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ABSTRACT

Millennials are entering the workforce in droves and quickly becoming dominant players in the workforce. However, this generation has a reputation for their lack of loyalty to their employers and their tendency to job hop from one role to the next. Given the cost to recruit, hire, and train their replacements, it’s imperative to understand what motivates this generation of workers and how to incentivize them to stay with their current employers. The focus of this research is to explore the relationship between employee generation and turnover intentions, and how employee generation interacts with predictors of employee turnover intentions.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Over the course of my career, I have worked in a variety of finance roles at four different firms. While the roles themselves have had similarities across the board, these companies ranged from one of the largest banks in the world, to a technology storage company in the suburbs of Boston, to a large privately run financial intuition, and lastly to a smaller local bank. Each company has had a corporate culture that was unique from the next, but despite these differences the same nagging problem remained: the turnover of young talented workers.

In my experience, I’ve found that junior roles often end up vacant for some period of time. And while one employee exiting a role leads to an open opportunity for others, I have often found that internal movement in these junior roles is uncommon. While existing talent leaves to pursue external opportunities, the internal roles that open up resort to being filled with external hires. It begs the question, what drives these career decisions and what can be learned to help improve retention?

Over the last decade firms have seen Millennial workers inundating the workforce, many of whom are entering into leadership positions and are becoming more and more influential in companies today. Thompson and Gregory (2012) stated that demographic data showed that Millennials were on track to account for over half of the workforce within the next decade. However, this generation has a reputation for job hopping and thus retaining these workers has become much more challenging than it was for their preceding generations.
Problem Statement

Employee turnover “remains one of the most persistent and frustrating problems that organizations face” (O’Connell & Kung, 2007, p. 14) and is extremely costly. Companies are forced to foot the bill to recruit, hire, and train replacements, and can face productivity losses and project delays as a result. “According to a conservative estimate by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the average cost to replace an employee is $13,996” (O’Connell et al., 2007, p. 14). In addition to the costs incurred as a result of turnover, the company loses the investment they have already made in these employees and the knowledge that they have gained.

With the shift toward a greater number of Millennials in the workforce, coupled with how costly turnover is to a firm, it is important to understand not only what factors have an effect on employee turnover, but also how an employee’s generation can interact with this effect. More specifically, are the motivating factors different for Millennial employees than for older generations, and with this, can recruitment and retention practices be improved.

Research Question

The purpose of this research is to focus on the antecedents of employee turnover intentions that are relevant at the time of hire, and how these variables are moderated by employee generation. More specifically, what effects do monetary and non-monetary offerings have on employee turnover intentions, and are these effects moderated by employee generation?

This is particularly opportune research given the Millennial generations growing presence in the workforce and at the leadership table. It becomes increasingly
challenging to replace workers in more senior positions and takes time to find an optimal fit for the role. External hires are more costly to firms and this can result in vacant roles for long periods of time. Growing talent into senior positions within a company is a huge advantage and this research provides insights into how firms may be better positioned to do so.

Additionally, the insights from this research may be of particular importance to human resource departments within firms. An immense amount of time is spent on recruitment and retention strategies, and combating the growing trend of job hopping amongst Millennial workers. This research provides valuable insights into turnover intentions specifically amongst the Millennial generation that can be a useful tool in developing retention strategies.

While the practical implications are near and dear to my heart, this research study also bridges an identified gap in the literature. Employee turnover intentions have been researched extensively, but despite Millennial retention being such a hot topic in practice, there has been little research on the generational aspects of employee turnover intentions. Through this research study, both turnover intention theory and generation theory have been integrated to build on the existing literature on these two topics.

Bridging the gap between generation theory and turnover intention theory also provides an academic understanding and foundation to a very relevant practical problem. This research aims at forging the connection between academia and practice and to work together to combat a topical business challenge.
Dissertation Scope

This research study explores which predictor variables have the strongest effect on employee turnover, and how generation influences those relationships. This paper follows a traditional monograph structure and focuses on exploring the intersection of generation theory and turnover intention theory. More specifically, the antecedents of employee turnover are examined, as well as the effect employee generation has on these relationships.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

While there is ample literature on employee turnover intentions, the current literature has seemingly overlooked an important factor that may impact how management addresses this problem; how generational differences and preferences impact employee turnover. Tett and Meyer (1993) define turnover intention as “a conscious and deliberate willfulness to leave the organization”. People in the workforce make career decisions throughout their lives for a number of reasons, including to further their development, improve quality of life, and for personal outcomes such as to increase pay, flexibility, and work life balance. All of these decisions can come into play when one decides to stay with their current employer, or intends to leave. Extensive research has been done on the factors that influence an employee’s turnover intentions (Table 1).
Research shows that people who are satisfied with their job are less likely to leave than those who are dissatisfied. Job satisfaction in the literature encompasses a number of factors, including:

- Dissatisfaction with one's pay, or their perceived fairness of pay
- Supervisor and/or coworker dissatisfaction
- Overall Stress, including clarity of roles and responsibilities, workload, and workplace conflicts

Level of Training & Development

Employees who feel they are getting proper training and have a positive perception of their career development, are more likely to stay with an organization than those who do not (theory of development-attitude-behavior relationship).

Perception of Equality

Employees who have a perception of equality within an organization are less likely to leave than those who do not.

- Equality includes factors such as: perceptions of pay equality, equal opportunity, and attitude toward benefits.

Family & Personal Conflicts

Research shows that factors such as job interference with family, workplace conflicts, family and personal life, and the employee’s family support system all have an effect on employee retention.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antecedents</th>
<th>Key Findings</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Dissatisfaction</td>
<td>Research shows that people who are satisfied with their job are less likely to leave than those who are dissatisfied. Job satisfaction in the literature encompasses a number of factors, including:</td>
<td>Alkahati (2015); Bridges (2007), Johnston, &amp; Sager (2007); Griffeth, Hom, &amp; Gaertner (2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Training &amp; Development</td>
<td>Employees who feel they are getting proper training and have a positive perception of their career development, are more likely to stay with an organization than those who do not (theory of development-attitude-behavior relationship).</td>
<td>Rahman et al. (2013); Alkahati (2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Equality</td>
<td>Employees who have a perception of equality within an organization are less likely to leave than those who do not.</td>
<td>Alkahati (2005); Carraher (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family &amp; Personal Conflicts</td>
<td>Research shows that factors such as job interference with family, workplace conflicts, family and personal life, and the employee’s family support system all have an effect on employee retention.</td>
<td>Huffman, Casper, and Payne (2014); Moen, Kelly, and Hill (2001)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Literature Review of Employee Turnover Intention Theory

Turnover Intention Theory

One of the predominant theories of employee turnover is that job dissatisfaction is a leading indicator of employee turnover (Alkahati, 2015; Bridges, Johnston, & Sager, 2007; Griffeth, Hom, & Gaertner, 2000). Overall job satisfaction can encompass a number of different elements including pay satisfaction (employee’s perceived fairness of their pay, and pay distribution at an organization), supervisor and co-worker satisfaction,
and overall stress (employee’s clarity of role, workload, and the presence of conflict at work) (Griffeth et al., 2000).

As Bridges et. al (2007) explains, employees who are satisfied with their job are less likely to leave their employer than employees who are dissatisfied. While the literature has identified multiple aspects of job satisfaction, the scope of this research focuses solely on variables that are meaningful at the time of hire. For this reason, only pay satisfaction will be considered as part of this study.

Another principal theory of employee turnover is that both level of training and development is an antecedent of employee turnover (Rahman et al., 2013, Alkahati, 2015). Research has found there to be a positive relationship between development and employee retention. As an employee feels that they are getting proper training and has a positive perception of their career development, they are more likely to stay with their current employer than an employee who has a negative perception of training and development. Rahman et al. (2013) validated the theory of development-attitude-behavior relationship, and found that position development perception affected the employee’s intention to quit, and focus on career development from managers could reduce quit intentions.

Additional antecedents of employee turnover intentions were identified as an employee’s perception of equality within an organization, their perception of pay, and their attitude toward their benefits and opportunities (Alkahati, 2005; Carraher, 2011). Huffman, Casper, and Payne (2014) took a different approach and researched the impact of non-work influences, finding that such factors as job interference with family, the level of support from ones spouse, and family support has a positive association with
employee retention. Through a survey study of United States Army officers, Huffman et al. found that spousal career support, lower work interference with family, and higher job satisfaction all reduced the odds of employee turnover.

Similarly, Moen, Kelly, and Hill (2001) also considered family and personal conflicts and how schedule flexibility in the workplace influences employee retention. Moen et al. conducted a survey study of a sample of employees at a corporate headquarters. In a two-step process, Moen et al. collected survey results prior to implementing a “results only” work environment (ROWE initiative) and again after the program was put into place. The initiative shifts the focuses on measuring work commitment through employee results rather than by the amount of time spent in the office. Through their research, it was found that employees participating in the ROWE initiative that offered greater flexibility reduced the odds of employee turnover.

The focus of his study is on these variables that are relevant at time of hire, and combines them into one comprehensive model. Other variables identified as having a relationship with employee turnover intention fall outside the scope of this research. One such variable is the employee’s relationship with and attitude toward the organization itself. This organizational commitment variable includes the employee’s feelings toward the organization, the extent to which they identify with the organization, and their personal connection and involvement in the organization (Griffeth et al., 2000). As a person is more committed to their organization, there is a positive linkage to employee retention.

In addition to organizational commitment, organizational culture also has an influence on employee turnover. While organizational commitment is concerned with the
employees’ feelings toward the organization, organizational culture can be defined as the core set of beliefs and developed by the leaders of an organization, which these leaders believe are the optimal values for organizational success (Inabinett & Ballaro, 2014). Similarly, the culture of the organization and how it differentiates itself from other firms influences the employee’s decision to stay with their organization or to voluntary leave (Inabinett et al., 2014). Alkahtani (2015) explains, “The biggest factor in attracting and most importantly retaining key employees is culture” (p. 156). According to a study conducted by StackHands in 2014, it was found that “job turnover at an organization with a high focus on company culture is 13%, but 48% in companies with a low focus” (Finnick, 2014).

While both organizational commitment and culture have been shown to have an effect on employee turnover, the scope of this research only pertains to variables that can be controlled at the time of hire and thus organizational commitment and organizational culture are excluded from this research study. For these same reasons, behavioral antecedents and employee attitudes have also been excluded.

The literature on employee turnover is plentiful; however, there is limited research on how generational differences impact employee turnover intentions. Within any given organization, you may find that employees are multi-generational, with the preferences of these workers varying greatly from one generation to the next. As the workforce shifts from being saturated with Baby Boomers, to the influx of Millennials entering the work force, it’s important to understand these generational differences and how they may impact the underlying factors that influence employee turnover.
Generation Theory

A generation is defined as “an identifiable group that shares birth years, age location, and significant life events at critical developmental stages, divided by five-seven years into the first wave, core group, and last wave” (Kupperschmidt, 2000, p. 66). The introduction of generation theory first came about in Karl Mannheim’s 1923 essay (republished in 1952), The Problem of Generations. According to Mannheim (1952), people share the same “locations” in society and in history. These “locations” restrict them to a certain set of events and experiences during their formative years that generational units experience together. As a result, people who belong to the same generation are exposed to the same set of events in society at the same time; and it is these experiences that influence, or predispose them to a “certain characteristic mode of thought” (Mannheim, 1952; pg. 291).

The key finding from Mannheim’s essay was this idea of people being shaped by their similar experiences through the same social and historical process within time. As people live through the same events in history, they are shaped by shared social change (Mannheim, 1952; Ryder, 1965). Additionally, these new birth cohorts/generations provide the opportunity or vehicle for social change (Ryder, 1965). As these changes happen over time, younger generations are distinguished from older generations, and wish to distinguish themselves.

Despite Mannheim’s comprehensive theoretic framework on generation theory, this concept gained little attention over the coming years. This prompted Jane Pilsher’s 1994 article, Mannheim’s Sociology of Generations: An Undervalued Legacy, to raise the awareness of generation theory. She felt that Mannheim’s theoretical framework on
generation theory was undervalued and receiving scant attention, despite being interdisciplinary in nature, spanning across sociology, history, and social psychology studies (Pilsher, 1994).

While the idea of generation differences is an accepted notion when describing differences in amongst cohorts of people (Pilsher, 1994) there are still gaps in the literature. This may be attributed to the time consuming nature of researching generational changes over time. Additionally, generational differences are often difficult to distinguish between characteristics attributed to age. Key to this distinction is that generation theory is attributed to location in social change and historical process (Mannheim, 1952; Ryder, 1965) rather than similar preference attributed to a person’s age or similar life stage. This research offers contributions to generation theory and expands upon the existing literature (Table 2).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Key Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ‘The Problem of Generations’ in Essays on the sociology of knowledge | Karl Mannheim (1952. First published in 1923) | London: Routledge & Kegan Paul | People who belong to the same age group are exposed to the same set of events in history that influence their characteristics.  
“Individuals sharing in them with a common location in the social and historical process, and thereby limit them to a specific range of potential experience, predisposing them for a certain characteristic mode of thought and experience, and a characteristic type of historically relevant action” (pg. 291) |
| The Cohort as a Concept in the Study of Social Change                 | Norman B. Ryder (1965)           | American Sociological Review    | New birth cohorts provide the opportunity/vehicle for social change. These changes that happen over time distinguish one cohort from another.  
“Transformations of the social world modify people of different ages in different ways; the effects of these transformations are persistent” (pg. 861)       |
The idea of social cohorts, or generations, is interdisciplinary in nature (sociology, history, and social psychology) and is prevalent in language describing differences in groups, yet the attention it gets in literature is lacking. |
There is an increasing desire across all cohorts/generations of American workers for greater work life balance.                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| Beyond Mannheim: Conceptualising how people ‘talk’ and ‘do’ generations in contemporary society | Virpi Timonen & Catherine Conlon (2015) | Advances in Life Course Research | Inductive qualitative research building on Mannheim’s Generation theory. Participants identified and acknowledged that different generations possess certain characteristics; however they also acknowledged diversity within generations.  |

Table 2: Literature Review of Generation Theory
While empirical research on generation theory is limited, a comprehensive study published by Smola and Dutton (2002) supported Mannheim’s theory specifically as related to workplace values. Through their study, it was found that generational work values do differ, and these work values differ more so amongst generations than work values differ with age (Smola et al., 2002). Additionally, it was found that there is an increasing desire across all cohorts/generations of American workers for greater work life balance.

