017). However, even as her book title suggests and her research states, she believes Generation Z is completely unprepared for adulthood (Twenge, 2017), which is similar rhetoric to what has been said about Millennials (Marino, 2004).

Seemiller and Grace (2017) have been conducting empirical research using freshman surveys at American universities that included 150,000 responses from Generation Z students. They have found Generation Z to be compassionate, responsible,

thoughtful, and committed to social justice, while being money conscious, technology savvy, and entrepreneurial (Seemiller & Grace, 2016). Additionally, they have found this generation prefers to use the “appropriate” social media platform for their specific needs. While Seemiller and Grace only surveyed traditional Generation Z students starting college, they make comparisons to previous generations. They found that Generation Z will not just use Facebook to fit all their needs, the preferred method of social media for Millennials (Williams, 2015), but rather Gen Z branches out and prefers Snapchat, Twitter, and Instagram. Group texting also tends to dominate how Generation Z communicates with each other, making GroupMe a popular choice for the generation (Seemiller & Grace, 2017). However, the researchers also note that the generation actually prefers in-person human interaction (Seemiller & Grace, 2016). Beyond the generation’s technology preferences, Generation Z is found to be highly career-focused with a strong value on developing leadership competencies (Seemiller & Grace, 2017). The participants in their study also believe that following a passion will lead to happiness and allow them to improve the lives of others (Seemiller & Grace, 2016). Since this research was conducted in a university setting due to the age of the generation currently, the focus of Seemiller and Grace’s work is more about how to educate the generation than how to engage them in the workplace. However, some of the values they have identified seem similar to previous generations, including Generation Z’s interest in social justice. It is unclear if their interest in social justice and the way they participate in social justice is similar to previous generations. Seemiller and Grace (2016) did find that Generation Z is motivated by setting and completing benchmarks, thus they suggest

including gamification in university classes. This same logic could be adapted to work environments, yet has not been tested as of yet.

Issues with Generational Research

Common sense might lead us to question if generational research oversimplifies behaviors and values for large groups of people, raising the question of whether people born in a fifteen or twenty-year range can really be all that similar. Additional questions arise about those born on the cusp of some of these generations. Roberts, Edmonds, and Grijalva (2010) have speculated that age is maybe what is driving differences and not necessarily life events. Thus, younger adults tend to be more self-absorbed and life stage is more likely an explanation for their behavior than generational differences. Moreover, Tosti-Kharas, Riza, and Chanland (2018) found through a review of 124 peer-reviewed journals in English and corporate reports that multiple levels of analysis are needed to better understand generations in the workplace, since most only account for the individual level.

With much of the research on generations currently conducted by practitioners or told anecdotally, more academic research needs to be done to uncover the usefulness of the concept. Additionally, since generations are hot topics of conversation and in the vernacular, it also begs for researchers to consider that perhaps there is some validity, if not quite a bit of interest from the general public, in coming to a better understanding of the concept. Although, in research and practitioner information, the labels put on generations are worthy of further investigation. The labels placed on generations are in the form of stereotypes. Some of these stereotypes are truthful, others are harmful. Either

way, future exploration into the stereotypes influencing how generations are perceived and the values society places on the stereotypes is needed.

Stereotypes

Much of what has been said about different generations involves broad generalizations based on a few observations or beliefs – in other words, stereotypes. Greenwald and Banaji (1995) define stereotypes as a “socially shared set of beliefs about traits that are characteristic of members of a social category” (p. 14). Some stereotypes are positive and others are negative (Greenwald & Banaji, 1995), however stereotypes are also exaggerated beliefs (Allport, 1954) that evoke judgment (Secord, 1959) on highly visible characteristics (Snyder, 1981). Stereotypes help people process information (Moskowitz, 2005). Some researchers believe that stereotypes occur cognitively first through the activation of the stereotype and then with the decision to deploy the stereotype for the situation (Devine, 1989; Kunda & Spence, 2003).

Greenwald and Banaji (1995) further argue that stereotyping is implicit, as well as explicit. Thus, some stereotyping is obvious and something we think about. Whereas, implicit stereotyping involves non-conscious beliefs, thus people might not even be aware that they are relying on implicit stereotypes in their decision making and evaluation of others (Stone & Moskowitz, 2011). Greenwald and Banaji’s beliefs about the importance of recognizing implicit stereotypes in social psychology are now well accepted and led Greenwald, Banaji, and Nosek to start Project Implicit® in 1998 to help educate society about hidden biases and feelings (Project Implicit, 2017). An example of how implicit stereotypes affect people is demonstrated in Stone and Moskowitz’s (2011)

work where they found implicit biases affected the evaluations of medical professionals. Using Implicit Association Tests in a lab experiment, they found that most of the stereotyping was unintentional. They suggested we teach people to better understand their own biases and think about controlling for the biases. There currently is not an implicit test listed on the Project Implicit® site for generations, however there is one regarding age. While it can be difficult at times to determine people's exact age by just looking at them, it is easier to determine if they are young or old, and consequently allows for a good guess at which generation they belong to. Again, this is where grouping of individuals creates stereotypes.

Millennial Stereotypes

Considering that Millennials are the predominant generation in the workplace (U.S. Census Bureau, 2015), the focus of this research will be on Millennials. Since stereotypes can be unconscious and conscious beliefs, providing more research on whether people hold stereotypes of Millennials, whether Millennials' self-image matches stereotypes, and if stereotypes are unique to the generation can offer clarity regarding the usefulness of the current conversation about the generation. Generational stereotypes are not necessarily more harmful than other stereotypes, such as race and gender, instead the focus of this research is on how people are being treated in the workplace based on how popular generational stereotypes have become part of the vernacular. It is not surprising that some research indicates that some Millennial stereotypes are not always accurate. For example, Deal and Levenson (2016) utilized The Center for Creative Leadership's World Leadership Survey. The survey is administered in fifteen languages and takes

approximately twenty minutes to complete. Deal and Levenson used some of the data from the questions in the World Leadership Survey to learn about what Millennials wanted in the workplace (Deal & Levenson, 2016). They found that Millennials are not just “entitled and lazy,” but rather “entitled and hardworking.” Deal and Levenson believe that Millennials want a life outside of work, but they are willing to work long hours. Thus, the results challenge the stereotype that Millennials are lazy, because they are willing to contribute time to interesting work. The researchers suggest that a more accurate interpretation may be that Millennials must find their work interesting (Deal & Levenson, 2016). Additionally, Deal and Levenson (2016) found the global Millennials they surveyed to be “needy and independent,” while also wanting to “do good and do well,” and appreciating “high tech and high touch.” Each of these findings show that while Millennials fit one of the stereotypes of their generation (needy, wanting to do good, and high tech) they also valued characteristics not typically associated with the generation (independent, wanting to succeed and do well, and needing plenty of time with other people in person). The goal of this current research is to add and expand on Deal and Levenson’s work by considering stereotypes both from the point of view of millennials and that of other generations.

Additionally, through the same data from over 25,000 Millennials and 29,000 “older workers,” Deal and Levenson (2016) established five findings and made five general recommendations. Their recommendations include improving workplace flexibility, providing adequate support and feedback, providing Millennials opportunities to contribute to society, coaching but not micromanaging, and designing competitive

salaries. The data comes from twenty-two countries mostly in North America, Europe and Asia. However, the sample is largely from individuals in the United States. Although, the exact percentage of the sample that comes from the United States is not listed in their book. Through this survey, Deal and Levenson (2016) conclude that Millennials all over the globe are generally similar when it comes to what they want from their employers. While their work does offer well-researched insights on ways to engage Millennials in organizations, it does not offer specific recommendations. Furthermore, the recommendations could be considered vague and best practices for all managers and organizations. Thus, when designing work for generations, further investigation is need to help identify how Millennial employees can bring their best selves to work every day. Managers utilize engagement practices when trying to get the best from their employees.

Engagement

Engagement was initially defined by Kahn (1990) to mean how employees “use varying degrees of their selves, physically, cognitively, and emotionally in work role performances” (p. 692). The definition has been extended to include well-being, job involvement and personally fulfilling activities (Zigarmi, Nimon, Houson, Witt, & Diehl, 2009). The concept of workplace engagement stems from the Gallup Organization that surveyed employees to find correlations between employee engagement and employee retention with the aim of finding ways to lower burnout and turnover (Buckingham & Coffman, 1999).

Engaged employees bring many benefits to organizations including creating higher shareholder returns, profitability, productivity, and customer satisfaction

(Crawford, LePine & Rich, 2010; Harter, Schmidt, & Hayes, 2002). Work engagement was first developed to offer a contrast and possible solution to burnout (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). Thus, if employees have a connection to their work and find they are able to bring their best selves to work each day, they are better able to deal with the demands of their position. Maslach and Leiter (1997) believe that burnout and engagement are the negative and positive ends respectively of the gamut of well-being. Alternatively, Gallup's engagement model ranks people on engaged to disengaged to actively disengaged, which would indicate that their continuum is less focused on well-being and rather on behavior that positively contributes to the workplace and behavior that is destructive to morale and productivity (Gallup, 2013). Assuming each generation has different values and needs, it stands to reason that each would respond to different engagement practices.

In order to better understand engagement, the three most researched models will be explored. First, Kahn's (1990) conceptual engagement model will be discussed since it was the first of its kind. The model will also be linked to the values of the Millennial Generation to determine engagement practices that may create more engaged Millennials in the workplace. Second, the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale will be explained. It is mostly used by academics to determine engagement levels. Third, and last, the Gallup Work Engagement Survey will be presented. Gallup uses this as a consulting tool sold to businesses to better understand their employees' engagement levels and to make interventions to increase engagement.

Kahn's Engagement Model

Kahn's (1990) conceptual engagement model was the first to explain why employees engage and disengage in their work. Its lasting relevance continues to make it a common choice for explaining workplace engagement even though it was originally developed from psychology literature. By explaining that people need to bring their full selves to work in order to excel in their roles, Kahn (1990) offers factors that influence why someone would be fully present.

Some have categorized Kahn's work as "personal engagement" since it is individually focused and was not initially developed for the specific organizational context (Simpson, 2009), although it was published in a premier management journal. Additionally, the model seeks to understand behavior and decision-making that affects engagement at the individual, interpersonal, group, intergroup, and organizational levels. Kahn's model is made up of three psychological conditions: psychological meaningfulness, psychological safety, and psychological availability.

Psychological Meaningfulness. Psychological meaningfulness is defined as how employees determine if their work is being valued and producing a worthwhile benefit (Kahn, 1990). In order to be engaged in the workplace through meaningfulness, employees need to feel appreciated and essential. Employees will decide how much of themselves to give to work groups, projects, and the organization based on whether or not they receive incentives as an indication of how appreciated they are by the organization. There are three types of psychological meaningfulness including task characteristics, role characteristics, and work interactions (Kahn, 1990).

Task characteristics are position specific such as how challenging or easy the work is, how simple rules are to follow, or if creative solutions are allowed. Role characteristics consist of how well the job fits with the employee's self-image. Status and influence are also associated with roles characteristics. The final component of psychological meaningfulness is work interactions. Work interactions are how employees communicate with their superiors, peers, and subordinates. In order to produce psychological meaningfulness and engagement, these professional interactions must foster dignity, respect, and appreciation (Kahn, 1990).

Psychological Safety. Psychological safety consists of employees being able to live their authentic selves without concern that their careers or sense of self will be negatively affected (Kahn, 1990). Employees who feel they have psychological safety have a clear understanding of repercussions of their actions, thus it is necessary for safe workplaces to clearly define their expectations to employees. It is important for managers to create an environment that is nonthreatening and predictable. The safety dimension has the following four influences: interpersonal relationships, group and intergroup dynamics, management style and process, and organizational norms. Interpersonal relationships are the working relationships that employees have with their colleagues. The level of engagement is not only based on how much employees can trust their colleagues, but also based on how much support and flexibility they receive. Another determinant of psychological safety is group and interpersonal dynamics. The focus is on informal roles that allow for employees to express their true self without scrutiny both within a group and between groups in the organization (Kahn, 1990). For example, an

employee in the sales department would need to feel able to express herself not only with the sales department, but also when interacting with another department, such as finance or human resources.

Furthermore, management style and process can impact psychological safety since managerial behaviors can increase or decrease support for the employee. The employee needs to see demonstrated consistency and competency from the manager, as well. The final influence, organizational norms, dictates acceptable behavior of employees. The organization's culture will create shared expectations about performance, codes of conduct, and outcomes (Kahn, 1990).

Psychological Availability. Psychological availability is defined as having the necessary psychological, physical, and emotional resources to assist employees in achieving success at their job (Kahn, 1990). This final dimension of the psychological conditions includes the employee bringing together intelligence, emotions, and physical presence to create performance. These are the following four determinates of psychological availability: physical energy, emotional energy, insecurity, and outside life. First, physical energy consists of strength and nonverbal body language. Employees who are physically exhausted will not be able to engage in tasks and group work as people who are physically ready to contribute and participate. Another form of energy is emotional. Emotional energy can also be depleted and lead to exhaustion and frustration. Employee emotions such as interest, gratitude, hope, and inspiration are just as valuable to engagement as physical presence. The third determinant of insecurity identifies employees' confidence level about how they fit in the organization, workgroups, and

their role. Engaged employees are given opportunities to invest in themselves in order to increase performance. The final element of employees' outside lives affects their ability to engage in their work. Concern about non-work aspects of their lives such as family, friends, and volunteer work can draw employees' attention from the tasks and expectations of their job. However, outside lives can also benefit engagement by blending the work the employees do for the organization with what the employees do for those outside of the organization by utilizing shared skill sets (Kahn, 1990). All three of the psychological conditions are listed in Table 2, which also offers definitions, components, and influences.

Table 2

Dimensions of Psychological Conditions

Dimensions	Meaningfulness	Safety	Availability
Definition	Sense of return on investments of self in role performances.	Sense of being able to show and employ self without fear of negative consequences to self-image, status, or career.	Sense of possessing the physical, emotional, and psychological resources necessary for investing self in role performances
Experiential Components	Feel worthwhile, valued, valuable	Feel situations are trustworthy, secure, and predictable	Feel capable of driving physical, intellectual, and emotional energies into role performance

Types of Influence	Work Incentives or Disincentives	Social Systems	Individual Distractions
Influences	1. Tasks 2. Roles 3. Work	1. Interpersonal Relationships 2. Group and Intergroup Dynamics 3. Management Style and Process 4. Organizational Norms	1. Physical Energies 2. Emotional Energies 3. Insecurity 4. Outside Life

Note. Adapted from Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(4), 692-724.

Although, Kahn's (1990) model was theoretical, other researchers such as May et al., (2004) have attempted to measure the psychological constructs. These researchers created a 14 item scale, which they tested at one insurance company. They found validity in their scale from the study, suggesting that Kahn's work could be applied to understand personal or psychological engagement in that specific insurance company. However, the limited sample of one organization and one industry would warrant further investigation into the reliability, validity, and generalizability of their instrument. Additionally, Schaufeli and Salanova (2007) found that Kahn's (1990) psychological dimensions were similar to the dimensions of vigor, dedication, and absorption, calling into question the naming and usefulness of the dimensions. Other researchers have found that job demands and job resources are more important to discuss when trying to operationalize the concept of engagement (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). However, May, Gilson & Harter (2004) and Schaufeli and Salanova (2007) use Kahn's work as a starting point, and thus applying it

to what we know about Millennials begins to help us better understand potential engagement practices for Millennials.

Applying Kahn's Model to Millennials

By applying Kahn's (1990) engagement concept to what is known about Millennials, I propose ways to engage Millennials in the workplace. Based on what is known about Millennial characteristics, each of Kahn's three psychological conditions will yield suggestions based on the various influences motivating the psychological conditions.

Psychological Meaningfulness. Through the lens of connecting psychological meaningfulness influences to engaging Millennials, each of the following will be explored: task characteristics, role characteristics, and work interactions. For task characteristics, Millennials enjoy working in challenging environments that still have rules. Alsop (2008) states that Millennials like following rules, but do not always know the rules. Thus, it is important for employers and managers to set clear expectations so Millennials understand and abide by the rules. Another task characteristic that Millennials enjoy is when they are allowed to design creative solutions (Alsop, 2008). Just as Google gives their employees 20% time (D'Onfro, 2015), organizations can build flexible time into their employees' work schedules to work on projects that inspire them and drive the company towards innovation. Another way that employers can give their employees flexibility and creativity with their time is by allowing employees to work from home or work remotely regularly (or on occasion) to allow for employees to be inspired by different environments. Additionally, this allows Millennials to complete volunteer work

in their community and work on their passions outside of their job (Alsop, 2008). By creating some structure of what work needs to be completed, but allowing Millennials to design their day and time, organizations can provide the challenge and creativity Millennials crave.

As for role characteristics, Millennials feel that their voice is as important as everyone else's (Alsop, 2008). Thus, it is imperative for managers to show Millennials how their influence and role in the company will grow and transform during their tenure. Sujansky and Ferri-Reed (2009) suggest career laddering to illustrate career progression to Millennials. Additionally, career paths show career progression and help employees feel that the organization they work for is committed to their growth and development (Society for Human Resource Management, 2015). This also helps Millennials understand the rules and expectations to advancing their position within the workplace. In conjunction with offering Millennials performance reviews that are more frequent than annually, Millennials can measure their progress against the career laddering plan they create with their managers.

For the final influence to psychological meaningfulness, work interactions, Millennials want to be treated with respect and dignity even if they are entry-level employees. Millennials like to feel as important as everyone else in the office (Alsop, 2008), so open-office concepts where all the desks are the same size in what Morton (2014) refers to as bench seating can remove the cubical walls that limit communication and personal interactions. Additionally, open-office concepts have floating conference rooms and cafes that foster communication and can act as formal and informal meeting

places for work teams. The less structured and more creative spaces allow Millennials to feel they are treated with respect and appreciated.

Psychological Safety. Millennials seek psychological safety by living their true selves as it relates to the following four determinates of Kahn's (1990) model: interpersonal relationships, group and interpersonal dynamics, management style and process, and organizational norms. First, when Millennials look for support in workplace and interpersonal relationships it comes in the form of mentors and coaches. Millennials are driven and want to advance quickly in their careers. They view mentors and coaches as the people who can help them achieve their goals (Alsop, 2008). Creating an assigned mentorship program and training managers to be effective coaches builds the support Millennials desire.

Second, group and interpersonal dynamics that Millennials seek out involve informal roles that allow them to participate in ways they enjoy. Communication within and between groups can be fostered by the tech savvy Millennials through the use of social media and messaging platforms (Levine & Dean, 2012). For example, if the company is already using Gmail as the platform for work email, the Gchat function can be used in place of texting each other, yet it remains professional communication since it is managed by the company servers. Making this technology available and acceptable to use, allows for Millennials to take up informal roles with the use of messaging platforms. Millennials are better at communicating through technology than face-to-face communication (Alsop, 2008), so giving them an opportunity to communicate how they

normally and most successfully communicate allows for Millennials to bring their best selves to groups.

Third, management style and process also affect how engaged and safe Millennials feel in organizations. Millennials seek consistency and competency from their managers to act as coaches and to give feedback. Since the Millennial Generation can be sensitive and dislike critical feedback (Alsop, 2008), it is important for managers to offer their Millennial employees plenty of praise and regular feedback. Millennials expect feedback, even negative feedback to come in the form of a discussion that creates a learning opportunity rather than being scolded and punished. Sujansky and Ferri-Reed (2009) offer the following four ways to give positive feedback to Millennials: be as specific as possible, discuss the ramifications, ask for feedback, and tell them thanks. The researchers state that being specific helps reinforce the behavior the manager wishes the millennial to repeat. Also, by discussing the consequences of actions the Millennial will have a greater understanding of their contribution to the whole project or organization. Asking the millennial to provide the manager with feedback opens the conversations and builds the Millennial's confidence. By finishing the conversation with words of gratitude, the Millennial feels confident and appreciated. While this might appear elementary and expected of all managers when giving feedback, in practice it is not always displayed. Sometimes not enough information is provided. Other times, repercussions of actions are discussed, but not the action itself (Finkelstein & Fishbach, 2012). Thus, reinforcing the basics of positive feedback can help provide more engaged Millennial employees.

The fourth and final influence of psychological safety is organizational norms. Millennials enjoy working for organizations that allow them to dress casually and show their individuality through the display of their tattoos and piercings (Alsop, 2008). Creating shared expectations about what is acceptable for Millennials to wear in the workplace, helps protect Millennials from feeling scrutinized or underdressed. Perhaps even offering a casual dress day at the end of the workweek, or allowing casual dress when Millennials are not meeting with clients would offer Millennials an organizational norm that helps them feel secure.

Psychological Availability. Millennials find psychological availability in their jobs through physical energy, emotional energy, mitigating insecurity, and outside life. While some of these aspects such as physical energy may not seem to connect to psychological availability, the connection is that by having these sources of energy and stability, one can have greater psychological availability. As the first form of psychological availability, physical energy, is strength and non-verbal body language. For instance, the recent trend of standing at your desk for better health (Reader's Digest, n.d.; Vlahos, 2011), may be used as a way to accommodate the Millennials need for individuality and creativity. Additionally, about one fifth of companies in America now have gyms onsite for employees to exercise and maintain their physical health (Shellenbarger, 2011). The ability to exercise at work can help increase energy and give Millennials more flexibility in their schedule (e.g. taking a longer lunch break to go to a cycling class during lunch). As for non-verbal body language, Sujansky and Ferri-Reed (2009) suggests giving Millennials high-fives, since it offers support and encouragement;

plus, Millennials like high-fives and use them to communicate with each other. High-fives are just one example of how to relate to Millennials and offer quick and positive rewards.

Emotional energy is the second influence of psychological availability. The main influence in Millennials' emotions is gratitude (Sujuansky & Ferri-Reed, 2009). Millennials like to be told "thank you" and shown appreciation for their ideas and work. Without these simple displays of gratitude, Millennials feel undervalued, underappreciated, and are more likely to feel frustrated (Sujuansky & Ferri-Reed, 2009). As a result, Millennials with depleted emotional energy seek out other work opportunities where their emotional energies will be charged and cared for more appropriately. Millennials seek environments where they know they are making a valuable contribution. Thus, if they do not hear that from their superior and peers, they are more likely to detach from the work.

Another influence to psychological availability is the extent to which insecurity affects the Millennials' confidence. Millennials' parents have nurtured and cared for their egos, bringing Millennials to the workplace full of optimism and confidence. Some research suggests that Millennials may be prone to anxiety and depression as adults due to how much praise they received as children (Marano, 2004). If that is the case, it may be particularly important for managers to help Millennials understand their career trajectory and fit in the organization, while showing Millennials they value the Millennials' work. Additionally, in some research, Millennials have been found to enjoy working in groups, since they have been raised with never-ending group projects

throughout their education (Alsop, 2008). As a result, one could suggest that managers should also limit Millennials' insecurities by having Millennials work on projects with teams to make their work social. However, in spite of anecdotal accounts, there is little research to fully support these assertions, leading to the need for more research.

The last influencer of psychological availability is the Millennial Generation's outside of work lives. Friends and family are the most important part of Millennials outside lives. Millennials are in constant contact with their parents and rely on their parents for advice even regarding how to handle interpersonal issues with work colleagues (Alsop, 2008). While it might seem like Millennials are distracted by their phones and social media, the quick access to friends, family, and acquaintances allows them to get advice and help quickly to solve problems faster (Alsop, 2008). While this behavior may cause friction between generations in the workplace, allowing Millennials to be electronically social, can help the organization and workplace teams to quickly gather information (Alsop, 2008). Of course, the attachment to technology can also distract some Millennials (Alsop, 2008). As a result, it might be useful for managers to set clear expectations about technology and social media to gain benefits from its use. A summary of the engagement practices recommendations based on Kahn's psychological dimensions can be found in Table 3.

