

Impact Of Interpersonal Needs On Performance And Creativity Of Millennial Managers In National Capital Region, India

Dr. Anju Shukla¹, Prof. Brijesh Singh², Prof. Anu Singh Lather³, Dr. Shilpa Jain⁴

¹Assistant Professor, Jagannath International Management School, Kalkaji, New Delhi

²Research scholar from VTU, Belagavi & Associate Professor, Department of MBA, SJB Institute of Technology, Bangalore

³Vice Chancellor, Ambedkar University, Delh

⁴Assistant Professor, University School of Management Studies (UMS), Guru Gobind Singh Indraprastha University (GGSIU), Delhi

ABSTRACT

The research is undertaken to explore the effect of Interpersonal Needs on Performance and Creativity of Millennial Managers. Self-administered questionnaires were used to collect the data from respondents across the National Capital Region, India. The sectors covered for the study were Service and manufacturing. The research design for the study is quantitative, and systematic stratified sampling is used on a sample of 240 millennial. The results showed that overall the millennial managers who were high on their interpersonal skills (total wanted need and total inclusion need) showed a high score on performance. But, having a closer look at the results showed that managers having a high score at Expressed Inclusion, Wanted Control, Wanted Inclusion showed a low performance in contrast to managers who had a high score on Expressed Control and were high on the performance dimension. Also, the impact of interpersonal skills on Creativity of the millennial were examined. The results were mixed, the managers scoring high on Expressed Inclusion, Expressed Control, Total Affection and total need were high on the creativity dimension but the managers scoring high on wanted Affection, total expressed needs and total wanted needs had a low score on Creativity. The research sample consists of millennials from Delhi NCR only. The implications could be more generalized if the data would have been more inclusive if the data into consideration would have been collected from pan India. This research has important managerial implications, as the senior managers can know the specific needs of the millennials and help them meet those needs so as to increase the performance and creativity of this particular workforce. Interpersonal skills/people skills and creativity are few of the sought after skills in the largest working force which constitutes of the millennial. So, the interpersonal skills in relation to performance and creativity needs to be studied and understood so as to manage them in such a manner that the organization is able to achieve its goals through its employees in the most effective and efficient manner. The paper adds to management research by investigating the relationship between interpersonal skills, performance and creativity of millennials.

Keywords

Interpersonal Skills, Creativity, Performance, Sectors

Article Received: 10 August 2020, Revised: 25 October 2020, Accepted: 18 November 2020

Introduction

A distinctive mark for the 21st century has been the entry and rise of Millennials or Gen Y at the workplace and since then they have been receiving increasingly scholarly attention (Harris-Boundy & Flatt, 2010). Different authors have different opinions on the exact series of years which mark the age of Millennials. As per Woods, Wilson, and Walkovich (2011), Millennials were born between the years 1981 and 1999, whereas Black (2010) puts Millennials as those born between 1981 to 2001

Those born between the years 1977 and 1997, are Millennials as per Meister and Willyerd (2010), but as per Smola and Sutton (2002), Millennials are the ones who are born between 1979 and 1994. Also, Millennial Generation has been variously labeled as Nexus Generation, Nexters and Generation Y (Zemke, Raines, & Filipczak, 2000; Burke & Ng, 2006; Barnard, Cosgrove, & Welsh, 1998). Keeping all these ranges of years and labels aside, there exists a generational distinctiveness (Lindquist, 2008) about the people born between 1980s and 1990's and various authors have given different terminologies to these individuals based on their characteristics, to state a few - absorbed and overly self-confident, excessive display of narcissism and confidence (Myers & Sadaghiani, 2010;

Black, 2010). Self image of "I-am-special" (Lindquist, 2008).

The workplace at the moment comprises three generations working together at a single place namely Millennial, Generation- X and Baby Boomers, and very soon Millennial are going to dominate as Baby Boomers will retire paving the way for Generation - Z. Members of Millennium Generation and Generation X have different individuality and potential (Reisenwitz & Iyer, 2009)

Since, Millennials are going to form the largest working force and organizations are going to rely on them heavily in the coming future. Keeping this in mind it's really important to understand their characteristics, their workplace expectations and their altered aspirations so as to attract the best minds, train them to deliver their best and retain them longer.

