2017

Strategies to Improve Millennial Employee Engagement in the Luxury Resort Industry

Kei-Lin Cerf
Walden University

Walden University

College of Management and Technology

This is to certify that the doctoral study by

Kei-Lin Cerf

has been found to be complete and satisfactory in all respects,
and that any and all revisions required by
the review committee have been made.

Review Committee
Dr. Kathleen Barclay, Committee Chairperson, Doctor of Business Administration Faculty

Dr. Denise Gandy, Committee Member, Doctor of Business Administration Faculty

Dr. Neil Mathur, University Reviewer, Doctor of Business Administration Faculty

Chief Academic Officer
Eric Riedel, Ph.D.

Walden University
2017

Abstract

Strategies to Improve Millennial Employee Engagement in the Luxury Resort Industry

by

Kei-Lin K.H. Cerf

MBA, Marylhurst University, 2011

BS, Western Governors University, 2009

Doctoral Study Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Business Administration

Walden University

October 2017

Abstract

Millennials are estimated to compose half of the workforce by 2020. Many hospitality researchers have studied Millennial employee engagement, but less is known about how to apply strategies that are authentically engaging for Millennials. The purpose of this study was to explore Millennial employee engagement strategies. The research questions for this study were used to examine the engagement strategies of luxury resort leaders and how Millennial employees perceived engagement. A single case study design was used to gather interview, questionnaire, and company document data from employees of a luxury resort in Hawai`i. Kahn's employee engagement theory served as the basis for the conceptual framework. Six non-Millennial department heads participated in semistructured interviews by purposeful sampling and 11 Millennial employees completed an online, anonymous questionnaire. Saldana's 2-cycle coding analysis was used to determine themes based upon the conceptual framework, participant descriptions of engagement, and commonalities among effective strategies. The 3 most significant themes were the importance of (a) interpersonal respect, (b) interpersonal trust, and (c) meaningful relationships. Another worthwhile finding was the difference in perceptions of engagement aspects between Millennials and other generations. To fully engage Millennial employees, luxury resort leaders should focus on thoughtful communication, empathy, and relationship-building strategies. The implications for social change include the potential to foster happy, productive Millennial employees who contribute to the performance of their organizations. When resort leaders increase their skills to build respect, trust, and meaningful relationships, they improve workplace culture for all employees.

Strategies to Improve Millennial Employee Engagement in the Luxury Resort Industry

by

Kei-Lin K.H. Cerf

MBA, Marylhurst University, 2011

BS, Western Governors University, 2009

Doctoral Study Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Business Administration

Walden University

October 2017

Dedication

I dedicate this entire study and all its effort to my Millennial son, Jaggar Keali`iholokai Cerf. Regardless of how much I struggled with this journey, you never stopped believing in me.

May this piece of work serve as a reflection of my unwavering faith in you and all Millennials to lead us into a better world.

Acknowledgments

This study is a result of the collective efforts, faith, and support of many.

I would like to acknowledge and thank my chair, Dr. Kathleen Barclay. Without your patience, perseverance, and expertise, this accomplishment would not have been possible. Mahalo nui loa and me ke aloha pumehana. I also thank my other committee members, Dr. Denise Hackett and Dr. Neil Mathur. Your recommendations and insight were invaluable.

To my mother, father, and sister, thank you for always being there. You are the reasons why I am a strong, determined, articulate, complex thinker. Thank you for raising me with an extensive vocabulary, relentlessly correcting my grammar, and making sure I kept my elbows off the table at dinner time.

To my Millennial hanai children and youth leaders: Taylor, Michelle, Sanoe, Kassie, Isaiah, Kawena, Evan, Alek, Markjayson, Jeremy, DJ, and others, you inspired me to listen deeply to your words. Once I stopped trying to tell you what to think, I realized that your minds held the key to our future.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Section 1: Foundation of the Study

Improving and maintaining employee engagement (EE) is a priority for leaders to protect the financial performance of organizations (Markos & Sridevi, 2010). Richards (2013) discovered that 80% of regular employees believed that increases in EE resulted in financial performance improvements. Kahn (1990) described the theory of EE as the varying choices persons make to invest themselves in employed roles. Kahn alleged that the choice for self-investment varied depending on the task and the interpersonal relationships with other coworkers and supervisors. According to Markos and Sridevi (2010), productivity losses for employers with disengaged workers are significant while the benefits of EE are fruitful. Engaged in jobs that offer (a) autonomy, (b) variety, (c) significance, and (d) feedback, employees exhibit higher levels of job performance and lower levels of deviant behavior (Shantz et al., 2013). Thus, when employers struggle to establish productive employee relationships and loyalty, they are at risk of decreasing financial performance of the organization.

Background of the Problem

Andrew and Sofian (2012) described the engagement and retention of talented employees to be a critical priority for employers. The rates of turnover in the hospitality industry are high due to demanding hours and challenges with work-family balance (Brown, Thomas, Bosselman, 2015; Dimitrov, 2012). Baby Boomer generation employees are retiring, Generation X employees are taking upper and middle leadership positions, and Millennials are assuming entry-level leadership positions (Brown et al., 2015). Therefore, an opportunity for improvement in lies in exploring effective methods

of Millennial employee engagement (MEE) to increase productivity and reduce costs associated with employee disengagement and turnover among Millennials (Brown et al., 2015).

The Millennial generation (born 1980-2000), represent the largest generation in the workforce, have high expectations of employers, and want to work for firms that contribute to society in positive ways (Mirvis, 2012). Millennials also want creative challenges, autonomy, appreciation, interaction, and a caring environment (Holt, Marques, & Way, 2012). In exchange, Millennials tend to be collaborative, innovative, confident, and technologically savvy, which makes them highly valuable and worth the effort to engage them as employees (Holt et al., 2012).

In contrast to the benefits of employing Millennials, employers have discovered that managing employees from different generations is a challenge that often results in intergenerational workplace conflicts (Patterson, 2014). Millennials are reputed to have lower organizational commitment versus previous generations, which is a concern when paired with the high turnover rate of the hospitality industry (Brown et al., 2015). Brown et al. (2015) noted that the priority that Millennials place on work-life balance creates a greater risk for turnover in the hospitality field. Thus, it is important that leaders understand which leadership strategies are effective in retaining the Millennial workforce (Ruys, 2013).

Problem Statement

The cost of employee turnover for employers can range from 30% to 250% of the employee's annual salary (Nolan, 2015). Millennial employees are estimated to compose

half the workforce by 2020 (Nolan, 2015). Leaders in the hospitality industry are challenged with understanding how to manage, engage, and retain Millennial employees (Rosa & Hastings, 2016). The general business problem is that a lack of EE decreases an employer's organizational performance. The specific business problem is that some non-Millennial luxury resort leaders lack strategies to improve MEE.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this qualitative single case study was to explore the strategies that non-Millennial luxury resort leaders use to improve MEE. The target population was non-Millennial luxury resort leaders located in Hawai`i who have Millennial employees in their departments. The implications for positive social change include the potential to foster happy and productive Millennial employees who contribute to the organizational performance of their employers. The luxury resort industry and educational institutions with hospitality management programs may benefit from information that could improve corporate culture and increase graduates remaining in their field of study, respectively (Brown et al., 2015).

Nature of the Study

I chose a qualitative methodology for this study. The qualitative approach allows for exploring the insights of participants who are experiencing the phenomenon (Hanson, Balmer, & Giardino, 2011). The three methods available for research studies are qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods. Each method was explored and quantitative and mixed methods were unsuitable for the following reasons. Quantitative studies have hypotheses and researchers test these using quantitative approaches. Therefore,

quantitative was not the method to use because I explored existing strategies in use. In addition, the increased data collection of a mixed methods study would not be helpful to me in exploring business leader and employee perceptions. Thus, a mixed method approach was not my choice to explore this phenomenon in a single case.

I used a single case study design to explore the topic of MEE. Yin (2014) described the appropriateness of using a case study design when a researcher wishes to know the *how* and *why* of a phenomenon. I considered using the following qualitative research designs: case study, phenomenology, and ethnography. Phenomenological researchers explore the meaning of the phenomenon through the lived experiences of participants (Hanson et al., 2011; Tirgari, 2012). Petty, Thomson, & Stew (2012) described phenomenological methodology as an exploration of unique experiences, but the Millennial employee experience in this case is not unique. In an ethnographic approach, the focus is on the aspects of a culture-sharing group and explaining the meaning of that culture in context (Hanson et al., 2011; Rogers, 2014). Ethnography was not a suitable design for the study because, although Millennials are part of a culture-bound group, the focus of the study was the strategies non-Millennial luxury resort leaders use to improve MEE. I rejected both the ethnographic and phenomenological designs and chose a single case study design. A single case study design was appropriate for exploring an emerging phenomenon in depth at a single location (Yin, 2014).

Research Question

RQ1: What strategies do non-Millennial luxury resort leaders in Hawai`i use to improve Millennial employee engagement?

SQ1: How do the Millennial employees perceive the engagement strategies attempted by their leaders?

Interview Questions

I used the following interview questions, also included in the interview protocol attached as Appendix A, to discover the non-Millennial luxury resort leaders' experience with strategies used for engagement of Millennial employees (RQ1):

1. Why are Millennial employees important to your organization?
2. What strategies do you use to help your Millennial employees have autonomy and a voice in decisions?
3. What strategies do you use to provide your Millennial employees with clear expectations, feedback, and recognition?
4. What strategies do you use to help your Millennial employees to feel that their employment is worthwhile and valuable?
5. What strategies do you use to help your Millennial employees to feel that they are safe to ask for help or share new ideas?
6. In what ways do you try to provide work-life balance for your Millennial employees?
7. What strategies have you found to be successful and which ones have been unsuccessful?
8. What other comments do you have about strategies for Millennial employee engagement?

Millennial Online Questionnaire

Single case studies can be either *holistic*, with one unit of analysis or *embedded*, with multiple units of analysis (Yin, 2014). I used an embedded single case design to collect the following data: (a) semistructured interview data from luxury resort leaders, (b) online questionnaire data from Millennial employees, and (c) company documents. Yin (2014), who emphasized collecting multiple sources of evidence, considered questionnaires as an appropriate form of data collection when studying an organization's employees and managers.

To explore RQ1, my first data collection instrument was the semistructured interviews with non-Millennial luxury resort leaders. For my second data collection instrument, I asked Millennial employees, both supervisory and nonsupervisory, to complete an online open-ended questionnaire (Appendix B). After answering questions about their age and length of service, Millennial staff responded to questions regarding EE at their workplace. For my third data collection source, I collected and reviewed company documents related to strategies for EE.

Conceptual Framework

The theory that served as the conceptual framework for this study was the engagement theory developed by Kahn (1990). Kahn explored the ways in which people choose to involve themselves in given roles, which Kahn referred to as *self-in-role*. In Kahn's qualitative study of personal engagement, Kahn determined that employees displayed engagement as *personal presence*, which appears on physical, cognitive, and emotional levels. Also, Kahn posited that people engage or disengage during three

momentary psychological conditions: (a) meaningfulness, (b) safety, and (c) availability. Kahn posited that employees determined engagement by the level of benefit derived from investing themselves in physical, cognitive, and emotional ways. The reasons why employees choose to engage or disengage themselves from their work roles are important to employers because a lack of EE can affect organizational performance (Bakker, Albrecht, & Leiter, 2011).

I used Kahn's (1990) engagement theory as a basis to explore MEE through the perceptions of luxury resort leaders and Millennial staff. One purpose of the research was to explore Hawai`ian luxury resort leader strategies, including those relating to psychological meaningfulness, safety, and availability. The findings of this study could contribute to the existing literature by discovering how leader strategies, based on Kahn's theory conditions, might affect MEE.

Operational Definitions

Baby Boomer generation (Boomers): The Baby Boomer generation are the individuals who were born from 1946-1964 (Holt et al., 2012; Patterson, 2014).

Employee engagement (EE): EE is the mental and emotional energy that an employee invests in behavior to advance a company's positive outcomes (Shuck, Twyford, Reio, & Shuck, 2014).

Generation X (Gen X, Gen Xers): The Gen X generation are the individuals who were born from 1965-1979 (Patterson, 2014).

Millennial generation (Generation Y, Gen Ys): The Millennial generation are the individuals who were born from 1980-1999 (Patterson, 2014).

Personal engagement: Personal engagement is the investment of persons' positive sense of self in their behaviors towards others, their roles, and in work tasks (Kahn, 1990).

Psychological availability: Psychological availability is a persons' impressions of their physical, emotional, or psychological capacity to engage (Kahn, 1990).

Psychological meaningfulness: Psychological meaningfulness is the feeling derived when a person believes the personal investment in that person's role is worthwhile, useful, and valuable (Kahn, 1990).

Psychological safety: Psychological safety is the feeling derived when a person can share personal thoughts, feelings, and ideas without fear of negative consequences (Kahn, 1990).

Veteran generation (Traditionalists): The Traditionalist generation are individuals who were born from 1925-1945 (Patterson, 2014).

Assumptions, Limitations, and Delimitations

Assumptions

Assumptions are the aspects of the study that are assumed to be true but cannot be verified through the study (Ellis & Levy, 2009). Crowe et al. (2011) stated that qualitative case study researchers assume information collected from multiple forms of data include similar themes. Another assumption of qualitative studies involving interviews is that the participants answer truthfully and behave responsibly in regards to the information given. An assumption of this particular study was that participants cared about the financial performance of the company and wished to improve employee

performance. I assumed that the participants believed that promoting EE is a worthwhile endeavor. Finally, based on my review of the qualitative case study design, I made an educated assumption that the design was appropriate for exploring this phenomenon involving a single case.

Limitations

According to Ellis and Levy (2009), limitations are weaknesses of the study that researchers acknowledge in the event other researchers want to replicate the study with similar results. Examples of limitations are uncontrollable aspects that may change the potential of generalizing the findings to a larger population (Ellis & Levy, 2009). For example, data about the participants from a particular geographic area, sample, and population may not represent other areas and populations. For the study, the geographic area was limited to the state of Hawai`i. If I expanded the data collection to include the entire state, the results could have been noticeably different. Similarly, if the sample population included organizations with larger budgets and staff dedicated to EE implementation, the resulting data may have indicated higher activity levels. Also, the scope of this study was limited to one luxury hotel location owned by a multinational corporation.

Delimitations

Delimitations are boundaries selected by the researcher to create specificity about the scope of the study (Ellis & Levy, 2009). The Millennial employees referred to in this study were comprised of individuals age 20-34 at the time of the study and did not include the entire Millennial generation as defined by Mirvis (2012) or Patterson (2014).

Also, I limited the three psychological conditions of Kahn's (1990) engagement theory to the use of meaningfulness and safety for this study and did not include physical or emotional availability. Likewise, I limited the scope of the study to the Millennial employees of one location in Hawai`i and did not include locations in other states or countries.

Significance of the Study

Contribution to Business Practice

As Baby Boomer generation employees retire from the workforce, organizations search for strategies to engage Millennial employees (Brown et al., 2015). However, the differences in culture between generations are sometimes difficult to bridge (Patterson, 2014). While researchers attempt to keep pace with emerging generations, the speed of change within the Millennial population is unprecedented (Holt et al., 2012).

Markos and Sridevi (2010) indicated the keys of EE as a combination of maximum job satisfaction and job contribution. They also indicated necessary drivers, such as corporate culture (social identity), opportunities for growth, decision-making authority, open communication, supportive relationships, and a sense of meaning contributed to EE (Markos & Sridevi, 2010). However, Millennials differ from previous generations in that they expect meaningfulness in the work and more social responsibility from employers (Holt et al., 2012). Thus, organizations must consider both EE and socially responsible strategies to meet these expectations and retain the talent (Mirvis, 2012). Thus, additional information in this area would be valuable to help guide leaders through this emerging business phenomenon.

The findings of this study may contribute to the effective practice of business by discovering which strategies of EE work well with Millennial employees in the luxury resort industry. In addition, understanding more about the difference in perceptions between non-Millennial leaders and their Millennial employees could reduce multigenerational conflict and improve organizational performance (Chi, Maier, & Gursoy, 2013).

Implications for Social Change

The results of this study could contribute to social change by informing non-Millennial luxury resort leaders of MEE strategies to use for improved organizational performance. In addition, the implications for positive social change include the potential to foster happy and productive Millennial employees. Information from the study could also be added to the existing literature on both Millennials and EE. The luxury resort industry, human resources (HR) practitioners, and educational institutions with hospitality management programs may benefit from information that could improve corporate culture, employee retention, and increased numbers of graduates remaining in their field of study, respectively (Brown et al., 2015).

A Review of the Professional and Academic Literature

This section includes a review of the literature relating to EE and Millennials along with an expanded discussion of Kahn's (1990) engagement theory from the conceptual framework. I begin this section with the details of the search for literature as well as the count of final sources. The review of the literature is organized to start with the benefits and challenges of EE and then to proceed to multigenerational engagement,

followed by the unique characteristics of Millennials. Also included in the literature review are areas of debate and gaps in the literature. Following the data collection, new research that emerged since the proposal was added to the literature review.

This literature review is a collection of the information gathered from 68 peer-reviewed sources, six doctoral studies/dissertations, and two books, 93% of which were published from 2013 to July 2017. The articles are from the following online research databases: AB/INFORM Complete, Business Source Complete, Dissertations and Theses at Walden University, EBSCO e-books, Health and Psychological Instruments, ProQuest Central, ProQuest Dissertations and Theses, SAGE Knowledge, and SAGE Research Methods Online. The following search terms led to relevant articles on the topics: *case studies, corporate social responsibility, employee engagement, employee volunteering, engagement (practice and theory), human capital, human resource development/management, job engagement, mentoring, Millennial(s), multigenerational, qualitative research, recruitment, retention, talent management,* and *workforce development.*

In some cases, the search terms did not yield useful results, so I used the individual components, such as *Millennial(s)* and *engagement,* and then I narrowed the search to relevant articles. Also, some content did not align with the research topic. Examples of this content included *agency theory, human capital theory, social capital theory, social exchange theory, stakeholder theory, strategic human resource model,* and *strategic planning theory*.

Application to the Applied Business Problem

The purpose of this qualitative single case study was to explore the strategies that non-Millennial luxury resort leaders use to improve MEE. The target population was non-Millennial luxury resort leaders located in Hawai`i who have Millennial employees in their departments.

I chose the engagement theory developed by Kahn (1990) as a conceptual framework for this study. Kahn explored the ways in which people choose to involve themselves in given roles, which Kahn referred to as self-in-role. Kahn's concept of engagement, the perceivable investment of a person's positive attitude and actions in their work and relationships to others, served as the basis for future engagement studies. In Kahn's qualitative study of personal engagement, Kahn determined that employees displayed engagement as personal presence, which appears on physical, cognitive, and emotional levels. Also, Kahn posited that people engage or disengage during three momentary psychological conditions, (a) meaningfulness, (b) safety, and (c) availability. For example, Kahn stated that employees determined psychological meaningfulness by the level of benefit derived from investing themselves in physical, cognitive, and emotional ways. The reasons that employees choose to engage or disengage themselves from their work roles are important to employers because a lack of EE can affect organizational performance (Bakker et al., 2011).

Shuck et al. (2014) used the social exchange theory and Kahn's (1990) roles of engagement to examine the relationship between employee perceptions of HR development (HRD) practices and EE and turnover. They explored whether the three

facets of cognitive, emotional, and behavioral engagement combined with participation in HRD reduced the likelihood of turnover intent (Shuck et al., 2014). Richards (2013) also used Kahn's theory of engagement plus the theory of planned behavior to study EE among aerospace employees. Across the span of EE literature, Kahn's theory of engagement continues to serve as a basis from which scholars can extend and expand research in the field.

Other theories relating to motivation and performance include Gilbert's (2007) behavior engineering model (BEM) from 1978 and Vroom's (1964) expectancy theory. Hillman (2013) used the BEM in his study of the performance of Millennials. Gilbert's original BEM compared the aspects of information, instrumentation, and motivation across both the environmental supports, such as the employer, and the person's behavior repertory (Hillman, 2013). Regarding Millennials, Hillman discovered that data, the information aspect of the environment, was especially important due to the Millennials' need for frequent feedback and clear expectations. Also, Hillman stated that the instruments and capacity cells of the BEM were relevant to Millennials because of the need to use innovative tools to allow Millennial employees to increase their capacity in new ways.

Vroom (1964) posited that a combination of *expectancy*, *instrumentality*, and *valence* could predict motivation. According to Vroom, expectancy is the employee's confidence that improved effort will result in improved results; instrumentality is the belief that the employer will reward the performance; and valence is the employee's measure of value for the reward. Eversole, Venneberg, and Crowder (2012) used

expectancy theory and generational theory as the theoretical framework for their study on multigenerational workforces. Eversole et al. posited that the combination of the two theories allowed for the prediction of workplace engagement and performance.

Work and Employee Engagement

Organizations worldwide have an ongoing need to keep employees engaged. At best, India has 37% of workers engaged, the United States has 33%, and at the lowest, China has 17% engagement (Schullery, 2013). Worldwide, the EE level is only 31% (Schullery). In Australia, medical facilities have recently needed to acquire and retain 13,500 new registered nurses per year to meet demand (Tillott, Walsh, & Moxham, 2013). These figures indicate a priority area for employers and a topic worthy of ongoing research.