More recently, an inductive empirical study published by Timonen and Conlon (2015) built upon Mannheim’s Generation theory though qualitative research. It was found that participants identified and acknowledged that different generations possess certain characteristics (Timonen et al, 2015), however they also acknowledged that diversity exists within generational cohorts. This dissertation is focused on the convergence of employee turnover theory and Generation theory through empirical study.

Generational Characteristics

There are currently multiple generations in the workforce, including Baby Boomers, Generation X, and Generation Y or Millennials. Each generation is defined by birth years, however the bookends to each of these generational labels is blurred throughout the literature. For example, Baby Boomers can be defined as beginning with a birth year as early as 1942 or a starting birth year as late as 1947.

For the purpose of this research, Baby Boomers are defined as having a birth year of 1940 to 1960, Generation Xer’s as having a birth year of 1960 to 1980, and Generation Y or Millennials as having a birthday year after 1980 through the year 2000. In the spirit of Mannheim’s generation theory, while all three generations are seen working together
in the workforce today, each have very different characteristics that can be attributed to the very different social and historical process they lived through and experienced together (Table 3).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Key Findings</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td>Grew up in post war era, during a number of historical movements.</td>
<td>(Engelman, E., 2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard Working &amp; Results Driven</td>
<td>Hard a very strong work ethic, work hard, and have seen that persistence pays off.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyal</td>
<td>Grew up when retirement pensions were prevalent.</td>
<td>Twenge, Cambell, Hoffman, and Lance (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work is an Important Aspect of Life</td>
<td>Work is an important aspect of life</td>
<td>Twenge et al. (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional</td>
<td>Grew up during transitional times: divorce rates rise, more single parent households, corporations downsizing, layoffs.</td>
<td>Engelman (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen X</td>
<td>Greater independence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outspoken</td>
<td>“Trophy kid” generation and aren’t afraid to voice opinions</td>
<td>Bannon, Ford, &amp; Meltzer (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennial</td>
<td>Have a preference toward work life balance, personal time, and flexibility.</td>
<td>Bannon et al. (2011); Hershatter and Epstein (2010); Thompson et al. (2012); Twenge et al. (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Firm Loyal</td>
<td>Technology advances led to instant access and answers.</td>
<td>Engelman (2009); Thompson et al. (2012); Twenge et al. (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not used to waiting for things.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Starting their careers during the 2007 financial crisis. Saw people loyal to their firms get let go.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Literature Review of Generational Characteristics

Baby Boomers grew up in the post war era at a point in time when a number of historical movements occurred, helping shape this generation who were young and impressionable at that time (Engelman, E, 2009). During their upbringing, Baby
Boomers lived through the anti-war movement, the civil rights movement, the women’s movement, and student activism. They witnessed incredible changes occurring in the world around them (Engelman, E, 2009).

Drawing parallels to Mannheim’s Generation Theory, it may help explain why Baby Boomers have been described as being hard working, results-driven, and loyal (Engelman, 2009). This generation saw persistence pay off during these historical movements (Engelman, 2009). Baby Boomers have also been described as long-term oriented (Twenge, Cambell, Hoffman, and Lance, 2010). Many Baby Boomers saw pensions as a defined benefit and stayed at their current companies knowing in turn they would collect this long term benefit upon retirement.

Promotion is less important to this generation as when compared to the younger generations that followed it, and they feel more strongly that work should be an important component of a person’s life (Twenge et al., 2010). Baby Boomers have been described as a generation who “lives to work” whereas the younger generations “work to live” (Twenge et al., 2010).

Generation Xer’s are found to be more independent than Baby Boomers. This generation grew up in a transitional time where traditional households were no longer the rule. Single parent households were becoming more common as well as households where both parents worked (Engelman, 2009). As a result, this generation had more independence and was left responsible for themselves while their parents worked; often coming home from school to an empty house (Engelman, 2009).

During the Generation X formidable years, this transition Generation saw more divorce, more single parent households, as well as companies downsizing. Mannheim
suggests that these events may help shape this generation’s characteristics. This greater independence and seeing a lower sense of traditional stability may lead to a lower sense of loyalty for this generation.

Generation Xer’s have been described as quick leaners. They were found to be more likely to exit the workforce if they inherited a large sum of money than Baby Boomers (Smola et al., 2003), likely due to their lack of loyalty to their companies and the workplace. It has been said that this generation transitioned from the “live-to-work” mentality of the Baby Boomer generation before them to a “work-smarter-not-harder” attitude (Engelman, 2009).

Generation Y, also known as Millennials, have been exposed to a different social world than previous generations and that, according to Mannheim’s theory, may help influence and shape the characteristics of this generation. Millennials have grown up during a time of helicopter parents and greater oversight by adults and institutions. They have experienced significant leaps in technology as well as political and economic turmoil (Thompson & Gregory, 2012). Millennials are accustomed to gaining access to information and answers quickly as a result of the internet. They are the first generation in the workforce that was born in to the “wired world” and smart phones (Twenge et al., 2010).

The Millennial generation spent their formative years in a world that was forever changed by events in history including 9/11, the Enron scandal, school shootings, the Oklahoma City bombing, and the OJ Simpson murder case (Engelman, 2009). Growing up in uncertain times made this generation less trusting of others and, as a result, more self-reliant (Engelman, 2009).
This generation has been criticized for a lack of patience. They are accustomed to getting instant results and are not used to waiting for things. They have also been criticized as “trophy kids” and a generation who is always looking for positive reinforcement. Millennials are the most educated generation in the workforce and voice their opinions (Bannon, Ford, & Meltzer, 2011).

Millennials have been reported to have different attitudes and preferences than previous generations (Queiri, Wan Yusoff, & Dwaikat, 2014). These distinguishing traits and characteristics have led to a number of stereotypes associated with the Millennial generation. For example, Millennials in the workforce have been criticized for being needy, disloyal, and casual in the workplace (Thompson et al., 2012).

More specifically, in the workplace, Millennials are often thought of as being more casual than prior generations, including Generation X, in both their physical appearance and workplace manner. Technological advances during their upbringing allow for more flexible work hours and remote connectivity. This generation is accustomed to a life with cell phones, the internet, and social networking so they are always able to stay connected and maintain relationships using these powerful technological tools.

In 2015, Google was named the number one company where top Millennials most desired to be employed (Adams, 2015). Google is known for its open and transparent culture and forward thinking work environment that promotes efficiencies in the life of their workers, including free haircuts, dry cleaning, and bike repairs. While these perks may not be considered traditional, they are appealing to this new generation of workers. Additionally, in the research conducted by the National Society of High School Scholars
it was found that 70% of Millennials cared about flexible hours whereas only 46% cared about base salary (Adams, 2015).

Millennials were just starting their careers when the recession hit in 2007. Prior to the financial crisis, employment was plentiful. During this time, many companies downsized and cut back due to uncertain financials times. This generation has been criticized for job hopping and being disloyal to their companies. However, these events in history may help to explain this observation.

Prior generations saw pensions as an established norm and people were rewarded for staying with a company long term. Millennials have seen frequent restructures and layoffs since the financial crisis, and workforce globalization efforts are becoming common practice. Companies are focused on remaining competitive on costs and the search for lower cost labor is not uncommon. This push to stay competitive and keep expenses low can lead to an environment where this generation is skeptical of their job security.

There are differences from one generation to the next, and our experiences and life events change our preferences and values over time. As our preferences and values change over time, what motivates us will too. Millennials may not be motivated by the same factors as their parents (Loughlin & Barling 2001). After seeing their parents sacrifice time with them when they were children as a result of jobs that required “face time” at their offices, this generation in turn has made work-life balance a priority (Hershatter and Epstein, 2010). Millennials “do not want to repeat what they perceive to be the mistakes of their parents, many of whom worked long hours at the expense of family and friends, only to get downsized” (Bannon et al., 2011). Merit increases and
competitive compensation packages may not be enough and as effective in retaining Millennial talent.

Summary

Looking at each literature stream independently, there is a strong foundation of research that has already been established. However, taken together, the literature seems to suggest that there is an opportunity for new insights on these topics to emerge. This research integrates these bodies of research and examines the connections among the existing literature. More specifically, this includes an investigation of the intersection of generation theory and turnover intention theory, and how an employee’s generation may help to explain turnover behavior.
CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODS

Research Design

Participants

In order to explore the relationship between employee generation and turnover intentions, it was important for the sample to include a wide range of demographics. A sufficient sampling from all generations was imperative. To help limit any unintended multicollinearity with other external factors, a wide range of industries, role types, seniority, ethnicities, etc. were desired. For these reasons, in order to obtain such a diverse sample, Amazon Mechanical Turk was chosen for data collection.

Instrument

As previously mentioned, it was imperative to this research study that data was collected from a wide range of respondents spanning across many generations, demographic categories, and industries. For these reasons, Amazon Mechanical Turk was chosen as the platform to deploy the instrument for data collection purposes.

A questionnaire (Appendix C) was designed that consisted of demographic questions as well as previously defined measures that have been used and validated in the literature. This survey was created using Qualtrics software. The survey was kept brief, taking about 5 minutes to complete.

Because the vast amount of research that has been done on employee turnover, it would be impossible to explore the effects of generation on all of the predictor variables that have been identified in the literature. As a result, it was necessary to narrow the focus of this study. To begin to understand the effects generation has on employee
turnover intentions, the scope of this study will focus on six independent variables that are relevant at the time of time.

These six variables include: attitude toward flexible work arrangements, paid time off satisfaction, employee perks desired use, training satisfaction, pay satisfaction, and stock ownership satisfaction. The variables are further grouped into two categories: non-monetary incentives (made up of attitude toward flexible work arrangements, paid time off satisfaction, and employee perks desired use) and monetary incentives (made up of pay satisfaction, and stock ownership satisfaction).

Historically, monetary inducements were primarily used in practice to incentivize employees. The research suggests that Millennials may not be incentivized by monetary offerings and instead place more value on their personal time, work life balance, and convenience. For these reasons, it was important to look at the non-monetary variables identified in the model. For example, flexible work arrangements allow employees to schedule their work hours in a manner that best fits their personal lifestyle and commitments. The research seems to suggest that perhaps flexible work arrangements may incentivize Millennial workers. Similarly, the literature explains that Millennials value their personal time. Thus, paid time off may be of greater importance to this generation.

The literature also suggests that convenience is an important value to the Millennial generation. Being able to save time through on site laundry service or an on-site gym may be an important incentive for this generation. Additionally, with Millennials placing great emphasis on a work-to-live attitude it would be important to understand if those employers who are blurring the lines between work and play through
office perks such as video games on site, social parties, and office Ping-Pong are actually effective tactics in retaining these young workers. Lastly, training satisfaction is also included to understand if on-the-job training is an important factor in turnover decisions.

Definitions & Measures

**Flexible Work Arrangements** are defined as “employer provided benefits that permit employees some level of control over when and where they work outside of the standard workday” (Lambert et al., 2007) and includes: flextime, compressed work week, telecommuting, and part-time work (Timms et al., 2015). Flexible Work Arrangements Usage will be measured using a Four Item FWA subscale from Allen’s (2001) 10-item measure of work–life organizational policies (Timms et al., 2015). Attitude Toward Flexible Work Arrangements will be measured using an 11 item 5 point Likert scale from the Flexible Work Arrangement Questionnaire (Albion, 2004).

**Paid Time Off (PTO) Satisfaction** is defined as “the extent to which an employee is satisfied with benefits that offer time off with pay and includes amount of annual vacation, the policy that governs when paid vacation may be used, the number of paid holidays, and the number of sick leave days” (Balkin et al, 1993). PTO Satisfaction will be measured using a 5-point Likert scale from Balkin and Griffeth (1993) factors of 5 Benefits Satisfaction scale.

**Training Satisfaction** is defined as the degree to which an employee is satisfied with the job training that is available to them. Training Satisfaction is measured using the Job Training and Job Satisfaction Survey (Schmidt, 2007) subscale of “employee satisfaction with training”. The subscale consists of four questions, using a six-point Likert scale from 1=disagree very much to 6=agree very much.
**Employee Perks** are defined as employer offerings for consumption, including “nonpecuniary compensation that has productive use and provides intrinsic motivation” to employees (Marino et al., 2008). Employee perks desired use will be measured using Sun (2016) 5-point Likert scale for Perk Usage modified for “desired” use.

**Pay Satisfaction** is defined as “a discrepancy between how much pay one feels one should receive and how much one feels is actually received” (Heneman and Schwab, 1985, p. 129). Pay Satisfaction will be measured using the Pay Satisfaction Questionnaire (Heneman and Schwab, 1985) with a 5 point Likert scale from very dissatisfied to very satisfied.

**Stock Ownership Satisfaction** is defined as an individual employee’s satisfaction with stock ownership (Klein and Hall, 1988). This will be measured using a 7-point Likert scale measuring satisfaction of ESOP with responses ranging from completely disagree (1) to completely agree (Rosen, Klein, & Young, 1986).

**Generation** is defined as “an identifiable group (cohorts) that shares birth years, age location, and significant life events at critical developmental stages (times) divided by 5-7 years into first wave, core group, and last wave” (Kupperschmidt, 2000). Generation will be measured using birth year, and each generation is defined as having a birth year as follows: Traditional born before 1940, Baby Boomers between 1940-1960, Generation X between 1960-1980, Generation Y/ Millennials between 1980-2000 (Kupperschmidt, 2000).

**Employee Turnover Intention** is defined as “a conscious and deliberate willfulness to leave the organization” (Tett and Meyer, 1993). This will be measured
using a 7-point Likert scale using a three-item turnover intentions indicator ranging in value from extremely unlikely to extremely likely (Konovsky & Cropanzano, 1991).
Pilot Study

Conceptual Model and Hypotheses

The research on employee turnover intentions is plentiful. However, the effect employee generation has on this construct has been overlooked. The conceptual model for this research brings together these two theories and bridges this gap in the literature (Figure 1).

