2013

An Analysis Of Generational Differences And Their Effects On Schools And Student Performance

Lisa Paniale
University of Central Florida

AN ANALYSIS OF GENERATIONAL DIFFERENCES AND THEIR EFFECTS ON SCHOOLS AND STUDENT PERFORMANCE

by

LISA D. PANIALE
B.S. Indiana University of Pennsylvania, 1985
M.S. University of Central Florida, 1993

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Education
in the School of Teaching, Learning, and Leadership
in the College of Education
at the University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida

Spring Term
2013

Major Professor: Barbara A. Murray

ABSTRACT

This study examined the effects of generational differences on student achievement of students in Brevard Public Schools, Brevard County, Florida. The independent variable was the generational cohorts (Traditionalist, Baby Boomer, Generation X, and Millennials). The dependent variable was the factors of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and work motivation. A second dependent variable was Value-Added Measure (VAM) scores calculated by the Department of Education for the state of Florida for each teacher of grades K-12. These VAM scores were derived from the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT) Reading and Math Developmental Scale scores to show a teacher's effect on student achievement. A convenience sample of teachers was surveyed from the population of all Brevard Public Schools teachers, and respondents' VAM scores were analyzed for differences in the means.

Findings showed that there was a statistically significant difference in job satisfaction among the generational cohorts based on the benefits factor. Baby Boomers found benefits to be a more important aspect of job satisfaction than did Millennials. There was also a statistically significant difference in organizational commitment among the generational cohorts based on career at current school. Baby Boomers found spending the rest of their career at their current school significantly more important than did Millennials. There was no statistically significant difference among the generational cohorts in work motivation or means of VAM scores.

Recommendations were made for future studies that generalize the finding to other counties in Florida, other states, and other countries. The possibility of generational impact being a cultural experience would be addressed. Another possible future study included examining individuals within a single generational cohort. Gender considerations are one area

for study. Furthermore, it is recommended that future studies move beyond one timeframe for gathering data. A longitudinal study of the same people within a generation from the beginning of their career to the end to determine if values change due to aging and gaining experience as compared to belonging to a generation should be conducted.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank many, many individuals who have assisted in the completion of this dissertation – some of whom did not even know they were a part of it. I would like to thank, first and foremost, my dissertation chair, Dr. Barbara A. Murray for her guidance, support, advice, patience, and encouragement throughout this journey. Through her confident demeanor, wealth of knowledge, and everlasting energy, Dr. Murray has been my inspiration since I first had her for class while earning my Master's Degree nearly 20 years ago. Thank you also to my dissertation committee Dr. Walter Doherty whose thought-provoking stories always had me thinking of ways to improve my own practice as a savvy school leader. Thank you to Dr. Rosemarye Taylor who was a calming voice in this crazy world of education. Dr. Taylor's advice continuously kept me on my toes in finding new information to enhance my research. Thank you to Dr. Lynn Spadaccini who generously gave me her time, contributions, and expertise. She had more faith in me than I did in myself.

Thank you to the members of my cohort who, through their triumphs, gave me the inspiration to get moving and keep going.

I could not have completed this process without the support and understanding of the awesome staff at Audubon Elementary. Their cheerleading, patience, and encouragement kept me going during the last three years when I could have easily given up on my dreams.

Thank you also to all the participants of this study. They afforded me the opportunity to dig a little deeper into the world of generations in schools and I truly appreciate all their candor and interest in this project.

Lastly, this dissertation would not have been possible without the love, support, and most of all understanding from my family. Thank you to my husband who has put up with my insufferable frustrations, financial obligations, and piles and piles of papers and books around the house. Thank you for still being my husband at the end of this journey.

To my beautiful "Millennial" daughters who helped me understand the ways of their generation. Thank you for accepting my absence at basketball games, for forgiving me when I gave you only half my attention when you were trying to share something with me, and your unconditional love for my irritability and frustrations during this process.

Thank you to my mother-in-law who was always there to bail me out of my neglected family duties and for having hot meals ready for my family.

A special thank you to my sisters who are spread out across the country and did not realize they were even a part of this journey. They spent 3 years hypothesizing what on earth was keeping me so busy that phone calls, cards, and other forms of communication came to a screeching halt. Your concern for my neglect of family matters lets me know you truly care.

Thank you for the special place each of you has in my heart and in my life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1: THE PROBLEM AND ITS COMPONENTS

Introduction

"For the first time in modern history, workplace demographics now span four generations. Twenty-five year old new hires find themselves working side-by-side with colleagues who are as much as fifty years older than they are" (Arnsparger, 2008, p. 1). Due to the different generational factors and values, the current workforce is changing and generational discord in the workplace is increasing. Formerly the differences were not an issue because the younger employees did what they were told by the elders in charge. Presently a more intricate workplace exists, one in which leaders must be responsive to age-related issues to be effective (Stauffer, 2003). In the workplace more than ever before, younger workers are taking on more important leadership roles, hierarchies are giving way to team-based configurations which allow younger workers to participate more in decision making, and seniority has less influence than in the past (Stauffer, 2003).

Some members of each generation are guilty of forming derogatory opinions of another generation's characteristics thinking and behavior. For example, Baby Boomers may believe members of Generation X are self-centered and lazy. Likewise, Xers may believe that Boomers are serious, demanding, and lack creativity (Stauffer, 2003).

Categorization based on age can cause detriment to the workplace more in the present day than in the past because individuals from many generations are mixing in the workplace. One generation does not have to accept values of the other, or even comprehend the values of the other. Harmony and productivity can result by simply acknowledging and permitting the

differences in values (Stauffer, 2003). Generational research is relatively new, with the majority of research being conducted in the last 10 to 15 years. Stauffer (2003) implores managers to seek awareness of differing generational values.

> The key implication of a mixed-generation workplace for you is clear: The better you understand the unique combination of factors that motivates each generation, the better you can tap those motivators and gain the best combined effort for your entire team. (Stauffer, 2003, p. 3).

To retain an age-diverse workforce, leaders must understand the elements that create job satisfaction, levels of commitment, and motivational factors for each generation. According to Lancaster and Stillman, (2005), there are four "clashpoints" caused by generational differences which necessitate the need for new patterns of leadership (p. 20). These clashpoints are career goals, view of rewards, work-life balance, and retirement (Lancaster & Stillman, 2005).

Generational factors are shaping the leadership of public schools in America and will continue to do so into the next decade. The next generation of leaders in schools will be significantly different from the leaders of today in many ways, including what their values are and how these values affect their styles of leadership. Understanding this generational phenomenon is critical to successful relationships in the workplace. According to Roland Barth (2006), Founding Director of the Principals' Center at Harvard University, "The nature of relationships among the adults within a school has a greater influence on the character and quality of that school and on student accomplishment than anything else" (p. 8).

Values delineate what people presume to be essentially right or wrong. Therefore, work values apply this definition to the work environment. The focus of this study was on the

generational differences among adult employees in schools and their effect on student performance. Four themes arise among the relationships between the adults in the schools. The first theme is the differences in job satisfaction among generational cohorts of K – 12 teachers. The second major theme is the differences in levels of organizational commitment among generational cohorts of K – 12 teachers. The third theme is the differences in work motivation among generational cohorts of K – 12 teachers. The fourth theme is whether or not generational factors among K – 12 teachers affect student performance.

The demographics of the four generations that exist in the workforce today are: Traditionalists (G.I. Generation and Silent Generation), Baby Boomers, Generation X, and the Millennials (Lancaster & Stillman, 2005). According to Harris (2005), there are approximately 75 million members of the Traditionalist generation. The largest generation in 2012 was the Baby Boomer generation with 76.5 million members. Generation X is comparatively small with only 46 million members. The youngest generation in the workforce today, the Millennials, is some 72 million strong (Harris, 2005). This generation is sometimes referred to as the second wave of Boomers. According to Elliott (2009), 10 percent of the current workforce consists of Traditionalists, 45 percent Boomers, 30 percent Xers, and 15 percent Millennials.

While researchers differ in the specific years of birth that characterize the different generations, most agree that there are five generational cohorts in existence today. Following the categories of generations labeled by Strauss (2005), the G.I. Generation (1901-1924) and Silent Generation (1925-1943) were combined to form the Traditionalist generation. Elliott (2009) defines the other three generations as Boomers (1944-1960), Generation X (1961-1980), and Millennial Generation (1981 – 2000).

All members of a generation have been impacted by the major world events, celebrities, heroes, technology, music, and disasters that occurred during their formative years. Understanding and embracing these conventional differences can help create harmony rather than contention in the workplace.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine generational differences among K-12 teachers regarding job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and work motivation. A second purpose was to examine what effect these generational differences had on student achievement. In addition, the purpose of this study was to add to the body of knowledge that the influence relationships have on the success of a school, and the achievement of students in the school.

Statement of the Problem

To date, there is little, if any, research in education to determine whether the generational differences in job satisfaction, commitment, and motivation among K – 12 teachers affect student performance. For the purpose of this study, student achievement was measured using student Developmental Scale Scores on the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT) from a sample of teachers. Teachers were given a state-calculated Value-Added Measure (VAM) score based on the achievement and learning gains obtained by their students over multiple years.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

The study will be guided by the following research questions:

1. To what extent, if any, does job satisfaction differ among generational cohorts of K – 12 teachers?

H_0: There is no statistically significant difference in job satisfaction among generational cohorts of K – 12 teachers.

2. To what extent, if any, does commitment differ among generational cohorts of K – 12 teachers?

   H_0: There is no statistically significant difference in commitment among generation cohorts of K – 12 teachers.

3. To what extent, if any, does work motivation differ among generational cohorts of K – 12 teachers?

   H_0: There is no statistically significant difference in work motivation among generational cohorts of K – 12 teachers.

4. To what extent, if any, do Value-Added Measure scores differ among generational cohorts of K – 12 teachers?

   H_0: There is no statistically significant difference in Value-Added Measure scores among generational cohorts of K – 12 teachers.

Delimitations

The sample was selected for convenience and geographically delimited to teachers from public, non-charter schools in Brevard County, Florida. The study was delimited to those participants who could be contacted electronically. Additionally, participants were delimited to teachers who have chosen teaching as their only career, have 5 or more years of teaching experience, and who service students in only one school location. In order to maintain comparable numbers among the generational populations, Traditionalists were not surveyed due to the limited number of members remaining in the workforce. The results of this study were not used to make generalizations about all K-12 school teachers. Since this study was conducted only in Brevard County, the applicability of the findings were considered limited.

Limitations

The study will be based on the following limitations:

1. The assumption that the surveys returned were representative of the participant population.
2. The assumption that the participants responded accurately and honestly to all of the questions in the survey.
3. The assumption that the survey was a valid assessment of teachers' work values.
4. The assumption that the generational cohorts were identified according to the dates listed in the Definition of Terms.

Definition of Terms

The classification used to label the generations were not consistent because the numerous authors writing about generational differences have created a variety of different names to label the various generations. For the purpose of this study, the following terms were defined:

Generation: a group categorized by shared years of birth and life events occurring at critical stages of development (Kupperschmidt, 2000).

Traditionalists: also known as Veterans were born between 1922 and1943. Traditionalists grew up with depression and war. Their core work values are conformity and sacrifice. (Elliott, 2009).

Baby Boomers: born between 1944 and 1960. Boomers are overachievers, inspired, idealists, and are commonly narcissistic. Their core work values are optimism and personal growth. (Elliott, 2009). The term Baby Boomers was coined by Landon Jones

in his book *Great Expectations,* which recorded the events of the Boomer generation (Center for Generational Studies, 2009).

Generation X: born between 1961 and 1980. Gen Xers are possibly the least understood of the generations. Xers are loyal to themselves and not their employers. Their core work values are techno-literacy and informality. (Elliott, 2009). The term Generation X was coined by Douglas Coupland when he authored the book *Generation X* (Center for Generational Studies, 2009).

Millennials: also known as Generation Y, Generation WHY, Nexters, and Internet Generation were born between 1981 and 2000. Millennials are often the children of Boomers and nearly as large in number of their parents' generation. They are multi-taskers and team oriented. This generation has been rewarded for everything and needs constant feedback. Their core values are social ability and street smarts. (Elliott, 2009). This term was coined by sociologist Neil Howe and William Strauss (Center for Generational Studies, 2009).

Job Satisfaction: "pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job as achieving or facilitating one's job values" (Locke, 1969, p. 317).

Organizational Commitment: "emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization" (Steers, 1977, p. 46).

Motivation: "an inner drive that causes one to act. Employee motivation causes one to abandon their own goals for the goals of the organization" (Mullen, 1993, p. 1).

Inner work life: "the confluence of perceptions, emotions, and motivation that individuals experience as they react to and make sense of the events of their workday" (Amabile & Kramer, 2011, p. 20).

Value-Added Measure (VAM): "a statistical method that estimates the effectiveness of a teacher or school. The difference between a student's actual and predicted results is the estimated 'value' that the teacher or school added during the year with respect to the content tested" ("Florida's common language," 2011, p. 29).

Teacher Effect: a factor unique to a teacher and "thought to be the causal impact of the teacher's instructional efficacy on the student's achievement as reflected via test scores" (American Institutes for Research, 2011, p. 2).

Significance of the Study

In 2012, individuals worked in an environment where there were four diverse generations in the workplace. Each of these generational cohorts has distinctive attitudes, values, and goals concerning work and their responsibility in the workplace. Understanding generational differences is one of the best ways to strategize and resolve conflicts and perhaps raise student achievement. A sense of communal unity and shared goals must be instilled to create a workplace where workers are encouraged and eager to share knowledge. To improve student performance in a multigenerational environment requires teachers and administrators to have a basic understanding of the various preferences, values, goals, commitment, and motivators before effective teaching strategies can be created. This understanding allows the

implementation of new programs and procedures, and allows administrators to adjust their leadership styles to the newer generations of teachers.

Conceptual Framework

An essential principle of this study is that members of a particular generation have particular values unique to that generation. Important to that discussion is the question of whether job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and work motivation are related to that generation's values.

Herzberg (1987), Pink (2009), and Amabile and Kramer, (2011) all reported that there is more than one form of motivation: extrinsic and intrinsic. As described by Amabile and Kramer (2011), extrinsic motivation is "motivation to do something in order to get something else" (p. 34). A few examples of this type of motivation are working 14-hour days for two weeks just to meet a deadline; taking a position because the pay and benefits are great; or doing whatever it takes to win an organizational reward (Amabile & Kramer, 2011). According to Amabile and Kramer (2011), intrinsic motivation is described as the love of work itself. Finding the work interesting, engaging, challenging, or enjoyable are examples of loving the work (Amabile & Kramer, 2011).

Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory is based on two fundamental sets of factors: hygienes and motivators. Hygiene factors are connected with the style of supervision, organizational policies, pay, physical work conditions, relationships with others, position, safety, and personal life (Terpstra, 1983). Herzberg (1987) contended that it was important to be attentive to these factors to prevent employees from becoming dissatisfied with their work.

Paying attention to only the hygiene factors does not motivate employees (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959). Consistent with Herzberg et al. (1959), the motivator factors consist of achievement, recognition, advancement, growth, responsibility, and the work itself. Factors that lead to job satisfaction are separate from those that lead to job dissatisfaction. One set of human needs is derived from humankind's animalistic nature. According to Herzberg (1987), basic biological needs, such as the need for food, make it necessary to earn money, therefore making the drive for money a basic need. Additionally, Herzberg (1987) stated that the second set of human needs connects to characteristics unique to humans – the ability to achieve. The desire for achievement leads to the experience of psychological growth.

Pink (2009) confirms that the biological drive of Herzberg's hygiene factors such as pay, working conditions, and job security did not create job satisfaction and were inadequate for motivation. Pink (2009) also agreed that Herzberg's motivational factors such as enjoying the work itself, and achieving personal growth were intrinsic factors that elevated satisfaction and performance. In the 1950's, Abraham Maslow doubted the idea that human behavior was a result of simply seeking stimuli that were positive and avoiding stimuli that were negative (Pink, 2009). In the 1960's, Douglas McGregor, who brought Maslow's beliefs to the business world with Theory X and Theory Y, disputed the postulation that humans would not do much work without external rewards and punishments (Pink, 2009). In 1950, W. Edwards Deming, whose work was supported in Japan while disregarded in the United States, argued intrinsic rather than extrinsic motivators were the key to personal growth and achievement (Pink, 2009). Giving credit in part to Maslow, McGregor, Herzberg, and Deming, intrinsic motivators were integrated into organizations (Pink, 2009). Pink (2009) points out that with job tasks becoming less routine

and based more on creativity, organizations needed an upgrade in motivators. Behavioral scientists have divided on-the-job tasks into two categories: "algorithmic and heuristic" (Pink, 2009, p. 27). An algorithmic job task is one where specialized instructions, or an algorithm which leads to a single conclusion, are followed (Pink, 2009). No algorithm exists for a heuristic task. With a heuristic task, novel solutions are discovered through experimentation of possibilities (Pink, 2009).

In line with researchers Amabile and Kramer (2011), Pink (2009) explained that when rewards and punishments are used for routine, or algorithmic tasks, they are effective. However, when "carrots and sticks" are used for tasks that involve creativity, they can actually extinguish intrinsic motivation (Pink, 2009, p. 28). If extrinsic motivators are particularly strong, they can also weaken intrinsic motivation (Amabile & Kramer (2011). An example of this is the constant reminder of a looming deadline. If the work is done primarily to make the deadline, the excitement of creating something exceptional is lost (Amabile & Kramer, 2011). Moreover, Pink (2009) indicates that extrinsic motivators can lead to unethical behavior. Several examples of unethical behavior triggered by extrinsic rewards for goals set by others are school counselors doctoring student transcripts to help seniors get into college, athletes injecting themselves with steroids to enhance performance, and sales people working on a sales quota overcharging customers to meet the quota (Pink, 2009). A study conducted in 2000 by economists Uri Gneezy and Aldo Rustichini showed that punishment does not always promote good behavior; sometimes it even extinguishes it (Pink, 2009). During the fifth week of the study, the economists posted a sign at a day care center stating that parents who picked up their child late would have a fine imposed on them. The underlying theory was that a negative consequence

would reduce the negative behavior (Pink, 2009). Instead of a decrease in the number of parents arriving late, there was actually an increase. Some parents saw the fine imposition as a way to buy extra time as a reward and not as a punishment.

Pink (2009) revealed that most parents picked up their children on time because of their intrinsic desire to treat the teachers fairly based on the relationship the teachers had built with the parents. It is this intrinsic desire to which organizations must upgrade if they are to function smoothly (Pink, 2009). Autonomy plays an important role in intrinsic motivation. An experiment in autonomy was carried out by Meddius, one of three companies run by CEO Jeff Gunther in Charlottesville, Virginia (Pink, 2009). For the first 90 days of 2009, the company became a ROWE - a "results-only work environment" (Pink, 2009, p. 84). ROWEs were the creation of former Best Buy human resource executives, Cali Ressler and Jody Thompson (Pink, 2009). As reported by Pink (2009), people in a ROWE workplace do not follow schedules. They show up at any time they want and they leave any time they want. They only have to complete their work. Where, when, and how they do it is up to them (Pink, 2009). The employees discovered that having autonomy made them more productive and less stressed (Pink, 2009). Because of this autonomy, employees are less likely to leave a job for another for a mere $10,000 to $20,000 raise. The freedom gained to do their work was more precious than a pay raise. The focus must be on the work people get done as opposed to how many hours they worked (Pink, 2009).

Research conducted by Amabile and Kramer (2011) has shown that out of all the positive events of inner work life, the single greatest motivator is making progress on the job. The substance of the job stimulates growth or motivation. The days that people feel the most

motivated are the days they feel they have made the most progress. On days of impediment, people are also less extrinsically motivated (Amabile & Kramer, 2011). Making progress on meaningful work enhances inner work life and as a result, long-term progress is improved (Amabile & Kramer, 2011).

Motivation is an "internal engine" with benefits which show up over a longer period of time (Herzberg, 1987, p. 13). Genuine progress generates positive emotions and leads to a feeling of accomplishment which feeds motivation. An effective example of this is provided by Herzberg (1987) relating external (hygiene factors) and internal (motivator factors) to motivation. In his example, Herzberg (1987) describes the hygiene factor of money where an employee receives a bonus of $1000 one year and a $500 bonus the following year. Although extra awards were received each year, psychologically the employee sees this lesser amount as a salary cut. Whereas, if motivation were based on intrinsic factors, then the employee still feels a sense of accomplishment and personal growth (Herzberg, 1987). Conversely, the motivator factor of an individual who writes a book, which is a major accomplishment, and then the following month writes an article, which is a lesser accomplishment, results in the individual still feeling motivated since the accomplishment was intrinsic. The nature of intrinsic motivators has a much longer effect on employees' attitudes than do extrinsic hygiene factors (Herzberg, 1987).

A theoretical framework for generational differences can be followed back to the 1950s originating in sociology. Karl Mannheim is believed to be the originator of generational theory. Mannheim's essay "The Problem of Generations", regarded as one of the most organized and complete treatment of generation is the underpinning of generational research. Mannheim (1952) perceived that the generation to which a person belongs is influenced by generational

events on cohorts of people across class and social location. Class-position is defined by Mannheim (1952) as a common location individuals hold in society. Social location differs from a concrete group, such as a family, tribe, etc. because a concrete group cannot exist without its members concretely knowing each other. Such knowledge does not exist between members of a generation. The unity of generations is comprised by the similarity of location of a group within a social whole (Mannheim, 1952). Generation location is based on life span, aging, and the factors of life and death. Individuals who share the same birth year are presented with a common location on an historical timeframe.

Mannheim (1952) stated that the Positivist approach to generations suggested that generation follows generation at regular intervals. Because mankind flows as a continuous stream with one generation following another generation and does not completely disappear, nor is it altered like that of a butterfly or caterpillar, we find it necessary to safeguard the continuity of generations. Mannheim (1952) also remarked that if the average duration of life of each individual were either shortened or lengthened, the pace of progress would also change. Lengthening the life-span of an individual slows up the paces of progress. Contrariwise, reducing the span by half would accelerate the tempo. Since individuals are living longer, older generations are influencing more. Mannheim (1952) stated that individuals are not members of the same generation merely by sharing the same birth year. The inherent tendency for individuals of the same generation to share common experiential, intellectual, and emotional data is present. However, the members of the generation are not uniformly given the same characteristics. The individuals must share common intellectual, social, and political experiences in order to create a solidified bond between members of a generation to form common responses

through their common experiences. A shared response to a catastrophic event unifies a cohort of people (Mannheim, 1952). Along those same lines, Kupperschmidt (2000) defined a generation as a group categorized by shared years of birth and life events occurring at critical stages of development. People who are in adolescence or young adulthood during momentous events produce a common memory of those events which will have an effect on future attitudes and behaviors. These events are known, as indicated by Parry and Urwin (2010), as generational imprinting.

The research conducted in this study was based on the conceptual framework that the values, such as job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and work motivation, of different generations make each generation unique. The two frameworks fit together as part of this study because as different generations work together in the workplace, they influence and are influenced by the interaction with each other. According to Elliott (2009), the American workforce is made up of 10 percent Traditionalists, 45 percent Baby Boomers, 30 percent Generation Xers, and 15 percent Millennials. Understanding what motivates the members of these generations and designing strategies that are equally effective in making everyone productive and happy is the first objective to a successful institution.

Overview of Methodology

Research Design

This quantitative, non-experimental research study was designed to determine whether significant differences in means existed in job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and work motivation among generational cohorts and whether these differences had an effect on student achievement. Student achievement was determined by longitudinal test score data from the

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT) results for reading and math and Value-Added Measure (VAM) scores. The function of VAM is to differentiate teacher performance by means of statistical models to measure student learning growth and credit this growth to specific teachers. A survey created by Autumn Moody, Ph.D. (2007) was used to collect quantitative data on job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and work motivation from K-12 teachers in Brevard Public Schools, Brevard County, Florida. The data collected from this survey and Value-Added Measure (VAM) scores were put into the software program Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) for statistical analysis.

Population

The population for the study was comprised of the 5,289 teachers in public elementary, middle, and high schools in Brevard County, Florida for the 2011 – 2012 school year excluding charter schools, virtual schools, and university labs. Twenty-five percent of the high schools, 25 percent of middle schools, and 25 percent of elementary schools in Brevard County were selected for convenience to create the study sample. The researcher notified the Principal of each selected school for assistance in promoting the return of the surveys. Each participant was emailed the informed letter of consent and survey link. The individuals were categorized in a generation based solely on birth year as described earlier.

Data Collection and Instrumentation

A sample of teachers from 4 high schools (25%), 4 middle schools (25%), and 15 elementary schools (25%) were surveyed electronically. Permission to use the survey was obtained from the author of the survey, Autumn Moody, Ph.D. (2007). Dr. Moody's survey was created based on a combination of appropriate questions from three surveys. One survey, the

McCloskey/Mueller (1990) Satisfaction Scale (MMSS) measured factors of job satisfaction such as salary, vacation, benefits, hours, flexibility, recognition, and decision making. A second survey used by Dr. Thomas Becker, Professor at the University of Delaware, measured factors of commitment such as loyalty, difficulty and guilty in leaving the organization, and emotional attachment to the organization. Questions from a third survey measuring motivation for different generations were originally used by Koenigsknecht (2005). Some of the factors of motivation were being challenged, taking more responsibility without additional pay, teamwork, and being valued. The original instrument used by Moody (2007) for employees at banks and brokerage organizations has been demonstrated as reliable and had validity; therefore, the proposed survey may be assumed to be reliable and have validity for use with teachers.

Data Analysis

The data collected in this study were subjected to statistical analysis through the use of a computer software program, Statistical Package for Social Sciences, Version 18 for Windows (SPSS, 2010). Various methods of data analyses such as descriptive statistics and the statistical test analysis of variance (ANOVA) were used. The dependent variables, reported as interval data, were those that characterize employee satisfaction, commitment, and motivation. A second dependent variable was student achievement as measured by teacher effect as determined by a Value-Added Measure (VAM) score. An ANOVA was used to determine whether mean differences occurred in job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and work motivation among generational cohorts of K-12 teachers in Brevard Public Schools, Brevard County, Florida. Furthermore, an ANOVA was used to determine whether mean differences occurred in VAM

scores among this same group of teachers. Generational type was the independent variable. The individuals were classified in a generation based entirely on birth year as explained earlier.

Summary

As instructional leaders search for ways to increase student achievement, all considerations must be investigated. Included in this investigation is the understanding of generational differences and how to best utilize these differences to the fullest advantage. Tapping into the strength of each generational cohort increases teamwork. Increased teamwork and collegial relationships increase student achievement.

Organization of the Study

Chapter 1 introduces the problem statement and its design components such as the purpose of the study, research questions and their related hypotheses, the delimitations and limitations, definition of key terms, conceptual framework as the basis for the study, and an overview of the methodology. Chapter 2 provides a review of the literature and research related to the problem of the study. Chapter 3 presents the methodology used to conduct the study, including a review of the research questions and hypotheses, the research design, procedures used for the collection of data and analysis of that data, and a summary. Chapter 4 describes the results produced by processing the data with statistical tests. Chapter 5 presents the findings of the study, implications for practice, and recommendations for future research.

CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

"For the first time in our history, we have four separate and distinct generations working shoulder-to-shoulder and face-to-face in a stressful, competitive workplace" (Lancaster & Stillman, 2005, p. 13.) Understanding the basics of generational research is essential in comprehending the impact of this phenomenon. The majority of generational research has been completed within the last decade due to the changing demographics of the workforce (Lancaster & Stillman, 2005). To communicate these basics, this chapter has been organized to divide the literature into eight sections. The first section presents an overview of the history of generational research. The second section discusses generations of 2012. The third section examines generations in the workplace. The next three sections are associated with the following topics as they relate to age diversity: job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and work motivation. It is hypothesized that the previously stated topics are influenced by generational differences, which affects student achievement. The next topic examined is the research regarding challenges in public schools. The final section summarizes recommendations for leadership of individuals from mixed generations.

