

Analysis of Followership Styles of Millennials Employed in Private and Public Secondary Institutions

Vincent Paola A. Torres

The Graduate School, University of Santo Tomas, España 1008 Manila and Dalubhasaan ng Lungsod ng Lucena, 4301 Lucena City, Philippines

Received 08-09-2024

Revised 09-09-2024

Accepted 13-10-2024

Published 15-10-2024



Copyright: ©2024 The Authors. Published by Publisher. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

Abstract:

The improvement of work quality through good employee – employer relationships has been the focus of many business and public administration studies. Significant disciplines such as behavioral and social sciences have been fascinated by the changing stereotypical characteristics of different generations and how they predict the future of work in business and government service. With the millennial generation entering workforce in great numbers, there is no doubt that a new wave of workers and leaders will influence the world in the years to come. The study utilized a descriptive method using the one-way analysis of variance and t-test. The theory of Robert Kelley on Followership and the work principles of the respondents were used to analyze the responses. The 140 respondents, are predominantly female college graduates. They worked in private institutions in less than three years. Results showed significant relationships between educational attainment and tenure with the Active Engagement Scores (AES) of millennials. This suggests that millennials are engaged and contributing members of their organization when they gain tenure. Therefore, the findings highlighted a response for a better understanding of millennials' active engagement to produce a competent and efficient workforce.

Keywords: Followership, Millennial, Private and Public Secondary Institution, Independent Thinking, Active Engagement

1. Introduction

The millennial generation, born between 1984 and 1996, are now starting to enter the workforce in great numbers (Andelius, 2014). Without a question that a new wave of workers and leaders will continue to influence the workplace for many years to come. Millennials take a significant share in decisions of national interest as they become leaders and officials in their chosen fields. With this and the anticipated replacement of "baby

boomers," there is a need for understanding the millennials' working principles and views. According to the survey done by Deloitte (2015), millennials will make up 75% or more of the global workforce in little more than ten years. From the given data alone, understanding this generation plays a significant role in advancing and developing the work environment and the critical decisions that affect the organization.

Andelius (2014) enumerated the following attributes commonly associated with the millennials: (1) interested in leadership positions and expect to advance rapidly in their careers, (2) they resist hard work, (3) care about personal development and work-life balance than traditional trappings of success, such as money and status, (4) arriving to the workforce during more challenging economic conditions, (5) believe government has significant influence in today's society, and (6) rely on friends and family for input on career issues. From these characteristics, one would realize that understanding this generation plays a role in how organizations build around them, for they would occupy significant positions soon. Understanding this generation, it is also good to notice the concept of this generation's ideas of leaders and followers.

In the Philippines, there are little known facts about the millennials, but Rappler, a citizen journalism website using social media and crowd-sourcing for news distribution, dedicates one of their links to understanding the Millennials. Based on this website, according to the 2010 Census, there is an estimated 25 million Filipino millennials aged 15-29. In 2015, Filipino millennials aged 15-34 comprised 53% of the working-age population, and 45% were employed. And Filipino millennials aged 16-18 prefer working overseas. This given data shows that understanding this generation plays a crucial role in an organization's development process, for they will comprise more than half of the organization (dela Cruz, 2016).

The researcher considered this study a response to the need to understand millennials in the workplace, as they are notoriously branded as a "misunderstood" generation. Misunderstood in the sense that there are many characteristics associated to them, and most of them are negative connotations. Understanding how they follow their leaders plays a significant role on how the organizations shape the totality of the work environment. After all, they will assume seats that may require high qualifications, most of which may not be familiar to them. Though they will work hard to give them the advancement required in their

career. Understanding this generation allows the company to look outside the box, for they must attract and retain millennials as part of their organization. They give a fresh look to the organizations. Millennials are associated with technology, to become part of a workplace that would push them to their limits and would not settle for good enough.

The researcher also focused on the idea of followership, as explained by Robert Kelley. When Robert Kelley wrote for the very first time the idea of the follower of followership, in Kelley's own words, his only goal is to give attention to followers—not really knowing what could be the outcome. As he saw a potential to better understand the idea of leadership, "Leadership needs to include followership because leaders neither exist nor act in a vacuum without followers."

With these premises, the researcher found the opportunity to better understand the millennial generation concerning how this group of people follows and why they follow, for they will occupy higher positions in the organizations. With the given scenario, the researcher saw the importance of understanding why people follow the system in relation to private and public institutions. Several surveys assumed Filipino millennials opt to work for the government rather than private institutions.

