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<td>Extrinsic Motivation</td>
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<tr>
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<td>Full-time pre-tenure, tenure track professors at baccalaureate, master’s, and doctoral degree granting institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Motivation</td>
<td>Type of motivation that engages in activity rewarding in itself</td>
<td></td>
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<tr>
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</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research indicates that Millennials will represent forty-seven percent of the workforce in 2014, and evolve to dominate the global workplace as the prominent generational cohort by 2020. These demographic projections surface major considerations for recruitment and succession planning within the business realm; and especially higher education. Millennials have distinct attributes that govern their perspectives on the workplace that differ significantly from other generations.

The purpose of this study was to investigate how the idiosyncrasies of this generation’s workplace preferences (specific to the Millennial faculty population) impact job satisfaction. The research inquiry was launched utilizing institutional data from four-year public and private institutions in the Southeast in order to assess the relationship between overall job satisfaction and mentoring satisfaction; and to compare Millennial faculty job satisfaction to senior generations. The institutional data for this study was provided by the Harvard University Graduate School of Education’s Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE)’s survey results.
The COACHE Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey instrument assesses a number of benchmark themes that relate to overall job satisfaction, tenure and promotion, climate, culture, collegiality, and nature of work. Using the demographic portrait of the Millennial generation and Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory as a theoretical framework, multiple linear regression analysis was utilized to determine correlations between the variables identified and their impact on Millennial faculty job satisfaction. From the analysis of 9,496 faculty responses, the study produced statistically significant outcomes that addressed the research inquiry.

The outcome of the investigation signals a strong correlation between the impacts of mentoring satisfaction on the overall job satisfaction of Millennial faculty. Secondary analysis revealed notable statistical significance in respect to the correlation between overall job satisfaction within a comparative generational cohort. Pragmatic talent management and organizational development strategies are recommended to address the outcomes of this investigation to assist institutions in leveraging the power of the multi-generational workforce to attract and retain Millennial faculty.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

The Modern Workplace

Today’s global economy and economic fluctuations have caused business and academia to pay closer attention to its (arguably) most important resource, people. Employees serve as the key to achievement and growth for an organization due to the increased reliance on knowledge and performance to fuel productivity and efficiency. Today’s ‘knowledge workers’ represent the most coveted members of the workforce. Leadership expert and researcher Peter Drucker proclaims that knowledge workers are generally professionals such as teachers, lawyers, architects, physicians, nurses, engineers, and scientists. He adds that a knowledge worker is “one who works primarily with information or one, who develops and uses knowledge in the workplace,” (Drucker, 1973, 1999). Researchers suggest there is a correlation between job satisfaction and job performance, and that a “better understanding of factors associated with it helps guide employees’ activities in a desired direction” (Mandal and Dalal, 2006).

When considering motivation and job satisfaction from an educational lens, having satisfied educators at the post-secondary level is imperative. Estimates are that 6,000 jobs in higher education need to be filled annually due to retirements and that the demand for qualified college faculty will continue to grow nationwide (Quinn and Chandan, 2012). However, generational shifts could arguably be identified as an even greater concern for institutions of higher learning.

For the first time in history there are four generational cohorts working alongside each other; Traditionalists (individuals born 1945 and earlier), Baby Boomers (individuals born between 1946 and 1964), Generation X (individuals generally born
between 1965 and 1978), and Millennials/Generation Y (individuals born between 1979 to 2000). While generational diversity brings a variety of experiences and perspectives to the workplace, the differing needs and values of each generation must be addressed in order to build and maintain a high-performing organization (Lieber, 2010). This is especially true as generations hold varying levels and positions across many industries.

The Emergence of Millennials in the Workplace

For several years, Baby Boomers have been the dominant generational cohort in the workplace. This demographic trend is rapidly changing as Millennials are the fastest growing segment of the multi-generational workforce to date and will become the dominant cohort of the future (Meister and Willyerd, 2009). This shift provides an array of considerations for employers as they seek ways to design careers and organizational climates that promote maximum contributions and satisfaction among their personnel. One cannot ignore the very unique expectations and viewpoints that each cohort has for their career.

Due to their upbringing and cultural zeitgeist that predominated while they were growing up, this generation [Millennials] has an entirely different work ethic, attitude, and a different set of values shaking the foundation of workplaces everywhere. (Lipkin and Perrymore, 2009)

The work ethic and values that Lipkin and Perrymore (2009) describe has fueled the success of several Millennial leaders in business. For example, Millennials populate the top leadership ranks of two of the most successful corporations of our time: Facebook and YouTube.

Just a few years ago, generations were separated at work by rank and status. In hierarchical organizations, the oldest employees filled executive positions, the middle-aged held mid-management jobs and the youngest worked on the frontlines. People weren’t likely to rub elbows on a daily basis with other age groups. Today [Traditionalists] report to Generation Xers while Millennials present ideas to Baby Boomers. Four distinct
generations work side-by-side to solve problems, make decisions, manage projects, serve customers, and design products. (AARP, 2007)

This changing dynamic has caused the rise of Millennials to become a major topic in the workplace.

There is no right or wrong in learning the behavior traits of Millennials compared to past generations, but their uniqueness does bring forth realities that must be addressed by the systems in place—whether it is education or the workplace. (Emeagwali, 2011)

As we consider the emergence of Millennials as the prevailing cohort in the workplace, all sectors—especially higher education need to pay close attention to their impact on the organizational climate.

**Statement Of Problem**

Any college or business that is inclusive of an engaged and productive employee base with strong morale is a recipe for a high-performance organization. When considering the importance of job satisfaction and retention—there is a strong business case for significant study and research into what keeps employees satisfied. The increasing number of retirements projected from the Baby Boomer generation is starting to force organizations to examine succession planning initiatives and organizational capacity. Talent management for optimal employee performance is an essential ingredient for organizational success, viability, and growth.

According to the Society of Human Resource Management (SHRM), direct replacement costs related to employee turnover averages fifty to sixty percent of an employee’s salary and total replacement costs are upwards of 90%-200%, (Allen, 2008). Organizations must constantly evaluate the core tenants that contribute to job satisfaction and motivation to remain viable.
The Association of Colleges and Universities (AACU) cites that the average age of an American professor is rising due to massive hiring in the 1960s, little growth in total faculty size, slow faculty turnover, good health care, and a decline in the rate of retirement (AACU, 2001). The subject of job satisfaction is important to examine for the entire working population, but there is a particular segment of academe—Millennials that must be closely studied due to their increasing presence.

Since Millennials have emerged within the faculty ranks, studying and identifying themes that lead to job satisfaction and motivation among this group can provide key indicators that will lead to attracting and retaining this population of professionals and future leaders. In a recent job satisfaction survey of secondary teachers, researcher Azerbaijan Baku stresses:

It is an undeniable fact that teachers play a key role in the education life of students. Teachers are foremost among those who have a considerable influence on future generations of a nation. Teachers need to be satisfied with their position in order to fulfill their responsibilities. (Baku, 2012)

Baku’s research and other external factors further illuminate the importance of this issue on the higher education agenda.

**Purpose of This Study**

The purpose of the study is to investigate the job satisfaction factors of Millennial faculty at four-year institutions in Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Virginia based upon survey results provided by the Harvard University Graduate School of Education’s Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE). Founded in 2002 (with funding from the Ford Foundation and Atlantic Philanthropies), the COACHE organization is a self-sustaining research entity focused on connecting academic leaders with the opportunity to cultivate and optimize data to support
institutions and outcomes. Institutions that partner with the COACHE organization must be four-year colleges or universities (COACHE, 2013).

The COACHE organization provided survey responses from institutions in the aforementioned states to address the following research questions:

- Is there a significant difference between overall job satisfaction among Millennials compared to other surveyed faculty?
- As a generational cohort, is there a significant relationship between overall job satisfaction among Millennials and their satisfaction with mentoring opportunities at their institutions?

**Limitations**

The following limitations have been identified in respect to this study:

- The study is limited to analysis of institutional survey results from public and private four-year colleges and universities in Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina and Virginia collected in 2011.
- Data collection was conducted by a third party using a pre-designed survey instrument related to job satisfaction, and institutional raw data sets were provided to the researcher by the Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE) at Harvard University’s Graduate School of Education.
- All survey responses were self-reported.
- Institution names have been de-identified and must be kept confidential in accordance with COACHE’s policies and the researcher’s agreement with the organization.

**Significance of Study**

The topic and analysis set forth in this study is noteworthy for a variety of reasons. Industry experts project that the Millennial generation will dominate the workforce by 2020. According to Jeanne Meister, author of the 2020 Workplace, "Millennials will be entering the workforce in record numbers…representing forty-seven percent of the workforce by 2014," (Meister and Willyerd, 2009). In industries such as...
information technology and digital media, Millennials make up a large percentage of the workforce already. Furthermore, Millennials have a different approach to work that varies greatly from their generational counterparts. Flexibility in work scheduling, performance rewards, career pathing, community service and balance are some of the overarching workplace priorities for this generation. The uptick of Millennial employees poses a significant risk to institutions from a succession planning perspective if they are not deliberately recruited and retained.

Additionally, The Chronicle of Higher Education detailed the lack of interest in presidential opportunities for many academics that are currently in senior level positions. The article states that a 2008 survey by the Council of Independent Colleges revealed that one-third of Chief Academic Officers did not want to become presidents because of lack of enthusiasm for the position and a concern about work/life balance (Stripling, 2011). These attitudes coupled with the imminent generational turnover contribute to a leadership gap that serves as a catalyst for investigation into the job satisfaction of the emerging Millennial generation.

In the academic sector, many institutions may not realize the importance of attracting and retaining Millennials into higher education careers—especially in faculty roles. Without a continuous pipeline of qualified candidates that are committed to the profession and promotional opportunities; institutions will continue to have issues with hiring qualified candidates for presidencies and other senior level administrative positions going forward.

The Millennial generation will soon begin to make its mark as college and university faculty members. They will also bring new attitudes, behaviors, and expectations. The ways that institutions adapt to differences between
Millennials and previous generations and capitalize on their strengths will have long-term implications for every institution. (Kelly, 2007)

Literature on the impact of Millennial teachers in general (secondary and post-secondary) states that Millennials are a flight risk in the teaching profession because they are less committed than earlier generations to making a career out of teaching (Richardson, 2011). Flight risks among the faculty population further reinforce the need for study and research of the Millennial generation. Experts assert that the professoriate may be becoming “less attractive overall to the younger generations” and that younger people are choosing industry instead of academia due various processes related to tenure and service expectations (Fogg, 2008). Having the capability to evaluate, predict and recommend critical strategies to retain and recruit Millennials enhances succession strategies on a global level.

Millennials [may be] less committed than earlier generations to making a career out of teaching. This means that concerns about the loss of new teachers may become even more pronounced, as Millennials become the primary source of new teachers. (Richardson, 2011)

Now is the time to elevate and devote significant inquiry into this topic.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

The problem under investigation in this study has multiple prisms for examination as it relates to the Millennial generation. Kelly (2007) states that it’s important to consider future faculty (e.g. Millennials) before they arrive because the planning and changes associated with this group will not occur overnight. He adds that Millennials are starting to emerge more prominently at the community college level, and will continue to enter the faculty ranks at four-year institutions in increasing numbers (Kelly, 2007).

This review of literature provides a sound framework for the investigation at hand. The hypotheses generated for this study are influenced by the literature uncovered relative to generational cohort traits, the applicability of the Herzberg Two-Factor Theory as it aligns with those demographics, and contemporaneous research related to job satisfaction.

This review provides critical insights into the sample group from a demographic perspective, followed by a review of job satisfaction and motivational theoretical frameworks with specific emphasis and focus on Herzberg’s Two Factor Theory. These topics align with the background and problem presented in Chapter 1, and serve as framework for the investigation.