These aspects of generational differences are considerably influencing leadership in American public schools and will become more prominent in the next decade. The new generation of school leaders will be notably different than their predecessor in countless ways, including what their values are and how that affects their leadership style. Learning what these value differences are is be an initial step in understanding generational differences in educational leadership and adds to the research on generational values and their effect on student

achievement. This study examined potential generational differences among K – 12 teachers in Brevard Public Schools, Brevard County, Florida during the 2011-2012 school year.

History of Generational Research

Classical sociologists, such as Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, contemplated the relationship between age and social structure when reflecting on generations. Scholars of educational research regarded that the true sociology of generation started with Karl Mannheim's revolutionary essay on generations (Edmunds & Turner, 2002). Originally published in German in 1928, in English in 1952, and then again by Bryan Turner in 1997, Mannheim's "The Problem of Generations" sparked generational research (Macleod, 2005). In 2002, Bryan Turner, along with colleague June Edmunds, published *Generations, Culture, and Society* wherein they examined the indications of Mannheim's essay. This essay outlined Mannheim's analysis of the impact of generational experience on groups of people across "class" and "generational location" (Edmunds & Turner, 2002, p.8). Edmunds and Turner (2002) specified three building blocks in Mannheim's Theory of Generation:

1. Generational Site or Location - Mannheim defined a generation as members of a class who are exposed to the same historical or cultural circumstances by a cohort of individuals the same age. Mannheim focused on the way age groups could act as change agents of social change and become carriers of intellectual and organizational alternatives of the status quo (Edmunds & Turner, 2002, p. 8).
2. Generation as Actuality - Mannheim suggested that a generation becomes an "actuality" when a concrete bond is created among members of a generation who are exposed to traumatic or catastrophic events (Edmunds & Turner, 2002, p. 8).

3. Generational Units - Mannheim articulated that there may be distinctive divisions within a generation. Subgroups and subdivisions form within an age cohort. Any quantity of generation units may exist within a given generation. These units are oriented toward one another, sometimes only in the sense of fighting one another. They are held together by a common experience, but deal with the experience in different ways, constituting separate generational units (Edmunds & Turner, 2002).

The next highly regarded scholarly work in the study of generational research came in 1991 by William Strauss and Neil Howe. In their book titled *Generations –The History of America's Future 1584 – 2069,* Strauss and Howe (1991) looked at the American lifecycle, from childhood through old age, as it was lived by each generation. Although many scholars base the length of a generation on the average span of years that pass between being born and giving birth, Strauss and Howe (1991) base the length of a generation on the length of a phase of life. In a separate work by Strauss and Howe (1997), it states that the basic length of generations will remain the same as long as the transition to adulthood transpires around age 20, the transition to midlife around age 40, and the transition to old age around age 60. A pattern of a recurring cycle of four distinct Phases of Life of equal twenty-two-year lengths was examined by Strauss and Howe (1991). These life phases were defined in terms of central social roles. Nearly every culture experiences a rite of passage from the dependence of youth into the independence of adulthood. Additionally, most societies acknowledge a midlife shift when an adult is considered experienced and forced into retirement from laborious social and economic life.

As indicated by Strauss and Howe (1991), the four Phases of Life are Youth, Rising Adulthood, Midlife, and Elderhood. Youth lasts from birth to age 21. The central role of those

in this phase of life is dependence. Among some of the personality traits of Youth are growing, learning, accepting protection and nurture, and avoiding harm-acquiring values. Rising Adulthood begins at age 22 and continues through age 43. Activity is the central role of Rising Adults with working, starting families and livelihoods, serving institutions, and testing values as personality traits. Midlife begins, according to Strauss and Howe (1991), at age 44 and lasts until age 65. It is during this Phase of Life where leadership is the central role. Parenting, teaching, directing institutions, and using values are among its personality traits. The fourth Phase of Life is Elderhood. Elderhood is entered at age 66 and lasts through age 87. Stewardship takes on the central role. Personality traits of Elderhood are supervising, mentoring, channeling endowments, and passing on values (Strauss & Howe, 1991).

Strauss and Howe (1991) referred to part of the generation time period as social moments. A social moment, as defined by Strauss and Howe (1991), typically lasts a decade, when people observe that significant historical events are drastically altering their social environment. Also according to Strauss and Howe (1991), social moments do not arrive at random. They arrive on a rather regular schedule, more or less separated by two phases of life. The two types of social moments are:

> Secular Crisis – "When society focuses on reordering the outer world of institutions and public behavior" (p. 71).
>
> Spiritual Awakenings – "When society focuses on changing the inner world of values and private behavior" (p. 71).

A secular crisis and a spiritual awakening do not occur continuously. They alternate in type between secular crises and spiritual awakenings. Major crises occur approximately every 90

years (the length of a long human life) and spiritual awakenings recur halfway between those crises (approximately 40 to 45 years). A symbiotic relationship exists between historical events and generational traits. Historical events shape generations during the formative years of childhood and young adulthood. Then in turn, as parents in midlife and as elders, generations shape history (Strauss & Howe, 1991).

As indicated by Strauss and Howe (1991), crisis is an era in which institutional life in America is shattered and rebuilt in response to a perceived threat to the nation's survival. People come together and become members of a larger group. These moments have redefined the Nation's identity. An example of a Crisis is the Stock Market Crash of 1929.

An Awakening is an era when institutions are attacked for the sake of personal and spiritual independence. Some eras that are examples of Awakenings include the Puritan Awakening (1621 – 1649), the Great Awakening (1727 – 1746) and the most recent Awakening in America was the Consciousness Revolution from the late 1960s through the 1970s (Strauss & Howe, 1991).

The time between an era of Crises and Awakening is called a High. Institutions are strong and individualism is weak during a High. The most recent High in America was the post-World War II High which began in 1946 and ended on November 22, 1963 with the assassination of President John F. Kennedy (Strauss & Howe, 1991).

An Unraveling is the time between an Awakening and a Crisis. The frame of mind during this era is the opposite of a High. Institutions are weak and skepticism is extreme. Individualism is strong and thriving. Examples of eras of Crises include the American

Revolution (1773 – 1794), the Civil War (1860 – 1865), the Great Depression and World War II (1929 – 1946) (Strauss & Howe, 1991).

Social moments are separated by a two-life-phase pattern. If one generation (Traditionalist) is entering rising adulthood during one social moment, then a second generation (Boomer) is entering youth during that same moment. Generations that come of age as young adults during a Crisis or an Awakening directly engage in the lessons of that momentous period and forward these lessons in their attitudes and actions later in life. In their book *Generations – The History of America's Future 1584 – 2069,* Strauss and Howe (1991) label these generations as *dominant* generations. Generations that are in their youth during a Crisis or Awakening take a dependent role during a defining era, which shapes their later attitudes and actions very differently. These generations are labeled as *recessive* generations by Strauss and Howe (1991). The four archetypes of generations that repeat sequentially and are based on their relativity to social moments are Idealist, Reactive, Civic, and Adaptive. The generations in each archetype share a similar age-location in history, as well as some basic attitudes towards family, risk, cultures, values, and civic engagement (Strauss & Howe, 1991).

- Dominant Idealist generations are born during a High (following a Crisis) and during a time of rejuvenated community life. Idealists grow up as increasingly indulged youth following a secular crisis. Idealists come of age and spend their rising adult years as narcissistic crusaders during an Awakening. Idealists spend their midlife cultivating principles and focusing on morals during an Unraveling, and spend old age as a visionary in a Crisis (Strauss & Howe, 1991).

- Recessive Reactive generations are born during a time of spiritual agendas of an Awakening. Reactivists grew up as under protected and criticized youths. During an Unraveling period, Reactive generation matures into risk-taking alienated rising adults, spends midlife as a pragmatic leader during a secular crisis, and spends old age in a new High as a reclusive elder (Strauss & Howe, 1991).
- Dominant Civic generations are born during an Unraveling, following an Awakening, in the time of self-reliance and laissez faire. This dominant generation grows up as protected youth. A Civic generation spends its rising adult years as heroic, team-oriented, optimistic young adults overcoming a secular crisis, spends midlife powerful and building institutions during a High, and emerges as a busy elder in the next spiritual awakening (Strauss & Howe, 1991).
- Recessive Adaptive generations are born during a Crisis and grow up as overprotected and suffocated youths. An Adaptive generation matures into conformist rising adults in a new High, spends indecisive midlife in an Awakening, and spends old age as a sensitive elder in an Unraveling (Strauss & Howe, 1991).

Archetypes do not create archetypes similar to themselves. They create opposing archetypes. Strauss and Howe (1997) explain, "Your generation isn't like the generation that shaped you, but it has much in common with the generation that shaped the generation that shaped you" (p. 79). The relationship between the generational archetypes and the eras is summarized in Table 1. Reading along the diagonal, lower left to upper right, we can identify the connections between social moments and personality traits.

Table 1 The Generational Diagonal: How One Generation Flows to the Next

	Unraveling era	Crisis era	High era	Awakening era
Elderhood	(Adaptive) sensitive	(Idealist) visionary	(Reactive) reclusive	(Civic) busy
Midlife	(Idealist) moralistic	(Reactive) pragmatic	(Civic) powerful	(Adaptive) indecisive
Rising adulthood	(Reactive) alienated	(Civic) heroic	(Adaptive) conformist	(Idealist) narcissistic
Youth	(Civic) protected	(Adaptive) suffocated	(Idealist) indulged	(Reactive) criticized

Similar to Strauss and Howe's (1991) Phases of Life, Erik Erikson's Developmental Stages were also based on personality traits. Erik Erikson, a well-known developmental psychologist, suggested that individuals progress all the way through eight psychosocial stages that stretch from birth to death to acquire qualities necessary for healthy and successful emotional development (Carlisle, 2010). Erikson's theory states that development expands in a series of predetermined stages, that there is a most favorable time for the dominance of a stage, and that the settlement of early stages significantly influences the outcomes of later stages (Dunkel & Sefcek, 2009). The stages build upon one another and the fashion in which each task

is resolved impacts the remainder of the development in an intense way (Dunkel & Sefcek, 2009). Failure to successfully deal with a stage means an individual is propelled into the next stage not ready for the emotional challenge ahead. Erikson's stages are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2 Developmental Stages of Erik Erikson

Stage	Basic Conflict	Significant Relationships	Virtue	Ego Development Outcome
Infancy (birth to 18 months)	Trust vs. Mistrust	Maternal parent or significant caregiver	Hope	A sense of trust is developed when caregivers provide reliability, care, and affection. A lack of these will lead to mistrust.
Early Childhood (18 months to 3 years)	Autonomy vs. Shame and Doubt	Parents	Willpower	Personal control over the body and acquiring independence. Success produces feelings of autonomy; failure brings about feelings of shame and doubt.
Play Age (3 to 5 years)	Initiative vs. Guilt	Basic family	Purpose	Control and power need to be asserted over the environment by children. Exerting too much power results in disapproval which ensues a sense of guilt.
School Age (6 to 11 years)	Industry vs. Inferiority	School and neighborhood; parents still important although less	Competence	New academic and social skills are developed. Competence is obtained by success, while inferiority results from failure.
Adolescence (12 to 18 years)	Identity vs. Role Confusion	Peer groups	Fidelity	A sense of self and personal identity is acquired by teens. Success leads to an ability to stay true to oneself. Failure leads to experiencing role confusion and upheaval.
Young Adulthood (18 to 35 years)	Intimacy and Solidarity vs. Isolation	Marital partners and friends	Love	Loving, intimate relationships are formed by young adults. Success leads to intimacy on a deep level, while failure results in isolation and distance.
Middle Adulthood (40 to 65 years)	Generativity vs. Self-absorption and	Workplace, community, and family	Care	Adults create culture and transmit values through family. Success comes from caring for others and

Stage	Basic Conflict	Significant Relationships	Virtue	Ego Development Outcome
	Stagnation			producing something that contributes to the betterment of society (generativity). Failure leads to self absorption and stagnation from involvement in the world.
Late Adulthood (65 to death)	Integrity vs. Despair	All of mankind	Wisdom	Older adults need to reflect on life and feel contentment. Success leads to feelings of wisdom and acceptance. Failure results in despair and perceived failures.

As individuals pass through each of these stages, they develop the various life-stage virtues needed to live a successful and productive life. During the third stage of Initiative versus Guilt, the psychosocial strength that is gained is purpose. As children traverse the psychosocial stage of Industry versus Inferiority, the virtue of competence should be developed (Dunkel & Sefcek, 2009). Teens moving through the Identity versus Role Confusion stage results in the development of fidelity. Erikson believed that if a healthy identity is not developed during adolescence, all other developmental stages later in life are affected (Carlisle, 2010). Young adults surface from the Intimacy versus Isolation stage with the capacity to love. During the Generativity versus Stagnation stage of middle adulthood, adults are expected to develop the virtue of caring. During this stage, adults are faced with the task of being productive and working to shape the next generation; usually their own children. Merely having children does not accomplish generativity (Davis & Clifton, 1995). Each adult must have some way to support the next generation. Older adults are expected to develop the virtue of wisdom during Erikson's final stage of Integrity versus Despair (Carlisle, 2010). In old age, a person must reflect on their lives and have a sense of satisfaction or regret (Dunkel & Sefcek, 2009).

As stated by Strauss and Howe (1991), all of society is unfolding on a regular cyclic basis and repeats itself every four generations or so. There are five cycles and 18 generations in American history (Strauss & Howe, 1991). Starting with the European cohort group of 1584 through 1614, the Puritan Generation included the majority of the Old World immigrants. With approximately 25,000 persons, almost all of them were English. The personality traits exhibited by the Puritan Generation who self-selected to immigrate to America were also displayed by their peers who stayed in Europe. Starting with the Puritans and applying the 22-year cycle discussed above, a total of 18 generations in America have been located. These generations were grouped into five generational cycles (Colonial, Revolutionary, Civil War, Great Power, and Millennial) – each beginning with an Idealist-type generation and ending with an Adaptive type. Four of these cycles have already been completed with the fifth, the Millennial Cycle, which began in 1967, still underway (Strauss & Howe, 1991)

The first cycle, the Colonial Cycle, was comprised of four generations who were all literally immigrants and were influenced by their Old World peers. This generation was the smallest generation as it was 100% immigrant. With each generation in the Colonial Cycle, the number of members of each generation increased, the percentage of immigrants decreased, and the percentage of slave population increased (Strauss & Howe, 1991).

When the fifth generation, the Awakeners, was born, a new cycle was started. This was the first true American generation whose parents were born in America. The remaining generations in the Revolutionary Cycle were fully ancestral. The Idealist Awakening Generation continued with the trend of increasing generational population, decreasing immigrant percentage, and an increase of slave population (Strauss & Howe, 1991). This generation was the first

generation to reach a population of over 1 million members and had the highest percentage of slave populace of any American generation (Strauss & Howe, 1991).

The first four cycles averaged eighty-nine years in length. The Millennial Cycle, which began in 1967, is still underway (Strauss & Howe, 1991). The generations within this cycle are the Idealist Boomers, Reactive Generation X, and Civic Millennials. More detailed discussion of these generations will occur further in Chapter 2. The eighteen American generations and their Cycles are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3 Eighteen American Generations

Cycle	Total number	Generation	Birth year	Type	% immigrant	% slave
Colonial:	25,000	Puritan	1584 –1614	Idealist	100	1
	100,000	Cavalier	1615 –1647	Reactive	61	4
	160,000	Glorious	1648 –1673	Civic	42	12
	340,000	Enlightenment	1674 –1700	Adaptive	34	17
Revolutionary:	550,000	Awakening	1701 –1723	Idealist	19	18
	1,100,000	Liberty	1724 –1741	Reactive	24	19
	2,100,000	Republican	1742 –1766	Civic	17	17
	4,200,000	Compromise	1767 –1791	Adaptive	10	15
Civil War:	11,000,000	Transcendental	1792 - 1821	Idealist	20	13
	17,000,000	Gilded	1822 - 1842	Reactive	28	10
	22,000,000	Progressive	1843 - 1859	Adaptive	27	9
Great Power:	45,000,000	Missionary	1860 –1882	Idealist	23	1
	45,000,000	Lost	1883 - 1900	Reactive	21	-

Cycle	Total number	Generation	Birth year	Type	% immigrant	% slave
	63,000,000	G.I.	1901 –1924	Civic	9	-
	49,000,000	Silent	1925 - 1942	Adaptive	9	-
Millennial	79,000,000	Boom	1943 –1960	Idealist	10	-
	93,000,000	Thirteenth (Gen X)	1961 –1981	Reactive	11	-
	76,000,000	Millennials	1982 - ?	Civic	12	-

Generations of 2012

In order to grasp the differences in generational factors and the innate conflict that could occur between them, it is imperative to further investigate the generations that are occupying the same moment in time. Five generations interacted in society in 2012. These generations are the General Infantry (G.I.) generation, Silent generation, Boomer generation, Generation X, and Millennial generation. Strauss and Howe (1991) have provided valuable insights into the characteristics of each generation.

The initials G.I. can stand for two different things – General Issue or Government Issue. This terminology was consistent with the G.I. generation's lifestyle. High priority was placed on being "general" or "regular" (Strauss & Howe, 1991, p. 264). The idea of being a regular guy was instilled young in this generation. Strauss & Howe (1991) point out that this generation was raised to believe that anything prepackaged or uniform was more likely to be wholesome. This culture during this time was an *Ozzie and Harriet* conformist culture. The government protected this generation from people and things that could cause harm to them. Growing up between two

World Wars and the Great Depression, this generation learned to do without. When members of this generation were coming of age, the government provided them with jobs. When they became rising adults, they were provided with an abundance of preferential advantages in education, employment, and family structure (Strauss & Howe, 1991). During midlife, tax cuts were a benefit. When they reached elder hood, newly charitable pensions and subsidized medical care were provided. Consistent with Strauss and Howe (1991), the G.I. generation was a Civic generation. Loyalty could best describe this generation. Putting aside individual needs and wants and working together toward common goals helped instill in this generation that amazing things could be accomplished by working all together (Lancaster & Stillman, 2005).

The Adaptive Silent generation was very withdrawn, cautious, indifferent, unimaginative, unadventurous, and silent (Strauss & Howe, 1991). This generation produced thirty years of Presidential aides, and three First Ladies. However, no members of their generation have been elected President (Strauss & Howe, 1991). During their youth, the Silent generation was overprotected. This generation was the first American generation to be born primarily in hospitals. They are the generation who created the America as we know it today through their hard work and vision (Zemke, Raines, and Filipczak, 2000). Lost (the generation prior to G.I.) and G.I. parents of the Silent generation followed a strict feeding regimen and behavioral rules. They were told that the older generations had made great sacrifices so they could grow up and enjoy peace and prosperity. The first wave of the Silent generation looked to the G.I.s for role models. However, throughout their coming of age, few saw any action in war before VJ-Day sent them home, but not as the heroes they emulated. As Strauss and Howe (1991) stated, they felt "inner-world tension amid the outer-world calm" (p. 287). The last wave of this generation

was just ahead of the fiery Boomers. During their Rising Adulthood and Midlife years, they landed a man on the moon, wiped out polio, tetanus, tuberculosis, and whooping cough with miracle vaccines (Zemke et al., 2000). According to Strauss and Howe (1991), this generation has been called the generation "betwixt and between" (p. 281). The two halves of this generation were not created equal. In midlife, the Silent generation born during the first half craved the respect of the manly and serious G.I. elders, while those born in the second half tried to fit in with the Boomers (Zemke et al., 2000). Even as late as their elder years, they still looked at the G.I.s for guidance and the Boomers for direction in social mores. While the Boomers were on their soapbox concerning open marriage and free love, the second-halfers of the Silent generation found themselves sandwiched in between socially as well (Zemke et al., 2000). Some defining moments during the Silent generation's point in time were the Korean War, the Great Depression, the New Deal, the silver screen, labor unions, Pearl Harbor, and the assassination of President Kennedy.

The Idealist Baby Boomer generation changed every market they entered. During this generational timeframe, Boomers parents had fought a war for the right to bear children and child rearing was considered a hobby and a pleasure (Zemke et al., 2000). They were fixated on self. Strauss and Howe (1991) noted that during their youth, Boomers' moms were guided by Dr. Benjamin Spock to follow a permissive feeding schedule and a clean-your-room-when-you-are-ready attitude philosophy. Everything Boomers did was in the spotlight. They felt the purpose of the world was to serve their needs and wants (Zemke et al., 2000). The inner world became the focus of the Boomers because the outer world was tranquil. Boomers' G.I. parents taught them critical thinking. All through the coming of age, student movements increased and

became emotionally intense. Most of the emotional frenzy was set around the Vietnam War. Campus unrest was the leading problem of the nation during this generation's coming of age. The older generations were fixated on the youth. An example of this fixation was the awarding of the right to vote to eighteen-year-olds. A central theme throughout Boomers' lifestyle was narcissism (Strauss & Howe, 1991). A mixture of high self-esteem and selective self-indulgence gave Boomers a reputation of cultural wisdom. Their energies turned inward and Boomers were focused on fixing what was wrong with America (Lancaster & Stillman, 2005). In their rising adulthood years, a large proportion of Boomers had an impatient desire for personal satisfaction, and weak civic instincts (Strauss & Howe, 1991). As indicated by Lancaster and Stillman (2005), Boomers are characteristically competitive. They were born and raised with 80 million peers and there was great competition for everything. Although graced with many blessings and privileges, Boomers had to fight for much of what they have earned during their adulthood (Lancaster & Stillman, 2005). While approaching midlife, Boomers felt that because they are now older, they know better. Boomers no longer despised government. They used it to redirect their purposes. Boomers are still attracted to lawlessness when pursuing their higher purpose. They were optimistic and had a sense that anything was possible. The boom in production of consumer goods and the promise of a good education for everyone allowed Boomers to grow up in a world of affluence with many opportunities. G.I. and Silent parents did everything they could to provide opportunities for their children (Strauss & Howe, 1991).

Strauss and Howe (1991) called the next generation the Thirteenth generation. This generation is also commonly called Generation X. According to Lancaster and Stillman (2005), this generation is quite possible the most misunderstood generation. As youth, they were looked

at as hindrances by their Silent mothers and fathers. They were also seen as headaches and things you take pills not to have (Strauss & Howe, 1991). Glass (2007) states that this group is significantly smaller than the Boomer generation due largely to the easy access to birth control. As the first generation of latchkey kids, they learned to be self-sufficient at an early age. They came home from school to an empty house, prepared dinner for themselves, and did their homework ("Move Over Mom & Dad – We're not like you!", 2004). Gen X children were born at a time when the divorce rate was twice that of their Boomer parents (Glass, 2007). Divorce was the central fear of the Gen Xer since only 20% of the women in 1980 believed that parents in bad marriages should stay together for the sake of the children. As a result, this group has been marked as skeptical (Lancaster & Stillman, 2005) and with a survivor mentality (Zemke et al., 2000). This group did not experience much of a coming of age. As noted by Zemke et al. (2000), Generation X watched as America failed militarily (losing the Vietnam War), politically (the resignation of President Nixon), and economically (the Japanese/American economic wars). They were forced to grow up fast and were overloaded with information (Strauss & Howe, 1991). Cable, digital, and satellite TV, video games, cell phones, microwaves, and the personal computers sprung up during their lifetime (Lancaster & Stillman, 2005). Generation Xers have learned to be resourceful and independent. Sports created by Generation X have been inclined to be individual sports such as skateboarding, mountain biking, rock climbing, and rollerblading ("Move Over Mom & Dad – We're not like you!", 2004). As rising adults, they experienced the world only as a source of pleasure and pain. Growing up with events like the Challenger explosion and the Columbine High School shootings, they felt powerless to change the world.

They are members of the first generation who did not expect to be better off than their parents (Espinoza, et al., 2010).

The generation subsequent to Generation X is the Millennial generation. The Millennials have been wanted, valued, and coddled from birth. They are often looked upon as cute, cheerful, scout-like, and wanted (Strauss & Howe, 1991). According to Zemke et al. (2000), nearly two-thirds of the Millennials were planned. The members of this generation are the most wanted generation because even though birth control and abortions were extensively available, their families nonetheless chose to have them (Glass, 2007). Their parents have micromanaged their lives with playgroup dates, team sports, music lessons, and other highly structured activities, thus coining the term "helicopter parents" (Glass, 2007, p. 100). Their parents make up the most age-diverse ever who range from teenagers to Boomers who delayed having children until their forties (Zemke et al.). Accustomed to a scheduled life, the Millennials look to their parents as part of their decision-making process ("Call Them Generation Y or Millennials", 2004). This generation is incredibly techno-savvy where technology has moved right into their pockets. The members of the Millennial generation have had access to cell phones, pagers, and computers since they were still in diapers (Lancaster & Stillman, 2005). Because technology is second nature to Millennials, this generation is the first generation to not need an authority figure to access information (Espinoza, et al., 2010). The use of the Internet for members of the Millennial generation is as natural as breathing. As indicated by Zemke et al., they know more concerning technology than their parents and are teaching and coaching them in technology. Their world has always included bottled water, chat rooms, and overnight delivery. On the down side, however, Millennials grew up seeing terrorist attacks on American soil (Glass, 2007). This

generation has never known a world where kids do not shoot and kill other kids. They have never known a world without terrorist attacks, crack, or AIDS. Statistically, as stated by Zemke et al., the Millennials are less sexually promiscuous than the other generations. The members of this generation are the most globally aware and racially diverse generation in American history (Chester, 2002; Glass, 2007).

Generations in the Workforce

With the appearance of the Millennial generation, the workplace today has for the first time in American history four generations working together at the same time. With two generations (the G.I. Generation and Silent Generation) born in the first half of the last century, they have a tendency to behave and believe very similarly and are sometimes combined to form the Traditionalist Generation (Lancaster & Stillman, 2005). For the purpose of this study, they will be referred to as Traditionalists. As a result, these four generations exist in the workforce and in K-12 schools today (Traditionalist, Baby Boomer, Generation X, and Millennials). Each of these generational cohorts has a distinctive career goal and brings diverse strengths to the job. With Baby Boomers refusing to retire and Millennials hitting the workforce, the structure of the workforce has considerably changed in the last few years. Due to the different generational factors and values, the current workforce is changing and generational discord in the workplace is increasing. When two or more generations knock headfirst into each other, collisions are bound to arise. Lancaster and Stillman (2005) refer to these collisions as "clashpoints" (p. 20).

> Stereotypes also arise from resentment. Xers resent Traditionalists for being resistant to change and unwilling to hand over the reins. Boomers resent Xers for finding it so easy to change jobs whenever they feel like it and for demanding balance in their lives the

> Boomers would never have thought to ask for. Traditionalists resent Millennials for their entitlement mentality when Traditionalists had to work for everything they've gotten. Millennials resent Boomers for leaving the planet a mess when they were supposed to be the ones to clean it up. And on it goes. The resentment becomes worse at work, where the generations are competing for the same turf and fairness is on the line (Lancaster & Stillman, 2005, p. 17).

Failure to address these differences can lead to conflict, misunderstanding, and miscommunication in the workplace. Generational research is relatively new, with the majority of research being conducted in the last 10 to 15 years. Scholarly research has been conducted on generational differences in the workplace. Most of these studies concentrated on Baby Boomers and Generation X. Recent research has expanded the domain to include Millennials, which, according to the U.S. Department of Labor Bureau of Labor Statistics comprised about 16% of the labor force (Toossi, 2010). Numerous articles in various journals such as *Journal of Organizational Behavior* (Becker & Billings, 1993), *Journal of Occupational Behavior* (Bhagat & Chassie, 1981), and *Administrative Science Quarterly* (Hrebiniak & Alutto, 1972) have addressed generational differences in the workplace. Additionally, several quantitative studies by researchers such as Cellillie (2003), Moody (2007), and Koenigsknecht (2002) have been grouped as related in content. Research conducted by Lancaster and Stillman (2005), suggests there are four "clashpoints" caused by generational differences which necessitate the need for new patterns of leadership (p. 20). These "clashpoints" are career goals, view of rewards, work-life balance, and retirement. Developing an understanding of this phenomenon is critical to

successful leadership in the workplace. The generational factors are shaping the leadership of public schools in America and will continue to in the next decade.