Table 3

Summary of Kahn's (1990) Dimensions and Recommendations

Kahn (1990)	Applied Recommendation
Psychological Meaningfulness	
Task	Flexible Work Schedules
Role	Understanding of Career Progression
Work	Open-Office Workspaces
Psychological Safety	
Interpersonal Relationships	Coaches & Mentors
Group & Inter-group Relationships	Company Wide Messaging System
Management Styles & Process	Provide Constructive Feedback
Organizational Norms	Casual Dress
Psychological Availability	
Physical Energies	Promote Physical Health (e.g. gyms)
Emotional Energies	Offer Gratitude
Insecurities	Team Projects
Outside Life	Utilize Social Media Connections

Application & Critiques of Kahn's Model

Scholars have utilized Kahn's work to explain the antecedents of engagement (Rich, Lepine, & Crawford, 2010) finding that there is a relationship between value congruence, perceived organizational support, core self-evaluations (antecedents) and task performance that is mediated by job engagement. However, they also found that job

involvement, job satisfaction, and intrinsic motivation were also mediating factors between the antecedents and task performance, which demonstrates that the definition of engagement is still a bit murky. Some scholars believe engagement includes job satisfaction (Nimon, Shuck & Zigarmi, 2015) and furthermore employee engagement is a repackaging of job satisfaction. It seems even Kahn's (1990) model would include some form of job involvement since the third psychological condition is about how a person brings their psychological, physical, and emotional resources to complete their work. The Rich et al. (2010) study makes a contribution by adding the role of intrinsic motivation, perhaps demonstrating that Kahn's (1990) model was lacking an aspect of intrinsic motivation as part of psychological engagement. However, the Rich et al. (2010) model does not fully define intrinsic motivation, so further investigation of the concept would be necessary before adding it to this study.

Additionally, Kahn's (1990) theoretical work does not provide empirical evidence of performance outcomes. Sacks (2006) emphasizes that Kahn's model focuses on psychological conditions, thus limiting the level to the individual person. Shuck and Wollard (2010) acknowledge that Kahn's (1990) work was the first to offer engagement as a separate concept, however much more has been done since to try to operationalize the conception. While theoretically Kahn's work does suggest there is a connection to outcomes, it is not proven in his work. As such, later researchers have tried to predict performance from engagement including the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004) and the Gallup Work Audit (Gallup, 2013). In order to address some of the shortcomings of the Kahn model, other models of engagement have been proposed.

Utrecht Work Engagement Scale

Another approach to evaluating engagement is the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale, which was developed in the Netherlands (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). The Utrecht Work Engagement Scale was developed with a positive psychology approach to go beyond any particular event or interaction with an individual to determine workplace engagement. This is done through the use of a self-reported questionnaire. In the preliminary manual for the scale published in 2004, the scale had not yet been administered in the United States by the primary researchers. Schaufeli and Bakker (2004) first published their scale and work in order to allow for other researchers to help test it in other organizations and in other countries. Since then, engagement scholars have focused on testing the scale's construct validity in a dozen countries in Europe, Asia, Africa, and North America and found consistency (Balducci, Fraccaroli, & Schaufeli, 2010; Schaufeli, Bakker, & Salanova, 2006; Shimazu, Schaufeli, Kosugi, Suzuki, Nashiwa, Kato, Sakamoto, Irimajar, Amano, Hirohata, Goto, & Kitaoka-Higashiguchi, 2008). The Utrecht Work Engagement Scale is also the most popular engagement model with 83% of PsychINFO articles about engagement using this model (Schaufeli & Salanova, 2011). While this research intends to measure engagement practices rather than the level of engagement of the employees at the organization, it may seem unnecessary to utilize the Utrecht Work Engagement scale in the study. However, in order to contribute to the current conversation with other engagement scholars and provide a value added to the organization participating in the research, the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale has been added to the survey.

Application of Model and Critique. The Utrecht Work Engagement Scale is not specific to only one generation or only one context. As a means of comparison, this engagement model can be used to assess all participants and all generations in the workplace. As a result, the scale has become popular with academics (Schaufeli & Salanova, 2011). However, as the questions were originally written in Dutch and translated to English (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004), some of the phrasing may appear awkward to the native English speaker. Compared with Kahn's theoretical model, the Utrecht Engagement Scale is a research-based instrument used to capture levels of engagement of employees at an organization. There are other engagement scales available, and while this is the most popular for academics, there is another engagement scale that is more popular with practitioners.

Gallup Work Engagement Survey

Another approach to assess employee engagement comes from the Gallup Organization. Gallup bases its employee engagement measure on a hierarchy of engagement that starts with an employee's basic needs, and then progresses to how the individual and others view his or her contributions. The third stage is focused on belonging, and the fourth and final stage is focused on personal growth. The underlying assumption to Gallup's model is that engaged employees will move the organization forward because they are passionate and connected to the company (Gallup, 2013). Gallup has probably one of the most well-established work engagement surveys and sells their services directly to organizations. Since it was developed in 1998, the instrument called "Q¹²" has been given to over 25 million people in 195 countries in 70 languages

(Harter, Schmidt, Kilham, & Asplund, 2006). Gallup's latest workplace engagement report states that the Q¹² is designed to measure "emotional engagement," which indicates if an employee will do more than what is required to help the organization succeed (Gallup, 2013). The underlying theories that Gallup tests with this instrument are 1) raising employee productivity, and 2) improving employers' ability to have employees who are emotionally invested in their work (Gallup, 2013). There are twelve questions Gallup uses to determine workplace engagement and categorize employees into the follow three groups: engaged, not engaged, actively disengaged. Gallup also notes that organizations that are successful at creating engaged employees also utilize the "Accountability Index" Gallup created to help track the process of workgroups trying to create a more engaged team (Gallup, 2013).

Application of Model and Critique. While the Gallup Q¹² does not account for generational differences, it is a respected consulting tool used to help organizations bring not engaged and actively disengaged employees to the engaged group (Gallup, 2013). Additionally, the Q¹² measures how engaged an employee is in the organization, whereas, I am looking to determine practices that lead to greater engagement. Moreover, the questions Gallup uses to determine engagement do not measure all the components of engagement (e.g. job satisfaction, job involvement, organizational commitment, job affect, and positive affect), which is evident from the questions asked in the Q¹² survey. The questions and survey can be found in Table 4. While there is plenty of data collected from Gallup's Q¹², if the questions are not written to accurately measure the concept of

engagement, then the measure lacks construct validity, justifying why the survey is not necessarily aligned with what the research in this dissertation hopes to capture.

Table 4

Questions from Gallup's Q¹² Survey

Number	Question
1	I know what is expected of me at work.
2	I have the materials and equipment I need to do my work right.
3	At work, I have the opportunity to do what I do best every day.
4	In the last seven days, I have received recognition or praise for doing good work.
5	My supervisor, or someone at work, seems to care about me as a person
6	There is someone at work who encourages my development.
7	At work, my opinions seem to count.
8	The mission or purpose of my company makes me feel my job is important
9	My associates or fellow employees are committed to doing quality work.
10	I have a best friend at work.
11	In the last six months, someone at work has talked to me about my progress.
12	This last year, I have had opportunities at work to learn and grow.

Engagement and Work-Related Motivation

The concept of motivation is closely related to engagement. Motivation is defined as attitudes and feelings that influence observable behaviors (Herzberg, Mausner, &

Snyderman, 2017). The understanding of motivation in the workplace started with a rewards and punishment approach (Katzell & Thompson, 1990). As the understanding of the concept grew, more complex models and ways of understanding motivation also developed (MacDonald, Kelly, & Christen, 2019). For example, hygiene factors from Herzberg's Dual-Factor Theory including job security, relationships with supervisors, and interpersonal relationships are seen in Kahn's work as psychological safety. However, Cook and Hunsaker (2001) claim that these hygiene factors do not create job satisfaction and are merely feelings. This raises questions about the role feelings and self-reported data play in capturing true engagement. However, Kahn (1990) would disagree with Cook and Hunsaker (2001) stating that workplace norms and relationships are critical to developing workplace engagement and that would go beyond feelings. The debate on whether job satisfaction is part of workplace engagement demonstrates another gap in the definition of the workplace engagement construct.

Critiques of Engagement

As evident by the two different engagement scales and the theoretical model, one of the major critiques of engagement is that the definition might be a bit murky. Both engagement scales claim to measure engagement, yet they are quite different. One focuses on the relationships in the workplace and the level of friendship and feedback provided by superiors (Gallup) and the other focuses on the individual and their feelings and energy to complete tasks at work (Utrecht). Kahn's (1990) theoretical framework focuses on psychological well-being in the workplace. While all three engagement theories and models offer elements that are similar, such as the focus on the workplace

and interactions with others, each is using slightly different definitions, which in turn creates different components and measures.

Another critique of engagement is that it is an old concept that is just a repackaging of old concepts (Newman & Harrison, 2008). Engagement overlaps with other organizational behavior concepts including job satisfaction, job involvement, organizational commitment (Macey & Schneider, 2008), job affect, and positive affect (Newman & Harrison, 2008). As a result, a new question arises. Is this repackaging useful and necessary, or is it simply redundant? Newman and Harrison (2008) argue that workplace engagement is a higher order behavioral construct. Thus, they answer the question that engagement may be many other things, yet needs all of those concepts to be engagement. However, some researchers and practitioners are using engagement to mean different things, since not all of those organizational behavior concepts are being used in each definition and each piece of research. There does seem to be some consistency with using the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (Schaufeli & Salanova, 2011) to measure engagement, providing some consistency across studies. However, with the varying definitions being used, there is still some concern regarding construct validity.

Pilot Study

In spring of 2016, I conducted a qualitative study with two participants from each generation to determine what helped them feel engaged in their work and what made them want to leave their jobs. It was a convenience sample, and thus lacks external validity. To some extent, the findings echoed the typical anecdotal information – the stereotypes – that is often shared about Millennials. The two Millennials in my study

preferred more time working with other people than those interviewed from other generations. Additionally, there was a difference in the relationship the Millennials expected to have with their boss that would add to their workplace engagement. The two Millennials both mentioned that they wanted to be friends with their boss, whereas the other four participants from other generations only wanted a working relationship with their superior. These findings generally support the stereotypes of Millennials as social and wanting to spend more time at work collaborating with others, while also blurring the lines of professional relationships by having managers who are their friends. While the pilot study provided support of a self-image matching two generational stereotypes, more Millennial stereotypes need to be explored to both understand how Millennials view themselves (self-image) and how others view Millennials (managers).

Conclusion

Together, what is known about generations in the American workplace and concepts of stereotypes and engagement identifies a need for more empirical research to validate or negate anecdotal practitioner work. Generational behaviors and characteristics suggest generational groups may have different workplace needs that could create different work engagement strategies. While the concept of engagement is a bit murky, the foundational work of Kahn (1990) and the current focus on Schaufeli and Bakker's (2004) Utrecht Work Engagement Scale help to identify practices and ways to test for engagement. A gap in the research is that Millennials have not been asked to what extent they self-identify with generational stereotypes. A need for research that helps determine the usefulness of generations in developing engagement practices while also determining

if those in a generation are all that different from those in other generations is needed.

Accounting for stereotypes and how others perceive Millennials is another area for further exploration.

Research Questions

This study seeks to answer the following three questions:

1. To what extent do managers hold the typical stereotypes of Millennials?
2. To what extent do Millennials' self-images reflect those stereotypes?
 - 2a. Is this self-perception unique to this generation? (i.e., other generations do not see themselves the same way)
3. How do the Millennial stereotypes influence desired engagement practices at work?

Hypotheses

Perry, Hanvongse, and Casoinic (2013) looked at three generations (excluding Generation Z) through a literature review of 64 practitioner articles and 37 academic articles. Through their analysis, there was agreement on stereotypes for each generation. Building upon their research, this study plans to test some of their stereotypes (entitled, disloyal, multi-taskers, passionate, sensitive, social, creative, lazy, flexibility, and self-centered) for Millennials. Based on the literature the following hypothesis will be tested:

H1: Millennials' self-image is positively correlated with stereotypes of the generation

In the literature, not all of the engagement practices discussed were linked to specific motivations or stereotypes, as such the hypotheses for this study were created

using the two engagement practices that are connected in the literature. Millennials are said to be creative with their work schedules (Harrington, Van Deusen, Fraone, & Morelock, 2015; Sujansky & Ferri-Reed, 2009). Lancaster and Stillman (2003) offer that Millennials work to live, thus they want time with their families and personal passions. As a result, Millennials are more likely to enjoy working remotely where there is a blending of technology, work, and personal life. Based on the literature the following hypothesis will be tested:

H2: The stereotype of creative is positively related to the desire to having a flexible work schedule.

Millennials have been said to not take criticism well, which often leads to tears (Aslop, 2008; Marano, 2004). As a result of their sensitive nature, the final hypothesis to be tested is:

H3: The stereotype of sensitive is negatively related to the desire for feedback on work performance.

The findings of this research can help managers and human resources practitioners better understand if Millennials are unique since they are being compared with their Baby Boomer, Generation X, and Generation Z co-workers. The research also offers insight into how managers' perspectives of their Millennial employees are consistent or inconsistent with current stereotypes. The research questions the use of generations and helps to inform human resource practices.

CHAPTER 2:

METHODS

To address the research topic, data was collected using a survey instrument administered in two service organizations located in the United States and operated by the same parent company. Information about the participants, procedures, and measures is presented in this chapter.

Participants

Employees in two service-based organizations within the same parent organization completed the survey. Organizations were chosen through convenience sampling. The two organizations are owned by the same holdings company, Account Control Technology Holdings, Inc. (ACT Holdings). ACT Holdings owns the following three organizations: Account Control Technology, Inc.; Convergent Healthcare, Inc.; and Convergent Outsourcing, Inc. Initially, Account Control Technology Inc. with its 800 employees and offices in five locations nationwide was chosen to deploy the survey. Due to sensitive issues the organization was facing, the research and participants in this study shifted to Convergent Healthcare, Inc. and Convergent Outsourcing, Inc., which at the time of the survey employed 2,986 people, 827 of which identified as male (Account Control Technology Holdings, Inc., 2018). This decision was made in conjunction with the Human Resources Department so that the issues the company was facing would not skew data and employees would not feel like they were being evaluated by the organization.

Convergent Healthcare is a thirty-year-old organization that as a third party helps hospitals seek reimbursement for their services. Convergent Outsourcing, Inc. was founded in the 1950s and is one of America's largest customer service outsourcing companies. It primarily operates call centers for the cable, commercial, telecom, and utility sectors (Account Control Technology Holdings, Inc., 2018).

Sample

The instrument was deployed in the Learning Management System (LMS) that the organizations used to conduct training and testing of employees. The participants were invited to the survey via email and were provided with two reminders during the three-week period the survey was available. A total of 1097 employees from these two organizations participated in the survey (response rate of 36.7%). The participants were divided into generational groups using the demographic question on the survey. The generational groupings were based on existing research and literature as follows:

- Baby Boomers: those born between 1945-1964 (n=113)
- Generation Xer: those born between 1965-1979 (n= 277)
- Millennials: those born between 1980 to 1995 (n= 570)
- Generation Z: those born between 1996 to 2000 (n= 96)

These age ranges are consistent with previous studies and allow for comparison with other studies (Crumpacker & Crumpacker, 2007; Twenge, 2010). Participants in this study were divided into two groups of non-managers and managers based on whether they currently supervise other people. Human Resources provided the survey to the appropriate group of participants based on their role in the organization.

Non-Manager Sample

Generation. Table 5 presents demographic information about the non-managerial sample of 948 employees who completed the survey. As indicated in the data in Table 5, the largest generational group was Millennials followed by Generation X. This breakdown is expected given that non-managerial positions are typically entry-level, and non-managerial respondents belonged to the following generations: 104 (11.3%) were from the Baby Boomer Generation, 227 (24.7%) were from Generation X, 503 (54.7%) were from the Millennial Generation, and 85 (9.3%) were from Generation Z. Additionally, 27 participants chose not to specify the year they were born and thus I was unable to place them into a generation based on the literature. There were also two individuals who are part of the Silent Generation, the generation that proceeded the Baby Boomers. They were born in 1940 making them 78 this year. The Silent Generation includes those born between 1925 and 1944 (Sanburn, 2015).

Table 5

Generations of Non-Manager Participants

Generation	N	%
Baby Boomers	104	11.3%
Generation X	227	24.7%
Millennials	503	54.7%
Generation Z	85	9.3%
Total	919	100.0%

The range of years of birth provided in the sample was from 1940 to 2001, making participants between the ages of 17 and 78 this year. It is a bit difficult to

compare the study's sample for this generation to the information the U.S. Census uses since it classifies Millennials as those born between 1982 and 2000 and this research looks at those born between 1980 and 1995. However, in 2015, the United States (U.S.) Census Bureau said that Millennials born between 1982 and 2000 were now exceeding the size of the Baby Boomer population, which were 83.1 million and 75.4 million respectively (U.S. Census Bureau, 2015). When compared to the labor force, there are more than double the number of Millennials in this sample than Generation X and five times the number of Millennials than Baby Boomers in this sample.

Education. The non-managerial sample predominately held high school diplomas (or equivalent) and some college courses, 265 participants (28%) and 485 participants (51.2%) respectively. There were 144 respondents (15.3%) with a bachelor's degree, 42 people (4.5%) with a master's or professional degree, and two individuals (0.2%) with a doctoral degree. Additionally, there were four participants (0.4%) without a high school degree and eight participants who skipped the question. This information can also be found in Table 6. The U.S. Census estimates that 30.3% of the population age 25 and older in 2016 had a bachelor's degree or higher, whereas 87% of the population age 25 or older had at least a high school diploma or equivalent (U.S. Census Bureau, 2018). Since the question about highest level of education earned was asked to participants in this study, it makes comparison a bit more difficult. However, of the participants, 19.4% had a bachelor's degree or higher, which is lower than the percentage for the U.S. population, while 98.4% percent of sample had at least a high school diploma or equivalent, which is higher than the percentage for the U.S. population. Considering that a high school

diploma is required for most of the jobs the company employees, it is not surprising that nearly all people in the sample have achieved that level of education.

Table 6

Highest Level of Education Achieved by Non-Manager Participants

Highest Level of Education	N	%
Less than High School Degree	4	0.4%
High School Graduate	265	28.2%
Some College	485	51.6%
Bachelor's Degree	144	15.3%
Master's or Professional Degree	42	4.5%
Total	940	100.0%

Race. The following races made up the sample: White, Black, Native American, Asian, Hawaiian, Hispanic, and Mixed Race. The percentages of each race are found in Table 7. Of the 948 participants, 920 specified their race (97%). The sample is predominately Black (374 participants, 40.7%) and White (287 participants, 31.2%). Then following in order of frequency, 132 participants identified as Hispanic (14.3%), 93 participants identified as Mixed Race (10.1%), 22 participants identified as Asian (2.4%), nine participants identified as Native American (1%), and three participants identified as Hawaiian (0.3%) round out the race demographics of the sample.

Table 7

Percentages of Races Represented in Non-Manager Participants

Race	N	%
White	287	31.2%
Black	374	40.7%
Native American	9	1.0%
Asian	22	2.4%
Hawaiian	3	0.3%
Hispanic	132	14.3%
Mixed Race	93	10.1%
Total	920	100.0%

Currently, the U.S. Census Bureau estimates that 61.3% of the population is White, 17.8% Hispanic, 13.3% Black, 5.7% Asian, 1.3% Native American, 0.2% Hawaiian, and 2.6% Mixed Race (U.S Census Bureau, 2018). Compared with the population, the sample offers a larger percentage of Black and Mixed Race participants, with fewer White and Asian participants than the population.

Gender. The sample is predominately female (725 employees, 76.5%). Also, 196 respondents were male (20.7%) and 14 employees identified as “other” (1.5%). There were an additional 13 employees who chose not to disclose their gender (1.4%). According to the US Census Bureau, 50.8% of the U.S. population is female (U.S Census Bureau, 2018), thus the data in this survey skews female. However, the organization where this survey was deployed is 78.3% female, which is fairly consistent with the sample.

Managers Sample

Generation. Of the 149 managers who completed the survey, nine participants were Baby Boomers (6.6%), 50 participants were from Generation X (36.5%), 67 participants were from the Millennial Generation (48.9%), and 11 participants were from Generation Z (8.0%). This information is also located in Table 8. An additional 12 participants chose not to disclose their year of birth, thus not allowing for them to be sorted into a generation. The range of years of birth provided was from 1952 to 1998, making participants between the ages of 20 and 66 this year. Compared with the non-manager sample, numbers were similar in that Millennials led in the percentage represented, however there was a higher percentage of Generation X managers than of non-managers. This could be because Generation X is older and farther into their careers and thus more likely to have the years of experience to serve in a managerial role.

Table 8

Generations of Manager Participants

Generation	N	%
Baby Boomers	9	6.6%
Generation X	50	36.5%
Millennials	67	48.9%
Generation Z	11	8.0%
Total	137	100.0%

Education. Table 9 includes the percentages and frequencies of highest level of education achieved by managers. The managers in the sample all at least had a high school diploma (or equivalent). There were 32 managers who only held high school

degrees (22.4%), 71 managers who had attended some college (49.7%), 28 managers had a bachelor's degree (19.6%), and 12 managers had a master's or professional degree (8.3%). There were an additional six managers who chose not to disclose the highest level of education they had received (4%). The education category percentages for managers are fairly similar when compared to non-managers with the exception that the manager's sample has more master's and professional degrees. Again, compared with census data for the year 2016, there were 26.9% of participants who had a bachelor's degree or higher, which is higher than the non-manager sample (19.4%), but still lower than the census estimate of 30.3% (U.S. Census Bureau, 2018).

Table 9

Highest Level of Education Achieved by Manager Participants

Highest Level of Education	N	%
High School Graduate	32	22.4%
Some College	71	49.7%
Bachelor's Degree	28	19.6%
Master's or Professional Degree	12	8.3%
Total	143	100.0%

Race. The following races made up the sample: White, Black, Native American, Asian, Hawaiian, Hispanic, and Mixed Race. Of the 149 managers, 136 disclosed their race (91.3%). Similar to the non-managers' sample, managers predominately identified as Black (56 managers, 41.2%) and White (50 managers, 36.8%). Then following in order of frequency, 13 managers identified as Hispanic (9.6%), 12 managers identified as Mixed Race (8.8%), two managers identified as Asian (1.5%), two managers identified as

Hawaiian (1.5%), and one manager identified as Native American (0.7%) rounding out the race demographics of the sample. The frequencies and percentages are located in Table 10. The managers' races were very similar percentages to the non-managers with most of the managers being White or Black (71.4%). Again, compared with the population, the sample has a larger percentage of Black and Mixed Race participants, with fewer White and Asians represented.

Table 10

Percentages of Races Represented in Manager Participants

Race	N	%
White	50	36.8%
Black	56	41.2%
Native American	1	0.7%
Asian	2	1.5%
Hawaiian	2	1.5%
Hispanic	13	9.6%
Mixed Race	12	8.8%
Total	136	100.0%

Gender. Again, the sample is predominantly female (95 employees, 63.8%). Also, 44 respondents were male (29.5%) and two employees identified as “other” (1.3%). There were an additional eight employees who chose not to disclose their gender (5.4%).