Figure 1. Pilot Study - Monetary and Non-Monetary predictors of Employee Turnover Intentions Moderated by Generation

For Millennials, the literature suggests that personal lives and family time is more important than work. They watched their parents work hard and sacrifice family time at
home, and as a result believe there is more to life than just a big paycheck (Twenge et al., 2010). Instead they have a view of “I can always get another job” and are unwilling to miss out on family time as their parents had done who were loyal to their companies, but then were only to be laid off (Loughlin et al., 2001). This core value of the Millennial generation leads to Hypothesis 1.

*Hypothesis 1a: Paid Time Off Satisfaction will have a negative effect on Employee Turnover Intentions*

*Hypothesis 1b: Paid Time Off Satisfaction will have a greater negative effect on Employee Turnover Intentions amongst Millennial employees than Generation X and Baby Boomers*

In addition to valuing family time, Millennials desire work life balance, flexible hours, more leisure time, and casual dress. They want their jobs to accommodate their family and their personal lives. Millennials “want jobs with flexibility, telecommuting options, and the ability to go part-time or leave the workforce temporarily to have children (or to travel or spend time with friends)” (Twenge et al., 2010, p. 1123). This leads to Hypothesis 2.

*Hypothesis 2a: There will be a negative correlation between Attitude toward Flexible Work Arrangements and Employee Turnover Intentions*

*Hypothesis 2b: Attitude toward Flexible Work Arrangements will have a greater effect on Employee*
Turnover Intentions among Millennial employees than Generation X and Baby Boomer employees

Given the Millennial generation’s change in attitudes and shift in preferences, nonstandard (part time, contractor, etc) jobs are on the rise (Loughlin et al., 2001). Additionally, unique companies like Google are offering on site laundry, doctor appointments, and fitness centers to allow employees the ability to get things done at work and increase leisure time outside of the office (Twenge et al., 2010). This introduction of unique offerings leads to Hypothesis 3.

Hypothesis 3a: There will be a negative correlation between Employee Perk Desired Use and Employee Turnover Intentions

Hypothesis 3b: Employee Perk Desired Use will have a greater effect on Employee Turnover Intentions among Millennial employees than Generation X and Baby Boomer employees

Millennials are accustomed to a competitive world. The Millennial generation has seen increased pressure and competition when applying to colleges. They are known to have a robust appetite for work. This generation is ambitious in nature and is known to have a strong work ethic. As such, the following hypothesis is posed:

Hypothesis 4a: There will be a negative correlation between Training Satisfaction and Employee Turnover Intentions
Hypothesis 4b: Training Satisfaction will have a greater effect on Employee Turnover Intentions among Millennial employees than Generation X and Baby Boomer employees.

For prior generations, pensions were offered to incentivize employees to stay with their employer. Rynes, Gerhart, and Minette’s (2004) studies that were conducted prior to Millennial saturation in the workforce found at the time that money was considered a “yardstick for social status”, and that comparing ones wealth relative to their peers was part of human nature. In addition, compensation heavily effected attraction, retention, and performance of those in the workforce. Conversely, the literature suggests that Millennials value work life balance, leisure time, and flexibility but there is minimal empirical research on how generational differences affect employee turnover. Studies show that prior generations valued money, relative wealth, and social status and were thus motivated and incentivized by compensation and pension packages. These reasons lead to the final hypotheses.

Hypothesis 5: Non-Monetary Incentives will have a greater effect on Employee Turnover Intentions among Millennial employees than older generations

Hypothesis 6: Monetary Incentives will have a greater effect on Employee Turnover Intentions among Generation X and Baby Boomer employees than Millennial employees

The aforementioned hypotheses were then further studied through the pilot study that ensued.
Data and Analysis

The pilot study consisted of a sample size of 172 responses, from a wide variety of participants who had varied demographic characteristics across age, gender, and race. Many industries are represented by the sample in the pilot study, with the 3 most represented industries being Health Care and Social Assistance, accounting for 10% of the pilot study population, and Finance and Insurance, and Government and Public Administration each accounting for 9% of the pilot study sample.

The participants in the pilot study were 51% male and 49% female, and 65% Millennials, 30% Generation X, and 5% Baby Boomers. 71% of respondents have a degree of some kind, and over 90% of respondents have at least some college education. Over 95% of the respondents are currently employed, most of whom are employed in full-time positions (85% of participants).

A linear regression model was used to examine the relationship between the independent variables identified in the conceptual model and the dependent variable Employee Turnover Intention. Overall, it was found that there was significant variability of the dependent variable ($SD = 2.04$). The independent variables are attitude toward flexible work arrangements, paid time off satisfaction, employee perks desired use, training satisfaction, pay satisfaction, stock ownership satisfaction. The $R^2$ of the Regression Model of all independent variables (Table 4) was 0.28, suggesting that 28% of Employee Turnover Intentions could be explained by the Independent variables identified.
The pilot study yielded some interesting results. Because the sample size was small, only two variables were found to be statistically significant in the multi linear regression model; pay satisfaction and perks desired use. However, there were correlation effects amongst the independent variables that account for some of the results that were found to not be statistically significant in the overall model. When looking at these variables independently, it yielded significant results. These findings are discussed in greater detail in the following section.

In the overall multi linear regression model, paid time off satisfaction was not found to be a significant predictor of employee turnover intentions. However, through a Pearson Correlation analysis, PTO satisfaction was found to be very highly correlated to pay satisfaction ($r = .44$), and stock ownership attitude ($r = .29$). A simple linear regression found a strong negative relationship between PTO satisfaction and employee turnover intention (-.25 Beta) and $p < .01$. Additionally, when the multi linear regression was run while removing the two correlated variables, PTO satisfaction was again found

Table 4: Pilot Study - Multi Linear Regression of IV’s on Employee Turnover Intentions

The pilot study yielded some interesting results. Because the sample size was small, only two variables were found to be statistically significant in the multi linear regression model; pay satisfaction and perks desired use. However, there were correlation effects amongst the independent variables that account for some of the results that were found to not be statistically significant in the overall model. When looking at these variables independently, it yielded significant results. These findings are discussed in greater detail in the following section.

In the overall multi linear regression model, paid time off satisfaction was not found to be a significant predictor of employee turnover intentions. However, through a Pearson Correlation analysis, PTO satisfaction was found to be very highly correlated to pay satisfaction ($r = .44$), and stock ownership attitude ($r = .29$). A simple linear regression found a strong negative relationship between PTO satisfaction and employee turnover intention (-.25 Beta) and $p < .01$. Additionally, when the multi linear regression was run while removing the two correlated variables, PTO satisfaction was again found
to have a strong negative relationship with employee turnover intention (-.26 Beta) and \( p < .01 \).

When comparing the data by groups, PTO satisfaction had the greatest effect amongst the Baby Boomer generation (-.88 Beta, \( p < .01 \)) however the sample size for this generation is quite small at only 7 respondents. Millennials followed (-.27 Beta, \( p < .01 \)) with the weakest effect being amongst the Gen X (-.26 Beta), but this finding was only marginally significant with a \( p \) value of <.10.

The moderating effect of generation on the relationship between PTO satisfaction and employee turnover intentions was tested using an interaction variable through a simple linear regression. PTO was found to have a greater effect on the Baby Boomer generation when compared to the Gen X generation (Beta .82, \( p < .05 \)) and Millennial generation (.49 Beta, \( p < .05 \)). The difference in the coefficient between Boomers and the younger generations was found to be significant, but the difference between GenX and Millennials was not found to be statistically significant.

Employee perk desired use was found to have a negative effect on employee turnover intentions (-.26 Beta, \( p < .01 \)). The independent variable was found to be closely correlated to stock option satisfaction through a Pearson correlation analysis \( (r = -.41) \). A multi linear regression was re-run removing the correlated independent variable stock option satisfaction and yielded similar results but weaken the strength of the relationship slightly (Beta: -.20, \( p < .05 \)).

When comparing groups, the relationship between perks desire use and employee turnover intentions was the strongest amongst Millennial respondents (Beta -.26, \( p < .05 \)). Baby Boomer and GenX results were not found to be statistically significant.
The moderating effect generation has on the relationship between Perks desired use and employee turnover intentions was again tested using an interaction variable through a simple linear regression. Perks desired use was found to have a greater effect on Millennials when compared to the Baby Boomer generation (\(-.56\) Beta, \(p < .05\)) and the GenX generation (\(-.22\) Beta, \(p < .05\)). The difference in the coefficient between Boomers and the GenX generation was not found to be statistically significant.

Training satisfaction was not found to be a statistically significant predictor of employee turnover intentions in the multi linear regression (Beta -.05, \(p > .05\)), analysis as well as through a simple linear regression (Beta -.11, \(p > .05\)).

An ANOVA analysis of the Non-Monetary variables indicated that these four independent variables are statistically significant in predicting the dependent variable, employee turnover intention \((F(4, 161) = 4.47, p < .05)\). When comparing groups, the it was found that the non-monetary variables were strong predictors of the dependent variable amongst Millennials and this finding was highly statistically significant \((F(4, 106) = 5.16, p < .01)\). Similarly, the non-monetary variables were strong predictors of the employee turnover intentions amongst Baby Boomers \((F(4, 3) = 5.91, p < .05)\).

However, the other generational findings were not found to be statistically significant.

Generation X had a much lower F ratio than Millennials as hypothesis 5 predicted, but the was found to not be a statistically significant predictor of employee turnover intentions. Similarly, the Baby Boomers results were not found to be statistically significant however the \(f\) ratio was stronger than amongst the Millennial generation.
An ANOVA analysis of the Monetary independent variables (pay satisfaction and stock ownership satisfaction) indicated that these variables are highly statistically significant in predicting the dependent variable, employee turnover intention ($F(2, 168) = 23.83, p < .01$). Amongst the Millennial generation, you see the $f$ ratio drop significantly ($F(2, 108) = 5.91, p < .01$) but remains high amongst the Generation X respondents ($F(2, 47) = 19.29, p < .01$) showing that the model fit is much stronger among Generation X than for Millennials workers. The results for the Baby Boomer generation were not found to be statistically significant.

Discussion of Results

Paid time off satisfaction was not found to be a significant predictor of employee turnover intentions in the overall multi linear regression model. However a strong negative relationship was found through a simple linear regression, which removed the highly correlated variable of paid time off. As such, Hypothesis 1a was not found to be supported in the overall model because of this correlation, but once the correlated variable was removed, Hypothesis 1a was supported.

Hypothesis 1b was only partially supported where PTO satisfaction had a weaker effect on employee turnover intentions amongst the Gen X generation than compared to the Millennial generation, however was not found to be a significant predictor. However, the PTO satisfaction had a greater effect on employee turnover intentions amongst the Baby Boomer generation than the Millennial generation which contradicted Hypothesis 1b.

Attitude toward flexible work arrangements was not found to be a statistically significant predictor of employee turnover intentions in the multi linear regression
analysis as well as through a simple linear regression. Flexible work arrangement usage was also collected through the pilot study, but was also found not to be a statistically significant predictor of employee turnover intentions. A larger study would need to be conducted to determine if a relationship exists as well as better understand the strength of the effect. As a result, Hypothesis 2a and 2b were not able to be supported through this pilot study.

A significant negative relationship was found between employee perk desired and employee turnover intentions, supporting Hypothesis 3a. Hypothesis 3b was also supported through the data analysis, finding that perks desired use had a greater effect on Millennials than the older generations.

As a result, Hypotheses 4 and 5 were not able to be supported through this pilot study. A larger study would also be needed to determine if a relationship exists and the strength of the effect. Because of the small sample size of the pilot study, these results were not found to be statistically significant. Similarly, Hypothesis 6 is only partially supported by the data and would also require more respondents to potentially yield statistically significant results.

The pilot study data was analyzed further using the demographic data collected through the questionnaire to explore any underlying variables that may interact with the model. Some interesting findings emerged that are worth further investigation. The most interesting variable of note was found to be gender and the possible interaction this may have.

The overall regression model was re-run, this time splitting the results between male respondents and female respondents. Through a comparison of the regression
coefficients between the two groups, it was found that employee perk desired use was no longer a significant predictor of employee turnover intentions amongst female respondents. In the overall regression model employee perk desired use was found to have a negative effect on employee turnover intentions (Beta: -.26, p < .01). When the data were split between male and female respondents, employee perk desired use was found to have a greater effect on employee turnover intentions amongst males (Beta: -.67, p < .01) but amongst female respondents this was not a significant predictor of employee turnover intentions.

Table 5: Pilot Study - Multi Linear Regression of IV’s on Employee Turnover Intentions (DV) by Gender
Research shows that men are more likely to fit into a work focused profile than women, while more women fit into a family focused profile than men (Cinamon & Rich, 2002). This finding may help explain why employee perk desired use is a more significant predictor of employee turnover intentions amongst men than women. Employee perks such as company-provided computers, phone, meals, beverages, and gyms may be important conveniences in a more work focused profile, but not as imperative in a family focused profile.

Additionally, social role theory suggests women are more likely to take on domestic type roles such as a homemaker or child care giver, while men are more likely to take on financial provider roles (Eagly, 2001). This finding may also help provide insight as to why employee perk desired use is a more significant predictor of employee turnover intentions amongst men than women. Given that men are more likely to take on financial provider role, it likely makes sense that perks such as on-site laundry services, and company concierge services may be more important to them than women who are more likely to take on domestic roles.

An ANOVA analysis of the Non-Monetary and Monetary variable led to some interesting results. In the overall model, Non-Monetary variables were statistically significant in predicting employee turnover intention \((F(4, 161) = 4.47, p < .05)\). When comparing groups, Non-Monetary variables were only significant in predicting employee turnover intention amongst male respondents \((F(4, 80) = 3.16, p < .05)\) but not female respondents. When doing the same comparison amongst Millennial respondents, Non-Monetary variables are highly statistically significant in predicting employee turnover
intentions \( (F(4, 54) = 7.6, p < .01) \), but are again not found to be statistically significant amongst female respondents.

An ANOVA analysis of Monetary variables in the overall model indicated that these variables are highly statistically significant in predicting the dependent variable, employee turnover intention \( (F(2, 168) = 23.83, p < .01) \). When splitting the data and then when comparing groups, monetary variables were highly significant in predicting employee turnover intention amongst both male \( (F(2, 84) = 6.23, p < .01) \) and female \( (F(2, 81) = 19.13, p < .01) \) respondents, with a stronger \( F \) ratio amongst females. When doing the same comparison amongst Millennial respondents, Monetary variables were highly significant in predicting employee turnover intention amongst female respondents \( (F(2, 49) = 7.77, p < .01) \) but not significant amongst male respondents.

