JOB SATISFACTION PREFERENCES OF GENERATION Y;THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN JOB SATISFACTION AND ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT*

Gül Selin Erben**
Gizem Akıncı Büyüktaş***

ABSTRACT

This study aims to examine Generation Y's work expectations in Turkey; and in relation to that; analyzing their current overall satisfaction and type of commitment they have towards their organization. With Generation Y's population at workplace increasing day by day; their expectations and preferences at workplace is being a more relevant matter in order to retain this generations' talent. This study focuses on the concepts of motivation theories, organizational commitment and the relationship between Generation Y motivators and organizational commitment. These concepts then have been linked to the quantitative analysis that has been conducted by 251 Generation Y employees in Turkey. With the survey method, their work preferences and their current level of satisfaction and organizational commitment have been questioned.

It is found out that motivators and job commitment have a positive relationship; as there is a positive relationship between Generation Y job commitment and overall satisfaction.

Keywords: *Y Generation, Human Resources Management, Organizational Commitment, Job Satisfaction*

Y KUŞAĞININ İŞ MEMNUNİYETİ TERCİHLERİ; İŞ MEMNUNİYETİ
ve ÖRGÜTSEL BAĞLILIK ARASINDAKİ İLİŞKİ

Gül Selin Erben
Gizem Akıncı Büyüktaş

ÖZ

Bu çalışmanın amacı Türkiye'deki Y kuşağı çalışanlarının işten beklentilerini incelemektir. Ayrıca, bu çalışmada Y kuşağı çalışanlarının iş beklentileri ile iş tatmini ve kurumsal bağlılıkları arasındaki ilişki irdelenmektedir. Y kuşağı çalışanlarının artmasıyla, bu çalışanların iş beklentilerini bilmek, yetenekli Y kuşağı bireylerini kurumlarda tutmak için önemli hale gelmiştir. Niceliksel araştırma tasarımı çerçevesinde 251 Y kuşağı çalışanına anket uygulanmıştır. Ankette, Y kuşağı çalışanlarına iş beklentileri, mevcut iş memnuniyetleri ve kurumsal bağlılıkları ile ilgili sorular sorulmuştur. Yapılan istatistiki analizler sonucunda Y kuşağı çalışanlarının işten beklentileriyle ilgili memnuniyet seviyelerinin yüksek olduğu ancak ek güdüleyicilere ve düzenlemelere de açık oldukları bulunmuştur. Buna ek olarak, güdüleyici faktörlerinden memnun olanların (hijyen faktörlerden memnun olanlara oranla) daha yüksek kurumsal bağlılık seviyesine sahip oldukları ortaya konulmuştur.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *Y Kuşağı, İnsan Kaynakları Yöneti Örgütsel Bağlılık, İş Tatmini*

1. Introduction

There are numerous Job Motivation theories that focus on the factors that keep employees motivated. Both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation factors are defined by many theories. The most fundamental motivation theories are; content theories of motivation and process theories of motivation (Osabiya, 2015). While content theories focus on the employee needs and the content of motivation, process theorists mainly focus on goals and processes in general. Today, most of the employment markets are fulfilled with employees that belong to Generation Y. Generation Y members have different life expectations, values, work-style preferences, leadership preferences compared to generation X members. Hence, it is significantly important to understand the basic motivations of Generation Y employees. (Arora, Dhole, 2019)

The main objective of this study is twofold; first, the preferences of generation Y with respect to Herzberg's two factor theory will be analyzed. Then, the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational comitment will be analyzed. In this study, the motivation of Generation Y employees is analyzed within the perspective of Herzberg's two factor theory. (Herzberg, 1959).

2. Job Motivation in Relation to Job Satisfaction

There are numerous Job Motivation theories that focus on the factors that keep employees motivated. Both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation factors are defined by many theories. The most fundamental motivation theories are; content theories of motivation and process theories of motivation (Osabiya, 2015). While content theories focus on the employee needs and the content of motivation, process theorists mainly focus on goals and processes in general.

In this study, the motivation of employees is analyzed within the perspective of Herzberg's two factor theory. Frederick Herzberg was a well-known psychologist focusing on management, job performance and employee relations at work (Herzberg, 1959). During his academic career, Herzberg closely monitored workers and engineers and their satisfaction level in different conditions and at different times at work. He constructed his Two Factor Theory as an improvement of Maslow's Need Hierarchy (Spiegel, 2013). Different from what

Maslow's Pyramid of Needs suggests; his theory involved the idea that the satisfaction factors and dissatisfaction factors at work are not interrelated but two separate concepts. With this in mind, while monitoring the motivation factors that make the workers content at work, he used a list of factors for the workers to rank and rate in order of desirability. In addition to that, he questioned workers spontaneously about their likes and dislikes of the job, and created an inventory or questionnaire deriving from his research (Johnson, 2005).

Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory or Motivation – Hygiene Theory was created as a result of these studies. According to this theory, some factors were creating satisfaction, which were later named as 'Motivators' whereas some were creating dissatisfaction, which were grouped as 'Hygiene Factors'. If the motivators existed in a company, it made employees motivated at work, however the non-existence of hygiene factors are what made them feel unmotivated. With this classification, the companies are able to focus on different aspects of job motivation more clearly and more to the point (Herzberg, 1959). According to Herzberg's Theory, motivators at work setting are achievement, recognition, responsibility, advancement, growth and the work itself. On the other hand, salary, company policy, peer relations, and supervising styles are evaluated as hygiene factors. It can be understood that Herzberg stressed the importance of intrinsic motivation factors such which provide employees sense of accomplishment and which increase their self-esteem, self-worth.

