Southeastern University

FireScholars

PhD in Organizational Leadership

Spring 2024

Exploring the impact of workplace spirituality on Millennials' job satisfaction and organizational commitment using the Multidimensional Existential Meaning Scale

Nathan S. Gonzalez
Southeastern University - Lakeland

Follow this and additional works at: https://firescholars.seu.edu/org-lead

Part of the Leadership Commons

Exploring the impact of workplace spirituality on Millennials' job satisfaction and organizational commitment using the Multidimensional Existential Meaning Scale

Submitted to Southeastern University

Jannetides College of Business, Communication, and Leadership

In partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in Organizational Leadership

Nathan S. Gonzalez
April 06, 2024

Jannetides College of Business, Communication, and Leadership

Southeastern University

This is to certify that the dissertation prepared by:

Nathan S. Gonzalez

titled

EXPLORING THE IMPACT OF WORKPLACE SPIRITUALITY ON MILLENNIALS' JOB SATISFACTION AND ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT USING THE MULTIDIMENSIONAL EXISTENTIAL MEANING SCALE

Has been approved by his/her committee as satisfactory completion of the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Approved By:

Bethany Peters, Ph.D., Chair

Southeastern University,

Jannetides College of Business, Communication, and Leadership

Debra Dean, Ph.D., Committee Member

Southeastern University,

Jannetides College of Business, Communication, and Leadership

Jolene Erlacher, Ph.D., Committee Member

Southeastern University,

Jannetides College of Business, Communication, and Leadership

Southeastern University Institutional Review Board Approval:

September 14, 2023

Abstract

The aim of this research was to assess how meaning in life influences job satisfaction and organizational commitment among Millennials across diverse professions. Data were collected to examine these relationships comprehensively, employing the Multidimensional Existential Meaning Scale, Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, and Organizational Commitment Questionnaire. Despite extensive research in workplace spirituality, research on Millennials and meaning in life remains scarce. Methodologically, this research adopted a quantitative cross-sectional design involving 131 participants from 24 industries in the United States. Reliability analyses demonstrated the trustworthiness of the employed scales, with strong correlations observed between job satisfaction and organizational commitment with the dimensions of meaning in life. Multiple regression analysis substantiated the predictive relationship between meaning in life dimensions and work outcomes. The findings revealed that comprehension and purpose significantly predicted job satisfaction and organizational commitment, whereas mattering exhibited no predictive capacity. These results provide valuable insights into Millennials' experiences with meaning in life in the workplace.

Keywords: meaning in life, Millennials, workplace spirituality, job satisfaction, organizational commitment

Dedication

To my wife, Sharon, who has been my constant throughout all of life's changes. Thank you for your unwavering love, endless support, boundless patience, and for being my source of strength and inspiration throughout this process. You are my best friend, and I quite literally couldn't have done this without you. I love you more than you can imagine.

To my beautiful children, Valery and Luke. You are my greatest achievement and bring so much meaning to my life. I love being your father. As you grow, I pray that you will constantly be reminded of the calling that God has placed on your lives. Keep Christ at the center of your lives, work hard, and you will accomplish more than you ever thought possible.

To my parents, Jackie and Jose Elias. Your sacrifices, encouragement, and guidance have shaped me into the man I am today. You instilled in me the values of hard work and a heart for learning, but more importantly, you modeled what it means to truly love God. Thank you for being my role models, mentors and for believing in me when I did not believe in myself.

To my brother, Nick. I truly cherish being your big brother. You always find a way to encourage and lift me up when I need it the most. Watching you flourish into the man God has called you to be has been one of my favorite things in life. You inspire me to be better.

Acknowledgements

To Southeastern University's Organizational Leadership Doctoral program: Thank you for caring about my whole person: mind, body, and spirit. Throughout life's significant changes in the past five years, all of my professors set me up for success and ensured I would cross the finish line. I am proud to be a part of this program.

To Dr. Peters: Thank you for your expertise, coaching, guidance, and grace. I knew from the moment I took your class that I wanted you to be my chair and it was the best decision I could have made. I appreciate all you've done for me.

To Dr. Dean: I am so grateful for your intentionality and availability. There were moments of doubt and confusion in this journey, but your willingness to help me every step of the way gave me so much peace.

To Dr. Erlacher: Thank you for your valuable insight and encouragement. Your feedback and insight brought much-needed clarity. I hope I can continue to follow in your footsteps in impacting future generations.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

List of Figures

Chapter 1 – Introduction

The time has come that a Millennial (born between 1981 and 1995) is most likely soon to be your boss. As Veterans and Baby Boomers, the most senior generations within the workforce, transition into retirement, organizations within the United States progressively rely on Millennials to fill executive, management, and leadership positions (Shukas, 2020). Generational scholars have been predicting Millennials' critical influence on the workplace and are now grappling with the realities of engaging and attracting a generation known to have unique workplace expectations (Bogosian & Rousseau, 2017, p. 387). The Millennial generation brings many unique contributions to the workforce, including a greater focus on spirituality, such as seeking meaning and significance at work. According to the Deloitte (2017) study, a unique value of the Millennial generation is that many prefer to seek purpose in their organizations without sacrificing their passions and social purpose. Furthermore, purpose is a reoccurring theme within workplace spirituality and is conceptualized as inner motivations that give a greater meaning to life (Overell, 2008).

The effects of workplace spirituality are experienced differently among Millennials compared to their generational counterparts (Jolliffe & Foster, 2022), yet research on past and present approaches to engage Millennials using workplace spirituality is scarce. To render a culture of innovation, collaboration, and creativity, organizations should seek to better understand what Millennials desire or expect from their workplace experience while striving to gain a deeper understanding of the Millennial mindset (Jones, 2017). From an industrial and organizational psychology perspective, expressing empathy and understanding can motivate employees effectively (Eyring, 2022). As Millennials adopt benevolent and universally oriented values, organizational practices that reflect Millennials' self-transcendent characteristics are needed (Črešnar & Nedelko, 2020). Scholars and practitioners should evaluate the effectiveness of strategies to support Millennials rather than adopt a "one size fits all" approach, which may fail in meeting the unique needs of this prominent generation (Stewart et al., 2016).

Failing to invest in the purpose development and spirituality of Millennials can affect an organization's ability to retain and engage the workforce's most prominent generation (Burstein, 2013). Therefore, the aim of this study was to understand how workplace spirituality impacts the job satisfaction and organizational commitment of Millennials.

Some workplace characteristics that influence the Millennial generation are opportunities for achievement, work-life balance, positive work relationships, and participation in work that helps others and has meaning (Kuron et al., 2015). Millennials also place great importance on intrinsic values, such as personal morals, and on positively impacting society (Buzza, 2017). McMurray and Simmers (2020) indicated that although Millennials are less religious than other generational cohorts, they seek spirituality in the workplace, an aspect of whole-person development that concerns finding a sense of connection between oneself and the workplace (Rathee & Rajain, 2020). The term whole-person refers to the four realms of human nature: physical, emotional, cognitive, and spiritual (Piercy, 2013). Millennials value a whole-person perspective, as work life and home life are not mutually inclusive entities; instead, they are cohesive and integrated (D. Wang, 2015). A whole-person approach to business challenges the traditional organizational perspective as it emphasizes less wealth and economic development and incorporates a spiritual environment that improves all areas of life (Gjorevska & Takács, 2016; Marques, 2005).

Over the past few decades, the widely discussed construct of workplace spirituality has gained the attention of scholars and organizational practitioners as it encompasses an individual's pursuit of a higher purpose, personal meaning, and transcendent values (Gotsis & Kortezi, 2008; Schutte, 2016). Cavanagh (1999) defined spirituality as "the desire to find ultimate purpose in life, and to live accordingly" (p. 188). Concerning the whole person, a working definition of spirituality is "the quest for life-meaning and self-awareness for a higher purpose demonstrated through efforts to achieve the common good for all" (Piercy, 2013, p. 32). Mitroff and Denton (1999) defined workplace spirituality as the effort to discover one's ultimate purpose in life, develop a solid connection to co-workers

and other people associated with work, and align one's core beliefs and the values of the organization. It is important to note that purpose and meaning are reoccurring themes within spirituality in the workplace (Overell, 2008). Frankl (1946) and Maslow (1968) referred to meaning in life as not only the center of human motivation, but also the focus of psychological well-being.

Therefore, psychologists have defined meaning in life as (a) significance, which refers to the extent to which an individual feels connected to others and as if they matter; (b) purpose, which is described as being engaged in goal directed pursuits; and lastly (c) coherence, which is known as the understanding of one's life and experiences making sense (Heintzelman & King, 2014; King et al., 2006; Martela & Steger, 2016; Park & George, 2013). George and Park (2017) argued that this tripartite view of meaning in life would facilitate a deeper understanding of the concept and therefore, developed the Multidimensional Existential Meaning Scale (MEMS). Considering that Mitroff and Denton's (1999) definition of workplace spirituality closely relates to George and Park's (2017) tripartite approach to measuring meaning in life, in this study, the MEMS was used to measure reoccurring themes in workplace spirituality.

Spirituality in the workplace directly addresses the needs of the Millennial generation, as it inspires employees to engage in their role beyond obligation and encourages participation in work that aims for the common good of others (M. Wang et al., 2019). Grant (2017) indicated that purpose is an emerging cultural narrative, and organizations have started to shift to focus more on "transforming business through the science of purpose" as Millennials, more than any generation, are searching for purpose and purposeful work (p. 2). Although spirituality and purpose in the workplace have proven to yield physical and psychological benefits such as motivation to achieve goals, the attainment of a more optimistic outlook, reduced stress, and increased resilience, scholars still question whether these concepts should be used as a tool to increase organizational commitment and engagement (Grant, 2017; Schutte, 2016). Therefore, future research should seek to understand how spirituality in the workplace affects the organizational outcomes of Millennials, such as job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

Statement of the Problem

Within the present ever-changing and unstable business contexts, organizational leaders identify and develop new strategies to embrace challenges and bring change (Iordanoglou, 2018). Unfortunately, employee development approaches fail to meet the current organizational challenges and demands (Deloitte, 2016). Although the Millennial generation has been labeled as narcissistic and self-absorbed (Galdames & Guihen, 2022), E. E. Smith and Aaker (2013) suggested that Millennials are unique contributors in the workplace in their quest for purpose integration and spiritual fulfillment beyond superficial needs. Yet most traditional workplaces do not integrate spirituality as a core component of employee development (Rothausen, 2017). Organizations may have more difficulty motivating Millennials as they do not live to work and view work as less central in their lives (Chatrakul & Smithson, 2016; Chen & Lian, 2015). In summation, scholars have extensively researched how to support Millennials as followers (E. Martin & Warshawsky, 2017; Rodriguez & Rodriguez, 2015), but there is a need for a comprehensive exploration of the development of Millennials through the lens of purpose and workplace spirituality (Bannerman, 2018).

Purpose of the Research

Although the influence of spirituality and purpose within the workplace has become increasingly relevant, little attention has been given to examining its relationship to Millennials and their development (McMurray & Simmers, 2020). In the current study, the MEMS, the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ), and the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCG) were used to measure meaning in life, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment among Millennials of various professions and organizations. The research approach adopted for this study was a correlational quantitative research design to analyze a cross-sectional dataset and compare meaning in life's effects on job satisfaction and organizational commitment among Millennials.

Research Question(s)/Hypotheses

Millennials are often viewed as narcissistic, entitled, and self-absorbed, and it may be commonly believed that this generation lacks organizational commitment while being highly monetarily motivated (Twenge, 2013). Conversely, generational research suggests that the low engagement rates and retention of Millennials may not be an issue of a lack of loyalty or compensation but a failure of organizational leadership to meet their spiritual needs (Alper, 2015). This study encompassed an exploration of reoccurring themes in workplace spirituality, such as meaning in life, and its impact on job satisfaction and organizational commitment among Millennials. The following two primary research questions guided this study:

Research Question 1

Can meaning in life (measured by the Multidimensional Existential Meaning Scale) predict job satisfaction among Millennials?

> H1a: Comprehension (independent variable) predicts job satisfaction (dependent variable).
>
> H1b: Purpose (independent variable) predicts job satisfaction (dependent variable).
>
> H1c: Mattering (independent variable) predicts job satisfaction (dependent variable).

Research Question 2

Can meaning in life (measured by the Multidimensional Existential Meaning Scale) predict organizational commitment among Millennials?

> H2a: Comprehension (independent variable) predicts organizational commitment (dependent variable).
>
> H2b: Purpose (independent variable) predicts organizational commitment (dependent variable).
>
> H2c: Mattering (independent variable) predicts organizational commitment (dependent variable).

The aim of this study was to use an online anonymous survey instrument distributed through the partnering organizations to participants. Comparative data

were gathered via anonymous, voluntary online surveys using MEMS (George & Park, 2017), the MSQ (Weiss et al., 1967), and OCG (Mowday et al., 1979).

Significance of the Research

As the Baby Boomer and Gen X leaders transition into retirement, Millennials are assuming leadership roles and creating a dramatic shift in workplace values (Cioletti, 2017; Potter, 2018). Millennials differ from their generational counterparts as their perception of purpose is inseparably tied to job satisfaction (Klimkiewicz & Oltra, 2017). A Deloitte (2017) study revealed that two-thirds of Millennials selected an organization whose purpose aligned with their individual purpose, whereas only 1 in 5 Millennials found satisfaction in organizations that lack clarity of purpose. Although Millennials are often described as needy, high-maintenance job-hoppers with low organizational commitment, such claims are frequently only anecdotal and lack empirical credibility (Deal et al., 2010; Edge et al., 2011; Hershatter & Epstein, 2010; Murray et al., 2011). Therefore, scholars and practitioners should invest in future research to understand how Millennials perceive spirituality within the workplace.

Conceptual/Theoretical Framework

The conceptual framework of this study focused on two components: Millennials and spirituality in the workplace. Spirituality in the workplace was interpreted through the lens of the tripartite view of meaning in life. According to George and Park (2016), the three distinct, but nonrelated subconstructs are comprehension, purpose, and mattering. In addition, the aim of this study was to offer information regarding the intersections of the two concepts in this framework.
Millennials

Millennials, also known as Generation Y, bring forth their perspectives of an ideal work environment shaped by their values and explanations (Rony, 2019). The "Digital Generation" represent not only highly confident achievers who are tech-savvy, but also globally minded individuals who strive to make a difference in the work they are involved in (Hallman, 2016). Millennials also seek purpose above material gain (Cox et al., 2014) and desire their opinion and thoughts to be

valued and accepted (C. Smith & Turner, 2015). Therefore, organizations should aim to understand and meet the needs of this population, as Millennials are considered the most prominent generation within the workforce and transitioning into leadership roles.

Workplace Spirituality

Spirituality in the workplace has been researched since the 1990s, and researchers have proposed its relationships to factors that contribute to desired organizational outcomes, such as job satisfaction, employee motivation, and organizational performance (Belwalkar & Vohra, 2016). Purpose and meaning are reoccurring themes within workplace spirituality and are conceptualized as inner motivations and desires to participate in activities that give greater meaning to life (Overell, 2008). Research has indicated links between workplace spirituality and positive organizational dynamics (Garcia-Zamor, 2003; Jurkiewicz & Giacalone, 2004; Milliman et al., 1999), such as performance, commitment, and job satisfaction. Workplace spirituality is increasingly being incorporated to increase the possibility of the workforce "applying greater effort in comparison to those who see it merely as a means to a paycheck" (Rathee & Rajain, 2020, p. 36).

Methodology

The research approach adopted for this study was a quantitative methodology with a correlational design to guide the research in determining whether a relationship existed between meaning in life, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment among Millennials and whether there is predictive capacity of the variables. Creswell (2012) stated that a correlational research design is most appropriate for identifying relationships between variables and predictive patterns within samples. After receiving approval from the Institutional Review Board, surveys with a random sample of participants followed using electronic mail, including a link to SurveyMonkey.

Instrumentation

The independent variable, meaning in life (MIL), was measured using the MEMS tool designed by George and Park (2017), which explicitly measured the

sub-constructs of meaning in life: comprehension, purpose, and mattering. The comprehension construct was defined as the extent to which individuals perceive a sense of coherence and understanding regarding their lives (Baumeister, 1991; Reker & Wong, 1988). Purpose refers to "the degree to which individuals experience their lives as being directed and motivated by valued life goals" (George & Park, 2017, p. 2). Lastly, the mattering construct is the degree to which individuals feel that their existence is of significance, importance, and value in the world (Becker, 1973/1997; George & Park, 2014; King et al., 2006). After collecting data from three samples of undergraduate college students, George and Park (2017) documented Cronbach's coefficient alpha as follows: 0.90, 0.90, and 0.90 for comprehension, 0.89, 0.89, and 0.88 for purpose, and 0.84, 0.85, and 0.90 for mattering.

