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This study examines generational similarities and differences in terms of perceptions hospitality employees have of leadership, dissatisfaction and intent to leave within their organization. Leaders in the hospitality industry recognize the ability to source and retain employees long-term is fundamental to improving customer services and achieving expected financial returns. This study investigated, through survey instrumentation, the workplace perspectives of 885 hospitality industry employees pertaining to multigenerational groupings. The information from this study helps guide hospitality industry leaders and human resource professionals in developing policies, processes, and practices that create a productive work environment and employees integrated across multigenerational groupings.
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INTRODUCTION

The hospitality industry represents a significant component of the overall US economy consisting of 11% of the gross national product with annual lodging revenues close to 2 billion dollars. Direct jobs attributed to the lodging industry represent close to 2 million (AH&LA, 2010). Due to challenging economic times the hospitality industry is experiencing a significant period of economic uncertainty and financial operating performance (STR, 2010). A contributing factor beyond macro-economic conditions within the hospitality industry driving hospitality leaders toward increased focus on improving guest perception of service is employee service performance as a means of maintaining and expanding market share in order to improve profitability (Deloitte, 2006).

Leaders in the hospitality industry recognize that the ability to source and retain employees long-term is fundamental to improving guest services. According to leaders at the Disney Institute by “when you train, develop, and retain highly-skilled employees who understand and convey the truths and values of your business, you’ll realize positive economic effects (Disney Institute, 2010). Business leaders who provide training opportunities for their employees that engage them in co-creating the vision and objectives for the organization in providing excellent customer service often experience increased retention and reduced employee turnover. In addition to hotel location, quality standards, and leaders who deliver
on service promises, guests mention employee attitudes as a defining factor influencing their choice and loyalty to a particular hotel or food and beverage services business. Because these service line employees interact day-to-day with guests through technology systems, they exert a powerful influence on whether customers develop negative or positive impressions of their experiences (Gursoy et al., 2008).

The challenge for hospitality industry leaders and human resource professionals of today is how to create supportive work environments for an increasingly diverse population of multigenerational employees and work groups. With a global economy, the aging population in many of the developed economies means that, increasingly, employees will be sourced from all over the world. Essential in effective leadership within the hospitality industry will be the need to develop new standards of human resource management in order to connect with an increasingly more diverse workforce that reflects a multigenerational, micro-cosmos of religious, nationalities, and culturally diverse backgrounds.

The majority of companies in the hospitality industry operate within large-scale, bureaucratic organizational structure with communication and the flow of information in a highly structured and formalized manner (Lucas, 2003). Leadership is usually top-down and transactional, focused on reacting to and solving problems. Many popular hotel chains (i.e.; Hyatt Hotel Corporation, Holiday Inn, Starwood Hotels, and Harrah’s) have achieved success with the hierarchy based organizational structure and scientific approach to management delivery. Leading hospitality organizations across the country (i.e., Disney, Marriott, and Four Seasons, RLH Corporation 2008) have implemented policies and practices that require, to some degree, collaboration and cooperation among workers to increase productivity and provide the highest quality goods and services to customers. The hospitality industry conducts business in a highly competitive global economy and conflict among workers can adversely affect the efficient delivery of high quality service (Coombes, 2007). Researchers indicate it is crucial for hospitality leaders and managers to understand multigenerational similarities and differences in worldview, attitudes, work philosophy, and ways of interacting with others, enabling them to make informed decisions in creating positive working conditions that attract and retain highly productive workers (Zemke, Raines, & Filipczak, 2000).

