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Yet there are almost countless studies of work motivation and/or workplace happiness and working performance, most of the researches have been in the perspective of older generations like Generation X or The Baby Boomers. The lack of perspective of Millennials (or Generation Y) is natural, since as part of workforce Millennials are still a very young generation. However, since humans do get older, more and more Millennials are joining world’s workforce and will eventually become tomorrow’s leaders. Therefore, it is important to learn how Millennials see the world and what are the features that can be seen as common to them. By understanding what makes a generation that is family-centric but ambitious, education oriented but upbeat, to reach goals and perform effectively, gives a clear advantage. Thus, the goals of this study are to find out what work motivation means to Western world Millennials and understand their values as well as how they perceive trust in a workplace. This study also investigates other generations’ values and generation-specific features, so that it is clearer to understand how much Millennials differ from them and what features have stayed the same over time.

Since this study is qualitative in its nature, the research method has been qualitative as well. This study utilizes semi-structured interview with three sub-themes, that all measure certain parts of the bigger picture of work motivation. The interview and the theoretical evidence provided interesting results that have academic value as well as managerial implications. Some of the most important results was the difference of values and the very nature between Millennials and other generations. Based on this study, it is safe to say that Millennials are the first generation for a long time that is clearly a crossroad generation of old and new business methods. This is greatly so because of Internet and its new perspective of technology and business practices. Although, this study provides information that can be widely generalized, the reader should bear in mind the cultural background of this study’s Millennials and the fact that the immediate business field in this study is knowledge-based, which means businesses that are offering expert services like consultancy.
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1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

Generation Y, or Millennials, are a demographic cohort that is usually seen as people who have born between 1981 and 2000 (Finney, 2008). However, the starting and ending ages may vary, since beginnings and endings of generations are never exact or universe. Therefore, the starting and ending ages should be seen more like indicators than specific time lines. Millennials is a demographic cohort that has evolved after Generation X. Millennials as a generation is also the very next generation that is inheriting managerial positions in business life. Since many researchers in the field of work motivation, like Herzberg, McGregor or McClelland, have started researching motivation as a phenomenon from around 1950, the most of the motivation researches are thus been done by and for people born in 1946 until 1964 (The Baby Boomers), as well as, by and for people born in 1965 until 1980, Generation X. Although, The very first of the four generations that still exists in current workforce are The Traditionalists, which includes the people born between 1928 and 1945.

It is crucial to recognize that every generation values and recognizes different motivation practices, and this leads to situation where certain actions for motivational purposes work only to people from a certain generation. Therefore, in order to understand why companies are motivating employees the way they are, it is important to know what sort of environments these four generations grew up in and what made them to value motivational practices they currently value. The Traditionalists (1928-1945) had stable and good teen years, since they witnessed many successful actions made by their governments and authorities (e.g. the first manned spaceflight). Successful experiences and prosperous lifestyle led them to feel that world is full of opportunities. Therefore, according to Finney (2008), The Traditionalists started to feel comfortable in hierarchies, respected authorities, they were loyal to institutions, and valued financial rewards and security. (Finney, 2008).

The Boomers (1946-1964), on the other hand, spent their youth in a world that were broken in many ways. They experienced many setbacks like assassinations of
idealistic leaders and witnessed Vietnam War, as well as the civil rights movement and Watergate. At that time, Baby Boomers were the largest generation, which led them to compete for everything. Therefore, after many disappointments they wanted their world to change. That and the vast population led them to value competitive and idealistic environment with anti-authoritarian approach. Generation X (1965-1980), instead, had a less global focus during their childhood mainly because the Cold War ended. During Generation X’s teenage years world turned into depression and divorce rates increased tremendously. Generation X was also the first “latchkey children” generation, where children were left alone during working hours. This led them to become more self-reliant and loyal to their friends and colleagues. People from Generation X tend to have disloyalty to institutions and are used to handle vast amount of information. (Finney, 2008).

Generation Y (1981-2000), or Millennials, are, instead of other generations, very confident and goal-oriented. Millennials have seen tragedies like terrorism, school shootings and depression but they have also had a very pro-child parenting culture that has made them very family-centric. The fact that Millennials have born to use Internet have made them to differ from other generations and also shortened their patience on reaching goals. Overall, Millennials seem to be very goal-oriented, favoring education, confident, and more impatient than other generations. (Finney, 2008).

In other words, there are some major distinctions between Millennials and other generations, such as the way employees are seen and the way employees should be treated. The major conflict comes into picture when organizations have employees and managers from different generations but there is only one motivation system or compensation model. It is clear that if the motivation system is created for Boomers by Boomers, it will not be very effective on people from Generation X and even less effective on Millennials. On the other hand, by creating three or four different motivation systems won’t solve the problem either, since it can be confusing, and will not be very effective or fair to everyone. However, all generations still have some motivational features in common. The solution for this conflict is first to understand the differences between generations and respect them equally, and then create a system that is generalized but still allowing individual preferences to matter.
By letting individual dimensions to be involved in generalized motivation system requires it trust from both sides. To make it work, employees need to trust their employer but the employer needs to trust its employees, too. This study’s main goal is to penetrate to the concept of work motivation in the eyes of Millennials and also to evaluate how they see and experience trust in the workplace. It will also reveal the possible relation between workplace trust and work motivation and how strong it is.

Trust as a concept is complex and in order it to work, it requires both trusting beliefs and trusting intentions (Dirks, et. al. 2009). Dirks and his colleagues also point out that trust “is a willingness to make oneself vulnerable to another in the presence of risk”. This means that if the organization decides to increase their level of trust within the organization, both parties need to make oneself vulnerable. Therefore, most companies are publicly informing that they already have mutual trust with their employees, but in many cases that is not true. The reason why this is not entirely true is probably that neither of the two parties are not willing to take a risk to become vulnerable – employees fear layoffs after being too honest and trusting their employer and employer fears its employees to misuse its trust. But trust is an essential part of life and especially now when our world is becoming more and more connected and globalized.

1.2 Goal of research and research problem

The topic of this study is something that has been close to my personal interest for a long time. One of the reasons why I decided to examine this particular subject is my personal interest on Millennials’ perspective to work motivation and trust. Since I am a Millennial myself as well, I feel that I should know more about our own motivation behavior and why some work motivation practices that seem to work well on older employees and managers, doesn’t seem to reward me and my fellow Millennials the same way. Currently, there are available many management books that have addressed the lack of trust to be the reason why especially younger employees are not feeling very rewarded. The lack of feeling of success may lead to lower performance and may decrease the whole working community’s performance and level of motivation (Singh, 2013). Therefore, I feel that it is crucial for managers and their employees to identify what motivates them and whether the existing motivation
system is effective or not to that certain work community. Another reason for the study is that Millennials are the next generation to lead organizations and by now it seems that their leading practices may differ quite a much from Generation X’s leading behavior. Third reason is the actual lack of academic research in this particular perspective. Currently, there are not enough studies about Millennials who are on managing positions and how they value work motivation and trust. It is the most important matter to understand, if managers from other generations want to motivate tomorrow’s leaders properly and effectively. As told before, actions in work motivation practices that did apply twenty or thirty years ago may not apply today or ten years from now. Therefore, understanding how Millennials perceive world and how they value their free time as well as work time matters the most, if we desire to motivate Millennials effectively in future.

1.3 Research Gap and research question

Even though there are plenty of researches about work motivation and trust, there is, in fact, a research cap when we are observing Millennials and their motivational behavior. There are even smaller amount of researches about how Millennials perceive trust as part of work motivation. Part of the reason for the lack of academic publications about Millennials or their motivational behavior is, as Finney (2008) points out, that Millennials have not lived long enough to allow researchers to fully analyze their behavior in work-life and motivational preferences. Another reason could be that since the most of the Millennials have only recently started their career progress, it has not been attractive for researchers to make researches about them that would actually give any valuable results. On the other hand, it can be highly valuable to study a huge generation that will soon become a major workforce in the whole world. Therefore, this study will tackle Millennials’ perspective and study how trust and work motivation is linked in Millennials’ world and how it is valued and defined. Thus the main research question is:

*How Millennials experience work motivation and see trust as part of it.*

Naturally, the main research question can be divided into smaller questions. These smaller sub-questions will clarify what trust in the workplace means to Millennials
and how work motivation is generally experienced. Also the research question leads to investigate how Millennials would create their own, perfect motivation system. When I was designing the actual framework for this research, I realized that in order to fully comprehend Millennials’ perception on trust as part of work motivation, I needed to elucidate Traditionalists’, Generation X’s, and The Boomers’ perception on work motivation. So, before I can answer to actual research question, I need to answer to smaller questions first. The way I am going to research Traditionalists’, Generation X’s, and The Boomers’ values in work motivation, I will lean on heavily to the literature. Based on theories and approaches like Vroom or Locke’s theories, I will analyze what those theories will actually emphasize on work motivation.

1.4 Contribution

This study is going to concentrate on Western world’s Millennials and their thoughts and experiences of work motivation and trust in a workplace. Therefore, this study is providing valid results for academic world, as well as for business world. Business world is in constant change and now when world is more connected than ever before, many traditional management practices will change. This means that Millennials that are one of the largest age cohorts in the world, will necessarily affect on company hierarchies and current managerial structures. Organizations that realize the future impact of Millennials can gain extra advantage to other companies by implementing a work culture that fits well for Millennials’ preferences. Millennials are a crossroad generation that utilize both traditional and modern management tools and require combination of motivators of those two worlds. For years job security has not been what is used to be and thus Millennials have grown in a world where sinecures are not a possibility anymore. This has led them to value fast promotion pace and readiness to switch companies if their career advancement is not fast enough. This study will provide useful information for companies that desire to keep their highly trained talents also in the future. Also Universities and other academic institutions can learn how their current customers are operating and what they appreciate. Understanding common behaviors among a certain generation is always crucial, when organizations or institutions are creating their short and long-term strategies but in this case it is even more important. The change between prevailing generations is certain and not something that might happen. Therefore, neglecting the possibility
to learn how the next prevailing generation will behave and prefer, mainly shows careless and indifferent attitude that will be self-destructing in long term. All in all, this study is trying to reveal some of the most fundamental attributes and features Millennials in the Western world have, and also investigate the importance of trust in the workplace and how it is related to effective work motivation.

### 1.5 Used research method and the structure of the study

The main method of carrying out this study is by creating a qualitative interview. More specifically, the primary research method is semi-structured interview, which consists three thematic parts. First part is concentrating on work motivation and how Millennials perceive it. It also tries to measure how Millennials experience current work motivation systems and what work motivation means to them as a concept. Second part is about trust in a workplace. This part is concentrating on Millennials’ experience in work related trust and how they perceive it as a concept. In this part I will try to get the interviewees to describe how they feel trust and how important it is for them to get their job done. In other words, this part investigates the relation between work motivation and trust. Third and the last part will concentrate on enhancements. This part tries to find what the interviewees would think as the perfect work motivation system for Millennials, what they would take off from current models, and would their designed work motivation system fit for other generations as well. All of the interviews will be done separately and privately, so that effects of group thinking would be minimized and personal opinions and thinking would be maximized. There will be four pre-selected interviewees that will participate on the interview via a telecommunication program Skype. Every interview will be recorded and light transcripts will be made, as well.

This study will be structured in traditional order, where after the introduction section there will be theoretical framework and literature review that consists generations that are still working and also information about work motivation. The generations that I am going to present are The Traditionalists, The Baby Boomers, and Generation X. Naturally, also Millennials will be described. After generations section I will present three prevalent approaches that are describing work motivation and trust in suitable way. Then I will present the Era aspect of work motivation and how
it is important in this particular study. Lastly, I will provide a short conclusion about this study’s theoretical framework and work motivation. After theory of work motivation and descriptions of generations, I will introduce trust and what it is in workplaces. This chapter will penetrate to explain how trust in the workplace differs from trust that we have in our personal lives. I will also reveal how to repair once broken trust.

After theoretical parts I will introduce empirical data and its analysis. Here, I will first introduce the interviewees and a more thorough description of the chosen research method. Then I will go through the empirical evidence part-by-part, and breaking down the answers. After analyzing the empirical evidence I will provide a discussion where I will point out the major points and scrutinize the findings openly. Lastly, conclusions and implications will be presented. Conclusions are about answering to the research question and implications will define how the findings can be integrated into business life. I will also go through reliability and validity, limitations of the study, and naturally my propositions for future researches.
2 DEFINING WORK MOTIVATION

Whether you walk, work, eat, or talk to your colleague, you need to have will in order to carry out your task. This applies especially when the action you are about to engage is conscious. Will, or better known as motivation, is our driving force. It is also very personal to all of us. One motivator could be perfect for you to carry out a certain task, but at the same that motivator couldn’t be worse to somebody other. There are almost myriad amount of factors that affect on our daily motivation, from cultural dimension to age and generations. Validity of certain motivators also changes over time, and therefore companies need to constantly update their motivation system to answer to always changing needs of employees (Wayne, 2009). Today, organizations call the recognition of employee motivation as “employee engagement”, but as Wayne (2009) points out, the meaning of the term has stayed relatively vague and shows only the general direction.