An Overview of the Millennial Generation

The Millennial generation age range varies among researchers. The common estimates of this generational cohort include individuals born from 1977 through 1981, and ending as late as 2002. The most common range is an individual born between 1977 and 2000, which represents the majority of the research assessments. The
Millennial generation is by far the most diverse generational cohort to date with more individuals of color (especially African-American and Hispanic) than any other cohort—with the exception of Generation X, (BSG Concours, 2007). Millennials have higher levels of attainment of baccalaureate and graduate degrees, particularly among females and minorities as well. Counteractive to that trend, Millennials have experienced higher than average unemployment rates since the early 2000’s due to the economic recession and its impacts on certain industries (Erickson 2008, NCES 2007, Blain, 2008). These events have shaped the Millennial generation's career entry and advancement trajectory.

Attributes of Millennials

Life experiences and the childhood upbringing of the Millennial cohort contribute significantly to their worldviews. Some of the key seminal historic events that have shaped this generation’s worldview includes the: Release of Nelson Mandela/Apartheid ending, Oklahoma City bombing, Death of Princess Diana, AIDS epidemic, Columbine High School shootings, World Trade Center attacks, Enron corporate scandal, Iraq War, The Internet, Launch of Facebook, and Hurricane Katrina. These bedrock events have molded this generation’s perspectives in a prominent way.

In addition to the historical events that shape the Millennial worldview, Howe and Strauss (2000) have identified seven fundamental characteristics that largely describe this group grounded in their research:

- Special: The childhood experience of a Millennial leads them to believe they are extremely special and important to the world.
- Confident: Parental interaction has given them a very optimistic (although sometimes unrealistic) perspective on the future.
- Achieving: Millennials are on track to be the most highly educated generational cohort to date.

- Sheltered: This group has experienced significant safety initiatives (such as car seats, helmets, seatbelts, etc.) compared to other generations before them.

- Team Oriented: Millennials like to be surrounded by people typically, and enjoy working in teams.

- Pressured: Millennials are accustomed to significant study requirements and constant opportunities.

- Conventional: They tend to adhere to the values of their Baby Boomer/Generation X parents.

Additional attributes of this group include a perception that they are self-centered—which is why Millennials are often referred to as the ‘me’ generation (AARP, 2007). This is somewhat debated anecdotally and from a research perspective, but is commonly attributed to the fact that Millennials have been provided with a variety of options as it relates to activities, schedules, and other aspects of their lives that are tailored to their individual needs. Another contributor to this attribute is the constant praise and attention that Millennials receive from their (often Baby Boomer or Generation X) parents. Millennials tend to have very close relationships with their parents, and they evolve into friendships that remain highly influential in their adulthood. Furthermore, Millennials are often very astute at multi-tasking due to the packed schedules they may have experienced during childhood because their parents had careers outside the home.

Another relevant point of consideration is that Millennials grew up as the overscheduled children of Baby Boomers. They learned how to juggle Advanced Placement (AP) classes with before-school choir practice and afterschool sports. They listened to music and watched television while they did their homework (Richardson,
and questioning, (Kehril and Sapp, 2006).

Millennials have always had immediate access to information, and are used to communicating with friends and family using digital means. They spend about sixteen hours a week on the web; eighty percent read blogs on a regular basis and forty percent write them (Tresser, 2007). While these are skills that are valuable in the workplace, they can cause Millennials to have weak intrapersonal communication skills in the long term without proper education and coaching. When evaluating technology practices, knowing the baseline demographics and attributes of the Millennial generational cohort sets a strong foundation for evaluating their expectations of the workplace.

**Millennials in the Workplace**

The body of literature that speaks to the impact of the Millennial generation on today’s workplace is vast. Experts universally agree that the Millennial workforce has expectations that differ significantly from their counterparts in the Baby Boomer and Traditionalist generations. Their workplace attitudes (which motivate their career paths) include flexibility, team orientation and individualism, and continual learning (Brown et al., 2010).

The Harvard Business Review published important research that provides a more detailed portrait of Millennials that reveals several overarching major workplace characteristics (Hewlett, Sherbin, and Sumberg, 2009):

- **Ambition** – Eighty-four percent of Millennials profess to be ambitious and willing to go the extra mile for their employer.

- **Loyalty vs. Quest** – Only forty-five percent of Millennials intend to stay with their current employer for their entire career. Most reported that they are more
concerned with challenges and new experiences from a professional perspective.

- Impacting the World – A large number of Millennials (eighty-six percent) report that it’s important that they make some type of contribution to the planet and/or world as a part of their work.

- Comfortable with Diversity – Approximately seventy-five percent of Millennials are comfortable (and in some cases expect) to work with (and for) individuals from different ethnicities and backgrounds. They tend to embrace diversity in the workplace and see it as a positive aspect of the job.

- Achievers – Millennials report that setting high expectations and meeting them is very important aspect of their job satisfaction.

Researchers summarize that:

Generation Y shares characteristics with both Generation X and Baby Boomers, but has its own distinguishing characteristics including cultural tolerance, a willingness to volunteer, and familiarity with technology. As the most diverse generation, Millennials demonstrate a readiness to accept a wide range of cultural differences. In addition to increased levels of tolerance, Generation Y’s self-confidence and expectation to quickly move up the career ladder leads some researchers to label them the entitlement generation. (Brown et al., 2010)

Brown et al. (2010) also note that Millennials are more technologically adept. This assertion can vary according to the availability of technology and income level of the specific cohort member, which may limit access. The characteristics described by Brown et al. (2010) are far-reaching beyond the typical workforce expectations of the average employee. The high expectations of Millennials regarding technology advancements/availability, volunteer opportunities, collaboration, and social consciousness in their careers may be values normally integrated into the typical workforce dynamic.

**Work-Life Balance**

The United States is viewed as one of the strongest capitalistic societies in the world as Americans typically spend more time at work than their global counterparts.
Twenge et al. (2007) reports that work hours among Americans has increased significantly in the last thirty years, while decreasing in other nations. As a result of most Millennials being raised by working parents they place a premium on work-life balance (and time outside of work) even though they expect to spend the majority of their time in the workplace.

Members of the younger generations grew up watching their parents sacrifice for their careers, and they want something different: balance, freedom and autonomy. For these new 20-something workers, the line between work and home doesn't really exist. (Trunk, 2007, Fogg, 2008)

Millennials are looking for work-life integration versus work-life balance. A recent study indicated that thirty-six percent of Millennial men said they would walk away from a job that didn't offer them a flexible work schedule, and almost half of Millennials expect to work standard office hours five to ten years from now (Holland, 2013).

Millennials crave the ability to set their own schedules allowing them to multi-task their lives. This is often in contrast with the organizational climate they may find themselves in. Claps (2010) projects that:

[More than] ninety percent of the workplace or more remains largely calibrated to family patterns and life-cycle rhythms of the early and mid-20th century when wives typically raised children and husbands worked forty hours a week in a factory, office or store.

This construct is vastly different from the realm that Millennials desire in regards to their work, and is often one of the key factors in their selection of job opportunities. Organizations must consider policies that keep these considerations and workplace preferences in mind.

In addition to the work-life balance expectations, additional noteworthy workplace elements of Millennial expectations detailed in Figure 2-1 include:
• Talent not seniority should influence career advancement.
• Rules that make sense should be followed; otherwise Millennials will make up rules as they go along.
• The workplace should evolve to meet their needs instead of their assimilation to the workplace.
• Preferred methods of contact include email, texting, social media, and instant messaging.

While some may view the aforesaid workplace attributes as challenges, these expectations can have positive impacts. Lipkin and Perrymore (2009) assert that the immense initiative, demand for work conditions that potentially benefit everyone, and the desire for interpersonal equality among all ranks as traits Millennials have that serve as a positive influence on organizational dynamics. A Millennial’s loyalty to their co-workers and friends versus their actual organization may enable them to serve as valuable change agents in industries (such as higher education) that may not organically evolve as fast as others to meet their common goals.

**Career Advancement and Progression Expectations**

Research also suggests that Millennials are very resistant to the assumptions and workplace culture that their Traditionalist and Baby Boomer generation counterparts (who are often their supervisors) subscribe to. Author and multi-generational communications consultant Cam Marston stresses that Traditionalist and Baby Boomer professionals assume that Millennials share their definition of success. They believe that younger workers should ‘pay their dues’ and follow the same timeframe and paths to achieve similar levels of promotion (Marston, 2007). This assumption is contradictory to a Millennial’s actual perception of career pathing. Due to the higher degree of educational attainment for this cohort, they view this topic through a different paradigm.
Even though Millennials may share a desire to move up the career ladder quickly, they demonstrate a willingness to ‘pay their dues’ in other ways, often through education as they perceive more advanced degrees accelerate advancement in the workplace. (Brown, et al. 2010)

A Millennial employee will not typically assume that years of service is equivalent to competency, which conflicts with many organizational dynamics—especially the tenure track within the academic realm.

It is estimated that more than thirty percent of individuals between the ages of 25 and 29 have a college degree (Twenge, 2007). However, these degrees have also amounted in a higher than average level of debt as well. Although Millennials expect swift career advancement, this sense of urgency is fueled by their upbringing and their burgeoning debt (Claps, 2010).

Moreover, Millennials are starting to populate the management ranks in other industries at a rate that outpaces senior generations. It’s estimated that 87% of Millennials took on a new management role between 2008 and 2013, compared with 38% of Generation X managers and 19% of Baby Boomers (Holland, 2013). With this rapid progression, expectations of career mobility will continue to rise. A Millennial’s drive for success may be off-putting to their generational counterparts but when focused in the right direction can be advantageous for their careers and the organizations they serve.

A core component/expectation that Millennials have for their career advancement process is clear direction and transparency because they are used to having instant access to information. Millennials may not respond well to the levels subjectivity that are occasionally part of the tenure track process, and may not view it as the ‘crown-jewel’ of
a faculty career. The mystery, guidelines and timing that shroud the process may conflict with a Millennial’s expectation for quick promotion and career progression. The tenure track is typically influenced by one’s research, scholarly record, and service in the field. This contradicts the expectations of Millennials, as they may not share the same affinities to a specific institution or to a particular role:

The academic model is predicated on an individual remaining with one organization throughout his or her career. Once tenure is earned and awarded, the majority of professors will not leave the institution just to start the process over again at another institution. Generation X and Generation Y both acknowledge that they prefer rewards to be based on competence and contributions, not on tenure with the organization. (Hannay, 2010)

Clearly the Millennial expectation of career mobility and attainment is in strong contrast with the historic premise of higher education.

**Professional Development**

Millennials are constantly seeking learning opportunities as a result of achieving higher levels of education.

The Generation Y cohort values professional development and continuous learning. This group is aware of the need for constant skill development and updating to build a portable career. (Shaw and Fairhurst, 2008)

Millennials value opportunities to learn especially if they perceive it will provide tools needed for career advancement and growth. Shaw and Fairhurst (2008) assert that Millennials would rather ‘do’ than ‘listen’ as they believe experience is most important. Millennials often gravitate to experiential learning, coaching, and technology infused learning opportunities when considering their professional development options.
Millennials and Mentoring

Relationships and connections are highly coveted by Millennials. Their desire for constant connectivity with people and technology fuels their affinity for mentoring. Because Millennials view their parents as stewards of their upbringing and coaches, they have similar expectations of workplace interactions.

Millennials look for mentoring relationships and see them as a key component of their professional growth and maturity (Evans and Forbes, 2012). When Millennials are in the early stages of their career, not only do they desire mentoring, they need it. Sheef and Theilfoldt (2004) indicate that a Millennial’s fondness for personal attention also contributes to the appreciation and positive response to this approach in the workplace.

