

Florida State University Libraries

Electronic Theses, Treatises and Dissertations

The Graduate School

2007

Generation and the Psychological Contract: How Civil Service Reform Is Perceived by Public Sector Workers

Melanie Hicks



**THE FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES**

**GENERATION AND THE PSYCHOLOGICAL
CONTRACT: HOW CIVIL SERVICE REFORM IS
PERCEIVED BY PUBLIC SECTOR WORKERS**

by

Melanie Hicks

A Dissertation submitted to the
Askew School of Public Administration and Policy
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

**Degree Awarded:
Summer Semester 2007**

**Copyright © 2007
Melanie Hicks
All Rights Reserved**

The members of the Committee approve the dissertation of Melanie Hicks on the 23 day of April, 2007.

Mary Ellen Guy
Professor Directing Dissertation

Pam Perrewe
Outside Committee Member

James Bowman
Committee Member

Kaifeng Yang
Committee Member

Approved:

Francis Berry, Director, Askew School of Public Administration and Policy

David Rasmussen, Dean, College of Social Science

The Office of Graduate Studies has verified and approved the above named committee members.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>Chapter</i>	<i>Page</i>
LIST OF TABLES	v
ABSTRACT	ix
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
Background of the Study	1
New Work Environment	2
Disputes	5
Statement of the Problem	5
Significance of the Study	6
Overview of the Study	7
CHAPTER 2: CIVIL SERVICE REFORM AND THE PSYCHOLOGICAL CONTRACT	8
Historical Perspectives	8
Ongoing Reforms at the Federal Level	10
Ongoing Reforms at the State Level	12
Florida	13
Model Perspectives	15
Perceptions of Reforms Over Time	17
The Psychological Contract	19
Early Writings	20
Research Streams	22
Generation Perspective	26
Matures and Boomers	26
Generation X	27
Generational Conflict	30
Similarities and Differences	31
Hypotheses	32
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY	36
Units of Analysis	36

Variables Measured	36
Development of Survey and Pilot Survey Instrument	39
Methods of Analysis	41
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	43
Sample Description	43
Generational Cohort	45
Findings	45
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSIONS	72
Findings Review	73
Alternative Explanations	77
Life Stage	77
Perception vs. Reality	77
Growth Over Time	79
Future Research	81
APPENDICES	83
APPENDIX A: Survey Questions	83
APPENDIX B: Human Subjects Committee Approval Letter	89
APPENDIX C: Survey Invitation Letter	90
APPENDIX D: Descriptive Statistics Tables	91
APPENDIX E: Analysis of Variance Tables	100
APPENDIX F: Dissertation Timeline	104
REFERENCES	105
BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH	116

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1: Distinctions between “old” v. “new” characteristics of the Psychological Contract	4
Table 1.2: Career profiles and Competencies of Boundaryless v. Bounded Careers	4
Table 2.1: Major Civil Service Reform Changes by State	12
Table 2.2: A Comparison of Four Models of Public Human Resource Management	16
Table 2.3: A Comparison of Three Models of Civil Service Reforms	17
Table 2.4: Literature Review of Categories of Psychological Contract Types	22
Table 2.5: Literature Review of Conditions Affecting Psychological Contract	23
Table 2.6: Literature Review of Psychological Contract Violation Consequences	23
Table 2.7: Summary of Expected Direction of Results by Hypothesis	35
Table 4.1: Sample and Population Comparison	44
Table 4.2: Generational Cohorts by Corresponding Birth Years	45
Table 4.3: Variable List and Corresponding Hypothesis	46
Table 4.4: Summary of Relationships between Variables and Hypotheses	46
Table 4.5: Analysis of Variance of Attitudes about Psychological Contract by Generation	47
Table 4.6: Ryan-Einot-Gabriel-Welsch F test for Psychological Contract and Employment Status	47
Table 4.7: Ryan-Einot-Gabriel-Welsch F test for Psychological Contract and Annual Income	48
Table 4.8: Analysis of Variance of Attitudes about Civil Service Reform by Generation	49
Table 4.9: t-test for Civil Service Reform and Education	49
Table 4.10: t-test for Civil Service Reform and Employment Status	51
Table 4.11: t-test for Civil Service Reform and Gender	52

Table 4.12: Ryan-Einot-Gabriel-Welsch F test for Civil Service Reform and Race	52
Table 4.13: Ryan-Einot-Gabriel-Welsch F test for Civil Service Reform and Political Party	53
Table 4.14: Ryan-Einot-Gabriel-Welsch F test for Civil Service Reform and Annual Income	53
Table 4.15: Analysis of Variance of Attitudes about Job Movement by Generation	54
Table 4.16: Ryan-Einot-Gabriel-Welsch F test for Job Movement and Political Ideology	54
Table 4.17: t-test for Job Movement and Political Party	55
Table 4.18: Analysis of Variance of Attitudes about Worker Career Control by Generation	56
Table 4.19: Analysis of Variance of Attitudes about Employer Career Control by Generation	56
Table 4.20: t-test for Worker Career Control and Employment Status	57
Table 4.21: t-test for Worker Career Control and Annual Income	57
Table 4.22: Ryan-Einot-Gabriel-Welsch F test for Employer Career Control and Annual Income	59
Table 4.23: Analysis of Variance of Attitudes about Organizational Loyalty by Generation	60
Table 4.24: Ryan-Einot-Gabriel-Welsch F test for Organizational Loyalty and Education	61
Table 4.25: Ryan-Einot-Gabriel-Welsch F test for Organizational Loyalty and Employment Status	61
Table 4.26: Ryan-Einot-Gabriel-Welsch F test for Organizational Loyalty and Political Ideology	62
Table 4.27: Analysis of Variance of Attitudes about Career Commitment by Generation	62
Table 4.28: Ryan-Einot-Gabriel-Welsch F test for Career Commitment and Education	63
Table 4.29: Ryan-Einot-Gabriel-Welsch F test for Career Commitment and Annual Income	63

Table 4.30: t-test for Career Commitment and Employment Status	64
Table 4.31: Analysis of Variance of Attitudes about Affective Commitment by Generation	65
Table 4.32: Ryan-Einot-Gabriel-Welsch F test for Affective Commitment and Annual Income	66
Table 4.33 t-test for Affective Commitment and Employment Status	66
Table 4.34: Analysis of Variance of Attitudes about Continuance Commitment by Generation	67
Table 4.35: Ryan-Einot-Gabriel-Welsch F test for Continuance Commitment and Generation	68
Table 4.36: t-test for Continuance Commitment and Gender	68
Table 4.37: Analysis of Variance of Attitudes about Normative Commitment by Generation	69
Table 4.38: Ryan-Einot-Gabriel-Welsch F test for Normative Commitment and Annual Income	70
Table 4.39: Ryan-Einot-Gabriel-Welsch F test for Normative Commitment and Employment Status	70
Table 5.1: Comparison of significant differences by variable	73
Table 5.2: Career profiles and Competencies of Boundaryless v. Bounded Careers	80
Table A.1: Frequency Tables	91
Table A.2: Cross Tabulations Table of Annual Income by Generation	93
Table A.3: Cross Tabulations Table of Education by Generation	94
Table A.4: Cross Tabulations Table of Gender by Generation	95
Table A.5: Cross Tabulations Table of Race by Generation	96
Table A.6: Cross Tabulations Table of Employment Status by Generation	97
Table A.7: Cross Tabulations Table of Political Party by Generation	98
Table A.8: Cross Tabulations Table of Political Ideology by Generation	99

Table A.9: Analysis of Variance Descriptive Statistics Table	100
Table A.10: Analysis of Variance Full Output for Factors and Control Variables by Generation	102

ABSTRACT

Civil Service reform has swept through all levels of government during the last decade. These reforms call for greater managerial flexibility at the expense of civil servant employment security and tenure. This work examines the effects of these reforms on the psychological contract of various generations working in Florida's state government.

The psychological contract can be defined as an exchange agreement of promises and contributions between two parties, the employee and employer, and includes an individual's beliefs regarding mutual obligations (Rousseau, 1990, 1995). Psychological contract theory is believed by many to be the most accurate explanation of the varied, albeit primarily negative, reactions of employees to job insecurity (King, 2000). The psychological contract becomes an important and appropriate framework to study employee perceptions of civil service reforms.

In this research, three distinct literatures were reviewed to build a theory of worker perceptions based on generational cohort. First, a brief account of the civil service reform efforts taking place. From there, the work outlined streams of research associated with the psychological contract and generational differences. From there, gaps in the literature were identified and hypotheses proposed. The hypotheses fell into four groups: psychological contract obligations, job security, self-reliance, and loyalty/commitment levels. Age (birth year) was converted to generational cohort variables which were used in the exploration of generational differences. Analysis of Variance was used to identify the differences in means. The predicted theory of this research was that various generations hold differences in psychological contract perceptions, self-reliance factors, and various career and organizational commitment measures. This theory was only partially supported by the findings. The findings were significant in the area of continuance commitment. There was also significance found between the hypotheses and various control variables. Possible reasons for this are discussed.

Employment conditions are changing rapidly in today's public and private work environments. Researchers have attempted to capture the effects of those changes on perceptions, including their effects on the psychological contract. This research contributes to a better understanding of civil service reform, psychological contract, and generational differences. Moreover, it highlights the need for additional research that will illuminate a more accurate conceptualization of the relationship between generation and worker perceptions.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Classic works such as Arthur Miller's *Death of a Salesman* (1949), John Steinbeck's *Of Mice and Men* (1937), and F. Scott Fitzgerald's *The Great Gatsby* (1925) all paint various portraits of the "American Dream" and its shortcomings. Commonly known as a perceived faith held by many about what life in the United States should be, the concept of the "American Dream" is built upon the idea that with hard work, courage and determination, anyone can create opportunities and achieve a better life for themselves.

In everyday life the "American Dream" can be seen in people's perceptions about marriage, family, homeownership and the work environment. In recent decades, many of these ingrained perceptions about the foundation of America have been changing. The entrance of women into the workplace gave way to two career families, which is rapidly giving way to a nation of single parents. The robust internet-driven economy of the late 1990's allowed interest rates to drop low while homeownership reached record levels, but not all social changes were seen as positive. As organizations tighten their belt to stay competitive in a growing global market, they are experiencing a change the social contract of the workplace. These same trends are appearing in the public sector as well.

Background of the Study

Across the nation civil service reform is sweeping through all levels of government. These reforms call for greater managerial flexibility at the expense of civil servant employment security and tenure. This work examines the effects of these reforms on the psychological contract¹ of various generations working in Florida's state government. The literature review begins with a brief account of the reforms at hand, before moving on to highlight various models used to frame those reforms. From there, the work outlines streams of research associated with the psychological contract and various generations. Finally, gaps in the literature are identified and hypotheses proposed. The hypotheses fall into four groups: psychological contract

¹ Psychological Contract is defined as an inducement-contribution exchange agreement between an employee and employer typically implied and often conflictual.

obligations, job security, self-reliance, and loyalty/commitment levels. Age (birth year) converted to generational cohorts is the variable used to explore generational differences.

New Work Environment

A ten-year study of the US private sector workforce (1993 – 2003) identified important aspects of what is termed the “new economy” work environment. “In order to adjust, organizations of all sizes have tried to become more lean and flexible. After years of downsizing, restructuring and reengineering, the myth of job security is dead. In the real new economy, everybody is thinking as a free agent. The traditional long term employer-employee bond has morphed into a short-term transactional relationship” (Tulgan, 2004, p. 24). Moreover, the study found seniority, age, rank, and rules to be diminishing, organizational charts flattening, and layers of management removed. Employees defined career success less by rank or seniority and more in highly personal terms such as learning marketable skills and building relationships. In order to effectively manage human capital, the study advised organizations to optimize human resources by having “the right people in the right places at the right times, [and] employing them exactly as long as you need them and no longer” (Tulgan, 2004, p. 26). Similar to “lean manufacturing” or “just in time inventory” management, the new work environment calls on leaders to see human capital in the same vein.

As the current business environment is infused with instability, traditional ideas of job security in exchange for hard work and loyalty are steadily diminishing (Sims, 1994). U.S. workers now average 10 employers throughout their adult lives (Topel & Ward, 1992). Even countries with a reputation for lifetime employment and loyalty are seeing effects of this changing work environment. Cheng (1991) found that Japanese male workers go through an average of six employers in their adult lives. Employment conditions are changing rapidly in today’s public and private work environments. Researchers have attempted to capture the effects of those changes on perceptions, including their effects on the psychological contract. Some have expressed it in the following terms:

In the recent past, employees went to work for an organization expecting to stay with that employer if things worked out. The traditional, implicit “employment contract” was that if people worked hard and remained loyal to the organization they would have careers and a long term future in that organization, barring

some economic catastrophe. Today, mobility across employers and even industries is expected. Downsizing, outsourcing, and the externalization of employment reigns supreme. (Pfeffer, 1998)

The psychological contract can be defined as an exchange agreement of promises and contributions between two parties, the employee and employer, and includes an individual's beliefs regarding mutual obligations (Rousseau, 1990, 1995). Psychological contract theory is believed by many to be the most accurate explanation of the varied, albeit primarily negative, reactions of employees to job insecurity (King, 2000).

Violations of the psychological contract often elicit emotional reactions of disappointment, frustration, and distress (Pate & Malone, 2000; Robinson & Morrison, 1995) as well as anger, resentment, bitterness and indignation (Pate & Malone, 2000; Rousseau, 1989). An individual's reaction, however, is dependent upon the strength of the perceived contract and severity of the violation (McClean Parks & Kidder, 1994; Pate & Malone, 2000).

In the new work environment, sometimes called the "new deal" (Herriot & Pemberton, 1995), employers, limited by tightening fiscal conditions, are no longer able to guarantee job security and long term career opportunities. Even successful companies are changing the social and work contract. Many organizations are opting for a "protean" (Hall & Moss, 1998) or "boundaryless" (DeFillippi & Arthur, 1994) approach to employee development by providing growth and training opportunities in place of job security. A "protean" career is defined as one managed by the employee rather than the organization (Hall & Moss, 1998). For the employee, this kind of career mentality requires self-awareness and personal responsibility gained through individual developmental growth (Kegan, 1994). Kegan found the adults in his sample to both love the autonomy but also fear the lack of external support. In fact, only half of the adults in the sample indicated they had reached a level of psychological development that allowed them to be comfortable with this organizational environment. Hall and Moss (1998) found their interviewees took an average of seven years to become comfortable with the understanding of the new relationship.

In addition, employers have had to adjust their expectations away from organizational loyalty and commitment, moving instead to the value added by each employee during their time on the job (Hall & Moss, 1998; McCarthy & Hall, 2000). Rousseau (1995) believes

organizations are moving toward an “adhocratic” model of employment: one where the employee/employer partnership is viewed as temporary and the timeline of this relationship is based on exterior factors such as profitability, technology advances or project/contract-specific employment needs etc. Employees have also been charged with dealing with these changes in employment contracts and some have argued that the initial anger associated with psychological contract violation has subsided into recognition of the realities of the ”new deal” working environment (Herriot, 2001).

Descriptions of various views of the new organizational environment are listed below. Table 1.1 describes distinctions between the characteristics of the traditional vs. the new psychological contract. Table 1.2 examines the three career profiles generally discussed in the workplace as the basis for psychological contract creation.

Table 1.1

Distinctions between “Old” and “New” Characteristics of the Psychological Contract

Old Contract	New Contract
Organization is “parent” to employee “child”	Organization and employee enter into “adult” contracts focused on mutually beneficial work
Employee’s identity and worth are defined by the organization	Employee’s identity and worth are defined by the employee
Those who stay are good and loyal; others are bad and disloyal	The regular flow of people in and out is healthy and should be celebrated
Employees who do what they are told will work until retirement	Long term employment is unlikely; expect and prepare for multiple relationships
The primary route for growth is through promotion	The primary route for growth is a sense of personal accomplishment

Source: Kissler (1994); Maguire (2002)

Table 1.2

Career Profiles and Competencies of Boundaryless v. Bounded Careers

Competency	Bounded	Boundaryless
Know-why identity	Employer-dependent	Employer independent
Know-how employment context	Specialized	Flexible
Networks	Intra-organizational, hierarchic	Inter-organizational, non hierarchic

Source: DeFillippi and Arthur (1994)

Disputes

Despite the mounting research on the “new” work environment, there are some researchers who say that the “old” work environment existed more as a perception than as a reality. Copeland (2005) used a 2004 census data supplement to the Current Population Survey to examine trends of 60,000 households and view overall tenure changes compared with previous years. The research found that, among all wage workers age 20 and older, the median tenure was 4.0 years or slightly more from 1983 – 2004. Private and public sector workers showed slight differences: Median tenure for private sector workers held steady at 3.6 years while tenure for public sector workers increased from 6.0 years in 1983 to 7.5 years in 1998 before declining to 7.0 years in 2004. The author sees these findings as evidence that long term tenure has never existed to the extent perceived. However, he is quick to point out that data on tenure is not a measure of perception but rather of reality. In other words, the data measures the actual length of time workers have been with their current employer (i.e., stability) rather than the perception of workers to be able to remain in their present job (i.e., security).

This is consistent with the work of Hall and Moss (1998). They argued that lifetime employment was not the norm in US business organizations despite strong union presence. Rather the perception of job security existed due in large part to strong internal labor markets and human resource policies favoring long term employment security. In fact, although nearly a third of the workforce was unionized at that time, the authors estimate only 3.4% of Americans worked under any explicit agreement regarding long term security in 1975 and even less in the turbulent 1980’s. These understandings were not legally binding but rather were ambiguous, nonbinding “traditions,” “practices,” or “philosophies” (p. 24).

The previous research was based in the private sector, and is yet to be confirmed either way by public sector research. Whether or not the traditional work environment ever existed in reality, the perception that it did affects workers’ interpretations of the current work environment. These perceptions warrant studies of changes over time. Generational cohorts provide a means for such a comparison. As Berman and West (2003) contend, changes in state civil service protection policies call for a closer examination of the psychological contract between public employers and workers, and its nuances.

Statement of the Problem

The new work environment is not only affecting the private sector but also the public sector through civil service reforms. The purpose of this study is to better understand the role that the psychological contract plays in worker perceptions and reactions to those reforms. The analyses compare reactions and consequences based on generational cohort and specific ideologies. Specifically, the dissertation aims to establish a deeper understanding of the psychological contract by answering three research questions: (a) what effect does generation have on perceptions of organizational and career loyalty and commitment, (b) what effect does generation have on perceptions of career movement and job security, and (c) what effect do the current work environment changes have on perceptions of public sector work and organizational obligations by generation? The ultimate goal of this study is to provide helpful information to both scholars and practitioners about the ramifications of reform movements in government, enabling better human capital planning and human resource policy implementation for the future.

Significance of the Study

This study has both practical and theoretical implications. First, civil service reform has a long historical precedent, dating as far back as the mid-1800's. As local, state, and federal executives compete for workers in an environment that requires speed and flexibility, they are examining their own merit and civil service systems to identify possible reforms. For example, the State of Florida has set the pace for civil service reforms in both scope and speed. Examining effects of reform more than five years after implementation, this study identifies effects of these reforms on civil service workers and informs debate about reforms in other states and jurisdictions. Public managers must continue to lead despite constant work environment changes impelled by political leaders. Understanding the ramifications of these reforms on their workforce as well as any differences that might appear in generational cohorts will enhance their ability to effectively manage and lead.

Finally, this research enhances three bodies of literature: civil service reform, generation studies, and psychological contract theory. Civil service reform literature is a rapidly growing body of work sparked by reforms at both the federal and state level. Continued empirical work on this topic will enhance the overall understanding of the reforms' effects. Generational studies to date are full of contradictions, providing little definition (Chetkovich, 2003; Light, 1999; Yang & Guy, 2006). Although one study cannot clarify these contrasts, a deeper and more detailed

analysis of potential differences and similarities will enhance understanding. While a large body of literature exists regarding the psychological contract in private firms, there is less research focusing on the psychological contract in public employment. Examining the point at which civil service reform affects the psychological contract and clarifying the effect as it relates to generational cohorts moves all three literatures into a new stream.

Overview of the Study

This chapter has introduced the subjects of civil service reform and the new work environment. Research questions were posed and their importance highlighted. The remaining chapters will discuss these topics in more detail and then test them empirically.

Chapter Two begins with a review of literature on civil service reforms, specifically highlighting the most sweeping and radical civil service reforms of certain states. It goes on to explain the arguments for and against these reforms. The chapter then examines two existing models for understanding reformed civil service systems. The next section of the chapter reviews psychological contract literature and literature on generational cohorts. Research on civil service reforms has reported worker reactions to drastic reform efforts but has yet to examine the in-depth effects of these reforms on workers, particularly in light of the new work environment. By reviewing all three of these literature streams, this work attempts to further inform understanding of psychological contracts of public sector workers differentiated by their generational cohort. The chapter closes by proposing hypotheses to be tested in public agencies.

Chapters three and four present the research design and findings of the survey. Chapter three illustrates the variables, survey design, pilot study, sampling, and implemented statistical techniques. Chapter four reports the results and discusses their implications as well as the study's limitations.

Finally, Chapter five concludes the dissertation by drawing conclusions and making recommendations for practical and theoretical knowledge that can be gleaned from this work. Suggestions for future research studies are discussed.

CHAPTER 2

CIVIL SERVICE REFORM AND THE PSYCHOLOGICAL CONTRACT

This chapter begins with a review of the literature on civil service reforms at both the federal and state level. Throughout time, the need for reform and the style of that reform has varied dramatically, creating new problems as quickly as old ones were solved. These reforms and their consequences are first discussed. Next, the chapter reviews the most recent reform movements afoot in Florida as well as outlining a few theoretical models offered in the literature to help frame the reforms and account for some of their shortcomings.

The chapter then moves on to a discussion of the psychological contract. As literature in this area is scarce in public administration journals, most of the literature reviewed is taken from other fields. First an overview of psychological contract theory definitions and literature is provided. The section begins with a look at the beginnings of the theory and how it developed. Next, break-away research streams are examined, including those focused on categorization, conditions affecting the psychological contract, and contract violation consequences.

The next section of this chapter explores current research on generational characteristics and differences. Literature in this area is mixed. While some writers advocate management strategies based on understanding differences, others find no substantial evidence to support differential management. Arguments for each are examined.

Finally, the last section of this chapter illuminates hypotheses that connect generational differences, reactions to civil service reforms, and psychological contract theory. The hypotheses fall into four groups: psychological contract obligations, job security, self-reliance, and loyalty/commitment levels. Generational cohorts created from birth year/age are used as an indicator of generation.

Historical Perspectives

Civil service reform movements are nearly as old as the civil service system itself. The original civil service system, based on equity, fairness, and representation, was put into place to battle the Jacksonian-era spoils system. However, despite good intentions, the system became increasingly cumbersome and filled with red tape and bureaucracy. These problems, still present today, incited the continual cycle of civil service reform movements.

The first major civil service reform would come on the heels of a national tragedy. Spurred by the death of President James Garfield by a rejected political appointee, a bipartisan majority passed the Pendleton Civil Service Reform Act in January 1883, which established an official merit system (Hoogenboom, 1961). The merit system was made up of three main premises: competitive entrance exams, relative security from partisan removal, and political neutrality in public office (Van Riper, 1958). The merit system, established by the Pendleton Act and envisioned by the reformers, improved the ranks of civil service by reducing partisan hiring and promotions and setting the tone for the modern merit system.

By 1900, professionalization was slowly becoming standard and the quality of educated workers recruited to public service was increasing. Political neutrality was being blanketed in and partisan policy influence was being replaced with professionalized management and business principles (Hoogenboom, 1961). These principles were reinforced under President Theodore Roosevelt's leadership. During his administration, public service moved toward a stronger administrative and organizational form that strengthened competitive service rules and clarification regarding patronage versus permanent service. This reform is credited with actively commencing the "metamorphosis" from the original merit system into public personnel management (Van Riper, 1958, p. 540).

Despite the growing professionalization, government and politics were not without partisan blunders. The executive corruption of the Watergate era under President Richard Nixon reinforced the resolve of policy makers and the nation to continue decentralization and civil service reform. Following Watergate, President Jimmy Carter initiated the most sweeping reform legislation since 1883, the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978. Speaking of the reform, Carter had this to say at his State of the Union address of 1978:

But even the best organized Government will only be as effective as the people who carry out its policies. For this reason I consider civil service reform to be absolutely vital. Worked out with the civil servants themselves, this reorganization plan will restore the merit principle to a system that has grown into a bureaucratic maze. It will provide greater management flexibility and better rewards for better performance without compromising job security. (Naff and Newman, 2004, pg. 192)

However, despite these strengths, criticism continued to point to overlapping layers of complex rules and procedures that led to slow and confusing hiring and promotion criteria

coupled with an inability to offer comparable pay and benefits. Smaller inadequacies were also revealed, such as the provision for demonstration projects with no mechanism to make permanent those found to be successful (Nelson, 2004). Spurred by the growing problem of recruitment and retention in government, the 1990's saw a massive resurgence of interest in civil service reform under the campaign promises of soon-to-be President Clinton and the innovations recommended by the book *Reinventing Government* (Osborne & Gaebler, 1992). Morale among governmental workers was excruciatingly low and public confidence in government was in parallel form. Public management turned its focus to the management of organizations, supervision of workers, and customer service, using the newest initiative: total quality management (TQM). TQM focused quality improvement in all areas from customer interactions to employee participation to precise statistical performance measurements (Deming, 1994). Directly following Clinton's election, the President and his administration announced the physical product of their reinvention plan: the National Performance Review. It outlined ways to cut unnecessary spending, eliminate red tape, view serving the public as customer service, deregulate administrative power to empower employees, and remove mandates from local communities in order to give them greater flexibility (Shafritz & Hyde, 1997).

Ongoing Reforms at the Federal Level

Although the reinvention reform efforts mark the last major overhaul of the federal government's human resource system, other smaller reforms, particularly in response to the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, have come about more recently. Federal level managers continue to express concern over the rigidity of the personnel system.

Managers were left with limited flexibility and discretion, isolated in important ways from both those they managed and supervised and those who wanted to manage them...The paradox is that layers upon layers of rules do not ensure control or accountability. (Ingraham, 1995, p.3)

In 1999, just two years shy of a new presidency, leaders from academic, political and organizational backgrounds gathered at the Wye River Forum to discuss merit reforms that would shift focus away from protecting workers and toward better performance (Abramson, 2001). This message was heard repeatedly across the nation and even quietly at the polls in 2000.