Since motivation itself is wide and reaches to every aspects of our lives, I find it reasonable to narrow the wide understanding of motivation down to work motivation and focus on that specific area. It is also crucial to recognize that the means of work motivation differs greatly between industries and cultures. To clarify, an American company from service industry and an Asian company from steel industry should concentrate on different practices of work motivation. Today, mastering motivation practices is essential in corporate world (Latham, 2007). It has led the field of Human Resources, and Industrial and Organizational Psychology to make work motivation as their cornerstone subject (Latham, 2007).

In this chapter I am going through work motivation and how it is seen in Western world. I am going to reveal the background of work motivation and present some of the most prevalent theories of the field of work motivation. I also explain the difference between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation and how those styles are seen in today’s world. The second theoretical part of this chapter is about trust and how it is seen as part of work motivation. Trust as a practice in work motivation is becoming more and more popular and noticed among researchers in the field of work motivation. The work itself has changed a lot during the last generation to more
initiative and creative (Wayne, 2009). Thus, it has also brought up trust to become more dominating factor in work motivation.

2.1 Background to work motivation

The actual term “motivation” comes from the Latin word “movere”, which means movement (Latham, 2007). William James (1890) and Freud (1913) studied motivation long before Herzberg or Vroom, but the studies had only personal perspective. The first study that included motivation in workplaces was by Hugo Munsterberg in 1913 (Latham 2007; Hothersall, 1984). Munsterberg studied factory workers and during that study he recognized two psychological states, “dreadful monotony” and “mental starvation”, and the need for overcome those states (Latham, 2007). Even though the study itself was not particularly observing work motivation, it is nowadays seen as the first touches of work motivation in academic world. The first researcher that was specifically studying work motivation was Maier (Latham, 2007). Maier (1955) explained work motivation by creating a following formula (Latham, 2007):

\[ \text{Job performance} = \text{ability} \times \text{motivation} \]

It is notable, that Maier was also a mentor for Victor Vroom, who created Expectancy Theory about ten years later (1960, 1964). Expectancy Theory is a famous work motivation theory that aligns to process theories approach (Miner, 2007). It endeavors to explain how people get motivated. At about the same times, in 1959 Herzberg created a Motivation Hygiene Theory that was one of the cornerstone theories in content theory approach. Content theories try to explain why people get motivated. It is interesting to notice that those two main approaches were created almost at the same time, yet in different locations. Based on the amount of motivation theories, it seems that 1950s and 1975 were the times when researchers started to really become interested in work motivation (Latham, 2007).

To better understand work motivation and why its’ myriad practices work or doesn’t work, one should recognize how time, politics and cultural dimensions affect on the practices and theories. These dimensions also explain why Herzberg, Maier, Vroom,
William James or Freud saw the same concept so differently. Those dimensions also explain why Millennials value certain motivators differently than Baby Boomers and why some motivators, like financial incentives, still are popular, yet not very effective.

In 1911, a famous experimental psychologist Thorndike noticed that when reward was given immediately after certain behavior, the frequency of that behavior increased. This experiment was conducted with animals, but it was one of the first discoveries of motivation by psychologists (Latham, 2007). Six years later Thorndike conducted an experiment with humans where he studied their performance and productivity. These two researches are important in the field of work motivation, since behaviorists didn’t include motivation almost at all in their studies until 1970s (Latham, 2007). It seems that Thorndike had accidentally found the basics of setting motivating goals. It was Thomas Ryan (1970) who enhanced motivational goals for usage of work motivation and Edwin Locke, who enhanced Thomas Ryan’s work into Goal Setting Theory (1990) (Miner, 2005).

Today, work motivation is, as told before, a cornerstone in Human Resources Management. Work motivation is transformed and redefined throughout the years and today it contains a lot more factors and angles than it used to include before. Cognitive theories of motivation started to prevail in early 2000 and were integrated with personality and affective processes (Latham, 2007; Brief, & Weiss, 2002). Work motivation has been divided into intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation and new information is constantly drawn from various sources like from social psychology and clinical psychology. Now, when Millennials are beginning to land on managerial positions, work motivation will get again new dimensions and paradigms.

### 2.2 Prevalent theories and approaches of work motivation

I have included three motivation theories that I see prevalent to help us to understand and study why and how Millennials value their own motivational practices and how they see trust to be one of the practices. The ages of the theories are varying from 1970’s to early 2000, but they have all survived throughout the times and are still valid.
2.2.1 Theory of Uses and Gratifications

Theory of Uses and Gratifications (Katz, Blumler, & Gurevitch, 1974) and its updated version Theory of Uses and Gratifications 2.0 (Ruggiero, 2000) have been chosen to this study because of their ability to explain how people use certain vehicles like websites, blogs, or other distribution channels for masses to fulfill their profound motivational needs. The first version of the theory (1974) lists five assumptions that create the framework of the theory. First, audience is conceived of as active. Like researchers point out, we should always consider mass media to be mainly goal directed (Katz, Blumler, & Gurevitch, 1974). Second, in mass communication process there is a relationship between the source of information and audience and that need gratification is linking and directing the relationship. Third assumption is that “The media compete with other sources of need gratification.” (Katz, Blumler, & Gurevitch, 1974: 511). Fourth assumption states that goals of mass media production can be concluded from the data that is gathered from its audience. The last, fifth assumption made by Katz et. al. is that “Value judgments about the cultural significance of mass communication should be suspended while audience orientations are explored on their own terms.” (Katz, Blumler, & Gurevitch, 1974: 511).

Even though those five assumptions are more than four decades old, the value those assumptions produce haven’t diminish, when studying how people behave today and how people use media. For my study, the most important assumption this theory gives is that people chooses their preferred media vehicles themselves in a way it best fulfills their need gratifications. There is a research that has applied the Theory of Uses and Gratifications to study what motivates people to blog (Sepp, Liljander, & Gummerus, 2011). Researchers Sepp, Liljander and Gummerus (2011) found three main gratifications: process gratification, content gratification, and social gratification. This research is especially important, when we are studying Millennials and what makes them motivated. Sepp et. al.’s (2011) research shows that there are, indeed, to be found powerful motivators other than the ones organizations are usually practicing (financial motivators, for example) since blogging is usually just a hobby or other ways non-profit.
Even though the Sepp et. al.’s (2011) research is strictly limited to studying motivations to blog, the results the research provides can be implemented into other areas, as well. The researchers found that under process gratification there are five sub-dimensions: emotion management, self-enjoyment, enjoyment of helping others, self-improvement, and escapism (Sepp, Liljander, & Gummerus, 2011). These dimensions of process gratification can be also found in other areas of life, as well. Content gratification has four dimensions: life-documenting, commenting, information sharing, and entertaining others. Last, social gratification had five dimensions: community forum, getting empathetic support, self-presentation, finding people like me, and reciprocity. These all sub-dimensions are not only eligible to examine motivational behavior of blogging, but also eligible to work life. Blogging in essence is working just like working the work offered by traditional employment arrangements. Still, especially many Millennials are willing to spend their spare time blogging.

The dimensions Sepp et. al. (2011) discovered, explain clearly what makes Millennials to channel their energy and time voluntarily and get a gratifying feeling. If the results from Sepp et. al.’s (2011) research would be applied and modified to other work sectors as well, it could open a new working standard where employees feel that their work is gratifying and emotionally rewarding. State of The American Workplace (2013) Gallup shows that 30% of American employees are engaged and inspired at work while 70% of American employees are “not engaged” or “actively disengaged” at work. The engagement results of around 100 million employees prove that there is still a long way to go in employee happiness and that we should continue to develop current motivation practices. Better utilization of the Theory of Uses and Gratifications could offer at least a part of the solution to motivate employees better and make them more engaged at work.

2.2.2 Theory of KITA

KITA as a theory is not Herzberg’s first and possibly not the best known but it applies well when studying current work motivation practices. Frederick Herzberg originally presented KITA in 1987, which makes it fresh enough to touch Millennials’ working behavior but still old enough to have plenty of field-testing.
In its simplest KITA is about giving a kick to make employees more motivated. Herzberg highlights that most of the performance incentives like financial bonus structures or big paychecks are not very effective and can even hurt employees’ work morale (Herzberg, 1987). These types of motivators are called extrinsic motivators, which means that the actual motivation is given to employee by a third party. For example, when a manager is giving his or her employees a big bonus on top of regular monthly salaries, it means that the feeling of gratification is coming from external source, not from internal sources. The work itself has not changed more interesting or challenging because of the bonus, which means that the next time this manager wants his or her employees to stay motivated, he or she needs to pay again. When, instead of motivating extrinsically manager decides to apply the practices of KITA, this manager begins to motivate his or her employees intrinsically (Herzberg, 1987). Intrinsic motivation is about making the work itself satisfying and that the need and feel of gratification comes from the work or staying at work (Wayne, 2009).

Main types of KITA are Negative Physical KITA, Negative Psychological KITA, and Positive KITA (Herzberg, 1987). Naturally, Negative Physical KITA and Negative Psychological KITA is not recommended since it is brutal, ineffective in the long run, and could backfire because of frustrated, sacred or angry employees. Herzberg points out that managers that use Negative Psychological KITA are not actually motivating their employees, it only causes movement (Herzberg, 1987). Herzberg also highlights that Positive KITA is not actually motivating either, since Positive KITA is still “kicking” employees to do better but not creating a generator inside an employee that would keep him or her motivated without constant “kicks”.

The essentials in the theory of KITA are to understand how to get employees to “charge” themselves instead of giving them constantly “kicks”. Herzberg recommends that by enriching employees’ jobs will eventually create intrinsic motivation (Herzberg, 1987). The ways management can enrich jobs create intrinsic motivation among employees are, for example, the following:

- Increase individuals’ accountability for their work by loosening control
- Giving individuals’ responsibility for a complete process of work
• Make information available directly to employees rather than sending it through their managers first
• Enable people to take on new, more challenging tasks they haven’t handled before
• Assign individuals specialized tasks that allow them to become experts

These suggestions may frighten some managers, since these could cause many new arrangements in the beginning, but it would eventually direct everyone back on the right paths where managers develop and lead their employees, not just give directions and supervise the quality of work, and employees to keep operations running and performing better (Herzberg, 1987).

Frederick Herzberg has obviously been thoughtful when he created KITA. When work is becoming more and more complex, it also allows employees to develop themselves and work with more challenging tasks. As long as managers allow new workforce to enjoy always challenging tasks and teamwork responsibilities, work motivation will increase. It is up to managers to exploit this trend or kill it and go back to work environment where responsibilities and accountability are divided to almost nil.

2.2.3 Fair Process – a decision making approach

Decision making approach of Fair Process is striving for explaining how management should lead employees in the knowledge-based business field (Kim & Mauborgne, 1997). The key idea in this particular approach is that employees are individuals that have the basic need of being valued and respected, and that by neglecting those needs during a decision process will significantly hurt the outcome of how employees are taking the decision (Kim & Mauborgne, 1997). By applying Fair Process’ practices, it will not only make employees more motivated but it will also decrease resistance that changes usually cause.

Albeit the name Fair Process could refer to conformity in the workplace, it is not about harmony but to pursue the best ideas. The point is not to please everyone, but
to create an environment where employee feels that he or she is heard and respected as a valued member of the work community (Kim & Mauborgne, 1997). Researchers Kim and Mauborgne suggest that by including the three main principles Fair Process introduces, the results start to show. The principles are the following:

- **Engagement.** *Engagement in Fair Process is about having employees to participate on decision-making process and allowing them to give an input and evaluate and/or challenge each other’s ideas. This shows trust and respect from management to their employees. When an employee is feeling respected and trusted, he or she will become more committed to the company.*

- **Explanation.** *It is crucial to explain the thinking processes that had led management to the certain decision. By explaining the whys and hows, management gets their employees to back and respect the decision.*

- **Expectation clarity.** *Expectation clarity means basically transparency in decision-making process. The point is to weed out favoritism and lower the amount of the politics among employees. As the name refers, management should be clear on penalties of failure and other rules of the process.*

In the knowledge-based organizations trust, commitment and idea creation is essential for surviving and thriving, thus Fair Process works especially well in that business sector (Kim & Mauborgne, 1997). That is also the reason why I chose this approach to be a part of this study. Current business world seems to be shifting from manual working culture to knowledge-based work culture. This means that if the trend stays the same, Millennials, the future managers and workers, are also more and more employed in those businesses. Therefore, it is important managements and companies to start adapting Fair Processes’ practices and take the full advantage of motivated, committed employees.
2.3 Dimensions of work motivation

In order to comprehend why some motivators work on some people and on some they doesn’t, it is good to understand some of the dimensions work motivation have. For this study I have collected three dimensions: era aspect, cultural aspect, and political aspect. The Era aspect will be studied more profoundly due to the nature of this study, other dimensions will be described more briefly in this particular section. It is crucial to notice that these all aspects or dimensions are not isolated but actually working together. For clarification, I will present an example. Let’s have two hypothetical humans, a 60-year-old American management consultant from the State of New York and a 25-year-old Japanese technology entrepreneur. When these two characters are compared, a 60-year-old American management consultant from the State of New York will, most likely, be motivated differently than a 25-year-old Japanese startupper from Tokyo metropolitan area. Why? First of all, because the happenings what people experience during their teenage phase will shape their values and needs dramatically (Finney, 2008). Secondly, location matters. There are almost myriad of cultures and sub-cultures worldwide. Even within European countries cultures may vary greatly (Kaasa, Vadi, & Varblane, 2014). One distinctive feature every culture has is the habit of shaping values. That is called cultural difference, and it literally means that people from different cultural backgrounds value things differently (Chang, 2009). Thirdly, legislation and current, prevalent political ideology affects on culture, which naturally affects on the way people think and how they value things.