Markos and Sridevi (2010) described EE as a mutually beneficial relationship between employer and employee wherein the employee is contributing their peak performance and experiencing the greatest amount of job satisfaction. While work engagement (WE) and EE can imply the same concept, Schaufeli and Salanova (2011) argued that WE is more task oriented while EE refers to the employee in relation to their role and organization. Schaufeli and Salanova also stated that, based on Google search hits (640,000 vs. 35,500), EE is the more common term used in business compared to WE, which is preferred in academia. The authors also argued that another difference between the two terms is that WE is operational while EE is conceptual (Schaufeli & Salanova, 2011). Similarly, Andrew and Sofian (2012) identified two types of EE, *job engagement* and *organizational engagement*, which refer to dedication to the job and

loyalty to the company, respectively. According to their findings, peer support from co-employees and professional development from employers were the top two factors for predicting EE (Andrew & Sofian, 2012).

Bakker et al. (2011) determined that WE is a separate psychological construct from job satisfaction or turnover and that it consists of two core dimensions, energy and involvement/identification. If the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) is used to determine WE as the opposite of burnout, Schaufeli and Salanova (2011) agreed that WE is a combination of capability/energy/vigor and willingness/involvement/dedication plus absorption. However, Schaufeli and Salanova disagreed with using the Oldenburg Burnout Inventory or the Maslach Burnout Inventory because burnout and WE are not perfect opposites. Scoring low on either burnout inventory does not equate to high WE (Schaufeli & Salanova, 2011). De Bruin and Henn (2013) analyzed the use of the 9-item UWES and confirmed that there is empirical evidence to support the validity of the combined score of vigor, dedication, and absorption. Findings indicated that separately measuring the dimensions was not justified, but the authors noted that absorption was the weakest of the three dimensions (de Bruin & Henn, 2013).

In addition, Bakker et al. (2011) suggested that a climate of engagement could be determined by exploring the six areas of work life, (a) workload, (b) control, (c) reward, (d) community, (e) fairness, and (f) values. Schaufeli and Salanova (2011) expressed that the six areas were only effective when used to study WE at the collective level, while the individual level was used to study employee perceptions of this climate. Despite the existence of tools to measure WE, Bakker et al. (2011) discussed that engagement varies

throughout the day, as much as 40% to 70%, both within the individual and through their interactions with others. Also, Schaufeli and Salanova (2011) pointed out that employees can be in varying stages rather than only engaged or burned out. As noted, the authors suggested that WE and EE could also differ based on a collective versus individual perspective, respectively.

Markos and Sridevi (2010) described the various factors that drive EE such as, opportunities for growth, challenges, good work relationships, supportive leadership, input in decision-making, appreciation, communication, and rewards. Markos and Sridevi also pointed out that most engagement drivers are not financial, and that engaged employees tend to have a combination of personal attributes, good organizational climate, and established HR practices for engagement.

With all the benefits of EE, there are still some undesirable outcomes, which Bakker et al. (2011) refer to as the *dark side* of engagement. Such issues include over enthusiasm, unrealistic goals, workaholics, and conflicts with work-life balance (Bakker et al., 2011). Schaufeli and Salanova (2011) also agreed with the focus on WE and burnout, but disagreed that WE creates workaholics. While WE can lead to burnout, workaholics are compulsively compelled to work rather than choosing to engage in their work (Schaufeli & Salanova, 2011).

Despite these risks, the benefits of keeping employees engaged are numerous. Markos and Sridevi (2010) indicated that EE is linked to organizational performance while employee disengagement costs up to $355 billion each year. In contrast, engaged employees can promote the company to others and help to increase operating margin and

net profit (Markos & Sridevi, 2010). Gawke, Gorgievski, and Bakker (2017) also stated that the behaviors of engaged employees, such as intrapreneurship, could result in competitive advantage for the employer and enhanced competency for the employees.

Employee Engagement and Job Performance

Andrew and Sofian (2012) identified two types of EE, *organizational engagement*, which is commitment to the employer, and *job engagement*, which is commitment to the actual job role and its tasks. Guided by the social exchange theory of perceived cost and benefit, Andrew and Sofian determined that co-worker support and adequate employee development could strengthen the level of job engagement and thus, job performance. Truss, Shantz, Soane, Alfes, and Delbridge (2013) considered EE as a possible mechanism that connects HR management (HRM) and organizational performance. Findings regarding the link between HRM and improved performance have been inconclusive, but the relationship between EE and job performance and employee well-being are documented (Shantz et al., 2013; Truss et al., 2013). Shantz et al. (2013) compared the effect of job design on EE and job performance. According to their findings, task variety, autonomy, task significance, and feedback were positively associated with engagement and EE lead to improved task performance and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) (Shantz et al., 2013). Also, EE was negatively linked to deviant behaviors such as stealing, lateness, property damage, and unauthorized use of paid time (Shantz et al., 2013). Soane, Truss, Alfes, Shantz, Rees, and Gatenby (2012) used their own ISA Engagement Scale to examine the relationship between EE and job performance. Soane et al. (2012) built upon Kahn's (1990) engagement theory

and the concepts of vigor, absorption, and dedication by Schaufeli, Salanova, Gonzalez-Roma, and Bakker (2002) to create a new model based on *intellectual, social*, and *affective engagement*. Similar to Shantz et al., Soane et al. (2012) determined that EE measured using the ISA Engagement Scale was positively associated with both task performance and OCB, but negatively associated with job turnover.

Bakker et al. (2011) referred to *vigor*, *dedication*, and *absorption* throughout their review of WE as signs of engaged employees in active jobs. In addition, Bakker et al. proposed that job resources plus personal resources, such as psychological capital, plus transformational leadership styles are likely to result in workplace engagement. The authors reviewed the existing knowledge on EE and determined that engaged employees are a benefit to themselves and the employer because engaged employees are enjoying the work and able to build and drive their own engagement (Bakker et al., 2011).

Yadav and Aspal (2014) defined the difference between job satisfaction and EE as the difference between being happy at the workplace and committed to tasks that help the whole company succeed. Satisfied employees are content with their jobs while highly engaged employees exert additional energy and innovation to advance their organizations and create competitive advantage (Yadav & Aspal, 2014). Ariani (2014) agreed that EE was more than job satisfaction and established that supportive leadership and EE also affected organizational citizenship behavior. According to Ariani, supportive leaders help engaged employees to invest in organizational citizenship behavior by positively contributing to the social and psychological work environment. This finding indicates that EE could contribute to overall job satisfaction in the workplace.

Scott (2014) echoed the emphasis on sustaining employees for engagement in her study of animal care workers in a veterinary hospital. Scott determined that employees felt they were not fully engaged in their jobs due to a lack of recognition, constructive feedback, work-life balance, inadequate software, and the leadership style of one manager. Similarly, Richards (2013) discovered that interesting work, new opportunities, appropriate roles, clear expectations, appreciation, meaningfulness, autonomy, and supportive relationships were factors of EE. Richards also described the need for leaders to combine EE initiatives with cost-saving process improvements or they risk achieving only short-term gains. Yadav and Aspal (2014) noted the connection between EE, talent management, and organizational success and added that employers should recruit new talent based on the characteristics of their top performing employees.

Another HRM aspect for engagement is *flexibility HRM*, which appeals to younger as an aspect of engagement and older workers as a tool to maintain job performance (Bal & De Lange, 2014). Bal and De Lange used signaling theory to explain how the employers' willingness to make flexibility HRM available indicated higher EE, even prior to actual use. However, Bal and De Lange also noted that the use of flexibility HRM indicated higher EE among younger workers and improved job performance among older workers. The authors' findings suggest that an employer's commitment to EE practices could be beneficial even before employees use such benefits.

Employee Engagement and Organizational Performance

Bakker et al. (2011) noted the challenge of measuring the organizational impacts of EE. While this issue does remain, it is not impossible for value-based leaders to establish ROI based on the intrinsic returns of happier employees. In addition, employers experience financial returns when EE reduces costs associated with employee turnover (Shuck et al., 2014). Yadav and Aspal (2014) also emphasized the need to have engaged, innovative employees who could keep the company competitive. Similarly, when employees practice intrapreneurship that results in innovation, new business, or revitalization of products, organizations will thrive (Gawke et al., 2017). Andrew and Sofian (2012) emphasized the need to engage, retain, and attract talented employees as a critically important part of the recovery from economic recession. Engaged employees not only provide better service and help retain more customers than disengaged employees do, but they also attract new talented employees to the company (Andrew & Sofian, 2012). According to Ferinia, Yuniarsi and Disman (2016), meaningful relationships in the workplace create EE that strengthens organizational culture, enhances job performance, and improves competitive advantage. Therefore, employers could suffer significant losses if they cannot keep employees engaged.

Leadership commitment can directly affect EE and organizational performance (Nasomboon, 2014). When combined with strategic alignment, also related to *employers branding*, Nasomboon found that leadership commitment was an aspect that made companies attractive to future employees (Nasomboon, 2014). In his case involving petrochemical company managers, leadership style not only affected EE, but also

determined the company's performance because of the EE, thus creating financial returns.

Shuck et al. (2014) explored EE and its relationship to turnover intent among health care employees. Shuck et al. concluded that employee perceptions of the company's HRD practices helped shape employees' cognitive, emotional, and behavioral engagement. According to Shuck et al., the levels of these three areas of engagement defined employees' intent to leave their jobs and the authors determined a positive relationship between EE and employee retention. Chalofsky and Cavallaro (2013) discussed the role of HRD in helping employees to determine fit, balance between self and work, and the role of work in a *meaningful life*. Because Millennials have an ingrained expectation of work-life balance, Chalofsky and Cavallaro posited that the concept of meaningful work needed to be expanded to consider how work and other aspects fit together within a person's life. According to the authors, HRD professionals and employees could explore fit strategies by drawing on concepts such as continuous learning, human agency, personal mastery, self-determination, self-efficacy, and integrated wholeness (Chalofsky & Cavallaro, 2013). In light of the documented benefits of EE, Shantz et al. (2013) recommended that HR leaders make improvements to job design as long as the benefits of improved performance are greater than the costs of redesign and higher pay for top performing employees.

Employee Engagement and Corporate Citizenship

There is a passive trend among companies such as IBM, Salesforce.com, and Unilever, to leverage the company's corporate social responsibility (CSR) activities to

attract, engage, and retain employees (Mirvis, 2012). Over 90% of Fortune 500 companies are using corporate volunteering to engage their workforces, including allowing company time for such activities (Grant, 2012). According to Mirvis (2012), the movement towards strategic CSR for engagement is due in part to a global gap in EE. Mirvis discovered through two reports that only 21% and 33% of employees felt fully engaged in their jobs while the remaining were *simply enrolled, disenchanted,* and *disconnected* or *not engaged* and *actively disengaged*, respectively. The possibility that CSR could improve the engagement gap has led to multiple studies in this area. Lee, Choi, Moon, and Babin (2014) discovered that developing a corporate code of ethics and engaging in corporate philanthropy could create positive perceptions of employers, improve productivity, and increase retention of hospitality workforces. Grant (2012) also stated that prospective employees are looking for socially responsible companies that and added that corporate volunteering efforts have shown to engage and retain existing employees. According to Dimitrov (2012), hospitality employees selected employer involvement in the community as one of the criteria for establishing meaningfulness in the workplace to keep them engaged. Cycyota, Ferrante, and Schroeder (2016) found that 97% of Fortune's 100 Best Companies in 2013 included and encouraged employee volunteering as part of their CSR profile.

Lin, Tsai, Joe, and Chiu (2012) studied job seeker perceptions and determined that corporate citizenship (CC) was a viable recruitment resource if job seekers believed that a company's CSR profile made them a quality employer and/or held the potential for career success. The authors used the signaling and expectancy theories to frame an

exploration of CC in relation to firm attractiveness and career expectations, respectively (Lin et al.,2012). The conceptual model for the study included four dimensions of corporate citizenship, *economic, legal, ethical*, and *philanthropic*. In their study, the researchers determined that economic and legal citizenship showed both employer attractiveness and career potential to job seekers (Lin et al., 2012). In contrast, ethical and philanthropic citizenship meant only employer attractiveness for potential employees (Lin et al., 2012). These findings agree with Mirvis (2012), who established that among various reports, employees prioritize fair treatment by their employers over other forms of CSR, but also that 75% of employees prefer to work for socially responsible companies and 9 out 10 employees want to participate in their company's CSR activities. This combination of results indicates that perceptions of CSR are highly subjective.

Mirvis (2012) studied the effects of three different approaches to CSR as models of engagement: *transactional* (employee-created), *relational* (organization and employee-created), and *developmental* (organization-created for mutual growth). The transactional model, also referred to as On-Demand CSR, is a form of HR management, which has shown to affect employee performance positively and reduced intentions to quit (Mirvis, 2012). The relational model, such as the one used by Levis Strauss & Co., is useful in building a culture of social responsibility between the employer and employees, which creates a sense of social identity that engages employees (Mirvis, 2012). In comparison, the developmental model can help to move the organization and employees together in a strategy of socially responsible growth, but as seen with Timberland, it requires strong leadership to stay on target (Mirvis, 2012). Barkay (2012) studied the Active Playgrounds

Project of Coca-Cola Israel, which appears to be an example of development model CSR as the organization attempted to improve its public image in a socially responsible way. While restoring playgrounds did improve community and employee relations, there were hints of criticism that the company was mandating the use of employee bodies to mitigate the product's association with causing obesity (Barkay, 2012). Yim and Fock (2013) noted that the success of using employee volunteering for engagement was partly dependent on whether employees were motivated by pride or because they believed volunteering was a calling. In this case, organization-created CSR, was referred to as social responsibility climate, could be meaningful for pride-motivated employees when they are recognized, but detrimental for calling-motivated employees who feel the organization cheapens or manipulates their intrinsic values about volunteering (Yim & Fock, 2013). The authors referred to this quandary as a double-edged sword of social responsibility climate and advised managers to study employees and temper levels of CSR promotion to suit their employees' needs for meaningfulness (Yim & Fock, 2013). Similarly, Mirvis recommended that organizations choose the approach that fit the company and the relationship they wish to have with employees.

These findings support the idea that CC/CSR as expressed through a quality work environment, moral and legal standards, and philanthropy to the community are all drivers of engagement that attract and retain employees. Several examples exist of large corporations that are investing both financial resources and human capital in an effort to position themselves as attractive employers that attract and retain employees (Lee, Choi, Moon, & Babin, 2014; Lin, Tsai, Joe, & Chiu, 2012). As younger employees increase

their numbers in the workforce, their preference for socially responsible employers and meaningful job task may continue to drive this trend.

Employee Engagement in the Hospitality Industry

The hospitality industry, including the visitor, travel, and service industries, is heavily dependent on the willingness of front-line employees to provide high quality customer service (Mohamed, Nor, Hasan, Olaganthan, & Gunasekaran, 2013). Despite the rigorous quality standards of many hotel corporations, obedience does not equal engagement. Hospitality leaders need additional skills in order to do more than manage compliance (Chi et al., 2013). For example, Kim, Im, and Hwang (2015) discovered that the psychosocial benefits of mentoring, including friendship and counseling from superiors, reduced role conflict and role ambiguity among hotel employees. In addition, service-oriented industry workers are subject to increased stress and early job burnout and turnover due to the level and intensity of interactions with clients (Lu & Gursoy, 2013). Also, demanding hours and schedules in the hospitality industry can put a strain on work-family balance, which contributes to disengagement (Dimitrov, 2012). Thus, engaging and retaining employees to avoid job burnout and turnover is a hospitality management priority.

Lu and Gursoy (2013) studied generational differences in job satisfaction and turnover intention among hospitality workers. Despite the high priority to avoid employee burnout, reducing hospitality job demand is not feasible, and managers should strive to increase job resources for employees (Lu & Gursoy, 2013). Gursoy, Chi, and Karadag (2013) also studied the engagement of hospitality workers by exploring

multigenerational conflict among work values. The findings indicated that Boomers valued work centrality, Gen Xers valued power, and Millennials valued work-life balance and good leadership (Gursoy et al., 2013). Gursoy et al. concluded that if leaders understood the differences in work values, they could increase engagement accordingly and minimize disengagement associated with multigenerational conflict.

Review of Recommendations for Employee Engagement

Several aspects of EE repeatedly appeared throughout the review of the literature. Because many researchers used Kahn's (1990) engagement theory as the base of the studies, their recommendations for managerial practice shared common themes. For example, multiple authors indicated that organizations should institute policies for engagement and include EE as part of the organizational culture rather than as a single project (Nasomboon, 2014; Richards, 2013). Transformational, supportive leadership and empowerment of employees have appeared in multiple articles as the most conducive leadership approaches for creating EE in the workplace (Ariani, 2014; Singh, 2013; Tillott et al., 2013). The optimum work environment provides a positive, caring workplace culture with policies for justice and a safe place to voice opinions and give feedback without fear of negative consequences (Holt et al., 2012; Kahn, 1990).

Job boredom, lack of challenges and creativity consistently appeared as reasons for disengagement and authors suggested employers should consider how to keep employment and roles engaging through cross training, job crafting, and progressive tasks (Bakker et al., 2011). Similar to cross training, multiple authors found that employees engage in jobs that include opportunities for growth such as training,

coaching, and support for developing confidence and emotional intelligence (Alrawabdeh, 2014; Richards, 2013). Employees want clear communication about the organization and opportunities to share ideas and feedback with leadership. Open door policies, focus groups, and other forms of communication can strengthen engagement (Singh, 2013; Tillott et al., 2013).

Although most engagement drivers are not financial, incentives are one critical aspect of engagement and research indicated that rewarding top performers could help maintain a corporation's competitive advantage (Alrawabdeh, 2014; Markos & Sridevi, 2010). Also, having inadequate tools, materials, funding, technology, or information can cause employees to disengage (Markos & Sridevi, 2010). Employees want to feel as though their work has meaning and/or contributes to a larger, greater cause. When given the choice, employees also prefer to work for organizations that are socially responsible and contribute to the community/world in a positive way (Grant, 2012; Lee, Choi, Moon, & Babin, 2014; Lin, Tsai, Joe, & Chiu, 2012). Finally, an investment in career should not require unreasonable sacrifices in other areas. Although work-life balance may not directly create EE, balance contributes to job satisfaction and employee retention while a lack of balance can either conflict with engagement or deter employee investment in roles (Bal & De Lange, 2014; Lu & Gursoy, 2013).

Multigenerational Workforces

According to Chi et al. (2013), Baby Boomer employees are in upper management, Generation X has reached middle management, and companies expect Millennials to fill entry-level management positions. Boomers, who were expected to

retire, have stayed in the workforce for financial security and to avoid the boredom of retirement (Young, Sturts, Ross, & Kim, 2013). There is an ongoing need to understand how to transfer important knowledge and experience from retiring Boomers to younger employees (Corwin, 2015).

In countries such as Japan, the U.S.A., and Germany, organizations are attempting to manage this *demographic scissor* phenomenon of large older and young workforces (Festing & Schäfer, 2014). As these multigenerational teams attempt to lead equally diverse workers, conflicts arise when generations segregate and feed misunderstandings about expectations and values (Chi et al., 2013; Srinivasan, 2012). In 2016, the U.S. workforce is comprised of up to five generations

- Veterans or Traditionalists, born between 1925-1945;
- Baby Boomers, born between 1946-1964;
- Generation X, born between 1965-1979;
- Millennials or Generation Y, born between late 1980-2000;
- Generation Z, born after 2000 (Haeger & Lingham, 2014; Patterson, 2014).

Unlike the Veteran and Baby Boomer generations who have clear defined timelines, the timelines for subsequent generations are open to interpretation. In 2015, the Veterans at the age of 70 and over, and Generation Z, at the age of 16 and younger, represent a small portion of the workforce compared to the Baby Boomers, Generation X, and Millennials. Also as of 2015, Baby Boomers may be as old as 69 or as young as 50. Due to multiple perspectives, Generation X could be anywhere from 49 to 35 years old and Millennials from 37 to 15 years old (Chi et al., 2013; Mirvis, 2012). Festing and

Schäfer (2014) cautioned not to generalize between generations and *tweeners*, those individuals born in the overlap, are likely to share characteristics. In addition, Haeger and Lingham (2014) discovered that Generation X shares characteristics with both Boomers and Millennials, earning them the nickname, *Sandwiched Generation*.

With so much age diversity in the workplace, there is a significant opportunity for a variety of perspectives, skills, and experience across the history of industries (Patterson, 2014). Unfortunately, the same diversity of the generations also causes misunderstandings and conflict in the workplace (Gursoy et al., 2013; Srinivasan, 2012). In their study of multigenerational workforces in a U.S. hotel organization, Chi et al. (2013) established that Millennial employees held more positive perceptions of managers in their own generation versus those older or younger. They used parallel responses within the other generations, and line staff used length of employment as another qualifier of abilities (Chi et al., 2013). Similarly, Saffer (2012) discovered generational segregation and differences in respect among nurses in one medical unit of a hospital. Similar to the aspects of Kahn's (1990) engagement theory, Saffer studied employee perceptions of leadership style, autonomy, mutual respect, and leadership support. Perceptions across the four elements varied among the four generations from Veterans to Millennials, but the Baby Boomers and Millennials who felt the least respected and autonomous seemed most susceptible to job dissatisfaction (Saffer, 2012). Haeger and Lingham (2014) determined that the use of technology by the different generations could result in conflicting values, such as texting during meetings. However, Haeger and Lingham's findings indicated that Generations X and Y are using technology and social

media to create *Work-Life Fusion* by multitasking and staying connected while away from the office.

