

THE IMPACT OF INTRINSIC AND EXTRINSIC MOTIVATION ON JOB CHOICE IN GENERATION Y

April London, Siena College

ABSTRACT

The goal of the present study was to continue research on job choice, specifically in Generation Y. Using a 2 x 2 experimental design of type of reward and the term in which the reward is received, 140 undergraduate students from Generation Y were surveyed. The present study examined main interactions and interactive effects of the type of reward that was being offered (extrinsic vs. intrinsic) and the term that the reward would be received (short term vs. long term) on acceptance, satisfaction, organizational commitment, and intent to stay. Results of multivariate and univariate analyses indicated that the type of reward had a main effect on satisfaction, organizational commitment, and intent to stay, while the term only had a main effect on intent to stay. Results did not support a main effect of type or term on acceptance. Implications of these findings are discussed.

INTRODUCTION

Looking for a job is always a challenging and time consuming process, especially right out of college. Finding the right job is even more difficult. The process of looking for a job has been studied numerous times and is described as “job choice.” A potential employee can spend days searching the Internet, going to job fairs, and networking to see what positions are available. Once that person finds a job they may be interested in, they evaluate what the organization is offering. The process of finding a job is long and can stressful. Therefore, the individual will want to make sure they fit their criteria with a job that mirrors their needs.

As future employees are attempting to find the right fit, organizations want to find and hire the best and the brightest talent they can find to fill any vacancies. If an organization can successfully adapt their job characteristics to cater to people looking for jobs, they will have a much better chance of finding the best-fit candidate. Once a business has filled a position, they will also want to be sure that the employee enjoys working with the organization. Doing so will allow for a low employee turnover rate, which is important considering the costs of hiring a new employee. According to recent research, the cost of recruiting, hiring, and training one new employee can be over \$4,000 (Praefder). This doesn't include any indirect costs such as missed business because of the vacant position. With these high costs associated with filling a vacant position, it is vital that an individual is not only hired, but that they intend to stay with the organization for some time.

Graduating seniors are the next group of employees that businesses will be looking to hire. These graduates are members of Generation Y. Generation Y are a new and unique group that is more educated and technology savvy than any previous generation. With the help of the Internet and numerous search engines this group will be able to search online for jobs that have the characteristics they desire. The organizations that are able to cater directly to the needs of this generation will be able to recruit the top applicants of the graduating seniors.

Some past research has sought to determine the individual characteristics that are influential to job choice but little research has been conducted for the graduates of Generation Y. While characteristics that ranked high in the past such as a more flexible schedule, relaxed working conditions and high salaries may still be attractive, research has not proven that Generation Y will continue these trends. Each passing generation has reported changes in work values. Businesses cannot assume that the same values that were true for the Baby Boomers or Generation X will hold true for graduates of this generation.

Many studies have been conducted on job choice. However, there has not been much recent research on how an individual will react to job specifications or characteristics. Specifically, research has not explored what

determines the types of characteristics of a job are most attractive to these soon-to-be college graduates of Generation Y. This knowledge would be valuable to recruiters who are trying to market their job openings. If recruiters know what characteristics of the job are most attractive to Generation Y, organizations could revise their marketing strategy to gear it specifically to this group. Meanwhile, the students searching to begin their careers will have a better chance of finding exactly what they are looking for in their first job. In seeking to find what initially attracts Generation Y, managers may also wish to know what motivates Gen Y to be satisfied, committed, and willing to stay with the organization. High levels of these three indicators may produce a lower turnover rate, which will prevent high turnover costs in the future.

The current study will seek to find what job characteristics members of Generation Y are looking to find. In doing so we will divide these job characteristics into two types of factors, intrinsic and extrinsic. The factors will then be tested to see if Generation Y prefers more intrinsic rewards or extrinsic rewards. The current study will then test how satisfaction, commitment, and intent to stay changes with the different rewards. The current study will also seek to find how the term that the rewards are received affects the job choice of Generation Y.

It is critical for companies to identify what students are looking for in their entry level jobs. With this study, hopefully recruiters will know what aspects to advertise to catch the attention of the best and brightest students. Also the current study may help companies organize their jobs specifically to administer to the wants and needs of their new future employees. With a cost of around \$4,000 to recruit just one new employee, it will be very advantageous to get it right the first time.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Generation Y and Job Choice

Over the past two decades recruiting top applicants has become increasingly difficult. Learning how to attract the best applicants is critical for recruiters in today's world (Chapman, Uggerslev, Carroll, Piasentin, and Jones 2005). The key is not just to attract the best applicants, but also to be able to retain them. The average cost of recruiting, hiring, and training a new recruit is around \$4,000 (Praefder). These high costs make it is vital that the turnover rate remains low. The question then becomes, what attracts these top applicants that will also motivate them to stay with the organization in the long term?

Each new wave of graduates has expected different things from their careers. These graduates can be grouped according to their generation. A generation is defined as set of individuals that share birth years, age location, and similar significant life events at critical development stages (Smola and Sutton 2002). Each group shares historical or social experiences that distinguish their generation from the rest as well as sharing common beliefs and behaviors (Smola and Sutton 2002, Lindquist 2008). The generations that are relevant in today's work world are the Baby Boomers, Generation X, and Generation Y. These generations each have its own history and attributes that makes them a unique group.

The Baby Boomers were born between 1945 and 1964 (Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Company). They grew up with a sense of entitlement and expected the best from life. Some key events that they were effected by are the Vietnam War, the civil rights movement, the Kennedy and King assassinations, and the sexual revolution (Smola and Sutton 2002). Traditional values and material success made a comeback during this generation (Smola and Sutton 2002). They are passionate about their careers and work hard enough to have created the 60-hour work week (Lindquist 2008). Baby Boomers were such a large generation that they were happy to secure any job and worked long hours to keep them (Kadlec, 2007). There was little concern for whether the job was a good fit with the individual (Kadlec, 2007). Baby Boomers did not mind working long hours. Some never planned to retire (Lowe, Levitt, Wilson, 2008). This generation did not require things to move at a fast pace. Instead they paid their dues and climbed the corporate ladder at their own pace (Lowe, Levitt, Wilson, 2008).