The Deloitte Global Millennial Survey 2019, very clearly states that the Millennials have altogether different drives in comparison to their previous generation, they are pretty ambitious and want to earn and become wealthy like their earlier counterparts but their priorities, they want to travel and see the world first rather than owning a house which comes second on the priority list. Also, they show a priority towards community and social service in comparison to having children and starting families.

As per the Deloitte survey 2017, 38% of the millennials would quit their jobs in the next 2 years and surprisingly this number has risen to 49% in 2019, which shows that it's going to become a challenge for the companies to retain their workforce. Companies need to look for such HR strategies which makes the millennial more engaged and committed to their current organisation. Companies need to reshape the work environment in physical as well as nonphysical terms to cope with the changing demands of Gen Y.

We need to have a look at the characteristic features of the generation and need to build on it so as to firstly make them stay and then to increase the work performance and productivity. The Deloitte survey 2019 says that the millennials are not loyal to the organization they are working with, instead they are proved to have great loyalty towards their bosses whom they see as mentors and who tend to be leading and not dictating (Pasiaka, 2009), they are ready to work for the right person though they may be paid less (Pasiaka, 2009). The employees like to have good interpersonal relationships with their managers and prefer to be cared for (Andert, 2011).

A number of practitioners have stated that Millennials enjoy working in teams as their upbringing has been on group education and team sports and this would help them to replicate the same at their workplace (Kowske et al., 2010; Myers and Sadaghiani, 2010; Cahill and Sedrak, 2012). A collaborative work environment has been among the top five important things Millennials desire from a job (Business.com, 2017; Bresman, 2015; Asghar, 2014). Millennials have been found to be more tolerant of the diverse environment around them which has led to more teamwork with least friction (Shih & Allen, 2007; Behrens, 2009; Deal et al., 2010; Andert, 2011; Kaifi et al., 2012).

A number of researches have quoted Millennials workplace behavior, specifically on team work culture which is preferred by Millennials, but the role this team work which is the result of good interpersonal skills have on the performance and creativity of the Millennials have not been addressed in particular. This piece of work deals with the impact of Millennial managers interpersonal needs on performance and creativity.

Review of Literature

As per the Deloitte Survey of 2019 on Global Human Capital Trends, thirty-one percent of the respondents say that "most" or "almost all" work is done in teams. And more than 50 percent (53%) responded that team culture results in better. From 2019 and beyond technology is going to make team models easier. "Working in teams" was ranked as one of the top 10 trends that is going to play an important part in improving performance of the organizations. As per the survey, 65% of the respondents regarded it as "very important" for organizational performance but accepted that the organization is just 33% ready to embrace such a trend. The survey also brought out that adopting team structures improves organizational performance.

As per an article which appeared in India Today in November 2019, in the present environment, interpersonal skills like emotional and behavioral skills are much sought after, since they constitute 60% of the workplace success.

The top 10 skills identified by The World Economic Forum (WEF) focus on intangible skills again.

In another survey by EdpowerU in 2019, and through our all-embracing work with Gen Z and Millennials at the workplace, they identified the key intangible skills that will contribute to 60-70% of workplace success for 2020, are Behavioral Skills and Emotional Intelligence. As per another article which featured in "The Statesman" in January 2020, millennials value collaboration over competition because collaboration begets success, innovation and power which otherwise is not possible. Also, they feel that transparency, honesty and integrity remain the core values which will ultimately lead to increased job satisfaction and retention. These practices will also improve the productivity and creativity of the teams as a workplace.

Way back in 2014 Gutfreund said on the basis of Group studies of millennials that to the extent of 88% employees prefer a shared work – culture rather than a competitive one. In a study Su-Hie Ting and Kien-Bee Ooi (2015) wanted to explore what influence does students' workplace experience have on their work life expectation and how much these expectations are similar to Gen Y characteristics. The data was collected from 147 students doing their polytechnique course. The results revealed that the employees expected their seniors to guide them through their feedback, along with engaging in more team assignments.

In another work of Ooi and Ting's (2015) where they studied 105 job advertisements from newspapers and jobstreet.com, they came to the conclusion that teamwork ranked 2nd most frequently mentioned criteria in job advertisement.

Many authors in their research have come to the conclusion that Generation Y are more acceptable to the diversity around them and enjoy collaborating in teams and working in groups than their earlier generation (Frankel, 2016; Campione, 2014; Kilber et al., 2014; Gursoy, Chi, & Karadag, 2013; Roberts et al., 2013; Cekada, 2012; Smith & Galbraith, 2012; Balda & Mora, 2011; Gentry et al., 2011; Black, 2010; Myers and Sadaghiani, 2010).