Measures

The survey used in the study consists of 52 questions (see Appendix A for all questions in the survey). It is based on stereotypes and engagement practices derived from the literature and the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale. The first question in the

survey allowed for identification of participants as either managers or employees and each group was then guided to a separate set of questions.

The survey is divided into five sections. The first section includes 10 questions that assess agreement with typical stereotypes of Millennials (see Appendix A – questions 2 to 12). These ten questions are used to answer the first research question regarding managers' perceptions of their Millennial employees. After managers completed the ten questions they continued on to the rest of the survey that all other participants received. For those who answered "no" to the first question (Do you currently supervise anyone who is considered to be part of the Millennial Generation?), the survey gave the same questions with different wording to assess the extent to which participants describe themselves in terms of the commonly held stereotypes of Millennials (see Appendix A – questions 13 to 23). In addition, this survey included questions using a 4-point Likert scale that measured the extent to which participants agree or disagree with the need for various engagement practices (see Appendix A – questions 24 to 35). A 4-point Likert scale was chosen so that there was not a middle neutral point where those who were confused or uninterested would pick it instead of stating a preference for or against the engagement practice. The questions are based on Kahn's (1990) model and can be found in Appendix C. These questions cover engagement practices such as flexible work schedule, recognition, encouragement, relationship with supervisor, feedback, competition, individuality, expectations, health, and learning opportunities.

Additionally, nine questions from the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale were included (see Appendix A – questions 36 to 44). The Utrecht Work Engagement Scale is comprised of the following three constructs: vigor, dedication, and absorption. The shorted version includes nine questions and has been found to still contain the same validity as the initial seventeen question scale (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). Vigor refers to high resilience and energy. Each question is ranked on a 7-point Likert scale, where 1 is “never feels this way” and 7 is “always feels this way” at work. Someone who scores high on vigor puts in extra effort and is not drained by difficulties she might face in work. The Cronbach alpha for vigor vary from 0.75 to 0.91 for each question across 25 studies. Correlations with the longer version are between 0.95 and 0.97 (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004).

The Utrecht Work Engagement Scale defines dedication as finding meaning at work, while also being proud and passionate about the work being done. Additionally, someone who is dedicated would feel inspired and challenged at work. The Cronbach alpha for dedication vary from 0.83 to 0.93 for each question across all studies. Correlations with the longer version are between 0.92 and 0.96 (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). The third and final component of Utrecht Work Engagement Scale is absorption. Someone who is absorbed in their work will find that time passes quickly since they are happily engrossed in their work. The Cronbach alpha for absorption vary from 0.75 to 0.94 for each question across all studies. Correlations with the longer version are between 0.88 and 0.94 (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). The correlations help show why the shorter nine question version is typically utilized.

The last section of the survey focuses on demographic information (see Appendix A – questions 45 to 52).

Procedures

In early 2018, the executive responsible for human resources at the holdings organization first contacted all potential participants in the survey and communicated the study's purpose and procedures through an email announcement (See Appendix B). The announcement was followed by an email from the Director of Talent Engagement and Culture that said the survey was available on the company's L.E.A.P. system, which is the internal learning and development platform for the organization. Both emails included information from the human resources professional explaining the purpose of the study, the voluntary nature of participation in the study, and provided a link to complete the survey, which used Survey Monkey to collect the data. Survey Monkey was used instead of Qualtrics since the platform was congruent with the L.E.A.P system. Since the survey was connected to the program employees were already using for training and development, it was easy to access and was regularly checked by employees. To reduce nonresponse error, I used a modified Dillman Method. Since the Dillman Method was initially designed for mail, I modified it to be done with a web-based survey. The Dillman Method includes sending an introductory letter along with the survey, plus a follow up two additional times after the initial send out to non-responders. The Dillman Method is believed to help achieve response rates of 50-80 percent (Dillman, Smyth, & Christian, 2014). Based on other optional surveys the company has administered in a similar fashion, it was expected that about a third of employees would respond. The

36.7% response rate to this survey was somewhat close to the expected response rate. The initial deployment was followed by two email reminders, each with a link to the survey, providing the same information and text listed in the initial request (see Appendix B). The first reminder went out one week after the survey was initially sent; the second reminder the week after that. The survey was closed out and no longer available at the end of three weeks.

Analyses

The first research question assesses the extent to which those in Managerial positions hold stereotypes of their Millennial employees. The results of questions 2-12 of the survey (see Appendix A) are used to determine the extent to which managers at the organization hold the typical stereotypes of Millennials. Given that the first question is descriptive in nature, the analytic procedure used to address the first question will be descriptive statistics.

The second research question aims at assessing whether Millennials' self-image matches that of the stereotypes commonly held by managers and whether that self-image is unique to that generation. A scale of the stereotypes was created to compare the four generations' responses through an ANOVA (Analysis of Variance). I assessed if there is a difference between the generational groups (Baby Boomers, Generation X, Millennials, and Generation Z).

The final research question compares the engagement preferences of Millennials to those of other generations. This research question was addressed using an Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regression model to estimate the relationship between stereotypes

and engagement practices which shows that if people identify with a stereotype, then they would benefit (or not) from a certain engagement practice. All analyses were conducted using the statistical software SPSS version 24.

CHAPTER 3:

FINDINGS

First, correlations between various stereotypes were run to determine if managers hold the typical stereotypes of the Millennial Generation. Nine of the ten stereotypes tested were found to be significantly correlated. Second, consistency of Millennials' self-image with stereotypes held by others was determined through correlations and creating a scale to better understand overall agreement with stereotypes of the generation. To answer the secondary question regarding how unique the self-perception is to the generation, the data was divided by generation and an ANOVA was run. Third, to determine how Millennial stereotypes correlate with engagement practices, two multiple regressions were estimated.

Managers' Stereotypes of Millennials

1. To what extent do managers hold the typical stereotypes of Millennials?

The first research question sought to understand the extent that managers hold stereotypes of the Millennial Generation. All managers were sent the survey and 149 managers responded. There were 131 cases, which means 18 cases were excluded for respondents not answering all ten of the questions. While the respondents include the 67 Millennial managers, these managers have been omitted from the sample, as I seek to understand how non-Millennial managers view their Millennial employees. The following stereotypes were tested: entitled, disloyal, lazy, needy, sensitive, creative, multi-taskers, passionate, valuing work-life balance, and social. The descriptive statistics including means and standard deviations can be found in Table 11.

Table 11

Summary Statistics of Managers' Perceptions of Millennial Stereotypes

Variable	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Minimum</i>	<i>Maximum</i>
Entitled	74	2.64	1.028	1	4
Disloyal	73	2.03	1.000	1	4
Lazy	72	2.15	0.914	1	4
Creative	75	2.68	0.918	1	4
Multi-Tasker	75	2.61	0.999	1	4
Passionate	75	2.56	0.933	1	4
Work-Life Balance	75	2.64	0.995	1	4
Needy	74	2.58	1.085	1	4
Sensitive	75	2.73	1.057	1	4

The positive stereotypes of creative, multi-taskers, passionate, and valuing work-life balance were reverse coded. The stereotype of social was omitted, since it was not strongly correlated to any of the other stereotypes. This item lacked validity because participants could have thought “social” meant in-person communication, raising issues of construct validity. The pairwise correlations can be found in Table 12, showing the significance and strength of each correlation.

Table 12

Pairwise Correlations of Managers' Perceptions of Typical Millennial Stereotypes

	Entitled	Disloyal	Lazy	Needy	Sensitive	Creative	Multi-Taskers	Passionate	Work-Life Balance
Entitled	-								

Disloyal	0.616*	-						
	(0.000)							
	72							
Lazy	0.695*	0.730*	-					
	(0.000)	(0.000)						
	71	70						
Needy	0.568*	0.499*	0.493*	-				
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)					
	73	72	71					
Sensitive	0.586*	0.466*	0.467*	0.707*	-			
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)				
	74	73	72	74				
Creative	0.145	0.144	0.067	0.101	0.189	-		
	(0.219)	(0.223)	(0.574)	(0.392)	(0.103)			
	74	73	72	74	75			
Multi- Taskers	-0.074	0.024	-0.116	0.102	0.055	0.527*	-	
	(0.531)	(0.838)	(0.334)	(0.385)	(0.642)	(0.000)		
	74	73	72	74	75	75		
Passionate	0.076	-0.024	-0.079	-0.167	-0.038	0.575*	0.482*	-
	(0.522)	(0.609)	(0.508)	(0.155)	(0.744)	(0.000)	(0.000)	
	74	73	72	74	75	75	75	
Work-Life Balance	0.015	-0.101	-0.183	-0.074	0.075	0.286*	0.497*	0.453*
	(0.897)	(0.396)	(0.124)	(0.529)	(0.525)	(0.013)	(0.000)	(0.000)
	74	73	72	74	75	75	75	75

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Overall, the nine remaining stereotypes, once “social” was omitted, had significant correlations at the 0.05 and 0.01 level. There was high reliability between the items (Cronbach’s Alpha = 0.813). There are two strong positive linear relationship in the results ($r > 0.7$), which are the correlations between Lazy and Disloyal, and between

Sensitive and Needy. Thus, when managers identified Millennial employees as Lazy, they also saw Millennial employees as Disloyal, and vice versa. Similarly, with Sensitive and Needy, when managers saw their Millennial employees as Sensitive they also identified them as Needy. Some of the correlations are moderately positive ($r > 0.5$) and significant ($p < 0.05$). These include the six correlations between the following variables: Disloyal and Entitled, Lazy and Entitled, Needy and Entitled, Sensitive and Entitled, Multi-Taskers and Creative, and Passionate and Creative.

There are eight weak significant positive correlations ($0.3 > r < 0.5$). These include the following correlations: Needy and Disloyal, Needy and Lazy, Sensitive and Disloyal, Sensitive and Lazy, Passionate and Multi-Taskers, Work-Life Balance and Creative, Work-Life Balance and Multi-Taskers, and Work-life Balance and Passionate. However, Creative does not have a relationship ($-0.3 > r < 0.3$) with any of the following variables: Entitled, Disloyal, Lazy, Needy, and Sensitive. Additionally, Passionate does not have a relationship ($-0.3 > r < 0.3$) with any of the following variables: Entitled, Sensitive, Disloyal, Lazy, Needy, and Sensitive. Lastly, Multi-Taskers does not have a relationship ($-0.3 > r < 0.3$) with any of the following variables: Entitled, Disloyal, Sensitive, Needy, and Lazy.

Interestingly, the positive stereotypes (Creative, Multi-Taskers, Passionate, and Work-Life Balance) showed moderate to weak positive correlations with each other. Similarly, the negative stereotypes (Entitled, Disloyal, Lazy, Needy, and Sensitive) showed strong, moderate, and weak positive correlations with each other. This finding was not unexpected. While it was thought that all might correlate together, instead

managers who were more likely to see positive stereotypes saw other positive stereotypes, whereas managers who saw negative stereotypes were more likely to see negative stereotypes.

Managers' Perceptions by Gender

Since the sample of managers skews female (47 female managers and 27 male managers), the correlations were also run separately for each gender. The correlation results for male managers can be found in Table 13. The correlation results for female managers can be found in Table 14. When comparing the male managers and female managers, six of the significant correlations were slightly different.

The significant correlation between Disloyal and Entitled indicates that for male managers there is a weak positive relationship ($r=0.495$) between Disloyal and Entitled, whereas there is a strong positive relationship for female managers ($r=0.718$).

Additionally, the significant correlation between Lazy and Entitled indicates that for male managers there is a moderate positive relationship ($r=0.628$) between Lazy and Entitled, whereas for female managers there is a strong positive relationship ($r=0.712$). Similarly, for male managers there is a moderate positive relationship ($r=0.608$) between Sensitive and Needy, whereas for female managers there is a strong positive relationship ($r=0.744$). Also, for male managers there is a weak positive relationship ($r=0.480$) between Sensitive and Entitled, whereas for female managers there is a moderate positive relationship ($r=0.620$). Moreover, the significant correlation between Work-Life Balance and Multi-Taskers indicates for male managers there is a weak positive relationship ($r=0.451$), whereas for female managers there is a moderate positive relationship ($r=0.501$). The last

correlation that is slightly different based on gender shows there is a stronger relationship between the two stereotypes for male managers. The significant correlation between Needy and Disloyal indicates that for male managers there is a moderate positive relationship ($r=0.581$), whereas for female managers there is a weak positive relationship ($r=0.444$).

Additionally, there are twelve correlations that differed in significance and strength based on gender. There was not a significant correlation between Needy and Lazy for the male managers, whereas for the female managers, there was a significant, moderate positive relationship ($0.5 > r < 0.7$). This was also the case for the following correlations: Sensitive and Disloyal, Sensitive and Lazy, Multi-Taskers and Creative, and Passionate and Work-Life Balance. For the following three correlations, there were not significant relationships between the items for male managers, but there were significant, weak positive relationships ($0.3 > r < 0.5$) for the female managers: Creative and Disloyal, Work-life Balance and Creative, and Work-Life Balance and Passionate. The correlation between Passionate and Creative does not indicate a relationship for male managers, whereas for female managers there is a significant strong positive relationship ($r=0.716$).

Three of the correlations between stereotypes indicated relationships for male managers, while for the female managers there are no relationships. The correlation between Passionate and Needy indicates a moderate positive relationship ($r=0.566$) for male managers, whereas for female managers there is not a significant relationship. For the remaining two correlations between Multi-Taskers and Lazy and between Passionate

and Disloyal, there are weak positive relationships ($0.3 > r < 0.5$) for male managers, while for female managers there are no significant relationships. Breaking down the manager sample by gender shows that for female managers there are more and stronger positive correlations between the generational stereotypes.

Table 13

Pairwise Correlations of Male Managers' Perceptions of Typical Millennial Stereotypes

	Entitled	Disloyal	Lazy	Needy	Sensitive	Creative	Multi-Taskers	Passionate	Work-Life Balance
Entitled	-								
Disloyal	0.495*	-							
	(0.009)								
	27								
Lazy	0.628*	0.762*	-						
	(0.001)	(0.000)							
	26	26							
Needy	0.539*	0.581*	0.333	-					
	(0.004)	(0.002)	(0.104)						
	26	26	25						
Sensitive	0.480*	0.319	0.181	0.608*	-				
	(0.011)	(0.104)	(0.375)	(0.001)					
	27	27	26	26					
Creative	0.177	-0.069	-0.011	0.168	0.189	-			
	(0.377)	(0.732)	(0.957)	(0.411)	(0.346)				
	27	27	26	26	27				
Multi-Taskers	-0.305	-0.035	-0.424*	-0.003	-0.028	0.136	-		
	(0.122)	(0.864)	(0.031)	(0.989)	(0.890)	(0.498)			
	27	27	26	26	27	27			

Passionate	-0.209 (0.295) 27	-0.439* (0.022) 27	-0.367 (0.065) 26	-0.566* (0.003) 26	-0.372 (0.056) 27	0.127 (0.527) 27	0.187 (0.350) 27	-
Work-Life Balance	-0.106 (0.427) 27	-0.227 (0.254) 27	-0.322 (0.109) 26	-0.150 (0.464) 26	0.066 (0.744) 27	-0.018 (0.931) 27	0.451* (0.018) 27	0.352 (0.072) 27

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 14

Pairwise Correlations of Female Managers' Perceptions of Typical Millennial

Stereotypes

	Entitled	Disloyal	Lazy	Needy	Sensitive	Creative	Multi- Taskers	Passionate	Work-Life Balance
Entitled	-								
Disloyal	0.718* (0.000) 43	-							
Lazy	0.712* (0.000) 43	0.734* (0.000) 42	-						
Needy	0.558* (0.000) 45	0.444* (0.003) 44	0.544* (0.000) 44	-					
Sensitive	0.620* (0.000) 45	0.597* (0.000) 44	0.586* (0.000) 44	0.744* (0.000) 46	-				
Creative	0.189 (0.214) 45	0.317* (0.036) 44	0.143 (0.355) 44	0.122 (0.419) 46	0.247 (0.098) 46	-			

Multi-Taskers	0.075 (0.622) 45	0.126 (0.414) 44	0.058 (0.709) 46	-0.132 (0.383) 46	0.135 (0.372) 46	0.645* (0.000) 46	-	
Passionate	0.274 (0.069) 45	0.198 (0.197) 44	0.095 (0.538) 44	0.084 (0.577) 46	0.211 (0.159) 46	0.716* (0.000) 46	0.601* (0.000) 46	-
Work-Life Balance	0.137 (0.369) 45	0.009 (0.956) 44	-0.106 (0.494) 44	-0.011 (0.940) 46	0.114 (0.452) 46	0.372* (0.011) 46	0.501* (0.000) 45	0.492* (0.001) 46

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Managerial Scale

A scale was created in order to compare the managers' perceptions of their Millennial employees with the self-perceptions of the non-managers, who are also Millennials. The purpose of the scale was to better measure the construct of Millennial stereotypes. Scales also help to reduce item-specific measurement errors, by utilizing multiple items to measure the construct (Boateng, Neilands, Frongillo, Melgar-Quinonez, & Yang, 2018). This scale of managers' responses includes both genders with 68 valid cases. Once the items were standardized, the Cronbach's Alpha was 0.733. Each question had a 4-point Likert scale, meaning that with nine items, the scale ranged from 9 to 36.

The mean score for the scale was 22.49 with a standard deviation of 5.036. All of the stereotypes with the exception of one stereotype would lower the Cronbach's Alpha if deleted. The exception, "Work-Life Balance" would raise the Cronbach's Alpha from 0.733 to 0.747, which is an increase of 0.14. Based on the minimal increase it was determined that Work-Life Balance would stay in the scale for comparison with the non-

manager Millennial sample. These statistics for the combined scale of stereotypes can be found in Table 15. A Hotelling's T-Squared Test shows there is a difference between the univariate means of the stereotypes ($T^2 = 57.132$, $F = 6.395$, $df = 8,60$; $p = 0.000$).

Assuming the data is normally distributed with equal variances, the Hotelling's T-Squared Test with one sample was used to test if the means for the managers' sample is equal to the population means of managers.

Table 15

Scale of Manager's Perceptions of Millennial Stereotypes

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Squared Multiple Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
Entitled	19.82	19.103	0.588	0.615	0.676
Disloyal	20.46	19.804	0.529	0.586	0.688
Lazy	20.37	20.982	0.428	0.662	0.707
Needy	19.90	20.-94	0.430	0.535	0.706
Sensitive	19.75	19.175	0.556	0.539	0.682
Creative	19.87	20.743	0.453	0.499	0.703
Multi-Taskers	19.91	21.903	0.257	0.443	0.736
Passionate	19.94	21.967	0.278	0.498	0.731
Work-Life Balance	19.87	22.564	0.186	0.361	0.747

Millennials' Self-Image

2. To what extent does Millennials' self-image reflect those stereotypes?

To answer the second question, about the extent to which Millennials' self-image is consistent with the stereotypes derived from the literature, pairwise correlations were run from the non-manager sample. Also, reliability statistics were run, a scale was

created, and an ANOVA was run to better understand how Millennials' self-perceptions were or were not aligned with common stereotypes of the generation. The descriptive statistics, including mean, sample size, range, and standard deviation can be found in Table 16. Similar to the questions managers answered about their Millennial employees, the questions that Millennials answered also used a 4-point Likert scale where 1= Not at all, 2=A little, 3=A lot, and 4=A great deal. The sample sizes ranged from 486 to 498 depending on how many Millennials answered the questions. However, 467 were considered valid based on listwise deletion of the 503 total cases (92.8%).

Table 16

Descriptive Statistics of Millennials' Self-Image of Stereotypes

Variable	n	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Minimum	Maximum
Entitled	486	1.84	1.011	1	4
Disloyal	496	1.12	0.471	1	4
Lazy	491	1.44	0.721	1	4
Creative	498	1.88	0.876	1	4
Multi-Tasker	497	1.63	0.789	1	4
Passionate	495	1.50	0.744	1	4
Work-Life Balance	498	2.74	0.697	1	4
Needy	497	1.64	0.831	1	4
Sensitive	498	2.11	0.955	1	4

Again, these statistics use the following recoded positive variables for consistency: Creative, Multi-Taskers, Passionate, and Work-Life Balance. Social was removed for the same issues of content validity. Initial correlations show both the strength of the correlations and the significance levels. While most of the correlations are

significant at the $p < 0.01$ level, as noted in Table 17, the Pearson Correlations are not strong (at or under 0.5). As such, when I ran reliability statistics for the nine items, the Cronbach's Alpha was 0.672. When the items were standardized, the Cronbach's Alpha rose to 0.706. The significant correlations are positive; however, the strength of the correlations is not very strong.

There were no strong positive linear relationships in the results ($r > 0.7$). Compared to the managers' perceptions, there were fewer moderate correlations, as well. Only two correlations are moderately positive ($r > 0.5$) and significant ($p < 0.05$). This includes the relationship between Passionate and Multi-Taskers and the relationship between Work-Life Balance and Passionate. There were nine correlations that had weak positive relationships ($r > 0.3$) including the following: Lazy and Disloyal, Needy and Disloyal, Needy and Lazy, Sensitive and Lazy, Sensitive and Needy, Multi-Taskers and Creative, Passionate and Creative, Work-Life Balance and Lazy, and Work-Life Balance and Multi-Taskers. However, 25 of the correlations do not have a relationship ($-0.3 > r < 0.3$) including the following: Disloyal and Entitled, Lazy and Entitled, Needy and Entitled, Sensitive and Entitled, Sensitive and Disloyal, Creative and Entitled, Creative and Disloyal, Creative and Lazy, Creative and Needy, Creative and Sensitive, Multi-Taskers and Entitled, Multi-Taskers and Disloyal, Multi-Taskers and Lazy, Multi-Taskers and Needy, Multi-Taskers and Sensitive, Passionate and Entitled, Passionate and Disloyal, Passionate and Lazy, Passionate and Needy, Passionate and Sensitive, Work-Life Balance and Entitled, Work-Life Balance and Disloyal, Work-Life Balance and Needy, Work-Life Balance and Sensitive, and Work-Life Balance and Creative.

Table 17

Correlations of Millennials' Self-Image of Stereotypes

	Entitled	Disloyal	Lazy	Needy	Sensitive	Creative	Multi- Taskers	Passionate	Work-Life Balance
Entitled	-								
Disloyal	0.268* (0.000) 485	-							
Lazy	0.179* (0.000) 480	0.465* (0.000) 489	-						
Needy	0.276* (0.000) 484	0.398* (0.000) 495	0.398* (0.000) 490	-					
Sensitive	0.193* (0.000) 484	0.284* (0.000) 495	0.345* (0.000) 490	0.466* (0.000) 496	-				
Creative	-0.180* (0.000) 483	0.037 (0.418) 494	0.094* (0.037) 489	0.020 (0.661) 495	0.036 (0.418) 496	-			
Multi- Taskers	-0.046 (0.311) 481	0.141* (0.002) 492	0.209* (0.000) 487	0.175* (0.000) 493	0.149* (0.001) 494	0.364* (0.000) 494	-		
Passionate	-0.081 (0.075) 481	0.251* (0.000) 492	0.207* (0.000) 487	0.078 (0.085) 483	0.056 (0.215) 493	0.397* (0.000) 493	0.500* (0.000) 491	-	
Work-Life Balance	-0.023 (0.610) 483	0.266* (0.000) 494	0.304* (0.000) 489	0.128* (0.004) 495	0.132* (0.003) 496	0.273* (0.000) 496	0.409* (0.000) 495	0.531* (0.000) 493	-

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Millennials' Self-Image by Gender

Since the data skewed female for the non-managers who were also Millennials (Males=117 and Females=371) in the same way as the first research question about managers' perceptions, the correlations of Millennials' self-image were also run by gender and compared. The correlations for the male Millennials' self-image are presented in Table 18. The correlations for the female Millennials' self-image are located in Table 19. The mean scores and standard deviations for both the male and female samples were very similar.