In Herzberg's two factor theory, motivators are rather intrinsic to the job itself, meaning that they are inner factors that are felt by the employee himself, rather than provided from the outside; whereas hygiene factors are more extrinsic. Job dissatisfaction is the result of extrinsic non-job-related factors labeled as hygiene factors (Ramdolph & Johnson, 2005). If the hygiene factors exist in a work environment, it does not bring job motivation, according to Herzberg's theory. Motivators are what create job motivation in the long run. On the other hand, lack of hygiene factors may create dissatisfaction at workplace. Deducting from that, it can be said that the organizations can focus on motivators and create the type of work environment that will enrich employees' recognition, growth and advancement. Since this theory gives rise to different categories in job motivation and provides a remedy for organizations to be more

effective in employee management, in this study, Herzberg's Motivation Theory is used as a tool to understand Generation Y's motivators and the relation between their work attitudes and the current conditions at work.

3. Organizational Commitment

Organizational commitment in a workplace results in employees' feeling a part of the community they work in and being in sync with the organization's goals, as well as working towards achieving them. In a sense, commitment brings internalization of organization's values and goals and the feeling of being a part of the team. According to Charles O'Reilly's (2001) article, in California Management Review, there are three stages of being a committed employee; which are compliance, identification and internalization. At the first stage, the employee feels responsible in following company policies and rules and works towards his / her responsibilities. In the second stage, the employee willingly accepts organization's influence to create a satisfying relationship with the organization. Finally, internalization comes when employee's values, goals and expectations are congruent with the company's values and expectations.

Even though the studies continually suggest that employee commitment positively effects job performance, empirical evidence shows that even though there is a correlation, it is weak to generally state that there is a direct link between commitment and performance (Starnes and Truhon, 2006). However, employee commitment is effective in employees' tendency to stay at their current job, which affects the turnover rate. Commitment also, generally effects organizational behavior in workplace. Committed employees tend to show less withdrawal behaviors such as being absent at work, job searching and eventually leaving the organization (Starnes and Truhon, 2006). For the reasons stated above, creating job commitment is an important agenda for organizations to sustain talented employees and creating a dedicated work environment overall.

Meyer and Allen (1991) have developed a three – component model of commitment in order to explain different levels of organizational commitment that affects employees' organizational behavior. According to Meyer and Allen (1991) they created this model based on the previous organizational commitment studies to improve the classification of different types of commitment. The three types that are affective commitment, continuous commitment and normative commitment provide a framework to understand employees' level of internalizing the organizational values and goals and thus give the employers a map of where employees see themselves in the organization. Continuance commitment is about the need to stay in an organization by weighing the costs and benefits of continuing to work at that organization. If an employee has continuance commitment; he / she stays at the organization as long as the benefits match or overweigh the costs of leaving the organization. The second scenario is not being able to leave the organization due to lacking the opportunity to work at a better place. For example, even though an employee is dissatisfied with work, work environment and the company generally, he / she might need to stay there because his / her salary and compensation would not improve in another company. Employees, who have affective commitment, want to stay at that organization and continue to work at their current job willingly and with a sense of belonging. Generally, these employees identify with the company goals and feel a part of the organization; which means they fit into the structure. These employees feel that their organization values them. Thus, they tend to act in a way that contributes positively to the company culture. In the affective commitment model, employees have emotional connections with the organization and this makes them feel personally responsible about company's success and goals. The affectively committed employees have a tendency to display positive attitudes and have a high performance. Employees with normative commitment have a sense of moral obligation to stay in the organization. They feel if they leave the organization, it will affect the organization negatively or will have bad results for the other employees. If an employee feels he / she is given many opportunities during the years he / she stayed there, it will create a reluctance for that person to leave the organization since the employee thinks he / she is 'ought to' stay in the company. This may be due to training opportunities the company provides or the employee may feel that he / she is a valuable asset in the company. Thus, leaving is not morally a viable choice for the employee. This type of commitment occurs when employee's personal norms coincide with the organizations' and what the company did over the years for that employee

(Ying Yi, Kiazad, Cheng, Capezio, Restubog, et.al. 2017).

4. Generation Y at Workplace

In several studies, age is studied as a moderating variable between job characteristics and work motivation. As the ages of ethe emplyees increase they are more likely to be motivated by intrinsic factors than the younger employees (Ng & Feldman, 2010; Rhodes, 1983,Cavangh, Kraiger and Henry, 2019) . Hence, age can be evaluated as an important determinant of work related attitudes. Generation can be defined as group of individuals that share common experiences in a certain time period which cause them to also share common believes, life choices, values and behaviors (Goldgehn, 2004). A generation usually witnesses the same historical and social events that result in this generational classification. As for members of generation Y, which can be also referred as Millenials, are most commonly defined as the generation born between 1980 – 2000 even though it is important to note that due to different phases of technological and socio – cultural advancements in different parts of the world, this age gap may vary (Wiedmer, 2015). The most common developments for Generation Y can be listed as, globalism, the Internet age and technological advancements. Looking at demographics, according to Deloitte's (2017) study, Generation Y will comprise three-quarters of global workforce. According to the Goldbeck Recruitment Company CEO Henry Goldbeck (2017), main attributes of Generation Y compared to previous generations in workplace are as shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Main Attributes of Generations