With approximately 70 million members each, Baby Boomers and the Millennials have roughly twice the numbers as Generation X (Hewlett, Sherbin, & Sumberg, 2009). Espinoza et al. (2010) points out that when Generation Xers entered the workforce, they opposed the Baby Boomers and the Veterans, but purely did not have the numbers to influence the workplace the way they wanted. Millennials believe they can change the world and purely by their sheer number have already changed many things in society and in the workplace ("Move Over Mom & Dad", 2004).

The oldest of the generations, the Traditionalists (G.I. Generation and Silent Generation) have a strong work ethic and a wealth of experience. Zemke et al., (2000) use the metaphor "American values" (p. 18) to describe the loyalty, respect for authority, and civic pride characteristics of the Traditionalists. The Traditionalists' career goals tend toward creating a legacy. The majority of members of this generation expected to build a career for a lifetime with one company (Lancaster and Stillman, 2005). Their goals were to find a good company, stay with that company for a long time, work their way up, become vested, and through accomplishments, acquire tenure and security (Lancaster & Stillman, 2005). Lancaster and Stillman (2005) point out that Traditionalists perceive approaching their bosses about a possible change in career path as a disloyalty to the organization. Having traveled "down a career path the longest doesn't mean they have reached their final destination" (Lancaster & Stillman, 2005, p. 56). Their loyalty to a company is evident as they see work as a privilege. Many Traditionalists' parents lost jobs during the Great Depression and the entire family experienced

poverty (Zemke et al., 2000). They are used in the workforce today as leaders, trainers, and recruiters (Lancaster and Stillman, 2005). Perceiving Traditionalists as being loyal, having a strong work ethic, serving their organizations, and having the desire to give back allows them to share a lifetime of experiences and leave behind a legacy. Traditionalists are not interested in climbing the corporate ladder. They would rather leave that to their younger Boomer and Generation X counterparts.

Lancaster and Stillman (2005) declare that Traditionalists view rewards in the workplace as simply fulfillment in a job well done. They view work as a genuine reward and were not raised to take work for granted. Receiving a paycheck and benefits package was reward enough for this generation. Simple rewards such as recognition through a write-up in a company newsletter are important to Traditionalists. Lancaster and Stillman (2005) point out that Traditionalists resent the younger generations coming into jobs and demanding rewards without acquiring the years of experience to earn them. Traditionalists feel that one should earn rewards by putting in the time. Because Traditionalists are nearing retirement and because they are used to saving for the future, they have the highest rate of savings of all four generations in the workplace. According to Zemke et al. (2000), Traditionalists prefer traditional rewards such as plaques or a photo with the CEO. Also, sending a handwritten note is received better by a Traditionalist than a congratulatory email or fax.

Traditionalists differ as well with the issue of work-life balance. The Traditionalists are accustomed to a military model and stick to a much disciplined work schedule, such as showing up to work on time (Lancaster & Stillman, 2005). They take pride in receiving recognition for

perfect attendance. Their demonstration of work-life balance is as straightforward as supporting the shift in work-life balance of the younger generations.

Lancaster and Stillman (2005) report that for Traditionalists, balance also means finding resources to help them transition into retirement. Traditionalists' loyalty to companies has been so unyielding that many of them are not ready for the liberation once they acquire it during retirement. They worry about their self-worth once they are no longer needed on the job (Lancaster and Stillman, 2005). Additionally, they have worked with the same people for so many years that they worry about how they are going to replace the personal relationships and the bonding experiences they have had at work for so long (Lancaster and Stillman, 2005). Traditionalists view retirement as their reward for hard work, preparation, and saving up for this time in their lives. As indicated by Lancaster and Stillman (2005), this generation deferred gratification until their children were on their own and their financial responsibilities paid. They see retirement as a time to do all the projects and adventures they did not get to do while working (Lancaster & Stillman, 2005). Traditionalists are the "healthiest, wealthiest, best educated generation ever to retire" (Lancaster & Stillman, 2005, p. 126). According to Lancaster and Stillman (2005), close to thirty percent of Traditionalists are enrolled in school and they make up over eighty percent of the luxury travelers. Because of their excellent health and concern for outliving their savings, 72% of Traditionalists plan to continue working after formal retirement (Lancaster & Stillman, 2005). Some return part-time to their organizations to serve as mentors and to give back a little of their expertise. Others choose to focus their energy on non-profit organizations which contribute to the community (Lancaster & Stillman, 2005). In line with Wyatt Watson's 1999 survey on phased retirement, 70% of companies offer a phased retirement

program or other flexible options, such as telecommuting or job sharing (Lancaster & Stillman, 2005). Retaining these skilled workers is the primary reason employers offer phased retirement (Lancaster & Stillman, 2005).

Similar to the Traditionalists, Baby Boomers are full of a wealth of experience and knowledge. Their career goals comprise of building a "stellar career" (Lancaster & Stillman, 2005, p. 57). Realizing they have a limited amount of time left to shine, they want to make the most of their remaining career years (Lancaster & Stillman, 2005). Surpassing their own career ambitions is their main focus. They are, however, reaching a place in their careers where they have a limited amount of time left to make considerable contributions (Lancaster & Stillman, 2005). Lancaster and Stillman (2005) declared one approach for Boomers to stand out among the workforce was to design a career path that springs them to the next level of opportunity and challenge to exhibit hidden talents. Boomers are focused on finding work that offers fulfillment and accomplishment. "Face time" is important for Boomers (Lancaster & Stillman, 2005. p. 112). Presenting at meetings, staying until the boss leaves, and dropping by the boss's office are effective ways to climb the career ladder. This generation loves to be challenged.

The satisfaction of a job well done was not enough for Boomers. They view rewards as titles, money, a better shift, the corner office, seniority, and other concrete recognition indicators that reinforce their performance in the workplace (Lancaster & Stillman, 2005). Boomers have been groomed since birth that they must do better than their parents did. This generation takes a lot of pride in what they have accomplished and observable rewards such as company cars and expense accounts were once admired by Boomers (Lancaster & Stillman, 2005). As Boomers have increasing pressure put on them by aging parents and maturing children, time has become

more valuable than money. As recommended by Lancaster and Stillman (2005), companies should look for ways to provide rewards that save Boomers time.

Boomers are optimistic and future-oriented and feel that the rough handling they endured while coming up through the ranks is a rite of passage (Arnsparger, 2008). They are in favor of the sixty-hour workweek and bring a positive sense of spirit to the workplace (Zemke et al., 2000). They have been referred to as the civil rights and empowerment generation (Zemke et al., 2000). Baby Boomers are seeking meaning for themselves in the work-life balance issue. They are at the point in their lives where they are seeking answers to where they have been and where they are going (Lancaster & Stillman, 2005). They want to know how far they have come and where they are headed next. The stress put on them by their aging parents and maturing children at the same time they are reaching the peak of their careers has made them feel the "sandwich effect" (Lancaster & Stillman, 2005, p. 84). They have searched for ways to balance their work-life and their family-life.

Retirement concerns for Baby Boomers cause a great deal of apprehension and discomfort (Lancaster & Stillman, 2005). Any reference to retirement insults this generation. Their validation comes from professional accomplishments and they are not yet ready to slow down (Lancaster & Stillman, 2005). Boomers see themselves as forever young and retain their impact. Adler (2005) found that Boomers "literally think they're going to die before they get old" (p. 1). Boomers want to hold on to their youth, but even more significant, they want to hold on to their authority. They want to be able to gain knowledge of and succeed at any life stage. Their youthfulness, energy, ambition, and good health will make them sought-after leaders and mentors well past retirement age. According to the Bridgeworks Survey conducted

by Lancaster and Stillman (2005), Boomers see retirement as withdrawal from a steady career and enter into a cycle of consultation-type jobs. A Del Webb survey in 1998 found that Boomers expect to retire at the average age of 61 and 36 % intend to run a home business (Lancaster & Stillman, 2005). On account of laptop computers, Boomers are accustomed to bringing work home, answering emails, participating in conference calls, all from home at the dining room table. Boomers' Traditionalist parents (also known as the "silent" generation) did not talk about their own financial situations. As a result, Boomers have little knowledge of what inheritance their parents are going to leave them. They are uncertain as to whether or not they will be able to afford to retire on just their savings (Lancaster & Stillman, 2005). Lancaster and Stillman (2005) stated that organizations have begun to offer training in financial and emotional preparation for the transition of retirement for Boomers.

Lancaster and Stillman's (2005) data show that Generation X's career goals focus on developing a "portable career" (p. 58). Members of Generation X are described by Traditionalists and Boomers as disloyal because of the Xers frequency in changing jobs in order to build a résumé (Lancaster & Stillman, 2005). Lancaster and Stillman (2005) stated that Generation Xers continuously develop a repertoire of skills and experiences they can take with them when they feel their jobs have become obsolete. Building a collection of accomplishments and knowledge allows Generation Xers to be mobile with the purpose of focusing on career security rather than job security (Lancaster & Stillman, 2005). Xers were raised with the awareness that personal computers become outdated in a few months and cannot help but believe that about their careers. Xers are impatient when it comes to moving up the career ladder. They react to instant gratification and anticipate a quick promotion for good work rather than waiting

in line (Parry & Urwin, 2010). Members of Generation X are seen as skeptical as well as clever, resourceful and willing to work from dawn until dusk. They are fragmented and want feedback, yet hate close supervision (Zemke et al., 2000).

Generation Xers are less concerned with job loyalty than are Traditionalists and Baby Boomers. Many members of Generation X witnessed their parents captured by corporate America and are disinclined to suffer the unpleasant consequences for success (Lancaster & Stillman, 2005). Therefore, freedom is the supreme reward for Gen Xers. Growing up as latchkey kids meant they were used to having freedom (Zemke et al., 2000). Rewards geared towards tenure and vesting are not seen as valuable to most Generation Xers (Lancaster & Stillman, 2005). According to Lancaster and Stillman (2005), freedom to Generation X means portable savings and retirement plans, constant training opportunities, relaxed dress codes, paid time off, and open office designs. In keeping with the research conducted by Lancaster and Stillman (2005), Generation Xers want rewards for security *now,* where Traditionalists wanted to ensure security *later.* Rewards geared toward vesting in their future have less value for Xers. One of the greatest rewards a company can give to a Generation Xer's peak performance is time. Time off can be in the form of a sabbatical. A Gen X employee will come back to work even more committed (Lancaster & Stillman, 2005).

Generation X wants work-life balance in the workplace now, not when they are too old to enjoy it (Lancaster & Stillman, 2005). It is difficult for Generation Xers to comprehend why showing up for work on time is essential when the work is nonetheless getting finished (Lancaster & Stillman, 2005). According to Lancaster and Stillman's BridgeWorks Generations Survey (2005), 37% of Generation Xers believe they have not reached the level of work-life

balance for which they are seeking. An example of the work-life balance they are searching for is that Xers do not want to work for a boss who continuously watches the clock and notes when an employee is a few minutes late. As long as the work turned in is good, Xers believe flexibility with time at work should not be an issue. This generation lured this balance into the limelight of today's workplace (Lancaster & Stillman, 2005). Lancaster and Stillman (2005) convey that as much as Generation X wants that job of their dreams, they are not willing to sacrifice the lifestyle they desire. Members of this generation saw their parents spend evenings and weekends at the office and give all of their attention to work issues. Xers "work to live" and not "live to work" as they have witnessed their parents doing (Zemke et al., 2000, p. 99). Where Boomers felt face time was a tactical tool, Gen Xers see it as a waste of time (Lancaster & Stillman, 2005). Many members of this generation ask why they must follow rigid schedules of start and stop times when the work gets completed. They do not think much of work hours. This generation felt they should be able to take vacations when they want them, work fewer weekends, and go home on time (Lancaster & Stillman, 2005). Work is only one segment of a full life as perceived by members of Generation X.

In keeping with Lancaster and Stillman (2005), retirement is something looked forward to by Gen Xers. They are saving money for retirement faster than the Baby Boomers did. Research obtained by Lancaster and Stillman (2005) shows that Generation X saves money at an earlier age than the Baby Boomers did. This generation cut their teeth on compound interest. According to the research group Third Millennium, Xers are skeptical that Social Security will be non-existent when they are ready to retire (Lancaster & Stillman, 2005). In contrast to seeing retirement as the ultimate reward as the Traditionalists do, or as a chance to retool as the Baby

Boomers, Generation X views retirement as a chance to renew. Enjoying themselves throughout their careers and not just at retirement is important to them (Lancaster & Stillman, 2005). Generation Xers, having seen their parents and grandparents work hard and give up so much, will take time out during their careers to travel, try a new profession, and spend time with their families (Lancaster & Stillman, 2005). A common trend with Generation X is to take a portion of time off between jobs to downshift and regroup. Rewarding a member of Generation X with time off will allow time for renewal. Getting time off at the end of a long career will in no way make sense to this generation (Lancaster & Stillman, 2005). Lancaster and Stillman (2005) proclaim that Xers would rather walk out than burn out as Boomers have or be thrown out as Traditionalists were. A program that offers an opportunity for a sabbatical might make Generation Xers more productive. The "great reward" of retirement at the end of an extensive career will never seem sensible to Generation Xers (Lancaster & Stillman, 2005, p. 138).

Millennial career goals focus on building "parallel careers" (Lancaster & Stillman, 2005, p. 65). This generation is used to multi-tasking. Furthermore, decision-making for Millennials has always been rapid. This generation has played with video games and simulations since they were youth and have learned to act fast, observe what happens, and adjust (Lancaster & Stillman, 2005). Millennials have been programmed to balance their lives since birth (Lancaster & Stillman, 2005). Millennials can learn several jobs concurrently and do them substantially well. Data collected through the BridgeWorks Generations Survey show that Millennials will experience as many as 10 *career* changes in their lifetimes (Lancaster & Stillman, 2005). Moreover, college career counselors make Millennials aware that they can expect to have as

many as five to seven careers for several different companies during their lives (Espinoza, et al., 2010).

Rewards are viewed by Millennials as both tangible and intangible (Lancaster & Stillman, 2005). This generation needs the financial (tangible) reward to pay for their expenses together with their entertainment. These tangible rewards can be in the form of gift certificates, free meals, or tickets to events. Intangible rewards, such as a fun work environment, working with teams of peers, and participating in work decisions are just as important to Millennials as financial rewards (Lancaster & Stillman, 2005). As a result of being included in family decisions from early in their lives, they need bosses who allow them to create a fun environment, work with peers in teams, and participate in the decision making in order to feel valued. As indicated by Lancaster and Stillman (2005), one crucial reward for Millennials is being engaged in meaningful work. Millennials need to feel that their work is making a difference in the world.

Millennials have had the notion of balance etched into their heads since birth by their Boomer and Gen X parents (Lancaster & Stillman, 2005). Flexible work schedules are needed for Millennials to balance their busy lives. With the competitive pressure to beat the other seventy-six million Millennials into the best colleges, a balance of academic accomplishments and social interests must be shown on college applications. Due to their over programmed youth years, Millennials will continue to carry their overloaded lives into the workplace and to see work as just one of many important activities instead of top priority (Lancaster & Stillman, 2005). Lancaster and Stillman (2005) report that a MonsterTRAK.com survey shows that college students selected flexible hours as the most important benefit in the workplace. Time is a huge concern for this overscheduled generation (Lancaster & Stillman, 2005). A less stressed,

more balanced workforce can be achieved through flexible scheduling. Flexible scheduling is a dream come true for the Millennials. This generation is used to being busy and they tend to do better with work schedules that permit them to fit in the many activities in which they participate.

Retirement is seen to Millennials as another cycle of work that is meaningful to them (Lancaster & Stillman, 2005). This generation may by no means understand why anyone would retire in order to renew when the work they are involved in is meaningful and fun (Lancaster & Stillman, 2005). Members of the Millennial generation want to work hard and play hard all in the same environment.

Job Satisfaction

Since job satisfaction is a concept reflecting how much employees get pleasure from their jobs, it is important to realize the wishes of employees and determine if age is significantly correlated with an individual's desires at work. Akpinar, Bayansalduz, and Toros (2012) points out that when satisfaction is high, motivation and performance increase while absenteeism and teacher turnover decrease.

Job satisfaction research began in combination with attitude and morale research (Mitchell, 1978). Mitchell (1978) found that one of the most repeatedly researched attitudes is job satisfaction - how one feels about one's job. He discovered more than 3,000 articles and research reports had been published on job satisfaction (Mitchell, 1978). Hoppock (1935) first studied job satisfaction involving employed adults in industry and school teachers. The National Center for Education Statistics (1997) reports that a teacher's satisfaction may affect the quality and consistency of instruction given to students. As with other careers, both intrinsic and

extrinsic factors affect a teacher's satisfaction. Intrinsic satisfaction can come from daily interactions with students, student demographics such as low or high minority percentages, and teachers' perception of their control (NCES, 1997). Individuals enter the teaching profession because of intrinsic factors, such as the joy one receives from teaching and working with children. Very few individuals enter the teaching profession because of extrinsic rewards such as salary, benefits, or prestige (NCES, 1997). Also, according to the NCES (1997), other extrinsic factors that affect satisfaction are availability of school resources and perceived support from administration. Teachers who perceive a lack of support are not motivated to do their best in the classroom. This, in turn, causes dissatisfaction and teachers are more likely to change schools or leave the profession altogether when they do not feel satisfaction (NCES, 1997). Researchers have found only a limited impact of incentives such as higher salaries and merit increases on teacher satisfaction and commitment (NCES, 1997).

Given that job satisfaction reflects how much pleasure employees get from their jobs, it is important to understand employee values, attitudes, behaviors, preferences, and expectations to determine if age is significantly correlated with an individual's desires at work. The National Center for Education Statistics (1997) surveyed approximately 75,000 teachers in 14,000 schools and found job satisfaction levels among teachers decreased as the age increased.

The NCES (1997) reports that attracting and retaining high quality teachers is a high priority for education in the United States. One of the factors in developing a high quality faculty is teacher's job satisfaction (NCES, 1997). Satisfaction influences teacher effectiveness, which, in turn, promotes student achievement. Additionally, NCES (1997) reports that younger teachers with less experience have higher levels of satisfaction than do older, more experienced

teachers. Teacher autonomy is positively associated with career satisfaction. Teachers who feel they have little autonomy show lower levels of satisfaction than teachers who feel they have greater autonomy (NCES, 1997). Also reported by NCES (1997) are that workplace conditions had a positive relationship with teacher's job satisfaction. The most satisfied secondary teachers felt they had more parental support than the least satisfied secondary teachers (NCES, 1997).

Other quantitative research indicated mixed findings of differences based on age in employees' satisfaction. Cellillie (2003) measured different levels of job satisfaction of Baby Boomer and Generation X nurses. The research, conducted in a hospital environment where the atmosphere was extremely intense, indicated findings that showed a statistically significant difference based on age among the various generations with the variables "opportunities for social contact at work" and "opportunities to participate in nursing research" (Cellillie, 2003, p. 62-63).

Moody (2007) measured differences in commitment, motivation, and employee satisfaction among Baby Boomers, Generation X, and Generation Y (Millennials) of individuals in the financial services industry workforce. A voluntary and anonymous survey was implemented to gather data. Additionally, managers were interviewed regarding their experiences managing generational differences (Moody, 2007). Four factors of job satisfaction were analyzed: benefits, advancement, control over work, and control over decisions. An analysis of the qualitative data indicated that statistically significant differences occurred in two of the four factors affecting job satisfaction among the three generations. Benefits, the first of the four factors indicating a significant difference, showed that differences occurred between Generation X and Millennials (Generation Y) and between Baby Boomers and Millennials

(Generation Y) (Moody, 2007). Mean responses for advancement opportunities indicated that significant differences exist between Baby Boomers and Millennials (Generation Y) at a 1% level of significance. The qualitative data gathered via the interviews with bank managers verified the findings.

In the quantitative study by Ghazi and Maringe (2011), 180 head teachers from government elementary schools in Toba Tek Singh, Punjab, Pakistan were surveyed. The findings indicated that there is a significant difference among head teachers' level of job satisfaction based on age. The younger and older head teachers were found to be significantly more satisfied than the middle-aged teachers.

Chambers' (2010) study utilized a job satisfaction questionnaire to determine the satisfaction level of elementary teachers in grades K-5 in an urban school district in North Carolina as substantiated by five factors making up total job satisfaction. School factors (students' race, social economic status, and school achievement), teacher factors (age and experience), and total job satisfaction were analyzed using the F-test, set at a significance level of .05. Chambers (2010) concluded that significant differences in employees' level of job satisfaction were related to other factors, but not age. Chambers (2010) found that satisfaction levels varied on teacher's years of teaching experience with teachers having 0-4 years of experience. Job satisfaction for teachers with 0-4 years of teaching experience was significantly lower than teachers with 11 or more years of teaching experience. Her findings indicated that no statistically significant differences occurred among the age groups of teachers which affected their total job satisfaction (Chambers, 2010).

Akpinar, Bayansalduz, and Toros (2012) measured job satisfaction levels of secondary education teachers using a job satisfaction questionnaire. The research was conducted with 114 teachers working in seven secondary schools in Karaman, Turkey. Akpinar et al. (2012) found a statistically significant difference regarding position at school, and the school they work in, but no statistically significant difference regarding job satisfaction levels of teachers for age in internal satisfaction, external satisfaction, and total score.

Organizational Commitment

Organizational commitment is multidimensional and can mean different things to different people. It can mean retaining the most qualified people, preventing people from leaving the organization, or employees giving their 100% to the organization while on the job. For the purpose of this study, organizational commitment is defined as "emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization" (Steers, 1977, p. 46). Recent research suggests that organizational commitment is linked to motivation, absenteeism, turnover, and other behaviors which influence the organization (Daboval, 1998). Organizations are demanding their employees to do more with less, work smarter, and go above and beyond. Employees' reaction to these challenges depends on the depth of their commitment to the organization (Daboval, 1998). Previous research by Becker, Billings, Eveleth, and Gilbert (1996) suggest individuals can be committed to an organization based on compliance, identification, and internalization. Compliance occurs when specific attitudes and behaviors are adopted to attain rewards or avoid punishments (Becker et al., 1996). Identification occurs when particular attitudes and behaviors are adopted with the aim of being connected to a fulfilling, self-defining bond with another person or group (Becker et al., 1996). Lastly, internalization occurs when the

content of specific attitudes and behaviors is congruent with the individuals' value systems (Becker et al., 1996). Commitment to an organization can be targeted to the organization itself, supervisors, co-workers, union, or the profession (Becker et al., 1996). Leaders can utilize information about attitudes of the variety of generations in the workplace to develop policies which support commitment. Katzell and Thompson (1990) have identified seven key strategies for increasing commitment through improving work motivation. The first of the seven key strategies is ensuring workers are placed in the appropriate jobs that match their motives and values. Secondly, jobs must be made attractive, interesting, and satisfying. The third key strategy is positive reinforcement of effective performance. The fourth strategy involves setting work goals that are clear, challenging, attractive, and difficult but attainable. The fifth strategy recommends that provisions for personal, social, and material resources that facilitate effectiveness and eliminate constraints to performance. Strategy number six states that interpersonal and group environments must support the attainment of goals. The seventh and last strategy is the sociotechnical parameters of the system (individual, social, and technical) must be harmonized (Katzell & Thompson, 1990).

There have been an abundance of researchers such as Daboval (1998), Heinzman (2004), McGuiness (1999), Love (2005), and Swearingen (2004) who have conducted studies on Baby Boomers, Generation X, and Millennial employees that addressed how generational differences influence employees' level of commitment.

Daboval (1998) surveyed 167 employees of a privately owned jewelry manufacturing organization. Of the respondents, 74% identified themselves as Generation X employees and 26% identified themselves as Baby Boomer employees. Mean comparisons and t-tests were

performed to test for significance. Daboval (1998) found a significant difference regarding levels of commitment based on identification commitment between the two generations and internalization commitment between the two groups. Survey results show that Baby Boomer employees have a higher level of commitment based on identification commitment and internalization commitment than Generation X. Moreover, Daboval (1998) found a significant difference in level of commitment toward supervisors and the employing organization. The results showed a higher level of commitment for Baby Boomer employees than Generation X employees toward supervisor and organization.

Heinzman's (2004) study surveyed 135 manufacturing employees at two different upper mid-western firms involved in the manufacture of products for the aerospace industry for a relationship between age, tenure, and job satisfaction and affective commitment (want to stay), continuance commitment (need to stay), and normative commitment (feel obligated to stay). Using regression analysis, Heinzman (2004) found that although age was positively related to affective commitment, it was not significant. Age, tenure, and job satisfaction did not have an overall effect on continuance commitment. Both tenure and job satisfaction had a positive relationship to normative commitment and were significant in the t-test. For total organizational commitment (the mean total affective, continuance, and normative commitment), the analysis of age, tenure, and job satisfaction resulted in a positive relationship with tenure and job satisfaction showing significance, and age not showing significance.

McGuiness (1999) measured levels of commitment (affective, continuance, and normative) for 150 Baby Boomer and Generation X employees in one private school and child care agency with locations in two cities in Southern New York and one in Western Connecticut.

The respondents were employed as childcare workers, social workers, recreational counselors, and teachers working in residential treatment, foster care workers, supervised independent living and group home facilities. An analysis of the results indicated that there is no significant difference between the level of affective, continuance, or normative commitment between baby Boomers and Generation Xers.

Love (2005) conducted a survey from a mailing list of 100 public, private, and not-for-profit organizations, all of which had over 500 employees. The final sample consisted of 15,461 respondents from the Baby Boomer generation and Generation X. An analysis of results indicated that commitment levels did not differ significantly between Baby Boomers and members of Generation X when no other factors were taken into account. Levels of organization commitment differed when based on gender, life cycles, job type, industry sector, and tenure.

Swearingen (2004) surveyed 182 and interviewed 21 nurses and one focus group of four staff nurses regarding nurses' level of job commitment and retention rate of Baby Boomer and Generation X nurses in two large hospitals in Central Florida. The quantitative analysis consisted of multiple regression and independent t-tests to determine a presence or absence of significant differences between the means of the responses of the two generational cohorts. A statistically significant positive relationship was found between nurses' satisfaction and leadership characteristics, leadership characteristics and retention of nurses, nurses' satisfaction and the presence of Servant-Leadership characteristics, and nurse retention and Servant-Leadership characteristics. No significant differences were found between the two generational cohorts for any of these factors. The qualitative analysis demonstrated a statistically significant positive relationship in regards to nursing retention between the two generational cohorts.

Generation X nurses were more likely to not see a job as a "lifelong commitment", were more likely to "job hop", and "leave an organization if they don't like the work environment" (p. 113) than Baby Boomers.

Miller (2006) measured levels of commitment of 177 individuals consisting of managers, supervisors, and hourly employees at 15 hotels in upstate New York. Levels of affective commitment were based on turnover rates, extrinsic and intrinsic work rewards, organizational climate, work values, and perception of alternative employment. Respondents were members of the Matures, Baby Boomer generation, Generation X, or Millennials (Generation Y). An analysis of results indicated a significant correlation between generation cohort and turnover rates, extrinsic and intrinsic work rewards, work values, and perception of alternative employment. Millennials (Generation Y) reported the lowest level of commitment and the highest intention to leave. Matures reported the highest levels of commitment and the lowest intentions to leave. Matures also reported the highest level of satisfaction with both intrinsic and extrinsic rewards. Generation X employees reported higher levels of satisfaction with intrinsic and extrinsic work rewards than Baby Boomers or Generation Y, which might imply a higher commitment to an organization that offers work rewards that are important to them. Generation Y have a statistically high level of perception of alternative employment and a low sense of commitment to their employer.