The dependent variables were job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Job satisfaction was measured using the MSQ (Weiss et al., 1967). Lester et al. (2014) reported a Cronbach's coefficient alpha of 0.93 for the short-form MSQ. Organizational commitment was measured using the OCQ (Mowday et al., 1979). Garg and Rastogi (2009) reported Cronbach's coefficient alpha of 0.88 for OCQ.

Population and Sample

Field (2013) stated that sampling is used to collect data from a small population subset and then analyze the data as a population representative. For the purpose of this study, there were six predictor variables. According to Hair et al. (2006), obtaining 15-–20 participants per predictor variable is recommended when conducting a multiple regression analysis. Once 120 usable surveys had been achieved, the quantitative analysis began. The sample population for the current study included Millennials from different organizational industries and professions.

Analysis

I used a multiple regression analysis to examine the prediction capacity of the independent variable on the dependent variable (Girden & Kabacoff, 2011). The software used for multiple regression analysis was SPSS Version 21.

Scope and Limitations

The limitations of this study may affect the interpretation of the collected data and the results. Creswell (2012) defined limitations as "the potential weaknesses or problems with the study identified by the researcher" (p. 199). This study occurred in the United States; therefore, the findings may not be generalizable to other geographic regions. Additionally, the sample size of the populations may not be generalizable. Pallant (2010) recommended obtaining a larger sample size than necessary to generalize results to a larger population. The aim of the current study was to target a diverse group of Millennials of various age groups, job experience, various experiences of workplace spirituality, and from different organizational industries and professions.

Definition of Terms

Several terms require clarification for this study to have meaning and application. The following definitions help clarify the meaning of each term as it appears within the study:

Comprehension. The comprehension construct of meaning in life was defined as the extent to which individuals perceive a sense of coherence and understanding regarding their lives (Baumeister, 1991; Reker & Wong, 1988).

Mattering. The mattering construct of meaning in life is viewed as the degree to which individuals feel that their existence is of significance, importance, and value in the world (Becker, 1973/1997; George & Park, 2014; King et al., 2006).

Meaning in Life. George and Park (2016) defined meaning in life as "the extent to which one's life is experienced as making sense, as being directed and motivated by valued goals, and as mattering in the world" (p. 206). Their conceptualization of meaning in life comprises three distinct but related subconstructs: comprehension, purpose, and mattering.

Millennials. Strauss and Howe's (1991) generational theory associated a 20-year timeframe with the emergence of every new generation. Millennials, often referred to as 'Generation Y' or the 'Me Generation,' are a "generation cohort born

during the last two decades of the twentieth century and therefore began their adult life in the new millennia" (Galdames & Guihen, 2022, p. 3).

  Purpose. Purpose refers to "the degree to which individuals experience their lives as being directed and motivated by valued life goals" (George & Park, 2017, p. 2).

  Workplace Spirituality. According to Mitroff and Denton (1999), workplace spirituality is the effort to discover one's ultimate purpose in life, develop a solid connection to co-workers and other people associated with work, and align one's core beliefs and the values of the organization.

Summary

  Workplace spirituality, specifically meaning in life, and its impact on Millennials is an organizational concept that warrants further explored. The aim of this study was to examine the effect of meaning in life on job satisfaction and organizational commitment among Millennials of various organizational settings and professions. The instruments used to obtain data for this study included the MEMS, the MSQ, and the OCQ.

Chapter 2 – Literature Review

Although researchers have explored the concept of generational cohorts for decades, attention to generations in the workplace has increased in prevalence over the past 20 years. Numerous credible and sizeable international consulting firms, such as Deloitte, have studied the attitudes, perceptions, and characteristics of generations to provide organizational resources for managing different generations (Jolliffe & Foster, 2022). The American Psychological Association (2017) conducted annual work and well-being surveys to compare generational groups and work outcomes such as stress and career satisfaction. Psychological research organizations, such as the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, provide valuable information to examine the quality of evidence regarding generational stereotypes. As the working preferences and characteristics between generational cohorts differ, researchers, organizations, and practitioners are making efforts to understand the attitudes, behaviors, and values of past, present, and future generations. The purpose of this dissertation was to advance the understanding of how Millennials are affected by spirituality in the workplace by evaluating the organizational outcomes of job satisfaction and organizational commitment using the MEMS (2017), the MSQ (1967), and the OCQ (1979).

Researchers have suggested that although most literature focuses on Millennials as followers, a focus on their attributes and behaviors as a leader is lacking (Faller & Gogek, 2019; Lopez & Grubbström, 2018; Nolan, 2015). Additionally, practitioner data, such as the Pew Foundation data sets, indicated generational cohorts have different views on workplace spirituality. The current study adopted a quantitative approach to understand the impact of spirituality on Millennials' job satisfaction and organizational commitment. The aim of this literature review is to define generational cohorts within the workplace, identify characteristics of Millennials, and understand the dynamic between spirituality in the workplace and job satisfaction and organizational commitment of Millennials.

Generational cohorts and their differences in values and behaviors represent a form of workplace diversity (Cletus et al., 2018). Organizations are responsible

for leveraging workplace diversity to comprehend how a generational cohort's work values may impact how they must be managed and led (Urick et al., 2016). Workplace diversity is an organizational concept that indicates the complex physical, sociological, or psychological differences and similarities among employees (Cletus et al., 2018; Griffin & Moorhead, 2014). Within a global organizational context, employees must interact and compete across various backgrounds (Patel, 2016) while understanding individual uniqueness, such as personality, age, gender, ethnicity/race, religion, marital status, income, and work experience (Nwinami, 2014). However, individuals with different values, ideas, work ethics, and communication have always existed in the workplace. Kelly et al. (2016) suggested that generational differences can affect various aspects of an organization, such as recruiting, building teams, change management, employee motivation, and productivity.

Generational differences in the workplace and the impact of socially constructed groupings on organizational outcomes is an area of disagreement among researchers. Costanza and Finkelstein (2017) argued,

> Researchers have generally not identified and then appropriately tested a sufficient explanation for why generations exist and why they should have an impact, have struggled to find empirical evidence actually supporting generationally-based differences, have offered numerous and viable alternative explanations for differences that have been observed, and, like their practitioner colleagues, have not conducted systematic assessments on the effectiveness of interventions designed to address any perceived differences. (p. 109)

Much of the debate over generations in the workplace has revolved around whether the social-historical construction of ages helps conclude whether they meaningfully affect organizational outcomes (Costanza & Finkelstein, 2015). Twenge et al. (2010) depicted that although generational stereotypes are widely and commonly accepted, the research is sparse and contradictory. Researchers Jorgensen (2003), Macky et al. (2008), and Sackett (2002) focused on detailing misguided organizational practices that create talent management and human resources

strategies "based on stereotypical generational differences in the workplace and have encouraged research efforts to focus on validated and effective methods for understanding and handling evolving changes in the workforce" (Costanza & Finkelstein, 2017, p. 109).

Although Urick et al. (2016) suggested that many aspects of workplace generational debates perpetuate stereotypes and exacerbate conflict, other scholars proposed that the understanding, analysis, and acceptance of each generation's beliefs and values act as a valuable resource for organizational growth (Betchoo, 2015; Tamunomiebi & Onah, 2019). For example, Powell (2018) described these differences as personal characteristics that exert a lifelong impact and shape an individual's self-image and sense of identity. Ultimately, although researchers have not found a consensus on the validity of generational studies, some believe that each generation brings forth different perspectives, perceptions, and expectations into the workplace, which impact how they behave, how they prefer to be managed and recognized, and how they choose to manage others (Scott & Bird, 2012).

Generational Theory

Although the notion of the term 'generation' is prevalently used to "make sense of differences between age groupings in society and to locate individual selves and other persons within historical time," social scientists have paid significant attention to understanding the significance of a generation (Pilcher, 1994, p. 481). Whereas there is no universally agreed age range regarding generational theory (Jolliffe & Foster, 2022, p. 453), it is agreed that generations are a group of people born within a particular era who share common attitudes, knowledge, and experiences that affect their values and beliefs (Johnson & Johnson, 2010; Tamunomiebi & Onah, 2019; Zemke et al., 2013). Several scholars have attempted to group generations by social and historical backgrounds. At the same time, Kupperschmidt (2000) defined a generation by shared years of birth and the significant events during critical stages of their lives. Current studies indicate the prominence of two generational theories: Karl Mannheim's generational theory and William Strauss and Neil Howe's generational theory.

Social scientists desire to understand generations and the tensions between them and have allotted the opportunity to explain cultural change. Pilcher (1994) suggested that many academicians praised Mannheim's essay "The Problem of Generations" as the most developed perspective of generations from a sociological point of view (Bengtson, 1974). Karl Mannheim (1952) was considered the first modern scholar to investigate the development of generational values and differentiate generations by two distinct factors: a common location in historical time and an active awareness of the experiences within that historical location (Knight, 2009). Notably, Mannheim believed that an individual's year of birth is insufficient in classifying them within a specific generation; conversely, he suggested that it is essential for them to participate in the defining life events of the generation.

Historical events may not have the same effect on individuals of different cultural and social backgrounds. The National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine (2020) cited the modern example of the terrorist attack on September 11, 2001, on the World Trade Center in New York City. Although Americans who witnessed the events were deeply affected by this significant event, it would not affect the attitudes and thinking of those outside the United States who experience terrorism more regularly. According to Mannheim's (1952) theory, even Americans of different socioeconomic status, education, and wealth may have construed the tragic event alternatively. In agreement with Mannheim, Ryder (1965) rejected the notion that generations "emerged at regularly spaced intervals, noting that the rhythm of generations depends on the timing of historical, social, and cultural events occurring during young adulthood are particularly influential" (p. 848). Ultimately, later generational theorists stressed the importance of culturally bound life stages in addition to historical events, such as education, marriage, building a family, and career (M. W. Riley et al., 1973).

William Strauss and Neil Howes's generational theory stemmed from their book *Generations: The History of America's Future 1584 to 2069* and strayed away from scientific theories in two distinct ways. First, Strauss and Howe's generational theory associated a 20-year timeframe with the emergence of every

new generation. They believed "that four generational personalities (idealist, reactive, civic, and adaptive) emerge every 20 years or so in a cyclical pattern that repeats roughly every 80 years, driven by a generational reaction to the prior generation" (National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, 2020, p. 42). This generational theory also highlights that generations are formed by how historical events shape their members' lives and that those events affect and influence people differently depending on their birth (Strauss & Howe, 2007). According to Strauss and Howe (2007), generations are categorized and labeled by four archetypes: prophet, nomad, hero, and artist. The archetypes are categorized by characteristics such as similarities in age, geographical and historical location, values, culture, communication, and technology.

Generational Labels

Strauss and Howe's (1991) generational theory was instrumental in how American culture described and labeled generations. Generational labels are often used to describe groups born within a specific time-period; for example, Millennials are often described as the generations born roughly in the 1980s and 1990s. Both globally and domestically, the identification and knowledge of varying ages have been discussed and applied in various contexts, such as research, business, and human resources (Dimock, 2018; U.S. Census Bureau, 2015). Ultimately, using generational labels creates convenience around categorizing people, mainly by age. Appelbaum et al. (2022) noted, "By their nature, generational characteristics are a generalization of a group of individuals. This can lead to negative generalizations and stereotypes that create a stigma against a group" (p. 10).

Williams (2019) explained that the purpose of today's generational research is to assist organizations in understanding the recruitment, development, retention, and motivation process of various generations. Cogin (2012) detailed that each generation reacts differently to workplace scenarios, such as behaviors, training, learning style, communication style, problem-solving, and leadership. In the workplace, the focus on generational labels is also used to assist in managing multiple ages by understanding broad generational descriptions. Although the

generational explanations used within organizations may not overtly acknowledge potential diversity within generational cohorts, practitioners should be aware of creating an environment enrooted in respect, inclusivity, and openness "where workers of all ages and cultural backgrounds can share who they are without fear of being judged, 'fixed,' or changed" (National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, 2020, p. 44). Organizational research aimed at exploring generational differences helped researchers understand social change. Still, it has also been used in psychological research to connect outcomes to work-related values, attitudes, and behaviors. This literature review will highlight four workplace generations that differ in expectations and values according to generational theory, including Baby Boomers, Generation X, Millennials, and Generation Z.

Figure 1

Different Labels for Generational Categories and Associated Birth Years From Various Sources

Relative Age of Worker in 2020	Fry (2018)	Howe and Strauss (2007)	Campbell, Twenge, and Campbell (2017) and Twenge Website *	Variations in Birth Years among Researchers (Costanza et al., 2012)
Under 25	Postmillennial or generation Z (1997 or later)	Homeland (2005–2025?)	iGen (1995–2012?)	
26–40	Millennial (1981–1996)	Millennial (1982–2005?)	Millennial (1980–1994)	Millennial (1976/1982–1999/2000 or later)
41–55	Generation X (1965–1980)	Generation X (1961–1981)	GenX (1965–1979)	Generation X (1961/1965–1975/1981)
56–74	Baby boomer (1946–1964)	Boom (1943–1960)	Baby boomer (1946–1964)	Baby boomer (1943/1946–1960/1969)

Note. Adapted from *Are generational categories meaningful distinctions for workforce management?,* by National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, 2020, p. 45.

Baby Boomers

The term "Baby Boomer" was given to individuals born between 1946 and 1964, after World War II, and raised during a time-period of opportunity, growth, and optimism (Hogan et al., 2008; Tamunomiebi & Onah, 2019). The term originated from the United States' significant increase in the birth rate following the

war. The Baby Boomers were shaped by events such as the Vietnam War, Watergate, the civil rights movement, the Kennedy and King assassinations, and the sexual revolution (Becton et al., 2014). Becton et al. (2014) stated, "Because this generation comprises such a large segment of society, Boomers have had a strong generational presence (i.e., significant influence on society)" (p. 177).

Regarding their skill set, Baby Boomers are known to be rational thinkers, highly productive, and task-oriented, but hardly delegate tasks as they enjoy being in charge (Abrams & Von Frank, 2013). Baby Boomers believe firmly in their abilities as employees and are resistant to change (Harris, 2015), and are also characterized as "workaholics, strong-willed, value promotions, titles, corner offices and reserved parking spaces, and they spend rather than save" (Kupperschmidt, 2000, p. 68). They also respond well to authority and direction yet do not appreciate constant feedback while attempting to achieve goals (Tolbize, 2008).

Generation X

Neil (2010) described Generation X, born between 1965 and 1980, as the first to witness mass media and technology. Therefore, they are known to understand and use technology more efficiently than Baby Boomers (Graves, 2013). Seemiller et al. (2019) noted that Generation X is considered the majority of the senior members of the workforce as Baby Boomers continue to retire. Another distinct difference between Baby Boomers and Generation X is a lack of company loyalty. Appelbaum et al. (2022) credited Generation X's lack of company loyalty to "watching and experiencing the impact on their parents from downsizing and layoffs" (p. 8). The term "latchkey kids" was used to describe Generation X. Many came from broken and empty homes as parents were obligated to work long hours, leading to this generation becoming adults early (Becton et al., 2014)

Eisner (2005) noted that Generation X is described as individualistic, lacks loyalty and trust in organizations, and works diligently on work-life balance. A common stereotype of Generation X is that they are "more likely to leave an employer for more challenging work, a higher salary, or better benefits because

they grew up in an era where organizational loyalty and commitment were not regularly rewarded with job security" (Becton et al., 2014, p. 177). Generation X seeks instant specific, constructive feedback (P. Allen, 2004) and aims to find job satisfaction. Egri and Ralston (2004) provided empirical support to show that compared to Baby Boomers, Generation X attributes higher importance to openness to change values and lower priority to self-enhancement values. Although Generation X exhibit similar technological behaviors to younger generations regarding social media and smartphones, they "tend to have different communication preferences from those of younger generations" (Mahmoud et al., 2021, p. 197). For example, whereas Generation Z prefers texting, Generation X uses emails and phone calls within the workplace.

Millennials

Generation Y, most commonly known as Millennials, were born between 1981 and 1995 and are the children of Baby Boomers and early Generation X. They were raised by supportive or "helicopter" parents and are considered to have strong social and family ties (Appelbaum et al., 2022). Millennials are characterized as confident, optimistic, sheltered, looking for opportunities for achievement, and feeling pressured to excel. Millennials "have not known life before cell phones, personal computers, and ATMS" (Becton et al., 2014, p. 177). Therefore, Millennials are familiar with various aspects of internet content and find technology a fundamental part of their everyday lives (Seemiller et al., 2019). This generation is the first "high-tech" generation in the workplace and frequently multitasks when needed (Johnson & Johnson, 2010). Chi et al. (2013) noted that, unlike the Baby Boomers, Millennials seek constant feedback and reassurance from their counterparts and leaders. Millennials do not fear speaking their minds, expressing opinions, and questioning authority. Significantly, this generation prefers a cordial and polite relationship with authority and admires leaders who collaborate and bring people together (Ardueser & Garza, 2021). In addition to being team-oriented, Millennials are known to be more accepting of diversity and inclusion practices (Farrell & Hurt, 2014).