	Generation Baby Boomers (1943-1960)	Generation X 1960-1981)	Generation Y (1982-2001)
Work Ethic& Values	Workaholics, work efficiently,personal fulfillment,desire quality,question authority	Eliminate the task ,self-reliance,want structure and direction, skeptical	What's next, multitasking, tenacity, enterpreneurial,tolerant, goal-oriented
Work is...	An exciting adventure	A difficult challange,a contract	A means to an end, fulfillment
Leadership Styles	Consensual , collegial	Everyone is the same ,challange others , ask why	Not yet determined
Interactive Style	Team player, loves meeting	Enterpreuner	Participative
Communacitons	In person	Direct, immediate	E-mail, voice mail
Feedback	Don't appreciate	Sorry to interrupt , but how am I doing?	Whenever I want it at the push of a button
Rewards	Money, title, recognition	Freedom is the best reward	Meaningful work
Messages That Motivate	You are valued, you are needed	Do it your way, forget the rules	You will work with other bright creative people
Work &Family Life	No balance, work to live	Balance	Balance

As it can be seen, since Generation Y has been brought up by protective and what is called 'helicopter parents' that are involved in their children's lives in every aspect, this generation has grown up to be more demanding, more used to getting what they demand in life and more community-oriented with a sense of meaning and joy in life in general; instead of a sense of duty and loyalty to the workplace (Wiedmer 2015). Compared to the previous generations that had seen Great Wars and economic depressions, this generation does not necessarily see work as a place that should be committed completely as a purpose of living.(Bencsik; Horváth-Csikós,Juhász,2016). This generation is more individualistic and focus on their personal needs more than their corporate lives and because of this, they are often misunderstood and labeled as 'lazy and irresponsible' by the previous generations. However, this generation merely seeks work – life balance and need to feel continuous development and praise at work to satisfy their need for meaning (Wiedmer, 2015). Creativity and using technology efficiently are also important attributes of Generation Y, as seen from Table 4.1; because with the impact of technological advancements and being able to reach multiple sources of information at once, this generation is able to multitask and think outside the box at workplace; thus ready to take on more responsibilities in a shorter time span than the previous generations (Reeves and Oh, 2008). Due to political and economic conditions and different timings, some countries may have different time periods in which the Generation Y is born and raised (Wiedmer, 2015). It is a known fact that technological advancements and neoliberal economic policies were introduced late in Turkey comparatively and especially the Internet was actively being used just after 1994's (Yüksekbilgili, 2015). Thus, in order to correctly understand Generation Y's work attitudes, preferences and motivation elements in Turkey, first it is important to focus on the right group of Generation Y people. By scholars such as, Arsenault, Lower, Miller and Washington, it is widely accepted that the generation born between the years 1980 – 2000 are Generation Y (Yüksekbilgili, 2015). However, a recent study by the same researcher with participation of one thousand two hundred and forty-seven people shows that Turkey's Generation Y consists of people born between the years 1983 – 1994 (Yüksekbilgili, 2015). In this study, the most common Generation Y attributes in literature is measured in people born between the years 1980 – 2000. These attributes were; preferring flexible working hours,

11

the internet being the most important tool of communication, close follow-up and use of technology, wishing to start their own business, freedom being a priority, having great self – confidence, multitasking, defining themselves as impatient and wishing to be in contact by using social network during work hours. The result of this study shows that, people who show these nine attributes are born between the years 1983 – 1994, which is considered to be the actual time frame for Generation Y in Turkey. In the quantitative research of this study, people who were born between these years took part in the survey. Also, another study of Yüksekbilgili (2013) that focuses on Turkish Type Generation Y reveals that, out of thirty-three most common attributes of Generation Y in literature, twenty-four are valid attributes for Generation Y population in Turkey. This means some of the most common Generation attributes apply in Turkey as well, but not all of them. Thus, even though global literature is crucial in understanding Generation Y's main attitude and motivation factors in Turkey, it is vital to focus on studies that are specific for Generation Y in Turkey to fully grasp this generation's attitude in work life.

5. Differences of Generation X and Y at Workplace

As it is stated, there is a mixture of Generation X and Y employees in workplaces and this may lead up to several conflicts about the different preferences at workplace and communication problems due to different priorities at work (Dokadia, Rai, Chawla, 2015). In order to set a workplace for motivated, efficient and happy Generation Y employees, it is important to know the differences between these two generations and how to create an environment where they can work together in harmony.

Generation Y is most commonly seen and described in many articles written by Generation X as "hedonistic, self – centered, easily bored and focused on getting promotions easily, not patient, not really responsible and cares about having fun and bend the rules as much as possible; which is not acceptable in a serious and structured workplace" (Tufur, 2011). Employees of Generation X are mostly managers and executives now, and as the Generation Y population continues to increase at workplaces and their struggle to understand and tackle with Generation Y problems escalates as well. Thus, first more positive attributes of Millen-

nial should be taken into consideration while dealing with those problems. Aside from the attributes mentioned above, Generation Y is also described as more visionary, creative, multi-tasking, and great at using technology and creating a dynamic work atmosphere (Tufur, 2011).

One of the important conflicts Generation Y's faces at workplace is the inability to bend the Generation X's structured and strict understanding of how workplaces should be and how employees should behave. According to Deloitte's (2017) study of Generation Y conducted in thirty countries by eight thousand participants around the world, thirty-one percent of all participants and forty percent of all participants from Turkey prefer to work freelance rather than in a corporate company. Moreover, sixty-five percent of participants in Turkey believe that flexible work conditions are very important in their job satisfaction, overall employee happiness, performance and work – life balance. These results show that, corporations who are managed by Generation X employees may face a serious problem of retaining Generation Y in their companies, especially if the flexible work conditions do not apply. Instead of labeling this new generation as "materially spoiled" as Leslie Goldgehn (2004) did, taking solid steps toward adapting what Generation X created as workplaces into workplaces that are attractive for Generation Y is the key to create job content at workplace.