Generation X (Gen X) individuals were born between 1965 and 1978 and are known for their self-reliance, informality and practicality (Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Company). Their younger years were filled with financial, family, and societal insecurity along with rapid change and a lack of solid traditions (Smola and Sutton 2002). Growing up in homes where the norm was having both parents working, they tend to be more individually minded rather than collective (Smola and Sutton 2002). This generation is considered very skeptical and had a

reduced sense of workplace loyalty while also distrusting authority (Roberts, 2005). Differing from many of the Baby Boomers, this generation became well educated and technologically savvy. They were also more entrepreneurial in nature (Roberts, 2005). Generation X differs from the Baby Boomers in job characteristic choices. Generation X is smaller, and has never known job scarcity, so they are able to hold out until they find a job they like. They desire more money, but also want to separate their careers from their personal lives (Kadlec 2007). Generation X also differs from the Baby Boomers because of the speed that they want things to get done. While Baby Boomers were satisfied with taking their time to climb the corporate ladder, Generation X wants to find ways to get things done fast, possibly even by bending the rules a bit (Lowe, Levitt, Wilson, 2008).

Generation Y (Gen Y) individuals were born between 1979-2001 (Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Company). They are just now beginning to enter the workplace. This generation is the first generation to be wired 24 hours a day with cell phones and the Internet (Smola and Sutton 2002) and is the most well educated of the generations (Roberts, 2005). It is thought that because Gen X-ers craved higher salaries and desired to be more financially sound, Generation Y will want even more (Smola and Sutton 2002). Gen Y was brought up on self-esteem building and personal autonomy. They also tend to be more optimistic, idealists, multi-skilled risk takers, have respect for authority, and a more global outlook (Roberts, 2005). Generation Y-ers also dislike micromanagement and slowness (Lowe, Levitt, Wilson, 2008).

These differences in generations, causes a gap in what the Baby Boomers and Generation X previously desired in a job and what Generation Y will now desire. Specifically, studies that have been conducted in the past may not be relevant to the new wave of college graduates headed out into the job world. A few studies have been conducted that have tried to determine what is important to Generation Y. One study conducted by Smola and Sutton (2002) looked at the difference in work values for Generation X and Y. The study was conducted across the country, including over 350 individuals. The subjects were asked to complete a survey exploring three main issues: (1) if the generational differences in work values among today's employees are different from previous generations (2) if the work values of today's workers are different from those in 1974 and (3) if the work values remain constant or change as workers get older.

The results of this study found that there are different values among today's employees and past workers. The first major difference is that younger workers had a strong desire to be promoted more quickly. Another interesting difference is that younger employees would be more willing to quit their job immediately if they inherited a lot of money. This means that they want immediate results. The study concluded that the newer generations care less about the company and are more "me" oriented. It showed that the new generations want fast results. They are not willing to sit around and wait for rewards or results to come to them. Generation Y wants to get what they want from work and then move to focus more on their private life. In short, they think more in the short term than in the long term.

Another study conducted by Blancero, DelCampo, and Marron (2008) wanted to find the characteristics, work styles, strengths, and weaknesses of Generation Y. Specifically, this study looked at the differences in the total Generation Y population and Hispanic Generation Y-ers. The sample consisted of 272 Hispanic Generation Y-ers and 1713 Hispanics in total. The results of this study sought to outline Generation Y so that recruiters would better understand them. Results suggest that the work style of this generation is very fast paced. They found that Generation Y seeks quick and frequent feedback. Technology savvy, this generation is used to being constantly connected and able to get quick responses. They also desire and expect to see progress in their careers quickly. This can be attributed for a need for "instant gratification," which means that they want something and they want it now.

Generation Y differs from the previous generations of Baby Boomers or Generation X. Generation Y wants results fast. They want to be promoted quickly, have almost instantaneous feedback, and have a strong desire for "instant gratification." As a result of this previous research, the present study presents the following hypothesis:

H1: A job is more likely to be accepted by individuals of Generation Y if the attributes will be received in the short term rather than the long term.

Extrinsic Motivation

Being motivated can be defined as being moved to do something (Deci and Ryan, 2000). A motivated individual is someone who is inspired and energized to move towards an end (Deci and Ryan 2000). Countless

theories have been developed to explain motivation. One popular theory of motivation, developed by Deci and Ryan, suggests two separate potential motivators: intrinsic and extrinsic. This section focuses on extrinsic factors while the next section will focus on intrinsic factors.

Extrinsic motivation can be defined as doing something because it leads to a separable outcome (Deci and Ryan 2000). That means that outside encouragement or rewards are earned from performing a task rather than actual enjoyment of the task. Relating to job evaluation, extrinsic motivation, especially money and pay rewards, are a very important motivator to make decisions on whether to join an organization (Rynes, Gerhart, and Minette 2004).

Money and pay are not the only extrinsic awards an employee may receive from a job, although, according to past research, salary is one of the most important factors in a person's decision to accept or reject a job offer (Rynes, Gerhart, and Minette 2004, Judge and Bretz 1992). Some say that job security, type of work, advancement opportunity, company characteristics, and pay are just a few of these that are weighed in any decision (Jurgensen 1978, Judge and Bretz 1992). Judge and Bretz (1992) also found that promotion opportunities are one of the most important job attributes leading to a job choice decision. In a study conducted 30 years ago, the top three factors in a job were benefits, hours, and pay. Even though benefits and hours ranked higher, there seemed to be a rise in importance of pay (Jurgensen 1978). In a more recent study, extrinsic rewards have been defined as pay, stock options, bonuses, gain sharing, promotions and benefits (Cummings and Worley 2007).

In 2008 a study was conducted to determine how to recruit Generation Y. This study reported on a survey conducted by a recruiting and job placement firm Robert Half International Inc. and Yahoo! HotJobs. It surveyed 1,007 21-28 year olds from Generation Y. According to the results, the top criteria for accepting jobs were salary, benefits, and potential for advancement. This may be because one of Generation Y's main concerns is saving enough money for retirement since Social Security is rumored to be obsolete by the time that generation is able to take advantage of it. Therefore, Generation Y has had it drummed in their heads by parents that Generation Y is going to have to take care of themselves later in life. Another important factor that Generation Y wished to have in a job was bonuses for achieving a high performance rate. One executive that was interviewed said that another reason Gen-Yers want more money is because of skyrocketing health care costs. (Randolph, 2008).

After reviewing the findings of previous research, the present study decided to use pay, bonuses such as monetary bonuses or stock options, and opportunity for advancement as the primary extrinsic factors. Salary and other monetary rewards have been in the top factors of job choice in every study that was reviewed. Similarly, opportunity for advancement was also found as a primary factor linked to job choice. These extrinsic factors have been top contenders in job choice decisions in previous research. Therefore, the present study believes that these extrinsic factors are very influential in the job choice process and may have the most impact on a job decision.