Millennials expect mentoring from their direct manager, and other individuals who surround them on a regular basis due to their curiosity and necessity for constant feedback. This is one of the most common traits found in empirical and popular literature regarding expectations of this group. Millennials see mentoring as their ‘road map’ to success. Due to their varied experiences and preferences, there are a variety of mentoring approaches that experts state Millennials respond well to including:

- One-on-One Mentoring: This is the standard relationship that establishes goals and learning opportunities with one individual. This approach (albeit traditional) can be particularly effective if the mentor/advisor has the desired leadership characteristics that Millennials highly regard and respect as explained in Chapter 2. Walker (2009) suggests that first-time educators should be automatically assigned mentors to help them get acclimated and provide ongoing support as they build their foundation in the profession.

- Group Mentoring: This is particularly attractive to Millennial faculty as it allows for more collaboration with a group of individuals who may have similar learning desires or goals. Central College in Minnesota has implemented a Teaching Circles program that allows six to ten faculty members to collaborate and discuss common college issues that affect their jobs. They
receive a stipend for their participation as an incentive for engagement and continual learning (Kelly, 2007).

- Situational Mentoring: This type of mentoring is micro-targeted to address a very specific need such as shortening the learning curve on a specific topic and/or solving a specific problem. This is an appealing approach as it provides the quick on-demand learning that Millennials desire. Cammillion Solutions (a major software company) has instituted this approach under the name ‘micro-feedback’. This approach allows managers to provide on-demand and quarterly reviews that are limited to specific and targeted topics (Meister and Willyerd, 2010).

- Anonymous Mentoring: This is a technology-based approach that matches mentors and mentees using psychological assessments, and is usually funded by the employer. It creates the opportunity for additional schedule flexibility to ensure routine interaction. It also aligns with a Millennial's comfort level with technology (Meister and Willyerd, 2010).

The learning relationship between Millennials and leadership can yield additional benefits for mentors. Since the presence of Millennials is growing throughout the workforce and in the student population mentors can often learn from their mentees as well. This is a concept commonly referred to as ‘reverse mentoring’ and is often an unintended benefit of the mentoring process. The reverse mentoring concept is evolving to become more intentional—especially in the business world. Companies such as Cisco Systems, Johnson and Johnson, and General Electric (GE) are implementing formal reverse mentoring partnerships (Ellis, 2013).

When considering the fact that Millennials are ‘digital natives’ they are typically comfortable with technology, and can often provide insights within the education realm in regards to Millennial students. Through the reverse mentoring process, Millennial faculty can provide valuable coaching and development opportunities to senior faculty that will not only help them continue to adapt to the multi-generational workforce, but can also help them interact more effectively with their students. “Opportunities for learning and open discussion provided by mentoring are fluid and countless, and new
relationships formed by mentors and mentees can be inspiring and genuine," (Ellis, 2013). Reverse mentoring gives employees a ‘window’ into higher levels of the organization, so as individuals retire and leave they [Millennials] have a better understanding of the business (Meister and Willyerd, 2010).

**Leadership Preferences of Millennial Faculty**

Millennials have been exposed to a variety of life experiences and workplace roles due to the success of their parents and secondary learning experiences. As a result, they set an extremely high bar for supervisors and expect them to serve as role models and guides for career development purposes (Claps, 2010). The top leadership values Millennials desire in a manager include dedication, strong listening skills, focus, encouragement, dependability and optimism, (Campbell, 2002). These preferences are important, as Millennials not only expect to learn from their direct supervisor, but from individuals throughout the organization. Brown et al. (2010) support this characterization as they indicate, “Generation Y anticipates continual learning experiences from their superiors and those of other generations.” Millennials respond and prefer leaders who embody a collaborative and coaching leadership style to a formal authoritative approach. “Based on research and anecdotal information Millennial faculty will likely respond better to a collaborative governance structure than an authoritative one,” (Kelly, 2007). They gravitate towards leaders that consider and value their opinions, but also can make quick decisions and provide immediate solutions to support their daily work (Claps, 2010).
Technology Expectations of Millennial Faculty

Technology is a necessity for the average citizen, and is growing exponentially in education as a teaching and productivity tool. The increased number of Millennial students and faculty (combined with their heightened technology expectations) has forced all generations to embrace the latest instructional management systems, mobile application technology, social media, and the Internet as tools for learning and engagement. For Millennials this is commonplace for interaction.

The most obvious difference between Millennials and previous generations is in the area of technology. There have always been some faculty members who enthusiastically adopted new technologies, but for many new technologies have been something to deal with rather than to embrace. (Kelly, 2007)

For institutions who are slow to adapt to technology, and/or have dated technology access, this may contribute to dissatisfaction for this generational cohort. Kelly adds “As Millennials enter the academic workplace, the conversation will likely shift from faculty coping with new technologies to faculty pushing the envelope when it comes to experimenting with emerging technologies,” (Kelly, 2007). Clearly, institutions must invest in technology for a robust student and employee experience especially for Millennials. Now that the general context for the Millennial generation has been set, the next section will explore the review of the critical job satisfaction and motivational theories that guide this study.

Theoretical Frameworks for Job Satisfaction and Motivation

The marketplace’s reliance on knowledge workers has forced businesses to consider the core drivers of motivation and job satisfaction to promote bottom-line results. Knowing the intrinsic factors that motivate and promote satisfaction has become increasingly important to organizational success.
Although studies of industry workers provide meaningful data on job satisfaction, it is perhaps misleading to assume that findings pertaining to this population can be generalized for all people in all occupations. (Brown, et al., 2012).

Levers of motivation and job satisfaction can vary according to industry. Author Jim Collins asserts, “You cannot manufacture passion or motivate people to feel passionate. You can only discover what ignites [their] passion and the passion of those [around them],” (Collins, 2001). Capturing the essence of what ignites Millennial faculty and fuels their job satisfaction provides valuable direction that will ensure that one of the most treasured institutions of our nation—higher education will have individuals at its helm to ensure its ongoing vitality and relevance.

Today, faculty are asked to think beyond routine instruction and scholarship and focus holistically on a student success. To do so, colleges must begin to tap into the elements that fuel a faculty member’s long-term motivation and job satisfaction. Doing so helps identify key motivators that support their achievement and performance.

Job satisfaction or dissatisfaction depends on a large number of factors ranging from where employees have to eat their lunch to a sense of self-fulfillment they may receive from doing their jobs. (Brown et al., 2012)

The stimulus for motivation varies according to generation. While early theorists have uncovered universal themes that apply to most employees, perspectives about the Millennial generation and foundational theories related to job satisfaction are critical to the workplace desires and growth potential of this cohort. Keeping these theories at the forefront of leadership development, succession planning, and employee retention strategies is essential to long-term organizational sustainability.
Foundational Theories of Job Satisfaction and Motivation

While this study isolates the Millennial generation as a core focus from a analysis perspective, it is imperative to understand the foundational job satisfaction theories that relate to how job satisfaction is determined to help set the stage for further analysis and interpretation of study outcomes and conclusions. The cornerstone theory that guides this study is derived from the themes and empirical research uncovered by Frederick Herzberg. It is also influenced by other foundational and modern theories that align with Herzberg’s research. When evaluating the foundation of job satisfaction and motivational study, Abraham Maslow is heralded as the forefather of this topic because of the creation of the Hierarchy of Needs methodology and serves as a starting point for the discussion.

Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs

Abraham Maslow is often referred to as the forefather of human psychology. He authored the preeminent foundational theory of motivation commonly referred to as Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs. In his writings, *A Theory for Human Motivation* and *Motivation and Personality* Maslow asserts that individuals are stimulated by a series of needs that primarily influence their human behavior. Particularly, Maslow asserts that if certain fundamental needs were not met, individuals would not seek additional levels of fulfillment and achievement. Maslow’s theory details a series of five levels that an individual must progress to in order to achieve complete fulfillment; they are (Maslow, 1943):

- Physiological Needs: Breathing, Food, Water, Homeostasis, Sexual Activity, and Sleep
• Safety Needs: Personal and Financial Security, Health and Well-Being, Protection Against Danger

• Love and Belonging: Friendship, Intimacy, and Family

• Esteem: Achievement, Adequacy, Freedom, and Strength

• Self-Actualization: Need for Self-Development, Continuous Improvement and Achievement of Purpose/Capabilities

Maslow believed that each level had to be met prior to an individual exhibiting behavior for the next. He asserted that the former level provided motivation for the latter. Maslow claimed that if these needs were met, an individual’s motivation would be at optimal levels. This assertion was (and continues) to be debated relative to its impacts on job satisfaction. Maslow’s theory has been subsequently applied and utilized as a barometer of motivation and job satisfaction for decades. Maslow’s research is applicable across many instances within the personal/human relation’s realm. Maslow’s explanation for human behavioral needs is also widely accepted among the academic community, and has served as the foundation for the core theory that guides this investigation—the Herzberg Two-Factor Theory which hones in on this methodology from a workplace perspective. The Herzberg Two-Factor Theory serves a guiding framework for the assessment of the Millennial generation from a job satisfaction perspective, which ultimately shapes the premise for this research.

**Herzberg’s Two-Factor (Motivator-Hygiene) Theory**

Frederick Herzberg (a contemporary of Abraham Maslow) is one of the most influential psychologists, professors, and researchers in the realm of business management and motivation (Carter, 2006). Herzberg’s qualitative study of 200 engineers in the late 1950’s resulted in the publication of the “Two-Factor Theory” theory (also known as the “Motivation-Hygiene” Theory) in 1959. Herzberg asserts that
internal and external influences (motivation and hygiene factors) contribute to an
individual’s job satisfaction and dissatisfaction and cannot be measured on the same
scale as shown in Figure 2-2. Herzberg states that factors that relate to the content of
an individual’s job—achievement, recognition, increased responsibility, growth, and
advancement serve as motivators. “What makes people happy is not what they do, but
how well they are treated,” (Herzberg, 1974).

Hygienic factors are factors that related to the treatment of employees and are
highly based upon systems, policies and relationships with superiors and management.
While hygienic factors can provide a boost to morale/satisfaction, Herzberg’s study (and
subsequent application of his theory) discovers that it is not sustainable without the
balance of motivators. Hygienic factors identified in the study are: company policy and
administration, supervision, interpersonal relations, working conditions, salary, and
security. Herzberg’s findings resulted in the Two-Factor Theory becoming one of the
most common benchmarks for job satisfaction and employee motivation measurement
following its initial publishing.

**Application and Viability Of Herzberg’s Theory**

An EBSCO Host search of contemporary articles published citing the Herzberg
theory resulted in over 855 entries. From a dissertation outlook over 650 dissertations
have been developed utilizing the Herzberg Theory as its framework or foundation
according to the Proquest Dissertation database. Over 80 of those dissertations were
published within the last twelve to eighteen months. In addition to Herzberg’s theoretical
framework being leveraged by contemporary scholars, researchers have validated the
theory and its relevancy on measurement of work motivation.
Nigel Bassett-Jones and George C. Lloyd (2005) replicated Herzberg’s study with over 3000 participants. The study resulted in the reinforcement of Herzberg’s assertions that hygienic factors (such as money) do not serve as intrinsic motivators and influencers of job satisfaction. Comparatively, factors such as career advancement, growth, and recognition serve to support sustainable motivation and concrete job satisfaction overall. Bassett-Jones and Lloyd (2005) state, “despite the criticism, Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory still has utility nearly 50 years after it was first developed,” (Bassett-Jones and Lloyd, 2005).

In addition to contemporary research applications (such as Bassett-Jones and Lloyd) the increased narrative and publication of Herzberg’s outcomes are a popular bedrock for workplace motivation and satisfaction. Herzberg’s Harvard Business Review article based on his historic research, *One More Time, How Do You Motivate Employees?* is one of the most requested and downloaded articles of all-time according to the publisher (Herzberg, 2002). Although Herzberg’s theory is widely recognized, it was not immediately accepted with overwhelming concurrence, as several researchers challenged Herzberg’s findings upon its publication in 1959 and thereafter.