To clarify how these aspects are working, let’s get back to the two hypothetical persons. This 60-year-old American management consultant is from the generation that is commonly called as The Baby Boomers. According to Finney (2008), Baby Boomers tend to lean on to anti-authoritarian approach. They also, due to the enormous size of their generation, value competitive and idealistic environment where you can get what you want if you just have what it takes (Finney, 2008). The 25-year-old Japanese startupper is, instead of the American consultant, from the generation called Generation Y or Millennials. Millennials, according to Finney, are technology-savvy, confident and very much goal-oriented. Yet these two individuals may share some of the same values, they still are not motivated the same due to
cultural and political aspects. We don’t even have to go as far as to Japan to notice cultural differences at work. The dominant difference between motivation behaviors seems to be, based on Finney’s results (2008), age. People from different generations are simply motivated differently. Therefore, when politics affect on culture and culture affect on people, I find it safe to primarily use generations to identify and differentiate people with certain motivation behaviors from each other.

Next, I will go through the dimension of generations, or the Era aspect, and shed light on what it consists and how different generations vary. Naturally, there are possibly many other aspects as well, but for the sake of simplicity and the nature of this study; I have limited the more profound look to the Era aspect.

2.3.1 Era aspect

Currently, workplaces are becoming more and more age diverse and the traditional power-relations where younger employees are answering to older managers are changing (Cogin, 2012). According the study (Cogin, 2012; Burke, 2005) that studied about generational differences in companies that have more than 500 employees, 58% of Human Resource Management professionals have reported about strifes where younger and older employees have clashed because of the different standpoints about work ethics and work-life balance.

I am examining work motivation primarily from the aspect of generations. Therefore, eras and their generations are playing a significant role in the study. I have limited generations to the generations that still have members who are in the working age. These generations are Traditionalists, The Baby Boomers, Generation X, and Millennials (Finney, 2008). In this section I will describe each of the four generation and explain why they have certain preferred motivators. It is good to notice that even the generations listed below have precise starting and ending years, they should still be taken more like guidelines than a precise rule (Lancaster & Stillman, 2003). Also, location and therefore culture will affect to the range of defining years, as well. But for the sake of clarity of this study, I decided to keep the dates as they were presented in Martha Finney’s book (2008). Also, for clarification, most of the information that is gathered here about different generations is based on Western culture, more
precisely, American culture. The main purpose of the information about older
generations (from Traditionalists to Generation X) is mostly to provide an example
of behavior, thus it only scratches the surface. As I showed in my previous example
where I compared fictional young Japanese entrepreneur and mid-aged American
consultant, cultures define much of how we perceive this world. Even though it is
clear that Americans are not Europeans, we all belong under Western culture’s
umbrella. In Western culture decades have been sufficiently same for Americans and
Europeans due to significant events like World Wars or Cold War and consequences
they caused, so therefore it is safe enough to present American culture’s causations
and compare them to Millennials.

**The Traditionalists 1928-1945**

The Traditionalists, also called as “The Silent Generation” are the oldest of the
generations that have still employees as part of the current workforce (Fogg, 2009).
In order to understand what and why Traditionalists value certain matters and
motivators, we need to understand what happened during their teenage years
(Erickson, 2007). During that time, Traditionalists were culturally influenced by
experiences like Great Depression, World War II, Korean War, postwar boom era,
and the Servicemen’s Readjustment Act (also known as G.I. Bill). Even though
young Traditionalists had to experience dramatic consequences of Korean War and
World War II, they also experienced an era of prosperity, which was also a
consequence of the endings of the wars. According to Erickson (2007),
Traditionalists had a living environment where authorities were trusted and respected
and that all you had to do were to attain the financial rewards that were promised to
you.

Life the young Traditionalists experienced was indeed prosperous and economical
upswing. This led Traditionalists to respect the following values (Erickson, 2007):

- Respect of authorities
- Comfortable in hierarchy
- Loyal to institutions
• Rule makers and conformists
• Motivated by financial rewards and security

In addition to Erickson’s study, Researcher Fogg (2009) also found out that workplace values Traditionalists appreciated were the following:

• Loyalty
• Recognition
• Resistance to change

Therefore, it is quite clear why Traditionalists created companies and other organizations where incentives like financial motivators and clear hierarchy levels were dominating motivators. These companies were functioning well until the next generation, The Baby Boomers, entered to markets.

*The Baby Boomers 1946-1964*

The Baby Boomers were the largest generation in the United States (Erickson, 2007). Members of the Baby Boomers were experiencing quite different youth than Traditionalists. First of all, due to the large amount population, Baby Boomers were constantly competing against others. Also, during Baby Boomers’ teenage years world had changed into place that didn’t have the same trustworthy authorities Traditionalists used to have, and they didn’t feel that the world was not working well (Erickson, 2007). According to Tamara Erickson (2007), the responsibility for fixing the world fell to individuals.

Some of the major cultural influences Baby Boomers experienced during their teenage years, were the assassination of the President John F. Kennedy, popularization of television, pop music bands like Beatles, first moon walk, Vietnam War, antiwar protests, and sexual revolution (Fogg, 2009). These matters modified Baby Boomers’ values and made them to respect workplace values like dedication, face time, and team spirit (Fogg, 2009). Also, apart the workplace values, they started to appreciate following values (Erickson, 2007):
• Anti-authority
• Idealistic approach
• Motivation to change the world
• Constant competition against others

These motivational attributes made them quite a contrary cohort to the previous generation, Traditionalists. Therefore, when Baby Boomers entered to business life, they also started to stir the system itself. Hierarchical company structures and high-authority working environment that didn’t allow many changes started to change and naturally caused conflicts among younger and older employees (Cogin, 2012; Burke, 2005).

**Generation X 1965-1980**

Members of the cohort named Generation X, or the Me Generation, born into world where they witnessed several culture-shaping occurrences during the formative years of their childhood. The cultural influences like the fall of the Soviet Union, women’s liberation movement, Music television (MTV), music genres like grunge, rise of home video games and personal computers, birth of the Internet, and dot-com boom and bust, as well as high increase in divorce rates and single parent homes, were all shaping the members of Generation X to become more independent from their parents or guardians and more leaning on to their friends (Fogg, 2009 & Erickson, 2007).

Piper Fogg (2009) and Erickson (2007) have both listed the values that Generation X seem to appreciate:

• Work-life balance
• Autonomy
• Flexibility
• Informality
• Self-reliant
• Lacking loyalty to institutions
- Rule-morphing
- Tribal
- Comfortable accessing a wide variety of information

According to Erickson (2007), Generation X was the first generation of “latch-key” kids, meaning that when both parents were working and not home, kids of Generation X had to stay home alone or with friends. When they entered the labor market, they couldn’t accept all the fashions previous generations were expecting from them. In comparison to Baby Boomers, members of the Generation X didn’t value constant competition against colleagues the way members of Baby Boomers valued. On the other hand, these two generations also shared some of the values. The common values were, as shown before, anti-authoritarian approach and common distrust against institutions. Although, even Baby Boomers and members of the Generation X share some of the values, a research made by researchers John Benson and Michelle Brown found that members of the Generation X had still significantly lower job satisfactory level and significantly higher willingness to quit than Baby Boomer colleagues (Benson & Brown, 2011). Therefore, it can be interpreted that even though some of the values are same, not all values are equal. It seems that it is enough that dominating values of motivation vary to cause dramatic results in job satisfactory level and thus work performance.

**Millennials 1981-2000**

Since Millennials, or Generation Y, is this research’s subject of study, I feel obliged to be more thorough describing Millennials than I was with the other generations. First, I will give a similar introduction than I did for previous generations. Then, I will reveal managerial implications what researcher Erickson (2007) recommends.

Millennials are the youngest generation thus far, that have members in the current labor market. Since Millennials are still quite young as a generation and none of them have retired yet, the studies are mostly still in preliminary phase. Nevertheless, Erickson (2007) and Fogg (2009) have done their assessments about Millennials. During their formative years of childhood cultural occurrences like the followings,
have modified their values. Here are some of the influences that happened (Fogg, 2009):

- Internet era
- Terrorist attacks
- Mobile phones
- School massacres
- Social media

Millennials have born when Internet was already globally implemented and that has been one of the key influences that have made them to appreciate certain values (Erickson, 2007). According to Erickson (2007), in the United States Millennials are the largest consumer and employee group in the history, which means over 70 million individuals. Millennials have experienced both bull and bear markets and that has also modified their beliefs and wants.

The following list reveals who Millennials, at least in general, are (Erickson, 2007):

- Confident and full of self-esteem
- Upbeat
- Pro-education and goal-oriented
- Socially conscious and highly tolerant
- Plugged in to technology; parallel thinkers
- Financially savvy
- Family-centric

What is important to recognize is that, according to Erickson (2007), 90% of teens reported that they are very close to their parents. This means that their Baby Boomer parents are seen as role models. It is a huge increase to survey made in 1974 that measured how Baby Boomers saw their relationship to parents. According to Erickson (2007), the survey showed that more than 40% of Baby Boomers did think that they could be better without their parents. Erickson (2007) points out that for
companies that are hiring Millennials family-centricity could be one of the key elements to understand.

Since Millennials are quite different when compared to other generations, they also require different management practices to keep them motivated and performing well. Erickson (2007) compiled a list of suggestions that could help current managers to build a working environment optimal for Millennials:

- **Bell-Shaped career paths.** Corporations should have honorable “down-shifting” career opportunities like Deans who decide to teach or consult again. This keeps talented people motivated as it expands career opportunities without shame or discomfort.

- **Design cyclic work.** Work that has intense two-or-three-month periods and calm month periods is, according to Erickson (2007) very attractive to Millennials, since this arrangement helps Millennials to balance their work-life balance.

- **Accommodate blended lives.** Since world is now faster because of electronic communication and other work related technology, 35-40 hours per week should be sufficient.

Likewise, researcher Fogg (2009) listed her findings about what are the values Millennials prefer the most at workplace:

- **Feedback**
- **Recognition**
- **Fulfillment**
- **Advanced technology**
- **Fun**

Based on Erickson’s (2007) and Fogg’s (2009) researches, Millennials seem individuals that are entrepreneurial with I-want-it-know attitude. They seem to appreciate highly the benefits technology provides and don’t want life to be only working. Most of all, Millennials are family-centric yet confident and full of self-
Naturally, it is crucial to recognize that these are all generalizations and therefore these attributes may not describe every individual, but when studying Millennials’ motivation behavior in general, generalizations are necessary.
3 TRUST AS A MOTIVATOR FOR MILLENNIALS

Trust as a term is usually used to describe promises that are either kept or broken; yet trust in a workplace can be much more than that (Stephenson, 2007). In this research trust will be seen as part of the workplace’s culture. It means that trust will, as a term mean precisely the cultural aspect - the trust between employee and employer. According to Stephenson, a study that took 30 years clearly proved that trust is a factor that keeps people together. Trust creates an invisible bond between trusted people, whether they are colleagues, friends or classmates (Stephenson, 2007; Levi-Strauss, 1969; Sahlins, 1963, 285–303; Bosk, 1978). In other words, trust enables us to make transactions with other trustworthy people and seclude the untrustworthy. In business, transactions are, whether material or immaterial, vital. If a certain organization suffers from culture of distrust among its employees and employer, this will possibly lead the organization to eventually underachieve in its business markets. Put differently, organizations that foster trust are generally more profitable (Reina & Reina, 2007).

Researchers Dennis Reina and Michelle Reina (2007) discovered from one certain case company that low job satisfaction level could be a result of employees’ distrust of leadership and company. When employees can’t or don’t trust on decisions made by the management, they have unclear vision of the future of the organization, or have trouble understanding how they are evaluated, or to whom they should answer to, their work performance start to decrease (Reina & Reina, 2007). According to Dennis and Michelle Reina (2007), distrust leads employees to go through motions, organization’s collaborations break down, the amount of resignations rise, and in-fights against organization and management increases. Basically, the organization begins to rotten inside and makes the whole organization weaker. Therefore, it is safe to say that the culture of trust has a big role in organization’s potential.