Once inaugurated, President George W. Bush set forth five government-wide initiatives for continued reform within the federal government. Bush's reforms focused on strategic human capital management, expanded use of technology, improved financial management, budget and performance integration, and competitive progress (Office of Management and Budget [OMB], 2002). The Office of Management and Budget worked within the Government Performance and Results Act of the previous administration and attempted to assist agencies as they developed and tracked performance-based outcome measures. This drew large bipartisan praise (Crumpacker and Crumpacker, 2004).

Following 9/11, federal reforms took on heightened urgency as complex bureaucracy, lack of efficiency, inadequate managerial control, and poor communication earned partial blame for the terrorist attacks. Civil service reform was a key element of the reform. Specifically, President Bush signed the Homeland Security Act creating, among other things, the Department of Homeland Security. This new agency was given greater flexibility than any other federal department for HR reform. Even with the added flexibility this proved no small feat because the department consolidated 23 different agencies. In order to balance the needed changes with the merit-based core values of the traditional civil service, an advisory network was developed that included federal employees' unions, managers from the various agencies, and experts from OPM, among others (Nelson, 2004).

In addition to the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Defense and the Transportation Security Administration were also granted legislative approval to develop their own personnel systems, exempt from Title 5. This immediately affected 50% of the federal civil service population. These exemptions came about because managers expressed the need for more flexibility in recruitment, hiring, firing, length of probation, reassignment, promotion, and pay (Naff & Newman, 2004; Nelson, 2004). Although many hailed the creation of the Department of Homeland security, as with all civil service reforms it was not without its critics.

Throughout history, significant reforms have taken place at the federal level. Over time these reforms have shifted the focus of human resource management away from traditional centralized control to more results oriented decentralization (Woodard, 2005). This has set the tone for state governments to follow. However, current federal reforms, while significant, pale in comparison to the more radical reforms afoot in some states. The next section of the chapter reviews the various reforms currently afoot in states around the country. For many years, civil

service reform movements followed a trickle-down model starting with reforms at the federal level and eventually working their way down to the states. However, many state reform efforts have now surpassed those at the federal level in both their scope and progressiveness. These reforms have incurred strong support as well as passionate opposition.

Ongoing Reforms at the State Level

Unlike the Pendleton Act of 1883 and the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978, both of which trickled down to influence lower levels of government; current state civil service reforms have been more radical and sweeping than those at the federal level. Hays and Sowa (2006) performed a nationwide survey to document the various arrays of reform being enacted in each state. Of the 50 states, 16 reported massive decentralization, while another 24 were moving in that direction. In the most extreme cases, the old “merit system” has been completely abolished. Issues most often reformed include the reduction or abolition of centralized testing and the movement of classification, compensation, job assignments, performance appraisals, and other employment conditions to agency control. Finally, a new development coming out of highly reformed states is the adoption of a consultative format where the central human resource office provides technical support to agencies with no control responsibilities.

Table 2.1 identifies the most significant aspects of 6 state reform efforts. The reforms range from extreme and highly criticized (i.e., Florida, Georgia, Texas) to moderate and even praised (i.e., Utah, New York, Louisiana). In all but one case, at-will employment is a main priority, although the depth to which this particular reform extends into the agency ranks varies. Following the chart is a more in-depth look at Florida’s reform efforts, known as Service First. This detailed background on Florida contributes to the understanding gained from the findings of this research.

Table 2.1
Major Civil Service Reform Changes by State

	Georgia	Florida	Texas	New York	Utah	Louisiana
Reform	At-will	At-will	At-will	Procedural	At-will	Decentralize &
Priority	employment	employment	employment	Overhaul	employment	Reorganize
Employees affected	All new hires after July 1, 1996 and most promotions and/or transfers	16,300 Career Service Employees, primarily supervisory	100% of State Employees	Variable	Variable	Combined 7 classified departments into 3 non-classified

Table 2.1 Continued

Benefits	N/A	Health insurance coverage expanded, additional sick and vacation days	Increased health insurance, retirement and non-monetary benefits	N/A	Nineteen categories of at-will employment and benefits vary for each	N/A
Hiring	Agencies can recruit and hire freely, or hire GMS to do it for them. Written exams largely eliminated for management	Jobs listed on central job bank, agencies can advertise and hire freely - no waiting. Written exams largely eliminated	Jobs listed on central job bank agencies can advertise and hire freely - no waiting. Written exams largely eliminated	Testing and recruitment timeline improvements, flexibility from enhanced applicant lists	Individual agencies responsible for job classes. Hiring and firing based on classification chosen	Internet vacancy posting and computer imaging personnel records give greater efficiency
Layoffs	Agencies free to develop their own procedures for discipline and dismissal	Seniority/bumping eliminated, "reasonable cause" dismissal cause definition broadened to eliminate intent	Exceptions to at-will doctrine follow federal laws only	Changes mainly related to improved testing procedures and early retirement incentives	Individual agencies responsible for job classifications. Hiring and firing based on classification chosen	N/A
Compensation	Agencies permitted to create new job classifications; Merit System maintains a compensation plan tied to classification for entry-level positions	New broadbanding, agency to set "market pay," lump sum bonuses tied to measurable savings to state	Pay steps within a job class, or sliding scale and based on performance	Reduction and consolidation of state titles and pay bands	Compensation set by Department of Human Resources based on classification	N/A
Appeals	Internal agency appeal boards or employee seeks rule of law in court of appeals	Internal agency appeal boards, PERC power reduced, employees to seek rule of law in court	Internal agency appeal boards or employee seek rule of law in court of appeals	N/A	At will employees to seek rule of law in court for inequitable treatment or dismissal	N/A
Other		Education and training funding increased		Technological and communication improvements		Civil Service changed from enforcer to consultant

Source: Adapted from Battaglio and Condrey (2006); Cogburn, 2006; Department of Human Resources State of Utah, 2005; and Walters, 2002 and West 2002.

Florida

One of the more recent, Florida's civil service system was created in 1967 after complaints were lodged that employee turnover was damaging banking, real estate, and retail

interests. Advocates of job protection claimed loans and other big-ticket sales could not be made to the state workers because many would be laid off by the in-coming political officials after each election. Stabilization in the form of guaranteed tenure was designed to ensure reliable operation of Florida's state agencies (Bowman *et al.*, 2003). Later, in 1980 and 1985, the Florida legislature moved two management classifications of employees from permanent service to gubernatorial appointees. In 1998, Governor Jeb Bush was elected after promising to create "business-like" government, where efficiency and management flexibility would be the rule. Consistent with the "reinventing government" reforms at the federal level, Governor Bush believed that the state workforce should be as small as possible and that as many state services as possible should be contracted out to private providers. To this end, he immediately ordered his state agencies to reduce their workforce by 25% over the next five years and initiated legislation for further changes as well (Bowman *et al.*, 2003).

Governor Bush set out to reform Florida's civil service system, enlisting the help of the Florida Council of 100 and Florida Tax Watch, two well known pro-business advocacy groups. Their aim was to speed hiring times, increase productivity, and reduce administrative costs. They saw the civil service system as outdated and cumbersome and looked to the private sector for a model of greater efficiency. In their view, civil service protections were a hindrance to good performance and believed that poor performers were protected from accountability. Among their proposals was the transfer of career service employees to at-will status, the abolition of the Public Employee Relations Commission (PERC), and elimination of bumping rights. PERC was an agency set up to provide and oversee the appeals process for employees who file grievances. These changes were accomplished in 2001 and were named "Service First" (H.R. 369, 2001).

In March 2001, the Service First initiative was announced by the Governor as a way to reform the civil service system, remove job protection for underperforming employees, and start enabling good managers more discretion. Although his initial desire was to remove all job protections, the Governor compromised moving only 16,901 of the nearly 180,000 Career Service (CS) state employees to newly classified Select Exempt Service (SES) status. These employees were no longer protected under the civil service system. Although the employees affected by the reclassification lost job protection, they were afforded other benefits such as fully paid health insurance and additional leave time.

Service First reforms met the call for streamlining recruitment in order to reduce administrative costs. This was accomplished by significantly cutting documentation requirements, such as eligibility paperwork, applicant demographics files, interview documentation, and candidate ratings. After the reforms, all that managers were required to do was to write a rationale for why the winning candidate was hired. Further streamlining was found in the area of classification and compensation. By broadbanding, (i.e., reducing the number of job classifications and extending salary ranges for each classification) managers were given flexibility to reward staff with higher salaries and offer promotions without having to go through the lengthy procedure of documenting the need to reclassify someone's job because of a change of duties.

A key difference between reforms in Florida and those in Georgia is that Georgia's grandfather clause exempted existing workers from at-will reforms. Instead, Georgia's reforms focused on new hires at all levels. Although this eased fears of current workers, the reform is actually more progressive than Florida's because over time the entire Georgia state workforce will eventually be unclassified. In Florida, by contrast, a specific number of existing positions were moved to unclassified status, upsetting some current employees but limiting the scope of the reform (West, 2002).

Other states are taking small, incremental steps toward reform. Washington, Wisconsin, Kansas, and South Carolina are moving away from formalized testing and focusing more on knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSAs). Michigan, New York, South Carolina and many counties across the nation are attempting to create new job titles and classifications in order to offer managers more flexibility to move people from position to position as well as to accommodate broadband classifications (Hayes, 2004; Walters, 2002). In addition, the State of Washington recently gave sweeping power to its state personnel director to rewrite the state's civil service rules. The city of Washington, D.C. has followed Florida's lead and removed tenure for middle and upper management titles. These reforms, whether extreme or moderate, follow a trend toward greater flexibility, discretion, and responsibility for managers.

Model Perspectives

Researchers have attempted to categorize reform efforts within various model perspectives in order to better understand their similarities and differences. First, Condrey (2002) conducted interviews on the Georgia reform as well as a case study of one agency to

examine bureaucratic response. He found that most of those he interviewed did feel the system was a hindrance to effective work in the state. However, his observations led him to theorize that implementation problems could have been reduced if Georgia would have moved from the traditional system to the strategic model rather than the reform model. The strategic model would have allowed for some centralization to remain and for the individual agencies to work with the centralized office for better continuity.

Battaglio and Condrey (2006) furthered Condrey's (2002) work by embracing his three methods for delivery of human resource management: the traditional model, the reform model, and the strategic model; and then adding a fourth model, the privatization/outsourcing model, all illustrated in Table 2.2 (Condrey, 2005). Contracting out, load shedding, sale of state assets, vouchers, franchise agreements, deregulation, and other arrangements for transferring production of governmental goods and services into private hands are examples of the fourth method (privatization/outsourcing), and are ever-more prevalent in the US and around the globe (Fernandez, Lowman, & Rainey, 2002).

A second set of models was outlined first by Naff (2006) and further by Naff and Newman (2004). This group consists of three models, illustrated in Table 2.3 the modernization model, the radical reform model, and the status quo model. Battaglio and Condrey (2006) use these models to assess various state and local cases, finding most to be modernization with some radical reform and only one remaining at status quo. Tables 2.2 and 2.3 illustrate the primary aspects of each model.

Table 2.2
A Comparison of Four Models of Public Human Resource Management

Function	Traditional model	Reform model	Strategic model	Privatization/ Outsourcing model
Service delivery	Centralized	Decentralized	Collaborative	Private Contract Entity
Goal Orientation	Uniform enforcement of rules, policies, and procedures	Manager centered	Respectful of human resource management and organizational goals	Focus on effective contract negotiation and administration
Communication pattern	Top-down	Two-way	Multidirectional	Reports and contract monitoring activities
Feedback characteristics	Formal and informal complaints	Muted	Continuous	Muffled feedback

Table 2.2 Continued				
Value orientation	"Merit"	Immediate responsiveness to organizational mission and goals	Effective organizational functioning coupled with a respect for effective human resource management practices	Values efficiency and private sector values, perhaps to the detriment of other important organizational goals
Role of human resource management manager	Enforcer of "merit"	Diminished authority and control	Organizational consultant	Diminished authority and control
Perception of human resource management profession	Hindrance to effective organizational functioning	Adjunct collection of skills	Full managerial partner	Adjunct collection of skills
Role of education	Public personnel administration	Adjunct to managerial skills	Human resource management, general management, practical focus	Contract negotiation and administrative skills

Source: Condrey, Stephen E. 2005. "Toward Strategic Human Resource Management." *Handbook of Human Resource Management*, 2nd ed. Stephen E. Condrey. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Table 2.3
A Comparison of Three Models of Civil Service Reforms

Modernization model	Radical reform model	Status quo
Incremental change initiated through statutory reform initiatives	Change implemented by granting agencies exemption from civil service protection	Traditional merit system continues
Cognizant of the "constellation of supporters and opponents" in political environment	Change prompted by partisan forces	No recent/significant change(s) to system under way
Decentralization of merit system	Dismantling of merit system	Preservation of traditional merit system
Broadbanding Agencies and department responsibility for staffing decisions	Pay-for-performance Agency unique systems	Pay grade system Government-wide civil service system

Source: Adapted from Naff & Newman (2004) and Naff (2006).

Perceptions of Reforms over Time

Multiple studies indicate public HR professionals in at-will states are pleased with the reforms (Lasseter, 2002; Walters, 2003). One such survey of HR directors in Texas indicates positive as well as mixed responses toward complete at-will employment in Texas (Cogburn, 2006). Some of the most notable responses include:

- 97.4% *agreed* "even though employment is at-will, most employee terminations are for good cause"
- 2.6% *agreed* with knowing of a person fired so that other people with friends or connections to government could be hired.

- ❑ 72.4% *agreed* that employees in their respective agencies have been terminated at-will for poor performance.
- ❑ 65% *disagreed* that at-will employment “makes state government less attractive than would be the case if there was more job security”
- ❑ 70% *disagreed* that “lack of job security makes recruiting and retaining employees difficult”
- ❑ 63.6% *disagreed* that at-will employment “discourages employees from freely voicing objections to management directives” (Coggburn, 2006, pp.10-12)

This survey also gives strength to Kellough and Nigro (2000) and Walters (2002) who found that early fears about widespread partisan coercion in Georgia, Texas, and Florida have not been realized. David Ferguson, for example, head of personnel for the Florida Department of Transportation, found partisan fears to be unwarranted. His agency scrapped required test scores in favor of individually written KSAs for positions. Despite serious reservations about the change, Ferguson indicated the fears that union officials held of managers “rewriting KSAs so they could hire their buddies” has not happened. “In fact, I think allowing managers to do KSAs has been one of the best changes yet” (Walters, 2002, p. 33).

One proponent, Reuben Lasseter (2002), a Georgia Department of Human Resources personnel director, used his own experiences to shed light from an insider’s point of view. Using his department as a sample, he finds that although they are quicker to terminate an employee than before the reform, “the percentage of employees being dismissed is still very low and ...reflects the balanced approach to discipline we are trying to achieve” (p. 128). Further, he outlines three types of internal employee reactions to the potential of unclassified status. The first show “almost total lack of concern” (p. 131). These, he says, feel confident in their skills and abilities and see little advantage to having protection. The second are willing to move if it means a promotion but are concerned about the loss of protections. Finally, there are those to whom protection means enough that they would be willing to give up a substantial promotion in order to keep it. Overall, Lasseter believes reform has created a more reasonable balance between the merit system and operating agencies.

Furthermore, some critics have become proponents over time. Mike Sorrells is one example. In 1997 he warned that Georgia officials were “throwing out the baby with the

bathwater” (Walters, 2002, p. 27). He worried about patronage hiring and overall quality control. When re-interviewed in 2002, he indicated he still had lingering fears about potential legal ramifications but, overall, he would not want to return to the old days (Walters, 2002). In fact, Walters found that out of the 99 employees he interviewed, virtually all of them expressed the strong opinion that they would not want to go back to the pre-reform state of civil service.

For the last half of the Twentieth Century, organizational relationships have been perceived as a trade off between the loyalty and commitment given by employees in return for lifetime career security from employers. As mentioned earlier in this chapter, reorganization, privatization, downsizing and reclassification have swept the public sector in the name of civil service reform. Mirroring changes taking place in other sectors of the labor force, these reforms emphasized managerial flexibility and cost reduction. The civil service reform literature, as reviewed above, holds primarily descriptive accounts of the reforms. Only a few studies take a step beyond and assess the consequences of these reforms. More research is necessary to fully understand the reforms’ effects on the public workforce and psyche. This research attempts to enhance existing civil service literature by examining the relationship between civil service reform effects and workers’ age as framed by psychological contract theory. Understanding the psychological contract perceptions of the public workforce will shed light on the true effects these reforms have on public employees. It may also suggest preemptive changes in reform strategies to ensure successful implementation.

Throughout history civil service efforts have strengthened and weakened cyclically as each reform created its own problems. Civil service reform efforts are under scrutiny as they pervade both federal and state government.

Civil service reform is a rapidly growing concern yet lags in empirical work. Researchers across the country have carefully observed and inscribed the various reforms going on around them, yet they are just beginning to empirically test the reactions and consequences for public sector employees. Although many studies exist in the general management literature, few focus on employee psychological contract perceptions or their potential generational correlates in the public sector. The next section reviews psychological contract literature and generational effects before outlining hypotheses for an empirical study in the Florida state government.

The Psychological Contract

The psychological contract can be defined as an inducement-contribution exchange agreement between an employee and employer. It extends from early writings of Chester Barnard and his classic book *Functions of the Executive* (1938). In it he highlights the importance of employer/employee communication in times of change. In particular he highlights four conditions for communication to be effective: it must be understood by recipient, it must be possible for the recipient to do what is being asked, what is being asked must not be incompatible with the recipient's own goals, and it must not be incompatible with the goals of the organization. He believed the effectiveness and efficiency of an organization was predicated on workers level of understanding and acceptance of organizational goals and this understanding could only happen through the right communication. In particular he believed that unless the employees believed the message being communicated was in congruence with their own personal goals, they would resist. Psychological contract theory extends the idea that individual goals create the resistance or acceptance of workplace change and continues to highlight the importance of an individual's beliefs regarding mutual obligations to the organization (Rousseau, 1990, 1995).

The public administration literature offers little enlightenment on the topic, yet Berman and West (2003) contend that rapidly changing state civil service protection policies call for a closer examination. In the single article of its kind, Berman and West begin a preliminary study using surveys from city managers of large cities (i.e., population over 50,000). They found only about half of their sample perceived being engaged in a psychological contract. Of those relying on such an understanding, results indicated positive work aspects including increased openness, communication, loyalty, and trust.

Literature on psychological contract theory from other fields is vast. Its beginning lies in theoretical formation pieces, moves to various dimensions, and finally breaks into various side streams, each examining a different piece of this phenomenon. This section will describe the major foci of this literature.

Early Writings

Psychological contract theory began with intense studies on the contract formation process (McFarland, Shore & Tetrick, 1994; Rousseau & Greller, 1994). A debate exists regarding the time at which the psychological contract is developed. Some believe employees

bring a set of expectations to the organization stemming from previous experiences and that these become the psychological contract known as “pre-entry expectations” (McFarland, Shore & Tetrick, 1994). Pre-entry expectations have long since been considered key in the socialization process. Porter and Steers (1973) claimed that clarification of expectations among newcomers was key to reducing turnover. Others found those expectations subject to change once employer interaction takes place. Post-entry expectations were reinforced through employee/employer interaction and subsequently became part of the psychological contract (Robinson, 1996).

Organizational change is thought to play a large role in employee perceptions and the psychological contract. Social information processing theory posits that employees will alter their perceptions and expectations of the employee/employer relationship at the onset of organizational change (Robinson, Kraatz, & Rousseau, 1994b; Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978). This exemplifies the importance of proper organizational change implementation, as employees who are presented with clearly communicated change plans will form their expectations and a psychological contract to match the change.

Rousseau (2001) moves the literature forward with in-depth analyses on psychological contract formation by examining schemata and their place in psychological contract formation. A schema can be defined as the cognitive organization or mental model of conceptually related elements (Beck, 1967; Horowitz, 1988; Stein, 1992). Pre-employment schemata provide a reference point for employees to construct their expectations about their employment experiences and obligations. Over time, the work environment improves the accuracy of the schemata as the schema moves toward congruence between the individual’s experience and the beliefs in the worker’s schema (Rumelhart & Norman, 1978). Once that congruence is reached, schemata are said to be resistant to change (Crocker, Fiske, & Taylor, 1984).

Under certain conditions, however, the psychological contract can be altered. In a normal situation, when individuals receive information in conflict with their current schemata, they process it on the surface and ultimately reject it. In order for a contract change to occur, an individual must process the discrepant information more thoroughly or deeply than he or she otherwise would. Factors that influence an individual’s motivation to process at a deeper level include the current information-processing load, the time available to make the change, how the change is organized and implemented, and available attention paid by the individual. Therefore,

since adjustment to the schema requires cognitive effort, workplace changes that are rushed, disorganized or sent via mixed messages tend to meet resistance, as individuals are not given proper time and information for deeper cognitive processing. Further, changes that shock the status quo including sudden job insecurity, skill obsolescence, and turnover of familiar relationships tend to be perceived negatively (Crocker et al., 1984).

Other early psychological contract literature included studies of the frequency and process by which breach and violation occurs (Anderson, 1996; Morrison & Robinson, 1997; Robinson & Rousseau, 1994a). Most believe there exist two main reasons for the perception of contract breach: reneging and incongruence (Morrison & Robinson, 1997; Robinson & Morrison, 2000). Reneging occurs when the organization and its representatives knowingly fail to meet an agreed upon obligation. Incongruence reflects a gap in the shared understanding between an employee and the organization as to whether an obligation exists.

Research Streams

Following the basic formation and violation literature, three more streams of research have emerged: *categorizations* of the psychological contract; *conditions* that effect, enhance or detract from them; and *consequences* of contract violation. Primary pieces from each of these three streams are detailed within Tables 2.4, 2.5, and 2.6. Table 2.4 highlights literature that creates categories to better understand the psychological contract. Table 2.5 examines the conditions that lead to the creation, growth, or violation of the psychological contract. Table 2.6 examines the effects or consequences that result when a psychological contract is violated.

Table 2.4
Literature Review of Categories of Psychological Contract Types

Author	Description
Rousseau (1990, 1995)	Created one of the first categorizations differentiating between transactional contracts (short term, performance related) and relational contracts (longer term, ambiguous). Other, less discussed categories include balanced and transitional. Categorization based on two dimensions – time frame and tangibility.
Hall and Moss (1998)	Interviewed 49 people about changes in the perceived psychological contract in their organizations. Found three types of companies: "Lost in the trees," those in current trauma; "See the forest for the trees," those starting to see the big picture and accept the new contract; and "Comfortable in the forest," those who used continuous learning to move slowly and deliberately into the new contract phase.
Shore and Barksdale (1998)	Adding to Rousseau, they identify four other classification types: mutual high obligations, mutual low obligations, employee over-obligations, and employee under-obligations.
Janssens, M., Sels, L. and Van den Brande, I. (2003)	Adopting a "feature-oriented assessment" (1354) and following Rousseau and Mclean Parks (1993) model, they examine an eight dimension scale (time-frame, tangibility, scope, stability, exchange symmetry, contract level, employee obligations, and employer obligations) and find six separate psychological contract profiles: loyal, instrumental, weak, unattached, investing, and strong.

Table 2.5
Literature Review of Conditions affecting Psychological Contract

Author	Methodology/Sample	Results
Robinson and Morrison (2000)	Expanded a previous model, Morrison and Robinson (1997) with a mail survey of 147 recently MBA graduates with new full time jobs.	Findings indicated employees were more likely to perceive contract breach when their organization has been performing poorly, when they reported their own performance was low, when they had not experienced a formal process of socialization, and when they had little interaction with member of the organization prior to being hired. In addition, employees were more likely to perceive contract breach if they had experienced previous contract violation or if they had numerous employment alternatives at the time of hire.
Maguire (2002)	Case study of an Australian banking organization	Contrary to hypothesis, psychological contract maintenance was still considered an important aspect of the employee/employer relationship. However, the author feels organizations need to find ways to best cultivate the psychological contract to fit the rapidly changing work environment.
Coyle-Shapiro and Kessler (2003)	United Kingdom mail survey of 5,709 non management employees in the public sector.	Findings support norm of reciprocity, or idea that employees who perceive fulfillment of their obligations will reciprocate by fulfilling their expected organizational obligations.
Edwards, J.C., Rust, K.G., McKinley, W., and Moon, G. (2003)	Four studies conducted in US, Singapore and Korea	Findings indicate an individual's belief in ideology of self-reliance reduces the degree to which they perceive layoffs as a breach of psychological contract.
Tekleab and Taylor (2003)	Surveyed 478 non faculty university employees and 283 managers	Results show disagreement between employees and managers on employee obligations and violations but not on the organization's obligations. Further employee tenure with the manager and the level of leader member exchange positively affected agreement on employee obligations.
Sutton and Griffin (2004)	A national longitudinal study focused on 235 final year occupational therapy students surveyed immediately prior to entering the profession and 14 months later.	Results indicated post-entry experiences with supervision predicted psychological contract violation and jointly predicted job satisfaction while pre-entry and met expectations did not.

Table 2.6
Literature Review of Psychological Contract Violation Consequences

Author	Methodology/Sample	Results
King (2000)	425 mail surveys were sent to business school alumni of a large mid-Atlantic American University	Results indicate white-collar workers who feel insecure about their jobs are less willing to act on behalf of their organization but do so in subtle ways. In addition, respondents with high job insecurity tended to have a higher degree of career loyalty, indicating they felt their careers should take precedence over the goals of any employer. Finally, results indicated that white-collar worker reactions to job insecurity is not predicated on whether or not they have a psychological contract for job security.