Patterson's (2014) study of government employees identified similar disconnection between generations due to lack of mutual respect, poor communication, and differences in technology skills. Patterson's respondents also felt that management leaders were failing to solve the problem, which is interesting because it indicated that the respondents felt it was the responsibility of leadership to mitigate generational differences. Park and Gursoy (2012) stated that Millennials and their vocal nature would expose poor HR practices within their organizations. In addition, Park and Gursoy discovered that, when compared to Boomers and Gen Xers, engaged Millennial employees are less likely to leave their employers. Another interesting perspective from Patterson's research was a question from younger generations who asked why the person who complains gets to decide how the target person should behave. This viewpoint is characteristic of Millennial values about equality and justice.

Yadav and Aspal (2014) also mentioned multigenerational workforces in their study and noted that recruitment managers need to adjust their approaches to appeal to different generations. Examples of generation diversity included work attitudes, desirable benefits, career goals, work environment, corporate culture, motivation, and rewards (Yadav & Aspal, 2014). In regards to managing multiple generations, Yadav and Aspal recommended that managers understand the various attitudes towards authority, leadership styles, communication, feedback, coaching, and mentoring. Lu and Gursoy (2013) also discussed using different approaches for the various generations, noting that

Millennials experienced emotional exhaustion earlier and require more interim rewards than Boomers.

One multigenerational workforce technique is *reverse mentoring*; wherein Boomers are paired with Millennials for cross-generational learning (Chaudhuri & Ghosh, 2012). An especially interesting aspect of the Chaudhuri and Ghosh (2012) study is that Boomers in their late stages of career displayed the same workplace preferences as Millennials. For example, Boomers want telecommuting and flex time in order to remain competitive as they become less physically resilient (Bal & DeLange, 2014; Chaudhuri & Ghosh, 2012). Boomers, like Millennials, also thrive on challenges, like learning new things, want freedom from pressures to conform, and value interaction, which may make the connection between the two generations more feasible. Unlike Millennials, Boomers do not enjoy working with computers or other fast-evolving technologies and this presents an opportunity for Millennials to share their expertise and feel a sense of value (Chaudhuri & Ghosh, 2012; Rai, 2012).

Moon (2014) also highlighted the need for reverse mentoring and added two additional roles; a *wise guide*, perhaps from the Gen X generation, and a *side guide*, a peer mentor from the Millennial generation. According to Moon (2014), a model of individual, one-on-one mentoring is more effective than group leadership development. Corwin (2015) also found mentoring to be an important aspect in the process of transfering tacit knowledge from Boomers to younger coworkers. The 43 million Generation X employees are not able to replace the 77 million Boomers and so knowledge will need to be transferred to Millennials as well (Corwin, 2015). At a time

when Millennials are requesting increased attention and mentoring (Gallicano, Curtin, & Matthews, 2012; Moon, 2014), mentoring may create value and engagement in the workplace for multiple generations.

Despite multiple authors documenting the many differences between generations, there are also several points of similarity. For example, both Millennials and Boomers want flexible work designs although for different reasons (Bal & De Lange, 2014). Like Millennials, Gen Xers also believe that work should be fun, but do not expect employers to provide it (Schullery, 2013). Millennials want quality and fairness in the areas of communication, compensation, work-life balance, professional development, and autonomy (Gallicano et al., 2012); which are sentiments shared by other generations. Boomers and Millennials both want to make positive contributions to society and the environment (Young et al., 2013). According to Young et al. (2013), Boomers are the most satisfied of the three generations, but this may be due to seniority combined with reduced expectations. Hansen and Leuty (2012) determined no significant differences in altruistic values among generations and that workplaces values differed more between genders in the same generation versus between generations. HR managers should prioritize the desires for communication, clear expectations, frequent feedback, meaningful and challenging work, and employee mentoring for all the generations (Young et al., 2013). In addition, highly engaged talent management practices such as professional development and advancement are recommended for both Generation X and Y (Festing & Schäfer, 2014).

Millennials

The 75 million Millennials, or Generation Y, represent a significant portion of the workforce and engaging them as employees can be challenging (Holt et al., 2012). In India, Generation Y is only a ten-year span (1981-1991), but the population represents over 25% of the country (Srinivasan, 2012). Beyond their sheer numbers, engaging and retaining Millennials is a priority because their unique skills contribute to the economy (Maxwell & Broadbridge, 2014). As Holt et al. (2012) described, Millennials exhibit contrasting views about the workplace compared to previous generations. Raised by hard working, independent, Baby Boomers or Generation X parents, they have been carefully raised with high expectations, self-esteem, optimism, collaboration, and a sense of righteousness (Holt et al., 2012). Aside from the often remarked skills in technology, Millennials also excel in other areas such as diversity, equality, teams, achievement, values, and social/civic engagement (Holt et al., 2012).

However, the widely coveted technology skills of Millennials may have come at a cost. LaBan (2013) noted that Millennials are more socially isolated, have increased distractibility, a shortened attention span, and poor writing skills. In addition, the early and prolonged exposure to technology that created faster cognitive responses has also hindered Millennials' ability to recall information (LaBan). Millennial depression is prevalent and the suicide rate of Millennial medical residents is double the rate of the general population (LaBan, 2013). Finnoff (2013) disagreed with LaBan's assessment of Millennials as socially challenged, stating that Millennial residents had been able to form positive relationships with patients, colleagues, and faculty. Finnoff added that educators

should change teaching methods to be more social, such as small group discussions and active discovery with peers. Rand (2013) agreed with LaBan's description of Millennial characteristics such as wanting mentors, expecting more guidance, and defending work-life balance, but felt other characteristics were vague and could be multigenerational. Similar to Finnoff (2013), Rand stated that educators of Millennials should adapt and share presentations files with students rather than suspecting them of stealing content. Contrary to LaBan's (2013) assessment of Millennials as isolated, Millennials employees and learners may want more interaction and connection rather than less (Finnoff, 2013; Rand, 2013).

One challenge with Millennials is that they expect certain aspects, which are significant deviants from the status quo. Such expectations include work-life balance, instant and continuous feedback, appreciation, mutual respect, fairness, justice, modern technology, and social equity for all (Holt et al., 2012). While few would argue against the value of these points, traditional norms dictate that new generations must 'pay their dues' first, and this causes friction in the workplace.

Characteristics of Millennials

The substantive literature on Millennials has contributed to the understanding of Millennial characteristics through themes identified by several authors. For example, Millennials feel strongly about certain values such as, respect, equality, diversity, fairness, justice, recognition, social impact, knowledge, personal and professional growth, autonomy, relationships, work-life balance (Holt et al., 2012; Moon, 2014). As consumers, the expressive and socially sympathetic nature of Millennials causes them to

focus on the ethics of producers and their products; visibly boycotting brands that they believe are manipulative or socially irresponsible (Bucic, Harris, & Arli, 2012). Over half of Millennials make an effort to buy green products and 47% would pay more for environmentally friendly products and services (Smith & Brower, 2012). However, despite these higher levels of social and environmental consciousness, Millennials can fluctuate between self-gratification and social responsibility in their decision-making, which makes their behavior difficult to predict (Bucic et al.,2012). Due to the focus on their values, Millennials have higher expectations of their employers, such as, environments that allow for input, involvement, access to leadership, flexible schedules, telecommuting, current technology, mentoring, enjoyable job roles, and advancement (Ozcelik, 2015; Saffer, 2012; Schullery, 2013).

The review of the literature also revealed several themes about workplace strengths attributed to Millennials. The results contained in the findings supported the positions of several authors who posited about the need to engage and retain their skill sets, such as, being the most technologically adept generation, fast learners, adaptable, team oriented, social, pro-diversity, pro-equality, and open to mentoring (Chi et al., 2013; Holt et al., 2012; Moon, 2014). However, engaging employees with such advanced skills requires employers to provide workplace challenges and opportunities for creativity. Without sufficient challenge and engagement, Millennial employees may become harder to manage and exhibit behaviors such as, questioning of authority, impatience with slow learners or processes, unwillingness to work with a lack of technology, rejection of long

hours and other barriers to work-life balance, and refusal to respect age or seniority without proof of expertise (Moon, 2014; Saffer, 2012; Schullery, 2013).

In a study of 132 Millennials in the Los Angeles area, Holt et al. (2012) discovered that respondents were motivated by challenges, personal growth, and making a positive impact. They also discovered that respondents preferred to connect face-to-face in order to be genuine, be open to experiences, and be sympathetic (Holt et al., 2012). These findings are in contradiction to the assumption that Millennials only want to connect virtually through social media.

Millennial Engagement

Within the United States, EE rate of 36%, Boomers are 39% engaged, Gen Xers are 35%, and Millennials are only 16% (Schullery, 2013). The significant difference in engagement may be due to the high expectations of Millennials, which are not being met in the reality of the workplace (Schullery, 2013). The gap in engagement represents an employer issue because Millennials can bring significant benefits to organizations that want to remain creative, innovative, and competitive; especially with Millennial consumers (Schullery, 2013).

According to Gallicano et al. (2012), the seven major stressors for the Millennials in their study were: inadequate compensation, lack of work-life balance, poor communication, lack of empowerment, competition and conflict, perceived unethical practices by leaders, and power distance and hierarchy. Nolan (2015) noted that Millennials are challenged by the stereotypes about them, such as being disloyal, needy, entitled, and casual.

In addition, Gallicano et al. (2012) described the Millennial employees struggle with the *silver curtain*, a perception that older leaders are not transfering power, authority, or leadership to younger, aspiring leaders. Combined with Millennial perceptions of weak leadership and the emotion tax caused by workplace stressors, Millennials are less engaged than prior generations. Considering that the list of Millennial stressors is similar to those of any generation, the engagement challenge may not be one of the unrealistic expectations, but rather one of workplace tolerance.

Millennials and the Hospitality Industry

The hospitality industry, in particular, has high rates of turnover due to demanding hours and challenges with work-family balance (Brown et al., 2015; Dimitrov, 2012). Millennials are reputed to have lower organizational commitment versus previous generations, which is a concern when paired with the high turnover rate of the hospitality industry (Brown et al., 2015). More specifically, Brown et al. (2015) identified that the priority that Millennials place on work-life balance creates a greater risk for turnover in the hospitality field. Rosa and Hastings (2016) found that hospitality managers were challenged by requests for time off from Millennial employees who were attempting to pursue work-life balance.

Lu and Gursoy (2013) discovered that Millennials in the hospitality industry experienced emotional exhaustion earlier and require more interim rewards than Boomers. Once exhausted, Millennials were much more likely to experience job dissatisfaction and turnover intention compared to Boomers (Lu & Gursoy, 2013). Interestingly, the differences in attitudes between Millennials and Gen-Xers or Boomers

and Gen-Xers was not as significant, which implied that Millenials may be experiencing more job dissatisfaction if they are reporting directly to a Boomer (Lu & Gursoy, 2013). In contrast, Chi et al. (2013) found that Millennial hospitality employees felt disconnected from and discriminated against by both older generations.

Gursoy et al. (2013) and Park and Gursoy (2012) also studied the engagement of hospitality workers by exploring multigenerational conflict based on work values. The findings indicated that Boomers valued *work centrality*, Gen Xers valued *work-life balance* and *power*, and Millennials valued *work-life balance, recognition, non-compliance*, and *leadership* (Gursoy et al., 2013). Boomers are patient and value authority and hierarchy while Millennials are impatient and want to question authority and status quo (Gursoy et al., 2013). Likewise, Park and Gursoy (2012) found that Millennials were more likely to experience turnover intention, but that once engaged, Millennials were more dedicated to their jobs compared to older generations.

Despite the high priority to avoid employee burnout, reducing hospitality job demand is not feasible, and managers should strive to increase job resources, such as work-life balance (Lu & Gursoy, 2013). In addition, Chi et al. (2013) recommended that hospitality leaders explore ways to reduce hierarchy and address the power imbalance between Millennials and older generations. Park and Gursoy (2012) suggested that hospitality HR leaders consider ways to increase engagement in ways suitable for each generation. They also cautioned that Millennials are likely to call out poor HR practices, but that this could be an opportunity for organizational improvement (Park & Gursoy, 2012).

Millennial Expectations of Leadership

Due to Millennial expectations for a supportive work environment, the relationship between the supervisor and the Millennial employee has become a trend in the EE literature. Holt et al. (2012) identified transformational leadership as the best style to lead Millennials because of they appreciate honesty, integrity, vision, and meaning. Graybill (2014) determined that Millennials value leaders who display teamwork, communication, respect, vision, and influence. Ruys (2013) found that beyond the typical Millennial desires for work-life balance, meaningful work, and fair compensation, Millennials also wanted leaders to exhibit respect for employees and follow a moral code for ethical decision-making. This is consistent with the priority that Millennials place on ethics and justice and implies that they are holding leaders to a higher standard. According to Ruys' findings, Millennials would leave an employer if they discover them to be lacking in morals and values. After watching parents struggle with layoffs during the recession, Millennials focus on building individual skills versus longevity in the workplace and look for employers to establish credibility before they fully commit (Ozcelik, 2015). With many Millennials struggling to pay off student debt, Nolan (2015) noted that Millennials are concerned about how they will afford their own children's education.

Because of the nurse shortage problem, Saffer (2012) studied the effect of leadership styles on multiple generations of nurses in a magnet hospital. Saffer felt that the rate at which new nurses were leaving the profession was a problem significant enough to make the EE and retention of nurses a priority area for research. Her findings

indicated that all generations felt varying degrees of support, but the younger generations (X and Y) felt there were less autonomy and mutual respect under the leader's authoritarian leadership style. If it is true that Millennials want respect, autonomy, support, mentoring, and transformational leadership (Chi et al., 2013), then this authoritarian style would not be conducive to engaging the Millennial nurses. Similarly, Gallicano et al. (2012) surveyed Millennials to determine the levels of trust, satisfaction, control mutuality, and commitment between employees and their supervisors. In general, the Millennial employees felt positive about their employers, believed their opinions were being heard, and the employer wanted to maintain a good relationship (Gallicano et al., 2012). However, the Millennials gave their supervisors lower scores for being involved in decision-making, which Gallicano et al. stated was a sign that Millennial employees were being heard, but not included. Additionally, ethnic minority Millennials felt the least amount of commitment and relationship from their employers (Gallicano, et al. 2012), which could be an indication that the employers have not caught up with the higher Millennial expectations for equality and social justice.

According to Holt et al. (2012), Millennials are not interested in climbing the corporate ladder, becoming an executive, or making more money if it means sacrificing their work-life balance. Similarly, Ehrhart, Mayer, and Ziegert (2012) discovered that Millennials determined their organizational attraction during the job search phase based on whether employer website content highlighted work-life balance. In addition, Millennial job seekers also rated prospective employers based on the web site usability as an indicator of the company's use of modern technology methods (Erhart et al., 2012).

An outdated, ineffective website or online application may signal to Millennials that the company is outdated and resistant to innovation (Rai, 2012). Consequently, the attractors that worked with previous generations do not motivate Millennials, and organizations need transformational leaders to innovate, inspire and mentor rather than dictate and manage. Collaboration, cross-cultural literacy, shared leadership, and servant leadership should be included in the skill building of future leaders (Graybill, 2014).

Millennial Expectations of Corporate Citizenship

Millennials have genuine interest in contributing to social improvement, community service, and volunteerism, which leads them to have citizenship expectations of employers (Cycyota et al., 2016; Ferri-Reed, 2014; Holt et al., 2012; Mirvis, 2012). Cycyota, Ferrante and Schroeder (2016) and Ruys (2013) found that Millennial employees wanted meaningful work that contributed positively to the larger community, families, and the broader world. In order to retain Millennials, employers should communicate the connection between the organization's mission and vision and its positive impact on society (Ruys, 2013). Peloza, Loock, Cerruti, and Muyot (2012) explored the gap between sustainability perceptions and reality by surveying stakeholder groups from six different countries to determine their perceptions of 100 globally recognizable organizations. Of the total sample, 800 were students graduating within the next eight months as representatives of the potential employee stakeholder group (Peloza et al., 2012). Peloza et al. discovered that 90% of the graduating student group felt that corporate citizenship was important to them. The difference between stakeholder groups

was attributed to the higher expectations of the students who were a younger demographic.

Lin, Tsai, Joe, and Chiu (2012) studied 627 graduating business students in Taiwan to determine if perceived corporate citizenship contributed to the firm's attractiveness and perceived career potential. The participants determined economic and legal citizenship to be necessary for determining attractiveness and career potential while ethical and philanthropic citizenship determined only attractiveness (Lin et al., 2012). Lin et al.'s participants were Millennials who felt that corporate citizenship was a plausible indicator of firm attractiveness that leaders should consider. Similarly, Peloza et al. (2012) recommended that executives address the gap in stakeholder perceptions and prioritize the younger demographics' attraction to CSR because of the need to remain competitive as skilled employees become scarce. Further confirmation of this priority is the recommendation by Peloza et al. to direct sustainability marketing at colleges and university to attract young talent. Ferri-Reed (2014) recommended that employers integrate CSR strategies as one of the four aspects to create a Millennial-friendly workplace. Providing time for employees to volunteer is not only an employer culture benefit, but also allows Millennials to make social connections with other employees and departments that share their citizenship interests (Nolan, 2015). Combined with open communication, internal networking through social media, creative workplace designs, employer-supported opportunities for volunteering, and supporting social causes will attract Millennial talent (Ferri-Reed, 2014). Cycyota, Ferrante, and Schroeder (2016)

noted that Millennials are attracted to organizations that are engaged in CSR and 69% would refuse to work for an employer who is not socially responsible.

In contrast, Twenge, Campbell, and Freeman (2012) asserted that the popular view of Millennials as more civic-minded and socially responsible is actually incorrect. In their study of 18-year-olds from the Boomer, Gen X, and Millennial generations, results indicated that rates of caring for others are steadily declining (Twenge et al., 2012). While Twenge et al. did not examine if perceptions of caring increased over time, the findings did indicate that Millennials did not reverse non-caring rates nor did they stand out as more caring than previous generations for the same time period. That said, Twenge et al. (2012) concluded that it is a national concern when the sheer numbers of Millennials are combined with declining rates of concern for others, advocacy for social or environmental reform, and political involvement.

Areas of Opportunity for Millennial Employers

As Baby Boomers prepare to retire from the workplace, organizations must learn to develop Millennials as the leaders of the future. Corwin (2015) and Ozcelik (2015) highlighted the need to focus on mentoring as a means for transferring valuable knowledge from Boomers to younger generations. In addition to their other interesting qualities, employers covet Millennial employees for their skills that create value in the new economy (Maxwell & Broadbridge, 2014). Several authors discussed recommendations for employers to build the engagement of Millennial employees. While each study had some unique insights, such as workspace designs (Ferri-Reed, 2014), several main topics emerged as areas that employers could consider for improvement.

Gallicano et al. (2012) discussed the Millennial employee's need for *autonomy* characterized by allowing self-authority, flexibility, telecommuting, and increased trust by supervisors. Ruys (2013) described this desire for autonomy more specifically as not micromanaging Millennial employees and allowing them to create. Young et al. (2013) discussed the Millennial need for c*hallenge* and *meaning* characterized by meaningful work, changing roles or projects, corporate culture, and opportunities to make a difference.

Millennials also prioritize *leadership styles* such as the presence of transformational or servant leadership and absence of autocratic or hierarchical leadership (Festing & Schäfer, 2014; Graybill, 2014). Leading Millennial employees also requires *clear* c*ommunication* and *collaboration* characterized by providing openness, clarity, feedback, and involvement in discussions and decision-making (Ferri-Reed, 2014; LaBan, 2013; Rai, 2012). Millennials are also attracted to corporate citizenship such as corporate philanthropy, employee volunteering, and other support for social causes (Holt et al., 2012; Mirvis, 2012; Peloza, 2012).

To compensate Millennial employees, authors recommended improving entry salary, recognition, and rewards (Gallicano et al., 2012; Ruys, 2013) combined with professional development such as mentoring and additional learning opportunities (LaBan, 2013). In addition, many Millennial employees are not interested in sacrificing their wellness for corporate advancement so employers need to consider work-life balance by setting reasonable expectations and respecting commitments to marriage and parenting (Park & Gursoy, 2012; Ruys, 2013).

Summary and Transition

Employers worldwide are looking to increase engagement of Millennial employees and retain the skilled talent needed to replace retiring Boomers. In addition to the cost of losing Millennial employees due to disengagement and turnover, employers risk losing the Millennial talent that becomes their competition (Ferri-Reed, 2014). Millennials do not believe that they should be exclusive in receiving more, but rather that employers should provide more to their employees (Gursoy et al., 2013). Despite the extant literature on generational differences, there is equal evidence of similarities between generations (Gallicano et al., 2012). Young et al. (2013) encouraged employers to look for the similarities instead of differences between generations, embrace change, and relax traditional systems, especially before Generation Z arrives.

I introduced the problem, the purpose of the study, research questions, interview questions and online questionnaire, definitions, assumptions, limitations, and delimitations in Section 1. I discussed Kahn's (1990) theory of engagement in an expanded conceptual framework section. A review of academic literature provided the background for the two primary topics of EE and the Millennial generation. Section 2 contains my reasons for selecting a qualitative single case study to explore MEE. In addition, Section 2 contains the detailed steps necessary to gather, organize, and analyze data using a qualitative method and case study design.