2. Research Methods

The study used a descriptive correlational design to determine the Followership Styles of millennials employed in private and public institutions. Descriptive statistics, mean, and standard deviation used to summarize the data gathered, and inferential statistics and Pearson's *r* correlation used to determine the relationship among variables.

a. Subjects and study site

The research focused on millennials, aged 22 to 34 years old, living and working in Lucena City, either in private or government secondary institutions. The researcher distributed a letter of request stating interest and approval. The respondents were selected through a purposive sampling technique.

The respondents were of various tenures and departments in their respective institutions.

b. Research instrument (Data measure) and personal data sheet

To determine the followership style among millennials, the researcher adapted the questionnaire prepared by Robert E. Kelley (1992), which can be found in his book *The Power of Followership*. It is a self-diagnostic instrument consisting of 20 questions, in which the respondents will answer guided by a 5-point Likert Scale on frequency: 5 being always, and 0 being rarely. Results of the data gathered will be interpreted using a scoring key provided also by Robert E. Kelley. It categorized how the respondents carried out their followership role and not on who they are as a person.

The researcher also used a Personal Data Sheet to measure the respondents' score in their idea of followership. The researcher developed a Personal Data Sheet to gather the demographic profile of respondents. It collected information such as gender, educational attainment, type of institution, and tenure.

c. Data collection

With the questionnaire provided by Kelley, the researcher gathered data through surveys. Based on 140 respondents, 56 males and 84 females were determined as samples using purposive sampling. The researcher asked for permission to conduct the study, which will be either endorsed or approved by their respective supervisors or whoever will accommodate the request. The researcher consulted the adviser to interpret the test scores for each measure her study tries to understand.

d. Ethical considerations

The researcher sought approval from the Ethics Review Board of the University of Santo Tomas (UST) Graduate School. The researcher also sought approval from the proper authorities to conduct the

study. The data gathered from the test administration were ensured anonymity and confidentiality guaranteed to the respondents. The researcher also sought permission from the authors of the instrument, and proper citations for the use of the instrument also be observed.

e. Data analyses

The following statistical treatments were used to answer the research questions. All collected data were tallied and subjected to various statistical methods: 1) Mean Scores and Standard Deviations were used to determine the homogeneity and variability of the participants' responses. 2) T-test, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), and Scheffes test were used to determine the relationship between variables.

3. Results and Discussion

a. Respondent profile

The frequency distribution of the respondent's gender, as shown in Table 1, indicates that there are more females, 84 or 60%, than males, 56 or 40%, respectively. Most respondents are college graduates, with 83 or 59.29%; a few are college undergraduates, 12 or 8.6%, and a minority of 2.81% or 4 have post-graduate units. Of the millennials included in the survey, 51 out of 140 respondents, or 36.43%, are from public secondary schools, and the majority, or 63.57%, are from private institutions.

It can also be observed that more millennials have worked for a few years or less than three (3) years. This comprises the majority, or 53.57% of the respondents. Those working for more than ten (10) years are a minority among the respondents (7.18%), 3–6 years (23.57%, and 7–10 years (15.71%).

Table 1. Socio-demographic profile of respondents.

Demographic Variables		
	F	%
A. Gender		
Male	56	40%
Female	84	60%
B. Educational Attainment		
College Undergraduate	12	8.60%
College Graduate	83	59.29%
With MA units	24	17.15%
MA Graduate	17	12.15%
With Post Graduate Units	4	2.81%
C. Type of Institution		
Public	51	36.43%
Private	89	63.57%
D. Tenure		
Less than 3 years	75	53.57%
3-6 years	33	23.57%
7-10 years	22	15.71%
More than 10 years	10	7.15%

b. Followership styles of millennials

The followership styles of the respondents were compared among sampled gender categories, educational qualifications categories, type of institution categories, and tenure categories. The followership style was determined using the Followership Style questionnaire from The Power of Followership of Robert E. Kelley (1992). It is a self-diagnostic instrument consisting of twenty (20) questions, which the respondents answered and guided by a 5-point Likert Scale. Using the scoring key provided also by Robert Kelley, followership styles will arise using the totals from Independent Thinking items and Active Engagement items. Using the totals from these items, the scores are plotted on the graph by drawing two perpendicular lines connecting the two given scores. The coordinates of these two dimensions will be the basis upon which the five styles of followership will emerge, namely, alienated, exemplary, passive, conformist, or pragmatist. By identifying which quadrant one's scores are categorized, one learns the skills as a follower and areas for growth and development. Since most employees use their time within the

followership role, it stands to reason that they tend to perform as followers, influencing how satisfied these employees are with everyday work experience.