Table 2.6 Continued

Coyle-Shapiro (2002)	Surveyed 480 public sector employees over three years	Contrary to the hypothesis, findings show procedural or interactional justice did not affect the relationship between what an employer offers and the employee's organizational citizenship behavior.
Pate, J., Martin, G., and McGoldrick, J. (2003)	A longitudinal mix-method study of a medium sized textile company in rural Britain	Examining the consequences of psychological contract breach on employee attitude and behaviors, results suggested perceived contract violations affected worker attitudes but not behaviors. Qualitative interviews gave insights into the reasons, which included a sense of pride in their work and collegiality among employees.
Pugh, S.D., Sharlicki, D.P., and Passell, B.S.. (2003)	Quantitative mail survey sent to 141 layoff victims using an outplacement service	Evidence of mistrust of their new employer and cynicism toward their new place of employment were found.
Hislop (2003)	Theoretical piece expanding an existing model	Expanding Guest and Conway's (1997) model of psychological contract to link commitment with knowledge sharing suggesting that commitment may be an important variable influencing worker attitudes and willingness to share information. Further underlying the psychological contract may affect commitment levels and therefore knowledge sharing.
Gakorvic and Tetric (2003)	Surveys were collected from 161 employees at a large financial corporation	Results indicated fulfillment of organizational obligations predicted both emotional exhaustion and job satisfaction; therefore psychological contract breach contributes to employee job strain.
Cortvriend (2004)	A focus group methodology within a primary care trust in England.	Looking into the effects of the merger, subsequent de-merger and significant organizational restructuring of the organization, they found that leadership and management styles had a significant impact on staff experiences. In addition, rapid and prolonged changes in the organization hurt psychological contract perceptions leading to negativity and even departure.
Turnley, W.H., Bolino, M.C., Lester, S.W., and Bloodgood, J.M (2004)	Quantitative survey of 109 US union employees	Findings indicated the relationship between psychological contract breach and union commitment is stronger when individuals perceive their union to be highly instrumental in protecting their rights.

Research by Janssens, Sels, and Van den Brande (2003) moves from theoretical to empirical following the Rousseau and Mclean Parks (1993) model and using a “feature-oriented assessment” (p. 1354). In order to examine the psychological contract on an eight-dimension scale, they created the categorical classifications described below. These dimensions (time-frame, tangibility, scope, stability, exchange symmetry, contract level, employee obligations, and employer obligations) were tested on a sample of public, private, and non-profit organizations in Belgium.

Findings indicate that six distinct psychological contract profiles exist, each with individual characteristics. The first profile is the *loyal psychological contract*, where the emphasis is on long term involvement in exchange for loyalty. They found this profile to be held mostly by poorly educated blue collar workers. The second profile, the *instrumental psychological contract*, is held by workers who hold high expectations toward their employers but feel little obligation on their own part. This profile was held by a mix of blue and white collar workers mainly in operational positions, similarly poorly-educated.

The third profile is held by average-educated workers found in all hierarchical levels and all pay ranges. Respondents in the aptly named *weak psychological contract* had low scores in all areas. A fourth, the *unattached psychological contract*, was found in young, highly educated white collar and executive workers. These respondents were found to score low on long term involvement and on loyalty but high on personal investment.

The *investing psychological contract* makes up the fifth profile and is comprised of the highest pay category and high education, although not as high as the unattached profile. Respondents in this group scored high on all employer obligation scales except for equal treatment and scored far above average on personal investment and flexibility. Finally, the sixth cluster profile, the *strong psychological contract*, exemplified the highest recorded scores on everything except personal investment. This cohort was found to be older respondents with greater tenure and seniority. Additionally it was comprised of more middle management and civil service jobs than any of the other profiles.

Janssens et al. (2003) also drew some overarching conclusions worthy of further examination. First, effective commitment was found in three of the profiles: strong, investing, and loyal. This type of commitment was related to employer obligations of long term involvement and employee obligations of personal investment, flexibility, and loyalty. Traditionally this type of commitment was viewed as a highly desirable trait for employability. However, this study found employability to be higher for the unattached psychological contract, which is driven by the combination of short-term employer investment obligations as well as strong yet short term employee personal investment. In other words, employers are put at ease because their commitment to the employee is seen as short term so there is no pressure to make changes when the market or financial standing changes. The employees in this category are looking to further themselves, giving large amounts of personal investment for only a short

timeframe. These short term employee perspectives are seen to be related to the ease of movement in the labor market.

The categories in Janssen's work and the age and generational similarities of the participants leads to an interesting question: Do changing work conditions affect workers' perceptions of the psychological contract differently based on age? As with all survey research, the work in this dissertation is a snapshot capturing perceptions at one point in time. Therefore, using generational cohorts can offer insight into generational perception differences and similarities. The following section examines previous literature on the topic of generation.

Generational Perspective²

Research indicates that attitudes toward the psychological contract are influenced by employees' experiences (DeMeuse, Bergmann, & Lester, 2001); therefore, it can be hypothesized that generation will have an effect as well. Generational cohorts are defined as a group of people sharing similar and stable social and historical life experiences over the course of their lives (Rosow, 1974). The effect of generation on worker perceptions of the current civil service changes is an undeveloped topic of interest for both theoreticians and practitioners seeking smooth civil service reform transitions. However, generational studies in the literature have conflicting findings, leaving much debate among scholars and practitioners about their relevance. There are three primary generations that comprise the majority of workers in today's work force. Characteristics of each are below, and although commonly associated with the said generations, these profiles are generalizations based on multiple sources both academic and mainstream in nature and are not intended to encompass the varied exceptions of individuals within each cohort.

Matures and Boomers

Research on both Matures (those born approximately 1925 to 1942) and Boomers (those born from approximately 1943 to 1960) paint a picture of a loyal, hardworking, and secure generation. Matures are found to value comfort and stability more than either of their counterpart generations. Their lack of education as compared to more recent generations further contributes to their desire to avoid the unknown and maintain stability at all costs ("Baby Boomers Grow Up," 1996). Having experienced the Great Depression, they are more economically cautious and

² Generational cohort birth dates vary slightly from source to source. Dates in this study are adapted from Strauss and Howe (1991).

pessimistic than following generations. They are considered conservative, hardworking, and conforming (Robbins, 1998). Relatively few Mature women moved into the workforce compared to later generations. However, Matures do value social components in both work and home. Like Boomers, they place high emphasis on warm, friendly workplace relationships (LaRocco, House, & French, 1980; Yankelovich, 1979). Similarly to GenXers, they are willing to trade off high compensation for greater leisure time (Robbins, 1998; Smith & Clurman, 1997).

Boomers, on the other hand, are reportedly more concerned with money and willing to spend more of their disposable income on products and entertainment than previous generations (“Baby Boomers Grow Up”, 1996). Unlike the generations that sandwich them, Boomers report placing high value on work and generally receive high levels of job satisfaction from it (Rhodes, 1983). Boomers’ upbringing was set in a traditional home life where variation was minimized in public and self esteem and idealism were instilled. Boomers report feeling a sense of drive and dedication in the workplace, stemming from their belief in their capabilities to change the world (Cordeniz, 2002). This notion of bucking the status quo credits Boomers with launching change agent societal movements from the war and civil rights protests of the 1960s to the drug culture and rock and roll era of the 1970s and 1980s (Kahlert, 1999).

Like Matures, Boomers are also seen as a tight knit social group, valuing friendly, warm relationships with coworkers much more than younger generations (LaRocco, House, & French, 1980; Yankelovich, 1979). More educated and progressive than Matures, they began the two-career family trend that continues today. Adding to the chaotic lifestyle is the sandwich effect of caring for both aging parents and teenage children and the need to adapt to the technological age that was thrust upon them in mid-career (Kahlert, 1999). Matures and Boomers show signs of shared ties in the areas of stability, work, and social networks. These ties changed dramatically as the next generation came of age. A dramatic shift in expectations of work and personal relationships has been observed and will be detailed in the next section.

Generation X

Over the last decade numerous studies have been conducted tracing the workforce trends and general preferences of what is called “Generation X” (also referred to as Gen X or GenXers). This refers, roughly, to those born between 1961 and 1981 and currently comprises more than 30% of the public workforce (Jurkiewicz, 2000). “Gen X,” as it is frequently called, is a generation of nearly 49 million of the best-educated and most technologically advanced

individuals in US history (Reynolds, 2004). Soon they will begin to reach peak earnings and become the most important component of gross domestic product and consumer expenditures.

General values viewed most important by GenXers are a sense of belonging/teamwork, ability to learn new things, autonomy, and entrepreneurship (Hornblower, 1997; Ramo, 1997; Tulgan, 1995). GenXers strive for authority, independence, and a voice in decision making (Jennings, 2000). Hornblower (1997) found GenXers to be more competitive, risktaking and success-minded than Boomers.

In a study employing 250 telephone interviews, Generation X respondents described themselves as hard workers who see jobs as a means to an end and claimed to have little confidence and loyalty to leaders and institutions (Tulgan, 1997). Other surveys, however, indicated GenXers voiced great commitment to their profession and organization. However, they anticipated movement out of their current employment institution as well as their profession over the course of their work life to provide themselves the diversified skill set needed to be successfully self-reliant (Smith, 2000).

Speaking at the 2004 Annual Convention of the American Banking Association, Greg Churchman, a retention strategist specializing in generational differences among GenXers said, “People tend to leave when they are not challenged and see no prospects for growth. Salary and benefits are important [to younger workers], but are not usually the top priority” (Churchman, 2004, p.12). He outlines four important traits employers should know about their Gen X employees: “Time is more important to them than money, over 70% plan to own their own business, they are accustomed to inherent wealth, and they are well attuned to the information age” (Churchman, 2004, p.12).

Another trend becoming prevalent in younger workers is the ease with which they switch jobs and job sectors. These trends are further evidence to support the notion of predisposing experiences causing generational differences in the workplace. Conflicts are particularly prevalent in public workplaces, where stability and tenure have been traditional norms.

Right now one of the things I know is that there's not one single career that I think will satisfy me and keep me interested and energized enough to actually contribute the next 40 years.

- Kevin, Master of Public Policy student, JFK School of Government (Chetkovich, 2003, p.668)

Simply stated, young Americans are no longer willing to wait patiently for the chance to accomplish something worthwhile....The government-centered public service has been replaced by a new public service in which government must compete for talent. ...[G]overnment...is not configured to offer the work that young Americans want (Light, 1999, pp. 1-2).

Evidence of this new public service is found in a variety of changing attitudes but most prominently in the rapid rate of job and sector switches. A study was conducted by Light (1999) involving a sample of 1000 graduates of MPP and MPA programs in five separate cohorts (spanning 1973 – 1993) interviewed in 1998. What he found was a clear shift in young employee work expectations that no longer aligned with the traditional public sector career civil servant system. Particular evidence of this trend was found in four areas. First, when asked if they would stay in their current sector or with their current employer for the rest of their career, the 1990's cohort (predominantly Generation X) was four times less likely than the 1970's cohort (primarily Baby Boomer generation) to stay with the same employers and three times more likely to say they would switch both sector and job sometime in their careers. Further, over half of the interviewees had already switched sectors at least once since graduating. Second, views on single-employer careers were measured with the question of how long a person should stay with any given employer, and only 5% of the total sample indicated a person should stay more than 10 years with a single employer. Sixty-two percent of the respondents indicated they were doing work today that they would like to do in five years and when asked to choose among government, private sector, or a non-profit, 63% chose the sector they were already in.

In similar research, Chetkovich (2003) interviewed over a hundred Master of Public Policy students in the J. F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University over a five-semester time frame between 1999 and 2001. The intent was to gauge student attitudes and career goals as they moved through the program and into their first job. Insights from these interviews included a clear expectation by the students of multi-sector careers, a desire for interesting work, a belief in private sector skill development, and skepticism about government in general. Students reported feeling confident they would work in multiple sectors during their career and felt it was more difficult to enter the private sector from the public sector than vice versa. Add this to the general concern expressed over financial burdens left from educational loans, and many of these policy students were openly seeking only private sector employment as

their first priority. Even more enlightening, *not one of the students interviewed indicated they would pursue lifelong careers in the public sector*. Reasons varied but included lack of confidence in government's ability to perform well, low expectation for intellectual challenge and influence, less innovation, fewer opportunities, and lack of support for learning. This research holds important and upsetting insights for public sector human resource practitioners as they struggle to attract the best and brightest to public service.

Generational Conflict

As these three primary generations merge into the modern workforce, conflicting needs and priorities elevate workplace conflicts. Evidence of this can be found in the perceptions reported by each. Boomers view GenXers as holding uncommitted, "slacker" attitudes as well as being self absorbed and arrogant. They also resent the Gen X drifter or revolving-door orientation that leads GenXers to change jobs frequently. In contrast, Generation Xers voiced great commitment to the profession even though they anticipated eventual movement from the organization and even the career field. They saw Boomers as over cautious slaves to hierarchy. They defended their independence, noting it was not arrogance but rather a need to be self-reliant (Jurkiewicz, 2000; Laabs, 1996; Smith, 2000).

Beyond perceptions and stereotypes lie differing needs based on age and life stage. Boomers and Matures are looking to maximize their retirement benefits while GenXers are just beginning to need childcare (Flynn, 1996). Further conflict erupts as GenXers feel blocked for career opportunities by Boomers remaining in their jobs well past traditional retirement age. As the path to success becomes more about horizontal enhancement and less about upward mobility, the line between sectors (i.e. public, private, or non profit) continues to disappear. Furthering this scenario is the increasing hierarchical conflict between Boomers and GenXers. Lack of financial planning and general personal satisfaction from work are both said to be causing Boomers to stay in their jobs longer, leaving less room for GenXers to move up the ladder. Lack of upward movement even with peak performance is forcing GenXers to seek opportunities for advancement elsewhere, thus contributing to the lack of loyalty GenXers show toward their employers (Holtz, 1995; Laabs, 1996; Russell, 1996).

Despite these conflicts in basic characteristics, evidence is mixed as to just how different the various generations are from one another. The discussion of new workforce entrants' behavior and tenure is neither new nor definitive. Research of this nature dates back to the

1970's and 1980's when Baby Boomers were first entering the workplace. Even then debate existed in the literature over turnover rates. Some findings suggest turnover rates spiked during the first two to four years when controlling for age, and declined monotonically thereafter (March, J.C., & March, J.G., 1977). Others directly disputed this finding using a heterogeneous model including both individual and organizational differences (Schmittlein & Morrison, 1981).

Other studies observed high first year workplace turnover, especially among recent college graduates (Wanous, 1977). At the time, three main conclusions were believed to account for this: individuals lacked commitment to the organization (Buchanan, 1974; Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979); individuals were inadequately socialized by the organization (Van Maanen, 1976); or individuals' initial expectations about the job were not fulfilled (Dunnette, Arvey, & Banas, 1973). This final conclusion lays a foundation for future research on the psychological contract. Research by O'Reilly and Caldwell (1981) found that workplace turnover among new entrants was reduced when the individual perceived the job choice to be irrevocable. In other words, an employee was found more likely to stay in the job if they perceived their job choice to be binding. Determining if the psychological contract composition varies by age could further these findings.

Research on similarities indicates basic principles remain the same despite differing societal influences. Proponents of generational differences see important distinctions in the varied expectations of different generations causing shifts in the workplace environment. This research is discussed below.

Similarities and Differences

Subscribers to the variance model, as seen above, see notable differences between the workplace values and preferences of the three generations, and hypothesize that at-will doctrines present a closer alignment with GenX values, while traditional civil service protection policies fit more closely with Mature and Boomer preferences and values.

Santos and Cox (2000) gave further evidence to the variance model in their study of workplace stress. In a study of 413 nurses using a three-component occupational adjustment model, Baby Boomers and Generation X employees held significantly different perceptions of occupational stress. Boomers scored highest in stress levels on role overload and role boundaries, while GenXers noted highest stress on the physical workplace environment. Despite this model's apparent evidence, other research produces differing conclusions.

Jurkiewicz and Brown (1998) surveyed 278 workers from five municipalities using 15 work-related factors for ranking of their importance. They found only two significant differences between the age on any of those 15 work factor preferences. The sample was rerun for a 2000 study where they found only 3 differences, all from the data focused on personal growth. This probably points to differences in life stages rather than generational cohort. Both Boomers and GenXers indicated they were motivated by “a stable and secure future,” (Jurkiewicz, 2000, p. 60) however, the source of this security (i.e., a single organization, multiple organizations throughout a career, or an individual’s own capabilities) was not specified. Yang & Guy (2006) also found no differences between Boomers and GenXers in work motivators when examining 314 government workers using measures from the 2002 General Social Survey. Finally, in the work most closely aligned with this research, DeMeuse et al. (2001) examined 204 individuals across three generations looking at employee/employer relationship changes since the 1950s. In particular, researchers focused on the relational component to work environment. They predicted that perceptions of the relational component of the employment relationship would decrease over the past five decades and that time and generation as well as experience would have an effect on the relationship. Results confirmed the hypothesis that perceptions of the psychological contract had changed over time, and that experience and time but not generation had an effect on these perceptions.

Hypotheses

DeMeuse’s work begins the investigation of age and generation and its correlation with the psychological contract. It is limited, however, because members of the younger two generations infer hypothetically about the experiences of the workplace prior to their entrance. It is likely that this method required them to call upon stereotypical inaccuracies or workplace myths to answer the questions. These mixed empirical results leave more questions to answer, especially in the area of psychological contract theory and the public sector. More work is needed to fully understand the effect that generation has on the psychological contract in the workplace³. To this end, the following discussion explains the hypotheses that guide this research.

³ Debate exists over whether age/life stage and generational cohort can be separated to offer individual insight on behavior. This research does not purport to solve this mystery but rather uses age as an indicator of generation and believes this to be a sufficient measure for knowledge building purposes.

In describing work values, Tulgan (1995) hypothesized that financial, family, and societal insecurity, rapid change, and great diversity evident in the upbringing of GenXers, led to a sense of individualism over the traditional collectivism documented in Boomer and Mature character descriptions. As a result, GenXers are believed to be less committed to their organization and more committed to themselves (Meda, 1996). They demand immediate gratification and are skeptical of long term promises made by large institutions. They turn away from traditional career paths followed by their parents, including traditional norms of success in favor of free-agency (Billingsley, 2000; Tulgan, 2004). They are credited with “inventing the free-agent, job-oriented, performance based work ethic that all other generations, willingly or not, have had to embrace,” (Howe, 2004, p. 32). This free agent mentality is evident in their tendency to change jobs on average every 18 months (Kronenberg, 1997). Jennings (2000) found job-hopping to be a normal, accepted method of career advancement for GenXers. Some believe this is a reactionary reversal of the workaholicism of their parents (Coolidge, 1997a; Deutschman, 1992; Hornblower, 1997). Others note that, as “latch-key” kids, GenXers learned to care for and depend solely on themselves at an early age further contributing to their sense of individualism (Robbins, 1998; Tulgan, 1995). Either way, GenXers entered the workforce with a frame of reference that did not include job security, pensions, or a traditional career model seen as mandatory by other generations (Coolidge, 1997a; Tulgan, 1995). The experiences can be hypothesized to predispose younger generations to ideas and expectations very different from those of previous generations, including organizational obligations, reasons for going into public service and expectations of length of stay in one employment position.

H1: The older the generation, the more the perceived psychological contract obligations will increase.

H2: The older the generation, the more perceptions of job security as a valued aspect of public service work will increase.

H3: The older the generation, the more perceptions of job movement as an acceptable career strategy will decrease.

As noted above, studies have found differences in the preconceived notions of the workers entering the workforce, in particular their independence and autonomy. Janssens et al. (2003) found the young, highly educated white collar workers were predisposed toward the unattached psychological contract, i.e., generally lacking the desire for long term organizational involvement and loyalty but not lacking individual personal investment. This complements a growing segment of the management literature which defines employment ideology as a “relatively coherent set of beliefs that bind some people together and that explain their worlds in terms of cause and effect relations” (Beyer, 1981, p. 66). The “ideology of self-reliance,” as described by McKinley, Mone, & Barker (1998) is founded on the belief that employees should be as independent of employers as possible, particularly regarding their own employability. This kind of ideology lowers employee expectations for job security, thus making downsizing less destructive on the employee’s psyche. Further it can be hypothesized that these unattached and self-reliant tendencies are more likely in younger generations as opposed to older generations.

H4: The older the generation, the more the belief in the “ideology of self-reliance” will decrease.

Finally, King (2000) found white collar workers who feel insecure about their jobs are less willing to act on behalf of their organization but do so in subtle ways that do not draw attention to themselves. Waning organizational citizenship, mediocre work quality, diminished organizational commitment can all have negative impacts on an organization yet go undetected for long lengths of time.

In addition, respondents with high job insecurity tended to have a higher degree of career loyalty, indicating they felt their careers should take precedence over the goals of any employer. Previous research indicates the current wave of civil service reforms have caused extreme insecurity among Florida’s state workers (Bowman et al., 2003; West, 2002). Using King’s (2000) research as the basis, this research hypothesizes this insecurity leads to greater career and less organizational loyalty further enhancing the perceived “new work environment.”

H5: The older the generation, the more organizational loyalty will increase.

H6: The older the generation, the more individual career commitment will decrease.

Meyer et al. (1993) contend organizational commitment is best understood as a three component model with three distinct areas of commitment each reflecting various perceived aspects of the work environment. Affective commitment is seen as an affective attachment to the organization. Continuance commitment is the perceived cost associated with leaving the organization. And normative commitment mirrors the more traditionally definition of organizational commitment as commitment as an obligation to remain in the organization. This research also considers these three components individually to refine understanding of commitment perceptions.

H7: The older the generation, the more affective commitment will increase.

H8: The older the generation, the more continuance commitment will increase.

H9: The older the generation, the more normative commitment will increase.

In sum, this chapter proposes seven hypotheses exploring psychological contract categories, perceptions of the psychological contract through the eyes of various generations, and career and organizational loyalty and commitment in the new work environment. Table 2.7 below highlights the expected direction of the results for each hypothesis. The next chapter details the research methodology for the empirical study.

Table 2.7
Summary of Expected Direction of Results by Hypotheses

Dependent variables	Expected direction
H1: Psychological Contract Obligations	Positive
H2: Job security as public service value	Positive
H3: Sector Switching as a Career Method	Negative
H4: Belief in Ideology of Self-Reliance	Negative
H5: Organizational Loyalty	Positive
H6: Career Commitment	Negative
H7: Affective Commitment	Positive
H8: Continuance Commitment	Positive
H9: Normative Commitment	Positive

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This chapter outlines the research methodology and design strategy for the dissertation. This research, based on the traditional philosophy of science, attempts to make progress in both the social science and public administration paradigms by building on the theory and hypotheses outlined in the previous chapters.

The chapter is organized into four subsections: units of analysis and variables measured, survey, data collection, and data analysis. Potential limitations and trade-offs are also discussed.

Units of Analysis

Using individual State of Florida Senior Management Service (SMS), Career Service (CS) and Select Exempt Service (SES) workers as the unit of analysis, a survey was developed and sent to a sample of state government workers with an indicator question determining their generational cohort by their birth year. Questions gauged perceptions of workers on the following components: psychological contract obligations; job security as an important characteristic of employment; the frequency of experienced and expected job change; career commitment and ideology of self-reliance; organizational loyalty; and three various types of organizational commitment.

Variables Measured

The survey examined nine dimensions as well as demographic information on the respondents. The dimensions are explained below followed by a bullet list of the survey questions for each dimension. The full survey can be found in Appendix A.

Psychological Contract. Psychological contract obligation was assessed with six items adapted from Janssens *et al.* (2003); Robinson *et al* (1994) as found in Tekleab and Taylor (2003); and Ashford *et al.*(1989). The items were Likert scale ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree.

To what extent do you agree that the State of Florida and/or your agency are obligated to provide each of the following to you:

- An attractive benefits package
- Fair treatment
- Job security

- Feedback on your performance
- Opportunities for career development
- Transfer opportunities should my current job be eliminated

Organizational Loyalty. Organizational loyalty was assessed with 4 items adapted from Jannsens *et al.* (2003); and Robinson *et al.* (1994) as found in Tekleab and Taylor (2003). The items were Likert scale ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree.

To what extent do you feel you are obligated to provide each of the following to the State of Florida and/or your agency:

- Volunteer to do tasks that fall outside my job description
- Develop new skills as needed
- Perform my job in a reliable manner
- Work extra hours if needed to get the job done

Job Movement. Job movement was assessed using 3 newly created items. The items were Likert scale ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree. One should stay in their job for at least 5-10 years.

- One should not change jobs multiple times in their lifetime
- One should not change employers multiple times in their lifetime

Career Commitment. Career commitment was assessed using a measure developed by Blau (1985, 1988). The first four items were taken from Liden & Green (1980), the remaining two from Downing *et al.* (1978). Blau notes that content for the measure was based primarily on existing items measuring occupational commitment (Downing *et al.* 1978) and career orientation (Liden & Green 1980). The items were Likert scale ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree.

- If I could get another job besides my current profession, that paid the same amount, I would probably take it.
- I definitely want a career for myself in the field I am working in now.
- If I could do it all over again I would not choose to work in my current profession.

- If I had all the money I needed without working, I would probably still continue to work in my current profession.
- I like this profession too much to give it up.
- I am disappointed that I ever entered my current profession.

Ideology of Self Reliance. Ideology of self reliance was assessed using 2 separate, renamed, and newly created items based on theory in McKinley *et al.*(1998). The items were Likert scale ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree.

Worker Career Control

- I am in control of my career.

Employer Career Control

- My career success is dependent on my organization.

Civil Service Reform/Job Security. The survey also contains a section directly assessing opinions of civil service reform and job security. Civil service reform perceptions were assessed using 3 created items surveyed using a Likert 5-point scale.

In recent years, many states including Florida have made changes to their civil service system classifications including the removal of employment tenure.

- I believe civil service reforms such as loss of job security is detrimental to recruitment of qualified applicants for state government jobs.
- Job security makes me more motivated to perform my job.
- I believe job security is an important aspect to state government work.

Three Commitment Factors. Three other types of commitment were assessed; affective, continuance, and normative. The affective, continuance and normative commitment factors were taken from Meyer et al (1993). The three commitment factors were measured on a 7-point scale both scales ranging from 1 = strongly agree to 7 = strongly disagree.

Affective Commitment

- I do not feel a strong sense of “belonging” to my organization.
- I do not feel like “part of the family” at my organization.
- This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me.

Continuance Commitment

- It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to.
- Too much of my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my organization right now.
- I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this organization.

Normative Commitment

- I would feel guilty if I left my organization now.
- This organization deserves my loyalty.
- I would not leave my organization right now because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it.
- I owe a great deal to my organization.