Deal et al. (2010) suggested that Millennials differ considerably from preceding generations, specifically in higher self-esteem, assertiveness, and narcissism. According to Mahmoud et al. (2021), Millennials find motivation through opportunities for development and the promotion of authenticity and transparency. Notably, this generation seeks meaningful work (Ryan, 2001) while prioritizing lifelong learning and happiness within the family (Mitchell, 1998). Eisner (2005) stated that, like Baby Boomers, Millennials have a strong desire to find success and base their success on the significance of their work. Millennials firmly hold values, "including being more ambitious to make a difference and secure a comfortable life" (Ardueser & Garza, 2021, p. 4). T. Martin and Otterman (2016) noted that among those firmly held values, Millennials have unrealistic entitlement expectations in conjunction with immediate recognition and the expectation of instant gratification.

Generation Z

Finally, Generation Z is a label that categorizes people born between 1996 and 2012. Seemiller et al. (2019) recorded that Generation Z is the most racially diverse generation, with 49% of the cohort being non-White. Like Millennials, Generation Z is known for being nonconforming and open-minded, especially regarding gender fluidity. Significantly, Generation Z was raised in a technology-driven lifestyle resulting in an expectation of always having speedy high-tech communication in conjunction with readily available information (Janssen & Carradini, 2021). Ryback (2016) stated that Generation Z's need for flexible working hours and utilization of technology are nearly identical within the workplace. Berkup (2014) characterized Generation Z as individualistic, addicted to technology, lacking the desire to be a part of a work team, and adopting global points of view. Seemiller et al. stated that, like Millennials, Generation Z prefers instant messaging and text messages as their primary platforms for communication. Ultimately, Generation Z grew up in a complex environment immersed in significant influences of technology, which may have led to their focus on

discovering truth, specifically what is true to them and the truth of others (Francis & Hoefel, 2018),

Mahmoud et al. (2021) also noted that although Generation Z is highly intrinsically motivated, this generation values performing well at work. Ardueser and Garza (2021) stated, "They have also been characterized as being achievement-oriented, have greater economic well-being, are more highly educated, and are more ethnically and racially diverse than any other generation" (p. 4). Although Generation Z is highly achievement-oriented, Francis and Hoefel (2018) argued that it is the most devoted generation in searching for deeper meaning and truth. From a well-being perspective, organizations should invest in their mental health and wellness resources as Generation Z has the highest rate of diagnosed depression, followed by anxiety, compared to other generations (American Psychological Association, 2019).

Workplace Spirituality

Spirituality in the workplace has been an increasing interest to both practitioners and scholars (Giacalone et al., 2005). However, although spirituality is an emerging field within the workplace, Miller and Ewest (2013) stated that there is scarce practical support within organizations that ascribe to being spiritual. Conversely, Young (2020) argued that workplace spirituality is receiving well-deserved attention due to its ability to create an environment of self-expression and inner purpose that assists organizational consciousness. Farmer et al. (2019) noted the synergy between individual values and workplace spirituality, which "serves as a guiding principle to personal practice" (Jolliffe & Foster, 2022, p. 452). McGhee (2019) described workplace spirituality as a tool to assist employees in realizing they have a sense of purpose and community at work. Ultimately, workplace spirituality allows the employee the opportunity to move beyond economic self-interest and motivate employees to work toward the benefit of others and their well-being (Jolliffe & Foster, 2022; Wimbush & Shepard, 1994).

Defining Workplace Spirituality

Schutte (2016) explained that a lack of agreement on a widely accepted definition of workplace spirituality leads to not a "dominant paradigm or a prevailing framework within which the discussion on workplace spirituality is carried out" (p. 2). Therefore, scholars consistently aim to clarify workplace spirituality's definition to create a common ground for theoretical discourse and empirical examination (Schutte, 2016). Nonetheless, researchers in workplace spirituality explain that the process of discovering meaning through work is more profound than material success (Madden, 2015). Ashmos and Duchon (2000) described the concept of workplace spirituality as the understanding that inner life is nourished and nourished by meaningful work within the community. Jurkiewicz and Giacalone (2004) defined workplace spirituality as "a framework of organizational values evidenced in the culture that promotes employees' experience of transcendence through the work process, facilitating their sense of being connected to others in a way that provides feelings of completeness and joy" (p. 6).

Workplace spirituality is defined as an employee's experience that leads to self-transcendence, meaning, and community while acknowledging that these experiences may stem from the organizational environment—including organizational ones (Pawar, 2008). McMurray and Simmers (2020) stated that workplace spirituality not only reinforces values of concern for self and others, but it is also considered the foundation for an employee's ethical schema, which impacts how they interact with other individuals and groups workplace. In addition to creating a space for responsible business practices, workplace spirituality also encourages a more meaningful work experience. Rathee and Rajain (2020) suggested that research supports that the fundamental elements of workplace spirituality are inner life, meaningful work, a sense of community, alignment with organizational values, and a sense of contribution to society. For this study, the concept of workplace spirituality mirrored Mitroff and Denton's (1999) thoughts on workplace spirituality as an individual's effort to search for the ultimate purpose in life while having a solid connection with others associated with work and having alignment between organizational values and one's core beliefs.

Figure 2

Elements of Workplace Spirituality

Elements	Authors	Views
Inner life	Ashmos and Duchon (2000)	Inner life is about assimilating one's power and using it to live a more satisfying life.
	Rego, Cunha, and Souto (2007)	There is nourishment of inner life by meaningful work.
	Albuquerque, Cunha, Martins, and Sá (2014)	Inner life means that employees have spiritual needs at work besides cognitive, emotional, and physical needs.
Meaningful work	Ashmos and Duchon (2000)	Meaningful work is about connection between soul and work.
	Rego et al. (2007)	Meaningful work dimension explains self-esteem, job involvement, intrinsic work satisfaction, and affective commitment.
	Albuquerque et al. (2014)	This dimension assumes work is valued by the employees for reasons beyond their remuneration.
Sense of community	Ashmos and Duchon (2000)	Living in connection to other human beings is part of being alive.
	Albuquerque et al. (2014)	Feeling of belongingness to a community is part of what increases the spirituality at work.
Alignment with organizational values	Rego et al. (2007)	Value alignment dimension explains intention to quit and commitment.
Sense of contribution to society	Rego et al. (2007)	The sense of endowment to the community is similar to the meaningful work.

Note. Adapted from " Workplace spirituality: A comparative study of various models," *Jindal Journal of Business Research*, *9*(1), 2020, p. 31.

Dimensions of Workplace Spirituality

Regarding the multifaceted nature of workplace spirituality, it is important to note that spiritual values can be discussed and applied from an individual, organizational, and interactive perspective (Kolodinsky et al., 2008). In *From Advocacy to Science*, Giacalone et al. (2005) suggested that scales used to evaluate spirituality are "designed to assess individual adherence to theistic connection, or membership affiliation" and additionally measure an "interactive relationship of organizational and personal beliefs and their impact on criterion variables" (p. 521). Miller and Ewest (2013) suggested an organizational rubric in which spiritual instruments were classified into three distinct categories: manifestation scales, development scales, and adherence scales.

By definition, manifestation scales relate to the "orientation to universal religious or spiritual values, disclosing specific manifestations, phenomenological

experiences without regard to specific traditions, and expressions of a person's values and corresponding motivations" (Miller & Ewest, 2013, p. 39). For example, the Spirituality at Work Scale (SAW) (Ashmos & Duchon, 2000) measures three aspects of spirituality: inner life, meaningful work, and community. Not only does this instrument measure the individual perspective, but it also delves into organizational perception as it is concerned with understanding how well an employee identifies with the mission, values, and goals of their organization. Ultimately, the aim of the SAW is to recognize how spirituality can assist in creating a more productive work environment. The Spiritual Climate Inventory (Pandey et al., 2009) measures the integration of work and spirituality, while focusing on harmony with self, harmony within the work environment, and transcendence. Harmony with self focuses on a person finding meaning, purpose, and enrichment within their work, whereas harmony with work relates to respect with others and diverse relationships. Lastly, transcendence addresses the divine and direct connectedness with existence (Miller & Ewest, 2013).

Miller and Ewest (2013) defined development scales as "the level of development within the participant in reference to a range of mature versus immature behavior, and/or nascent or developed religious/spiritual expectations" (p. 40). The Spiritual Leadership Scale (Fry et al., 2005) seeks to understand and measure spiritual leadership, which is considered as the establishment of values congruence between the leader and the follower, more specifically relating to strategy and empowering teams. The elements of spiritual leadership add value to the areas of organizational commitment, productivity, and employee well-being. Lastly, the adherence scale category relates "to authentic adherence of religious, spiritual, or traditional beliefs and to the integration or practice of specific religious or spiritual traditions without regard to maturity" (Miller & Ewest, 2013, p. 40). The Forgiveness Scale (Hargrave & Sells, 1997) considers religiosity in its approach as it recognizes that the concept of forgiveness is found in various religions, such as Christianity, Judaism, Zen Buddhism, Confucianism, and Islam (Hargrave & Sells, 1997; Miller & Ewest, 2013). Forgiveness is not only viewed as central to the cultivation and development of relationship with self and others, but

it is also correlated with the development of cognitive and moral reasoning (Miller & Ewest, 2013). Although scholars have various definitions of workplace spirituality, the application of the variables mentioned depicts the multidimensional nature of the interactive relationships between the individual and organizational perspectives. Notably, a plethora of instruments is used to measure workplace spirituality, but for this study, the MEMS was selected to understand the relationship between meaning in life, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment among the Millennial generation.

Meaning in Life

According to Valdivia and Li (2022), meaning in life (MIL) is a psychological experience that has increased interest due to its relevance to human existence. Wong (2017) stated that one of humanity's primary motivations is a pursuit of MIL. Although MIL research continues to flourish, researchers have labeled its conceptualization as abstract and problematic (Martela & Steger, 2016). George and Park's (2017) research on the tripartite approach to measuring MIL detailed the myriad of definitions used to define the term depending on the specific concept, such as:

> The intuitive feeling that things make sense (Heintzelman & King, 2014), having goals (Ryff, 1989), engagement in activities that are personally valued (Scheier et al., 2006), having an 'integrated and consistent understanding of self, others, and life in general (Reker, 2000, p. 48), having a life aim (McKnight & Kashdan, 2009), feeling fulfillment (Reker & Wong, 1988), and experiencing a sense of significance (Crumbaugh & Maholick, 1964).

Notably, these definitions and varying conceptualizations impede the researcher's ability to accurately predict and compare MIL across studies. Although scholars have debated the conceptualizations of MIL, many have agreed with the convergence of Steger's (2013) definition. The more concise, multifaceted conceptualization is as follows:

> Meaning is the web of connections, understandings, and interpretations that help us comprehend our experience and formulate plans directing our

energies to the achievement of our desired future. Meaning provides us with the sense that our lives matter, that they make sense, and that they are more than the sum of our seconds, days, and years (p. 165)

Steger's (2013) definition emphasizes three components of MIL: comprehension (a cognitive component), purpose (a motivational component), and mattering (an evaluative component).

George and Park (2017) argued that a tripartite view of MIL suggests a multidimensional view facilitates a more in-depth and detailed understanding of meaning in life. Comprehension is considered the degree to which people perceive understanding or coherence regarding their lives. Purpose is the extent to which people experience life as being directed and motivated by valued life goals (McKnight & Kashdan, 2009). Lastly, mattering is the degree to which individuals feel that their life is of significance, importance, and value to the world (George & Park, 2014).

Multidimensional Existential Meaning Scale

The MEMS (George & Park, 2017) is a self-report questionnaire consisting of 15 items, which are grouped into three subscales: comprehension, purpose, and mattering. Participants rate each item on a 7-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 = *very strongly disagree* to 7 = *very strongly agree*. George and Park (2017) developed the instrument using three separate samples of undergraduate students from a large university in the northeastern region of the United States. The researchers reported high internal consistency for each subscale, with Cronbach's alpha values of 0.90, 0.90, and 0.90 for comprehension, 0.89, 0.89, and 0.88 for purpose, and 0.84, 0.85, and 0.90 for mattering.

The Influence of Generational Diversity on Spirituality in the Workplace

As the growing body of literature and knowledge about the foundations of spirituality in the workplace increases (Benefiel et al., 2014), there are gaps in research regarding the influence of contextual factors on spirituality, such as generational diversity (McMurray & Simmers, 2020). Yet with various generations occupying the workplace, it is vital for leaders to understand how shared

generational characteristics such as affect relationships, work ethic and behavior, intrinsic and extrinsic motivators, and collaboration, including workplace spirituality (McMurray & Simmers, 2020). However, although generational scholars and practitioners are committed to addressing the impact of generations in the workplace (Haserot, 2008; McDonald, 2008), little empirical evidence exists on the relationship between spirituality in the workplace and generational diversity (McMurray & Simmers, 2020). Further research exploring generational views on workplace spirituality may provide insights into critical organizational functions, such as productivity and human resource policy development (Hernaus & Poloski Vokic, 2014; Sori et al., 2006).

Spirituality in the workplace not only reinforces values of concern for self and others, but it is also considered the "foundation for a person's ethical schema, impacting how an individual interacts with other individuals and groups within the workplace, encouraging more meaningful work experiences and fostering responsible business performance" (McMurray & Simmers, 2020, p. 70). Cartwright's (2001) spiritual development theory highlighted that contextual variables such as subjective experiences, social interactions, and life events impact spiritual growth. Sori et al. (2006) believed that understanding how different generations view spirituality in the workplace could assist in leadership's strategic and tactical functions, such as human resource policy development and meeting employee expectations.

The increasing interest in spirituality in the workplace and generational diversity has helped practitioners understand the intersection between work and life, which allows individuals to pursue meaningful experiences within the workplace. For example, Baby Boomers measure their self-worth by advancing up the corporate ladder and through organizations with integrity and structure and find meaning when they work for organizations that demonstrate integrity, purpose, and structure (McMurray & Simmers, 2020). Baby Boomers are also known to have strong, formal, and well-established local ties for a sense of community and interconnectedness. Generation X finds meaning through their work and life responsibilities, considers their core values prime motivators, and prioritizes social

connections rather than material ones (Daboval, 1998; McMurray & Simmers, 2020). A study by the Pew Foundation indicated that although Millennials are considered less religious than their older counterparts, they are just as spiritual (Pew Research Center, 2010). Notably, the Millennial generation aims to serve the benefit of others while having strong social connections domestically and globally.

Spirituality and Millennials

One unique aspect of Millennials in the workplace is that although they indicated they were less religious than older generations, they considered themselves just as spiritual (McMurray & Simmers, 2020). Significantly, Millennials consider a purpose-driven workplace a foundational and underlying expectation and desire to transform organizational cultures into businesses that create impactful change (Deloitte, 2017). In Madden's (2015) literature regarding the pursuit of meaning and purpose, they referenced Gallup Organization research, stating that many people engage in finding meaning through work that is deeper than material success. Ultimately, Madden argued that the commitment of searching for meaning through work "carries the potential both for great individual satisfaction and for gains in society as people seek ways to serve, honoring their connectedness with each other and with the surrounding world" (p. 75). This study focused on identifying how Millennials are impacted by workplace spirituality.

To enhance, cultivate, and develop the Millennial generation as leaders, organizations should be committed to understanding their attitudes, characteristics, behaviors, and expectations (Folarin, 2021). Millennials want to be valuable contributors to their organizations and society in general. Studies by the Society for Human Resource Management depicted that Millennials were highly eager to use their skills to benefit a cause and sought out organizations with more company-wide service opportunities. According to a Deloitte (2017) study, Millennials are consistently seeking purpose within the organization and they serve without sacrificing their identity at work and nourishing a fulfilling life outside the workplace. Specifically, Millennials aim to work for companies that relate to their passions, serve a social purpose, and prioritize work/life balance (Deloitte, 2017)

As of 2015, Millennials embodied most of the workforce and consistently assumed leadership positions with direct reports. The Millennial mindset has not only assisted in evolving cultural norms, but it has also transformed the status quo by seeking purpose within their organizations. Research suggests that this generation's most sought-after organizational culture element is to be purpose-driven in their work (Deloitte, 2017). According to Deloitte's (2015) Millennial survey, 2 out of 3 Millennials stated that they chose to work for an organization because of their purpose. Conversely, in organizational cultures without an overt purpose, only 1 out of 5 Millennials found satisfaction in their role.

The modernization of purpose in the workplace through technology, skill alignment, innovation, and work-life integration has positively impacted productivity, engagement, and retention (Deloitte, 2017). A CompTIA survey depicted that Millennials believed they were in the upper tier of using technology (CopmTIA, 2023), and innovative technology allowed Millennial professionals to work more purposefully. Millennials are known to combine business social tools with networking applications to collaborate continuously and believe that technology has developed a more fulfilling work life (Deloitte, 2015).