Table 18

Correlations of Male Millennials' Self-Image of Stereotypes

	Entitled	Disloyal	Lazy	Needy	Sensitive	Creative	Multi-Taskers	Passionate	Work-Life Balance
Entitled	-								
Disloyal	0.333* (0.000) 114	-							
Lazy	0.160 (0.089) 114	0.533* (0.000) 115	-						
Needy	0.520* (0.000) 114	0.348* (0.000) 116	0.307* (0.001) 116	-					
Sensitive	0.207* (0.000) 114	0.255* (0.000) 116	0.337* (0.001) 116	0.445* (0.000) 116	-				

	(0.027)	(0.006)	(0.000)	(0.000)				
	114	116	116	117				
Creative	0.210*	-0.167	-0.234*	0.013	-0.074	-		
	(0.025)	(0.074)	(0.011)	(0.891)	(0.426)			
	114	116	116	117	117			
Multi-Taskers	0.105	-0.168	0.268*	-0.063	-0.223*	0.456*	-	
	(0.267)	(0.071)	(0.004)	(0.499)	(0.016)	(0.000)		
	114	116	116	117	117	117		
Passionate	0.059	-0.348*	-0.204*	-0.010	-0.019	0.429*	0.453*	-
	(0.534)	(0.000)	(0.029)	(0.914)	(0.842)	(0.000)	(0.000)	
	113	115	115	116	116	116	116	
Work-Life Balance	0.062	-0.354*	-0.361*	-0.009	-0.131	0.475*	0.282*	0.485*
	(0.511)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.920)	(0.159)	(0.000)	(0.002)	(0.000)
	114	116	117	117	117	117	117	116

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 19

Correlations of Female Millennials' Self-Image of Stereotypes

	Entitled	Disloyal	Lazy	Needy	Sensitive	Creative	Multi-Taskers	Passionate	Work-Life Balance
Entitled	-								
Disloyal	0.257*	-							
	(0.000)								
	360								
Lazy	0.180*	0.450*	-						
	(0.001)	(0.000)							
	355	363							
Needy	0.170*	0.424*	0.411*	-					
	(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.001)						
	359	368	363						

Sensitive	0.187*	0.302*	0.340*	0.472*	-			
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)				
	359	368	363	368				
Creative	0.156*	0.013	-0.054	-0.037	-0.022	-		
	(0.003)	(0.809)	(0.303)	(0.485)	(0.677)			
	359	368	363	368	369			
Multi-Taskers	0.045	-0.123*	-0.141*	-0.198*	-0.124*	0.361*	-	
	(0.393)	(0.019)	(0.007)	(0.000)	(0.017)	(0.000)		
	356	365	360	365	366	367		
Passionate	0.082	-0.204*	-0.205*	-0.110*	-0.078	0.388*	0.520*	-
	(0.123)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.35)	(0.136)	(0.000)	(0.000)	
	357	366	361	366	366	367	364	
Work-Life Balance	0.003	-0.229*	-0.290*	-0.183*	-0.153*	0.205*	0.456*	0.545*
	(0.957)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.003)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.002)	(0.000)
	358	367	362	367	368	369	367	366

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

There are eleven correlations that are different based on the gender (male or female) of the Millennials. The correlation between Lazy and Disloyal indicates a significant, moderate positive relationship for male Millennials ($r=0.533$), but only indicates a weak positive relationship for female Millennials ($r=0.450$). Additionally, the significant correlation between Needy and Entitled indicates the male Millennials see both stereotypes in themselves more than female Millennials ($r=0.520$ for males and $r=0.170$ for females). The following three significant correlations indicate weak negative relationships for male Millennials ($-0.3 > r < -0.5$), but did not indicate relationships for female Millennials: Passionate and Disloyal, Work-Life Balance and Disloyal, and Work-Life Balance and Creative.

The following two significant correlations indicate weak positive relationships ($0.3 > r < 0.5$) for male Millennials, but did not indicate relationships for female Millennials: Disloyal and Entitled, and Work-Life Balance and Creative. Alternatively, the following two significant correlations did not indicate a relationship for male Millennials, yet indicated a weak positive relationship ($0.3 > r < 0.5$) for female Millennials: Sensitive and Disloyal, and Work-Life Balance and Multi-Taskers. Lastly, the following two significant correlations indicate weak positive relationships ($0.3 > r < 0.5$) for male Millennials, whereas there are moderate positive relationships ($0.5 > r < 0.7$) for female Millennials: Passionate and Multi-Taskers, and Work-Life Balance and Passionate.

Scale of Millennials' Self-Image

When the stereotype scale was created for Millennial non-manager responses in the same way that the scale was created for managers using the nine items, the mean was 14.52, with a standard deviation 3.77. Comparing this to the mean of the scale of managers' perceptions (mean = 22.49, SD = 5.036), the non-managers' mean was lower and the distribution was smaller than the managers' distribution. The purpose of the scale was to better measure the construct of Millennial stereotypes. When looking for items in the scale to keep or omit, the item-total statistics found in Table 20 were considered. Since deleting all but one item (*Entitled*) from the scale would drop the Cronbach's Alpha, no items were omitted. *Entitled* also stayed as part of the scale due to it being very close to the current Cronbach's Alpha ($\alpha = 0.708$ and $\alpha = 0.0706$ respectively). A Hotelling's T-Squared Test shows there is a difference between the means of the

stereotypes ($T^2 = 887.77$, $F = 109.30$, $df = 8,459$; $p = 0.000$). Assuming the data is normally distributed with equal variances, the Hotelling's T-Squared Test with one sample was used to test if the means for the Millennials' Self-Image sample is equal to the population means.

Table 20

Scale of Millennials' Self-Image of Stereotypes

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Squared Multiple Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
Entitled	12.704	12.402	0.114	0.152	0.708
Disloyal	13.400	12.447	0.470	0.324	0.638
Lazy	13.088	11.402	0.477	0.307	0.621
Needy	12.891	11.110	0.439	0.333	0.625
Sensitive	12.418	10.930	0.373	0.254	0.641
Creative	12.642	12.252	0.194	0.211	0.681
Multi-Taskers	12.897	11.307	0.431	0.332	0.627
Passionate	13.036	11.696	0.393	0.425	0.637
Work-Life Balance	13.069	11.592	0.452	0.354	0.627

Since many of the correlations did not show strong relationships, one survey item that was added to help answer the second research question was the one about whether or not the Millennials in the sample identified as Millennials. Participants were asked how strongly they identified as a Millennials on the same 4-point Likert Scale where 1= Not at all, 2=A little, 3=A lot, and 4=A great deal. The findings can be seen in Table 21. There were 203 Millennials who did not identify as Millennials. There were 264 Millennials

who did identify as Millennials (scoring themselves as a 2, 3 or 4). There was a total of 467 participants. Further tests were run to determine if there was a statistically significance difference between the mean scores on the self-identification of the stereotypes.

Table 21

Descriptive Statistics of Millennials' Self-Image by Self-Identification as Millennials

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Entitled	No	203	1.74	0.963	0.068	1.61	1.87	1	4
	Yes	264	1.87	1.024	0.063	1.75	2.00	1	4
	Total	467	1.81	0.999	0.046	1.72	1.90	1	4
Disloyal	No	203	1.13	0.514	0.036	1.06	1.20	1	4
	Yes	264	1.11	0.423	0.026	1.05	1.16	1	4
	Total	467	1.12	0.464	0.021	1.08	1.16	1	4
Lazy	No	203	1.43	0.696	0.049	1.33	1.52	1	4
	Yes	264	1.43	0.726	0.045	1.34	1.52	1	4
	Total	467	1.43	0.712	0.033	1.37	1.50	1	4
Needy	No	203	1.59	0.836	0.059	1.48	1.71	1	4
	Yes	264	1.66	0.817	0.050	1.56	1.75	1	4
	Total	467	1.63	0.825	0.038	1.55	1.70	1	4
Sensitive	No	203	2.06	0.983	0.069	1.92	2.20	1	4
	Yes	264	2.13	0.936	0.058	2.02	2.25	1	4
	Total	467	2.10	0.956	0.044	2.01	2.19	1	4
Creative	No	203	1.99	0.931	0.065	1.86	2.12	1	4
	Yes	264	1.79	0.822	0.051	1.69	1.89	1	4
	Total	467	1.88	0.875	0.041	1.80	1.96	1	4
Multi-Taskers	No	203	1.65	0.851	0.060	1.53	1.77	1	4
	Yes	264	1.60	0.733	0.045	1.51	1.69	1	4

	Total	467	1.62	0.786	0.036	1.55	1.69	1	4
Passionate	No	203	1.54	0.815	0.057	1.43	1.66	1	4
	Yes	264	1.43	0.661	0.041	1.35	1.52	1	4
	Total	467	1.48	0.733	0.034	1.42	1.55	1	4
Work-Life Balance	No	203	1.55	0.759	0.053	1.44	1.65	1	4
	Yes	264	1.38	0.628	0.039	1.30	1.45	1	4
	Total	467	1.45	0.693	0.032	1.39	1.51	1	4

Finally, to answer the second research question, an ANOVA was run using the stereotype scale scores to determine if there were any differences between Millennials who do identify as Millennials and Millennials who do not identify as Millennials. I also ran a two-sample independent group t-test to see if there were statistically significant differences between the means of the groups. The two-sample independent t-test showed where among the groups each statistical difference occurred. This allowed me to compare means between specific groups that responded statistically different from another group. The Levine's Test for Equality of Variance and t-test for equality of means is shown in Table 22. The variance is statistically significant for two stereotypes (Passionate, where $p = 0.001$, and Work-Life Balance, where $p = 0.000$). This means the second line of the table (equal variances not assumed) for these two stereotypes is read, whereas for the other seven stereotypes the first line where equal variances are assumed is read. There are two stereotypes where the mean scores are significantly different.

	Not Assumed			2.343	405	0.020	0.194	0.083	0.031	0.356
Multi-Taskers	Equal Variances Assumed	2.840	0.093	0.705	465	0.481	0.052	0.073	-0.093	0.196
	Not Assumed			0.692	399	0.490	0.052	0.075	-0.095	0.199
Passionate	Equal Variances Assumed	10.292	0.001	1.683	465	0.093	0.115	0.068	-0.019	0.249
	Not Assumed			1.638	383	0.102	0.115	0.070	-0.023	0.253
Work-Life Balance	Equal Variances Assumed	13.360	0.000	2.675	465	0.008	0.172	0.064	0.046	0.298
	Not Assumed			2.610	389	0.009	0.172	0.066	0.042	0.301

There are statistically significant differences in the means for two stereotypes:

Creative ($p = 0.018$) and Work-Life Balance ($p = 0.008$). The results of the ANOVA can be found in Table 23. For Creative, there was a significant difference between the mean scores for Millennials who do not identify as Millennials ($M = 1.99$, $SD = 0.931$) and Millennials who do identify as Millennials ($M = 1.79$, $SD = 0.822$); $t(465) = 2.381$, $p = 0.018$. This means that on average, Millennials who identify as Millennials saw themselves as less creative than those who do not identify as Millennials. For Work-Life Balance, there was a significant difference between the mean scores for Millennials who do not identify as Millennials ($M = 1.55$, $SD = 0.759$) and Millennials who do identify as Millennials ($M = 1.38$, $SD = 1.38$); $t(389) = 2.610$, $p = 0.009$. This means that on

average, Millennials who identify as Millennials saw themselves valuing Work-Life

Balance less than Millennials who do not identify as Millennials.

Table 23

ANOVA of Millennials' Self-Image by Self-Identification as Millennials

	Source	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Entitled	Between Groups	2.009	1	2.009	2.018	0.156
	Within Groups	462.784	465	0.995		
	Total	464.792	466			
Disloyal	Between Groups	0.083	1	0.083	0.386	0.535
	Within Groups	100.439	465	0.216		
	Total	100.522	466			
Lazy	Between Groups	0.001	1	0.001	0.002	0.961
	Within Groups	236.487	465	0.509		
	Total	236.488	466			
Needy	Between Groups	0.473	1	0.473	0.694	0.405
	Within Groups	316.697	465	0.681		
	Total	317.169	466			
Sensitive	Between Groups	0.619	1	0.619	0.677	0.411
	Within Groups	425.650	465	0.915		
	Total	426.270	466			
Creative	Between Groups	4.299	1	4.299	5.671	0.018
	Within Groups					
	Total					

	Within Groups	352.497	465	0.758		
	Total	356.797	466			
Multi-Taskers	Between Groups	0.307	1	0.307	0.497	0.481
	Within Groups	287.607	465	0.619		
	Total	287.914	466			
Passionate	Between Groups	1.517	1	1.517	2.832	0.093
	Within Groups	249.078	465	0.536		
	Total	250.595	466			
Work-Life Balance	Between Groups	3.387	1	3.387	7.153	0.008
	Within Groups	220.180	465	0.474		
	Total	223.567	466			

H1: Millennials' self-image is positively correlated with stereotypes of the generation

Based on the findings to the second research question, I do not find support for the second hypothesis that Millennials' self-image is positively correlated with the stereotypes of the Millennial Generation. This is due to the participants' responses and the majority of the correlations showing no relationship between the identification with Millennial stereotypes. Additionally, when adding in the variable of how much Millennial participants identified as Millennials, only two significant findings were found and both were not positive correlations. Millennials who identified as Millennials saw themselves as less creative and valuing Work-Life Balance less than those Millennials

who do not identify as Millennials. The literature suggested that Millennials would identify more with both stereotypes.

Managers' Perceptions and Millennials' Self-Image

In order to compare the managers' perceptions of Millennials and the non-manager Millennial's self-image, an Independent Samples T-Test was run. The descriptive statistics can be found in Table 24. The nine stereotypes from the scales are compared to see where managers' and millennials' responses were statistically different.

Table 24

Descriptive Statistics of Managers' Perceptions and Millennials' Self-Image

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Entitled	Millennials	467	1.81	0.999	0.046	1.72	1.90	1	4
	Managers	68	2.66	1.016	0.123	2.42	2.91	1	4
	Total	535	1.92	1.039	0.045	1.83	2.01	1	4
Disloyal	Millennials	467	1.12	0.464	0.021	1.08	1.16	1	4
	Managers	68	2.03	0.977	0.118	1.79	2.27	1	4
	Total	535	1.23	0.633	0.027	1.18	1.29	1	4
Lazy	Millennials	467	1.43	0.712	0.033	1.37	1.50	1	4
	Managers	68	2.12	0.907	0.110	1.90	2.34	1	4
	Total	535	1.52	0.774	0.033	1.45	1.58	1	4
Needy	Millennials	467	1.63	0.825	0.038	1.55	1.70	1	4
	Managers	68	2.59	1.068	0.130	2.33	2.85	1	4
	Total	535	1.75	0.916	0.040	1.67	1.83	1	4
Sensitive	Millennials	467	2.10	0.956	0.044	2.01	2.19	1	4
	Managers	68	2.74	1.045	0.127	2.48	2.99	1	4
	Total	535	2.18	0.990	0.043	2.10	2.27	1	4
Creative	Millennials	467	3.12	0.875	0.040	3.04	3.20	1	4

	Managers	68	2.62	0.915	0.111	2.40	2.84	1	4
	Total	535	3.06	0.895	0.039	2.98	3.14	1	4
Multi-Taskers	Millennials	467	3.38	0.786	0.036	3.31	3.45	1	4
	Managers	68	2.57	1.012	0.123	2.33	2.82	1	4
	Total	535	3.28	0.860	0.037	3.20	3.35	1	4
Passionate	Millennials	467	3.52	0.733	0.034	3.45	3.58	1	4
	Managers	68	2.54	0.953	0.116	2.31	2.77	1	4
	Total	535	3.39	0.830	0.036	3.32	3.46	1	4
Work-Life Balance	Millennials	467	3.55	0.693	0.032	3.49	3.61	1	4
	Managers	68	2.62	1.008	0.122	2.37	2.86	1	4
	Total	535	3.43	0.802	0.035	3.36	3.50	1	4

Table 25

Independent Sample Test of Managers' Perceptions and Millennials' Self-Image

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		T-Test for Equality of Means					95% Confidence Interval	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig.	Mean Diff.	Std. Error Diff.	Lower	Upper
Entitled	Equal Variances Assumed	0.170	0.681	-6.528	533	0.000	-0.848	0.130	-1.103	-0.593
	Not Assumed			-6.442	87	0.000	-0.848	0.132	-1.110	-0.586
Disloyal	Equal Variances Assumed	85.394	0.000	-12.621	533	0.000	-0.912	0.120	-1.152	-0.672
	Not Assumed			-7.572	71	0.000	-0.687	0.096	-0.876	-0.499

Lazy	Equal Variances Assumed	4.494	0.034	-7.159	533	0.000	-0.687	0.096	-0.876	-0.499
	Not Assumed			-5.988	79	0.000	-0.687	0.115	-0.916	-0.459
Needy	Equal Variances Assumed	15.747	0.000	-8.614	533	0.000	-0.961	0.112	-1.180	-0.742
	Not Assumed			-7.114	79	0.000	-0.961	0.135	-1.230	-0.692
Sensitive	Equal Variances Assumed	3.930	0.048	-5.051	533	0.000	-0.635	0.126	-0.881	-0.388
	Not Assumed			-4.726	84	0.000	-0.635	0.134	-0.902	-0.368
Creative	Equal Variances Assumed	0.815	0.367	4.434	533	0.000	0.507	0.114	0.282	0.731
	Not Assumed			4.290	86	0.000	0.507	0.118	0.272	0.741
Multi-Taskers	Equal Variances Assumed	14.603	0.000	7.588	533	0.000	0.805	0.106	0.597	1.014
	Not Assumed			6.292	79	0.000	0.805	0.128	0.551	1.060
Passionate	Equal Variances Assumed	15.891	0.000	9.817	533	0.000	0.974	0.099	0.779	1.169
	Not Assumed			8.086	79	0.000	0.974	0.120	0.734	1.214
Work-Life Balance	Equal Variances Assumed	33.489	0.000	9.714	533	0.000	0.933	0.096	0.744	1.121
	Not Assumed			7.381	76	0.000	0.933	0.126	0.681	1.184

Table 25 shows the T-Test for equality of means and the Levene's Test for Equality of Variances. The Levene's Test shows that the variance is statistically significant ($p < 0.001$) for the following stereotypes: Disloyal, Lazy, Needy, Sensitive, Multi-Taskers, Passionate, and Work-Life Balance. This means that the second line of the table (equal variances not assumed) for these stereotypes is read, whereas for the stereotypes of Entitled and Creative the first line where equal variances are assumed is read.

For each of the nine stereotypes, there is a statistically significant difference between the managers' perceptions and the non-manager Millennials' self-image. When comparing the means from the descriptive table and the T-Test results, it shows that Managers see Millennials as more Entitled, Disloyal, Lazy, Needy, and Sensitive than Millennials see themselves. Millennials see themselves as more Creative, Multi-Taskers, Passionate, and valuing Work-Life Balance than Managers did. Interestingly, Millennials rated themselves higher on positive stereotypes, whereas Managers rated Millennials higher on negative stereotypes.

Comparing Millennials with Other Generations

2a. Is this self-perception unique to this generation?

To answer the second part of the second research question, descriptive statistics were run on the non-managers' sample who stated to what extent they identify with the Millennial stereotypes. This allowed for a comparison between generational groups and to answer the question if Millennials are different from other generations. For consistency, "social," was once again removed from this analysis. The descriptive

statistics can be found in Table 26. The range is offered for each of the stereotypes.

Interestingly, for all 80 Generation Z respondents, there were three stereotypes (Multi-Taskers, Work-Life Balance, and Passionate) that only received positive self-identification scores. This means that none of the 80 Generation Z respondents scored themselves as “1 = Not at all” when asked if they saw themselves as Multi-Taskers, valuing Work-Life Balance, and Passionate.

Additionally, Table 27 shows the homogeneity of variances including the Levene Statistic, which shows if it is appropriate to assume that variances are equal or unequal. The following stereotypes are listed in the table as rejecting the null hypothesis of homogeneity of variance ($p < 0.05$): Entitled, Lazy, Sensitive, Creative, Passionate, and Work-Life Balance. Follow up non-parametric tests, which make no assumptions about how the data is distributed, could provide an alternative interpretation of the data, and will be conducted in future research.

Table 26

Descriptive Statistics of Non-Managers' Self-Image with Millennial Stereotype

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Entitled	Baby Boomers	94	1.46	0.888	0.092	1.28	1.64	1	4
	Generation X	214	1.52	0.923	0.063	1.39	1.64	1	4
	Millennials	467	1.81	0.999	0.046	1.72	1.90	1	4
	Generation Z	80	2.24	1.105	0.124	1.99	2.48	1	4
	Total	855	1.74	1.001	0.034	1.67	1.81	1	4

Multi-Taskers	Baby Boomers	94	3.24	0.743	0.077	3.09	3.40	1	4
	Generation X	214	3.34	0.775	0.53	3.23	3.44	1	4
	Millennials	467	3.38	0.786	0.36	3.31	3.45	1	4
	Generation Z	80	3.23	0.636	0.071	3.08	3.37	2	4
	Total	855	3.34	0.766	0.26	3.29	3.39	1	4
Passionate	Baby Boomers	94	3.41	0.739	0.076	3.26	3.57	1	4
	Generation X	214	3.33	0.797	0.055	3.22	3.44	1	4
	Millennials	467	3.52	0.733	0.034	3.45	3.58	1	4
	Generation Z	80	3.60	0.565	0.063	3.47	3.73	2	4
	Total	855	3.47	0.741	0.025	3.42	3.52	1	4
Work-Life Balance	Baby Boomers	94	3.53	0.699	0.072	3.39	3.68	1	4
	Generation X	214	3.49	0.768	0.052	3.39	3.59	1	4
	Millennials	467	3.55	0.693	0.032	3.49	3.61	1	4
	Generation Z	80	3.53	0.616	0.069	3.39	3.66	2	4
	Total	855	3.53	0.705	0.024	3.48	3.58	1	4

Table 27

Homogeneity of Variances for Self-Image with Millennial Stereotypes

	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Entitled	5.439	3	851	0.001
Disloyal	2.514	3	851	0.057
Lazy	11.919	3	851	0.000
Needy	0.525	3	851	0.665
Sensitive	4.034	3	851	0.007
Creative	3.274	3	851	0.021
Multi-Taskers	1.334	3	851	0.262

Passionate	6.608	3	851	0.000
Work-Life Balance	3.569	3	851	0.014

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to compare the effect of generations on identification with Millennial stereotypes. Based on the information in Table 28, there were four groups being compared (Baby Boomers, Generation X, Millennials, and Generation Z.).