This study examined through survey data, the similarities and differences in the expectations of hospitality industry employees from each of the generational groups in order to provide a more in-depth understanding of the leadership challenges facing the hospitality industry. The purpose of this study was to explore the unique perspectives individuals from each generational cohort bring to their interactions with others and their views of leadership,
job dissatisfaction and their linkage to intention to leave within the organization. The objectives of this study are to measure the differing views of leadership by job category and generational grouping in order to examine the link between dissatisfaction and intention to leave the organization. The study proposes to:

1. Profile the demographic generational composition of the hospitality industry workforce.

2. Evaluate whether views of leadership and job dissatisfaction among employees differ among generational groupings.

3. Measure the intent to leave among employees in the organization by generational grouping.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Profile of generational groups in American society

Within the last seventy-five years, advances in technology have transformed the world, with people living longer in societies that are more diverse and complex than in the past: issues about life and work are often discussed within the context of a multigenerational global society (Bernstein, Alexander, & Alexander, 2007). Researchers and social scientists who study the effects of population on society, use the term “generation” to refer to people born in the same general time span who share key life experiences perceptions about the world, and how one interacts with it, are influenced by the era during which one is born and raised. The effects of those key life experiences tend to be relatively stable over the course of their lives. Due to these distinct key life experiences, each generation develops a personality that determines members of each generation’s feelings toward authority and organizations (Kupperschmidt, 2000). For example, members of generations who come of age in lean times or war years tend to think and act differently than those born and raised in peace and abundance. The generational personality is also likely to determine what individuals want from work, what kind of workplace environment they desire and how they plan to satisfy those wants and desires. Due to generational differences, these wants and desires tend to vary from generation to generation. Broadly speaking, in the United States, the formative years of one generation occurred when the country was experiencing economic depression, uncertainty, and a nation at war (i.e., the Great Depression, WWI, WWII, Vietnam Conflict, Gulf War(s) while another generation were raised during periods of economic abundance, distanced from the effects of national or world conflict (Gursoy & Swanger, 2007). Therefore, people from different generations may have problems understanding others’ perspectives
about work, creating stress, confusion, and frustration in a demanding workplace like the hospitality industry.

Specifically, workers in the hospitality industry are represented by three primary generational groups who hold different views about the world, country, work, and self: Baby Boomers, Gen-Xers, and Millennials. Following is a brief profile of each generational group:

Baby Boomers (1946-1964): These individuals, born during or shortly after World War II, were raised in an era of extreme optimism, opportunity, and progress. Boomers, for the most part, grew up in two-parent households with the mother as primary care-giver and the father as sole income earner. They lived in neighborhoods and attended schools that were relatively free from crime and violence. During the period of post-war prosperity, large manufacturing and service-oriented companies generally provided their workers with job security and Baby Boomers expected to begin their careers and retire from the same company. They represent about two-thirds of all U.S. workers. On the job, they value loyalty, respect the organizational hierarchy, and generally wait their turn for advancement.

Generation X or Gen-Xers (1965-1980): As members of the generation following the Baby Boomers, Gen-Xers were born into a rapidly changing social climate dominated by social and civil unrest, and advances in science and technology that moved the average citizen into the computer age. They grew up in two-career families in a society with rising divorce rates, an economy in recession, increased crime and violence in schools, corporate downsizing, and loss of job security. On the job, they can be fiercely independent, like to be in control, and want fast feedback.

Millennials (1981-1999): The children of Baby Boomers or early Gen-Xer parents, Millennials were born into the current high-tech, neo-optimistic times. Although the youngest workers, they are fast learners, impatient, and the most technologically adept (Zemke, Raines, & Filipcza 2000).

Multigenerational workforce era

The hospitality workforce today reflects an increasingly diverse workforce in terms of multigenerational groupings. This has created unique challenges for both individuals and organizations in today’s society (Bernstein, Alexander, & Alexander, 2007). Many employers are faced with situations involving employees who are unable to work together productively, often due to differing perspectives in ages, values, morals, and ways of dealing with each other. The affects of multigenerational differences has been experienced in the hospitality and other industries because people are remaining in the workforce longer creating environments where employees often experience confusion, frustration, and stress when
working with individuals outside their own generational groups. According to researchers, in
the fast-paced global economy with increased pressure for higher productivity and quicker
results, the demand for collaboration and compromise has intensified. Multigenerational
differences in perspectives create fertile ground for conflict and an “us vs. them” mentality
that results in job dissatisfaction, high employee turnover, and decreased productivity (Yang
& Guy, 2006). The hospitality industry that provides services for their customer base is
especially sensitive to the underlying tension of multigenerational conflict in the workplace.