Work Motivation

There are many motivational theorists such as Max Weber, Elton Mayo, W. Edwards Deming, and Peter Senge. Many theories of motivation exist and scholars disagree about the way people behave when it comes to motivating factors. Scholars agree, however, that among

the variety of human behaviors that exist in organizations, three motivational patterns are evident (Owens & Valesky, 2007). The First Pattern: Direction in Making Choices is evident when individuals are faced with an assortment of possible options (Owens & Valesky, 2007). An example of this pattern is when one teacher routinely arrives at school early in the morning and prepares for the day before students arrive. Another teacher arrives around the same time as the students. Motivational inferences may be made regarding these behaviors, but one does not actually know what caused the choice to be made (Owens & Valesky, 2007).

The Second Motivational Pattern: Persistence is the diligence with which a chosen course of action is pursued (Owens & Valesky, 2007). Some individuals will work meticulously for long hours to create high-quality results, while others may consider a mediocre result as good enough. Some teachers take work home and continue working on it there, whereas others stop working as soon as the students leave and never give it another thought until students arrive the next day (Ownes & Valesky, 2007).

The Third Pattern: Intensity is an indicator also linked to motivation. One individual can work with intense concentration on a task, whereas another individual works much less intensely on a task (Owens & Valesky, 2007). Patterns of intensity need to be observed and interpreted more cautiously than either direction or persistence because factors, such as environment and skill level which are beyond the control of the individual, may be involved (Owens & Valesky, 2007). For example, working in an atmosphere where there are many uncontrolled interruptions, as is commonplace in some schools, makes it difficult to establish whether the level of intensity is the choice of the individual or the result of the environment.

One important factor of organizational behavior is that, as a member of an organization, an individual does not act alone. The member of the organization always acts as a member of a group, and that notion is vital to understanding organizational behavior (Owens & Valesky, 2007). Group performance can cause individual members to rise above themselves for the betterment of the group. Members of a group share certain purposes, values, and expectations for behavior that link them in common purpose and alter not only your own behavior but your opinions and beliefs as well (Owens & Valesky, 2007). The power of group norms in motivating people at work have been plainly recognized in the Western Electric studies in 1924.

The Western Electric Studies, or Hawthorne Studies, has had a deep impact on the understanding of organizational motivation. The Hawthorne Works of the Western Electric Company, near Chicago, Illinois, manufactured electrical components. The purpose of the study was to determine the relationship between levels of light and worker productivity (Owens & Valesky, 2007). Two groups of employees were selected to complete work under similar conditions. With one group, the intensity of the light under which this group worked was varied, and held constant with the other group. A supplementary experiment was designed where workers assumed that the light intensity was varied. Light bulbs were changed to create the impression that there would be more illumination when, in fact, bulbs with the same intensity were installed. Each time the bulbs were changed, an increase in output by the workers was the result. The group was responding to the perception of the expectations and not to the changes in the physical environment (Owens & Valesky, 2007). This experiment showed a direct connection between productivity and psychological happenings, such as expectations of others. This phenomenon is also called the Hawthorne Effect.

In 1927, the National Research Council withdrew from the study (Western Electric Company, 2007). The Harvard Business School Team, led by Elton Mayo, continued with a new experimental study. Mayo contended that social unification and teamwork, not external factors such as pay incentives or the physical environment, were most likely to increase efficiency and worker satisfaction (Briskin, 1996). The description of the study was carefully explained to the women workers. Working conditions, such as a shorter working day and work week, midmorning lunches, and rest periods were changed and the pace of production was set at a comfortable pace (Owens & Valesky, 2007). Anytime an experimental change was planned, the women were included. Output rose slowly and steadily rising higher than in the preceding period. When work conditions were returned to pre-experiment conditions, productivity continued to rise. An analysis of the findings of this study concluded that the workers liked the experimental environment and deemed it fun. Additionally, workers were allowed to work freely and without anxiety. Moreover, the workers were consulted about planned changes and were involved in the decision-making process. The women were empowered, made to feel as if they were an important part of the company, and gained ownership of their work (Owens & Valesky, 2007). The higher productivity attained during the Western Electric studies resulted from the group of workers developing cohesiveness, higher morale, and values that were highly motivating. This concept called teamwork is a powerful motivator (Owens & Valesky, 2007).

To increase employee effectiveness, some organizations are adopting the team approach. Work teams started out in America as quality circles (Mullen, 1993). W. Edwards Deming was credited with being the first to introduce quality circles. Deming dealt with the relationships between employees and managers, and showed that employees would only be motivated when

they were confident about their managers' leadership (Mullen, 1993). In opposing the need to break down barriers between management and employees which results in the removal of employee fear, Deming indicted that task-oriented leaders can be obsessed with goals and treat people as objects. Deming proposed that employees be presented with opportunities to work as a team to contribute to organizational effectiveness and personal growth (Briskin, 1996).

Motivation is, according to Mullen (1993), "an inner drive that causes one to act. Employee motivation causes one to abandon their own goals for the goals of the organization" (p. 6). The solution is how to have the employee abandon their own goals for the organization's goals. One solution is the task as the motivational tool. Frederick Taylor, known as the father of time studies, made a case for a better system to encourage workers to work harder through higher pay, rather than through individual incentives that afforded workers the capability to cheat for their pay (Mullen, 1993). The non-controllable affliction of the task must be taken from the worker and allow the worker to perform the task to be performed. It is the leaders' responsibility to let the workers know what is expected and that expectation must be demanding and challenging (Mullen, 1993). The worker must have input to feel a part of the team.

As indicated by Mullen (1993), another key to getting the worker to abandon their own goals for the goals of the organization is the worker's right to be human. Abraham Maslow supported the need for self-actualization, and theorized that each stage on the pyramid is based on the preceding stage. Leaders must motivate each employee on the level they are on and create a work environment which allows employees to express freedom (Mullen, 1993).

The power to be is inherent in all organizations. Rather than empower employees, some managers continue to believe that power is control. Power systems play a major role in how

motivated individuals can become in their role in the organization (Mullen, 1993). The most common form of power is in the form of compensation. The harder an employee works, in theory, the more the employee will be compensated (Mullen, 1993). B.F. Skinner is most noted for his work in control theory. Old style of management no longer works in modern organizations. People want to work with management and have a say in the decisions.

Janiszewski (2004) conducted a substantial qualitative study to determine if there are differences in the importance of financial (compensation) versus nonfinancial (recognition and autonomy) variables on motivation between Baby Boomers and Generation X independent insurance agents. Sixteen independent insurance agency owners from a Northeast state were interviewed using the phenomenological approach. Eight Baby Boomers and eight Generation X agents participated in the study. The 20 open-ended questions were changed as necessary during the interview process to gain insight into the importance of the variables. Although the difference was not significant, Generation X agents mentioned compensation as important more often than Boomers suggesting that compensation is more important to them. No significance difference was shown between Baby Boomers and Generation X agents in the importance of recognition. Additionally, no significant difference was shown between Baby Boomers and Generation X agents in the importance of autonomy. All respondents considered autonomy important. Factors other than generation have a greater impact on the agent's motivation.

Koenigsknecht (2002) studied whether or not differences exist in motivation and trust between Baby Boomer and Generation X employees who hold similar positions. The factors examined were challenging work, compensation, feeling valued, and organizational trust. Out of the 461 surveys that were distributed, a total of 204 surveys were used. Respondents included

employees from two local manufacturing companies and one high-tech company in Colorado Springs, Colorado, and graduate students from Colorado Technical University and Webster University. An analysis of the survey results was conducted using t-tests. Results revealed significant differences in trust factor between Baby Boomer and Generation X employees. According to Koenigsknect (2002), Generation Xers are less trusting than Baby Boomers because Xers grew up watching their parents lose jobs while being told corporate rhetoric about being part of a family. There results also revealed there were no significant findings in the challenging work variable based on generation. Additionally, there were no significant findings in the compensation variable based on generation. Furthermore, there were no significant findings in the feeling valued variable based on generation.

Generational Challenges in Public Schools

Generational discord is not solely experienced in the corporate workplace; it is experienced in today's K-12 school as well. The role that the Traditionalists, Baby Boomers, Generation X, and Millennials have on today's K-12 education system is worth investigating.

As indicated by William Strauss (2005), Traditionalists attended elementary and secondary school during the 1930s and 1940s. Many became educators from the 1950s through the 1990s. Until recently, some were school administrators and now nearly all are retired from those careers. The educational tone was set by this generation in the experimental decades of the 1970s and 1980s. The Traditionalists are the most critical of today's teachers and students. Many still influence on university campuses as trustees and senior faculty members (Strauss, 2005). Being in their formative years during the Great Depression and World War II, Traditionalists were raised in uniform families and harmonized neighborhoods (Strauss, 2005).

They were very civic minded. Hardships were overcome by teams that worked together in the form of unions and collective bargaining. Their participation in civic duties, such as voting and helping at schools, was an expected part of life ("Move Over Mom & Dad", 2004). Traditionalists had a strong commitment to higher education and a respect for authority (Sprague, 2008).

Civic confidence and community service were strong when Boomers journeyed through K-12 schools (Strauss, 2005). The teaching vocation was at a height of community prestige. Well-educated G.I. Generation women dominated the teaching profession. Baby Boomers first entered universities in the early 1960s. By the end of the decade, the Boomers had turned campus life into a topsy-turvy experience with inexhaustible protests and riots. As stated by Strauss (2005), college was "the generational experience that brought them together" (p. 2). Baby Boomers look back on their education experience fondly; however, according to Strauss (2005), women of this generation were less likely to go into teaching than the two prior generations. Boomers became the annoying yet supportive parents of the 1980s (Strauss, 2005). Boomer teachers have been in the classrooms for the past thirty years. The vast majority of superintendents of schools are Boomers. Universities, U.S. Congress, and the White House are now the platforms of influence for this generation (Strauss, 2005). This generation supported Title IX and school reform. Boomers volunteered in order to solve issues, not because of civic duty (Strauss, 2005).

During the early 1980s when Generation Xers were passing through school, the social aspect of schools changed drastically. With the release of the U.S. Department of Education's "A Nation at Risk" in 1983, Gen Xers were accustomed to hearing one expert after another insult

their schools as being ineffective, teachers were incompetent, and they themselves were labeled "somewhere between disappointing and stupid" (Strauss, 2005, p. 2). As a result, Generation X considered education to be a less prestigious career. Gen Xers look back on their educational experience with less fondness than Boomers. They are zealous defenders of No Child Left Behind, school accountability, school choice, charter schools, vouchers, and home-schooling (Strauss, 2005).

The Millennial generation is made up of approximately half of the offspring of Boomers and half the children of Generation X. During the late 1980's, members of the Millennial generation began replacing Gen Xers as the K-3 school-age population. The 1990s brought the first wave of Millennials into middle schools and high schools. At the time of this writing, the last wave is still in elementary schools. The Millennials have also taken over law, business, graduate, and doctoral programs. Millennials fill all aspects of education in American society (Strauss, 2005).

The findings through literature indicate that generational differences among school staff members do have an effect on the school culture. Millennials may show up to work wearing flip flops, tattooed, or have iPod ear buds hanging from their ears driving the Traditionalists and Boomers insane. Millennials are accustomed to sharing their opinions freely and in doing so are often seen as disrespectful by the older generations. Traditionalists and Baby Boomers who lived to work and respected hierarchy and authority must develop familiarity with the values and behaviors of the younger generations to facilitate a strong collegial relationship.

Generational Leadership

A growing body of evidence suggests that among school-related factors, leadership is second only to teaching in contributing to student achievement (Lovely, 2005). As Suzette Lovely (2010) points out, leadership positions in schools in America are held by Baby Boomer superintendents, principals, and school boards. Nevertheless, schools are full of Generation X teachers and administrators who envision things differently. According to Lovely (2005), administrators from the Traditionalist generation are likely to equate age with hierarchy and status in the workplace. Change is difficult for this tradition-infused generation of leaders who are apt to be more conventional than the younger leaders. Millennials are a generation used to working collaboratively. Team projects and helping to plan the family vacation are activities they have participated in since childhood. Leaders must become accustomed to new methods and policies. Many of the existing policies have been set by Boomers who did not understand the way of the Millennials (Lovely, 2005).

Traditionalists had a command-and-control style of leadership. They take charge, delegate, and make the majority of decisions (Zemke et al., 2000). As Zemke et al.(2000) also points out, the early days of participative management caused frustration and poor morale. Therefore, Traditionalists never had a good reason for changing their leadership style.

Zemke et al. (2000) stated that the Boomers' leadership style is tended toward collegial. They were truly zealous and concerned about participation and spirit in the workplace. The Civil Rights movement of the 1960s had an impact on the personality of their leadership and creating a fair and level playing field for all was important to Boomers. However, according to Zemke et al.(2000), they rarely practice this style of leadership. Influenced by the command-and-control

style of their Traditionalist supervisors, Boomers have not developed the skills necessary to lead with participative management.

Generation Xers were drawn to leadership roles for more humane reasons than the Boomer generation before them. This generation tends to be fair and straightforward leaders. They are not interested in the political substance (Zemke et al, 2000).

The findings in literature emphasize that diversity on a school staff extends beyond gender and ethnicity. When making any significant changes, it is best to have a diversified mix of generations on a committee. Strategically assigning tasks to members of the different generations taps into the strengths of each member, thus increasing teamwork. School administrators should look carefully at their school workforce through a generational awareness. Failure for school leaders to deal with generational differences may cause misunderstandings and miscommunication. Understanding generational similarities and differences can lead to more productivity, more collegiality, and therefore, better student achievement. School leaders greatly influence workplace experience of teachers, instructional approaches, and career paths. Promoting collegiality among school staff is an important role of the school leader.

Leaders with open minds and energized growth plans will find ways to satisfy the demands of the school workplace. Espinoza et al. (2010) state it best - "It is not until one becomes conscious of generational difference that one can develop genuine relationships between generations" (p. 16).

Although private companies are not in the delicate subject of educating children, organizations can learn from one another. There are several corporations making headlines by creating an age-friendly work environment. Corporations such as Starbucks, Ben and Jerry's,

and Microsoft have done extremely well in creating age-friendly work environments (Lovely, 2005). These companies follow the ACORN principles as their design for success. The ACORN principles can be applied to the work of school leaders:

- *Accommodate employee differences*. Using creativity and flexibility to put people in the right place, on the right assignment, with the right supervisor, is representatively powerful and organizationally sensible. Some examples of this type of accommodations are allowing teachers to work part time, allowing guidance counselors to read reports at home, and permitting speech pathologists to work four, ten-hour days per week.
- *Create workplace choices*. Today's successful school districts pattern themselves around the needs of students first, the expectations of parents second, and their own needs last. Successful leaders are result focused and create an atmosphere that allows employees to establish their own course of action to complete their tasks.
- *Operate from a sophisticated management style*. Successful school leaders assemble a team of people who share a vision and collaboratively work to accomplish it. They vary their leadership style according to the situation or the person. The big picture and specific goals are shared. Generationally savvy school leaders provide appropriate feedback, recognition, and rewards.
- *Respect competence and initiative*. Knowledgeable school leaders treat everyone as if each has something magnificent to offer. They get the right people on the bus (and the right people off) and take advantage of the strengths of the staff by

making certain everyone is in the right seat on the bus. By expecting the best in people and assuming they always do their best, supervisors are trusted by their employees, and employees feel respected by their supervisor. They are willing to work harder as a result.

- *Nourish retention.* To disregard the shortage of administrators, teachers, and qualified labor in the American workplace, school districts are likely to have high turnover rates, to fill vacancies with unqualified applicants, and are inclined to promote insiders too soon. Successful school administrators are devoted to attracting newcomers, holding onto experienced staff by assigning them stimulating responsibilities, mentoring and coaching, and increasing opportunities for both professional and personal growth (Lovely, 2005).

Chapter 2 included a summary of the history of generational research, generational issues in the workplace, generational issues in schools, and generational differences in leadership. The methodology used to investigate generational differences in schools as they relate to student achievement will be described in Chapter 3 and will include the instrumentation, data collection, and data analysis. The data and data analysis pertinent to this study will be presented in Chapter4. Chapter 5 will include a summary and discussion of the findings, limitations, conclusions, and recommendations for future research.

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to determine if significant differences existed in job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and work motivation among generational cohorts of K-12 teachers. Also, the purpose was to determine whether there was a relationship between those differences in job satisfaction, commitment, and motivation among generational cohorts of K – 12 teachers and student achievement. The differences will be determined using the results of a survey and state-calculated Value-Added Measure (VAM) scores based on multiple years of data derived from Reading and Math scores of Florida's annual statewide assessment instrument, the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT). This chapter provides the study's research questions and , the survey instrument, the statistical procedures chosen for data analysis, and summary.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

The study will be guided by the following research questions:

1. To what extent, if any, does job satisfaction differ among generational cohorts of K – 12 teachers?

   H_0: There is no statistically significant difference in job satisfaction among generational cohorts of K – 12 teachers.

2. To what extent, if any, does organizational commitment differ among generational cohorts of K – 12 teachers?

   H_0: There is no statistically significant difference in organizational commitment among generation cohorts of K – 12 teachers.

3. To what extent, if any, does work motivation differ among generational cohorts of K – 12 teachers?

   H_0: There is no statistically significant difference in work motivation among generational cohorts of K – 12 teachers.

4. To what extent, if any, do Value-Added Measure scores differ among generational cohorts of K – 12 teachers?

   H_0: There is no statistically significant difference in Value-Added Measure scores among generational cohorts of K -12 teachers.

Research Design

This quantitative, non-experimental research study was designed to determine whether significant differences existed in job satisfaction, organizational commitment, work motivation among generational cohorts and whether these differences influenced student achievement based on the effect of the teacher on student performance. A survey created by Autumn Moody, Ph.D. (2007) was used to collect quantitative data on job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and work motivation from K-12 teachers in Brevard Public Schools, Brevard County, Florida. A VAM score for each teacher was calculated by the state department derived from 2010-2012 FCAT Reading and Math scores. There were four categories of teachers that determine how data are aggregated. One category was teachers who teach courses associated with FCAT Reading and Math. Another category contained teachers who teach courses not associated with FCAT Reading and Math who have students who took FCAT. A third category comprised teachers that were not in FCAT associated courses and had no FCAT students. A fourth category was for teachers assigned to the district office who are not associated with a specific school. Teachers counted in this research were from the first two categories and taught students who took the FCAT ("Overview of Brevard's", 2012). The data collected were put into the software program Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) for statistical analysis.

Population

The population for the study was comprised of K -12 teachers employed by Brevard Public Schools, Brevard County, Florida for the 2011 – 2012 school year. The population will include teachers in elementary, middle, junior/senior, and high schools excluding charter schools, virtual schools, and university labs. The total population of teachers in the school year 2011 – 2012 was 5,289.

Sample

Convenience samples were selected from the 86 schools in Brevard County (58 elementary, 12 middle, 4 junior/senior, 12 high schools.) Charter schools, virtual schools, and university lab schools were not included in this study. These samples were used to test for differences in job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and work motivation among generational cohorts of K – 12 teachers and the effect of these differences on student performance. The individuals were categorized in a generation based solely on birth year as defined earlier.

The Survey Instrument

The survey instrument was used to collect the quantitative data from K-12 teachers employed by Brevard Public Schools, Brevard County, Florida. The survey was administered to teachers in schools selected for convenience in Brevard Public Schools, Brevard County, Florida. Fifteen elementary schools, four middle schools, and four high schools were selected from the eighty-six total schools in the Brevard Public School District located in Brevard County, Florida. The survey was originally developed by Autumn Moody, PhD (2007) and comprised of three sections related to job satisfaction, motivation, and commitment. Proper permission has been obtained from the author to use the survey for this study. (See Appendix F). A section on

demographic data information was also included and designed specifically for this study. The survey included four sections: 7 questions concerning demographics; 12 questions regarding job satisfaction; 13 questions regarding commitment; and 13 questions relating to employee motivation. Questions 1 through 12 related to employee satisfaction, questions 13 through 25 dealt with commitment, and questions 26 through 38 addressed motivation. The survey was designed with the demographic data first to disqualify those participants who did not fit the criteria of working at only one location, teaching for five years or more, and respondents who entered teaching as a second career. A 7-point Likert-type scale with answer choices ranging from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree was used. The questions related to job satisfaction were expected to determine if respondents from separate generations have similar or contrasting factors that are the basis for job satisfaction. These dimensions of job satisfaction: pay, benefits, flexibility, environment, social aspect, recognition, empowerment, promotion, educational opportunities, and decision making control were assessed. The commitment questions focused on loyalty to current school, current principal, and coworkers, feelings regarding loyalty, leaving or staying at current school, commitment in respect to money, benefits, responsibility, and freedom. The instrument also measured the motivation concept for the various generations. Some of the motivational factors measured were being challenged, willingness to take on more responsibilities without additional pay, recognition, freedom to speak openly, flexible schedule, teamwork, contributing to school's success, and feeling valued.

The original instrument used by Moody (2007) for employees at banks and brokerage organizations has been demonstrated as reliable and had validity; therefore, the proposed survey may be assumed to be reliable and have validity for use with teachers.

Selection of Participants

The survey was distributed to a varied sample of individuals in a specific population. Participants for the study were all teachers from 15 elementary, 4 middle schools, and 4 high schools in Brevard County, Florida. Participants were disqualified if they had been teaching for less than five years, were located at more than one school, and had a career prior to teaching. Each participant received a brief cover letter explaining the purpose of the survey (Appendix B), copy of the electronic survey (Appendix A), an informed consent letter (Appendix C), and Brevard Public Schools IRB Review letter (Appendix E). The informed consent letter provided the participant a more in-depth description of the study and explained any concerns they may have about their participation. A specific date for submission was specified in the cover letter. A follow-up email was sent a few weeks later, and then a third email a few days before the submission date deadline.

Data Collection

An electronic survey service (Survey Monkey) was utilized by this researcher in order to gather demographic information and data to determine if generational differences were present in Brevard Public School K-12 teachers. An email was sent to the teachers at selected Brevard Public Schools, with an introduction of the survey and a link to the survey site containing the survey. The survey was completed online. Participants were first connected to an informed consent screen. The informed consent was highly specific as to the nature of the study, and participant approval was obtained before the survey was accessed.

Teachers' VAM scores were obtained through Brevard Public Schools Office of Accountability, Testing, and Evaluation. All identifying information was cleaned, coded, and

verified. Original VAM data was kept secure at the Office of Accountability, Testing, and Evaluation.

Data Analysis

Survey data were collected and tabulated by the online survey service, Survey Monkey. Data analysis will be conducted through the use of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) program.

Participants were first be classified into one of the following generational cohorts: Traditionalist (born between 1922 and1943), Baby Boomers (born between 1944 and 1960), Generation X (born between 1961 and 1980), and Millennials (born between 1981 and 2000) (Ellis, 2009). Various methods of data analyses such as descriptive statistics and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) were used. An ANOVA statistical procedure was utilized to determine whether differences occur in job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and work motivation, and VAM scores among generational cohorts of K-12 teachers in Brevard Public Schools, Brevard County, Florida. An ANOVA was the appropriate statistical procedure because there are multiple independent variables and multiple dependent variables being studied. The independent variables include teachers from different generational cohorts (Baby Boomers, Generation X, and Millennials) and different levels of schools (elementary, middle, and high). ANOVA allows the correlation between the dependent variable to be controlled while manipulating the independent variables.

Additionally, each dependent variable was indicated with an interval/ratio measure. The ANOVA was used because the researcher studied whether a normally distributed interval dependent variable (satisfaction, commitment, motivation factors, and teacher VAM scores)

differs between independent variables (generational cohorts). The results provided a comprehensive and accurate description to effectively utilize generational diversities to increase student achievement. Table 4 shows the test conducted for each research question.

Table 4 Tests Conducted for each Research Question

Research question	Hypothesis	Test of normality	Test of homogeneity of variances		Statistical test	Post hoc
1. To what extent, if any, does job satisfaction differ among generational cohorts of K – 12 teachers?	There is no statistically significant difference in job satisfaction among generational cohorts of K – 12 teachers.	Shapiro-Wilk	Levene's salary, benefits, flexibility, relaxing, environment, recognition, empowerment, advancement, education, control over work, control over decisions	Welch's social contact, title	Analysis of Variances (ANOVA)	Tukey HSD
2. To what extent, if any, does organizational commitment differ among generational cohorts of K-12 teachers?	There is no statistically significant difference in organizational commitment among generational cohorts of K-12 teachers.	Shapiro-Wilk	Levene's all factors of commitment	Welch's none	Analysis of Variances (ANOVA)	Tukey HSD
3. To what extent, if any, does work motivation differ among generational cohorts of K-12 teachers?	There is no statistically significant difference in work motivation among generational	Shapiro-Wilk	Levene's being challenged, future opportunities, speak freely, more assignments,	Welch's Team member flexible schedule, valued factors, freedom for creativity, communication	Analysis of Variances (ANOVA)	None

Research question	Hypothesis	Test of normality	Test of homogeneity of variances		Statistical test	Post hoc
	cohorts of K-12 teachers.		authority for decisions, empowerment, recognition, specific instructions	for goals		
4. To what extent, if any, do Value-Added Measure scores differ among generational cohorts of K-12 teachers?	There is no statistically significant difference in Value-Added Measure scores among cohorts of K-12 teachers.	Shapiro-Wilk	Levene's all VAM scores	Welch's none	Analysis of Variances (ANOVA)	none

Summary

Chapter three presented the methodology which was used in this study of differences between generational cohorts. Included in this chapter were an introduction, the research questions and the related null hypotheses, the research design, and the survey instrument. The research design included information concerning the population of the study, data collection, and data analysis.

CHAPTER 4: ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Introduction

This chapter provides an analysis of the data related to the demographic characteristics of the sample and the results of the study with regard to the research questions. There are numerous generational cohorts working together in schools today. Each generational cohort possesses distinctive generational characteristics and values that transfer over into the workplace (Zemke et al., 2000).

The researcher hypothesized that differences in job satisfaction, commitment, and motivation of Baby Boomer, Generation X, and Millennial teachers may exist due to differences in generational values and personality. The problem posed in the study was whether Baby Boomer, Generation X, and Millennial teachers demonstrate significantly different values in job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and work motivation, and if these differences have an effect on student achievement in the school district of Brevard County, Florida. For purposes of this study, Baby Boomers were born between 1944 and 1960; Generation X members were born between 1961 and 1980; and Millennials (also known as Generation Y) were born between 1981 and 2000. Job satisfaction, defined as "pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job as achieving or facilitating one's job values" (Locke, 1969, p. 317), reflects how much pleasure employees get from their job. Organizational commitment can mean different things to different people. For the purposes of this study, organizational commitment was defined as "emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization" (Steers, 1977, p. 46). The relationship between employee motivation and an organization's culture has been studied and clarified. For the purposes of this study, work motivation is defined

as “an inner drive that causes one to act. Employee motivation causes individuals to abandon their own goals for the goals of the organization” (Mullen, 1993, p. 1). The effect on student achievement was determined by teachers’ Value-Added Measure (VAM) scores which were derived from mean scale scores on the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT). According to the Florida Department of Education’s *Florida Common Language of Instruction* (2011), VAM is “a statistical method that estimates the effectiveness of a teacher or school. The difference between a student’s actual and predicted results is the estimated ‘value’ that the teacher or school added during the year with respect to the content tested” (p. 29). A better understanding of differences in the values of generational cohorts as they relate to job satisfaction, commitment, and motivation would allow administrators to better lead intergenerational staff in order to increase student achievement.

The statistical test analysis of variance (ANOVA) and post hoc tests were used as appropriate. The dependent variables were those that characterize employee satisfaction, commitment, and motivation. A second dependent variable was student achievement as measured by teacher effect as determined by a Value-Added Measure (VAM) score. The independent variable was generational type as determined by year of birth, for purposes of this study, Baby Boomer, Generation X, and Millennial.