Section 2: The Project

Section 2 is a review of the reasons why I selected a qualitative single case study to explore MEE. Section 2 includes expanded discussions about the role of the researcher, population and sampling, ethical research, data collection, analysis, and steps for ensuring reliability and validity of the data.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this qualitative single case study was to explore the strategies that non-Millennial luxury resort leaders use to improve MEE. The target population was non-Millennial luxury resort leaders located in Hawai`i who have Millennial employees in their departments. The implications for positive social change include the potential to foster happy and productive Millennial employees who contribute to the organizational performance of their employers. The luxury resort industry, HR practitioners, and educational institutions with hospitality management programs may benefit from information that could improve corporate culture, employee retention, and increased numbers of graduates remaining in their field of study, respectively (Brown et al., 2015).

Role of the Researcher

Houghton, Casey, Shaw, and Murphy (2013) described the qualitative researcher as one of the research instruments because the researcher collects the data. Therefore, I was the main data collection instrument for the study. Prior to data collection, my personal bias with the topic stemmed from my prior work in HR and my interest in Millennial development. I am a Generation X parent of a Millennial child and have an interest in understanding the techniques that are useful in relating to Millennials. As a

native resident of Hawai`i, I wanted to explore strategies that might help corporations to develop employees while also strengthening themselves as employers.

Unluer (2012) and Greene (2014) referred to an employee researcher as an *insider-researcher*. Greene described insider research as that conducted by a researcher who has intimate knowledge of the group and is also a member of the participant group. I am familiar with the organization and understand the company culture, but I am not an employee. I worked in the resort industry and have knowledge of the field, which may encourage potential participation.

I followed all the ethical guidelines of research. In 1979, the National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research outlined the research protocol for human subjects in the Belmont Report (National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research, 2014). Yin (2014) emphasized the need for protection of human rights, equal treatment, and sensitivity to vulnerable populations.

Yin (2014) also reminded researchers to avoid bias and keep an open mind when collecting data, especially with evidence that may be contrary to expectations. This advice is relevant because bias can be introduced either by preexisting opinion or perceptions developed during the research. Yin also pointed out that researchers must continue to consider all evidence equally, especially any evidence that is contrary to the researcher's personal expectations.

An interview protocol is a detailed description of each step of the interview process, which helps researchers to remember important points, stay on task, and include

prompts as needed (Jacob & Furgerson, 2012). Interview protocols are useful in research applications such as the study of teachers by Kim, Kim, Lee, Spector, and DeMeester (2013) or in organizational applications such as the counseling of language learners by Harootian and O'Reilly (2015). My interview protocol for this study is available in Appendix A and the online questionnaire protocol is available in Appendix B.

Participants

Yin (2014) suggested collecting different types of data to provide multiple sources of evidence when conducting a qualitative case study. For example, Unluer (2012) used both semistructured interviews with leaders and open ended online questionnaires with employees. Similar to the participants in Unluer's (2012) study, I used semistructured interviews with non-Millennial leaders for RQ1 and online questionnaires with both supervisory and nonsupervisory Millennial employees for SQ1. To be eligible as an interview participant to explore RQ1, the department head participants must have had Millennial employees and had experience with strategies used to improve MEE. Robinson (2014) described such requirements as *inclusion* and *exclusion* criteria. In this case, interview participants were included if they were luxury resort leaders who had Millennial employees, but excluded if they were Millennials themselves. Millennial leaders participated through the online questionnaire.

The process of gaining access to participants includes ethical consideration about encouraging voluntary participation (Marshall & Rossman, 2016). Marshall and Rossman stated that results could be skewed if participants were recruited with monetary incentives versus those participants who were volunteering for the contribution to social change.

Yin (2014) added that ethical considerations for access to participants also included the subject organization, which may have specific institutional requirements for protection of participants and information. In addition, Yin (2014) advised that researchers prepare themselves to adapt to the schedules and availability of the participants, including the possibility of special arrangements to accommodate the participant.

Before attempting to contact potential participants, they must be informed that the study is occurring. I asked the resort leader to notify his department heads and Millennial employees of the study, that he had given his approval to participate as an organization, and that any participation was voluntary and would not affect employment. Following communication to the staff, I e-mailed the interview participants directly with an invitation to participate (Appendix C) and included the informed consent form. The letter of cooperation signed by the resort leader is available in Appendix E.

To protect the privacy of the Millennial employees' personal e-mail addresses, the HR office forwarded my e-mail invitation to participate (Appendix D). No one in the department knew which employees agree to be interviewed or respond to the online questionnaire unless they chose to self-disclose this information. This helped to protect participant confidentiality.

To help establish a working relationship, I needed to speak with some of the same participants on multiple occasions to organize schedules and develop trust. As an example, McClerklin (2013) used preparation meetings prior to interviews because it helped to educate participants about the process and further establish a working relationship. Trust is essential to obtaining candid responses and consistent results

(Cronin, 2014). Professionalism is also a critical factor in establishing a working relationship with participants (Thomas, 2015). In consideration of the department head's busy schedule, interviews took place at a time and in a setting that was most convenient and comfortable for the participant.

Research Method and Research Design

Research Method

I chose a qualitative method and an embedded single case study design to explore MEE. Rogers (2014) described qualitative research as a means to add human perception and meaning to facts and predictions. Radley and Chamberlain (2011) argued that qualitative methods are superior to quantitative when studying human behavior because detailed data emerges from specific participants rather than the aggregate of participants. Crowe et al. (2011) added that researchers sometimes use qualitative methods to explore quantitative results in more depth. Likewise, Crowe et al. (2011) discussed instances where data from quantitative surveys do not represent a full picture of the phenomenon because the data do not include the meaning behind the results. Information collected in naturalistic settings can yield richer descriptions of the phenomenon versus using quantitative methods alone (Crowe et al., 2011; Hanson et al., 2011).

Ruys (2013) stated that mixed methods was helpful to perform an in-depth exploration of quantitative survey data with qualitative interviews. According to Ruys, the quantitative data did not provide enough depth and a mixed methods approach allowed for the use qualitative interviews to gather rich responses from a small sampling of survey participants. However, this study does not include a quantitative survey.

Therefore, a qualitative method was the best choice to gather perspectives from leaders who are experiencing a phenomenon such as MEE.

Research Design

Yin (2014) encouraged researchers to determine whether a single case study is holistic, with one unit of analysis, or embedded, with multiple units of analysis. I employed an embedded, single case study design in my research study. Unluer (2012) described a single case study design as effective for performing an in-depth exploration of a phenomenon within a particular location. Farley-Ripple (2012) noted that an embedded, single case study design allowed for an exploration of evidence within the characteristics of a specific organization, an aspect that could affect decision-making. Yin (2014) described the appropriateness of using the case study method for determining the *how* and *why* of a phenomenon. As Crowe et al. (2011) described, the goal is to understand the social meaning of processes from different perspectives. In addition, the case for the study is *instrumental* because the organization is not unique in experiencing the phenomenon, which is indicative of an *intrinsic* case (Crowe et al., 2011).

I considered other qualitative research designs, but chose not to use them because they were not suitable for my study in regard to the topic and participants. For example, ethnography is the documented description of a culture and its meaning (Rogers, 2014; Walker, 2012). In an ethnographic approach, the focus is on the aspects of a culture-sharing group, such as teachers or social workers (Hanson et al., 2011). Ethnography is not a suitable design for the study because, although Millennials are part of a culture-bound group, the focus of the study was the strategies leaders use to improve MEE.

In contrast, phenomenological researchers explore the meaning of a phenomenon through the lived experiences of participants (Tirgari, 2012; Walker, 2012). Petty et al. (2012) described this methodology as an exploration of unique experiences, but the Millennial employee experience in this case is not unique. Although the interviews include questions about experiences with the phenomenon, the inquiry is not the same level of significant life experience that is appropriate for phenomenology (Thomas, 2015). Because I was exploring leader strategies rather than Millennials as a group, I did not select an ethnographic design. In addition, because the Millennial employee experience is not unique, I did not select phenomenology as a research design. I selected a single case design for this study.

One measure of qualitative research quality is the concept of data saturation. Saturation occurs when no new insights, themes, or perspectives appear (Hanson et al., 2011). Walker (2012) described saturation as the collection of data until information becomes redundant. However, the process of determining saturation in qualitative designs can be ambiguous (O'Reilly & Parker, 2012; Walker, 2012). O'Reilly and Parker (2012) advocated for the research community to stop relying on saturation as a means of determining research quality. However, saturation remains a common process for determining transferability in qualitative research (Walker, 2012). Therefore, I used multiple data collection techniques to pursue data saturation:

1. semistructured interviews with non-Millennial resort leaders.
2. online questionnaires with Millennial supervisory and nonsupervisory employees, and

3. company documents about EE (in general or Millennial-focused).

Population and Sampling

Yin (2014) stated that it is misleading to imply that case studies have a sample size because the case is the sample, which for a single case study makes a sample size of one. Similarly, Suri (2011), who described the techniques of synthesists, also indicated that sampling occurs when choosing the case rather than the participants. Instead, Yin (2014) encouraged researchers to determine whether a single case study is holistic, with one unit of analysis or embedded, with multiple units of analysis. I used an embedded single case design with semistructured interview data from non-Millennial luxury resort leaders and subunit data from Millennial supervisors and Millennial nonsupervisory employees.

The organization was a large luxury resort in Hawai`i that employed many Millennial employees, but was not unique compared to other resorts. Yin (2014) described this lack of singularity as being a *common* case, one of five rationales for choosing a single case approach. I used this information to determine if my initial selection of this case organization was appropriate (Crowe et al., 2011). If the company was not experiencing the phenomenon or did not have a significant number of Millennial employees, then the case selection would have been inappropriate.

In addition, the organization's staff was multigenerational, which allowed for strata such as non-Millennial leaders, Millennial supervisors, and Millennial line staff. Because the organization had many Millennial employees, was multigenerational, and not

unique among resorts, I deemed the employer to be relevant to the topic and appropriate for the case study.

Purposeful sampling is used to select participants who are relevant to the topic (Yin, 2014). Palinkas et al (2015) described purposeful sampling as a process to select individuals who are knowledgeable about the phenomenon, willing to participate, and able to share their opinions in an articulate, thoughtful manner. According to the descriptions of purposeful sampling strategies by Palinkas et al. (2015), a group of non-Millennial resort leaders is considered a combination of a homogenous and purposeful, random sample because I was looking for any participants within a particular subgroup. Robinson (2014) also referred to this sampling as demographic homogeneity because the participants share a common trait, such as role or age group. A purposeful sampling method was effective to select six non-Millennial luxury resort leaders who oversee departments with Millennial employees.

When choosing the number of participants, Robinson (2014) suggested that researchers choose a number that is both ideal and practical, which could be an approximate range instead of a fixed number. Palinkas et al. (2015) noted that the number of participants depends on the study design and the depth of detail desired. In other examples of case studies with interview participants, Cronin (2014) decided to use five interview participants while Unluer (2012) used six. Because the resort had fewer than 20 department heads, I recruited six directors for interview participants.

For the Millennial online questionnaire participants, I had assistance from the HR department to distribute an e-mail invitation to recruit at least 10 of the Millennial

supersivory and nonsupervisory employees to participate (Appendix D). These additional groups were part of the multiple sources of evidence that Yin (2014) recommended for single case studies. By approaching the phenomenon from various perspectives, valuable information appeared through converging themes.

Hanson et al. (2011) emphasized the importance of not pre-establishing numbers for participants, but rather encouraged researchers to strive for saturation instead. Saturation occurs when no new insights, themes, or perspectives appear (Hanson et al., 2011). Walker (2012) also described data saturation as the point of repetition in the data set where no new information appears. Fusch and Ness (2015) recommended using methodological triangulation, which is the use of multiple sources of data collection. Therefore, I used methodological triangulation to pursue data saturation by collecting three sets of data from different sources.

Hanson et al. (2011) described case studies as an example of how qualitative interviews with a few individuals may be more informative than quantitative data gathered from many participants. In this case, interview participants were non-Millennial luxury resort leaders who had Millennial employees in their department and had experience with strategies used to improve MEE.

Participants were encouraged to select a time and setting that was most convenient and comfortable for them (Thomas, 2015). To accommodate participants, interview appointments in homes and during weekends were acceptable as long as the location could maintain a quiet setting and reliable recording quality. However, some participants may become uncomfortable with being recorded, and the recorder becomes a

barrier to data collection (Yin, 2014). In this study, if a participant did agree to recording during the interview, they would not be included in the study. All of the interviews were conducted in the workplace and none of the participants objected to being recorded.

For online questionnaire participants to be eligible, the participant must be a nonexecutive in the organization and have been born between 1980 and 1996. Since I could not have direct access to employee e-mail addresses, the HR department distributed the e-mail invitation (Appendix D), which contained a link for employees to participate in the online questionnaire. However, the HR staff did not know which employees participated.

Ethical Research

An ethical data collection process must protect the participants on multiple levels and respect vulnerable populations (Yin, 2014). An IRB is an institution's administrative body with the authority to approve or disapprove proposals for human subject research (Largent, 2016). To ensure that ethical protection for participants is adequate, I submitted to the Internal Review Board (IRB) an application that outlined the study, the protection of participants, and plans for secure data collection and storage. The IRB approved the proposal prior to data collection. The IRB approval number is #10-24-16-0328061, which expires on October 23, 2017.

All participants reviewed and signed an informed consent form as part of my ethical guidelines. Largent (2016) described a well-developed informed consent document as being concise, universally understandable, free of jargon, and containing

only the essential information. The consent form serves to inform the participant of the study's purpose and the right to refuse or withdraw (Crowe et al., 2011; Saffer, 2011).

Participation is voluntary and participants have the right to withdraw at any time during a study. If a participant withdrew during the interview stage, that data would not be included. Largent (2016) stated that compensation for participants is not necessary, but recognized incentives as being important for recruitment. Participants did not receive any compensation for participation in the study. None of the participants asked to withdraw.

The identity of interview participants, including signed consent forms, was kept confidential throughout the research process, with each participant referred to by an alphanumeric code. All files were saved in an online, password protected, Dropbox account and on a password protected computer to secure the digital data against accidental loss. In addition, the handwritten notes and other hard copy documents were stored in a locked file cabinet. All forms of data will be stored securely for 5 years and then destroyed.

Data Collection Instruments

Due to the direct involvement with participants, a case study researcher is the primary data collection instrument (Kahn, 1990; Scott, 2014). Yin (2014) described the need for researchers to collect multiple forms of data when performing case studies. For example, Unluer (2012) used both semistructured interviews and questionnaires as multiple data collection methods. As the primary data collection instrument of this study, I gathered various forms of data. The primary source of data was from non-Millennial leaders in a luxury resort through semistructured interviews (Appendix A). As a second

data set, I conducted online questionnaires with supervisory and nonsupervisory Millennial employees (Appendix B). As the third data set, I gathered company documents that reflected attempts by company leaders to engage employees, especially if the attempts targeted towards Millennials.

Available in Appendix A is the interview protocol, which includes the questions, and the speaking script for each step. Yin (2014) described the necessity of a protocol as a means to help organize and manage the design of the interview questions and their relevance to the research question. Marshall and Rossman (2016) stated that semistructured interview protocols include scripted, specific questions, which allows for efficiency in the data analysis phase. My interview protocol (Appendix A) includes the research question and the script for the discussion on informed consent and the interview questions. Appendix B is the online questionnaire protocol, which includes the questions, as they appear online. In this way, the protocols serve as a tool to manage the sequence of events and the alignment between the data collection process and the intention of the study.

To enhance the reliability and validity of the data collection instruments, I asked four colleagues of similar job positions in different organizations to review the interview questions for ease of understanding prior to use with participants. No data were collected and the volunteers were not included as interviewees for data collection. Based on their feedback, I refined the interview questions for clarity of wording.

Both Hanson et al. (2011) and Houghton et al. (2013) emphasized the need to be flexible with semistructured interview questions so that researchers can remain open to

new lines of inquiry. Marshall and Rossman (2016) also noted that researchers should possess good listening skills and the ability to ask follow-up questions when participants present an opportunity. Following the interviews, I provided the typed interview transcription to the participants and asked them to perform a transcript review so they could check for accuracy.

Using Facebook, I asked six Millennials to review the online questionnaire for ease of understanding. No data were collected and the volunteers were not included as participants for data collection. Based on their feedback, I revised the questions and online form for clarity of wording. The open-ended online questionnaire (Appendix B) is necessary because the participants align with the research subquestion, which is how Millennials are perceiving the EE strategies in their workplace.

Data Collection Techniques

Non-Millennial Luxury Resort Leader Interviews

The semistructured interviews with resort leaders are a primary data collection technique. Marshall and Rossman (2016) described interviews as a data collection technique that can gather in-depth information from fewer participants. Kahn (1990) stated that semistructured interviews were valuable because, as the participants relived various situations through dialogue, Kahn was able to explore participants' psychological and emotional experience with the phenomenon. Harvey (2015) discovered rich data with participants through the use of semistructured interviews, which helped to shape the direction of subsequent data collection. Therefore, I used semistructured interviews with

non-Millennial luxury resort leaders as one data collection technique to explore how employers use various strategies to engage Millennial employees.

As with any form of qualitative data collection, there are advantages and disadvantages. Hanson et al. (2011) described interviews as valuable forms of data collection because of the ability to explore topics in-depth and collect narrative data. However, with the increased interaction comes an elevated responsibility to consider the sensitivity of participants and protect confidentiality at all times (Crowe et al., 2011; Yin, 2014). A survey instrument was not the first choice because it would not provide information about the *how* or *why* of the phenomenon (Crowe et al., 2011). Therefore, I chose semistructured interviews, with open-ended questions, as the primary data collection technique to gather perspectives from non-Millennial luxury resort leaders.

I e-mailed each interview participant an invitation (Appendix C) and the informed consent form that described the purpose of the study, the criteria for selection, and the process, which includes the time commitment, recording of interviews, and right to withdraw. Petty et al. (2012) described an effective interview as being between 30-90 minutes in length and audiotaped for transcription. I completed the interviews face-to-face, allowing up to 60 minutes for the entire session including any questions about the consent form. Interviews took place in the locations requested by the participant where they were most comfortable and without distraction.

I recorded all the interviews with a digital recorder and another recording device as a backup in case of accidental loss. Scott (2014) used audio recordings during interviews, which left her free to take field notes about the participant's energy, tone,

demeanor, and other data that might not appear in the transcribed text. After reviewing the voluntary consent language, all six interview participants signed the consent form and the recorded interviews lasted between 15 and 33 minutes. An independent, professional transcription company, Rev, transcribed all interview recordings to ensure the accuracy of the recorded data. Rev employees are bound to the company's confidentiality agreement, and the company signed a nondisclosure agreement, attached as Appendix F. I sent the transcribed recordings by e-mail to the participants for transcript review and all participants replied with their approval.

Anonymous Millennial Online Questionnaires

In addition to interviews, Yin (2014) recommended questionnaires as an additional data collection technique for gathering multiple forms of case study evidence. In example, Unluer (2012) used both interviews and open-ended questionnaires for participant data collection. Bekhet and Zauszniewski (2012) used qualitative interviews and a questionnaire as their multiple forms of data to pursue methodological triangulation. Similarly, while conducting the interviews with the leaders, I gathered anonymous online questionnaire responses from the resort's Millennial employees between the ages of 20-35 in both supervisory and nonsupervisory positions. Included in the online questionnaire were questions about their age, job role, and length with the company.

I scheduled one week to collect online questionnaire responses from this group. However, initial participation in the online questionnaires was insufficient and I left the collection period open for four weeks. Upon closing of the online questionnaire format,

there were four supervisory and seven nonsupervisory Millennial employee responses. Questionnaire participants completed the informed consent form. Of the 11 questionnaire participants, five reported having a Millennial supervisor and all were between the ages of 18 to 37. One participant reported employment with the company of less than one year while the other ten indicated employment between 1-9 years.

Company Data Related to Employee Engagement

As my third data set, I gathered company data, also referred to as *artifacts* and *corporate archival data*, related to strategies for EE. Marshall and Rossman (2016) described company artifacts as those documents, records, material objects, and website content that pertain to the topic. Yin (2014) stated that documents are an important part of any case study data collection because documents are specific, stable, and broad in time span. Cotteleer and Wan (2016) also supported using archival data as an opportunity to study the history of an organization's activities. Therefore, the request for review of company data included all content relating to EE strategies. The company documents provided consisted of 12 pages of information about employee benefits, the recognition policy, workplace wellness initiatives and awards, and a leadership-training program.

Data Organization Technique

One aspect of case studies is the volume of data gathered from multiple sources, which a researcher needs to organize in thoughtful ways. Yin (2014) suggested maintaining two databases; one for the collected data and another for documenting the researcher's report. In contrast, Scott (2014) maintained a single database of all data collected and used a flash drive and computer files while keeping the identity of

participants in a separate, secured location. I labeled each interview recording and transcript with the date, time of the interview, and participant(s) using a confidential alphanumeric code. I organized each online questionnaire response by the order they arrived and by supervisory or nonsupervisory position.

I used field notes of my research process to include items such as impressions of the participants, environment, and notations during the data analysis process. I used participant codes in my field notes instead of names or titles to protect the confidentiality of all participants and the location. I organized all data collected in a manner that makes it easily retrievable and protected from any outside parties.