Today, when business is becoming more and more service-oriented and complex where employees are constantly collaborating with each other both horizontally and vertically in the company structure, trust is becoming increasingly important factor to motivate people to perform better and keep them engaged. Based on Erickson’s
(2007) and Fogg’s (2007) researches about Millennials, we can see that Millennials are probably going to expect stronger culture of trust within organizations.

3.1 Harnessing trust as a tool

When management decides to take the advantage of trust and adds it to their Human Resources’ tools, understanding how trust behaves in organizations is crucial. In organizations, trust serves two important need, human need and business need (Reina & Reina, 2007). Even though these needs are separated in theoretical level, these needs cannot be treated individually. They are constantly overlapping each other and therefore decrease or increase in human need reflects on business need. According to Dennis and Michelle Reina (2007), Watson Wyatt Worldwide research discovered that “organizations in which front-line employees trusted senior leadership posted a 42 percent higher return on shareholder investment over those firms in which distrust was the norm.” (Reina & Reina, 2007: pp. 170). This should not be a surprise that organizations with higher level of trust are more profitable and have higher job satisfaction levels, yet many companies are still having distrust as a norm. Since no company wants to perform poorer than its competitors, fostering distrust is probably not part of anyone’s strategy. Hence, it is safe to assume that these companies don’t seem to have the right tools to increase their workplace trust and/or develop a culture where trust is respected. They may also try to make changes too fast, which usually causes them just to fail and even backfire (Kotter, 1995). Making changes takes a lot of time and should be seen as a process rather than chain of events (Kotter, 1995). This applies also when the goal of change is to rebuild the lost trust.

3.1.1 Human need

Human need of trust is fundamental and the glue that keeps people together. Organizations are only as good as their employees, so it would be strategic to develop their employees to become better and more effective. When employees have a properly working culture of trust, they cooperate and innovate freely (Reina & Reina, 2007). Culture of trust allows employees to be who they are and enable them to become contributors at work. In other words, when employees feel that they are
trusted and they trust back, they want to come to work and produce (Reina & Reina, 2007).

On the other hand, when employees start to lose their trust to the management or the company, it will launch a vicious cycle what researchers Dennis and Michelle Reina call The Reina Trust and Betrayal Model (Reina & Reina, 2007). This model describes how employees lose their trust and how it starts to corrupt the whole organization. Reina and Reina have discovered that first signs of decreasing trust are gossiping, constantly arriving late, and difficulties to keep agreements and promises. Then it will escalate and cause symptoms like people taking credit for another colleague’s work and managers to delegate without authority. Finally, distrust will grow so strong that people are ready for sabotaging corporate data or sharing corporate secrets (Reina & Reina, 2007).

As a conclusion, human need of trust is a powerful force within organizations. When it is handled right and fostered, it brings the best out of people. Employees are more willing to work, they produce, and they are effective and more satisfied with their job. On the other hand, distrust will lead to betrayal and can rotten the whole organization. Regaining the lost trust is a huge project and requires strong actions. It will also be a long process and definite results can be seen and experienced after years of change (Kotter, 1995). To avoid that pitfall, organizations should start to value and pay more attention to trust between humans.
Figure 1. The Reina Trust and Betrayal Model. (Adapted from Reina, & Reina, 2007)
3.1.2 Business need

As told in the previous section, companies that actively foster and nurture trust are more profitable than the ones that don’t. Also, these companies who are seeing trust as a valuable element of their Human Resources practices, tend to have higher level of employee satisfaction (Reina & Reina, 2007). Dennis and Michelle Reina (2007) claim that, based on University of British Columbia report, for employees trust is the most important element in management practices. They have also found that even a slight increase in trust of management is basically an equivalent of 36 per cent increase in salary. On the other hand, if trust has been broken and employees have hard time trusting their management, it causes similar feelings than what 36 per cent cut in salary would cause (Reina & Reina, 2007).

Business need of trust means, like shown in the previous paragraph, trust of management. How trustworthy employees see their management, defines the current level of business need of trust. Naturally, trust in business is a two-way-street. If employees are not trustworthy, management may have hard time showing trust. This may cause prolonging distress within company and will eventually lead to previously presented The Reina Trust and Betrayal Model (Reina & Reina, 2007). According to researchers Reina and Reina, many managers mistakenly believe that lost trust will be gained back over time. In reality, if nothing is done to repair mistrust, it will only get worse. Michelle and Dennis Reina recommend, that in order to restore the lack of business trust, managers should actively strive to practices that heal trust. It requires thoughtful actions, intension and attention (Reina & Reina, 2007). Another thing that is many times misunderstood is the positive effect of broken trust. Clearly, breaking trust, ipso facto, is never healthy for thriving work community, but that causes the need for restoring it. When successfully restored, this can strengthen relationships and performance, even though many may believe otherwise (Reina & Reina, 2007).
3.2 Repairing trust

Repairing broken trust is crucial part of the wellbeing of work community. Since trust will be broken every once in a while in working community, it is good to comprehend the nature and the outcomes of trust and how it can be restored after breaking it. Both internal and external factors may damage trust within company, but fixing it happens still the same way. By repairing trust or the deficit of trust within the company, could enhance trust and make it more robust (Kramer & Lewicki, 2010). There is also represented various ways to encounter mistrust and getting over it. One of the practices I am going to present in this study is Reina’s model Seven Steps for Healing (Reina & Reina, 2007).

Researches about trust repair have been increasing the past 15 years because companies have become more and more international and competitive (Kramer & Lewicki, 2010). Internationalization, competitiveness, and dynamic working environment have made organizations to develop associating partners with other companies. This phenomenon has led organizations to realize the importance of trust (Kramer & Lewicki, 2010; Reina & Reina, 2007). When trust occurs, so will mistrust. Therefore, organizations are constantly looking new ways to maintain and enhance trust, as well as how to repair it once broken. To comprehend trust repair, one must first recognize the differences between different types of trust repair (Kramer & Lewicki, 2010). Researchers Dirks, Kim, and Cooper (2009) have identified three conceptual perspectives that all have different outcomes. These perspectives are: attributional perspective, balance perspective, and structural perspective. Basically, attributional perspective is describing situation where one party has deceived or other ways broken another’s trust. Here trust repair is for restoring the positive attributions and efface the negative. Balance perspective means that something has destabilized social equilibrium and trust repair is for restoring the social balance back. The third, structural perspective means repairing relationships’ structural environment (Dirk et al. 2009).

All of the above affect on work environment and therefore to employees’ motivation and performance. Even though, there are many practices to repair trust, I will
introduce Reina’s Seven Steps for Healing (see figure 2). This model breaks down how management should face, repair, and finally regain that once lost trust.

Figure 2. Seven Steps for Healing Trust. (Adapted from Reina, & Reina, 2007)

According to Dennis and Michelle Reina (2007), the model of Seven Steps for Healing increases the awareness of the elements of healing that are often forgotten e.g. during changes. The researchers remind that sometimes, during the process of healing, one needs to revisit some of the steps more than once and may move through more than one step simultaneously. To clarify, this model is a tool for management to recognize distrust among their employees and repair it.
First, manager should pay attention how employees are operating in working environment. Subtle signs as coming late to meetings, gossiping, anger, or avoiding talking directly to individuals may mean hidden distrust among employees (Reina & Reina, 2007). Especially anger is often a sign of disappointment or being hurt, so Reina and Reina are suggesting that manager should really listen, observe and acknowledge the feeling in the work environment. On the second step, manager should create for his or her employees a constructive way to express their feelings, concerns and issues. This helps employees to decrease their level of negativity and concentrating back to work performance (Reina & Reina, 2007). Third step of the model is to giving support to employees. For instance, if the company is making major changes, that would cause many of its employees to have distrust towards the company. In this case, manager should explain the reasons for change and answer to questions concerned employees make. Also, by standing for his or her employees the manager will gain more trust and make the company look more trustworthy as well.

Fourth step encourages manager to reframe the experiences his or her employees have gone through in a bigger picture. By carefully explaining what led them to experience those feelings of distrust or hate will stabilize the feelings his or her employees might have (Reina & Reina, 2007). It is easier for people to accept changes and getting over the moments of distrust when they know why something happened, why it was necessary, or how the problem will be solved. Fifth step is about taking responsibility. By taking responsibility the manager acknowledges the truth and what went wrong. Also, by behaving like this the manager takes his or her employees to confess their part of wrongdoing or misbehavior. As Michelle and Dennis Reina (2007) pointed out, employees are still part of the process of recovery even they can’t affect on change itself. By encouraging employees to drop negative behavior will create a stronger bond of trust between the manager and his or her employees (Reina & Reina, 2007). Sixth step will encourage manager to forgive. The manager should forgive the people who caused the trouble in the first hand, he or she should also forgive his or her employees who behaved negatively and caused trouble in the working community, but mainly the manager should be able to forgive him/herself. This is the only way to get over it. Lastly, seventh step is about letting go and moving on. The manager should accept what cannot be changed and together with his or her employees objectively review what everyone’s gone through.
It is clear that building trust is not an easy task and rebuilding trust is even more difficult. Repairing trust is a long process that doesn’t get fixed without enormous efforts (Kramer & Lewicki, 2010; Reina & Reina, 2007). Yet, stronger and sturdier relationship of trust among management and employees will be reached when managers keep listening, backing their employees, telling the truth, and keeping promises (Reina & Reina, 2007). Also, by adding some fun into the process will generate happier thoughts among employees and therefore expedite the healing process and increase their effectiveness (Yerkes, 2007; Yerkes & Steinauer, 2001).

To summarize what trust is in the workplace and how to repair it when broken, it is in its basic level the following: openness, transparency, freedom to express emotions, and forgiveness. In order to create a trusting work environment, one needs to recognize trust’s levels of need, open communication between employees, and realize that trust is not something that will automatically regenerate over time. Managers should cherish trust and respect its existence; after all, businesses are built on trust, both within and outside of organizations.

3.3 Brief summary of the chapters two and three

The purpose of this section is to wrap the most important parts from chapters two and three and revise them before entering to empirical section. In this section I will not introduce any new information but to summarize the main points.

Chapter two included two major parts, descriptions of generations and dimensions of work motivation. First I described what work motivation and shared a Maier’s (1955) formula that was:

\[ \text{Job performance} = \text{ability} \times \text{motivation} \]

Then I presented some of the most prevalent theories and approaches. These were Katz et al.’s Theory of Uses and Gratifications (Katz, Bulmer, & Gurevitch, 1974; Ruggiero, 2000), Herzberg’s Theory of KITA (1987), and Kim and Mauborgne’s Fair Process – a decision making approach (1997). The Theory of Uses and Gratifications was chosen due to its ability to explain how people are using social
vehicles like televisions, websites or blogs to fulfill their profound motivational needs. Herzberg’s Theory of KITA was concentrating on studying motivational practices and their ability or inability to deliver real happiness and long-lasting performance. The key point was to understand how to get employees “charged” rather than giving them constant motivational “kicks”. The last of the theories was actually an approach called Fair Process. Its point was to show how managers should lead their employees in knowledge-based business fields. Its sole purpose was to teach managers to pursue for best ideas rather than creating a harmony among their employees.