Existence, Relatedness, Growth. Rising costs may not be the only reason new college graduates will want more money or other extrinsic factors. This could also be linked to Alderfer's existence, relatedness, and growth (ERG) theory. This theory began as a study to explore human needs and the desires and satisfactions that people experience (Alderfer 1972). Alderfer was heavily influenced by Maslow's (1954) hierarchy of needs and ERG theory is presented as an alternative. Existence, relatedness, and growth are primary needs that an organism seeks to fulfill. Contrary to Maslow, where a person must fulfill lower needs first, in ERG theory a person can exist in any one of these three stages of need at any one time. The three stages can be defined as follows.

Existence needs can be described as material and physiological desires. This includes items such as food and shelter. It also includes pay, benefits, and physical working conditions. A defining characteristic of existence needs is that they can be divided. When resources are limited, if one person receives more, another will receive less. For instance, if a budget permits only a certain amount of money, one person's bonus eliminates the possibility for extra money for others (Alderfer 1972). Being college students, one might assume that many of these needs, especially money, may not be met. This may be attributed to factors such as debt from student loans or a simple lack of resources because of being unemployed full time.

Relatedness needs suggest the relationships with significant others that individuals maintain. These others may include family, friends, superiors, coworkers, subordinates, and enemies. A basic characteristic is that satisfaction depends on a process of sharing or mutuality (Alderfer 1972). Students in college may have more

opportunity to become fulfilled in relatedness needs. This may be because of frequent interactions with roommates, in clubs, or in class. It may also be linked to belonging to a group, whether that is a specific class or a group of friends.

Growth needs are defined by making creative or productive effects on himself or on the environment. Fulfilling growth needs may include a person utilizing their knowledge or to grow in what they currently know. Satisfaction depends on a person finding ways to be what they are fully and becoming what he/she can be (Alderfer 1972). The subjects of this study are college students who daily find themselves challenged to grow and learn more. They also utilize their knowledge to perform tasks such as homework. Therefore, growth needs may already be met by college seniors.

What can be taken from Alderfer's Existence, Relatedness, Growth theory is that when any one of these needs is unfulfilled, it will be desired. Generation Y college students lack existence needs because while attending college they are spending their money on tuition and living costs, causing most to be in debt. College can provide comradely while also providing an environment for a student to grow.

Pay, bonuses, and promotion have been found in previous research as top factors in job choice. These extrinsic factors are believed by the present study to be the most critical factors in a job decision. Students are also believed to be in the stage of existence, which would make extrinsic factors even more attractive. As a result of previous research of extrinsic motivation and existence, relatedness, growth theory, the present study presents the following hypothesis:

H2: Jobs with positive extrinsic factors and negative intrinsic factors will have a higher acceptance rate than those with negative extrinsic factors and positive intrinsic factors.

Intrinsic Motivation

Intrinsic motivation refers to doing something because the task itself is interesting or enjoyable (Deci and Ryan 2000). To further that explanation, intrinsic motivation is based on the need for competence and self-determination (Deci and Ryan 1985). Although intrinsic motivation is not a primary drive, it energizes behavior and is vital to human function (Deci and Ryan 1985). In past research, intrinsic motivation has been tested using the "free choice" measure where participants in the study are asked to perform a task, then later given "free choice time." Deci (1971) then measured how much time was spent returning to complete the task when no outside reward was offered. In Deci's study, he found that those with only intrinsic motivation worked on the task longer in their "free choice" time than those that had also been given extrinsic motivation. In a job setting, an intrinsically motivated job would be described as a job that is enjoyed for the job itself (Deci 1971, Deci and Ryan 1985, Deci and Ryan 2000). Therefore, the first factor used in the current study to describe an intrinsically motivated job opportunity is if the person enjoyed the job they are asked to accept.

One important study relating to intrinsic and extrinsic motivation is the study "Effects of Externally Mediated Rewards on Intrinsic Motivation" by Edward L. Deci (1971) who is a pioneer in intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. This study was conducted with two laboratory experiments and one field experiment to determine the effects of external rewards on intrinsic motivation. The hypothesis of this experiment was that if someone was engaged in an activity for intrinsic reasons and was then offered external rewards such as money, then the intrinsic motivation would decrease.

In the study, students were asked to use puzzle pieces to produce different configurations. During each session, the experimenter would leave the room for eight minutes where the subjects could work on whatever they chose. The subject's intrinsic motivation was determined by how much of this "free time" was used to work on the puzzle. The results of this first experiment concluded that an extrinsic reward of pay increased motivation while it was available. Once it was taken away, intrinsic motivation decreased dramatically. The control group's intrinsic motivation increased throughout the experiment.

The second study mimicked the first, but was used in the real setting of a biweekly college newspaper. Subjects were asked to make newspaper headlines. The experimental group was given money for each headline but only for three weeks. The experimental group began underperforming when compared with the control group as soon as they began to be paid. In this experiment, Deci found that when money is introduced as a motivator,

subjects lose intrinsic motivation. Money causes subjects to reevaluate the activity. It is used to “buy off” a subject’s intrinsic motivation for an activity. It is seen as a controlling factor. Furthermore, once extrinsic factors are removed, instead of returning to being intrinsically motivated, the same behavior that was exhibited when extrinsic factors were present persisted. The control group that only had the option of being intrinsically motivated used more “free choice” time to work on the puzzle. The control group also wrote more headlines than those that were offered extrinsic factors as a motivator. Deci (1971) found that the lowering of “free choice” time spent on the puzzle and writing fewer headlines than the control group may have been because offering money in return for performance lowered their intrinsic motivation.

Job Characteristics Model. Relating to job opportunities, intrinsic motivation can be applied to determine how much a person enjoys doing their job. Hackman and Oldham (1980) came up with five key dimensions that must be present in order to make a job enriching and fulfilling. They are autonomy, skill variety, task identity, task significance, and feedback about results. These five core job dimensions can lead to three psychological states. These states are the individual must feel responsibility for the outcomes of the job, the job must be meaningful and matter to others, and the individual must have feedback. Two of these, meaningfulness and autonomy are relevant to the current research.

Hackman and Oldham (1975) have grouped skill variety, task identity, and task significance as leading to the critical psychological state of experienced meaningfulness of the job. This is defined as the degree that an employee sees the job as being meaningful, valuable, and worthwhile (Hackman and Oldham 1975). These factors are very important to how employees view their job. It also has a direct impact on the intrinsic motivation of the individual. Because of this link to intrinsic motivation, the current study uses meaningfulness of the job is the first factor used to distinguish a job as intrinsically motivated.