Like any other generation, Millennials who feel they cannot use their favorable skills believe they cannot work purposefully. A 2015 Gallup survey illustrated that Millennials were less likely than any other generation to say they have the opportunity to do what they do best at work. This research related skill alignment and purpose presented global implications, showing that regardless of geography, only twenty-eight percent of Millennials believed their organization adequately used their skills (Deloitte, 2017). The improper use of Millennials' workplace skills not only affects their ability to work purposefully but also ultimately leads to high rates of turnover.

Skill alignment, innovation, and purpose in the workplace are connected for all generations, yet Millennials in the Deloitte study believed organizations were underserved in areas such as research and development. In addition, although innovation is a critical organizational aspect and Millennials are eager for opportunities to innovate, 25% of Millennials believed that the central barrier to

innovation is senior management's inability to be flexible and develop new processes to solve problems (Deloitte, 2017). Lastly, Millennials are often more purposeful within the workplace when their organizations empower them regarding well-being and work-life integration.

Workplace Spirituality and Organizational Outcomes

Benefiel et al. (2014) argued that the need to integrate spirituality in the workplace not only assists in establishing ethical values that help guide guiding organizational principles but also promotes employee well-being and environmental and social responsibility without sacrificing fiscal performance. Although implementing workplace spirituality is associated with positive organizational outcomes, organizations should implement intentional organizational change strategies to instill workplace spirituality practices. Researchers such as Ashmos and Duchon (2000) studied how workplace spirituality could be implemented by organizations to increase productivity.

From an employee perspective, workplace spirituality assists employees in self-discovery and individual development as it induces positive behavior change (Illes & Zsolnai, 2015; Khasawneh, 2011). Rahman et al. (2015) suggested that spirituality in the workplace creates more opportunities for overall knowledge sharing, which leads to increased trust. Regarding employee well-being, Daniel (2015) noted that employees who work for organizations with high levels of spirituality tend to experience lower levels of work stress.

Job Satisfaction

Scholars have considered the implications of workplace spirituality and identified links to positive organizational outcomes such as "an increased commitment to organizational goals, increased honesty and trust, greater kindness and fairness, increased creativity, even increased profits and morale, higher levels of productivity and performance, reduced absenteeism, connectedness with the colleague's job satisfaction and intrinsic motivation" (Schutte, 2016, p.3). Benefiel et al. (2014) also noted the positive outcomes of organizational commitment, job satisfaction, reduced frustration, reduced inner conflict, and retention. Ultimately,

workplace spirituality provides a framework for integrating the individual and the organization through power sharing, empowerment, and non-financial values that can be nurtured (Benefiel et al., 2014; McMurray & Simmers, 2020).

According to Akehurst et al. (2009), job satisfaction is considered "the most important and frequently studied attitude" (p. 280). Whereas an institutional concept of job satisfaction exists, mainly describing an employee's attitude regarding work, the definition for job satisfaction has gradually evolved. In Hoppock's (1935) doctoral thesis, *Job Satisfaction*, he described job satisfaction as the combination of psychological, physiological, and environmental circumstances that cause an individual to genuinely feel satisfied with a job. Karatepe et al. (2006) described job satisfaction as a set of favorable or unfavorable feelings and emotions in which an employee views their work.

Organizational Commitment

Fares and Noordin (2016) described organizational commitment as "one of the most widely examined variables in literature" (p. 30). Organizational psychologists argued that only job satisfaction had received more research attention than organizational commitment (Rego & Cunha, 2008). Organizational commitment is a psychological state that depicts an employee's relationships with the organization and reduces the likelihood that the employee will leave the organization (N. J. Allen & Meyer, 2000).

Considering the effects on common workplace dimensions, research supports the notion that workplace spirituality yields benefit regarding organizational performance and commitment. Significant relationships exist between higher levels of individual, group, and organizational performance and workplace spirituality (Albuquerque et al., 2014; Daniel, 2015; Jurkiewicz & Giacalone, 2004; Pirkola et al., 2016; Rego et al., 2007) as it creates cross-level connection. Rego and Cunha (2008) studied the influence of workplace dimensions and workplace spirituality and found that employees felt more connected to their place of work when they experienced spirituality, which led to a more profound sense of obligation and loyalty to the organization.

Summary

Understanding spirituality in the workplace has increasingly gained interest, as there is relevant overlap between work and life and the employee's pursuit of meaningful workplace experiences (McMurray & Simmers, 2020; Pawar, 2008). Although each generation holds various motivators and expectations in their views of the workplace (Cogin, 2012), research is scarce on the effect of spirituality in the workplace and Millennials, specifically regarding MIL.

Chapter 3 – Methodology

This chapter includes details of the quantitative methods used to examine the relationships between Millennials' meaning in life, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. The aim of this survey research was to investigate the relationship and predictive capacity between meaning in life, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. The surveys were cross-sectional, whereas the data were collected at one point in time. Data analysis encompassed a multivariate statistical methods approach to convert the complex data into valuable and applicable information (see Hair et al., 2006).

Research Questions and Hypothesis

A research question "is the first and most general step in designing and conducting a research investigation" and "must be specific so that it can be answered with a research project" (Cozby & Bates, 2018, p. 53). Creswell (2012) described research questions as tools to narrow the purpose of the study to specific questions that the researcher seeks to answer; researchers typically state multiple research questions to fully explore the topic. A hypothesis is defined as "statements in quantitative research in which the investigator makes a prediction or a conjecture about the outcome of a relationship among attributes or characteristics" (Creswell, 2012, p. 111). Lastly, a prediction, or a deliberate guess, follows the hypothesis and is directly testable, while including specific variables and methodologies.

The current study involved an exploration of the impact of meaning in life on job satisfaction and organizational commitment among Millennials in various organizational spaces. The research approach adopted was a survey research method to examine the correlations between the three factors of meaning in life and their predictive capacity on two organizational outcomes: satisfaction, and commitment. The primary research questions that guided this study are as follows:

Research Question 1

Can meaning in life (measured by the Multidimensional Existential Meaning Scale) predict job satisfaction among Millennials?

H1a: Comprehension (independent variable) predicts job satisfaction
(dependent variable).

H1b: Purpose (independent variable) predicts job satisfaction (dependent
variable).

H1c: Mattering (independent variable) predicts job satisfaction (dependent
variable).

Research Question 2

Can meaning in life (measured by the Multidimensional Existential Meaning Scale)
predict organizational commitment among Millennials?

H2a: Comprehension (independent variable) predicts organizational
commitment (dependent variable).

H2b: Purpose (independent variable) predicts organizational commitment
(dependent variable).

H2c: Mattering (independent variable) predicts organizational commitment
(dependent variable).

Research Design

Correlational research designs are nonexperimental methods that allow the
researcher to observe the covariation between variables (Cozby & Bates, 2018).
Creswell (2012) stated that correlational research designs are most appropriate
when researchers aim to identify relationships between variables and predictive
patterns within the samples. For this study, a self-administered survey method was
used to make generalized claims about the population. A survey design assists
researchers in answering various questions: descriptive questions, questions
regarding the relationship between variables, and questions about the predictive
relationships between variables. The research approach applied in this study was a
quantitative methodology with a correlational design, which assisted the researcher
to determine whether a relationship existed between meaning in life and job
satisfaction and organizational commitment among Millennials using surveys.

Variables and Measures

The MEMS measured the independent variables, specifically the tripartite view of the instrument: comprehension, purpose, and mattering. The dependent variables were assessed using MSQ and OCQ. Also evaluated were demographic questions, such as age, education, gender, race, and job title. DeVellis (2017) noted that reliable instruments perform consistently and predictably. Hair et al. (2006) defined reliability as the "extent to which a variable or set of variables are consistent in what it is intended to measure. If multiple measurements are taken, the reliable measures will all be consistent in their values" (p. 3).

Regarding reliability for a scale, Cronbach's coefficient alpha is considered the most commonly used measure, and most scholars agree on a minimum internal consistency coefficient of .70 (Robinson, 2009; Taherdoost, 2016). Dean (2021) referred to internal consistency as "the extent that responses to items designed to measure a single construct are consistent with each other" (p. 14). Whereas internal consistency refers to the consistency of survey responses across constructs, Cronbach's coefficient alpha determines the interrelatedness of the items within the scale.

The MEMS (George & Park, 2017) is a 15-item self-report questionnaire that comprises three five-item subscales that measure an individual's comprehension, purpose, and mattering. Each item is rated on a 7-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 = *very strongly disagree* to 7 = *very strongly agree*. George and Park (2017) developed this instrument using three samples of undergraduate students from a large university located in the northeastern region of the United States. After collecting data from three samples of undergraduate college students, the researchers documented Cronbach's coefficient alpha as follows: 0.90, 0.90, and 0.90 for comprehension, 0.89, 0.89, and 0.88 for purpose, and 0.84, 0.85, and 0.90 for mattering.

The MSQ (Weiss et al., 1967) evaluated and assessed satisfaction within intrinsic and extrinsic aspects of the work environment. Weiss et al. (1967) developed the questionnaire based on the assumption that work fit depends upon the correlation between the individual's skills and the existence of reinforcement

within the work environment. The self-reporting measure has a long form, consisting of 100 questions with 20 subscales that measure satisfaction. The short-form consists of 20 items with the highest correlation from the original subscales of the MSQ. Lastly, the MSQ rates each response on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 = *very dissatisfied*) to 5 = *very satisfied*. Lester et al. (2014) reported a Cronbach's alpha of 0.93 for the short-form MSQ.

The OCQ (Mowday et al., 1979) is a 15-item widely used instrument measuring professional commitment. Porter et al. (1974) defined organizational commitment as the "relative strength of an individual's identification with and involvement in a particular organization" (p. 604). The three factors used to describe organizational commitment were willingness to exert effort, desire to maintain membership in the organization, and acceptance of organizational values. The response format used a 7-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 7 = *strongly agree*. Garg and Rastogi (2009) reported a Cronbach's coefficient alpha of 0.88 for OCQ.

Population and Sampling

Cozby and Bates (2018) referred to the population as a composition of individuals of interest to the research. Creswell (2012) stated that a population is when "a group of individuals possesses one characteristic that distinguishes them from other groups" (p. 381). The sample is a group of study participants selected from the target population from which the researcher generalizes to the target population (Creswell, 2012). A large sample size is vital, as larger sample sizes are more likely to yield accurate data that reflect the true population value (Cozby & Bates, 2018; Creswell & Creswell, 2018).

Although the "rule of thumb" for the recommended participants per predictor has generated much debate (R. D. Riley et al., 2019), Hair et al. (2006) recommended 15–20 participants per predictor variable for multiple regression analysis. Because this study had six predictor variables, the goal was to obtain 120 surveys. The participants did not receive compensation, and the recruiting process entailed surveys emailed to a random sample of Millennials, ranging in year of

birth from 1981 to 1995. Additionally, when the participants completed the survey, they were asked to email it to others interested in participating in the study.

Data Collection

The data collection method for this study was random sampling, with SurveyMonkey, an online anonymous survey data collector, for collecting the responses. The researcher entered the MEMS, MSQ, and OCQ into SurveyMonkey so that all 55 questions, including the demographic inquiries, were answered within one survey. Potential participants received the survey via email and the social media platforms LinkedIn and Instagram.

Analysis

The analysis method for data in this study was multiple regression analysis using the 29th version of IBM's Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). According to Creswell (2012), multiple regression analysis is appropriate "where multiple independent variables may combine to correlate with a dependent variable" (p. 350). By identifying these relationships, predictions can be made about the dependent variable. This dissertation focused on investigating the relationship between meaning in life, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment experienced by Millennials. Hence, multiple regression analysis was the most suitable approach for data analysis.

According to Uma Sekaran and Bougie (2010),

> Multiple regression analysis provides a means of objectively assessing the
> degree and the character of the relationship between the independent
> variables and the dependent variable: the regression coefficients indicate the
> relative importance of the independent variables in the prediction of the
> dependent variable. (pp. 350-351)

Multiple regression analysis is a quantitative research strategy employed to predict relationships between an independent variable and a dependent variable. Because data collection occurred through a survey instrument at a single point in time, this research strategy is also referred to as cross-sectional (Creswell, 2009). The

primary aim of this dissertation was to examine a sample of Millennials and draw generalizations about the population.

Summary

      This chapter included details of the study methods and resources selected for this study to examine the correlations between the three factors of meaning in life and its impact on job satisfaction and organizational commitment. The aim of this study was to generate quantitative descriptions of various aspects of the population studied (see Pinsonneault & Kraemer, 1993). The research methodology employed encompassed quantitative data research principles and methods to examine meaning in life, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment among Millennials in various professional groups, which, according to Creswell (2009), would provide an understanding of relationships between the independent and dependent variables. Lastly, data analysis involved multiple regression analysis to examine the correlations and predictive capacity between meaning in life, job satisfaction and organizational commitment among Millennials.

Chapter 4 – Results or Findings

This research was an examination of the relationship between meaning in life, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment of Millennials using a quantitative cross-sectional study. The participants were selected using random sampling, including respondents working in 24 industries across the United States. In total, 131 complete surveys were used, which satisfied the minimum sample size required for the analysis. The participants did not receive compensation, and the recruiting process entailed posting information regarding the research on LinkedIn and Instagram. To meet the study's qualifications, the participant had to a Millennial employee, ranging in year of birth from 1981 to 1995. Additionally, when the participants completed the survey, they were asked to email it to others interested in participating.

The initial step was to analyze the sample using descriptive statistics. The second step was to perform an internal consistency reliability analysis to assess the reliability of each scale and subscale. Subsequently, the researcher performed a correlation analysis to describe the strength and direction of the relationships between meaning in life, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. The other analysis conducted was a multiple regression analysis to evaluate the six independent variables as predictor variables.

Population Demographics

The aim of this study was to obtain a random sample that could be used to generalize to a broader population. The general demographics, such as year of birth, gender, and ethnicity or race, are described in Table 1. The participants in the study ranged in year of birth from 1981 to 1995, and the median year of birth was 1990. The participant population depicted a noticeable difference in the number of women (82.4%) who completed the survey compared to men (17.6%). Regarding the education demographic, most participants graduated with at least a bachelor's degree (38.9%), whereas the second highest education level was completing graduate school (33.6%).

Another goal of this research was to have a diverse group of employees participate in the study. The race and ethnicity breakdown in Table 1 revealed that Asian, Black or African American, Hispanic or Latino, Middle Eastern or North African, Multiracial or Multiethnic, and White individuals were represented within the study. Conversely, although diversity is present, most employees who participated were Hispanic or Latino (44.3%) and White (40.5%). The list of races and ethnicities was obtained from SurveyMonkey and used as a guideline.

Table 1

General Demographics of Survey Participants

Variable	N	%
Year of Birth		
1981	3	2.3
1982	7	5.3
1983	3	2.3
1984	5	3.8
1985	3	2.3
1986	9	6.9
1987	6	4.6
1988	8	6.1
1989	15	11.5
1990	14	10.7
1991	16	12.2
1992	20	15.3
1993	10	7.6
1994	6	4.6
1995	6	4.6
Gender		
Male	23	17.6
Female	108	82.4
Education		
Completed High School	14	10.7
1 Year of College	4	3.1
2 Years of College	6	4.6
3 Years of College	4	3.1
Graduated from College	51	38.9
Some Graduate School	8	6.7
Completed Graduate School	44	33.6
Race or Ethnicity		
Asian	5	3.8
Black or African-American	5	3.8
Hispanic or Latino	58	44.3

Variable	N	%
Middle Eastern or North African	4	3.1
Multiracial or Multiethnic	6	4.6
White	53	40.5

Table 2 shows the participant's job roles and the various industries represented. Most participants were either individual contributors (28.4%) or managers (22.9%). Moreover, 22.1% of the participants identified as *other* and specified their job roles as director, nurse, or teacher. Lastly, another goal of this study was to include participants from various industries and professions. Table 2 shows the diverse industries in the survey, with most participants employed in healthcare/pharmaceuticals (35.9%) and education (16.8%). The industries represented were defined using SurveyMonkey as a guideline for industries. The participants who chose *other* self-identified as consultancy, sports agency, legal, and hospitality.