Demerouti, Peeters, & van der Heijden in 2014 during their research found that when employees believe that they have work/life balance, which is associated with a positive relationship between employee and employer, they typically have better enrichment and positive behavioral performance at the workplace. Daud in 2016 have also tried to associate characters of Millennial with the job performance.

Objectives of the Study

The study aimed at following objectives:

1. To study the effect of Interpersonal needs (Total Interpersonal Needs, Total Expressed Needs, Total Wanted Needs, Wanted Affection, Wanted Inclusion, Wanted Control, Expressed Inclusion, Expressed Control, Expressed Affection) on performance of millennial managers.
2. To study the impact of Interpersonal needs (Total Interpersonal Needs, Total Wanted Needs, Total Expressed Needs, Expressed Inclusion, Expressed Control, Expressed Affection, Wanted inclusion, Wanted control, Wanted affection) on creativity of millennial managers.

Research Methodology

Sample

The data was collected from managers of Service and Manufacturing firms around the National Capital Region, India. The sample size was of 240 managers. The sample collection was done by picking up every 3rd manager from the strata and the technique followed was stratified systematic sampling.

Survey Instruments

A three - part questionnaire was used for data collection.

1. Abbreviated Torrance Test for Adults (Goff & Torrance, 2002)
2. The Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation-Behavior (William Schutz, 1958)
3. Performance Evaluation Form (Prof. Anu Singh Lather, Dr. Shilpa Jain)

Abbreviated Torrance Test for Adults (Goff & Torrance, 2002)

In the year 2002 , Goff & Torrance developed ATTA which consisted of 2 figural and 1 verbal exercise and the time limit to complete the test is 3 minutes.

Reliability

Reliability of Abbreviated Torrance Test was carried out through KR21 Reliability Coefficient, which ranged from .38 to .84 for various dimensions individually and inter - rater reliability varied from .95 to .99 (Goff and Torrance, 2002).

Validity

The content and face validity of the instrument has been established for the main instrument i.e. TTCT and ATTA is a modified version of it, so the validity stands established for this instrument as well by the Scholastic Testing Service (Goff & Torrance).

The Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation-Behavior (William Schutz, 1958)

FIRO-B is an instrument which intends to calculate Interpersonal needs on three different scales of being Included , Control and Affection and at two different dimensions of wanted and Control . It consists of 54 items. We get twelve scores, which is commonly used in interpretation of the result:

- Total Scores for Behavior which is a summation of Expressed scores total and Wanted scores total.
- Total Scores of Need , which is a cumulative score of Total Inclusion, Total Control and Total Affection.
- Individual Cell Scores of each score i.e. eI, wI, eC, wC, eA, and wE)
- Overall Need Score – is the total of the six individual cell scores

1. Total Behavior Scores (Total Expressed and Total Wanted) –

This score represents a total of expressed behavior (initiation of action of desired behavior) and wanted behavior (want of others to initiate desired behavior).

a) Expressed Behavior (E) – is the initiation of action of desired behavior.

b) Wanted Behavior (W) – is the want of others to initiate desired behavior.

2. Total Need Scores (Total Inclusion, Total Control and Total Affection) – it is the sum total of need for inclusion, need for control and need for affection, and its core may vary from 0 to 18.

a) Need for Inclusion – is the need to have social interactions, recognition, belonging, participation and associations with others.

b) Need for Control - refers to the need to direct, take accountability of the tasks and ability to influence others or be influenced by them.

3. Need for Affection - refers to the emotional associations connecting people so as to establish close and warm relationships with others.

4. Individual Cell Scores - Each individual cell score represents the combination of a need with the Expressed or Wanted dimension of that need. The meaning of the six cells are:

a) Expressed Inclusion need - The extent to which one makes an effort to include others in your group.

b) Expressed Control need - The extent to which one makes an effort to control or influence others.

c) Expressed Affection need - The extent to which one tries to get close to other people.

d) Wanted Inclusion need - The degree to which one wants others to include oneself in their activities.

e) Wanted Control need - The extent to which one is comfortable working in well-defined situations with clear expectations and instructions.

f) Wanted Affection need - The extent to which one wants others to act warmly toward oneself and to take a personal interest in us.