Descriptive Statistics

Demographic Findings and Analysis

A total of 1,150 surveys were distributed electronically via Survey Monkey. A response rate of 39.7% was achieved, resulting in 456 surveys returned. Of those 456 returned, 7 respondents opted out resulting in 449 completed surveys. The survey included 4 sections: 7

questions concerning demographics; 12 questions regarding job satisfaction; 13 questions regarding commitment; and 13 questions relating to employee motivation. For the purpose of this study, the sample was further reduced to 253 respondents who possessed the following characteristics: working at a single school, having teaching as a first career, and having 5 or more years of teaching experience. The final sample was reduced to 159 teachers who possessed VAM scores generated by the individual teacher as opposed to obtaining a VAM score based on school data.

All data were cleaned, coded, and verified before being entered into an Excel spreadsheet. The data were then imported into SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences Version 18.0). Demographic data were obtained from sample respondents to the survey and included such information as year of birth, gender, years worked as a full-time teacher, number of years at current school, school level teaching at time of survey, whether or not the respondent had another profession before teaching, and whether or not the respondent worked in a single school or multiple schools. Percentages and frequency distributions were used to analyze the demographic data to better illustrate the demographics of the sample. Question 2 on the survey asked the respondents to select the range of dates representing the of their birth. The ranges were labeled as Traditionalist for the years between 1923 and 1943, Baby Boomer for the years between 1944 and 1960, Generation X for the years between 1961 and 1980, and Millennials for the years 1981 or later.

Generational cohort

The distribution of the survey respondents' answers to which generation they belong is found in Table 5. The low number of Millennials appears to be due to many members of this

generation having yet to enter the workforce. Of the 159 respondents, 25% (n = 40) were from the Baby Boom Generation, 64% (n=101) were from Generation X, and 11% (n=18) were from the Millennial Generation.

Table 5 The Number and Percentage of Respondents among Generational Cohorts

Generation	Number of respondents	Percentage of respondents
Baby Boomer	40	25%
Generation X	101	64%
Millennial	18	11%
Total	159	100%

Gender

The results of this study's gender dispersal shown in Table 6 are an appropriate representation of the teaching force in the United States. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics Household Data Annual Averages (2011), 97.7% of pre-school and kindergarten teachers, 81.7% elementary and middle school, 58% secondary teachers, and 85.4% special education teachers are female.

As expected, of the 159 respondents, females comprised a large majority of the sample. Of the teachers in the sample, 82% (n=131) were women and 18% (n=28) were men. The distribution of the survey respondents' answers to gender based on generational cohort is found

in Table 7. Approximately 24% (n=31) of the female teachers were members of the Baby Boom generation, 63% (n=82) of females were members of Generation X, and 14% (n=18) of female teachers were members of the Millennials. This compares to 32% (n=9) of male were members of the Baby Boom generation, 68% (n=19) of males were members of Generation X, and 0% (n=0) of male teachers were Millennials.

Table 6 The Number and Percentage of Respondents based on Gender

Gender	Number of respondents	Percentage of respondents
Male	28	18%
Female	131	82%
Total	159	100%

Table 7 The Number and Percentage of Respondents among Generational Cohorts based on Gender

Gender	Generational cohort	Number of respondents	Percentage of respondents
Female	Baby Boomer	31	24%
	Generation X	82	63%
	Millennial	18	14%
Total female		131	100%
Male	Baby Boomer	9	32%
	Generation X	19	68%
	Millennial	0	0%
Total male		28	100%

Years as full-time teacher

Twenty-three percent (n=37) of the final sample had 5-9 years of full-time teaching experience. Furthermore, 40% (n=64) of the sample had 10-19 years of teaching experience, and 36% (n=58) of the sample had 20 years or more teaching experience. Of the 37 teachers with 5-9 years' experience, only nearly 3% (n=1) was a Baby Boomer, nearly 49% (n=18) were members of Generation X, and 49% (n=18) members of the Millenial generation. Of the 64 teachers with 10-19 years' experience, slightly more than 9% (n=6) were Baby Boomers, and

nearly 91% (n=58) were members of Generation X. There were no members of the Millennials teaching for 10-19 years (n=0). Of the 58 teachers teaching 20 years or more, almost 57% (n=33) belong to the Baby Boom generation, and 43% (n=25) were members of Generation X. There were no members of the Millennials teaching for 20 years or more (n=0). It is believed that Millennials have not been in the teaching field long enough to have been teaching for 10 years or more. The years of teaching experience of the respondents appear to have a direct relationship to generational cohort to which they belong.

The distribution of the survey respondents' answers to how many years they have been teaching full time is found in Table 8. The distribution of the survey respondents' answers to how many years of full-time teaching based gender and generational cohort is found in Table 9.

Table 8 The Number and Percentage of Respondents as Related to Years of Full-time Teaching

Range of Years as full-time teacher	Number of respondents	Percentage of respondents
5-9	37	23%
10-19	64	40%
20 and over	58	36%
Total	159	100%

Table 9 The Number and Percentage of Years of Full-time Teaching among Generational Cohorts

Generation cohort	Number of respondents	Percentage of respondents	Number of respondents	Percentage of respondents	Number of respondents	Percentage of respondents
	5-9 years experience	5-9 years experience	10-19 years experience	10-19 years experience	20+ years experience	20+ years experience
Baby Boom	1	3%	6	9%	33	57%
Gen. X	18	49%	58	91%	25	43%
Millenial	18	49%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	37	100%	64	100%	58	100%

School level

Of the 159 respondents, 64% (n=101) taught elementary school level, 16% (n=26) taught middle school, and 20% (n=32) taught high school. Elementary school consisted of grades K-6. Middle school comprised grades 7-8, and high school grades 9-12. Of the 101 elementary school teachers who participated in the survey, 23% (n=23) were members of the Baby Boom generation, 67% (n=68) were members of Generation X, and 10% (n=10) were Millennials. The 26 middle school teachers who responded to the survey were comprised of approximately 15% (n=4) Baby Boomers, 69% (n=18) Generation X, and 15% (n=4) Millennials. Of the 32 high school teachers who responded to the survey, nearly 41% (n=13) were members of the Baby Boom generation, 47% (n=15) were Generation X members, and nearly 13% (n=4) were members of the Millennial generation.

The distribution of the survey respondents' answers to what school level they are teaching is found in Table 10. The distribution of the survey respondents' answers to what school level they are teaching relating to generational cohort is found in Table 11.

Table 10 The Number and Percentage of Respondents based on School Level

School Level	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Elementary	101	64%
Middle School	26	16%
High School	32	20%
Total	159	100%

Table 11 The Number and Percentage of Respondents based on School Level and Generational Cohort

School Level	Baby Boomer		Generation X		Millennial	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Elementary	23	23%	68	67%	10	10%
Middle	4	15%	18	69%	4	15%
High	13	41%	15	47%	4	13%

In addition to the questions regarding demographics, the survey included 38 statements rated by the respondents using a 7-point Likert scale associated with job satisfaction, employee commitment, and work motivation.

Satisfaction

The first 12 statements were used to determine what factors increase employees' level of job satisfaction. The mean responses of each generation and collectively were calculated and are displayed in Table 12. The standard deviation was included to demonstrate how the responses were distributed around the mean.

Table 12 Means and Standard Deviations: Job Satisfaction

Job Satisfaction Factors	BB (n=40)		Gen X (n=101)		Millennials (n=18)		All (n=159)	
	Mean	*SD*[a]	*Mean*	*SD*[a]	*Mean*	*SD*[a]	*Mean*	*SD*[a]
Salary	5.93	1.269	5.67	1.415	5.22	1.517	5.69	13.97
Benefits	6.20	1.067	5.76	1.471	5.17	1.823	5.81	1.447
Flexibility	5.90	1.194	5.96	1.095	5.94	.998	5.94	1.104
Relaxing environment	5.88	1.305	5.93	1.351	6.06	1.259	5.93	1.322
Social contact	5.28	1.694	5.31	1.340	5.44	.856	5.31	1.388
Recognition	5.50	1.536	5.15	1.403	5.72	.958	5.30	1.404
Empowerment	5.65	1.189	5.22	1.647	5.44	1.199	5.35	1.502
Advancement	4.80	1.897	4.59	1.557	5.06	1.434	4.70	1.633
Title	3.73	1.664	3.54	1.603	3.72	.958	3.61	1.555
Education	5.43	1.551	5.02	1.543	5.44	1.097	5.17	1.506
Control over work	6.40	1.105	6.02	1.208	5.72	1.018	6.08	1.174
Control over decisions	6.18	1.152	5.97	1.269	5.56	1.199	5.97	1.237

Note. BB = Baby Boomers; Gen X = Generation Xers; Mill. = Millennials
[a]Standard Deviation

Commitment

Statements 13-25 of the survey were used to determine levels of commitment of the teachers. The mean and standard deviation of the statements were calculated for each generation and collectively for all survey respondents. The results are displayed in Table 13.

Table 13 Means and Standard Deviations: Commitment

Commitment Factors	BB (n=40)		Gen X (n=101)		Millennials (n=18)		All (n=159)	
	Mean	*SD*[a]	*Mean*	*SD*[a]	*Mean*	*SD*[a]	*Mean*	*SD*[a]
Leave if not happy	4.38	1.849	4.54	1.830	5.06	1.697	4.56	1.820
Owe to current school	5.28	2.038	4.85	1.702	4.67	1.495	4.94	1.773
Hard to leave	5.74	1.831	5.52	1.689	4.56	2.175	5.47	1.805
Loyalty	5.58	1.796	5.29	1.763	4.44	2.064	5.26	1.823
Feel guilty if leave	4.55	2.183	4.37	1.948	3.72	1.994	4.34	2.015
Career at current school	5.78	1.874	5.27	1.754	4.44	2.036	5.30	1.844
To current school	5.80	1.620	5.39	1.655	4.72	2.024	5.42	1.707
To current principal	5.43	1.723	5.15	1.931	4.33	2.223	5.13	1.928
To coworkers	5.53	1.679	5.44	1.466	5.56	1.464	5.47	1.513
Leave for more money	4.20	1.911	4.85	1.688	5.11	1.231	4.72	1.722
Leave for better benefits	4.47	1.797	4.60	1.686	4.61	1.577	4.57	1.693
Leave for more responsibility	3.30	1.682	3.48	1.712	4.22	1.517	3.52	1.695
Leave for creative freedom	4.08	2.018	4.07	1.920	4.67	1.680	4.14	1.918

Note. BB = Baby Boomers; Gen X = Generation Xers; Mill. = Millennials
[a]Standard Deviation

Motivation

Statements 14-26 of the survey were used to determine levels of motivation of the teachers. The mean and standard deviation were calculated for each generation as well as for all the survey respondents. The results are shown in Table 14.

Table 14 Means and Standard Deviations: Motivation

Motivation Factors	BB (n=40)		Gen X (n=101)		Millennials (n=18)		All (n=159)	
	Mean	*SD*[a]	*Mean*	*SD*[a]	*Mean*	*SD*[a]	*Mean*	*SD*[a]
Being challenged	4.47	1.768	4.45	1.466	4.83	1.339	4.50	1.530
Future opportunities	3.00	1.826	3.12	1.840	3.61	1.290	3.14	1.782
Speak freely	5.98	1.423	5.91	1.234	6.06	1.110	5.94	1.264
More assignments	5.80	1.572	5.66	1.251	6.00	.907	5.74	1.305
Team member	6.13	1.305	5.82	1.329	6.06	.639	5.92	1.265
Flexible schedule	5.55	1.648	5.68	1.224	5.56	1.542	5.64	1.371
Authority for decisions	5.75	1.597	5.65	1.220	5.72	1.179	5.69	1.313
Empowerment	6.35	.834	6.06	1.075	5.78	1.003	6.10	1.020
Recognition	5.58	1.583	5.44	1.389	5.83	1.098	5.52	1.409
Valued	5.03	1.981	4.53	1.911	5.28	1.179	4.74	1.873
Freedom for creativity	5.48	1.797	5.54	1.308	5.61	1.037	5.53	1.413
Communication of goals	5.65	1.494	5.53	1.367	5.94	.725	5.61	1.344
Specific instructions	4.65	1.981	4.79	1.722	5.17	1.295	4.80	1.746

Note. BB = Baby Boomers; Gen X = Generation Xers; Mill. = Millennials
[a]Standard Deviation

Inferential Statistics

Findings

The problem statement for this study is recapped by the question "To what extent do generational differences in job satisfaction, commitment, and motivation among K – 12 teachers affect student performance?" The study was guided by a set of research questions and hypotheses.

Research Question and Hypothesis #1

> To what extent, if any, does job satisfaction differ among generational cohorts of K – 12 teachers?
>
> H_0: There is no statistically significant difference in job satisfaction among generational cohorts of K – 12 teachers.

Due to the small sample size, a Shapiro-Wilk Test was run to determine whether the job satisfaction factors were approximately normally distributed for each generational cohort. Although the assumption of normality was violated for each factor of job satisfaction ($p<.05$), the researcher has chosen to conduct the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) test anyway as the one-way ANOVA is fairly robust to deviations from normality (Lund & Lund, 2012). Results from the Shapiro-Wilk Test for job satisfaction are displayed in Appendix G. The ANOVA was conducted to determine if members of different generational cohorts possess different value factors with regards to job satisfaction. The test was conducted using an alpha of .05. There was homogeneity of variances for the following factors of job satisfaction, as assessed by Levene's Test of Homogeneity of Variance (salary, $p = .733$; benefits, $p = .141$; flexibility, $p = .091$; relaxing environment, $p = .634$; recognition, $p = .321$; empowerment, $p = .078$; advancement, $p = .349$; education, $p = .430$; control over work, $p = .830$; control over decisions, $p = .553$). The

assumption of homogeneity of variances for social contact and title factors was violated, as assessed by Levene's Test of Homogeneity of Variances (social contact, $p = .017$; title, $p = .040$). (See Appendix H). Since the assumption of homogeneity of variances was violated for social contact and title factors of job satisfaction, a robust Welch's ANOVA was performed for these two factors.

A one-way ANOVA test was used on the data set of 159 respondents for each of the remaining factors of job satisfaction to determine that there was a statistically significant difference ($F_{2,156} = 3.383$, $p < .05$) in job satisfaction means based upon generational cohorts for the benefits factor. An analysis of the responses to the survey statement "Benefits (insurance/retirement) are an important aspect of my job satisfaction" (Appendix A, Section 2, Question 2) indicated a significant difference in how the respondents from the different generations answered. It can be determined which cohorts are different using a post hoc test. Table 15 contains the ANOVA findings which include degrees of freedom between the groups and within the groups, the F value, and the p value. Complete ANOVA results are displayed in Appendix I. ANOVA findings for benefits factor for job satisfaction can be found in Table 16. The effect size indicates that approximately 4% ($\eta^2 = .042$) of the variance in scores were accounted for or explained by benefits factor.

Table 15 ANOVA Results for Job Satisfaction

Job Satisfaction	*df*	*F*	*p*
Salary	2,156	1.594	.206
Benefits	2,156	3.383	.036*
Flexibility	2,156	.042	.959
Relaxing environment	2,156	.114	.892
Social contact	2,156	.096	.909
Recognition	2,156	1.826	.164
Empowerment	2,156	1.229	.296
Advancement	2,156	.711	.493
Title	2,156	.244	.784
Education	2,156	1.381	.254
Control over work	2,156	2.499	.085
Control over decisions	2,156	1.569	.212

Computed using alpha = .05
*p < .05.

Table 16 ANOVA Results for Benefits Factor of Job Satisfaction

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable:JSBNFTS

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
BORNYRSNUM	13.759	2	6.879	3.383	.036	.042
Error	317.197	156	2.033			
Corrected Total	330.956	158				

a. R Squared = .042 (Adjusted R Squared = .029)

Because group sizes were not equal, a harmonic mean sample size was used when the Tukey HSD post hoc test was performed to evaluate pairwise differences between the means. The post hoc Tukey HSD indicated a decrease in the importance of benefits for Baby Boomers (M=6.20, SD= 1.067) to Millennials (M=5.17, SD= 1.823), a mean decrease of 1.03, 95% CI [-1.99 to -.08], which was statistically significant (p = .031). Tukey indicated a decrease in the importance of benefits for Baby Boomer (M=6.20, SD= 1.067) to Generation X (M=5.76, SD= 1.471), a mean decrease of .438, 95% CI [-1.07 to .19], which was not statistically significant (p = .231). Tukey indicated a decrease in the importance of benefits for Generation X (M=5.76, SD= 1.471) to Millennials (M=5.17, SD= 1.823), a mean decrease of .596, 95% CI [-1.46 to 1.27], which was not statistically significant (p = .235). The results of the Tukey post hoc test are displayed in Table 17. Table 18 displays benefits means and standard deviation. The post hoc results for all survey responses can be found in Appendix J.

Table 17 Post Hoc Results for Benefits Factor of Job Satisfaction

Multiple Comparisons

JSBNFTS
Tukey HSD

(I) BORNYRS A= 1923 - 1943; B=1944-1960; C=1961-1980; D=1981 or later	(J) BORNYRS A= 1923 - 1943; B=1944-1960; C=1961-1980; D=1981 or later	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
B	C	.438	.266	.231	-.19	1.07
	D	1.033*	.405	.031	.08	1.99
C	B	-.438	.266	.231	-1.07	.19
	D	.596	.365	.235	-.27	1.46
D	B	-1.033*	.405	.031	-1.99	-.08
	C	-.596	.365	.235	-1.46	.27

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Table 18 Means and Standard Deviations: Benefits Factor for Job Satisfaction

Report

JSBNFTS

BORNYRS A= 1923 - 1943; B=1944-1960; C=1961-1980; D=1981 or later	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
B	6.20	40	1.067
C	5.76	101	1.471
D	5.17	18	1.823
Total	5.81	159	1.447

Because Levene's Test of Homogeneity of Variance was violated for the social contact and title factors, ($p<.05$), the Welsh F test was conducted to determine if the variance of these

factors were significantly different from the other factors. (See Table 19). The social contact factor of job satisfaction was not statistically significantly different among the means of generational cohorts as indicated by Welch's ($F_{2, 50.723} = .192$, $p > .05$). The title factor of job satisfaction was not statistically significantly different among the means of generational cohorts as indicated by Welch's ($F_{2, 53.045} = .288$, $p > .05$).

The findings reject null hypothesis #1 by concluding differences do exist among the three generational cohorts of K-12 teachers in relation to job satisfaction. The differences occur in the area of benefits.

Table 19 Welch Robust Test for Social Contact Factor of Job Satisfaction

Robust Tests of Equality of Means

		Statistic[a]	df1	df2	Sig.
JSSOCCNT	Welch	.192	2	50.723	.826
JSTITLE	Welch	.288	2	53.045	.751

a. Asymptotically F distributed.

Research Question and Hypothesis #2

To what extent, if any, does commitment differ among generational cohorts of K – 12 teachers?

H_0: There is no statistically significant difference in commitment among generation cohorts of K – 12 teachers.

A Shapiro-Wilk Test was run to determine whether the commitment factors were approximately normally distributed for each generational cohort. Although the assumption of normality was violated for each factor of commitment ($p<.05$), the researcher has chosen to conduct the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) test anyway as the one-way ANOVA is fairly robust to deviations from normality (Lund & Lund, 2012). Results from the Shapiro-Wilk Test for commitment are displayed in Appendix K. The ANOVA was conducted to determine if members of different generational cohorts possess different value factors with regards to organizational commitment. The test was conducted using an alpha of .05. There was homogeneity of variances for the all factors of commitment, as assessed by Levene's Test of Homogeneity of Variance (leave if not happy, $p = .857$; owe to current school, $p = .136$; hard to leave, $p = .091$; loyalty, $p = .452$; feel guilty if leave, $p = .422$; career at current school, $p = .673$; to current school, $p = .457$; to current principal, $p = .251$; to coworker, $p = .392$; leave for more money, $p = .053$; leave for better benefits, $p = .651$; leave for more responsibility, $p = .291$; leave for creative freedom, $p = .480$). A complete listing of Levene's Test of Homogeneity of Variances is displayed in Appendix L.

A one-way ANOVA test was used on the data set of 159 respondents for each of the factors of commitment to determine that there was a statistically significant difference ($F_{2,156} = 3.377$, $p< .05$) in commitment means based upon generational cohorts for the career at current

school factor. Data were missing for one member of Generation X for the factor current school, one member of Baby Boomer for the factor hard to leave, and one member of Generation X for the factor of commitment to coworker. An analysis of the responses to the survey statement "I would be happy to spend the rest of my career at my current school" (Appendix A, Section 2, Question 18) indicated a significant difference in how the respondents from the different generations answered. Approximately 89% ($\eta^2 = .893$) of the variance in scores were accounted for or explained by career factor. Tables 20 and 21 contain the ANOVA findings which include degrees of freedom between the groups and within the groups, the F value, and the p value. Complete ANOVA results are displayed in Appendix M.

Table 20 ANOVA Results for Organizational Commitment

Commitment	*df*	*F*	*p*
Leave if not happy	2,156	.876	.418
Owe to current school	2,155	1.058	.350
Hard to leave	2,155	2.872	.060
Loyalty	2,156	2.454	.089
Feel guilty if leave	2,156	1.073	.345
Career at current school	2,156	3.377	.037*
To current school	2,156	2.563	.080
To current principal	2,156	2.035	.134
To coworker	2,155	.073	.929
Leave for more money	2,156	2.637	.075
Leave for better benefits	2,156	.087	.916
Leave for more responsibility	2,156	1.940	.147
Leave for creative freedom	2,156	.768	.466

Computed using alpha = .05
*p < .05.

Table 21 ANOVA for Career Factor of Organizational Commitment

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable:CMTCAREER

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Intercept	4469.491	1	4469.491	1313.799	.000	.893
Error	537.509	158	3.402			
Corrected Total	537.509	158				

a. R Squared = .000 (Adjusted R Squared = .000)

Tukey HSD post hoc test was performed to evaluate pairwise differences between the means. The post hoc results for all survey questions are found in Appendix N, however, the ones showing significant differences in regard to organizational commitment analysis are summarized in Table 22.

The post hoc Tukey indicated a decrease in the commitment to career at current school for Baby Boomers (M=5.78, SD= 1.874) to Millennials (M=4.44, SD= 2.036), a mean decrease of 1.33, 95% CI [-2.55 to -.11], which was statistically significant (p = .029). Tukey indicated a decrease in the commitment to career at current school for Baby Boomer (M=5.78, SD= 1.874) to Generation X (M=5.27, SD= 1.754), a mean decrease of .508, 95% CI [-1.31 to .30], which was not statistically significant (p = .296). Tukey indicated a decrease in the commitment to career at current school for Generation X (M=5.27, SD= 1.754) to Millennials (M=4.44, SD= 2.036), a mean decrease of .823, 95% CI [-1.92 to .28], which was not statistically significant (p = .183). Table 23 displays career at current school means and standard deviation.

Table 22 Post Hoc Results for Career Factor of Commitment

Multiple Comparisons

CMTCAREER
Tukey HSD

(I) BORNYRS A= 1923 - 1943; B=1944-1960; C=1961-1980; D=1981 or later	(J) BORNYRS A= 1923 - 1943; B=1944-1960; C=1961-1980; D=1981 or later	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
B	C	.508	.340	.296	-.30	1.31
	D	1.331*	.516	.029	.11	2.55
C	B	-.508	.340	.296	-1.31	.30
	D	.823	.465	.183	-.28	1.92
D	B	-1.331*	.516	.029	-2.55	-.11
	C	-.823	.465	.183	-1.92	.28

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Table 23 Means and Standard Deviations: Career Factor for Commitment

Report

CMTCAREER

BORNYRS A= 1923 - 1943; B=1944-1960; C=1961-1980; D=1981 or later	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
B	5.78	40	1.874
C	5.27	101	1.754
D	4.44	18	2.036
Total	5.30	159	1.844

The findings reject null hypothesis #2 by concluding differences do exist among the three generational cohorts of K-12 teachers in relation to organizational commitment. The differences occur in the area of career at current school.

Research Question and Hypothesis #3

To what extent, if any, does work motivation differ among generational cohorts of K – 12 teachers?

H_0: There is no statistically significant difference in work motivation among generational cohorts of K – 12 teachers.

A Shapiro-Wilk Test was run to determine whether the motivational factors were approximately normally distributed for each generational cohort. The assumption of normality was violated for each of the motivational factors ($p < .05$), however, the researcher has chosen to continue with the ANOVA test due to the robustness to deviations of normality as previously

indicated (Lund & Lund, 2012). Complete results from the Shapiro-Wilk Test for motivational factors are displayed in Appendix O.

The Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was conducted to determine if members of different generational cohorts encompass different value factors with regards to motivational factors. The test was conducted using an alpha of .05. There was homogeneity of variance for the following factors of motivation, as assessed by Levene's Test of Homogeneity of Variance (being challenged, $p = .092$; future opportunities, $p = .084$; speak freely, $p = .593$; more assignments, $p = .153$; authority for decisions, $p = .244$; empowerment, $p = .792$; recognition, $p = .126$; specific instructions, $p = .093$). The assumption of homogeneity of variances for team member, flexible schedule, valued factors, freedom for creativity, and communication for goals was violated, as assessed by Levene's Test of Homogeneity of Variances (team member, $p = .029$; flexible schedule, $p = .030$; valued, $p = .046$; freedom for creativity, $p = .041$; and communication for goals, $p = .004$). A complete listing of Levene's Test of Homogeneity of Variances is displayed in Appendix P. A one-way ANOVA test was used on the data set of 159 respondents for each of the remaining factors of motivation to determine that there was no statistically significant difference ($p > .05$) in motivational factors among generational cohort. Data are missing for one member of Generation X for the factor team member, and one member of Generation X for communication of goals. Table 24 contains the ANOVA findings which include degrees of freedom between the groups and with the groups, the F value, and the p value. Complete ANOVA results for motivation are displayed in Appendix Q.

Table 24 ANOVA Results for Motivational Factors

Motivation	*df*	*F*	*p*
Being challenged	2,156	.493	.612
Future opportunities	2,156	.757	.471
Speak freely	2,156	.115	.891
More assignments	2,156	.570	.567
Team member	2,155	.940	.393
Flexible schedule	2,156	.168	.846
Authority for decisions	2,156	.084	.919
Empowerment	2,156	2.213	.113
Recognition	2,156	.653	.522
Valued	2,156	1.830	.164
Freedom for creativity	2,156	.064	.938
Communication of goals	2,155	.749	.474
Specific instructions	2,156	.542	.582

Computed using alpha = .05
*p < .05.

Because the assumption of homogeneity of variances was violated for team member, flexible schedule, valued factors, freedom for creativity, and communication for goals factors of motivation, a robust Welch's ANOVA was performed for these five factors. (See Table 25). There was no statistically significant difference in team member factor of motivation among the means of generational cohorts as indicated by Welch's ($F_{2, 60.146} = 1.064$, $p = .351$). There was no statistically significant difference in flexible schedule factor of motivation among the means

of generational cohorts as indicated by Welch's ($F_{2,39.305}$ =.142, p = .868). There was no statistically significant difference in valued factor of motivation among the means of generational cohorts as indicated by Welch's ($F_{2,52.179}$ = 2.664, p = .079). There was no statistically significant difference in freedom of creativity factor of motivation among the means of generational cohorts as indicated by Welch's ($F_{2, 45.474}$ = .066, p = .936). There was no statistically significant difference in freedom of creativity factor of motivation among the means of generational cohorts as indicated by Welch's ($F_{2,56.688}$ = 1.785, p = .177).

There was no statistically significant difference among the means (p> .05) of motivation factors among the generational cohorts. Therefore, null hypothesis #3 cannot be rejected.

Table 25 Welch Robust Test for Team Member, Flexible Schedule, Valued Factors, Freedom for Creativity, and Communication for Goals

Robust Tests of Equality of Means

		Statistic[a]	df1	df2	Sig.
MTVTEAM	Welch	1.064	2	60.146	.351
MTVSCH	Welch	.142	2	39.305	.868
MTVVAL	Welch	2.664	2	52.179	.079
MTVFREE	Welch	.066	2	45.474	.936
MTVCOMM	Welch	1.785	2	56.688	.177

a. Asymptotically F distributed.