Table 2

Participant's Job Roles and Industry

Variable	N	%
Job Role		
Individual Contributor	37	28.4
Team Lead	15	11.5
Manager	30	22.9
Senior Manager	5	3.8
Regional Manager	3	2.3
Vice President	5	3.8
C-Level (e.g., CEO, CFO, CLO)	1	.8
Owner	6	4.6
Other (please specify)	29	22.1
Industry		
Advertising/Marketing	3	2.3
Agriculture	1	.8
Airlines/Aerospace	1	.8
Automotive	2	1.5
Construction/Machinery/Homes	3	2.3
Education	22	16.8
Entertainment/Leisure	1	.8
Finance/Financial Services	1	.8
Food/Beverages	5	3.8
Government	3	2.3
Health/Fitness	2	1.5

Variable	N	%
Healthcare/Pharmaceuticals	47	35.9
Insurance	3	2.3
Manufacturing	1	.8
Nonprofit	6	4.6
Real Estate	3	2.3
Retail	1	.8
Telecommunications/Technology	6	4.6
Other (please specify)	20	15.3

Reliability and Relationships

Pallant (2010) noted that the prevailing tool for assessing the reliability of a scale is Cronbach's coefficient alpha (α). Per Hair et al. (2006), it is widely acknowledged that scores exceeding .70 represent a commonly agreed-upon lower threshold for alpha. In the context of this dissertation, an internal consistency reliability analysis was executed to appraise the dependability of each scale and its respective subscales. According to the data, all of the scales and subscales appeared to be reliable.

The MEMS short form comprises 15 questions that produce three subscales. The three subscales were evaluated using SPSS Version 29. Out of the 15 questions, one was reverse scored, and the negative scores were transformed using SPSS to accommodate the reverse scores. Cronbach's coefficient alpha values for the MEMS short form included comprehension, yielding an alpha value of .87; purpose, yielding an alpha value of .89; and mattering, yielding an alpha value of .85 (see Table 3). As all alpha values were above .70, the data collected from the MEMS are considered reliable.

Table 3

Multidimensional Existential Meaning Scale Short-Form Coefficient Alpha

Subscale	*a*
Multidimensional Existential Meaning Scale Short-Form	
Comprehension	.87
Purpose	.89
Mattering	.85

The MSQ short form consists of 20 questions. It has three subscales, including intrinsic satisfaction, yielding an alpha value of .88; extrinsic satisfaction, yielding an alpha value of .86; and general satisfaction, yielding an alpha value of .93 (see Table 4). All alpha values were above .70; therefore, the data collected from the MSQ are considered reliable.

Table 4

Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire Short-Form

Subscale	a
Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire Short-Form	
Intrinsic Satisfaction	.88
Extrinsic Satisfaction	.86
General Satisfaction	.93

The OCQ comprises 15 items, with six items subject to reverse scoring. To account for the negatively scored items, a reverse scoring transformation was applied using SPSS, resulting in a calculated alpha of .93 (see Table 5). The alpha, surpassing the threshold of .70, signifies the reliability of the OCQ data for the current study.

Table 5

Organizational Commitment Questionnaire Short-Form

Scale	a
Organizational Commitment Questionnaire Short-Form	.93

The correlation analysis included the following variables: comprehension, purpose, mattering, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. Table 6 displays the results of the means, standard deviations, and correlations between the dependent and independent variables. The purpose of correlation analysis was to examine and describe the strength of relationships between the variables in the study. The variables job satisfaction and comprehension were found to be strongly positively correlated, $r(130) = .56$, $p < .01$. Additionally, job satisfaction and purpose had a strong and positive correlation, $r(130) = .50$, $p < .01$. Lastly, the variables job satisfaction and mattering were weakly positively correlated, $r(130) =$

.26, $p < .01$. The variables of organizational commitment and comprehension were found to be strongly positively correlated, $r(130) = .50$, $p < .01$. Job satisfaction and purpose were strongly positively correlated, $r(130) = .50$, $p < .01$, whereas the variables job satisfaction and mattering were weakly positively correlated, $r(130) = .23$, $p < .01$ (see Table 6).

Table 6

Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations among Dependent and Independent Variables

Variable	*M*	*SD*	1	2	3	4
1. Comprehension	5.57	.99	-			
2. Purpose	6.20	.83	.59**	-		
3. Mattering	4.81	.86	.32**	.42**	-	
4. Job Satisfaction	70.10	15.11	.56**	.50**	.26**	-
5. Organizational Commitment	5.10	1.27	.50**	.50**	.23*	.72**

Note. $*p < .05$. $**p < .01$.

Hypothesis Testing

Multiple regression analysis was performed to analyze the predictive relationships between the six independent variables and the dependent variables of job satisfaction and organizational commitment. This approach was beneficial for this study as multiple regression analysis is not only based on correlation, but I also "allows a more sophisticated exploration of the interrelationship among a set of variables" (Pallant, 2010, p. 95). The quantitative analysis comprised two models. The first model evaluated the six independent variables with job satisfaction, whereas the second model evaluated the six independent variables with organizational commitment.

Job Satisfaction

The first research question and sub-questions associated with the study are as follows:

Research Question 1

Research question one asked if meaning in life (measured by the Multidimensional Existential Meaning Scale) predicts job satisfaction among Millennials. This research question included the following three hypotheses:

H1a: Comprehension (independent variable) predicts job satisfaction (dependent variable).

H1b: Purpose (independent variable) predicts job satisfaction (dependent variable).

H1c: Mattering (independent variable) predicts job satisfaction (dependent variable).

To test each hypothesis, regression testing was performed. As shown in Table 7, comprehension significantly predicted job satisfaction, $b = .413$, $t(4.68) = 6.23$, $p < .01$; therefore, H1a was accepted. Purpose significantly predicted job satisfaction, $b = .241$, $t(2.60) = 4.38$), $p < .01$; therefore, H1b was accepted. Mattering did not significantly predict job satisfaction, $b = .26$, $t(.334)$, $p < .01$.; therefore, H1c was rejected.

Table 7

Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

Predictor	Job Satisfaction ($n = 131$)			
Variable	B	SE	β	p
Comprehension	6.23	1.34	.413	<.001
Purpose	4.38	1.68	.241	.010
Mattering	.461	1.38	.026	.74

*Note. *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$.

Organizational Commitment

Research Question 2

Research question two was as follows: can meaning in life (measured by the Multidimensional Existential Meaning Scale) predicts organizational commitment among Millennials? This research question included the following three hypotheses:

H2a: Comprehension (independent variable) predicts organizational commitment (dependent variable).

H2b: Purpose (independent variable) predicts organizational commitment

(dependent variable).

H2c: Mattering (independent variable) predicts organizational commitment

(dependent variable).

To test each hypothesis, regression testing was performed. As shown in

Table 8, comprehension significantly predicted organizational commitment, b =

.323, *t*(3.54) = .410, *p* < .01; therefore, H2a was accepted. Purpose significantly

predicted organizational commitment, b = .312, *t*(3.27) = 4.78), *p* < .01; therefore,

H2b was accepted. Mattering did not significantly predict job satisfaction, b = -

.010, *t*(-.125), *p* < .01.; therefore, H2c was rejected.

Table 8

Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

Predictor	Organizational Commitment (*n* = 131)			
Variable	B	*SE*	B	*p*
Comprehension	.410	.116	.323	<.001
Purpose	.478	.146	.312	.001
Mattering	-.015	.120	-.010	.901

*Note. *p* < .05, **p* < .01

Summary

This chapter included a presentation of the results of a quantitative cross-

sectional study exploring the relationship between meaning in life, job satisfaction,

and organizational commitment among Millennials. The research involved 131

participants from 24 industries in the United States, selected through random

sampling. The study's methodology included descriptive statistics, internal

consistency reliability analysis, correlation analysis, and multiple regression

analysis. Reliability analyses demonstrated the dependability of the employed

scales. The MEMS exhibited reliability for its three subscales: comprehension (α =

.87), purpose (α = .89), and mattering (α = .85). Similarly, the MSQ and OCQ

demonstrated reliability with alpha values above .70.

Correlation analysis revealed strong positive correlations between job satisfaction and comprehension ($r = .56$), purpose ($r = .50$), and slight positive correlation with mattering ($r = .26$). Organizational commitment showed similar correlations with comprehension ($r = .50$), purpose ($r = .50$), and mattering ($r = .23$). These results provided a nuanced understanding of the relationships between the study variables. Hypothesis testing through multiple regression analysis addressed the research questions and associated hypotheses. For job satisfaction, comprehension (H1a) and purpose (H1b) significantly predicted the outcome, whereas mattering (H1c) did not. Similarly, for organizational commitment, both comprehension (H2a) and purpose (H2b) significantly predicted the outcome, whereas mattering (H2c) did not.

In summary, Chapter 4 contained a systematic analysis of the demographics of the study population, evaluation of the reliability of measurement scales, examination of correlations among variables, and rigorous testing of the hypotheses through multiple regression analysis. The findings contribute to understanding the relation between meaning in life, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment among Millennials.

Chapter 5 – Discussion

This study was a cross-sectional quantitative research to examine the relationships and predictive capacity between Millennials' meaning in life, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. The study also encompassed an assessment of the demographic questions, such as age, education, gender, race, and job title. Multivariate statistical methods were used to convert the data into pertinent information (Hair et al., 2006). The aim of this study was to contribute to the current state of leadership, workplace spirituality, and generational theory research. The MEMS was used in this research to understand meaning in life of Millennials in various industries in the United States, the MSQ to assess job satisfaction, and the OCQ to assess organizational commitment.

The ensuing sections of this chapter focus on the research inquiries and theoretical implications pertaining to Millennials' meaning in life, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment within various professions and organizations. Subsequently, the researcher delves into the study's limitations, explores the practical implications of the findings, and provides recommendations for future research. This chapter concludes with a summarization of the study's research overview.

Research Question 1

The first research question was, "Can meaning in life (measured by the Multidimensional Existential Meaning Scale) predict job satisfaction among Millennials?" The relationship between meaning in life and job satisfaction was hypothesized through three sub-questions to address the tripartite view of meaning in life. H1a proposed that comprehension predicted job satisfaction, H1b proposed that purpose predicted job satisfaction, and H1c proposed that mattering predicted job satisfaction. The findings for H1a showed that comprehension significantly predicted job satisfaction in Millennial employees within various industries in the United States. According to the tripartite view of meaning in life, comprehension is an individual's sense of coherence and understanding (Baumeister, 1991; Wong, 1998). Although comprehension has been linked to highly predicting well-being

outcomes, such as life satisfaction (George & Park, 2016), previous research did not delve into its specific relation to the prevalent work outcome of job satisfaction, especially regarding the Millennial workforce.

Similar to H1a, H1b depicted that purpose significantly predicted job satisfaction in Millennial employees. Within the context of meaning in life, "individuals high on purpose have a clear sense of the ends they are striving toward, and they value such ends" (George & Park, 2016, p. 2) and are motivated and directed by their life goals. Conversely, individuals who lack purpose experience a sense of aimlessness and disengagement. Therefore, this result was expected as Millennial employees believe that having a sense of purpose is a primary reason for choosing an employer (Van den Bergh & De Wulf, 2017).

Lastly, H1c depicted no predictive capacity between job satisfaction and mattering. By definition, mattering refers to the perception or belief that one's existence has significance and importance (George & Park, 2016). Conversely, although mattering is generally not given as much attention as comprehension and purpose, George and Park (2016) highlighted that it consistently predicts strong relationships with aspects of spirituality. Some scholars have questioned whether mattering should be a conclusive element of meaning in life as it may "fail to capture the MIL experience among people who are not narcissistic" (Valdivia & Li, 2022, p. 180). Although the hypothesis focused on predictive capacity, it is important to note that the correlation testing showed a relationship between job satisfaction and mattering.

Research Question 2

The second research question was, "Can meaning in life (measured by the Multidimensional Existential Meaning Scale) predict organizational commitment among Millennials?" The relationship between meaning in life and organizational commitment was hypothesized through three sub-questions to address the tripartite view of meaning in life. H2a proposed that comprehension predicted organizational commitment, H2b proposed that purpose predicted organizational commitment, and H2c proposed that mattering predicted organizational commitment. The findings

for H2a showed that comprehension significantly predicted organizational commitment in Millennial employees within various industries in the United States. As mentioned before, within the scope of meaning in life, comprehension refers to an individual's sense of understanding and coherence regarding their lives. Although organizational commitment is known as one of the widely examined work outcomes in literature (Rego & Cunha, 2008), previous research does not delve into how comprehension affects an employee's relationship with their organization.

H2b showed that purpose significantly predicted organizational commitment in Millennial employees. George and Park (2016) described purpose as having "a clear sense of the valued ends toward which one is striving and to be highly committed to such ends" (p. 210). The results of this research contribute to Millennial views within the workplace as this generation aims to work for organizations that assist in nourishing a fulfilling life outside of the workplace and serve a social purpose (Deloitte, 2017). As noted before, much of the research regarding the sub-constructs of meaning in life is not explicitly related to work outcomes; therefore, this research contributes to how purpose can be used to aid in the organizational commitment of Millennials in the workplace.

Similar to H1c, H2c depicted no predictive capacity between mattering and organizational commitment, but the correlation testing showed a relationship between mattering and organizational commitment. Notably, the mattering sub-construct is known to be a "very promising factor for psychological explorations of meaning in life as it enables researchers to examine people's lives in terms of significance, importance, and value in the world" (Gerymski & Krok, 2020, p. 185). Considering the lack of predictive capacity between mattering, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment, H1 and H2 were partially accepted. Overall, researchers have not delved into mattering's impact on work outcomes, such as job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Conversely, it is essential to note that research reveals a consistent pattern suggesting that a profound sense of meaning and purpose in one's professional endeavors can yield positive effects across various dimensions of professional life. Specifically, studies have

consistently demonstrated a positive correlation between finding meaning in one's work and elevated levels of job satisfaction (Klussman et al., 2020). This correlation is attributed to individuals experiencing a heightened sense of fulfillment when their work is perceived as purposeful and contributes to a greater meaningful goal. Meaningful work is associated with increased motivation and engagement, as employees who derive purpose from their tasks exhibit a more significant commitment to their roles. Existing research further indicates that employees who perceive their work as meaningful are likelier to demonstrate enhanced organizational commitment, aligning their contributions with personal values and goals (Guangrong et al., 2021). This alignment, in turn, contributes to higher levels of commitment to the organization and increased employee retention rates, ultimately fostering organizational stability.

Implications

This dissertation contributes to the current state of leadership, workplace spirituality, and generational theory research. This study also offered insights into Millennials' experiences with meaning in life. Millennials were also asked to reflect on their job satisfaction and organizational commitment, the two most studied work outcomes. In this section, the theoretical and practical implications regarding the Millennial generation and meaning in life in the workplace are explored.

Theoretical Perspective

From a theoretical literature perspective, this researcher explored the following four overarching theories: workplace spirituality, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and generational theory. In the context of this study, workplace spirituality provided a lens to understand how Millennials perceived meaning in life and sought to investigate the correlation between workplace spirituality and job satisfaction, as suggested by Ghazzawi et al. (2016), as well as to explore the association between workplace spirituality and organizational commitment, as proposed by Chawla (2016). Therefore, it was vital to have access

to a reliable and valid tool to measure workplace spirituality in the context of the study.

Traditionally, tools such as the Spiritual Leadership Scale (Ashmos & Duchon, 2000) and the SAW (Fry et al., 2005) have been used to adequately measure spirituality in the workplace. Although scholars offered diverse interpretations of workplace spirituality, what remains consistent is the multidimensional interplay between the individual and organizational variables. Numerous instruments exist to gauge workplace spirituality, but, for the purpose of this study, the MEMS was chosen to explore the relationship between meaning in life and the two most researched work outcomes. Specifically, job satisfaction served as a dependent variable, influenced by the perceived meaning in life, and indicated that Millennials who perceive their work as meaningful are likely to experience higher levels of job satisfaction. Organizational commitment served as another dependent variable and suggested that Millennials who found meaning in life are more likely to exhibit strong organizational commitment.

The focus on Millennials acknowledges the distinct perspectives and priorities of this generational cohort, contributing to the broader discourse on generational dynamics within the workplace. The integration of workplace spirituality, work outcomes, and generations theory provides a comprehensive framework for examining the relationships between meaning in life, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment among Millennials. It underscores the importance of aligning organizational values and practices with employees' personal and professional aspirations, particularly within the context of generational shifts and evolving workplace dynamics. By incorporating these theoretical perspectives, this study contributes to a deeper understanding of how organizations can foster environments conducive to meaningful work experiences and enhanced Millennial employee outcomes

Practitioner Perspective

From a practitioner literature perspective, this research provides insight and directions for organizations seeking to improve Millennials' job satisfaction and organizational commitment in various roles and professions. The MEMS (George

& Park, 2016) can be an organizational tool used to assess components of workplace spirituality concerning comprehension, purpose, and mattering. Although traditionally, MEMS has been used as a tool in psychology, organizations may use it to develop, cultivate, and sustain meaning in life within a generation that refers to a purpose-driven workplace as their most sought-after organizational culture element (Deloitte, 2017). According to this research, comprehension, and purpose, two of the three sub-constructs of meaning in life, can predict job satisfaction and organizational commitment. With this valuable information, organizational leadership can gear development opportunities toward assisting Millennials to experience understanding regarding their lives and become directed and motivated by their valued goals (George & Park, 2016).