5. The Overall Need score symbolizes a person's total want for human interface. It represents the extent to which the individual considers that other people and human relations can be a source of personal satisfaction.

Reliability

The FIRO-B instrument was constructed using Guttman scaling procedures, a more appropriate index of internal consistency is reproducibility. The usual criterion for reproducibility is 90% - that is, 90% of responses are predictable from knowledge of the scale scores. The reproducibility of FIRO-B scale varies between .93 to .94 which is consistent and high. The instrument shows internal consistency reliability between the range of .85 to .97, which is good.

The following table (Table 1) shows the reproducibility and internal-consistency reliability of the FIRO-B scale.

Table 1: Reliability and Reproducibility of the FIRO-B Scales

FIRO-B Scale	Reproducibility	Reliability
Expressed Inclusion	.94	.87
Wanted Inclusion	.94	.96
Expressed Control	.93	.93
Wanted Control	.94	.86
Expressed Affection	.94	.86
Wanted Affection	.94	.85
Mean	.94	.89

Source: Reproducibility coefficients from Schutz (1978).

Validity

The instrument is valid and it has been proved by various studies in the area of relationships/friendships (-.03 to .27) (Hammer & Schnell, 2000), MBTI Form M instrument (-.56 to .29) and the CPI instrument (-.48 to .51) (Hammer & Schnell, 2000) etc to name a few.

Performance Evaluation

The performance evaluation schedule was developed by Prof. Anu Singh Lather and Dr. Shilpa Jain . This questionnaire tries to measure the overall performance of the individual on 13 performance criteria. The scoring of the test is done with the help of likert scale ranging from very high to very low on a 5-point scale.

Time taken to complete the test is around 10 minutes and it can be undertaken in groups or at individual level.

The reliability coefficient was calculated for the scale and the Conback Alpha was found to be .719 and split half reliability coefficient is 0.722. The test has high face validity

Procedure

The subjects for the study were selected by adopting stratified systematic sampling .The tests were administered after communicating the purpose of it.

Results and Discussion

Interpersonal Relations and Performance

The impact of Interpersonal needs was found through Regression analysis (Total Interpersonal Needs, Total Wanted Needs, Total Expressed Needs, Expressed Inclusion, Control and Affection, Wanted Inclusion, Control and Affection) on performance of millennial managers.

The outcome showed that there is a considerable relationship between interpersonal relations that need orientation and performance of gen Y employees. The table (Table 2) shows that employees having high performance have shown a strength of connection with Interpersonal relations need orientation ($R^2 = 0.209$). The B score for Expressed control is 0.075 at a Sig. level of .000. Same holds good for total wanted need with B score of .081 and total inclusion need, with B score of 0.982 units with significance of .025. But other dimensions of need like expressed Inclusion, Wanted Control and Wanted Inclusion have shown a negative coefficient score which means that for every unit increase in these dimensions will lead to decrease in performance score by 1.029 (Sig. = .019) units, .141 (Sig. = .000) units and 1.151 (Sig. = .009) units respectively.

This result means that Gen Y employees who tend to have an orientation towards Expressed Control i.e. they tend to make efforts to control or influence others as per their own whims they tend to show a better performance at the workplace.

Employees high on wanted need score i.e. the more the employees who want other person to initiate action and they themselves want to be on the recipient side , the better their performance is, because he will motivate others to put across their views , he will allow them to speak their mind and hence will raise the level of performance.

Employees showing a high score on total inclusion need meaning that they consider including others in their activities, and like to be a part of their activities in the workplace. These are social beings and like to get noticed. This tendency will obviously tend to lead to a better performance because it clearly shows that the employee is a team player and loves to take everybody along.

The negative coefficient score of expressed Inclusion means that the increase in its one unit score will lead to a decrease in performance by 1.029 units. It means that the more one makes an effort to include others in your group the lower its performance goes. It means that when there is a lack of willingness the performance drops and that's quite normal. The negative coefficient score of wanted control means that the increase in its one unit will lead to a decrease in performance by 0.141 units. This means that employees who tend to show a good performance will not like others to take charge of their actions and do not like others to guide them. They like to go ahead by making their own roads, also they are not very comfortable working in well-defined situations and don't appreciate a lot of instructions and directions. They need space , freedom and a flexible environment. The negative coefficient score of wanted inclusion means that the increase in its one unit increase will lead to a decrease in performance by 1.151

units. This means that the ones who keep on looking for an opportunity to be included in others activity and social groups will not have an internal satisfaction , which will

clearly lead to low focus and a reduced performance from his side .