These findings suggest that gender may have a relationship with the independent and the dependent variables. It also suggests that gender may further have an effect on employee generation and its relationship with the independent variables and the dependent variables. Based on these findings, further exploration into this relationship is recommended.

**Strengths and Weaknesses**

The overall conceptual model uses strong measures for all variables. Each variable in the model has been previously used and validated in prior research and are supported by published literature.

The data collection for the model was done through Amazon Mechanical Turk, which is a well reputed resource for research studies. Additionally, the survey for the
data collection was administered via Qualtrics, a leader in research software. Using these tools contributed to strong data collection methods.

A limitation of the research was the small sample size of the pilot study. A larger sample size may lead to more statistically significant results, and greater analysis that could be completed. In addition, as it pertains to the generational data, there were few respondents from the baby boomer generation. A larger sample size would allow for more representation from this sector of the workforce.

Conclusions

While the pilot study yielded some interesting results, a future study with more respondents and a larger sample size is necessary to do a more fine-grained analysis of the aforementioned factors influencing employee turnover intentions. Additionally, a larger sample size would allow for the ability to do further analysis on demographic differences amongst the respondents.

Through the survey, demographic variables, especially gender, led to some thought-provoking results. It would be interesting to better understand if any of these variables influence employee turnover intentions, or interact with the independent variables studied within the conceptual model.
Expanded Study

Through an in-depth pilot study, it was found that demographic factors may also have an effect on employee turnover intentions. The conceptual model was expanded to include gender as an additional variable to be explored in gaining a greater understanding of employee turnover intentions. Specifically, what employee incentives have the strongest effect on employee turnover intentions, and how generation and gender may impact those relationships.

The pilot study findings suggest a possible relationship between gender and employee generation and employee turnover intentions. The linkages between gender and generation have been previously studied, but the literature on this relationship seems to be under researched. Over the course of the last few decades, we have seen the norm shift from households with one working parent to now households where both parents work. Women specifically have shifted from homemakers to college graduates and prominent members of the workforce.

With this shift in household dynamics over time, it is reasonable to believe that gender differences may be seen in the workplace preferences of Millennial workers compared to the perspectives of Baby Boomer workers. For example, men within the Baby Boomer generation may have a spouse at home who cares for the household. Conversely, male Millennial workers likely have a spouse who is also in the workforce. As a result, Millennial men may value work life balance more than their Baby Boomer counterpart. Similarly, men within Baby Boomer may be the sole provider for the family and, as a result may value competitive compensation more than men of younger generations who may have a spouse in the workforce.
The expanded study explored the theoretical underpinnings of the relationship between gender and generation. Gender was added to the conceptual model as a control variable to further explore this relationship and provide a greater understanding of how it interacts with the relationship between generation and employee turnover intention predictors.

Theory Development

The findings from the pilot study suggested that gender may have a relationship with the variables of interest, generation and employee turnover intentions. This dissertation explored the link between generation theory and employee turnover intentions through a larger empirical study, but also focused on how gender may fit in the overall model through exploratory research.

First, I turned to the literature to gain greater understanding of how the interaction effects of gender and generation have been researched previously. Gender differences have been studied at great lengths in the academic literature. Specific to gender differences in the workforce, gender disparity in senior leadership roles and the lack of women reaching the top seat in organizations has been a dominant topic in both practice as well as theory. One way to approach gender differences in the workforce is by applying social role theory and gender stereotypes (Cundiff & Vescio, 2016; Eagly et al., 2000; Heilman, 2012; Stelter, 2002).

Social Role Theory

Social role theory suggests that rather than the result of biology (Stelter, 2002), the behavioral differences between the male and female gender are “a function of gender roles and other proximal causes, which in turn arise from the distal causes that define the
positions of women and men in the social structure” (Eagly, 2001, p. 1070). That is, there a belief that society predefines what gender should be from a behavioral perspective. Eagly (2001) finds that women are more likely to take on domestic, unpaid types roles such as a homemaker or child care giver, whereas men are more likely to take on paid provider roles.

These feminine and masculine type roles also translate into leadership styles. Women in leadership positions are also in many cases managing a household and raise children in their personal lives. Women have been found to bring their nurturing behaviors into their leadership styles, praising employees and inspiring confidence in subordinates (Stelter, 2002; Krishnan et al., 2005). Women have been found to have a more participative leadership style then men (Dwyer et al., 2003; Stelter, 2002), promoting a more collaborative environment that welcomes sharing information and power (Stelter, 2002; Krishnan et al., 2005). Conversely, male leaders have been found to embrace competitive individualism (Dwyer et al., 2003).

While the traditional masculine leadership style has been found to be more task-oriented and goal-focused (Stelter, 2002), in some cases, it has been found that women in leadership positions may avoid competition, and may be more cooperative and lead through inclusion (Dwyer et al., 2003; Stelter, 2002). While some men may have a leadership style that is directive and controlling (Stelter, 2002), women have been found in some cases to bring people together and place focus on interpersonal relationships (Krishnan et al., 2005).

In addition to these social roles influencing leadership style it also influences the way people perceive these gender roles (Cundiff et al., 2002; Heilman, 2012). Despite
the progress society has made and efforts made within organizations, gender stereotypes still exist in the workplace and hinder women in the workforce (Cundiff et al., 2002; Heilman, 2012). Cundiff et al. (2016) found that gender disparity attributed to discrimination was stronger amongst women than men. When explaining gender disparity in leadership positions, women were more likely to perceive this inequality to be a result of discrimination than men. Additionally, women who are successful in masculine roles find themselves less liked than their male counterparts (Heilman, Wallen, Fuchs, & Tamkins, 2009). This negative perception of successful women in traditionally masculine roles can ultimately influence career opportunities, and even a person’s salary (Heilman et al., 2009).

Preference Theory

Social role theory is one accepted explanation of gender differences in the literature. Other research shows that another accepted explanation to gender differences is preference theory. This theory explores the idea of three worker profiles: 1) a home or family focused worker that place high importance on family, 2) a work centric worker who places high importance and commitment toward their career, and 3) a dual, or adaptive worker that falls somewhere in the middle, prioritizing both (Cinamon et al., 2002; Hakim, 2006). Research shows that more women than men fit into the family focused profile, while more men than women fit into the work focused profile (Cinamon et al., 2002).

Preference theory suggests that the diversity in lifestyle preferences and career choices by men and women play a role in gender disparity in the workforce (Cinamon et al., 2002; Hakim, 2006). As men and women have differing preferences, it influences the
decisions they make not only in their personal lives but also in their career and employment choices.

Using preference theory to explain gender differences within the workforce draws parallels with the moderating effect gender played in the pilot study findings. Bringing gender into the conceptual model as a control variable expands upon gender preference theory and further explores how gender interacts with generation in predicting employee turnover intentions.

The relationship between generation and gender has been narrowly explored in the literature. Jovic, Wallace, and Lemaire (2006) explored the relationship between generation and gender as it relates to physicians’ work attitudes and behaviors. More specifically, the study examined by gender how Baby Boomer and Generation X physicians’ perceive the work attitudes and behaviors of each generation and additionally examined how these perceptions compared to what was actually seen in work hours patient care satisfaction.

Overall, Jovic et al. found that perceived behavior and work attitude differences varied more between generations than actual behaviors and attitudes. However, the study did find some underlying differences between gender and generations. The study found that Baby Boomer physicians believe that younger generations of doctors are less committed, not as hard working, and more focused on work life balance. However, Generation X physicians believe the opposite; they think they’re just as hard working and committed, but they don’t feel long hours reflect their work ethic. In reality, both generations average the same work hours per week, yet the data did show that 15% of the
women worked less than a 40 hour work week while only 6% of men did the same (Jovic et al., 2006).

The study also found one third of female and male Baby Boomers felt that family responsibilities interfered with work while one quarter of female Gen X and hardly any male Gen X felt this to be the case. The study found that Baby Boomers view work and family as independent of one another while Gen X feels they’re interdependent and they can be committed to both at the same time. The article suggests that younger generation men are more accepting of balancing family and work responsibilities whereas older generations express acrimony about family responsibilities impacting their career (Jovic et al., 2006).

A similar study exploring the relationship between generational and gender differences was conducted by Dial, Downey, and Goodlin (2010). While similar results were found, the sample was very different. Dial et al. (2010) explored work stress in prison looking at generational and gender differences. The research found that generation and gender significantly impacted prison workers stress level at work. Males of the oldest generation, Traditional or Silent Generation, were found to have the lowest work stress while Gen X females were found to have the highest. The study found that generally speaking, males and older generations had lower work stress than females and older generations (Dial et al., 2010).

While these findings supported that work stress was influenced by both gender and generation, the study was limited to correctional facilities where employees face challenges that are unique to this industry. For example, women may face more stress in the criminal justice field than men. The article contributed to the research bridging the
relationship between generation and gender, but still leaves many gaps left to be explored.

Another study conducted by Lyons, Duxbury, & Higgins (2005) also explored the intersection of generation and gender theories. The research found that some gender based differences in human values priorities vary across generations (Lyons, Duxbury, Higgins, 2005). Three values in particular, achievement, tradition, and universalism varied significantly by both generation and gender.

While achievement is typically viewed as a more masculine value, the findings were quite contrary and found women valued achievement more than men and younger women more so than female Baby Boomers. Universalism and the well-being of others were found to be more important to women than men, but less important to the Gen X generation than to Baby Boomers. Tradition was found to be less important to Gen X than to their Baby Boomer counterparts, but men of both generations found tradition to be more important than women (Lyons et al., 2005).

The linkage between generation and gender was strongly support by Lyons et al., as the study found that they should not be looked at independent of one another in values studies. The literature provides support for the relationship between gender and generation through the course of these studies, but gaps remain in examination of the interaction between these two variables. That is, the manner in which these variables interact with employee turnover intentions has not yet been explored.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article Title</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Key Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social role theory of sex differences and similarities: A current appraisal</td>
<td>Eagly, A. H. (2001)</td>
<td>The developmental social psychology of gender</td>
<td>The article explores social role theory. Social role theory suggests that gender differences in behavior are “a function of gender roles and other proximal causes, which in turn arise from the distal causes that define the positions of women and men in the social structure.” Social role theory suggests gender implications:   - Women are more likely than men to take on domestic type roles (i.e. homemaker, child caregiver)   - Men are more likely than women to take on provider roles (i.e. roles in the paid economy, primary provider)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender stereotypes and workplace bias</td>
<td>Madeline E. Heilman (2012)</td>
<td>Research in Organizational Behavior</td>
<td>The paper explores the workplace consequences of descriptive and prescriptive gender stereotypes. It was found that these gender stereotypes still exist in work settings, and that women in the workforce are hindered by gender stereotypes Women are prone to being seen as incompetent to handle male gender type roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Stereotypes Influence How People Explain Gender Disparities in the Workplace</td>
<td>Cundiff, J. L., &amp; Vescio, T. K. (2016)</td>
<td>Sex Roles</td>
<td>The study found that participants who endorse gender stereotypes were less likely to attribute gender disparities to discrimination. Participants attributed the lack of representation of females in leadership positions more to toward gender discrimination than they did for STEM roles. Women made more attributions to gender discrimination than men.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women, careers, and work-life preferences</td>
<td>Hakim, C. (2006)</td>
<td>British Journal of Guidance &amp; Counselling</td>
<td>Gender inequality is actually reduced through flexible and family-friendly HR policies. This is attributed to preference theory. Three classifications of work-lifestyle preferences:   - Home Centric: family main priority, prefer not to work   - Adaptive: want both, want to work but not totally committed to career   - Work Centric: work main priority and are committed to work These 3 classifications explain the gender gap using preference theory, and the diversity in lifestyle preferences and career choices by men and women.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender differences in the</td>
<td>Cinnamon, R. G., &amp; Rich, Y.</td>
<td>Sex Roles</td>
<td>3 worker profiles are established:   - Family: Assign high importance to family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Title</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Journal/Publication</td>
<td>Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of work and family roles: Implications for work–family conflict</td>
<td>- Dual: Assign high importance to both work and family - Work: Assign high importance to work</td>
<td>- Women were underrepresented in the “Work” profile; however men were equally distributed throughout the profiles. - More women than men fit the “Family” profile. - More men than women fit the “Work” profile.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender diversity in management and firm performance: the influence of growth orientation and organizational culture</td>
<td>Sean Dwyer, Orlando C. Richard, Ken Chadwick (2003)</td>
<td>Journal of Business Research</td>
<td>Gender diversity is beneficial for firms seeking growth Gender diversity benefits are fully realized when the appropriate culture is in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A few good women – on top management teams</td>
<td>Hema A. Krishnan, Daewoo Park (2005)</td>
<td>Journal of Business Research</td>
<td>There is a positive relationship with the ratio of women on top management teams and organizational performance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6, continued: Literature Review of Gender Studies

This research focused on the antecedents of employee turnover intentions that are relevant at the time of hire, and how these variables interact with employee generation, as well as employee gender. More specifically, this dissertation explored, what effects monetary and non-monetary offerings have on employee turnover intentions, and does employee generation and employee gender interact with this relationship? The expanded study builds upon the findings in the pilot study to further explore these questions.
**Conceptual Model and Exploratory Questions**

This dissertation builds upon the pilot study conceptual model by incorporating the new variable, gender, based on the discussed findings of that study and the subsequent literature review. Gender has been added to the model as a control variable, and the research study explores how gender interacts with the relationships established in the pilot study model (Figure 2).

![Diagram of Monetary and Non-Monetary predictors of Employee Turnover Intentions Moderated by Generation and controlled by Gender](image)

**Figure 2.** Monetary and Non-Monetary predictors of Employee Turnover Intentions Moderated by Generation and controlled by Gender

Employee gender was examined to understand if and how it interacts with the relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variables. As such, in addition to the aforementioned hypotheses of the pilot study, the expanded study also
explores the interaction of the control variable gender in the conceptual model. The goal of the expanded study was to form some preliminary conclusions about the role gender plays on the relationship between generation and predictors of employee turnover intentions. Specifically, the expanded study aimed to understand,

Does employee gender interact with the relationship between generation and the predictor variables of employee turnover intentions?