Autonomy is described as the degree to which a person feels they have freedom and can use their discretion to schedule the work and decide how to complete it (Hackman and Oldham 1980). Deci and Ryan (2000) have also developed a theory called Cognitive Evaluation Theory (CET) which specifies that an individual will not enhance intrinsic motivation unless it is accompanied by a sense of autonomy. With autonomy being such a pivotal factor in whether an individual is intrinsically motivated from both the job characteristics standpoint and Deci and Ryan’s theory of CET, the current study felt that it should be included in the research. Therefore, this factor is the second aspect used to describe a job as intrinsically motivated.

These intrinsic factors can be combined in an overall measure of job enrichment. When people find that their jobs are more enriching, they are internally motivated and satisfied (Cummings and Worley 2007). Intrinsic factors give a person an internal perceived locus of causality, which means that they are in charge of their own actions and behavior (Deci and Ryan 2000). This, combined with a sense of autonomy (Deci and Ryan 2000), will make a job more attractive and satisfying.

O’Reilly and Caldwell conducted another study in 1980. It looked at the impact of intrinsic and extrinsic factors on satisfaction and commitment. This study was conducted with 171 graduates of an MBA program who answered a questionnaire prior to graduation. After graduation, these subjects went to work at whatever job they had accepted. Six months later 101 subjects returned to answer a questionnaire on their satisfaction and commitment to their current jobs. The findings of this study concluded that intrinsic factors tend to lead to higher attitudinal commitment. It also found that extrinsic justifications for behavior and as a factor in job choice may have decreased commitment and job satisfaction.

Another study conducted by Lowe, Levitt, and Wilson (2008) examined the challenges facing employers today to retain Generation Y in the workplace. Generation Yers want to be part of an innovative and active organization. They are also much more likely to intend to leave if they are dissatisfied with the organization. Generation Y would also rather have a flat hierarchy and prefer to be coached instead of told what to do by the “boss” while also having freedom and flexibility.

The study looked mainly at how to retain Generation Y since they seem to switch jobs much more than previous generations. The first way that they recommended building this organizational commitment is to give Gen Yers challenging and meaningful work that they can take ownership of. Gen Yers would also like to have flexibility in their work in order for them to do the job their own way. This sense of autonomy gives them the feeling that they provide a valuable contribution and they are also very engaged (Lowe, Levitt, and Wilson, 2008).

This study found that the factors of autonomy, meaningfulness, and enjoying the job in itself may cause a Generation Y member to be more likely to intend to stay with the organization while also increasing their organizational commitment and satisfaction.

Previous studies performed by Deci and Ryan have found that intrinsic motivation makes an individual much more likely to be motivated and perform well as opposed to those that were extrinsically motivated. Other research conducted by Hackman and Oldham outlined the factors of a job that will cause an individual to be intrinsically motivated. More recent research has found that intrinsic factors may increase satisfaction, organizational commitment, and satisfaction. As a result of the previous research conducted on intrinsic motivation, the present study presents the following hypothesis:

H3a: Jobs that have positive intrinsic factors and negative extrinsic factors will have a higher level of satisfaction than jobs with negative intrinsic factors and positive extrinsic factors.

H3b: Jobs that have positive intrinsic factors and negative extrinsic factors will have a higher level of organizational commitment than jobs with negative intrinsic factors and positive extrinsic factors.

H3c: Jobs that have positive intrinsic factors and negative extrinsic factors will have a higher level of intent to stay than jobs with negative intrinsic factors and positive extrinsic factors.

METHOD

Pilot Testing

An initial pilot test was conducted to investigate the responses of participants in the study. A sample of 11 undergraduate students from Siena College was used. Respondents were asked to read the scenario they were given, take the survey, and share their feedback. Three manipulation checks were used to determine if the hypothetical job offers were conveying the proper information. These checks asked if the offer had positive intrinsic factors, positive extrinsic factors, and if the rewards were given in the short term or long term. Based on the feedback and results of the manipulation checks, changes were made to improve the survey.

Sampling and Data Collection

The goal of this study was to gather data from Generation Y students at Siena College, a college located in upstate New York. Generation Y students who are going to be entering the work force in the next year or two were the primary targets of this study. Most surveys were administered in a classroom setting of upper level business, computer science, or psychology classes. There were no incentives offered for participating and participation was completely voluntary. Participants were given a survey with one of four job scenarios. They were then asked to assume they were being offered this job. Respondents were first asked how likely they were to accept the job offer they had been given. After the initial acceptance question, they were then asked to then assume they had accepted the job and answer the questions based on their perceptions of it. This survey can be seen in Appendix 1.

The scenarios are described as follows:

Scenario #1. “Extrinsic short term” offered positive extrinsic benefits and negative intrinsic benefits immediately. For the extrinsic factors the subject was presented with: “The job you are offered gives you a higher starting salary than you expected. The company is known for giving sizable bonuses every year. In the short term you should expect to receive a promotion.” For the intrinsic factors the subject was presented with: “This job is something you do not particularly enjoy doing. Your boss must have the final say in how you perform your tasks. Your job will not have any impact in the lives of others.”

Scenario #2. “Extrinsic long term” offered positive extrinsic benefits after a long period of time and negative intrinsic benefits. For the extrinsic factors the subject was presented with: “The job you are offered has a lower starting salary than expected but in the long term there will be opportunities for rapid salary increases. Your job offers stock options as a significant benefit but it will take effect in the long term. You will most likely be in this job at your current position for the short term, but in the long term there will be opportunities for promotion.” For

the intrinsic factors the subject was presented with: “This job is something you do not particularly enjoy doing. Your boss must have the final say in how you perform your tasks. Your job will not have any impact in the lives of others.”

Scenario #3. “Intrinsic short term” offered positive intrinsic benefits and negative extrinsic benefits immediately. In the intrinsic factors the subject was presented with: “You enjoy performing the work your job entails. You are given the freedom to complete the tasks as you see fit. This job has an immediate impact in the short term on the lives of others.” For the extrinsic factors the subject was presented with: “The job you are offered gives you a lower starting salary than you expected. Raises and bonuses are given, but not regularly. Most likely, you will not receive a promotion in the future.”

Scenario #4. “Intrinsic long term” offered positive intrinsic benefits after a longer period of time and negative extrinsic benefits. For the intrinsic factors the subject was presented with: “You enjoy doing this job, but in the long term you will be given the opportunity to do something in this job that you truly love doing. Currently, you must answer to a manager, but in the long term you will be your own boss and can complete the job’s tasks the way you see fit. This job will have an impact on the lives of others in the long term.” For the extrinsic factors the subject was presented with: “The job you are offered gives you a lower starting salary than you expected. Raises and bonuses are given, but not regularly. Most likely, you will not receive a promotion in the future.”