Table 2 : Stepwise regression of Employee Interpersonal Relations Need orientation on Performance

	F (sig)	R ²	Adjusted R ²	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
				B	Std. Error			
	10.279	.209	.189	3.916	.151		25.938	.000
eI				-1.029	.436	-2.679	-2.363	.019
Wc				-.141	.032	-.401	-4.388	.000
eC				.075	.021	.221	3.533	.000
wI				-1.151	.436	-3.565	-2.640	.009
Total Wanted (wl+wC+wA)				.081	.025	.474	3.280	.001
Total Inclusion				.982	.436	4.715	2.254	.025

Interpersonal Relations and Creativity

The results (Table 3) illustrates that, participants attaining high scores on creativity have shown a strength of association with Interpersonal relations (R² = 0.664). The results show a positive score with eI ,eC, total affection and total need score whereas a negative coefficient score with wA, Total Expressed and Total wanted.

The positive coefficient score means that, for every unit increase in eI ,eC, total affection and total need, creativity of employees tend to increase by 16.210 (Sig. = .000) units, 21.540 (Sig. = .000) units , 18.156 (Sig. = .000) units and 1.624 (Sig. = .000) units.

The score means that employees have more expressed inclusion like including others in their activities , also they don't mind joining a group or a social setting if it interests them. These types of employees will love to take initiatives and tend to have a high creativity level. It's because they

have the free will , they are more expressive of their emotions and wants , hence tend to create things out of their imaginations and expressions.

The score shows that the individuals having an elevated score on expressed control tend to have high creativeness as well. And this is clear from the fact that these employees make an effort to control or influence others, they want others to go their way , also if others are in control of them , they tend to be running the show so clearly their creativity tends to increase because of the environment and people all acting as per their desires.

Employees having a tendency towards affection are open and like to display their warmth , care and concerns. They have tenderness, encouragement and support for others and want others to get closer to them. The results show that such employees have a higher creativity.

The score shows that employees having a high score on total interpersonal needs tend to have high creativity levels as well. The result shows that people who get involved in

engage in interpersonal interface with many people and on a regular basis like getting involved with others (i.e. high on total need score) have displayed an elevated scores on fluency, originality, elaboration and flexibility etc which is a part of creativity of employees.

And the negative coefficient score with wA, Total Expressed and Total wanted means that for every unit increase in these dimensions will lead to decrease in employee creativity by 14.217 (Sig. = .000) units, 20.654

(Sig. = .000) units and 2.243 (Sig. = .002) units respectively. This means that employees who tend to have a need for wanted affection i.e. the extent to which his need for close relationships are not met, he will have a low score on creativity. Also, employees having a higher tendency for expressed need i.e. the more he wants to make an effort to be a part of groups, the more he wants to control or influence others or the more he wants to have close relations with others, the lesser creativity he/she shows.

Table 3 : Stepwise regression of Employee Interpersonal Relations on Total Creativity

	F (sig)	R ²	Adjusted R ²	Un standard Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
				B	Std. Error			
	65.522	.664	.654	50.328	4.021	-.883	12.516	.000
Wa				-14.217	2.343	1.029	-6.067	.000
el				16.210	2.195	1.556	7.386	.000
eC				21.540	1.785	-2.577	12.068	.000
Total Expressed				-20.645	1.457	1.819	-14.174	.000
Total Affection				18.156	1.934	-.320	9.389	.000
Total Wanted				-2.243	.724	.374	-3.097	.002
Total Need Score				1.624	.818		1.984	.048

Conclusion

Millennials account for over half of the country's population. By now i.e. 2020, millennials account for 50% of the global workforce. The present belongs to them. They are the makers of enterprise today. So, the present leaders all over i.e. in various organizations and institutions need to capture the attention of this hyperactive, immensely talented pool.

One of the main purpose for this study is to equip the leaders of the Business houses with Millennials job expectations and motivational factors. The leaders may utilize the suggestions of this study to meet the expectations of Millennial Generation employees henceforth improve work culture and contribute to organizational overall growth.

This study has put its focus on very important aspects of a corporate i.e. the interpersonal skills of Millennial Generation, their impact on performance and creativity.