Research Question and Hypothesis #4

> To what extent, if any, do Value-Added Measure scores differ among generational cohorts of K – 12 teachers?
>
> H_0: There is no statistically significant difference in Value-Added Measure scores among generational cohorts of K – 12 teachers.

Once again, a Shapiro-Wilk Test was run to determine whether the Value-Added Measure (VAM) scores were approximately normally distributed for each generational cohort. The assumption of normality was met for two generational cohorts (Baby Boomer, $p > .05$ and Millennials, $p > .05$). The assumption of normality was violated for Generation X ($p < .05$). The researcher has chosen to conduct the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) test since the one-way ANOVA is fairly robust to deviations from normality (Lund & Lund, 2012). Results from the Shapiro-Wilk Test for VAM scores are presented in Appendix R. The ANOVA was conducted using an alpha of .05. There was homogeneity of variances, as assessed by Levene's Test of Homogeneity of Variance (p. = .155) as shown in Table 26.

A one-way ANOVA test was used on the data set of 159 respondents all of whom received a Value-Added Measure score which was state-calculated using a formula which includes scores on the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT) for reading and math for students taught by each specific teacher to determine that teacher's effect on student achievement. In Florida, the prediction was based on numerous years of previous data. Those scores were compared to the scores of other students in Florida with similar characteristics in the same grade and subject. If the student performed at the level predicted, that additional amount is the value that the teacher expected to have added to student learning during that year. Performance less than the predicted score indicated that statistically, the student was not able to

achieve his/her full learning potential for the year ("Overview of Brevard's", 2012). There were four categories of teachers that determine how data were aggregated. One category is teachers who teach courses associated with FCAT reading and math. Another category contains teachers who teach courses not associated with FCAT reading and math who have students who took FCAT. A third category comprised teachers that were not in FCAT associated courses and had no FCAT students. A fourth category was for teachers assigned to the district office who are not associated with a specific school. Teachers counted in this research were from the first two categories (those who taught students who took the FCAT) ("Overview of Brevard's", 2012).

The ANOVA indicated that there was no statistically significant difference in VAM scores among the generational cohorts ($F_{2,156} = .131$, $p > .05$). Tables 27 and 28 contain the ANOVA findings. There was no statistically significant difference among the means ($p > .05$) of VAM scores among the generational cohorts. Therefore, null hypothesis #4 cannot be rejected.

Table 26 Levene's Test of Homogeneity of Variances for Value-Added Measure Scores

Test of Homogeneity of Variances

2012 TAV Regardless of Business Rules

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
1.889	2	156	.155

Table 27 ANOVA Results for Value-Added Measure Scores

ANOVA

2012 TAV Regardless of Business Rules

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.039	2	.019	.131	.877
Within Groups	22.978	156	.147		
Total	23.016	158			

Table 28 ANOVA Results for Value-Added Measure Scores

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable:2012 TAV Regardless of Business Rules

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
BORNYRSNUM	.039	2	.019	.131	.877	.002
Error	22.978	156	.147			
Corrected Total	23.016	158				

a. R Squared = .002 (Adjusted R Squared = -.011)

A compilation of tests findings for each research question are shown in Table 29.

Table 29 Findings for each Research Question

Research question	Hypothesis	Findings	Generational groups	Reject or fail to reject
1. To what extent, if any, does job satisfaction differ among generational cohorts of K – 12 teachers?	There is no statistically significant difference in job satisfaction among generational cohorts of K – 12 teachers.	There was a statistically significant difference ($F_{2,156} = 3.383$, $p < .05$) in job satisfaction means based upon generational cohorts for the benefits factor.	A statistically significant decrease in the importance of benefits for Baby Boomers (M=6.20, SD= 1.067) to Millennials (M=5.17, SD = 1.823).	Reject the null hypothesis.

Research question	Hypothesis	Findings	Generational groups	Reject or fail to reject
2. To what extent, if any, does organizational commitment differ among generational cohorts of K-12 teachers?	There is no statistically significant difference in organizational commitment among generational cohorts of K-12 teachers.	There was a statistically significant difference ($F_{2,156} = 3.377$, $p < .05$) in commitment means based upon generational cohorts for the career at current school factor.	A statistically significant decrease in the commitment to career at current school for Baby Boomers (M= 5.78, SD= 1.874) to Millennials (M= 4.44, SD= 2.036).	Reject the null hypothesis.
3. To what extent, if any, does work motivation differ among generational cohorts of K-12 teachers?	There is no statistically significant difference in work motivation among generational cohorts of K-12 teachers.	There was no statistically significant difference ($p>.05$) in motivational factors among generational cohorts.		Failure to reject the null hypothesis.
4. To what extent, if any, do Value-Added Measure scores differ among generational cohorts of K-12 teachers?	There is no statistically significant difference in Value-Added Measure scores among cohorts of K-12 teachers.	There was no statistically significant difference in VAM scores F2,156 = .131, p.05) among the generational cohorts.		Failure to reject the null hypothesis.

Chapter 5 presents the summary, conclusions, implications, and recommendations for further research.

CHAPTER 5: FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to determine if any differences exist among Baby Boomer, Generation X, and Millennial K-12 teachers regarding job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and work motivation. A second purpose was to determine if any differences exist among Baby Boomer, Generation X, and Millennial K-12 teachers' Value-Added Measure scores when used to indicate teacher effect on student achievement. To accomplish this task, a survey was conducted from a representation of the K-12 teachers in Brevard Public Schools, Brevard County, Florida. The findings are intended to add to the body of knowledge about the effect of generational values on student performance and assist educational leaders with the influence of relationships on the success of a school, and the achievement of students in the school. It is vital to be savvy about generational differences because in the twenty-first century generations are working together more than ever before, in part to the downfall of the bureaucratic establishment in support of a horizontal design, new technology, globalization, and a more information-friendly environment (Arsenault, 2004). The misinterpretation and under appreciation of generational differences occur from the traditional, but mistaken, belief that people change their values, attitudes, and preferences as they age. A generation's attitudes and preferences are life-long effects (Arsenault, 2004).

The problem posed in the study was whether or not the generational differences in job satisfaction, commitment, and motivation among K – 12 teachers affected student performance. For the purpose of this study, student achievement was determined by the VAM score indicating a teacher's effect on student performance. VAM scores were calculated using student Developmental Scale Scores on the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT) Reading

and Math for a sample of teachers. Teachers were given a state-calculated Value-Added Measure (VAM) score based on the achievement and learning gains obtained by their students. In Florida, the prediction was based on several years of prior data. Those scores were compared to the scores of other students in Florida with similar characteristics in the same grade and subject. If the student performed what was predicted, that additional amount is the value that the teacher is said to have added to student learning during that year. Performance less than the predicted score indicated that statistically, the student was not able to achieve his full learning potential for the year ("Overview of Brevard's", 2012).

Research Questions and Hypotheses

1. To what extent, if any, does job satisfaction differ among generational cohorts of K – 12 teachers?

   H_0: There is no statistically significant difference in job satisfaction among generational cohorts of K – 12 teachers.

2. To what extent, if any, does organizational commitment differ among generational cohorts of K – 12 teachers?

   H_0: There is no statistically significant difference in organizational commitment among generational cohorts of K – 12 teachers.

3. To what extent, if any, does work motivation differ among generational cohorts of K – 12 teachers?

   H_0: There is no statistically significant difference in work motivation among generational cohorts of K – 12 teachers.

4. To what extent, if any, do Value-Added Measure scores differ among generational cohorts of K – 12 teachers?

   H_0: There is no statistically significant difference in Value-Added Measure scores among generational cohorts of K – 12 teachers.

Summary of Results

Findings of this study centered on whether the null hypothesis for each research question was rejected or failed to be rejected, indicating whether members of a generational cohort did or did not have varying values with regards to job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and motivation, and whether or not these values impacted student achievement.

Null Hypothesis #1 – Rejected: A statistically significant difference does exist in job satisfaction among generational cohorts of K-12 teachers.

Null hypothesis #1 was rejected based on results from the ANOVA. The ANOVA test indicated there was a statistically significant difference in job satisfaction based on generational cohorts for the benefits factor. An analysis of the responses from the data set of 159 respondents to the survey statement "Benefits (insurance/retirement) are an important aspect of my job satisfaction" indicated a significant difference in how the respondents from the different generations answered.

A post hoc Tukey HSD indicated a statistically significant decrease in the mean score in the importance of benefits for Baby Boomers (M=6.20) to Millennials (M=5.17). This suggests that benefits are statistically significantly more important to Baby Boomers than to Millennials which corresponds to research. The research conducted by Lancaster and Stillman (2005) proposed that Baby Boomers admire tangible benefits such as company cars and expense accounts. During the time when Generation Xers were born, the US Social Security system came under investigation as potentially not being able to pay Gen Xers in their retirement years (Glass, 2007; Lancaster & Stillman, 2005). Millennials, on the other hand, find intangible

benefits such as being engaged in meaningful work and making a difference in the world as important. Other quantitative research suggests statistically significant differences in job satisfaction among employees of various ages. Chambers (2010) found that levels of job satisfaction varied based on teachers' years of teaching experience with teachers having 0-4 years of teaching experience possessing a lower level of job satisfaction than teachers with 11 or more years of teaching experience. Moody (2007) conveyed in her findings that the benefits factor of job satisfaction among individuals in the financial services industry workforce indicated a significant difference between Generation X and Millennials, and between Baby Boomers and Millenials. A study on commitment to an organization conducted by Daboval (1998) found a significant difference between Baby Boomers and Xers, and therefore recommended different benefits packages for each generation.

Null Hypothesis #2 – Rejected: A statistically significant difference does exist in commitment among generational cohorts of K-12 teachers.

Null hypothesis #2 was rejected based on results from the ANOVA. The ANOVA test indicated there was a statistically significant difference in commitment based on generational cohorts for the career at current school. An analysis of the responses from the data set of 159 respondents to the survey statement "I would be happy to spend the rest of my career at my current school" indicated a significant difference in how the respondents from the different generations answered.

A post hoc Tukey HSD indicated a statistically significant decrease in the mean score in the commitment to career at current school for Baby Boomers (M=5.78) to Millennials (M=4.44). This suggests that commitment to maintaining a career at their current school is

statistically significantly more important to Baby Boomers than to Millennials which corresponds to literature. Lancaster and Stillman (2005) contend that Baby Boomers often resent the younger generations for finding it so easy to change careers anytime they feel like it. Also in alignment with research conducted by Lancaster and Stillman (2005), Millennials can learn several jobs simultaneously and do them well. They prepare to change careers 10 times during their lifetimes. Younger generations grew up observing their parents lose jobs to layoffs and acquired feelings that of organizations are not loyal to employees so they should not feel loyal to them (Lancaster & Stillman, 2005). Himmelberg (2007) concurred that Millennials (Generation Y) are loyal to themselves, not their organization. Rather than going through the career-building hardships with one company, they just change organizations.

These findings support other quantitative research. Daboval (1998) stated Baby Boomers have a traditional attitude about loyalty. In a survey of 167 employees of a privately owned jewelry manufacturing organization, Daboval (1998) found Baby Boomers have a statistically significantly higher level of identification and internalization commitment toward the employing organization than younger generations. This higher level of commitment may be due to values shared by Baby Boomers that reflect their loyalty to an organization. The findings are consistent with Janiszewski's (2004). Results from that study show that Boomers tend to stay with an organization with the goal of transforming it from within (Janiszewski, 2004).

In a survey of 182 nurses, a qualitative analysis done by Swearingen (2004) indicated a statistically significant positive relationship regarding nursing retention between Baby Boomers and Generation X nurses. Nurses from younger generations were more likely to leave an organization if they do not like the work environment than Baby Boomers.

Null Hypothesis #3 – Failure to reject: There is no statistically significant difference in motivational factors among generational cohorts of K-12 teachers.

Failure to reject null hypothesis #3 was based on the results of the ANOVA test. The ANOVA test used on the data set of the 159 respondents indicated there was no statistically significant difference in motivational factors based on generational cohorts. The data show that Baby Boomers felt that although being a member of a team as motivation to do better at work was slightly more important (M=6.13) than to Millennials (M=6.06) and Generation X (M=5.82), the difference was not statistically significant.

According to Owens and Valesky (2007), team work is a powerful motivator. As indicated by Lancaster and Stillman (2005), working with teams of peers and participating in work decisions are important to Millennials. This study indicated that although Millennials found this value to be an important motivator (M=6.06), which is higher than that of Generation X (M=5.82), it was not statistically significantly different. Lancaster and Stillman (2005) also denoted that Generation Xers were resourceful and independent. Gen Xers have created many sports that are inclined to be individual sports such as skateboarding, rock climbing, and roller blading ("Move Over Mom & Dad", 2004). This is an indication that Generation X would prefer to work alone and not as part of a team. The findings of this study suggest this to be an accurate statement, although the differences in the value of teamwork among the generations are not statistically significant. This study indicated that Millennials found teamwork to be an important motivator (M=6.06), which is higher than that of Generation X (M=5.82), though not statistically significantly different. Contradictory to the literature is that Baby Boomers (M=6.13) denoted team work as a motivating factor of higher importance than the younger generations, again though, the difference was not statistically significant.

The findings are also contradictory to literature for the factor of flexible schedule. Lancaster and Stillman (2005) stated that flexible work schedules are needed for Millennials to balance their busy lives. Of the three generations surveyed, Generation X felt that flexible work schedules were somewhat more important (M=5.68) than did Baby Boomers (M=5.55) and Millennials (M=5.56), although the difference was not statistically significant. Although Millennials had a higher mean (M=5.61) for the motivational factor "Freedom for creativity", than both Generation X (M=5.54) and Baby Boomers (M=5.48), the difference was not statistically significant. These findings are in contrast with literature. Strauss & Howe (2006) stated that Millennials are less willing to take academic risks, be creative, and "think outside the box" (p.92).

The findings for some of the factors were in concurrence with quantitative research. According to the study conducted by Janiszewski (2004), there was no statistically significant difference in motivation between Baby Boomers and Generation X independent insurance agents. Although Janiszewski (2004) found that on a 20-question survey, Generation X agents mentioned compensation as being a more important motivating factor than Baby Boomers did, the difference was not statistically significant. Furthermore, Janiszewski (2004) discovered that respondents from all three generations considered the motivating factor of autonomy important. Therefore, there was no statistically significant difference among the autonomy factor. This study indicated that autonomy in the form of flexible schedules and authority for decisions was important to all generational cohorts.

Koenigsknecht (2002) obtained similar results in a study conducted with employees from manufacturing companies. Koenigsknect (2002) found no significant differences in the challenging work variable nor the feeling valued variable of motivation based on generation.

Null Hypothesis #4 – Failure to reject: There is no statistically significant difference in Value-Added Measure scores among generational cohorts of K-12 teachers.

Failure to reject null hypothesis #4 was based on the data from an ANOVA. The ANOVA test used on the data set of the 159 respondents indicated there was no statistically significant difference in Value-Added Measure scores based on generational cohorts.

These findings contradict literature. According to Strauss and Howe (2006), Millennials are on track to becoming the smartest, best-educated generation of adults in U.S. history. Members of the Millennial generation are better prepared and organized than Generation X. Espinoza et al. (2010) stated that Millennials "embrace change and thrive on brainstorming, creating, and problem solving" (p. 72). Because all of the Millennials in this study had less than 10 years experience, they have not yet suffered from what Espinoza et al. (2010) called "bias of experience" (p. 73). Millennials' inexperience permits them to envision opportunities that members of older generations see as obstacles. It is assumed that the creativity and willingness to change are strengths to Millennials and would enhance their classroom performance, thus increasing student achievement (Espinoza et al., 2010).

Millennials have an obsession with feedback (Espinoza et al, 2010; Lancaster & Stillman, 2005; Zemke et al., 2000). Feedback improves student achievement (Duijnhouwer, Prins, & Stokking, 2011). Since Millennials know how important feedback is, it is assumed Millennials

use feedback in their classrooms which, in turn, will improve the Millennial teachers' effect on student achievement. An increase in student achievement leads to higher VAM scores.

Another contradiction with literature is the effect of work-life balance on student achievement. The presumption is that the work-life balance that the younger generations so desperately seek negatively reflects the achievement of their students. Generation X saw their parents spending evenings and weekends working and do not understand why when the work is none-the-less finished, they need to stick to a strict work schedule (Lancaster & Stillman, 2005). Xers "work to live" and not "live to work" (Zemke et al., 2000, p.99). Therefore, when quitting time approaches, Xers and Millennials are often seen going home for the day while Boomers continue working. Some organizations, such as schools, do not have cultures that support balance plans and programs, such as flexible schedules (Lancaster & Stillman, 2005). Teachers' unions create barriers because initiatives must be negotiated and both sides must agree. Teachers do not have the option to work from home, or come in late, or work nights instead of days (Lancaster & Stillman, 2005). The assumption can be made then that Generation X and Millennials find the work-life balance they crave within the time constraints of a school day. Therefore, the differences did not appear as significant, and furthermore do not affect student achievement.

Recommendations for Future Research

The research in this study was delimited to K-12 teachers in Brevard Public Schools, Brevard County, FL. Because of this, it cannot be assumed that teachers in other counties in Florida, other states, and countries vary in their values of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and work motivation. Studying teachers in other Florida counties, states, and

countries would open the research opportunities to generalize values to all members of generational cohorts. Doing so would address issues highlighted by other researchers. Bal and Visser (2011), for instance found that teachers working in a high school in the Netherlands who were given organizational support and possibilities for a change in work role were motivated to continue working after the age of retirement. Similarly, Anari (2011) studied the role of gender and age of high school English teachers in Kerman, Iran on job satisfaction and concluded that there was no significant difference among the teachers with different ages concerning their job satisfaction. Additionally, Ghazi and Maringe (2011) found that younger and older head teachers in Pakistan were significantly more satisfied than the middle-aged teachers. Performing a study among teachers in other counties in Florida, other states, and other countries would help confirm and validate the finding of this research.

Another possibility for future studies includes examining individuals within a single generational cohort. Gender considerations are one area for study. An example might be to examine whether Millennial women have values similar to Millenial men. Janiszewski (2004) found that recognition was not as important to Baby Boomer males as it was to Boomer females. This is perhaps because the male has established his standing "in the male kingdom" by this time (Janiszewski, 2004, p. 125). Additionally, compensation is more important to the Xer female than to the Xer male (Janiszewski, 2004).

Future studies could also move beyond one timeframe for gathering data. A longitudinal study of the same people as they age could be conducted. A comparison is needed to understand whether differences in work values are due to aging or to generational effects. A longitudinal study would evaluate if there were generational differences in work values and whether these

values fluctuate as workers grow older. People commonly change what they want from their jobs as they proceed through their careers. Do Baby Boomers think retirement benefits are more important than Millennials do because Boomers are closer to the age of retirement than Millennials are? Or have Baby Boomers always cared more about benefits because of specific events that have occurred in their lives during their formative years?

Erikson's developmental stages are based on the premise that there is a predominant issue at each stage which may or may not be successfully resolved within that stage (Dunkel & Sefcek, 2009). How earlier issues are resolved determines how later issues will be resolved. For example, if the quality of care is good in infancy during the Trust versus Mistrust stage, the child learns to trust the world to meet her needs. If not, trust continues to be an unresolved issue throughout the subsequent stages of development. According to Dunkel and Sefcek (2009), developing the basic sense of trust makes it more probable an individual will develop along a course that comprises a sense of autonomy, industry, identity, intimacy, generativity, and integrity.

Carlisle (2010) points out that in Erikson's Initiative versus Guilt phase, children who successfully develop the virtue of purpose are able to develop their own sense of individuality and become useful to others in life. They are able to avoid conflict and develop healthy relationships with adults (Carlisle, 2010). All members of a generation have been impacted by the major world events, celebrities, heroes, technology, music, and disasters that occurred during their formative years. According to McMaken (2001), during their formative years, children must learn trust, autonomy, initiative, and industry in order to have a "preparatory foundation" for the adolescence stage (p. 1). During Erikson's Middle Adulthood stage, individuals think

about the future and the impact they will have on the next generation and generations to come. Erikson's Generativity versus Stagnation is concerned with investing in the future (Carlisle 2010). Those who successfully gain the virtue of caring will be content that they have positively contributed to making the world a better place. The final stage identified by Erikson is Late Adulthood. It is in this stage where a person feels integrity over a life well-lived or despair over past regrets. It is also during this stage that a person usually retires from the workforce. Conducting a study of a group of individuals throughout their career over a thirty-year period would provide data to indicate if Baby Boomers provide the same answers to survey questions regarding job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and work motivation when they first began their careers and were in Erikson's Young Adulthood stage as when they are progressing through their careers during Middle Adulthood, or at the end of their careers during Erikson's Late Adulthood stages.

Implications for Policy and Practice

A growing body of evidence suggests that among school-related factors, leadership is second only to teaching in contributing to student achievement (Lovely, 2005). As Lovely (2010) points out, leadership positions in schools are held by Baby Boomer superintendents, principals, and school boards. Nevertheless, schools are full of Generation X teachers and administrators who envision things differently. Savvy school principals know that looking at generational needs of employees is important in creating a culture that supports teaching and learning. They know that every generation has the potential to add to the betterment of the school.

Zemke et al (2000) report that Xers "work to live" and not "live to work"(p. 99). Millennials need flexible schedules to balance their busy lives (Lancaster & Stillman, 2005). Traditionalists take pride in receiving recognition for perfect attention (Lancaster & Stillman, 2005). There are many different views of work ethic and perception of the importance of attendance in the workplace.

Since schools are not organized to provide the freedom to work from home, come in late, or work nights instead of days, some employees design their own flexible schedules by using every available sick day, whether they are sick or not. According to the Employee Benefit Research Institute (2005), public employees rely on accrual of paid sick leave to supply income during episodes of illness and temporary disability. In 2007, 87 percent of employees had access to paid sick leave (Leave programs, 2005). Most public employees accrue sick leave on an annual basis and are permitted to carry forward unused sick leave balances. According to Florida statute 1012.61 (2012), teachers employed on a full-time basis in public schools are entitled to four days of sick leave each contract year from the first day of employment and earn one day of sick leave for each month of employment. Additionally, there is no limit on the number of days of sick leave teachers may accrue (Florida statute 1012.61, 2012). Many cumulative plans place a limit on the number of days that can be carried over to the subsequent years. Long-service employees with good heath can have enormous sick leave accumulations during the later years in their careers (Leave programs, 2005). In some organizations employees are compensated for their unused sick leave at the time of retirement.

In this study, Baby Boomers indicated that benefits such as retirement are more important to them than was indicated by Millennials. Getting time off at the end of a long career will in no

way make sense to Millennials (Lancaster & Stillman, 2005). The "great reward" of retirement at the end of an extensive career will never seem sensible to Generation Xers (Lancaster & Stillman, 2005, p. 138).

One recommendation for organizations trying to improve attendance and reduce absenteeism came from the findings of research conducted by Hammond (1982) on teachers in Petersburg, Virgina. A policy should be adopted granting compensation to teachers at the end of a specified period of time, for example, every year, rather than only at retirement. It is suggested that teachers who tend to use paid sick leave as quickly as they earn it would have more incentive to save the days thus improving attendance if there were more frequent remuneration instead of only at the time of retirement.

Teachers in Brevard Public Schools have the option of an annual pay back for not more than 10 of accumulated sick days during each school year provided the teacher is not absent for more than five workdays during the school year (Brevard County Florida Administrative Procedures, 2005). Employees who are eligible for the sick leave buy back are paid at a rate of 80 percent multiplied by their daily rate of pay. Days paid out are deducted from accumulated leave balance (Brevard County Florida Administrative Procedures, 2005). Employees who are absent more than five workdays during the school year are not eligible for the buy back. Millennials and Xers who do not see retirement benefits as important may be inclined to save their sick days so that they are eligible for the sick leave buy back program.

As indicated by Lancaster and Stillman (2005), one of the greatest rewards a company can give to a Generation Xer's peak performance is time. Time off can be in the form of a sabbatical. A Gen X employee will come back to work even more committed (Lancaster &

Stillman, 2005). A change in policy which creates programs that offer opportunities for sabbaticals for further study, travel, or health restoration might make Generation Xers more productive. The "great reward" of retirement at the end of an extensive career will never seem sensible to Generation Xers (Lancaster & Stillman, 2005, p. 138).

According to Lovely (2005), administrators from the Traditionalist generation are likely to equate age with hierarchy and status in the workplace. Change is difficult for this tradition-infused generation of leaders who are apt to be more conventional than the younger leaders.

Baby Boomers had once turned campus life into a topsy-turvy experience with inexhaustible protests and riots and look back at their educational years with fondness (Strauss, 2005). Boomers have been in the classrooms for the past thirty years. They are good for schools because it is in the Boomers' blood to innovate and break new ground. They grew up in an era of reform and believe they can change the world. Getting this generation on board first will ensure new programs and policies will get implemented once buy-in is established.

As a result of Generation X continuously hearing that schools were ineffective, teachers were incompetent, and they themselves were labeled "somewhere between disappointing and stupid" (Strauss, 2005, p.2), they considered education to be a less prestigious career. They are staunch defenders of No Child Left Behind, school accountability, school choice, charter schools, vouchers, and homeschooling (Strauss, 2005). They feel powerless to change the world, but feel capable of being a friend to one elderly person or sick child. They are not interested in leadership positions because of the additional required personal time ("Move Over Mom & Dad", 2004). Generation Xers are good for schools because they want to be heard and are creative thinkers. Freedom is important to members of Generation X, and getting buy-in from

this generation will encourage them to use this freedom to figure out how they will achieve the end result.

Millennials grew up with technology and it is a large part of their life. They have never known life without cell phones, voice mail, Automated Teller Machines(ATMs), personal computers (PCs), and chat rooms. The structured lives of the Millennials has aided them in being able to multi-task because they are used to juggling sports, school, and their social lives since they were young children. Millennials are good for schools because they know technology like no one else and they are a generation used to working collaboratively. Team projects and helping to plan the family vacation are activities they have participated in since childhood. Many of the existing policies have been set by Boomers who did not understand the way of the Millennials (Lovely, 2005). Leaders must become accustomed to new methods and policies.

When making any significant changes, it is best to have a diversified mix of generations in a learning community. Strategically assigning tasks to members of different generations taps into the strengths of each member, thus increasing teamwork. School administrators should look carefully at their school workforce through a generational lens. Each of these generational cohorts has a distinctive career goal and brings diverse strengths to the job. If school leaders are not knowledgeable of the ways to utilize these diverse characteristics of work values to the fullest advantage, conflict can occur. Knowing the generational foundations that can either connect colleagues or dismantle their teamwork is valuable in establishing collaborative teams. Without this knowledge, it is impossible to nurture collaborative teams that are results-oriented and achievement-driven.

Professional learning communities are one channel for high quality work. Maintaining unity among groups who do not easily see things the same way is an exhausting undertaking, since collegiality does not come easily to most educators. Millennials, who are seasoned with social networking sites such as Facebook, MySpace, and LinkedIn, covet the opportunity to share ideas in professional learning communities with cohorts around the world through these sites (Lancaster, 2010). When generational factors are included in all aspects of leading a school, a stage for collaboration is set. When holding Professional Learning Community meetings in schools to improve student learning, the collaboration among teachers must go beyond congeniality. Teachers must work collegially and deal with difficult questions about the essence of teaching and learning (O'Donovan, 2009). School principals must understand and plan for generational differences to help these diverse groups collaborate effectively. Tuning in to employee strengths and making weaknesses insignificant fosters a great appreciation for diversity.

Literature emphasizes that diversity on a school staff extends beyond gender and ethnicity (Lancaster, 2004). Focusing on relationships is more than increasing achievement scores. Making relationships the center of concentration is a means of laying the foundation for a year or two beyond (Fullan, 2002). Failure for school leaders to deal with generational differences may cause misunderstandings and miscommunication. Understanding generational similarities and differences can lead to more productivity, more collegiality, and therefore, better student achievement. School principals greatly influence workplace experience of teachers, instructional approaches, and career paths. Promoting collegiality among school staff is an

important role of the school leader. Fullan states that "leaders build relationships with diverse people and groups – especially with people who think differently (Fullan, 2002, p. 18).