As Generation Y continues to populate workplaces, their work values and expectancies from their companies are becoming an important and unavoidable issues (Jonck, Van der Walt, Sobayeni, 2017). Generation Y's work values differ from the previous generation. This is due to, according to Dickinson & Emler (1992), children's understanding of employment is highly affected by their parents' work experiences. Later it is further suggested that children's understanding of employment at previous ages might be highly effective in their future experiences and work choices (Pfau, 2016). During their parents' career, in 80's and 90's, Generation Y witnessed how work life affected their parents and whether their years of efforts and hard work are rewarded at the end. Thus, these experiences are thought to make Generation Y "skeptical, unimpressed by authority and self – reliant in their orientation towards work" (Jurkiewicz, 2000). According to Hewlett et al. (2009),

Generation Y values their quality of life and is working to live their lives; as a result their work should provide standards that can match this generation's expectancies in private life; may it be traveling, shopping or higher education. These standards may be provided under the concepts of flexibility and progressive policies. Another very important work value for this generation is flexible work hours and flexibility of these hours; which means looking at the work that is done and not to the work hours (Brown et al. 2009). Since this generation is highly connected in terms of technology, the work – private life division may be fading rapidly and they value the type of work that allows them to integrate them both. In addition, they value work – life balance greatly; and want their work to be means of their life and not the other way around. In addition to all, Generation Y both values their individuality and their individual development, they seek individual attention and recognition constantly and also want to be a part of a team and work closely with other team members (Brown et al. 2009). Feeling important and valued as an individual and also having meaningful work relationships with other co-workers are important assets for Generation Y (Bansal, 2017). These values lead Generation Y employees to have their own set of work preferences that makes them content at work. According to Hewlett et al. (2009), there are six types of reward that are more important than salary for this generation. These are, high-quality colleagues, flexible work arrangements, prospects for advancement, recognition from management or organization, advancement and promotion and access to new experiences and challenges" (Hewlett et al. 2009). These rewards coincide with the work values that are attributed to Generation Y. Companies that choose to provide these rewards and take Generation Y's values to restructure their work policies will certainly see the impact on this generation.

6. The Effect of Job Motivators on Organizational Commitment for Generation Y

According to an article published in Capital in 2008, forty-five percent of Generation Y population in Turkey wish to start their own business rather than working in big companies. Article mentions characteristic qualities of this generation and how their perspective at work will change corporate working principles eventually. According to this article, Generation Y has a lower sense of commitment compared to other generations; they challenge authority and have a tendency to switch work places if they are not content at work. In another article, published in Harvard Business Review, it is mentioned that in a 2015 Gallup Poll, it was seen that the least engaged group in the workplace were Millenials with an engagement rate of twenty-nine percent (Benson, 2016).

There are several important studies that are conducted to show the correlation between the level of job satisfaction and job commitment to understand the employees who may have a tendency to quit and how to retain valuable employees in that regard. Job satisfaction simply occurs when employees are satisfied with the overall conditions, compensation and benefits, the content of the work and the work environment such as colleagues and other physical conditions (Locke, 1976). In a recent article by Yi (2014), it is underlined that there is a positive correlation between employees' expectancies and their level of commitment. This finding also coincides with Cohen and Golan's (2007) ideas in their article, also studying to find a link between commitment level and job expectancy.

Compared to other generations, Generation Y is in more need of tools of commitment since it is a more independent generation that focuses on individual satisfaction and content in life. (Civelek, Çemberci, Aşçı, Öz, 2017).They are more likely to leave a job they are not satisfied with and start their own business since they are more individualistic. Thus, it is important for corporations to adapt according to this generation's demands in order to retain the talent. In Benson's article in Harvard Business Review, it is openly stated that, "If companies want to retain these valued workers (Millennials), they will have to double their efforts to meet Millennials where they are (Benson 2016). In addition to that, the strongest predictor of organizational commitment of Generation Y is found out to be the work – life balance as it is also supported in Benson's article as in many other studies (Yi, 2014). Increasing jobs that provides work – life balance, will increase the job commitment and retain the talent in the organization.

In order to further point out the importance of understanding and empathizing with Generation Y's work attitude in order to create job commitment, it is important to see previous study results about the subject.

Huang, Lawler & Lei's (2007) and Vijaya and Hemamalini's (2012) studies discuss the positive effects of work – life balance to the job commitment level of Generation Y. In addition to this, study done by Deery and Jago (2015) resulted that work- life balance had a vital role to alleviate high level of intention to leave. The result of these studies indicate that there is a positive relationship between work – life balance and job commitment of Generation Y. Thus, in order to create a work environment long - lasting and alluring for Generation Y, creating work policies that coincide with Generation Y work preferences is simply vital. This shows employers a path to follow in order to create job satisfaction and consequently job commitment. Several work – life balance practices such as providing flexible work arrangements seem to be the first step to take to increase job satisfaction for Generation Y.