The aforementioned hypotheses from the pilot study, in addition to this new exploratory study, were developed into a refined conceptual model and further explored through the expanded study that ensued.

Method

The refined conceptual model and hypotheses were tested through an expanded research study. The established questionnaire (Appendix C) that was created in the Qualtrics system was further tested through distribution to the advisory committee, and refined based on feedback. The pre-established measurements of the variables found in the literature were again used to support the quantitative analysis. Additionally, two open ended qualitative questions were added to the instrument to allow for supplementary qualitative data analysis.

Since gender had been incorporated into the refined conceptual model this variable was already included in the initial survey and therefore did not need to be added. Additional demographic questions were also again included to better understand the profile of participants. Similar to the pilot study, Amazon Mechanical Turk was leveraged for data collection purposes by targeting only participants living within the
United States. The expanded research study attempted to collect 1,000 respondents to allow for ample data analysis, one of the limitations of the pilot study.

The independent and dependent variables and measures from the pilot study will also be used in the dissertation proposal and will remain unchanged. However, the expanded conceptual model introduces a new variable; gender. **Gender** is treated as a binary variable, defined as either male or female. Respondents are asked to choose their response.

Employee gender is controlled for in the model to observe if this variable has an impact on the relationship between the variables identified in the model and the dependent variable, employee turnover intentions. To determine if gender has an effect on the relationships in the model, a hierarchical multiple linear regression analysis was used and the change in the $R^2$ was observed.
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

Participants

The study included 815 responses, collected using Amazon Mechanical Turk. The sample represented a wide variety of demographic categories across age, gender, and industry (Table 7). The participants in the study included 60% / 484 female responses, and 40% / 324 male. 64% / 525 of the respondents are Millennials, 31% / 252 Generation X, and 5% / 38 are Baby Boomers. 95% / 764 of the respondents are currently employed; most of whom are employed in full time positions (78% / 627 participants).

The sample also represented a range of different marital statuses. 49% / 396 of the respondents are married, while 40% / 324 have never been married. Another 9% / 70 are divorced, 2% / 14 separated, and 1% / 8 are widowed. The sample was highly educated, with over 90% / 736 of the sample having some college experience and over 70% / 572 having a degree of some sort.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Millennial</td>
<td>Less than HS</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GenX</td>
<td>HS Grad</td>
<td>396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Baby Boomer</td>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>Widowed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Yr Degree</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 Yr Degree</td>
<td>Divorced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Degree</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>Separated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Participant summary and demographic response frequency

The sample also included responses from a wide range of different industries. All industries included in the survey had some representation and the top three industries in the survey account for 36% / 291 of respondents. These three industries include health
care and social assistance with 17% / 134 of responses, finance and insurance with 10% / 83 of responses, and retail with 9% / 74 of responses.

Findings

Overall, it was found that there was significant variability of the dependent variable, employee turnover intentions ($SD = 1.78$). The mean response for the dependent variable was 3.37, slightly skewed toward more likely than not the sample intended to turnover (median = 4).

A linear regression model was used to examine the relationship between the independent variables identified in the conceptual model and the dependent variable of Employee Turnover Intentions. The independent variables were: 1) attitude toward flexible work arrangements, 2) paid time off satisfaction, 3) employee perks desired use, 4) training satisfaction, 5) pay satisfaction, and 6) stock ownership satisfaction. The $R^2$ of the Regression Model of all independent variables was 0.16, suggesting that 16% of Employee Turnover Intentions could be explained by the independent variables identified.
Table 8. Linear Regression Model Summary of the Predictor variables on the dependent variable Employee Turnover Intentions

Within the overall model, two of the independent variables were not found to be significant predictors of employee turnover intentions. These variables were stock ownership satisfaction and perks desired use. However, through a Pearson correlation analysis it was found a negative relationship between stock ownership satisfaction and employee turnover intention exists (-.07 Beta) and $p < .05$. However, the same was not found true of perks desired use. Through a Pearson correlation analysis, this variable was still not found to be a statistically significant predictor of the dependent variable (.03 Beta, $p > .10$).
Table 9. Pearson Correlation Analysis of all Variables and Employee Turnover Intentions

PTO satisfaction was found to be a significant predictor of employee turnover intentions. In the overall model, PTO satisfaction was found to be a significant predictor of the dependent variable (-.13 Beta, p <.01) (Table 8). Using a Pearson correlation analysis (Table 9), it was found that PTO satisfaction was marginally correlated to pay satisfaction (r = .45). Through a similar linear regression, removing the correlated
variable, a stronger negative relationship between PTO satisfaction and employee turnover intention was found \((-0.28 \text{ Beta}, p < .01)\).

When comparing the data by groups, PTO satisfaction was found to be a significant predictor of employee turnover intentions amongst all three generations. The greatest effect was found amongst the Baby Boomer generation \((-0.32 \text{ Beta}, p < .05)\) and the GenX generation \((-0.32 \text{ Beta}, p < .01)\). The smallest effect was found amongst the Millennial generation \((-0.25 \text{ Beta}, p < .01)\), but had a stronger significance than Baby Boomers.

### Table 10: Linear Regression of PTO Satisfaction on Employee Turnover Intentions, comparing by Generational groups
The significance of these findings was determined by testing the moderating effect generation has on the relationship between PTO satisfaction and employee turnover intentions. The moderation effect was tested using a hierarchical multiple linear regression analysis. The greater effect found among the Baby Boomer generation as compared to the Millennial generation was found to be marginally significant (Beta -.05, p < .10). However, greater effect found among the Baby Boomer generation when compared to GenX was not found to be statistically significant. Similar results were found between GenX and Millennials. While there were differing effects when comparing groups, this difference was not found to be statistically significant.

### ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>203.704</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>203.704</td>
<td>69.604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>2353.891</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>2.924</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2557.595</td>
<td>806</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>211.218</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>70.406</td>
<td>24.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>2346.377</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>2.922</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2557.595</td>
<td>806</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: TurnoverInt_Group
b. Predictors: (Constant), PTO_Centered
c. Predictors: (Constant), PTO_Centered, PTO_Boom_Interaction, PTO_GenX_Interaction

### Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3.375</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PTO_Centered</td>
<td>-.431</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3.367</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PTO_Centered</td>
<td>-.381</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PTO_Boom_Interaction</td>
<td>-.386</td>
<td>.282</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PTO_GenX_Interaction</td>
<td>-.113</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.042</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: TurnoverInt_Group

Table 11: Moderation effect of Baby Boomers and GenX compared to Millennials on predictor variable, PTO Satisfaction on Employee Turnover Intentions

57
The effect PTO satisfaction has on employee turnover intentions was also demarcated by female and male respondents. This effect was found significant for both genders, but had relatively the same coefficient (male = Beta -.27, \( p < .01 \), female = Beta -.27, \( p < .01 \)). To confirm gender did not influence the relationship between PTO satisfaction and employee turnover intentions, a hierarchical multi linear regression was performed to control for gender and was not found to be significant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R Square Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.278</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>1.71015</td>
<td>.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.278</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>1.71109</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), PTO_Centered  
b. Predictors: (Constant), PTO_Centered, Gender

Table 12: Hierarchical Linear Regression of PTO on Employee Turnover Intentions controlled by Gender

A pairwise frequency table (Table 13) was used to understand of the importance of PTO in relation to the other independent variables. The table suggested support of the findings from the regression analysis. When respondents were asked to indicate the factor most important to them when considering leaving their organization, they picked PTO 61% of the time. This response rate was as high as 66% amongst Baby Boomers, followed by 63% amongst Gen X, and 60% amongst Millennials.
Table 13: Pairwise Analysis of the Independent variables and Employee Turnover Intentions by Gender & Generation

In the pairwise frequency table, PTO was chosen most frequently behind competitive compensation (chosen 83% of the time) similar to the findings of the regression analysis of the model where PTO satisfaction had the second strongest effect following pay satisfaction. The results of the pairwise analysis were also reviewed by gender, and did not find significant difference between gender responses by generation with the exception of Millennials. Female Millennials picked PTO 63% of the time where male Millennials picked PTO 56% of the time.

Interestingly, in a qualitative analysis (Table 14) of opened ended questions asked to the respondents, difference results were found. When asked what benefit at their current employer was most important to them and why, 24% of Millennial respondents
indicated PTO (the top indicator). This was compared to 20% or GenX respondents (the third factor) and only 13% of Baby Boomers (the third factor).

Table 14: Qualitative Analysis of the Independent variables and Employee Turnover Intentions by Generation

When the question was angled more toward why the respondents chose to stay at their employer versus leave, the responses were interesting to note. When asked what benefit, if offered to you, would be hardest to give up and why, 24% of Millennial
respondents indicated this was PTO (the top indicator). This was compared to 30% of GenX respondents (also the top indicator) versus only 16% of Baby Boomers (the third factor). When asked this question, some themes among the generational groups were seen.

While Baby Boomer responses were limited, PTO time was typically mentioned in terms of “vacation time”. Common themes among GenX respondent appeared to be focused around family time and recharging away from work. One respondent indicated that “paid time off would be hard to give up. I enjoy my personal time and need a time to rest and recharge. I hate to be penalized financially because I am taking a needed rest”. Another stated, “paid weeks off, because I live to spend time with my family”. Among Millennials, one theme that stood out was that time off was viewed more as a necessity, and additionally taking time without losing wages was valued. Responses included, “vacation time, it is vital to me to have this in order to do a good job and not get burned out” and “giving up paid time off would be difficult because there are a lot of things I would need to do throughout the year and not being paid would be harder”.

Attitude toward flexible work arrangements was also found to be a significant predictor of employee turnover intentions. In the overall model, this independent variable was found to be a significant predictor of the dependent variable, however had a positive effect on the dependent variable (.08 Beta, $p < .01$). Attitude toward flexible work arrangements was not found to have a significant correlation to any of the other independent variable through a Pearson analysis, and, as such, similar results were seen through a simple linear regression analysis (.09 Beta) and $p < .01$. 
Table 15: Linear Regression of predictor variable Flexible Work Arrangement Attitude on Employee Turnover Intentions

However, through a reliability test of the scale of each independent variable (Table 16) it was found that the scale for flexible work arrangement attitude was weak. The Cronbach alpha value of 0.51 was found to be only marginally acceptable, suggesting that there is inconsistency in the measure.

Table 16: Scale reliability of the model variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Cronbach Alpha</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude toward Flexible Work Arrangements</td>
<td>0.513</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid Time Off Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.887</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Perk Desired Use</td>
<td>0.913</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.924</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.921</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stock Ownership Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.816</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Turnover Intentions</td>
<td>0.904</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A comparison of the data by generational groupings revealed that the variable attitude toward flexible work arrangements was only found to be a significant predictor of employee turnover intentions amongst the Millennial respondents (.10 Beta, \( p < .01 \)).

### ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Millennial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>17.186</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17.186</td>
<td>5.724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>1561.228</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>3.002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1578.414</td>
<td>521</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GenX</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>2.683</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.683</td>
<td>.811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>824.264</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>3.310</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>826.947</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1.311</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.311</td>
<td>.295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>160.188</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.450</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>161.497</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: TurnoverInt_Group  
b. Predictors: (Constant), FWA_Att_Centered

### Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Millennial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FWA_Att_Centered</td>
<td>3.285</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.296</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GenX</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3.493</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FWA_Att_Centered</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3.812</td>
<td>.347</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FWA_Att_Centered</td>
<td>.288</td>
<td>.531</td>
<td>.090</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: TurnoverInt_Group

Table 17: Linear regression of flexible work arrangement attitude on employee turnover intentions compared by generational group

The significance of this finding was determined by testing the moderating effect generation has on the relationship between attitude toward flexible work arrangements and employee turnover intentions using a hierarchical multiple linear regression analysis. The effect of generation on the relationship between attitude toward flexible work
arrangements and employee turnover intentions was not found to be statistically significant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>20.712</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.712</td>
<td>6.540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>2561.946</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>3.167</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2582.658</td>
<td>810</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>22.180</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.393</td>
<td>2.330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>2560.478</td>
<td>807</td>
<td>3.173</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2582.658</td>
<td>810</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: TurnoverInt_Group  
b. Predictors: (Constant), FWA_Att_Centered  
c. Predictors: (Constant), FWA_Att_Centered, FWA_Boom_Interaction, FWA_GenX_Interaction

**Coefficients**<sup>a</sup>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3.375</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>54.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FWA_Att_Centered</td>
<td>.260</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3.374</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>53.894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FWA_Att_Centered</td>
<td>.296</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FWA_GenX_Interaction</td>
<td>-.134</td>
<td>.223</td>
<td>-.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FWA_Boom_Interaction</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.461</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: TurnoverInt_Group

Table 18: Interaction effect of generation on the relationship between flexible work arrangement attitude and employee turnover intentions

The effect of attitude toward flexible work arrangements on employee turnover intentions was also examined across gender categories. While a significant predictor for both genders, attitude toward flexible work arrangements was found to be only marginally significant amongst males. A slightly greater effect was found for female
respondents (Beta .10, p < .05) than for male respondents (Beta .09, p < .10). Through a hierarchal multi linear regression test, gender was controlled for and was not found to have an effect on the relationship between attitude toward flexible work arrangements and employee turnover intentions ($R^2$ change .01).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
<th>F Change</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig. F Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.009b</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>1.78461</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>.803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.095b</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>1.77781</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>7.162</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Gender  

The pairwise frequency table suggests that the importance of flexible work arrangements is an important factor when considering leaving an organization when compared to the other factors in the model. Respondents chose flexible work arrangements 55% of the time when asked to select the factor that is most important to them when considering leaving your current employer. This response was the highest amongst GenX respondents (58%) and the same between Baby Boomers and Millennials (53%).
The pairwise frequency table did detect a difference in level of importance of flexible work arrangements between male and female respondents. 60% of the time female respondents chose flexible work arrangements compared to only 47% of the time for the male respondents. The lowest response was amongst Baby Boomer males, choosing flexible work arrangements only 43% of the time, compared to the highest response amongst GenX females at 64% of the time.

In a qualitative analysis of opened ended questions asked to the respondents, the results were similar to those of the pairwise analysis. When asked what benefit at their current employer was most important to them and why, 24% of GenX respondents indicated this was flexibility (the top indicator). This was compared to 20% of Millennial respondents (the third factor) and 16% of Baby Boomers (the second factor).