**Common Challenges to Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory of Job Satisfaction**

When initially published Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory was groundbreaking and presented a significant paradigm shift within the behavioral sciences. As a result of its significance, several researchers questioned its ultimate validity. In the article “*Does Herzberg’s Theory Really Work?*” Paul W. Cummings replicated Herzberg’s study with 310 employees at a chemical company using the rank-order selection method. The study allowed participants to assign significance to 22 job satisfaction and dissatisfaction factors. Cummings’ hypothesis was that Herzberg’s theory assumed that
impacts of motivators and hygienic factors were equivalent for all employees.

Cummings felt that the Two-Factor Theory was not universal. His challenge was that other organizational factors—specifically a person’s level in the organizational hierarchy directly impacts an individual’s ranking of motivators and hygiene factors significantly. The outcomes of Cummings’ research reinforced Herzberg’s overall differentiation between motivators and hygienic factors to measure employee satisfaction. However, Cummings’ research also supported his hypothesis that weight assigned to job satisfaction/dissatisfaction factors is highly influenced by an employee’s rank in an organization.

Cummings’ research also indicated that lower level employees reported a higher degree of job dissatisfaction than senior employees. Cummings states in his final study that,

Work values change significantly as one moves up within the organizational structure. Management can create motivational job satisfaction at all levels of the organization (if it wants to) and are willing to apply contemporary management methods. (Cummings, 1974)

Another challenge to the generality of Herzberg’s research was related to his research methods. Dr. Robert B. Ewen outlined several questions related to the research methodologies used in the Herzberg study in an article published in the Journal of Applied Psychology. Ewen questioned the perceived generalizations that Herzberg made in his study conclusions, (Ewen, 1964). His particular issue related to the viability of his research methods and data. Ewen stated that Herzberg made statements about the causes of overall job satisfaction and dissatisfaction without having any data relevant to overall job satisfaction and dissatisfaction, (Ewen, 1964). Specifically, Ewen outlined a series of substantive challenges to Herzberg’s research which include:
- **Narrow Range of Jobs Investigated**
  Ewen asserts that by choosing only accountants and engineers, Herzberg and his associates only used a 'small sample' of jobs that could've been studied (Ewen, 1964).

- **Use of Only One Measure of Job Attitudes**
  Since Herzberg only used a semi-structure interview to determine the various job attitudes, Ewen states that this approach is only viable for a study that is 'exploratory' in nature, not one that is claiming the breadth and depth of findings that Herzberg asserts in his published research (Ewen, 1964).

- **No Viability and Reliability Data**
  In the research findings, parallel-form or test retest reliability coefficients were not reported, which raises questions about the test method feasibility and integrity (Ewen, 1964).

- **No Measure of Overall Satisfaction**
  In Herzberg's study, he delineates motivators and hygienic factors for job satisfaction and dissatisfaction, but does not highlight any universal measures for overall job satisfaction. Ewen further states that because other factors (such as rank as illustrated by Paul Cummings) impact a person's assessment of both factors; it is necessary to identify or rule out through research the establishment of universal factors of satisfaction at work (Ewen, 1964).

  British researcher Godfrey Gardner also challenged Herzberg’s outcomes by raising questions regarding the impact of the rank order methodology that participants used to rate the impact of job satisfaction/dissatisfaction factors. Gardner asserts that the factors were too heavily influenced by Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs theory (Gardner, 1977). Conversely, Gardner agrees with Paul W. Cummings' conclusions that Herzberg's theory is incomplete because it does not provide an overarching measure to gauge comprehensive job satisfaction. Gardner arrived at his conclusions through the replication of Herzberg's research in three distinct studies.

  Ironically enough, an article co-authored by Herzberg in 1971 alludes to the fact that the rank-order methodology can possibly produce results that could be misinterpreted (Grigaliunas and Herzberg, 1971). However, the article also reinforces
Herzberg’s theory as being the benchmark for job satisfaction stating that the theory has undergone “well over 50 replications and is perhaps, the most replicated study in contemporary industrial psychology,” (Grigaliunas and Herzberg, 1971). The questions raised by challenges to Herzberg’s research may be arguably valid. However, the theory’s premise has continued to resonate in the research community and has been applied as a context for modern-day research and publication. Clearly, Herzberg’s theory has endured the scrutiny of the research community and has been elevated to acceptance by the workforce/business community.

**Future Research/Gaps In Application of Theory**

While Herzberg’s theory continues to be the common framework for job satisfaction; the landscape of literature regarding Herzberg’s theory and its application is lacking depth in several critical areas. Particularly notable is the lack of research that specifically applies the theory of job satisfaction by gender, race/ethnicity, or age group, which influenced the identification of additional variables for testing within this investigation. The majority of the published research may focus on a specific job role (which may be inclusive of race, gender or age) but there is not a broad representation of a specific analytical focus on these groups. Due to the evolving makeup of today’s business and academic world, the relevancy of such research and focus will continue to be a necessity for consideration.

It is very evident from the volume of literature utilizing Herzberg’s theory that the research community will continue to test and debate its validity while also expanding its reach. From the specific evidence and recognition of Herzberg’s findings related to motivation within the research community, it’s clear that Herzberg’s Theory is debatably
the point of reference for all research based job satisfaction evaluation post-Maslow. Its endurance within the research community speaks volumes regarding its applicability.

**Additional Foundational and Modern Job Satisfaction Theories of Note**

While Herzberg’s theory serves as the theoretical foundation for this investigation, an environmental scan of methodologies results in several additional foundational and modern-day theories that compliment themes from Herzberg’s research that will apply to the analysis and interpretation of this study’s results. While these theories may not have the universal acceptance, they have applicability in respect to Millennial job satisfaction as the body of research in this specific area continues to develop.

**McClelland’s Need for Achievement Theory**

Dr. David McClelland was a distinguished professor and human psychological theorist best known for his creation of the ‘Need for Achievement’ theory. Unlike his counterparts, McClelland strongly believed that motivational factors were shaped by one’s climate and environment and centered upon three core drivers: achievement, affiliation, and power. McClelland asserts,

> Those high [or dominant] in achievement set goals privately for themselves of intermediate difficulty so they are likely to get a sense of personal accomplishment. Those [influenced heavily by] power seek to stand out publicly and do so in gambling [and] taking more extreme risks…[while individuals] high in affiliation try to avoid public competition by taking low risks. (McClelland and Watson, 1973)

Overall, McClelland’s theory suggests that whatever driver is most dominant will dictate an individual’s initiative, motivation and satisfaction in their particular job. McClelland’s theory may have more relevance in the private sector versus academia, but does align with the career progression that Millennials expect.
McGregor’s X and Y Theory

Social psychologist Douglas McGregor of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) provided the academic world with a workplace focused theory of motivation that provided a comparison of perspectives from an employee and organizational viewpoint. Theories X and Y detail management perspectives of origins of employee motivation.

Theory X relies on the assumption that individuals require constant motivation because they are naturally unmotivated. Specifically it assumes that 1) individuals naturally do not like work; 2) individuals must be directly influenced to get the best work from them; and 3) individuals will evade accountability in order to advance their well-being (McGregor, 1960). Theory Y aligns with Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs and assumes that individuals are self-motivated and enjoy work. Theory Y’s approach is a more participatory style of management motivation, and strongly recommended in McGregor’s findings. Members of early generational cohorts may tend to subscribe to components of Theory X as they are used to working for or employing the ‘command and control’ leadership approach.

Person-Organization Fit Theory

Person-Organization Fit Theory (P-O fit) is a theory developed by the University of Maryland’s Amy K. Kristoff. Kristoff reveals a significant degree of correlation between an individual’s values (at the organizational and personal level), which in turn influences their retention significantly (Kristoff, 1996). Kristoff asserts that an organization that aligns its values with the individuals they hire will experience low turnover rates. In some cases, P-O fit may be more of an overriding factor than one’s intellectual aptitude to complete a specific job. Kristoff’s theory argues that the ideal
state for employee job satisfaction and retention is when P-O fit is complementary and
aligns with the mission, vision, and values of an organization, (Krisjoff, 1996). An
organization must truly assess and identify its actual culture versus its aspirational
culture to hone in on the traits that are critical to P-O fit. Using those benchmarks,
organizations can apply this theory in a fashion that will enhance its ability to attract and
maintain all generations, especially Millennials. Person-Organization Fit theory can be
partially applicable in higher education due to the unique culture that can vary by
institutional type and role.

**Flow Theory of Motivation**

The Flow Theory of Motivation is a methodology created by Mihalyi
Csikzentmihalyi in the early 1990’s to describe the experiences of people who are
motivated to achieve or engage in activity just for the sake of doing it (Csikzentmihayi,
1990). He argues that some people are motivated by initiatives or tasks (themselves)
with no desire for external reward. He refers to this as the “Flow Theory”, as individuals
who fall into this category are often in an intense flow or zone of concentration and
focus when they are working towards goals or on tasks (Csikzentmihayi, 1990).

Individuals who fit into the Flow Theory have a high level of intrinsic motivation.
However, the theory asserts that this level of motivation is heightened exponentially
when individuals have a sense of control, receive feedback, and have the time and
resources to complete their goals. A drawback for individuals who are governed by the
Flow Theory is that they are often disinterested in tasks that do not promote a high
degree of expectation and achievement. This can be problematic when employees are
paired in work environments with individuals who are not intrinsically motivated and
require a higher degree of extrinsic motivation for job performance and satisfaction. It can also cause dissatisfaction in environments that are extremely bureaucratic or have significant progress barriers or levels of management. The Flow Theory provides another theme that aligns with the theoretical framework as a Millennials desire for connection, feedback and service to the community/world can influence and/or deter their internal motivation.

**Job Satisfaction of Faculty at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs)**

In addition to the general job satisfaction theories and frameworks presented, there is an emerging body of research as it relates to job satisfaction of Millennial faculty by institutional type and race/ethnicity that is worthy of consideration. Due to the diversity and the openness to cultural differences of Millennials, it further reinforces the future applicability of this research within the context of job satisfaction.

The body of research relative to job satisfaction from a race/ethnicity perspective is still emerging, with only a few notable studies to date that feature varied levels of conclusions.

Currently there are 105 Historically Black Colleges and Universities across the nation (Quinn and Chandan, 2012). The history of these institutions is tantamount to evaluating the job satisfaction of the faculty who work there. According to the Thurgood Marshall Fund Incorporated (2012) Historically Black Colleges and Universities (commonly referred to as HBCUs) were established in 1965 during the Civil Rights era as part of congressional legislation in Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965,
although the first HBCU (Cheney University in Pennsylvania) was actually established in 1837—prior to this legislation.

For a number of decades, HBCUs were the only avenue available for African Americans to pursue higher education. The Thurgood Marshall Fund also reports that although HBCU’s account for three percent of colleges or universities; they produce 20 percent of the nation’s African-American baccalaureate earners and more than 50 percent of African-American teachers and engineers (Thurgood Marshall Fund, 2012). It is also reported that 70 percent of African-American doctors and dentists and 35% of African-American attorneys earned their bachelors degrees at an HBCU; and that HBCUs as a whole comprises 14 percent of African-Americans matriculating in college (Quinn and Chandan, 2012).

Conversely, the exponential results of graduates do not match with the level of funding and makeup of the professoriate. Although parity funding and declining state funding affects all public institutions—HBCUs tend to be hardest hit due to already minimal resources. Although HBCU’s comprise a high degree of graduates, the earning potential and donor behaviors of this group are not strong enough to augment gaps in funding that HBCUs often encounter (Quinn and Chandan, 2012). This often results in these institutions having to cultivate an environment of extreme efficiencies in order to continue their record of positive outcomes.

