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This study examined the motivational differences across the major generations and the specific cusps between the Veterans and Baby Boomers, between Baby Boomers and Generation X, and between Generation X and Generation Y.

Data were collected from 1,098 self-selected employees of a large healthcare system in the Midwest. A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was performed to statistically analyze the data. Significant differences in the sources of motivation among the four generations and the cusps of generations for four of the five MSI subscales were identified.

Intrinsic process motivation was found to be significantly higher for Generation Y than Generation X, Baby Boomers, and the cusp between Baby Boomer and Generation X. Intrinsic process was also significantly higher for Generation X than Baby Boomers and the cusp between Baby Boomer and Generation X.

Instrumental motivation of Generation Y was significantly higher than Generation X, Baby Boomers, and the cusp between Baby Boomer and Generation X. The Generation X cohort identified instrumental motivation to be significantly higher than Baby Boomers, and Baby Boomers were significantly higher than the cusp between Baby Boomer and Generation X.
Generation Y was significantly higher than Generation X, Baby Boomers, and the cusp between Baby Boomer and Generation X in self-concept external. Generation X was significantly higher in self-concept external when compared to the cusp between Baby Boomer and Generation X.

The Baby Boomer cohort was significantly higher than Generation Y and Generation X in goal internalization. The cohort in the cusp between Baby Boomer and Generation X identified Goal Internal to be significantly higher than Generation X and Baby Boomers.

No statistically significant differences were identified between the generations for self-concept internal.

The results of this study support previous research findings of significant differences in the sources of motivation among the generations. Understanding the generational differences in the sources of motivation provides a realistic means for organizations to adapt practices and policies related to recruitment, retention, and engagement of a multigenerational workforce.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Today’s workforce is more age diverse than at any other time in history. Sometimes described as the “generation gap”—or more accurately in today’s workforce, several generation gaps—these gaps play a significant role for organizational leaders. Employees from different generations have different experiences, goals, and expectations, potentially causing difficulty as they work side by side (Kogan, 2001). The four generations in today’s workforce consist of Veterans, Baby Boomers, Generation X, and Generation Y.

As another generation of workers enters the workforce, this multigenerational workforce continues to be a topic of interest in the applicable literature. This interest is the result of the recognition of a change in the age demographics of the workforce (Pitt-Catsouphes & Smyer, 2007). It is predicted that by 2015 the U.S. population over the age of 65 will increase by 26%, and that for every two experienced workers that leave the workforce only one will enter it (Eisner, 2005). Veterans and Baby Boomers are exiting the workforce at a slower rate than anticipated and, in some cases, rejoining the workforce. According to the Congressional Budget Office’s (2011) labor force projections, there is no single explanation to the increase in labor force participation among older workers. The aged 55-plus labor force generally showed consistent increases, rising from 27.1 million to 33.1 million between 2007 and 2012 (Rix, 2013). The widening age demographic amongst the multiple generations in the workforce is compelling employers to consider how generational differences can present both opportunities and challenges in work performance and productivity. Leaders must take
into account the values, views on authority, attitudes towards work, and communication style of each generation. These differences clearly impact each generation’s expectations of their leaders and of the work environment (Stanley, 2010).

One of the major issues facing organizations today is motivation (Wiley, 1997), and organizational success is dependent on motivated employees who are satisfied with their jobs (Robbins, 2003). Motivation is a significant factor in job satisfaction, productivity, and performance as demonstrated by the theories surrounding motivation (e.g., Alderfer, 1969; Bandura, 1986; Deci, 1975; Hackman & Oldham, 1980; Herzberg, 1968; Katz & Kahn, 1978; Leonard, Beauvais, & Scholl, 1999; Locke & Latham, 1990; Maslow, 1943; McClelland, 1961; Murray, 1951; Vroom, 1964). While progress has been made to identify individuals’ sources of motivation and factors that affect motivation in the workplace, the application of this knowledge presents a challenge with a multigenerational workforce.

Healthcare is one of many organizations expected to be impacted by the large number of Baby Boomers existing the workforce and cause a shortfall of healthcare providers in the near future. According to the Center for Workforce Studies of the Association of American Medical Colleges, as of 2009, 40% of current U.S. doctors are over the age of 55. In addition, about 30% of today’s working nurses are over the age of 50, and more than half of them could retire in the next 10 years. The shortage of other healthcare workers is equally concerning. Hospitals nationwide report vacancy rates of 13% for pharmacists, 15% for radiology technicians, 10% for laboratory technologists, and 5% for housekeeping and maintenance staff (First Consulting Group, 2001).
Given the potential staffing challenges in healthcare, a study to investigate the generational difference in work motivation of healthcare workers is timely. Understanding these differences in work motivation can help leaders to create work environments that are conducive to job satisfaction for all generations in the workforce.

**Defining Generations**

A generational cohort refers to an “identifiable group that shares birth years, age location, and significant life events at critical developmental stages” (Kupperschmidt, 2000, p. 66). Generational differences are believed to occur as the result of significant influences in the environment during an individual’s early development and socialization, which impact the development of personality, values, and beliefs that then remain stable into adulthood (Macky, Gardner, & Forsyth, 2008).

It has been suggested that generations evolve cyclically rather than linearly (Howe & Strauss, 2007; Lancaster & Stillman, 2002). Each generation breaks away from the previous generation, scrutinizes the adult excesses of the generation prior to that, and replaces the fundamental nature and spirit of the departing generation (Rickes, 2010). The concept of generation in sociological study was first introduced by Mannheim (1952). Researchers agree that there are four broad generations of employees, although they differ slightly on the exact years of birth that constitute each generation. The generational cohorts include: Veteran (1922-1944), Baby Boomer (1945-1964), Generation X (1965-1981), and Generation Y (1982-2000) (Howe & Strauss, 2000; Lancaster & Stillman, 2002).

The shared formative experiences of a generational cohort define them as an identifiable group. However, the periods immediately before and after a generation forms
may have large numbers of individuals unaffected by the same experiences (King, 2005). Typically, four generations have been identified in the research. Mitchell (2003) recognizes that there is a subgroup in the Silent (Veteran) generation, referred to as the Swing generation. This subgroup consists of activists and free thinkers who were born in the later years of the Silent birth period, which created a fifth generation. Zemke, Raines, and Filipczak (2000) proposed subdividing the generations into two halves. They consider the subgroup born between 1930 and 1943 as the Sandwich group. These individuals’ beliefs and attitudes float between the Veterans and Baby Boomers. A similar subdivision can be made between early and late Baby Boomers and Generation X.

Lancaster and Stillman (2002) recognize the existence of cusps between generations. Similarly, Wellner (2000) argued for a “Generation Jones,” which overlaps the end of the Baby Boomer and beginning of the Generation X periods. The individuals born near the beginning or end of a generation do not closely resemble those born in the middle. Zemke et al. (2000) noted that individuals born in these cusps may actually identify with both generations.

In 2006 Baby Boomers began turning 59½ years of age and could access their 401K retirement monies (Callanan & Greenhaus, 2008). In January 2008 Baby Boomers began turning 62 and were eligible for Social Security benefits (Cutler, 2008). These events signal the onset of retirement for Baby Boomers, which make up 34% of the total workforce and hold nearly 41% of executive, administrative, and managerial positions (Dohm, 2000). As this group of individuals leaves the workforce, they take with them 40-50 years of organizational knowledge as well as their loyalty, competiveness, and strong work ethic. While on the other end of the continuum, Generation Y workers, a group that
is approximately 70 million strong, are entering the job market. (Eisner, 2005; Zemke et al., 2000). These individuals are financially savvy, grew up in the digital age, and bring new demands to the workplace (Eisner, 2005; Zemke et al., 2000). Motivation has been shown to be linked to job satisfaction, productivity, and performance (Mitchell, Holtom, Lee, Sablynski, & Erez, 2001). Understanding the sources of motivation for each generation will provide insight into our multigenerational workforce. This information can assist employers in recruitment and retention strategies as well as maintaining performance and productivity of a multigenerational workforce.

Generational differences have been studied in relation to work values (Lyons, Duxbury, & Higgins, 2005; Smola & Sutton, 2002), job satisfaction (Eskildsen, Kristensen, & Westlund, 2004; Jurkiewicz, Massey, & Brown, 1998), career motivation (Greller, 2000), personality and motivation (Wong, Gardiner, Lang, & Coulon, 2008), work-related motivational factors (Jurkiewicz, 2000), psychological traits (Twenge & Campbell, 2008), and sources of motivation (Barbuto & Miller, 2008). While the research on generational differences continues to grow, the effects of these differences vary in the reported research.

**Defining Motivation**

Motivation is typically described as a force, either intrinsic or extrinsic, that helps us achieve our goals. The discussions around motivation are concerned with what energizes and directs human behavior and how the behavior is maintained. Various theories exist around motivation and are generally classified as either content theories or process theories. In content theory, it is believed that an individual possesses factors that
energize, direct, and sustain behavior. Process theories of motivation are concerned with how behavior is energized, directed, and sustained (Porter, Bigley, & Steers, 2003).

Maslow (1943), Alderfer (1969), and McClelland (1961) addressed motivation based on an individual’s needs. Herzberg (1968) was the first to identify factors that improved work motivation. These are the four most prominent content theories of motivation. In the process theories, human decision processes are in part responsible for an individual’s behavior. Locke’s (1996) goal setting theory and Vroom’s (1964) expectancy theory explored work motivation from a dynamic process.

There are a number of theories pertaining to work motivation. Ryan and Deci (1985) proposed an intrinsic/extrinsic model, identifying self-determination on a continuum of motivation. Hackman and Oldham (1980) proposed a model in which meaningfulness of work, responsibility, and knowledge and outcomes are necessary characteristics for high motivation. Kanfer, Chen and Pritchard (2008) contend that “work motivation is a psychological process that influences how personal effort and resources are allocated to action pertaining to work, including the duration, intensity, and persistence of these actions” (p. 5).

Work motivation has been explored from various perspectives and is clearly a complex phenomenon. No one theory has been adequate to sufficiently understand the topic. Leonard et al. (1999) proposed an integrative taxonomy of motivation in response to the increasing diversity in organizational settings. They identified five basic sources of motivation: intrinsic process motivation, extrinsic or instrumental motivation, self-concept external, self-concept internal, and motivation based on goal internalization.
Barbuto and Scholl (1998) developed the Motivation Sources Inventory (MSI) to measure this new taxonomy.

The age demographic of the current workforce continues to widen. Knowledge of the generational differences of work motivation will provide managers and leaders with practical management implications to retain and recruit an engaged, motivated, and productive workforce by modifying tasks and responsibilities that recognize an employee’s source of motivation.

Purpose Statement

Studies have examined various effects of generation on work-related behaviors. While data exists exploring the relationship between motivation and generations, it has been inconclusive. The previous study exploring generational differences using the MSI identified differences in the sources of motivation between Baby Boomers and Generation X. Generation Y was excluded in the previous study due to a disproportionately small sample size. Studying a population sample that may include an adequate number of Generation Y participants will add to the body of research on generations and motivation.

Previous research on generations has explored only full cohort of generations. Popular literature recognizes those periods directly before or after a generational cohort as the cusps of the generations (Lancaster & Stillman, 2002; Zemke et al., 2000). In addition to the generations, this study will also look at the cusps of generations.

The purpose of this study is to examine the motivational differences across the major generations and the specific cusps between the Veterans and Baby Boomers, between Baby Boomers and Generation X, and between Generation X and Generation Y.
**Research Questions**

1. Are there key differences in the sources of motivation between Veterans, Baby Boomers, Generation X, and Generation Y?

2. Are there key differences in the sources of motivation of individuals born in the cusps between Veterans and Baby Boomers, Baby Boomers and Generation X, and Generation X and Generation Y?

**Limitations and Delimitations**

A limitation of this study is the broad applicability or generalization of the findings. The scope of the study was limited to self-selected employees of a large healthcare system in the Midwest. Therefore, this research will not be descriptive for all healthcare employees. While further research may eventually support these findings to be generalizable, this study can only apply to the employees who served as participants.

**Definitions**

*Generational cohorts* - Share birth years and have a common bond based on significant historical, political, economic, and social events occurring during their formative years. Veteran cohort was born between 1922-1945. Baby Boomer cohort was born between 1946-1964. Generation X cohort was born between 1965-1981. Generation Y cohort was born between 1982-2000. Baby Boomer Generation X cusp cohort was born between 1960-1965. Generation X Generation Y cohort was born between 1978-1983.

*Intrinsic process* - This motive describes individuals who primarily want to engage in activities that are pleasurable or things they consider fun (Leonard et al., 1999).
Extrinsic/instrumental - Individuals extrinsically or instrumentally motivated perceive their behavior will lead to tangible outcomes such as pay, bonuses, or promotions (Leonard et al., 1999).

Self-concept external - This source of motivation is externally based. Individuals seek affirmation of traits and competencies. This motive focuses on the individual’s reputation and the concern with others’ opinion of their work (Leonard et al., 1999).

Self-concept internal - These individuals are inner driven. They seek out new challenges at work, and are interested in developing and improving their abilities (Leonard et al., 1999).

Goal internalization - These individuals let their principles guide their choices. They are not concerned for themselves, but the greater good (Leonard et al., 1999).

Significance

Today’s multigenerational workforce has increasingly attracted the attention of employers as it relates to recruitment, retention, training, and employee engagement (Pitt-Catsouphes & Smyer, 2007). It is not difficult to find stories and articles in popular literature concerning the different generational cohorts in the workforce. However, the study of generational differences is relatively new in empirical research and findings to date have been inconclusive. It is well documented that workplace motivation can affect a variety of organizational behaviors, so to study the sources of motivation of the four generations (Veteran, Baby Boomer, Generation X, and Generation Y) present in today’s workforce will build on the current knowledge of work preferences of the generations. The results of the study may provide managers and leaders with practical management
implications to retain and recruit an engaged, motivated, and productive generationally diverse workforce.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter will explore relevant research on motivation and generational theories to establish a foundation for this study. The review includes an overview of contemporary theories of motivation, a historical overview of generational theory, and a review of modern generational theory as it pertains to the four generations included in this study.