Professional development opportunities should consist of a training program that educates administrators, directors, managers, department heads, teachers about the values of the various generations. Professional development trainers must tailor the training to the specific needs of the audience. According to Zemke et al. (2000), each generation has its own learning style based on how they learned in school. Traditionalists are accustomed to the traditional way of learning with an expert lecturing or presenting. Well-researched information that is supported by facts and examples is received best by Traditionalists (Zemke et al., 2000). They do not like to be involved in "what if" scenarios that could possibly cause them embarrassment. Zemke et al. (2000) also points out that the font of the printed materials should be large enough to be seen by older eyes.

Boomers, according to Zemke et al. (2000) are lifelong learners and respond to a variety of training formats, such as workshops, books, videos, audiotapes and self-help guides. Boomers prefer a more casual atmosphere and enjoy interacting with the other participants. Printed training materials should be full of information with links or references for areas they wish to dig deeper into (Zemke et al., 2000).

Generation Xers are more comfortable than the older generations learning from a computer (Zemke et al., 2000). The training format preferred by Xers is interactive video, distance learning, CD-ROM, and Internet courses. Zemke et al. (2000) explain that Xers cannot get enough of role-playing experiences. They thrive on opportunities to practice their skills and

get feedback instantaneously. Printed training materials that contain a lot of graphics, type, sidebars, headings, subheadings, cartoons are preferred by Generation Xers (Zemke et al., 2000).

Millennials read more than any of the other generations (Zemke et al., 2000). They are accustomed to working on projects in teams. Role-playing is essential for this generation. Millennials are technology natives. They will get more information from the Internet than the previous generations (Zemke et al., 2000). Getting information from a manual just is not the Millennials' way of learning.

Lastly, mentoring programs are a perfect fit for the many generations that interact in the workplace. By pairing older, experienced workers with younger, technologically confident employees, both groups are motivated to form a bond that otherwise never would have existed (Elliott, 2009). Members of the younger generations can help members of the older generations feel comfortable with the new ideas and paradigms that come along. Younger workers help motivate older employees by tapping into their expertise and making them still feel useful in the workplace.

The next time a team is formed, leaders are advised to bring in enough people so that all generations are represented. Organizations that embrace generational differences attract a wider range of qualified applicants, retain qualified personnel, create among the generations an organization greater than the sum of its parts, and compete more successfully (Elliott, 2009). The result is a more efficient workplace – and increased student achievement.

Conclusion

On the whole, this study, through both the literature review and original research, supports the idea that there are differences in values among the generations in job satisfaction,

organizational commitment, and work motivation. This study measured the values of three generations as revealed on a survey and the effect of teachers on student achievement of Brevard Public Schools as recorded by their performance on Reading and Math Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT). The three generations were Baby Boomers, born between 1944 and 1960; Generation X, born between 1961 and 1980; and Millennials, born between 1981 and 2000. The VAM scores were calculated by the state of Florida and were based on multiple years FCAT data. Teachers who taught students in FCAT tested grades were included in the study. The finding indicated that differences occurred in job satisfaction and commitment among the generations. No differences occurred among the generations for motivation and VAM scores. Benefits were seen as more important to Baby Boomers than to the younger generations. Staying at their current school for the rest of their career was also found to be more important to Baby Boomers than to the younger generations.

Although the findings of this research are consistent with the majority of comparable studies on the differences among the generational cohorts, the delimitations of the study suggest the need for expansion so that the findings can be generalized. Additionally, there is a need for further research. That research should include a cross-cultural study of generational differences and a longitudinal study of one generation to determine if aging and experience account for the differences. In the future, however, research should be put into practice so that the best of all generations can be brought out and used to capitalize on learning opportunities for students.

APPENDIX A EMPLOYEE SURVEY

Section 1: Information About You

Directions: Please circle only one response for each of the following statements. Complete confidentiality is assured. Thank you very much for your time.

1. Do you work at a single school or multiple schools?

A. Single school
B. Multiple schools

2. I was born between the following years:

A. Between 1923 and 1943
B. Between 1944 and 1960
C. Between 1961 and 1980
D. 1981 or later

3. How many years have you been a full-time teacher?

A. 0-2
B. 3-6
C. 7-9
D. 10-19
E. 20 and over

4. Did you have another profession before teaching?

A. Yes
B. No

5. I am

A. Male
B. Female

6. How many years have you taught at your current school?

A. 0-3
B. 4-6
C. 7-9
D. 10-19
E. 20 and over

7. At which school level do you currently teach?

A. Pre-Kindergarten
B. Elementary
C. Middle/junior high
D. High school

Section 2:

Please answer the following questions using the scale shown below. Circle the number that corresponds to your answer.

7 – Strongly Agree, 6 – Agree, 5 – Slightly Agree, 4 – Neutral, 3 – Slightly Disagree, 2 – Disagree, 1 – Strongly Disagree

1. Salary is an important aspect of my job satisfaction.	**7 6 5 4 3 2 1**
2. Benefits (insurance/retirement) are an important aspect of my job satisfaction.	**7 6 5 4 3 2 1**
3. Flexibility is an important aspect of my job satisfaction.	**7 6 5 4 3 2 1**
4. A fun and relaxing work environment is an important aspect of my job satisfaction.	**7 6 5 4 3 2 1**
5. Social contact is an important aspect of my job satisfaction.	**7 6 5 4 3 2 1**
6. Recognition is an important aspect of my job satisfaction.	**7 6 5 4 3 2 1**
7. Empowerment if an important aspect of my job satisfaction.	**7 6 5 4 3 2 1**
8. Advancement opportunities are an important aspect of my job satisfaction.	**7 6 5 4 3 2 1**
9. Having a title is an important aspect of my job satisfaction.	**7 6 5 4 3 2 1**
10. Educational opportunities are an important aspect of my job satisfaction.	**7 6 5 4 3 2 1**
11. Control over my work is an important aspect of my job satisfaction.	**7 6 5 4 3 2 1**
12. Control over decision making is an important aspect of my job satisfaction.	**7 6 5 4 3 2 1**
13. If I am unhappy at work I will leave my current school.	**7 6 5 4 3 2 1**
14. I owe a great deal to my current school.	**7 6 5 4 3 2 1**
15. It would be hard for me to leave my current school.	**7 6 5 4 3 2 1**
16. I feel my current school deserves my loyalty.	**7 6 5 4 3 2 1**
17. I would feel guilty if I left my current school.	**7 6 5 4 3 2 1**
18. I would be happy to spend the rest of my career at my current school.	**7 6 5 4 3 2 1**
19. I feel great commitment to my current school.	**7 6 5 4 3 2 1**

20. I feel a great commitment to my principal.	**7 6 5 4 3 2 1**
21. I feel a great commitment to my coworkers.	**7 6 5 4 3 2 1**
22. I would leave my organization for more money.	**7 6 5 4 3 2 1**
23. I would leave my organization for better benefits.	**7 6 5 4 3 2 1**
24. I would leave my organization for more responsibility.	**7 6 5 4 3 2 1**
25. I would leave my organization for greater creative freedom.	**7 6 5 4 3 2 1**
26. Being challenged is just as important as the pay I receive.	**7 6 5 4 3 2 1**
27. I would move to a higher level demanding job with no additional pay for future opportunities.	**7 6 5 4 3 2 1**
28. Being able to speak openly and freely is important to me.	**7 6 5 4 3 2 1**
29. I prefer a principal who recognizes my abilities and gives me more interesting assignments.	**7 6 5 4 3 2 1**
30. The feeling I get from being part of a team motivates me to do good at work.	**7 6 5 4 3 2 1**
31. Knowing that I have a flexible schedule motivated me to do my work.	**7 6 5 4 3 2 1**
32. Being given decision-making authority motivates me.	**7 6 5 4 3 2 1**
33. Being empowered to determine the method to do my work motivates me.	**7 6 5 4 3 2 1**
34. Receiving recognition from my principal and organization motivates me.	**7 6 5 4 3 2 1**
35. Knowing my principal values my work is more important than monetary rewards.	**7 6 5 4 3 2 1**
36. Creative freedom motivates me to do better work.	**7 6 5 4 3 2 1**
37. Communication of specific goals motivates me to achieve them.	**7 6 5 4 3 2 1**
38. I prefer a principal who gives me very specific instructions.	**7 6 5 4 3 2 1**

Thank you for your valuable participation.

APPENDIX B COVER LETTER FOR EMPLOYEE SURVEY

Lisa Paniale
862 Woodbine Drive
Merritt Island, FL 32952

April 23, 2012

Dear Teacher:

As a doctoral student at the University of Central Florida, I am inviting you to participate in a research project to study employee commitment, motivation, and job satisfaction as a K-12 teacher employed by the Brevard Public School District. Along with this letter is a short survey which asks a variety of questions about the above mentioned topics.

The results of the project will be used to complete my dissertation. Your participation is greatly appreciated and will help me understand the feelings and beliefs of today's K-12 teachers. I hope the results of this survey will be useful for administrators to become more effective.

I do not know of any risks to you if you decide to participate in the survey and I guarantee your responses will not be identified with you personally or your school. Please be assured that your individual survey input will be kept completely confidential.

The survey should take about ten minutes to complete. Participation is voluntary and there is no penalty if you decide not to participate. Regardless of whether you choose to participate or not, please let me know if you would like a summary of the results.

An included consent form provides you greater detail of the study, but if you have any questions or concerns about completing the questionnaire or about being in the study, you may contact me at 321-449-4038. The survey responses are vital and I appreciate your time and effort in making the study possible. Please complete questionnaire by May 21, 2012.

Sincerely,

Lisa Paniale
Principal
Audubon Elementary
Doctoral Candidate
University of Central Florida

APPENDIX C INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Explanation of Research

Informed Consent Form

Title of Project: An Analysis of Generational Differences and Their Effects on Schools and Student Performance

Principal Investigator: Lisa Paniale

Faculty Supervisor: Barbara A. Murray, Ph.D.

You have been randomly selected and are being invited to take part in a research study which will include about 300 teachers in Brevard County Public Schools, Brevard County, Florida. You are being asked to take part in this research study because you are a K-12 teacher in Brevard Public Schools who is located at a single school, as opposed to working at multiple sites, have been teaching for 10 or more years (or 3 or more for teachers born in 1981 or later), and who has had teaching as their only career. Whether you take part is up to you.

- The purpose of this study is to examine generational differences among K-12 teachers regarding job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and work motivation. Also, the purpose is to examine what effect these generational differences have on student achievement. To date, there is little if any research in education to determine whether the generational differences in job satisfaction, commitment, and motivation among K-12 teachers affect student performance.

- You will be asked to complete a confidential survey which asks about your job satisfactions, organizational commitment, and motivation. Your principal was sent an email notification that a survey would be sent to the teachers at your school, but will not know whether or not you decided to participate or have access to the information you provide. The school district will receive aggregate data at the completion of this study.

- The survey will take approximately 10 minutes to complete.

Study contact for questions about the study or to report a problem: If you have questions, concern, or complaints, or think the research has hurt you, talk to Lisa Paniale, Doctoral Student Educational Leadership Program, College of Education, or Dr. Barbara Murray, Faculty Supervisor, Educational Leadership Program, College of Education (407-823-1473) or by email at lisapaniale@knights.ucf.edu.

IRB contact about your rights in the study or to report a complaint: Research at the University of Central Florida involving human participants is carried out under the oversight of the Institutional Review Board (UCF IRB). This research has been reviewed and approved by the IRB. For information about the rights of people who take part in research, please contact:

Institutional Review Board, University of Central Florida, Office of Research & Commercialization, 12201 Research Parkway, Suite 501, Orlando, FL 32826-3246 or by telephone at (407) 823-2901.

Brevard County IRB: This research has been reviewed and approved by the Brevard Public Schools IRB.

APPENDIX D UCF IRB REVIEW

University of Central Florida

University of Central Florida Institutional Review Board
Office of Research & Commercialization
12201 Research Parkway, Suite 501
Orlando, Florida 32826-3246
Telephone: 407-823-2901 or 407-882-2276
www.research.ucf.edu/compliance/irb.html

Approval of Exempt Human Research

From: **UCF Institutional Review Board #1**
FWA00000351, IRB00001138

To: **Lisa D Paniale**

Date: **June 14, 2012**

Dear Researcher:

On 6/14/2012, the IRB approved the following activity as human participant research that is exempt from regulation:

Type of Review:	UCF Initial Review Submission Form
Project Title:	An Analysis of Generational Differences and Their Effects on Schools and Student Performance
Investigator:	Lisa D Paniale
IRB Number:	SBE-12-08247
Funding Agency:	None

This determination applies only to the activities described in the IRB submission and does not apply should any changes be made. If changes are made and there are questions about whether these changes affect the exempt status of the human research, please contact the IRB. When you have completed your research, please submit a Study Closure request in iRIS so that IRB records will be accurate.

In the conduct of this research, you are responsible to follow the requirements of the Investigator Manual.

On behalf of Sophia Dziegielewski, Ph.D., L.C.S.W., UCF IRB Chair, this letter is signed by:

Signature applied by Janice Turchin on 06/14/2012 02:06:52 PM EDT

Janice M Turchin

IRB Coordinator

APPENDIX E BREVARD COUNTY IRB REVIEW

School Board of Brevard County
2700 Judge Fran Jamieson Way Viera, FL 32940-6699
Dr. Brian Binggeli, Superintendent

School Board

March 19, 2012

Dear Ms. Paniale,

Thank you for your application to conduct research in the Brevard Public Schools. This letter is official verification that your application has been accepted and approved through the Office of Accountability, Testing, & Evaluation. However, approval from this office does not obligate the principal of the schools you have selected to participate in the proposed research. Please contact the principals of the impacted schools in order to obtain their approval. Upon the completion of your research, submit your findings to our office. If we can be of further assistance, do not hesitate to contact our office.

Sincerely,

Vickie B. Hickey

Vickie B. Hickey, Resource Teacher
Office of Accountability, Testing, and Evaluation

Office of Accountability, Testing & Evaluation
Phone: (321) 633-1000 FAX: (321) 633-3465

APPENDIX F COPY OF EMAIL GRANTING PERMISSION TO USE SURVEY

From: Autumn Moody [Moody@cofo.edu]
Sent: Monday, February 13, 2012 7:56 PM
To: Lisa Paniale
Subject: RE: permission request to use questionnaire

Lisa,

I would be glad for you to use my questionnaire. I have continued my interest and research in generational studies, so I would love to see your results. Good Luck and let me know if you need anything else from me.

Autumn

Dr. Autumn Moody

Associate Professor of Business

College of the Ozarks

Point Lookout, MO 65726

417-690-2556

moody@cofo.edu

From: Lisa Paniale [mailto:lisapaniale@knights.ucf.edu]
Sent: Sunday, February 12, 2012 9:17 PM
To: Autumn Moody
Subject: permission request to use questionnaire

Lisa Paniale

862 Woodbine Drive

Merritt Island, FL 32953

321-449-4038

February 12, 2012

Dr. Autumn Moody

Associate Professor of Business/Management

College of the Ozarks

Point Lookout, Missouri 65726-0017

moody@cofo.edu

Dear Dr. Moody,

I am writing to request permission to use the questionnaire you developed for determining whether there were statistically significant differences among employees of different generations of the workforce in the financial services industry. I came across your questionnaire while reading your dissertation "Examining and Exploring Generational Differences by Understanding Commitment, Employee Satisfaction, and Motivation." I am a doctoral student at the University of Central Florida working toward a Doctorate in Educational Leadership. For my dissertation research, I intend to investigate to what extent job satisfaction, commitment, and motivation differ between generational cohorts among K-12 teachers in Brevard County, Florida public schools. I also intend to investigate to what extent a relationship exists between generational factors among K-12 teachers and student performance. I am willing to share results of this research with you.

I was in the process of compiling questions from various questionnaires, such as the Mueller and McCloskey Satisfaction Scale (MMSS) (1990), Becker's commitment survey (1996), Paul E. Spector's Job Satisfaction Survey (1994), and the Employee Motivation Survey used by Susan K. Koenigsknecht (2005) in order to create a questionnaire which applied to my study when I discovered your survey. If permission is granted, I plan to use the questions regarding job satisfaction, commitment, and motivation verbatim. I will create additional questions for my questionnaire relating to personal information which fit the parameters of my study.

Chair of my dissertation committee is Dr. Barbara Murray; committee members are Dr. Walter Doherty and Dr. Rosemarye Taylor of University of Central Florida. If you wish to discuss issues concerning this research, please do not hesitate to contact Dr. Murray at 407-823-1473 or me at 321-449-4038. I can also be reached by email at lisapaniale@knights.ucf.edu.

Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

Lisa Paniale

Doctoral Candidate, University of Central Florida

APPENDIX G SHAPIRO-WILK TEST OF NORMALITY FOR JOB SATISFACTION

Tests of Normality

	BORNYRS A= 1923 - 1943; B=1944-1960; C=1961-1980; D=1981 or later	Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a]			Shapiro-Wilk		
		Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
JSSALARY	B	.227	40	.000	.776	40	.000
	C	.274	101	.000	.779	101	.000
	D	.220	18	.022	.888	18	.036
JSBNFTS	B	.298	40	.000	.754	40	.000
	C	.267	101	.000	.739	101	.000
	D	.241	18	.007	.861	18	.013
JSFLX	B	.272	40	.000	.788	40	.000
	C	.267	101	.000	.806	101	.000
	D	.300	18	.000	.799	18	.001
JSRELAX	B	.256	40	.000	.817	40	.000
	C	.251	101	.000	.767	101	.000
	D	.260	18	.002	.725	18	.000
JSSOCCNT	B	.191	40	.001	.868	40	.000
	C	.152	101	.000	.907	101	.000
	D	.254	18	.003	.882	18	.028
JSREC	B	.228	40	.000	.813	40	.000
	C	.193	101	.000	.896	101	.000
	D	.225	18	.016	.886	18	.033
JSEMP	B	.216	40	.000	.870	40	.000
	C	.217	101	.000	.874	101	.000
	D	.178	18	.135	.916	18	.109
JSADVOPPS	B	.192	40	.001	.890	40	.001
	C	.153	101	.000	.935	101	.000
	D	.245	18	.006	.872	18	.020
JSTITLE	B	.241	40	.000	.857	40	.000
	C	.196	101	.000	.928	101	.000
	D	.225	18	.016	.886	18	.033
JSEDOPPS	B	.245	40	.000	.843	40	.000
	C	.188	101	.000	.905	101	.000
	D	.194	18	.072	.916	18	.108

SHAPIRO-WILK TEST OF NORMALITY FOR JOB SATISFACTION

JSCTRL	B	.331	40	.000	.572	40	.000
	C	.246	101	.000	.749	101	.000
	D	.205	18	.043	.876	18	.023
JSDECIS	B	.265	40	.000	.683	40	.000
	C	.252	101	.000	.751	101	.000
	D	.200	18	.055	.845	18	.007

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

APPENDIX H LEVENE'S TEST OF HOMOGENEITY OF VARIANCES FOR JOB SATISFACTION

Test of Homogeneity of Variances

	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
JSSALARY	.311	2	156	.733
JSBNFTS	1.981	2	156	.141
JSFLX	2.429	2	156	.091
JSRELAX	.457	2	156	.634
JSSOCCNT	4.167	2	156	.017
JSREC	1.144	2	156	.321
JSEMP	2.590	2	156	.078
JSADVOPPS	1.060	2	156	.349
JSTITLE	3.296	2	156	.040
JSEDOPPS	.848	2	156	.430
JSCTRL	.187	2	156	.830
JSDECIS	.595	2	156	.553

APPENDIX I ANOVA FOR JOB SATISFACTION

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
JSSALARY	Between Groups	6.173	2	3.086	1.594	.206
	Within Groups	302.104	156	1.937		
	Total	308.277	158			
JSBNFTS	Between Groups	13.759	2	6.879	3.383	.036
	Within Groups	317.197	156	2.033		
	Total	330.956	158			
JSFLX	Between Groups	.105	2	.052	.042	.959
	Within Groups	192.386	156	1.233		
	Total	192.491	158			
JSRELAX	Between Groups	.405	2	.202	.114	.892
	Within Groups	275.834	156	1.768		
	Total	276.239	158			
JSSOCCNT	Between Groups	.372	2	.186	.096	.909
	Within Groups	303.905	156	1.948		
	Total	304.277	158			
JSREC	Between Groups	7.126	2	3.563	1.826	.164
	Within Groups	304.383	156	1.951		
	Total	311.509	158			
JSEMP	Between Groups	5.524	2	2.762	1.229	.296
	Within Groups	350.752	156	2.248		
	Total	356.277	158			
JSADVOPPS	Between Groups	3.809	2	1.904	.711	.493
	Within Groups	417.701	156	2.678		
	Total	421.509	158			
JSTITLE	Between Groups	1.188	2	.594	.244	.784
	Within Groups	380.636	156	2.440		
	Total	381.824	158			
JSEDOPPS	Between Groups	6.235	2	3.118	1.381	.254
	Within Groups	352.180	156	2.258		
	Total	358.415	158			
JSCTRL	Between Groups	6.766	2	3.383	2.499	.085
	Within Groups	211.172	156	1.354		

ANOVA FOR JOB SATISFACTION

	Total	217.937	158			
JSDECIS	Between Groups	4.769	2	2.385	1.569	.212
	Within Groups	237.130	156	1.520		
	Total	241.899	158			

APPENDIX J TUKEY HSD FOR JOB SATISFACTION

Multiple Comparisons

Tukey HSD

Dependent Variable	(I) BORNYRS A= 1923 - 1943; B=1944-1960; C=1961-1980; D=1981 or later	(J) BORNYRS A= 1923 - 1943; B=1944-1960; C=1961-1980; D=1981 or later	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound
JSSALARY	B	C	.252	.260	.598	-.36	.87
		D	.703	.395	.180	-.23	1.64
	C	B	-.252	.260	.598	-.87	.36
		D	.451	.356	.416	-.39	1.29
	D	B	-.703	.395	.180	-1.64	.23
		C	-.451	.356	.416	-1.29	.39
JSBNFTS	B	C	.438	.266	.231	-.19	1.07
		D	1.033*	.405	.031	.08	1.99
	C	B	-.438	.266	.231	-1.07	.19
		D	.596	.365	.235	-.27	1.46
	D	B	-1.033*	.405	.031	-1.99	-.08
		C	-.596	.365	.235	-1.46	.27
JSFLX	B	C	-.060	.207	.954	-.55	.43
		D	-.044	.315	.989	-.79	.70
	C	B	.060	.207	.954	-.43	.55
		D	.016	.284	.998	-.66	.69
	D	B	.044	.315	.989	-.70	.79
		C	-.016	.284	.998	-.69	.66
JSRELAX	B	C	-.056	.248	.973	-.64	.53
		D	-.181	.377	.882	-1.07	.71
	C	B	.056	.248	.973	-.53	.64
		D	-.125	.340	.928	-.93	.68
	D	B	.181	.377	.882	-.71	1.07
		C	.125	.340	.928	-.68	.93

TUKEY HSD FOR JOB SATISFACTION

JSSOCCNT	B	C	-.032	.261	.992	-.65	.59
		D	-.169	.396	.904	-1.11	.77
	C	B	.032	.261	.992	-.59	.65
		D	-.138	.357	.922	-.98	.71
	D	B	.169	.396	.904	-.77	1.11
		C	.138	.357	.922	-.71	.98
JSREC	B	C	.351	.261	.372	-.27	.97
		D	-.222	.396	.841	-1.16	.72
	C	B	-.351	.261	.372	-.97	.27
		D	-.574	.357	.246	-1.42	.27
	D	B	.222	.396	.841	-.72	1.16
		C	.574	.357	.246	-.27	1.42
JSEMP	B	C	.432	.280	.274	-.23	1.10
		D	.206	.426	.879	-.80	1.21
	C	B	-.432	.280	.274	-1.10	.23
		D	-.227	.384	.825	-1.13	.68
	D	B	-.206	.426	.879	-1.21	.80
		C	.227	.384	.825	-.68	1.13
JSADVOPPS	B	C	.206	.306	.779	-.52	.93
		D	-.256	.464	.846	-1.35	.84
	C	B	-.206	.306	.779	-.93	.52
		D	-.461	.419	.514	-1.45	.53
	D	B	.256	.464	.846	-.84	1.35
		C	.461	.419	.514	-.53	1.45
JSTITLE	B	C	.180	.292	.810	-.51	.87
		D	.003	.443	1.000	-1.05	1.05
	C	B	-.180	.292	.810	-.87	.51
		D	-.178	.400	.897	-1.12	.77
	D	B	-.003	.443	1.000	-1.05	1.05
		C	.178	.400	.897	-.77	1.12
JSEDOPPS	B	C	.405	.281	.321	-.26	1.07
		D	-.019	.426	.999	-1.03	.99

TUKEY HSD FOR JOB SATISFACTION

	C	B	-.405	.281	.321	-1.07	.26
		D	-.425	.384	.513	-1.33	.48
	D	B	.019	.426	.999	-.99	1.03
		C	.425	.384	.513	-.48	1.33
JSCTRL	B	C	.380	.217	.190	-.13	.89
		D	.678	.330	.103	-.10	1.46
	C	B	-.380	.217	.190	-.89	.13
		D	.298	.298	.578	-.41	1.00
	D	B	-.678	.330	.103	-1.46	.10
		C	-.298	.298	.578	-1.00	.41
JSDECIS	B	C	.205	.230	.648	-.34	.75
		D	.619	.350	.183	-.21	1.45
	C	B	-.205	.230	.648	-.75	.34
		D	.415	.315	.389	-.33	1.16
	D	B	-.619	.350	.183	-1.45	.21
		C	-.415	.315	.389	-1.16	.33

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

APPENDIX K SHAPIRO-WILK TEST OF NORMALITY FOR COMMITMENT

Tests of Normality

	BORNYRS A= 1923 - 1943; B=1944-1960; C=1961-1980; D=1981 or later	Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a]			Shapiro-Wilk		
		Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
CMT LV	B	.127	39	.117	.925	39	.013
	C	.178	99	.000	.917	99	.000
	D	.211	18	.033	.892	18	.042
CMT OWE	B	.242	39	.000	.807	39	.000
	C	.184	99	.000	.897	99	.000
	D	.203	18	.049	.906	18	.074
CMT NOLV	B	.266	39	.000	.710	39	.000
	C	.249	99	.000	.804	99	.000
	D	.247	18	.005	.872	18	.019
CMTLYLT	B	.241	39	.000	.757	39	.000
	C	.217	99	.000	.832	99	.000
	D	.163	18	.200*	.897	18	.051
CMTGLTY	B	.173	39	.005	.868	39	.000
	C	.154	99	.000	.909	99	.000
	D	.195	18	.069	.907	18	.076
CMTCAREER	B	.324	39	.000	.677	39	.000
	C	.178	99	.000	.845	99	.000
	D	.136	18	.200*	.917	18	.115
CMTCRTSC	B	.262	39	.000	.742	39	.000
	C	.230	99	.000	.828	99	.000
	D	.221	18	.020	.877	18	.023
CMTPRIN	B	.212	39	.000	.830	39	.000
	C	.198	99	.000	.835	99	.000
	D	.229	18	.013	.861	18	.013
CMTCOWR	B	.261	39	.000	.804	39	.000
	C	.192	99	.000	.845	99	.000
	D	.286	18	.000	.847	18	.007
CMTMON	B	.163	39	.010	.915	39	.006
	C	.167	99	.000	.904	99	.000

SHAPIRO-WILK TEST OF NORMALITY FOR COMMITMENT

	D	.258	18	.003	.874	18	.021
CMTBEN	B	.143	39	.042	.923	39	.011
	C	.158	99	.000	.921	99	.000
	D	.264	18	.002	.879	18	.025
CMTRESP	B	.208	39	.000	.891	39	.001
	C	.149	99	.000	.927	99	.000
	D	.280	18	.001	.897	18	.051
CMTFREE	B	.141	39	.049	.919	39	.008
	C	.146	99	.000	.920	99	.000
	D	.190	18	.086	.937	18	.260

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

*. This is a lower bound of the true significance.