When the question was turned a bit more toward when the respondents chose to stay at their employer versus leave, the responses again were found to be similar to what was seen in the pairwise analysis. When asked what benefit, if offered to you, would be hardest to give up and why, 30% of GenX respondents indicated this was flexibility (the top indicator). This was compared to 23% of Millennial respondents (the second factor) and 21% of Baby Boomers (the second factor).

As previously stated, employee perks desired use was not found to have a statistically significant effect of employee turnover intentions. When this variable was examined in more detail it was found to be a statistically significant predictor for only female respondents versus males (Beta .08, p < .05) and for female Millennial respondents (Beta .12, p < .05) suggesting that employee perks are only a significant predictor of employee turnover intentions among women in the sample.
Table 20: Linear Regression of Perks Desired Use on Employee Turnover Intentions compared by Generation and Gender

The interaction effect of gender on the relationship between employee perks desired use and employee turnover intentions was found to be marginally statistically
significant (Beta .09, p < .10). However, gender did not influence the relationship between employee perks desired use, generation, and employee turnover intentions.

### ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Regression</td>
<td>2.241</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.241</td>
<td>.703</td>
<td>.402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>2580.417</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>3.190</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2582.658</td>
<td>810</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Regression</td>
<td>11.758</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.879</td>
<td>1.848</td>
<td>.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>2570.900</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>3.182</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2582.658</td>
<td>810</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: TurnoverInt_Group  
b. Predictors: (Constant), Perks_Centered  
c. Predictors: (Constant), Perks_Centered, F_Perks_Interaction

### Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>.5375</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>53.815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perks_Centered</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>.380</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>53.904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perks_Centered</td>
<td>-.081</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>-.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F_Perks_Interaction</td>
<td>.243</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>.093</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: TurnoverInt_Group

Table 21: Interaction effect of Gender on the relationship between Employee Perks Desire Use and Employee Turnover Intentions
Table 22: Interaction effect of Generation on the relationship between Employee Perks Desire Use and Employee Turnover Intentions controlling Gender

In a pairwise analysis of the factors identified in the model, employee perks was only chosen 40%. The highest response were amongst Millennials (43%) followed by GenX (36%) and then Baby Boomers (28%). Responses were generally similar when compared by gender, with the largest variance seen among the Baby Boomer generation, likely in part attributable to the small sample size (Millennial males 44%, Millennial females 43%, GenX males 38%, GenX females 35%, Baby Boomer males 35%, Baby Boomer female 22%).

In the qualitative analysis, Perks again were not identified in a top factor of consideration when weighing employee benefits. When asked, what benefit at your current employer is most important to you and why, only 4% of respondents indicated
perks, with the top response amongst female Millennials (6%). When asked, what benefit is most important to you when considering a new job and why, only 1% indicated perks with the top response amongst female Millennials (2%). And lastly, when asked what benefit, if offered to you, would be hardest for you to give up and why, only 3% of respondents choice employee perks. However, this time the baby Boomer generation indicated perks the most at 10% for females and 6% for males.

Training satisfaction was found to be a significant predictor of employee turnover intentions in the overall model (.11 Beta, p < .05). Using a Pearson correlation analysis, it was found that training satisfaction was correlated to pay satisfaction (r = .39) and to PTO satisfaction (r = .33). Through a similar linear regression, removing the correlated variables, a stronger negative relationship between training satisfaction and employee turnover intention was found (.25 Beta, p < .01).

### ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Regression</td>
<td>154.480</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>154.480</td>
<td>51.577</td>
<td>.000b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>2423.057</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>2.995</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2577.537</td>
<td>810</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: TurnoverInt_Group
b. Predictors: (Constant), Training_Centered

### Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>3.372</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td></td>
<td>55.484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training_Centered</td>
<td>-0.520</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>-.245</td>
<td>-7.182</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: TurnoverInt_Group

Table 23: Linear Regression of predictor variable Training Satisfaction on Employee Turnover Intentions
When comparing the data by groups, training satisfaction was found to be a significant predictor of employee turnover intentions amongst all three generations. The strongest relationship was amongst the Baby Boomer generation (\(-.32\) Beta, \(p < .01\)), followed by GenX (\(-.27\) Beta, \(p < .01\)). The weakest effect was found amongst the Millennial generation (\(-.23\) Beta, \(p < .01\)).

### Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Err</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennial</td>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>4.355</td>
<td>.215</td>
<td>20.270</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training_Group</td>
<td>-.474</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>-.227</td>
<td>-5.303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GenX</td>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>4.788</td>
<td>.319</td>
<td>15.019</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training_Group</td>
<td>-.562</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>-.267</td>
<td>-4.377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomer</td>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>6.234</td>
<td>.980</td>
<td>6.361</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training_Group</td>
<td>-1.043</td>
<td>.405</td>
<td>-.395</td>
<td>-2.578</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Turnoverint_Group

Table 24: Linear Regression of predictor variable Training Satisfaction on Employee Turnover Intentions, compared by generation groups

A hierarchical multi linear regression was used to test the significance of these findings and to determine the moderating effect generation has on the relationship between training satisfaction and employee turnover intentions. The greater effect among the Baby Boomer generation had compared to the Millennial generation was found to be marginally significant (Beta \(-.05\), \(p < .10\)). However, the greater effect the Baby Boomers had when compared to GenX was not. Similarly, the difference in effects between GenX and Millennials were not found to be statistically significant.
When comparing the effect training satisfaction has on employee turnover intentions by female and male respondents, training satisfaction was found to be a significant predictor for both groups (male = Beta -.22, p < .01, female = Beta -.27, p < .01). A hierarchical multi linear regression was performed to test for the significance in the difference between the gender coefficients. The $R^2$ for the model slightly increased by .002, and the effect was found to be marginally significant (Beta -.07, p < .10).
Table 26: Model Summary of the effect of Gender on independent variable, Training Satisfaction and the effect on Employee Turnover Intentions

Table 27: Moderation effect of Female respondents compared to males on predictor variable, Training Satisfaction on Employee Turnover Intentions

The effect was further reviewed to see if gender impacted the relationship between training satisfaction, generation, and employee turnover intentions. When controlling for gender, $R^2$ for the model slightly increased, suggesting there may be some impact from gender on the overall model.
Table 28: Interaction effect of Generation on the relationship between Training Satisfaction and Employee Turnover Intentions, controlled by Gender

A pairwise analysis of the importance of training in relation to the other independent variables, results were similar to the findings from the regression analysis. When respondents were asked to indicate the factor most important to them when considering leaving their organization, they picked training 30% of the time. However, this response rate was as highest amongst Baby Boomers (32%). Additionally, the top response group was female Baby Boomers at 33%, with the lowest response among GenX males (22%).

In a qualitative analysis of opened ended questions asked to the respondents, similar results were again found. When asked what benefit at their current employer was most important to them and why, only 2% of respondents indicated training. However, for Baby Boomers this was indicated 8% of the time, and for female Baby Boomers this was indicated 10% of the time.

When the question was rephrased, and focused more on why the respondents chose to stay at their employer versus leave, the responses were similar. When asked what benefit, if offered to you, would be hardest to give up and why, only 1% of respondents indicated training. However, Baby Boomers indicated training the most out
of the three generations, and female baby Boomers indicated training the most out of all the segments of respondents (5% of the time).

An ANOVA analysis of the Non-Monetary variables indicated that these four independent variables are statistically significant in predicting the dependent variable, employee turnover intention \((F(4, 801) = 25.89, p < .01)\). An Additional ANOVA analysis was preformed to compare generational groups. It was found that the non-monetary variables were statistically significant predictors of the dependent variable amongst Millennial respondents \((F(4, 515) = 13.11, p < .01)\). Similarly, the non-monetary variables were strong predictors of the employee turnover intentions amongst GenX respondents \((F(4, 243) = 10.75, p < .01)\) followed by Baby Boomers with the weakest effect \((F(4, 33) = 3.06, p < .05)\).

Table 29: ANOVA of Non-Monetary predictor variables on Employee Turnover Intentions, compared by generation groups

A hierarchical multi linear regression was conducted to determine if the different effects amongst generations was statistically significant. After removing perks desired
use after this variable was found not to be a predictor of employee turnover intentions, the hierarchical multi linear regression found that when adding generation to the model, the \( R^2 \) only slightly improved by 0.4\%. The 2\textsuperscript{nd} model, including generation was found to be statistically significant \( (F(4, 801) = 26.88, p < .01) \). For the second model, Generation was found to be statistically significant (Beta .07, \( p < .05 \)).

Table 30: Generation effect on the relationship between Non-Monetary incentives and Employee Turnover Intentions

Adding gender to a new block in the hierarchical multi linear regression found no increase in the overall fit of the model \( (R^2 \text{ change} = 0) \), and found that gender was not a significant predictor of the dependent variable.

Table 31: Model summary of the relationship between Non-Monetary incentives and Employee Turnover Intentions adding both Generation and Gender
An ANOVA analysis of the Monetary variables identified in the model, stock ownership satisfaction and pay satisfaction, indicated that these variables were statistically significant in predicting employee turnover intentions \((F(4, 809) = 61.54, p < .01)\). When re-running the model and comparing by generation, it was found that the monetary variables were statistically significant predictors of employee turnover intentions across all generations. Millennials were found to have the greatest effect \((F(2, 518) = 36.01, p < .01)\), followed by GenX respondents \((F(2, 248) = 22.42, p < .01)\), with Baby Boomers following behind with the weakest effect \((F(2, 35) = 4.62, p < .05)\).

### Table 32: ANOVA of the Monetary predictor variables on Employee Turnover Intentions, compared by generation groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S Ig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Millennial</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>192.007</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>96.004</td>
<td>36.006</td>
<td>.0001a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>1381.173</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>2.666</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1573.181</td>
<td>520</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GenX</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>126.642</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>63.321</td>
<td>22.424</td>
<td>.0001b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>700.305</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>2.824</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>826.947</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomer</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>33.718</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.859</td>
<td>4.618</td>
<td>.017b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>127.779</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.651</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>161.497</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: TurnoverInt_Group
b. Predictors: (Constant), Stock_Group, Pay_Group

A hierarchical multi linear regression was again conducted to determine if the different effects found when comparing generations was statistically significant. A hierarchical multi linear regression found that when adding generation to the model, the \(R^2\) only slightly improved by 1%. The second model, including the generation variable,
was found to be statistically significant \( (F(3, 807) = 43.57, p < .01) \). Also within the second model, Generation was found to be statistically significant (Beta .09, \( p < .01 \)).

Table 33: Generation effect on the relationship between monetary incentives and employee turnover intentions

Adding gender to a new block in the hierarchical multi linear regression found no increase in the overall fit of the model \( (R^2 \text{ change} = 0) \), and gender was not a significant predictor of the dependent variable.

Table 34: Model summary of the relationship between monetary incentives and employee turnover intentions adding both generation and gender
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION

Discussion of Results

Overall, the data led to mixed support of the overall hypotheses (Table 35). In general, the data did suggest support of generation having an effect on the relationship between the predictor variables and employee turnover intentions, however some results were mixed or only partially supported. Similarly, the data did show that there may also be a connection between gender and the overall model, suggesting further research may be warranted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Supported?</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Paid Time Off Satisfaction will have a negative effect on Employee Turnover Intentions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Paid Time Off Satisfaction will have a greater negative effect on Employee Turnover Intentions amongst Millennial employees than Generation X and Baby Boomer employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>There will be a positive correlation between Attitude toward Flexible Work Arrangements and Employee Turnover Intentions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Attitude toward Flexible Work Arrangements will have a greater effect on Employee Turnover Intentions among Millennial employees than Generation X and Baby Boomer employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>There will be a negative correlation between Employee Perk Desired Use and Employee Turnover Intentions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Employee Perk Desired Use will have a greater effect on Employee Turnover Intentions among Millennial employees than Generation X and Baby Boomer employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>There will be a negative correlation between Training Satisfaction and Employee Turnover Intentions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Training Satisfaction will have a greater effect on Employee Turnover Intentions among Millennial employees than Generation X and Baby Boomer employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Non-Monetary Incentives will have a greater effect on Employee Turnover Intentions among Millennial employees than older generations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Monetary Incentives will have a greater effect on Employee Turnover Intentions among Generation X and Baby Boomer employees than millennial employees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 35: Summary table of hypotheses and findings

Paid time off satisfaction was found to be a significant predictor of employee turnover intentions. The more dissatisfied respondents were with paid time off, turnover intentions were more likely. The independent variable was found to be negative
correlated to the dependent variable as predicted, thus supporting Hypothesis 1a. When looking at PTO satisfaction amongst the different generational groups, the strongest effect was seen among the Baby Boomer generation, followed by GenX, and lastly by Millennials. However, only the greater effect the Baby Boomer generation had when compared to the Millennial generation was found to be statistically significant, but when compared to GenX it was not.

While these findings partially supported the hypothesis that generation would have a moderating effect on the relationship between PTO satisfaction and employee turnover intentions, it would found to be contradictory to what was predicted. It was the Baby Boomer generation where this effect was the strongest, and weakest amongst the Millennial generation. Some Baby Boomers stated that they felt that they needed paid time off because it was important to them to be able to spend time with their family. When asked, what benefit, if offered to you, would be hardest for you to give up and why, another stated “time off, I love the freedom of time off”.

One possible reason for finding that paid time off actually has more of an effect on Baby Boomers rather than Millennials may be attributed to flexibility. As previously stated, Millennials are accustomed to balancing work and life responsibilities and working more flexibly than the Baby Boomer generation. Baby Boomers, on the other hand, were found to view career and family independent from one another (Jovic et al., 2006). As a result, Baby Boomers may feel they need more paid time off to spend time with their families whereas Millennials may feel they are able to accomplish this through flexibility.
A number of Millennials attributed their importance of flexibility to the importance to family time. On stated, that flexible work arrangements were of most importance because “if I gave them up, I would feel as if I were choosing work over my family”. Another said, “Flexible hours so I can spend time with family”. However, when Baby Boomers responded that flexibility was of top importance, none of the responses mentioned family. Instead, Baby Boomer viewed flexibility as a work convenience, with the benefit focused on telecommuting and work from home. This separation of career and family for Baby Boomers may be why they place such emphasis on paid time off.