Motivation

The word motivation originates from the Latin word for movement, movere. The importance of motivation in the workplace is portrayed by the equation introduced by N. R. F. Maier: job performance = ability x motivation (Latham, 2007). Researchers in the motivation field have found three common characteristics in the definitions of motivation that include an idea or event that energizes, guides, and sustains human behavior over time (Steers, Mowday, & Shapiro, 2004).

While there are several definitions for motivation, Mitchell (1982) defines motivation as “those psychological processes that cause the arousal, direction, and persistence of voluntary actions that are goal directed” (p. 81). Rudolph and Kleiner (1989) define motivation as “the development of a desire within an employee to perform a task to his or her greatest ability based on that individual’s own initiative” (p. i). Motivation theory research is concerned with identifying those things that generate enough arousal, intensity, or desire to cause people to act toward goal achievement (Mitchell, 1982; Rudolph & Kleiner, 1989).
Current research suggests that the study of motivation originated in the 19th century; however, the earliest approaches date back to the time of the Greek philosophers. The viewpoint at this time was the concept of hedonism: seeking pleasure and avoiding pain (Steers et al., 2004). This theory of motivation was refined over the 17th and 18th centuries, and by the end of the 19th century motivation moved from the philosophical field to the newly established psychology field.

Models described as instinct theories were developed by behavioral scientists. McDougall (as cited in McClelland, 1966) claimed that certain behavior tendencies were instinctive and common to every race. Thirteen instinctive propensities were identified by McDougall that included food-seeking, disgust, sex, fear, protective and parental, self-assertive, and acquisitive. Instincts identified by James (Steers et al., 2004) were similar to McDougall and included instincts such as locomotion, curiosity, sociability, fear, jealousy, and sympathy.

The development of models based on drive or reinforcement began to emerge as limitations of the instinct theories increased. During this evolution of motivation theory, the scientific management movement began. Frederick Taylor’s (1911) intent was to contrast the unscientific approaches practiced in traditional management settings and implement a scientific approach to managerial decision making. Taylor believed in individual rewards as opposed to group rewards, noting that group work undermined individual productivity, thereby decreasing personal ambition. Taylor’s scientific management approach that incorporated time and motion studies, standardization, job training, pay for performance, scientific employee selection, increased operating efficiency, shortened work week with rest periods, and shared rewards appeared to be
objectively valid. However, failure to follow through with components that impacted employee satisfaction discredited the model (Locke, 1968; Steers et al., 2004). Social influences on behavior, the role of group dynamics, and the multiple motivational influences on employees came under consideration in the 1930s (Steers et al., 2004). During this time, the human resources movement emerged noting that low morale of employees was the result of management’s failure to treat workers as human beings (Steers et al., 2004).

Content-based theories began to emerge in the 1940s. These theories identify the “why” of motivation—the sources of human motivation (Barbuto, 2006). Maslow’s hierarchy of needs is one of the early content-based theories of motivation. Maslow identified basic needs as the premise for motivation. He categorized these needs as deficiency needs (needs to be mastered before developing a healthy personality) and growth needs (relating to individual achievement and attaining human potential) (Maslow, 1943; Steers et al., 2004). The deficiency needs are identified as physiological needs, which are our basic needs for sustaining life and include breathing, food, water, sleep, etc. Maslow alleged that each level of need had to be met prior to higher needs emerging. The second level of deficiency needs, according to Maslow, is the safety need that includes security of body, employment, family, and property. Love and belonging is the final deficiency need that includes friendship, family, and intimacy. Once an individual has satisfied each of the deficiency needs, the higher growth needs begin to materialize. The growth needs of esteem and self-actualization involve our need for a high evaluation of oneself and for the esteem of others. Once this esteem is realized, a discontent or restlessness may develop moving the individual into the final self-
actualization stage (Maslow, 1943). A problem with the hierarchy is that it assumes that a person can only be motivated by one predominant category/need at a time.

While Maslow’s theory is well known and logical from an intuitive standpoint, research has been unable to verify this theory (Miner, 2003). There is little evidence to support the theory that needs are organized or structured in a hierarchical order, or that needs must be satisfied prior to moving one towards the next level (Wahba & Bridwell, 1973). Although Maslow’s theory lacks empirical data to support it, it is the most recognized of the motivation theories of need.

Alderfer’s existence-relatedness-growth (ERG) theory collapsed Maslow’s need categories into three general classes of existence, relatedness, and growth (Alderfer, 1969; Porter et al., 2003). Alderfer argued that it was difficult to identify where safety parted from the physiological needs in Maslow’s model, and similarly to identify the dividing point between love and self-esteem (Alderfer, 1969). The existence needs identified by Alderfer included the various forms of physiological and material needs, combining Maslow’s physiological and safety needs. Alderfer included all the needs surrounding relationships with significant individuals in one’s life as relatedness needs. The growth needs involve the aspects of creativity and productivity for oneself and the environment (Alderfer, 1969). Individuals do not fulfill each need in Alderfer’s model prior to moving to the next need as in Maslow’s theory. As with Maslow’s theory, empirical evidence is lacking for Alderfer’s theory.

While Maslow identified five levels of need, Murray (1951) identified 27 needs he called psychogenic needs, which he believed to be primarily at the unconscious level. Murray developed the Thematic Apperception Test (TAT) which is a personality test
designed to identify personality themes and unconscious motivation. McClelland (1961) refined Murray’s needs into three classes: the need for achievement, power, and affiliation. McClelland proposed that an individual’s needs are acquired over time and shaped by life experiences.

Individuals with a high need for achievement seek to excel. These individuals will avoid high- and low-risk situations, require regular feedback, and prefer to work alone or with other high achievers (McClelland, 2001; Miner, 2003). The need for power is subdivided into personal and institutional power. Individuals high in need for personal power want to direct others, while those with high institutional power needs work with others to advance the goals of the organization. Individuals with high need for affiliation prefer harmonious relationships and need to feel accepted by others. These individuals like work that involves significant personal interaction and they tend to be conformers (McClelland, 1966).

As content theories attempt to identify the “why” of motivation, process-based theories explore the “how” of motivation. They describe the general course of action to bring about motivation. Herzberg (1968) studied what caused satisfaction and dissatisfaction for employees in the work environment and was the first to explore factors that improved work motivation. Herzberg identified hygiene and motivator factors that impacted job attitudes. Hygiene factors included elements such as company policy, supervisory practices, job security, and wages. Hygiene factors do not provide positive satisfaction; however, dissatisfaction results from their absence. Motivators, in comparison, include variables such as achievement, recognition, responsibility, and growth. Motivators offer positive satisfaction arising from the intrinsic conditions of the
job itself (Herzberg, 1968). Herzberg argued that eliminating the cause of dissatisfaction would not cause satisfaction, but result in a neutral state. Satisfaction will only occur as a result of motivators.

Work motivation is regarded from a dynamic perspective in process-based theories. Goal theory demonstrates the link between motivation and the fundamental values of a person or social entity (Locke & Latham, 1990). Locke’s goal setting theory identifies content (difficulty and specificity) and intensity as attributes of goals (Porter et al., 2003).

There are three basic tenets of goal setting theory. First, goals are directly linked to values and affect action through choices, direction, and the priority of action. Second, goals affect the intensity of action based on the importance and difficulty of the goal. Finally, the greater the perceived value and the difficulty to achieve a goal the more likely persistence will be affected (Locke, 2000; Locke & Latham, 2002). Studies indicate that easily attainable goals actually produce lower performance than difficult goals. Goals that are specific and difficult lead to greater achievement (Porter et al., 2003).

Vroom’s (1964) expectancy theory was developed for work situations. According to the model, individuals make conscious and rational choices for work behaviors. Individuals evaluate work behaviors and choose the behaviors they believe will bring about the rewards they value most. According to expectancy theory, the motivation level of an individual will be influenced by the expected effort required to achieve the resulting outcome of the performance (Porter et al., 2003).
Ryan and Deci’s (2000) intrinsic/extrinsic model proposed that an individual’s behavior can be intrinsically motivated, extrinsically motivated, or amotivated. Individuals who engage in activities that are pleasurable are intrinsically motivated, while extrinsic motivation describes those activities that are a means to an end and not the pleasure of the activity. Amotivation is nonregulated and described by Ryan and Deci as the state of lacking the intention to act. Ryan and Deci identify self-determination on a continuum of motivation in which regulatory styles and processes are identified. Although all individuals will not progress through each style of regulation, they begin to internalize behavior regulation from personal experiences and situational factors (Porter et al., 2003).

The various content and process-based theories provide valid means to explore an individual’s motivation. Process-based motivation theories focus on the inducement of motivation, how to motivate, whereas the content theories identify the sources of our motivation. Leonard et al. (1999) developed a metatheory of work motivation integrating various aspects of existing theories. The three sources of motivation identified by previous authors include “intrinsic process, motivation based on goal internalization, and extrinsic or instrumental motivation” (Leonard et al., 1999, p. 971).

Individuals motivated by intrinsic process find motivation in the work itself. These individuals find the behavior challenging, and there are no external controls regulating the behavior. Goal internalization is the source of motivation for a behavior in the individual who adopts attitudes and behaviors based on congruency with their personal value system. Individuals motivated by extrinsic or instrumental rewards believe their behaviors will lead to certain outcomes.
These previous models of motivation did not take into account behavior changes across situations when expectancies and valences remain constant. Self-concept has been described as a multifaceted phenomenon. Leonard et al. (1999) present a multidimensional perspective that suggests the attributes that individuals perceive include traits, competencies, and values. Traits describe the repeated behavioral patterns individuals exhibit. Competencies refer to the perception of the skill abilities, talents, and knowledge individuals possess. Values are concepts and beliefs about desired situations. They go beyond individual situations to guide individual choices, and evaluate behavior and events based on relative importance.

According to Leonard et al. (1999), an individual’s self-concept consists of three interrelated sets of self-perception. The perceived self describes an individual’s perception of their actual traits, competencies, and values. The ideal self represents the actual traits, competencies, and values they would like to possess. The social identity of individuals comes from the social categories to which they belong.

Leonard et al. (1999) synthesized these existing theories of motivation into a metatheory of work motivation. Self-concept is incorporated into this theory as an additional source of motivation. Barbuto and Scholl (1998) developed the MSI to measure this new taxonomy. The development procedures produced five subscales with relatively high validity and reliability (Cronbach’s alpha ranging from 0.83 to 0.92), indicating that the subscales captured the five sources of motivation proposed in the metatheory of work motivation by Leonard et al. (1999). The five sources of motivation identified include intrinsic process, extrinsic/instrumental rewards, external self-concept, internal self-concept, and goal internalization.
Intrinsic process motivation stems from the sheer enjoyment of performing certain kinds of work or engaging in certain types of behaviors that are pleasurable or are considered fun (Barbuto, Brown, Wheeler, & Wilhite, 2003; Leonard et al., 1999). For individuals motivated by this source of motivation, the incentive is the enjoyment of the work itself (Barbuto, 2006). This type of motivation has been described by other need-based motivation theories that include existence needs (Alderfer, 1969), intrinsic pleasure needs (Murray, 1964), and physiological needs (Maslow, 1954). Deci (1975) described this motive as intrinsic motivation to obtain task pleasure, and Staw (1976) described it as intrinsic task motivation that is devoid of any external controls or rewards (Barbuto, Brown, Wilhite, & Wheeler, 2001).

Instrumental or extrinsic motivation describes individuals who perceive their behavior will lead to certain tangible outcomes such as pay, bonuses, or promotions (Barbuto, 2006; Leonard et al., 1999). Instrumental motivation is the integration of the following theories: Etzioni’s (1961) alienative and calculative involvement, Barnard’s (1938) exchange theory, and Katz and Kahn’s (1978) legal compliance and external rewards (Barbuto et al., 2001).

Self-concept external source of motivation is externally based. These individuals are primarily other-directed and seek affirmation of traits, values, and competencies. This motive focuses on the individual’s reputation and the concern with others’ opinion of their work (Leonard et al., 1999). The ideal self comes from role expectations or reference groups. It is characterized by seeking to satisfy the reference group as a means to gain acceptance and then status in the reference groups (Barbuto et al., 2001; Barbuto, 2006). This source of motivation is similar to several other motivation theories. These
include Etzioni’s (1961) social moral involvement; Deci’s (1975) extrinsic interpersonal motivation; and Staw’s (1976) and Barnard’s (1938) social inducements, conformity to group attitudes, and communion. This source of motivation has also been described by McClelland (1961) and Murray (1964) as the need for affiliation; by Maslow (1954) as the need for love, affection, and belonging; and by Alderfer (1969) as relatedness needs. The classic examples of social rewards or social exchanges portray the self-concept as an external source of motivation.

Self-concept internal individuals are inner driven. They seek out new challenges at work and are interested in developing and improving their abilities (Leonard et al., 1999). Individuals motivated by self-concept internal possess a set of internal standards for traits, competencies, and values, and are motivated by actions that reinforce these standards (Barbuto, 2006). Self-concept internal is similar to earlier theories including McClelland’s (1961) and Murray’s (1964) need for achievement, Maslow’s (1954) need for esteem, Herzberg’s (1968) motivating factors, Alderfer’s (1969) growth needs associated with developing one’s potential, Deci’s (1975) internal motivation to overcome challenges, Staw’s (1976) intrinsic motivation to pursue personal achievement, and Katz and Kahn’s (1978) ideal of internalized motivation derived from role performance (Barbuto et al., 2001).

Goal internalization is void of a self-interest component, making it different than the previous four sources of motivation. These individuals let their principles guide their choices. They are not concerned for themselves, but the greater good (Leonard et al., 1999). Strong ideals and beliefs are critical for these individuals to deliver high-quality work. They possess a strong sense of duty to the pursuit of common goals (Barbuto,
Individuals with goal internalization do not require strong inducements; rather, they possess a belief that they can assist the organization to attain its goals (Barbuto et al., 2001).