APPENDIX L LEVENE'S TEST OF HOMOGENEITY OF VARIANCES FOR COMMITMENT

Test of Homogeneity of Variances

	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
CMT LV	.154	2	156	.857
CMT OWE	2.022	2	155	.136
CMT NOLV	2.437	2	155	.091
CMTLYLT	.799	2	156	.452
CMTGLTY	.868	2	156	.422
CMTCAREER	.397	2	156	.673
CMTCRTSC	.787	2	156	.457
CMTPRIN	1.395	2	156	.251
CMTCOWR	.943	2	155	.392
CMTMON	2.988	2	156	.053
CMTBEN	.430	2	156	.651
CMTRESP	1.243	2	156	.291
CMTFREE	.736	2	156	.480

APPENDIX M ANOVA FOR COMMITMENT

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
CMT LV	Between Groups	5.813	2	2.907	.876	.418
	Within Groups	517.369	156	3.316		
	Total	523.182	158			
CMT OWE	Between Groups	6.642	2	3.321	1.058	.350
	Within Groups	486.725	155	3.140		
	Total	493.367	157			
CMT NOLV	Between Groups	18.273	2	9.137	2.872	.060
	Within Groups	493.068	155	3.181		
	Total	511.342	157			
CMTLYLT	Between Groups	16.013	2	8.006	2.454	.089
	Within Groups	508.893	156	3.262		
	Total	524.906	158			
CMTGLTY	Between Groups	8.704	2	4.352	1.073	.345
	Within Groups	632.957	156	4.057		
	Total	641.660	158			
CMTCAREER	Between Groups	22.308	2	11.154	3.377	.037
	Within Groups	515.202	156	3.303		
	Total	537.509	158			
CMTCRTSC	Between Groups	14.652	2	7.326	2.563	.080
	Within Groups	445.952	156	2.859		
	Total	460.604	158			
CMTPRIN	Between Groups	14.937	2	7.468	2.035	.134
	Within Groups	572.547	156	3.670		
	Total	587.484	158			
CMTCOWR	Between Groups	.339	2	.170	.073	.929
	Within Groups	359.059	155	2.317		
	Total	359.399	157			
CMTMON	Between Groups	15.314	2	7.657	2.637	.075
	Within Groups	452.950	156	2.904		
	Total	468.264	158			
CMTBEN	Between Groups	.507	2	.254	.087	.916
	Within Groups	452.411	156	2.900		
	Total	452.918	158			
CMTRESP	Between Groups	11.011	2	5.506	1.940	.147

ANOVA FOR COMMITMENT

	Within Groups	442.699	156	2.838		
	Total	453.711	158			
CMTFREE	Between Groups	5.666	2	2.833	.768	.466
	Within Groups	575.290	156	3.688		
	Total	580.956	158			

APPENDIX N TUKEY HSD FOR COMMITMENT

Multiple Comparisons

Tukey HSD

Dependent Variable	(I) BORNYRS A= 1923 - 1943; B=1944-1960; C=1961-1980; D=1981 or later	(J) BORNYRS A= 1923 - 1943; B=1944-1960; C=1961-1980; D=1981 or later	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound
CMT LV	B	C	-.170	.340	.872	-.97	.64
		D	-.681	.517	.388	-1.90	.54
	C	B	.170	.340	.872	-.64	.97
		D	-.511	.466	.518	-1.61	.59
	D	B	.681	.517	.388	-.54	1.90
		C	.511	.466	.518	-.59	1.61
CMT OWE	B	C	.425	.332	.407	-.36	1.21
		D	.608	.503	.449	-.58	1.80
	C	B	-.425	.332	.407	-1.21	.36
		D	.183	.454	.914	-.89	1.26
	D	B	-.608	.503	.449	-1.80	.58
		C	-.183	.454	.914	-1.26	.89
CMT NOLV	B	C	.219	.336	.792	-.58	1.01
		D	1.188	.508	.054	-.01	2.39
	C	B	-.219	.336	.792	-1.01	.58
		D	.969	.456	.088	-.11	2.05
	D	B	-1.188	.508	.054	-2.39	.01
		C	-.969	.456	.088	-2.05	.11
CMTLYLT	B	C	.288	.337	.671	-.51	1.09
		D	1.131	.513	.073	-.08	2.34
	C	B	-.288	.337	.671	-1.09	.51
		D	.843	.462	.165	-.25	1.94
	D	B	-1.131	.513	.073	-2.34	.08
		C	-.843	.462	.165	-1.94	.25
CMTGLTY	B	C	.184	.376	.877	-.71	1.07
		D	.828	.572	.319	-.53	2.18
	C	B	-.184	.376	.877	-1.07	.71
		D	.644	.515	.426	-.58	1.86

TUKEY HSD FOR COMMITMENT

	D	B	-.828	.572	.319	-2.18	.53
		C	-.644	.515	.426	-1.86	.58
CMTCAREER	B	C	.508	.340	.296	-.30	1.31
		D	1.331*	.516	.029	.11	2.55
	C	B	-.508	.340	.296	-1.31	.30
		D	.823	.465	.183	-.28	1.92
	D	B	-1.331*	.516	.029	-2.55	-.11
		C	-.823	.465	.183	-1.92	.28
CMTCRTSC	B	C	.414	.316	.392	-.33	1.16
		D	1.078	.480	.067	-.06	2.21
	C	B	-.414	.316	.392	-1.16	.33
		D	.664	.433	.278	-.36	1.69
	D	B	-1.078	.480	.067	-2.21	.06
		C	-.664	.433	.278	-1.69	.36
CMTPRIN	B	C	.276	.358	.720	-.57	1.12
		D	1.092	.544	.114	-.19	2.38
	C	B	-.276	.358	.720	-1.12	.57
		D	.815	.490	.223	-.34	1.97
	D	B	-1.092	.544	.114	-2.38	.19
		C	-.815	.490	.223	-1.97	.34
CMTCOWR	B	C	.085	.285	.952	-.59	.76
		D	-.031	.432	.997	-1.05	.99
	C	B	-.085	.285	.952	-.76	.59
		D	-.116	.390	.953	-1.04	.81
	D	B	.031	.432	.997	-.99	1.05
		C	.116	.390	.953	-.81	1.04
CMTMON	B	C	-.651	.318	.105	-1.40	.10
		D	-.911	.484	.147	-2.06	.23
	C	B	.651	.318	.105	-.10	1.40
		D	-.260	.436	.823	-1.29	.77
	D	B	.911	.484	.147	-.23	2.06
		C	.260	.436	.823	-.77	1.29
CMTBEN	B	C	-.129	.318	.913	-.88	.62
		D	-.136	.483	.957	-1.28	1.01
	C	B	.129	.318	.913	-.62	.88

TUKEY HSD FOR COMMITMENT

		D	-.007	.436	1.000	-1.04	1.02
	D	B	.136	.483	.957	-1.01	1.28
		C	.007	.436	1.000	-1.02	1.04
CMTRESP	B	C	-.175	.315	.843	-.92	.57
		D	-.922	.478	.134	-2.05	.21
	C	B	.175	.315	.843	-.57	.92
		D	-.747	.431	.196	-1.77	.27
	D	B	.922	.478	.134	-.21	2.05
		C	.747	.431	.196	-.27	1.77
CMTFREE	B	C	.006	.359	1.000	-.84	.85
		D	-.592	.545	.524	-1.88	.70
	C	B	-.006	.359	1.000	-.85	.84
		D	-.597	.491	.446	-1.76	.57
	D	B	.592	.545	.524	-.70	1.88
		C	.597	.491	.446	-.57	1.76

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

APPENDIX O SHAPIRO-WILK TEST OF NORMALITY FOR MOTIVATION

Tests of Normality

	BORNYRS A= 1923 - 1943; B=1944-1960; C=1961-1980; D=1981 or later	Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a]			Shapiro-Wilk		
		Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
MTVCHAL	B	.192	40	.001	.917	40	.006
	C	.180	99	.000	.929	99	.000
	D	.327	18	.000	.777	18	.001
MTVHGHLV	B	.163	40	.009	.888	40	.001
	C	.191	99	.000	.895	99	.000
	D	.230	18	.013	.939	18	.282
MTVSPK	B	.257	40	.000	.728	40	.000
	C	.233	99	.000	.797	99	.000
	D	.313	18	.000	.766	18	.001
MTVASSI	B	.251	40	.000	.740	40	.000
	C	.254	99	.000	.857	99	.000
	D	.222	18	.019	.860	18	.012
MTVTEAM	B	.324	40	.000	.705	40	.000
	C	.264	99	.000	.799	99	.000
	D	.312	18	.000	.789	18	.001
MTVSCH	B	.236	40	.000	.815	40	.000
	C	.253	99	.000	.865	99	.000
	D	.214	18	.028	.858	18	.012
MTVDECI	B	.233	40	.000	.756	40	.000
	C	.227	99	.000	.858	99	.000
	D	.194	18	.071	.872	18	.019
MTVEMP	B	.332	40	.000	.752	40	.000
	C	.243	99	.000	.791	99	.000
	D	.199	18	.058	.879	18	.025
MTVRECO	B	.216	40	.000	.813	40	.000
	C	.201	99	.000	.857	99	.000
	D	.283	18	.001	.846	18	.007
MTVVAL	B	.220	40	.000	.842	40	.000
	C	.183	99	.000	.910	99	.000
	D	.230	18	.013	.896	18	.050

SHAPIRO-WILK TEST OF NORMALITY FOR MOTIVATION

MTVFREE	B	.202	40	.000	.797	40	.000
	C	.182	99	.000	.876	99	.000
	D	.202	18	.051	.886	18	.033
MTVCOMM	B	.218	40	.000	.810	40	.000
	C	.235	99	.000	.871	99	.000
	D	.364	18	.000	.771	18	.001
MTVINST	B	.177	40	.003	.874	40	.000
	C	.172	99	.000	.912	99	.000
	D	.227	18	.015	.892	18	.042

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

APPENDIX P LEVENE'S TEST OF HOMOGENEITY OF VARIANCES FOR MOTIVATION

Test of Homogeneity of Variances

	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
MTVCHAL	2.425	2	156	.092
MTVHGHLV	2.522	2	156	.084
MTVSPK	.525	2	156	.593
MTVASSI	1.901	2	156	.153
MTVTEAM	3.627	2	155	.029
MTVSCH	3.582	2	156	.030
MTVDECI	1.421	2	156	.244
MTVEMP	.233	2	156	.792
MTVRECO	2.103	2	156	.126
MTVVAL	3.141	2	156	.046
MTVFREE	3.253	2	156	.041
MTVCOMM	5.641	2	155	.004
MTVINST	2.416	2	156	.093

APPENDIX Q ANOVA FOR MOTIVATION

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
MTVCHAL	Between Groups	2.323	2	1.161	.493	.612
	Within Groups	367.425	156	2.355		
	Total	369.748	158			
MTVHGHLV	Between Groups	4.821	2	2.410	.757	.471
	Within Groups	496.852	156	3.185		
	Total	501.673	158			
MTVSPK	Between Groups	.373	2	.187	.115	.891
	Within Groups	252.117	156	1.616		
	Total	252.491	158			
MTVASSI	Between Groups	1.951	2	.976	.570	.567
	Within Groups	266.954	156	1.711		
	Total	268.906	158			
MTVTEAM	Between Groups	3.009	2	1.505	.940	.393
	Within Groups	248.079	155	1.601		
	Total	251.089	157			
MTVSCH	Between Groups	.637	2	.318	.168	.846
	Within Groups	296.206	156	1.899		
	Total	296.843	158			

MTVDECI	Between Groups	.294	2	.147	.084	.919
	Within Groups	271.982	156	1.743		
	Total	272.277	158			
MTVEMP	Between Groups	4.535	2	2.268	2.213	.113
	Within Groups	159.855	156	1.025		
	Total	164.390	158			
MTVRECO	Between Groups	2.604	2	1.302	.653	.522
	Within Groups	311.107	156	1.994		
	Total	313.711	158			
MTVVAL	Between Groups	12.713	2	6.356	1.830	.164
	Within Groups	541.715	156	3.473		
	Total	554.428	158			
MTVFREE	Between Groups	.257	2	.129	.064	.938
	Within Groups	315.302	156	2.021		
	Total	315.560	158			
MTVCOMM	Between Groups	2.716	2	1.358	.749	.474
	Within Groups	280.954	155	1.813		
	Total	283.671	157			
MTVINST	Between Groups	3.326	2	1.663	.542	.582
	Within Groups	478.234	156	3.066		
	Total	481.560	158			

APPENDIX R SHAPIRO-WILK TEST OF NORMALITY FOR VAM SCORES

Tests of Normality

	BORNYRS A= 1923 - 1943; B=1944-1960; C=1961-1980; D=1981 or later	Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a]			Shapiro-Wilk		
		Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
2012 TAV	B	.169	40	.005	.946	40	.055
Regardless of	C	.203	101	.000	.579	101	.000
Business Rules	D	.237	18	.009	.903	18	.066

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

APPENDIX S MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR VAM SCORES

Descriptives

2012 TAV Regardless of Business Rules

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Minimum	Maximum
B	40	.0544	.2032	.0321	-.0105	.1194	-.3947	.6447
C	101	.0276	.4600	.0458	-.0632	.1184	-3.7168	1.0579
D	18	.0015	.1110	.0262	-.0537	.0568	-.1546	.2716
Total	159	.0314	.3817	.0303	-.0284	.0912	-3.7168	1.0579

REFERENCES

Adler, J. (2005). The boomer files. *Newsweek*. Retrieved on March 27, 2011 from http://www.agewave.com/media_files/newsweek111405.html

Akpinar, S., Bayansalduz, M., & Toros, T. (2012). The study on job satisfaction levels of secondary education teachers in respect of some variables. *International Journal of Academic Research,* 4(1), 134-138.

Arnsparger, A. (2008). 4GenR8tns: Succeeding with colleagues, cohorts, & customers. *Generations at Work*. Retrieved on March 28, 2011 from http://www.generationsatwork.com/articles_succeeding.php

Amabile, T. & Kramer, S. (2011). The progress principle. Using small wins to ignite joy, engagement, and creativity at work. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Publishing.

American Institutes for Research. (2011). *Florida value-added model technical report.* Manuscript in preparation. Retrieved on September 21, 2011 from http://www.fldoe.org/committees/sg.asp

Anari, N.N. (2012). Teachers: Emotional intelligence, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. *Journal of Workplace Learning,* 24(4), 256-269.

Arsenault, P.M. (2004). Validating generational differences: A legitimate diversity and leadership issue. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal,* 25(2), 124-141.

Bal, P.M., & Visser, M. S. (2011). When are teachers motivated to work beyond retirement age? The importance of support, change or work role and money. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership.* doi: 10.1177/1741143211408448

Barth, R. (2006). Improving relationships within the schoolhouse. *Educational Leadership.* Retrieved on September 6, 2012 from http://www.state.tn.us/education/cte/ad/rubric/doc/improvingrelationships.pdf

Becker, T. E., & Billings, R. (1993). Profiles of commitment: An empirical test. *Journal of Organizational Behavior,* 14, 177-190.

Becker, T.E., Billings, R. S., Eveleth, D.M., & Gilbert, N.L. (1996) Foci and bases of employee commitment: Implications for job performance. *Academy of Management Journal,* 39(2), 464-482.

Bhagat, R.S. & Chassie, M.B. (1981). Determinants of organizational commitment in working women: Some implications for organizational integration. *Journal of Occupational Behavior,* 2, 17-39.

Brevard County (Florida) Administrative Procedures. (2005). *3420E:Annual sick leave buy back.* Retrieved from http://www.neola.com/brevardco-fl/

Briskin, A. (1996). Fear and learning in the workplace. *Journal for Quality and Participation, 19* (7), 28-34.

Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2011). Household data annual averages. Retrieved on July 13, 2012 from http://www.bls.gov/cps/spsaat1

Call them generation y or millennials: They deserve our attention. (2004, August). *Merrill Associates.* Retrieved March 26, 2011, from http://www.merrillassociates.com/topic/2005/05/call-them-gen-y-or-millennials-they-deserve-our-attention/.

Carlisle, S. (2011). *Examining the thoughts and actions of Harry Potter through the lens of Erik Erikson's psychological stages*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses (PQDT). (UMI No. 3447100)

Cellillie, K.L. (2003). *Job satisfaction of baby boomer and generation x nurses: A descriptive study.* (Master's thesis). Retrieved on March 22, 2012 from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses (PQDT). (UMI No. 1416630)

Center for Generational Studies. (2009). Retrieved on October 26, 2012 from http://www.generationaldiversity.com/faq.html

Chambers, S.K. (2010). *Job satisfaction among elementary school teachers.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved October 29, 2012 from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses (PQDT). (UMI No. 3403216)

Chester, E. (2002). *Employing generation why?.* Colorado: Tucker House Books.

Daboval, J.M. (1998). *A comparison between Baby Boomer and Generation X employees' bases and foci of commitment.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved July 11, 2011 from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses (PQDT). (UMI No. 9823312)

Davis, D. & Clifton, A. (1995). *The epigenetic psychosexual stages.* Retrieved from http://www.haverford.edu/psych/ddavis/p109g/erikson.stages.html

Duijnhouwer, H., Prins, F. J., & Stokking, K. M. (2011). Feedback providing improvement strategies and reflection on feedback use: Effects on students' writing motivation, process, and performance. *Learning and Instruction.* 22(3), 171-184.

Dunkel, C.S. & Sefcek, J. A. (2009). Eriksonian lifespan theory and life history theory: An integration using the example of identity formation. *Review of General Psychology,* 13 (1), 13-23. doi. 10.1037/a0013687

Edmunds, J., & Turner, B. (2002). *Generations, culture, and society*. Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Elliott, S. (2009). *Ties to tattoos. Turning generational differences into a competitive advantage*. Dallas, TX: Brown Books Publishing Group.

Espinoza, C., Ukleja, M., & Rusch, C. (2010). *Managing the millennials: Discover the core competencies for managing today's workforce.* Hoboken, New Jersey. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Florida Department of Education, (2011). *Florida's common language of instruction* (DOE Form No. EQEVAL-2012-4). Retrieved on September 21, 2012 from http://benefits.brevard.k12.fl.us/HR/comp/pas/ilpas%20gt/CommonLanguage.pdf

Fullan, M. (2002). The change leader. *Educational Leadership.* 59(8), 16-21. Retrieved January 31, 2011 from EBSCOhost.

Ghazi, S.R., & Maringe, F. (2011). Age, gender and job satisfaction among elementary school head teachers in Pakistan. *Education, Knowledge and Economy,* 5(1,2), 17-27.

Glass, A. (2007). Understanding generational differences for competitive success. *Industrial and Commercial Training,* 39, 98-103.

Hammond, S.M.B. (1982). *A study of the relationship between use of sick and personal leave and selected factors for teachers in the public schools of Petersburg, Virginia.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses (PQDT). (UMI No. 303234804)

Harris, P. (2005). Boomer vs. echo boomer: The work war? *ASCD*. Retrieved on June 27, 2011 from http://www.skillsoft.com/infocenter/documents/Boomer_vs_Echo_Boomer.pdf

Heinzman, J., Jr. (2004). *The relationship of age, tenure and job satisfaction to organizational commitment: A study of two mid-western firms.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved on October 31, 2012 from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses (PQDT). (UMI No. 3144702)

Herzberg, F. (1987). One more time: How do you motivate employees? *Harvard Business Review,* 65, 109-120.

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. (1959). *The motivation to work*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Hewlett, S., Sherbin, L., & Sumberg, K. (2009). How gen y & boomers will reshape your agenda. *Harvard Business Review*, July/August, 71- 76. Retrieved on March 28, 2011from EBSCOhost.

Himmelberg, M. (2007). Generation Y floods the workplace. Get ready for generation y: impatient, with a purpose. *Orange County Register.*

Hoppock, R. (1935). *Job satisfaction.* New York: Harper.

Hrebiniak, L.G. & Alutto, J.A. (1972). Personal and role-related factors in the development of organizational commitment. *Administrative Science Quarterly,* 17, 555-572. Retrieved October 26, 2012 from http://www.jstor.org/stable/2393833

Janiszewski, R.D. (2004). *Motivational factors that influence Baby Boomers versus Generation X: Independent insurance agents.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved October 31, 2012 from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses (PQDT). (UMI No. 3146573)

Katzell, R., & Thompson, D. (1990). Work motivation. *American Psychologist, 45,* 144-153.

Koenigsknecht, S.K. (2002). *A comparison of the motivational factors of Baby Boomer and Generation X employees.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved on July 11, 2011 from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses (PQDT). (UMI No. 3045944)

Kupperschmidt, B. R. (2000). Multi-generational employees: strategies for effective management. *Health Care Manager*, 19(1), 65 – 76.

Lancaster, L. (2004). *When generations collide: How to solve the generational puzzle at work.* Paper presented at The Management Forum Series.

Lancaster, L. (2010). Meeting millennials teachers on their own high-tech turf. *The School Administrator*, 6, 14-15. Retrieved on March 27, 2011from http://www.aasa.org/SchoolAdministratorArticle.aspx?id=11036.

Lancaster, L. C. & Stillman, D. (2005). *When generations collide: Who they are. why they clash. how to solve the generational puzzle at work*. New York: Harper Paperbacks.

Leave programs in the public sector. (2005). *Employee Benefit Research Institute.* Retrieved from http://www.ebri.org/pdf/publications/books/fundamentals/2009/47_Leave_PUB-SCT_Funds-2009_EBRI.pdf

Locke, E. A. (1969). What is job satisfaction? *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 4*, 309 – 336. doi: 10.1016/0030-5073(69)90013-0

Love, K. (2005). *Generational impacts on organizational commitment: An examination of the Baby Boom Generation and Generation X at work.* (Master's thesis). Retrieved on October 31, 2012 from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses (PQDT) (UMI No. 1034618791)

Lovely, S. (2005). Creating synergy in the schoolhouse. *The School Administrator*, 6(8). Retrieved on March 27, 2011from EBSCOhost.

Lovely, S. (2010). Generations at school: Building an age-friendly workplace. *The School Administrator*, 67 (1), 10-16. Retrieved on March 27, 2011from http://www.aasa.org/SchoolAdministratorArticle.aspx?id=11138.

Lund, A. & Lund, M. (2012). One-way ANOVA in SPSS. Laerd Statistics Premium. Retrieved on December 9, 2012 from https://statistics.laerd.com/premium/one-way-anova-in-spss.php

Macleod, D. (2005). Karl Mannheim on sociology of generational cohorts. Retrieved on November 19, 2011 from http://www.postkiwi.com/2005/karl-mannheim-on-generational-cohorts/.

Mannheim, K. (1952). The problem of generations. Retrieved on July 2, 2011 from http://learningspaces.org/n/files/mannheim.pdf

McGuiness, S. V. (1999). *The effect of generation group identification on organizational commitment: A study of Baby Boomers and Generation X.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved on October 26, 2012 from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses (PQDT). (UMI No. 9950753)

McMaken, M. V. (2001). *The relationship between Erikson's developmental tasks and children identified as at-risk.* (Master's thesis) Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 1402718)

Miller, E. J. (2006). *The effect of rewards, commitment, organizational climate and work values on intentions to leave: Is there a difference among generations?* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved on October 31, 2012 from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses (PQDT) (UMI No. 3249953)

Mitchell, T. R. (1978). *People in organizations, understanding their behavior.* New York: McGraw-Hill Inc.

Moody, A. (2007). *Examining and exploring generational differences by understanding commitment, employee satisfaction, and motivation. (*Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved on June 19, 2011from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses (PQDT). (UMI No. 3298966)

Move over mom & dad – We're not like you! (2004, August). *Merrill Associates.* Retrieved March 26, 2011, from http://www.merrillassociates.com/topic/2003/03/move-over-mom-dad-we-re-not-you/.

Mueller, C.W., & McCloskey, J.C. (1990). Nurses' job satisfaction: A proposed measure. *Nursing Research*, 39 (2), 113-117.

Mullen, P. (1993). Employee monetary systems: The past or future in employee motivation. *Industrial Management,* 35(6), 1-5. Retrieved January 19, 2012 from http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_hb3081/is_n6_v35/ai_n28632510/

National Center for Education Statistics. (1997). *Job satisfaction among America's teachers: Effects of workplace conditions, background characteristics, and teacher compensation.* Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement, US Department of Education.

O'Donovan, E. (2009). Managing generational diversity. *District Administration.* Retrieved from EBSCO Host.

Overview of Brevard's 2012 instructional personnel performance appraisal system. (2012). Retrieved on November 2, 2012 from http://benefits.brevard.k12.fl.us/HR/comp/pas/ipinfo/2012_Evaluation_System_Overview_10.31.12.pdf

Owens, R.G., & Valesky, T.C. (2007). *Organizational behavior in education: Adaptive leadership and school reform* (9th ed.). Boston: Pearson.

Parry, E., & Urwin, P. (2010). Generational differences in work values: A review of theory and evidence. *International Journal of Management Review*, 13, 79-96. doi: 10.1111.j.1468-2370.2010.00285.x

Pink, D.H. (2009) *Drive: The surprising truth about what motivates us.* New York, NY: Penguin Group (USA), Inc.

Sprague, C. (2008). The silent generation meets generation Y: How to manage a four generation workforce with panache. *Human Capital Institute*. Retrieved on March 26, 2011 from EBSCOhost.

SPSS Corporation. (2010). Statistical package for social sciences (Version 17) [Computer Software]. Chicago, IL: Author.

Stauffer, D. (2003). Motivating across generations. *Harvard Management Update, 8*(3), 3-6.

Steers, R.M. (1977). Antecedents and outcomes of organizational commitment. *Administrative Science Quarterly,* 22, 46-56. Retrieved on October 26, 2012 from http://www.jstor.org/stable/3000166

Strauss, W. (2005). Talking about their generations: Making sense of a school environment made up of gen-Xers and millenials. *The School Administrator*, 62. Retrieved on March 27, 2011 from http://www.aasa.org/SchoolAdministratorArticle.aspx?id=7816.

Strauss, W., & Howe, N. (1991). *Generations – The history of America's future 1584 – 2069*. New York: William Morrow.

Strauss, W., & Howe, N. (1997). *The fourth turning: What the cycles of history tell us about America's next rendezvous with destiny.* New York: Broadway Books.

Strauss, W., & Howe, N. (2006). *Millennials and the pop culture.* LifeCourse Resources.

Swearingen, S. (2004). *Nursing leadership characteristics: Effect of job satisfaction and retention of Baby Boomer and Generation X nurses.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved on October 31, 2012 from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses (PQDT). (UMI No. 3163629)

Terpstra, D. E. (1983, April). *Theories of motivation – borrowing the best.* Paper presented at the Fifth Industrial Energy Conservation Technology Conference. Houston, TX.

Toossi, M. (2005). Labor force projections to 2014: retiring boomers. *Monthly Labor Review* November 2005. Retrieved October 26, 2012 from http://www.cse.sc.edu/~buell/References/BureauLaborStatistics/art3full2014.pdf

U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2010). *Women in the labor force: A databook.* Retrieved on September 13, 2012 from http://www.bls.gov/cps/wlf-intro-2011.pdf

Western Electric Company. (2007). *Western Electric Company Hawthorne Studies Collection.* Baker Library, Harvard Business School. Retrieved on November 10, 2012 from http://oasis.lib.harvard.edu/oasis/deliver/~bak00047

Zemke, R., Raines, C., & Filipczak, B. (2000). *Generations at work: Managing the clash of Veterans, Boomers, Xers, and Nexters in your workplace.* New York: AMACOM.