It is also apropos to note the importance of diversity as a component for talent management and succession planning as well. The National Center for Education Statistics (2003) reports a shortage of faculty overall and an even greater shortage of faculty of color at postsecondary institutions in the United States.
The National Center for Educational Statistics also asserts that institutions should be proactive in their efforts to diversify faculty and to ensure they represent the makeup of their student body (NCES, 2003). This chapter discusses the importance of diversity to Millennials, which should make the ability to attract diverse faculty to academe a reasonable focus. When evaluating the demographic makeup of the professoriate at HBCU’s there are noteworthy trends of research as it relates to minority faculty—especially African-Americans. NCES reports that the number of African-American faculty members have declined at HBCU’s, which they project may be a result of a lower number of African-American’s attaining terminal degrees and/or choosing to pursue careers in higher education, (Boston, 2002). Hooker and Johnson (2011) report that even though people of color represent 30 percent of the United States population, they only represent 15 percent of full-time faculty; with African-Americans comprising an even lower rate of faculty representation at 7 percent (although they represent 12-13 percent of the population). These demographic changes are important to note as job satisfaction at these institutions has been assessed throughout the years.

**Notable Contemporary Studies**

Similar to the body of research relative to Millennial faculty job satisfaction there is not a sizeable amount of longitudinal studies of reference as it relates to the examination of job satisfaction among faculty at HBCUs compared to PWIs. This can be troublesome considering the demographic representation previously mentioned. There are, however, a number of notable contemporary studies that have begun to probe this topic from a myriad of perspectives.
A 2011 study conducted by Allison Rose featured qualitative research that investigated job satisfaction among 31 faculty members at HBCUs and PWIs. Rose’s findings indicated that mentoring was deemed as a strong driver of job satisfaction, although there were disparities at it relates to the formalities and effectiveness levels within the institutional context (Rose, 2011). Both sets of respondents signaled dissatisfaction as it relates to the culture of career advancement/promotion; but this level of dissatisfaction varied greatly when evaluated at an academic department level.

During the same year as Rose’s research, Hooker and Johnson (2011) published their study of sixteen African-American male faculty at PWIs and HBCUs. The main themes from their investigation indicated that surveyed faculty were satisfied with the level of job flexibility they experienced, but indicated dissatisfaction with financial compensation. Faculty also reported that institutional fit and diversity were major factors in job satisfaction. For those that reported lower degrees of satisfaction with these themes, they projected significant retention issues and possible departure from academe as a result of their attitudes (Hooker and Johnson, 2011).

In 2009, a qualitative study was conducted to analyze the influences of job satisfaction of eleven African-American faculty members at HBCUs and PWIs respectively (Wright, 2009). The outcome of this study indicated that the level of job satisfaction as it relates to job flexibility and interactions with students is very strong among HBCU faculty compared to their counterparts who served at PWIs. HBCU faculty were more dissatisfied with their workloads, pay, and perceived favoritism in respect to promotional opportunities. Faculty at the PWIs that were surveyed reported dissatisfaction with their work environment, limited diversity, and negative perspectives
among students. Wright’s conclusions were that freedom, job flexibility, and levels of recognition on the job influenced job satisfaction specifically (Wright, 2009).

Hubbard and Sage (2009) also published research that shared outcomes of the attitudes and perceptions of faculty serving at predominantly Black or Hispanic institutions. While they surveyed faculty on a variety of topics, the themes related to job satisfaction that developed from their experiment are relevant to further research. Faculty at predominantly Black institutions were less satisfied with their opportunities for career advancement, quality of students, and decision making capabilities (Hubbard and Sage, 2009). They also reported that when evaluating job satisfaction at the two-year institution level, significant statistical gaps were not evident.

Berrian (2006) focused a study on two specific institutions (Tennessee State University and Vanderbilt University) when evaluating job satisfaction within the context of institutional type. Berrian’s study of 170 faculty members from both institutions resulted in the overarching conclusion that institutional type does influence job satisfaction (Berrian, 2006).

Specifically, survey participants at Tennessee State University (an HBCU) reported a lower degree of job satisfaction compared to their counterparts at Vanderbilt University (a PWI). However, when examining this result within the racial context, job satisfaction was higher for Caucasian faculty at Tennessee State University compared to Caucasian faculty at Vanderbilt University (Berrian, 2006). Moreover, African-American faculty at Tennessee State University reported a significantly higher degree of job satisfaction than their African-American counterparts at Vanderbilt University. The results of Berrian’s work illustrate the impacts and importance of institutional type and fit
as it relates to overall job satisfaction. This outcome also aligns with Kristoff’s (1996) Person-Oorganizational Fit theory illustrated previously in the chapter.

While Berrian (2006) evaluated this topic for specific institutions, Dr. Gloria McNeal published findings in 2003 that were exclusive to a specific academic discipline in her survey of African-American nursing faculty at PWIs and HBCUs on topics related to scholarship, productivity, and satisfaction (McNeal, 2003). McNeal’s survey of 147 nursing faculty produced two key research outcomes at it relates to the assessment of job satisfaction. African-American faculty at PWIs reported job dissatisfaction in respect to leadership, work environment, and socialization processes compared to their HBCU counterparts (McNeal, 2003). HBCU faculty reported dissatisfaction with salary levels, lack of mentorship, and unequal expectations as it results to performance (McNeal, 2003). This aligns with previous contemporary research outcomes presented by Herzberg (1974) as it relates to hygiene factors and motivators that dictate satisfaction and levels of motivation.

A secondary yet recent study of note is Quinn and Chandan’s (2012) research as it relates to the demographical differences of job satisfaction for faculty at HBCU’s using the Leadership Practices Inventory as a theoretical framework. While their focus was primarily on specific leadership questions, they did uncover relevant ancillary themes. When surveying overall job satisfaction by gender they did not uncover any statistical differences, but did note statistical differences for survey results according to ethnicity, (Quinn and Chandan, 2012). These studies in confluence with the research framework presented provide a sound framework for inquiry.
Conclusion

The aforementioned theories and research overview detail the core premises of thought leadership regarding the demographic lens, job satisfaction perspectives, and recent experiments as it relates to the focus of this study. The utilization of the generational demographic portrait of Millennials and the Herzberg Two-Factor Theory provide a strong guide for this investigation which will ultimately produce outcomes to help shed light into the dynamics that drive this emerging group. This theoretical framework provides a strong springboard for this probe.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRADITIONAL WORK ETHIC</th>
<th>MILLENNIAL (GEN Y) WORK ETHIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work comes first</td>
<td>Life comes first</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinction between work and personal time</td>
<td>No distinction between work and personal time = work/life integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow the rules no matter what</td>
<td>Follow the rules that work and make their own rules if they do not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The boss deserves respect</td>
<td>Equality and respect are given only when earned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniority = promotion</td>
<td>Talent = promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 to 5 with overtime expected</td>
<td>No defined work clock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work is based on hours</td>
<td>Once work is finished I can leave for the day even if its before 5pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference for face-to-face contact</td>
<td>Preference for digital contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dress the part at all times</td>
<td>Dress the part when necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will change to meet the needs of the organization</td>
<td>Expect the organization to change to meet their needs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2-1. Traditional versus Millennial Work Ethic Chart
Figure 2-2. Herzberg two-factor theory framework overview
CHAPTER 3
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this study is to investigate job satisfaction among tenured and non-tenured Millennial faculty at colleges and universities within North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, and Georgia. Forecasts of this generation’s emergence in the workplace and academic ranks warrant investigation into the factors that will help them gravitate to and flourish in academic careers. Nonetheless, it is crucial to recognize that Millennials have an immensely different perspective on the world of work. With the aging professoriate, and the growing entry of Millennial faculty into the ranks of colleges and universities nationwide, examining the motivational drivers and job satisfaction of this group is vital. This chapter will review the research methodology for this investigation, research questions, and details regarding the data and procedure for analysis.

To initiate the study, a data set from the Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE) at Harvard University’s Graduate School of Education was requested from results derived in their survey instrument administered to institutions nationwide. COACHE’s Faculty Job Satisfaction survey instrument focuses on the following benchmarks:

- Nature of the Work (Overall, Research, Teaching)
- Tenure and Promotion
- Work and Home
- Climate, Culture and Collegiality
- Overall Job Satisfaction
The COACHE studies and respective data were selected for this analysis, as their data is complementary to the job satisfaction factors identified for analysis and indexing as part of this study. These studies also represent a comprehensive systematic view of the chosen generational cohort address a set of common research questions. Leveraging the COACHE data for this investigation and its subsequent results will be useful in the ongoing talent management, retention and leadership development of this generational cohort.

**Research Questions and Hypotheses**

As stated in the review of literature, the investigation into job satisfaction of Millennial faculty is not only critical to the success of academia, but a necessary inquiry for the world of work overall (Howe and Strauss, 2000). The research questions for the investigation were formed based on the environmental review of literature regarding Millennials generally and the examination of their role within higher education. The rationale for both questions takes into consideration the strong influence of a Millennial's generational perspectives in contrast with historical norms in higher education.

The first research question answered in this study was: Is there a significant difference between the overall job satisfaction responses among the Millennials compared to other surveyed faculty? The null and alternative hypotheses statements formulated for research question one are:

- **Null Hypothesis:** There is not a significant difference between overall job satisfaction of Millennials compared to other surveyed faculty.
- **Alternative Hypothesis:** There is a significant difference between overall job satisfaction of Millennial faculty compared to other surveyed faculty.
The second research question in the investigation was: As a generational cohort, is there a significant difference between overall job satisfaction among Millennials and their satisfaction with mentoring opportunities at their institutions? The null and alternative hypotheses statements formulated for second research question are:

- Null Hypothesis: There is not a significant difference between the overall job satisfaction of Millennial faculty, and their satisfaction with mentoring at their institutions.
- Alternative Hypothesis: There is a significant difference in the relationship between the overall job satisfaction of Millennial faculty, and their satisfaction with mentoring at their institutions.

Based on the hypotheses stated, it is projected that the outcome of this study addresses the research questions outlined, but also indicates the degree of correlation that may be evident among the variables tested.

**Procedure for Data Collection and Acquisition**

The researcher contacted the COACHE organization regarding the availability and access to data for the study based upon previously administered surveys. The COACHE organization provides doctoral students to access results for dissertation purposes upon completion of an application, which includes a summary of research plans, data storage, and confidentiality agreement. Once a sample group was identified that fit within those standards, a data set comprised of results was supplied to the researcher for data delimitation, organization, and analysis. The raw data set was comprised of results from 10,453 respondents.

**Southeastern Colleges and Universities**

The sample group referred to as Southeastern Colleges and Universities includes public and private institutions from Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina,
and Virginia. These institutions enlisted the COACHE organization at Harvard University’s Graduate School of Education to administer job satisfaction surveys at their respective institutions. The researcher’s agreement with the COACHE organization does not allow for individual identification of the institutions provided in the data set. However, some institutions within the Southeast that have made their survey results public in the past include Clemson University, North Carolina State University, and the University of North Carolina at Charlotte.

**The Population and Sample**

All full-time tenured and non-tenured faculty from colleges and universities in Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina and Virginia surveyed by the COACHE organization in 2011 and 2012 were provided in the requested data set. Per the data confidentiality agreement with the COACHE organization, we will refer to this group as the “Southeastern Colleges and Universities”. The initial data set provided included 10,453 individuals. After initial data delimitation of individuals that did not have an outcome score necessary for analysis, the final analytic sample was 9,456 faculty responses.