The MSI is an integrated taxonomy of the various theories of motivation. This instrument has demonstrated relatively high validity and reliability, indicating that the subscales capture the five sources of motivation with reliability coefficients ranging from 0.83 to 0.92 (Barbuto & Scholl, 1998). The MSI has been used to predict leaders’ influence tactics and transformational leadership behaviors (Barbuto & Scholl, 1998; Barbuto, Fritz & Marx, 2000, 2002). The five sources of motivation were found to be better predictors of behavior than McClelland’s (1985) trichotomy of needs model in two studies examining the antecedents of leaders’ behavior (Barbuto et al., 2000, 2002). These findings support the model of five sources of motivation over the three-need model of McClelland. The MSI has demonstrated strong relationships with a variety of behaviors supporting its selection for use with this study.

Barbuto et al., (2000) examined the relationship between motivation and transformational leadership. The results demonstrated the leader’s sources of motivation as a better predictor of transformational leadership when the MSI was used rather than a leader’s needs as measured by the Job Choice Decision-making Exercise.

The relationship between organizational citizenship behaviors and the sources of motivation was examined by Barbuto et al. (2001). This study found significant relationships between organizational citizenship behaviors and instrumental, self-concept external, and self-concept internal sources of motivation. The relationship of the five sources of motivation and the organizational citizenship behaviors of altruism and
generalized compliance were also studied (Barbuto et al., 2003). A significant positive correlation for employees’ self-concept internal and altruistic behavior was identified; however self-concept external demonstrate a significant negative relationship with altruistic behavior. No correlation between goal internalization and altruistic behavior was indentified in either study. The subscales were less reliable in this study than previous studies with a reliability coefficient ranging from 0.66 to 0.81.

Barbuto, Trout, and Brown (2004) assessed the reliability of the instrument and the predominance of the five sources of motivation in an agricultural business population. The analysis demonstrated strong internal reliability of the five subscales, supporting the reliability of the instrument. The results indicated that self-concept internal was the most prevalent source of motivation in this sample of agricultural workers. The other four sources of motivation were evenly distributed across the sample. This study produced reliability coefficients ranging from 0.69 to 0.81.

Barbuto (2005) explored a leader’s sources of motivation as an antecedent to the styles of transactional, charismatic, and transformational leadership. The MSI subscales correlated with leader self-reports and raters’ perceptions on the transformational leadership behaviors of inspirational motivation, idealized influence, and individual consideration. The subscales were also significantly correlated for both leaders and raters for charisma, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership. This study demonstrated relatively high reliability with reliability coefficients ranging from 0.71 to 0.85.

Motivational differences of business leaders in the United States and South Africa were measured using the MSI (Barbuto & Gifford, 2007). South African managers scored higher on self-concept external and goal internalization motivation while American
managers scored significantly higher on intrinsic process. As companies become more globally oriented, the knowledge of motivational differences may provide practical information as motivation as been demonstrated to be linked to employees’ commitment, job satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors (Barbuto et al., 2003). The reliability coefficients for this study varied slightly between the groups and were somewhat lower than in previous studies. For the managers from the United States the values ranged from 0.60 to 0.73, while for the South African managers the range was from 0.53 to 0.73.

Barbuto and Story (2011) explored the relationship between employees’ sources of motivation and organizational citizenship behaviors. The study was conducted with employees in the agricultural industry and the results found a significant positive relationship between self-concept internal motivation and organizational citizenship behaviors. The study found a negative relationship between instrumental and self-concept external motivations and organizational citizenship behaviors. The study produced reliability coefficients ranging from 0.71 to 0.91.

**Generations**

Since the middle ages it has been reported how significant events influence our lives. As individuals we memorize public events (the Kennedy and King assassinations, the Challenger explosion, 9/11) by remembering where we were and what we were doing at the time (Howe & Strauss, 2013). The sum total of these events has helped to shape us, but an important factor is our age at the time of such events. These historical events shape peer groups differently based on their current life stage. Generational differences have
existed throughout time; however, beginning with the industrial revolution and the subsequent technology and information age these differences gained popularity.

The first work recognizing generational progression was August Comte’s *Cours de Philosophie Positive* (as cited in Schlesinger, 1986). John Stuart Mill, in *A System of Logic, Book VI*, noted that history should be considered in periods in which people have grown up together, have been educated together, and take control of society together (Howe & Strauss, 2000; Schlesinger, 1986).

Jose Ortega y Gasset (1933/1961), in his book *The Modern Theme*, described generation as “a dynamic compromise between mass and individual . . . . it is the pivot responsible for the movements of historical evolution” (p. 15). Each generation builds upon the previous generation’s ideas, values, and institutions while simultaneously exploring the creative genius inherent of its own generation.

Mannheim (1952) first introduced the concept of generational cohorts as an additional means for the examination of social stratification in modern sociology. Individuals born into a class view the world through their lived experiences. While it is possible to move from one class to another, the generation one is born into is unchangeable. Manheim’s work has been expanded upon in the identification of generational cohorts. Generational cohorts share birth years, have a common bond, and share a common set of characteristics based on significant historical, political, economic and social events and technological advances occurring during their formative years (Dencker, Joshi, & Martocchio, 2007; Kupperschmidt, 2000; Mannheim, 1952; Reeves & Oh, 2008). The subsequent life experiences each generational cohort experiences shape similar core values and a unique work ethic for each generational group. Although not all
members of a generation will be the same, the majority of the group will possess certain inherent qualities based on their collective life experiences. Eyerman and Turner (1998) describe generations as cohorts of persons passing through time who share common experiences that provide a collective memory, therefore integrating the cohort over a finite period of time. These shared emotions, attitudes, and preferences—along with a set of embodied practices—create a generational culture or tradition.

Most researchers agree that for the first time in history there are currently four generations of employees in today’s workforce. Although the exact years of birth vary slightly in the research, the generational cohorts include: Veteran (1922-1945), Baby Boomer (1946-1964), Generation X (1965-1981), and Generation Y (1982-2000) (Howe & Strauss, 2000).

The Veterans are the oldest and smallest sector of the workforce, comprising approximately 4% of the total work population (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2009). This group has also been called Matures, Silents, the Forgotten Generation, Seniors, and the World War II Generation (Eisner, 2005; Harris, 2005; Zemke et al., 2000). This group came of age during the Great Depression and lived through World War II, the bombing of Pearl Harbor, the New Deal, the Korean War, the golden age of radio, the silver screen, and the rise of labor unions (Zemke et al., 2000).

The Veterans—born before 1946—are over 67 years of age, primarily retired or soon to be retiring, and will result in a diminished presence in the workforce. According to Morton (2004), there is an imbalance of gender in this group with approximately 21 million women compared to 14 million men. The potential causes include the effects of war, stress as the sole financial provider of the family, and smoking and poor health
habits of men. Although a small number in the workforce, Veterans retain significant influence in the workforce as board members, trustees, senior faculty at universities, and they are some of the wealthiest Americans (Straus, 2005).

This group was mature beyond their years as a result of what they had been through and disciplined by their military training and sacrifices. They have been described by Tom Brokaw as the “Greatest Generation” (1998). They possess a traditional sense of dedication and remain true to their values of personal responsibility, duty, honor, and faith. These individuals buy into the status quo and possess a traditional allegiance to company and job. Veterans are “an irreplaceable repository of lore and wisdom, practical wiliness and more than a few critical organizational contacts” (Zemke et al., 2000, p. 19).

This generation has immense faith in organizations including churches, government, and the military. Patriotism is a given for this generation. They are willing to endure personal sacrifice to do a good job. This generation learned early on that individual needs and wants took a back seat, and by working together toward common goals great things could be accomplished. Veterans value loyalty, dependability, hard work, respect for authority, and adhering to rules (Lancaster & Stillman, 2002; Pekala, 2001; Zemke et al., 2000).

Baby Boomers represent the largest single population growth in United States history and is the largest generational cohort numbering between 76 million and 80 million. They are the largest group in today’s workforce, comprising 42 to 48% of the total workforce (Eisner, 2005; Morton, 2001; Zemke et al., 2000). While Baby Boomers are reaching the age of retirement, not all Baby Boomers will necessarily be retiring.
Reynolds (2004) found that Baby Boomers are actually beginning second or third careers as the reality of Social Security funding is disappearing. According to Zemke et al. (2000), Baby Boomers are motivated to work for the enjoyment and sense of purpose it provides as well as the income.

The Baby Boomer cohort views themselves as special or unique, and this view has been reinforced throughout their life by media coverage (Love, 2010). The single most important arrival during Boomers’ birth years was that of the television. An entire generation now had a new set of reference points as public events were revealed through this new medium (Lancaster & Stillman, 2002). Boomers were witnesses to the Vietnam War, the Kennedy and King assassinations, the civil and women’s rights movements, the Cold War, the space race, Woodstock, the student shootings at Kent State, Watergate, and the OPEC oil embargo by way of television which permanently changed this generation.

Baby Boomers grew up in a relatively prosperous world full of rich opportunities. The sacrifices of their Veteran parents created a world in which parents did everything to ensure that Baby Boomers would have the opportunities they had only dreamed of. However, while Baby Boomers had many blessings and privileges, they have had to fight for much of what they have achieved due to the sheer numbers of peers competing for a limited number of jobs and promotions (Lancaster & Stillman, 2002).

As a group, they are one of the most educated generations in American history and, in many cases, their careers have defined them as a person. This group of individuals is independent, driven, idealistic, optimistic, politically active, health conscious, and remains loyal and attached to organizations. Baby Boomers are good at relationships, strong team players, consensus builders, seek fairness, and are good at managing and
motivating teams (Hart, 2006; Lancaster & Stillman, 2002; Pekala, 2001; Smola & Sutton, 2002; Zemke et al., 2000).

Generation X represents approximately 34% of today’s workforce and numbers between 41 and 46 million (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2009). Other names given to this generation include Twenty-something’s, Slackers, Generation Next, the MTV Generation, and Xers (Howe & Strauss, 1991; Lancaster & Stillman, 2002; Zemke et al., 2000).

Generation X has been described as possibly the most misunderstood generation in the workforce. They have been given a negative characterization from the media—as well as literature—being characterized as individuals who are skeptical, cynical, and pessimistic (Morton, 2003; O’Bannon, 2001). As a group, this generation did not have many heroes to emulate. Leading people during their formative years include Bill Clinton, Monica Lewinsky, Ted Bundy, Al Bundy, Beavis and Butt-Head, Clarence Thomas, O.J. Simpson, Dennis Rodman, Madonna, and Michael Jordan. In part, the eruption of 24-hour media coverage exposed every potential role model as simply someone who was too human to be their hero (Lancaster & Stillman, 2002). This generation experienced the collapse of the Berlin Wall, AIDS, the Challenger explosion, American hostages in Iran, terrorist attacks at the Munich Olympic Games, and as young adults the September 11 attack on the Twin Towers (Eisner, 2005; Zemke et al., 2000).

Generation X as children were latchkey kids, raised by television. This generation grew up during a time of economic recession and downsizing of the workforce where nearly a third of Generation X children grew up in poverty (Morton, 2003). During their formative years, nearly every American institution was in the spotlight for some type of
criminal activity and the divorce rate continued to rise. Gen Xers put more faith in themselves rather than institutions (Lancaster & Stillman, 2002). In addition to the failure of institutions, violence began to surface in Gen Xers’ lives sending the message that the world isn’t safe. AIDS, crack cocaine, missing children on milk cartons, child molesters, and drunk drivers began to appear close to home.

With all things considered, Generation X has learned to be resourceful and independent. They are comfortable with change, diversity, think globally, and are savvy with technology; however, they are not typically loyal to a particular company or organization, and they tend to have poor people skills and can be impatient. Gen Xers are unimpressed with authority. They are self-reliant but require immediate and continuous feedback. They have a strong desire for work-life balance; therefore, work-related goals will be insignificant compared to their personal values and goals. This group works to live, not live to work (Eisner, 2005; Hart, 2006; Lancaster & Stillman, 2002; Pekala, 2001; Smola & Sutton, 2002; Zemke et al., 2000).

Generation Y is the generation that will fill the gap in the workforce that the Baby Boomers will leave behind as they retire. Generation Y comprises about 20% of the workforce and numbers between 76 and 79 million (Eisner, 2005; Morton, 2002; Zemke et al., 2000). Generation Y has also been called Millennials, Nexters, Generation E, the Digital Generation, Generation Net, or the Internet Generation (Harris, 2005; Martin & Tulgan, 2001; Zemke et al., 2000).

Generation Y is unlike any other youth generation in recent history. They are the most racially and ethnically diverse cohort. One in five Generation Y individuals is the child of an immigrant parent. In addition, they are more affluent, better educated, and
technologically savvy than previous generations. Generation Y come from smaller families and one in three births was to unwed mothers (Eisner, 2005; Morton, 2001; Zemke et al., 2000).

Generation Y has grown up with technology; the Internet and MTV have always been around. Defining moments for this generation include a great deal of violence with the Columbine High School shootings, the Oklahoma City bombings, the World Trade Center attacks, and the onset of the Afghanistan and Iraq Wars (Harris, 2005; Zemke et al., 2000). Generation Y has grown up in a world with 24/7 access. They are the first generation to grow up with the Internet and are connected at all times with cell phones that provide voice communication, texts, pictures, video, music, and Internet access (Eisner, 2005; Morton, 2001; Zemke et al., 2000).

Generation Y embraces the challenge of new opportunities, displays a high level of confidence, and are seen as determined and driven in the work environment similar to Baby Boomers. Generation Y displays high levels of inclusivity, self-reliance, and tolerance. The core values of this generation include ambition, enthusiasm, adaptability, optimism, reliability, openness, moral virtue, and civic duty. This generation is placing expectations on employers toward social responsibility and seeks opportunities to make a positive impact on society (Eisner, 2005; Hart, 2006; Lancaster & Stillman, 2002; Pekala, 2001; Smola & Sutton, 2002; Zemke et al., 2000). Given this generation’s education, their “technological sophistication, positive expectation, and their apparent bent for collective action and you probably have a formula for greatness” (Zemke et al., 2000, p. 131).
The American workforce currently consists of up to four generations working side by side in organizations. While each generation brings its values, strengths, and weaknesses to the workplace, it is important to understand how they see the world and what motivates them to keep engaged in the workforce. Several studies have explored generational differences in the workplace related to work values, personality traits, and motivation.