The frequency of the followership style was counted and tabulated according to the different variables used. It could be seen in the result that most millennials are pragmatist regardless of their gender, educational qualifications, type of institutions, and tenure, as shown in Tables 2 to 5. These employees hug the middle of the road and question their leader's decision, but not too often or critically. They perform their required tasks but seldom venture beyond them. They live by the slogan "better safe than sorry", and frequently, it is a coping response to an unstable situation, either organizationally or politically. They can be further characterized as employees who disagree with their perceptions compared to others' perceptions. According to several research studies, millennials are described as those who are ambitious and money-oriented, who want to enjoy life experiences better and get what they want in life. (Visa Study, 2012)

Table 2. Frequency distribution of the followership style of respondents when grouped according to gender.

Fellowship Style	Male	Female	Total
	F	F	
Alienated			
Exemplary	21	27	48
Passive			
Conformist		1	1
Pragmatist	35	56	91
	56	84	140

Table 3. Frequency distribution of followership style of respondents when grouped according to education.

Fellowship Style	College Undergraduate	College Graduate	With MA units	MA Graduate	With PHD units	Total
	F	F	F	F	F	
Alienated						
Exemplary	2	26	9	9	1	47
Passive						
Conformist		1				1
Pragmatist	10	56	15	8	3	92
	12	83	24	17	4	140

Table 4. Frequency distribution of the followership style of respondents when grouped according to institution.

Fellowship Style	Public	Private	Total
	F	F	
Alienated			
Exemplary	20	31	51
Passive			
Conformist	1		1
Pragmatist	30	58	88
	51	89	140

Table 5. Frequency distribution table of the followership style of respondents when grouped according to tenure.

Followership Style	less than 3 years	3-6 years	7-10 years	10 years and above	Total
	F	F	F	F	
Alienated	1				1
Exemplary	18	12	7	6	43
Passive					0
Conformist					0
Pragmatist	56	21	15	4	96
	75	33	22	10	140

c. Variations in the followership style of millennials in private and public secondary institutions

The means were compared to determine the differences in the characteristics of millennials. The T-test and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for one-way data classification was used.

Table 6. T-test for the difference in independent thinking of millennials among various institutions.

Variables compare	Df	Mean	T-test	T- crit	Decision	Level of significance at 0.05
Public	18	3.65	0.48	1.734	Accept Ho	Not Significant
Private		3.6				

Table 7. T-test for the difference in active engagement of millennials among various institutions.

Variables compare	Df	Mean	T-test	T- crit	Decision	Level of significance at 0.05
Public	18	3.86	0.78	1.734	Accept Ho	Not Significant
Private		3.8				

Tables 6 and 7 revealed the t-test results that indicate a significant difference in independent thinking and active engagement of the sampled respondents in the types of institution category. With the absolute computed t-value of 0.48 for the respondent's independent thinking and 0.78 for the respondent's active engagement, and a critical t-value of 1.734, the null hypothesis was accepted at a significant 0.05 level. With this finding, the researcher concluded that there is no significant difference between millennials' independent thinking and active engagement in private and public secondary institutions. This is justified by the weighted arithmetic mean of $X = 3.36$ for the respondents from public institutions and the weighted arithmetic mean of $X^2 = 3.8$ for respondents from private institutions, which are closely related in value.

d. Variations in followership styles of millennials based on gender, tenure, and education

Tables 8 and 9 revealed the t-test result on finding the significant difference in the Independent Thinking variable and Active Engagement variable of the respondents when they are grouped according to gender. With the absolute computed t-value of 1.71 and a critical t-value of 1.734 for the Independent Thinking variable and the absolute computed t-value of 0.81 and a critical t-value of 1.734, the null hypothesis was accepted at a significance of 0.05. With this finding, the researcher concluded that there is no significant difference in the independent thinking variable and active engagement variable of male and female respondents. This is justified by the weighted arithmetic mean of $X_1 = 3.56$ for the males and weighted arithmetic mean of $X_2 = 3.73$ for females for their independent thinking variable and weighted arithmetic mean of $X_1 = 3.89$ for males and weighted arithmetic mean of $X^2 = 3.82$ for females for active engagement variable which are all closely the same value.