Insights derived from studies using the MEMS can directly inform organizational interventions to enhance Millennials' sense of meaning and purpose, individually or at work. A practical recommendation would be to use leadership development programs (O'Malley & Williams, 2012), such as mentorship initiatives or workshops, to help Millennial employees understand the connection between their purpose and the meaningful contributions and impact they have on their organizations (Kuron et al., 2015). Development opportunities used to guide Millennials toward a process of self-development and reflection can aid in higher stages of spiritual development (Rothausen, 2017). Advanced phases of spiritual growth can alter an individual's understanding of the purpose of life and life's work, which are considered the pinnacle of human development (Avolio, 2010; Kegan & Lahey, 2010; Laloux, 2014).

One significant challenge is the presence of a traditional organizational culture that may be resistant to incorporating spiritual principles. Organizations with rigid structures, hierarchical norms, and a clear separation between personal and professional life may find embracing a more holistic approach challenging. Employee skepticism and potential discomfort with intertwining personal beliefs with the workplace can hinder the acceptance of spirituality practices (Jurkiewicz & Giacalone, 2004). Overcoming these barriers requires a strategic and inclusive approach where individuals are encouraged to have their spiritual practices without

offending others. Before implementing spirituality into development initiatives, leaders and employees should be trained in respectful pluralism.

In the context of workplace spirituality, the training would apply Hicks's (2002) conditions of respectful pluralism by education employees on embracing differences in spiritual and religious, cultural, and political beliefs, and perspectives within the organizational setting. Through various mediums such as workshops, seminars, and interactive sessions, employees would be equipped with essential skills to engage in constructive dialogues, navigate sensitive topics, and confront unconscious biases. Moreover, the incorporation of respectful pluralism training fosters attributes such as active listening, empathy, and understanding, thereby fostering collaboration and synergy among heterogeneous teams. By investing in these training initiatives, organizations not only nurture a workplace culture that is more inclusive and harmonious but also bolster productivity, spur innovation, and enhance overall employee satisfaction.

Future longitudinal studies may give organizational leaders a dynamic understanding of how existential meaning evolves within the Millennial generation. This approach may assist in crafting strategic human resource policies and talent management approaches that adapt to the changing career aspirations and existential considerations of Millennials throughout different stages of their professional lives (Hernaus & Poloski Vokic, 2014; Sori et al., 2006). Cultural variations in existential meaning, as assessed through the MEMS, are pertinent in diverse and multicultural Millennial workplaces. Therefore, recognizing and respecting the cultural factors influencing Millennials' perceptions of purpose and significance in their careers enables organizational leaders to foster inclusive and diverse work environments. This awareness can enhance team collaboration, innovation, and overall organizational effectiveness, aligning with the values of the Millennial generation.

Limitations

Although this study met the recommended participants per predictor variable criteria, only 131 out of the 164 responses were completed. The lack of

completions could have resulted from the researcher not using a progress bar within SurveyMonkey that would have provided the participants with knowledge regarding the length and time commitment of the survey. Another study limitation was homogeneity of the research participants. Notably, 82.4% of women, compared to 17.6% of men, completed the survey. From a race and ethnicity standpoint, this research lacked diversity, as 44.3% were Hispanic and Latino and 40.5% were White. The lack of diversity may limit the generalizability of the findings to a broader population. Unfortunately, the demographic survey questions did not identify the participants' geographic locations; therefore, it is assumed that most participants were from the United States.

It is important to note that the recruitment strategy heavily relied on LinkedIn and Instagram, which may have resulted in a biased sample, favoring individuals more active on these platforms, which may also limit the generalizability of these findings. Lastly, a cross-sectional design was used in this study, capturing data at a single point in time and potentially limiting the ability to establish causal relationships between the variables. Longitudinal studies may have provided a more comprehensive understanding of how meaning in life influences job satisfaction and organizational commitment in Millennials over time.

Future Research

The findings of this study expand the knowledge of meaning in life, how Millennials experience it in the workforce, and how it relates to job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Moreover, the study showed significant predictive capacity with each independent variable, except with mattering and its relations to job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Although participants in this study did not identify mattering as a predictor of job satisfaction and organizational commitment, it is still a component of meaning in life that should further explored. It is essential to note that this study was conducted post-COVID-19, and the workforce is still navigating organizational changes that affect primary work outcomes, such as job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

Significantly, future research should focus on a diverse selection of research participants, as men and minority populations are underrepresented. Although education was a demographic question, there was a disparity as most participants were college graduates (79.2%). A future study can include salary as a demographic question and inquire whether the combination of education and salary predicts higher rates of meaning in life in Millennials. Future researchers should also attempt to select participants outside the United States and explore how individuals of different cultural backgrounds experience meaning in life and how it affects their job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Furthermore, similar studies with employees from faith-based institutions could provide deeper insights into how specific organizational cultures cultivate meaning in employees' lives.

Future research could also include the exploration of meaning in life experienced by Millennial leaders and how it impacts how they lead. Although 33 % of the participants of this study were leaders, only less than 1% were C-Level (CEO, CFO, CLO, etc.). Andert et al. (2019) highlighted how each generation enters the workplace with expectations of leadership roles and bases those expectations on their experiences and the significant events that occurred throughout their upbringing. Notably, Millennials are the youngest leaders to emerge within the workplace, and organizational research must be focused on understanding differences in their leadership styles. Taylor (2020) suggested that Millennials are purpose-driven leaders who stress impacting society and within their organizations. Although the literature suggests that Millennials have different views on leadership and followership compared to previous generations (Ben-Hur & Ringwood, 2017; Fore, 2012; Medyanik, 2016), there is a knowledge gap concerning the full exploration of their ability to lead and their behaviors within the workplace (Bargavi et al., 2017; Bushardt et al., 2018; Medyanik, 2016). Future researchers may aim to explain that though Millennials are considered less religious than their most of their generational counterparts (McMurray & Simmers, 2020), they consider themselves just as spiritual and seek purpose-driven workplaces.

A qualitative or mixed methods approach would be beneficial as future researchers could use interviews to explore how Millennials experience

comprehension, purpose, and mattering within the workplace. Considering a qualitative approach, understanding the perspectives of the subconstruct mattering would offer further insights into this study as it was the only independent variable with no predictive capacity on the work outcomes. Lastly, a longitudinal study would assist in gaining an understanding of how training and leadership development impact the relationship between meaning in life, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. One may investigate meaning of life of Millennials in the workplace, establishing a foundation for understanding job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Subsequently, the design of training programs may revolve around relevant independent variables, allowing a longitudinal examination to ascertain whether addressing these independent variables through training leads to improvement in the dependent variable over time.

Summary

In this study, aimed at contributing to leadership, workplace spirituality, and generational theory, the MEMS was employed to discern Millennials' meaning in life across various industries in the United States. Job satisfaction and organizational commitment were assessed using the MSQ and the OCQ, respectively. In Chapter 5, the researcher navigated through research inquiries, theoretical implications, limitations, practical implications, and recommendations for future research.

Research Question 1 focused on the predictive relationship between meaning in life and job satisfaction. The tripartite view of meaning in life is examined through sub-questions H1a, H1b, and H1c. The findings revealed that comprehension and purpose significantly predict job satisfaction, aligning with existing literature. However, mattering had no predictive capacity, prompting contemplation on its role within the broader context of meaning in life regarding Millennials in the workplace.

Research Question 2 addressed the predictive capacity of meaning in life on organizational commitment, probing H2a, H2b, and H2c. Similar to Research Question 1, comprehension and purpose emerged as significant predictors,

contributing valuable insights into the less-explored realm of comprehension's impact on organizational commitment. Mattering exhibited no predictive capacity, prompting further considerations regarding its applicability in work outcomes.

The study's implications extend to leadership, workplace spirituality, and generational theory, offering insights into Millennials' experiences with meaning in life. The MEMS is a valuable tool for organizations seeking to enhance workplace environments and foster connections with Millennials. From a practitioner perspective, the study provides actionable directions for organizations aiming to improve job satisfaction and organizational commitment among Millennials.

The chapter highlighted limitations, including incomplete responses, gender imbalance, and a lack of diversity in race and ethnicity. Future research recommendations encompass the exploration of diverse participant profiles, consideration of global perspectives, and an investigation into the impact of religion on the relationship between meaning in life and work outcomes. Avenues for researching Millennials, employing qualitative or mixed methods approaches, and conducting longitudinal studies to evaluate the impact of training and leadership development on the identified relationships were also suggested. The chapter concluded with a comprehensive overview of the research, framing it within the broader context of the study's objectives and outcomes.

References

Abrams, J., & Von Frank, V. (2013). *The multigenerational workplace: Communicate, collaborate, and create community*. Corwin Press.

Akehurst, G., Comeche, J., & Galindo-Martin, M. (2009). Job satisfaction and commitment in the entrepreneurial SME. *Small Business Economics*, *32*, 277–289. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-008-9116-z

Albuquerque, I. F., Cunha, R. C., Martins, L. D., & Sá, A. B. (2014). Primary health care services: Workplace spirituality and organizational performance. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, *27*(1), 59–82. https://doi.org/10.1108/JOCM-11-2012-0186

Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (2000). Construct validation in organizational behavior research: The case of organizational commitment. In R. D. Goffin & E. Helmes (Eds.), *Problems and solutions in human assessment: Honoring Douglas N. Jackson at seventy* (pp. 285–314). Springer US.

Allen, P. (2004). Welcoming Y. *Benefits Canada*, *28*(9), 51–53.

Alper, B. A. (2015). *Millennials are less religious than older Americans, but just as spiritual*. Pew Research Center.

American Psychological Association. (2017). *Supervisor support critical to employee well-being and workforce readiness*. https://www.apa.org/news/press/releases/2017/10/employee-well-being

American Psychological Association. (2019). *Gen Z more likely to report mental health concerns.* https://www.apa.org/monitor/2019/01/gen-z

Andert, D., Alexakis, G., & Preziosi, R. C. (2019). The millennial effect: A multi-generational leadership model. *International Leadership Journal*, *11*(2).

Appelbaum, S. H., Bhardwaj, A., Goodyear, M., Gong, T., Sudha, A. B., & Wei, P. (2022). A study of generational conflicts in the workplace. *European Journal of Business and Management Research*, *7*(2), 7–15.

Ardueser, C. M. B. A., & Garza, D. (2021). Exploring cross-generational traits and management across generations in the workforce: A theoretical literature review. *RAIS Conference Proceedings*, 1.

Ashmos, D. P., & Duchon, D. (2000). Spirituality at work: A conceptualization and measure. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, *9*(2), 134–145. https://doi.org/10.1177/105649260092008

Avolio, B. J. (2010). Pursuing authentic leadership development. In N. Nohria & R. Khurana (Eds.), *Handbook of leadership theory and practice* (pp. 739–768). Boston: Harvard Business Press.

Bannerman, B. (2018). Cross-generational effects of workplace spirituality on job and life satisfaction. *Theses and Dissertations*, *358*. https://csuepress.columbusstate.edu/theses_dissertations/358

Bargavi, N., Samuel, A. A., & Paul, P. J. D. (2017). Intra-generational differences in the personality traits of millennial leaders in the Indian I.T. industry. *International Business Management*, *11*(6), 1254–1262.

Baumeister, R. F. (1991). *Meanings of life*. Guilford press.

Becker, E. (1997). *The denial of death*. Free Press Paper Backs. (Original work published 1973).

Becton, J. B., Walker, H. J., & Jones-Farmer, A. (2014). Generational differences in workplace behavior. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *44*(3), 175–189. http://doi.org/10.1111/jasp.12208

Belwalkar, S., & Vohra, V. (2016). Workplace spirituality, job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behaviors: A theoretical model. *International Journal of Business and Management*, *11*(8), 256–262. http://doi.org/10.5539/ijbm.v11n8p256

Benefiel, M., Fry, L. W., & Geigle, D. (2014). Spirituality and religion in the workplace: History, theory, and research. *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality*, *6*(3), 175–187. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0036597

Bengtson, V. L. (1974). Generation and family effects in value socialization. *American Sociological Review*, *40*(3), 358–371. https://doi.org/10.2307/2094463

Ben-Hur, S., & Ringwood, D. (2017). Making generational differences work: What empirical research reveals about leading Milennials. *Perspectives for Managers*, *1*(17), 1–4.

Berkup, S. B. (2014). Working with generations X and Y in generation Z period: Management of different generations in business life. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, *5*, 218–229. https://doi.org/10.5901/mjss.2014.v5n19p218

Betchoo, N. K. (2015). *Managing workplace diversity: A contemporary context*. Bookboon.com.

Bogosian, D. R., & Rousseau, C. (2017). How and why millennials are shaking up organizational cultures. *Rutgers Business Review*, *2*(3), 386–394.

Burstein, D. D. (2013). *Fast future: How the millennial generation is shaping our world*. Beacon Press.

Bushardt, S. C., Young, M., & Bari, A. (2018). Transitioning to management: Challenges and opportunities for the millennial generation. *The Journal of Business Diversity*, *18*(1), 9–16. https://doi.org/10.33423/jbd.v18i1.514

Buzza, J. S. (2017). Are you living to work or working to live? What millennials want in the workplace. *Journal of Human Resources Management and Labor Studies*, *5*(2), 15–20. http://doi.org/10.15640/jhrmls.v5n2a3

Cartwright, K. B. (2001). Cognitive developmental theory and spiritual development. *Journal of Adult Development*, *8*(4), 213–220. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1011386427919

Cavanagh, G. F. (1999). Spirituality for managers: Context and critique. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, *12*(3), 186–199. https://doi.org/10.1108/09534819910273793

Chatrakul, N. A. U., & Smithson, J. (2016). Entitled or misunderstood? Towards the repositioning of the sense of entitlement concept in the generational difference debate. *Community, Work & Family*, *19*(2), 213–226. https://doi.org/10.1080/13668803.2016.1134116

Chawla, V. (2016). Workplace spirituality governance: Impact on customer orientation and salesperson performance. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, *31*, 498–506. https://doi.org/10.1108/JBIM-08-2014-0153

Chen, J., & Lian, R. (2015). Generational differences in work values in China. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, *43*(4), 567–578. https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2015.43.4.567

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. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2013.01.009

Cioletti, A. (2017). Millennials are killing everything. *License! Global*, *20*, Article 6. https://search-proquest-com.ezproxy.uwplatt.edu/ docview/1965043086?accountid=9253

Cletus, H. E., Mahmood, N. A., Umar, A., & Ibrahim, A. D. (2018). Prospects and challenges of workplace diversity in modern day organizations: A critical review. *HOLISTICA–Journal of Business and Public Administration*, *9*(2), 35–52. http://doi.org/10.2478/hjbpa-2018-0011

Cogin, J. (2012). Are generational differences in work values fact or fiction? Multi-country evidence and implications. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, *23*(11), 2268–2294. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2011.610967

CopmTIA. (2023). *Workforce and learning trends 2023*. https://www.comptia.org/content/research/workforce-and-learning-trends-2023

Costanza, D. P., & Finkelstein, L. M. (2015). Generationally based differences in the workplace: Is there a there there? *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, *8*(3), 308–323. http://doi.org/10.1017/iop.2015.15

Costanza, D. P., & Finkelstein, L. M. (2017). Generations, age, and the space between: Introduction to the special issue. *Work, Aging and Retirement*, *3*(2), 109–112. http://doi.org/10.1093/workar/wax003

Cox, A., Hannif, Z., & Rowley, C. (2014). Leadership styles and generational effects: Examples of US companies in Vietnam. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, *25*(1), 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2013.778311

Cozby, P. C., & Bates, S. C. (2018). *Methods in behavioral research* (13th ed.).
McGraw-Hill.

Črešnar, R., & Nedelko, Z. (2020). Understanding future leaders: How are personal
values of generations Y and Z tailored to leadership in industry 4.0?
Sustainability, *12*(11), Article 4417. https://doi.org/10.3390/su12114417

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed
methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and
evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Pearson.

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative,
quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Sage.

Crumbaugh, J. C., & Maholick, L. T. (1964). An experimental study in
existentialism: The psychosomatic approach to Frankl's concept of
noogenic neurosis. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, *20*, 200–207.
http://doi.org/10.1002/1097-4679(196404)20:2<200::AID-
JCLP2270200203>3.0.CO;2-U

Daboval, J. M. (1998). *A comparison between Baby Boomer and Generation X
employees' bases and foci of commitment*. [Unpublished doctoral
dissertation, Nova Southeastern University].

Daniel, J. L. (2015). Workplace spirituality and stress: Evidence from Mexico and
US. *Management Research Review*, *38*(1), 29–43.

Deal, J. J., Altman, D. G., & Rogelberg, S. G. (2010). Millennials at work: What
we know and what we need to do (if anything). *Journal of Business and
Psychology*, *25*, 191–199. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-010-9177-2

Dean, D. (2021). Clearly communicating conceptions of validity and reliability. In
M. Bocarnea, B. Winston, & D. Dean (Eds.), *Advancements in
organizational data collection and measurements: Strategies for addressing
attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors* (pp. 27–42). Business Science.