Media has sensationalized generational differences, but the research remains inconclusive. It is perceived that individuals’ work ethic has eroded over the last few decades; however, in 1730 the proclamations of profitable diligence signified the first significant break in work values away from pursuing one’s vocation for the glory of God toward the end of personal advancement (Middlekauff, 1999). As scientific management was adopted, a decline in intrinsic employee motivation was recognized. Extrinsic manipulations were introduced in an effort to return work ethic back to its previous levels (Bernstein, 1997).

Shifts in attitudes toward work began to occur in the mid 1970s with an emphasis from work to self, and has continued to increase over the past four decades reflecting the common statement that people just don’t want to work as hard as they used to. The reality may be that while the value of hard work remains constant, it is the meaning of hard work that has changed (Jurkiewicz, 2000).

Employee behavior is typically shaped by the predominating values present at the time the employee entered the workforce (Jurkiewicz, 2000). Baby Boomers tend to place a high value on work. They value warm, friendly relationships with coworkers and tend
to be optimistic. Gen Xers typically value a sense of belonging, of gaining knowledge, autonomy, flexibility, and short-term rewards.

Jurkiewicz (2000) studied Baby Boomers and Gen Xers on work-related factors in terms of what they wanted from their jobs. The results suggested more similarities than differences between the groups. Baby Boomers ranked the chance to learn new things and the freedom from pressure to conform higher, while Gen Xers ranked freedom from supervision higher than Boomers. No other significant differences of work-related motivational factors were found between the two group rankings.

Although Jurkiewicz (2000) found more similarities than differences between Baby Boomers and Gen Xers, other studies on work values and beliefs found significant differences by generation. Smola and Sutton (2002) adapted a questionnaire developed by Cherrington, Cordie, and England (1979) and Cherrington (1980) about the attitudes of workers toward their jobs, companies, communities, and work in general. The primary scales of Cherrington’s survey correspond to desirability of work outcomes, pride in craftsmanship, and moral importance of work.

The subjects were divided into generations identified as WWIIers (1909-1923), Swingers (1934-1945), Baby Boomers (1946-1964), Generation Xers (1965-1977), and Millennials (1978-1995). Sample size from the WWIIers, Swingers, and Millennials was too small and therefore not included in the analysis. No difference was identified between the groups concerning pride in craftsmanship; however, significant differences were found in the desirability of work outcomes and moral importance of work (Smola & Sutton, 2002). Gen Xers reported a desire to be promoted more quickly than Baby Boomers did. Gen Xers also felt more strongly that “working hard makes one a better
person,” while Boomers felt that “work should be one of the most important parts of a person’s life.”

Gen Xers’ work values are significantly different than those of Baby Boomers. They display a “what’s in it for me” attitude, are less loyal to the company, and tend to work toward personal goals alongside the organization’s goals (Smola & Sutton, 2002). Gen Xers have a more idealistic attitude toward work than Baby Boomers.

The notion that each generation is lazier and more self-centered than the previous generation is commonplace in popular literature. Smola and Sutton (2002) also examined the question of work values remaining constant or changing as workers age. The findings indicate that workers’ values do change with age. Rather than becoming more responsible and supportive of the company and job, the findings suggest that employees developed a less idealized view of work. When compared to a younger sample in 1974, the older employees in 1999 were less likely to believe that hard work is an important part of life, that it makes a person better, a man’s worth is influenced by his job performance, or that one should feel a sense of pride in their work. These responses may suggest that society’s view on work may actually have a greater impact on our viewpoints of work than that of age and maturity. Overall, the findings of Smola and Sutton (2002) suggest that generational experiences influence work values more than age and maturity.

Lyons et al. (2005) also explored the generational differences of work values between Matures, Baby Boomers, Gen Xers, and Millennials. Work values were measured from a work value survey developed by Lyons (2003). The items measured included intrinsic work values, extrinsic work values, prestige work values, altruism work values, and social work values. Results indicated that the four generations differed
significantly with respect to the set of five work values. Altruistic work values were significantly more important to Matures than Gen Xers and Millennials. Baby Boomers held altruistic work values significantly more important than Millennials; however, no significant difference existed between Matures and Baby Boomers.

Social work values and prestige were significantly more important to Millennials than the other generational cohorts. Gen Xers emphasized the importance of intrinsic work values compared to both the older and younger cohorts. Prestige work values were significantly more important for Gen Xers than Baby Boomers or Matures. The Mature and Baby Boomer generations placed great importance on altruistic work values compared to the younger generations. Lyons et al. (2005) found no significant difference in the work values of the Mature and Baby Boomer generations.

Twenge and Campbell (2008) reviewed data from studies of generational differences in psychological traits and attitudes. The studies found that steady linear change exists rather than sudden generational shifts. For most traits, generational change moves steadily in one direction and typically does not reverse. Among college student samples, self-esteem and narcissism were higher than for the older generations. By the mid-1990s, the average college man had higher self-esteem than 86% of college men in 1968. The average college woman in the mid-1990s had higher self-esteem than 71% of Baby Boomer college women. The average college student in 2006 scored higher in narcissism than 65% of students in the early 1980s. On the surface, these traits may look good but narcissists find it difficult to take someone else’s perspective, tend to take more risks, lack empathy, and may have difficulty getting along with others.
The increase in self-esteem and narcissism may be contributing to the high expectations of employees (Twenge & Campbell, 2008). A job is no longer simply a job, but a lifestyle option. Generation Y has grown up with a world of opportunities and believe they can do anything. These many options may, in fact, result in a more difficult time in making a decision.

An individual’s locus of control will distinguish those who attribute the cause of events as either internal (to themselves) or external (to the environment). College students have experienced an increased external locus of control over the last few decades (Twenge & Campbell, 2008). This change has implications in the work setting related to attitudes, perceptions, and behaviors. Individuals with an external locus of control are more likely to blame others and are less likely to take responsibility for their own actions.

Twenge, Campbell, Hoffman, and Lance (2010) examined the attitudes of three generations of high school seniors concerning decisions surrounding their future employment. The five work values examined were leisure time, intrinsic rewards, extrinsic rewards, altruistic rewards, and social interactions. Recent generations were more likely to value leisure at work—Generation Y significantly greater than Generation X and Baby Boomers, and Generation X significantly greater than Baby Boomers. Generation X and Generation Y value extrinsic rewards more than Baby Boomers; however, Generation Y are less likely to value this quality as Generation X. There was no difference in the value for intrinsic rewards between Generation X and Baby Boomers. In contrast, intrinsic rewards were less valued by Generation Y. There were no differences among the three groups on the value of a job that allows for altruistic
behavior. Generation X and Baby Boomers did not differ in their value for work that allows for social interaction, while Generation Y was significantly less than either Generation X or Baby Boomers in this value (Twenge et al., 2010).

Cogin (2012) examined the work values of the four generational cohorts across five countries. The protestant work ethic is defined as “an orientation towards work which emphasizes dedication to hard work, deferment of immediate rewards, conservation of resources, the saving surplus of wealth, and the avoidance of idleness and waste in any form” (Beit-Hallahmi, 1979, p. 263). The protestant work ethic scale developed by Blau and Ryan (1997) includes the four dimensions of hard work, dislike of leisure, asceticism, and independence. The highest work values for Generation X and Y were asceticism; however, the lowest work value for Generation X was independence and for Generation Y it was anti-leisure. Baby Boomers and Traditionals both reported hard work as the most important work value with the lowest work value for Baby Boomers identified as independence, and for Traditionalists it was asceticism. These findings show a clear pattern for the decrease in importance of the value of hard work in younger generations, which supports the popular notion that there is a decline in the work ethic of Generation Y (Cogin, 2012).

Wong et al. (2008) examined differences in personality and motivation drivers between Baby Boomers, Generation X, and Generation Y. The Occupational Personality Questionnaire was used as a measure of personality, and the Motivation Questionnaire measured motivational drivers. The results indicated that the greatest differences were between Baby Boomers and Generation Y, with Generation X scores falling between the other two generations. Significant generational differences were found between
generational groups in the achieving, affiliative, conscientious, and optimistic traits. Generational differences were found in three of the six motivational drivers including affiliation, power, and progression.

Wong et al. (2008) found generational differences that indicated that Generation X and Generation Y were more ambitious and career centered than Baby Boomers; however, Baby Boomers self-reported more optimism than Generation Y. Generation Y was significantly more affiliative than Baby Boomers or Generation X. The motivational drivers of affiliation, power, and progression were significantly different among the generations. Generation X and Generation Y were more motivated by progression than Baby Boomers. Generation Y was more motivated by affiliation than Baby Boomers and less motivated by power than Generation X, who were less motivated by power than Baby Boomers.

Barbuto and Miller (2008) explored the differences in work motivation and generational cohorts. Five categories of generational cohorts were established which included Post-war (age 63 and over), Boomer 1 (age 54-63), Boomer 2 (44-53), Generation X (age 32-43), and Generation Y (age 18-31). Work motivation was measured using the MSI. The Generation Y and Post-war cohorts were excluded from the analysis due to a small population sample. Goal internalization and instrumental motivation held the only significant differences between generational cohorts. Boomer 1 was significantly higher than Generation X in goal internalization, with no significant difference with Boomer 2. Generation X was significantly higher in instrumental motivation than Boomer 1, with no difference with Boomer 2. While this study divided the Baby Boomer group, the middle generation was not found to be significantly different
from the other two generations, which is similar to the findings identified by Jurkiewicz (2000).

The results from Barbuto and Miller (2008) may be associated with career stage rather than generational differences. Instrumental motivation may be influenced by years of earnings. Baby Boomers tend to be more economically sound and may no longer be instrumentally motivated as their careers are established. Wong et al. (2008) suggested that the differences observed in their study may be better explained by age, rather than generational differences.

The generational cohorts described in the previous studies are the primary groupings for much of the current research. Several authors have explored the cusps of the generations, those periods directly before or after a generational cohort. Zemke et al. (2000) found that individuals born at the end of a generation cohort were more similar in their values and views to the next generation. They subdivided the generations into two halves. The Sandwich group (1930-1943) was found to fluctuate between the beliefs and attitudes of the Veterans and the Baby Boomers. The Boomers were divided into first half and late boomers, and slightly different traits were associated with each group.

Lancaster and Stillman (2002) recognized the existence of cusps between generations. They identified three specific cusps: between the Veterans and Baby Boomers (1940-1945), between Baby Boomers and Gen X (1960-1965), and between Gen X and Gen Y (1978-1983). Individuals in these cusps may share traits with either the preceding or subsequent generation, resulting in a form of generational identity crisis. Individuals in these cusps may feel as if they don’t belong in the work environment. However, these individuals may actually be one of corporate America’s most valuable
assets. These individuals tend to be naturals at mediating, translating, and mentoring between the two generations. Since they have the ability to relate to more than one generation they are able to see the world of work through different lenses making them managers who are both efficient and effective.

**Healthcare Workers**

Work motivation can impact work related outcomes in healthcare. While work motivation is a frequently discussed topic in the nursing management literature, there is limited empirical evidence on this topic. Toode, Routasalo, and Suominen (2011) reviewed 24 studies that dealt with work motivation; they were concerned with working staff nurses and provided research results about the factors affecting nurses' work motivation. There were five factors affecting nurses work motivation; workplace characteristics, working conditions, personal characteristics, individual priorities, and internal psychological states.

Work motivation is not limited to the assigned work tasks of an individual, but includes the employees desire to do the work well. Intrinsic motivation was identified as a major determinant of performance in the work environment. High work motivation was also found to increase nurses' work ability (Toode et al., 2011).

A greater understanding of the factors that motivate nurses to do their best may increase the possibility of developing better healthcare service. Dave, Dotson, Cazier, Chawla, and Badgett (2011) found that nurses demonstrate different levels of satisfaction with the intrinsic rewards of nursing. Two distinct groups of nurses were identified in the analysis, those more satisfied with intrinsic rewards (72%) and those only mildly positive for intrinsic rewards, but very close to neutral (28%). Those individuals with slight
satisfaction in intrinsic rewards expressed strong dissatisfaction with the extrinsic factors such as financial rewards, pay, job security and fringe benefits. This group may be more likely to be motivated by extrinsic rewards rather than the satisfaction of caring for the patient. Employers may need to expand and deepen the appeal of both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation in an effort to increase job satisfaction and reduce turnover.

The current healthcare workforce from the executive level to the staff level is comprised of mutigenerational staff members. Each of the four generations possesses their own values, work behaviors, relationship styles and motivation. Dols, Landrum, and Wieck (2010) found five general themes from focus groups conducted with 25 nurses with experience ranging from three months to 30 years. The themes identified were transitioning from student to nurse, managing difficult staffing conditions, maintaining morale, dealing with safety matters, and building relationships that enhance teamwork.

Generational differences were identified for transitioning from student to nurse, managing difficult staffing conditions, and maintaining morale. The Millennials desire personal attention from those in charge and want to know their efforts are recognized and valued.

Extended staffing deficits have both a physical and emotional impact on staff members. The interference this has on the work life balance of Gen Xers and Millennials may result in diminished care for patients. The staff in all generations desired acknowledgement and respect by their managers. They expect a culture of fairness in interactions with the manager and coworkers. Gen Xers and Millennials are easily disillusioned if fairness is missing or devalued (Dols et al., 2010).
The current nursing workforce includes members from all four generations. Individuals are entering the nursing workforce at a wide range of ages with a growing number entering the profession in their late 20's and early 30's. Keepnews, Brewer, Kovner, and Shin (2010) studied newly licensed registered nurses from the generational cohorts of Baby Boomers, Generation X, and Generation Y. The study found no differences between the generations in domains of job variety, autonomy, quantitative workload, organizational constraints, non-local job opportunities, and collegial physician-RN relations. Significant differences among the generations were identified for job satisfaction, organizational commitment, work motivation, work to family and family to work commitment, and promotional opportunities.

Baby Boomers reported higher work motivation than Generation X or Y. Generation X reported higher work to family and family to work conflict than Baby Boomers and Generation Y. Organizational commitment was higher for Generation Y than Generation X or Baby Boomers. Generation Y also reported the highest perception of workgroup cohesion, promotional opportunities, mentor support, and supervisor support (Keepnews et al., 2010).