Apart from the above results of this study there is one result which is quite different from other studies and also from other groups i.e. Gen X and Baby Boomers. The score depicts that participants having a high score on total interpersonal needs tend to have high creativity levels as well. The result shows that employees who get involved in interpersonal interface with a lot of people and on a regular basis also take pleasure in getting others involved in their activity (i.e. high on total need score) have shown a high score on creativity of employees. This score of Generation Y is different from earlier scores of Gen X and Baby boomers, wherein the employees having a high score on IPR showed a low score on creativity. This shows that Gen Y love to be connected, value social interactions and this makes them satisfied and tend to develop a higher creativity as well. The results of this study if put into practice by the leaders can attract, retain and motivate Millennial employees and also create a fair and diverse environment. And there could be exceptional increase in the performance of employees leading to higher productivity of the company.]

References

- [1] Andert, D. (2011). Alternating leadership as a proactive organizational intervention: Addressing the needs of the Baby Boomers, Generation Xers and Millennials. *Journal of Leadership, Accountability, and Ethics*, 8(4), 67-83.
- [2] Asghar, R. (2014, January). What Millennials Want in the Workplace (And Why You Should Start Giving it to Them). *Forbes*. Retrieved from: <https://www.forbes.com/sites/robasghar/2014/01/13/what-millennials-want-in-the-workplace-and-why-you-should-start-giving-it-to-them/#4e00b9624c40>
- [3] Balda, J.B. and Mora, F. (2011). Adapting Leadership Theory and Practice for the Networked, Millennial Generation. *Journal of Leadership Studies*. [Online]. 5(3), pp. 13-24. [Accessed 28 January 2018]. Available from: <https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/>
- [4] Barnard, R., Cosgrove, D., & Welsh, J. (1998). *Chips & pop: Decoding the nexus generation*. Toronto: Malcolm Lester Books.
- [5] Bee, O. K., & Hie, T. S. (2015). Employers' emphasis on technical skills and soft skills in job advertisements. *The English Teacher*, 44(1), 1.
- [6] Behrens, W. (2009). *Managing Millennials: They're Coming to a Workplace Near You*. *Marketing Health Services*, 19-21.
- [7] Black, A. (2010). Gen Y: Who they are and how they learn. *Educational Horizons*, 88(2), 92-101.
- [8] Bresman, H. (2015). What millennials want from work, charted across the world. *Harvard Business Review*, 2.
- [9] Business.com (2017). 10 of the largest ecommerce markets in the world by country. Richie Edquid. Available at: <https://www.business.com/articles/10-of-the-largest-ecommerce-markets-in-the-world-b/> (Accessed February 22, 2017)
- [10] Business.com Editorial Staff. (2017, February) How Companies Are Changing Their Culture to Attract (And Retain) Millennials. *Business.com*. Retrieved from: <https://www.business.com/articles/how-are-companies-changing-their-culture-to-attractand-retain-millennials/>
- [11] Business (2019). Redesigning Workplace Communication for the millennial workforce. Bhavin Turakhia. Retrieved from: <https://www.thestatesman.com/business/re-designing-workplace-communication-for-the-millennial-workforce-1502738764.html>