After theories I moved on to Era aspect. There I listed four generations that still exist in the current workforce (see also Table 1). The oldest of the generations is The Traditionalists, that are the people who born between 1928 and 1945. They respect authorities and hierarchies, are loyal to institutions and rule makers, and are motivated by financial rewards and job security. After Traditionalists came The Baby Boomers (1946-1964). They were at that time the largest generation, until Millennials born. Baby Boomers appreciate idealistic approach, don’t believe in authorities, are constantly competing with each other, and want to change the world. After Baby Boomers came Generation X (1965-1980). They want work-life balance, are self-reliant and flexible. They also lack loyalty to institutions and are very tribal. They are also the first “latchkey children” and are comfortable accessing a wide variety of information. Lastly, Millennials stepped in to picture. Millennials are people born between 1981 and 2000, yet the ending year is still under arguments. Millennials are born in the Internet era and are therefore more upbeat and plugged into technology. They are financially savvy and confident, and they respect education very highly. Even though they are family-centric, they are goal oriented and socially conscious. They also value fun in the workplace.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>The Traditionalists</th>
<th>The Baby Boomers</th>
<th>Generation X</th>
<th>Millennials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Generation-specific features</strong></td>
<td>Respect of authorities</td>
<td>Anti-authority</td>
<td>Work-life balance</td>
<td>Confident and full of self-esteem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comfortable in hierarchy</td>
<td>Idealistic approach</td>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>Upbeat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loyal to institutions</td>
<td>Motivation to change the world</td>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>Pro-education and goal oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rule makers and conformists</td>
<td>Constant competition against others</td>
<td>Informality</td>
<td>Socially conscious and highly tolerant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motivated by financial rewards and security</td>
<td>Resistance to change</td>
<td>Self-reliant</td>
<td>Plugged in to technology: parallel thinkers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resistance to change</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lacking loyalty to institutions</td>
<td>Financially savvy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tribal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comfortable accessing a wide variety of information</td>
<td>Family-centric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Generations and their specific features. (Collected from Erickson, 2007, & Fogg, 2009)

After work motivation and Era aspect I went on to chapter three. Chapter three is about trust in the workplace and how it can be repaired if lost or broken. Researchers Dennis and Michelle Reina (2007) were huge influencers in this chapter, since they have done very much work in the field of trust. Based on the researchers whom work
I referred, it seems that Millennials are appreciating more trust in the workplace than other generations. Trust should be seen as a tool of modern management. In order to utilize trust in the workplace, managers need to realize that trust have two dimensions; human and business dimension. Human need of trust is the glue that keeps people together. Business need of trust is the trust that is between employees and management. When trust is broken or lost, researchers Reina and Reina (2007) recommended that managers should pay a lot of attention on how to repair or heal it back to its former levels. It is important to realize that against common belief, trust is not healing itself, even over time. It needs proactive actions to restore it back and by following the Seven Steps for Healing by Reina and Reina (2007), managers can understand how and why people behave as they behave. Naturally, all of the cases of lost or broken trust are individual and therefore one general, stereotypical approach is impossible to present, but by understanding the fundamentals of trust and its repairing processes managers are closer to solution and the whole process of healing is more controlled.
4 METHODOLOGY AND RESEARCH DESIGN

This particular research is studying how Millennials are seeing and experiencing current work motivation practices and how trust is valued in their work environment. The purpose of this study is to provide results that can utilize for managerial implications but also for academic purposes. To achieve these goals, this research emphasizes Millennials’ experiences and opinions. In order to obtain valuable and valid empirical part, I have carefully chosen the interviewees based on their age, background, business experience, and orientation in business life. The following sub-chapters are going through the chosen methodology, research design, data collection and analysis, and challenges that these practices may cause.

4.1 Semi-structured interview

Interviews are one of them most popular measuring methods in social studies (Hirsjärvi & Hurme, 1984). Interviews can be roughly divided into three sub-categories that are: unstructured interview, semi-structured interview, and structured interview (Hirsjärvi, Remes, & Sajavaara, 1997). The reason for interview’s popular usage in social studies is in its very nature. Interviews can give results that qualitative methods would miss; yet they can also provide results that can be measured quantitatively.

For this study, I have chosen from the three main interview categories the semi-structured interview method. Even though this study is not labeled under social studies but business studies, it is the very nature of this study that defines the required measurement vehicle. To be clear, semi-structured interview is closer to unstructured interview than to structured interview (Hirsjärvi & Hurme, 2001). The main difference between unstructured and semi-structured interview is that in semi-structured interview the researcher can assume that all of the interviewees understand the topic and are eligible to participate (Hirsjärvi & Hurme, 2001). Also, semi-structured interview has a structure that has been defined beforehand. In this study I will have a specific topic and light structure but the interview itself will be delicately curated.
Since my research is studying how Millennials perceive trust as part of effective work motivation, interview is an essential instrument of measurement. Semi-structured interview is good when reliable measuring is difficult or impossible, and when proper analysis requires more profound answers than the ones a researcher could assume beforehand (Engwall, 1983). In other words, semi-structured interview allows interviewees to produce unexpected information. Another advantage of semi-structured interview is the size of the sample. Basically, unstructured and semi-structured interviews are useful when sample sizes are small, but fairly ineffective when researcher is about to interview larger audiences. To make a proper unstructured or semi-structured interview, the researcher should pay extra attention to questions he or she is going to present (Zacharias, 2012). By and large, semi-structured interview can be either orally produced or written (Zacharias, 2012; Hirsjärvi, et al., 1997). If the researcher decides to produce it orally, then, naturally, it is not called a semi-structured interview but an open-ended questionnaire. Since semi-structured interview should be highly oral without much of restrictions other than what the theme itself allows, the questions need to be very open-ended so that the interviewees are able to answer as freely as possible (Zacharias, 2012; Hirsjärvi & Hurme, 2001).

In this particular case, I am trying to investigate interviewees’ feelings, thoughts, perceptions, and earlier experiences. I have divided the interview’s main theme into three sub-themes that I call parts. Part One will consist questions about work motivation, Part Two is about trust in a workplace, and Part Three is Enhancements, which means that the interviewees can share their own thoughts and opinions on how to make for them a perfect motivation system. According to Hirsjärvi et al. (1997), unstructured interviews are the closest to normal conversation. Basically, this is also the case with semi-structured interviews, where the difference to unstructured is its theme restrictions. During the recorded execution, I will interview them orally, and segue them through the structure and their thought process. My purpose as an interviewer is mainly helping my interviewees to deepen their immediate answers to really describe the matters at hand (Hirsjärvi & Hurme, 2001).
4.2 Qualitative research

Qualitative research differs profoundly from quantitative research. First of all, quantitative researchers are usually more concerned on reliability than qualitative researchers (Willig, 2013). The reason why qualitative researchers are less concerned with reliability is “…because qualitative research explores a particular, possibly unique, phenomenon or experience in great detail.” (Willig, 2013: 24). Yet, this does not mean that there would not be any researcher that would utilize quantitative methods. In many cases, researches can be multi-strategic, meaning that the researchers measure results with qualitative and quantitative devices (Hirsjärvi & Hurme, 2001). In this study I will stick with qualitative measuring, due to the nature of this research.

In this chapter I am not going to analyze the assumptions that separate quantitative and qualitative researches from each other, but to concentrate on qualitative research methods and occasionally compare it to methods of quantitative research. Methodologically, some of the biggest differences between quantitative and qualitative research is that quantitative research is based on deductive process that is highly causal and where predictions are based on generalization. In quantitative research reliability and validity are the key elements to define how trustworthy the research is. In comparison to quantitative research, qualitative research is more inductive process that goes from individuals to masses, appreciates contexts and results are based on verification. (Hirsjärvi & Hurme, 2001; Wilson, 1996; Creswell, 1994). In other words, “Qualitative researchers are concerned with process rather than simply with outcomes or products.” (Bogdan & Knopp Biklen, 2006: 6).

In this study, I am following the guidelines of qualitative research and instead of presenting hypotheses and trying to solve them by questionnaires, I will utilize semi-structured interview and analyze gathered data inductively. Researchers Robert Bogdan and Sari Knopp Biklen (2006) describe this as a bottom up method, where many separate (or even incongruous) elements or nuggets of information are gathered and combined together, which eventually will form a verifiable data that can be compared with the theories that are, like in this study, provided in theoretical part of the study. According to Bogdan and Knopp Biklen (2006), qualitative
researchers are concerned “…with making sure they capture perspectives accurately.” (Bogdan & Knopp Biklen, 2006: 8). This will help researchers to keep contexts intact and correct. Hirsjärvi and Hurme (2001) point out that qualitative researcher assumes that the variables are highly complex and attached to each other, which makes it so hard to measure quantitatively but when measured qualitatively, it will become verifiable. For summarizing argument about the differences between qualitative and quantitative research methods, qualitative research will gather data first and then make the hypotheses and grounded theory, where as quantitative research first have hypotheses and the empirical work is reflected to them (Hirsjärvi & Hurme, 2001).

4.3 Data collection and analysis

Data collection and analysis is an essential part of any academic research. The way data is gathered and analyzed differ, depending on which research methods the researcher is utilizing. In this particular case, the research is purely qualitative and therefore the data collection is done by organizing a semi-structured interview that is recorded. After interviews the collected data will be analyzed based on the recorded material. According to Hirsjärvi & Hurme (2001) transcripts can be either specific or unspecific. Specific transcripts mean, according to Hirsjärvi & Hurme (2001), that transcripts should be done with the greatest accuracy. This means specific coding, marking every sighs and background sounds like snaps and claps, and identifying pauses between talk. Also, every word must be written accordingly. Unspecific transcript allows more freedom in interpretation process and only things that the researcher seems valid for the context should be written down. In this method background sounds, pauses and sighs as well as coding should be left outside.

In qualitative research data collection has usually three possible ways to gather information (Tessier, 2012). The most traditional way is to make field notes. This method has been very popular in times where technological devices was not yet invented or implemented. When technology developed and analogical as well as digital accessories became more and more popular, the need for written field notes started to fade and transcripts started to take over (Tessier, 2012). When more and more sophisticated technological solutions like computers appeared, field notes and
transcripts got another competitor to provide solution for data collection. According to Tessier (2012), all of the above data collection vehicles have their pros and cons, so in order to produce a quality research where at least some of the cons are tackled, Tessier recommends that researchers should consider using them together.

Even though transcripts are very traditional in qualitative research, transcripts are not compulsory (Hirsjärvi & Hurme, 2001). When there are not many interviewees and if the actual interviews are not long, the researcher may also analyze straight from the recordings, without creating a transcript first (Hirsjärvi & Hurme, 2001). Therefore, in this particular research where I have only four interviewees and from ten to twenty minutes per part in the interview, I will produce the analytics by forming an unspecific transcript from the recordings. The main analytical framework is narrative analysis, where the subjects of examinee are work motivation, trust in the workplace, and enhancements to current motivation systems in the eyes of Millennials. Even though this is following mainly the guidelines of narrative analysis, the analysis is also partly hermeneutic, which means that the understanding of the theme get deeper the more interviews will be examined and interpreted. Since the semi-structured interview is divided into three parts, the analysis will also be divided into the three parts.

Interviews will be carried out via telecommunications application software Skype and recorded utilizing a special program designed for recording Skype video calls. This enables me to re-examine the interviews and count in to analysis all the facial factors that the interviewees may produce will being interviewed. After the interviews are done, I will open the main points out in the parts I have divided earlier. This allocation of parts will help the reader to understand the analysis and how Millennials from different backgrounds will examine and process the same topics and themes.
### 4.4 Challenges

Whether making a qualitative or quantitative research, there are always certain challenges that the researcher should take into account. In qualitative research some of the usual challenges are (Hirsjärvi & Hurme, 1984; Hirsjärvi & Hurme, 2001):

- Sample size
- Questions and/or questionnaire
- Proper methods for analysis
- Correct interviewees
- Is the interviewer impacting on interviewees’ answers

In this research I have been trying to prevent as many problems as possible. I have narrowed my interviewees to ones that are in right age and from various business sectors. The questions are composed carefully to not to steer too much interviewees’ thoughts and opinions but enough to create a unified theme. Although, no matter how thorough the researcher tries to find and fix possible challenges, there will always be the possibility that something will be missed.
5 DESCRIBING THE INTERVIEWEES

The interviewees that I have chosen to participate are all Millennials and Finnish nationals, who are representing various business sectors. Even though all of the interviewees are Finnish nationals, one of them has been and still is working in Central Europe (United Kingdom and France), where he also did his university degree (United Kingdom). This will give a valuable insight how motivation practices are seen in other European countries and how trust is understood in their work environment. Other interviewees are creating their professional career in Finland. As an annotation, all of the interviewees have an academic background; some are from business and some from natural sciences.

Most of them have already been working for several years and are now in managerial positions. This gives an advantage to study how much they have pondered motivational matters in the perspectives of an employee and manager. Since they have just started their professional career, there has not been much time from being an employee to manager, which means that both perspectives should be still freshly in mind.

Since I am conducting an interview where all of the interviewees are young adults, the interview is tailored especially for their age. Hirsjärvi & Hurme (2001) point out that when the researcher is interviewing people from different generation cohorts the researcher should notice that certain age groups require certain way of conducting the interview. In my situation where the interviewees are born from 1988 to 1990, I need to realize that they may have some negative or positive expectations to previous and current motivation practices. They may be biased in either way, due to the lack of years of experience or because of the impact of their superiors. By this I mean that more experienced employees can affect to the way younger employees think, making newcomers to value or disvalue things they normally would or would not value.

In order to achieve a more comprehensible analysis but to retain interviewees’ anonymity, I have given an alphabetical name for each interviewee: A, B, C, and D.
• **Person A** is male and has been born in 1988, has graduated as a Master of Economic Sciences with accounting as a major, and currently working in a big telecommunication organization.

• **Person B** is female, has been born in 1990 and is graduating as a Master of Economic Sciences with Management as a major, and work currently in a marketing company.

• **Person C** is female, born in 1990 and has graduated as a Bachelor of Natural Sciences and works in Zoo.