Research has found differences in motivation between the generations, although the findings are inconsistent. Studies have explored full cohorts of generations but the cusps of generations have not been studied. This study examined differences in the sources of motivations that exist for the generations and cusps of generations. The following were the hypotheses for this study.

Are there key differences in the sources of motivation between Veterans, Baby Boomers, Generation X, and Generation Y?
H1a: The motivation source intrinsic process will be significantly higher for
    Generation X and Generation Y than Baby Boomers and Veterans.

H1b: The motivation source instrumental will be significantly higher for
    Generation X and Generation Y than Baby Boomers and Veterans.

H1c: The motivation source self-concept external will be significantly higher for
    Baby Boomers, Generation X, and Generation Y than for Veterans.

H1d: The motivation source self-concept internal will be significantly higher for
    Baby Boomers and Veterans than for Generation X and Generation Y.

H1e: The motivation source goal internalization will be significantly higher for
    Baby Boomers and Veterans than for Generation X and Generation Y.

These hypotheses are represented in the proposed model (see Figure 1).
Figure 1. Proposed model for hypotheses testing for generations.
Are there key differences in the sources of motivation of individuals born in the cusps between Veterans and Baby Boomers, Baby Boomers and Generation X, and Generation X and Generation Y?

H2a: The motivation source intrinsic process will be significantly higher for Generation X, Generation Y, and the cusp between Generation X and Y than Baby Boomers, Veterans, the cusp between Baby Boomers and Veterans, and the cusp between Baby Boomer and Generation X.

H2b: The motivation source instrumental will be significantly higher for Generation X, Generation Y, and the cusp between Generation X and Y than Baby Boomers, Veterans, the cusp between Baby Boomers and Veterans, and the cusp between Baby Boomer and Generation X.

H2c: The motivation source self-concept external will be significantly higher for Baby Boomers, Generation X, Generation Y, the cusp between Baby Boomer and Generation X and the cusp between Generation X and Y than for Veterans, and the cusp between Baby Boomers and Veterans.

H2d: The motivation source self-concept internal will be significantly higher for Baby Boomers, Veterans, the cusp between Baby Boomers and Veterans, and the cusp between Baby Boomer and Generation X than for Generation X, Generation Y, and the cusp between Generation X and Y.

H2e: The motivation source goal internalization will be significantly higher for Baby Boomers, Veterans, and the cusp between Baby Boomers and Veterans than for Generation X, Generation Y, the cusp between Baby Boomer and Generation X, and the cusp between Generation X and Y.
These hypotheses are represented in the proposed model (see Figure 2).
Figure 2. Proposed model for hypotheses testing for generations and cusps of generations.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes the methods that were used to examine the differences in the sources of motivation across the major generations and the specific cusps between the Veteran and Baby Boomer generation, between the Baby Boomer and Generation X generation, and between the Generation X and Generation Y generations. The primary method of research for this study was quantitative. The researcher administered the instrument via a web-based survey site. The subsequent sections describe the population, research design, variables, and instrumentation in the study.

Approval

Approval from the Graduate Committee took place August 2011. Permission to use the MSI instrument was obtained July 2012. Approval from the research site occurred in November 2012. Formal application to the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln occurred in December 2012, with approval granted December 12, 2012. A copy of the permission email, site approval, and official notice of IRB approval are located in Appendix A.

Informed Consent

Each survey included an email cover letter explaining the IRB’s guidelines. Participants were informed of the purpose and procedures of the study, potential risks and discomforts, and benefits. They were given the freedom to ask questions or withdraw from the study at any time. Their confidentiality was assured, and the addresses and telephone numbers of the IRB and the researcher were provided. Since the survey was conducted online, no participant signature was obtained. Completion and submission of
the survey indicated the participant had given informed consent to participate in the study. A copy of the consent is included in Appendix B.

**Population and Sample**

Potential participants for this study were employees of a large healthcare system in the Midwest. Solicitation for participation was completed though a designated all employee email list provided by the organization. Emails were sent from the researcher through an organizational representative with access to the email list of participants asking for their voluntary participation in January 2012. The email contained a link which provided access to the SurveyMonkey™ website for those participants interested in taking part in the study. Copies of the emails are located in Appendix C.

The timeframe for data collection was 26 days from the sending of the first email. Second and third follow-up emails were sent on the seventh and fourteenth days following the initial email.

Return rates were calculated as the actual number of completed surveys returned. Due to the need to have year of birth to determine generational cohort, surveys missing this data item had to be eliminated from the study.

Surveys were sent via a health system email list which contained 3,013 names. One thousand ninety-eight surveys were returned for a response rate of 36%. Not all participants completed all demographic questions on the survey and 1048 surveys were utilized in the analysis. Participants were 93.0% female and 6.5% male, with an age range from 22 years to 81 years of age. Participants’ educational level included 0.2% with a high school diploma or equivalent, 6.9% with some college but no degree, 27.8% had an associate’s degree, 49.7% held a bachelor’s degree, 13.5% with master’s degrees, 0.9%
with a doctorate, and 1.0% with a professional (M.D. or D.D.S) degree. Table 1 provides an overview of participant demographics.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age by Generation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomer</td>
<td>499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation Y</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school diploma or equivalent</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college, but no degree</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate’s degree</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s degree</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional degree (M.D. or D.D.S)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job title for current position</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse</td>
<td>845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager/Director</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse Practitioner/Clinical Nurse Specialist</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator/Team lead</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other titles: nursing assistant, social worker, administrative assistant, physician, educator, IT/analyst, executive, quality/compliance, behavioral health, material management</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in current position</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;35</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Design

A survey research design was used. Variables are measured in survey research by asking questions of a sample of people from a population and using the answers to describe the relationships among that population (Fowler, 2009). This procedure allows the researcher the ability to collect quantitative data where a statistical analysis can be conducted to describe trends about the survey question responses and test the research hypotheses. The meaning of the data can be interpreted by the researcher by comparing the results of the statistical analysis to past research studies (Creswell, 2008). This study builds on previous exploratory research using a quantitative methodological approach.

Measures

MSI

The sources of motivation were measured using the MSI (Barbuto & Scholl, 1998). Leonard et al. (1999) proposed an integrative taxonomy of motivation expanding on previous research efforts. They identified five sources of motivation: intrinsic process, instrumental, external self-concept, internal self-concept, and goal internalization. The MSI was developed and validated to measure individual motivational styles in the five constructs identified in the integrative taxonomy of motivation.

The authors identified 78 potential scale items which were formally examined and resulted in 60 items for testing. Varimax-rotated component pattern and factor analysis identified six unique items for each subscale. The final instrument contained 30 items that demonstrated relatively high validity and reliability indicating the subscales depict the five sources of motivation. The subscales had coefficient alphas as follows for each construct: intrinsic process = 0.92, instrumental = 0.83, self-concept external = 0.85, self-
concept internal = 0.90, and goal internalization = 0.90 (Barbuto & Scholl, 1998). The final items are listed as one for every sixth item throughout the survey. A copy of the instrument can be found in Appendix D. Each of the dimensions exists in everyone in varying amounts. The score for each dimension provides information concerning the preferences of our sources of motivation.

**Demographics**

A series of questions pertaining to demographic information were asked of the participants. The items included year of birth, gender, highest education level, and current job position. With the exception of year of birth, the questions were optional. A copy of the instrument can be found in Appendix D.

**Variables in the Study**

The dependent variables in the study were the sources of motivation: intrinsic process, extrinsic/instrumental rewards, external self-concept, internal self-concept, and goal internalization. The independent variables are the generational cohorts: Veteran, Baby Boomer, Generation X, Generation Y, and the specific cusps between the Veteran and Baby Boomer generation, between the Baby Boomer and Generation X generation, and between the Generation X and Generation Y generations.

**Potential Ethical Issues**

Ethical considerations for this research were few as there was minimal interaction between the researcher and the participants. The individual survey responses were anonymous and did not collect any personal data that could be traced back to the participants. All participants were informed about the use of the data and were assured their responses were confidential and secure.
**Delimitations and Limitations**

The scope of the study is limited to self-selected employees of a large healthcare system in the Midwest that was primarily female (93.0%). Self-selection is a limitation of survey research since respondents include those individuals that had the time and interest to respond (Creswell, 2003). The MSI is self-reported and may be a limitation in this study. Self-reported data may be minimized or exaggerated. Self-report studies may be biased by the person's state of mind, feelings, or situation at the time they complete the instrument.

An additional limitation of this study relates to the topic of the study itself -- motivation. The results presented speak to the respondents work motivation however the results may be skewed due to those individuals who did not respond to the survey. The difference between these two groups may include a variety of factors. These include the individual’s motivation, the actual topic of the research, the fact that there was no incentive for participation, and a personal desire to participate in research. According to Chadi (2014) individual’s motivation to complete surveys is linked to actual life satisfaction responses.

The Veteran cohort, the cohort consisting of the cusp between Veteran and Baby Boomer, and the cohort consisting of the cusp between Generation Y and Generation X were disproportionally small in reference to the sample and were excluded from the analysis. Therefore, this research will not be descriptive for all healthcare employees. While further research may eventually support the concept that these findings are generalizable, this study can only apply to the employees who will serve as participants.
Data Analysis

Surveys were distributed via an email invitation through a designated all-employee email list to potential participants. The email contained a link to the survey and demographic form. The completed surveys were submitted by participants through a third-party vendor, SurveyMonkey™. Surveys were accessible only to the researcher and were not utilized by SurveyMonkey™ or any others. Access to SurveyMonkey™ was password protected and network security, hardware security, and software security were ensured. SurveyMonkey™ was chosen for this study because of its ease of use, data handling capabilities, and affordability.

All participants completed the survey and demographic forms on the SurveyMonkey™ site. The data from these surveys were downloaded into a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet. The MSI scores were calculated using the formula feature in Microsoft Excel.

A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was performed to statistically analyze the data. MANOVA is a generalization of analysis of variance (ANOVA) in which there are several dependent variables. In this study the MANOVA is used to ask whether the five sources of motivation vary based on the generational cohort of the individual. MANOVA has an advantage over a series of ANOVAs with a large sample size when there are several dependent variables in that there is protection against inflated Type 1 error due to multiple tests of correlated dependent variables (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007).

This chapter has outlined the methods used for this study. The surveys were distributed to employees of a large healthcare system in the Midwest via a web-based
survey site. The data was downloaded and analyzed to determine differences in sources of motivation across the major generations and the specific cusps between the Veteran and Baby Boomer generation, between the Baby Boomer and Generation X generation, and between the Generation X and Generation Y generations.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The present study was designed to explore differences in the sources of motivation between the generational cohorts of Veteran, Baby Boomer, Generation X, and Generation Y, the cusp between Veteran and Baby Boomer, the cusp between Baby Boomer and Generation X, and the cusp between Generation X and Generation Y. This chapter contains the results of the statistical analysis.

Simple Statistics and Correlations

Simple statistics and correlations were calculated for the dependent variables of the study participants. Variable means, standard deviations, and correlations are reported in Table 2.

Nunnally and Bernstein (1994) concluded that minimum reliability (Cronbach’s alpha) measures for scale reliability should be at 0.70. In this study, three of the five subscales achieved generally acceptable reliability estimates: instrumental (0.776), self-concept external (0.761), and goal internal (0.756). Hair, Anderson, Tatham, and Black (1998) deemed values of 0.60 to 0.70 as the lower limits of acceptability the subscales of self-concept internal (0.683) and intrinsic process (0.646) have achieved.
Table 2

*Descriptive Statistics and Correlation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>IP</th>
<th>Inst</th>
<th>SCE</th>
<th>SCI</th>
<th>GI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Process (IP)</td>
<td>1048</td>
<td>17.60</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental (Inst)</td>
<td>1048</td>
<td>15.83</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>.468*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Concept External (SCE)</td>
<td>1048</td>
<td>17.27</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>.454*</td>
<td>.606*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Concept Internal (SCI)</td>
<td>1048</td>
<td>19.27</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>.336*</td>
<td>.348*</td>
<td>.485*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal Internal (GI)</td>
<td>1048</td>
<td>19.23</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>.374*</td>
<td>.273*</td>
<td>.373*</td>
<td>.642*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Reliability coefficient estimates (α) are in parenthesis along the diagonals.
* Correlation is significant at the level of p <0.01
Table 3 contains the descriptive statistics for the generational cohorts and generations and cusp of generations cohorts on the MSI subscales. The Veteran cohort was disproportionally small in reference to the sample and was excluded from the analysis.