Gender was also explored to see if this variable interacted with the relationship between paid time off satisfaction, generation, and employee turnover intentions. Through a hierarchical regression analysis, a statistically significant interaction was not found. As such, gender was not found to have an effect on the relationship between paid time off satisfaction, generation, and employee turnover intentions.

Attitude toward flexible work arrangements was found to have a positive correlation to employee turnover intentions rather than negative as predicted. Thus, Hypothesis 2a was not supported. One possible reason for this may be that respondents who have a strong positive attitude toward flexible work arrangements do not have flexibility in their current role, and desire to obtain flexibility through changing jobs.

Hypothesis 2b predicted that a stronger positive effect would be found among Millennial workers than workers of the older two generations. When comparing the effect of flexible work arrangement attitude by generational groups, it was found that flexible work arrangement attitude was only a significant predictor of employee turnover intentions amongst the Millennial generation. Millennials were found to have a stronger
positive effect when compared to GenX and Baby Boomers; however, only the Millennial
generation was found to be statistically significant. As such, the greater effect among
Millennial workers compared to the older two generations was not found to be
statistically significant. As a result, Hypothesis 2b was not supported.

However, the pairwise analysis and qualitative analysis did lend to some
interesting results. Through a pairwise comparison, Millennials chose flexible work
arrangements slightly more often than Baby Boomers did (53.4% of the time for
Millennials compared to 52.9% of the time for Baby Boomers). But, it was GenX who
placed the greatest importance on flexible work arrangements (58%).

The qualitative analysis yielded similar results. When asked what benefit at their
current employer was most important to them and why, Millennial respondents again
chose flexibility more often than Baby Boomers did. However, it was again the GenX
generation who chose flexibility most often. Similar results were seen when asked what
benefit, if offered to them, would be hardest to give up and why, as well as when asked,
what benefit is most important to you when considering a new job and why.

For all three of the open ended questions, GenX placed the greatest importance on
flexibility, followed by Millennials, and lastly followed by Baby Boomers. While these
results supported Millennials placing greater importance on flexibility than the baby
Boomer generation, it was the GenX generation that placed the greatest importance on
flexibility.

Generally, flexibility was one of the top factors chosen by Millennials; however
Gen X respondents indicated flexibility more often relative to other benefits. One reason
for this may be that Millennials have come to expect flexibility versus viewing it as a
benefit. The Millennial generation has entered the workforce with remote working options, video conferencing, and smart phones as the norm. Additionally, this generation has made work-life balance a priority. Millennials may view flexibility more as the norm where GenX employees may view flexibility as a great benefit to balance career and family.

Additionally, while both the qualitative and pairwise analysis found that amongst generations, Gen X respondents placed the most importance on flexibility, followed by Millennials, and lastly by Baby Boomers; it was also found that females place greater importance on flexibility across the board. In the pairwise analysis, female GenX respondents chose flexibility most often (64% of the time), while Baby Boomer men chose flexibility the least often (43% of the time). In the qualitative analysis, similar results were seen. Female GenX respondent’s places greatest importance on flexibility, and Baby Boomer male respondents indicated flexibility least often. These results indicate that gender does in fact effect the relationship between flexible work arrangements, generation and employee turnover intentions.

Employee perks desired use was not found to have a statistically significant effect of employee turnover intentions, thus Hypotheses 3a and 3b were not supported. However, in the pairwise analysis of the factors identified in the model, employee perks was only chosen most often amongst Millennials (43% of the time) followed by GenX (36%) followed by Baby Boomers (28%). This suggests that perks are a more important factor to the Millennial generations than to the older two generations as predicted, however this variable may not be a significant factor is deciding whether or not to leave a job or organization.
Training satisfaction was found to be a significant predictor of employee turnover intentions in the overall model thus supporting Hypothesis 1a. However, the greatest effect was found amongst the Baby Boomer generation, followed by GenX, and lastly by Millennials. The greater effect training had on turnover intentions between the Baby Boomer generation compared to Millennials was found to be statistically significant while the comparison to the GenX generation was not. While generation having a moderating effect on the relationship between training satisfaction and employee turnover intentions, the effect was weakest amongst Millennials. As such, Hypothesis 4b was not supported.

An ANOVA analysis of the Non-Monetary variables found that these four independent variables were statistically significant in predicting employee turnover intentions. It was also found that the effect was greatest among the Millennial generation, followed by GenX, and lastly by Baby Boomers, thus supporting hypothesis 5. Gender was added as a control variable to explore if it interacted with this relationship. However, it was found that gender did not appear to influence this relationship.

An ANOVA analysis of the monetary variables identified in the model, stock ownership satisfaction and pay satisfaction, found that these variables are statistically significant in predicting employee turnover intentions. However, Millennials were found to have the greatest effect followed by GenX respondents, and lastly by Baby Boomers. While this finding supports the hypothesis that generation moderates the relationship between the monetary variables and the dependent variable, it was found to be contradictory to what was predicted.
However, through the pairwise analysis, Baby Boomer chose monetary benefits over Non-Monetary benefits most often when compared to the other generations (63% of the time. This was followed by GenX, who chose monetary benefits 62% of the time, followed by Millennials who chose monetary benefits the least when compared to the older two generations (57% of the time).

Mixed results were found through a qualitative analysis. When asked, what benefit at your current employer is most important to you any way, Baby Boomer most often indicated monetary benefits (37% of the time), followed by GenX (26% of the time) and then Millennials whom indicated monetary benefits 25% of the time. However, when ask what benefit, if offered to you, would be hardest for you to give up and why, Baby Boomer and Millennials both chose monetary benefits 24% of the time, while GenX chose these benefits 19% of the time.

When exploring if gender interacts with the relationship between monetary incentives, generation, and employee turnover intentions, both the pairwise analysis and qualitative analysis found support for this. In the pairwise analysis, across all generations, male respondents chose monetary incentives more frequently than their female counterparts. In the qualitative analysis, when respondents were speaking to importance, male respondents of each generation indicated monetary incentives more often than their female counter parts in all but two instances.

The qualitative analysis also led to some interesting insights beyond the hypotheses proposed in this study. Most notably, one common reoccurring theme when respondents were asked to indicate the benefits most important to them was health insurance. May indicated that health insurance has become too expensive to carry on
their own. When asked, what benefit, if offered to you, would be hardest for you to give up and why, one respondent answered, “health insurance, because it's super expensive” while another said, “decent health care, affordable healthcare is hard to come by these days”.

Cost seemed to be the most prevalent factors to the importance of health insurance as an important benefit. Given the rising rates of health insurance as well as policy changes, corporate benefits for free and subsidized health insurance in likely becoming a more and more important factor for consideration when changing jobs. Future research is recommended to explore this relationship further.

The most interesting finding of the qualitative analysis was that when respondents were asked, what benefit is most important to you when considering a new job and why, 51% of the time respondents indicated compensation. It was found to be the number one factor across all genders, and all generations but a significant margin. Flexibility was the second indicator at only 17%. Compensation continues to be the top factor when changing jobs, and thus continues to be of upmost importance in the recruitment process and in the formal offer made to candidates.

However, when respondents were asked what was would be hardest give up, their competitive compensation was only chosen 18% of the time, and third important overall behind flexibility and paid time off. The same results were seen when asked what benefit at their current employer was most important to them. Compensation was only indicated 21% of the time.

When comparing the response between what benefit is most important to you when considering a new job and what benefit at your current employer is most important
to you, Millennials saw the largest change in indicating monetary benefits (29% reduction). Baby Boomers saw the least amount of change (11% reduction).

Similar results were found when comparing the response between, what benefit is most important to you when considering a new job and, what benefit would be hardest to give up, Millennials and GenX saw the largest change in indicating monetary benefits (both with a 30% reduction) while the gap in responses from Baby Boomers saw the least amount of change (24% reduction).

These findings suggest that there may be a significant difference in motivating factors when it comes to recruitment versus retention. While compensation appears to be the single most important factor when considering a new role and offer, compensation may not be the key to retention. Rather than annual raises, retention may be more effectively gained through providing employees with greater flexibility and increased paid time off. Additionally, this may be most imperative to consider when trying to retain Millennials workers.

It may be that competitive compensation is still a primary incentive when pursuing a new job, but perhaps rewarding employees through non-monetary incentives may be the key for retention. Given that work life balance was identified in the literature as a key value for Millennial employees, these findings may suggest that if they feel they have achieved this, they may be less likely to pursue other opportunities.

Limitations

The focus of this research was to better understand the effects of generation and how this variable moderates the relationship between predictor variables and turnover intentions. Amazon Mechanical Turk was used to collect data from a diverse
demographic participant pool across a variety of industries. As a result, this limited the
data collection to online surveys. More detailed qualitative analysis and interviews
would be suggested to gain insight into how different generations are motivated different
to stay in or leave their current position.

In addition, a limitation of the research was the small representation of the Baby
Boomer generation. A larger sample size of Baby Boomer respondents may lead to more
statistically significant results when comparing generational cohorts. The qualitative
insights from this generation were limited as a result of the small sample size. A larger
type of Baby Boomer respondents may also lead to more insightful open ended
responses.

Because of the vast predictors of employee turnover intentions identified in the
literature, the scope of this study was limited to those variables that are relevant at time of
hire. Additional research is suggested to explore the effect generation has on other
predictors of employee turnover intentions. Additionally, the research indicated that
Health Insurance should be considered for further exploration.

The qualitative responses suggested that the rising costs of health care may be a
primary factor in indicating this to be an important factor in career decisions. While this
factor may be financially motivated, further exploration and research is need to better
understand how Health Insurance may play a role in employee turnover intentions.

Additionally, the exploratory study of the role gender plays in the overall
conceptual model suggests that this relationship warrants additional empirical research.
There is some evidence that gender may influence the relationship between the predictor
variables and employee turnover intentions in addition to generational considerations.
Human capital is often thought to be the lifeblood of a corporation and its success. In order to sustain their competitive advantage and ensure future success, it is imperative for firms to retain their resources and talent. With Millennials coming in and saturating the workforce, their shift in preferences and values cannot be ignored. As a result of this shift, it can be expected that the motivational factors that influence this generation have also changed. Given the research completed to date and the emphasis this generation places on flexibility, convenience, and leisure time, it can be expected that the non-monetary offerings will have a negative impact on Millennial turnover.

Employee incentives are known to influence employee behavior; whether it be using stock options as incentives to influence level of risk taking (Deutsch, Keil, & Laamanen, 2011) or momentary incentives to motivate knowledge transfer (Fey & Furu, 2008). Multi-generational firms need to ensure that the packages they offering to employees incentivized them to stay at the firm long term.

The contributions of this research are twofold. First, from an academic perspective this research expands upon the research that has already been done to date, and explores a gap in today’s literature, the cross section between employee turnover intention theory and generation theory, and the interaction with employee turnover intentions. The findings of this study suggest that an employee’s generation does in fact have an effect on predictor variables and their relationship with employee turnover intentions.
Furthermore, the findings suggest that an additional effect may exist when adding gender to the overall conceptual model. This leads the way for future studies to expand upon this topic of inquiry.

From a practitioner perspective, this research provides important insights that can be applied to recruitment and retention practices and human resources strategies. In today’s business world, firms struggle with employee turnover and how to keep their best talent. More specifically, corporations today struggle to retain workers of the Millennial generation.

This research suggests that while competitive compensation remains one of the most important factors when choosing to accept an offer for a new role, compensation may not be the key to effective retention. This also appears to be particularly true for the Millennial generation. Rather than competitive raises, increased paid time off and increased flexibility may be more effective in retaining Millennial talent.

The qualitative data collection uncovered some themes in responses that seem to suggest that the lines between flex time and paid time off have become blurred. The respondents indicated both PTO and flexibility as been of prime importance in order to spend time with their families, and also taking care of personal or family needs. It seems that Millennial workers have grown accustomed to using flexibility to find work life balance, while Baby Boomers place great value in paid time off. This distinct difference in preferences between the different generations builds upon the existing literature and provides new insights for human resource leaders.

The findings from this study will help human resource leaders and strategic leadership teams understand the primary factors that are important to the workforce, and
specifically the Millennial generation. This provides useful information for companies to tailor competitive employment packages, as well as employee benefits, to be best suited to recruit valuable talent. But, more importantly, the findings from this research may be more impactful for retention strategies, and may contribute to reducing significant costs associated with recruiting and replacing talented workers.

Given the number of Millennials entering into the workforce and leadership positions, it will be critically important for corporations to retain their talent and knowledge in order to remain competitive. The contributions from this research can help companies set effective human resource strategies to retain and foster talent.
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: IRB PROTOCOL FORM

1) Abstract of the study

Millennials are entering the workforce in droves and quickly becoming dominant players in the workforce. However, this generation has a reputation for their lack of loyalty to their employers and their tendency to job hop from one job to the next. Given the cost to recruit, hire, and train their replacements, it’s imperative to understand what motivates this generation of workers and how to incentivize them to stay with their current employers. This research will focus on how generation moderates the effects of non-monetary incentives and monetary incentives on employee turnover.

2) Protocol Title

Understanding Employee Turnover Intentions amongst Millennial Workers

3) Investigator

Caitlin Kane, DBA Candidate, Fox School of Business, Temple University

4) Objectives

This study is intended learn what factors are considered when an employee intends to leave an organization.

5) Rationale and Significance

This study examines the turnover intentions of workers across generations, and the factors considered when an employee intends to leave an organization. We expect that subjects in the Millennial generation will put more consideration in Non-Monetary incentives than Monetary Incentives in comparison to subjects in older generations. The outcome of this study is expected to have significance on Human Resource strategies.

6) Resources and Setting

All researchers have passed the CITI training. An on-line questionnaire will be distributed on Amazon Mechanical Turk using Qualtrics.