For each of these four different hypothetical job offers there were two versions. In version A, the positive benefits were listed in the first paragraph followed by the negative factors in the second paragraph. In version B, the negative factors were listed in the first paragraph and the positive benefits were listed in the second paragraph. This counterbalancing was conducted to ensure that the reader did not respond based on whether the positive or negative factors came first.

Participants

140 individuals responded to the survey. The following characteristics applied to the 140 participants: 42% are male and 58% are female; the average age for participants is 21; 87% are Caucasian, 4% are Asian or Asian American, 1.4 are African American, and 4% are Hispanic American; the average GPA was between 3.1 and 3.5; 19% are the first in their family to attend college; 75% have worked 0-2 years, 15% have worked 3-5 years, 6% have worked 6-8 years, and 2% have worked 9 or more years; 49% believed they will receive 0-2 job offers, 43% believed they will receive 3-5 job offers, 3% believe they will receive 6-9 job offers; 14% are in the school of Science, 72% in Business, and 14% in Liberal Arts.

Measures. The survey had three different sections. These sections included: (a) their personal reaction to the scenario they had been given and how it impacted their likelihood to accept the job, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and intent to stay with the organization, (b) how significant each of the factors used in the job scenario are including salary, interest in the job, personal significance in the company, personal power in the company, bonuses, and advancement opportunity, and (c) their current living condition as defined by the measures of existence, relatedness, and growth.

Acceptance. Acceptance was measured using a single item, five-point Likert-type scale (1= very unlikely, 5= very likely). The item stated “How likely are you to accept this job?”

Job Satisfaction. Job satisfaction was measured using a five item, five-point Likert-type scale (1= strongly disagree, 5= strongly agree). Items included “Generally speaking, I am very satisfied with my job” and “I frequently think of quitting my job” and resulted in a coefficient alpha estimate of reliability of .65.

Organizational Commitment. Organizational commitment was measured using a 15 item, five-point Likert-type scale (1= strongly disagree, 5= strongly agree). Items included “I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this organization be successful” and “I talk up this organization to my friends as a great place to work” and resulted in a coefficient alpha estimate of reliability of .77.

Intent To Stay. Intent to stay was measured using a five item, five-point Likert-type scale (1= strongly disagree, 5= strongly agree). Items included “I intend to stay with this organization” and “I am currently looking for another job outside of this organization” and resulted in a coefficient alpha estimate of reliability of .89.

Significance of Salary. The significance of salary was measured using a single item, five-point Likert-like scale (1= not important, 5= very important). The item stated “Rate these factors from very important to not important: Salary”.

Significance of Interest in the Job. The significance of interest in the job was measured using a single item, five-point Likert-like scale (1= not important, 5= very important). The item stated “Rate these factors from very important to not important: Interest in the Job”.

Significance of Personal Significance. The significance of personal significance was measured using a single item, five-point Likert-like scale (1= not important, 5= very important). The item stated “Rate these factors from very important to not important: Personal Significance”.

Significance of Personal Power. The significance of personal power was measured using a single item, five-point Likert-like scale (1= not important, 5= very important). The item stated “Rate these factors from very important to not important: Personal Power”.

Significance of Bonuses. The significance of bonuses was measured using a one item, five-point Likert-like scale (1= not important, 5= very important). The item stated “Rate these factors from very important to not important: Bonuses”.

Significance of Advancement Opportunity. The significance of advancement opportunity was measured using a one item, five-point Likert-like scale (1= not important, 5= very important). The item stated “Rate these factors from very important to not important: Advancement Opportunity”.

Existence. Existence was measured using a five item, five-point Likert-type scale (1= strongly disagree, 5= strongly agree). These items were based on the description given of existence needs (Alderfer 1972). Responses were based on if the needs of existence were met (1= needs are being met, 5= needs are met). Items included “I’m worried my budget won’t cover what I need to buy” and “I always have enough money to cover all of my expenses” and resulted in a coefficient alpha estimate of reliability of .75.

Relatedness. Relatedness was measured using a five item, five-point Likert-type scale (1= strongly disagree, 5= strongly agree). These items were based on the description given of relatedness needs (Alderfer 1972). Responses were based on if the needs of existence were met (1= needs are being met, 5= needs are met). Items included “I am usually accepted by others” and “People are influenced by my opinions” and resulted in a coefficient alpha estimate of reliability of .61.

Growth. Growth was measured using a five item, five-point Likert-type scale (1= strongly disagree, 5= strongly agree). These items were based on the description given of growth needs (Alderfer 1972). Responses were based on if the needs of growth were met (1= needs are being met, 5= needs are met). Items included “I like to learn new things” and “Volunteering in the community is not something I like to do” and resulted in a coefficient alpha estimate of reliability of .35.

Manipulation Check

At the end of the survey, respondents were asked to answer three questions based on their hypothetical job description. These questions tested if the subjects identified key factors in their description that might cause them to react as the study hypothesized. The first question was “Did the job scenario you read above provide good salary and benefits?” This question was trying to see if the respondent saw it as having positive extrinsic factors. The second question “Did the job scenario you read above provide a satisfying work environment where you could engage in meaningful work” saw if the scenario had positive intrinsic factors. The third question “Did the job scenario you read above focus on short term or long term benefits” made sure the respondent measured the positive results happened in the right time period.

Analysis

A 2x2 multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used to test Hypotheses 1-3 because of the correlation between the dependent measures. The MANOVA was then followed up using an analysis of variance for each of the three measured outcomes (i.e. job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and intent to stay).

RESULTS

Manipulation Checks

Manipulation checks were analyzed according to the scenario that was given. 84% of respondents rightly identified that “Extrinsic Short Term” had positive extrinsic factors and 87% believed the rewards were given in the short term. “Extrinsic Long Term” respondents rightly identified that the results were negative for intrinsic factors and 81% believed that rewards were given in the long term. 90% of respondents of the “Intrinsic Short Term” scenario answered correctly that the extrinsic factors were negative and 80% answered that the rewards were received in the short term. “Intrinsic Long Term” respondents correctly identified the scenario as being intrinsic 75% of the time and rewards given in the long term 67% of the time.

Effects of Scenarios

The MANOVA showed main effects of both type of reward (extrinsic verses intrinsic), multivariate $F(4, 133) = 34.341, p < .05$, and term (short term verses long term), multivariate $F(4, 133) = 2.965, p < .05$. This test did not find statistically significant evidence of an interaction between the two variables.