Similar to data organization by Scott (2014), I kept the central database of participants, codes, recordings, questionnaire responses, and the respective signed consent forms separately from transcripts and analyzed findings. All of the relevant documents were in categorized folders and saved through an online Dropbox account, which was also synced to the password protected computer. To protect against accidental digital data loss, users can copy data from a Dropbox folder to a USB drive periodically (Richards, 2013; Scott, 2014). In addition, I stored the recordings, handwritten notes, and other hard copy documents in a locked file cabinet, which is an acceptable protective procedure also employed by Saffer (2012). I will destroy all data after 5 years.

Data Analysis

Methodological triangulation is the practice of using different sources and types of data (Wilson, 2014). Bekhet and Zauszniewski (2012) described methodological triangulation as being either *across method*, using mixed methodologies, or *within-*

method, which was using multiple sources of data within the same method. Fusch and Ness (2015) recommended methodological triangulation as a means to reach data saturation and help to establish validity. Yin (2014) determined that the multiple forms of evidence should converge to support the same findings, thereby establishing creditability. Therefore, I pursued establishing creditability by employing methodological triangulation using interviews, online questionnaires, and company documents.

Hanson et al. (2011) described data analysis as an iterative process of immersing oneself in the data. Hanson et al. posited that qualitative data analysis occurs in three phases: (a) the initial immersion in the data, (b) the secondary clustering of codes and creation of themes, and (c) the final confirmation of themes and interpretation of findings. Similarly, Rogers (2014) described the steps of qualitative data analysis as *reducing*, *visualizing*, *synthesizing*, and then *verifying*. Saldaña (2015) described the coding process as cyclical; involving at least a first and second cycle and adding more cycles as needed. *Provisional* coding is a form of first cycle coding based on a list of predetermined themes that build upon existing research (Saldaña, 2015). I used Kahn's (1990) aspects of EE to create the provisional codes. Following the initial coding, researchers can also use *descriptive* coding wherein a word or phrase is used to categorize the data (Saldaña, 2015). After the first cycle coding is complete, researchers can use second cycle codes such as *pattern* coding to group first-cycle codes into sets or themes (Saldaña, 2015). To code the data and verify themes, I used a combination of first and second cycle coding and software-based analysis.

Researchers used qualitative research software programs to aid in data analysis (Patterson, 2014, Richards, 2013). The MAXQDA 12 software program is beneficial for the process of grouping the various comments to identify central themes. I used the MAXQDA 12 software program to perform a first phase of analysis on the interview transcriptions and online questionnaire responses. After a third-party agency transcribed each interview and the participant approved the transcript, also known as *transcript review*, I uploaded the transcripts to MAXQDA 12 for the initial auto-coding process. For the online questionnaires, I imported the responses from the Microsoft Excel format into the MAXQDA 12 software for analysis. The MAXQDA 12 analysis function can organize the interview and questionnaire data and help to track the various levels of coding. Following the cyclical coding process, I reviewed the results to look for differences and bias.

In addition, I looked for any similarities between themes found in the responses, the research question, and the conceptual framework. For example, Patterson (2014) looked for themes relating to generational theory. I looked for themes that indicated aspects of Kahn's (1990) engagement theory are present in the strategies used by luxury resort leaders to engage Millennial employees. The final research study includes the extent to which the resulting data answered the research question, areas for future research, any new information published after the start of data collection, and implications of how the findings may add to the body of knowledge on EE and Millennials.

Reliability and Validity

Munn, Porritt, Lockwood, Aromataris, and Pearson (2014), who created the ConQual approach for establishing confidence in qualitative findings, stated that dependability and credibility were similar to both quantitative reliability and validity. They described creditability as the fit between a researcher's interpretation of the findings and the original data, while dependability is the measure of reasonableness of the process for the study's research question and methodology (Munn et al., 2014).

Reliability

Houghton et al. (2013) indicated that qualitative researchers often use *dependability* as a measure of reliability. Dependability, which is a measure of how reliable or stable the data are, is established through *audit trails* and *reflexivity* (Houghton et al., 2013). Hanson et al. (2011) suggested that multiple researchers, peer debriefing, rigorous procedures, and member checking were all methods to establish dependability in qualitative research.

The Walden University doctoral study committee reviewed the protocols (Appendices A & B) and multiple sources of evidence. In addition, a third-party transcription service provider transcribed all the interviews so that three parties participated in validating the transcribed data for each interview: me, the transcriber, and the participant. I invited interview participants to review completed transcripts to check for accuracy. Participant identity was kept confidential at all times.

Validity

Houghton et al. (2013) described creditability as the extent to which the findings can be perceived as valuable and believable. To establish credibility, Greene (2014) suggested that researchers used prolonged engagement with participants, participant interview checking, and triangulation. Triangulation is the use of multiple methods, sources, researchers, and theories to validate findings (Greene, 2014). Yin (2014) also discussed employing data triangulation from multiple data sources to establish validity. Cronin (2014) noted that triangulation helped to counter balance the vulnerability of using only a single strategy to establish validity.

Transferability is the likelihood that future researchers could apply the process of a study to another comparable situation and yield similar results (Houghton et al., 2013). Hanson et al. (2011) determined that thoroughly describing the population sample, interview setting, and findings established transferability so that other researchers can compare settings. Houghton et al. (2013) stated that confirmability was determined in the same manner as dependability, through audit trails and using reflexivity in the form of field notes. Researchers should keep a detailed account of all steps and observations, including thick descriptions that would allow the steps to be replicated (Houghton et al., 2013). Bekhet and Zauszniewski (2012) stated that direct quotes from participants helped to establish creditability and *neutrality*, which they equated to confirmability. Per Yin's (2014) recommendations, I established validity through multiple sources of evidence and transcript reviews.

Saturation remains a common process to pursue transferability in qualitative research (Walker, 2012). Saturation occurs when no new insights, themes, or perspectives appear (Hanson et al., 2011). Houghton et al. (2013) described saturation as the point at which no new data is emerging. In his findings, Walker (2012) also emphasized that researchers must indicate if saturation was achieved and how it was determined. Bekhet and Zauszniewski (2012) claimed that reaching data saturation allowed them to achieve *applicability*, which was equal to transferability. Therefore, I interviewed luxury resort leaders, utilized online questionnaires, and analyzed company documentation to achieve data saturation.

Summary and Transition

My decision to use a qualitative, single case study was based on the appropriateness of using this method to explore a topic in-depth and understand what Yin (2014) described as the *how* and *why* of an emerging phenomenon. In this section, I detailed my reasoning for selecting this method and design along with the specifics steps to conduct the study within these parameters. In addition, I described the research process, including details about the participants, sampling, research ethics, and the collection, organization and analysis of data. These descriptions are necessary for creating a foundation for the case study and documenting the steps for establishing reliability and validity. As noted, the data collection processes, such as recording interviews, transcript review, and using the qualitative software, are also methods to maintain research quality.

In Section 3, I present (a) the findings of the study, (b) areas that need further research, (c) the implications for future applications, and (d) recommendations for improving engagement among Millennial employees.

Section 3: Application to Professional Practice and Implications for Change

Introduction

In this section, I present my findings on the strategies that were perceived as the most effective in engaging Millennial employees in a luxury resort. In addition, this section includes applications to professional practice, implications for social change, recommendations for action, areas that need further research, and my reflections.

The purpose of this qualitative single case study was to explore strategies that non-Millennial luxury resort leaders use to improve MEE. Collecting the data from employees of one luxury resort in Hawai`i, I conducted six semistructured interviews with non-Millennial department heads, received 11 anonymous online questionnaire responses from supervisory and nonsupervisory Millennials, and reviewed company documents related to EE. Company documents consisted of employee benefit policies, awards for work place wellness, schedules of wellness activities, manager training information, and promotional materials for employee benefit programs.

I first coded responses according to my conceptual framework based on Kahn's (1990) engagement theory and the literature review of MEE, which guided the interview and online questionnaire questions. After reading multiple references to building trust and earning respect as effective leadership practices, I used a Lexile search tool to find all instances of the words *trust* and *respect* by all respondents. After exploring the foundational aspects of most of the engagement strategies, I created two major themes: *interpersonal respect* and *interpersonal trust.* After a second cycle coding, one additional theme of *meaningful relationships* emerged.

The interpersonal respect theme includes (a) value recognition, (b) feedback, (c) autonomy, and (d) work-life balance. Interpersonal trust includes (a) safe environments, (b) voice in decision-making, and (c) clear expectations. Meaningful relationships includes (a) worthwhile purpose, (b) mentoring, and (c) effective listening.

Presentation of the Findings

The primary source of data was through semistructured interviews from six non-Millennial leaders in a luxury resort in Hawai`i. I used eight open-ended interview questions to explore the research question: What strategies do luxury resort leaders in Hawai`i use to improve Millennial employee engagement?

Each department head had been with the company for at least 1 year and had Millennial employees in the department. Out of 11 possible candidates, six responded to the e-mail invitation to participate (Appendix C). I performed member checking by having all interview participants review and approve their interview transcripts.

The conceptual framework for this study was based on Kahn's (1990) engagement theory and supplemented by the literature on MEE. Kahn believed that people choose to engage or disengage themselves in work roles under three psychological conditions: meaningfulness, safety, and availability. I used semistructured interview questions and company documents to gather insight about how the six luxury resort leaders perceived and used strategies they believed to be most successful or unsuccessful for engaging Millennials (see Appendix A). In Tables 2-4, I show the major and minor themes along with the frequency of participants, both Millennial and non-Millennial, who indicated the theme as important for MEE.

On the online questionnaire for Millennial employees, I used questions to explore most and least engaging job aspects, the aspects believed to engage Millennials, and their perceptions of their supervisor's attempts at engagement (see Appendix B). Table 1 shows the list of engagement aspects that were presented in the online questionnaire and the frequency that each was chosen by the 11 Millennial participants in response to Question 3, "Which three are the most important to you?"

Table 1

Top Three Engagement Aspects Chosen by 11 Millennial Participants

Aspect	n	% of participants
Feeling that your work is worthwhile and valuable	10	91%
Clear expectations, feedback, and recognition	9	82%
Work-life balance	6	55%
Safe culture to ask for help or share new ideas	5	45%
Voice in decision-making	3	27%
Autonomy	0	0%

Note. *n* = frequency

Major Theme 1: Interpersonal Respect

Resort leader responses to interview questions 4 and 7 and Millennial online questionnaire responses provided the results for this theme. Interpersonal respect included *value recognition, feedback, autonomy,* and *work-life balance* strategies, but it also included respecting employees for whom they were as individuals. Ruys (2013) found that Millennials wanted leaders to exhibit respect for employees and follow a

moral code for ethical decision-making. Graybill (2014) determined that Millennials value leaders who display teamwork, communication, respect, vision, and influence. Responses about interpersonal respect referred to the employee's work role, tasks, and the interactions directly tied to roles and tasks.

Aside from recognition and feedback, resort leaders indicated that interpersonal respect included showing credibility and follow through with Millennials. Holt et al. (2012) found that Millennials expected mutual respect, fairness, and justice from employers. Interview Participant (IP) 4 stated, "If they're looking for things, there's a lot they hold you to as far as follow up and follow through, so you got to have that." IP1 also commented about credibility by stating, "They like to know that it's a formal meeting, so you don't want to do things in passing." Both participant comments echo the research of Ozcelik (2015) who stated Millennials are looking for their leaders to establish credibility before they fully commit to an employer.

Millennial participants commented about interpersonal respect as an effective leadership strategy. In example, Questionnaire Participant Nonsupervisory (QPNS) 4 described effective leadership as, "[Leaders are] connecting with the staff on a personal level, getting to know if they love what they do, if this is where they want to be." QPNS6 stated, "She is wonderful about including me in decision making, always looking for the bigger picture." In response to online Question 7 about least engaging aspects, QPNS3 described situations when interpersonal respect was not present, such as, "Upper management. They don't know what us as front line employees do. Plus they only focus on giving criticism rather than building up the team."

According to participant responses, a leader's ability to convey interpersonal respect for a Millennial employee was important for engagement. Millennial respondents indicated that failure to convey respect damaged the employee/supervisor relationship and, in some cases, damaged the employee/company relationship. Once interpersonal respect is damaged, IP1 noted that Millennial employees are reluctant to forget the incident.

Table 2 shows the frequency of participants who indicated the importance of minor themes: value recognition, feedback, work-life balance, and autonomy. The combination of respondents' perceptions and the priority they placed on the minor themes lead to the creation of the major theme, interpersonal respect.

Table 2

Frequency of Minor Themes Under Interpersonal Respect Theme

Theme	Resort leaders (n = 6)	Millennial supervisors (n = 4)	Millennial nonsupervisors (n = 7)
Value recognition	5	2	6
Feedback	5	2	2
Work-life balance	6	2	4
Autonomy	3	0	1

Interpersonal respect: Value recognition. Resort leaders and Millennial employees both indicated recognition of an employee's value as an important aspect of engagement. Kahn (1990) described the psychological condition of meaningfulness as the

state of being when employees choose to engage because they feel they are valued in the workplace. Lu and Gursoy (2013) discovered that Millennials in the hospitality industry experienced emotional exhaustion earlier and required more interim rewards than Baby Boomers. Similarly, Holt et al. (2012) and Ozcelik (2015) both stated that Millennials expect appreciation from employers.

Additional analysis of this theme revealed two types of value recognition: (a) *external*, which was projected to a larger audience; and (b) *individual*, which transpired between supervisor and employee. When asked about recognition, most of the leader participants discussed using traditional external recognition strategies, such as publicly announcing rewards for positive guest comments or exceeding job expectations. IP6 described this activity as, “We have a system in our company for rewarding the "wow job" with a [token] that we give them . . . and then they will get maybe a gift card or maybe a little golfing for free.” IP2 described this form of external recognition as, “We often engage in ‘wow activities’ so that we can complement our Millennials in a public way, often through e-mails that we post in hard copy for everyone to see.” In addition, the review of company documents included employee benefit policies, awards for work place wellness, schedules of wellness activities, manager training information, and promotional materials for employee benefit programs. My analysis of the company documents revealed multiple opportunities for employees to receive public recognition for exceptional performance, such as perfect attendance or employee of the month, quarter, and year. However, there was less information about training of leadership styles that develop interpersonal trust, respect and relationship-building. This finding indicated

to me that there may be a difference in perceptions between Millennials and non-Millennials of what activities each group considered to be engaging.

When asked about effective leadership strategies, some leaders described recognition as being more individual-focused. One tactic was to convey a sense of value recognition in conceptual terms relating to organizational culture, as described by IP3:

> What works best is to convey that we value them. That in the process of having hired them, that we hire quality, and we hire the best. That goes toward their self-esteem. We want to make sure that they understand that.

Other tactics focused on conveying the value of the specific individual and showing respect for their contributions. IP5 described the scenario of individual-focused recognition as employees needing reassurance that they are doing a good job or, "I've been accepted. My idea is good."

Millennial respondents indicated the importance of feeling worthwhile and valuable through their responses to Question 6 about most engaging aspects of their work. Similarly, a lack of appreciation and recognition appeared on the responses to Question 7, which were the least engaging aspects of their jobs. Additional mentions of this theme appeared in the responses to Questions 8 and 9, which asked them to choose their top three engagement strategies from the conceptual framework. Responses did not indicate a preference for either external or individual recognition, but appeared to touch on both organizational culture and the importance of individual validation. QPNS5 stated, "I think it is important to create a positive corporate culture where employees look forward to coming to work each day." Questionnaire Participant - Supervisor (QPS) 2

mentioned that she appreciates compliments and value recognition because it boosts her confidence, and she shows appreciation for her staff in similar ways.

A notable minor theme of value recognition was the comparison in how different generations viewed the importance of recognition. Comments from resort leaders indicated that previous generations are accustomed to not receiving recognition. IP5 said, “Yes, I think all the other generations, they’re like, ‘Okay, I didn't get that. That's all right.’” IP4 suggested,

> I think sometimes we lose that focus because we're so driven to say, "Hey, this is our job. This is what we do." The generations are very different because the way that I have been taught things it's like, you just go. You don't need the recognition.

Based on resort leader responses, earlier generations are accustomed to traditional organizational cultures that did not provide value recognition in a timely or sensitive manner. In addition to any desires for a feeling of appreciation, IP2 remarked that Millennial employees had more stake in the benefits of value recognition because they perceived that it helped them fit in and advance in the department.

The generational differences in perception of value recognition are an important aspect for leaders to understand when attempting to engage their multigenerational teams. Yadav and Aspal (2014) recommended that leaders keep generational differences in mind when designing recognition and other employee initiatives.

Interpersonal respect: Feedback. Resort leaders had multiple insights about feedback for Millennials and noted that, once the feedback and corrective action were understood, their Millennial employees exhibited timely course correction. Holt et al.

(2012) noted that Millennials wanted both immediate and continuous feedback. IP3 noted that Millennials were searching for feedback to keep them on track with their aspirations for advancement. In one example, IP2 noted the response to feedback was sometimes better than other generations:

> They value feedback either positive or critical . . . some of the people can seem almost indifferent, but when given the feedback, they would act on it. They really respond to it. It's not like someone who is a bit older and slower to move forward, but rather they quickly act on it. It's good.

Providing successful feedback relied on the leader's ability to convey respect, sensitivity, relevance, specific explanations, and visual examples, as needed. Resort leaders indicated that employees found the feedback to be meaningful and relevant if it either helped to validate their value or provided an opportunity for growth. IP4 gave an example of specific and detailed feedback:

> It's sharing with them the measurements of the guest experience so they have a clear understanding on what kind of impact they're making so that they can see, "Oh, jeez, I didn't do that," and it made such an impact for that experience. Or "Oh my gosh, I did this and it was so great that this is what happened to the experience.".

Millennial respondents were clear and succinct in their desire for feedback. QPNS7 stated, "I feel I need to know if I am doing an adequate job or not and how I can improve." QPS2 echoed some of the sentiments of the resort leaders by saying, "I love

when managers give me feedback either good or bad. I want to know what I can improve on as well as receive the amazing recognition."

Although resort leaders indicated that the act of providing sensitive and explicit feedback required more effort, Millennial employees appeared to respond well and evolve quickly. Resort leaders believed in the importance of the feedback, did not question the Millennial employees' need for it, and did not see the process as an additional burden.

Interpersonal respect: Work-life balance. Kahn defined the psychological condition of availability as having the physical, emotional and mental capacity to be engaged in the workplace (1990). For this study, the exploration of availability was limited to asking respondents to discuss perceptions of work-life balance opportunities. Both resort leaders and Millennial employees discussed work-life balance in terms of availability to take time off within the year-round resort environment. IP6 emphasized the need for leaders and HR to work together to hire enough people so that employees are not overworked. IP6 felt that failing to plan for adequate staffing was a reflection on his leadership, "If somebody has to be scheduled six days, that looks bad on me, and they don't have work balance."

Resort leaders also stated that it was important to be mindful of the scheduling impact on employees and acknowledge their personal life commitments. IP5 stated, "I think it's constantly being aware of their family, their needs outside of the resort, and always being engaged to see what's happening." Similarly, IP3 commented that she used a combination of knowing the employee's life situation and reviewing requests on a case-

by-case basis. In addition to being aware of employee circumstances, IP5 noted that leaders should take an active role in encouraging employees to keep their personal commitments, “Don't forget, you need to leave at this certain time. Be sure you get out of here,” so they don't feel guilty that they have to stay because we are busy.”

Resort leaders and the review of company documents indicated work-life balance opportunities were available in terms of workplace wellness, but none of the Millennial employees commented on the resort’s wellness efforts in their comments about work-life balance. Both supervisory and nonsupervisory Millennial employees indicated their definition of work-life balance was the time spent away from the workplace and did not include wellness activities while at work. According to Ozcelik (2015), the Millennial definition of work-life balance is synonymous with flexible working arrangements.

Two Millennial participants felt strongly about the need for work-life balance. QPNS1 described the importance succinctly as, “I want to be successful in my career but not at the cost of my personal life.” QPNS6 described work-life balance in terms of measuring priorities, “Work life balance is the most important. No matter how much I love my job it will never compare to spending time at home with my family and friends.” In contrast, the absence of work-life balance was seen as a breach of interpersonal respect. QPNS6 stated,

> It's one thing to have vacation hours to use, but it's only a perk if you actually get approved time off. It tends to be a slap in the face for most line staff to see their bosses coming and going on vacation and them never getting enough days off in a row to go anywhere.

Brown et al. (2015) identified that the priority that Millennials place on work-life balance creates a greater risk for turnover in the hospitality field. According to Holt et al. (2012), Millennials are not interested in climbing the corporate ladder, becoming an executive, or making more money if it means sacrificing their work-life balance. Because Millennial employees are not interested in sacrificing their happiness for corporate advancement, employers need to consider reasonable expectations and respecting commitments to marriage and parenting (Park & Gursoy, 2012; Ruys, 2013).

Interpersonal respect: Autonomy. Despite multiple studies that indicated autonomy was an important aspect to Millennials (Chi et al., 2013; Gallicano et al., 2012; Ruys, 2013), the theme of autonomy was not as strong as other themes. In response to interview Question 2 - "What strategies do you use to help your Millennial employees have autonomy and voice in decisions?"- only IP6 discussed the topic at length.