Deloitte. (2015). *Mind the gaps: The 2015 Deloitte Millennial survey*.
https://www2.deloitte.com/content/dam/Deloitte/global/Documents/About-
Deloitte/gx-wef-2015-millennial-survey-executivesummary.pdf

Deloitte. (2016). *The 2016 Deloitte millennial survey: Winning over the next generation of leaders*. https://www2.deloitte.com/content/dam/Deloitte/global/Documents/About-Deloitte/gx-millenial-survey-2016-exec-summary.pdf

Deloitte. (2017). *2017 Deloitte Millennial Survey*. https://www2.deloitte.com/content/dam/Deloitte/global/Documents/About-Deloitte/gx-deloitte-millennial-survey-2017-executive-summary.pdf

DeVellis, R. F. (2017). *Scale development: Theory and applications* (4th ed.).Sage.

Dimock, M. (2018). *Defining generations: Where Millennials end and post-Millennials begin*. Pew Research Center. https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2019/01/17/where-millennials-end-and-generation-z-begins/

Edge, R., Cockerham, J., Correale, C., Dion, B., Figueroa-Altmann, A., & Geetter, C. (2011). Is your facility struggling with millennial nurse retention? *Nursing Management*, *42*(6), 19–23. https://doi.org/10.1097/01.NUMA.0000397921.88595.1d

Egri, C. P., & Ralston, D. A. (2004). Generation cohorts and personal values: A comparison of China and the United States. *Organization Science*, *15*(2), 210–220. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1030.0048

Eisner, S. P. (2005). Managing generation Y. *SAM Advanced Management Journal*, *70*(4), 4–15.

Eyring, J. D. (2022). Bringing evidence to others: Know your audience first. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, *15*(2), 280–283. https://doi.org/10.1017/iop.2022.3

Faller, M., & Gogek, J. (2019). Break from the past: survey suggests modern leadership styles needed for millennial nurses. *Nurse Leader*, *17*(2), 135–140. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mnl.2018.12.003

Fares, D., & Noordin, K. (2016). Islamic spirituality, organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior: A proposed conceptual framework. *Middle East Journal of Business*, *11*, 28–37. https://doi.org/10.5742/MEJB.2015.92769

Farmer, M., Allen, S., Duncan, K., & Alagaraja, M. (2019). Workplace spirituality in the public sector: A study of US water and wastewater agencies. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, *27*(3), 441–457. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-11-2017-1281

Farrell, L., & Hurt, A. C. (2014). Training the millennial generation: Implications for organizational climate. *E Journal of Organizational Learning & Leadership*, *12*(1), 47–60.

Field, A. (2013). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics*. Sage.

Folarin, K. (2021). Cultivating millennial leaders. *American Journal of Leadership and Governance*, *6*(1), 1–7. https://doi.org/10.47672/ajlg.727

Fore, C. W. (2012). *Next generation leadership: Millennials as leaders*. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Capella University].

Francis, T., & Hoefel, F. (2018). True Gen': Generation Z and its implications for companies. *McKinsey & Company*, *12*, 1–10.

Frankl, V. E. (1946). *Man's search for meaning*. Beacon Press.

Fry, L. W., Vitucci, S., & Cedillo, M. (2005). Spiritual leadership and army transformation: Theory, measurement, and establishing a baseline. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *16*(5), 835–862. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2005.07.012

Galdames, S., & Guihen, L. (2022). Millennials and leadership: A systematic literature review. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, *33*(1-2), 146–162. http://doi.org/10.1080/14783363.2020.1812380

Garcia-Zamor, J. C. (2003). Workplace spirituality and organizational performance. *Public administration review*, *63*(3), 355–363.

Garg, P., & Rastogi, R. (2009). Effect of psychological wellbeing on organizational commitment of employees. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *8*(2), 42–51.

George, L. S., & Park, C. L. (2014). Existential mattering: Bringing attention to a neglected but central aspect of meaning? In A. Batthyany & P. Russo-Netzer (Eds.), *Meaning in positive and existential psychology* (pp. 39–51). Springer. http://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4939-0308-5_3

George, L. S., & Park, C. L. (2016). Meaning in life as comprehension, purpose, and mattering: Toward integration and new research questions. *Review of general psychology*, *20*(3), 205–220. https://doi.org/10.1037/gpr0000077

George, L. S., & Park, C. L. (2017). The multidimensional existential meaning scale: A tripartite approach to measuring meaning in life. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, *12*(6), 613–627. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2016.1209546

Gerymski, R., & Krok, D. (2020). Psychometric properties and validation of the Polish adaptation of the Light Triad Scale. *Current Issues in Personality Psychology*, *7*(4), 341–354. https://doi.org/10.5114/cipp.2019.92960

Ghazzawi, I., Smith, Y., & Cao, Y. (2016). Faith and job satisfaction: Is religion a missing link? *Journal of Organizational Culture, Communications and Conflict*, *20*, 1–29.

Giacalone, R. A., Jurkiewicz, C. L., & Fry, L. W. (2005). *From advocacy to science: The next steps in workplace spirituality research. Handbook of psychology and religion.* Sage.

Girden, E. R., & Kabacoff, R. (2011). *Evaluating research articles from start to finish*. Sage.

Gjorevska, N., & Takács, S. (2016, June). Making organizations more meaningful: Linking spirituality, leadership and flow theory in the workplace. In *An Enterprise Odyssey. International Conference Proceedings* (p. 113). University of Zagreb, Faculty of Economics and Business.

Gotsis, G., & Kortezi, Z. (2008). Philosophical foundations of workplace spirituality: A critical approach. *Journal of business ethics*, *78*, 575–600. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-007-9369-5

Grant, G. B. (2017). Exploring the possibility of peak individualism, humanity's existential crisis, and an emerging age of purpose. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *8*, Article 232729. https://doi.org/10.3389%2Ffpsyg.2017.01478

Graves, F. (2013). *The pedagogy of organizational leaders: Identifying generational differences and how those differences may cause workplace conflict* (Publication No. 3566385) [Published doctoral dissertation, Baker College). ProQuest Dissertation and Theses database.

Griffin, R. W., & Moorhead, G. (2014). *Managing people in organization*. Cengage Learning.

Guangrong, D., Spencer, S., & Blazek, S. (2021). Purpose and purposefulness at work: The impact on employee engagement and organizational commitment. *Journal of Organizational Psychology*, *21*(6), 55–72.

Hair, J., Black, W., Babin, B., Anderson, R., & Tatham, R. (2006). *Multivariate data analysis* (6th ed.). Pearson Prentice Hall.

Hallman, H. (2016). *Millennial teachers: Learning to teach in uncertain times*. Routledge.

Hargrave, T. D., & Sells, J. N. (1997). The development of a forgiveness scale. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, *23*(1), 41–62. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1752-0606.1997.tb00230.x

Harris, M. C. (2015). *Exploring different generations: A phenomenological study on conflict management in the workplace* (Publication No. 3722198) [Published doctoral dissertation, Capella University]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.

Haserot, P. W. (2008). Maintaining professionalism & harmony across the generations at work. *Women Lawyers Journal*, *93*(3), 15–18.

Heintzelman, S. J., & King, L. A. (2014). Life is pretty meaningful. *American Psychologist*, *69*(6), 561–574. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0035049

Hernaus, T., & Poloski Vokic, N. (2014). Work design for different generational cohorts: Determining common and idiosyncratic job characteristics. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, *27*(4), 615–641. https://doi.org/10.1108/JOCM-05-2014-0104

Hershatter, A., & Epstein, M. (2010). Millennials and the world of work: An organization and management perspective. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, *25*, 211–223. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-010-9160-y

Hicks, D. A. (2002). *Religion and the workplace: Pluralism, spirituality, leadership*. Cambridge University Press

Hogan, H., Perez, P., & Bell, W. (2008). Who (really) are the first baby boomers. In *Joint Statistical Meetings Proceedings, Social Statistics Section, Alexandria* (pp. 1009–1016). American Statistical Association.

Hoppock, R. (1935). *Job satisfaction*. Harper.

Illes, K., & Zsolnai, L. (2015). The role of spirituality in business education. *Society and Business Review*, *10*(1), 67–75.

Iordanoglou, D. (2018). Future trends in leadership development practices and the crucial leadership skills. *Journal of leadership, Accountability and Ethics*, *15*(2). https://doi.org/10.33423/jlae.v15i2.648

Janssen, D., & Carradini, S. (2021). Generation Z workplace communication habits and expectations. *IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication*, *64*(2), 137–153. http://doi.org/10.1109/TPC.2021.3069288

Johnson, M., & Johnson, L. (2010). *Generations, Inc.: From boomers to Linksters – managing the friction between generations at work*. AMACOM.

Jolliffe, P., & Foster, S. (2022). Different reality? Generations' and religious groups' views of spirituality policies in the workplace. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *181*(2), 451–470. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-021-04951-9

Jones, W. (2017). *Examining the impact of leadership practices on millennial retention in a multigenerational workplace within a traditional hierarchical organization* (Publication No. 10638942) [Published doctoral dissertation, North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State University]. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.

Jorgensen, B. (2003). Baby boomers, generation X and generation Y? Policy implications for defence forces in the modern era. *Foresight*, *5*(4), 41–49. http://doi.org/10.1108/14636680310494753

Jurkiewicz, C. L., & Giacalone, R. A. (2004). A values framework for measuring the impact of workplace spirituality on organizational performance. *Journal of business ethics*, *49*, 129–142. http://doi.org/10.1023/B:BUSI.0000015843.22195.b9

Karatepe, O. M., Yavas, U., Babakus, E., & Avci, T. (2006). Does gender moderate the effects of role stress in frontline service jobs? *Journal of Business Research*, *59*(10–11), 1087–1093.

Kegan, R., & Lahey, L. (2010). Adult development and organizational leadership. In N. Nohria & R. Khurana (Eds.), *Handbook of leadership theory and practice* (pp. 769–787). Boston: Harvard Business Press.

Kelly, C., Elizabeth, F., Bharat, M., & Jitendra, M. (2016). Generation gaps: Changes in the workplace due to differing generational values. *Advances in Management*, *9*(5), 1–8.

Khasawneh, S. (2011). Cutting-edge panacea of the twenty-first century: Workplace spirituality for higher education human resources. *International Journal of Educational Management*, *25*(7), 687–700.

King, L. A., Hicks, J. A., Krull, J. L., & Del Gaiso, A. K. (2006). Positive affect and the experience of meaning in life. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *90*(1), 179–196. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.90.1.179

Klimkiewicz, K., & Oltra, V. (2017). Does CSR enhance employer attractiveness? The role of millennial job seekers' attitudes. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, *24*(5), 449–463. https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.1419

Klussman, K., Curtin, N., Langer, J., & Nichols, A. L. (2020). Examining the effect of mindfulness on well-being: Self-connection as a mediator. *Journal of Pacific Rim Psychology*, *14*(5), 1–7. http://doi.org/10.1017/prp.2019.29

Knight, W. E. (2009). Generational differences in workplace values among institutional researchers: implications for improving the profession. *Folia Oeconomica Stetinensia*, *23*(2), 204–221. http://doi.org/10.2478/foli-2023-0027

Kolodinsky, R. W., Giacalone, R. A., & Jurkiewicz, C. L. (2008). Workplace values and outcomes: Exploring personal, organizational, and interactive workplace spirituality. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *81*, 465–480. http://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-007-9507-0

Kupperschmidt, B. R. (2000). Multigeneration employees: Strategies for effective management. *The Health Care Manager*, *19*(1), 65–76. https://doi.org/10.1097/00126450-200019010-00011

Kuron, L. K., Lyons, S. T., Schweitzer, L., & Ng, E. S. (2015). Millennials' work values: Differences across the school to work transition. *Personnel Review*, *44*(6), 991–1009.

Laloux, F. (2014). *Reinventing organizations*. Nelson Parker.

Lester, P. E., Inman, D., & Bishop, L. K. (2014). *Handbook of tests and measurement in education and the social sciences*. Rowman & Littlefield.

Lopez, C. I., & Grubbström, E. (2018). *Motivational factors and Leadership preferences of the Millennial generation: Unlocking the potential of our future leaders.* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Blekinge Institute of Technology].

Macky, K., Gardner, D., & Forsyth, S. (2008). Generational differences at work: Introduction and overview. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *23*, 857–861. http://doi.org/10.1108/02683940810904358

Madden, T. (2015). Journeys of purpose: A review of literature about work and spirituality. *International Journal of Religion & Spirituality in Society*, *5*(4), 69–76.

Mahmoud, A. B., Fuxman, L., Mohr, I., Reisel, W. D., & Grigoriou, N. (2021). "We aren't your reincarnation!" workplace motivation across X, Y and Z generations. *International Journal of Manpower*, *42*(1), 193–209. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJM-09-2019-0448

Mannheim, K. (1952). The problem of generations. In P. Kecskemeti (Ed.), E*ssays on the sociology of knowledge* (pp. 276–320). Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Marques, J. (2005). HR's crucial role in the establishment of spirituality in the workplace. *The Journal of American Academy of Business*, *7*(2), 27–31.

Martela, F., & Steger, M. F. (2016). The three meanings of meaning in life: Distinguishing coherence, purpose, and significance. *The Journal of Positive Psychology, 11*(5), 531–545. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2015.1137623

Martin, E., & Warshawsky, N. (2017). Guiding principles for creating value and meaning for the next generation of nurse leaders. *JONA: The Journal of Nursing Administration*, *47*(9), 418–420. https://doi.org/10.1097/nna.0000000000000507

Martin, T., & Otterman, R. (2016). Generatoinal workforce demographic trends and total organizational rewards which might attract and retain generational employees. *Journal of Behavioral and Applied Management*, *16*(2), 91–115.

Maslow, A. H. (1968). *Toward a psychology of being* (2nd ed.). D. Van Nostrand.

McDonald, P. (2008). The multigenerational workforce. *Internal Auditor*, *65*(5), 60–67.

McGhee. (2019). Integrating Christian spirituality at work: Combining top-down and bottom-up approaches. *Religions (Basel, Switzerland)*, *10*(7), Article 433. https://doi.org/10.3390/rel10070433

McKnight, P. E., & Kashdan, T. B. (2009). Purpose in life as a system that creates and sustains health and well-being: An integrative, testable theory. *Review of general Psychology*, *13*(3), (242–251. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0017152

McMurray, A. J., & Simmers, C. A. (2020). The impact of generational diversity on spirituality and religion in the workplace. *Vision*, *24*(1), 70–80. https://doi.org/10.1177/0972262919884841

Medyanik, K. K. (2016). *A holistic, qualitative case study regarding the leadership traits and styles of the millennial generation*. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Northcentral University].

Miller, D. W., & Ewest, T. (2013). The present state of workplace spirituality: A literature review considering context, theory, and measurement/assessment. *Journal of Religious & Theological Information*, *12*(1-2), 29–54. http://doi.org/10.1080/10477845.2013.800776

Milliman, J., Ferguson, J., Trickett, D., & Condemi, B. (1999). Spirit and community at Southwest Airlines: An investigation of a spiritual values-based model. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, *12*(3), 221–233. https://doi.org/10.1108/09534819910273928

Mitchell, B. A. (1998). Too close for comfort? Parental assessments of "boomerang kid" living arrangements. *The Canadian Journal of Sociology*, *23*(1), 21–46. https://doi.org/10.2307/3341660

Mitroff, I. I., & Denton, E. A. (1999). A study of spirituality in the workplace. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, *40*(4), Article 8. https://sloanreview.mit.edu/article/a-study-of-spirituality-in-the-workplace/

Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M., & Porter, L. W. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *14*(2), 224–247. https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791(79)90072-1

Murray, K., Toulson, P., & Legg, S. (2011). Generational cohorts' expectations in the workplace: A study of New Zealanders. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, *49*(4), 476–493. https://doi.org/10.1177/1038411111423188

National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. (2020). *Are generational categories meaningful distinctions for workforce management?* National Academies Press.

Neil, S. (2010). Leveraging generational work styles to meet business objectives. *Information Management Journal*, *44*, 28–33.

Nolan, L. S. (2015). The roar of millennials: Retaining top talent in the workplace. *Journal of Leadership, Accountability and Ethics*, *12*, 69–75. http://na-businesspress.homestead.com/JLAE/NolanLS_Web12_5_.pdf

Nwinami, S. J. (2014). An Assessment of the effect of workforce diversity on employee of the science review, prospective commentary, and guiding framework. *Journal of Management*, *40*(5), 1297–1333.

O'Malley, A. L., & Williams, D. E. (2012). Emerging leaders: The roles of flourishing and religiosity in millennials' leadership development activity. *Journal of Spirituality, Leadership and Management*, *6*(1), 48–58. http://doi.org/10.15183/slm2012.06.1115

Overell, S. (2008). *Inwardness: The rise of meaningful work*. Work Foundation.