In the past individuals from different generations had worked in the same organization,
however, they were usually separated from each other by the nature of their job and their
position in the company hierarchy. The oldest or veteran employees, typically white males,
held supervisory positions, mid-career employees served in middle management, and the
youngest employees, mostly Gen-Xers, worked at entry level or non-supervisory positions.
Additionally, the command-and-control hierarchical structure of most organizations, governed
by formality and protocol often restricted the “mixing” of workers from different generational
groups; employees interacted mostly with their peers and less often with their supervisors.
Collaboration and sharing power in the decision-making process was very limited. Typically,
veteran employees were the decision-makers who issued directives that were then handed
down and communicated to younger workers through the line supervisor. Feedback from
lower level employees was not solicited and the reasoning or justification behind orders given
generally was not provided (Martin & Tulgan, 2002).

Through the sharing of diverse perspectives and ideas, a positive, creative synergy can be
introduced into the problem solving process. A drawback to generational blending and
integration is that it can lead to inter-generational conflict in the workplace due to different
perspectives related to appropriate work attire, values, worldviews, and ways of working,
talking, and thinking (Raines, 1997). Within the bureaucratic organizational system
predominating corporations in the hospitality industry, is an increasingly diverse workforce.
Leaders are faced with the challenge of managing and leading workers that range in age from
17 or 18 to employees in their late 60s and 70s. Based on their year of birth, Americans
belong to one of four generations: Veterans, Baby Boomers, Gen-Xers, and Millennials. Not
only are there notable differences in each of the generational groupings there exists the
phenomenon of bringing each of their perspectives together within a common work or
organizational environment (Jennings, 2000). Major demographic shifts are occurring in the
overall workforce and by 2012, employee’s aged 35-45 will be in the prime of their career
contribution to the workplace. The majority of mid-level managers are hired from this group
and it is expected that there will be a 10% decrease in the number of workers available to fill these leadership positions. With a decreasing labor force as Baby Boomers retire, in the hospitality industry every skilled worker of every age will be needed in every successful enterprise.

Job Dissatisfaction and Intent to leave

There has been increasing focus in the literature regarding the relationship between leadership, and employee dissatisfaction. Allen, Shore, and Griffeth (2003) found that perceived organizational support (POS) and supportive leadership practices were significantly negatively correlated with intentions to leave. In the literature, the theoretical process of the formation of these cognitions places job dissatisfaction as antecedent to search intentions, followed by intentions to quit (Crossley et al., 2007). Moreover, Cascio (2006) cautioned that the challenge is to develop a organizational culture that encourages employees to stay and suggested implementing progressive management techniques such as promoting feelings of accomplishment, making work fun, and providing a challenging but supportive environment.

The importance of managing lower job dissatisfaction and intention to leave is significant to the hospitality industry because of the high reliance on customer service interactions among front line workers. Impling satisfied workers are necessary in order to ensure consistency and satisfaction when dealing with customer interactions prominent to the hospitality industry (Kim et al, 2005). Causal relationships between job dissatisfaction and organizational support are linked to intent to leave (Cho, Johanson, & Gucheit, 2009). Moreover, Herzberg (1966) indicated in absence of organizational support job dissatisfaction may increase and lead to higher frequency of intent to leave among workers thereby contributing to higher turnover. Of particular importance related to job dissatisfaction of hospitality industry workers is the perceived organizational support of their leaders and supervisors. Researchers indicate there exists a significant negative influence on workers intent to leave as it pertains to their view of leadership and supervisory support within the organization (Cho, Johanson, & Gucheit, 2009). They also link decentralized organizational structure, flexible work schedules, socialization, and empowerment as strong influencers towards lower intent to leave and increased levels of job satisfaction (Tepeci & Bartlett, 2002; Subramaniam et al., 2002).