> If I tell them to clear the tables from one side today, [it] doesn't mean every table has to be exactly like that . . . As long as they find a more personal touch to my guests, they find their own style, then they're more developed rather than every employee doing the same things in the same way.

Other resort leader comments about autonomy focused on the need to help Millennials fully understand the purpose of their role and the desired outcome of their tasks. "It's up to them providing that we have provided them with the clarity and importance of their job," said IP4. In addition to providing clear expectations, IP5 remarked, "You need to let them feel as though they can make a decision on certain

things." In this instance, providing autonomy was a strategy to help build employee confidence.

Only one Millennial respondent answered online Question 6 about most engaging aspects of the job with a mention of autonomy, "I have autonomy, and I am not tied down to my desk," said QPNS6. In response to online Question 3, which asked respondents to choose their top engagement strategies, none of the Millennial employees chose autonomy as one of their top three.

Despite the lack of responses for autonomy in this study, an employee's ability to work autonomously remains important. Gawke et al. (2017) stated that employee intrapreneurship, which is the autonomous innovation and value creation of new business, products, or processes, can help to improve an employer's strategic advantage. In addition, employees who are creating new resources through intrapreneurship or job crafting are enhancing their skills and personal resources, which leads to greater competency and well-being (Gawke et al., 2017).

Major Theme 2: Interpersonal Trust

Employees can choose to engage or disengage depending on the level of safety they perceive in their environment (Kahn, 1990). Unlike interpersonal respect, which refers to respect for an employee's time, role and task performance, interpersonal trust refers to the level of trust between the employee and their supervisor, peers, or organization. Ferinia, Yuniarsi and Disman (2016) referred to interpersonal trust in combination with empathy and acceptance as *rapport* and noted its importance in building workplace relationships. In this study, level of safety was expressed as a

combination of trust in their supervisor to behave in a supportive manner (*safe environment*), a manager's ability to acknowledge the value of employee insight (*voice in decision-making*), and *clear expectations*. Multiple authors indicated that leading Millennial employees required providing openness, clarity, and involvement in discussions and decision-making (Ferri-Reed, 2014; LaBan, 2013; Rai, 2012).

When asked about effective engagement strategies, IP1 responded, "Creating a safe environment is probably the most important. I think that age group really wants that. They almost demand it a little bit." Similarly, IP6 described the importance of interpersonal trust in his advice for new resort leaders, "You have to get to know the personalities. They have to get engaged with their team. They have to have trust in the team."

Interpersonal trust included clear expectations because employees trusted supervisors to provide enough clarity for employees to feel safe in their roles. According to Kahn (1990), clear expectations are necessary in order to understand when they were behaving positively within interpersonal relationships, such as with other coworkers, leaders, or compared to company norms. Some responses about clear expectations also aligned to the interpersonal respect theme, but it emerged as a precondition so that they could perform their jobs effectively, improve on performance, and receive recognition for their improvements.

Table 3 shows the frequency of participants who indicated the importance of the minor themes: safe environments, voice in decision-making, and clear expectations. The

combination of respondents' perceptions and the priority they placed on the minor themes lead to the creation of the major theme: interpersonal trust.

Table 3

Frequency of Minor Themes Under Interpersonal Trust Theme

Theme	Resort leaders (n = 6)	Millennial supervisors (n = 4)	Millennial nonsupervisors (n = 7)
Safe environments	6	4	3
Voice in decisions	6	4	4
Clear expectations	5	4	5

Interpersonal trust: Safe environments. According to resort leaders, maintaining safe environments for Millennials involved more than having an open door policy for workplace issues. The optimum work environment provides a positive, caring workplace culture with policies for justice and a safe place to voice opinions and give feedback without fear of negative consequences (Holt et al., 2012; Kahn, 1990). Contrary to the belief that Millennials do not want to interact with other generations, Finnoff (2013) and Rand (2013) found that Millennials want more interaction and connection rather than less. Multiple responses indicated the resort leaders had circumstances wherein *safe to ask for help* translated to responding to a personal crisis for a Millennial employee. IP1 described the importance of maintaining sensitive and thoughtful work environments for both personal and professional concerns:

> Really that safety thing is super, super important to them. I've had conversations with people that were struggling where I've said, "You call me any time day or night. I'm always available." Then making sure I answer the phone and that I take the time no matter what I'm doing to let them vent or speak. Again, it really goes back to that safe environment.

Similarly, IP2 discussed safe environments in terms of privacy, “If you have an opportunity to connect with your Millennial staff and let them know that there's confidentiality, it builds a trust.” In some cases, safe environments included a leader’s initiative to check on struggling employees. IP3 described this as, “There might be some other issues going on with them that we need to reach out. ‘How are you doing? What's going on?’ Seeing if they would open up.”

In contrast, Millennial respondents did not mention as many personal aspects as part of their desire for safe environments. When asked why a *safe culture to ask for help* was important for engagement, QPS1 stated, “Being able to ask for help and share ideas creates growth and allows for personal development at work, which can make a job more fulfilling.” QPNS7 stated the need for safe environments as, “I need to know that I can express myself without fear of retaliation.”

In the example provided by QPNS4, comments about a safe environment were part of a desire to feel safe in her role:

> I find that having someone that I can easily express my concerns or questions to allows me to be more engaged in my job. I would much rather ask for help as opposed to guessing and possibly jeopardizing the quality of work that I put out.

It was not clear from the responses why the perception of *safe to ask for help* differed among the Millennials and non-millennials. However, the importance of the aspect was clear among all participant groups and leaders should anticipate responding to both personal and professional challenges arising from Millennial employees.

Interpersonal trust: Voice in decision-making. Although Millennial respondents indicated a voice in decision-making is important for engagement, leaders remarked that additional work is necessary to build trust when soliciting and responding to Millennial input. Kahn (1990) posited that employees needed to feel safe to contribute their ideas. Gallicano et al. (2012) found that Millennials who ranked their employers high in listening, but low in collective decision-making indicated that Millennials were being heard but not included. Resort leaders responded that there were three instances wherein trust was a component of including Millennial voice in decision-making: (a) creating enough trust for the employee to share their opinion, (b) maintaining that trust by following through, and (c) leaders having enough trust in their employees to solicit and use their opinions. Several responses from leaders indicated that they sometimes needed to work harder to solicit Millennial input and create a trust environment. “I need to get their trust. If I'm going to disagree with their decisions and their opinion, they're not going trust me” (IP6). Similarly, IP5 described how trust was a precondition to receiving Millennial voice, “Once you've gained the respect from them and they know that you can be trusted and it's okay, you're not going to shove their ideas [away], then they're open.”

In some cases, receiving Millennial voice in decision-making was tied to their trust in the safe environment leaders created for hearing ideas. IP2 described how they

are making input meetings smaller, "…as opposed to sort of old school ways where you have general meetings and large group audiences. We're shrinking it a little bit and that's actually creating more of a comfortable venue for millennials." IP4 shared that sometimes the meeting had to be as small as one-on-one to ask, "[We ask] 'Hey, how's everything going? Do you have anything to share with us?' Hopefully, you get something out of that and it allows them to be a little bit more open."

All instances of establishing trust as part of employing Millennial voice in decision-making were deemed important by resort leaders. Whether by earning Millennial trust through maintaining safe environments or by making sure to follow through with the recommendations that Millennials had shared, resort leaders believed that interpersonal trust was necessary.

As with other themes, there was a notable difference in perception about voice in decision-making between resort leaders and Millennial respondents. While resort leaders cited trust as critical in soliciting and receiving Millennial voice, Millennial respondents spoke about providing voice in decision-making as an expression of valuing their opinion and desire to contribute. Both supervisory and nonsupervisory Millennials responded that voice in decision-making should be part of the organizational culture. QPS4 said, "I feel that when implementing new expectations to employees, it's positive when the manager ask for feedback from their staff before making decisions." QPNS5 remarked, "Instead of simply telling employees what to do, it is crucial to regularly ask employees for their opinions in order to strengthen the workplace culture. I think being successful starts with innovation and hearing everyone's ideas and feedback." QPNS6 added, "A voice in

decision-making is more important than autonomy because I need to have a voice or there is no connection or sense of pride in my job. Otherwise, I'm just clocking in to complete tasks and clocking out."

Resort leaders discussed Millennial voice in decision-making as a trust strategy while Millennials discussed the topic in terms of feeling valued. In the first instance, leaders appeared to be discussing employees who were reluctant to give their opinion. In contrast, the notable Millennial comments appear to have come from employees who would share their opinions willingly.

Interpersonal trust: Clear expectations. According to Kahn (1990), clear expectations are an aspect of both the meaningfulness and safety psychological conditions. Under meaningfulness, clear expectations provide clarity for job tasks, procedures, and goals. Under the safety condition, clear expectations provide consistency, predictability, and clarity of consequences (Kahn, 1990). IP1 provided the following insight to express why she felt clear expectations contributed to engagement:

> To me, the one thing I've learned that's super helpful is that everybody wants boundaries. You want to know what the expectation is of you. I think if we create that, they're kind of happy. I think they crave it.

Gallicano et al. (2012) and Graybill (2014) indicated that Millennials wanted leaders who could provide clarity and good communication. Singh (2013) and Tillott et al. (2013) both indicated that clear communication of expectations could strengthen engagement. Despite the benefits of clear expectations for MEE, resort leaders expressed that this was an area wrought with additional challenges. Within this topic area, there

were multiple references to *hand-holding* and providing additional explanations or requiring employees to acknowledge expectations in writing. In some cases, leaders expressed a mismatch between company expectations and the Millennial's expectations of themselves. IP3 described her approach to remedy some of the challenges by stating, "We tell them that we are an ohana [family] in business and we expect you to be an important factor in that equation [by] showing up on time and to put in an honest day's work." In another example from IP4, she described a need to make expectations clear by using multiple formats such as verbal, visible examples, reconfirming, and signed documentation. According to IP1, another strategy for providing clear expectations included aspects of voice in decision-making so employees can have ownership of the commitment.

As with the feedback theme, leaders stated that they needed to include the reasons for the expectations. IP6 referred several times to explaining the reasoning for policies and IP3 described the situation as, "They need to be told why, because just saying, 'This is the rule'; they question authority . . . in their minds they're like, 'Well, why is that important?'"

Responses from Millennials about clear expectations referred to trusting in the clarity about tasks and roles or understanding the workplace. In regards to tasks and roles, QPNS1 stated, "It is important for me to understand the expectations so that I can meet the needs of my department." In reference to understanding workplace norms, QPNS2 described her reasons for valuing clear expectations as, "So there is a positive and transparent environment." Though not specific as to tasks or norms, QPNS4 added to the

theme by sharing, “Clear expectations is another essential part of engagement. Knowing what is expected from me allows me to understand where I need to be in the work that I do.”

While it is apparent from the responses that clear expectations are important for both leaders and Millennials, leaders still felt that it was an ongoing challenge. None of the Millennial responses provided insight for how to deliver expectations and boundaries, but some of the resort leader tactics appeared viable.

Major Theme 3: Meaningful Relationships

After analyzing the themes of interpersonal respect and trust, meaningful relationships emerged as the third major theme. A positive relationship, with either the supervisor or the company, provided ongoing context for behaviors of respect and trust. Ferinia, Yuniarsi, and Disman (2016) noted that work is completed through the social capital that is developed through relationships. Resort leaders shared that having meaningful relationships with their Millennials created opportunities to foster their growth through mentoring and improve connection through effective listening. As IP3 described, “It's the soft people skills that make a big difference to them.” Fostering such relationships requires a unique commitment from leaders. IP6 shared that the commitment included some level of vulnerability, “From the manager perspective, sometimes we have to put our guard down.” Another aspect of the commitment is the authenticity of the connection that is important to Millennials, such as the bond described by IP2, “Yeah, it's a very strong bond. It's not a teacher-student, parent-child bond. It's a

respect bond." Similarly, IP1 shared, "I think being true to yourself and true to them is super important."

From the Millennial perspective, QPS2 described the significance of meaningful relationships as, "Getting to know the employee shows a lot about a manager." Millennial respondents indicated that circumstances which involved positive personal interaction with guests and coworkers were some of the most engaging aspects of their jobs. Likewise, Millennial respondents indicated that circumstances involving negative interpersonal conflict were among the least engaging. In some cases, the lack of meaningful relationship caused hurt feelings, such as the situations described by QPS2, "When other managers or employee take their anger and frustration out on me. [Or] I try to talk to a manager about my work and they don't seem to care and push my needs aside." In another example from QPS2, "Some employees feel as if they are just another employee. You never, ever want an employee to feel that way. Being engaged and understanding helps a ton." In this instance, Millennial employees want their leaders to be engaged with them as individuals so they can be engaged in their work and the company.

Supportive leadership and empowerment of employees have appeared in multiple articles as the most conducive leadership approaches for creating EE in the workplace (Ariani, 2014; Singh, 2013; Tillott et al., 2013). Holt et al. (2012) identified transformational leadership as the best style to lead Millennials because of they appreciate honesty, integrity, vision, and meaning. While meaningful relationships may be valuable to all generations, Millennial responses indicated that the quality of

workplace relationships, including their relationship with the organization, may be weighed more heavily in their perceptions of EE.

Table 4 shows the frequency of participants who indicated the importance of the minor themes: worthwhile purpose, mentoring, and intentional listening. The combination of respondents' perceptions and the priority they placed on the minor themes lead to the creation of the major theme: meaningful relationships.

Table 4

Frequency of Minor Themes Under Meaningful Relationships Theme

Theme	Resort leaders (n = 6)	Millennial supervisors (n = 4)	Millennial nonsupervisors (n = 7)
Worthwhile purpose	6	4	6
Mentoring	5	2	1
Intentional listening	6	3	0

Meaningful relationships: Worthwhile purpose. Millennial respondents described their desire for worthwhile purpose as belonging in and contributing to an interconnected organizational culture that fostered respect, trust, and positive interactions. Young et al. (2013) posited Millennials need to feel a sense of challenge and meaning through meaningful work, changing roles or projects, corporate culture, and opportunities to make a difference. According to QPNS7, this meant, "I need to feel that my effort makes a difference." The distinction is important because Millennials described

worthwhile purpose in terms of being in a worthwhile and positive environment instead of merely doing worthwhile tasks.

Ten out of 11 Millennial respondents chose, *Feeling that your work is worthwhile and valuable,* in their top three of six engagement strategies (Table 1). When asked, half of the resort leader participants expressed the worthwhile purpose aspect as an opportunity for advancement within the company. IP2 and IP6 both described the company's willingness to allow employees to move up and transfer between departments as being worthwhile. IP1 shared that her strategy was to find out what employees ultimately wanted from the job and to support them in their goals.

However, Millennial participants expressed worthwhile purpose as the company valuing their time and tasks or roles and tasks that provided a sense of fulfillment. When asked in online Question 4 about why they chose their top three strategies, the nonsupervisory Millennial respondents offered several replies "My time is my most valuable asset therefore, I want to feel that my time is valued and is respected," said QPNS1. QPNS2 stated,

> You must really want to be in this industry so a lot of it comes intrinsically. Beyond that, keeping positivity, and making the employee feel their position makes a difference in the workplace is good. It's not just about the pay, there are a lot of different parts that makes the workplace a good one or not.

QPNS4 remarked,

> Feeling that the work I do here is worthwhile and valuable is most important to me because that is what I feel is most engaging part of my job. I take great pride in the work that I put out.

QPNS5 added,

> I think it is important to create a positive corporate culture where employees look forward to coming to work each day. If employees are satisfied with their work environment and are treated well, they will ultimately treat their guests the same.

Other comments by resort leaders appeared to reflect the worthwhile environment described by Millennials. Effective strategies included fostering a sense of belonging or inclusion such as, “We're trying to build a sense of everybody has an important role. That there's no one person or job description that is less important than another. That together we make this place strong” (IP3). In another example, worthwhile and valuable was expressed in terms of impact, such as a front-line employee’s ability to make or break a guest experience. IP4 described this tactic as, “…really explaining their purpose in their particular position and how important it is what they do every day for that guest or any interaction that they're having.”

Another interesting set of perspectives came from the Millennial supervisor respondents who identified feelings of *worthwhile* and *valuable* as a result of receiving value recognition, positive environment, and opportunities for growth. The most significant comments were the following: QPS1 said, “Being able to ask for help and share ideas creates growth and allows for personal development at work, which can make a job more fulfilling” QP3 stated, “It helps me feel as if my time, energy, and opinion are

valued as many can overlook ‘young people’ for their inexperience” According to QPS4, “Knowing that we are valuable to a company is crucial for long-term employees and being appreciated so that we put the extra effort into exceeding our guest's expectations and keep striving for better results.”

Millennial respondents described the sense of worthwhile purpose as being more than value recognition or opportunities for advancement. For Millennials, worthwhile purpose is an ongoing relationship with the company and their supervisors wherein they (a) perform valuable tasks, (b) experience a sense of fulfilment, (c) feel appreciated for their time and effort, and (d) are contributing to a bigger picture of success.

Meaningful relationships: Mentoring. Resort leaders indicated that Millennial employees sometimes needed more interaction than other generations in order to be effective. In some cases, this was described as *hand-holding*, but the overall theme that emerged was that a coaching or mentoring leadership style was effective in drawing out better performance from Millennial employees. Alrawabdeh (2014) and Richards (2013) found that employees engage in jobs that include opportunities for growth such as training, coaching, and support for developing confidence and emotional intelligence.

IP1 stated that she begins early at the interview stage to start exploring what Millennial employees ultimately what from the position and employment with the company. Instead of assuming that the employee is limited to the exact job position, IP1 asks new Millennial employees, "What do you see this job as being? What do you hope to get from this job?” After hiring new Millennial employees, more mentoring is needed for training and IP6 allows for voice in decision-making to engage new employees in the

mentoring process. “I know what I want to coach, but I encourage them to come tell me what skills they need to know to guide them to be successful in the job” (IP6).

Once a Millennial employee is on board, resort leaders described how mentoring continues beyond the orientation stage and that this is where the amount of mentoring differs from other generations. Rand (2013) found that Millennials were looking for more mentors and additional guidance in order to be successful. As IP4 commented, “Millennials take a little more hand-holding and checking back with them more often for a longer period of time.” Likewise, IP5 explained, “I think a lot of hand-holding is needed and I feel that they do ask a lot. It's really important that you empower them so you don't have to spoon-feed them.” When asked how IP5 mentors Millennials that are asking questions, she responded, “You just say, ‘How would you do it?’ That way it gets them to think so that they feel empowered [and then I say] ‘Great idea. It's exactly how I would have done it.’

In contrast, some Millennial employees are very driven and the mentoring is based on keeping up with the speed of their ambition. Both IP1 and IP4 remarked that they had motivated Millennials in their departments with IP4 describing the situation as, “You’ve got powerhouses that are like, ‘Okay, give me the next thing. Help me learn.’ so you’ve got to keep up with that as well.”

Millennial respondents felt that mentoring to support their professional growth was a key aspect of engagement. QPNS1 stated that receiving new or challenging responsibilities from supervisors helps to keep her engaged. Millennial supervisor, QPS4, shared that mentoring her own employees is an aspect that keeps her most engaged at

work. The most notable Millennial comment about mentoring was provided by QPS3, who stated:

> For one to feel completely ‘engaged’ someone has to take notice and invest in younger employees/managers. If no one pays attention, actively challenges, or motivates a young manager, you can feel like a number in the system or lost. The more the senior team helps the junior team, the more engaged they will all be.

Corwin (2015) highlighted the need to focus on mentoring as a means for transferring valuable knowledge from Baby Boomers to younger generations. Kim et al. (2015) discovered that the psychosocial benefits of mentoring, including friendship and counseling, reduced role conflict and role ambiguity among hotel employees. Although it may take more time and effort to mentor Millennial employees, both resort leaders and Millennial respondents indicated mentoring was an effective leadership strategy for keeping employees engaged.

Meaningful relationships: Intentional listening. Intentional listening was a strategy that leaders used to earn respect from Millennials, convey respect to them, and build trust in their Millennial relationships. More than just having a voice in decisions, resort leaders stated that Millennials had a distinct desire to be heard and know that conversations had meaning. Millennials wanted to know that there was an ongoing listening relationship versus the act of delivering their opinion in group meeting or a survey. For example, IP4 shared, “Really listening is the key. Listening and follow up, they will remember it.” In another example, IP1 stated, “I think that they want to know that they're being heard. That seems to be just resounding across the board.” In contrast,

IP1 shared that ineffective tactics with Millennials is to avoid intentional listening, which has resulted in employees complaints such as, "They don't listen to me. They just tell me, but they don't ever listen to what I want to say."

An example under the themes of intentional listening was expressed by IP5 as listening to display acceptance and authenticity:

> They feel like, “I've been listened to. This is how I'm viewed. I'm not shunned for how I feel.” Once you gain the respect from them, it's tremendous. Listen and just encourage them and then implementation of their ideas is huge.

IP4 expressed this same acceptance by describing the need to put aside stereotypes and bias about Millennials because each one is different and needs to be treated as an individual. IP2 shared that listening was her advice for other leaders who are trying to engage their Millennials, “It's valuable perspective to listen and to observe how they engage with those around them. It makes me feel better about where our world is going, when I know our Millennials better.”

Similarly, Millennial respondents stated that qualities of an effective leader included being approachable to talk to and remaining open to feedback. QPS2 and QPS3 both suggested that leaders maintain an open mind and willingness to listen. QPS4 described an example of ineffective leadership as, “It's not successful when the manager doesn't put themselves at the same level as the employee to get a clear understanding of how they feel.” Resort leaders stated that listening helped engage employees and Millennial employees felt that good leaders were those who listened to their younger staff.