**Instrumentation**

The instrument used to administer this survey was developed, tested and validated by the COACHE organization to assess benchmark scores including overall job satisfaction. Dimensions were rated along a five-point Likert scale (e.g., satisfaction, effectiveness, agreement, clarity, etc.) (Likert, 1935). In some cases scores may not include survey dimensions not pertinent to the research questions due to institutional type or cohort year provided, (COACHE, 2013).
The COACHE organization reports that “the survey's validity [has been] through many hours of cognitive testing with faculty at various institutional types. Following a multi-institutional pilot study, our analyses of the data, including feedback from respondents and advice of academic leaders of various institutional types (e.g., research universities and liberal arts colleges), produced a unified faculty instrument, the COACHE Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey, that includes many questions directed at all tenure-stream faculty, but others asked only of pre-tenure faculty, or of tenured faculty, or of associate professors, and so on,” (COACHE, 2013). The survey gathers data along these themes to help Chief Academic Officers (CAOs) answer the following questions:

- How do faculty of different career stages experience academic work life at my institution?
- How do their experiences compare to those of faculty at peer institutions?
- Do their experiences differ by rank, gender, or race/ethnicity?
- What policies or practices are associated with high levels of faculty satisfaction and vitality?

The specific benchmarks assessed within the instrument include satisfaction related to the following variables:

- Nature of the Work (Overall, Research, Teaching): Focus of time as a faculty member, courses taught, support for research, etc.
- Tenure and Promotion: Tenure process, criteria, standards, possibility for achievement, support from institution
- Work and Home: Institutional benefits available to support work/life balance (i.e. childcare, etc.) support of personal and professional life balance during tenure process and in respect to promotional opportunities
• Climate, Culture and Collegiality: Formal and informal mentoring, organizational fit, interaction with faculty, administration, professional development and collaborative opportunities

• Overall Job Satisfaction: Reported job satisfaction at the department, division, and institutional levels

The administration process for the survey consists of an email invitation that includes a unique URL for each participant based upon names and email addresses provided by the participating institution. The survey includes 270 questions that relate to the aforementioned themes, as reflected in the examples shown in Figures 3-1, 3-2, and 3-3 respectively. Faculty responses are aggregated and provided in a report to the institution that reveals survey results at the institutional and divisional level.

Research Approach

The data set provided by the COACHE organization was analyzed to determine any type of significant relationship or differences in reported scores from the Millennial cohort in comparison with other variables indicated in the study. Particular focus was given to the overall job satisfaction benchmark score, which is comprised of several survey items that related to reported satisfaction/dissatisfaction at the department, division, and institutional level.

Procedure for Analysis: Multiple Linear Regression

When contemplating the possible relationship among multiple factors when considering in a research study, regression is the logical procedure for this type of investigation. The specific statistical technique utilized for this study is multiple linear regression. Multiple linear regression is a workhorse of statistical methods for analysis of independent variables (“the causes”) and dependent variables (“the effects”), (Beck, 1980). The sophisticated level of analysis provided by this statistical technique is the
best foundation for this study, and also provides a significantly increased level of predictive analyses.

Beck (1980) states that multiple linear regression allows for a researcher to incorporate more than one independent variable in an equation resulting in a robust explanation of the dependent variable and making the effect of the independent variable more certain. Utilizing this method allows the determination of any correlation between the factors included in the research questions aforementioned, in addition to the identification of the level of significance (if any) that may be present among the relationships between these variables. However, it is important to note that correlation is not the indicator of causality, but does provide data outcomes that could possibly feed into future cause and effect analysis. Higgins (2005) states that multiple linear regression provides for the investigation into how an established group of explanatory variables are associated with a dependent variable of interest.

Furthermore, multiple regression analysis provides the opportunity to identify any significant relationship between the stated variables in order to address the research questions. Specifically, this statistical method will help determine the presence of a relationship (if any) between the identified variables.

The variables identified for research clearly identify what groups are receiving experimental treatment and the outcomes that result from it (Creswell, 2009). For this investigation, the reported overall job satisfaction benchmark score will serve as the dependent variable. The Millennial faculty job satisfaction responses overall and responses related to mentoring satisfaction will serve as independent variables in
accordance with the stated research questions. The independent variables will be controlled for institutional type (private/public) and gender.

The Millennial cohort variable was chosen as a result of the research presented that illustrates a significant difference in the workplace expectations of this age group compared to counterparts in other generations. Mentoring was chosen as another variable due to the emphasis and importance of this trait within the workplace research related to the Millennial generation (Blain, 2008). The Herzberg Two-Factor Theory as presented in Chapter 2 (as it relates to workplace preferences of Millennials) provides a theoretical framework that contributes to the goal of this study. This approach will produce results that illustrate correlations and how they can serve as possible predictors of job satisfaction.

The multiple regression statistical technique is based on a number of assumptions. Ostrom (1990) states that if these expectations are met, it indicates that the estimations are unbiased, efficient and consistent. These assumptions are typically assessed through visual inspection of the histograms (scatterplots) produced through data analysis. The fundamental assumptions for multiple regression analysis that Ostrom (1990) and Beck (1980) both outline include:

- **Linearity**: The relationship between the variables is linear.
- **Homoscedasticity**: The residuals have constant variance, regardless of the value of the dependent variable.
- **Absence of Univariate Outliers**: There are no extreme values present in the data.
- **Normality**: Residuals are normally distributed and are not related to explanatory variables.
- **Non-autoregression**: Residuals are not correlated with one another.
• Zero Mean: The expected values of residuals is zero.

In addition to the assumptions above, the level of significance utilized for this study is .05, which is common for most educational statistical analysis, (Beck, 1980).

**Preparation for Analysis**

The data for this research was provided in a secure file to the researcher from the COACHE organization. The data was cleaned to ensure its readiness for analysis. First, the survey sample of 10,453 faculty responses was reduced to a final analytic sample of 9,496, which only includes responses from 2011. This was the only year in the data provided that included survey responses from Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs), which provided for a more robust survey group. From a demographic perspective, Millennial faculty were coded as individuals with reported ages between 18-35. The remaining survey group included individuals ages 36 and above. Institutional type was coded to ensure identifiers for variables and controls. Private and public institutions were also recoded (private =0, public = 1).

From a survey perspective, any survey responses outside of the Likert Scale (1-5) were coded as missing. The directions of the scale indicate that the only valid responses were 1-5 where 1 was not satisfied and 5 was very satisfied. Any reported number other than 1-5 was coded as missing and not factored into the analyses.

The reliability of the scale for the survey designed from the COACHE organization was double-checked and was deemed as highly reliable with Cronbach’s Alpha reported as .848 as shown in Figure 3-4 based upon the reliability statistics provided. Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient range is 0 to 1. The nearer Cronbach’s
alpha coefficient is to one the better the internal reliability of the items in the scale (Higgins, 2005).

Summary

The statistical technique for this study is geared towards identifying traits that contribute to Millennial job satisfaction that may ultimately influence their job satisfaction. The responses from this generational cohort can be used to influence professional development and/or retention strategies in academia. Results from the data analysis are detailed in Chapter 4.
GLOBAL SATISFACTION

If you were to choose to leave your institution, what would be your primary reason?
- For other family or personal needs
- To pursue an administrative position in higher education (e.g. chair, dean, or provost)
- To pursue a nonacademic job
- To find a more collegial work environment
- To move to a preferred geographic location
- To find an employer who provides more resources in support of your work
- To work at an institution whose priorities match your own
- To improve your prospects for promotion
- To retire
- To improve your quality of life
- To improve your salary/benefits
- To improve the employment opportunities for your spouse/partner
- Other (Please specify):
- There is no reason why I would choose to leave this institution
- Decline to answer

Figure 3-1. COACHE survey global satisfaction survey example

NATURE OF WORK -- OVERALL

Please rate your level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the portion of your time spent on the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very dissatisfied</th>
<th>Decline to answer</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service (e.g., department/program administration, faculty governance, committee work, advising/mentoring students, advising alumni or prospective students/parents)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative tasks (e.g., creating and submitting reports, routine paper work)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach (e.g., extension, community engagement, technology transfer, economic development, K-12 education)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3-2. COACHE nature of work survey question example
Figure 3-3. COACHE survey mentoring question example

Figure 3-4. COACHE reliability statistics for faculty job satisfaction survey data
CHAPTER 4
PRESENTATION OF RESULTS AND IMPLICATIONS

Opening Remarks

The investigation of the job satisfaction of Millennial faculty is the cornerstone of this investigation due to the external factors and implications of the Millennial generation’s entry into the workforce. While Millennials have accelerated their domination in certain industries to date; they are steadily increasing in presence among the faculty ranks, which provides a platform for this research inquiry. To assess the perceptions of job satisfaction among Millennial faculty members in Southeastern Colleges and Universities this chapter presents the results of the data analyzed in Chapter 3. The analysis will address the following questions:

- Is there a significant difference between the overall job satisfaction responses among the Millennials compared to other surveyed faculty?
- As a generational cohort, is there a significant difference between overall job satisfaction among Millennials and their satisfaction with mentoring opportunities at their institutions?

Survey Responses

Full-time faculty at colleges and universities within the Southeastern Colleges and Universities sample group were included in the data provided by the COACHE organization from surveys administered in 2011 and 2012. The data set provided by the COACHE organization consisted of responses from 10,453 individuals, which resulted in a final analytic sample of 9,456 as detailed in Chapter 3. Table 4-1 documents the demographic breakdown of the analytic sample (n).
From a gender perspective, sixty-two percent of respondents (5,887) were male, compared to thirty-eight percent (3,609) who were female.

When evaluating institutional type, eighty-eight percent of respondents (7,670) were faculty at public institutions, while slightly over nineteen percent (1,826) were employed at a private college or university. Of this total group, close to three percent (262) faculty members worked at a private or public Historically Black College or University (HBCU).

Generational cohort demographics indicated that almost eight percent (742) of the faculty included in the final analytic sample are considered Millennials.

**Statement of Method and Interpretation of Results**

Multiple regression analysis was performed to determine the results of this study using SPSS. Data provided by the COACHE organization was inputted and verified for accuracy. The first research question examined the potential of any statistical significance in the reported job satisfaction of Millennials compared to other faculty. The null hypothesis was: There is no significant difference between the reported job satisfaction of Millennial faculty in comparison to other surveyed faculty.

The baseline assumptions for this analysis were acceptable. The independence of the observations presented was confirmed as a result of the study being designed to only elicit one response per individual per year. Normality was assessed and deemed appropriate as shown in the P-Plot of residuals as shown in Figures 4-1 and 4-2. Homoscedasticity was also determined by visual examination of the same figures, which also displayed a uniform dispersion of residuals.

Correlation and multiple regression analyses were conducted to examine the relationship between job satisfaction of Millennials compared to the remaining survey sample. Figure 4.3 summarizes the descriptive statistics and analytic results. The mean
rating for the survey sample was 3.65. As shown in Table 4-2 each of the job satisfaction scores is positively and significantly correlated with the criterion indicating there is a difference between the job satisfaction reported by Millennial faculty in comparison to the remainder of the group. However, the difference is not a strong predictor due to the small effect size. There was no differentiation identified in the results in regards to gender.

The multiple regression model produced a p-value of <0.001 and a coefficient of determination of $R^2 = .017$, which indicates a seventeen percent variance in job satisfaction among Millennial faculty compared to senior generations. This can be interpreted as a useful predictor of analysis. The ninety-five percent confidence interval for this group is between 3.57 and 3.63. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected, and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. However, while the results do indicate a statistically positive relationship, its small effect size does minimize its ability to be deemed a solid predictor of job satisfaction differentiation overall.