7. Research Questions and the Hypotheses

The main purpose of this study is to get an understanding about Generation Y's main work preferences and attitudes in Turkey and study the relation between these and job commitment. In this sense, two research questions are; 1) What are Generation Y's preferences at work place? 2) What is the relationship between Generation Y's preferences and attitudes towards work and their level of job commitment? In order to reply to these questions, a survey was conducted on 251 Generation Y employees from Turkey. In these questions, level of importance of both motivators and hygiene factors (from Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory) and their current level of satisfaction about these factors are measured. The second part of the survey consists of questions which measure the level of commitment. Meyer & Allen's Organizational Commitment Questionnaire was used to measure organizational commitment of the employees. In the survey, Generation Y employees were asked about theimselves their current level of satisfaction with regard to their work preferences and their commitment to their organization. The extent satisfying Generation Y's work preferences is seen by finding how important these factors are for them (their preference at work) and their current level of satisfaction from these factors.

The relationship between the current level of satisfaction with regard to their work preferences and job commitment is examined and both motivators and hygiene factors are analyzed under the

sub-headings. Job commitment is a dependent variable; preferences and satisfaction from these preferences are determined as independent variables.

Hypotheses of the study are as follows;
H [1]: There is a negative correlation between Generation Y's preferences in work life and their level of satisfaction about these preferences in Turkey.
H [1B]: Satisfaction of motivators will predict organizational commitment more than satisfaction of hygiene factors.
H [2] : Employees' overall satisfaction will predict their organizational commitment significantly.

8. Sampling

The unit of analysis and the research population is white color employees who belong to Generation Y that are between the ages 24 to 35. Convenient sampling is used in order to collect data. To summarize the demographic results of the survey, 47,9 percent of the sample consists of women and 57,2 percent of the sample is single. 59 percent of the participants have Bachelor Degree and the average age of the participants is 28,2. The survey is conducted on 251 participants. The surveys are distributed via Internet and the return rate is 63 percent.

9. Measures

In this study, Herzberg's Two – Factor Theory is used as a scale to measure the importance of motivators and hygiene factors for Generation Y white collar workers. In addition to that, Meyer & Allen's Three Component Model of Commitment is used to measure organizational commitment. 3 items were excluded from the commitment scale. 1 item belongs to normative commitment sub dimension of the commitment scale. "I feel that I owe this organization a lot." The other two items, which were excluded, belong to the continuance commitment sub dimension of the commitment scale. "Right now, staying with my organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire." and "I would consider working at another organization if I hadn't given that much to this organization."

A 5-point response scale was employed for work alienation test, ranging from "strongly disagree" (1) to "strongly agree" (5).

10. Statistical Analysis and Findings

First, internal consistency and factor structures of the scales were tested by reliability analysis and factor analysis. Simple regression and correlation analysis were conducted to test the hypotheses. Additionally, independent sample T-tests and ANOVA were conducted to test whether there is a difference between demographic variables in terms of organizational commitment. Reliability analysis was conducted in order to test the internal consistency of the scales that are used in the questionnaire. The Cronbach Alpha values of all the scales are given in the Table 2.

Table 2. Results of the Reliability Analysis

Variable	Cronbach Alpha
Organizational Commitment	.921
Affective Commitment	.928
Continuance Commitment	.800
Normative Commitment	.856
Hygiene Factors Preference	.576
Hygiene Factors Satisfaction	.767
Motivation Factors Preference	.887

Confirmatory factor analysis was conducted with the principles component method and varimax rotation in order to determine the dimensions of the variables. Only three scales out of nine revealed factors and other scales were gathered under one factor. Kaiser –Meyer Olkin (KMO) values of all three scales were greater than. 50 and Bartlett's test was significant at level .000. If an item has MSA value smaller than 0.50, then that item should be left out of the analysis. (Sipahi et al. 2006). All the scales that are used in this study were evaluated with respect to these criteria. As a result of the factor analysis tems 9.1, 9.5 and 10.6 were extracted. (Table 3).

In order to test the generated hypotheses, correlation analysis and simple regression analyses were conducted. Results of the correlation analysis Show that here is not a negative correlation between the preferences of Gen Y in work life and their level of satisfaction about these preferences **(Table 4)** thus, **H^1 is rejected.** However, result of the correlation analysis revealed that there is a significant and **positive correlation between the satisfaction level of motivators and hygiene factors.** In order to test the H1B, single regression analysis was conducted. As a result, it has been seen that satisfaction with motivator factors predicts organizational commitment more than satisfaction with

hygiene factors. Thus, **H^{1B} is accepted.**

Table 3. Results of the Factor Analysis of Organizational Commitment Scale

FACTORS	Loadings	Factor Variance%
Factor 1:Affective Commitment		46,8
I would be happy to stay in this organization.	.870	
I feel this organization's problems are my own.	.855	
I feel a strong sense of belonging here.	.850	
I feel emotionally attached to this organization.	.834	
I feel part of the family at this organization.	.834	
This organization has great personal meaning	.597	

for me.		
Factor 2 Continuance Commitment		14,2
Staying in this organization is necessary as much as desire.	.762	
It would be hard for me to leave my job even if I want to.	.691	
Too much of my life will be disrupted if I leave my job right now.	**.793**	
I have too few options to consider leaving my job.	.582	
If I did not put so much of myself here, I would consider leaving this organization.	.676	
Factor 3 Normative Commitment		
Even if it were to my advantage, it would not be right to leave my organization.	.626	
I would feel guilty if I leave my organization.	.636	
This organization deserves my loyalty.	.660	
I owe a great deal to my organization.	.693	
KMO: ,918 **Bartlett's Test p: ,000**		