Based on participant responses, intentional listening along with mentoring and sense of purpose, helped to build meaningful relationships by exhibiting respect and establishing trust. These findings coincide with aspects of the engagement theory (Kahn, 1990) and other research about EE. For example, Gallicano et al. (2012) found that Millennial employees felt positive about their employers when they believed their opinions were being heard and the employer wanted to maintain a good relationship. Also, open door policies, focus groups, and other forms of listening can strengthen engagement (Singh, 2013; Tillott et al., 2013). Similar to Kahn's (1990) meaningfulness condition, Ferinia, Yuniarsi and Disman (2016) determined meaningful relationships in the workplace created EE that strengthened organizational culture, enhanced job performance, and improved competitive advantage.

Applications to Professional Practice

The findings of this study support the conceptual framework based on Kahn's (1990) engagement theory and the existing literature on Millennial employees. Kahn believed that people choose to engage or disengage themselves in work roles under three psychological conditions: meaningfulness, safety, and availability. The three main themes that emerged from this study were interpersonal respect, interpersonal trust, and meaningful relationships. The interpersonal respect theme is similar to Kahn's meaningfulness condition and interpersonal trust is similar to the safety condition. However, there were also minor themes that merged and evolved because of Millennial input, such as worthwhile purpose and clear expectations.

The results from this study indicated that leaders who wish to engage their Millennial workforce should focus on building and maintaining respectful, trusting, meaningful relationships. Multiple authors also indicated that Millennials expected respect, trust, and positive relationships from their leaders (Ferinia, Yuniarsi & Disman, 2016; Nolan, 2015; Ozcelik, 2015). More specifically, Nolan (2015) indicated that the positive relationship with the direct supervisor determined the amount of all other engagement aspects.

The luxury resort industry and educational institutions with hospitality management programs may benefit from the findings, which may either inform strategies to improve corporate culture or increase hospitality graduates remaining in their field of study, respectively (Brown et al., 2015). Based on the findings, luxury resort leaders might examine existing policies regarding value recognition, feedback, and work-life balance. Beyond annual, quarterly, monthly, or occurrence-based recognition, Millennial respondents indicated that resort leaders should focus on conveying appreciation for employees in an ongoing context. Recognition is important for all employees, but Millennials are looking for more than annual or quarterly validation of their value to the supervisor, department, and company. When leaders provide positive affirmation and build interpersonal respect, the Millennial's sense of meaningful relationship with the supervisor, department, and company can lead to improved organizational performance (Nolan, 2015). As multiple Millennial respondents indicated, happier employees resulted in happier resort guests.

In addition to developing interpersonal respect, luxury resort leaders may consider ways to develop safe environments and opportunities for including Millennial voice in decision-making. According to Millennial and resort leader participants, both aspects were important for engaging and retaining Millennials. Additional findings from resort leaders indicated that Millennials could add value for departments by contributing innovative ideas and fresh perspective. Once interpersonal trust was established, a company could benefit from receiving Millennial input and, if input was acted upon, also benefit from Millennial engagement in change initiatives. Organizations able to retain engaged Millennials who contribute to a company's innovation may increase their competitive edge (Gawke et al., 2017).

While meaningful relationships are the context for building interpersonal respect and trust, they are also the context for a sense of worthwhile purpose, mentoring, and intentional listening. Intentional listening also contributes to building trust and gathering Millennial voice in decision-making. When Millennials feel a sense of worthwhile purpose and professional development through mentoring, they are likely to be committed to their employers (Nolan, 2015; Ozcelik, 2015). Engaged Millennials who promote the employer can improve company retention and recruitment, which can increase organizational performance (Ferinia, Yuniarsi, & Disman, 2016).

Implications for Social Change

Information about the strategies used to engage Millennial luxury resort employees could provide insight to resort leaders for increasing job satisfaction for Millennial employees and reducing turnover. The implications for social change include

the potential to foster happy, productive Millennial employees who contribute to the performance of their organizations. When resort leaders increase their skills to build respect, trust, and meaningful relationships, they improve workplace culture for all employees.

Organizations with engaged employees can benefit from positive outcomes such as lower levels of workplace stress and higher levels of employee wellness, task efficiency, and organizational performance (Ferinia, Yuniarsi, & Disman, 2016). When employees experience less stress and more job satisfaction, their coworkers and subordinates also benefit (Ferinia et al., 2016). Employees who are engaged and increase their capacity through skill development, also increase their confidence about resources and stability, which enhances feelings on well-being (Gawke et al., 2017). If engaged Millennials are contributing to the competitive advantage of their resort employers, they also benefit from the company's improved financial performance (Nolan, 2015). Increased revenues and/or decreased costs can result in increased employee wages, which may in turn benefit the communities where employees live.

Recommendations for Action

Luxury resort and HR leaders should review existing practices for fostering interpersonal respect, interpersonal trust, and meaningful relationships with Millennial employees. Traditional approaches for providing annual recognition, feedback, and performance reviews are less effective with Millennial employees, who are looking for more value recognition and constructive feedback on an ongoing basis. Luxury resort leaders should also be mindful about staffing appropriately to manage work-life balance.

Millennial employees, who are less interested in workplace wellness strategies, are more concerned with conditions that threaten their ability to be away from work. Because the luxury resort industry is not conducive to offering telecommuting, flexible schedules, or regular holidays for work-life balance, industry leaders might pay close attention to staffing and scheduling to avoid employee disengagement.

When the norms of an industry are a barrier to providing work-life balance, leaders should explore other creative ways to provide benefits and enticements to Millennial employees. Millennials who experienced the effects of the recession and are burdened with student loans are concerned about financial stability and being able to afford their children's education (Nolan, 2015). Providing long-term financial benefits, such as retirement and professional development, along with short-term benefits, such as paid meals or award and prize recognition, can increase engagement and retention (Nolan, 2015).

Luxury resort leaders with strong interpersonal skills should share their best practices of building interpersonal trust with other leaders. While some leaders are naturally comfortable with providing a safe environment, a voice in decision-making, and clear expectations to Millennial employees, other leaders may need to learn how to improve interpersonal skills. Similarly, the sharing of best practices should include leadership development to help establish a sense of worthwhile purpose for Millennial employees. Nolan (2015) recommended that managers avoid assuming stereotypes about Millennials and develop leadership skills that focus on developing employees as individuals instead of generalized groups.

The findings indicated that Millennials define *worthwhile purpose* differently from previous generations. While most resort leaders determined job value in terms of opportunity, Millennials determined job value in terms of purpose and significance. HR managers should notice the need for shifts in leadership requirements and seek out professional training to help resort leaders improve interpersonal communication, relationships, and mentoring skills. Those working in organizational effectiveness and executive recruitment should pay attention to the need for specialized leadership skills that include higher levels of interpersonal intelligence.

I will share the findings and recommendations of this study with the corporate offices of the case study location as an executive summary. I also plan to submit the study for publication in business-related academic journals and other publications for the luxury resort industry. In addition, Walden University will publish the findings online as a doctoral study. I am available to give presentations on this topic for luxury resort leaders, at professional conferences, and other organizations interested in improving EE of Millennials.

Recommendations for Further Research

I limited this study to a single luxury resort location in the state of Hawai`i. Research on the topic of MEE could be enhanced if future researchers include additional luxury resort locations within the same corporation. The corporation's resorts are located in several countries and a comparison of leadership strategies across multiple cultures would be informative.

Likewise, future research could be used to compare leadership strategies and differences in corporate culture across multiple luxury resort corporations. To provide contrast, data gathered from other nonluxury hotel locations would also contribute to the research of Millennial EE in the hospitality industry.

Reflections

I learned as much from the doctoral study process as I did from the research study. The iterative process of reading, writing, refining, revising, and reflecting has been profound. With practice, I was able to use the revisions as new knowledge in my approach to research and critical thinking.

I did not struggle with significant personal bias, but I was surprised to learn that some leaders had such intuitive knowledge about how to connect with their Millennial employees. I did not expect there to be so much clarity and empathy in their responses. I was also fascinated to discover that Millennial employees were defining engagement aspects, such as work-life balance, in different terms from their non-Millennial supervisors. I anticipated that the different generations would prioritize the aspects differently, but did not realize that the generations perceived the meaning of the concept in different ways.

Learning and practicing the components of the doctoral study has already contributed value to my existing work. I use the interview protocol process, qualitative analysis, and triangulation to inform my use of focus groups with public school teachers and other education stakeholders. Even at an informal level, the quality of my work in these areas has improved. Since completing the data collection process, I am better at

development of problem statements, research questions, and interview questions for new projects. Using a research study approach for problems of practice in my workplace has helped to expand and refine my work in ways that are benefitting my community.

Conclusion

The two most significant findings that emerged from this study were the importance of respectful, trusting, meaningful relationships between Millennials and their supervisors and the different in definition of engagement aspects between Millennials and other generations. For example, the non-Millennial leaders' understanding of work-life balance as a concept differs from that of Millennial employee respondents. In addition, Millennials determine other engagement aspects such as worthwhile purpose, value recognition, and safe environments in non-traditional ways. To fully engage Millennial employees and improve organizational performance, luxury resort leaders should focus on professional development that enhances intentional communication, social-emotional intelligence, and interpersonal relationship-building skills. The Millennial workforce is requesting a new kind of corporate culture based on respect, trust, and meaningful relationships, one that could ultimately benefit us all.

References

Alrawabdeh, W. (2014). How employees' loyalty programs impact organizational performance within Jordanian banks. *International Business Research, 7*(9), 119-128. doi:10.5539/ibr.v7n9p119

Andrew, O. C., & Sofian, S. (2012). Individual factors and work outcomes of employee engagement. *Procedia—Social and Behavioral Sciences, 40,* 498-508. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.03.222

Ariani, D. W. (2014). Relationship leadership, employee engagement, and organizational citizenship behavior. *International Journal of Business and Social Research, 4*(8), 74-90. Retrieved from http://thejournalofbusiness.org

Bakker, A. B., Albrecht, S. L., & Leiter, M. P. (2011). Key questions regarding work engagement. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 20,* 4-28. doi:10.1080/1359432X.2010.485352

Bal, P. M., & De Lange, A. H. (2014). From flexibility human resource management to employee engagement and perceived job performance across the lifespan: A multisample study. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*. *88,* 126-154. doi:10.1111/joop.12082

Barkay, T. (2012). Employee volunteering: Soul, body and CSR. *Social Responsibility Journal, 8*(1), 48-62. doi:10.1108/17471111211196566

Bekhet, A. K., & Zauszniewski, J. A. (2012). Methodological triangulation: An approach to understanding data. *Nurse Researcher, 20*(2), 40-43. doi:10.7748/nr2012.11.20.2.40.c9442

Brown, E. A., Thomas, N. J., & Bosselman, R. H. (2015). Are they leaving or staying: A qualitative analysis of turnover issues for Generation Y hospitality employees with a hospitality education. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 46*, 130-137. doi:10.1016/j.ijhm.2015.01.011

Bucic, T., Harris, J., & Arli, D. (2012). Ethical consumers among the millennials: A cross-national study. *Journal of Business Ethics, 110*, 113-131. doi:10.1007/s10551-011-1151-z

Chalofsky, N., & Cavallaro, L. (2013). A good living versus a good life: Meaning, purpose, and HRD. *Advances in Developing Human Resources, 15*, 331-340. doi:10.1177/1523422313498560

Chaudhuri, S., & Ghosh, R. (2012). Reverse mentoring a social exchange tool for keeping the boomers engaged and millennials committed. *Human Resource Development Review, 11*, 55-76. doi:10.1177/1534484311417562

Chi, C. G., Maier, T. A., & Gursoy, D. (2013). Employees' perceptions of younger and older managers by generation and job category. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 34*, 42-50. doi:10.1016/j.ijhm.2013.01.009

Corwin, R. (2015). *Strategies to retain tacit knowledge from baby boomers* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Full Text database. (UMI No. 3689125).

Cotteleer, M. J., & Wan, X. (2016). Does the starting point matter? The literature-driven and the phenomenon-driven approaches of using corporate archival data in

academic research. *Journal of Business Logistics, 37*, 26-33. doi:10.1111/jbl.12114

Cronin, C. (2014). Using case study research as a rigorous form of inquiry. *Nurse Researcher, 21*(5), 19-27. doi:10.7748/nr.21.5.19.e1240

Crowe, S., Cresswell, K., Robertson, A., Huby, G., Avery, A., & Sheikh, A. (2011). The case study approach. *BMC Medical Research Methodology, 11*, 100-108. doi:10.1186/1471-2288-11-100

Cycyota, C. S., Ferrante, C. J., & Schroeder, J. M. (2016). Corporate social responsibility and employee volunteerism: What do the best companies do? *Business Horizons, 59*, 321-329. doi:10.1016/j.bushor.2016.01.004

de Bruin, G. P., & Henn, C. M. (2013). Dimensionality of the 9-item Utrecht work engagement scale (UWES–9). *Psychological Reports, 112*, 788-799. doi:10.2466/01.03.PR0.112.3.788-799

Dimitrov, D. (2012). Sources of meaningfulness in the workplace: A study in the US hospitality sector. *European Journal of Training and Development, 36*, 351-371. doi:10.1108/03090591211204788

Ellis, T. J., & Levy, Y. (2009). Towards a guide for novice researchers on research methodology: Review and proposed methods. *Issues in Informing Science and Information Technology, 6*, 323-337. Retrieved from www.informingscience.org/

Ehrhart, K. H., Mayer, D. M., & Ziegert, J. C. (2012). Web-based recruitment in the millennial generation: Work–life balance, website usability, and organizational

attraction. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 21*, 850-874. doi:10.1080/1359432X.2011.598652

Eversole, B. A., Venneberg, D. L., & Crowder, C. L. (2012). Creating a flexible organizational culture to attract and retain talented workers across generations. *Advances in Developing Human Resources, 14*, 607–625. doi:10.1177/1523422312455612

Farley-Ripple, E. N. (2012). Research use in school district central office decision making: A case study. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 40*, 786-806. doi:10.1177/1741143212456912

Ferinia, R., Yuniarsi, T., & Disman, H. (2016). Relationship between selected factors of motivation, employee engagement and employee performance among nurses at adventist hospital. *International Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences, 5*(3), 177. doi:10.14419/ijbas.v5i3.5948

Ferri-Reed, J. (2014). Millennializing the workplace. *Journal for Quality & Participation, 37*, 13-14. Retrieved from http://asq.org/pub/jqp/

Festing, M., & Schäfer, L. (2014). Generational challenges to talent management: A framework for talent retention based on the psychological-contract perspective. *Journal of World Business, 49*, 262-271. doi:10.1016/j.jwb.2013.11.010

Finnoff, J. T. (2013). Comments from Gen X. *PM&R, 5*, 604-605. doi:10.1016/j.pmrj.2013.04.012

Fusch, P. I., & Ness, L. R. (2015). Are we there yet? Data saturation in qualitative research. *Qualitative Report, 20*(9), 1408-1416. Retrieved from http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR20/9/fusch1.pdf

Gallicano, T., Curtin, P., & Matthews, K. (2012). I love what I do, but… A relationship management survey of millennial generation public relations agency employees. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 24*, 222-242. doi:10.1080/1062726X.2012.671986

Gawke, J. C., Gorgievski, M. J., & Bakker, A. B. (2017). Employee intrapreneurship and work engagement: A latent change score approach. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 100*, 88-100. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2017.03.002

Gilbert, T. F. (2007). *Human competence: Engineering worthy performance*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.

Grant, A. M. (2012). Giving time, time after time: Work design and sustained employee participation in corporate volunteering. *Academy of Management Review, 37*, 589-615. doi:10.5465/amr.2010.0280

Graybill, J. O. (2014). Millennials among the professional workforce in academic libraries: Their perspective on leadership. *Journal of Academic Librarianship, 40*, 10-15. doi:10.1016/j.acalib.2013.09.006

Greene, M. J. (2014). On the inside looking in: Methodological insights and challenges in conducting qualitative insider research. *Qualitative Report, 19*(29), 1-13. Retrieved from http://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr

Gursoy, D., Chi, C. G. Q., & Karadag, E. (2013). Generational differences in work values and attitudes among frontline and service contact employees. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 32,* 40-48. doi:10.1016/j.ijhm.2012.04.002

Haeger, D. L., & Lingham, T. (2014). A trend toward work–life fusion: A multigenerational shift in technology use at work. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 89,* 316-325. doi:10.1016/j.techfore.2014.08.009

Hansen, J., & Leuty, M. (2012).Work values across generations. *Journal of Career Assessment, 20,* 1-19. doi:10.1177/1069072711417163

Hanson, J. L., Balmer, D. F., & Giardino, A. P. (2011). Education: Qualitative research methods for medical educators. *Academic Pediatrics, 11,* 375-386. doi:10.1016/j.acap.2011.05.001

Harootian, D. P., & O'Reilly, E. N. (2015). Supporting learners and advisors: An advising interview protocol for intensive language programs. *Studies in Self-Access Learning Journal, 6,* 86-96. Retrieved from http://sisaljournal.org/archives/mar15/harootian_oreilly/

Harvey, L. (2015). Beyond member checking: A dialogic approach to the research interview. *International Journal of Research & Method in Education, 38,* 23-38. doi:10.1080/1743727X.2014.914487

Hillman, D. R. (2013). Applying Gilbert's teleonomics to engineer worthy performance in Generation Y employees. *Performance Improvement, 52*(10), 13-21. doi:10.1002/pfi.21377

Holt, S., Marques, J., & Way, D. (2012). Bracing for the Millennial workforce: Looking for ways to inspire Generation Y. *Journal of Leadership, Accountability & Ethics, 9*(6), 81-93. Retrieved from http://www.na-businesspress.com/jlaeopen.html

Houghton, C., Casey, D., Shaw, D., & Murphy, K. (2013). Rigour in qualitative case-study research. *Nurse Researcher, 20*(4), 12-17. doi:10.7748/nr2013.03.20.4.12.e326

Jacob, S. A., & Furgerson, S. P. (2012). Writing interview protocols and conducting interviews: tips for students new to the field of qualitative research. *Qualitative Report, 17*(42), 1-10. Retrieved from http://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol17/iss42/3

Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal, 33*, 692-724. doi:10.2307/256287

Kim, S. S., Im, J., & Hwang, J. (2015). The effects of mentoring on role stress, job attitude, and turnover intention in the hotel industry. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 48*, 68-82. doi:10.1016/j.ijhm.2015.04.006

Kim, C., Kim, M. K., Lee, C., Spector, J. M., & DeMeester, K. (2013). Teacher beliefs and technology integration. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 29*, 76-85. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2012.08.005

LaBan, M. M. (2013). A late Y2K phenomenon: Responding to the learning preferences of generation Y—bridging the digital divide by improving generational dialogue. *PM&R, 5*, 596-601. doi:10.1016/j.pmrj.2013.04.010

Largent, E. A. (2016). Recently proposed changes to legal and ethical guidelines governing human subjects research. *Journal of Law and the Biosciences,* Advance online publication, 1-11. doi:10.1093/jlb/lsw001

Lee, Y. K., Choi, J., Moon, B. Y., & Babin, B. J. (2014). Codes of ethics, corporate philanthropy, and employee responses. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 39*, 97-106. doi:10.1016/j.ijhm.2014.02.005

Lin, C. P., Tsai, Y. H., Joe, S. W., & Chiu, C. K. (2012). Modeling the relationship among perceived corporate citizenship, firms' attractiveness, and career success expectation. *Journal of Business Ethics, 105*, 83-93. doi:10.1007/s10551-011-0949-z

Lu, A. C. C., & Gursoy, D. (2013). Impact of job burnout on satisfaction and turnover intention: Do generational differences matter? *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*. Advance online publication, July 15, 2013. doi:10.1177/1096348013495696

Markos, S., & Sridevi, M. S. (2010). Employee engagement: The key to improving performance. *International Journal of Business & Management, 5*, 89-96. doi:10.5539/ijbm.v5n12p89

Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (2016). *Designing qualitative research* (6th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Maxwell, G. A., & Broadbridge, A. (2014). Generation Y graduates and career transition: Perspectives by gender. *European Management Journal, 32*, 547-553. doi:10.1016/j.emj.2013.12.002

McClerklin, A. (2013). *Making sense of corporate social responsibility from a nonprofit-centric perspective.* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Full Text database. (UMI No. 1318831995)

Mirvis, P. (2012). Employee engagement and CSR: Transactional, relational, and developmental approaches. *California Management Review, 54*(4), 93-117. doi:10.1525/cmr.2012.54.4.93

Mohamed, R. K. M. H., Nor, C. S. M., Hasan, N. A., Olaganthan, V., & Gunasekaran, Y. (2013). The impact of an organization's culture towards employees' performance: A study on the frontline hotel employees. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 3*(8), 1-28. doi:10.6007/IJARBSS/v3-i8/107

Moon, T. M. (2014). Mentoring the next generation for innovation in today's organization. *Journal of Strategic Leadership, 5*, 23-35. Retrieved from http://www.regent.edu/acad/global/publications/jsl/home.htm

Munn, Z., Porritt, K., Lockwood, C., Aromataris, E., & Pearson, A. (2014). Establishing confidence in the output of qualitative research synthesis: The ConQual approach. *BMC Medical Research Methodology, 14*, 108-121. doi:10.1186/1471-2288-14-108

Nasomboon, B. (2014). The relationship among leadership commitment, organizational performance, and employee engagement. *International Business Research, 7*(9), 77-90. doi:10.5539/ibr.v7n9p77

National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research. (1978). The Belmont report: Ethical principles and guidelines for the protection of human subjects of research. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

Nolan, L. S. (2015). The roar of Millennials: Retaining top talent in the workplace. *Journal of Leadership, Accountability, and Ethics, 12*(5), 69-75. Retrieved from http://www.na-businesspress.com/jlaeopen.html

O'Reilly, M., & Parker, N. (2012). 'Unsatisfactory saturation': A critical exploration of the notion of saturated sample sizes in qualitative research. *Qualitative Research, 13*, 190-197. doi:10.1177/1468794112446106.