Table 3  
*Descriptive Statistic Results of Motivational Sources by Generation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Generational cohort</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic process</td>
<td>Baby Boomer</td>
<td>17.1844</td>
<td>2.78516</td>
<td>499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>17.7806</td>
<td>2.43903</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generation Y</td>
<td>18.4811</td>
<td>2.24115</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>Baby Boomer</td>
<td>14.8597</td>
<td>4.37366</td>
<td>499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>16.2906</td>
<td>4.06812</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generation Y</td>
<td>17.6649</td>
<td>3.57621</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC External</td>
<td>Baby Boomer</td>
<td>16.7615</td>
<td>3.75040</td>
<td>499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>17.3675</td>
<td>3.45733</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generation Y</td>
<td>18.4865</td>
<td>3.19154</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC Internal</td>
<td>Baby Boomer</td>
<td>19.3086</td>
<td>2.86737</td>
<td>499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>19.1994</td>
<td>2.93260</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generation Y</td>
<td>19.2811</td>
<td>2.45988</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal Internal</td>
<td>Baby Boomer</td>
<td>19.6373</td>
<td>3.11214</td>
<td>499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>18.8889</td>
<td>3.18149</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generation Y</td>
<td>18.7568</td>
<td>3.00005</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 contains the descriptive statistics for the generational cohorts and generations and cusp of generations cohorts on the MSI subscales. The Veteran cohort, the cohort consisting of the cusp between Veteran and Baby Boomer, and the cohort consisting of the cusp between Generation Y and Generation X were disproportionally small in reference to the sample and were excluded from the analysis.
Table 4

Descriptive Statistic Results of Motivational Sources by Generation and Cusps of Generations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Generational cohort</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intrinsic process</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomer</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.6653</td>
<td>2.37328</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cusp between Baby Boomer &amp; Generation X</td>
<td>17.2857</td>
<td>2.85837</td>
<td>350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.25</td>
<td>2.24586</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.635</td>
<td>2.18240</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instrumental</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomer</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.0403</td>
<td>4.11750</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cusp between Baby Boomer &amp; Generation X</td>
<td>14.6829</td>
<td>4.49508</td>
<td>350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.1742</td>
<td>3.7222</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.635</td>
<td>3.60734</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SC External</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomer</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.2863</td>
<td>3.59187</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cusp between Baby Boomer &amp; Generation X</td>
<td>16.6771</td>
<td>37.9281</td>
<td>350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.9470</td>
<td>3.00207</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.5547</td>
<td>3.16906</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SC Internal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomer</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.1250</td>
<td>2.98520</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cusp between Baby Boomer &amp; Generation X</td>
<td>19.400</td>
<td>2.85063</td>
<td>350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.0833</td>
<td>2.73524</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.4818</td>
<td>2.39516</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal Internal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomer</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.9153</td>
<td>3.31676</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cusp between Baby Boomer &amp; Generation X</td>
<td>19.7714</td>
<td>3.03830</td>
<td>350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.6288</td>
<td>2.88297</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.8686</td>
<td>3.00200</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To analyze the data collected from the MSI and demographic information concerning generation provided by the participants, a MANOVA was conducted. The independent variables were the generational cohorts: Generation Y, Generation X, Baby Boomer, and Veteran. The cusps of generations were between Veteran and Baby Boomer, between Baby Boomer and Generation X, and between Generation Y and Generation X. The Veteran cohort—the cohort consisting of the cusp between Veteran and Baby Boomer—and the cohort consisting of the cusp between Generation Y and Generation X were disproportionally small in reference to the sample and therefore were excluded from the analysis.

The formal test for measuring homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices is Box’s M. This measure tests the null hypothesis that the observed covariance matrices of the dependent variables are equal across all groups. The analysis of the generations only had a p value of .024, satisfying the assumption of homogeneity. The analysis of the generations and the cusps of generations together had a p value of .000, indicating that the assumption of homogeneity was not satisfied. According to Tabachnick and Fidell (2007), this measure may be too strict for a multivariate application of ANOVA with large sample sizes (see Tables 5 and 6).

Table 5

*Box’s Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices for Generations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Box’s M</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Df1</th>
<th>Df2</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70.113</td>
<td>1.461</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5987.347</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( p < .05 \)
Table 6

*Box’s Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices Generations and Cusps of Generations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Box’s M</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Df1</th>
<th>Df2</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>107.440</td>
<td>1.750</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>92564.230</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .001

Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) note that Box’s M tends to be overly sensitive to non-normality in large samples and robust to the violation. Pillai’s criterion is said to be more robust than Wilks’ Lambda, Hotelling’s Trace, and Roy’s gcr criterion. Pillai’s criterion is the criterion of choice in large sample sizes, unequal n’s and where the assumption of homogeneity of covariance matrices is violated. Tables 7 and 8 reveal significant multivariate effects for generations (p = .000; partial eta-squared = .041 for Pillai’s criterion and p = .000; partial eta-squared = .043 for Wilks’ Lambda) and generations and cusps of generations (p = .000; partial eta-squared = .031 for Pillai’s criterion and p = .000; partial eta-squared = .033 for Wilks’ Lambda).

Table 7

*MANOVA results of Generations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pillai’s Trace</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>8.77</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3126</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks’ Lambda</td>
<td>.877</td>
<td>9.352</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2871.383</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .001
Table 8

**MANOVA results of Generations and Cusps of Generations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pillai’s Trace</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>5.780</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4490</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks’ Lambda</td>
<td>.847</td>
<td>6.097</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3322.565</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$p < .001$

Given the significance of the overall test, the univariate main effects were examined. Significant univariate main effects for generations were obtained for intrinsic process, $p < .05$, partial eta square = .038, observed power = 1.0; instrumental, $p < .05$, partial eta square = .062, observed power = 1.0; self-concept external $p < .05$, partial eta square = .030, observed power = .999; goal internal, $p < .05$, partial eta square = .016, observed power = .948 (see Table 9).

Table 9

**MANOVA Univariate Between-Subjects Results of Sources of Motivation for Generations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Process</td>
<td>274.547</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>91.516</td>
<td>13.725</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Self Concept External</td>
<td>1186.268</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>395.423</td>
<td>22.875</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Concept Internal</td>
<td>411.687</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>137.229</td>
<td>10.772</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal internal</td>
<td>2.991</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.997</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>.945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>165.351</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>55.117</td>
<td>5.690</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$p < .001$
Significant univariate main effects were also found for generations and cusps of generations. Intrinsic process, \( p < .05 \), partial eta square = .039, observed power = .999; instrumental, \( p < .05 \), partial eta square = .079, observed power = 1.0; self-concept external \( p < .05 \), partial eta square = .037, observed power = .999; goal internal, \( p < .05 \), partial eta square = .022, observed power = .958 (see Table 10).

**Table 10**

*MANOVA Univariate Between-Subjects Results of Sources of Motivation for Generations and Cusps of Generations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Process</td>
<td>231.842</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46.368</td>
<td>7.232</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>1312.747</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>262.549</td>
<td>15.393</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Concept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External</td>
<td>432.076</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>86.415</td>
<td>6.926</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Concept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>36.326</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.265</td>
<td>.921</td>
<td>.467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal internal</td>
<td>198.508</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>39.702</td>
<td>4.133</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( p < .001 \)

These results indicate that the means are not equal and by applying the Bonferroni technique to control for potential Type 1 errors we are able to identify where the specific differences exist. Statistically significant differences in the sources of motivation exist between the generational cohorts with the exception of self-concept internal (see Table 11).
Table 11

* Differences Between Generational Cohorts Based on MSI Subscales Using Bonferroni’s Correction (Excluding the Veteran cohort) *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Motivation</th>
<th>Generational Cohort</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic process</td>
<td>Generation Y</td>
<td>.7005</td>
<td>.23461</td>
<td>.017*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baby Boomer</td>
<td>1.2967</td>
<td>.22227</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>-.7005</td>
<td>.23461</td>
<td>.017*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baby Boomer</td>
<td>.5963</td>
<td>.17989</td>
<td>.006**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baby Boomer</td>
<td>-1.2967</td>
<td>.22227</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>-.5963</td>
<td>.17989</td>
<td>.006**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>Generation Y</td>
<td>1.3743</td>
<td>.37774</td>
<td>.002**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baby Boomer</td>
<td>2.8051</td>
<td>.35788</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>-1.3743</td>
<td>.37774</td>
<td>.002**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baby Boomer</td>
<td>1.4309</td>
<td>.28964</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baby Boomer</td>
<td>-2.8051</td>
<td>.35788</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>-1.4309</td>
<td>.28964</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Concept External</td>
<td>Generation Y</td>
<td>1.1190</td>
<td>.32427</td>
<td>.003**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baby Boomer</td>
<td>1.7250</td>
<td>.30723</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>-1.1190</td>
<td>.32427</td>
<td>.003**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baby Boomer</td>
<td>.6060</td>
<td>.24864</td>
<td>.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baby Boomer</td>
<td>-1.7250</td>
<td>.30723</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>-.6060</td>
<td>.24864</td>
<td>.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Concept Internal</td>
<td>Generation Y</td>
<td>.0817</td>
<td>.25594</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baby Boomer</td>
<td>-.0275</td>
<td>.24249</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>-.0817</td>
<td>.25594</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baby Boomer</td>
<td>-.1092</td>
<td>.19625</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baby Boomer</td>
<td>.0275</td>
<td>.24249</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>.1092</td>
<td>.19625</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal Internal</td>
<td>Generation Y</td>
<td>-.1321</td>
<td>.28277</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baby Boomer</td>
<td>-.8805</td>
<td>.26791</td>
<td>.006**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>.1321</td>
<td>.28277</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baby Boomer</td>
<td>-.7484</td>
<td>.21682</td>
<td>.003**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baby Boomer</td>
<td>.8805</td>
<td>.26791</td>
<td>.006**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>.7484</td>
<td>.21682</td>
<td>.003**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001
The following hypotheses were supported as sources of motivation for generations.

H1a: The motivation source intrinsic process will be significantly higher for Generation X and Generation Y than Baby Boomers and Veterans.

H1b: The motivation source instrumental will be significantly higher for Generation X and Generation Y than Baby Boomers and Veterans.

H1e: The motivation source goal internalization will be significantly higher for Baby Boomers and Veterans than for Generation X and Generation Y.

The following hypotheses were not supported as sources of motivation for generations.

H1c: The motivation source self-concept external will be significantly higher for Baby Boomers, Generation X, and Generation Y than for Veterans.

This source of motivation was significantly higher for Generation Y, but neither Generation X nor Baby Boomers.

H1d: The motivation source self-concept internal will be significantly higher for Baby Boomers and Veterans than for Generation X and Generation Y.

There was no statistically significant difference for this source of motivation between the generations.

Statistically significant differences in the sources of motivation exist between the generational cohorts with the exception of self-concept internal (see Table 12).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Motivation</th>
<th>Generational Cohort</th>
<th>Mean Diff</th>
<th>St. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal Internal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation Y</td>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>.3850</td>
<td>.30883</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baby Boomer</td>
<td>.9697</td>
<td>.26955</td>
<td>.005**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>Generation Y</td>
<td>-.3850</td>
<td>.30883</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baby Boomer</td>
<td>1.3493</td>
<td>.25519</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intrinsic process</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation Y</td>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>.9643</td>
<td>.25864</td>
<td>.003**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baby Boomer</td>
<td>-.9697</td>
<td>.26955</td>
<td>.005**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>-.5847</td>
<td>.27282</td>
<td>.486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cusp Btwn Boomer &amp; Gen X</td>
<td>Generation Y</td>
<td>-1.3493</td>
<td>.25519</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>-.9643</td>
<td>.25864</td>
<td>.003**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baby Boomer</td>
<td>-.3796</td>
<td>.21018</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Intrinsc**         |                     |           |           |      |
| Generation Y         | Generation X        | .4068     | .50370    | 1.000 |
|                     | Baby Boomer         | 1.5947    | .43963    | .005**|
| Generation X         | Generation Y        | -.4068    | .50370    | 1.000 |
|                     | Baby Boomer         | 2.9522    | .41621    | .000***|
| **Instrumental**     |                     |           |           |      |
| Baby Boomer          | Generation Y        | -1.5947   | .43963    | .005**|
|                     | Generation X        | -1.1339   | .44496    | .165  |
| Cusp Btwn Boomer & Gen X | Generation Y | -2.9522  | .41621    | .000***|
|                     | Generation X        | -2.4914   | .42184    | .000***|
|                     | Baby Boomer         | -1.3757   | .34280    | .001**|

| **Self-Concept**     |                     |           |           |      |
| Generation Y         | Generation X        | .6078     | .43081    | 1.000 |
|                     | Baby Boomer         | 1.2685    | .37601    | .012* |
| Generation X         | Generation Y        | -.6078    | .43081    | 1.000 |
|                     | Baby Boomer         | 1.8776    | .35598    | .000***|
| **External**         |                     |           |           |      |
| Baby Boomer          | Generation Y        | 1.2685    | .37601    | .012* |
|                     | Generation X        | -.6078    | .38057    | 1.000 |
| Cusp Btwn Boomer & Gen X | Generation Y | -2.9522  | .41621    | .000***|
|                     | Generation X        | -2.4914   | .42184    | .000***|
|                     | Baby Boomer         | -1.3757   | .34280    | .001**|

| **Goal Internal**    |                     |           |           |      |
| Generation Y         | Generation X        | .3984     | .34259    | 1.000 |
|                     | Baby Boomer         | .3568     | .29902    | 1.000 |
| Generation X         | Generation Y        | -.3984    | .34259    | 1.000 |
|                     | Baby Boomer         | .0417     | .30264    | 1.000 |
| **Internal**         |                     |           |           |      |
| Baby Boomer          | Generation Y        | -.3167    | .28691    | 1.000 |
|                     | Generation X        | -.3568    | .29902    | 1.000 |
| Cusp Btwn Boomer & Gen X | Generation Y | -2.750   | .23315    | 1.000 |
|                     | Generation X        | -.0818    | .28309    | 1.000 |
|                     | Baby Boomer         | .3167     | .28691    | 1.000 |

| **Goal Internal**    |                     |           |           |      |
| Baby Boomer          | Generation Y        | 2.398     | .37801    | 1.000 |
|                     | Generation X        | 2.398     | .37801    | 1.000 |
| Goal Internal        |                     |           |           |      |
| Baby Boomer          | Generation Y        | -1.1426   | .31657    | .005**|
|                     | Generation X        | -.0467    | .32992    | 1.000 |

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001
The following hypotheses were supported as sources of motivation for
generations and the cusps of generations. The Veterans and the cusp between Generation X and Generation Y were not included in this analysis due to an insufficient number of participants in these cohorts.

H2a: The motivation source intrinsic process will be significantly higher for Generation X, Generation Y, and the cusp between Generation X and Y than Baby Boomers, Veterans, the cusp between Baby Boomers and Veterans, and the cusp between Baby Boomer and Generation X.

H2b: The motivation source instrumental will be significantly higher for Generation X, Generation Y, and the cusp between Generation X and Y than Baby Boomers, Veterans, the cusp between Baby Boomers and Veterans, and the cusp between Baby Boomer and Generation X.

This hypothesis was only partially supported in that the Baby Boomers were higher in instrumental motivation than the cusp between Baby Boomers and Generation X.

H2c: The motivation source self-concept external will be significantly higher for Baby Boomers, Generation X, Generation Y, the cusp between Baby Boomer and Generation X, and the cusp between Generation X and Y than for Veterans and the cusp between Baby Boomers and Veterans.

This hypothesis was only partially supported in that only Generation Y and Generation X were higher in self-concept external than any of the other cohorts.

The following hypotheses were not supported as sources of motivation for generations and the cusps of generations.
H2d: The motivation source self-concept internal will be significantly higher for Baby Boomers, Veterans, the cusp between Baby Boomers and Veterans, and the cusp between Baby Boomer and Generation X than for Generation X, Generation Y, and the cusp between Generation X and Y. There was no statistically significant difference for this source of motivation between the generations and the cusps of the generations.