Table 28

ANOVA Results of Self-Image Based on Generation

		<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Entitled	Between	40.323	3	13.41	14.017	0.000
	Groups					
	Within Groups	816.035	851	0.959		
	Total	856.358	854			
Disloyal	Between	0.508	3	0.169	0.715	0.543
	Groups					
	Within Groups	201.557	851	0.237		
	Total	202.065	854			
Lazy	Between	12.589	3	4.196	8.439	0.000
	Groups					
	Within Groups	423.200	851	0.497		
	Total	435.789	854			
Needy	Between	14.149	3	4.716	7.164	0.000
	Groups					
	Within Groups	560.272	851	0.658		
	Total	574.421	854			

Sensitive	Between Groups	4.009	3	1.336	1.496	0.214
	Within Groups	760.253	851	0.893		
	Total	764.262	854			
Creative	Between Groups	8.095	3	2.698	3.570	0.014
	Within Groups	643.115	851	0.756		
	Total	651.209	854			
Multi-Taskers	Between Groups	2.625	3	0.875	1.492	0.215
	Within Groups	499.012	851	0.586		
	Total	501.637	854			
Passionate	Between Groups	6.807	3	2.269	4.179	0.006
	Within Groups	462.058	851	0.543		
	Total	468.865	854			
Work-Life Balance	Between Groups	0.526	3	0.175	0.351	0.788
	Within Groups	424.403	851	0.499		
	Total	424.929	854			

Of the nine common Millennial stereotypes (disloyal, lazy, creative, multi-taskers, passionate, work-life balance, needy, sensitive, and entitled) only five were found to have statistically significant differences between groups ($p < 0.05$). The five stereotypes were lazy, creative, passionate, needy, and entitled. Recognizing that there were some differences between generational groups, I then ran a post-hoc test, Fisher's Least Squares Differences (LSD), to determine which groups were different (Williams & Abdi,

2010). For each of the five stereotypes, I will provide explanation of the results in Table 29. For the following stereotypes, there were no statistical differences between generational groups: disloyal, multi-taskers, work-life balance, and sensitive.

Entitled

There was a significant effect of generations on self-identification with the stereotype “Entitled” at the $p < 0.01$ level, where $[F(3,851) = 14.017, p = 0.000]$. Millennials and Generation Z’s means scores were different from Baby Boomers at the $p < 0.01$ level. Millennials ($M = 1.81, SD = 0.999, p = 0.001$) and Generation Z ($M = 2.24, SD = 1.105, p = 0.000$) identified more as “Entitled” than Baby Boomers ($M = 1.46, SD = 0.888$) identified with the stereotype. Additionally, Millennials and Generation Z’s self-image was significantly different from Generation X at the $p < 0.01$ level. Millennials ($M = 1.81, SD = 0.999, p = 0.000$) and Generation Z ($M = 2.24, SD = 1.105, p = 0.000$) identified more as “Entitled” than Generation X ($M = 1.52, SD = 0.923$) identified with the stereotype. Also, Millennials and Generation Z significantly differed at $p < 0.01$ level. Thus, Millennials are different from the other three generational groups on their self-assessment of the stereotype “Entitled.” Millennials identified less “Entitled” than Generation Z.

Lazy

There was a significant effect of generations on self-identification with the stereotype “Lazy” at the $p < 0.01$ level, where $[F(3,851) = 8.439, p = 0.000]$. Millennials and Generation Z’s means scores were different from Baby Boomers at the $p < 0.01$ level. Millennials ($M = 1.43, SD = 0.712, p = 0.004$) and Generation Z ($M = 1.70, SD = 0.877,$

$p = 0.000$) identified more as “Lazy” than Baby Boomers ($M = 1.20$, $SD = 0.477$).

Additionally, Generation Z’s self-image was significantly different from Generation X at the $p < 0.01$ level. Generation Z ($M = 1.70$, $SD = 0.877$, $p = 0.000$) identified more as “Lazy” than Generation X ($M = 1.32$, $SD = 0.701$). Also, Millennials and Generation Z were significantly different at the $p < 0.01$ level. Thus, Millennials’ self-identification was different than Baby Boomers and Generation Z with the stereotype “Lazy.”

Millennials identified as more “Lazy” than Baby Boomers and identified as less “Lazy” than Generation Z.

Needy

There was a significant effect of generations on self-identification with the stereotype “Needy” at the $p < 0.01$ level, where $[F(3,851) = 7.164, p = 0.000]$.

Millennials and Generation Z’s means scores were different from Baby Boomers at the $p < 0.01$ level. Millennials ($M = 1.63$, $SD = 0.825$, $p = 0.001$) and Generation Z ($M = 1.83$, $SD = 0.965$, $p = 0.000$) identified more as “Needy” than Baby Boomers ($M = 1.31$, $SD = 0.640$) identified with the stereotype. Additionally, Generation Z’s self-image was significantly different from Generation X at the $p < 0.01$ level. Generation Z ($M = 1.83$, $SD = 0.965$, $p = 0.002$) identified more as “Needy” than Generation X ($M = 1.50$, $SD = 0.786$) identified with the stereotype. Also, Millennials and Generation Z significantly differed at $p < 0.05$ level. Thus, Millennials’ self-identification was different than Baby Boomers and Generation Z with the stereotype “Needy.” Millennials identified as more “Needy” than Baby Boomers, and identified as less “Needy” than Generation Z.

Creative

There was a significant effect of generations on self-identification with the stereotype “Creative” at the $p < 0.05$ level, where $[F(3,851) = 3.570, p = 0.014]$. Generation Z’s means scores were different from Baby Boomers at the $p < 0.05$ level. Generation Z ($M = 3.25, SD = 0.803, p = 0.018$) identified more as “Creative” than Baby Boomers ($M = 2.94, SD = 0.840$) identified with the stereotype. Additionally, Millennials and Generation Z’s self-image was significantly different from Generation X at the $p < 0.05$ level. Millennials ($M = 3.12, SD = 0.875, p = 0.025$) and Generation Z ($M = 3.25, SD = 0.803, p = 0.012$) identified more as “Creative” than Generation X ($M = 2.96, SD = 0.893$) identified with the stereotype. Thus, Millennials’ self-identification was different than Generation X with the stereotype “Creative.” Millennials identified as less “Creative” than Generation Z.

Passionate

There was a significant effect of generations on self-identification with the stereotype “Passionate” at the $p < 0.01$ level, where $[F(3,851) = 4.179, p = 0.006]$. Additionally, Millennials and Generation Z’s self-image was significantly different from Generation X at the $p < 0.01$ level. Millennials ($M = 3.52, SD = 0.733, p = 0.002$) and Generation Z ($M = 3.60, SD = 0.565, p = 0.006$) identified more as “Passionate” than Generation X ($M = 3.33, SD = 0.797$) identified with the stereotype. Thus, Millennials’ self-identification was different than Generation X with the stereotype “Passionate.” Millennials identified as more “Passionate” than Generation X.

Table 29

Post-Hoc Test of Least Squares Differences for ANOVA of Self-Image and Generations

Stereotype	Generation	Generation	Mean Diff.	Std. Error	Sig.	Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Entitled	Baby Boomers	Generation	-0.061	0.121	0.613	-0.30	0.18
		X					
		Millennials	-0.356*	0.111	0.001	-0.57	-0.14
		Generation Z	-0.780*	0.149	0.000	-1.07	-0.49
	Generation X	Baby	0.061	0.121	0.613	-0.18	0.30
		Boomers					
		Millennials	-0.295*	0.081	0.000	-0.45	-0.14
		Generation Z	-0.719*	0.128	0.000	-0.97	-0.47
	Millennials	Baby	0.356*	0.111	0.001	0.14	0.57
		Boomers					
		Generation	0.295*	0.081	0.000	0.14	0.45
		X					
		Generation Z	-0.424*	0.118	0.000	-0.66	-0.19
	Generation Z	Baby	0.780*	0.149	0.000	0.49	1.07
		Boomers					
		Generation	0.719*	0.128	0.000	0.47	0.97
		X					
		Millennials	0.424*	0.118	0.000	0.19	0.66
Disloyal	Baby Boomers	Generation	-0.048	0.060	0.427	-0.17	0.07
		X					
		Millennials	-0.011	0.055	0.836	-0.12	0.10
		Generation Z	-0.081	0.074	0.273	-0.23	0.06

	Generation X	Baby Boomers	0.048	0.060	0.427	-0.07	0.17
		Millennials	0.036	0.040	0.365	-0.04	0.12
		Generation Z	-0.033	0.064	0.602	-0.16	0.09
	Millennials	Baby Boomers	0.011	0.055	0.836	-0.10	0.12
		Generation X	-0.036	0.040	0.365	-0.12	0.04
		Generation Z	-0.070	0.059	0.237	-0.19	0.05
	Generation Z	Baby Boomers	0.081	0.074	0.273	-0.06	0.23
		Generation X	0.033	0.064	0.602	-0.09	0.16
		Millennials	0.070	0.059	0.237	-0.05	0.19
	Lazy	Generation X	-0.120	0.087	0.168	-0.29	0.05
		Millennials	-0.228*	0.080	0.004	-0.38	-0.07
		Generation Z	-0.498*	0.107	0.000	-0.71	-0.29
	Generation X	Baby Boomers	0.120	0.087	0.168	-0.05	0.29
		Millennials	-0.108	0.058	0.064	-0.22	0.01
		Generation Z	-0.378*	0.092	0.000	-0.56	-0.20
	Millennials	Baby Boomers	0.228*	0.080	0.004	0.07	0.38
		Generation X	0.108	0.058	0.064	-0.01	0.22
		Generation Z	-0.270*	0.085	0.002	-0.44	-0.10
	Generation Z	Baby Boomers	0.498*	0.107	0.000	0.29	0.71

Needy	Baby Boomers	Generation X	0.378*	0.092	0.000	0.20	0.56
		Millennials	0.270*	0.085	0.002	0.10	0.44
		Generation X	-0.191	0.100	0.057	-0.39	0.01
		Millennials	-0.319*	0.092	0.001	-0.50	-0.14
		Generation Z	-0.516*	0.123	0.000	-0.76	-0.27
	Generation X	Baby Boomers	0.191	0.100	0.057	-0.01	0.39
		Millennials	-0.127	0.067	0.057	-0.26	0.00
		Generation Z	-0.325*	0.106	0.002	-0.53	-0.12
	Millennials	Baby Boomers	0.319*	0.092	0.001	0.14	0.50
		Generation X	0.127	0.067	0.057	0.00	0.26
		Generation Z	-0.198*	0.098	0.044	-0.39	0.00
	Generation Z	Baby Boomers	0.516*	0.123	0.000	0.27	0.76
		Generation X	0.325*	0.106	0.002	0.12	0.53
		Millennials	0.198*	0.098	0.044	0.00	0.39
Sensitive	Baby Boomers	Generation X	0.184	0.117	0.115	-0.05	0.41
		Millennials	0.187	0.107	0.081	-0.02	0.40
		Generation Z	0.037	0.144	0.796	-0.24	0.32
	Generation X	Baby Boomers	-0.184	0.117	0.115	-0.41	0.05
		Millennials	-0.002	0.082	0.978	-0.15	0.16
		Generation Z	-0.147	0.124	0.235	-0.39	0.10

	Millennials	Baby Boomers	-0.187	0.107	0.081	-0.40	0.02
		Generation X	-0.02	0.078	0.978	-0.16	0.15
		Generation Z	-0.149	0.114	0.192	-0.37	0.08
	Generation Z	Baby Boomers	-0.037	0.144	0.796	-0.32	0.24
		Generation X	0.147	0.124	0.235	-0.10	0.39
		Millennials	0.149	0.114	0.192	-0.08	0.37
	Creative	Baby Boomers	-0.026	0.108	0.806	-0.24	0.18
		Millennials	-0.188	0.098	0.056	-0.38	0.00
		Generation Z	-0.314*	0.132	0.018	-0.57	-0.05
	Generation X	Baby Boomers	0.026	0.108	0.806	-0.18	0.24
		Millennials	-0.162*	0.072	0.025	-0.30	-0.02
		Generation Z	-0.287*	0.114	0.012	-0.51	-0.06
	Millennials	Baby Boomers	0.188	0.098	0.056	0.00	0.38
		Generation X	0.162*	0.072	0.025	0.02	0.30
		Generation Z	-0.126	0.105	0.232	-0.33	0.08
	Generation Z	Baby Boomers	0.314*	0.132	0.018	0.05	0.57
		Generation X	0.287*	0.114	0.012	0.06	0.51
		Millennials	0.126	0.105	0.232	-0.08	0.33

Multi- Taskers	Baby Boomers	Generation	-0.092	0.085	0.333	-0.28	0.09
		X					
		Millennials	-0.134	.087	0.121	-0.30	-0.04
		Generation Z	0.020	0.116	0.866	-0.21	0.25
	Generation X	Baby	0.092	0.095	0.333	-0.09	0.28
		Boomers					
		Millennials	-0.043	0.063	0.501	-0.17	0.08
		Generation Z	0.111	0.100	0.267	-0.09	0.31
	Millennials	Baby	0.134	0.087	0.121	-0.04	0.30
		Boomers					
		Generation	0.043	0.063	0.501	-0.08	0.17
		X					
		Generation Z	0.154	0.093	0.097	-0.03	0.34
	Generation Z	Baby	-0.20	0.116	0.866	-0.25	0.21
		Boomers					
		Generation	-0.111	0.100	0.267	-0.31	0.09
		X					
		Millennials	-0.154	0.093	0.097	-0.34	0.03
Passionate	Baby Boomers	Generation	0.083	0.091	0.362	-0.10	0.26
		X					
		Millennials	-0.103	0.083	0.215	-0.27	0.06
		Generation Z	-0.185	0.112	0.099	-0.41	0.03
	Generation X	Baby	-0.083	0.091	0.362	-0.26	0.10
		Boomers					
		Millennials	-0.186*	0.061	0.002	-0.31	-0.07
		Generation Z	-0.268*	0.097	0.006	-0.46	-0.08
	Millennials	Baby	0.103	0.083	0.215	-0.06	0.27
		Boomers					

		Generation X	0.186*	0.061	0.002	0.07	0.31
		Generation Z	-0.082	0.089	0.359	-0.26	0.09
Work-Life	Z	Baby Boomers	0.185	0.112	0.099	-0.03	0.41
		Generation X	0.268*	0.097	0.006	0.08	0.46
		Millennials	0.082	0.089	0.359	-0.09	0.26
		Generation Z	0.041	0.087	0.637	-0.13	0.21
	Boomers	Generation X	-0.18	0.080	0.818	-0.18	0.14
		Millennials	0.07	0.107	0.949	-0.20	0.22
		Generation Z	-0.041	0.087	0.637	-0.21	0.13
		Millennials	-0.060	0.058	0.306	-0.17	0.05
	X	Generation Z	-0.034	0.093	0.711	-0.22	0.15
		Baby Boomers	0.018	0.080	0.818	-0.14	0.18
		Generation X	0.060	0.058	0.306	-0.05	0.17
		Generation Z	0.025	0.085	0.767	-0.14	0.19
	Millennials	Baby Boomers	-0.07	0.107	0.949	-0.22	0.20
		Generation X	0.034	0.093	0.711	-0.15	0.22
		Generation Z	-0.025	0.085	0.767	-0.19	0.14
		Millennials					

*p< .05.

Millennial Stereotypes and Engagement Practices

3. How do the Millennial stereotypes influence desired engagement practices at work?

In order to answer the third research question about how Millennial stereotypes influence desired engagement practices at work, OLS regression models were estimated. The agreement scores for engagement practices are the dependent variables for the models. The descriptive statistics for each of the engagement practices are presented in Table 30. The sample includes managers and non-managers and ranges from 1,078 participants to 1,084. In order to predict how self-identification with Millennial stereotypes influences what engagement practices people want in the workplace, each of the eleven engagement practices will be explored through model building. Future research will include assumption checks. For each of the eleven engagement practices two regression models were run. The first model's independent variables are the items related to self-identification with the nine stereotypes. The second model includes those stereotypes as well as five more control variables including: role in the organization (Manager=1, Non-manager=0), race (White=0, People of Color=1) generation (Millennials=0, All other generations=1), gender (Male=0, Female=1, and other), and education level (High school graduate=0, Higher levels of education=1). The standardized betas will be interpreted when describing the linear relationships predicted by the regression models.

Table 30

Summary Statistics of Engagement Practices

Variable	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Minimum</i>	<i>Maximum</i>
I need clear expectations to help me identify how to advance at the organization	1082	3.14	0.925	1	4
It is important for me to have flexibility in my schedule	1083	3.25	0.822	1	4
It is important for me to have a voice in decision making at the organization	1082	3.12	0.802	1	4
I enjoy being recognized for my accomplishments at work	1084	3.48	0.693	1	4
I want my manager to care about me as a person	1082	3.39	0.758	1	4
I would like to have someone at work who encourages me to do my best	1084	3.35	0.794	1	4
I receive monthly feedback on my progress	1081	2.97	1.043	1	4
I want the organization to provide me with opportunities to promote my physical health	1082	3.11	0.886	1	4
I enjoy opportunities where I can learn something new	1079	3.73	0.519	1	4
I prefer to dress casually to express my individuality	1078	3.24	0.899	1	4

I enjoy healthy competition on team projects	1084	3.36	0.813	1	4
--	------	------	-------	---	---

Clear Expectations

To predict the factors that impact the need for clear expectations, two regression models were estimated. Both models can be found in Table 31. The first model accounted for 2.5% of the variance ($R^2 = 0.025$). The second model accounted for 4.5% of the variance ($R^2 = 0.045$). The R^2 change is significant at the $p < 0.05$ level for both models. The first model has an $F(9, 1022) = 2.948$, and $p = 0.002$. The second model has an $F(14, 1015) = 3.405$, and $p = 0.000$. Looking at the second model, since it accounts for more of the variance, there are two variables that make a unique statistically significant contribution to the model (Sensitive, where $\beta = 0.095$ and $p = 0.008$; and Race, where $\beta = 0.130$ and $p = 0.000$). The control variable of “Race” makes the largest statistical contribution to the second model ($\beta = 0.130$) when other variables have been removed. As the score on the predictor Sensitive increases by one standard deviation, the need for clear expectations increases by 0.095. People of color reported a need for clear expectations that is 0.130 higher than respondents who identify as white. Thus, the higher the score on being Sensitive or identifying as a person of color increases the need for clear expectations.

Table 31

Summary of Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Needing Clear Expectations

Variable	Model 1			Model 2		
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β
Entitled	0.036	0.031	0.040	0.017	0.032	0.018
Disloyal	0.132	0.072	0.074	0.133	0.072	0.074
Lazy	0.005	0.053	0.004	0.007	0.053	0.005
Creative	0.038	0.037	0.036	0.023	0.038	0.022
Multi-Taskers	-0.038	0.045	-0.031	-0.038	0.046	-0.031
Passionate	-0.004	0.051	-0.003	-0.014	0.051	-0.011
Work-Life Balance	0.093	0.051	0.072	0.086	0.050	0.066
Needy	-0.017	0.044	-0.015	-0.012	0.044	-0.011
Sensitive	0.094	0.035	0.096*	0.093	0.035	0.095*
Role				-0.133	0.084	-0.049
Race				0.258	0.064	0.130*
Generation				0.049	0.059	0.027
Gender				0.046	0.070	0.021
Education				0.065	0.037	0.031
R ²		0.025			0.045	
F for change in R ²		2.948*			3.405*	

Note. The following variables are dichotomized as follows with the reference category being the one that equals zero: Role in the Organization (Manager=1, Non-manager=0), Race (White=0, People of Color=1) Generation (Millennials=0, All other generations=1), Gender (Male=0, Female=1), and Education Level (High school graduate=0, Higher levels of education=1)

* $p < .05$.

Schedule Flexibility

For the second engagement practice, the importance of having a flexible schedule, two regression models were tested. Both models can be found in Table 32. The first

model accounted for 2.4% of the variance ($R^2 = 0.024$). The second model accounted for 2.7% of the variance ($R^2 = 0.027$). The R^2 change is significant at the $p < 0.05$ level for both models. The first model has an $F(9, 1022) = 2.794$, and $p = 0.003$. The second model has an $F(14, 1015) = 2.014$, and $p = 0.014$.

In the first model, there are two variables that make a unique statistically significant contribution to the model (Multi-Taskers, where $\beta = -0.076$ and $p = 0.046$; Sensitive where $\beta = 0.102$ and $p = 0.005$). Thus, as Multi-Tasker scores increase the interest in flexible schedules decreases. Additionally, as Sensitivity scores increase so does interest in having a flexible schedule. In the second model, there is one variable that makes a unique statistically significant contribution to the model (Sensitive, where $\beta = 0.102$ and $p = 0.005$). The stereotype of “Sensitive” makes the largest statistical contribution in both models ($\beta = 0.102$) when controlling for other variables. As the coefficient of the variable is positive, as the predictor (Sensitive) increases by one standard deviation, the desire for having a flexible schedule increases by 0.102. Thus, the higher the score on being Sensitive, the need for scheduling flexibility increases.

Table 32

Summary of Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Schedule Flexibility

Variable	Model 1			Model 2		
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β
Entitled	-0.009	0.028	-0.011	-0.013	0.029	-0.016
Disloyal	0.028	0.064	0.018	0.032	0.065	0.020
Lazy	0.047	0.047	0.041	0.045	0.048	0.039
Creative	0.011	0.033	0.011	0.004	0.034	0.004

Multi-Taskers	-0.081	0.040	-0.076*	-0.079	0.041	-0.074
Passionate	0.030	0.045	0.027	0.028	0.046	0.025
Work-Life Balance	0.089	0.045	0.077*	0.087	0.045	0.075
Needy	0.006	0.039	0.006	0.005	0.040	0.006
Sensitive	0.088	0.032	0.102*	0.089	0.032	0.102*
Role in Organization				-0.058	0.076	-0.024
Race				0.069	0.058	0.039
Generation				-0.010	0.053	-0.006
Gender				-0.005	0.063	-0.002
Education				0.055	0.058	0.030
R ²		0.024			0.027	
F for change in R ²		2.794*			2.014*	

Note. The following variables are dichotomized as follows with the reference category being the one that equals zero: Role in the Organization (Manager=1, Non-manager=0), Race (White=0, People of Color=1) Generation (Millennials=0, All other generations=1), Gender (Male=0, Female=1), and Education Level (High school graduate=0, Higher levels of education=1)

*p< .05.

H2: The stereotype of creative is positively related to the desire to having a flexible work schedule.

I do not find support for the hypothesis, as the stereotype of creative was not statistically significant in predicting the engagement practice of a flexible work schedule.

The only stereotype that was shown to predict wanting a flexible work schedule was being sensitive.

Voice in Decision Making

For the third engagement practice, the importance of having a voice in decision making in the organization, two regression models were tested. Both models can be found in Table 33. The first model accounted for 6.4% of the variance ($R^2 = 0.064$). The

second model accounted for 7.8% of the variance ($R^2 = 0.078$). The R^2 change is significant at the $p < 0.01$ level for both models. The first model has an $F(9, 1022) = 7.776$, and $p = 0.000$. The second model has an $F(14, 1015) = 6.178$, and $p = 0.000$. Looking at the second model, since it accounts for more of the variance, there are four variables that make a unique statistically significant contribution to the model (Entitled, where $\beta = 0.125$ and $p = 0.000$; Creative, where $\beta = 0.084$ and $p = 0.016$; Race, where $\beta = 0.086$ and $p = 0.007$; and Generation, where $\beta = -0.071$ and $p = 0.023$).

The stereotype of “Entitled” makes the largest statistical contribution to the second model ($\beta = 0.125$) when controlling for other variables. As the predictor Entitled increases by one standard deviation, the need for having a voice in decision making increases by 0.125. Additionally, as Creative increases by one standard deviation, the need for having a voice in decision making increases by 0.084. People of color reported a need for a voice in decision making that is 0.086 higher than respondents who identify as white. Millennials reported a need for having a voice in decision making that is 0.071 higher than other generations reported. Thus, the higher the score on being Entitled or Creative or identifying as a person of color, the desire for having a voice in decision making increases. Additionally, being a part of the Millennial Generation increases interest in having a voice in the decision making process.