• **Person D** is male, born in 1988 and is graduating as a Master of Economic Sciences in France and was working in a big consulting company and in a global startup.
6  ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

This section is about analysis that is based on the semi-structured interview I organized for this study. The analysis is following some of the basic guidelines of narrative analysis, but can be also be related to hermeneutic analysis where understanding of the theme is deepening every time the matter is more discussed and interpreted. This chapter is divided into three Parts that are about work motivation, trust in workplace, and enhancements of motivation system. The material is based on the recordings of the interviews and the unspecified transcripts. The interviews were held in Finnish due to the interviewees’ nationality and preferred choice of language, so the answers that are seen here are translated. The questions are purposely built to be sometimes recursive, complex, or even vis-à-vis conflicted. That is the nature of the interview and prevents the interviewees to plan ahead their answers or try to please the interviewer by giving answers that they assume the interviewer would like to hear. For clarification, the interviews were all held individually, so that other interviewees could not affect on others’ responses.

6.1  Part One: Work motivation

Part One’s sub-theme was work motivation. The main purpose of this part was to study how the interviewees saw, felt, and experienced work motivation. Other sub-themes like trust in a workplace or enhancements in motivation models are coming in later chapters. I may use terms effective, efficiency, and performance when describing effectiveness of work or work motivation. In this study, all of the terms above mean the same and should not be interpreted differently.

First question asked the interviewees to describe how they saw work motivation. All of the persons admitted that it is something that you intrinsically want to do. Person A described it as following:

You have to like what you do, it needs to be more than eight to four place and more than what makes you to pay bills and mortgage...You need a real interest for doing the job.
He also said that when the job is motivating, it makes you want to do it more and more and that raises the level of your own work motivation. He claimed that it makes the process to become a cycle that repeats itself by improving your work motivation that leads to higher want of doing the work, which leads back to higher work motivation. Person D described it to be a desire to do a particular work not because you have to but because you want to. Person B pointed out that work motivation is also a set of goals that make you engaged. Based on the answers by the interviewees, work motivation is seen very intrinsic process where your pure want is the core element.

Second question was asking the interviewees to figuring out the work motivation experiences they have previously had. Most of the interviewees told that the more exciting the work description is the better is the work motivation, in general. Person B told that she has had three different types of experiences about work motivation. Her list is following:

- Work environment that is so inspiring that it improves the overall willing to work
- Work that is financially very rewarding
- The work is inspiring you personally

Person D pointed out that work with other people is, at least for him, more rewarding than work that is done alone. He also added that getting good at your job and having successes constantly raises the overall work motivation, even though without financial incentives the gained level of motivation won’t last long. Persons A and C comment that work motivation has been almost always high. They explain that the reason is their jobs’ higher quality.

Third question inquired the possible bond between the working effectiveness and work motivation. All of the interviewees stated that effective working and work motivation have a clear positive bond; without one there is no other. Person A stated that:
They go hand in hand. If I work only for money, my work motivation isn’t high as is not my effectiveness.

Forth question inquired how important the interviewees felt work motivation’s appearance in their working environment and which kind of motivation practice they did value more, quality factor or volume factor. All of the interviewees told that working environment where work motivation is high is crucial for their happiness at work. Also, when I asked them to describe which factor of work motivation they valued more, quality was indisputably everyone’s first choice. Person C told that:

*Quality in motivation practices is more important. Sometimes it doesn’t even have to be very visual; sometimes it can be quite subtle, too.*

By claiming that motivation practice can be subtle, Person C meant that motivation at workplace could be as simple as sincere praises from the supervisor or employer. Person B, on the other hand claimed that both ways in motivation are important. According to her volume is good when it means things like comfortable work environment, but it has its limits. She said that things like trendy work environment loses its novelty due to familiarization and thus lowers its motivating effect. Quality in motivation like personal recognition is always good and doesn’t suffer as steep motivation downgrade as volume based motivation practices. Person D states that:

*The fact that others in your work environment are motivated affects on my own motivation as well. It also affects when the general motivation at work is low.*

Person D also added that small, volume based motivation practices like coffee machines or free pens does not affect on him or affects only very little. Person A stayed in line with others and stated that now when his co-workers are motivated, he is also motivated and that when he was younger and working at a warehouse, people there were quite unmotivated, which, based on how he described his warehouse experience, the general lack of work motivation affected on him, as well.

Fifth question asked the interviewees to explain what they felt that belonged to effective work motivation system. Even though earlier all of the interviewees stated
that money couldn’t be the only reason to stay motivated at work, yet Person A and Person B said that a proper compensation model is the key element. After financial rewarding models comes other motivation practices like in-house trainings, appealing work environment, personal praises from your immediate manager, feedback sessions, or changes in your work routines. Person B also told that small, surprising things are fun and thus motivating:

*Sometimes even small things like manager buying Easter eggs during Easter time is amusing and positively surprising.*

Although, small, positively surprising things like Person B’s suggested Easter egg pulls are not something that is usually listed in official work motivation models or systems. Still, it is good for managers to bear in mind that employees could appreciate benevolence, spontaneous acts like this and increase the happiness at the work environment. Fun in the workplace is an essential part when creating a work culture of engagement and that managers should not despise fun as a factor that could raise the level of company engagement and effectiveness (Yerkes, 2007).

Person C was the only one that did not mention financial benefits in her list. She would appreciate more that the managers would listen and understand their employees and establish a support network that would actively help employees by being a preemptive rather than a fixing organ of the company. To get this done properly, she recommends that companies should hire professional Human Resources managers that have real education and knowledge of how to motivate employees:

*There should be a support network that notices when something is wrong, even the employee him- or herself doesn’t recognize it...also professional people who have gone through some specific training about motivation practices so that motivation would not only be platonic praises like “well done” but more concrete practices.*

Person D was the only one of the sample group who highlighted the importance of career development. According to him an effective work motivation system is
basically a proper career development plan. Although he adds that an appealing work environment is also necessary.

Question six was about age as a factor when motivation systems are created. The purpose of this question was to find how Millennials saw other age groups and their validity to make good decisions when it comes to work motivation. The common consensus among the interviewees was that age matters in some cases, but the previous experience in the field of work motivation was more important when planning new work motivation models or systems.

Person D said that the parts that concern certain age groups in particular, should have similar aged people deciding and planning it but when it comes to career development age does not matter. Persons A, B, and C noted that different age groups are getting motivated differently and thus planned motivation practices should take into account generations and their preferences. Person B and C believed that younger employees want more financial benefits like bonuses that are tied to results but that older generations would want more subtle practices and less money-related practices. According to researchers of social studies, when people’s annual purchasing power parity rises above $10 000, non-monetary factors begin to determine happiness (Symanowitz, 2013). This may explain why Millennials can feel that financial rewards are especially important for them and less important for more experienced employees. Many Millennials are still only starting their career and in many cases the annual purchasing power parity is lower than $10 000, that causes the hunger for better bonuses and salaries.

Question seven tried to find out what sort of work motivation experiences the interviewees have had previously. Since all of the interviewees are still only starting their professional careers, naturally the amount of experiences from that field were quite limited. Even though there was a possibility to share both good and bad experiences, only the worst experiences were listed as following:

- *Leading from fear*
- *Lack of career development plans*
• Dull praises that does not mean what they should mean
• Constant criticizing

Good experiences were quite shallow, basically just noting that everything else is fine. But for the perspective of this study, I find bad experiences more interesting than good ones anyway. Some managers may think that keeping their employees in fear of losing their job is maintains or even improves work effectiveness especially during recession times, but this is actually harming the business now and in future (Doepke, 2010). Doepke (2010) reminds that employees are the brand ambassadors of the company and unhappy and fearful employee will deliver its fearful message to customers as well. Employees that are led from fear also remember it and the bad feeling fear has caused will stay and smolder (Doepke, 2010). This seems to be correct based on this interview as well, since Person B brought it up and stated that even though leading from fear will get employees to work harder, it does not mean that they are motivated; they do it because they have to. This is damaging to company since the quality of work will be minimum, according to Person B.

Person C said that dull comments or praises that does not mean what they suppose to mean give a negative impact on work motivation. Praises like “Well done” or “good work” should be used only when the employee has done a good job – not when manager happens to remember say that.

Person B also brought up constant criticism and its effects on work motivation. She recommends that managers or employers should consider leading from encouragement, where employees are reminded how grateful the company is for their efforts and that even sometimes employees mess things up, manager should try to see what was done also right. Mobile game company Supercell has made sure that failing is accepted and that it should be recognized as soon as possible (Lappalainen, 2013). When failing is commonly accepted and not punishable, employees don’t have fear that failing is same as losing job and thus not paralyze when mistakes happen. Now employees at Supercell make sure that mistakes will be noticed as soon as possible and they make everything to replace it with better solutions (Lappalainen, 2013).
Person D admits that even though the lack of career development plans is always lowering his work motivation, he understands that it is more dependable on your personal preferences and that some one may even consider “the unknown” positive. The way Person D sees it, career development as a factor is not based on age but personal preferences and traits and even some may like it, some may also dislike it since its hierarchical approach.

Question eight was related to the question seven, since it asked interviewees to recall any good or bad experiences of work motivation what they might have heard from their peers. Person A didn’t have anything particular to share and Person B shared the same answer, leading from fear, again. Person C mentioned that some of her friends have given positive feedback about bonus systems and reward programs that are based on results. Person D knew that his peers in France have been unsatisfied and very unmotivated because of French way of hiring interns. According to Person D, French companies are very strict on the ways they hire new employees and, at least interns can get permanent work only if any positions will become open due to layoffs. If these interns realize that no one from the permanent workers is going to resign or being fired, they will know that what ever they would do, they will not get permanent job. This, according to Person D, has made some of the interns passive, unmotivated, and therefore ineffective.

Question nine was about promotion and how it affects on Millennials’ motivation and does it change the preference of practices of motivation. All of the interviewees told that being promoted is itself a motivating thing. Person D stated that it is the utmost motivator. He also told that the higher in the hierarchy you advance, the less he is interested of small motivators. Person A was on the same wavelength as he also stated that the more you get promotions the less you care about the things your office has to offer (e.g. gym or trendy working environment).

During this question a contradiction appeared. It seems to be the differing in the beliefs of the need of compensation models when employees get older. Persons A and D seem to believe that the need for financial benefits will grow while Person B indirectly and Person C directly seem to believe that the need for financial
compensation will become less attractive the older an employee becomes. Person A stated that:

_When you get promoted, money-related compensation or the benefit of company cars or housing benefits begins to interest more and less all the other like general happiness at the workplace._

Although all of the interviewees convinced that promotion is one of the top motivators, Person B admitted that not every Millennial might be motivated for getting a promotion; some may only want to work, not to gain more responsibility:

_Depends on the individual but if talking about me, it (promotion) will absolutely affect on my motivation. For some people promotions and advancing further on career and get more challenges may not be important or motivating. For some people work is just an indirect way to earn money to live and do things he or she desires to do._

She also adds that in her own life work is inseparable from her personal life and therefore promotions are one of the indicators of how you develop as a human being. Person D says that even though employees in their twenties may be highly motivated by the external things like unlimited free snacks (like in Google), it will change to more quality-based motivators over time.

Question ten is about how work motivation could be enhanced so that it would be better for Millennials. It also asks the interviewees to identify the current practices and whether or not they should changed or removed. Even though the question allowed interviewees to create new motivators that are not currently in use, they all seemed to pick only the ones that are already in use. Person A told that he would prefer indenting motivators likes his company’s employee fund. He told that it is motivating to have motivators that indent employees to their company and that their employee fund where employees invest part of the salary is a good one. Person B preferred her current job style where she can operate as an entrepreneur. She said that being a kind of a freelancer helps her to be more flexible and decide her own working pace. This kind of arrangement also provides more power to your own
career development process and lowers the bureaucracy in the company. Person C would change their current way, where most of the motivators are verbal, to one that would also have more concrete practices (e.g. rewards). Person D would invest a lot to common well-being and more pro-active approach on career building. He also would improve international transfers within company so that as many new employees as possible could learn the way its done in their organization and indent themselves to their company. According to Person D, international transfers within organization is used heavily in German organizations and the results are good, so it could do good for employees in other organizations as well to practice more systematic internal, but international transfer.

Question eleven was mapping could an actual lack of work motivation practices strengthen working efficiency. The reason I created this question is to find out could anyone of the interviewed Millennials see an organization where work efficiency would be good or high, if there would be no additional motivators except the ones that are intrinsic. All of the interviewees were confident that an organization where would be no extrinsic motivator and only intrinsic ones could not provide a working environment that would enable employees to work more effectively. Person B answered that by making sure that employees have less, even in evenhandedly, cannot provide an environment where employees would want to work better and more effectively.

Question twelve and also the last question of the Part One, was asking how significant is work motivation for company’s performance. All of the interviewees answered that it was either the best or at least one of the top three of the most important factor. Person C told that:

Motivation creates work efficiency and work efficiency creates results.