The second research question examined the identification of any statistical significance in the difference between the reported job satisfaction of Millennial faculty in comparison with their satisfaction with mentoring at their respective institutions. The baseline assumptions for this analysis were acceptable. The independence of the observations presented was confirmed as a result of the study designed to only elicit one response per individual per year. Normality was assessed and deemed appropriate as shown in the P-Plot of residuals as displayed in Figures 4-4 and 4-5. Homoscedasticity was also determined by examination of the same figures, which also displayed a uniform dispersion of residuals, although a bit scarce in the top left corner.
Correlation and multiple regression analysis were conducted to determine the relationship between overall job satisfaction and mentoring satisfaction among Millennial faculty. Table 4-3 summarizes descriptive statistics and analytic results. The results indicate a strong statistical correlation between overall job satisfaction and mentoring satisfaction among this group.

The multiple regression model produced a p-value of <0.001 and a coefficient of determination of $R^2 = .27$ which indicates a twenty-seven percent variance in overall job satisfaction and satisfaction with mentoring. The ninety-five percent confidence interval for this value is between 2.09 and 2.20 respectively. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. The results indicate that each time an individual’s mentoring satisfaction increased by one point (on a 1-5 scale), their overall job satisfaction increased by .482 points. Mentoring is a strong statistical predictor in the determination of overall job satisfaction among this generational cohort.

**Implications of Results**

The results presented in this study reinforce the Herzberg Two-Factor Theory and subsequent theories referenced regarding Millennials. In general the totality of the outcomes do mirror the theoretical framework which indicates that workers experience a high degree of internal motivation from organizational achievement, advancement, recognition, and the ability to succeed (Herzberg, 2002). This is particularly similar to the foundational theories included in the writings of Maslow (1954), Herzberg (1959, 1974, 2002), and Csikzentmihayi (1990) respectively.

When considering the specific outcomes the first research question’s finding was somewhat surprising. The initial hypothesis did call for a more significant relationship
between overall job satisfaction based upon the different expectations of the Millennial work experience. While the outcomes of the research did not reject the hypothesis, it doesn’t confirm it with certainty. Several factors may have contributed to this outcome. Since the Millennial generation is just now beginning to integrate into the faculty ranks; the generational cohort may not have been large enough to truly assess the relationships as it relates to generational demographics. The sample group itself may also impact this outcome. It could be theorized that institutions that are willing to make a significant financial investment in the study of job satisfaction on a global scale may have leadership in place that represent the desired characteristics that Millennials covet as discussed in Chapter 2. The result may also indicate that although the sample size was appropriate for experimentation, there still is not enough representation of the Millennial cohort among the faculty ranks at this time. Clearly, more research is needed to further examine the strength of this correlation for the total body of academe.

The experiment’s strongest result regarding the impact of mentoring on overall job satisfaction does reinforce generational cohort demographics and expectations, but exponentially highlights the importance of this experience within the workplace. It further clarifies the necessity for all generations in academia to recognize the importance of mentorship. When considering the direct correlation between mentoring and job satisfaction, it is very clear that institutions must pay attention to this lever and its influence. A research inquiry into prominent junior faculty mentoring programs at degree-granting institutions produces several highly regarded and formalized programs at Emory University, The University of California at San Diego, Stanford Medical School, University of Oregon and the University of Wisconsin (Thomas, 2005). Institutions that
have intentional and deliberate approaches may see the type of strong job satisfaction levels illustrated in this study. The University of Michigan’s faculty mentoring policy states that:

The interests of the departments and programs, of the College and the University, and of individual faculty members are best served when the people we hire are constructively mentored and reviewed. Constructive mentoring and reviewing of tenure-track faculty works to help such faculty meet high standards of rigor, depth and innovation in scholarship, and to realize their full potential as scholars, teachers, and members of the academic community. (Thomas, 2005)

This type of commitment is necessary to sustain high levels of job satisfaction. It is also important to note that the outcome of this question provides a grim picture for institution’s that are unwilling to cultivate this type of environment or have a significant lack of mentors for younger faculty. Institutions that fall into this category may experience a higher degree of turnover and have retention issues compared to their counterparts who are able to institute this type of approach within the faculty ranks.

**Conclusion**

Based on the initial hypotheses asserted, both research questions do indicate positive correlations between overall job satisfaction of Millennial faculty compared to the variables tested. However, it remains important to note that the strongest indicator of job satisfaction among the variables tested is mentoring. The other indicator (generation/age demographics) did not produce results that would deem appropriate to submit the outcome as a strong predictor of overall job satisfaction (albeit moderately statistically significant). As recommended in the discussion points, further research will
determine whether the interpretations regarding these outcomes can provide an overarching predictor of job satisfaction related to generational cohort and institutional context.
Figure 4-1. Predicted vs. actual residuals for research question 1
Figure 4-2. P-P Plot of Residuals for Research Question 1
### Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Benchmark Score: Nature of Work - Mentoring [COACHE]</th>
<th>overall satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.0898</td>
<td>3.6570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>9359</td>
<td>9496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>1.01001</td>
<td>.96103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4-3. COACHE provided benchmark score data
Figure 4-4. Predicted vs. actual residuals for research question 2
Figure 4-5. P-Plot of residuals for research question 2
Table 4-1. Comparison of initial and analytic sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Initial Sample</th>
<th>Analytic Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HBCU</td>
<td>315 (3.0%)</td>
<td>262 (2.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>1,981(19.0%)</td>
<td>1,826(19.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>8,472(81.0%)</td>
<td>7,670(80.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennial</td>
<td>742 (7.1%)</td>
<td>742 (7.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>6,401(61.2%)</td>
<td>5,887(62.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>4,052(38.8%)</td>
<td>3,609(38.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total N</td>
<td>10,453</td>
<td>9,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parameter</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>3.599</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennial</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>0.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td>0.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: $R^2 = .017$, adj $R^2 = .016$, RMSE = 0.95
Table 4-3. Overall Satisfaction OLS Regression Results for Mentoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Semi-partial squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>UB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>2.143</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>76.28</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>0.482</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>57.08</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
<td>0.254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>0.188</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>8.68</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.029</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-1.68</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: $R^2 = .27$, adj $R^2 = .27$, RMSE = 0.82
CHAPTER 5
SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The Millennial generation’s emergence as the prevailing cohort in the workplace offers a new archetype for higher education. With that consideration in mind, colleges and universities must keep the management and optimization of the multi-generational workforce at the forefront of their strategic agendas. Talent governs an institution’s ability to attract and retain students—as quality faculty heavily influences learning outcomes and degree completion. As Millennials begin to replace Baby Boomers in the workplace and faculty ranks, institutions must have a deliberate strategy to address the work related needs of this dynamic group and what keeps them satisfied and engaged.

Examining what motivates and provides career satisfaction to Millennials is a critical element of consideration for leaders in the workplace. For higher education, the key drivers that influence job satisfaction for this group will provide a blueprint that can be leveraged to keep this generation in the academic world.

This study investigated the core job satisfaction influences as it relates to Millennial job satisfaction as reported by survey results provided by Harvard University’s Graduate School of Education Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE). The COACHE organization oversees the administration of their proprietary survey instrument to assess global job satisfaction and a variety of other factors that contribute to employee engagement and motivation. For the purpose of this investigation, survey results were acquired for Southeastern Colleges and Universities for surveys administered in 2011 to address the following questions:
• Is there a significant difference between overall job satisfaction among Millennials compared to other surveyed faculty?

• As a generational cohort, is there a significant relationship between overall job satisfaction among Millennials and their satisfaction with mentoring opportunities at their institutions?

The results presented in this investigation further illuminate the point that a multi-generational workforce is one of the most powerful tools an institution has to achieve its mission. Given that many professors work well into their 70's while students enter higher education typically at 18; there lies significant generational challenges on the college campuses, (Hannay, 2010). The conclusions and recommendations presented in this study provide a platform for reflection, adaption and further research.

**General Investigation Conclusions**

The outcome of this investigation aligns with the theoretical frameworks detailed in Chapter 2 as it relates to Millennial demographics and the application of the Herzberg Two-Factor Theory. The outcome of research question one illustrates a difference in overall job satisfaction by generational cohort. Although this difference is reported as modest, it represents a level of differentiation in regards to perceptions. The research presented in this study as it relates to workplace expectations of the Millennial generation is validated by the research outcomes—as they [Millennials] desire different experiences in the workplace. Chapter 2 discusses the importance of work-life integration, technology expectations, and career advancements that may contribute to this differentiation; but the outcomes are not such that we can define them as causation. However, the research does dictate that one would expect to see some disparity between the levels of satisfaction of this group compared to their faculty counterparts in other senior generations.
Another perspective for consideration as it relates to the moderate statistical difference between the job satisfaction of Millennials versus their counterparts could be the adoption and availability of cutting edge technology, as it may vary throughout the institution’s surveyed. If technology is not up to the standards that Milllennials experience personally or expect—it could possibly impact their satisfaction since technology is very important to this group.

The mentoring focus of research question two supports the theoretical framework outlined as it relates to job satisfaction and the Herzberg Two-Factor Theory. The Herzberg Two-Factor Theory states that hygiene factors such as salary, job duties, etc. contribute to keeping someone satisfied, but do not serve as motivators. Motivators are items that relate to relationships, advancement and recognition. Mentoring serves as arguably one of the strongest relationships and platforms for advancement and connection in the workplace.

The research presented states that relationships are not just key to overall job satisfaction, but are reinforced by the generational work preferences. The Herzberg Two-Factor Theory states that relationships and recognition are strong motivators to employees and evoke a high degree of morale (Herzberg, 1974). This explains the exceptionally strong results as it relates to the impact of mentoring on overall job satisfaction of Millennials.

**Suggested Organizational Strategies To Address Investigation Outcomes**

The research and outcomes presented in this study illustrate a number of considerations and takeaways for institutions. Contemporary research indicates that the top five needs across all generations that include: opportunities for advancement,
work/life balance, better salary/benefits, respect and recognition, and access to learning and development opportunities (Stanley, 2010). These factors include commonalities with job satisfaction research and motivators previously discussed, but also set the stage for specific recommendations that are related to this outcome of this study. The recommendations presented raise considerations that are necessary for institutions to review in order to survive and thrive.

**Intentional Talent Management and Succession Planning**

Talent management and succession planning are typically strategies utilized by the private sector. Succession planning is a topic that is contradictory to the culture of higher education, as academia tends to shy away from singling out individuals that are high potential and fostering plans to accelerate and support their advancement—which is a commonplace in the corporate world (Barden, 2009). However, academia’s reliance on knowledge workers will require that institutions take a very purposeful and methodical approach to this topic.

The American Council on Education (ACE) states that the most pressing talent management issue facing institutions today is succession planning (American Council on Education, 2008). Succession planning is an activity that is commonplace in the business world, but academia has not been as quick to adopt this strategy as an imperative to its bottom line. Being able to identify and cultivate future talent is essential to retaining and attracting Millennial faculty for instruction and administrative purposes.

Establishing a formal talent management and succession strategy rooted in institutional data is crucial. A 2012 higher education succession planning report by
Cornerstone On Demand states:

Formal succession planning gives institutional leaders the opportunity to discover future leaders that are hiding in plain sight. Formal succession planning is a forward thinking approach to leadership that pays dividends beyond a president or chancellor. It permeates all aspects of the organizational structure. (Cornerstone On Demand, 2012)

Administrators must confront this culture change in order to survive and ensure that institutions have the talent that they need for the future.

We must be intentional about preparing people for those top jobs. We must train them, and then give them meaningful experiences to put those lessons into action and to test their abilities before they are actually on the job. (Barden, 2009)

In addition to professional development and mentoring, institutions must create a work environment that promotes retention. Research indicates that recruitment and retention relies heavily on an institution’s ability to address the desire of Millennials for greater work/life balance and flexible schedules (Brown et al., 2012). Expert Cam Marston recommends the following steps as a starting point to cultivate an environment of retention to support talent management for Millennials (Marston, 2007):

- Anticipate the expectations of younger generations
- Develop a personal development and growth plan for all employees
- Get to know younger employees well and solicit feedback often
- Identify problem areas or areas of growth potential for younger employees
- Rate your organization’s current success in hiring/attracting new talent
- Study how your current environment promotes retention and how it can improve
- Consistently reward employees and managers who do their job well (publicly and privately)
Succession planning and talent management will be a challenging topic for higher education leaders due to cultural and organizational dynamics. Institutions that are assertive in confronting this issue (and design strategies to address it) are establishing a strong foundation for talent management and the future viability of their talent pool. Those that do not take deliberate steps to evaluate this issue and establish a steady pipeline for talent management and growth will suffer in the long-term.