Table 33

Summary of Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Voice in Decision Making

Variable	Model 1			Model 2		
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β
Entitled	0.120	0.026	0.153*	0.099	0.027	0.125*
Disloyal	0.002	0.061	0.001	0.015	0.061	0.010
Lazy	-0.027	0.045	-0.024	-0.036	0.045	-0.032
Creative	0.084	0.032	0.092*	0.077	0.032	0.084*
Multi-Taskers	0.046	0.039	0.044	0.040	0.039	0.039
Passionate	0.095	0.043	0.089*	0.081	0.043	0.075
Work-Life Balance	-0.047	0.043	-0.042	-0.050	0.043	-0.045
Needy	0.033	0.038	0.034	0.029	0.037	0.031
Sensitive	0.045	0.030	0.054	0.056	0.030	0.066
Role in Organization				0.046	0.072	0.020
Race				0.148	0.055	0.086*
Generation				-0.114	0.050	-0.071*
Gender				0.019	0.060	0.010
Education				-0.062	0.055	-0.143
R ²		0.064			0.078	
F for change in R ²		7.776*			6.178*	

Note. The following variables are dichotomized as follows with the reference category being the one that equals zero: Role in the Organization (Manager=1, Non-manager=0), Race (White=0, People of Color=1) Generation (Millennials=0, All other generations=1), Gender (Male=0, Female=1), and Education Level (High school graduate=0, Higher levels of education=1)

* $p < .05$.

Recognition

For the fourth engagement practice, enjoying being recognized for work accomplishments, two regression models were tested. Both models can be found in Table

34. The first model accounted for 6.5% of the variance ($R^2 = 0.065$). The second model accounted for 8.7% of the variance ($R^2 = 0.087$). The R^2 change is significant at the $p < 0.01$ level for both models. The first model has an $F(9, 1022) = 7.868$, and $p = 0.000$. The second model has an $F(14, 1015) = 6.914$, and $p = 0.000$. Looking at the second model, since it accounts for more of the variance, there are four variables that make a unique statistically significant contribution to the model (Entitled, where $\beta = 0.109$ and $p = 0.001$; Multi-Taskers, where $\beta = 0.112$ $p = 0.003$; Role in the Organization, where $\beta = -0.065$ and $p = 0.033$; and Gender, where $\beta = 0.101$ and $p = 0.001$).

The stereotype of “Multi-Taskers” makes the largest statistical contribution to the second model ($\beta = 0.112$) when other variables have been removed. As the predictor Entitled increases by one standard deviation, the need for being recognized for work accomplishments increases by 0.109. Additionally, as the score for Multi-Taskers increases by one standard deviation, the need to be recognized for work accomplishments increases by 0.112. Females reported a desire for recognition that is 0.101 higher than males reported. Managers reported a desire for recognition that is 0.065 less than non-managers. Thus, the higher the score on being Entitled or Multi-Taskers or being female increases the desire to be recognized in the workplace. Additionally, managers are less likely to want recognition.

Table 34

Summary of Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Being Recognized for Work Accomplishments

Variable	Model 1			Model 2		
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β
Entitled	0.087	0.023	0.128*	0.075	0.023	0.109*
Disloyal	-0.039	0.053	-0.029	-0.027	0.053	-0.020
Lazy	-0.034	0.039	-0.035	-0.033	0.039	-0.034
Creative	0.016	0.027	0.021	0.023	0.028	0.029
Multi-Taskers	0.111	0.033	0.123*	0.101	0.034	0.112*
Passionate	0.058	0.037	0.062	0.054	0.037	0.058
Work-Life Balance	0.035	0.037	0.036	0.021	0.037	0.022
Needy	0.058	0.032	0.071	0.061	0.032	0.074
Sensitive	0.031	0.026	0.043	0.024	0.026	0.033
Role in Organization				-0.132	0.062	-0.065*
Race				0.066	0.047	0.045
Generation				-0.044	0.043	-0.032
Gender				0.167	0.052	0.101*
Education				-0.087	0.047	-0.056
R ²		0.065			0.087	
F for change in R ²		7.868*			6.914*	

Note. The following variables are dichotomized as follows with the reference category being the one that equals zero: Role in the Organization (Manager=1, Non-manager=0), Race (White=0, People of Color=1) Generation (Millennials=0, All other generations=1), Gender (Male=0, Female=1), and Education Level (High school graduate=0, Higher levels of education=1)

*p< .05.

Relationship with Manager

For the fifth engagement practice, wanting managers to care about them, two regression models were tested. Both models can be found in Table 35. The first model accounted for 5.8% of the variance ($R^2 = 0.058$). The second model accounted for 7.6% of the variance ($R^2 = 0.076$). The R^2 change is significant at the $p < 0.01$ level for the first model for both models. The first model has an $F(9, 1022) = 6.968$, and $p = 0.000$. The second model has an $F(14, 1015) = 5.954$, and $p = 0.000$. Looking at the second model, since it accounts for more of the variance, there are six variables that make a unique statistically significant contribution to the model (Lazy, where $\beta = -0.086$ and $p = 0.034$; Creative, where $\beta = 0.078$ and $p = 0.027$; Multi-Taskers, where $\beta = 0.075$ and $p = 0.047$; Sensitive, where $\beta = 0.138$ and $p = 0.000$; Role in the Organization, where $\beta = -0.068$ and $p = 0.027$; and Gender, where $\beta = 0.102$ and $p = 0.001$). The stereotype of “Sensitive” makes the largest statistical contribution to the second model ($\beta = 0.138$) when controlling for other variables.

As the predictor Creative increases by one standard deviation, the need for a relationship with a manager that cares about them as a person increases by 0.078. Also, as the predictor Multi-Taskers increases by one standard deviation, the need for a relationship with a manager that cares about them as person increases by 0.075. Furthermore, as the predictor Sensitive increases by one standard deviation, the need for a relationship with a manager that cares about them as a person increases by 0.138. Females reported a desire to have a manager who cares about them as a person that is 0.102 higher than males. Managers reported a desire to have a manager who cares about

them as a person that is 0.068 less than non-managers. Thus, the higher the score on being Creative, Multi-Taskers, or Sensitive, or being female, the desire to have a manager who cares about them as a person increases. Alternatively, as Lazy increases, the desire for a manager to care about them decreases. Additionally, managers are less likely to want their managers to care about them as a person.

Table 35

Summary of Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Wanting Manager to Care About Me as a Person

Variable	Model 1			Model 2		
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β
Entitled	0.004	0.025	0.005	-0.001	0.026	-0.002
Disloyal	0.035	0.058	0.024	0.038	0.058	0.026
Lazy	-0.099	0.043	-0.094*	-0.091	0.043	-0.086*
Creative	0.062	0.030	0.072	0.067	0.030	0.078*
Multi-Taskers	0.084	0.037	0.085*	0.073	0.037	0.075*
Passionate	0.016	0.041	0.016	0.018	0.041	0.017
Work-Life Balance	0.061	0.041	0.058	0.047	0.041	0.044
Needy	0.051	0.036	0.057	0.056	0.035	0.062
Sensitive	0.123	0.028	0.154*	0.110	0.028	0.138*
Role in Organization				-0.150	0.068	-0.068*
Race				0.073	0.052	0.045
Generation				0.029	0.047	0.019
Gender				0.184	0.057	0.102*
Education				0.002	0.052	0.001
R ²		0.058			0.076	
F for change in R ²		6.968*			5.954*	

Note. The following variables are dichotomized as follows with the reference category being the one that equals zero: Role in the Organization (Manager=1, Non-manager=0), Race (White=0, People of Color=1) Generation (Millennials=0, All other generations=1), Gender (Male=0, Female=1), and Education Level (High school graduate=0, Higher levels of education=1)

* $p < .05$.

Encouragement

For the sixth engagement practice, wanting someone at work to encourage them to do their best, two regression models were tested. Both models can be found in Table 36. The first model accounted for 6.0% of the variance ($R^2 = 0.060$). The second model accounted for 7.7% of the variance ($R^2 = 0.077$). The R^2 change is significant at the $p < 0.01$ level for both models. The first model has an $F(9, 1022) = 7.289$, and $p = 0.000$. The second model has an $F(14, 1015) = 6.049$, and $p = 0.000$. Looking at the second model, since it accounts for more of the variance, there are five variables that make a unique statistically significant contribution to the model (Entitled, where $\beta = 0.077$ and $p = 0.025$; Creative, where $\beta = 0.090$ and $p = 0.011$; Sensitive where $\beta = 0.082$ and $p = 0.020$; Generation where $\beta = -0.067$ and $p = 0.031$; and Gender, where $\beta = 0.102$ and $p = 0.001$).

“Gender” makes the largest statistical contribution to the second model ($\beta = 0.102$) when controlling for other variables. As the predictor Entitled increases by one standard deviation, the need for encouragement increases by 0.077. Additionally, as the predictor Creative increases by one standard deviation, the need for encouragement increases by 0.090. Furthermore, as the predictor Sensitive increases by one standard deviation, the need for encouragement increases by 0.082. Females reported a need to receive encouragement in the workplace that is 0.102 higher than males. Millennials

reported a need to receive encouragement in the workplace that is 0.067 higher than other generations reported. Thus, the higher the score on being Entitled, Creative, or Sensitive, or identifying as female, the need to receive encouragement in the workplace increases. Also, being a part of the Millennial Generation increases the need to receive encouragement in the workplace.

Table 36

Summary of Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Wanting Encouragement

Variable	Model 1			Model 2		
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β
Entitled	0.066	0.026	0.084	0.060	0.027	0.077*
Disloyal	0.004	0.061	0.003	0.020	0.061	0.013
Lazy	-0.036	0.045	-0.033	-0.037	0.045	-0.033
Creative	0.071	0.031	0.078*	0.081	0.032	0.090*
Multi-Taskers	0.044	0.038	0.042	0.028	0.039	0.027
Passionate	0.078	0.043	0.073	0.079	0.043	0.074
Work-Life Balance	0.044	0.043	0.040	0.029	0.043	0.026
Needy	0.069	0.037	0.073*	0.068	0.037	0.071
Sensitive	0.077	0.029	0.092	0.069	0.030	0.082*
Role in Organization				-0.091	0.071	-0.039
Race				-0.013	0.054	-0.008
Generation				-0.107	0.050	-0.067*
Gender				0.194	0.059	0.102*
Education				-0.043	0.054	-0.024
R ²		0.060			0.077	
F for change in R ²		7.289*			6.049*	

Note. The following variables are dichotomized as follows with the reference category being the one that equals zero: Role in the Organization (Manager=1, Non-manager=0),

Race (White=0, People of Color=1) Generation (Millennials=0, All other generations=1), Gender (Male=0, Female=1), and Education Level (High school graduate=0, Higher levels of education=1)

* $p < .05$.

Feedback

For the seventh engagement practice, receiving monthly feedback on progress, two regression models were tested. Both models can be found in Table 37. The first model accounted for 4.7% of the variance ($R^2 = 0.047$). The second model accounted for 6.0% of the variance ($R^2 = 0.060$). The R^2 change is significant at the $p < 0.01$ level for both models. The first model has an $F(9, 1022) = 5.608$, and $p = 0.000$. The second model has an $F(14, 1015) = 4.648$, and $p = 0.000$. In the second model, since it accounts for more of the variance, there are four variables that make a unique statistically significant contribution to the model (Entitled, where $\beta = 0.101$ and $p = 0.004$; Passionate, where $\beta = 0.142$ and $p = 0.001$; and Generation where $\beta = -0.072$ and $p = 0.022$).

The stereotype of “Passionate” makes the largest statistical contribution to the second model ($\beta = 0.142$) when controlling for other variables. As the predictor Entitled increases by 1 standard deviation, the desire for monthly feedback increases by 0.101. Additionally, as the predictor Passionate increases by one standard deviation, the desire for monthly feedback increases by 0.142. Millennials reported a desire to receive monthly feedback that is 0.072 higher than other generations reported. Thus, the higher the score on being Entitled, or Passionate, the desire to receive monthly feedback increases. Also, being a part of the Millennial Generation increases the desire for monthly feedback.

H3: The stereotype of sensitive is negatively related to the desire for feedback on work performance.

I do not find support for this hypothesis, as the stereotype of sensitive was not statistically significant in predicting a disinterest in the engagement practice of receiving regular feedback. The only stereotype that was shown to statistically predict a lower interest in feedback was being a member of generation other than the Millennials.

Table 37

Summary of Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Getting Monthly Feedback

Variable	Model 1			Model 2		
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β
Entitled	0.124	0.035	0.121*	0.103	0.036	0.101*
Disloyal	0.041	0.080	0.020	0.065	0.081	0.033
Lazy	0.005	0.059	0.003	-0.004	0.059	-0.003
Creative	0.057	0.042	0.048	0.060	0.042	0.050
Multi-Taskers	-0.020	0.051	-0.015	-0.030	0.051	-0.022
Passionate	0.208	0.057	0.149*	0.198	0.057	0.142*
Work-Life Balance	0.014	0.056	0.009	0.001	0.056	0.001
Needy	-0.009	0.049	-0.007	-0.011	0.049	-0.009
Sensitive	-0.017	0.039	-0.016	-0.016	0.039	-0.014
Role in Organization				0.082	0.094	-0.027
Race				0.082	0.072	0.037
Generation				-0.151	0.066	-0.072*
Gender				0.129	0.079	0.052
Education				-0.120	0.072	-0.052
R ²		0.047			0.060	
F for change in R ²		5.608*			4.648*	

Note. The following variables are dichotomized as follows with the reference category being the one that equals zero: Role in the Organization (Manager=1, Non-manager=0), Race (White=0, People of Color=1) Generation (Millennials=0, All other generations=1), Gender (Male=0, Female=1), and Education Level (High school graduate=0, Higher levels of education=1)

* $p < .05$.

Physical Health

For the eighth engagement practice, wanting the organization to provide opportunities to promote physical health, two regression models were tested. Both models can be found in Table 38. The first model accounted for 6.2% of the variance ($R^2 = 0.062$). The second model accounted for 6.8% of the variance ($R^2 = 0.068$). The R^2 change is significant at the $p < 0.01$ level for both models. The first model has an $F(9, 1022) = 7.467$, and $p = 0.000$. The second model has an $F(14, 1015) = 5.267$, and $p = 0.000$. In the first model, there are two variables that make a unique statistically significant contribution to the model (Entitled, where $\beta = 0.088$ and $p = 0.009$; and Creative, where $\beta = 0.149$ and $p = 0.000$). The stereotype of “Creative” makes the largest statistical contribution to the second model ($\beta = 0.149$). As the predictor Entitled increases by one standard deviation, the desire to have the organization provide opportunities to promote physical health increases by 0.088. Additionally, as the predictor Creative increases by one standard deviation, the desire to have the organization provide opportunities to promote physical health increases by 0.149.

In the second model, the same two variables make a unique statistically significant contribution to the model (Entitled, where $\beta = 0.076$ and $p = 0.029$; and Creative, where $\beta = 0.147$ and $p = 0.000$). The stereotype of “Creative” makes the largest

statistical contribution to the second model ($\beta = 0.147$) when controlling for other variables. As the predictor Entitled increases by one standard deviation, the desire to have the organization provide opportunities to promote physical health increases by 0.076. Additionally, as the predictor Creative increases by one standard deviation, the desire to have the organization provide opportunities to promote physical health increases by 0.147. Thus, the higher the score on being Entitled and Creative, the desire to have the organization provide opportunities for to promote physical health increases.

Table 38

Summary of Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Getting Opportunities to Promote Physical Health

Variable	Model 1			Model 2		
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β
Entitled	0.076	0.029	0.088*	0.066	0.030	0.076*
Disloyal	0.115	0.068	0.067	0.125	0.068	0.073
Lazy	-0.039	0.050	-0.032	-0.042	0.050	-0.034
Creative	0.150	0.035	0.149*	0.148	0.036	0.147*
Multi-Taskers	0.049	0.043	0.042	0.042	0.043	0.036
Passionate	0.038	0.048	0.032	0.033	0.048	0.028
Work-Life Balance	0.014	0.048	0.011	0.006	0.048	0.004
Needy	0.073	0.042	0.069	0.072	0.042	0.068
Sensitive	-0.002	0.033	-0.003	-0.004	0.033	-0.004
Role in Organization				-0.071	0.080	-0.027
Race				0.083	0.061	0.044
Generation				-0.061	0.056	-0.035
Gender				0.086	0.067	0.041
Education				-0.004	0.061	-0.002

R^2	0.062	0.068
F for change in R^2	7.467*	5.267*

Note. The following variables are dichotomized as follows with the reference category being the one that equals zero: Role in the Organization (Manager=1, Non-manager=0), Race (White=0, People of Color=1) Generation (Millennials=0, All other generations=1), Gender (Male=0, Female=1), and Education Level (High school graduate=0, Higher levels of education=1)

* $p < .05$.

Learning Opportunities

For the ninth engagement practice, enjoying opportunities to learn something new, two regression models were tested. Both models can be found in Table 39. The first model accounted for 7.4% of the variance ($R^2 = 0.074$). The second model accounted for 8.2% of the variance ($R^2 = 0.082$). The R^2 change is significant at the $p < 0.01$ level for both models. The first model has an $F(9, 1022) = 9.050$, and $p = 0.000$. The second model has an $F(14, 1015) = 6.442$, and $p = 0.000$. In the second model, there are five variables that make a unique statistically significant contribution to the model (Entitled, where $\beta = 0.077$ and $p = 0.026$; Creative, where $\beta = 0.072$ and $p = 0.040$; Passionate, where $\beta = 0.095$ and $p = 0.018$; Work-Life Balance, where $\beta = 0.102$ and $p = 0.008$; and Generation, where $\beta = -0.087$ and $p = 0.005$). The stereotype of “Work-Life Balance” makes the largest statistical contribution to the second model ($\beta = 0.102$) of the stereotypes in the model.

As the predictor Entitled increases by one standard deviation, enjoying opportunities to learn something new increases by 0.077. Additionally, as the predictor Creative increases by one standard deviation, enjoying opportunities to learn something new increases by 0.072. Also, as the predictor Passionate increases by one standard

deviation, enjoying opportunities to learn something new increases by 0.095. Moreover, as the predictor Work-Life Balance increases by one standard deviation, enjoying opportunities to learn something new increases by 0.102. Millennials reported a score on enjoying opportunities to learn something new that is 0.087 higher than other generations. Thus, the higher the score on being Entitled, Passionate, Valuing Work-Life Balance. Alternatively, being a part of the Millennial Generation increases the desire for opportunities to learn something new at work.

Table 39

Summary of Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Interest in Learning Something New

Variable	Model 1			Model 2		
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β
Entitled	0.043	0.017	0.085*	0.039	0.017	0.077*
Disloyal	0.034	0.039	0.034	0.045	0.040	0.045
Lazy	-0.002	0.029	-0.002	-0.009	0.029	-0.012
Creative	0.045	0.020	0.079*	0.043	0.021	0.072*
Multi-Taskers	0.031	0.025	0.046	0.030	0.025	0.044
Passionate	0.068	0.028	0.098*	0.066	0.028	0.095*
Work-Life Balance	0.077	0.028	0.106*	0.074	0.028	0.102*
Needy	0.020	0.024	0.033	0.016	0.024	0.026
Sensitive	-0.037	0.019	-0.068	-0.034	0.019	-0.063
Role in Organization				-0.024	0.046	-0.016
Race				0.005	0.035	-0.004
Generation				-0.090	0.032	-0.087*
Gender				0.004	0.039	0.003
Education				0.008	0.035	0.007

R^2	0.066	0.082
F for change in R^2	9.050*	6.442*

Note. The following variables are dichotomized as follows with the reference category being the one that equals zero: Role in the Organization (Manager=1, Non-manager=0), Race (White=0, People of Color=1) Generation (Millennials=0, All other generations=1), Gender (Male=0, Female=1), and Education Level (High school graduate=0, Higher levels of education=1)

* $p < .05$.

Casual Dress

For the tenth engagement practice, preferring to dress casually to express individuality, two regression models were tested. Both models can be found in Table 40. The first model accounted for 3.4% of the variance ($R^2 = 0.034$). The second model accounted for 5.6% of the variance ($R^2 = 0.056$). The R^2 change is significant at the $p < 0.01$ level for both models. The first model has an $F(9, 1022) = 3.939$, and $p = 0.000$. The second model has an $F(14, 1015) = 4.282$, and $p = 0.000$.

In the second model, there are three variables that make a unique statistically significant contribution to the model (Multi-Taskers, where $\beta = -0.090$ and $p = 0.017$; Role in the Organization, where $\beta = -0.087$ and $p = 0.005$; and Gender, where $\beta = 0.068$ and $p = 0.007$). Generational group makes the largest statistical contribution of all the variables ($\beta = 0.093$). As agreement with identifying as a Multi-Tasker increases by one standard deviation, the desire for casual dress decreases by 0.090. Females reported a desire for casual dress in the workplace that is 0.068 higher than males. Additionally, managers reported a desire for casual dress in the workplace that is 0.087 less than non-managers. Thus, as Role in the Organization increases (more likely to be a manager), the desire to dress casually in the workplace decreases.

Table 40

Summary of Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Casual Dress to Express Individuality

Variable	Model 1			Model 2		
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β
Entitled	0.069	0.030	0.078*	0.053	0.031	0.060
Disloyal	-0.009	0.070	-0.005	0.013	0.070	0.008
Lazy	0.097	0.051	0.078	0.092	0.051	0.074
Creative	0.017	0.036	0.017	0.020	0.036	0.020
Multi-Taskers	-0.098	0.044	-0.084*	-0.106	0.044	-0.090*
Passionate	0.099	0.049	0.082*	0.095	0.049	0.079
Work-Life Balance	0.091	0.049	0.072	0.072	0.049	0.057
Needy	0.021	0.043	0.019	0.021	0.043	0.020
Sensitive	0.033	0.034	0.035	0.024	0.034	0.025
Role in Organization				-0.228	0.082	-0.087*
Race				0.086	0.062	0.044
Generation				-0.092	0.057	-0.051
Gender				0.182	0.068	0.068*
Education				-0.060	0.062	0.062
R ²		0.034			0.056	
F for change in R ²		3.939*			4.282*	

Note. The following variables are dichotomized as follows with the reference category being the one that equals zero: Role in the Organization (Manager=1, Non-manager=0), Race (White=0, People of Color=1) Generation (Millennials=0, All other generations=1), Gender (Male=0, Female=1), and Education Level (High school graduate=0, Higher levels of education=1)

* $p < .05$.

Competition on Team Projects

For the eleventh, and final engagement practice, enjoying healthy competition on team projects, two regression models were tested. Both models can be found in Table 41. The first model accounted for 9.7% of the variance ($R^2 = 0.097$). The second model accounted for 12.5% of the variance ($R^2 = 0.125$). The R^2 change is significant at the $p < 0.01$ level for both models. The first model has an $F(9, 1022) = 12.161$, and $p = 0.000$. The second model has an $F(14, 1015) = 10.403$, and $p = 0.000$. In the first model, there are six variables that make a unique statistically significant contribution to the model (Entitled, where $\beta = 0.073$ and $p = 0.027$; Creative, where $\beta = 0.139$ and $p = 0.000$; Multi-Taskers, where $\beta = 0.081$ and $p = 0.026$; Passionate, where $\beta = 0.121$ and $p = 0.002$; Needy, where $\beta = 0.040$ and $p = 0.008$; and Sensitive, where $\beta = -0.092$ and $p = 0.008$).