Table 8. T-test for the difference in independent thinking of millennials among various institutions.

Variables compare	df	Mean	T- test	T- critical	Decision	Level of significance at 0.05
Male (X1)	18	3.56	1.71	1.734	Accept Ho	Not Significant
Female (X2)		3.73				

Table 9. T-test for the difference in Active Engagement of millennials among various genders.

Variables compare	df	Mean	T-test	T- critical	Decision	Level of significance at 0.05
Male (X1)	18	3.89	0.81	1.734	Accept Ho	Not Significant
Female (X2)		3.82				

According to several research studies, we tend to see gender variation in how science interprets the thoughts and behaviors of males and females. However, the inclination to claim the said variations only limits us because it makes us blind to see their overwhelming similarities, and the dissimilarities do not exist.

With the available research about this generation, they are characterized as technical savvy, they possess a digital sixth sense. From this, the influence of technology and its impact on relationships and building values on how one promotes and shapes oneself is common to this generation.

Table 10. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) for differences in Independent Thinking of millennials among various educational qualifications.

Variables compared	Source	SS	df	MS	F-test	F-crit	Decision	Level of significance at 0.05
College undergrad (T1)	between groups	1.08	4	0.269	2.915	3.77	Accept Ho	Not Significant
College Grad (T2) With MA units (T3)	within groups	4.15	45	0.092				
MA (T4) With post graduate units (T5)	Total	5.23	49					

Table 11. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) for differences in Active Engagement of millennials among various educational qualifications.

Variables compared	Source	SS	Df	MS	F-test	F-crit	Decision	Level of significance at 0.05
College undergraduate (T1)	between groups	3.27	4	0.817	11.392*	3.77	Reject Ho	Significant
College Graduate (T2) With MA units (T3)	within groups	3.23	45	0.072				
MA Graduate (T4) With post graduate units (T5)	total	6.49	49					

Table 12. Scheffé's test on the significant difference in Active Engagement in the incategory of Educational Qualifications.

Comparison	Mean 1	Mean 2	Scheff'es	(F@a)(k-1)	with significance
T1 vs T2	3.38	3.85	8.86	6.71	
T1 vs T3	3.38	3.82	0.03	6.71	
T1 vs T4	3.38	4.19	9.96	6.71	*
T1 vs T5	3.38	3.80			
T2 vs T3	3.85	3.82			
T2 vs T4	3.85	4.19			
T2 vs T5	3.85	3.80			
T3 vs T4	3.82	4.19			
T3 vs T5	3.82	3.80			
T4 vs T5	4.19	3.80			

It can be gleaned in Table 10, the ANOVA test result found a significant difference in the respondent's Independent Thinking of sampled respondents when grouped according to education. With the absolute computed F-value of 2.95 and a critical F-value of 3.77, the researcher rejected the null hypothesis, which was significant at the 0.05 level. With these findings, the researcher concluded that there is no significant difference in the millennials' independent thinking.

As shown in Table 11, the ANOVA test result found a significant difference in the respondents' active engagement in the educational attainment category. With the absolute computed F-value of 11.32 and a critical F-value of 3.77, the researcher rejected the null hypothesis, which is significant at 0.05. With these findings, it is inferred that there is a significant difference in the millennials' Active Engagement when they are grouped according to educational attainment.

As seen in Table 12, the Scheffé's test confirmed this finding. The Scheffé's computed value of 9.96 is greater than the critical value of 6.71 compared to the College Undergraduate (T1) and MA graduate (T4) groups. This led the researcher to assert that the respondent's Active Engagement of college undergraduate is significantly different from the active engagement of MA graduate respondents. The variation in the finding is justified

in the weighted arithmetic mean of $X(T1) = 3.38$ for college undergraduate respondents and the weighted arithmetic mean of $X(T2) = 4.19$ for the MA graduate group.

From the gathered data, one can easily view that this generation values their personal development and gives importance to education. As it has been discussed in a research review done by the US Chamber Foundation, millennials recognize that more education leads to higher earnings for life and it is valuable to invest in their education. Higher education appears to be essential for economic security more and more jobs requiring postsecondary education. This also gives satisfaction in terms of pay and the lifestyle this generation is known for.