The counterbalancing of the surveys showed no difference in the MANOVA or ANOVA data analysis. Therefore, the counterbalancing did not produce an affect on the data.

Analysis of Variance for Type of Reward and Term of Reward

Source	Acceptance						Job Satisfaction						Organizational Commitment						Intent to Stay					
	SS	df	MS	F	p		SS	df	MS	F	p		SS	df	MS	F	p		SS	df	MS	F	p	
Type (R)	1.26	1	1.26	1.57	0.21		26.19	1	26.19	117.07	0.00		4.28	1	4.28	16.66	0.00		3.42	1	3.42	4.66	0.03	
Term (T)	0.49	1	0.49	0.61	0.44		0.08	1	0.08	0.35	0.56		0.35	1	0.35	1.44	0.23		6.96	1	6.96	9.49	0.00	
R x T	5.21	1	5.21	6.46	0.01		0.00	1	0.00	0.01	0.92		0.35	1	0.35	1.36	0.25		1.23	1	1.23	1.68	0.20	
Corrected	7.00	3	2.33	2.90	0.04		26.22	3	1.65	39.07	0.00		4.94	3	1.65	6.40	0.00		11.55	3	3.85	5.25	0.00	
Error	109.65	136	0.81				30.42	136	0.22				34.95	136	0.26				99.69	136	0.73			
Total	1419.00	140					1311.84	140					1148.72	140					985.24	140				

Acceptance. A 2x2 ANOVA was used to assess the effects of type of reward (extrinsic vs. intrinsic) and term (short term vs. long term) on acceptance. The summary of this analysis can be found on Table 1. As seen on Table 1, there is no support that there is a main effect of the type of reward on acceptance, $F(1, 133) = 1.565, p > .05$. Table 1 also shows that there is no support that there is a main effect between the term of the rewards on acceptance, $F(1,133) = .612, p > .05$. The analysis of the data does not support Hypothesis 1 or Hypothesis 2.

Job Satisfaction. A 2x2 ANOVA was used to assess the effects of type of reward (extrinsic vs. intrinsic) and term (short term vs. long term) on job satisfaction. The summary of this analysis can be found on Table 1 and the relevant means can be found on Table 2. A main effect was found for extrinsic vs. intrinsic, $F(1, 133) = 117.067, p < .05$. On average, job satisfaction was viewed as higher if the rewards were intrinsic ($M = 3.409$) than extrinsic ($M = 2.543$). The findings of this analysis support Hypothesis 3a.

Organizational Commitment. A 2x2 ANOVA was used to assess the effects of type of reward (extrinsic vs. intrinsic) and term (short term vs. long term) on organizational commitment. The summary of this analysis can be found on Table 1 and the relevant means can be found on Table 2. A main effect was found for extrinsic vs. intrinsic, $F(1, 133) = 16.662, p < .05$. On average, organizational commitment was viewed as higher if the rewards were intrinsic ($M = 2.984$) than extrinsic ($M = 2.634$). The findings of this analysis support Hypothesis 3b.

Intent to Stay. A 2x2 ANOVA was used to assess the effects of type of reward (extrinsic vs. intrinsic) and term (short term vs. long term) on organizational commitment. The summary of this analysis can be found on Table 1 and the relevant means can be found on Table 2. A main effect was found for extrinsic vs. intrinsic, $F(1, 133) = 4.659, p < .05$. On average, intent to stay was higher if the rewards were intrinsic ($M = 2.654$) than extrinsic ($M = 2.341$). The findings of this analysis support Hypothesis 3c.

TABLE 2

Descriptive Statistics for Type of Reward and Term of Reward

Condition	Acceptance			Satisfaction			Organizational Commitment			Intent to Stay		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD
Type of Reward												
Extrinsic	33	2.96	0.11	33	2.54	0.06	33	2.63	0.06	33	2.34	0.11
Intrinsic	34	3.15	0.11	34	3.41	0.06	34	2.98	0.06	34	2.65	0.10
Term of Reward												
Short Term	38	2.99	0.11	38	2.95	0.06	38	2.76	0.06	38	2.27	0.10
Long Term	35	3.11	0.11	35	3.00	0.06	35	2.86	0.06	35	2.72	0.10

TABLE 3

Means, Standard Deviations, Covariances and Correlations

Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	
1. Acceptance		3.05	0.08		0.303**	0.317**	0.339**	0.09	0.08
2. Job Satisfaction		2.98	0.04		0.65	0.541**	0.481**	.675**	0.02
3. Organizational Commitment		2.81	0.43			0.77	.700**	.323**	0.09
4. Intent to Stay		2.50	0.72				0.89	.164**	.247**
5. Type (R)									-0.05
6. Term (T)									
	**p < .05								

DISCUSSION

Several other studies have looked at what individuals may be looking for when it comes to job choice (Jurgensen 1978, Judge and Bretz 1992). These studies had found that some of the top job characteristics were pay, job security, type of work, advancement opportunity, and benefits. Though research had sought to determine the top job choice characteristics, job choice factors have never been split into intrinsic and extrinsic factors to determine which has a greater impact on the future employee's acceptance decision. They had also never divided the time frame in which the rewards are received. Because of these gaps, the present study sought to determine what impact dividing job choice characteristics into type of reward and the impact of the term these rewards were received in.

The present study found that type of reward (intrinsic or extrinsic) and the term in which the rewards were received (short term vs. long term) may not have an effect on acceptance decisions in Generation Y's future

employees. However, the subjects were asked to make these decisions based on hypothetical job characteristics descriptions. It is unclear how this may impact real-life job choice decisions.

The current study also sought the reactions of respondents to the job choice scenarios if they had accepted the offer. Previous studies have supported that motivation and satisfaction will increase when intrinsically motivating factors are introduced (Deci 1971, Hackman and Oldham 1980). The current study tested the responses to satisfaction, organizational commitment, and intent to stay with the organization. The current study found that not only the type of motivation used (intrinsic vs. extrinsic) but also the time period (short term vs. long term) could predict the reaction of the respondent in these three categories.

The present study adds to previous research on intrinsic and extrinsic motivation and how they may impact employees. Results showed that those respondents that received intrinsic rewards reported higher levels of satisfaction, organizational commitment, and intent to stay with the organization. Although other studies have measured the affects of pay and how it impacts intrinsic motivation, no study has specifically split the job choice characteristics into two different reward sets and measured them against one another. One possible explanation may be that in a real world situation no job is as black and white as the scenarios used in the present study. However, while managers must include both intrinsic and extrinsic rewards in their job characteristics, it may be worthwhile to integrate as many intrinsic features as possible. While this was the most important finding of the current study, another interesting discovery was found.