Development of Survey & Pilot Survey Instrument

An electronic survey using an online survey program (Zoomerang) was the format for the survey based on survey participants' direct access to computers. This program is widely used, user friendly, and approved for research use by Human Subjects Committee/Institutional Research Board. This research dissertation was approved by the Human Subjects Committee on June 29, 2006 (Appendix B).

Research on web surveys indicates a recent rise in usage and reliability. The primary advantage of their use is increased efficiencies including the cost savings of the nearly complete elimination of paper, postage, mailout and data entry (Dillman 2000). Reduced response time, well documented by past research, ability to survey thousands of subjects at one time and save hours of telephone interviewing or paper to data entry have all been cited as benefits of e-surveys (Bachmann, Elfrink, & Vazzana 1996; Kittleson 1995; Mehta & Sivadas 1995; Sproull 1986). Schleyer and Forrest (2000) found the total cost of web surveys 38 percent lower than the equivalent mail survey. Finally, research by Mehta and Sivadas (1995) and Tse et al (1995) found no difference in data quality between electronic and paper surveys. Dillman (2000) posits no other method offers greater potential for so little cost.

As with any survey method, web surveys are not without their limitations. Currently protocol for achieving accepted levels of quality have yet to be thoroughly developed and tested

as they have been for mail surveys (*e.g.*, Dillman 2000). Groves (1989) points out that in order for web surveys to be scientifically sound for generalization purposes, all members of the population must be given a known chance of being selected. Using populations where email addresses and computer accessibility are assured, such as the workplace population in this research, nearly eliminate this coverage problem (Dillman 2000).

Schaefer and Dillman (1998) and Dillman (2000) offer other suggestions for general protocol including multiple contacts, personalization of opening message, and mixed mode communication. They test these protocols using a sample of faculty from Washington State University. The 904 faculty members with e-mail access were divided into four groups and each received four contacts: pre-notice, questionnaire, thank you/reminder, replacement questionnaire; however each group varied between paper and e-mail questionnaires. Results indicated comparable response rates for mail and electronic surveys (57.5 and 58 percent respectively). Further advantages were found for electronic surveys including faster response time, lower item non-response, and more complete open-ended question responses. These results complement previous work by Bachmann, Elfrink, and Vazzana (1996); Mehta and Sivadas (1995); and Sproull (1986).

A small pilot pre-test was run in July of 2006 to determine construct validity, question clarity, flow, user friendliness, and internal reliability. Based on the pilot study feedback as well as feedback from the author's committee members, three new constructs were added to measure individual types of commitment; affective, normative and continuance. In addition, some items were re-written to reflect better clarity. The final survey was completed in August of 2006. It consisted of 12 sections. Section one asked about perceptions of generations and general employment questions. Section two asked more specific questions about generations while section three assessed the participants' psychological contract elements. Section four asked about participants' loyalty to their organization and section five sought opinions on job and sector movement among employees. Sections six, eight, nine and ten assessed four types of commitment: career, affective, continuance and normative. Section seven identified participants' ideology of self reliance and the final two sections asked specific questions about civil service reforms and basic demographics.

Sample

Personnel data files including email addresses were downloaded from the State of Florida “411” system at www.MyFlorida.com. The total population of State of Florida employees is 143,397, however employees not listed as having an assigned email address (i.e., an assigned work computer) were removed from the list. Employees without an assigned email address or work computer would likely be in hands-on field positions such as construction and lawn maintenance. These non-office positions will most likely be lower educated, lower income positions but unlikely to have significant differences from the sample with similar demographics. In addition, employees at the 11 state universities and the 28 community colleges were also removed as their employment status is substantially different from other state employees. The final population from which the sample was drawn was 67,467 people.

An electronic survey link was created which could be embedded within a survey invitation email letter (see Appendix C). The email letter and survey link was sent to a simple random sample of 1000 State of Florida employees on September 7, 2006. This timeframe was selected to avoid potential conflicts with the Legislative Session (March – May) and the annual budget process (June – Aug).

Based on the population characteristics, pilot study, and Dillman (2000), a sample of 1000 was determined to be the necessary sample size to achieve the 383 survey responses. This number was calculated as necessary to achieve the desired +/- 5% margin of error at a 95% confidence level ($P=.05$). A total of 392 (39%) surveys were completed.

A total of 58 emails were returned as undeliverable. Thirty-three of them were corrected and resent. The first batch returned 72 completed surveys. A reminder e-mail was sent 7 and 14 days after the original e-mail in order to obtain the aforementioned sample. The second batch, the largest of the three, returned 216 completed surveys and the final batch returned 104. In each batch, the majority of completed surveys were returned within the first 48 hours.

Method of Analysis

All completed surveys were collected using the Zoomerang program and downloaded into SPSS 2005 Version 14.0. Zoomerang compiles and collates the data by respondent and variable. Descriptive statistics were run on each of the above-mentioned items, generational categories and control/demographic information variables. These descriptive statistics are

discussed in detail in the next chapter and included for reference in table A.1 – A.8 in Appendix D.

The test for significant differences between generations was made using analysis of variance. Analysis of variance is a statistical method for evaluating the difference among means. This test is the most suitable technique to use when the independent variable is nominal and the dependent variables to be compared are interval or ratio (Blalock, 1979; Sweet & Grace-Martin, 2003). Technically Likert scale items are ordinal since there is no way to know for certain whether the increments are equidistant from one another. However, conventional research indicates parametric statistical tests, such as Analysis of Variance, are appropriate for Likert scale testing and results will yield the same conclusions (de Vellis, 1991; Fife-Schaw, 1995).

A Levene's test was used to determine whether the assumption of homogeneous variances among the generational cohorts was met. The Levene's test is used to determine whether the data meet the assumption of homogeneous variances (Levene, 1960). Where the Levene's test was significant, the assumptions of homogeneity were not met and *a priori* t-tests were run to identify the presence or absence of differences between groups. Where the Levene's test was not significant ($p > .05$), the assumptions of homogeneous variances were met and a Ryan-Einot-Gabriel-Welch (REGWF) *post hoc* test was performed to locate differences between means. The REGWF test is a stepwise, multiple comparison procedure used to control for familywise error (FWE) and based on ANOVA F statistics. This is a stepwise test for ordered means where the alpha level depends upon the number of steps each mean is from the other (Mickey et al., 2004). Stepwise methods are generally more powerful than single-step methods and more appropriate for hypothesis testing (Hochberg & Tamhane, 1987). Like the Student-Newman-Keuls and Duncan tests, this test is made for one-way balanced ANOVAs. Although tests that do not require any assumptions such as the Bonferroni-Holm are best for unbalanced samples, none are offered in SPSS or SAS. Therefore conventional social science research uses harmonic means to standardize the samples for use with unbalanced samples. Hochberg & Tamhane (1987) recommend REGWF as the most appropriate test of the three since it is the most conservative and does not allow the FWE to exceed alpha. Further they contend that REGWF is more computational intensive and powerful. Results are discussed in detail in the next chapter.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter outlines the results and highlights the important findings. The chapter is organized into two sections. Section one discusses the descriptive elements of the sample while section two presents the findings for each hypothesis.

Sample Description

This section outlines a description of the survey sample as well as the means by which the generational cohort was divided. The final survey respondent cohort consisted of 392 responses. The sample was randomly selected from all Florida state employees. The full demographic information on the sample is represented by the frequency tables (Table A.1) in Appendix D. Mature/Boomer Cuspers and Baby Boomer generational cohorts made up the largest percentage of the sample at 37.5% and 37.8% respectively. Generation X and Matures made up the smallest percentage with only 3.6% each. The sample was more than two-thirds women and more than three-quarters Caucasian. Income levels between \$20,000 and \$75,000 made up the largest proportion of the sample with \$35,000 – \$49,999 holding the greatest percentage at 30.4%. More than a third of the sample held a college degree, 25.5% held a Master's degree and 6.6% held a doctorate degree. Finally, 55.6% were Career Service employees, 40.3% were Select Exempt Service employees and only 4.1% were Senior Management Service employees.

The sample was compared for available representative qualities with the population using the 2005 Annual Workforce Report (State of Florida, 2005) and US Census data on the State of Florida. These comparisons can be seen in Table 4.1. No comparable data was available on generational cohorts, education level or political ideology. In the area of gender, the sample is two-thirds female (64.3%) and one third male (35.2%). This represents slight over-representation of women in the sample compared to the state's workforce (56% female). Concerning race, Caucasians are over represented while African Americans and Hispanics are underrepresented. For income, the sample is more highly paid than the population. For employment status, the sample is under representative of the Career Service employees yet over representative of Select Exempt Service workers. Finally, in the area of political party the

sample is slightly under representative of Republicans and slightly over representative of Democrats and Other.

Table 4.1
Sample and Population Comparison

Gender	Sample	Population
Female	64%	56%
Male	35%	43%
Unknown	1%	1%
Race*	Sample	Population
Caucasian	78%	61%
African American	13%	26%
Hispanic	4%	8%
Other	2%	2%
Unknown	3%	3%
Income*	Sample	Population
<\$20,000	2%	2%
\$20,000 - \$34,999	22%	29%
\$35,000 - \$49,999	30%	55%
\$50,000 - \$74,999	29%	10%
\$75,000 - \$99,999	13%	4%
>\$100,000	4%	1%
Employment status	Sample	Population
Career Service	56%	81%
Select Exempt Service	40%	18%
Senior Management Service	4%	1%
Political Party**	Sample	Population
Republican	25%	38%
Democrat	47%	40%
Independent/Other	28%	22%

*Certain categories collapsed/combined to create mirror comparisons

**Comparisons with State Employee unavailable so comparisons with state demographics made

There is no definitive bias between the sample and population. However, one could speculate that individual characteristics would affect a person's propensity toward certain items. For example, the overrepresentation of women could bias the job security measure as other

research indicates women have a higher propensity toward job security and tend to be more risk averse than men (Marquis, 1998). Political party could also have potential bias since the over representation of Democrats is in conflict with the current Republican administration’s advocacy for civil service reform policies. Overall there is no way to know for certain whether these differences in representation have a significant impact on the conclusions.

Generational Cohort.

The literature on generational cohorts varies dramatically in exact year ranges. For the purpose of this research five generational categories were chosen best representing the presumed ideological disparities among the population. These five groups included selections of the three commonly held generations, Matures, Baby Boomers, and Generation X, but also included two intermittent groups called “cuspers”, those born on the fringes of two generations (Lancaster and Stillman 2002). The sample consisted of only one traditionally viewed Millennial so that respondent was combined with the Generation X cohort. Table 4.2 lists the generational cohorts by their corresponding ranges of birth years.

Table 4.2
Generation Cohorts by Corresponding Birth Years

Generation	Birth Year Range
Matures	1925 - 1942
Mature/Baby Boomer Cusper	1943 - 1953
Baby Boomer	1954 - 1964
Baby Boomer/Generation X Cusper	1965 - 1975
Generation X	1976 -

Findings

This section outlines the 10 variables that were used to test the nine hypotheses in this research. Table 4.3 lists the variables derived from the survey instrument along with their corresponding hypothesis and Cronbach’s alpha. After running the descriptive statistics, a winnowing process was done to discard items which were not a good fit in order to obtain an acceptable alpha. For organizational loyalty, items 1-4 were kept while items 5-7 were discarded. For career commitment, items 1-6 were kept while item 7 was discarded. Finally for civil service reform, items 2-4 were kept while item 1 was discarded. The remaining analysis was done using the newly reduced factors.

Table 4.3
Variable List and Corresponding Hypotheses

Full Variable Name	Corresponding Hypothesis
Psychological Contract $\alpha = 0.8560$	H1: The older the generation, the more the perceived psychological contract obligations will increase.
Civil Service Reforms $\alpha = .8663$	H2: The older the generation, the more perceptions of job security as a valued aspect of public service work will increase.
Job Movement $\alpha = .8715$	H3: The older the generation, the more perceptions of job movement as an acceptable career strategy will decrease.
*Worker Career Control *Employer Career Control	H4: The older the generation, the more the belief in the "ideology of self reliance" will decrease.
Organizational Loyalty $\alpha = .6888$	H5: The older the generation, the more organizational loyalty will increase.
Career Commitment $\alpha = .8221$	H6: The older the generation, the more career commitment will decrease.
Affective Commitment $\alpha = .8715$	H7: The older the generation, the more affective commitment will increase.
Continuance Commitment $\alpha = .7300$	H8: The older the generation, the more continuance commitment will increase.
Normative Commitment $\alpha = .8604$	H9: The older the generation, the more normative commitment will increase.

*Factors for Worker Career Control and Employer Career Control do not report Alphas as they are each single items

Table 4.4 summarizes the relationship between the variables and the hypotheses. Following the tables, the results of the analyses of variance are discussed for each of the 9 hypotheses. Full Analysis of Variance tables can be found in Appendix E.

Table 4.4
Summary of Relationships between Variables and Hypotheses

Dependent Variables	Expected Direction	Actual Direction
H1: Psychological Contract Obligations	Positive	Not Significant
H2: Job Security as a public service value	Positive	Not Significant
H3: Sector switching as career method	Negative	Not Significant
H4: Belief in <i>Ideology of Self-Reliance</i>	Negative	Not Significant
H5: Organizational Loyalty	Positive	Not Significant
H6: Career Commitment	Negative	Not Significant
H7: Affective Commitment	Positive	Not Significant
H8: Continuance Commitment	Positive	Positive
H9: Normative Commitment	Positive	Not Significant

Psychological Contract.

H1: The older the generation, the more the perceived psychological contract obligations will increase.

The results of the Analysis of Variance revealed no significant difference between the generational cohorts in the area of psychological contract. These results are found in Table 4.5 The ANOVA was confirmed as valid by a Levene test of homogeneity of variances which revealed an insignificant result (p=0.137).

Table 4.5
Analysis of Variance of Attitudes about Psychological Contract by Generation

Generations	N	Mean	Std. deviation
Matures	14	1.55	0.50
Mature/Boomer Cusper	146	1.77	0.70
Baby Boomer	146	1.82	0.76
Boomer/Gen X Cusper	69	1.62	0.51
Generation X	14	2.00	0.71
Total	389	1.76	0.69

F = 1.75, df = 4, p = 0.137

However, there was a significant difference found on the basis of income and employment status. Psychological contract was significantly correlated with employment status. Senior Management Service employees were less likely than Selected Exempt Service or Career Service to hold a psychological contract where the latter believed the state was legally obligated to provide certain things such as benefits, due process, feedback and job security. These results, confirmed by insignificant Levene’s test results, are not surprising and are logically linked to the type of work done by SMS employees. In order to further examine differences, a Ryan-Einot-Gabriel-Walsch F (REGWF) test was run (Table 4.6).

Table 4.6
Ryan-Einot-Gabriel-Welsch F test for Psychological Contract and Employment Status

Employment Status	N	Subset 1	Subset 2
Career Service	215	1.7031	
Select Exempt Service	158	1.7975	
Senior Management Service	16		2.2708
Sig.		0.188	1.000

Subset for alpha = .05

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

This test further confirmed SMS employees to hold significantly different psychological contracts from SES and CS employees. It also confirmed that the psychological contracts of SES and CS employees were not significantly different from one another.

A Levene’s test also confirmed the integrity of the ANOVA results for psychological contract and annual income. A REGWF test reveals the highest income level (>\$100,000) to hold significantly different psychological contract expectations from all other income levels with the exception of the lowest income level (<\$20,000) (Table 4.7). Income levels between \$20,000 and \$100,000 were not found to hold significantly different psychological contract expectations from one another. This means employees in the highest income range did not hold strong psychological contract expectations of their organizations, while those in other income ranges did. The lowest income group (<\$20,000) was not found to be significantly different from either group. It is possible the finding on the lowest income group may have been skewed by the very low number of respondents.

Table 4.7

Ryan-Einot-Gabriel-Welsch F test for Psychological Contract and Annual Income

Annual Income	N	Subset 1	Subset 2
\$35,000 - \$49,999	118	1.6201	
\$20,000 - \$34,999	85	1.7000	
\$50,000 - \$74,999	112	1.7813	
\$75,000 - \$100,000	50	1.9400	
<\$20,000	3	2.0000	2.0000
>\$100,000	14		2.5595
Sig.		0.057	0.474

Subset for alpha = .05

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

Explanation for these results is linked to the nature of SMS employment. SMS employees, who tend to hold the highest incomes, are primarily appointed or hired directly by an elected official, causing them to be cognizant of the political process and the terminal/temporary nature of their positions. The lowest income employees are likely those working in part time or high turnover, entry level jobs. These jobs may also be perceived as temporary as the person expects to move into a better paying or full time position. In either case, if one perceives his/her position as temporary, it makes sense that they would not hold the same psychological contract

expectations such as job security, benefits and career development as their colleagues in longer-term, stable positions.

Civil Service Reform

H2: The older the generation, the more perceptions of job security as a valued aspect of public service work will increase.

The results of the Analysis of Variance for Civil Service Reform revealed no significant difference between the generational cohorts (Table 4.8). Levene’s test for homogeneity of variances confirmed these findings (p=0.885).

Table 4.8
Analysis of Variance of Attitudes about Civil Service Reform by Generation

Generations	N	Mean	Std. deviation
Matures	14	2.02	1.04
Mature/Boomer Cusper	145	2.41	1.09
Baby Boomer	147	2.40	1.09
Boomer/Gen X Cusper	67	2.47	1.10
Generation X	14	2.62	1.02
Total	387	2.41	1.09

F = 0.63, df = 4, p = 0.642

There were significant differences found between Civil Service Reform elements and income, race, education, employment status, political party and gender. A Levene’s test of homogeneity of variance confirmed the results for all control variables except education and employment status. Where the Levene’s test was significant and therefore assumptions of homogeneous variance were not met, *a priori* t-tests were run to look for significant differences. An *a priori* t-test was also run for gender since it was a two group comparison. Table 4.9 shows the results for t-tests that test for significant differences between attitudes about Civil Service Reform according to respondents’ level of education.

Table 4.9
t-test for Civil Service Reform and Education

Education	N	Means	Levene's Test		t-test for Equality of Means			
			F	Sig.	t	df	Sig.	
High School Some College	24 60	1.736 2.294	6.919	0.010	Equal Variances Not Assumed	-3.050	64	0.003
High School College Graduate	24 129	1.736 2.374	7.856	0.006	Equal Variances Not Assumed	-3.945	50	0.000
High School Some Graduate School	24 48	1.736 2.333	5.753	0.019	Equal Variances Not Assumed	-2.995	67	0.004
High School Masters Degree	24 100	1.736 2.553	8.436	0.004	Equal Variances Not Assumed	-4.724	61	0.000
High School Doctorate Degree	24 26	1.736 3.051	12.943	0.001	Equal Variances Not Assumed	-4.637	38	0.000
Some College College Graduate	60 129	2.294 2.374	0.343	0.559	Equal Variances Assumed	-0.491	187	0.624
Some College Some Graduate School	60 48	2.294 2.333	0.013	0.908	Equal Variances Assumed	-0.199	106	0.843
Some College Masters Degree	60 100	2.294 2.553	0.885	0.357	Equal Variances Assumed	-1.476	158	0.142
Some College Doctorate Degree	60 26	2.294 3.051	3.377	0.070	Equal Variances Assumed	-2.978	84	0.004
College Graduate Some Graduate School	129 48	1.374 2.333	0.159	0.691	Equal Variances Assumed	0.230	175	0.818
College Graduate Masters Degree	129 100	1.374 2.553	0.205	0.651	Equal Variances Assumed	-1.225	227	0.222
College Graduate Doctorate Degree	129 26	1.374 3.051	2.119	0.148	Equal Variances Assumed	-2.840	153	0.005
Some Graduate School Masters Degree	48 100	2.333 2.553	0.502	0.480	Equal Variances Assumed	-1.142	146	0.255
Some Graduate School Doctorate Degree	48 26	2.333 3.051	2.364	0.129	Equal Variances Assumed	-2.612	72	0.011
Masters Degree Doctorate Degree	100 26	2.553 3.051	1.185	0.279	Equal Variances Assumed	-1.955	124	0.053
Democrats Other	181 33	3.556 3.293	4.571	0.034	Equal Variances Not Assumed	1.249	39	0.219

The t-tests revealed significant differences in attitudes between employees with only a High School diploma and employees with all other levels of education. In each case the employees with only a High School diploma rated job security as significantly more important than employees in all other levels of education. In addition, there was a significant difference found between employees with a doctorate degree and those with some college, a college degree, or some graduate school. Here the employees with a doctorate degree value job security significantly less than other education levels. These findings are consistent with conventional wisdom that greater levels of education provide better access to employment and greater employment options, thereby lessening the need for job security.

The t-test for employment status (Table 4.10) found significant differences between each of the three levels of employment with regard to Civil Service Reform. Job security was found to be most important to Career Service employees and least important to Senior Management Service employees. This result, again, is consistent with conventional wisdom: those in career service positions, where job tenure is still present, would most value it. In addition, Senior Management Service employees can be assumed to have greater overall financial and career stability, and thereby have greater ability to handle potential transition time if their job was eliminated. As previously discussed, SMS employees' roles are considered temporary or terminal by nature so job security is not an expectation of employment.

Table 4.10
t-test for Civil Service Reform and Employment Status

Employment Status			Levene's Test		t-test for Equality of Means			
	N	Means	F	Sig.		t	df	Sig.
Senior Management Service	16	3.583	2.353	0.127	Equal Variances Assumed	2.947	170	0.004
Select Exempt Service	156	2.715						
Select Exempt Service	156	2.715	12.632	0.000	Equal Variances Not Assumed	5.547	291	0.000
Career Service	215	2.099						
Career Service	215	2.099	0.028	0.867	Equal Variances Assumed	6.191	229	0.000
Senior Management Service	16	3.583						

The final t-test was for gender (Table 4.11). Here women were found to value job security more than men. This finding has relevance in light of the growing trend of single mothers in the workplace and research on women’s propensity to be risk averse (Marquis, 1998). These tendencies could make job security more appealing to women who are concerned about maintaining their own financial and career stability.

Table 4.11
t-test for Civil Service Reform and Gender

Employment Status	N	Means	Levene's Test		t-test for Equality of Means			
			F	Sig.	t	df	Sig.	
Women	251	2.318	0.736	0.391	Equal Variances Assumed	-2.236	385	0.026
Men	136	2.576						

Where the Levene’s test confirmed the findings of the Analysis of Variance, a Ryan-Einot-Gabriel-Welsch F test was run to located differences between groups. For Race (Table 4.12) a significant difference was found between Caucasian and Other and all minority ethnic categories. Apparently, minorities value job security more than Caucasians and Other. This result could be an example of a perceived cultural bias, where minority employees feel less able to find alternative employment if their job was eliminated.

Table 4.12
Ryan-Einot-Gabriel-Welsch F for Civil Service Reform and Race

Race	N	Subset 1	Subset 2
Asian	5	1.533	
American Indian	4	1.917	
Hispanic	15	2.000	
African American	52	2.045	
Caucasian	299		2.503
Other	12		2.694
Sig.		0.901	0.905

Subset for alpha = .05

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

A second REGWF test was run between Civil Service Reform and Political Party (Table 4.13). This test revealed a significant difference between Democrats and Republicans and Independents. Employees categorizing themselves as Other were not significantly different from either group. In other words, those who classify themselves as Democrats valued job security

more than those classifying themselves as Republicans. This finding is consistent with classical research on party labels and their ideological underpinnings (Nie et al., 1967; Bastedo & Lodge, 1980), where Democrats tended to view larger governmental roles, aggressive social policies and job security through unionization very favorably.

Table 4.13

Ryan-Einot-Gabriel-Welsch F for Civil Service Reform and Political Party

Political Party	N	Subset 1	Subset 2
Democrat	181	2.236	
Other	32	2.365	2.365
Republican	96		2.583
Independent	78		2.615
Sig.		0.782	0.521

Subset for alpha = .05

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

Finally the last REGWF test was run on Civil Service Reform and Income (Table 4.14). This test found four significantly different groups. The employees in the lowest three income ranges were found to value job security most while the employees with incomes of greater than \$100,000 valued it the least. The importance of job security was progressively less important once an employee's income was above \$50,000. This finding again speaks to conventional wisdom that the greater an employee's income, the more financially stable they are, and the less they value or need job security.

Table 4.14

Ryan-Einot-Gabriel-Welsch F for Civil Service Reform and Annual Income

Annual Income	N	Subset 1	Subset 2	Subset 3	Subset 4
<\$20,000	3	1.778			
\$20,000 - \$34,999	118	2.065			
\$35,000 - \$49,999	85	2.141			
\$50,000 - \$74,999	111		2.526		
\$75,000 - \$100,000	49			2.966	
>\$100,000	14				3.952
Sig.		0.934	1.000	1.000	1.000

Subset for alpha = .05

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

Job Movement.

H3: *The older the generation, the more perceptions of job movement as an acceptable career strategy will decrease.*

The results of the Analysis of Variance for job movement revealed no significant difference between the generational cohorts (Table 4.15). A Levene's test of homogeneity of variances confirmed this ANOVA to be accurate with an insignificant result of $p=0.469$.

Table 4.15
Analysis of Variance of Attitudes about Job Movement by Generation

Generations	N	Mean	Std. deviation
Matures	13	3.31	0.69
Mature/Boomer Cusper	146	3.46	0.88
Baby Boomer	148	3.38	0.97
Boomer/Gen X Cusper	69	3.71	0.88
Generation X	14	3.86	0.80
Total	390	3.48	0.91

$F = 2.29, df = 4, p = 0.060$

There was a significant difference found between job movement and political party as well as job movement and political ideology. Levene's test confirmed the ANOVA to be valid for political ideology with an insignificant result of $p=0.137$. To further assess significant differences among the groups, an Ryan-Einot-Gabriel-Welsch F test was run. The REGWF test found those with conservative and moderate ideologies to hold less approval of job movement as an acceptable career strategy. Similarly, those who label themselves as liberal and very liberal in political ideology were found to be more approving of job movement as an acceptable career strategy. The two groups were found to be significantly different from one another. The respondents labeling themselves very conservative were not found to be significantly different from either group. Results can be seen in Table 4.16.