H2e: The motivation source goal internalization will be significantly higher for Baby Boomers, Veterans, and the cusp between Baby Boomers and Veterans than for Generation X, Generation Y, the cusp between Baby Boomer and Generation X, and the cusp between Generation X and Y. The final models of the sources of motivation are presented in Figures 3 and 4.
Figure 3. Model for results of hypotheses testing for generations
Figure 4. Model for results of hypotheses testing for generations and cusps of generations

H2a: 
H2b: 
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H2d: 
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CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter will contain a discussion of the findings, implications for practice, strengths and limitations of the study, and suggestions for future research.

Conclusions

This study found that there are significant differences in the sources of motivation among the four generations and the cusps of generations for four of the five MSI subscales. Significant differences were found for intrinsic process, instrumental, self-concept external, and goal internalization, while there was no statistically significant difference for self-concept internal. The sample population consisted of employees of a large healthcare system in the Midwest. Cohorts from the Veteran generation and individuals in the cusp between Veteran and Baby Boomer and the cusp between Generation X and Generation Y were excluded from the analysis as they were disproportionately small in relation to the population sample.

Sources of Motivation

Intrinsic process motivation, individuals who primarily want to engage in activities that are pleasurable or things they consider fun (Leonard et al., 1999), was found to be significantly higher for Generation Y than Generation X, Baby Boomers, and the cusp between Baby Boomer and Generation X. It was also significantly higher for Generation X than Baby Boomers and the cusp between Baby Boomer and Generation X. These findings show that members of the younger generations are more likely to be motivated by intrinsic process and to seek those situations that provide activities that are
pleasurable and fun. Broadbridge, Maxwell, and Ogden (2007) found that Generation Y identified working for enjoyment as a value they endorsed.

Instrumental motivation, behavior that will lead to tangible outcomes such as pay, bonuses, or promotions (Leonard et al., 1999) for Generation Y was found to be significantly higher than Generation X, Baby Boomers, and the cusp between Baby Boomer and Generation X. The Generation X cohort identified instrumental motivation to be significantly higher than Baby Boomers, and Baby Boomers identified instrumental motivation to be significantly higher than the cusp between Baby Boomer and Generation X.

In the analysis of generations only, the means show a pattern that as age increases the strength of instrumental motivation decreases. These findings are similar to other studies showing tangible benefits such as prestige, financial compensation and benefits, and advancement and promotion are significantly higher in the younger generations (Barbuto & Miller, 2008; Dencker et al., 2007; Eisner, 2005; Jurkiewicz, 2000; Kooij, DeLange, Jansen, Kanfer, & Dikkers, 2011).

Self-concept external is an externally based motivation in which individuals seek affirmation of traits and competencies and are concerned with others’ opinion of their work (Leonard et al., 1999). Generation Y was found to be significantly higher than Generation X, Baby Boomers, and the cusp between Baby Boomer and Generation X in self-concept external as was Generation X compared to the cusp between Baby Boomer and Generation X.

The external source of motivation was also identified by Lyons et al. (2005), noting that prestige work values and work that is highly esteemed and recognized by
others was significantly more important to Generation Y than Generation X or Baby Boomers. Generation X also placed more importance on this than did Baby Boomers. Twenge and Campbell (2008) also found that Generation Y had a more external locus of control. It is also noted that Wong et al. (2008) found that Generation Y is more motivated by being in an affiliative workplace than Baby Boomers.

This source of motivation in which individuals seek affirmation of traits and competencies suggests that the immediate gratification preference among the Generation X and Y cohorts may require more regular feedback and recognition (Cogin, 2012). Generation Y nurses also reported that recognition was a key motivator, true for both monetary and peer recognition (Lavoie-Tremblay, Leclerc, Marchionni, & Drevniol, 2010).

Individuals whose source of motivation is self-concept internal are inner driven. They seek out new challenges at work, and are interested in developing and improving their abilities (Leonard et al., 1999). No statistically significant differences were identified between the generations for this source of motivation. Twenge et al. (2010) noted that intrinsic values (finding meaning and interest in work) appear to be relatively constant across the generations.

Those individuals who let their principles guide their choices, and are not concerned for themselves but the greater good, have a strong goal internalization source of motivation (Leonard et al., 1999). The Baby Boomer cohort was significantly higher than Generation Y and Generation X in goal internalization. The cohort in the cusp between Baby Boomer and Generation X identified goal internal to be significantly higher than Generation X and Baby Boomers.
In the analysis of generations only, the means show a pattern that as age increases the strength of goal internalization also increases. In the analysis with the cusps, this pattern did not follow. The cusp between Baby Boomer and Generation X was significantly higher than both the Generation X and Baby Boomer cohort.

Altruistic work (work that benefits people and society) was significantly more important to Baby Boomers than to Generation X and Generation Y. Baby Boomers value contributing where a cause or moral connection is evident to the greater good of the organization (Barbuto & Miller, 2008; Dencker et al., 2007; Eisner, 2005; Jurkiewicz, 2000; Lyons et al., 2005; Smola & Sutton, 2002).

According to Bentley University (2014) 85% of millennials say working for a socially responsible or ethical company is important to them. Millennials also perceive themselves as more loyal to their personal values than to any company.

**Recommendations**

**Implications for Practice**

Understanding the differences among the generations in their sources of motivation has practical implications for organizations. Tensions increase while job satisfaction and productivity decrease when managers and coworkers do not understand the differences each generation brings to the workplace. While members of each generation may comment on how different or difficult the other generations are, the multigenerational workforce will continue to grow. At a minimum, a well-performing multigenerational workplace must recognize and accept that the different generations bring different preferences to the workplace. Organizations that gain a better understanding of these differences, embrace and respect these differences will create
better talent acquisition and retention strategies, increase productivity, and enhance employee engagement (Wilson, 2009).

As the multigenerational workforce continues to grow, managers will face the challenges of hiring, retaining, and motivating employees. Understanding the generational differences in the sources of motivation provides perhaps the most realistic means for organizations to adapt practices and policies that can impact employee engagement. Leadership practices in organizations must demonstrate they respect and value generational differences while they encourage their multigenerational employees. According to Gallup (2013), engaged employees have a 25% lower turnover rate and are 21% more productive. Identifying and addressing the motivational needs of each generation will allow organizations to develop strategies that are tailored to the preferences of each of the four generations.

The need to engage Baby Boomers and Veterans is critical for organizations. These generations possess a wealth of intuitional knowledge that organizations need to retain. Baby Boomers were higher in goal internalization than Generation X or Y. This concern for the greater good can be utilized by involving them in formal and informal mentoring programs which will provide older workers the opportunity to make a difference in their profession (Hornbostel, Kumar, & Smith, 2011). Additionally, organizations may consider alternatives ways for Baby Boomer and Veteran employees to exit the work force. Job sharing, part-time work or, other alternatives may keep an engaged employee and benefit both the employee and the organization.

Generation X and Generation Y represent our future leadership and in some cases our current leaders. Engaging these generations in identifying needed resources and
implementation methods may strengthen their potential for success (Broom, 2010).

Ensuring that formal training and growth opportunities are available will help to engage Generation X and Generation Y employees (Hornbostel, Kumar, & Smith, 2011).

The best managers focus on the talents and strengths of employees rather than their weaknesses (Buckingham & Coffman, 1999). Taking into consideration the sources of motivation for each generation can aid in creating high-performing intergenerational teams. This study found that the Baby Boomer cohort has a stronger preference for goal internalization. According to Blythe et al. (2008), Baby Boomer nurses were more satisfied with the type of work and the high standard of individual patient care they were able to provide. The idealist, passionate Baby Boomer will gravitate towards the mentor role to ensure the professional legacy of nursing continues.

Generations X and Y were higher in intrinsic process and instrumental motivation indicating that work enjoyment and prestige, financial compensation and benefits, and advancement and promotion are significant. Lavoie-Tremblay et al. (2010) found that, among Generation Y, monetary and peer recognition were key motivators. Similarly, Blythe et al. (2008) found that Generation X nurses identified monetary and personal development opportunities as important. Recruitment efforts for these generations should focus on career paths, mentorship opportunities, and training programs. Studies have shown that nearly eighty percent of Generations X and Y employees consider training opportunities when accepting a job (Hornbostel, Kumar, Smith, 2011).

There were no significant differences found between the generations or cusps of generations for self-concept internal. This source of motivation is the inner drive and desire to develop and improve abilities which is important for all generations. The
promotion of growth and development of the individuals can help to release the vast potential that exists in a diverse intergenerational workforce (Manion, 2010).

The World Health Organization (2006) suggests that 57 countries will face critical workforce shortages that will impact the delivery of nursing care. The imminent retirement of Baby Boomers will not only result in a decrease in the nursing workforce, but a significant loss of knowledge that cannot be easily replaced. Recruitment and retention strategies that benefit all generations of healthcare workers will be essential to maintain an adequate and engaged workforce (Lavoie-Tremblay et al., 2010; Stanley, 2010). Understanding the difference in the sources of motivation for the generations will assist organizations in developing successful recruitment and retention strategies that target the preferences of each generation.

**Strengths of Findings**

The primary strength of this study is that it identified significant differences in the sources of motivation among the current generations in the workforce. The findings identified that goal internalization was higher for Baby Boomers than Generation X, and instrumental was higher for Generation X than Baby Boomers which were also found in the study by Barbuto and Miller (2008).

**Limitations of Findings**

A limitation of this study is the broad applicability or generalization of the findings. The scope of the study was limited to self-selected employees of a large healthcare system in the Midwest that was primarily female (93.0%). Self-selection is a limitation of survey research since respondents include those individuals that had the time and interest to respond (Creswell, 2003). The MSI is self-reported and may be a
limitation in this study. Self-reported data may be minimized or exaggerated. Self-reported studies may be biased by the person's state of mind, feelings, or situation at the time they complete the instrument.

An additional limitation of this study relates to the topic of the study itself -- motivation. The results presented speak to the respondents work motivation however the results may be skewed due to those individuals who did not respond to the survey. The difference between these two groups may include a variety of factors. These include the individual’s motivation, the actual topic of the research, the fact that there was no incentive for participation, and a personal desire to participate in research. According to Chadi (2014) individual’s motivation to complete surveys is linked to actual life satisfaction responses.

The Veteran cohort, the cohort consisting of the cusp between Veteran and Baby Boomer, and the cohort consisting of the cusp between Generation Y and Generation X were disproportionally small in reference to the sample and were excluded from the analysis. Therefore, this research will not be descriptive for all healthcare employees. In addition, the results of this study cannot be generalized to other organizations, industries, or to different geographic areas of the United States.

**Implications for Future Research**

The results of this study support previous research findings that found significant differences among the generations and the cusps of generations in work motivation. Since the population for this study was limited to one healthcare organization, the ability to generalize from these current findings is limited and future research is needed.
Opportunities exist to examine the cohorts and cusps of generations in other workforce populations and geographical locations in the United States.

Expanding the research on generational differences in work motivation to other countries and cultures may promote a greater understanding of generational differences for both academic and organizational purposes. Multinational corporations may experience different intergenerational challenges due to the differences in the workers’ socialization experiences.

Longitudinal studies would be beneficial in the exploration of the impact a worker’s age plays in accentuating or moderating the generational differences identified in this study. In addition to age, a worker’s career stage may also play a role in the differences in the sources of motivation and should be considered in future research studying the effects of motivation among the generations.

Summary

This study examined the motivational differences across the major generations and the specific cusps between the Veterans and Baby Boomers, between Baby Boomers and Generation X, and between Generation X and Generation Y.

Data were collected from 1,098 self-selected employees of a large healthcare system in the Midwest. A MANOVA was performed to statistically analyze the data. Significant differences in the sources of motivation among the four generations and the cusps of generations for four of the five MSI subscales were identified.

Intrinsic process motivation was found to be significantly higher for Generation Y than Generation X, Baby Boomers, and the cusp between Baby Boomer and Generation
X, as well as for Generation X than Baby Boomers and the cusp between Baby Boomer and Generation X.

Instrumental motivation of Generation Y was significantly higher than Generation X, Baby Boomers, and the cusp between Baby Boomer and Generation X. The Generation X cohort identified instrumental motivation to be significantly higher than Baby Boomers, and Baby Boomers were significantly higher than the cusp between Baby Boomer and Generation X.

Generation Y was significantly higher than Generation X, Baby Boomers, and the cusp between Baby Boomer and Generation X in self-concept external, as was Generation X compared to the cusp between Baby Boomer and Generation X.

The Baby Boomer cohort was significantly higher than Generation Y and Generation X in goal internalization. The cohort in the cusp between Baby Boomer and Generation X identified goal internal to be significantly higher than Generation X and Baby Boomers.

No statistically significant differences were identified between the generations for self-concept internal.

The results of this study support previous research findings of significant differences in the sources of motivation among the generations. Understanding the generational differences in the sources of motivation provides a realistic means for organizations to adapt practices and policies related to recruitment, retention, and engagement of a multigenerational workforce.
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December 12, 2012

Rose Leavitt
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PO Box 473 Fort Calhoun, NE 68023
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Agricultural Leadership, Education and Communication
300 AGH, UNL, 68583-0709

IRB Number: 20121212855 EX
Project ID: 12855
Project Title: Generational Differences in Work Motivation of Healthcare Workers

Dear Rose:

This letter is to officially notify you of the certification of exemption of your project by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) for the Protection of Human Subjects. It is the Board's opinion that you have provided adequate safeguards for the rights and welfare of the participants in this study based on the information provided. Your proposal is in compliance with this institution's Federal Wide Assurance 00002258 and the DHHS Regulations for the Protection of Human Subjects (45 CFR 46) and has been classified as Exempt Category 2.

You are authorized to implement this study as of the Date of Exemption Determination: 12/12/2012.

1. Please include the IRB approval number (IRB#20121212855 EX) in the on-line informed consent form. Please email me a copy of the form, with the number included, for our records. If you need to make changes to the form, please submit the revised form to the IRB for review and approval prior to using it.