Pallant, J. (2010). *SPSS survival manual* (4th ed.). Open University Press.

Pandey, A., Gupta, R. K., & Arora, A. P. (2009). Spiritual climate of business organizations and its impact on customers' experience. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *88*, 313–332. http://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-008-9965-z

Park, C. L., & George, L. S. (2013). Assessing meaning and meaning making in the context of stressful life events: Measurement tools and approaches. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, *8*, 483–504. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2013.830762

Patel, T. K. (2016). A study on predictors to maintain workforce diversity among teaching faculties in engineering and management institutes of Surat City. *Research Hub - International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, *3*(5), 1–4.

Pawar, S. B. (2008). Two approaches to workplace spirituality facilitation: A comparison and implications. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *29*(6), 544–567.

Pew Research Center. (2010, February 17). *Religion among the millennials*. https://www.pewresearch.org/religion/2010/02/17/religion-among-the-millennials/

Piercy, G. (2013). Transformative learning theory and spirituality: A whole-person approach. *Journal of Instructional Research*, *2*, 30–42. http://doi.org/10.9743/JIR.2013.2.14

Pilcher, J. (1994). Mannheim's sociology of generations: An undervalued legacy. *British Journal of Sociology*, 481–495.

Pinsonneault, A., & Kraemer, K. (1993). Research methodology in management information systems. *Journal of Management Information Systems - Special Section: Strategic and Competitive Information Systems Archive*, *10*, 75–105.

Pirkola, H., Rantakokko, P., & Suhonen, M. (2016). Workplace spirituality in health care: An integrated review of the literature. *Journal of Nursing Management*, *24*(7), 859–868. http://doi.org/10.1111/jonm.12398

Porter, L. W., Steers, R. M., Mowday, R. T., & Boulian, P. V. (1974). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *59*, 603–609. http://doi.org/10.1037/h0037335

Potter, S. B. (2018, February 6). *What would a transfer of power from Baby Boomers to Generation X look like?* https://insight.factset.com/what-would-a-transfer-of-power-from-baby-boomers-to-generation-x-look-like

Powell, G. N. (2018). *Women and men in management.* Sage Publications.

Rahman, M. S., Osmangani, A. M., Daud, N. M., Chowdhury, A. H., & Hassan, H. (2015). Trust and work place spirituality on knowledge sharing behaviour: Perspective from non-academic staff of higher learning institutions. *The Learning Organization*, *22*(6), 317–332.

Rathee, R., & Rajain, P. (2020). Workplace spirituality: A comparative study of various models. *Jindal Journal of Business Research*, *9*(1), 27–40. https://doi.org/10.1177/2278682120908554

Rego, A., & Cunha, M. P. (2008). Workplace spirituality and organizational commitment: an empirical study. *Journal of organizational change management*, *21*(1), 53–75. https://doi.org/10.1108/09534810810847039

Rego, A., Pina, E., Cunha, M., & Souto, S. (2007). Workplace spirituality, commitment, and self-reported individual performance: An empirical study. *Management Research*, 5(3), 163–183. https://doi.org/10.2753/JMR1536-5433050303

Reker, G. T. (2000). Theoretical perspective, dimensions, and measurement of existential meaning. In G. T. Reker & K. Chamberlain (Eds.), *Exploring existential meaning: Optimizing human development across the life span* (pp. 39–58). Sage Publications. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452233703.n4

Reker, G. T., & Wong, P. T. (1988). Aging as an individual process: Toward a theory of personal meaning. In J. E. Birren & V. L. Bengtson (Eds.), *Emergent theories of aging* (pp. 214–246). Springer Publishing Company.

Riley, M. W., Johnson, M., & Foner, A. (1973). *Aging and society: Vol. 3. A sociology of age stratification*. Russell Sage Foundation.

Riley, R. D., Snell, K. I., Ensor, J., Burke, D. L., Harrell, F. E., Jr., Moons, K. G.,
      & Collins, G. S. (2019). Minimum sample size for developing a
      multivariable prediction model: PART II - binary and time-to-event
      outcomes. *Statistics in Medicine*, *38*(7), 1276–1296.
      https://doi.org/10.1002/sim.7992

Robinson, W. S. (2009). Ecological correlations and the behavior of individuals.
      International Journal of Epidemiology, *38*(2), 337–341.

Rodriguez, A., & Rodriguez, Y. (2015). Metaphors for today's leadership: VUCA
      world, millennial and "Cloud Leaders." *Journal of Management
      Developmen*t, *34*(7), 854–866. http://doi.org/10.1108/JMD-09-2013-0110

Rony, Z. T. (2019). Generation y challenges in becoming innovative leaders at
      organization in the 21st century. *International Journal of Recent
      Technology and Engineering*, *8*(2), 789–794.
      http://doi.org/10.35940/ijrte.B1164.0982S919

Rothausen, T. J. (2017). Integrating leadership development with Ignatian
      spirituality: A model for designing a spiritual leader development practice.
      Journal of Business Ethics, *145*, 811–829. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-
      016-3241-4

Ryan, A. M. (2001). The peer group as a context for the development of young
      adolescent motivation and achievement. *Child Development, 72*(4), 1135–
      1150. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8624.00338

Ryback, R. (2016). *From baby boomers to generation Z: A detailed look at the
      characteristics of each generation*. Psychology Today.
      https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/the-truisms-
      wellness/201602/baby-boomers-generation-z

Ryder, N. B. (1965). The cohort as a concept in the study of social change. In W.
      M. Mason & S. E. Fienberg (Eds.), *Cohort analysis in social research:
      Beyond the identification problem* (pp. 9–44). Springer New York.

Ryff, C. D. (1989). Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning
      of psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*,
      57(6), 1069–1081. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.57.6.1069

Sackett, P. (2002). The structure of counterproductive work behaviors: Dimensionality and relationships with facets of job performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, *10*(1-2), 5–11. http://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2389.00189

Scheier, M. F., Wrosch, C., Baum, A., Cohen, S., Martire, L. M., Matthews, K. A., Schulz, R., & Zdaniuk, B. (2006). The Life Engagement Test: Assessing purpose in life. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, *29*(3), 291–298. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10865-005-9044-1

Schutte, P. J. (2016). Workplace spirituality: A tool or a trend? *HTS: Theological Studies*, *72*(4), 1–5. http://doi.org/10.4102/hts.v72i4.3294

Scott, C. L., & Bird, M. Y. (Ed.). (2012). *Handbook of research on workforce diversity in a global society: Technologies and concepts*. IGI Global.

Seemiller, C., Grace, M., Dal Bo Campagnolo, P., Mara Da Rosa Alves, I., & Severo De Borba, G. (2019). How generation Z college students prefer to learn: A comparison of US and Brazil students. *Journal of Educational Research and Practice*, *9*(1), Article 25. http://doi.org/10.5590/JERAP.2019.09.1.25

Sekaran, U., & Bougie, R. (2010). *Research methods for business: A skill-building approach* (5th ed.). John Wiley & Sons.

Shukas, J. C. (2020). *The impact of workplace mentorship on emotional intelligence and job engagement of millennial employees* (Publication No. 27832276) [Published doctoral dissertation, The Chicago School of Professional Psychology]. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.

Smith, C., & Turner, S. (2015). *The radical transformation of diversity and inclusion: The millennial influence*. Deloitte University.

Smith, E. E., & Aaker, J. L. (2013, December 1). Millennial searchers. *New York Times*. https://www.nytimes.com/2013/12/01/opinion/sunday/millennial-searchers.html

Sori, C. F., Biank, N., & Helmeke, K. B. (2006). Spiritual self-care of the therapist. In K. B. Helmeke & C. F. Sori (Eds.), *The therapist's notebook for integrating spirituality in counseling: Homework, handouts, and activities for use in psychotherapy* (Vol. 1, pp. 3–18). The Haworth Press.

Steger, M. F. (2013). Experiencing meaning in life: Optimal functioning at the nexus of well-being, psychopathology, and spirituality. In P. T. P. Wong (Ed.), *The human quest for meaning: Theories, research and applications* (pp. 165–184). Routledge.

Stewart, J., Oliver, E., Cravens, K., & Oishi, S. (2016). Managing millennials: Embracing generational differences. *Business Horizons*, *60*. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2016.08.011

Strauss, W., & Howe, N. (1991). *Generations: The history of America's future, 1584 to 2069.* Morrow.

Strauss, W., & Howe, N. (2007). The next 20 years: How customer and workforce attitudes will evolve. *Harvard Business Review*, *85*(7-8), 41–52.

Taherdoost, H. (2016). Sampling methods in research methodology; How to choose a sampling technique for research. *International Journal of Academic Research in Management*, *5*(2), 28–36.

Tamunomiebi, M. D., & Onah, G. O. (2019). Organizational citizenship behaviour: A critical review of its development in a diversity driven workplace. *The Strategic Journal of Business & Change Management*, *6*(1), 41–60.

Taylor, C. (2020, July 3). *The millennial managers have arrived*. Korn Ferry. https://www.kornferry.com/insights/briefings-magazine/issue-39/the-millennial-managers-have-arrived

Tolbize, A. (2008). Generational differences in the workplace. *Research and Training Center on Community Living*, *5*(2), 1–21.

Twenge, J. M. (2013). The evidence for generation me and against generation we. *Emerging Adulthood*, *1*(1), 11–16. http://doi.org/10.1177/2167696812466842

Twenge, J. M., Campbell, S. M., Hoffman, B. J., & Lance, C. E. (2010). Generational differences in work values: Leisure and extrinsic values increasing, social and intrinsic values decreasing. *Journal of Management*, *36*, 1117–1142. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206309352246

Urick, M. J., Hollensbe, E. C., Masterson, S. S., & Lyons, S. T. (2016). Understanding and managing intergenerational conflict: An examination of influences and strategies. *Work, Aging and Retirement*, *3*(2), 166–185. https://doi.org/10.1093/workar/waw009

U.S. Census Bureau. (2015). *Data profiles*. https://www.census.gov/acs/www/data/data-tables-and-tools/data-profiles/2015/

Valdivia, D. S., & Li, P. J. (2022). Psychometric properties and internal validity of the multidimensional existential meaning scale. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development*, *55*(3), 166–186. https://doi.org/10.1080/07481756.2021.1998779

Van den Bergh, J., & De Wulf, K. (2017). Millennials at work. *Research World*, *63*(63), 19–21. https://doi.org/10.1002/rwm3.20490

Wang, D. (2015). Activating cross-border brokerage: Interorganizational knowledge transfer through skilled return migration. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *60*, 133–176. https://doi.org/10.1177/0001839214551943

Wang, M., Guo, T., & Shang, S. (2019). The effect of spiritual leadership on employee effectiveness: An intrinsic motivation perspective. *Frontiers in psychology*, *9*, Article 410653. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.02627

Weiss, D. J., Dawis, R. V., & England, G. W. (1967). Manual for the Minnesota satisfaction questionnaire. *Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation*, *22,* Article 120

Williams, G. (2019). Management millennialism: Designing the new generation of employee. *Work, Employment, and Society*, 1–17.

Wimbush, J. C., & Shepard, J. M. (1994). Toward an understanding of ethical climate: Its relationship to ethical behavior and supervisory influence. *Journal of Business ethics*, *13*, 637–647. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00871811

Wong, P. (1998). Implicit theories of meaningful life and the development of the personal meaning profile. In P. T. P. Wong & P. S. Fry (Eds.), *The human quest for meaning: A handbook of psychological research and clinical applications* (pp. 111–140). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Wong, P. (2017). Meaning-centered approach to research and therapy, second wave positive psychology, and the future of humanistic psychology. *The Humanistic Psychologist*, *45*. https://doi.org/10.1037/hum0000062

Young, J. (2020). *That's the spirit. The value of workplace spirituality*. CIPD.

Zemke, R., Raines, C., & Filipczak, B. (2013). *Generations at work: Managing the clash of Boomers, Gen Xers, and Gen Yers in the workplace*. Amacom.

Appendix A

Notice of Approval for Human Research

SOUTHEASTERN
UNIVERSITY

NOTICE OF APPROVAL FOR HUMAN RESEARCH

DATE:	September 14, 2023
TO:	Bethany Peters, Nathan Gonzalez
FROM:	SEU IRB
PROTOCOL TITLE:	Exploring the impact of workplace spirituality on Millennials
FUNDING SOURCE:	NONE
PROTOCOL NUMBER:	23 MT 26
APPROVAL PERIOD:	Approval Date: September 14, 2023 Expiration Date: September 13, 2024

Dear Investigator(s),

The Institutional Review Board (IRB) for the protection of human subjects has reviewed the protocol entitled, Exploring the impact of workplace spirituality on Millennials. The project has been approved for the procedures and subjects described in the protocol pending the following change:

- Please add IRB contact information to the informed consent (irb@seu.edu).

Any changes require approval before they can be implemented as part of your study. If your study requires any changes, the proposed modifications will need to be submitted in the form of an amendment request to the IRB to include the following:

> Description of proposed revisions;
> *If applicable,* any new or revised materials;
> *If applicable,* updated letters of approval from cooperating institutions

If there are any adverse events and/or any unanticipated problems during your study, you must notify the IRB within 24 hours of the event or problem.

At present time, there is no need for further action on your part with the IRB.

This approval is issued under Southeastern University's Federal Wide Assurance 00006943 with the Office for Human Research Protections (OHRP). If you have any questions regarding your obligations under the IRB's Assurance, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,

Rustin Lloyd
Chair, Institutional Review Board
irb@seu.edu

Appendix B

Multidimensional Existential Meaning Scale (MEMS)
George and Park (2016)

The MEMS (George & Park, 2017) is a 15-item self-report that comprises three five-item subscales that measure an individual's comprehension, purpose, and mattering. Each item is rated on a 7-point scale, ranging from 1 (very strongly disagree) to 7 (very strongly agree).

1. My life makes sense.
2. I know what my life is about.
3. I can make sense of the things that happen in my life.
4. I understand my life.
5. Looking at my life as a whole, things seem clear to me.
6. I have aims in my life that are worth striving for.
7. I have certain life goals that guide me to keep going.
8. I have overarching goals that guide me in my life.
9. I have goals in my life that are very important to me.
10. My direction in life in motivating to me.
11. There is nothing special about my existence.
12. Even a thousand year from now, it would still matter whether I existed of not.
13. Whether my life ever existed matters even in the grand scheme of the universe.
14. I am certain that my life is of importance.
15. Even considering how big the universe is, I can say that my life matters.

Appendix C

Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) Short Form
Weiss, Dawis, England, and Lofquist (1967)

Survey to determine the level of job satisfaction.

Ask yourself: How satisfied am I with this aspect of my job?

     5 = Extremely Satisfied
     4 = Very Satisfied
     3 = Satisfied
     2 = Somewhat Satisfied
     1 = Not Satisfied

1. Being able to keep busy all the time.
2. The chance to work alone on the job.
3. The chance to do different things from time to time.
4. The chance to be "somebody" in the community.
5. The way my boss handles his/her workers.
6. The competence of my supervisor in making decisions.
7. Being able to do things that don't go against my conscience.
8. The way my job provides for steady employment.
9. The chance to do things for other people.
10. The chance to tell people what to do.
11. The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities.
12. The way company policies are put into practice.
13. My pay and the amount of work I do.
14. The chances for advancement on this job.
15. The freedom to use my own judgment.
16. The chance to try my own methods of doing the job.
17. The working conditions.
18. The way my co-workers get along with each other.
19. The praise I get for doing a good job.
20. The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job.

Appendix D

Organizational Commitment Questionnaire
Mowday, Steers, and Porter (1979)

Instructions:
Listed below are a series of statements that represent possible feelings that individuals might have about the company or organization for which they work. With respect to your own feelings about the particular organization for which you are now working, please indicate the degree of your agreement or disagreement with each statement by checking on of the seven alternatives below.

(1) strongly disagree: (2) moderately disagree: (3) slightly disagree: (4) neither disagree nor agree: (5) slightly agree: (6) moderately agree: (7) strongly agree. An "R" denotes a negatively phrased and reverse scored item

1. I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this organization be successful.
2. I talk up this organization to my friends as a great organization to work for.
3. I feel very little loyalty to this organization. (R)
4. I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working for this organization.
5. I find that my values and the organization's values are very similar.
6. I am proud to tell others that I am part of this organization.
7. I could just as well be working for a different organization as long as the type of work was similar. (R)
8. This organization really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance.
9. It would take very little change in my present circumstances to cause me to leave this organization. (R)
10. I am extremely glad that I chose this organization to work for over others I was considering at the time I joined.
11. There's not too much to be gained by sticking with this organization indefinitely. (R)
12. Often. I find it difficult to agree with this organization's policies on important matters relating to its employees. (R)
13. I really care about the fate of this organization.
14. For me this is the best of all possible organizations for which to work.
15. Deciding to work for this organization was a definite mistake on my part. (R)