Establishment of Formal Mentoring Programming and Culture

The strongest outcome of this investigation is the impact of mentoring on job satisfaction. Creating a culture of mentoring is another key action strategy for consideration. Mentoring can engender loyalty from this group as positive relationships with mentors can foster a stronger commitment to an organization and serve as a retention tool.

The outcome of this investigation clearly indicates that mentoring is a prominent factor for this generation’s job satisfaction, which promotes retention. Mentoring also has bottom line benefits. The National Chamber Foundation (2012) shared in a recent report that Sun Microsystems experienced a 23% increase in retention for employees who participated in its formal mentoring program.

Similar to succession planning and talent management strategies, institutions must be intentional in their approach to building and maintaining formal mentoring programs. Since Millennials typically have close relationships with their parents and expect similar interaction with their colleagues (regardless of rank) this dynamic in the workplace is extremely important. Millennials are typically more open to authority figures than their Baby Boomer and Generation X counterparts were at the
same age; however they must deem the relationship as mutually beneficial, (Handrich and Keene, 2010). The term mentoring may garner mixed reviews as a faculty member’s experience may vary from positive to negative. It is vital to note that establishing a culture of mentoring and/or a formal mentoring program for faculty may be very different than one’s past personal experiences.

First, consideration must be given to the generational expectations in regards to mentoring. According to the American Society for Training and Development (ASTD), Millennials want the mentoring process to be experiential in nature and highly social. Millennials also need mentors to guide them with the foundational skills necessary to be effective within the organizational culture (Emelo, 2011). The ASTD also reports that, “Due to their exposure and ready access to information during their formal education years, [Millennials] don’t have patience for learning processes that take too long,” (Emelo, 2011).

Emelo’s (2011) assertion is representative of one of the best practice recommendations from the University of Michigan’s junior faculty mentoring program. The University of Michigan documents formal practices and principles that outline the expectations of all parties in regards to mentoring tenure-track faculty. The junior faculty mentoring guidelines state:

As soon as a candidate is offered a position and accepts, the chair or director should work with his/her colleagues to develop a mentoring plan for the new faculty member. The faculty member should be consulted in developing this plan. The plan should include attention to teaching, graduate supervision, and research and should be predicated on being helpful rather than authoritarian. This mentoring plan should include participation by several members of the department/program during the six years of the candidate’s progress towards tenure. (Thomas, 2005)
The development of a formal mentoring program can be initiated in a number of ways. Before embarking on this task institutions must recognize that the nature of mentoring has changed and must be dynamic to address the needs of Millennials. When considering the modernization of the mentoring relationship, roles have evolved to formulate a ‘learner’ and ‘advisor’ mindset that guides the relationship. This type of interaction creates an opportunity for a younger faculty member to learn from a multitude of individuals.

The establishment of a culture of mentoring and formalized programs will rely heavily on senior level faculty and seasoned leaders. There are additional benefits of the mentoring process beyond retention. Reverse mentoring is an additional advantage as outlined in Chapter 2. However, in order for reverse mentoring or any other type of mentoring program to be successful, senior faculty must have a high degree of job satisfaction themselves in order to provide proper guidance. Work responsibilities must also be designed and rewarded to incent more seasoned faculty to adopt junior faculty under their tutelage. This can be facilitated through more formalized education and leadership development in regards to the multi-generational workforce and the role of leaders play within it.

**Increased Leadership Development and Education for Senior Faculty and Leaders**

Once an institution decides to embark on a talent management and succession planning initiative, the next step is to educate key stakeholders and employees on the elements of a multi-generational workplace and how to maximize its stretch to support their organization’s mission.
Education is essential not only to a talent management strategy, but also contributes to the job satisfaction of senior generation cohorts who may be responsible for mentoring and leading Millennial faculty.

The values of senior members of the workforce cannot be dismissed and the needs of younger employees beginning their academic careers cannot be ignored. The different choices made by each generation must be understood and respected and wherever possible those differences should be accommodated. (Hannay, 2010)

Institutions should consider the creation of professional development programming and coaching opportunities that speak specifically to generations and how they impact organizational dynamics. Programming can be implemented through a variety of mediums such as face-to-face training, e-learning modules, or coaching/shadowing experiences. Benefits of this type of approach are two-fold as many of the competencies can also benefit student interactions especially for faculty at the community college level because they interface with a wide spectrum of age ranges in the classroom.

The Center for Creative Leadership recommends a three part leadership development approach for consideration that includes: 1) assessing leadership competencies, 2) offering developmental challenges based on leader strengths and performance gaps, and 3) providing supportive organizational programs (such as mentoring and training) that leverage a leader’s strengths (Froman, 2010). This approach is one of several that an institution could consider in the development of programming or individual plans to support leaders. An institution may have the organizational development expertise internally, but it may be appropriate to enlist an external partner especially if there is a significant cultural transformation underway.
Reconsideration of Traditional Career Pathing/Advancement

Career advancement in higher education is traditionally based on length of service. The three prongs of the academic work environment, research, teaching and service, and have remained remarkably consistent throughout the years. Similarly, the processes of awarding tenure and promotion have persisted in the same manner for the 20th and 21st century (Hannay, 2010). The standard of academic service is being challenged as Millennial faculty emerges in the professoriate. Millennial expectations and desires for advancement in the workplace are different from their generational counterparts. Institutions must recalibrate their approaches to career pathing from a faculty and administration perspective in order to effectively attract (and more importantly) retain Millennials within their employee base.

Since the traditional academic path is based on longevity and commitment to one institution (especially in regards to tenure), institutions must think creatively about strategies that provide recognition and advancement opportunities that are not based on length of service. Since Millennials need quick rewards and recognition for achievement, Hannay recommends that institutions should consider offering rewards and opportunities during a faculty member’s probationary period to foster growth and engagement (Hannay, 2010). Recognition of this type can be provided through formal rewards or opportunities to serve on committees where Millennials can interface with senior leaders and help shape college-wide decisions. This helps to build skills and accelerates readiness for advancement.

Another approach for consideration is ‘role rotations’ where faculty may be allowed to serve as a project lead or in an open administrative role in an interim
capacity to gain valuable experience under the oversight of senior faculty or administration. Experts emphasize that rotations “lend [themselves a] natural development process and the preference of Millennials wanting to take their time to figure things out. This can also benefit the organization by the pollinating new ideas and approaches across departments,” (Lipkin and Perrymore, 2009).

Through the permeation of professional development training and experiential opportunities with younger faculty, senior faculty and leaders will hopefully further embrace their responsibility to the younger generation. “There is one [final] responsibility for senior scholars which is to eventually let the younger generation take over. “You’ve got to know when to have the good grace to move over and let someone else drive,” (Fogg, 2008).

**Recommendations for Future Research**

After considering the direct outcomes of the research questions presented in this investigation, there is significant opportunity for future inquiry and research. The strength of the statistical outcomes for research question one was not as strong as the mentoring outcome. However, the outcomes from research question one should be a viable foundation for further investigation using COACHE research as the percentage of Millennial faculty increases.

A replication of this study can be facilitated in the future, in addition to a possible qualitative analysis that examines the specific attitudes and perceptions of Millennials as it relates to any of the influencing factors in respect to job satisfaction highlighted within the theories presented in Chapter 2.
It is also important to note that it would be suitable to consider further investigation of senior generational cohort job satisfaction as the workplace continues to become more generationally diverse. Examining any changes and or relationships between job satisfaction of older faculty would be worthy of consideration —especially in institutions that have a higher percentage of Millennial faculty among their ranks. This would help provide guidance as it relates to the approach required to maintain or increase job satisfaction among this group so that they can continue to serve as guideposts for the more dominant Millennial generation.

In addition to a replication of this study with a larger sample size, another framework for research consideration would be to conduct a similar investigation that also poses inquiry into the Millennial attitudes from a gender or ethnicity perspective. Since research does state that the Millennial generation is among the most diverse generation to date (Howe and Straus, 2000), as more Millennial faculty emerge in academe, it may offer the opportunity to survey perspectives and differences as it relates to race. This is an important lens of evaluation, as institutions continue to become more diverse overall in their student body and total employee makeup.

**Foundation for Future Investigation of Millennial Faculty at HBCUs**

The outcome of this study has afforded several opportunities for further investigation based upon the results presented, and the focus of COACHE research. The first opportunity for further research would be the exploration of possible job satisfaction differences between Millennial faculty at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) compared to Predominantly White Institutions (PWIs). The sample size provided for this study has moderate indicators of significance in regards to this
comparison, but not enough to warrant ultimate significance within the confines of the data provided. There are contemporary studies that have examined this topic at length that provide a foundation for this research.

In addition to the examination of the Millennial faculty by institution type, as the emergence of this group grows institution wide, further job satisfaction analysis can be considered in respect to Millennial staff, and Millennials in specific functional areas (i.e. Student Affairs, Development, etc.) As the members of this generation increase in dominance, it will provide a broader and more robust population for in-depth study and evaluation.

Conclusion

The future of higher education and the next generation of learners rely heavily on the engagement and contributions of Millennial faculty. While the topic of Millennials is popular; it is not fleeting as the demographic data undergirds the importance of ongoing evaluation of how this generation will change the world of work.

Millennials are forcing established systems...be it education, the workplace or Corporate America, to take them seriously; to reevaluate how they do business to accommodate [them], (Emeagwali, 2011).

While this study does highlight the importance of mentoring to retain Millennials and illustrates differences in job satisfaction by generation, it does not assume that institutions are not confronting this issue and implementing strategies to address it. There are organizations that have embraced this change and have initiated strategies to expand the management of their talent pipeline. However, the development of strategies cannot just resonate at the institutional level, it must be permeated throughout the leadership ranks and frontlines where day-to-day interactions and work
occurs. This is where the establishment of leadership development training, succession planning, and formal mentoring programs as referenced in Chapter 4 can make critical impacts.

For institutions that are in the initial stages of evaluating this issue, there is a strong necessity for leadership to examine any record of departures of Millennials and leadership gaps of current administration in order to ensure a sound springboard to implement the pragmatic strategies recommended in this publication. A commitment to the theories and outcomes of this work will not resonate and become part of the fabric of an institution without confronting possible trends of departure, or influences of leadership deficiencies on Millennial faculty satisfaction.

In summary, higher education will rely heavily on Millennials to become the transformative leaders needed to ‘disturb the higher education’ universe to ensure a bright future of opportunity for those that follow them (O’Banion, 2012). Walker (2009) captures the true benefits of this new cohort and what they bring to colleges and universities across the world:

[Millennials are] an exciting generation of teachers entering the classroom rich with knowledge, eagerness, and enthusiasm in their veins. They see the classroom as an integral part of the community and want to make meaningful contributions to society and guide their students to do the same. They are our future. (Walker, 2009)

The results of this investigation contribute valuable conclusions to the ongoing discussion and research into the talent management and retention of Millennials. This study further highlights the importance of Millennials and the necessity to prepare for their increasing emergence across all industries. Although their experiences and outlook may vary from those that typically supervise them, they are a valuable segment
within the multi-generational workplace. This study illustrates that differences can serve as strengths; and when embraced and recognized Millennials serve as a unique component of higher education that contribute to the ultimate goal of student success and degree completion.
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