Yazarın kendi hesaplamaları

Table 4. Correlation Analysis of the Variables

		Hygiene Importance Mean	Hygiene Satisf. Mean	Motivators Imptc. Mean	Motivators Satisf. Mean
Hygiene Importance Mean	Pearson Corr.	1	,129*	,388**	,098
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,041	,000	,122
	N	251	251	251	251
Hygiene Satisfaction Mean	Pearson Corr.	,129*	1	,094	,612**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,041		,136	,000
	N	251	251	251	251
Motivators Importance Mean	Pearson Corr.	,388**	,094	1	,187**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,136		,003
	N	251	251	251	251
Motivators Satisfaction Mean	Pearson Corr.	,098	,612**	,187**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,122	,000	,003	
	N	251	251	251	251

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Authors' calculations

Table 5. Result of the Multiple Regression Analysis Between Satisfaction of Motivators and Organizational Commitment

Independent Variables	R	R²	F	Beta
Satisfaction with motivator factors	.586	.305	64,496	398
Satisfaction with hygiene factors				.251
P: ,000 Dependent Variable: Organizational Commitment				
Independent Variables	R	R²	F	Beta
Satisfaction with hygiene factors	.621	.386	77,877	.237
Satisfaction with motivator factors				.447
P:,000 Dependent Variable: Affective Commitment				
Independent Variables	R	R2	F	Beta
Satisfaction with hygiene factors	.546	.298	52,759	.311
Satisfaction with motivator factors				.298
P:,000 Dependent Variable: Normative Commitment				

Authors' calculations

Results have revealed that, there was not a meaningful relationship between continuance commitment and motivators / hygiene factors. According to the result of the regression analysis between satisfaction of hygiene and motivator factors and normative commitment, it was seen that hygiene factors predict normative commitment more than motivator factors. This shows that as long as the most basic and vital elements at work such as salary and company policies coincide with employee preferences and satisfy them; they feel a moral obligation to stay in the organization. In order to test the H2, simple regression analysis was conducted. As seen in Table 8.10, overall satisfaction of employees significantly predicts organizational commitment. Thus, **H² is accepted.**

Table 6. Result of the Simple Regression Analysis between Overall Satisfaction and Overall Organizational Commitment

Independent Factor	R	R²	F	Beta Value
Over all Satisfaction	.584	.341	128,154	.584
P: ,000				
Dependent Variable: Organizational Commitment				

Authors' calculations

Results (Table 6) show that as the employees are satisfied with their jobs in general, they are commited to their organizations. Overall satisfaction is measured by asking questions such as " are you generally satisfied with your work?". Here, the respondents do not think abut the details of their job such as wage, supervisors, culture, benefits but

make an overall evaluation of their current job.

11. Discussion and Conclusion

In today's business world, Generation Y's expectations from work life create a demand for corporate firms to improve the work conditions and opportunities for white – collar employees. The complexity and sophistication of the business world inevitably altered the employee motives and expectations and made them highly individual and unique. Understanding these motives and improving the corporate culture according to that is beneficial for both the firms and employees who are now able to find numerous other job offers from many other corporate firms.

The first hypothesis was about the relationship between Generation Y employees' work preferences and their satisfaction of these preferences. The hypothesis argued that there is a negative correlation between them, but it is surprising that the quantitative analysis' results showed that there is not a negative relationship between what Generation Y demands from work life and their current level of satisfaction of these demands. These results indicate that, currently Generation Y employees' are not really unsatisfied with what they prefer at work to be crucial for them; even though they are open for additional motivators and adjustments.

Results of the analyses have revealed that people who are content with motivators at work tend to have higher organizational commitment compared to hygiene factors; thus it is more crucial to create satisfaction in motivators for employee retention. According to a survey conducted in 2014 by Turkey People Management Association (PERYÖN), "employee turnover has reached its peak in four years" where in eighty-two companies who took part in survey, 21 percent of employees has left their job, which is significantly high. According to the Human Capital Index Report prepared by Watson Wyatt, moderate voluntary turnover rate should be around 8 – 9 percent (Toten 2005). This is to point out that, employee retention is becoming one of the major focus points for corporate firms in Turkey and with more studies in this area, a focus can be created to make a change that will make both employees and firms satisfied and content at work.

In the second hypothesis, the relationship between job satisfaction and commitment has been studied.

According to the results, it has been seen that job satisfaction and commitment have a positive correlation and furthermore according to the analysis, motivators have a positive correlation with affective commitment. As stated earlier, affective commitment creates a sense of belonging for the employee towards the organization. The results show that, focusing on the employee motivators will create affective commitment. Also focusing on employees' job satisfaction will also increase their commitment towards organization; which is a crucial step for decreasing employee turnover.

In literature review, it has also been seen that organizational commitment of Generation Y is lower compared to other generations (Solnet & Kralj 2011:8). This finding supports the idea that corporate firms need to fully grasp this generation's motivators and shape the work culture accordingly. The findings of a study which were presented in 2017 with 81 Generation Y participants from İstanbul, have shown that the first and most important motivator for Generation Y is to have a meaningful relationship with colleagues and managers; that is a hygiene factor and is not supported by the data in this study.

References

Adıgüzel, O., Batur, Z., Ekşili, N. (2014). Kuşakların değişen yüzü ve y kuşağı ile ortayaçıkan yeni çalışma tarzı: Mobil
yakalılar. Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi. (19):165-182.

Altunışık, R., Coşku, R., Yıldırım, E. (2010). Sosyal bilimlerde araştırma yöntemleri spss uygulamalı. 6. Baskı. Sakarya: Sakarya Yayıncılık.

Arora, N., Dhole, V. (2019). Generation Y: Perspective, engagement, expectations, preferences and satisfactions from workplace; a study conducted in Indian context.Benchmarking: An International Journal. 26(5):1378-1404

Bansal, N. (2017). Motivation & Attitude of Generation Y in India: An Exploratory Study. Indian Journal of Industrial Relations. 53(1):102-114.