In the first model, the stereotype, “Creative” makes the largest contribution ($\beta = 0.139$). As the predictor Entitled increases by one standard deviation, the enjoyment of healthy team competition increases by 0.073. Additionally, as the predictor Creative increases by one standard deviation, the enjoyment of healthy team competition increases by 0.139. Also, as the predictor Multi-Taskers increases by one standard deviation, the enjoyment of healthy team competition increases by 0.081. Furthermore, as the predictor Passionate increases by one standard deviation, the enjoyment of healthy team competition increases by 0.121. Moreover, as the predictor Needy increases by one standard deviation, the enjoyment of healthy team competition increases by 0.040. Alternately, as the predictor Sensitive increases by one standard deviation, the enjoyment of healthy team competition decreases by 0.092. Thus, as the predictors (Entitled, Creative, Multi-Taskers, Passionate, and Needy) increase, so does the enjoyment of

healthy team competition. Alternatively, as Sensitive increases, the desire for healthy team competition decreases.

For the second model, there are seven variables that made a unique statistically significant contribution to the model (Disloyal, where $\beta = 0.076$ and $p = 0.049$; Creative, where $\beta = 0.125$ and $p = 0.000$; Multi-Taskers, where $\beta = 0.075$ and $p = 0.040$; Passionate, where $\beta = 0.100$ and $p = 0.011$; Role in Organization, where $\beta = 0.081$ and $p = 0.007$; Race, where $\beta = 0.128$ and $p = 0.000$; and Generation, where $\beta = -0.067$ and $p = 0.027$). “Race” makes the largest contribution ($\beta = 0.125$). As the predictor Disloyal increases by one standard deviation, the enjoyment of healthy team competition increases by 0.076. Additionally, as the predictor Creative increases by one standard deviation, the enjoyment of healthy team competition increases by 0.125. Also, as the predictor Multi-Taskers, increases by one standard deviation, the enjoyment of healthy team competition increases by 0.075. Furthermore, as the predictor Passionate increases by one standard deviation, the enjoyment of healthy team competition increases by 0.100.

Managers reported an enjoyment of healthy team competition that is 0.081 higher than non-managers. People of color reported an enjoyment of healthy team competition that is 0.128 higher than those who identified as white. Millennials reported an enjoyment of healthy team competition that is 0.067 higher than other generations reported. Thus, as the predictors (Disloyal, Creative, Multi-Taskers, Passionate, Role, and Race) increase, so does an enjoyment of healthy team competition. Thus, the higher the score on being Disloyal, Creative, Multi-Taskers, Passionate, or being a manager, the enjoyment of

healthy team competition increases. Alternatively, identifying as a person of color or being part of the Millennial Generation increases the desire for healthy team competition.

Table 41

Summary of Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Enjoying Healthy Competition on Team Projects

Variable	Model 1			Model 2		
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β
Entitled	0.059	0.026	0.073*	0.030	0.027	0.038
Disloyal	0.112	0.061	0.071	0.119	0.061	0.076*
Lazy	-0.022	0.045	-0.020	-0.032	0.045	-0.028
Creative	0.128	0.032	0.139*	0.115	0.032	0.125*
Multi-Taskers	0.086	0.038	0.081*	0.079	0.039	0.075*
Passionate	0.131	0.043	0.121*	0.109	0.043	0.100*
Work-Life Balance	0.014	0.043	0.012	0.018	0.042	0.016
Needy	0.077	0.037	0.079*	0.073	0.037	0.076*
Sensitive	-0.079	0.030	-0.092*	-0.057	0.030	-0.067
Role in Organization				0.192	0.071	0.081*
Race				0.224	0.054	0.128*
Generation				-0.109	0.049	-0.067*
Gender				-0.053	0.059	-0.027
Education				-0.071	0.054	-0.039
R ²		0.097			0.125	
F for change in R ²		12.161*			10.403*	

Note. The following variables are dichotomized as follows with the reference category being the one that equals zero: Role in the Organization (Manager=1, Non-manager=0), Race (White=0, People of Color=1) Generation (Millennials=0, All other generations=1), Gender (Male=0, Female=1), and Education Level (High school graduate=0, Higher levels of education=1)

* $p < .05$.

Almost all of the nine stereotypes and five control variables offer statistical significance in predicting at least one of the eleven engagement practices (Education does not appear). The stereotype of “Entitled” is a statistically significant variable in predicting six of the eleven engagement practices (decision making, recognition, encouragement, feedback, physical health, learning opportunities). “Generation” also is a statistically significant variable in predicting five of the eleven engagement practices (decision making, encouragement, feedback, learning opportunities, and team competition). The stereotype of “Creative” is a statistically significant variable in predicting five of the eleven engagement practices (decision making, encouragement, physical health, learning opportunities, and team competition). The stereotype of “Sensitive” is a statistically significant variable in predicting five of the eleven engagement practices (clear expectation, flexibility, recognition, relationship with manager, and encouragement).

Additionally, when examining the beta and standardized beta for each model for each engagement practice, both are still under one. Since the betas are small, the effect size and the slope of the regression line for each model is small. While the predictor variables described in each model are statistically significant, the size of the coefficients suggest that there is less practical significance to the findings as most predict a 0.1 change on a 4-point scale.

CHAPTER 4:

DISCUSSION

The primary purpose of this study was to examine anecdotal evidence from practitioner work through empirical study to determine what is known and what can be proven about generational stereotypes and engagement practices. This research aims to better understand how managers perceive Millennial employees, how Millennials self-identify with their generational stereotypes, and how Millennials differ from other generations. Additionally, the research sought to better understand the practices that engage Millennials at work. The results indicate that managers hold nine of the common Millennial stereotypes (entitled, disloyal, lazy, creative, multi-taskers, passionate, wanting work/life balance, needy, and sensitive). Millennials who identify as Millennials saw themselves as less creative and placed less value on work-life balance than Millennials who do not self-identify as Millennials. When compared to other generations, Millennials only differ in their responses to the following stereotypes: entitled, lazy, needy, creative, and passionate. Finally, the relationship between eleven engagement practices and stereotypes, controlling for role in the organization (manager vs. non-manager), generation, gender, and highest level of education is presented in regression models. Each regression model includes at least one stereotype that predicts an engagement practice.

This chapter will present a summary of the findings and their implications for future research. Contributions to the literature on Millennials and our understanding of

generational stereotypes and engaging generations in the workplace will also be explored, along with limitations of the current study and opportunities for future research.

Managers' Stereotypes of Millennials

The results of this study suggest that managers hold nine of the ten common stereotypes of Millennials. Specifically, the managers in this study believe Millennials to be entitled, disloyal, lazy, creative, multi-taskers, passionate, work-life balance, needy, and sensitive. The one stereotype they do not seem to hold is that Millennials are “Social.” While the data does not tell us why, earlier research of common stereotypes provides some clarity. Some studies (Alsop, 2008; Deal & Levenson, 2016) defined “Social” as “good with social media,” or “technologically savvy.” However, a participant could have easily read the word “Social” and thought of a more traditional definition, such as “tending to form cooperative and interdependent relationships with others” (Merriam-Webster, 2019). This divide between meaning in-person, gregarious behavior versus interacting with others through online platforms could have caused confusion and perhaps content validity issues. As a result, “Social” was not used in the scale or the rest of the analysis. A scale of the nine stereotypes was created with high internal consistency and reliability.

Consistent with other research, this study did find support for claims found in previous studies that other generations hold some stereotypes of Millennials as being lazy (Deal, Altman & Rogelberg, 2010) creative (Sujansky & Ferri-Reed, 2009) and liking work-life balance (Harrington, et al., 2015). Additionally, this study found support for the assertion that other generations see Millennials as wanting feedback (Alsop, 2008) and

Millennials being sensitive to criticism (Alsop, 2008; Marano, 2004). Consistent with the findings of Perry, Hanvogue, and Casoinic's (2013) literature review, this research supports some of the common stereotypes they identified of Millennials. This research further builds upon their work by adding "Needy" to the list of common stereotypes that others identify in Millennials. Additionally, the data showed that managers who saw Millennials as "Lazy" were very likely to see Millennials as "Disloyal." As both are negative stereotypes and have been mentioned by multiple articles (Deal, Altman & Rogelberg, 2010; Perry, et al., 2013; Schawbel, 2013), it is not surprising to find that the data shows both stereotypes are strongly correlated.

Interestingly, the managers who participated in this study were comprised mostly of Generation X (36.5%) and Millennials (48.9%). As such, it leads to the second research question's findings about the self-image of Millennials, and whether or not their self-image is consistent with these nine common stereotypes. While many anecdotal evidence of managers holding stereotypes of Millennials is available, the results of this study provide strong empirical evidence that stereotypes of this generation exist and are consistent with how it is often described in the popular press and social media. As this research looked only at the managers who were not part of the Millennial generation, future research may want to compare how Millennial Managers view other Millennial employees. If there is a bias there as well, it would be interesting to know the extent role in the organization plays on perceptions even with members of the same generation. Future research could also help to identify if the stereotypes are more strongly held by managers of one or more specific generations.

The research also showed perception differences between genders. The correlations showed stronger connections between fourteen of the stereotypes for female managers than they showed for male managers. For male managers, stronger connections were identified between four stereotypes, where three of the connections are paired relationships between negative and positive stereotypes (Passionate and Needy, Multi-Taskers and Lazy, and Passionate and Disloyal). As both samples of managers were small (47 females and 27 males), it becomes more difficult to provide generalizability. Future data collection could help build a larger sample and a better understanding of gender differences in managerial perceptions.

Millennials' Self-Image

The second research goal of this study was to explore how Millennials see themselves. In other words, do they agree with the common stereotypes that are used to describe them? The results of the correlations show that there is not as much agreement amongst members of the generation, as there were no strong positive correlations between the stereotypes. However, there were moderate positive relationships between Passionate and Multi-Taskers and between Valuing Work-Life Balance and Passionate. As the literature suggested that all of the Millennial stereotypes were related to the generation (Alsop, 2008; Crumpacker & Crumpacker, 2007; Deal, Altman & Rogelberg, 2010; Marano, 2004; Perry, et al., 2013; Schawbel, 2013), it is surprising that the data represented only two cases where there was identification. Many of the correlations of Millennials identifying with the Millennial stereotypes showed no relationship. Additionally, when comparing the means and scales of managers' perceptions and

Millennials' self-identification, the conclusion is supported that Millennials do not identify as consistently with their generational stereotypes as their managers' identify them as having the generalizations.

Perhaps this is because many of the previous studies were based on others' observations (Alsop, 2008; Marano, 2004; Perry, et al., 2013), whereas this data asks the Millennials about themselves. Adding to the significance of this study, the sample shows that Millennials view themselves differently than managers view Millennials. This finding contributes to the understanding of the generation since it goes beyond anecdotes and provides data to support that Millennials do not necessarily see themselves as others see them. One possible explanation for this could be that generation is not the most salient social identity participants in this study hold. Sinclair, Hardin, and Lowery (2006) conducted research that provided this explanation when trying to identify why some women saw themselves as bad at math. Much of how their self-scores in that research varied was mediated by the how much the women saw themselves as identifying with a certain identity.

As such, to better understand the data, the sample was divided into two groups based on the degree to which participants identified as a Millennial. By adding in self-identification, there were two findings that were somewhat unexpected. The first is that Millennials who identified as Millennials saw themselves valuing work-life balance less than Millennials who do not identify as Millennials. This was contradictory to what Harrington, et al. (2015) and Perry, et al. (2013) have stated. However, this does support Deal and Levenson's (2016) findings that Millennials are hard-working and willing to

work long hours. Future research may wish to break out the groups further to see if there are differences between those who identify a great deal as Millennials and those who only identify a little.

The other finding that was not expected is that Millennials who identified as Millennials saw themselves as less creative than Millennials who do not identify as Millennials. Perhaps this could be related to the insights Sujansky and Ferri-Reed (2009) and Harrington, et al. (2015) offer that Millennials are creative with their time and the role that creativity with scheduling plays into a need for flexible work schedules. Although, throughout Perry, et al.'s (2013) literature review of studies and articles on Millennials, "Creative" was a common theme. My findings indicate that Millennials may not strongly identify as "Creative" as other research has offered.

Additionally, the question about how well Millennials know themselves raises concerns. Perhaps future studies could include a measure of self-awareness to offer a possible modifier to why Millennials do not agree as strongly with the stereotypes others see in them. If self-knowledge does not modify the results, then it would further support the conclusions of this research.

When the data on Millennial self-identify were separated by gender and compared, there were fewer differences between genders in the correlations than when the Managers' sample was run separately by gender. The male Millennials identified stronger correlations for seven of the pairs of stereotypes, whereas the female Millennials identified stronger correlations for four of the pairs for stereotypes. Interestingly, three of the four correlations identified for female Millennials were the same as the ones

identified for the female managers (Work-Life Balance and Multi-Taskers, Sensitive and Disloyal, and Work-Life Balance and Passionate). This finding demonstrates that there may be a gender-based preference to see Millennials (either as their employees or themselves) as more likely to hold some of the common Millennial Generation stereotypes. Male managers and male Millennials both saw a negative relationship between Passionate and Disloyal, thus if they identify Millennials as more Passionate, they also see them as less Disloyal.

In order to compare the Managers' perceptions of their Millennial employees and the Millennial's self-image, scales were created using the managers' and Millennial non-managers' ratings on the stereotypes and an Independent Sample T-Test was run. The comparison of the scores for the scales showed that managers held more of the common stereotypes than Millennials did. Additionally, there were statistically significant differences between the mean scores for managers and Millennials for all nine of the stereotypes. Managers saw the negative stereotypes more clearly in their Millennial employees (Entitled, Disloyal, Lazy, Needy and Sensitive), whereas Millennials saw themselves as associated with the positive stereotypes (Creative, Multi-Taskers, Passionate, and valuing Work-Life Balance).

As stereotypes evoke judgement (Secord, 1959), it is important for managers to recognize their own biases and how their perceptions of Millennials do not match with Millennials' self-perceptions. Implications for managers include understanding how holding the negative stereotypes of the generation may be playing into how they perceive the work performance of Millennial employees. For example, if a manager sees their

Millennial employees as lazy, the manager may rate them lower in performance evaluations. Additionally, if a manager perceives their Millennial employees as sensitive, the manager may craft feedback in more positive, less critical ways.

Comparing Millennials with Other Generations

Another goal of this study was to understand if Millennials are all that different from other generations. In other words, are they seen as unique and do they see themselves as different from others? When comparing generational groups' responses to self-identification with the Millennial stereotypes, only five of the nine stereotypes had any differences to the extent to which the various generations self-identify with the stereotypes. For "Entitled," Millennials differed from Baby Boomers, Generation X, and Generation Z. This was the only stereotype where Millennials answered differently than all other generational groups in this study. For "Lazy," Millennials differed from Baby Boomers and Generation X. For "Needy," Millennials differed again from Baby Boomers and Generation X. For "Creative," Millennials differed from Generation X. For "Passionate," Millennials only differed from Generation X. There were not differences between generational groups for the following stereotypes: disloyal, multi-taskers, valuing work-life balance, and sensitive. While practitioners and researchers have pointed out all nine of these stereotypes define the Millennial generation (Alsop, 2008; Deal, et al., 2010; Harrington, et al., 2015; Marano, 2004; Perry et al., 2013; and Sujansky & Ferri-Reed, 2009), this research suggests that at least four stereotypes (disloyal, multi-taskers, valuing work-life balance, and sensitive) are not exclusive to the Millennial generation. As such, the findings suggest there is not as much difference in Millennials'

behavior and attitudes compared to those held by other generations as others have suggested.

Additionally, when comparing Millennials to the youngest generation, Generation Z, this research suggests that Generation Z identifies more with some of the Millennials stereotypes (Entitled, Lazy, Creative, and Needy) than Millennials identify with the Millennial stereotypes. Critics of generational theory, who suggest that age is a more relevant factor on these stereotypes and behavior in the workplace (Roberts, et al., 2010), would potentially be supported by this finding. Again, this calls into question the use of generations, since some of the studies (Alsop, 2008; Deal & Levenson, 2016) have an age range for the Millennials as up to year 2000. Incorporating those additional five birth years (1996 to 2000) could change the findings. For future research, taking this dataset and rerunning the generational groups with different age ranges may also provide more consistency of how a generation self-identifies with its stereotypes.

Millennial Stereotypes and Engagement Practices

One of the key goals of this research was to consider whether Millennials need different factors to keep them engaged at work. Each of the eleven regression models tried to show how stereotypes (model 1) and additional demographic information (model 2) predicted each of the eleven engagement practices. For each of the regression models, between 2.4% to 12.5% of the variance was explained by the coefficients. This may appear problematic since it does not provide precise predictions, however in all of the models the p-values provided evidence that the relationship between the variables and

outcome is not random. Additionally, there could be unexplained variability or other factors that account for more of the variance.

Some of the stereotypes are more useful in predicting engagement practices than others. For example, the stereotype of “Entitled” is a statistically significant predictor of six of the eleven engagement practices (decision making, recognition, encouragement, feedback, physical health, learning opportunities). The stereotype of “Creative” is a statistically significant predictor of five of the eleven engagement practices (decision making, encouragement, physical health, learning opportunities, and team competition). The stereotype of “Sensitive” is a statistically significant predictor of five of the eleven engagement practices (clear expectation, flexibility, recognition, relationship with manager, and encouragement).

A couple of the stereotypes only predicted one engagement practice. The stereotype of “Needy” significantly predicted the practice of team competition. Also, the stereotype of “Lazy” significantly predicted a disinterest in the engagement practice of wanting the manager to care about them as a person. Of the demographic variables, generation is a significant predictor in six engagement practices (decision making, recognition, encouragement, feedback, learning opportunities, and team competition), providing some more rationality to the argument that different generations want different engagement practices at work. See Table 42 for a list of which stereotypes and demographic variables predicted which engagement practices.

Table 42

Stereotypes and Demographic Variables that Predicted Engagement Practices

Variables	Predicted Engagement Practice
Entitled	Decision Making, Recognition, Encouragement, Feedback, Physical Health, & Learning Opportunities
Disloyal	Team Competition
Lazy	Relationship with Manager
Creative	Decision Making, Encouragement, Physical Health, Learning Opportunities, & Team Competition
Multi-Taskers	Recognition, Relationship with Manager, Casual Dress, & Team Competition
Passionate	Feedback, Learning Opportunities, & Team Competition
Work-Life Balance	Learning Opportunities
Needy	Team Competition
Sensitive	Clear Expectations, Schedule Flexibility, Recognition, Relationship with Manager, & Encouragement
Role	Relationship with Manager, Casual Dress, & Team Competition
Race	Clear Expectation, Decision Making, & Team Competition
Generation	Decision Making, Feedback, Learning Opportunities, & Team Competition
Gender	Relationship with Manager, Encouragement, & Casual Dress

For managers and human resources professionals, knowing how an employee identifies with stereotypes and other demographic variables can lead to a better understanding of how to engage that person in the workplace. Perhaps a more individualized approach is needed, as focusing on generations alone does not provide a

complete understanding of a person's values, behaviors, actions, or other identities she or he holds. These identities may influence how someone shows up in the workplace more than generational differences. Additionally, a generational stereotype, "Sensitive" can also be seen as a personality trait and it predicts five engagement practices (clear expectations, schedule flexibility, recognition, relationship with the manager, and encouragement). Sensitive was also a stereotype that was not statistically different amongst generational groups. Thus, this is another reason why managers and human resources must be cautious in applying the stereotypes they commonly believe to be consistent with the Millennial Generation to individuals within the generation.

Contributions

The research advances our knowledge of the Millennial Generation, its stereotypes, and engagement practices in the workplace. As the research not only asks those who manage Millennials about how they perceive their Millennial employees, but also offers insight into how the Millennials self-identify with generational stereotypes. None of the literature discussed in this dissertation has had both levels of assessment, instead it relies on one or the other to make general statements. The findings from the regression models can be used to engage Millennials at work, making the findings useful for practitioners and managers. For example, being part of the Millennial generation predicted an increased interest in having a voice in decision making, receiving encouragement in the workplace, a desire for monthly feedback, a desire to learn something new at work, and a desire for healthy team competition. There is some literature to support some of these findings. For example, practitioners said that

Millennials place a higher value on group tasks and positive feedback when compared to other generations (Alsop, 2008; Crumpacker & Crumpacker, 2007). Additionally, Millennials are said to want shared authority in the workplace (Crumpacker & Crumpacker, 2007). Since Millennials were given many team projects throughout their education (Alsop, 2008) this result is also consistent with previous work. Considering this research shows that being part of the Millennial generation increases the interest in having a voice in decision making, which could be seen as wanting shared authority, it supports what is already known about the generation.

Recognizing that Millennial employees may want specific engagement practices at work (voice in decision making, receiving encouragement, monthly feedback, learning opportunities, and healthy team competition), managers and human resources professionals can design work that will allow for Millennials to bring their best selves to work, increasing their engagement in the organization. Additionally, engagement leads to lower turnover and burnout (Buckingham & Coffman, 1999) as well as potentially creating higher shareholder returns, profitability, productivity, and customer satisfaction (Crawford, et al., 2010; Harter, et al., 2002). By designing work practices that help Millennial employees stay engaged in their work, the organization also benefits.

Limitations

Another limitation of the study involves the concept of generations. As is the case with all research about generations, classifying people into various groups is always arbitrary. While it has been stated earlier in the literature review, the government, practitioners, and academics use different date of birth ranges to mean the same

generations. While this can be confusing to compare across studies, the dates used in this study are utilized based on the premise that generations are formed by shared life events. With the invention of the internet and some technology (e.g. smart phones), the dates chosen to analysis this data coincide with the shared life events. As participants were asked their year of birth, the data could be sliced into different ranges and compared to determine if specific ranges provide more or less group homogeneity.

This research was conducted in two related organizations in the services sector operating under one corporate umbrella, a fact that may limit the generalizability of the findings. As such, the findings may not be generalizable to other sectors. However, the large sample size and its match with the characteristics of the general labor force mitigate some of these limitations. Some demographics of the sample of 1,097 participants are not necessarily representative, such as gender which is heavy skewed female (76%), whereas the national average according to the U.S. Census Bureau is closer to 50% (2018). Future research could include testing the survey in a male dominated field, such as engineering. A comparison between male Millennials and female Millennials is also needed to determine if other researchers and practitioners have identified differences in the generation based on gender. Although, there is a range of participant ages from 17 to 76 years old. There is also more diversity in terms of race in this sample than compared with the U.S. Census Bureau (2018) data.

Additionally, location of birth and where the survey was taken (IP Address) were collected through the study. However, as it was difficult to know when or how long someone has been in the United States, this data was not used to remove participants as I

was not able to determine what life events they had experienced in American culture. However, Deal and Levenson (2016) found no differences amongst participants of different countries in their study. While their work helped inform this study and can help provide some support for my generalization, future studies would also want to add additional questions to determine where someone lived during the key events that define generations.

Future Research

Although this study provides much needed empirical evidence regarding the Millennial generation, replication in other sectors and with larger samples is essential. In the regression models, very little of the variance is accounted for by the variables (most under 10%). As such, future research should also seek to discover what other factors are useful in predicting interest in engagement practices. These factors may be other identities that people hold including stereotypes of other generations. Perhaps future testing should include a list of stereotypes from each generation in the workforce. Future research and publication of the regression models would also need to include assumption testing such as conditional normal distributions of outcomes to ensure it is normal, homoscedasticity of error terms, independence of residuals from predictor variables, checks for outliers, and multicollinearity.