7) Prior Approvals

N/A

8) Study Design

a) Recruitment Methods

Subjects will be obtained by posting the study on the Amazon Mechanical Turk.
b) **Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria**

Subjects must be 18 years old and working 20 or more hours per week for pay.

c) **Study Timelines**

The duration of the questionnaire is estimated to be 15 minutes. The study is expected to be completed within 12 months of IRB approval.

d) **Study Procedures and Data Analysis**

To participate in the study, the survey will be posted on Amazon Mechanical Turk. Participants will receive compensation for participation. All subjects who participate will receive approximately $1 for completing the online survey. The payment will be made automatically via the Amazon payment system. Due to the nature of payment system, there will be up to 24 hours delay in payment after the subject completes the study. Data will be analyzed using regression analysis in SPSS.

e) **Withdrawal of Subjects**

Participants are free to withdraw from the survey at any time without penalty. However, if they choose to not complete the study then they will not receive compensation.

f) **Privacy & Confidentiality**

This study will not use or disclose subjects’ Protected Health Information (PHI).

Data from the study will be stored on a password protected computer, in a locked home or office.

No personal identifiable information will be included in the data set.

The data will be reported in terms of statistical summaries only.

The data will not be shared with others other than in aggregate terms for dissertation or journal publication purposes.

9) **Risks to Subjects**

I do not foresee any risks or discomforts associated with this study other than those encountered in day-to-day life.

10) **Potential Benefits to Subjects**

There are no immediate benefits to the subjects except for payment for completion of the questionnaire. All subjects who participate will receive approximately $1 for completing the online survey. The payment will be made automatically via the Amazon payment system. Due to the nature of payment system, there will be up to 24 hours delay in payment after the subject completes the study.
11) Costs to Subjects

There are no costs to the subjects.

12) Informed Consent

The consent process will take place prior to subjects' participation in the questionnaire. A waiver of written document of informed consent is requested as this research presents no more than minimal risk of harm to subjects and does not involve procedures for which written consent is normally required outside of the research context. In order to preserve confidentiality, the informed consent form will be electronically agreed to by the participants before gaining access to the online survey. The Statement on consent will read:

Statement of Consent: By clicking on the link to the survey below I am agreeing that I have read the above information, have received answers to any questions I asked, and I am over the age of 18 years old. I consent to take part in the study.

13) Vulnerable Populations

This study does not involve any listed vulnerable populations (adolescents, pregnant women, prisoners, adults unable to consent). We will not ascertain pregnancy status of subjects, in order to protect their privacy, however.
APPENDIX B: EMPLOYEE TURNOVER INTENTIONS CONSENT FORM

Research study: Understanding Employee Turnover Intentions Amongst Millennial Workers

Name and Department of Investigators:

Caitlin Kane, Fox Business School, DBA Candidate

What is the Purpose of this study? The purpose of this study is intended to learn what factors are considered when an employee intends to leave an organization. You must be working at least 20 hours per week for pay to take part in this study.

What we will ask you to do? This study consists of a questionnaire. The total estimated duration is 5 minutes. The questionnaire will include questions about your job, your work schedule, pay and benefit satisfaction, and your intention to leave your organization.

Risks & Benefits of this study? I do not foresee any risks or discomforts associated with this study other than those encountered in day-to-day life. There will be no costs for participating. The benefit to you as a participant is the payment the completion of the questionnaire.

Confidentiality: Your Amazon account information will be kept for tracking purposes only so we can pay you for your work. A limited number of research team members will have access to the data during data collection. This information, along with any other personally identifiable information about you, will be stripped from the final dataset. Efforts will be made to limit the disclosure of any personal information to people who have a need to review this information. However, the study team cannot promise complete secrecy.

The study is voluntary: Your participation in this survey is voluntary. You may decline to answer any question and you have the right to withdraw from participation at any time without penalty.

Who can I talk to about this research? If you have any questions, concerns, or complaints about this study, or feel that this research has hurt you please contact the research team by calling (781) 910-3455 or by e-mailing tug29369@temple.edu.

This research has been reviewed and approved by the Temple University Institutional Review Board. Please contact them at (215) 707-3390 or e-mail them at irb@temple.edu for any of the following: questions, concerns, or complaints about the research; questions about your rights; to obtain information; or to offer input.
Statement of Consent: By clicking on the link to the survey below I am agreeing that I have read the above information, have received answers to any questions I asked, and I am over the age of 18 years old. I consent to take part in the study.

Confidentiality: Efforts will be made to limit the disclosure of your personal information, including research study records, to people who have a need to review this information. However, the study team cannot promise complete secrecy. For example, although the study team has put in safeguards to protect your information, there is always a potential risk of loss of confidentiality. There are several organizations that may inspect and copy your information to make sure that the study team is following the rules and regulations regarding research and the protection of human subjects. These organizations include the IRB, Temple University, its affiliates and agents, Temple University Health System, Inc., its affiliates and agents, and the Office for Human Research Protections.

☐ By clicking on the link to the survey below I am agreeing that I am over 18 years old and to participate in this research project.
APPENDIX C: EMPLOYEE TURNOVER INTENTIONS SURVEY

Instructions

Thank you for your participation. This survey is intended to gain your thoughts and opinions about employee retention and turnover. The survey should only take a few minutes to complete. Please be assured that all of your answers will be kept strictly confidential. Your input is very much appreciated!

Questions
Please indicate the level of likelihood of each of the following questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Extremely likely (1)</th>
<th>Moderately likely (2)</th>
<th>Slightly likely (3)</th>
<th>Neither likely nor unlikely (4)</th>
<th>Slightly unlikely (5)</th>
<th>Moderately unlikely (6)</th>
<th>Extremely unlikely (7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How likely is it that you will look for a job outside of your organization in the foreseeable future? (1)</td>
<td>[●]</td>
<td>[●]</td>
<td>[●]</td>
<td>[●]</td>
<td>[●]</td>
<td>[●]</td>
<td>[●]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you think about quitting your job at your organization? (2)</td>
<td>[●]</td>
<td>[●]</td>
<td>[●]</td>
<td>[●]</td>
<td>[●]</td>
<td>[●]</td>
<td>[●]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If it were possible, how much would you like to get a new job outside of your current employer? (3)</td>
<td>[●]</td>
<td>[●]</td>
<td>[●]</td>
<td>[●]</td>
<td>[●]</td>
<td>[●]</td>
<td>[●]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following question is intended to understand your use of flexible work arrangements. Please select one of the four responses for each item below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not offered to me but I don't need it (1)</th>
<th>Not offered to me but I could use it (2)</th>
<th>Offered to me but not used (3)</th>
<th>Offered to me and I use it (4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flexitime (1)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compressed working week (2)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommuting (3)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time work (4)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Sharing (5)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following questions are intended to measure your attitude towards flexible work arrangements. Please respond to each of the below questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flexible work arrangements would help balance life commitments (1)</th>
<th>Strongly agree (1)</th>
<th>Somewhat agree (2)</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree (3)</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I cannot afford the loss of pay associated with most flexible work options (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible work options do not suit me because they would make me feel disconnected from the workplace (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working shorter hours would negatively impact my career progress within the organization (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working more flexible hours is essential for me in order to attend to family and personal responsibilities (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible working arrangements are essential for me to participate in family, social, and personal events (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible working arrangements would enable me to focus more on the job when I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>am at the workplace (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People at my workplace would react negatively to people using</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flexible working arrangements (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People using flexible working arrangements usually have less</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commitment to their work role (9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People using flexible working arrangements would often miss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>important work events or communications, such as staff meetings,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>training sessions, important notices, etc (10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would not be able to do paid work at all, if I could not use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flexible work arrangements (11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The below questions are intended to understand your satisfaction with your paid time off at your current employer. Please indicate your level of satisfaction with the items below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Extremely satisfied (1)</th>
<th>Somewhat satisfied (2)</th>
<th>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (3)</th>
<th>Somewhat dissatisfied (4)</th>
<th>Extremely dissatisfied (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vacation policy (1)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of paid weeks vacation I currently receive (2)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of paid holidays (3)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of paid sick leave days (4)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The below questions are intended to understand your desire to use of each of the following, if your employer provided it to you. Please indicate to what extent you would like to use each of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Always (1)</th>
<th>Most of the time (2)</th>
<th>About half the time (3)</th>
<th>Sometimes (4)</th>
<th>Never (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Company-provided computers (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company provided phone or phone plan (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasing work environment (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coworkers as a social support system (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company parties (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company gym or exercise classes (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company provided meals (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company provided alcohol (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company provided snacks and non-alcoholic beverages (9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pet friendly environment (10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company swag and free gear (11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-site laundry services (12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-site electronic entertainment systems (video games) (13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-site recreational activities (ping pong, etc) (14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following questions relate to your pay satisfaction. For each statement, please indicate your level of satisfaction:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Extremely satisfied (1)</th>
<th>Somewhat satisfied (2)</th>
<th>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (3)</th>
<th>Somewhat dissatisfied (4)</th>
<th>Extremely dissatisfied (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My take-home pay (1)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My most recent raise (2)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence my supervisor has on my pay (3)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My current salary (4)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The raises I have typically received in the past (5)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My overall level of pay (6)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of my current salary (7)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How my raises are determined (8)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following questions are intended to understand your attitude toward stock ownership. Please indication your level of agreement with each of the statements below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree (8)</th>
<th>Agree (9)</th>
<th>Somewhat agree (10)</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree (11)</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree (12)</th>
<th>Disagree (13)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree (14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Because of having employee ownership, work is/would be more satisfying (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I really don't care about the employee ownership plan at my company (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am/would be proud to own stock in my company (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee ownership at my company makes/would make day-to-day work more enjoyable (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owning stock at my company makes/would make me want to stay longer at my company than it otherwise would without stock ownership (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is very</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**important to me that my company have an employee stock ownership plan (6)**

Stock ownership in my company makes/would make me more interested in my company’s financial success (7)

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Employee ownership at my company gives/would give a greater share in the company profit (8)

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The below questions are intended to measure your level of satisfaction with training at your current employer. Please indicate your level of agreement to each of the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Agree very much (7)</th>
<th>Agree moderately (8)</th>
<th>Agree slightly (9)</th>
<th>Disagree slightly (10)</th>
<th>Disagree moderately (11)</th>
<th>Disagree very much (12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>My department provides learning/training opportunities to meet the changing needs of my workplace</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In my department, learning is planned and purposeful rather than accidental</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In my department, people are interested in both personal and professional development</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training and development are encouraged and rewarded in my department</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I view my education on-the-job as a continuous, lifelong endeavor</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I am proactive in seeking ways to improve what I do</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I deliberately seek out learning opportunities rather than waiting to be</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I have learning goals designed to enhance my current work assignment and to prepare me for future positions.

Overall, the on-the-job training I receive is applicable to my job.

Overall, the training I receive on the job meets my needs.

Overall, I am satisfied with the amount of training I receive on the job.

I am generally able to use what I learn in on-the-job training in my job.

The following series of 15 questions are intended to understand for each pair, which factor is more important to you when considering leaving your current employer.
Please select the below factor that is most important to you when considering leaving your current employer

- Paid Time Off (1)
- Competitive Salary (2)

Please select the below factor that is most important to you when considering leaving your current employer

- Employee Perks (1)
- Flexible Work Arrangements (2)

Please select the below factor that is most important to you when considering leaving your current employer

- Training (1)
- Paid Time Off (2)

Please select the below factor that is most important to you when considering leaving your current employer

- Stock Ownership (1)
- Competitive Pay (2)
Please select the below factor that is most important to you when considering leaving your current employer

- Paid Time Off (1)
- Flexible Work Arrangements (2)

Please select the below factor that is most important to you when considering leaving your current employer

- Employee Perks (1)
- Paid Time Off (2)

Please select the below factor that is most important to you when considering leaving your current employer

- Stock Ownership (1)
- Training (2)

Please select the below factor that is most important to you when considering leaving your current employer

- Flexible Work Arrangements (1)
- Stock Ownership (2)
Please select the below factor that is most important to you when considering leaving your current employer

☐ Competitive Pay (1)
☐ Employee Perks (2)

Please select the below factor that is most important to you when considering leaving your current employer

☐ Training (1)
☐ Flexible Work Arrangements (2)

Please select the below factor that is most important to you when considering leaving your current employer

☐ Stock Ownership (1)
☐ Paid Time Off (2)
Please select the below factor that is most important to you when considering leaving your current employer

- Employee Perks (1)
- Training (2)

Please select the below factor that is most important to you when considering leaving your current employer

- Competitive Pay (1)
- Flexible Work Arrangements (2)

Please select the below factor that is most important to you when considering leaving your current employer

- Stock Ownership (1)
- Employee Perks (2)

Please select the below factor that is most important to you when considering leaving your current employer

- Training (1)
- Competitive Pay (2)
What is your age?

________________________________________________________________

Please select the most appropriate answer to describe your current employment

▼ Employed full time (1) ... Disabled (7)

Please select your gender

☐ Male (1)
☐ Female (2)

Please select your highest level of education

☐ Less than high school (1)
☐ High school graduate (2)
☐ Some college (3)
☐ 2 year degree (4)
☐ 4 year degree (5)
☐ Professional degree (6)
☐ Doctorate (7)
Please select your marital status

- Married (1)
- Widowed (2)
- Divorced (3)
- Separated (4)
- Never married (5)
What industry do you currently work in? Please select the best answer from the below list.

- Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting (1)
- Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation (2)
- Broadcasting (3)
- College, University, and Adult Education (4)
- Computer and Electronics Manufacturing (5)
- Construction (6)
- Finance and Insurance (7)
- Government and Public Administration (8)
- Health Care and Social Assistance (9)
- Hotel and Food Services (10)
- Information Services and Data Processing (11)
- Legal Services (12)
- Military (13)
- Mining (14)
- Other Education Industry (15)
- Other Information Industry (16)
- Other Manufacturing (17)
- Primary/Secondary (K-12) Education (18)
- Publishing (19)
- Real Estate, Rental and Leasing (20)
- Religious (21)
- Retail (22)
- Scientific or Technical Services (23)
- Software (24)
- Telecommunications (25)
- Transportation and Warehousing (26)
- Utilities (27)
- Wholesale (28)
- Other Industry (29)
What year were you born?

What benefit at your current employer is most important to you and why?

What benefit is most important to you when considering a new job and why?

What benefit, if offered to you, would be hardest for you to give up and why?
Timing
First Click (1)
Last Click (2)
Page Submit (3)
Click Count (4)

Please make note of the 5 digit code below - You will need to input this code in Amazon Mechanical Turk to indicate you have completed this survey. Once you have done this, please click the button on the bottom of this page to submit your answers. You will not receive credit unless you click this button.
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