It is also common to this generation how knowledge and information are accessible. With this, Thompson (2011) even brands them as one of the most educated generations in history. This generation is commonly branded as digital natives; they influence institutions to interact with and teach them in numerous ways. As expressed in National Chamber Foundation research done in 2012, this generation bring a new personality in education—optimism, team orientation, and a confidence bordering on entitlement. They saw the importance of education in helping them earn money for the future.

Table 13. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) for differences in Independent Thinking of millennials among various tenures.

Variables compared	Source	SS	df	MS	F-test	F-crit	Decision	Level of significance at 0.05
Less than 3 years (T1)	between groups	0.51	3	0.170	2.551	4.39	Accept Ho	Not Significant
4 to 6 years (T2) 7 to 10 years (T3)	within groups	2.41	36	0.067				
More than 10 years (T4)	Total	2.92	39					

Table 14. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) for differences in Active Engagement of millennials among various tenures.

Variables compared	Source	SS	df	MS	F-test	F-critical	Decision	Level of significant at 0.05
Less than 3 years (T1)	between groups	0.74	3	0.248	6.308*	4.38	Reject Ho	Significant
4 to 6 years (T2) 7 to 10 years (T3)	within groups	1.41	36	0.039				
More than 10 years (T4)	total	2.16	39					

Table 15. Scheff's test on the variances in Active Engagement in the category of tenure.

Comparison	Mean 1	Mean 2	Scheff's	(F@a)(k-1)	with significance
T1 vs T2	3.76	3.95	4.93	3.14	
T1 vs T3	3.76	3.87	1.67	3.14	
T1 vs T4	3.76	4.13	17.93	3.14	*
T2 vs T3	3.95	4.13	0.86	3.14	
T2 vs T4	3.87	4.13	4.06	3.14	
T3 vs T4	3.87	4.13	8.67	3.14	

Provided in Table 13 is the ANOVA test results in finding the significant difference in independent thinking of sampled respondents among various tenures. With the absolute computed F- value of 2.551 and critical F- value of 4.39, the researcher accepted the null hypothesis, which was significant at the 0.05 level. With this finding, it was concluded that there is a significant difference in the independent thinking of millennials when grouped according to tenure. Table 14 shows the ANOVA test results that illustrate the significant difference in active engagement of sampled respondents

among various tenures. With the absolute computed F- value of 6.308 and critical F- value of 4.38, the researcher rejected the null hypothesis, which was significant at the 0.05 level. With this finding, it is evident that there is a significant difference in the active engagement of the millennials in terms of tenure. The Scheff's test confirmed this finding. The Scheff's computed value of 17.93 is greater than the critical value of 3.14.

The variation in the finding, as shown in Table 15 is justified by the weighted arithmetic mean of $X(T1) = 3.76$ for the employees employed for less than 3 years and the weighted arithmetic mean $X(T4) = 4.13$ for employees employed for more than ten (10) years. This led the researcher to claim that T1 respondents exhibited different active engagement among the groups of respondents than T4 respondents.

Millennials are born in an era where everything is readily available, and they have been raised to feel that they can get everything. From this conception that has been discussed by Thompson (2011), millennials think that as they become part of an organization, having an exciting work-life balance is their main priority. As Thompson (2011) discussed, to attract and retain these millennial employees, the organization must combine millennials' lifestyles and the organization's objectives. This only means that work task variation is needed to keep them stimulated and interested.

4. Conclusions and Recommendations:

From the study, it can be deduced that millennial teachers are all pragmatists, who are characterized as individuals who live by the slogan of "better safe than sorry." Robert Kelley has discussed that. This research strengthens the idea of how millennials are—as individuals and as employees. Many studies show they are the generation that values education and believes they can experience work-life balance and fulfill the lifestyle they want. The study supports a lot of previous research done to identify how millennials will shape the organization of today, for it is shared among generation a portrayal of the influence of technology on how it will influence their life decisions.

As more millennials make up the fastest-growing segment of the workforce now, employers have to compete for available talent and address the needs, desires, and attitudes of this vast generation. In line with this, the researcher designed a faculty and staff development program to help administrators and

millennial employees – faculty and staff - increase the effectiveness of employees.