Person B described it as:

I feel that it (motivation) is the most important core of the work efficiency. Without motivation employees can’t, especially in work that is more complex, perform very effectively...motivation is having a determinant role.
6.2 Part Two: Trust in a workplace and part of the work motivation

This part is trying to find how Millennials are seeing trust in a workplace and do they think that it is related to or part of work motivation. This sequence has, as it was in Part One, twelve questions that enables the interviewees to ponder and scrutinize trust and its possible dimensions. Just like in Part One, I am going to go through question-by-question, break down the answers, and try to find similarities or contradictions from the results. For clarity, I am using both terms “trust in a/the workplace” and just plain word “trust”. Both of the terms mean trust in a workplace and they should be seen here as synonyms. As I explained in the introduction of Part One, here also terms that describe the effectiveness of work (effective, efficiency, and performance) mean the same.

Question one of the Part Two was about trust in the workplace and what it means to Millennials. The purpose of this question was to see how Millennials experience trust and can they see it as part of their everyday work. As it was discussed earlier, cultural aspect has an important role in this and naturally the results could vary if the interviewees would be other nationalities than Finnish.

All of the interviewees were thinking that trust in the workplace is a two-way-street where employees as well as managers have their own, unique roles. Persons A and B said that trust in the workplace can be seen as trust that agreed deadlines are met and that everybody does their part as agreed:

*At work you need to make sure that it (work) will be done as promised and on time...if you promise something, you should also keep it.*

Person B also added that trust in the workplace has more individual approach, as well. She believes that trust in the workplace enables employees to be themselves without fear of being bullied or separated from the group. Person C saw that, even though the trust should be mutual, employer or manager should show their trust towards the employees. Basically, this means that Person C sees trust in the
workplace to be weighted more on management’s shoulders, from where it is driven towards their employee level. Person D believed that trust in the workplace means that you can trust with ease to your supervisors and co-workers without being afraid that someone would use dirtier tactics (that could cause trouble to you) in order to advance in his or her career:

*You should be able to be in your group without fearing that somebody from your group would stab you in the back to get forward on his or her career.*

He also adds that when everybody are cooperating and working to reach the same goals, trust in the workplace is working well.

Question two inquired the interviewees’ how they personally valued trust’s value in their immediate working environment. This question was very closely related to the first question and therefore some of the answers were very similar but sharper. For Person A, trust meant mostly that everybody is punctual and as good as one’s word. Person B weighted everyone’s right to be who he or she is without fear. She also pointed out that when the common consensus is that everything is done by the plan and promises are kept, it creates a feeling of safety. This is an important observation because safe environment can create a feeling of engagement and that is apt to improve happiness and willing to work (Symanowitz, 2013).

Person C values trust that is given from her supervisor. According to her, trust can also be seen in the workplace as an ease of asking help and receiving it without causing the feeling of shame. Person C says that when there is trust in the workplace, her quality of work is better as well. Person D also points out that the fear of asking help will diminish when trust is strong in the working environment. He values trust that will allow people in their immediate working environment to share thoughts and workloads without the fear of getting stabbed in the back.

Third question was asking the interviewees perspective of their current level of trust at work. Persons A and B were very happy to their current level of trust in the workplace, whereas Persons C and D felt that it could be higher. Even though Person B kept her workplace as a trusting community, she admits that sometimes she has
had troubles trusting in other project managers due to their inability to respect deadlines. Persons C and D had more controversial experiences. Person C told that even though the overall trust in the company is in good level, the shadow comes from gossiping. She said that she sees gossiping as a trust-decreasing element; when people talk behind back, it makes you question their trustworthiness as a colleague. Gossiping is something that companies should be paying a lot more attention. Surely, casual, coffee break gossiping about employees’ personal life happens in many offices and that can be considered as part of normal human behavior, but when gossiping becomes negative and concerns the company itself, managers should pay extra attention to it (Reina & Reina, 2007). According to researchers Michelle and Dennis Reina (2007), gossiping is one of the signs that employees are unhappy and are probably questioning their employer’s trustworthiness. If managers neglect it and do not fix it, the cycle of betrayal can become stronger among employees (Reina & Reina, 2007).

As did Person C feel some level of distrust within her organization, so did also Person D, who had as well controversial experiences from this particular topic. He told that even though the office he was working was trustworthy and people were working for same goals, the problem was another department of the same company that were showing visible signs of distrust towards Person D’s office. He told that this department was constantly demanding very specific reports and often accused Person D’s office of vague reporting:

*The trust within our own office was excellent, we were even friends with each other, but the Headquarter that was located abroad, where some of the supervisors worked, the mutual trust were very weak. There was a lot of vituperation (from the HQ) and they followed our performance very strictly. Often times angry emails were sent (from the HQ) without much of a reason and the tone was accusing and looked like the sole purpose (of the letters) were to fight and defend against other team, even though both teams belonged to same company.*

Forth question of the Part Two was measuring how much trust in the workplace impacts on Millennials’ work performance and job satisfaction. The purpose of this question was to understand does trust have any physical influences on them or their
work. Unfortunately, Person A missed this question and therefore couldn’t answer. Most likely the question itself was too simple or was too self-explanatory, since the interviewees were all just confirming that it has a direct impact on both elements, performance and job satisfaction, without much of a further elaboration.

Fifth question was trying to find how motivating it is to have or not have trust in the workplace. All of the Millennials that were interviewed thought that the more trust there is among your colleagues and managers, the more it improves your work motivation. Person B told that if one couldn’t trust on his or her company, it impacts on your work motivation as well. Person C said that trust in her workplace improves also her job satisfaction. Person D stated that workplace trust is very motivating. He also added that the way he sees it is that trust in the workplace improves job satisfaction, which is apt to improve work efficiency. Person A was very happy for his current level of workplace trust and thinks that it affects greatly on his level of motivation as well.

Sixth question was studying the bond between trust in the workplace and work motivation. The question tried to reveal the possible bond or relation between these two subjects and how strong it is, if it occurs. All of the interviewees confirmed that there is a clear, direct relationship between trust in the workplace and work motivation. Person B told that:

*Without trust there would be no motivation to do (work) because if you have constantly a fear that what you do might disappear or that it will be misused, there would be no motivation for doing your work.*

Person A believed that there is indeed a clear bond between work motivation and trust in the workplace, and that it also works in negative way; when trust in the workplace start to decrease, it will decrease personal work motivation, as well. He also adds that, sometimes trust can suffer if work motivation starts to decrease. According to Person A, the loss of work motivation could affect on the way one experiences the trust at his or her workplace. To clarify this statement, it basically means that sometimes trust can stay unchanged but yet decrease, if work motivation, for whatever reason, starts to decrease first:
If trust is weak, it decreases motivation as well because you can’t do your job as would like to do it. So basically when trust is weak, the motivation will decrease, as well. On the other hand, when the motivation is weak, trust could decrease, too, if you don’t have motivation to keep your deadlines. This leads to decreasing overall trust.

Person D pointed out that trust and work motivation goes hand in hand, especially when working closely together with other colleagues. He told that it increases motivation when you can trust others without fearing of wrongdoings from others.

Especially when you are part of a team, higher level of trust eases working, so that you don’t have to make double-checks so often and you can share tasks and responsibilities easier. This is will naturally increase performance and work becomes more effective.

Question seven was inquiring could trust in the workplace have a negative impact on work performance or on work motivation. First, this question caused confusion and the most direct answer was always no, but after explaining that the purpose is to find any sort of negative impact that trust could cause at work, Person B found one possibility. She explained that there is indeed a possibility of negative impact among trusting colleagues or with your supervisor. One scenario could be one where colleagues become too close and friendly. When persons are too close friends, sometimes difficult or unpleasant matters, like personal conflicts, can be hard to handle, which leads to situation where important discussions are simply not held. It gets even worse when manager becomes too friendly with his or her employees and subconsciously starts to avoid awkward or unpleasant situations that concern his or her employees.

Persons A and C told that only distrust is something that significantly decreases their performance and work motivation. Person D couldn’t think any situation where trust would actually decrease efficiency or work motivation. To draw conclusions that are based on the answers given by the interviewees, trusting work environment may have also negative impacts, but that they are not dominant and that they are usually signs or symptoms of much deeper issues that the company is undergoing.
Question eight was asking how interviewees would like their supervisor to show trust towards his or her employees and could it be encouraging. All of the interviewees but one brought up the need of freedom in the workplace. Person D told that sharing responsibility to manager’s employees is apt to show that he or she trust on his or her employees. Also being fair to everyone is another way of showing trust.

Person A said that by giving employees more freedom to decide matters that belong to their immediate work description is motivating and liberating. He told that it is encouraging to realize that you are trusted to make decisions without asking permissions:

*To give more “carte blanche” at work and bring decision-making process to lower levels, as well…today’s trend seems to be that making decisions belong to everyone…basically giving carte blanche and responsibility to decide matters that can be decided by employees… and of course it is encouraging.*

Person B brought the need of freedom in decisions by wishing more informal business structures and policies. She told that old, hierarchical way of leading is not working for her and that management should trust more on employees’ ability to make wise, informed decisions:

*Structures that allow more freedom in doing business and not so much of old fashioned Taylorism (where employees are treated as machines) where leading was hierarchical. It should be conversational and equal and decision-making decentralized.*

Person C was not bringing up concerns about work liberty per se, but she highlighted the importance of supervisor’s credibility. According to her answer, she feels that she want to believe on supervisor’s thoughts and actions. Based on Person C’s response, when manager has a good credence in the eyes of his or her employees, it increases trust among them. Person C also brought up the need for performance appraisals. She thinks that development discussions, both private and public, should be held even weekly. She would also appreciate hearing feedback that includes negative ones as
well only privately and leave it from public feedbacks, because publicly received negative feedback can be humiliating, which lowers temporarily work motivation.

Ninth question was reversed from question eight. This question inquired how employees should show that they trust their employer or manager. The purpose of this question was to find did the interviewees feel that trust in the workplace should be shown only from management to their employees or could employees participate improving trust, as well. This question divided people and only two of the four interviewees mentioned the same thing. Person A and Person C both agreed that by giving relevant feedback to supervisor employees can show that they trust and are committed to the company and/or to supervisor’s visions. It was interesting that the interviewees didn’t seem to fear giving feedback or critic face-to-face to their supervisor. In fact, none of the two persons didn’t mention or indicate any form of fear to give critic to their managers. Person C also added that when organizations organize company events for its employees, there employees could present information what and how they have done and what they have accomplished.

Person B stated that by being flexible on situations that come suddenly and require adaptive approach from employees and managers would be something how employees could show that they trust on their managers and company. She added that situations that would require an approach described above could be something like sudden, extra jobs or willing to accept monthly pays little later (if the company is struggling due to lack of money). Person D first thought that it is not primarily employees job to present trust toward their managers or company, but after a small thinking process he added that employees could indeed increase trust by being open and communicating clearly. The way I interpreted from Person D’s indications and sayings, he probably saw employees more like mirrors of managers’ trust practices rather than a source of trust itself.

Tenth question was asking could broken or lost trust be regained and if could, how. The purpose of this question was to study how Millennials experienced broken trust and how much it affects on their professional life. This question also seemed to divide people in two sides. Males, Person A and D, saw that broken or lost trust can be regained, although it may take some time. Females, Person B and C were more
undisputed that there are situations where regaining lost trust is not an option anymore. Especially Person C was quite certain that some problems may be so big that trust cannot be stabilized to its former level:

*It depends highly on people and situations...smaller things may not be that serious...but if the trust is completely shattered, for example information security breaches, it (trust) can be lost forever. (Person B)*

*It depends how severely it (trust) has been lost, but in working life...it is possible that it cannot be ever fully regained back because it (trust) is more serious in working life (than in personal life). It (trust hurting dilemmas) can surely be solved but the memory of it still stays. (Person C)*

As I stated earlier, Persons A and D were more compassionate towards lost trust and the possibilities to regain it back to former levels. Person A told that broken or lost trust can surely be restored but it may take long time. Although, he believed that broken trust could be fixed, he didn’t know any particular practice or way to do so. Person D was very affirmative on restoring trust but also believed that it can take significantly long time to reach the former levels. When asked how he would restore or fix broken or lost trust, he told that by doing the same things that developed the trust in the first time. He also believed that trust could be restored back without doing anything special, because people tend to forget over time.

Eleventh question was more like a case question where I introduced two fictive companies (A and B) that are cooperating. The question was that could there be trust among the people who are working in these two companies, even though there would not be trust among the companies themselves. All of the interviewees believed that this could indeed be possible. Only one who told that there is no possibility to have complete trust among the people of the two fictive companies, was Person C. She told that the reason why there cannot be a 100 percent trust among them is because of the fact that the trust these two companies have are, after all, built by their people. Others were more blunt in their answers, mostly just claiming that there is a clear possibility if these people are friends with each other. Person D acquiesced to answer that this is highly possible and that it probably quite common, as well.
As question twelve is basically a reversed question from question eleven, I am presenting the question twelve now as well and as part of the analysis of question eleven. The question twelve as turning the situation upside down and asked that could these two fictive companies (that were presented in question eleven) have trust even their employees would not have trust among each other (company A’s employees versus company B’s employees). The interviewees were more positive of this setting. All of the interviewees were thinking that it is possible that companies could have cooperation enabling trust among them even though their employees would not have that same, two-company-wide trust. Only Person A though that in this situation a 100 percent trust is not possible. Person B told that this is possible because big corporations are still cooperating even there is no mutual trust between their employees. Person C said that the reason she thinks this setting could be possible is if these two companies would be highly depended of the other. Person D was stating that this is most likely possible and as common as he thought the question eleven’s setting was.