Baltaş, A. (2009). İnsana ve işe değer katan yeni İK. İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.

Bencsik, A., Horvath-Csikos, G., Juhazs, T., (2016). Journal of Competitiveness.8(3): 90-106.

Benson, T. (2016). Motivating millenials takes more than flexible Work policies. Harvard Business Review. 94 (2):15-17

Burnett, J. (2008). Generations: The time machine in theory and practice. Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate Publishing Group.

Cavangh, T., Kraiger, K., Henry, K. (2019). Age-Related Changes on the Effects of Job Characteristics on Job Satisfaction: A Longitudinal Analysis. The International Journal of Aging and Human Development. DOI: 10.1177/0091415019837996

Civelek, M. E., Çemberci, M., Aşçı, M. S., Öz, S. (2017). The Effect of the Unique Features of Y Generation on Organizational Commitment.Journal of History, Culture and Art Research/Tarih Kültür ve Sanat Araştırmaları Dergisi. 6(6): 336-349.

Cohen, A., Golan, R. (2007). Predicting absenteeism and Turnover intentions by past absenteeism and work attitudes. Career Development International. 12 (5):416-432.

Coomers, D. Michaeland DeBard, R. (2004). Serving the millennial generation: New directions for student services. San Francisco: Jossey – Bass.

Curtis, R. C., Upchurch, S. R. (2009). Employee motivation and organizational commitment: A comparison of tipped and
non-tipped restaurant employees. International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration. 10 (3) :253 –269.

Deery, M., Jago, L. (2015). Revisiting talent management, work life balance and retention strategies. International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management. 27 (3):453-472.

Deloitte. (2017). The 2017 Deloitte millenial survey. Sydney, Australia.

https://www2.deloitte.com/au/en/pages/about-deloitte/articles/millenial survey-2017

Dickinson, J., Emler, N. (1992). Developing conceptions of work. Cambridge: Blackwell.

References

Dokadia, A., Rai, S., Chawla, D. (2015). Indian Journal of Industrial Relations. 51(1):81-96.

Ekwutosi O. C. M. (2013). Internalization of organizational culture: A theoretical perspective. International Journal of Business Tourism and Applied Sciences. 1 (2) :77-96.

Espinoza, C., Ukleja, M., Rusch, C. (2010). Managing the millennials: Discover the core competencies for managing today's workforce. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons Inc.

Fields, B. (2008). Millennial leaders. Issue no: 4. New York: Morgan James Pub.

Goldbeck, H., 2017, Generational motivation differences at workplace [online], Talent at Work, http://www.goldbeck.com/hrblog/motivational-differences between-the-generations-x-y-and-baby-boomers/ [accessed 3 December 2017].

Goldgehn, A. L. (2004). Generation who, what, y? What you need to know about generation Y. International Journal of EducationalAdvancement. 5(1) : 24-34.

Herzberg, F. (1959). The motivation to work. Issue no: 2. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons Inc.

Hewlett, S. A. Sherbin, L., K.Sumberg (2009). How gen y & boomerswill reshape your agenda. Harvard Business Review. 87 (4) :71-76.

Hobart, B. and Sendek, H. (2014). Gen Y now. San Francisco: Wiley.

Howe, Neil and Strauss, William (2009). Millennials rising: The next great generation. New York: Random House Digital.

Huang, Tung-Chun, Lawler, John and Lei, Ching-Yi (2007). The effects of quality of work life on commitment and turnover intention. Social Behavior and Personality. 35 (6):735-750.

Ince, Mehmet ve Gül, Hasan (2005). Yönetimde yeni bir paradigma: örgütsel bağlılık, Konya: Çizgi Kitapevi.

Jonck, Petronella, van der Walt, Freda, Sobayeni, Ntomzodwa (2017). A generational perspective on work values in a South African sample.SAJIP: South African Journal of Indurstrial Psychology. 43:1-9.

Jurkiewicz, L. Carole (2000). Generation X and the public employee.Public Personnel Management.29 (1) : 55-74.

Karp, Hank, Fuller Connie and Sirias, Danilo (2002). Bridging the boomer Xer gap: Creating authentic teams for high performance at work. Palo Alto: Davies-Black Pub.

Kaya, Harun (2008). Kamu ve özel sektör kuruluşlarının örgütsel Kültürünün analizi: Görgül bir araştırma. Maliye Dergisi. (155) :119 - 143.

Kuranchie-Mensah, Elizabeth, B. and Amponsah-Tawiah, Kwesi (2015). Employee motivation and work performance: A comparative study of Mining companies in Ghana. Journal of Industrial Engineering and Management. 9 (2) :255 – 309.

Lancaster, C.L., Stillman, D. (2002). When generations collide, who they are, why they clash, how to solve the generational puzzle at work. New York: Collins Business.

References

Lancaster, L., C., Stillman, D. (2010). The M-factor: How the millennial generation is rocking the workplace. New York: Harper Collins.

Lim Xtn Yi (2014). Factors that Affect Generation Y Workers' Organizational .Master Thesis of Business Administration,Universiti Tunku Abdul Rahman.

Lipkin, A. N., Perrymore, J. April (2009). Y in the workplace. Franklin Lakes: The Career Press.

Locke, A. E. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. Chicago: Rand-McNally.

McClelland, C. D. (1961). The achieving society. Princeton: Pickle Partners Publishing.