Since the present study is limited to the millennials working in private and public secondary schools as its participants, future researchers may conduct another study along this theme, which will cover participants from non-educational institutions. Such conduct of study may broaden the insights offered by the findings of this study. Future research will contribute supplementary ideas on the followership styles of millennials working in non-academic institutions.

References:

1. Andelius, J. (2014). Understanding a Misunderstood Generation: The First Large-Scale Study of How Millennial Attitudes and Actions Vary Across the Globe, and the Implications for Employers. Retrieved September 14, 2016.
2. <https://centres.insead.edu/emerging-markets-institute/documents/GlobalMillennialsSurvey-Part1-Understandingamisunderstoodgeneration.pdf>
3. Becker, E. (2015) Privileged but pressured? A study of millennials at work. *Child Development*. 73(5):1593–1610. doi: 10.1111/1467-8624.00492.
4. Bozkurt, K. (2014) A burning desire: Millennials Work Attitude. *Management Communication Quarterly*. 2005;18:344–384. doi: 10.1177/0893318904270742.
5. Brack, J., & Kelley, K, (2012). Maximizing Millennials in the Workplace. Retrieved September 14, 2016. <http://www.kenan-flagler.unc.edu/executive-development/custom-programs/~media/files/documents/executive-development/maximizing-millennials-in-the-workplace.pdf>
6. Caldwell, K. (2015) Assimilation and mutual acceptance. In: Greenhaus J, Callanan G, editors. *Encyclopedia of career development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage; pp. 31–32.

7. Chou, Shih Yung. (2012). Millennials in the Workplace: A Conceptual Analysis of Millennials' Leadership and Followership Styles. *International Journal of Human Resource Studies*, ISSN 2162-3058, 2012, Vol. 2, No. 2
8. Connecting the Millennials: A Visa Study. Retrieved September 14, 2016. http://www.visa-asia.com/ap/sea/mediacenter/pressrelease/includes/uploads/Visa_Gen_Y_Report_2012_LR.pdf
9. Darnold, H. (2014) Communication with people from different ages in the workplace: Thai and American data. *Human Communication Research*. 2006;32:74–108. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2958.2006.00004.x.
10. Greenfield, P. (2016). The desire to achieve more, Washington, DC: American Psychological Association; 81–123
11. Herriot P. (2014) Motivating Millennial at Work. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*. 11:385–402. doi:10.1080/13594320244000256.
12. Hertel G. & Geister S. (2016) Managing virtual teams: A review of current empirical research. *Human Resource Management Review*. 15:69–95. doi:
13. Hill, R. (2015). Managing across generations in the 21st century: Important lessons from the ivory trenches. *Journal of Management Inquiry*. 2002;11(1):60–66. doi: 10.1177/1056492602111020.
14. Howe N and Strauss W. (2014) Millennials rising. New York: Vintage Books; pp. 59-78
15. Jablin F. (2015). Organizational entry, assimilation, and exit. In: Putnam L, Roberts K, Porter L, editors. *Handbook of organizational communication*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage;. pp. 679–740.
16. Kahn, L. (2017). *Millennials demand on demand content*. Retrieved from <http://www.marketingcharts.com/television/millennials-demand-on-demand-content-4654>
17. Kelley, R. (1992). *The Power of Followership*. New York: Doubleday
18. Kirby E. (2015). The millennials learning style in the workplace *Journal of Applied Communication Research*. 2002;30(1):50–77. doi: 10.1080/00909880216577
19. Koch, W. (2012, The unique perspectives of the millennials expanded through the years. *USA Today*, p. A1.
20. Kristof, L. (20014). Towards a model of human resource solutions for achieving intergenerational interaction in organizations. *Journal of European Industrial Training*. 2007;31:592–608. doi: 10.1108/03090590710833651.
21. Lammam, C., Palacios, M., Ren, F., & Clemens, J., (2015). Comparing Government and Private Sector Compensation Canada. Retrieved September 14, 2016. <https://www.fraserinstitute.org/sites/default/files/comparing-government-and-private-sector-compensation-in-canada.pdf>
22. Lawler E. (2016) From job-based to competency-based organizations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 1994;15:3–15. doi: 10.1002/job.4030150103.
23. Ledford G. (2015). Creating high performance organizations: Practices and results of employee involvement and total quality management in Fortune 1000 companies. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
24. Leets L. (2014) Explaining millennials perceptions of work. *Research*. 2001;28:676–706. doi: 10.1177/009365001028005005.
25. Levit, A., & Licina, S., (2011). How the Recession Shaped Millennial and Hiring Manager Attitudes about Millennials' Future Careers. Retrieved September 14, 2016. http://www.careeradvisoryboard.org/content/dam/dvu/www_careeradvisoryboard_or_g/Future-of-Millennial-Careers-Report.pdf
26. Maier, L. (2015). Generational differences: An examination of work values and generational gaps in the hospitality workforce. *International Journal of*