Rather than studying actual turnover, it has been suggested that it is more important to investigate high intentions to leave, (Harris, Kacmar, & Witt, 2005). For hospitality leadership the goal is to eliminate or reduce those undesirable employee behaviors that might
adversely impact other employees, as well as to reduce the costs of actual turnover, both of which have economic costs to organizations. Researchers have indicated intentions to leave are expected to have a negative relationship with employee’s perceptions of a leader’s style. According to Bass and Riggio effective transformational leaders decrease followers’ intentions to leave by showing that a fundamental agreement exists between “the goals and values of the group, follower, leader and organization” (Bass & Riggio, 2006, p. 36). They contend employees who believe their personal needs are being met through a leader’s individualized attention and consideration will be less likely to leave the organization that is meeting these needs, and thus remain as a member of the organization.

Since the hospitality industry is staffed by a multigenerational workforce and the workplace is influenced by the social, political, and cultural norms, workers of each generational cohort bring varying perspectives and needs to their jobs and views of leadership. Examination of current organizational theory underscores the necessity of understanding how these key factors affect the ability of multigenerational workforce leaders to achieve organizational goals through improved worker satisfaction (Gursoy & Swanger, 2007). These factors include: (1) flattening of bureaucratic organizational structures, (2) transitioning of information acquisition from seeking the wisdom of older colleagues to utilizing information technology, and (3) a shifting in culture for peer to peer relationships from one of deference to one of assertiveness and inter-activeness goals.

METHODOLOGY

Based on a review of the literature, the following hypotheses were developed:

Hypotheses 1. Generational leadership perceptions have a negative effect on job dissatisfaction.

Hypothesis 2. Generational perceptions of leadership will be negatively related to their intentions to leave.

For this study, survey instrumentation was used through the administration of Gursoy and Swanger’s workplace perception survey (WPS). The survey was administered to 2,577 line-staff and managers, employed by the corporation under study. Participants included line-staff and managers from hotels located in California, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington, as well as line-staff and managers at the headquarters office. An e-mail was sent by principle investigators to 2,577 employees of the subject corporation inviting them to participate in the survey via email link to SurveyMonkey. Survey participation was voluntary.
and no incentive was offered for participation. Participants at both the individual hotels and headquarter offices of the subject corporation used SurveyMonkey, a Web-based software program to complete the survey using the internet. Access to SurveyMonkey was password protected and information was anonymous, then downloaded and converted to an SPSS data file format. A total of 511 hourly employee surveys were completed for a return rate of 19.59%. A total of 374 manager/executive level employees completed the on-line version of the survey for a return rate of 75.71%. The final participants for the study was n=885.

With the objective of strengthening the reliability and validity of the data to be used, items on the data scales were examined: those items best representing the variables to be examined in were retained and redundant or ambiguous items were deleted. To reduce the number of variables (test items) to a smaller number of factors, a principal component analysis was conducted (with varimax rotation and Kaiser normalization procedures), using the original raw data. Based on examination of the rotated component matrix, 76 items from the original (WPS) data were grouped into the 19 components. Following this initial process, items in each of the 19 components were examined through visual inspection based on the conceptual dimensions outlined in the present study for redundancy and ambiguous meaning. This resulted in the collapsed and final subscale categories for the study. Once items were grouped into one of the subscales, a reliability analysis was conducted. Based on item analyses and scale reliabilities, Cronbach’s internal consistency reliability coefficient alpha values were used to make decisions about items to retain and delete from the final draft of the survey for the present study. The reliability coefficient values were found to have landed in the acceptable and desirable levels of 0.50 to 0.60 (Nunnally, 1978).

Data analysis

The analysis of data in this study involved a combination of descriptive statistical measures, Pearson correlations, and Multivariate Analysis of Variance methods. Descriptive statistics were used to summarize the data, using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). Data analysis was used to determine staff and manager perceptions about their workplace and working with co-workers by job category, and managers across different generational groups. Analysis of Variance procedures were used to examine group differences
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Objective 1. Demographic profile

The study population consisted of 885 employees who had completed data for the study variables. Table 1 presents the frequencies and percentages for gender, generational group, and job category as follows:

Table 1. Frequencies and Percentages for the Demographic Variables of Sex, Generational Group, and Job Category (N = 885)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baby Boomer</th>
<th>Gen-Xers</th>
<th>Millennials</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>62.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>64.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ratio of females to males in the study sample was approximately 2:1 (n = 564 and n = 321, respectively). This is representative of workers in the hospitality industry. Among the three generational groups, Baby Boomers represented 30.6%, Gen-Xers 46.9%, and Millennials 22.5%. Compared to national workforce statistics, Baby Boomers represented 42%, Gen-Xers 29%, and Millennials 22%. In terms of the Millennial group, the percentage of workers in the study sample is representative of the percentage of Millennials in the general U.S. workforce; however, there were considerably more Gen-Xer workers (46.9%) of the study sample compared to the national average of 29%. In addition, while Baby Boomers comprise nearly half of the national workforce (42%), they only represented one-third of the study sample.

In the study sample, associates or line staff employees represented 67.9% of workers. This is expected because the largest employee segment in the hospitality industry is front-line service personnel who deal directly with customers. Managers/supervisors represent one-fourth of the study sample or (24.6%). They include workers who hold middle management positions in the hierarchical organizational structure. These individuals have daily interaction with associates providing leadership oversight, organization and assignment of work, provide
best practices for customer service standards, maintain adherence to policy and procedure, and assure achievement of financial goals. Finally, corporate employees represent the highest tier of hierarchy and include senior executives, primarily responsible for setting the corporate mission, vision, and strategic plan. These individuals answer to the CEO, CFO, and Board of Directors. They typically do not have day-to-day direct oversight over operational activities in the field, and have limited interaction with those at the lower levels of the organizational structure (i.e. associates).

Objective 2. Job dissatisfaction

Evaluate whether views of leadership and job dissatisfaction among employees differ among generational groupings and job category

H1: Generational leadership perceptions and job category have a negative effect on job dissatisfaction

The hypotheses suggested and supported that views of leadership would be negatively related to employee’s dissatisfaction and differ among generational groupings and job category. This was examined through univariate ANOVA, means and standard deviations by generational group, gender, and job category. A Significant main effect was found for job category, $F(2, 885) = 4.775, p < .01$. Post hoc analysis revealed significant mean differences between associate and manager supervisor groups ($M_D = -91, SE_D = .309, p < .01$). Though no significant effect was noted for generational group, a significant pairwise mean difference was found between Baby Boomer and Millennial groups ($M_D = 1.02, SE_D = .365, p < .05$).

**Table 2.** Means, Standard Deviations and Univariate ANOVA for Generational Group, Gender and Job Category on dissatisfaction subscale scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generational Group</th>
<th>Associate</th>
<th>Manager/ Supervisor</th>
<th>Corporate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$N$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>$N$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>35.03</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>35.04</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials Females</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>35.34</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>36.57</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>35.84</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>34.62</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANOVA: Generational Group, Job Category, & Gender by WFS: dissatisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main effect of Generational</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.729</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main effect of Job Category</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>73.02</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Effect of Gender (G)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.688</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GG x JC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.46</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.558</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GG x G</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.31</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.662</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC x G</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.906</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GG x JC x G</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.755</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within-cells error</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>15.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding job dissatisfaction the results in Table 2 indicate employee feelings about their dissatisfaction in the workplace. An example of a question in this subscale is “No one respects younger employees because of their age.” Based of the results shown in Table 2 The total mean score for the dissatisfaction subscale was 37.61 (N = 885, SD = 4.96). The scale item mean was 3.76 on a scale of 1 to 5, indicating over thirty-seven and one half percent of the employees in the subject corporation are dissatisfied with their job. Female dissatisfaction levels decreased across the three generational groups with the highest level of dissatisfaction levels among the Baby Boomer and the lowest level of dissatisfaction among the Millennial generations. In addition, females had the highest level of dissatisfaction for both the Baby Boomer and Gen-Xers groups, while males had the highest dissatisfaction levels among the Millennial generation.

Objective 3. Intent to leave

Measure the intention to leave the organization by generational grouping.

H2: Generational perceptions of leadership will be negatively related to their intentions to leave.