The present study also revealed that no matter what the reward, if it is received in the long term intent to stay increases. This means that when a respondent has to wait in order to receive their full rewards, it is more likely that they will stay at their job until they are acquired. This could be important for future employers to be aware of when hiring Generation Y. If you give them a goal to work towards, they are more likely to stay in order to receive the benefits of their hard work.

Although the current study returned some interesting findings, we believe that additional research is needed. The study only dealt with scenarios that clearly outlined which type of reward was being offered. It did not deal with the real world situation of mixed rewards and how those rewards may effect satisfaction, organizational commitment, or intent to stay. Future research may want to perform similar studies that test real world job scenarios and how they affect acceptance. Satisfaction, organizational commitment, and intent to stay should be tested as well against these real world scenarios.

Practical Implications

One interesting find of this study is that no matter the differences in job characteristics, the likeliness to accept the job is unaffected. There could be many causes of this outcome. One possible explanation could be the economy in which graduating college seniors are entering. In earlier years, graduates might have had numerous job offers. Today's seniors may possibly be entering one of the worst economies in the past decade. The unemployment rate is on the rise. While Generation Y is trying to start their careers, they will be competing against older generations who have recently been let go and already have years of experience. This being said, Generation Y may be more likely to accept any job that they are offered, no matter what the characteristics.

These findings may be of interest to both recruiters and managers who can use these results to shape their job specifications as they see fit. Although some members of Generation Y may look for high salaries, they may also wish to have some intrinsic factors to keep them motivated. Since the findings of the current study suggest that a job either type of reward has the same probability of being accepted, a business may benefit from having moderate extrinsic rewards and capitalize on intrinsic rewards. Intrinsic rewards do not have a cost associated with them but may produce higher motivation. Managers may want to ensure a higher level of satisfaction, organizational commitment, and intent to stay by modeling their job characteristics to include intrinsic motivation such as autonomy, meaningfulness, or even just a love for the job in itself.

Limitations

Additional research is needed to develop confidence in the validity of the present study's findings. One validity concern may be the use of a single Northeastern undergraduate college. This college's sample may not

extend to the greater population of Generation Y students who will soon be entering the workforce. This sample consisted of 87% Caucasian students. Over half of the students will have under \$30,000 in debt when they graduate college. This sample has very little diversity compared to the diversity of most college undergraduate students. Siena students are also primarily from the Northeast, causing a bias due to geographical location.

Another possible validity concern could be attributed to the survey itself. The responses were based on a hypothetical job characteristics description. If the students would have been reviewing job characteristics descriptions for actual job offer, they may have reacted differently. For the current study, the respondents were also asked to assume they had accepted the job, and then answer questions based on the description. These reactions were how satisfied they would be with the job, how committed they would feel to the organization, and if they intended to stay. Since these reactions were based solely on what they envisioned their response to be, they may not have produced the same effects. For the existence, relatedness, and growth section, the questions were based on the description of the theory and had not been previously tested. This may have caused the low coefficient alpha estimate of reliability for these items.

Conclusions

In summary, the present study makes contributions to the literature on extrinsic and intrinsic motivation, the span of time in which the reward is acquired, Generation Y, and job choice. The present study has found evidence that there is a main effect between the type of reward (extrinsic vs. intrinsic) and satisfaction, organizational commitment, and intent to stay. The results supported the claim that positive intrinsic rewards will have a higher degree of all three of these dependant factors. This further adds to the evidence that intrinsic factors will make an employee more motivated in his or her job. While reviewing effects, a main effect was also found between intent to stay and the time span in which the reward is acquired. If the reward will be received in the long term, the respondent has a higher measure of intent to stay.

Although hypothesis 3 was supported, the evidence did not support Hypothesis 1 or 2 of the present study. There was no statistical difference in acceptance of the job if the rewards were received in the short term verses the long term. This did not agree with Hypothesis 1 which stated that the acceptance rate would be higher for Generation Y if the rewards were received in the short term. There was also the evidence did not support that the respondent would have a higher acceptance rate if the scenario had positive extrinsic rewards and negative intrinsic rewards verses negative extrinsic rewards and positive intrinsic rewards.

There are practical implications of this study. First, when presenting graduating college seniors of Generation Y with a job offer, every job has the same likeliness to be accepted. The job offer could have extrinsic or intrinsic rewards that are received in the short term or the long term, but none of these options has a significant effect on the likeliness of acceptance. However, once the job is accepted, attitudes about the job are significantly different. If an organization not only wants to find the best students, but also wants to have a low turnover rate, they should shape their job characteristics to have positive intrinsic motivators. If the rewards are received in the long term, Generation Y intends to stay with the current organization even longer. Recruiters and managers in an organization should be aware of these findings so that they can best attract and retain Generation Y.

APPENDIX

Appendix 1

Introduction

This experiment will explore the factors that motivate college graduates to accept a first job. You will be given a hypothetical job description and asked to answer a few questions based on your perceptions of this job. This survey is part of a study I am performing to write my undergraduate thesis, which greatly depends on the results I obtain.

Your responses are completely anonymous and will be used purely for academic purposes. Should you wish at any time to stop the survey you are free to do so. This should take no more than 10 minutes and is voluntary. Your participation is greatly appreciated. Thank you!

6. I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this organization be successful	
7. I talk up this organization to my friends as a great place to work	
8. I feel very little loyalty to this organization	
9. I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working for this organization	
10. I find that my values and the organization's values are very similar	
11. I am proud to tell others that I am a part of this organization	
12. I could just as well be working for a different organization as long as the type of work were similar	
13. This organization really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance	
14. It would take very little change in my present circumstances to cause me to leave this organization	
15. I am extremely glad that I chose this organization to work for over others I was considering at the time I joined	
16. There is not too much to be gained by sticking with this organization indefinitely	
17. Often, I find it difficult to agree with this organization's policies on important matters related to employees	
18. I really care about the fate of this organization	
19. For me, this is the best of all possible organizations for which to work	
20. Deciding to work for this organization was a definite mistake on my part	

21. I intend to stay with this organization	
22. I am currently looking for another job outside of this organization	
23. I intend to leave this organization as soon as I can	
24. I am always looking for different jobs outside of this organization	
25. I am going to continue to work for this organization for a long time	

26. How important is it that you: (circle)

- a. Take personal satisfaction in your job
- b. Become financially sound through your job