Table 4.16

Ryan-Einot-Gabriel-Welsch F test for Job Movement and Political Ideology

Political Ideology	N	Subset 1	Subset 2
Conservative	87	3.3180	
Moderate	185	3.4018	
Very conservative	24	3.5556	3.5556
Liberal	73		3.7489
Very liberal	21		3.8571
Sig.		0.682	0.695

Subset for alpha = .05

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

Political party and job movement were found to be significant by the Levene's test therefore the assumption of homogeneous variance was not met. An *a priori* t-test was run to look for differences between job movement and political party (Table 4.17). T-tests revealed a significant difference between Republicans and Democrats where Republicans were less accepting of job movement as a career strategy. T-tests also found a significant difference between Republicans and Independents where again, Republicans were less favorable of job movement as an acceptable career strategy than Independents. There were no significant differences found between Democrats and Independents, Democrats and Other, Independents and Other or Republicans and Other.

These findings are surprising in light of classic political theory on party ideologies which claim conservatives and Republicans are more likely than liberal-minded or Democrats to adhere to market-based or business models of employment, which includes risk taking and fluidity (Bastedo & Lodge, 1980).

Table 4.17

t-test for Job Movement and Political Party

Political Party	N	Means	Levene's Test		t-test for Equality of Means			
			F	Sig.	t	df	Sig.	
Republicans	97	3.296	0.203	0.653	Equal Variances Assumed	-2.304	276	0.022
Democrats	181	3.556						
Democrats	181	3.556	2.145	0.144	Equal Variances Assumed	-0.554	258	0.580
Independents	79	3.620						
Independents	79	3.620	7.220	0.008	Equal Variances Not Assumed	1.487	46	0.144
Other	33	3.293						
Republicans	97	3.295	2.478	0.117	Equal Variances Assumed	-2.424	174	0.016
Independents	79	3.620						

Table 4.17 Continued

Republicans	97	3.295	2.411	0.123	Equal Variances Assumed	0.013	128	0.990
Other	33	3.293						
Democrats	181	3.556	4.571	0.034	Equal Variances Not Assumed	1.249	39	0.219
Other	33	3.293						

Ideology of Self Reliance.

H4: The older the generation, the more the belief in the “ideology of self-reliance” will decrease.

The results of the Analysis of Variance test of Ideology of Self Reliance hypothesis revealed no significant difference between the generational cohorts in either Worker Career Control or Employer Career Control (Table 4.18 and Table 4.19).

Table 4.18
Analysis of Variance for Worker Career Control by Generation

Generations	N	Mean	Standard deviation
Matures	14	2.07	1.21
Mature/Boomer Cusper	147	2.37	1.02
Baby Boomer	147	2.21	0.95
Boomer/Gen X Cusper	69	2.14	0.75
Generation X	14	2.07	0.83
Total	391	2.25	0.95

F = 1.08, df = 4, p = 0.367

The ANOVA result for Employer Career Control was confirmed using a Levene’s test for homogeneity of variance (p=0.150). For Worker Career Control the ANOVA result could not be confirmed as the Levene’s test was found to be significant (p=0.003). An a priori t-test was run and revealed no significant differences among any of the generational cohort groups.

Table 4.19
Analysis of Variance of Attitudes about Employer Career Control by Generation

Generations	N	Mean	Std. deviation
Matures	14	2.43	1.40
Mature/Boomer Cusper	147	3.02	1.13
Baby Boomer	147	2.99	1.14
Boomer/Gen X Cusper	69	2.99	1.06

Generation X	14	2.86	0.95
Total	391	2.98	1.13

F = 0.93, df = 4, p = 0.445

For Worker Career Control, significant differences were found in the Analysis of Variance for annual income and employment status. However, neither of the analyses met the assumption of homogeneous variances ($p < 0.001$ and $p = 0.006$ respectively). A priori t-tests were run on each to identify significant differences among the groups. T-test results for Worker Career Control and Employment Status are listed in Table 4.20. T-test results for Worker Career Control and Annual Income can be found in Table 4.21.

Table 4.20
t-test for Worker Career Control and Employment Status

Employment Status	N	Means	Levene's Test		t-test for Equality of Means			
			F	Sig.	t	df	Sig.	
Senior Management Service	16	2.060	0.709	0.401	Equal Variances Assumed	-0.600	171	0.953
Select Exempt Service	157	2.080						
Select Exempt Service	157	2.390	8.053	0.005	Equal Variances Not Assumed	3.183	354	0.002
Career Service	218	2.080						
Senior Management Service	16	2.060	4.515	0.035	Equal Variances Not Assumed	1.337	18	0.198
Career Service	218	2.390						

For employment status, no difference was found between the Senior Management Service employees and the Select Exempt employees or between the Senior Management Service employees or the Career Service employees. However, a significant difference was found between the Select Exempt Service employees and the Career Service employees where SES employees felt more in control of their own careers than CS employees.

Table 4.21

t-test for Worker Career Control and Annual Income

Annual Income	N	Means	Levene's Test		t-test for Equality of Means			
			F	Sig.		t	df	Sig.
<\$20,000 \$20,000 - \$34,999	3 86	3.000 2.410	0.245	0.622	Equal Variances Assumed	1.011	87	0.315
<\$20,000 \$35,000 - \$49,999	3 119	3.000 2.450	0.438	0.509	Equal Variances Assumed	0.907	120	0.366
<\$20,000 \$50,000 - \$74,999	3 112	3.000 2.130	0.133	0.737	Equal Variances Assumed	1.845	113	0.068
<\$20,000 \$75,000 - \$100,000	3 50	3.000 1.840	0.186	0.668	Equal Variances Assumed	2.601	51	0.012
<\$20,000 >\$100,000	3 14	3.000 2.000	0.033	0.858	Equal Variances Assumed	1.522	15	0.149
\$20,000 - \$34,999 \$35,000 - \$49,999	86 119	2.410 2.450	0.496	0.482	Equal Variances Assumed	-0.264	203	0.792
\$20,000 - \$34,999 \$50,000 - \$74,999	86 112	2.410 2.130	11.317	0.001	Equal Variances Not Assumed	2.137	161	0.034
\$20,000 - \$34,999 \$75,000 - \$100,000	86 50	2.410 1.840	9.307	0.003	Equal Variances Not Assumed	3.780	126	0.000
\$20,000 - \$34,999 >\$100,000	86 14	2.410 2.000	2.184	0.143	Equal Variances Assumed	1.407	98	0.163
\$35,000 - \$49,999 \$50,000 - \$74,999	119 112	2.450 2.130	19.351	0.000	Equal Variances Not Assumed	2.614	221	0.010
\$35,000 - \$49,999 \$75,000 - \$100,000	119 50	2.450 1.840	14.287	0.000	Equal Variances Not Assumed	4.268	129	0.000
\$35,000 - \$49,999 >\$100,000	119 14	2.450 2.000	3.443	0.066	Equal Variances Assumed	1.507	131	0.134
\$50,000 - \$74,999 \$75,000 - \$100,000	112 50	2.130 1.840	0.021	0.886	Equal Variances Assumed	2.131	160	0.035
\$50,000 - \$74,999 >\$100,000	112 14	2.130 2.000	0.013	0.909	Equal Variances Assumed	0.529	124	0.598
\$75,000 - \$100,000 >\$100,000	50 14	1.840 2.000	0.036	0.851	Equal Variances Assumed	-0.653	62	0.516

For annual income, significant differences were found between employees making less than \$20,000 and those making between \$75,000 and \$100,000. There were also significant differences between employees making \$20,000 - \$34,999 and those making \$50,000 - \$74,999

as well as those making \$75,000 - \$100,000. Significant differences were also found when comparing employees with annual incomes of \$35,000 - \$49,999 and those with annual incomes of \$50,000 - \$75,000 and those with incomes of \$75,000 - \$100,000. Finally, employees with incomes of \$50,000 - \$74,999 were significantly different from those employees with incomes of \$75,000 - \$100,000. In each of these comparisons, employees making more money felt greater control over their own careers than those making less.

Due to heteroscedasticity, the Analysis of Variance could not be used for Worker Career Control and political ideology ($p=0.020$) and gender ($p=0.001$) as well as Employer Career Control and Gender ($p=.032$). Therefore, *a priori* t-tests were run for each. These t-tests revealed no differences between any of the groups within each variable.

For the second part of this hypothesis, the Analysis of Variance revealed a significant difference between income and Employer Career Control. The Levene's test confirmed this finding ($p=0.066$). A Ryan-Einot-Gabriel-Welsch F test was run to find significant differences among the groups (Table 4.22).

Table 4.22
Ryan-Einot-Gabriel-Welsch F test for Employer Career Control and Annual Income

Annual Income	N	Subset 1	Subset 2
<\$20,000	3	2.333	
\$35,000 - \$49,999	119	2.815	
\$20,000 - \$34,999	86	2.872	2.872
\$75,000 - \$100,000	50	2.920	2.920
\$50,000 - \$74,999	112	3.170	3.170
>\$100,000	14		3.571
Sig.		0.118	0.101

Subset for alpha = .05

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

For Employer Career Control, employees in the highest income range (>\$100,000) were significantly different from those in the lowest two income ranges (<\$20,000 & \$35,000 - \$49,999) while employees in the middle three income ranges were not significantly different from either group. Employees in the highest income range did not feel the organization had control of their careers while those in the lowest income range felt the organization had the most control.

These findings again lend themselves to personal economic stability factors. Those with highest incomes are financially stable and have the flexibility to leave a job or transition between jobs at their discretion without significant financial hardship. In addition, those in the Select Exempt Service are comfortable with their at-will status and may have chosen it for the additional benefits that accompany it. Their personal work performance, something in their control, would be their career stability. For CS employees, largely rank and file, they depend on not only their own personal work performance but also the opinions and perceptions of their peers and superiors for career stability, leaving them much more vulnerable with elements out of their direct control. In addition, even five years after the large reform efforts done to change CS employees to SES, many may still fear further changes in civil service system policies.

Organizational Loyalty.

H5: The older the generation, the more organizational loyalty will increase.

The result of the Analysis of Variance for organizational loyalty revealed no significant difference between the generational cohorts (Table 4.23). This result was confirmed using a Levene test for homogeneity of variance (p=0.142).

Table 4.23
Analysis of Variance of Attitudes about Organizational Loyalty by Generation

Generations	N	Mean	Std. deviation
Matures	14	1.36	0.27
Mature/Boomer Cusper	147	1.61	0.47
Baby Boomer	148	1.61	0.52
Boomer/Gen X Cusper	68	1.68	0.48
Generation X	14	1.77	0.56
Total	391	1.62	0.49

F = 1.61, df = 4, p = 0.172

However, a significant difference was found between organizational loyalty and education, political ideology and employment status. Levene tests for homogeneity of variance confirmed this result for all three; education (p=.344), political ideology (p=.437), and employment status (p=.550). A Ryan-Einot-Gabriel-Welsch F (REGWF) test was run to further

test for significant differences in the groups. For education (Table 4.24), the REGWF found three subgroups where employees with a doctorate degree held the most organizational loyalty while those with only a high school diploma held the least. Employees with a Masters degree, some college and some graduate school were also similar to those with a Doctorate degree. Employees with any of these four education levels were significantly different from employees with either a college degree or a high school diploma. Employees with a high school diploma were significantly different from those with a Masters Degree and those with a Doctorate degree.

Table 4.24

Ryan-Einot-Gabriel-Welsch F test for Organizational Loyalty and Education

Education Level	N	Subset 1	Subset 2	Subset 3
Doctorate Degree	26	1.3365		
Masters Degree	100	1.5400	1.5400	
Some College	60	1.5708	1.5708	1.5708
Some Graduate School	51	1.6324	1.6324	1.6324
College Degree	131		1.7137	1.7137
High School	23			1.8261
Sig.		0.124	0.062	0.147

Subset for alpha = .05

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

For employment status, Senior Management Service employees have the strongest organizational loyalty while the Career Service employees held the weakest. A REGWF test was run to specify the differences and similarities in the groups. (Table 4.25)

Table 4.25

Ryan-Einot-Gabriel-Welsch F test for Organizational Loyalty and Employment Status

Employment Status	N	Subset 1	Subset 2
Senior Management Service	16	1.3438	
Select Exempt Service	158	1.5728	1.5728
Career Service	217		1.6717
Sig.		0.075	0.054

Subset for alpha = .05

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

The REGWF test found two subgroups. SMS employees were found to be significantly different from Career Service employees. Select Exempt Service employees were found to be significantly similar to both groups.

Both the education and the employment status findings are likely tied to employees' personal investment in the organization. Those with high levels of education and management employment status invest their own professional reputations and future career ambitions on the success of their organization and it is logical to assume that they are more committed to that organization during the duration of their tenure there.

Table 4.26
Ryan-Einot-Gabriel-Welsch F test for Organizational Loyalty and Political Ideology

Political Ideology	N	Subset 1	Subset 2
Liberal	73	1.5137	
Very liberal	21	1.5357	1.5357
Moderate	185	1.6027	1.6027
Very conservative	24	1.6042	1.6042
Conservative	88		1.7614
Sig.		0.581	0.057

Subset for alpha = .05

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

The REGWF test (Table 4.26) revealed significant differences between employees labeling themselves as liberal and those labeling themselves as conservative. Employees labeling themselves as very conservative, very liberal or moderate were found to be significantly similar to both groups. In other words, those labeling themselves as liberals held the highest levels of organizational loyalty while those labeling themselves as Republicans held the lowest levels. As mentioned previously, this finding can be attributed to the business or market beliefs held by those with conservative ideologies (Bastedo & Lodge, 1980). These ideologies value risk taking and fluidity which could be seen in conflict with organizational loyalty.

Career Commitment.

H6: The older the generation, the more individual career commitment will decrease.

The results of the Analysis of Variance for career control revealed no significant difference between the generational cohorts (Table 4.27). This result was confirmed using a Levene test of homogeneity of variance ($p=0.773$).

Table 4.27
*Analysis of Variance of Attitudes about Career
 Commitment by Generation*

Generations	N	Mean	Standard deviation
Matures	14	2.73	1.17
Mature/Boomer Cusper	144	3.42	1.16
Baby Boomer	146	3.30	1.22
Boomer/Gen X Cusper	69	3.49	1.16
Generation X	13	3.27	1.09
Total	386	3.36	1.18

F = 1.43, df = 4, p = 0.225

ANOVA results found a significant difference between career commitment and education, employment status, and income. A Levene test of homogeneity of variance confirmed this result for education (p=.323) and income (p=.213). A Ryan-Einot-Gabriel-Welsch F test was run to find the significant differences between the groups. Results can be seen in Table 4.28. For education, the REGWF revealed significant differences between employees with a doctorate degree and master's degree from those with a college degree, some college credit and a high school diploma. Employees with some graduate school were not found to be significantly different from either group. This means those with the highest levels of education held the highest career commitment while those with the lowest levels of education held the least. (Table 4.28)

Table 4.28
*Ryan-Einot-Gabriel-Welsch F test for Career Commitment
 and Education*

Education	N	Subset 1	Subset 2
Doctorate Degree	25	2.611	
Master's Degree	99	3.101	
Some Graduate School	51	3.373	3.373
College Degree	130		3.536
Some College Credit	57		3.589
High School	24		3.661
Sig.		0.054	0.841

Subset for alpha = .05

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

In the case of Career Commitment and income, the REGWF test found three subgroups that were significantly different from one another. The employees in the two highest income levels (>\$100,000 & \$75,000 - \$100,000) were found to be significantly different from employees making \$50,000 - \$74,999 and employees making \$20,000 - \$34,999. Employees making \$35,000 - \$49,999 and <\$20,000 were found to be significantly different from the highest income levels but significantly different from the other two subsets. The result (Table 4.29) indicates that those with the highest income hold the greatest career commitment.

Table 4.29
Ryan-Einot-Gabriel-Welsch F for Career Commitment and Annual Income

Annual Income	N	Subset 1	Subset 2	Subset 3
>\$100,000	14	2.337		
\$75,000 - \$100,000	49	2.723		
\$50,000 - \$74,999	112		3.212	
\$35,000 - \$49,999	119		3.599	3.599
<\$20,000	3		3.762	3.762
\$20,000 - \$34,999	83			3.776
Sig.		0.594	0.059	0.791

Subset for alpha = .05

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

The Levene's test could not confirm the validity of the ANOVA for career commitment and employment status so *a priori* t-tests were run (Table 4.30). They revealed significant differences between Senior Management Service employees and Select Exempt Service employees and Senior Management Service and Career Service employees. SMS employees have stronger career commitment than other employment statuses. There was no significant difference between Career Service and Select Exempt Service employees.

Table 4.30
t-test for Career Commitment and Employment Status

Employment Status			Levene's Test		t-test for Equality of Means			
	N	Means	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig.	
Senior Management Service	16	2.571	0.003	0.955	Equal Variances Assumed	-2.541	169	0.012
Select Exempt Service	155	3.302						
Select Exempt Service	155	3.302	8.088	0.005	Equal Variances	1.279	352	0.202

Table 4.30 Continued					Not Assumed			
Career Service	215	3.457						
Career Service	215	3.457	1.555	0.214		2.798	229	0.006
Senior Management Service	16	2.571			Equal Variances Assumed			

None of these results are particularly surprising if considered in light of personal investment in a person’s career. Those with highest levels of income and management level status have been in their current careers for many years. Similarly, those with the highest levels of education would also have invested tremendous time and effort into the preparation and qualification portion of their current career and are dedicated to it.

Three Commitment Factors.

H7: The older the generation, the more affective commitment will increase.

Affective commitment is defined as an affective attachment to the organization (Meyer et al., 1993). The results of the Analysis of Variance for affective commitment revealed no significant difference between the generational cohorts (Table 4.31). This was confirmed by a Levene’s test of homogeneity of variances (p=0.472). However, a significant difference was found between affective commitment and employment status and income. Levene’s test of homogeneity of variances confirmed this result (p=0.930).

Table 4.31
Analysis of Variance of Attitudes about Affective Commitment by Generation

Generations	N	Mean	Std. deviation
Matures	14	5.05	1.50
Mature/Boomer Cusper	145	4.56	1.58
Baby Boomer	148	4.85	1.49
Boomer/Gen X Cusper	69	4.47	1.62
Generation X	14	4.67	1.23
Total	390	4.67	1.54

F = 1.17, df = 4, p = 0.321

With the Levene's test affirming the ANOVA for Employment status and annual income, a Ryan-Einot-Gabriel-Welsch F test was run to locate any significant differences between the groups. The test revealed a significant difference between those with incomes ranging from less than \$20,000 through \$49,999 and those with incomes of \$50,000 through greater than \$100,000 (Table 4.32). This result revealed a stark difference in lower paid employees and higher paid employees and their attachment to the organization. Those in the lower income ranges felt a significantly lower attachment to the organization than those in the higher income ranges.

Table 4.32

Ryan-Einot-Gabriel-Welsch F test for Affective Commitment and Annual Income

Annual Income	N	Subset 1	Subset 2
<\$20,000	3	4.000	
\$35,000 - \$49,999	119	4.263	
\$20,000 - \$34,999	85	4.416	
\$50,000 - \$74,999	112		5.012
\$75,000 - \$100,000	50		5.113
>\$100,000	14		5.405
Sig.		0.924	0.870

Subset for alpha = .05

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

A Levene's test was run for employment status and affective commitment and a significant result was found indicating the assumption of homogeneous variance was not met. An *a priori* t-test was run to search for significant differences within the groups (Table 4.33).

Table 4.33

t-test for Affective Commitment and Employment Status

Employment Status			Levene's Test		t-test for Equality of Means			
	N	Means	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig.	
Senior Management Service	16	5.542	2.919	0.089	Equal Variances Assumed	1.654	171	0.100
Select Exempt Service	157	4.906						
Select Exempt Service	157	4.906	1.599	0.207	Equal Variances Assumed	-2.892	372	0.004
Career Service	217	3.457						
Career Service	217	3.457	5.545	0.019	Equal Variances Not Assumed	-3.767	19	0.001
Senior Management Service	16	5.542						

A significant difference was found between Select Exempt Service employees and Career Service employees as well as Senior Management Service and Career Service. In both cases the Career Service employees felt less affective attachment to the organization. Similar to organizational loyalty, upper division managers (who tend to make the highest salaries) would be expected to feel an affective attachment to their organization as their professional reputation and career success will be tied to the success of the organization. The finding of significant affective commitment by Select Exempt Service employees may be evidence that they are in their position by personal choice rather than for tenure purposes as they are free to move or leave the organization but have chosen to be with the particular organization.

H8: The older the generation, the more continuance commitment will increase.

Continuance commitment is the perceived cost associated with leaving the organization. The results of the Analysis of Variance for continuance commitment revealed a significant association between the generational cohorts (Table 4.34). This result was confirmed using a Levene test of homogeneity of variance ($p=0.077$).

Table 4.34
Analysis of Variance of Attitudes about Continuance Commitment by Generation

Generations	N	Mean	Std. deviation
Matures	14	2.95	0.81
Mature/Boomer Cusper	147	3.71	1.56
Baby Boomer	148	3.75	1.45
Boomer/Gen X Cusper	68	3.96	1.57
Generation X	13	5.03	1.20
Total	390	3.79	1.51

$F = 3.69, df = 4, p = 0.006$

A Ryan-Einot-Gabriel-Welsch F test was run to identify differences in the various generations from one another (Table 4.35). The REGWF found significant differences between Generation X employees and all other generations. Generation X was significantly more likely to leave the organization than their colleagues in older generations. This result makes intuitive sense as the perceived cost of leaving an organization would increase in two somewhat overlapping circumstances. First, the longer an employee has worked, the closer they would be

to pension vesting and the cost to an employee to leave prior to that vesting would be high. The older an employee is, the more they would be nearing retirement and would perceive a high cost to leaving. Finally, life stage would also play a role in the perceived cost to leave the organization. Younger employees tend to have less family commitments such as a spouse, children, or ailing parents and/or financial commitments such as mortgage or children in college, all of which would make leaving more costly. Younger generations would have fewer of these perceived expenses to factor into thoughts of leaving the organization.

Table 4.35

Ryan-Einot-Gabriel-Welsch F test for Continuance Commitment and Generation

Generation	N	Subset 1	Subset 2
Matures	14	2.952	
Mature/Boomer Cusper	147	3.712	
Baby Boomer	148	3.748	
Boomer/Gen X Cusper	68	3.961	
Generation X	13		5.026
Sig.		0.143	1.000

Subset for alpha = .05

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

In addition, the Analysis of Variance also found a significant association between gender and continuance commitment. A Levene's test confirms this result ($p=0.809$). An *a priori* t-test found females to have strong continuance commitment, which indicates they are less likely to leave the organization than men (Table 4.36).

Table 4.36

t-test for Continuance Commitment and Gender

Gender	Levene's Test				t-test for Equality of Means			
	N	Means	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig.	
Female	253	3.643	0.058	0.809	Equal Variances Not Assumed	-2.573	287	0.011
Male	137	4.049						

This finding, as mentioned above, has relevance in light of the growing trend of single mothers in the workplace as well as research on women risk behaviors (Marquis, 1998). In

addition, this finding complements numerous past research findings where women had greater continuance commitment than men (Stewart et al., 2006; Wahn, 1998; Aven et al. 1993).

H9: The older the generation, the more normative commitment will increase.

Normative commitment mirrors the more traditional definition of organizational commitment as a feeling of obligation to remain in the organization. The results of the Analysis of Variance for normative commitment revealed no significant difference between the generational cohorts (Table 4.37) This was confirmed by a Levene’s test of homogeneity of variances (p=0.863).

Table 4.37
Analysis of Variance of Attitudes about Normative Commitment by Generation

Generations	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Matures	13	3.35	1.31
Mature/Boomer Cusper	145	4.17	1.46
Baby Boomer	147	3.97	1.53
Boomer/Gen X Cusper	66	4.17	1.45
Generation X	13	4.56	1.30
Total	384	4.08	1.48

F = 1.52, df = 4, p = 0.195

There was a significant difference found for normative commitment between various income levels and varied employment status. A Levene’s test confirmed these results: income (p= 0.618), employment status (p=0.744). A Ryan-Einot-Gabrial-Welsch F (REGWF) test was run to locate significant differences between the groups (Table 4.38). Employees with the highest income (>\$100,000) and employees with the lowest income (<\$20,000) have strong normative commitment. Employees with incomes of \$75,000 - \$100,000, over \$100,000 and under \$20,000 were all found to be significantly different from those employees with income \$20,000 - \$34,999 and \$35,000 - \$49,999. Employees with incomes of \$50,000 - \$74,999 were not significantly different from either group.

Table 4.38

Ryan-Einot-Gabriel-Welsch F for Normative Commitment and Annual Income

Annual Income	N	Subset 1	Subset 2
>\$100,000	14	3.2857	
<\$20,000	3	3.4167	
\$75,000 - \$100,000	49	3.4796	
\$50,000 - \$74,999	112	4.0893	4.0893
\$20,000 - \$34,999	82		4.2226
\$35,000 - \$49,999	117		4.3162
Sig.		0.057	0.751

Subset for alpha = .05

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

For employment status, REGWF test revealed significant differences between all three groups. Senior Management Service employees were found to have strong normative commitment while the Career Service employees were found to have weak normative commitment (Table 4.39).

Table 4.39

Ryan-Einot-Gabriel-Welsch F for Normative Commitment and Employment Status

Employment Status	N	Subset 1	Subset 2	Subset 3
Senior Management Service	16	3.0938		
Select Exempt Service	156		3.9215	
Career Service	212			4.2665
Sig.		1	1	1

Subset for alpha = .05

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

Here employees with highest incomes and those in senior management were most likely to remain employed by the organization. One possible explanation for this result is employees in management, typically the highest income, feel an obligation to remain in the organization to help ensure its future success. This ties in closely with previous findings on organizational loyalty. The finding on employees with the lowest income level having the second highest level of normative commitment is surprising. However, it can be speculated that those with such low incomes may feel an obligation to stay in the organization due to personal financial instability associated with leaving.

This chapter described the sample, outlined the variables and their relationship to the hypotheses and detailed the results of the Analysis of Variance tests. In the next chapter, implications and conclusions drawn from these results will be discussed as well as ideas for future research.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to better understand the role that the psychological contract plays in worker perceptions and reactions to civil service reforms and the new work environment. The analysis compared reactions and consequences based on generational cohort. Specifically, the aim was to establish a deeper understanding of the psychological contract by answering three research questions: (a) What effect does generation have on perceptions of organizational and career loyalty and commitment, (b) What effect does generation have on perceptions of career movement and job security, and (c) What effect do the current work environment changes have on perceptions of public sector work and organizational obligations by generation?