Additionally, a measure of self-awareness could be added to the survey. The argument could be made that perhaps what is influencing the Millennials to not identify as strongly with their generational stereotypes is that they may not know themselves well. If a lack of self-knowledge does exist, it would influence the findings of the second and

third research questions. Testing for self-knowledge in future studies could help to answer this question and determine if participants' level of self-knowledge is influencing the results of their self-image. Utilizing a validated scale or set of questions to know how much a person knows about themselves could help mitigate concerns about participants simply not knowing who they are yet.

Also, future studies may want to include questions to determine where participants experienced key life events that contribute to generational groupings. The demographic question on race would also need to be rewritten as it did not include Latino/Hispanic or mixed race, which were both noted enough by participants to warrant adding both. Adding a question on other identities that the participant holds can also help show if more salient identities are present and are influencing responses more than generational identity.

Longitudinal studies may also provide some insight into the debate about the usefulness of generations versus age. If generational behaviors persist throughout decades, more support would be given to the usefulness of generations. Whereas, if we see preferences and behaviors change and develop as people age, the concept of generational groups would be less useful.

Additionally, some of the data collected in this study was not used in the analysis. There were two reasons that the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale was written into this survey. First it provides the organization that participated in this study a measure of the level of engagement at the organization. Second, with the large sample size and access to the organization, instead of having participants fill out another survey with this

information later on, it was all collected at once. The data can help to identify levels of engagement in similarly sized organizations and comparable industries and can be compared against other data sets also using the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale.

REFERENCES

- Account Control Technology Holdings, Inc. (2018). Our Companies. *Account Control Technology Holdings, Inc.* Retrieved from <http://accountcontrolholdings.com/Companies/tabid/191/Default.aspx>
- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Alsop, R. (2008). *The trophy kids grow up: How the millennial generation is shaking up the workplace*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands-resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(3), 309-328.
- Balducci, C., Fraccaroli, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2010). Psychometric properties of the Italian version of the utrecht work engagement scale (UWES-9). *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 26(2), 143-149.
- Buckingham, M., & Coffman, C. (1999). *First, break all the rules: What the world's greatest managers do differently*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
- Beutell, N. J., & Wittig-Berman, U. (2008). Work-family conflict and work-family synergy for generation X, baby boomers, and matures: Generational differences, predictors, and satisfaction outcomes. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 23(5), 507-523.
- Boateng, G. O., Neilands, T. B., Frongillo, E. A., Melgar-Quinonez, H. R., & Young, S.L. (2018). Best practices for developing and validating scales for health social, and behavioral research: A primer. *Front Public Health*, 6(1), 149.

- Cennamo, L., & Gardner, D. (2008). Generational differences in work values, outcomes and person-organization values fit. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 23(8), 891-906.
- Center for Creative Leadership. (2018). World Leadership Survey Project. *Center for Creative Leadership*. Retrieved from <https://www.ccl.org/about-our-research/current-research-projects/world-leadership-survey-project/>
- Cook, C. W., & Hunsaker, P. L. (2001). *Management and organizational behavior*. (3rd ed.). New York, NY: McGraw Hill.
- Cox, C. B., Young, F. K., Guardia, A. B., & Bohmann, A. K. (2017). The baby boomer bias: The negative impact of generational labels on older workers. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 48(2), 71-79.
- Crawford, E. R., LePine, J. A., & Rich, B. L. (2010). Linking job demands and resources to employee engagement and burnout: A theoretical extension and meta-analytic test. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(5), 834-848.
- Crossman, D. [David Crossman]. (2016, October 29). *Simon Sinek on Millennials in the workplace*. [Video File]. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hER0Qp6QJNU>
- Crumpacker, M., & Crumpacker, J. M. (2007). Succession planning and generational stereotypes: Should HR consider age-based values and attitudes a relevant factor or a passing fad? *Public Personal Management*, 36(4), 349-369.

- D'Amato, A. & Herzfeld, R. (2008). Learning orientation, organizational commitment, and talent retention across generations: A study of European managers. *Journal of Management Psychology*, 29(8), 929-953.
- D'Onfro, J. (2015). The truth about Google's famous '20% time' policy. *Business Insider*. Retrieved from <http://www.businessinsider.com/google-20-percent-time-policy-2015-4>
- Deal, J. J., Altman, D. G., & Rogelberg, S. G. (2010). Millennials at work: What we know and what we need to do (If anything). *Journal of Business Psychology*, 25(2), 191-199.
- Deal, J. J., & Levenson, A. (2016). *What Millennials want from work: How to maximize engagement in today's workforce*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill Education.
- Devine, P. G. (1989). Stereotypes and prejudice: Their automatic and controlled components. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 56(1), 5.
- Dillman, D. A., Smyth, J. D., & Christian, L. M. (2014). *Internet, phone, mail, and mixed-mode surveys: The tailored design method*. (4th ed.). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Dries, N., Pepermans, R., & De Kerpel, E. (2008). Exploring four generations' beliefs about career. Is satisfied the new successful? *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 23(8), 907-928.
- Edmunds, J., & Turner, B. (2005). Global generations: Social change in the twentieth century. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 56(4), 559-577.

- Finkelstein, S. R., & Fishback, A. (2012). Tell me what I did wrong: Experts seek and respond to negative feedback. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 39(1), 22-38.
- Gallup. (2013). State of the global workplace: Employee engagement insights for business leaders worldwide. Gallup. Retrieved from <http://www.gallup.com/services/176735/state-global-workplace.aspx>
- Glass, A. (2007). Understanding generational differences for competitive success. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 39(2), 98-103.
- Greenwald, A. G., & Banaji, M. R. (1995). Implicit social cognition: Attitudes, self-esteem, and stereotypes. *Psychological Review*, 102(1), 4-27.
- Harrington, B., Van Deusen, F., Fraone, J. S., & Morelock, J. (2015). *How millennials navigate their career: Young adult views on work, life and success*. Chestnut Hill, MA: Boston College Center for Work & Family.
- Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., & Hayes, T. L. (2002). Business-unit level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(2), 268-279.
- Harter M J. K., Schmidt, F. L., Kilham, E. A., & Asplund, J. W. (2006). Q¹² Meta-Analysis. *Gallup Consulting*, Retrieved from https://strengths.gallup.com/private/resources/q12meta-analysis_flyer_gen_08%2008_bp.pdf
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. B. (2017). *The motivation to work*. New Brunswick, NJ: Routledge.
- Howe, N., & Strauss, W. (2007). The next 20 years: How customer and workforce attitudes will evolve. *Harvard Business Review*, 85(7/8), 41-52.

- Howe, N., & Strauss, W. (1992). *Millennials rising: The next great generation*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.
- Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(4), 692-724.
- Katzell R. A., & Thompson, D. E. (1990). Work motivation: Theory and practice. *American Psychologist*, 45(2), 144-153.
- Kunda, Z., & Spencer, S. J. (2003). When do stereotypes come to mind and when do they color judgement? A goal-based theoretical framework for stereotype activation and application. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129(4), 522.
- Jurkiewicz, C. L. (2000). Generation X and the public employee. *Public Personnel Management*, 29(1), 55-74.
- Lancaster, L. C., & Stillman, D. (2003). *When generations collide: Who they are. Why they clash. How they solve the generational puzzle at work*. New York, NY: Harper Collins.
- Levine, A., & Dean, D. R. (2012). *Generation on a tightrope: A portrait of today's college student*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Levine, S. (2018). Commentary: Levine on Leadership. *Long Island Business News*, April 28, p.1.
- MacDonald, P., Kelly, S., & Christen, S. (2019). A path model of workplace solidarity, satisfaction, burnout, and motivation. *International Journal of Business Communication*, 56(1), 31-49.

- Macey, W. H., & Schneider, B. (2008). The meaning of employee engagement. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice*, 1(1), 3-30.
- Mannheim, K. (1952). *Essays on the sociology of knowledge*. London, UK: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Maslach, C. & Leiter, M. P. (1997). *The truth about burn-out*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- May, D. R., Gilson, R. L., & Harter, L. M. (2004). The psychological conditions of meaningfulness, safety and availability and the engagement of the human spirit at work. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 77(1), 11-37.
- Marano, H. E. (2004). A nation of wimps. *Psychology Today*, 37(6), 58-103.
- Merriam-Webster. (2019). Social. Adjective. *Merriam Webster*. Retrieved from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/social>
- Mitchell, M A., McLean, P., & Turner, G. B. (2005). Understanding generation x... Boom or bust introduction. *Business Forum*, 27(1), 26-31.
- Morton, J. (2014). Reconfiguring the open office. *Buildings*, 108(5), 44-48.
- Moskowitz, G. B. (2005). *Social cognition: Understanding others*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Newman, D. A., & Harrison, D. A. (2008). Been there, bottled that: Are state and behavioral work engagement new and useful construct “wines”? *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1(1), 31-35.

- Nimon, K., Shuck, B., & Zigarmi, D. (2015). Construct overlap between employee engagement and job satisfaction: A function of semantic equivalence? *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 17(3), 1149-1171.
- Perry, E. L., Hanvongse, A., & Casoinic, D. A. (2013). Making a case for the existence of generational stereotypes: A literature review and exploratory study. In J. Field, R. J. Burke, C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of Aging, Work and Society* (pp. 416-441). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishing.
- Project Implicit. (2017). About Us. *Project Implicit*. Retrieved from <https://implicit.harvard.edu/implicit/aboutus.html>
- Reader's Digest. (n.d.). Stand and deliver: The benefits of standing at your desk. *Reader's Digest*. Retrieved from <http://www.rd.com/health/wellness/stand-and-deliver-the-benefits-of-standing-at-your-desk/>
- Reisenwitz, T. H., & Iyer, R. (2009). Differences in generation X and generation Y: Implications for the organization and marketers. *Marketing Management Journal*, 19(2), 91-103.
- Rich, B. L., LePine, J. A., & Crawford, E. R. (2010). Job engagement: Antecedents and effects of job performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(3), 617-635.
- Roberts, B. W., Edmonds, G., & Grijalva, E. (2010). It is developmental me, not generational me: Developmental changes are more important than generational changes in narcissism – Commentary on Trezesniewski & Donnellan (2010). *Perspectives in Psychological Science: A Journal of the Association for Psychological Science*, 5(1), 97-102.

- Ryder, N. (1965). The cohort as a concept in the study of social change. *American Sociological Review*, 30(6), 843-861.
- Schaufeli, W., & Bakker, A. (2004). Utrecht work engagement scale: Preliminary Manual. *Occupational Health Psychology Unit, Utrecht University*.
- Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., & Salanova, M. (2006). The measurement of work engagement with a short questionnaire: A cross-national study. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 66(4), 701-716.
- Schaufeli, W., & Salanova, M. (2011). Work engagement: On how to better catch a slippery concept. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 20(1), 39-46.
- Schaufeli, W., & Salanova, M. (2007). Work engagement: An emerging psychological concept and its implications for organizations. In S. W. Gilliland, D. D. Steiner, & D. P. Skarlicki (Eds.), *Managing social and ethical issues in organizations* (pp. 135–177). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.
- Schawbel, D. (2013). You're probably wrong about millennials. *Harvard Business Review*. Retrieved from <https://hbr.org/2013/09/youre-probably-wrong-about-mil>
- Secord, P. (1959). Stereotyping and favorableness in perception of negro faces. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 59(1), 309-315.
- Seemiller, C., & Grace, M. (2017). *Generation Z leads: A guide for developing the leadership capacity of generation z students*. North Chareston, SC: CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform.

- Seemiller, C., & Grace, M. (2016). *Generation Z goes to college*. San Francisco, CA: Josey-Bass.
- Shellenbarger, S. (2011). Workplace workouts at the company gym. *The Wall Street Journal*. Retrieved from <http://blogs.wsj.com/juggle/2011/03/22/workplace-workouts-at-the-company-gym/>
- Shimazu, A., Schaufeli, W. B., Kosugi, S., Suzuki, A., Naashiwa, H., Kato, A., Sakamoto, M., Irimajiri, H., Amano, S., Hirohata, K., Goto, R., & Kitaoka-Higashiguchi, K. (2008). Work engagement in Japan: Validation of the Japanese version of the utrecht work engagement scale. *Applied Psychology*, 57(3), 510-523.
- Shuck, B., & Wollard, K. (2010). Employee engagement and HRD: A seminal review of the foundations. *Human Resource Development Review*, 9(1), 89-110.
- Simpson, M. R. (2009). Engagement at work: A review of the literature. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 46(7), 1012-1024.
- Sinclair, S., Hardin, C. D., & Lowery, B. S. (2006). Self-stereotyping in the context of multiple social identities. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 90(4), 529-542.
- Society for Human Resource Management. (2015). Developing employee career paths and ladders. *Society of Human Resource Management*. Retrieved from <http://www.shrm.org/templatestools/toolkits/pages/developingemployeeecareerpathsandladders.aspx>

- Snyder, M. (1981). On the self-perpetuating nature of social stereotypes. In D. Hamilton (Ed.). *Cognitive process in stereotyping and intergroup behavior* (pp. 183-212). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Stone, J., & Moskowitz, G. B. (2011). Non-conscious bias in medical decision making: What can be done to reduce it? *Medical Education*, 45(8), 768-776.
- Strauss, W., & Howe, N. (1991). *Generations: The history of America's future*. New York, NY: William Morrow.
- Sujansky, J. G., & Ferri-Reed, J. (2009). *Keeping the Millennials: Why companies are losing billions in turnover to this generation – and what to do about it*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Toossi, M. (2008). Labor force demographic data: Medium-term projections to 2016. *U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics*. Retrieved from <http://www.bls.gov/emp/emplab1.htm>.
- Tosti-Kharas, J., Riza, S. D., & Chanland, D. (2018). Generations me or generation we? A critical review and research agenda for understanding Millennial's careers. Presentation at *Academy of Management Annual Meeting*, Chicago, IL. August 13.
- Tulgan, B. (2009). *Not everyone gets a trophy: How to manage generation Y*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Twenge, J. M. (2010). A review of the empirical evidence on generational differences in work attitudes. *Journal of Business Psychology*, 25(2), 201-210.

- Twenge, J. M. (2017). *iGen: Why today's super-connected kids are growing up less rebellious, more tolerant, less happy – and completely unprepared for adulthood – and what that means for the rest of us*. New York, NY: Atria Books.
- U.S Census Bureau. (2018). Quick facts. *U.S. Census Bureau*. Retrieved from <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/US#viewtop>
- U.S Census Bureau. (2015). Millennials outnumber baby boomers and are far more diverse, census bureau reports. *U.S. Census Bureau*. Retrieved from <https://www.census.gov/newsroom/press-releases/2015/cb15-113.html>
- Vlahos, J. (2011). Is sitting a lethal activity? *The New York Times Magazine*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2011/04/17/magazine/mag-17sitting-t.html?_r=2
- Williams, A. (2015). Move over millennials, here comes generation z. *The New York Times Magazine*. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/2015/09/20/fashion/move-over-millennials-here-comes-generation-z.html>
- Williams, L. J., & Abdi, H. (2010). Fisher's least significant difference (LSD) test. In N. Salkind (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Research Design* (pp. 1-6). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishing.
- Wrenn, K. A., & Mauer, T. J. (2004). Beliefs about older workers' learning and development in relation to beliefs about malleability of skills, age-related decline, and control. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 34(2), 223-242.
- Zigarmi, D., Nimon, K., Houson, D., Witt, D., & Diehl, J. (2009). Beyond engagement: Toward a framework and operational definition for employee work passion. *Human Resource Development Review*, 8(3), 300-326.

APPENDIX A

Survey Questions

Millennials: Stereotypes, Self-Image, and Engagement in the Workplace

Start of Block: Default Question Block

Q1 Do you currently supervise anyone who is considered to be part of the Millennial Generation? (Born between the years 1980 to 1995)

☐ Yes (1)

☐ No (2)

Skip To: Q13-23 If Do you currently supervise anyone who is considered to be part of the Millennial Generation? (Born... = No

Page Break

Q2-12 To what extent do you agree that each of the following stereotypes of your Millennial employees is true?

	A great deal (1)	A lot (2)	A little (3)	Not at all (4)
Entitled (1)	☐	☐	☐	☐
Disloyal (2)	☐	☐	☐	☐
Lazy (3)	☐	☐	☐	☐
Creative (4)	☐	☐	☐	☐
Multi-Taskers (5)	☐	☐	☐	☐
Passionate (6)	☐	☐	☐	☐
Values				
Work/Life	☐	☐	☐	☐
Balance (7)				
Needy (8)	☐	☐	☐	☐
Sensitive (9)	☐	☐	☐	☐
Social (10)	☐	☐	☐	☐

Skip To: Qx If To what extent do you agree that each of the following stereotypes of your Millennial employees i... = Entitled

Page Break

Q13-23 To what extent do you agree that each of the following stereotypes describes you?

	Describes me extremely well (1)	Describes me very well (2)	Describes me slightly well (3)	Does not describe me (4)
Entitled (1)	☐	☐	☐	☐
Disloyal (2)	☐	☐	☐	☐
Lazy (3)	☐	☐	☐	☐
Creative (4)	☐	☐	☐	☐
Multi-Tasker (5)	☐	☐	☐	☐
Passionate (6)	☐	☐	☐	☐
Values Work/Life Balance (7)	☐	☐	☐	☐
Needy (8)	☐	☐	☐	☐
Sensitive (9)	☐	☐	☐	☐

Social (10)

☐☐☐☐

Page Break

Q24-35 For the next set of questions, please choose the answer that identifies how you agree or disagree with each engagement practice.

	Strongly agree (1)	Somewhat agree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Strongly disagree (4)
I need clear expectations to help me identify how to advance at the organization (1)	☐	☐	☐	☐
It is important for me to have flexibility in my schedule (2)	☐	☐	☐	☐
It is important for me to have a	☐	☐	☐	☐

voice in decision

making at the

organization (3)

I enjoy being

recognized for my

accomplishments

at work (4)

I want my

manager to care

about me as a

person (5)

I would like to

have someone at

work who

encourages me to

do my best (6)

I receive monthly

feedback on my

progress (7)

I want the

organization to

provide me with

☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐

opportunities to
promote my
physical health (8)

I enjoy
opportunities
where I can learn
something new
(9)

I prefer to dress
casually to
express my
individuality (10)

I enjoy healthy
competition on
team projects (11)

Page Break

strong and

vigorous

(2)

When I get

up in the

morning, I

feel like

going to

work (3)

I am

enthusiastic

about my

job (4)

I am proud

on the

work that I

do (5)

My job

inspires me

(6)

I am

immersed

in my work							
(7)							
I get							
carried							
away when							
I'm	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
working							
(8)							
I feel							
happy							
when I am							
working	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
intensely							
(9)							

Page Break

Q45 The last set of questions is about demographic information and will be used for statistical purposes.

Q46 What gender do you identify with?

- ☐ Male (1)
- ☐ Female (2)
- ☐ Other (3)

Q47 What is your home town?

(Please include city and state and/or country)

Q48 What is your year of birth?

Q49 What is the highest level of school you have completed or the highest degree you have received?

- ☐ Less than high school degree (1)

- ☐ High school graduate (high school diploma or equivalent including GED) (2)
 - ☐ Some college (3)
 - ☐ Bachelor's degree in college (4-year) (4)
 - ☐ Master's degree or Professional degree (JD, MD) (5)
 - ☐ Doctoral degree (6)
-

Q50 Choose one or more races that you consider yourself to be:

- ☐ White (1)
 - ☐ Black or African American (2)
 - ☐ American Indian or Alaska Native (3)
 - ☐ Asian (4)
 - ☐ Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander (5)
 - ☐ Other (6) _____
-

Q51 Do you identify as a member of the Millennial generation?

- ☐ Yes (1)
 - ☐ No (2)
-

Q52 How strongly do you identify as a Millennial?

- ☐ A great deal (1)
- ☐ A lot (2)
- ☐ A little (3)
- ☐ Not at all (4)

End of Block: Default Question Block

APPENDIX B

Request to Complete Survey Sent to Employees

In conjunction with the University of San Diego, Account Control Technology Holdings, Inc. aims to understand how to engage generations in the workplace. We need your help by answering an online survey. This survey will only take about 10 minutes to complete and will ask you questions about how you identify with generational stereotypes and ways that will help you bring your best self to work. Participation in the survey is not mandatory however the research hopes to identify ways to tailor engagement in organizations so we hope to have as many employees participate as possible. All you have to do is complete the survey which will be launched via L.E.A.P. on Monday, January 22 with a deadline on Friday, February 9th. Your answers will be kept strictly confidential and only aggregate data will be shared with your employer to provide the Human Resources and Operations Management Teams with ideas on how to better design our work environments. For questions or more information please contact Amanda Rominger, Director of Talent and Culture via email. Thank you!

APPENDIX C

Possible Engagement Practices

- 1) Allow Millennials flexibility in work schedules and voice in decision-making
- 2) Use career laddering and career pathing to illustrate advancement in the organization, while offering challenging work to keep Millennials motivated
- 3) Remove the cubical walls and barriers of rank to create an open-office concept full of creative spaces and transparency
- 4) Create a mentorship program and train managers to be affective coaches
- 5) Utilize Gchat or other company wide messaging systems to communicate clearly and often
- 6) Train managers to give positive feedback (and high-fives), discuss criticism with sensitivity, and request feedback from their Millennial employees
- 7) Articulate rules for casual dress and behavior that champion the expression of individuality
- 8) Promote positive attitudes through physical health programs such as company gyms
- 9) Immediately offer gratitude after a job well done
- 10) Create healthy competition with team projects that utilize social media connections

APPENDIX D

Utrecht Work Engagement Scale

The first three questions to assess vigor are the following:

1. At my work, I feel bursting with energy.
2. At my job, I feel strong and vigorous.
3. When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work.

The following statements measure dedication in the survey:

1. I am enthusiastic about my job.
2. I am proud of the work that I do.
3. My job inspires me.

The last three statements measure absorption in the survey:

4. I am immersed in my work.
5. I get carried away when I'm working.
6. I feel happy when I am working.

Nov 9, 2017 9:43 AM PST

Stephanie Van Dellen
Sch of Leadership & Ed Science

Re: Expedited - Initial - IRB-2018-50, Truth or Myth? The Millennial Generation's Stereotypes, Self-Image, and Engagement in the Workplace

Dear Stephanie Van Dellen:

The Institutional Review Board has rendered the decision below for IRB-2018-50, Truth or Myth? The Millennial Generation's Stereotypes, Self-Image, and Engagement in the Workplace.

Decision: Approved

Selected Category: 7. Research on individual or group characteristics or behavior (including, but not limited to, research on perception, cognition, motivation, identity, language, communication, cultural beliefs or practices, and social behavior) or research employing survey, interview, oral history, focus group, program evaluation, human factors evaluation, or quality assurance methodologies.

Findings: None

Research Notes:

Internal Notes:

Note: We send IRB correspondence regarding student research to the faculty advisor, who bears the ultimate responsibility for the conduct of the research. We request that the faculty advisor share this correspondence with the student researcher.

The next deadline for submitting project proposals to the Provost's Office for full review is N/A. You may submit a project proposal for expedited or exempt review at any time.

Sincerely,

Dr. Thomas R. Herrinton
Administrator, Institutional Review Board

Office of the Vice President and Provost
Hughes Administration Center, Room 214
5998 Alcalá Park, San Diego, CA 92110-2492
Phone (619) 260-4553 • Fax (619) 260-2210 • www.sandiego.edu