27. Think about what you are looking for in a full time job after you graduate from college. Rate these factors from very important to not important :

	Not Important	1	2	3	4	Very Important	5
Salary		1	2	3	4		5
Interest in the job		1	2	3	4		5
Personal significance in the company		1	2	3	4		5

Personal power in the company	1	2	3	4	5
Bonuses	1	2	3	4	5
Advancement opportunity	1	2	3	4	5

The following questions should be answered based on how you feel about your current life situation. The scenario you have been given should not have an impact on how you answer these questions. Place the number in the appropriate box:

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree

1. I'm worried my budget won't cover what I need to buy	
2. I always have enough money to cover all of my expenses	
3. I wish my home were more comfortable	
4. I worry about being covered by insurance once I graduate	
5. Money is not a problem for me	

1. I am usually accepted by others	
2. People are influenced by my opinions	
3. I am not comfortable sharing my thoughts and feelings with others	
4. People understand me as a person	
5. I usually feel distanced from people	

1. I like to learn new things	
2. Volunteering in the community is not something I like to do	
3. I search to find where I can be of help	
4. I enjoy using what I know to solve problems	
5. I wish I was more useful	

Demographics:

Please tell us about yourself by answering the following questions.

1. What is your age(circle)? 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 or over
2. Gender(circle) Male Female
3. Race
 _____ Caucasian _____ African American
 _____ Asian or Asian American _____ Hispanic American
 _____ Native American Indian _____ Other
4. What is your GPA? Below 2.0 2.0-2.5 2.6-3.0 3.1-3.5 3.6-4.0
5. Are you the first person in your family to go to college? Yes No
6. What is your estimated debt after college?
 \$0-14,999 \$15,000-29,999 \$30,000-44,999 \$45,000-59,999 \$60,000-74,999 above \$75,000
7. What percentage of your tuition will you personally pay for?
 0-25 % 26-50% 51-75% 76-100%
8. How many years have you worked full-time? 0 -2 3 -5 6 -8 9 or more
9. How many job offers do you believe you will receive? 0-2 3-5 6-9 10 or more
10. What school are you in? _____Science _____Business _____Liberal Arts
11. Did the job scenario you read above provide good salary and benefits? [yes/no]
12. Did the job scenario you read above provide a satisfying work environment where you could engage in meaningful work? [yes/no]
13. Did the job scenario you read above focus on short term or long term benefits [short term/long term]

REFERENCES

Alderfer, C.P. (1972). *Existence, Relatedness, and Growth*. New York, NY: The Free Press.

Blancero, D. M., DelCampo, R. G., & Marron, G. F. (2008). Ready or Not: Hispanic Millennials Are Here. *The Business Journal of Hispanic Research*, 2, 50-60.

- Chapman, D. S., Uggerslev, K. L., Carroll, S. A., Piasentin, K. A., & Jones, D. A. (2005). Applicant Attraction to Organizations and Job Choice: A Meta-Analytic Review of the Correlates of Recruiting Outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90 (5), Retrieved May 9, 2008, from <http://ovidsp.tx.ovid.com>.
- Cummings, T. G., & Worley, C. G. (2007). *Essentials of Organizational Development and Change*. Mason, Ohio: Cengage Learning.
- Deci, E. L. *Intrinsic motivation*. New York: PlenumPress, 1975.
- Deci, E. L. (1971). Effects of Externally Mediated Rewards on Intrinsic Motivation . *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 18, No. 1, Retrieved February 2, 2009, from <http://scholar.google.com>
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic Motivation and Self-determination in Human Behavior*. New York: Plenum.
- Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1975). Development of the Job Diagnostic Survey. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 60 No. 2, 159-170.
- Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1980). *Work redesign*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Lindquist, T. M. (Aug 2008). Recruiting the New Millennium Generation: The New CPA. *The CPA Journal*, Vol. 78, Iss. 8, Retrieved January 29, 2009, from <http://scholar.google.com>
- Judge, T. A., & Bretz, R. D. (June 1992). Effects of Work Values on Job Choice Decisions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77 (3), Retrieved May 9, 2008, from <http://ovidsp.tx.ovid.com/>.
- Jurgensen, C. E. (1978). Job Preference (What Makes a Job Good or Bad?). *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 63, No. 3, Retrieved January 28, 2009, from <http://scholar.google.com>
- Kadlec, D (Nov, 2007). Don't Trust Anyone Under Thirty. *Money*, 36, Retrieved May 5, 2008, from <http://www.proquest.com>
- Lowe, D., Levitt, K. J., & Wilson, T Solutions for Retaining Generation Y Employees in the Workplace. *Business Renaissance Quarterly*, Fall 2008, Retrieved February 5, 2009, from <http://scholar.google.com>.
- Maslow, A. (1954). *Motivation and Personality*. New York, NY: Harper.
- Northwestern Mutual Financial Network. *Millennium Generation Studies* [Brochure]. Milwaukee, WI:
- O'Reilly, C. A., & Caldwell, D. F. (1980). *Job Choice: The Impact of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Factors on Subsequent Satisfaction and Commitment*. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 65, 559-565.
- Prafder, E. W. Hiring Your First Employee. *Entrepreneur.com*, Retrieved February 18, 2009, from www.entrepreneur.com
- Randolph, N (April 7, 2008). Recruiting Generation Y. *San Diego Business Journal*, 29, Retrieved May 9, 2008, from <http://www.proquest.com>
- Roberts, W. (April/May 2005). APY Project- the IPWEA strategy for attracting young people to public works engineering. *IPWEA National*, Retrieved February 2, 2009, from <http://www.ipwea.org.au>
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivations: Classic Definitions and New Directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25, Retrieved May 9, 2008, from <http://idealibrary.com>.

Rynes, S. L., Gerhart, B. A., & Bretz, R. D. The Importance of Recruitment in Job Choice: A Different Way of Looking. *CAHRS Working Paper Series*, Retrieved January 26, 2009, from <http://digitalcommons.ilr.cornell.edu/cahrswp/389>.

Rynes, S. L., Gerhart, B., & Minette, K. A. The Importance of Pay in Employee Motivation: Discrepancies Between What People Say and What They Do. *Human Resource Management, Winter 2004, Vol. 43, No. 4*, Retrieved February 6, 2009, from www.interscience.wiley.com.

Smola, K. W., & Sutton, C. D. (2002). *Generational Differences: Revisiting Generational Work Values for the New Millennium*. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23, Retrieved August 23, 2008, from <http://www.jstor.org>.