Although the expected theory, that there would be significant generational differences, was only partially supported, this research plays an important role in understanding three literatures; civil service reform, psychological contract and generations. In the area of civil service reform, it illuminates consequences of reform efforts five years after they were implemented. In the area of psychological contract, it confirms that there are no significant differences in worker's perceived obligations by generation. However psychological contract perceptions are significantly affected by other factors, including education, income and employment status. Finally in the area of generational cohorts, this research adds more evidence that there are not grand scale differences in today's workforce.

This dissertation set out to examine the relationship between generations and Florida's state government workers' psychological contracts. Three distinct literatures were reviewed to build a theory hypothesizing differences among the generations: civil service reform, psychological contract and generations. First, a brief account of the reforms in various states was outlined along with various models used to frame those reforms. From there, the work examined streams of research associated with the psychological contract including categories, conditions and consequences. Finally research on generational differences and perceptions of such was reviewed. Gaps in the literature were identified and hypotheses proposed. The hypotheses fell into four groups: 1) psychological contract obligations, 2) job security, 3) self-reliance, and 4) loyalty/commitment levels. Age (birth year) was converted to generational cohort variables which were used in the exploration of generational differences.

An online survey was sent to a random sample of 1000 state workers and returned by 392 (39.2%) participants. This research found only one instance of generational differences, and it was in the area of continuance commitment. In the areas of psychological contract perceptions, self-reliance factors, and various career and organizational commitment measures, generation was not found to be a substantial factor. However, significant relationships were found on the affects of other variables such as employment status, political party, political ideology and income. More modest relationships were found for race and gender. Implications and possible reasons for these findings are discussed in detail below.

Findings Review

Table 5.1 and its subsequent notes illustrate the broader range of factors that influence state employees. Factors such as employment status and annual income clearly offer more influence on an employees’ perceptions than generational cohort.

Table 5.1
Comparison of Significant Differences by Variable

	Generation	Political Party	Political Ideology	Employment Status	Annual Income	Race	Gender	Education
Psychological Contract				A	B			
Organizational Loyalty			C	D				E
Job Movement		F	G					
Career Commitment				H	I			J
Worker Career Control				K	L			
Employer Career Control					M			
Civil Service Reform		N		O	P	Q	R	S
Affective Commitment				T	U			
Continuance Commitment	V						W	
Normative Commitment				X	Y			

Psychological Contract

- A: Senior Management Service employees hold weaker psychological contract obligations than Career Service or Select Exempt Service employees.
- B: Employees with the highest incomes (>\$100,000) did not hold strong psychological contracts with their organizations while all other incomes did.

Organizational Loyalty

- C: Employees labeling themselves as liberals held the strongest organizational loyalty while those labeling themselves as conservatives held the weakest.
- D: Senior Management Service employees held the strongest organizational loyalty while Career Service employees held the weakest.
- E: Employees with their doctorate degree held the strongest organizational loyalty while those with only a high school diploma held the weakest.

Job Movement

- F: Republicans were the less accepting of job movement as a career strategy than Democrats or Independents.
- G: Employees labeling themselves as conservative and moderate were less accepting of job movement as a career strategy than those labeling themselves liberal or very liberal.

Career Commitment

- H: Senior Management Service employees held the strongest career commitment of all three employment classifications.
- I: Employees with the highest incomes held the strongest career commitment
- J: Employees with a doctorate or master's degree held the strongest career commitment while those with a college degree, some college credit or a high school diploma held the weakest.

Worker Career Control

- K: Select Exempt Service employees felt more in control of their own careers than Career Service employees. Senior Management Service employees were not significantly different from either group.
- L: Employees making more money felt more in control of their careers.

Employer Career Control

- M: Employees at the highest income levels did not feel their organization controlled their careers while employees at the lowest income levels did.

N: Democrats valued job security more than Republicans or Independents.

Civil Service Reform

O: Career Service employees valued job security most while Senior Management Service employees valued it least.

P: Lowest three income levels value job security most, and then the value placed on job security decreased in steps as incomes went up.

Q: Minority employees value job security more than Caucasians and others.

R: Women value job security more than men.

S: Employees with only a high school diploma value job security most while those with a doctorate degree value it least.

Affective Commitment

T: Career Service employees are the least attached to the organization.

U: The lower the income of the employee the less attached they were to the organization.

Continuance Commitment

V: The younger the generation the more likely to foresee leaving the organization.

W: Women are less likely to leave the organization than men.

Normative Commitment

X: Senior Management Service Employees held the strongest normative commitment while Career Service employees held the weakest.

Y: Employees with the highest and lowest salaries held the strongest normative commitment.

These findings, discussed in chapter four, illuminate important lessons for the workplace. First, the reality is that the state employee workplace is more intricate than just young workers and older workers. But there are some motivators that will resonate with these workers. Successful policy or management techniques will have to calibrate personnel policies to address the issues that matter the most to varied identifiable, workforce populations.

For example, job security is a strong motivator for female and minority employees yet not particularly motivating for those with the highest education and income. In addition, long-term job commitment is not generally a strong factor for any younger employee, regardless of gender or race. Adjusting personnel practices to reinforce job security for women and minorities

as they age would be highly valued and motivating for the employee and tend to retain that increasingly skilled worker.

Other surprising findings are those related to psychological contract, or the perceived obligations employees feel their organization owes them. Ironically, it is the most highly compensated and lowest paid state employees that feel the least entitled of consideration by their employer. Those in between are most demanding and attuned to varied terms of employment, such as discussions on benefits and regulations.

In addition, there is a political management challenge that this research uncovers. It is the more liberal employees in agencies working for a conservative administration who are most loyal to the agency. This will inescapably result in on-going ideological tensions either between loyal liberal employees and loyal conservative managers or tensions between loyal liberal managers and the more conservative administration.

Further, politics continues to be an important workplace factor. Independent and Democratic employees are more likely to pursue job movement as a career development strategy than Republicans. This suggests that new and promising Republican employees will remain in jobs longer than Independent or Democratic candidates. This may not be a vexing problem for a Republican administration or their more conservative managers but this finding would give pause to a newly elected Democratic administration searching for a more stable workforce.

Although Senior Management Service have the strongest organizational loyalty, they also hold the weakest psychological contract obligation to the organization and feel they have the strongest control of their careers. They may be less mindful of the long-term interests and fortunes of the agency than other employees who are more deeply rooted in the agency. This may result—or explain—agency decisions that are short-term or short-sighted, as compared to long-term and strategic.

This research paints a surprising and intriguing picture of today's current Career Service employee. It also illuminates the challenges in effectively engaging them in the organization. Career service employees, who are often lower paid and less educated than SES and SMS employees, had weaker psychological contract obligations to the agency. They also held weaker organizational loyalty, lower career commitment and feel they have less control of their own careers. They were the least attached to the organization and held the weakest normative commitment. However, they valued job security most highly. In other words, they highly value

security at the agency but have little other attachment to the organization. For managers with a career service system that is increasingly less able to guarantee security, this disconnect should be a priority workforce concern.

Alternative Explanations

This research advances the work of those studies that have failed to find a relationship between generational cohort and work attitudes. In the late 1990's an independent review of a decade of literature revealed no significant confirmation of the existence of generational differences in academic journals (Smith, 2000). Despite this, in 2000 and 2002 five new books were published, with great acclaim, all exploring the variations on these differences (Florida, 2002; Lancaster & Stillman, 2002; John-Steiner, 2000; Ray & Anderson, 2000; Williamsen, 2000). They recommended ways to either meld those differences into a cohesive workplace or capitalize on those differences for the betterment of the community. If there is no evidence to suggest that differences exist, why then do mainstream writing and popular perceptions still insist they do?

Life stage

One possible explanation is that life stages, not generation, are causing perceived differences. Hughes & O'Rand (2005) contend that although early life experiences do affect people's perceptions in later years, there is no particular evidence to suggest that these experiences will have the same effect on all who experience them, even at the same life stage, due to variables such as race, gender, or social class.

Others argue that life stage is not only indistinguishable from generation research but that it plays a more significant role in people's behaviors in the workplace (Yang & Guy, 2006). This is also found in work by Smola & Sutton (2002) who surveyed 350 Boomers and Xers in 1974 and 1999; they found work values changed as each generation matured, both giving work a lower priority in life and placing less value in feeling a sense of pride at work. This may also explain why the single significant finding, continuance commitment—perceived cost of leaving the organization—increased as the generations got older.

Perceptions vs. Reality

A second explanation may lie in the difference between perception and reality. For example, in this sample, perceptions of job movement as an accepted career strategy were not

found to be significant; however, other evidence indicates that people are moving more and more rapidly between jobs (Jurkiewicz, 2000; Laabs, 1996; Smith, 2000). This may mean, simply, that people's perceptions have not kept pace with actual job actions. Such an explanation would give credence to Hall and Moss's (1998) contention that even in earlier years, job security may never have existed on the scale that it was perceived. Although people have yet to mentally recognize and accept job movement as an appropriate career strategy, there is evidence that they do partake in their own personal lives.

This idea of perception vs. reality is further evidenced in the disparity in Smith's (2000) research. Here Generation X respondents voiced great commitment to their profession and organization. However these same respondents also anticipated movement out of their current employment institution as well as their profession over the course of their work life. They attributed the expectation of job movement to the need to provide themselves the diversified skill set needed to be successfully self-reliant (Smith, 2000).

Leuenberger and Kluver (2006) highlight Florida's (2002) work on the segment of the current workforce known as the creative class. In their analysis, they point to the creative class as those who bring cutting edge practices and solutions to problem solving. In addition, this creative class is said to dedicate themselves fully to projects that enhance their own "life work" (p. 18). This dedication creates great organizational loyalty from the employee for at least the span of the project at hand. This mindset differs greatly from the traditional workplace mindset. The book points to the creative class as tied closely with generations, linking the creative class strongly to Generation Xers who are the most educated and entrepreneurial generation to date.

It is plausible, however, that these characteristics are not generational in nature but simply exhibited by those who have embraced the "new work environment" values regardless of age or generation. It would be expected that those embracing these values would be those in leadership. Possible evidence of this could be found in the senior management service employees' high rating of organizational loyalty as well as all three types of commitment factors.

Further, problems may lie in simple communication style differences, not actual work value differences. Derrick and Walker (2006), explore three of these potential miscommunications including enthusiasm vs. experience; growth vs. commitment; and individual vs. community. In each scenario, the goal of job commitment and organizational dedication was the same, yet communication styles used to reach those goals differed. These

specific differences could lead to generalizations that generations vary more widely than they actually do.

Finally, perceptions of the vast generational gap may be perpetuated in rumor when, in fact, they are actually a reflection of various personal preferences and ideological differences found in the workplace. For example, in this sample, all but one of the nine hypotheses were found to be significant not by generation, but rather by at least one if not multiple control variables such as political party, political ideology, education, income, and even cultural ethnicities. Perceived workplace differences are likely the product of stereotypes and varied life stage preferences rather than actual generational cohort differences.

Growth Over Time

A third explanation relative to the sample is personal growth attained in the five years since initial civil service reform. As mentioned in Chapter 2, employees gain the mentality of career stability, self-awareness and personal responsibility through individual developmental growth. Developmental growth is an individual's ability to gain cognitive comfort levels that allow acceptance of changes in the environments around them (Kegan, 1994). While Hall and Moss (1998) found interviewees took an average of seven years to become comfortable with the understanding of the new work environment, the traditional long term employer-employee bond has morphed into a short-term transactional relationship where seniority, age, rank, and rules are diminishing, organizational charts are flattening, and layers of management are disappearing (Tulgan, 2004, p. 24). Perhaps for this sample of State of Florida workers, five years has been a sufficient time to become comfortable with the current psychological contract or to adjust their positions accordingly.

This adjustment brings a fourth possible explanation. Hughes and O'Rand (2005) examine the idea that within a stated generational cohort, there may be significant differences within any particular generation. They, therefore, advocate breaking generations into subgroups based on experiences and varied personalities. This is a likely scenario of what has happened in the five years since civil service reform was implemented in Florida's state government: The vast divide seen in the results between Senior Management Service, Select Exempt Service and Career Service employees suggests that employees with personality qualities best suited for transitional, non-tenured positions have migrated, through self-selection and job transfer, into the SMS or SES positions while those with personality or ideological traits more comfortable in a

secure environment have moved to or remained in career service. This suggestion is in contrast to the original reform effort which arbitrarily reassigned certain career service positions to Select Exempt Service. However, this research suggests that during the more than five years since the original reform, employees may have either adapted to their new classification or transferred back to a career service position.

Table 5.2 makes useful, although somewhat overlapping, distinctions between three types of career profiles. These profiles can be seen as a good framework for comparing the various employment ranks of the state. The competency is most closely related to Senior Management Service employees because although they are at-will by definition, they are often placed in their role due to networks and by employment context. The bounded career is most closely related to career service employees due to employer dependence or high value placed on job security and hierarchical nature of the position. Finally, the boundaryless careers most closely resemble those of Select Exempt employees as they are flexible and independent of employer reliability. It is not a perfect match but certainly an interesting framework to view employment status and the elements of psychological contract, civil service reform perspectives, worker career control, organizational loyalty, career commitment, affective commitment, and normative commitment.

Table 5.2
Career Profiles and Competencies of Boundaryless v. Bounded Careers

Competency	Bounded	Boundaryless
Know-why identity	Employer-dependent	Employer independent
Know-how employment context	Specialized	Flexible
Networks	Intra-organizational, hierarchic	Inter-organizational, non hierarchic

DeFillippi and Arthur (1994)

In summary, the new work environment has found its way into Florida’s public sector workforce. Civil service reform has caused “belt tightening” in human capital and changed the workplace realities for many. This research found little evidence that generational cohort plays a large role in the perceptions that workers’ have on job security or psychological contract obligations between their organization and themselves. However, it uncovered evidence that aspects of the new work environment are having an effect in certain areas.

Future Research

This work offers many opportunities for future research efforts. One of those areas rich in possibility is the exploration of the varied employee commitment levels and their association with the control variables of employment status, education, income, political party, political ideology and race. Many of the findings in this regard were not surprising in light of the sample; however, it would be of interest to see if this varies from workplace to workplace or sector to sector. It would also be of interest to more closely examine those findings that were surprising, such as the persistent association between commitment and employment status, to find potential reasons why that held its significance. If this test could be fully run with an appropriate sample of all sectors of the workforce, and the results were consistent, then it would create the most thorough discredit to the generational differences thesis in mainstream writings.

A second opportunity for future research would be to use these same measures in particular small slices of the workforce. For example, comparing these measures of commitment and loyalty, as well as psychological contract, with critical workforce needs jobs (such as teachers, nurses and engineers) could illuminate various factors affecting an individual's desire to stay committed to their career and organization. Moreover, this may reveal what obligations they feel they are owed by the organization.

Reexamining this same sample in the future is a third idea for future research that would add to the body of knowledge on these three literatures. For example, if a random sample of the State of Florida workers was examined five years from now, a much larger proportion of millennial generation workers would be in the workforce while the number of matures will have diminished. It would be interesting to see the differences, if any, that this new dynamic brings to the workplace environment. It would also be of interest to gain a better understanding of any changes that time has had on psychological contract and commitment factors.

Finally, a last idea for future research would be a deeper examination of perceptions versus realities of generational differences. A more detailed survey of employees' perceptions of various generations and the realities of actual work behaviors could be conducted. It could then be followed up more critically by in-depth interviews to find out what is really at the heart of the myth behind generational differences. Each of the aforementioned ideas hold their own merits and limitations; however, each would further a stream of research unable to be captured by this study. They would yield deeper insights into employee perceptions as they relate to behaviors or

any differentiations that employees in non profit or private sectors may have from the sample presented here.

Although the theory of generational differences in the workplace was only partially confirmed, the ultimate goal of this study was reached: to provide helpful information to both scholars and practitioners about the ramifications of reform movements in government, enabling better human capital planning and human resource policy implementation for the future.

APPENDIX A SURVEY QUESTIONS

(Factor titles omitted in actual survey)

Generational Perceptions in the Workplace

Thank you for giving your expert opinions through this brief confidential online survey. The survey will acquire your perceptions and opinions of the current work environment as well as your past experiences. The entire survey should take no more than 8 minutes. Your participation in this study is voluntary and totally anonymous. The results of the research study may be published, but neither your name nor any identifying information will be used.

If you have any questions concerning the research study, please call or e-mail me at (850) 251-9037 or hicksms@aim.com or Dr. Guy at (850) 644-9170 or mguy@fsu.edu.

Thank you in advance for your participation and expertise.

Sincerely,

Melanie Hicks

Warm Up Questions

Please begin by answering a few demographic questions:

- When were you born?
- What generation would you say you most identify with?
 - Matures
 - Baby Boomers
 - Generation X
 - Millennial or Entitlement Generation
- How many years have you worked in the public sector?
- Have you worked any portion of your professional career in the private or non-profit sectors? If yes, how many years?
- How many years have you worked in your current position?

Generations

Please select the following statement that best describes you.

- I view a sense of belonging/teamwork, ability to learn new things, autonomy, and entrepreneurship as most important in the workplace.
- I value comfort and stability in the workplace and view myself as economically cautious.
- I place high value on work, generally receive high levels of job satisfaction from it and identify myself closely with my occupation.
- None of the above

Psychological Contract

The following questions ask your expectations of what your workplace should provide for you. Please state the degree to which you agree or disagree with the following statements. (1=strongly agree, 2= agree, 3=neutral, 4= disagree, 5=strongly disagree)

- To what extent do you agree that the State of Florida and/or your agency are obligated to provide each of the following to you:
 - An attractive benefits package
 - Fair treatment
 - Job security
 - Feedback on your performance
 - Opportunities for career development
 - Transfer opportunities should my current job be eliminated

Organizational Loyalty

The following questions assess what opinions of your workplace obligations. Please state the degree to which you agree or disagree with the following statements. (1=strongly agree, 2= agree, 3=neutral, 4= disagree, 5=strongly disagree)

- To what extent do you feel you are obligated to provide each of the following to the State of Florida and/or your agency:
 - Volunteer to do tasks that fall outside my job description
 - Develop new skills as needed
 - Perform my job in a reliable manner
 - Work extra hours if needed to get the job done

Job Movement

The following questions assess your opinions of job movement. Please state the degree to which you agree or disagree with the following statements. (1=strongly agree, 2= agree, 3=neutral, 4= disagree, 5=strongly disagree)

- One should stay in their job for at least 5-10 years.
- One should not change jobs multiple times in their lifetime
- One should not change employers multiple times in their lifetime

Career Commitment

The following questions assess your opinions about career development. Please state the degree to which you agree or disagree with the following statements. (1=strongly agree, 2= agree, 3=somewhat agree, 4=neutral, 5= somewhat disagree, 6=disagree, 7=strongly disagree)

- If I could get another job besides my current profession, that paid the same amount, I would probably take it.
- I definitely want a career for myself in the field I am working in now.
- If I could do it all over again I would not choose to work in my current profession.
- If I had all the money I needed without working, I would probably still continue to work in my current profession.
- I like this profession too much to give it up.
- I am disappointed that I ever entered my current profession.

Ideology of Self Reliance

The following questions assess your views of your personal competencies. Please state the degree to which you agree or disagree with the following statements. (1=strongly agree, 2= agree, 3=neutral, 4= disagree, 5=strongly disagree)

- I am in control of my career.
- My career success is dependent on my organization.

Affective Commitment

The following questions will ask your opinions about your organization. Please state the degree to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.

(1=strongly agree, 2= agree, 3=somewhat agree, 4=neutral, 5= somewhat disagree, 6=disagree, 7=strongly disagree)

- I do not feel a strong sense of “belonging” to my organization.
- I do not feel like “part of the family” at my organization.
- This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me.

Continuance Commitment

The following questions will ask your opinions about staying with your organization. Please state the degree to which you agree or disagree with the following statements. (1=strongly agree, 2= agree, 3=somewhat agree, 4=neutral, 5= somewhat disagree, 6=disagree, 7=strongly disagree)

- It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to.
- Too much of my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my organization right now.
- I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this organization.

Normative Commitment

The following questions will ask for your feelings about leaving your organization. Please state the degree to which you agree or disagree with the following statements. (1=strongly agree, 2= agree, 3=somewhat agree, 4=neutral, 5= somewhat disagree, 6=disagree, 7=strongly disagree)

- I would feel guilty if I left my organization now.
- This organization deserves my loyalty.
- I would not leave my organization right now because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it.
- I owe a great deal to my organization.

Civil Service Reform

In recent years, many states including Florida have made changes to their civil service system classifications including the removal of employment tenure. Please state the degree you agree or disagree with the following statements. (1=strongly agree, 2= agree, 3=neutral, 4= disagree, 5=strongly disagree)

- I believe civil service reforms such as loss of job security is detrimental to recruitment of qualified applicants for state government jobs.
- Job security makes me more motivated to perform my job.
- I believe job security is an important aspect to state government work.

Demographics

Please complete the following demographic information.

- What is your gender?
 - Male
 - Female
- What is your race/ethnicity?
 - Caucasian
 - African American
 - Hispanic
 - Asian
 - American Indian
 - Other
- What is your gross annual income before taxes?
 - Less than \$20,000
 - \$20,000 – \$34,999
 - \$35,000 - \$49,999
 - \$50,000 - \$74,999
 - \$75,000 - \$100,000
 - Over \$100,000
- What is the highest level of education of have attained?
 - High School
 - Some college
 - College Graduate
 - Some graduate school
 - Masters Degree
 - Doctorate Degree
- What is your employment category?

- Senior Management Service (SMS)
- Select Exempt Service (SES)
- Career Service (CS)
- Please complete the following sentence. In politics today, I would consider myself republican, democrat, independent, or other?
- Please complete the following sentence. In general, I would describe my political views as very conservative, conservative, moderate, liberal or very liberal?

APPENDIX B
HUMAN SUBJECTS APPROVAL

Florida State

UNIVERSITY

Office of the Vice President For Research
Human Subjects Committee
Tallahassee, Florida 32306-2742
(850) 644-8673 FAX (850) 644-4392

APPROVAL MEMORANDUM

Date: 6/29/2006
To: Melanie Hicks
P.O. Box 10266
Tallahassee, FL 32302

Dept.: PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION AND P9LICY

From: Thomas L. Jacobson, Chair

Re: Use of Human Subjects in Research
At Will Employment: The Psychological Effects of Civil Service Reform on Public Sector Workers

The forms that you submitted to this office in regard to the use of human subjects in the proposal referenced above have been reviewed by the Secretary, the Chair, and two members of the Human Subjects Committee. Your project is determined to be Expedited per 45 CFR § 46.110(b) 6 and has been approved by an accelerated review process.

The Human Subjects Committee has not evaluated your proposal for scientific merit, except to weigh the risk to the human participants and the aspects of the proposal related to potential risk and benefit. This approval does not replace any departmental or other approvals, which may be required. If the project has not been completed by **6/28/2007** you must request renewed approval for continuation of the project.

You are advised that any change in protocol in this project must be approved by resubmission of the project to the Committee for approval. Also, the principal investigator must promptly report, in writing, any unexpected problems causing risks to research subjects or others.

By copy of this memorandum, the chairman of your department and/or your major professor is reminded that he/she is responsible for being informed concerning research projects involving human subjects in the department, and should review protocols of such investigations as often as needed to insure that the project is being conducted in compliance with our institution and with DHHS regulations.

This institution has an Assurance on file with the Office for Protection from Research Risks. The Assurance Number is 1RB00000446.

Cc: Mary Ellen Guy
HSC No. 2006.0456

APPENDIX C
SURVEY COVER/ E-MAIL VERBIAGE

Dear Participant:

In recent years professionals in both the public and private sectors have been affected by rapid changes in the current work environment including the infusion of four generations working side by side. Input on your perceptions of your individual working environment can help inform leaders and policy makers of the challenges and opportunities you and your colleagues face in the workplace.

As a graduate student under the direction of Professor Mary Ellen Guy of the Askew School of Public Administration and Policy at Florida State University, I am conducting a research study on generational differences in the workplace within Florida's state government. A random sample of all state agencies will be collected to inform this research.

I am inviting your expert opinions and participation through a brief confidential online survey. The survey will acquire your perceptions and opinions of the current work environment as well as your past experiences. It will also offer opportunities for open-ended explanations at your leisure. The entire survey should take no more than 8 minutes.

Your participation in this study is voluntary and totally anonymous. In order to participate, simply click on the link below; this will lead you to a pass code screen. Enter the pass code listed below the link and begin the survey. Although the survey is brief, if you need to stop and begin again simply go back to the link, retype your pass code and it will continue where you left off. The survey will begin with a consent form to be checked in order to begin. If you choose not to participate or to withdraw from the study at any time, there will be no penalty. The results of the research study may be published, but neither your name nor any identifying information will be used.

If you have any questions concerning the research study, please call or e-mail me at (850) 251-9037 or hicksms@aim.com or Dr. Guy at (850) 644-9170 or mguy@fsu.edu.

Thank you in advance for your participation and expertise.