The hypotheses suggested and supported that views of leadership would be negatively related to employee’s intention to leave the organization and differ among generational groupings. This was examined through univariate ANOVA, means and standard deviations by generational group, gender, and job category. A significant difference was found between the generational groups, $F(2, 894) = 21.294$, $p < .001$. The post hoc analysis revealed that significant mean differences between Millennials and Baby Boomers ($M_D = -1.384$, $SE_D = .220$, $p < .001$) and Millennial and Gen-Xers ($M_D = -1.066$, $SE_D = .203$, $p < .001$) groups contributed to this significance.
Table 3. One-Way ANOVA of Intent to Leave Scale Score by Generational Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generational Group</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>4987.339</td>
<td>5.591</td>
<td>892</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5225.459</td>
<td></td>
<td>894</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Post Hoc Analysis of Intent to Leave

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation Group 1</th>
<th>Generation Group 2</th>
<th>MD</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Millennial</td>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td>-1.384</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.066</td>
<td>.203</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A sample question used to assess their intention to leave the company is “This job is temporary for me.” Regarding intent to leave the results presented in Table 3 indicateS that Baby Boomers have the highest intention to leave and Millennials have indicated the lowest intention to leave the company.

**DISCUSSION**

A goal of the study was to gain a better understanding of dissatisfaction and intent to leave among employees in the hospitality industry, especially across the different generational intentions to leave the company. Study results indicate as the workers get younger the differences in levels of dissatisfaction widen. Examination of mean scores across generational and job category groups indicated that compared to their Gen-Xers counterparts, Millennial manager/supervisor are more dissatisfied; whereas, Millennial corporate employees are less dissatisfied with their jobs. Not surprisingly dissatisfaction levels were found to be higher among non-managerial job categories than managers and supervisory job categories. Indicating a gap between those in leadership positions and those in line-level positions within the organization.

Based on the results of this study, it was found that the oldest workers (Baby Boomers) indicated the greatest intent to leave, while the youngest (Millennials) indicated the least. Baby Boomers who indicated an intention to leave the company may do so, not out of dissatisfaction with their jobs, but because they are thinking about their transition out of the workforce as retirement approaches. In this study Millennials may have indicated greater intentions to stay with the company because they are transitioning for the first time into the
workforce, are relatively new to the job, and/or are thinking about their long-term future with the company.

In terms of job category, based in this study, manager/supervisors had the most positive perceptions about the interpersonal relationships they had with other employees. This may be explained in part because managers, in a hierarchical structure have greater freedom of movement and access to people and critical and pertinent information about the organization. In addition, managers have the power and autonomy to engage other employees in the decision-making process, power that lower level line-staff typically do not have. These traits are most aligned with the values that are held by Millennials who view positively teambuilding, engagement, change, learning new things, diversity, and a commitment to making a life, not just a living. This finding would be consistent with the literature surrounding transformational or servant leadership principles that are based on similar desirable leadership qualities concerned with building a organizational community that brings together multiple employee groups. Leadership characteristics were measured based on the following traits: (a) use of effective communication and interpersonal skills, (b) problem solving, (c) enjoyment of the challenges and responsibilities of the job, (d) opportunities to learn new things and develop as a professional, (e) mentoring, (f) organizing and directing the activities of others, and finally, (g) ability to find a good work-life balance (Greenleaf, 2003).

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The goal of the study was to gain a better understanding of the multigenerational workforce and its effects on the organizational functioning and leadership practices within the hospitality industry. The results of this study add new understandings to the current literature about hospitality industry leadership, and multigenerational workforce perspectives about working in the hospitality setting. In summary, results of the present study support the premise that there exist both generational and job category differences in the perceptions employees hold about the workplace as it relates to their dissatisfaction and intention to leave the organization. Those generational and job category perspectives of leadership contribute to the increased complexity of operating a hospitality business enterprise, large or small, within the context of a global economy; it is vital for leaders to understand the workforce and the leadership approach supporting it. The implications of these findings are important because of their potential for improving the quality of workers’ experiences while on the job, improving the level of dissatisfaction and intention to leave among employees and the quality of the services they provide to guests through more optimal alignment with the leaders in the
organization. Leaders in the hospitality industry have indicated there is a strong relationship between favorable employee performance and positive customer satisfaction as a contributing factor in creating a strategic competitive advantage (Disney Institute, 2007). The ability to hire and retain employees long-term is fundamental to providing quality guest services and thus increased profits. In addition, with costs of $5,000-$6,000 to train a single employee, improving levels of dissatisfaction and lowering intent to leave through heightened awareness of generational perspectives can result in significant cost savings to organizations (Hinkin & Tracy, 2000).