We wish to remind you that the principal investigator is responsible for reporting to this Board any of the following events within 48 hours of the event:
* Any serious event (including on-site and off-site adverse events, injuries, side effects, deaths, or other problems) which in the opinion of the local investigator was unanticipated, involved risk to subjects or others, and was possibly related to the research procedures;
* Any serious accidental or unintentional change to the IRB-approved protocol that involves risk or has the potential to recur;
* Any publication in the literature, safety monitoring report, interim result or other
finding that indicates an unexpected change to the risk/benefit ratio of the research;
* Any breach in confidentiality or compromise in data privacy related to the subject or others; or
* Any complaint of a subject that indicates an unanticipated risk or that cannot be resolved by the research staff.

This project should be conducted in full accordance with all applicable sections of the IRB Guidelines and you should notify the IRB immediately of any proposed changes that may affect the exempt status of your research project. You should report any unanticipated problems involving risks to the participants or others to the Board.

If you have any questions, please contact the IRB office at 472-6965.

Sincerely,

Becky R. Freeman, CIP
for the IRB
November 5, 2012

Congratulations!

The Alegent Creighton Health Nursing Research Council is pleased to inform you that the study proposal: Generational Differences in Work Motivation of Healthcare Workers has been approved.

The following were suggestions recommended by council members that would make your proposal stronger:
- Recommend adding the background information as a thorough literature review is essential for all research proposals.
- Since the inclusion criteria is a minimum age of 19 and the survey asks birth date...one can assume that survey’s completed by those under 19 would be excluded. You may want to clarify this statement in the proposal.
- The process for de-identifying the demographic data that is collected from the study participants is not described.
- Explain how you identified what questions to ask on the survey.
- Regarding the statistics... the sampling nor the question format coupled with the unknown sample size make choice of statistics difficult since what is here would fit better with nonparametric parameters than parametric ones... with this type of study and the unknown return rate... it may be more descriptive in nature than anything else.
- We did not see a copy of the cover letter... but would certainly suggest that you set some parameters on how long she is going to accept returns... also if one puts in the email please complete in the next ___ days, there is better chance of the individual completing in a timely fashion.
- Attached is your proposal with comments/suggestions in red & yellow highlights.
- Also the sections under #7 on the UNL IRB proposal should be checked and it currently is not.

Your research revolves around motivation so the following field should be checked:
"Research on individual or group characteristics or behavior (including but not limited to, research on perception, cognition, motivation, identity, language, communication, cultural beliefs or practices, and social behavior). Research employing survey, interview, oral history, focus group, program evaluation, human factors"

Thanks for your submission and good luck!

Don’t forget to submit a summary of the research once the study is complete because research doesn’t end until your findings are shared. We would also recommend sharing your findings at Innovation & Research Day 2013, which will be held May 8, 2013.

Sincerely,

Jodeena M. Kempnich MSN, RN, CNML
Advanced Nurse Administrator, Alegent Health Center for Nursing

Nursing Research Council Members:
- Brenda Bergman-Evans Ph.D., APRN, BC
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You have permission to use the Motivation Sources Inventory (MSI) for your research project. Best wishes in your inquiry.
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John E. Barbuto, Jr. (Jay)
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Associate Professor of Organizational Behavior
Director, Center for Leadership
Mihaylo College of Business and Economics
California State University - Fullerton
800 N. State College Blvd - SGMH
Fullerton, CA 92831
leadership@fullerton.edu
jbarbuto@fullerton.edu
SGMH 5357C Center for Leadership (657) 278-8401
SGMH 5364 Faculty Office (657) 278-8675
APPENDIX B

INFORMED CONSENT
WEB-BASED INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Please read the following information carefully. You have been selected to participate in this survey as an employee of Alegent Creighton Health. Once you have read and agree to the terms of this consent agreement proceed to the survey. By completing and submitting the survey responses you are giving consent to participate in the research.

Title of Project: Generational Differences in Work Motivation of Healthcare Workers

Purpose of the Research: The purpose of this study is to examine the motivational differences across the major generations and the specific cusp between the Veterans and Baby Boomers, between Baby Boomers and Generation X, and between Generation X and Generation Y.

Procedures: Participation in this study will require approximately 15-20 minutes of your time to complete a web-based survey and an author created demographic questionnaire. Your participation is voluntary.

Risks and/or Discomforts: There are no known risks or discomforts associated with this research. You are free to withdraw from participation at any time in the process.

Benefits: There are no direct benefits to your participation in this study. The information gained from this study may help understand the generational differences in work motivation and provide managers and leaders with practical management implications to maintain an engaged, motivated and productive workforce.

Confidentiality: All responses to this survey will be anonymous and kept strictly confidential. The data will be kept in a locked cabinet for three (3) years after the study is complete and will then be destroyed. The information obtained in this study will be presented in a dissertation and may be published in scientific journals or presented at scientific meetings, but the data will be reported as aggregated data or anonymously.

Compensation: No compensation is provided for participation in this study.

Opportunity to Ask Questions: You may ask any questions concerning this research at any time by contacting either investigator at any time at the phone numbers listed below. If you would like to speak to someone else, please call the Research Compliance Services Office at 402-472-6965 or irb@unl.edu.

Freedom to Withdraw: Participation in this study is voluntary. You can refuse to participate or withdraw at any time without harming your relationship with the researchers, Alegent Creighton Health and Clinics, or the University of Nebraska-Lincoln or in any other way receive a penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

Consent, Right to Receive a Copy: You are voluntarily making a decision whether or not to participate in this research study. By completing and submitting your survey responses, you have given your consent to participate in this research. You may print a copy of this consent form for your records or request a copy from the principal investigator.

Name and Phone Number of Investigator(s)
Rose M Leavitt, M.A., M.S.N., R.N., Principal Investigator (402) 312-4702
Gina Maltin, PhD, Secondary Investigator (402) 472-4454

UNL IRB approval number IRB#20121212855 EX
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EMAIL REQUESTS TO PARTICIPANTS
From: Howland,Kathy A  
Sent: Monday, January 07, 2013 9:01 PM  
Cc: Leavitt,Rose M; Kempnich,Jody; Howland,Kathy A  
Subject: Request to participate in nursing research

This email is being sent on behalf of Rose Leavitt

Dear Participant,

I am a doctoral student at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. My dissertation research topic involves the study of generational differences in work motivation of healthcare workers. This study is an opportunity to examine generational differences in work motivation and provide managers and leaders with practical management implications to maintain an engaged, motivated and productive workforce.

As an employee of a health care system I invite you to participate in this research project by completing the online survey that is posted at the following website: https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/RLDissertation. The survey will require approximately 15 to 20 minutes.

Please complete the survey by February 1, 2013 Thank you in advance for your participation. Please don’t hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or comments by email at rleavittn@gmail.com or by phone at 402-312-4792.

Sincerely,

Rose M. Leavitt, M.A., M.S.N., R.N.

Ph.D. Candidate

University of Nebraska-Lincoln

The information contained in this communication, including attachments, is confidential and private and intended only for the use of the addressees. Unauthorized use, disclosure, distribution or copying is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you received this communication in error, please inform us of the erroneous delivery by return e-mail message from your computer. Additionally, although all attachments have been scanned at the source for viruses, the recipient should check any attachments for the presence of viruses before opening. Alegent Creighton Health accepts no liability for any damage caused by any virus transmitted by this e-mail. Thank you for your cooperation.
From: Howland,Kathy A  
Sent: Monday, January 14, 2013 9:00 PM  
Cc: Leavitt,Rose M; Kempnich,Jody  
Subject: Second Request to Participate in Nursing research

Sent on behalf of Rose Leavitt

This research project has been approved by the Alegent Creighton Nursing Research Council

Recently I contacted you by email about participating in a research survey on generational differences in work motivation of healthcare workers. If you completed the survey, thank you for participating. If you have not yet completed the survey, I want to remind you that the deadline for completion is February 1, 2013.

This research is part of my dissertation studies at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. The survey will require approximately 15 to 20 minutes and the information collected will be important in understanding more about generational differences in work motivation. Participation in this study is voluntary. When accessing the website, you will be directed to review an informed consent form prior to beginning the survey. All information obtained during this study will be kept strictly confidential. Please click on the following link to complete the survey https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/RLDissertation.

Thank you in advance for your participation. Please don’t hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or comments by email rleavittrn@gmail.com or by phone at 402-312-4792.

Sincerely,

Rose M. Leavitt, M.A., M.S.N., R.N.  
Ph.D. Candidate  
University of Nebraska-Lincoln
From: Howland,Kathy A  
Sent: Thursday, January 24, 2013 6:45 PM  
Cc: Leavitt,Rose M; Kempnich,Jody  
Subject: Final request to participate in nursing research

Sent on behalf of Rose Leavitt

This research project has been approved by the Alegent Creighton Health Nursing Research Council. We recognize the importance of nursing research is to improving care and our work environment and caregivers, so please consider supporting your fellow nursing colleague in her research. Below is the note from Rose.

Recently I contacted you by email about participating in a research survey on generational differences in work motivation of healthcare workers as part of my dissertation studies at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. **If you completed the survey, thank you for participating.** If you have not yet completed the survey, I want to remind you that the deadline for completion is February 1, 2013.

Participation in this study is voluntary. When accessing the website, you will be directed to review an informed consent form prior to beginning the survey. All information obtained during this study will be kept strictly confidential. The survey will require approximately 15 to 20 minutes and aid in understanding more about generational differences in work motivation. Please click on the following link to complete the survey **https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/RLDissertation.**

Thank you in advance for your participation. Please don’t hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or comments by email at rleavittrn@gmail.com or by phone at 402-312-4792.

Sincerely,

Rose M. Leavitt, M.A., M.S.N., R.N.

Ph.D. Candidate

University of Nebraska-Lincoln

---

The information contained in this communication, including attachments, is confidential and private and intended only for the use of the addressees. Unauthorized use, disclosure, distribution or copying is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you received this communication in error, please inform us of the erroneous delivery by return e-mail message from your computer. Additionally, although all attachments have been scanned at the source for viruses, the recipient should check any attachments for the presence of viruses before opening. Alegent Creighton Health accepts no liability for any damage caused by any virus transmitted by this e-mail. Thank you for your cooperation.
APPENDIX D

SURVEY INSTRUMENTS
Below are statements that describe the things that best motivate you. Rate your level of agreement with each of the following statements. There are no right or wrong answers – just your answers. Read each statement and answer honestly about yourself.

1. I prefer to do things that are fun.
   | Entirely Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Neutral | Somewhat Agree | Entirely Agree |
   | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

2. I like to be rewarded for extra responsibilities.
   | Entirely Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Neutral | Somewhat Agree | Entirely Agree |
   | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

3. It is important that others appreciate the work I do.
   | Entirely Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Neutral | Somewhat Agree | Entirely Agree |
   | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

4. Decisions I make reflect my personal standards.
   | Entirely Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Neutral | Somewhat Agree | Entirely Agree |
   | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

5. I work hard for a company if I agree with its mission.
   | Entirely Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Neutral | Somewhat Agree | Entirely Agree |
   | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

6. I get excited when working on things I enjoy doing.
   | Entirely Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Neutral | Somewhat Agree | Entirely Agree |
   | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

7. I will work harder if I get paid for the extra effort.
   | Entirely Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Neutral | Somewhat Agree | Entirely Agree |
   | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

8. I like to get recognition for a job well done.
   | Entirely Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Neutral | Somewhat Agree | Entirely Agree |
   | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

9. It is important that my work requires my unique skills.
   | Entirely Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Neutral | Somewhat Agree | Entirely Agree |
   | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

10. I need to believe in a cause before I work hard.
    | Entirely Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Neutral | Somewhat Agree | Entirely Agree |
    | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

11. I often put off work so I can do something better.
<pre><code>| Entirely Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Neutral | Somewhat Agree | Entirely Agree |
| ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
</code></pre>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. I work harder if I know my efforts will lead to better rewards.</td>
<td>Entirely Disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>Entirely Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I work harder if I know my efforts will be praised</td>
<td>Entirely Disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>Entirely Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I work harder if I know my skills are needed.</td>
<td>Entirely Disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>Entirely Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. When I believe in the cause, I work hard to help it succeed.</td>
<td>Entirely Disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>Entirely Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I get excited when I know I’ll be doing my favorite activities.</td>
<td>Entirely Disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>Entirely Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I work hard to find ways to earn more income.</td>
<td>Entirely Disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>Entirely Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I am motivated when people make me feel appreciated.</td>
<td>Entirely Disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>Entirely Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. My favorite tasks are those that are the most challenging.</td>
<td>Entirely Disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>Entirely Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I work hard when I feel a sense of purpose in the work.</td>
<td>Entirely Disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>Entirely Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I prefer to spend time with people who are fun to be with.</td>
<td>Entirely Disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>Entirely Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I like to find ways to earn more money.</td>
<td>Entirely Disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>Entirely Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I work hard on the job to strengthen my reputation.</td>
<td>Entirely Disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>Entirely Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
24. I prefer to do things that give me a sense of achievement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entirely Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Entirely Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. I am energized when I agree with an organization’s purpose.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entirely Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Entirely Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. When choosing jobs, I consider which job will be most fun.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entirely Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Entirely Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. I like to keep looking for better business opportunities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entirely Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Entirely Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. I give my best effort when I know others will notice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entirely Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Entirely Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29. I am motivated when my skills are needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entirely Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Entirely Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. My motivation will be high when I believe in what I’m doing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entirely Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Entirely Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. In what year were you born? (Enter 4-digit birth year; for example, 1976)

2. What is your gender?
   - Female
   - Male

3. What is the highest level of school you have completed or the highest degree you have received?
   - Less than high school degree
   - High school degree or equivalent (e.g. GED)
   - Some college but no degree
   - Associate degree
   - Bachelor degree
   - Master's degree
   - Doctoral degree
   - Professional degree (e.g. MD, DDS)

4. What is the job title for your current position?
   - Nursing Assistant
   - Medical Assistant
   - Nurse
   - Nurse manager/Director
   - Respiratory Therapist
   - Social Worker
   - Unit clerk/secretary/patient registrar
   - Administrative assistant
   - Physician
   - Other (please specify)

5. About how long have you been in your current position?
   - Years
   - Months