Sincerely,

Melanie Hicks

APPENDIX D
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

Table A.1
Frequency Tables

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Generational Categories			
Matures	14	3.6	3.6
Mature/Boomer Cusper	147	37.5	37.5
Baby Boomers	148	37.8	37.8
Boomer/Gen X Cusper	69	17.6	17.6
Generation X	14	3.6	3.6
Total	392	100	100
Gender			
Female	252	64.3	64.3
Male	138	35.2	35.2
Unknown	2	0.5	0.5
Total	392	100	100
Race			
African American	52	13.3	13.3
American Indian	4	1	1
Asian	5	1.3	1.3
Caucasian	304	77.6	77.6
Hispanic	15	3.8	3.8
Other	12	3.1	3.1
Total	392	100	100
Annual Income			
< \$20,000	3	0.8	0.8
\$20,000 - \$34,999	86	21.9	22.3
\$35,000 – \$49,999	119	30.4	30.9
\$50,000 - \$74,999	113	28.8	29.4
\$75,000 - \$99,999	50	12.8	13
>\$100,000	14	3.6	3.6
Total	385	98.2	100
Education			
High School Degree	24	6.1	6.1
Some College Credit	60	15.3	15.3
College Graduate	131	33.4	33.4
Some Graduate School	51	13	13
Masters Degree	100	25.5	25.5
Doctorate Degree	26	6.6	6.6
Total	392	100	100
Employment Status			
Career Service	218	55.6	55.6
Select Exempt Service	158	40.3	40.3
Senior Management Service	16	4.1	4.1
Total	392	100	100
Political Party			

Table A.1 Continued			
Republican	98	25	25
Democrat	183	46.7	46.7
Independent	79	20.2	20.2
Other	32	8.2	8.2
Total	392	100	100
Political Ideology			
Very Conservative	24	6.1	6.1
Conservative	88	22.4	22.4
Moderate	186	47.4	47.4
Liberal	73	18.6	18.6
Very Liberal	13	3.3	3.3
Total	392	100	100

Table A.2

Cross tabulation Table of Annual Income by Generation

Generations	<\$20,000	\$20,000- \$34,999	\$35,000- \$49,999	\$50,000- \$74,999	\$75,000 - \$99,999	>\$100,000	Total
Matures							
Count		3	5	2	4		14
% within Generation		21.43	35.71	14.29	28.57		100
% within Income		3.49	4.20	1.77	8.00		3.64
% of Total		0.78	1.30	0.52	1.04		3.64
Mature/Boomer Cusper							
Count	1	32	39	49	19	5	145
% within Generation	0.69	22.07	26.90	33.79	13.10	3.45	100
% within Income	33.33	37.21	32.77	43.36	38.00	35.71	37.66
% of Total	0.26	8.31	10.13	12.73	4.94	1.30	37.66
Baby Boomer							
Count		26	47	40	24	9	146
% within Generation		17.81	32.19	27.40	16.44	6.16	100
% within Income		30.23	39.50	35.40	48.00	64.29	37.92
% of Total		6.75	12.21	10.39	6.23	2.34	37.92
Boomer/Gen X Cusper							
Count	2	22	22	18	2		66
% within Generation	3.03	33.33	33.33	27.27	3.03		100
% within Income	66.67	25.58	18.49	15.93	4.00		17.14
% of Total	0.52	5.71	5.71	4.68	0.52		17.14
Generation X							
Count		3	6	4	1		14
% within Generation		21.43	42.86	28.57	7.14		100
% within Income		3.49	5.04	3.54	2.00		3.64
% of Total		0.78	1.56	1.04	0.26		3.64
Total							
Count	3	86	119	113	50	14	385
% within Generation	0.78	22.34	30.91	29.35	12.99	3.64	100
% within Income	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
% of Total	0.78	22.34	30.91	29.35	12.99	3.64	100

Table A.3

Cross tabulation Table of Education by Generation

Generations	High School Degree	Some College	College Graduate	Some Graduate School	Masters Degree	Doctorate Degree	Total
Matures							
Count	2		3	1	6	2	14
% within Generation	14.29		21.43	7.14	42.86	14.29	100
% within Education	8.33		2.29	1.96	6.00	7.69	3.57
% of Total	0.51		0.77	0.26	1.53	0.51	3.57
Mature/Boomer Cusper							
Count	9	24	47	23	36	8	147
% within Generation	6.12	16.33	31.97	15.65	24.49	5.44	100
% within Education	37.50	40.00	35.88	45.10	36.00	30.77	37.50
% of Total	2.30	6.12	11.99	5.87	9.18	2.04	37.50
Baby Boomer							
Count	9	26	49	17	36	11	148
% within Generation	6.08	17.57	33.11	11.49	24.32	7.43	100
% within Education	37.50	43.33	37.40	33.33	36.00	42.31	37.76
% of Total	2.30	6.63	12.50	4.34	9.18	2.81	37.76
Boomer/Gen X Cusper							
Count	3	10	25	9	18	4	69
% within Generation	4.35	14.49	36.23	13.04	26.09	5.80	100
% within Education	12.50	16.67	19.08	17.65	18.00	15.38	17.60
% of Total	0.77	2.55	6.38	2.30	4.59	1.02	17.60
Generation X							
Count	1		7	1	4	1	14
% within Generation	7.14		50	7.14	28.57	7.14	100
% within Education	4.17		5.34	1.96	4.00	3.85	3.57
% of Total	0.26		1.79	0.26	1.02	0.26	3.57
Total							
Count	24	60	131	51	100	26	392
% within Generation	6.12	15.31	33.42	13.01	25.51	6.63	100
% within Education	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
% of Total	6.12	15.31	33.42	13.01	25.51	6.63	100

Table A.4

Cross tabulation Table of Gender by Generation

Generations	Female	Male	Unknown	Total
Matures				
Count	10	4		14
% within Generation	71.43	28.57		100
% within Gender	3.97	2.90		3.57
% of Total	2.55	1.02		3.57
Mature/Boomer Cusper				
Count	96	50	1	147
% within Generation	65.31	34.01	0.68	100
% within Gender	38.10	36.23	50.00	37.50
% of Total	24.49	12.76	0.26	37.50
Baby Boomer				
Count	92	55	1	148
% within Generation	62.16	37.16	0.68	100
% within Gender	36.51	39.86	50.00	37.76
% of Total	23.47	14.03	0.26	37.76
Boomer/Gen X Cusper				
Count	45	24		69
% within Generation	65.22	34.78		100
% within Gender	17.86	17.39		17.60
% of Total	11.48	6.12		17.60
Generation X				
Count	9	5		14
% within Generation	64.29	35.71		100
% within Gender	3.57	3.62		3.57
% of Total	2.30	1.28		3.57
Total				
Count	252	138	2	392
% within Generation	64.29	35.20	0.51	100
% within Gender	100	100	100	100
% of Total	64.29	35.20	0.51	100

Table A.5

Cross tabulation Table of Race by Generation

Generations	African American	Indian	Asian	Caucasian	Hispanic	Other	Total
Matures							
Count	2			12			14
% within Generation	14.29			85.71			100
% within Race	3.85			3.95			3.57
% of Total	0.51			3.06			3.57
Mature/Boomer Cusper							
Count	15	2	2	121	3	4	147
% within Generation	10.20	1.36	1.36	82.31	2.04	2.72	100
% within Race	28.85	50.00	40.00	39.80	20.00	33.33	37.50
% of Total	3.83	0.51	0.51	30.87	0.77	1.02	37.50
Baby Boomer							
Count	19	2	2	112	8	5	148
% within Generation	12.84	1.35	1.35	75.68	5.41	3.38	100
% within Race	36.54	50.00	40.00	36.84	53.33	41.67	37.76
% of Total	4.85	0.51	0.51	28.57	2.04	1.28	37.76
Boomer/Gen X Cusper							
Count	15		1	48	3	2	69
% within Generation	21.74		1.45	69.57	4.35	2.90	100
% within Race	28.85		20.00	15.79	20.00	16.67	17.60
% of Total	3.83		0.26	12.24	0.77	0.51	17.60
Generation X							
Count	1			11	1	1	14
% within Generation	7.14			78.57	7.14	7.14	100
% within Race	1.92			3.62	6.67	8.33	3.57
% of Total	0.26			2.81	0.26	0.26	3.57
Total							
Count	52	4	5	304	15	12	392
% within Generation	13.27	1.02	1.28	77.55	3.83	3.06	100
% within Race	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
% of Total	13.27	1.02	1.28	77.55	3.83	3.06	100

Table A.6

Cross tabulation Table of Employment Status by Generation

Generations	Career Service	Select Exempt	Senior Management	Total
Matures				
Count	10	3	1	14
% within Generation	71.43	21.43	7.14	100
% within Employment				
Status	4.59	1.90	6.25	3.57
% of Total	2.55	0.77	0.26	3.57
Mature/Boomer Cusper				
Count	78	62	7	147
% within Generation	53.06	42.18	4.76	100
% within Employment				
Status	35.78	39.24	43.75	37.50
% of Total	19.90	15.82	1.79	37.50
Baby Boomer				
Count	79	62	7	148
% within Generation	53.38	41.89	4.73	100
% within Employment				
Status	36.24	39.24	43.75	37.76
% of Total	20.15	15.82	1.79	37.76
Boomer/Gen X Cusper				
Count	46	22	1	69
% within Generation	66.67	31.88	1.45	100
% within Employment				
Status	21.10	13.92	6.25	17.60
% of Total	11.73	5.61	0.26	17.60
Generation X				
Count	5	9		14
% within Generation	35.71	64.29		100
% within Employment				
Status	2.29	5.70		3.57
% of Total	1.28	2.30		3.57
Total				
Count	218	158	16	392
% within Generation	55.61	40.31	4.08	100
% within Employment				
Status	100	100	100	100
% of Total	55.61	40.31	4.08	100

Table A.7

Cross tabulation Table of Political Party by Generation

Generations	Democrat	Republican	Independent	Other	Unknown	Total
Matures						
Count	6	1	7			14
% within Generation	42.86	7.14	50.00			100
% within Political Party	3.28	1.03	8.86			3.57
% of Total	1.53	0.26	1.79			3.57
Mature/Boomer Cusper						
Count	79	30	24	10	4	147
% within Generation	53.74	20.41	16.33	6.80	2.72	100
% within Political Party	43.17	30.93	30.38	41.67	44.44	37.50
% of Total	20.15	7.65	6.12	2.55	1.02	37.50
Baby Boomer						
Count	68	36	32	7	5	148
% within Generation	45.95	24.32	21.62	4.73	3.38	100
% within Political Party	37.16	37.11	40.51	29.17	55.56	37.76
% of Total	17.35	9.18	8.16	1.79	1.28	37.76
Boomer/Gen X Cusper						
Count	27	23	13	6		69
% within Generation	39.13	33.33	18.84	8.70		100
% within Political Party	14.75	23.71	16.46	25.00		17.60
% of Total	6.89	5.87	3.32	1.53		17.60
Generation X						
Count	3	7	3	1		14
% within Generation	21.43	50.00	21.43	7.14		100
% within Political Party	1.64	7.22	3.80	4.17		3.57
% of Total	0.77	1.79	0.77	0.26		3.57
Total						
Count	183	97	79	24	9	392
% within Generation	46.68	24.74	20.15	6.12	2.30	100
% within Political Party	100	100	100	100	100	100
% of Total	46.68	24.74	20.15	6.12	2.30	100

Table A.8

Cross tabulation Table of Political Ideology by Generation

Generations	Very Conservative	Conservative	Moderate	Liberal	Very Liberal	Unknown	Total
Matures							
Count		4	7	3			14
% within Generation		28.57	50.00	21.43			100
% within Political							
Ideology		4.55	3.76	4.11			3.57
% of Total		1.02	1.79	0.77			3.57
Mature/Boomer Cusper							
Count	5	34	69	25	8	6	147
% within Generation	3.40	23.13	46.94	17.01	5.44	4.08	100
% within Political							
Ideology	20.83	38.64	37.10	34.25	61.54	75.00	37.50
% of Total	1.28	8.67	17.60	6.38	2.04	1.53	37.50
Baby Boomer							
Count	9	29	77	29	3	1	148
% within Generation	6.08	19.59	52.03	19.59	2.03	0.68	100
% within Political							
Ideology	37.50	32.95	41.40	39.73	23.08	12.50	37.76
% of Total	2.30	7.40	19.64	7.40	0.77	0.26	37.76
Boomer/Gen X Cusper							
Count	8	19	26	13	2	1	69
% within Generation	11.59	27.54	37.68	18.84	2.90	1.45	100
% within Political							
Ideology	33.33	21.59	13.98	17.81	15.38	12.50	17.60
% of Total	2.04	4.85	6.63	3.32	0.51	0.26	17.60
Generation X							
Count	2	2	7	3			14
% within Generation	14.29	14.29	50.00	21.43			100
% within Political							
Ideology	8.33	2.27	3.76	4.11			3.57
% of Total	0.51	0.51	1.79	0.77			3.57
Total							
Count	24	88	186	73	13	8	392
% within Generation	6.12	22.45	47.45	18.62	3.32	2.04	100
% within Political							
Ideology	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
% of Total	6.12	22.45	47.45	18.62	3.32	2.04	100

APPENDIX E
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

Table A.9
Analysis of Variance Descriptive Statistics Table

Generations	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Affective Commitment			
Matures	14	5.05	1.50
Mature/Boomer Cusper	145	4.56	1.58
Baby Boomer	148	4.85	1.49
Boomer/Gen X Cusper	69	4.47	1.62
Generation X	14	4.67	1.23
Total	390	4.67	1.54
Continuance Commitment			
Matures	14	2.95	0.81
Mature/Boomer Cusper	147	3.71	1.56
Baby Boomer	148	3.75	1.45
Boomer/Gen X Cusper	68	3.96	1.57
Generation X	13	5.03	1.20
Total	390	3.79	1.51
Psychological Contract			
Matures	14	1.55	0.50
Mature/Boomer Cusper	146	1.77	0.70
Baby Boomer	146	1.82	0.76
Boomer/Gen X Cusper	69	1.62	0.51
Generation X	14	2.00	0.71
Total	389	1.76	0.69
Job Movement			
Matures	13	3.31	0.69
Mature/Boomer Cusper	146	3.46	0.88
Baby Boomer	148	3.38	0.97
Boomer/Gen X Cusper	69	3.71	0.88
Generation X	14	3.86	0.80
Total	390	3.48	0.91
Career Commitment			
Matures	14	2.73	1.17
Mature/Boomer Cusper	144	3.42	1.16
Baby Boomer	146	3.30	1.22
Boomer/Gen X Cusper	69	3.49	1.16
Generation X	13	3.27	1.09
Total	386	3.36	1.18
Normative Commitment			
Matures	13	3.35	1.31
Mature/Boomer Cusper	145	4.17	1.46
Baby Boomer	147	3.97	1.53
Boomer/Gen X Cusper	66	4.17	1.45
Generation X	13	4.56	1.30
Total	384	4.08	1.48

Table A.9 Continued

Organizational Loyalty			
Matures	14	1.36	0.27
Mature/Boomer Cusper	147	1.61	0.47
Baby Boomer	148	1.61	0.52
Boomer/Gen X Cusper	68	1.68	0.48
Generation X	14	1.77	0.56
Total	391	1.62	0.49
Civil Service Reform			
Matures	14	2.02	1.04
Mature/Boomer Cusper	145	2.41	1.09
Baby Boomer	147	2.40	1.09
Boomer/Gen X Cusper	67	2.47	1.10
Generation X	14	2.62	1.02
Total	387	2.41	1.09
Worker Career Control			
Matures	14	2.07	1.21
Mature/Boomer Cusper	147	2.37	1.02
Baby Boomer	147	2.21	0.95
Boomer/Gen X Cusper	69	2.14	0.75
Generation X	14	2.07	0.83
Total	391	2.25	0.95
Employer Career Control			
Matures	14	2.43	1.40
Mature/Boomer Cusper	147	3.02	1.13
Baby Boomer	147	2.99	1.14
Boomer/Gen X Cusper	69	2.99	1.06
Generation X	14	2.86	0.95
Total	391	2.98	1.13

Table A.10

Analysis of Variance Full Output for Factors and Control Variables by Generation

Factor		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Affective Commitment	Between Groups	11.142	4	2.785	1.176	0.321
	Within Groups	911.835	385	2.368		
	Total	922.977	389			
Contingence Commitment	Between Groups	32.805	4	8.201	3.692	0.006
	Within Groups	855.135	385	2.221		
	Total	887.940	389			
Psychological Contract	Between Groups	3.321	4	0.830	1.754	0.137
	Within Groups	181.740	384	0.473		
	Total	185.061	388			
Job Movement	Between Groups	7.515	4	1.879	2.287	0.060
	Within Groups	316.303	385	0.822		
	Total	323.819	389			
Career Commitment	Between Groups	7.956	4	1.989	1.426	0.225
	Within Groups	531.400	381	1.395		
	Total	539.356	385			
Normative Commitment	Between Groups	13.308	4	3.327	1.523	0.195
	Within Groups	828.075	379	2.185		
	Total	841.383	383			
Organizational Loyalty	Between Groups	1.552	4	0.388	1.606	0.172
	Within Groups	93.289	386	0.242		
	Total	94.842	390			
Civil Service Reform	Between Groups	2.981	4	0.745	0.629	0.642
	Within Groups	452.351	382	1.184		
	Total	455.332	386			
Worker Career Control	Between Groups	3.902	4	0.976	1.079	0.367
	Within Groups	349.034	386	0.904		
	Total	352.936	390			
Employer Career Control	Between Groups	4.733	4	1.183	0.932	0.445
	Within Groups	490.060	386	1.270		
	Total	494.793	390			
Race	Between Groups	2.840	4	0.710	0.622	0.647
	Within Groups	441.811	387	1.142		
	Total	444.651	391			
Education	Between Groups	4.424	4	1.106	0.601	0.662
	Within Groups	711.982	387	1.840		
	Total	716.406	391			
Employment Status	Between Groups	2.147	4	0.537	1.626	0.167
	Within Groups	127.761	387	0.330		
	Total	129.908	391			
Gender	Between Groups	0.141	4	0.035	0.153	0.962
	Within Groups	89.278	387	0.231		
	Total	89.418	391			
Political Party	Between Groups	3.033	4	0.758	0.981	0.418
	Within Groups	299.090	387	0.773		

Table A.10 Continued

	Total	302.122	391			
Political Ideology	Between Groups	4.526	4	1.132	1.306	0.267
	Within Groups	335.349	387	0.867		
	Total	339.875	391			
Income	Between Groups	21.518	4	5.379	4.579	0.001
	Within Groups	446.472	380	1.175		
	Total	467.990	384			

APPENDIX F
TIMELINE

May – October 2005	Literature Review
November 2005 – April 2006	Theory Development
May 2006	Finalize & Defend Prospectus
June 2006	Survey Instrument Creation and Pilot Study
July 2006	Data Collection
August – October 2006	Data Analysis
October 2006 – March 2007	Write & Wrap-Up
April 2007	Defend
May 2007	Walk in Commencement Ceremony
August 2007	Officially Graduate

REFERENCES

- Abramson, M.A. (2001) Report from the Wye River Forum. In *Toward a 21st Century Public Service: Reports from four forums* (pp. 23-20). Arlington, VA: PricewaterhouseCoopers Endowment for the Business of Government.
- AFSCME v. Bush, Florida Supreme Court, Case No. 01766 (2001).
- Andersson, L.M. (1996). Employee cynicism: an examination using a contract violation framework. *Human Relations*. 49(11), 1395-1418.
- Andrews, D.C. and Stalick, S.K. (1994) *Business reengineering: The survival guide*. Englewood cliffs, NJ: Yourdon Press.
- Any questions? (1998, February). *State Personnel News* 22(1), 7.
- Aron, C.S. (1987) *Ladies and gentlemen of the civil service*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ashford, S.J., Lee, C. & Bobko, P. (1989) Content, casues and consequences of job insecurity: A theory based measure and substantive test. *Academy of Management Journal* 32, 803-829.
- Aven, F., Parker, B., McEvoy, G. (1993) Gender and attitudinal commitment to organizations: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Business Research*. 26, 63-73.
- Baby Boomers Grow Up. (1996) *The Strategic Solution*. Retrieved August 24, 2005 from <http://www.thestrategicedge.com>.
- Bachmann, D., Elfrink, J., and Vazzana, G. (1996) Tracking the progress of e-mail versus snail mail. *Marketing Research*. 8, 31-35.
- Barnard, C. (1938). *Functions of the Executive*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Barzelay, M. and Armajani, B.J. (1992) *Breaking through bureaucracy: A new vision for managing in government*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Bastedo, R. and Lodge, M. (1980) The meaning of party labels. *Political Behavior*. 2(3), 287-308.
- Battaglio, R.P. and Condrey, S.E. (2005) Civil service reform: Examining state and local government cases. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*. 26(6), 118-138.
- Beck, A.T. (1967) *Depression: clinical, experimental, and theoretical aspects*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Benest, F. (2003) Best practices for preparing the next generation. *Public Management* (June) pp. 23-28.
- Berman, E.M. and West, J.P. (2003) Psychological contracts in local government; a preliminary study. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*. 23(4), 267-285.
- Beyer, J.M. (1981) Ideologies, values and decision making in organizations. In P.C. Nystrom & W.H. Starbuck (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational design*. 2, 166-202. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Billingsley, M. (2000) Satisfying Gen X: can we do it? *Nursing Connection* 13(1), 72-74.
- Blalock, H. (1979) *Social Statistics*. Rev. 2ed. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Blau, G.J. (1985) The measurement and prediction of career commitment. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*. 58, 277-288.
- Blau, G.J. (1988) Further exploring the meaning and measurement of career commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*. 32, 284-297.
- Boston, J. (1996) *Public management: The New Zealand model*. Auckland, New Zealand: Oxford University Press.
- Bousquet, S. (2001, April 10). State workers rally against Bush plan. *The Miami Herald*, p.B5.

- Bowman, J. S., Gertz, M. C, Gertz, S.C. and Williams, R.L. (2003). Civil service reform in Florida state government: Employee attitudes 1 year later. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*. 23 (4), 286-304.
- Bowman, J.S. and West, J. (2006) Ending civil service in Florida government: Experiences in State Agencies. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*. 26(6), 139-157.
- Buchanan, B. (1974) Building organizational commitment: The socialization of managers in work organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 19, 533-546.
- Burke, R. J. and Cooker, C. L. (2002) (Eds.) *The New World of Work* Oxford: Blackwell.
- Carr, D.K. and Littman, I.D. (1992). *Excellence in Government: Total Quality Management in the 1990s*. 2d. Arlington, VA: Coopers & Lybrand.
- Cheng, M.T. (1991) The Japanese permanent employment system. *Organizational Science*. 18(2), 148-171.
- Chetkovich, C. (2003) What's in a sector? The shifting career plans of public policy students. *Public Administration Review*. 63(6), 660-674.
- Churchman, G. quoted in Streeter, B. (2004) Next generation employees, yeah, they're different. *American Bankers Association, ABA Banking Journal*. 96(12), 1.
- Coggburn, J. D. (2006) At-will employment in state government: Insights from the lone star state. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*.. 26(6) p.158-177.
- Cohen, D.M. (1998). Amateur government. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 8(4), 450-497.
- Condrey, S.E. (2002) Reinventing state civil service systems: The Georgia experience. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*. 22(2), 114-124.
- Condrey, S.E. (2005). Toward strategic human resource management. *Handbook of Human Resource Management*, 2nd ed. Stephen E. Condrey. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Coolidge, S.D. (1997a) I'm new; when's vacation. *The Christian Science Monitor* 89(155), 1.
- Coolidge, S.D. (1997b) In first jobs, grad sport skills – and attitude. *The Christian Science Monitor* 89(119), 1.
- Copeland, C. (2005) Employee tenure: stable overall, but male and female trends differ. *Employee Benefit Research Institute Notes*. 26(3), 1-15.
- Corbo, S.A. (1997) The X-er files. *Hospitals and Health Networks*. 71(7), 58.
- Cordeniz, J.A. (2002) Recruitment, retention, and management of Generation X: A focus on nursing professionals. *Journal of Healthcare Management*. 47(4), 237-250.
- Cortvriend, P. (2004) Change management of mergers: the impact on NHS staff and their psychological contracts. *Health Services Management Research*. 17, 177-187.
- Coyle-Shapiro, J.A-M. (2002) A psychological contract perspective on organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 23, 927-946.
- Coyle-Shapiro, J.A-M., and Kessler, I. (2003) The employment relationship in the U.K. Public Sector: A psychological contract perspective. *Journal of Public research and Theory*. 13(2), 213-230.
- Crocker, J. Fiske, S.T. & Taylor, S.E. (1984). Schematic bases of belief change. In J.R. Eiser (Ed.) *Attitudinal Judgment* (pp. 192-226). New York: Springer.
- Crumpacker, M. and Crumpacker, J.M. (2004). Elevating, integrating and institutionalizing strategic human capital management in federal agencies through the chief human capital officer. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*. 24(3), 234-255.

- DeFillippi, R.J. and Arthur, M.B. (1994) The boundaryless career: A competency based perspective. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 15, 307-324.
- DeMeuse, K.P., Bergmann, T.J. and Lester, S.W. (2001) An investigation of the relational component of the psychological contract across time, generation, and employment status. *Journal of Managerial Issues*. 13(1), 102-118.
- Deming, W. E. (1994) *The new economics: for industry, government, education* Cambridge, London: MIT Press - Center for Advanced Engineering Studies.
- Department of Human Resources, State of Utah. (www.dhrm.utah.gov) Accessed April 12, 16, 22, 24, 2005. Personal communication April 22, 2005.
- Derrick, K. and Walker, K. (2006) Talkin' 'bout my generation. *The Public Manager*. 35(2), 63-66.
- Deutschman, A. (1992) The upbeat generation. *Fortune*. 13(July), 42-54.
- De Vellis, R.. (1991) *Scale Development: Thoery and Applications*. London: SAGE.
- Dillman, D. (2000) *Mail and internet surveys: The taylored design method*.2d. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Dillman, D. (1978) *Mail and telephone surveys: The total design method*. New York: Wiley-Interscience.
- Doohan, J. (1999) *Key Indicators of the Labour Market*. Report of the International Labour Organization. Geneva.
- Downing, P., Dunlap, M., Hadley, B. & Ferrell, L. (1978) *Work attitudes and performance questionnaire*. San Francisco: School of Nursing, University of California.
- Dunn, D.D. (1997) *Politics and administration at the top: Lessons from down under*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh.
- Dunnette, M. Arvey, R. & Banas, P. (1973) Why to they leave? *Personnel*.50, 25-39.
- Edwards, J.C., Rust, K.G., McKinley, W., and Moon, G. (2003) Business ideologies and perceived breach of contract during downsizing: the role of the ideology of employee self-reliance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 24, 1-23.
- Fernandez, S., Lowman, C. E., and Rainey, H.G. (2002). Privatization and human resource management. In *Public personnel management: Current concerns, future challenges*. 3rd ed, Edited by Carolyn Ban and Norma M. Riccucci, 225-242. New York: Longman.
- Fife-Schaw, C. (1995) Levels of Measurement. In G. M. Breakwell, S. Hammond & C. Fife-Schaw (eds.) *Research Methods in Psychology*. London: SAGE.
- Florida, R. (2002) *The rise of the creative class: And how its transforming work, leisure, community and everyday life*. New York: Basic Books.
- Forbis, R., Green, R.T., Golden, A., Nelson, S. and Robinson, J. (2005) At will employment in Utah: What politicians and public managers think about at will employment in the public sector. *Presentation at the 66th National Conference of the American Society for Public Administration*. Milwaukee, WI: April 2-5, 2005.
- Foster, G.D. (1979) The 1978 Civil Service Reform Act: Post-mortem or rebirth? *Public Administration Review*. January/February.
- Flynn, G. (1996) Xers vs. Boomers: Teamwork or trouble? *Personel Journal* . 75(11), 86-90.
- Gakovic, A. and Tetrick, L.E. (2003) Psychological contract breach as a source of strain for employees. *Journal of Business and Psychology* 18(2), 235-246.
- Gazell, J. A. and Pugh, B.L. (1990) Administrative theory and large organizations of the future: Whither bureaucracy? *International Journal of Public Administration*. 13, 827-858.