What this means for industry practitioners is generational diversity and integration is a key factor in workforce productivity and customer service performance. Therefore, dissatisfaction and intention to leave must be managed effectively from a human resource perspective. In order to effectively mitigate line-level worker dissatisfaction, generational integration programming should be developed through comprehensive human resource training. Generational integration and training programs should incorporate the following constructs designed to prevent dissatisfied among line-level workers and lower their intention to leave (Gursoy & Swanger, 2007):

Training Strategies bridging Generation Xers and Baby Boomers:

- Show respect. Acknowledge that you have less experience and can learn from them.
- Choose face-to-face conversations. Many Baby Boomers find e-mail or voice mail too impersonal and prefer speaking with someone face to face.
- Value their experiences. Use them as a resource to learn what has — and hasn't — gone right at the company in the past.
- They are street savvy, politically connected, and came into a business world that put a premium on close customer relations. That need is back so their insights are once again invaluable.
- Baby Boomers are diplomatic and particularly adept at navigating politically charged environments.
- Motivate them with lots of public recognition, and involvement in decision-making.
- When mentoring them be tactful, let them tell you how they're doing, and think of yourself as a friendly equal.

Training Strategies bridging Baby Boomers with Generation X:

- Generation Xers like to have a spelled-out goal, some resources, and the freedom to decide on how they are going to get things done.
- Get to the point. Avoid corporate jargon, buzzwords and cliches that obscure what you're really trying to say. State your objectives clearly when communicating with Generation Xers.
- They don't thrive well with Boomer micro-management.
- Xers do not buy into work, for work's sake. To expect them to make too many sacrifices for the good of "the project" or "the company" too often, will send the average Xer job hunting.
• They also appreciate family-oriented rewards and time off as a perk.
• Xers like better technology. Personal technology and access to the best office tech is high on the list.
• Use e-mail. Take advantage of technology in your correspondence with a Generation Xer.

Training strategies for working with the Millennial Generation:
• Millennials tend to hang with a group of pals. It can seem exclusionary. And it can look like kids on the corner - while that's fun, it can be seen as immaturity to some. Don't expect to be included, or especially put-off by the behavior.
• Organize outings for them - everything from picnics and sporting events to a group theater night.
• Advancement may require more patience than they expect. They need help seeing that repeated tasks are not an insult, that is the way the work world functions; a lot of repetition.
• Challenge them. Millennials want to work on things that really matter. Offer more responsibility as a reward for their accomplishments.
• Ask them their opinion. Millennials love to collaborate and be team players. They respond less enthusiastically to a dictatorial chain-of-command style of management.
• There are lots of open avenues for education and skills building. Use them.
• Find them a mentor. Millennials have an affinity and great respect for older generations, especially Baby Boomers. Establish mentor-mentee relationships between these two groups and both parties will benefit.

This study, as with any study, had limitations. Reliability studies of the scales and subscales indicated good reliability; however, validity issues could be problematic. The process of collecting data for the study may have introduced a bias into the data. Line-staff were required to complete the survey as part of an in-service paid scheduled meeting, while manager/supervisors and corporate employees were allowed to complete an anonymous questionnaire online. The quantitative format used to collect data limited the ability to probe more in-depth into worker perceptions. Furthermore, the instrument format did not allow respondents to indicate factors important to them other than those presented on the survey and thus may have limited the ability of respondents to indicate their beliefs more accurately. Finally, a weakness to this study was the unequal sample sizes for the sex, generational, and especially the job category groups. For example, some groups were too small to yield any valid information.
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