- [12] Cahill, T. F., & Sedrak, M. (2012). Leading a multigenerational workforce: Strategies for attracting and retaining millennials. *Frontiers of Health Services Management*, 29(1), 3-15.
- [13] Campione, W. A. (2014). The influence of supervisor race, gender, age, and cohort on millennials' job satisfaction. *Journal of Business Diversity*, 14, 18–34.
- [14] Cekada, T. L. (2012). Training a multigenerational workforce: Understanding key needs & learning styles. *Professional Safety*, 57(03), 40-44.
- [15] DAUD, E. B. (2016). Affecting Generation Y Hybrid Vehicle purchasing intension using internet advertisement. Doctoral dissertation, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia.
- [16] Deloitte. (2017). The 2017 Deloitte Millennial Survey. New York, New York. Deloitte University Press. Retrieved from: <https://www2.deloitte.com/content/dam/Deloitte/global/Documents/About-Deloitte/gx-deloitemillennial-survey-2017-executive-summary.pdf>
- [17] Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu Limited (2019). The Deloitte Global Millennial Survey 2019: Societal discord and technological transformation create a “generation disrupted”
- [18] Deloitte Insights (2019). Global Human Capital Trends, Leading the social enterprise: Reinvent with a human focus.
- [19] Demerouti, E., Peeters, M. W., & van der Heijden, B. M. (2012). Work–family interface from a life and career stage perspective: The role of demands and resources. *International Journal of Psychology*, 47(4), 241-258. doi:10.1080/00207594.2012.699055
- [20] Frankel, L. P. (2016). Employee Retention: Seven Common-Sense Ways to Keep Your Star Millennials. *Employment Relations Today* (Wiley), 42(4), 49-56.
- [21] Gentry, W. A., Griggs, T. L., Deal, J. J., Mondore, S. P., & Cox, B. D. (2011). A comparison of generational differences in endorsement of leadership practices with actual leadership skill level. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 63(1), 39.
- [22] Harris-Boundy, J., & Flatt, S. J. (2010). Cooperative performance of Millennials in teams. *Review of Business Research*, 10(4), 30-46.
- [23] India Today (2019). Top emotional and behavioral skills every millennial job seeker must have today. Shubika Bilkha. Retrieved from: <https://www.indiatoday.in/education-today/jobs-and-careers/story/top-emotional-behavioural-skills-for-millennial-job-seeker-1616754-2019-11-07>
- [24] Kaifi, B. A., Nafei, W. A., Khanfar, N. M., & Kaifi, M. M. (2012). A multi-generational workforce: Managing and understanding millennials. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 7(24), 88.
- [25] Kilber, J., Barclay, A., & Ohmer, D. (2014). Seven tips for managing Generation Y. *Journal of Management Policy and Practice*, 15(4), 80.
- [26] Kowske, B. J., Rasch, R., & Wiley, J. (2010). Millennials' (lack of) attitude problem: An empirical examination of generational effects on work attitudes. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 25(2), 265-279.
- [27] Lindquist, T. M. (2008). Recruiting the millennium generation: the new CPA. *The CPA Journal*, 78(8), 56.
- [28] Meister, J. C., & Willyerd, K. (2010). Mentoring millennials. *Harvard business review*, 88(5), 68.
- [29] Myers, K. K., & Sadaghiani, K. (2010). Millennials in the workplace: A communication perspective on millennials' organizational relationships and performance. *Journal of business and psychology*, 25(2), 225-238.
- [30] Ng, E. S., & Burke, R. J. (2006). The next generation at work–business students' views, values and job search strategy. *Education+ Training*.

- [31] Ooi, K. B., & Ting, S. H. (2015). Work experience and polytechnic students' expectations of working life. *Work*, 1(2), 1-8.
- [32] Pasieka, S. A. (2009). Exploring the changing workforce: Understanding and managing the generation of Millennial workers. Northcentral University.
- [33] Pew Research Center. (2007). How young people view their lives, futures, and politics: A portrait of "Generation Next." <http://people-press.org/report/300/a-portrait-of-generation-next>.
- [34] Reisenwitz, T. H., & Iyer, R. (2009). Differences in generation x and generation y: Implications for the organization and marketers. *Marketing management journal*, 19(2).
- [35] Shih, W., & Allen, M. (2007). Working with generation-D: Adopting and adapting to cultural learning and change. *Library Management*, 28(1/2), 89-100. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/01435120710723572>
- [36] Smith, S. D., & Galbraith, Q. (2012). Motivating millennials: Improving practices in recruiting, retaining, and motivating younger library staff. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 38(3), 135-144.
- [37] Smola, K. W., & Sutton, C. D. (2002). Generational differences: Revisiting generational work values for the new millennium. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23, 363-382.
- [38] VanMeter, R. A., Grisaffe, D. B., Chonko, L. B., & Roberts, J. A. (2013). Generation Y's ethical ideology and its potential workplace implications. *Journal of business ethics*, 117(1), 93-109.
- [39] Woods, T. A., Wilson, T., & Walkovich, D. E. (2011). Targeting instructional strategies to address Gen Y learner characteristics. *The Journal of Physician Assistant Education*, 22(2), 38-41.
- [40] World Economic Forum (2017). The 10 Top Skills That Will Land You High-Paying Jobs by 2020, According to the World Economic Forum. Melanie Curtin. Retrieved from:
- [41] <https://www.inc.com/melanie-curtin/the-10-top-skills-that-will-land-you-high-paying-jobs-by-2020-according-to-world-economic-forum.html>
- [42] Zemke, R., Raines, C., & Filipczak, B. (1999). *Generations at work: Managing the clash of Veterans, Boomers, Xers, and Nexters in your workplace*. Amacom.