- Gore, A. (1993) *From Red Tape to Results: Creating a government that works better and costs less*. A report of the National Performance Review. Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office. September 7.
- Gossett, C.W. (2002) Civil service reform: The case of Georgia. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*. 22(2), 94-113.
- Green, M. (2002) Beware and prepare: The government workforce of the future. Management Education Group White Paper.
- Green, R., Forbis, R., Robinson, J., Nelson, S., Seelig, J., Stefaniak, A. (unpublished manuscript). The particular attraction of at-will employment in Utah governments: Fire first, ask questions later.
- Groves, R. M. (1989) *Survey errors and survey costs*. New York: John Wiley.
- Guest, D. and Conway N. (1997) *Employee motivation and the psychological contract*. IPD, London.
- Hall, D.T. and Moss, J.E. (1998) The new protean career contract: Helping organizations and employees adapt. *Organizational Dynamics*. 26(3), 22-37.
- Hammer, M. and Champy, J. (1993) *Reengineering the corporation: A manifesto for business revolution*. New York: Harper Collins Publishers.
- Hays, S.W. (2004) Trends and best practices in state and local human resource management: lessons to be learned. *Review of Public Personnel Management*. 24 (3), 256-275.
- Hays, S.W. and Sowa, J.E. (2006) A broader look at the “accountability” movement: Some grim realities in the state civil service systems. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*. 26(6) p.102-117.
- Heckscher, C. (1994) Defining the post-bureaucratic type. In C. Heckscher and A. Donnellon (eds) *The Post Bureaucratic organization*. (pg. 14-62). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Herriot, P. (2001) *The employment relationship*. Hove: Routledge.
- Herriot, P. and Pemberton, C. (1995) *New deals: The revolution in managerial careers*. Chichester: Wiley.
- Hislop, D. (2003) Linking human resource management and knowledge management via commitment: a review and research agenda. *Employee Relations*. 25(2), 182-202.
- Hochberg, Y. and Tamhane, A. (1987) *Multiple Comparison Procedures*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Holtz, G.T. (1995) *Welcome to the jungle: The why behind Generation X*. New York: St. Martin Press.
- Hood, C. (1991) A public management for all seasons? *Public Administration*. 69, 3-19.
- Hoogenboom, A. (1959) The Pendleton Act and civil service reform. *American Historical Review*. 64, 301-318.
- Hoogenboom, A. (1961) Thomas A. Jenckes and civil service reform. *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*. 47, 636-58.
- Hoogenboom, A. (1968) *Outlawing the spoils: A history of the civil service reform movement, 1865-1883*. Urbana, IL: Illinois University Press.
- Hornblower, M. (1997) Great expectations. *Time*. 149(23), 58-68.
- Horowitz, M.J. (1988) *Introduction to psychodynamics: a new synthesis*. New York: Basic Books.
- Howe, N. (2004) OrthodoX. *American Demographics*. 24(4), 32.
- H.R. 359, Fla. Laws, chap. 110 (2001).

- Hughes, M. and O'Rand, A. (2005) The lives and times of Baby Boomers. In *The American People*. R. Farley and J Haaga (eds) New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Hult, K. M. and Maranto, R. (1999) Right turn? Political ideology in the higher career civil service, 1987 – 1994. *Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association. Atlanta, GA.*
- Ingraham, P.W. (1987) Building bridges or destroying them: The president, the appointees, and the bureaucracy. *Public Administration Review*. 47(2), 425-435.
- Ingraham, P.W. (1995) *The foundation of merit: Public service in American democracy*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Janssens, M., Sels, L. and Van den Brande, I. (2003) Multiple types of psychological contracts: A six cluster solution. *Human Relations*. 56(11), 1349-1378.
- Jennings, A.T. (2000) Hiring Generation X. *Journal of Accountancy*. 189(2), 55–60.
- Johnson, R.N. and Libecap, G.D. (1994) *The federal civil service system and the problem of bureaucracy: The economics and politics of institutional change*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- John-Steiner, V. (2000) *Creative collaboration*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Josephson, M. (1938) *The Politicos 1865-1896*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.
- Jurkiewicz, C. (2000) Generation X and the public employee. *Public Personnel Management* 29(1), 55
- Jurkiewicz, C. L. and Brown, R.G. (1998) GenXers vs. Boomers vs. Matures; Generational comparisons of public employee motivation. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*. 18(4) 18-37.
- Kahlert, M.V. (1999) The baby boomer generation – impact on public libraries theoretical and practical evidence. Paper presented at the 66th IFLA Council and General Conference. Jerusalem, Israel. August 13-18, 1999.
- Kamensky, J. M.(1996) Role of reinventing government movement in federal management reform. *Public Administration Review*. May/June. 56(3), 247-255.
- Kaufman, H. (1986) The end of alliance: Public administration in the eighties. John Gaus Lecture delivered at eth annual meeting of the American Political Science Association (Aug. 29) mimeo.
- Kegan, R. (1994) *Over our heads: The mental demands of modern life*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Kellough, J.E. and Nigro, L. G. (2000) Civil service reform in Georgia: Going to the edge? *Review of Public Personnel Administration*. Fall, 41-54.
- Kellough, J.E. and Nigro, L. G. (2002) Pay for performance in Georgia state government: employee perspectives on GeorgiaGain after 5 year. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*. 22(2) 146-166.
- Kellough, J.E. and Selden, S.C. (1997) Pay for pPerformance in state government: Perceptions of state agency personnel managers. *Review of Public Personnel Management*. 17(1), 5-21.
- Kellough, J.E. and Selden, S.C. (2003) The reinvention of public personnel administration: An analysis of the diffusion of personnel management reforms in the states. *Public Administration Review*. 63(2), 165-176.
- King, J. E. (2000) White collar reactions to job insecurity and the role of the psychological contract: Implications for human resource management. *Human Resource Management*. 39(1), 79-92.
- Kingsley, D. (1944) *Representative bureaucracy*. Yellow Springs, OH: Antioch Press.

- Kissler, G.D. (1994) The new employment contract. *Human Resource Management*. 33(3), 335-351.
- Kittleston, M. (1995) An assessment of response rate via the postal service and e-mail. *Health Values*. 18, 27-29.
- Klay, E. & Crispo, N.S. (2001, March 28). Don't scrap the civil-service system. *Miami Herald*, p.B9.
- Kronenberg, G. (1997) Why Gen-Xers become ex-ers. *Las Angeles Mmes* 116(February 24): 14.
- Kuykendall, C.L. and Facer, R.L. (2002) Public employment in Georgia state agencies: The elimination of the merit system. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*. 22(2), 133-145.
- Laabs, J. J. (1996) Today's priorities may not be tomorrow's: eyeing future HR concerns. *Personnel Journal*. 71(1), 28-36.
- Lan, Z. and Rosenbloom, D. (1992) Public administration in transition? *Public Administration Review*. 52, 535-537.
- Lancaster, L. and Stillman, D. (2002) *When generations collide: Who they are, why they clash, how to solve the generational puzzle*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers.
- LaRocco, J.M., House, J.S. and French, Jr, J.R.P. (1980) Social support, occupational stress, and health. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*. 2, 202-218.
- Lasseter, R.W. (2002) Georgia's merit system reform 1996-2001: An operating agency's perspective. *Review of Public Personnel Administration* 22(2),125-132.
- Leuenberger, D. and Kløver J. (2006) Changing culture; Generational collision and creativity. *The Public Manager*. 34(4), 16 – 21.
- Levene, H. (1960). *Contributions to the Probability and Statistics*. San Francisco, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Liden, R & Green, S. (1980) On *measurement of career orientation*. Paper presented at the Midwest Academy of Management meeting. Cincinnati, OH.
- Light, P. (1999) *The new public service*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution.
- Linden, R. M. (1994) *Seamless government: A practical guide to re-engineering in the public sector*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Lipnack, J.P. and Stamps, J.S. (1993) *The TeamNet factor: bringing the power of boundary-crossing into the heart of your business*. Essex Junction, VT: Oliver Wright Publishing.
- Maguire, H. (2002) Psychological contracts: Are they still relevant? *Career Development* 7(3), 167-180.
- Maranto, R. (2002) Praising civil service but not bureaucracy: A brief against tenure in the U.S. civil service. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*. 22(3), 175-192.
- Maranto, R. and Johnson, J. (unpublished manuscript) 2006. Bringing back boss tweed? Could at-will employment work in state government and if so, where?
- Marquis, A. (1998) *Gender differences in risk-taking behavior : From family of origin to personality variables*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Texas Tech University.
- March, J.C. and March J. G. (1977) Almost random careers: The Wisconsin school superintendency, 1940-1972. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 22:377-409.
- McCarthy, J.F. and Hall, D.T. (2000) Organizational crisis and change: The new career contract at work. In R.J. Burke and C.L. Cooper (Eds.), *The organization in crisis: Downsizing restructuring, and privatization*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 5-20.
- McFarland Shore, L. and Tetrick, L.E. (1994) The psychological contract as an explanatory framework in the employment relationship. In Cooper, C.L. and Rousseau, D.M. (Eds), *Trends in Organizational Behavior Vol. 1*. Chicester: Wiley & Sons, 91-110.

- McKinley, W., Mone, M.A., and Barker, V.L., III (1998) Some ideological foundations of organizational downsizing. *Journal of Management Inquiry*. 7, 198-212.
- Mclean Parks, J. and Kidder, D.L. (1994) Till death do part...changing work relationships in the 1990s. In Cooper, C.L. and Rousseau, D.M. (Eds), *Trends in Organizational Behavior Vol. 1*. Chicester: Wiley & Sons, 111-136.
- McNair, C.J. and Leibfried, K. H. (1992) *Benchmarking: A tool for continuous improvement*. The Coopers and Lybrand Performance Solution Series. Essex Junction, VT: Oliver Wright Publications.
- Meda, D. (1996) New perspectives on work as value. *International Labour Review* 135(6), 633-644.
- Mehta, R. and Sivadas, E. (1995) Comparing response rates and response content in mail versus electronic mail surveys. *Journal of Market Research Society*. 37, 429-439.
- Meyer, J., Allen, N., & Smith, C. (1993) Commitment to Organizations and occupations: Extension and test of a three-component conceptualization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 78(4), 538-551.
- Mickey, R., Dunn, O. and Clark V. (2004) *Applied Statistics: Analysis of variance and regression*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Interscience.
- Miller, Z. (1996) Executive Order A-11-0007-1996.
- Millick, S.S. and Smith, L.W. (2002) From crisis to catastrophe. *PA Times*. 25(5).
- Morrison, E. and Robinson, S.L. (1997) When employees feel betrayed: a model of how psychological contract violation develops. *Academy of Management Review*. 22(1), 226-256.
- Mowday, R., Steers, R. & Porter, L. (1979) The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*. 14, 224-247.
- Mueller, C, Wallace J. & Price, J. (1992) Employee Commitment: resolving some issues. *Work and Occupations* 19, 211-236.
- Musolf, L. (1971) Separate career executives: Egalitarianism and neutrality. *Public Administration Review*. 31, 678 – 689.
- Naff, Katherine C. 2006. Prospects for civil service reform in California: A triumph of technique over purpose? In *Civil service reform in the states: Personnel policies at the sub-national level*, edited by J. Edward Kellough and Lloyd G. Nigro, 345-72. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Naff, K.C. and Newman, M.A. (2004). Symposium: Federal civil service reform: Another legacy of 9/11? *Review of Public Personnel Management*. 24(3), 191-201.
- National Commission on the Public Service (Volcker Commission). (1989). *Leadership for America: Rebuilding the public service*. Lexington, MA: Lexington.
- Nelson, M. (1982) A short, ironic history of American national bureaucracy. *Journal of Politics*, 44, 747-778.
- Nelson, S. (2004). The state of the federal civil service today. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*. 24(3), 202-215.
- Nie, N., Verba, S., and Petrocik, J. (1967) *The changing American voter*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Office of Management and Budget (2002). *The president's management agenda*. Quoted in Crumpacker, M. and Crumpacker, J.M. Elevating, integrating and institutionalizing strategic human capital management in federal agencies through the chief human capital officer. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*. 24(3), 234-255.

- O'Reilly, C. A. and Caldwell, D.F. (1979) Informational influence as a determinant of perceived task characteristics. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 64, 157-165.
- Osborne, D. (1993) Reinventing government: Creating an entrepreneurial federal establishment. In Will Marshall and Martin Schram, eds. *Mandate for Change*. Progressive Policy Institute. New York: Berkley Books.
- Osborne, D. and Gaebler, T. (1992) *Reinventing government: How the entrepreneurial spirit is transforming the public sector*. New York: Penguin.
- Osborne, D. and Plastrik, P. (1997) *Banishing bureaucracy*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Pate, J. and Malone, C. (2000) Post psychological contract violation: the durability and transferability of employee perceptions. *European Journal of Industrial Training*. 24(2/3/4), 158-166.
- Pate, J., Martin, G., and McGoldrick, J. (2003) The impact of psychological contract violation on employee attitudes and behaviour. *Employee Relations*. 25(6), 557-573.
- Perry, J.L. and Kraemer, K. L. (1983) *Public Management: Public and private perspectives*. Palo Alto: Mayfield Publishing Company.
- Pfeffer, J. (1998) *The human equation: Building profits by putting people first*. Harvard School Press.
- Pinchot, G. and Pinchot, E. (1993) *The end of bureaucracy and the rise of the intelligent organization*. San Francisco: Barrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.
- Porter, L.W. and Steers, R.M. (1973). Organizational, work and personal factors in employee turnover and absenteeism. *Psychological Bulletin*. 80, 151-176.
- Price, J. & Mueller, C. (1981) a causal model of turnover for nurses. *Academy of Management Journal*. 24, 543-565.
- Pugh, S.D., Sharlicki, D.P., and Passell, B.S. (2003) After the fall: Layoff victim's trust and cynicism in re-employment. *Journal of Organizational Psychology*. 76:201-212.
- Rainey, H.G. (1997) *Understanding and managing public organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Ramo, J.C. (1997) Peace is an excellent adventure. *Time* 149(23), 69.
- Ray P. and Anderson, S. (2000) *The cultural creatives: How 50 million people are changing the world*. New York: Three Rivers Press.
- Reilly, A, Brett, J. & Stroh, L. (1993) The impact of corporate turbulence on managers' attitudes. *Strategic Management Journal*. 14, 167-179.
- Reynolds, C. (2004) Gen X: The unbeholden. *American Demographics*. 24(4), 8-10.
- Rhodes, S.P. (1983) Age-related differences in work attitudes and behavior: a review and conceptual analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 328-367.
- Robbins, S.P. (1998) *Organizational Behavior* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Robinson, S.L. (1996) Trust and breach of the psychological contract. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41, 574-599.
- Robinson, S.L. and Morrison, E. (1995) Psychological contracts and OCB: the effect of unfulfilled obligations on civic virtue and behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 16(3), 289-298.
- Robinson, S.L. and Morrison, E. (2000) The development of psychological contract breach and violation: a longitudinal study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 21, 525-546.
- Robinson, S.L. and Rousseau, D.M. (1994a) Violating the psychological contract: not the exception but the norm. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 15(3), 245-259.

- Robinson, S.L., Kraatz, S.M., and Rousseau, M.D. (1994b) Changing obligations and the psychological contract: a longitudinal study. *Academy of Management Journal*. 37, 137-151.
- Rosow, J. (1974) *The worker and the job*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Rousseau, D.M. (1989) Psychological and implied contracts in organizations. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*. 2, 121-139.
- Rousseau, D. M. (1990) New hire perceptions of their own and employer's obligations: A Study of psychological contracts. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 11, 389-400.
- Rousseau, D.M. (1995) *Psychological contracts in organizations*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Rousseau, D.M. (2001) Schema, promise and mutuality: The building blocks of psychological contract. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*. 74, 511-541.
- Rousseau, D.M. and Greller, M.M. (1994) Human resource practices: administrative contract makers. *Human Resource Management*. 33(3), 385-402.
- Rousseau, D.M. and Mclean Parks, J. (1993) The contracts of individuals and organizations. In I.L. Cummings and B.M. Shaw (Eds), *Research in organizational behavior*. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, pp. 1-47.
- Royse, D. (2001, August 3). State employee union sues Bush. *Miami Herald*, p. 5B.
- Rueger, D. (1989) A twenty-year history and review of ADEA. *Labor Law Journal*. 40, 31-36.
- Rumelhart, D.E. and Norman, D.A. (1978) Accretion, tuning and restructuring: three modes of learning. In R. Klatsky & J.W. Cotton (Eds.) *Semantic factors in cognition* (pp. 37-53). Hillsdale, NJ: Laurence Erlbaum.
- Russell, C. (1996) War between generations. *American Demographics*. 18(7), 4-5.
- Salancik, G. R. and Pfeffer, J. (1978). A social information processing approach to job attitudes and task design. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 23, 224-253.
- Santos, S.R. and Cox, K. (2000) Workplace adjustment and intergenerational differences between matures, boomers and Xers. *Nursing Economics* January/February: 40-46.
- Sawyer, K. (1978) Carter's civil service victory confounds capital's cynics, *Washington Post*. October 14, p. A2. Found in Foster, G.D. The 1978 Civil Service Reform Act: Post-Mortem or Rebirth? *Public Administration Review*. January/February 1979.
- Schaefer, D.R. and Dillman, D. (1998) Development of a standard e-mail methodology: results of an experiment. *Public Opinion Quarterly*. 62(3), 378-390.
- Schleyer, T.K.L., and Forrest, J.L. (2000) Methods for the design and administration of web-based surveys. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*. 7, 400-425.
- Schmittlein, D. C. and Morrison, D. G. (1981) On individual-level inference in job duration research: A reexamination of the Wisconsin School of Superintendents study. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 26, 84 – 89.
- Sims, R.R. (1994) Human resource management's role in clarifying the new psychological contract". *Human Resource Management*. 33(3), 373-382.
- Shafritz, J.M. and A. C. Hyde. (1997) *Classics of public administration*. Ft. Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.
- Sherwood, F. and Breyer, L. (1987) Executive personnel systems in the states. *Public Administration Review*. 47(5), 410-416.
- Shore, L.M. and Barksdale, K. (1998) Examining the degree of balance and level of obligation in the employment relationship: A social exchange approach. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 19, 731-744.
- Skowronek, S. (1982) *Building a new American state*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

- Smith, B. (2000) Managing Generation X. *USA Today* November 5, 32-33.
- Smith, J.W. and Clurman, A.S. (1997) *Rocking the ages: The Yankelovich report of generational marketing*. New York: Harper Business.
- Smith, C., Organ, D., and Near, J. (1983) Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68, 653-663.
- Smola, K. and Sutton, C. (2002) Generational differences: Revisiting generational work values for the new millennium. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*.23(4). 363-382.
- Special Master Report (2001) Published recommendations by Mark Sherman, Special Master. April 3, 2001.
- Sproull L.S. (1986) Using electronic mail for data collection in organizational research. *Academy of Management Journal*. 29,159-169.
- State employees move toward market salaries. (2001 February) The Georgia Statement. *Georgia Merit System Newsletter*. pg. 1.
- Strauss, W. and Howe, N. (1991) *Generations: The history of America's Future, 1584-2069*. New York: William Morrow & Co.
- Stein, D.J. (1992). Schemas in the cognitive and clinical sciences. *Journal of Psychological Integration*. 2, 45-63.
- Stever, J. (1988) The fragmented philosophy and ideology of post-progressive public administration. *The End of Public Administration: Problems of the Profession in the Post Progressive Era*. Dobbs-Ferry, NY: Transnational Publisher, Inc.
- Stewart, S., Bing, M., Gruys, M., Helford, M. (2006) Men, women, and perceptions of work environments, organizational commitment, and turnover. *Journal of Business and Public Affairs*. 1(1). Accessed on the worldwide web at <http://www.scientificjournals.org/articles/1035.htm>.
- Sutton, G. and Griffin, M.A. (2004) Integrating expectations, experiences and psychological contract violations: A longitudinal study of new professionals. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*. 77, 493-514.
- Swann, W. B. and Read, S.J. (1981) Self-verification processes: how we sustain our self-conceptions. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*. 35, 656-666.
- Sweet, S. and Grace-Martin, K. (2003) *Data analysis with SPSS: A first course in applied statistics*. 2ed. Boston, MA: Pearson Education Inc.
- Tekleab, A.G. and Taylor, M.S. (2003) Aren't there two parties in an employment relationship? Antecedents and consequences of organization – employee agreement on contract obligations and violations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 24, 585-608.
- Theriault, S.M. (2003) Patronage, the Pendleton Act, and the power of the people. *Journal of Politics*. 65(1), 50-68.
- Topel, R.H. and Ward, M.P. (1992). Job mobility and the careers of young men. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*. 107, 439-479.
- Tse, A.C.B., Tse, K.C., Yin, C.H., Ting, C.B., Yi, K.W., Yee, K.P., Hong, W.C. (1995) Comparing two methods of sending out questionnaires: E-mail versus mail. *Journal of Market Research Society*. 37-441-446.
- Tulgan, B. (1995) *Managing Generation X. How to bring out the best in young talent*. New York: Nolo Press.
- Tulgan, B. (1997) *The manager's pocket guide to Generation X*. Amherst, MA:HRD Press.
- Tulgan, B. (2004) Trends point to a dramatic generational shift in the future workforce. *Employment Relations Today* Winter: 23 – 31.

- Turnley, W.H., Bolino, M.C., Lester, S.W., and Bloodgood, J.M. (2004) The effects of psychological contract breach on union commitment. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*. 77, 421-428.
- U.S. General Accounting Office. (1990, September) *The Public Service: Issues affecting its quality, effectiveness, integrity and stewardship*. (GAO/GGD-90-108). Washington, DC: Author.
- Van Maanen, J. (1976) Breaking in: Socialization to work. In R. Dubin (ed.) *Handbook of Work, Organization, and Society*. 67 – 130. Chicago: Rand-McNally.
- Van Riper, P. P. (1958) *History of the United States Civil Service*. Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson and Company.
- Vonnegut, M. (1999) New York state's new civil service. Paper prepared for the nomination for the Eugene H. Rooney, Jr. Innovative State Human Resource Management Award. National Association of State Personnel Executives, Lexington, KY.
- Wahn, J. (1998) Sex differences in the continuance component of organizational commitment. *Group & Organization Management*, 23(3), 256-266.
- Walters, J. (1998) Untangling Albany. *Governing*. 12(3), 18-22.
- Walters, J. (2002) Life after civil service reform: The Texas, Georgia and Florida experiences *Governing*. October. IBM Endowment for the Business of Government.
- Walters, J. (2003) Civil service reform tsunami. *Governing*. 16(8), 34-40.
- Wanous, J.P. (1977) Organizational entry: Newcomers moving from outside to inside. *Psychological Bulletin*. 84, 601-618.
- Watson, D. (2001, April 10). Sate workers decry cuts, bash Bush. *The Tampa Tribune*, p.5.
- Weissert, C.S. and Schram, S.F. (2000) The state of US federalism, 1999-2000. *Publius*. 30(1-2), 1-20.
- Weko, T.J. (1995) *The politicizing presidency*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.
- Welch Larson, D. (1994) The role of belief systems and schemas in foreign policy decision-making. *Political Psychology*. 15, 17-33.
- West, J. (2002) Georgia on the mind of radical civil service reformers. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*. 22(2), 79-93
- White, L. D. (1926). Introduction to the study of public administration. New York: Macmillan. Cf. Lynn, Laurence E. (2002) "Public Management" in *Handbook of Public Administration*. Chicago: Sage Publications. (pg. 124)
- White, L.D. (1954) *The Jacksonians: A study in administrative history*. New York: Macmillan.
- White, L.D. (1958) *The Republican era: 1869-1901*. New York: Macmillan.
- Williamsen, M. ed. (2000) *Imagine: What America could in the 21st Century*. Rodale Press.
- Wilson, J. Q. (1989) Reinventing public administration. John Gaus Lecture, *P.S. Political Science and Politics*, XXVII (4), 667-673.
- Woodard, C.A. (2005) Merit by any other name – Reframing the civil service first principle. *Public Administration Review*. 65(1), 109-116.
- Yankelovich, D. (1979, August 6) Yankelovich on today's workers. *Industry Week*. 61-68.
- Yang, S.B and Guy, M.E. (2006) Generation Xers: Changing preferences and management implications. *Public Personnel and Management Review*. 29(3), 267-284.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Melanie Hicks was born in Gulf Breeze, Florida on March 3, 1978. She currently serves as the Director of Research for the Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida (ICUF). After completing her Bachelor's at the University of Central Florida in Organizational Communications she pursued a Masters in Public Administration from the University of Miami.

While pursuing her degree she also worked as the Aide to Mayor John Marks, taught Introductory Public Administration and Local Government Policy at FSU, and worked with OPPAGA as a special projects coordinator. Her published works include a recent chapter in *Moc Ideja*, a grassroots policy manual written for policymakers in Bosnia and funded by the US Department of State.

She is a member of the Knight Foundation Community Catalyst Team, the Florida Chamber of Commerce Foundation Research Committee, the Community Improvement Advisory Council, Academy of Management, the American Society of Public Administration, a founding member of the Network of Young Professionals, the past President of the Public Administration Graduate Association, a volunteer advisor for Delta Delta Delta sorority and is politically active with her party.

Awards include the Florence Bayuk Scholarship for academic excellence; the University of Miami Outstanding Scholastic and Public Service Achievement Award; Pi Gamma Mu Honor Society; and the Rho Lambda Honor Society.

Melanie is married to Salvatore Tozzi and has two stepchildren Taylor (6) and Salvatore III (2).