McClelland, C. D. (1988). Human motivation. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Meyer, P. J., Allen, J.N.(1991). A three-component conceptualization of Organizational commitment. Human Resource Management Review. 1(1): 61-89.

Meyer, P. J., Allen, J.N. (1997). Commitment in the workplace. California: Sage.

Morrow, C. P. (1993). The theory and measurement of work commitment. Greenwich: JAI Press Inc.

Mowday, T. Richard, P. W. Lyman and Steers, M. R., (1982). Employee-organization linkages: The psychology of commitment, absenteeism, and turnover. San Diego: Academic Press.

Mullins, J.L. (2006). Essentials of organizational behavior. England: Prentice Hall.

Ng, T. W. H., & Feldman, D. C. (2010). The relationships of age with job attitudes: A meta-analysis. Personnel Psychology, 63, 677–718.

O'Reilly, C. (2001). Corporations, culture and commitment: Motivation and social control in organizations. California Management Review. 31 (4):9-25.

Osabiya, B. J. (2015). The effect of employees' motivation On organizational performance. Journal of Public Administration and Policy Research. 7 (4): 62 – 75.

Ott, J. S. (1989). Classic readings in organizational behavior. California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.

Pfau, N. B. (2016). What do millenials really want at work? The Same things the rest of us do. Harvard Business Review. 94 (4): 20-22.

Pink, H.D. (2010). Drive: The surprising truth about what motivates us. New York: Riverhead Books.

Price, L. J. (1977). The study of turnover. Ames: Iowa State University Press.

Queiri, A., Dwaikat, N. (2016). Factors affecting generation Y employees' intention to quit in Malaysian's business process outsourcing sector. Journal of Sustainable Development. 9 (2):78-92.

Ramlall, S. (2004). A review of employee motivation theories and their implications for employee retention within organizations. The Journal of American Academy of Business. 5 (1/2) :52-63.

References

Randolph, D. S. & Johnson, S.P. (2005). Predicting the effects of extrinsic and intrinsic job satisfaction factors on recruitment and retention of rehabilitation professionals. Journal of Healthcare Management, 50(1), 49-60.

Rawlins, C. I., Johnson, R. P.(2008). Understanding the new generation: What the millennial cohort absolutely, positively must have atwork. Journal of Organizational Culture. 12 (2) : 1-8.

Reeves, C. and Oh, E.(2008). Generational differences, in handbook of research on educational communications and technology. Issue no: 4. Springer: Athens.

Rhodes, S. R. (1983). Age-related differences in work attitudes and behavior. A review and conceptual analysis. Psychological Bulletin, 93, 328–367.

Sheahan, P.(2005). Generation Y. London: Hardie Grant Books.

Shore, L. M. ,Tetrick, L. E., (1994). The psychological contract as an explanatory framework in the employment relationship. New York: Wiley.

Simons, L.T., Enz, C. (1995). Motivating hotel employees. Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly. 36 (1): 20-27.

Sipahi, B., Yurtkoru, S., Çinko M. (2008). Sosyal Bilimlerde SPSS'le Veri Analizi. İstanbul: Beta Yayın.

Smith, C. P., Kendall, M.L., Hulin, L.C. (1969). The measurement of satisfaction in work and in retirement: A strategy for the study of attitudes. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Solinger, N. O., Van Olffen, W., Roe, R. (2008). Beyond The Three component model of organizational commitment. Journal of Applied Psychology. 93 (1):70–83.

Solnet, D., Kralj, A. (2011). Generational differences in work attitudes: Evidence from the Hospitality Industry. Hospitality Review. 29 (2):37-51.

Spiegel, E. D. (2013). The gen Y handbook: Applying relationship leadership to engage millennials. New York: SelectBooks.

Starnes, B. J., & Truhon, S. A. (2006). A primer on organizational commitment. American Society for Quality. Retrieved from http://asq.org/divisionsforums/hdl/qualityinformation/library/inde html?topic=24&PageNumber=2&StartRow=11

Sujansky, J., Ferri-Reed, J. (2009). Keeping the millennials: Why companies are losing billions in turnover to this generation- and what to do about it. New York: Wiley.

Toten, M. (2005). Is there an optimal level of turnover? https://workplaceinfo.com.au/hr-management/hr-strategy/analysis/is-there-an-optimal-level-of-employee-turnover

Tufur, M. (2011).Turkey Generation Y Mediacat specail supplement (online)Accessed November 12, 2014, from http://www.contento.com.tr/uploads/Turkeys_generation_Y.pdf

Türk, A. (2000). Y kuşağı. İstanbul: Kafekültür Yayınları.

References

Vijaya, T.G., R.Hemamalini (2012). Impact of work life balance on Organizational commitment among bank employees. Journal of Asian Research Consortium. 2(2):159-171.

Wiedmer, T. (2015). Generations do differ: Best practices in leading traditionalists, boomers, and generations x, y, and z. Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin. 82 (1):51-58.

Ying-Yi, C., Kiazad, K., Cheng, D., Capezio, A.,Restubog, S. L. (2017). Does Organizational Justice Matter? Implications for Construction Workers' Organizational Commitment. Journal of Management in Engineering. 33(2):1-10.

Yüksekbilgili, Z. (2013). Türk tipi y kuşağı. Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi. 12 (45) :342-353.

Yüksekbilgili, Z. (2015). Türkiye'de y kuşağının yaş aralığı. Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi. 14 (53) :259-267.

Zemke, R., Raines, C., Filipczak, B. (2000). Generations at work: Managing the clash of veterans, voomers, Xers and nexters in your workplace. New York: American Management Association.