Ozcelik, G. (2015). Engagement and retention of the Millennial generation in the workplace through internal branding. *International Journal of Business and Management, 10*, 99-107. doi:10.5539/ijbm.v10n3p99

Palinkas, L. A., Horwitz, S. M., Green, C. A., Wisdom, J. P., Duan, N., & Hoagwood, K. (2015). Purposeful sampling for qualitative data collection and analysis in mixed method implementation research. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research, 42*, 533-544. doi:10.1007/s10488-013-0528-y

Park, J., & Gursoy, D. (2012). Generation effects on work engagement among U.S. hotel employees. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 31*, 1195-1202. doi:10.1016/j.ijhm.2012.02.007

Patterson, C. (2014). *Determining methods for leaders to manage a multigenerational workforce*. (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Full Text database. (UMI No. 3617456)

Peloza, J., Loock, M., Cerruti, J., & Muyot, M. (2012). Sustainability: How stakeholder perceptions differ from corporate reality. *California Management Review, 55*(1), 74-95. doi:10.1525/cmr.2012.55.1.74

Petty, N. J., Thomson, O. P., & Stew, G. (2012). Ready for a paradigm shift? Part 2: Introducing qualitative research methodologies and methods. *Manual Therapy, 17,* 378-384. doi:10.1016/j.math.2012.03.004

Radley, A., & Chamberlain, K. (2012). The study of the case: Conceptualising case study research. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 22,* 390–399. doi:10.1002/casp.1106

Rai, S. (2012). Engaging young employees (Gen Y) in a social media dominated world–Review and retrospection. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 37,* 257-266. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.03.292

Rand, S. (2013). A Generation Yer's perspective on Generation Y learning. *PM&R, 5,* 602-603. doi:10.1016/j.pmrj.2013.04.013

Richards, W. K., Jr. (2013). *Exploring increased productivity through employee engagement*. (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Full Text database. (UMI No. 3602356)

Robinson, O. C. (2014). Sampling in interview-based qualitative research: A theoretical and practical guide. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 11*, 25-41. doi:10.1080/14780887.2013.801543

Rogers, R. H. (2014). Using ethnography to understand meaning: A review of Sam Ladner's practical ethnography: A guide to doing ethnography in the private sector. *Qualitative Report, 19*(47), 1-6. Retrieved from http://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr

Rosa, N. B., & Hastings, S. O. (2016). "Texting in their pockets": Millennials and rule violations in the hospitality industry. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management, 29*, 33-40. doi:10.1016/j.jhtm.2016.06.002

Ruys, J. (2013). *Leadership behaviors and workplace factors millennial workers find important for job satisfaction and retention* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Full Text database. (UMI No. 3573678)

Saffer, C. (2012). *Younger workers, older leaders: A qualitative study exploring generational perceptions of leadership in the nursing workforce.* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Full Text database. (UMI No. 3518201)

Saldaña, J. (2015). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Schaufeli, W. & Salanova, M. (2011). Work engagement: On how to better catch a slippery concept. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 20*, 39-46. doi:10.1080/1359432X.2010.515981

Schullery, N. M. (2013). Workplace engagement and generational differences in values. *Business Communication Quarterly, 76*, 252-265. doi:10.1177/1080569913476543

Scott, J. L. (2014). *Employee engagement in an animal research facility.* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Full Text database. (UMI No. 3621913)

Shantz, A., Alfes, K., Truss, C., & Soane, E. (2013). The role of employee engagement in the relationship between job design and task performance, citizenship and deviant behaviours. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 24*, 2608-2627. doi:10.1080/09585192.2012.744334

Shuck, B., Twyford, D., Reio, T. G., & Shuck, A. (2014). Human resource development practices and employee engagement: Examining the connection with employee turnover intentions. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 25*, 239-270. doi:10.1002/hrdq.21190

Singh, A. (2013). A study of role of McKinsey's 7S framework in achieving organizational excellence. *Organization Development Journal, 31*(3), 39-50. Retrieved from http://www.isodc.org/

Smith, K., & Brower, T. R. (2012). Longitudinal study of green marketing strategies that influence millennials. *Journal of Strategic Marketing, 20*, 535-551. doi:10.1080/0965254X.2012.711345

Soane, E., Truss, C., Alfes, K., Shantz, A., Rees, C., & Gatenby, M. (2012). Development and application of a new measure of employee engagement: The ISA engagement

scale. *Human Resource Development International, 15*, 529-547. doi:10.1080/13678868.2012.726542

Srinivasan, V. (2012). Multi generations in the workforce: Building collaboration. *IIMB Management Review, 24*(1), 48-66. doi:10.1016/j.iimb.2012.01.004

Suri, H. (2011). Purposeful sampling in qualitative research synthesis. *Qualitative Research Journal, 11*, 63-75. doi:10.3316/QRJ1102063

Thomas, S. J. (2015). *Exploring strategies for retaining information technology professionals: A case study* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Full Text database. (UMI No. 3681815)

Tillott, S., Walsh, K., & Moxham, L. (2013). Encouraging engagement at work to improve retention: Sarah Tillott and colleagues explore how a social interaction tool can help managers recruit and retain staff, and boost patient care. *Nursing Management, 19*(10), 27-31. doi:10.7748/nm2013.03.19.10.27.e697

Tirgari, V. (2012). Information technology policies and procedures against unstructured data: A phenomenological study of information technology professionals. *Academy of Information & Management Sciences Journal, 15*, 87-106. Retrieved from http://www.alliedacademies.org/aimsj_public.php

Truss, C., Shantz, A., Soane, E., Alfes, K., & Delbridge, R. (2013). Employee engagement, organisational performance and individual well-being: Exploring the evidence, developing the theory. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 24*, 2657-2669. doi:10.1080/09585192.2013.798921

Twenge, J. M., Campbell, S. M., & Freeman, E. C. (2012). Generational differences in young adults' life goals, concern for others, and civic orientation, 1966–2009. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 102,* 1045–1062. doi:10.1037/a0027408

Unluer, S. (2012). Being an insider researcher while conducting case study research. *Qualitative Report, 17*(29), 1-14. Retrieved from http://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr

Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and motivation*. New York, NY: Wiley.

Walker, J. L. (2012). Research column. The use of saturation in qualitative research. *Canadian Journal of Cardiovascular Nursing, 22*(2), 37-41. Retrieved from http://pappin.com/journals/cjcn.php

Wilson, V. (2014). Research methods: triangulation. *Evidence Based Library and Information Practice, 9*(1), 74-75. Retrieved from http://ejournals.library.ualberta.ca/index.php/EBLIP/index

Yadav, M. P., & Aspal, J. (2014). Importance of job satisfaction and talent management. *International Journal of Research in IT and Management, 4*(7), 55-65. Retrieved from http://www.euroasiapub.org/aboutjournal.php?title=IJRIM

Yim, F., & Fock, H. (2013). Social responsibility climate as a double-edged sword: How employee-perceived social responsibility climate shapes the meaning of their voluntary work? *Journal of Business Ethics, 114*, 665-674. doi:10.1007/s10551-013-1712-4

Yin, R. (2014). *Case study research design and methods* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Young, S. J., Sturts, J. R., Ross, C. M., & Kim, K. T. (2013). Generational differences and job satisfaction in leisure services. *Managing Leisure, 18,* 152-170. doi:10.1080/13606719.2013.752213

Appendix A: Interview Protocol

RQ1: What strategies do luxury resort leaders in Hawai`i use to improve Millennial employee engagement?	
SQ1: How do the Millennial employees perceive the engagement strategies attempted by their leaders?	
Steps	**Script**
Introduce the purpose of the study, confidentiality, and the end time	The purpose of this study is to explore how leaders attempt to engage Millennial employees and how Millennials perceive the employee engagement attempts. This study could benefit your organization by indicating which strategies are effective. All your information will be kept confidential and I encourage you to avoid using any identifying names. If you accidentally do, I will manually remove them to protect your confidentiality. In the final study, I will refer to any direct quotes with a randomized participant number, such as, IP2. Only I will know the actual participants. The interview will last between 30-45 minutes. Is that length still okay with your schedule?
Describe reason for recording interview and transcript review	I am asking for your consent to record the interview. This is important for three reasons. First, because I value your time and do not wish to make you wait while I write each word. Second, because transcribing the actual words helps to avoid any accidental bias that might occur if I was interpreting your responses with short notes. Third, because it allows me to truly listen to you. After the interview recording is transcribed, I will send it to you for your review. After the recording has been transcribed and reviewed, I will destroy the audio file. If all that makes sense, are you okay with my recording the interview?
Complete informed consent (make sure to carry extra forms	The Informed Consent Form was sent earlier and I have additional copies with me. Did you have any questions that you would like me to answer? (Answer questions as needed) As a reminder, you can withdraw your participation at any time during the interview and up until the completion of the study. If everything looks okay to you, please sign both copies so I can leave one for you for your reference.

Begin recording process	I'm going to start the recording and test it with the date and time. The recording will be kept safe and confidential. As a reminder, you can stop the recording at any time if you wish to end the interview or you run out of time. Are you okay to begin?
	1. Why are Millennial employees important to your organization?
	2. What strategies do you use to help your Millennial employees have autonomy and a voice in decisions?
	3. What strategies do you use to provide your Millennial employees with clear expectations, feedback, and recognition?
	4. What strategies do you use to help your Millennial employees to feel that their employment is worthwhile and valuable?
	5 What strategies do you use to help your Millennial employees to feel that they are safe to ask for help or share new ideas?
	6. In what ways do you try to provide work-life balance for your Millennial employees?
	7. What strategies have you found to be successful and which ones have been unsuccessful?
	8. What other comments do you have about strategies for Millennial employee engagement?
Wrap up interview thanking participant	Thank you so much for the time and valuable insight you have given today. I truly appreciate it.
Arrange for Transcript Review Transcribe interview and send full text back to participant to review for any changes/additions.	The recording will be transcribed by a professional service on the mainland, who has signed a professional confidentiality agreement. Once it is returned, I will e-mail it to you for review, which could require 15 minutes of your time. If you would like to make any corrections or if you wish to withdraw from the study at that time, please let me know within one week. Knowing that you are very busy, if I do not hear from you within seven days, I will accept that as your consent that the transcription is fine and you agree to remain in the study. If that sounds fine to you, please let me know which e-mail address you would like me to use. Again, thank you for your contribution to this research and you will hear from me soon. Aloha.

Appendix B: Millennial Online Questionnaire Protocol

Online Questionnaire Questions:

1. What is your age range?
   a. 18-22 years old
   b. 23-27 years old
   c. 28-32 years old
   d. 33-36 years old
2. How long have you been with the company?
   a. Less than 1 Year
   b. 1-4 Years
   c. 5-9 Years
   d. 10+ Years
3. Which describes your position with the company?
   a. Hourly or Salary Employee, who does not supervise any other employees
   b. Hourly or Salary employee, who does supervise other employees, including other Millennials
4. To the best of your knowledge, is your supervisor also a Millennial (between 18-36 years old)?

What is *employee engagement*?

Employee engagement is a term used to describe the concept of an employee's sustained personal investment in his or her work role. Engaged employees are more than just satisfied with their work. They are dedicated and energetic, often contributing increased productivity to their jobs and their organizations. Research indicates that engaged employees are happier, more effective and creative, and highly invested in their companies at a level that increases financial performance and competitive edge. Due to these reasons, employers worldwide are striving to understand how to engage employees.

1. Which two (2) aspects of your job are the *most* engaging for you?
2. Which two (2) aspects of your job are the *least* engaging for you?
3. The following engagement strategies are important to Millennials according to existing literature about Millennial employees. Which three are the most important to you?
   a. Autonomy
   b. Voice in decision-making
   c. Clear expectations, feedback, and recognition
   d. Feeling that your work is worthwhile and valuable
   e. Safe culture to ask for help or share new ideas
   f. Work-life balance
4. Why are these three strategies important to you?
5. In what ways does your supervisor try to maintain and/or improve employee engagement in your department?

6. In your opinion, which efforts are successful and which ones are not?
7. What other comments would you like to add on the topic of engaging Millennial employees in the luxury resort industry?

Appendix C: E-mail Invitations for Interviews

Interview E-mail Invitation

Do you sometimes find it challenging to engage your Millennial employees?
Have you had any success or learned any lessons that you could share?

Aloha,

My name is Kei-Lin Cerf and I am a graduate student studying strategies that non-Millennial, luxury resort leaders use to improve employee engagement among Millennials.

I was given your name and e-mail address as an example of a leader in the organization who has Millennial employees in their department. Attached is an Informed Consent document, which describes the purpose of the study and the potential benefit to you and the organization.

I hope you are able to participate in this research study and ask if you could spare 45 minutes of your time to discuss this topic. The interview will be recorded and all of your responses will be kept confidential. The Informed Consent document is included so that you are aware of your rights as a volunteer participant, including your right to withdraw from the study.

I am happy to meet during work hours, early before your workday begins or after 5pm. I can also meet on weekends if you would rather not talk at your workplace. Please let me know if any of the following days would work for you?

November 19, 20, 21, 23 (morning), and 28
December 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6

Mahalo nui and I look forward to talking with you soon, Kei-Lin Cerf

Appendix D: E-mail Invitations for Questionnaire

Anonymous Online Questionnaire E-mail Invitation

Do you feel fully engaged as an employee in your organization?
Could you share a few ideas of what would make your work more engaging for you?

Aloha,

My name is Kei-Lin Cerf and I am a graduate student studying strategies that non-Millennial, luxury resort leaders use to improve employee engagement among Millennials and how Millennial employees perceive engagement in their workplace.

You are receiving this invitation because you were identified as a Millennial employee of the organization who was born between 1980 and 1998. I hope you are able to participate in this research study and ask if you could spare 15 minutes of your time to answer questions about this topic through an anonymous online questionnaire.

You can quickly access the online questionnaire here:
http://www.surveyshare.com/t/Millennial-Employee-Engagement-Questionnaire

An Informed Consent document will appear so that you can be aware of your rights as a volunteer participant, including your right to refuse to participate or skip any questions that you do not want to answer.

A copy of the informed consent is attached for your convenience and files. After reviewing the same consent form online, you will have the choice to participate or decline. There are no negative consequences if you decline, but I hope that you will provide your perspective on this important topic.

Thank you, Kei-Lin Cerf

Appendix E: Letter of Cooperation from a Research Partner

August 19, 2016

Dear Kei-Lin Cerf,

I give permission for you to conduct the study entitled, *Strategies to Improve Millennial Employee Engagement in the Luxury Resort Industry*, within the _____. Individuals' participation will be voluntary and at their own discretion. As part of this study, I authorize you to engage in the following activities:

- Obtain the e-mail addresses of the department heads and Millennial employees who are eligible as participants
- Contact members of my organization to ask for participation in interviews or online questionnaires
- Visit the property for the purpose of interviews or hosting online questionnaire sessions
- Request copies of company documents that indicate strategies to maintain and/or improve employee engagement (i.e. employee benefits, wellness programs, work-life balance initiatives, culture-building activities, etc.)

We understand that our organization's responsibilities include communication with employees to inform them of the study and its purpose, copies of documents, and a room to collect participant responses, if needed. We understand that the research study will not disrupt normal business activity and therefore, does not require our supervision of the research activities. We reserve the right to withdraw from the study at any time if our circumstances change.

I confirm that I am authorized to approve research in this setting and that this plan complies with the organization's policies.

I understand that the data collected will remain entirely confidential and may not be provided to anyone outside of the student's supervising faculty/staff without permission from the Walden University IRB.

Sincerely,

General Manager

Appendix F: Rev Client Nondisclosure Agreement

CLIENT NON-DISCLOSURE AGREEMENT

This CLIENT NON-DISCLOSURE AGREEMENT, effective as of the date last set forth below (this "Agreement"), between the undersigned actual or potential client ("Client") and **Rev.com, Inc.** ("Rev.com") is made to confirm the understanding and agreement of the parties hereto with respect to certain proprietary information being provided to Rev.com for the purpose of performing translation, transcription, video captions and other document related services (the "Rev.com Services"). In consideration for the mutual agreements contained herein and the other provisions of this Agreement, the parties hereto agree as follows:

1. Scope of Confidential Information

1.1. "Confidential Information" means, subject to the exceptions set forth in Section 1.2 hereof, any documents or other text supplied by Client to Rev.com for the purpose of performing the Rev.com Services.

1.2. Confidential Information does not include information that: (i) was available to Rev.com prior to disclosure of such information by Client and free of any confidentiality obligation in favor of Client known to Rev.com at the time of disclosure; (ii) is made available to Rev.com from a third party not known by Rev.com at the time of such availability to be subject to a confidentiality obligation in favor of Client; (iii) is made available to third parties by Client without restriction on the disclosure of such information; (iv) is or becomes available to the public other than as a result of disclosure by Rev.com prohibited by this Agreement; or (v) is developed independently by Rev.com or Rev.com's directors, officers, members, partners, employees, consultants, contractors, agents, representatives or affiliated entities (collectively, "Associated Persons").

2. Use and Disclosure of Confidential Information

2.1. Rev.com will keep secret and will not disclose to anyone any of the Confidential Information, other than furnishing the Confidential Information to Associated Persons; provided that such Associated Persons are bound by agreements respecting confidential information. Rev.com will not use any of the Confidential Information for any purpose other than performing the Rev.com Services on Client's behalf. Rev.com will use reasonable care and adequate measures to protect the security of the Confidential Information and to attempt to prevent any Confidential Information from being disclosed or otherwise made available to unauthorized persons or used in violation of the foregoing.

2.2. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary herein, Rev.com is free to make, and this Agreement does not restrict, disclosure of any Confidential Information in a judicial, legislative or administrative investigation or proceeding or to a government or other regulatory agency; provided that, if permitted by law, Rev.com provides to Client prior notice of the intended disclosure and permits Client to intervene therein to protect its interests in the Confidential Information, and cooperate and assist Client in seeking to obtain such protection.

3. Certain Rights and Limitations

3.1. All Confidential Information will remain the property of Client.

3.2. This Agreement imposes no obligations on either party to purchase, sell, license, transfer or otherwise transact in any products, services or technology.

4. Termination

4.1. Upon Client's written request, Rev.com agrees to use good faith efforts to return promptly to Client any Confidential Information that is in writing and in the possession of Rev.com and to certify the return or destruction of all Confidential Information; provided that Rev.com may retain a summary description of Confidential Information for archival purposes.

4.2. The rights and obligations of the parties hereto contained in Sections 2 (Use and Disclosure of Confidential Information) (subject to Section 2.1), 3 (Certain Rights and Limitations), 4 (Termination), and 5 (Miscellaneous) will survive the return of any tangible embodiments of Confidential Information and any termination of this Agreement.

5. Miscellaneous

5.1. Client and Rev.com are independent contractors and will so represent themselves in all regards. Nothing in this Agreement will be construed to make either party the agent or legal representative of the other or to make the parties partners or joint venturers, and neither party may bind the other in any way. This Agreement will be governed by and construed in accordance with the laws of the State of California governing such agreements, without regard to conflicts-of-law principles. The sole and exclusive jurisdiction and venue for any litigation arising out of this Agreement shall be an appropriate federal or state court located in the State of California, and the parties agree not to raise, and waive, any objections or defenses based upon venue or forum non conveniens. This Agreement (together with any

agreement for the Rev.com Services) contains the complete and exclusive agreement of the parties with respect to the subject matter hereof and supersedes all prior agreements and understandings with respect thereto, whether written or oral, express or implied. If any provision of this Agreement is held invalid, illegal or unenforceable by a court of competent jurisdiction, such will not affect any other provision of this Agreement, which will remain in full force and effect. No amendment or alteration of the terms of this Agreement will be effective unless made in writing and executed by both parties hereto. A failure or delay in exercising any right in respect to this Agreement will not be presumed to operate as a waiver, and a single or partial exercise of any right will not be presumed to preclude any subsequent or further exercise of that right or the exercise of any other right. Any modification or waiver of any provision of this Agreement will not be effective unless made in writing. Any such waiver will be effective only in the specific instance and for the purpose given.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties have caused this Agreement to be executed below by their duly authorized signatories.

CLIENT

Print Name: Kei-Lin Cerf

By: Kei-Lin Cerf

Name: Kei-Lin Cerf
Title: Student
Date: April 17, 2016

Address for notices to Client:

REV.COM, INC.

By: (signature removed)

Name: (name removed)
Title: Account Manager
Date: March 15, 2016

Address for notices to Rev.com, Inc.:

251 Kearny St. Suite 800
San Francisco, CA 94108