- Hospitality Management. 2008; 27:458–488.
27. Martin, C. (2015). From high maintenance to high productivity: What managers need to know about the Millennials. *Industrial and Commercial Training*. 2005;37:39–44. doi: 10.1108/00197850510699965.
28. McPhee, R.. (2014). Organization fit: a framework for explanation. *Electronic Journal of Communication/La Revue Electronique de Communication*, 10(1–2). http://www.cios.org/getfile/MCPHEE_V10N1200
29. May, N. Gilson, R.& Harter, P. (2014) Group socialization: Temporal changes in individual-group relations. In: Berkowitz L, editor. *Advances in experimental social psychology*. New York: Academic Press; pp. 137–192.
30. Mayer, G. (2014). Selected Characteristics of Private and Public Sector Workers. Retrieved September 14, 2016. <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R41897.pdf>
31. Millennials: Finding Opportunity in Federal Service. Retrieved September 14, 2016. <https://www.opm.gov/fevs/reports/special-reports/millennials-report-finding-opportunity-in-federal-service-2014.pdf>
32. Millennials at Work: Reshaping the Workplace. Retrieved September 14, 2016, <https://www.pwc.de/de/prozessoptimierung/assets/millennials-at-work-2011.pdf>
33. Miller, A. (2015). Where will millennials find tomorrow's leaders? *Harvard Business Review* 23:123–129.
34. Miller, R. (2016) *Motivating millennials in the workplace*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage; pp. 621–675.
35. Ricketts, K. Followership. Retrieved September 14, 2016 <http://www2.ca.uky.edu/agcomm/pubs/elk1/elk1205/elk1205.pdf>
36. Rue, J. (2014) Workplace relationships. In: Smith S, Wilson SR, editors. *New directions in interpersonal communication*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage pp. 135–156.
37. Schaufeli & Bakker (2013) *Myths about Millennials: Understand the myths to retain Millennials*. Retrieved March 22, 2018, from http://humanresources.about.com/od/managementtips/a/millennial_myth.htm
38. Scheinader, D. (2014) Toward a theory of stakeholder identification and salience: Defining the principle of who and what really counts. *Academy of Management Review*. 22:853–886. doi: 10.2307/259247.
39. Silverthone, L. (2013). A test of antecedents and outcomes of employee role negotiation ability. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*. 1999;27:24–48. doi: 10.1080/00909889909365522.
40. Sheridan, M. (2012). Socialization in organizations and work groups. In: Turner ME, editor. *Groups at work: Theories and research*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum; pp. 69–112.
41. Smith, O. (2015) K. *Organizational communication: Approaches and processes*. 5. Boston: Wadsworth Cengage Learning: USA
42. The 2016 Deloitte Millennial Survey: Winning Over the Next Generation of Leaders. Retrieved September 14, 2016. <https://www2.deloitte.com/content/dam/Deloitte/global/Documents/About-Deloitte/gx-millennial-survey-2016-exec-summary.pdf>
43. The Millennial Generation: Research Review. Retrieved September 14, 2016. <https://www.uschamberfoundation.org/reports/millennial-generation-research-review>
44. Thompson, N. (2011). *Managing the Millennials: Employee Retention Strategies for Generation Y*. Retrieved September 14, 2016. http://scholarship.claremont.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1297&context=cmc_theses

45. Tollbize, A. (2008). Generational Differences in the Workplace. Retrieved September 14, 2016. https://rtc.umn.edu/docs/2_18_Gen_diff_workplace.pdf
46. Viechnicki, P. (2015). Understanding Millennials in Government: Debunking Myths about our Youngest Public Servants. Retrieved September 14, 2016. <https://www2.deloitte.com/insights/us/en/industry/public-sector/millennials-in-government-federal-workforce.html>
47. Yun, Chen Tsun. (2013). Followership: An Important Partner of Leadership. Business and Management Horizons, ISSN 2326-0297, 2013, Vol. 1, No.2