6.3 Part Three: Enhancing work motivation models

This is the third part and also the last of the three. This is also the shortest of the parts, consisting only three questions. There are two main reasons why this is part is so short compared to the other two. Firstly, qualitative research should not be judge by its length but its quality. In this particular case, the third part’s three questions are all on point and sufficient to provide the wanted information. Secondly, since these interviews has taken already approximately more than 30minutes of interviewee’s time and since none of them get any sort of compensation other than a feeling of goodwill, the quality of their answers would soon start to suffer greatly due the reasons already listed as well as physical fatigue. To bear in mind, all of the interviews took more than 40minutes to complete. When interviewees are spending their spare time after log working hours, I need to respect their devotion for my study and realize that I need to keep the interview in reasonable lengths. I may use terms motivation model or motivation system crisscross, as in this study they both mean the same. In this study, work motivation model or system means literally a model or
system the organization has created, which sole purpose is to increase work motivation and effectiveness in the company. These systems usually include some sort of financial compensation model, for example a basic monthly salary with result-based bonus structure or other rewarding program. They also may include company’s gym, coffee rooms, company cafes, comfortable working environment, meditation or yoga possibilities, or something else that the management could think of that would improve employees’ job satisfactory levels and work performance.

To clarify the purpose of this part, I will explain it as I did in the last parts’ introductions as well. This part, as told before, is consisting three questions that allow the interviewees to picture a work motivation model that would fit best for them. They can also remove or decrease the importance of any motivation practices that is currently in use. Finally, they assess how well their creation would work to other generations. Just like in other parts, I will break down the questions one by one and analyzing the answers that I have gathered. As a remark, during the interviews there were no any pauses or recesses.

Question one was about personal desires in motivation systems. The question inquired what practices or structures the interviewees would favor when creating their perfect motivation system. The purpose of this question was to study how self-confident they were when creating a model that would have only the abilities they valued and appreciated.

All of the persons, except Person D, mentioned immediately that one definite part of good motivation system is some sort of financial compensation system. Based on the answers, that compensation model could involve a bonus structure, and that it would be layered and branched. By stating layered and branched, it means that there could be different motivators that would preferably be tied to money. Person B noted that employees should be allowed to decide at least some of the motivators for them. She also said that the goals in the motivation system should be graduated, where different levels would offer goals and challenges that have various lengths and levels of difficulty. The reason she pointed out the graduated structure of goals is that she believes goals and motivation belong together. Last part of Person B’s perfect motivation model is transparency. She would like the model to be transparent, clear
and equal to everyone. Strangely enough, no one else seemed to point out equality in this particular question.

Summarizing Person B’s motivation system, it would have the following parts:

- Clear and transparent compensation model that would have layered and branched structure
- Graduated goal structure
- Clear, balanced, and transparent motivation system

Person A created a structure where he measured the weights of every aspect in percentages. According to him the dominating motivator is financial rewards. Then comes the working environment and possible trainings both internal and external. Lastly, Person A mentioned other minor motivators that he could not separate into individual units:

- 50% financial rewards
- 20% working environment in general
- 20% possible trainings
- 10% other motivators

Person C favored discussions. Even though she first told that a reward model where bonuses are shared is crucial, she also wanted to have open discussion and feedback sessions, and special days for improving work wellbeing, as well.

Person C's work motivation summarized:

- Reward program that would have bonuses and other money related rewards
- Open discussions and feedback sessions
- Special occasions for improving work related wellbeing

Person D valued highly a system where boosting career development would be set as a primary tool of motivation. He also added that employee’s own success and
achievements are highly motivating and that they are improving the personal career development, too. He mentioned that getting more responsibility from your supervisors is apt to make, at least him, very motivated. What Person D also mentioned was the fact that he is never looking for any sort of sinecures and that that sort of work will be very disappointing and demotivating.

Person D’s summarized work motivation model:

- System that would put career development on the fast track
- System that would emphasize personal success and achievements
- Responsibilities would be given more than currently
- Erasing the thoughts of having any sort of sinecures

Question two asked what practices or structures the interviewees would remove or diminish from their organization’s current work motivation system. They were allowed to remove what ever they wanted, no restrictions at all. The purpose of this question was to find how, after all the other questions that were related to this particular topic, they saw their current work motivation model and that would there be any similarities or contradictions when compared to their previous answers.

There was somewhat variability among responses. All of the interviewees mentioned that the current rewarding system could need a fixing solution. Person A told that bonuses that are tied to sales should belong to everyone who is directly part of the sales process. Now only managers are entitled to result based bonuses even though the actual sales people make the sales happen. Person B told that since she is officially a freelancer in her employer company, she is not entitled to all things that actual employees are entitled to, but still the managers are demanding her to contribute just like their actual employees. This has led to a situation where freelancers should do the same than permanent employees but without the security of the collective labor agreement. According to her, this model causes insecurity and therefore is not increasing work motivation. Also, the levels of wages should be more fair and balanced and trainings should be paid by the company and be a part of the motivation system, not on freelancers’ responsibility. Person C didn’t want to
remove anything from her organization’s current motivation system, but instead of
develop their special work wellbeing occasions to be more healthy and actually
improve their wellbeing rather than having only night outs with colleagues. She
would also add a proper rewarding model. Person D pointed out that he would like to
see better Human Resources –processes that would guarantee more balanced salaries
and keep feedback sessions fair and trusted. According to Person D, feedback
sessions are important and should be always conducted privately. This means that he
would like to hear both positive and negative feedback privately, so that he could
have a more profound discussion about them. Although he wants to have feedback
sessions private, he admits that general, sweeping praises and cheers could be held
publically.

Question three, which was also the final question of the Part Three, was about the
functionality of their own, personal work motivation system that they created in the
first question of the Part Three. The purpose of this question was to see their
confidence in creating such a huge and powerful model and how they measured their
own abilities to find a perfect solution that would serve well themselves, their
generation, as well as members from other generations.

What was very interesting was that three out of four interviewees were very
confident that their own motivation system (that they created in Part Three’s question
one) would fit well to others, as well. They didn’t seem to consider much age factors,
even though in earlier questions they identified the dilemma of age in motivation.
Person D was the only one that didn’t believe that his motivation system would be
very good for others. He believed that many people would not value career
development as high as he did, and thus his motivation system would not work
properly to all. On the contrary, Person A believed that his system would work, but
for the people who would do the same kind of work than what he did. Person B was
very confident that her system would work without a doubt even to people from
different generations. Person C was also confident that her system would work. She
believed that her motivation system would create healthy competition among her
company’s employees.
6.4 Millennials and their perception of work motivation and trust

This chapter is scrutinizing work motivation and trust in the eyes of Millennials. Naturally, this chapter is based on the empirical evidence that was described and analyzed above.

Even though the Millennials that were interviewed all told that for Millennials in general money or big salaries is not very important, they still listed the need of high pay to their own, personal top priorities when it was asked again later on the interview. One of the reasons why they listed it so high, even though they didn’t think that others of their generation would value it high, is that Millennials are still young and therefore not generally very wealthy. Naturally, Millennials (like the ones interviewed) who have high education want to start a career where they feel that their efforts in academic field have paid off. Another reason could be a more mundane one; money just allows them to do what they want to do during their spare time and allows them to have luxury in their life. However, the reasons why they rate the need for high pay itself is not important, but how they want to be compensated. It seems that Millennials are looking for motivation system that would, of course, include a compensation model, but also other motivators as well. Compensation model should be based on bonus per result, but that there would be other, more personal rewards, as well. Based on the interviews, Millennials would appreciate a motivation model that would be layered and branched. These branches would represent different levels of challenges; some of them would be easier and some of them would be more challenging.

Even though trust was not mentioned when the interviewees were allowed to create their own perfect motivation system, it was still strongly present. The features that the interviewees listed needed almost all trust, in order to work. Many of the motivators seemed to be qualitative (e.g. cozy work environment or transparent management) and only small amount (e.g. result based money bonuses) were quantitative. What was remarkable, was that yet they recognized that different generations may create motivation systems that are pleasing only themselves, the interviewees didn’t believe that their own, perfect motivation system would cause any troubles with older generations. They told that only the people with a proper
education can create good motivation systems, but they still were convinced that their own system would fit for all, even though none of the interviewees had any experience or education of work motivation. This indicates that even though Millennials live in a world that is more connected than ever before and where people from different backgrounds and beliefs are constantly colliding, they still have some sort of delusion that they know better what everybody else want or appreciates. From this behavior I can deduct that it is still easier to criticize others’ creations than your own. This is partly because of the perspective; when you are evaluating others work you are analyzing it more objectively but when you are evaluating your own work you are too close and become unwillingly subjective. However, this is something that is not generation related but just human. Another reason for this is that they are young and therefore lack the experience of good and bad motivation and how differently people from older generations may think.

Based on the interview, it is clear that Millennials are energetic and live in constant change. This is different when compared to other generations that valued and respected job security and balanced work life. The interviewed Millennials all agreed that they are ready to switch their workplace if their working preferences are neglected. Transparent and equal treating among employees was also important for them. Millennials seem to be very social and value team works very high. It is clear that Millennials are still a relatively young generation and that the findings of this study are only scratching the surface, but they still give a good perspective of Millennials’ fundamental values. Millennials are also a crossroad generation since their parents and grandparents are from older, more traditional generations where many of today’s commodities (e.g. Internet of Things) weren’t available. Millennials have born in a world where technology has been always available for them. This has changed their perspective of world permanently and fundamentally. Today’s connectivity has remodeled our way of making business remarkably and that has impacted on Millennials’ way of thinking. That has probably led Millennials to question former and current methods in business life and to demand new ways to be implemented. Therefore, Millennials as a generation will become a generation that will differ remarkably from former generations. They will be a new beginning.
6.4.1 Branched, Quarter-year Compensation Model

Based on the interviewees’ answers and theoretical contribution, I have created a compensation model (see figure 3 below) that would meet Millennials’ preferences in work motivation. I have named it a “Branched, Quarter-year Compensation Model” (later also called BQC model) and it should be integrated into organization’s motivation plan or system. The BQC model is layered into weeks, months, and quarter-year that all have their own unique goals and rewards. This compensation model is tackling Millennials’ needs of short and long-term goals, rewards that are both monetary and non-monetary, and personal participation in decision-making process. The BQC model also gives Millennials’ the freedom to decide how they meet the goals and also what non-monetary rewards they would like to get. Here is the illustration of the BQC model:
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**Figure 3. Branched, Quarter-year Compensation Model. Mikael Mäkinen, 2015.**

In order to understand the logic of Branched, Quarter-year Compensation Model, it is important to realize to whom it is designed for. The main focus has been naturally Western world Millennials that are highly educated, but since this model encourages managers to allow their employees a certain amount of freedom and trust, it will fit to organizations that are in knowledge-based business. Knowledge-based business means in this study businesses like consulting, marketing or other expert businesses.
BQC model can be divided into two sides, left and right, where left represent the structure of compensation. Right side is compensation checkpoints that literally means points in time when team’s accomplishments are measured and rewarded. First of the branches is week goals that consists daily goals. These goals can be anything from daily sales quota to the amount of contacted clients, depending on the type and quality of job. These goals should be relatively easy to reach and decided by the team’s immediate manager. The point in this branch is that when the team has reached all of the daily goals, they will be rewarded non-monetary in the end of the week. Employees should be allowed to decide how they will be rewarded (naturally in the given budget) and they should decide it immediately when their week starts. The logic here is that employees need to keep their eyes on a price whole week, and what would be a better price than the one they have chosen personally. To clarify the value of the weekly reward, it could be anything from having a movie in the conference room to Friday sparkling wine session. It should also vary every now and then.

Monthly rewards should always be monetary and the value should be defined by the success of the month. The point is that the potential monetary reward is big enough to make people work for it, and it should have a clear formula that defines the end value. This formula should be based on weekly achievements. The more successful weeks employees have had, the closer they are to the potential bonus. When employees can calculate and strategize their bonus cuts during the month, they will always know what to expect and un-needed negative surprises are thus minimized. Lastly come quarter-year checkpoints. Here previous, successful months define the value of the monetary reward that is given by the end of the last month of the quarter-year. Naturally, the potential value should always be clear to employees and calculations should be made with ease, during the quarter. Finally, when the quarter of the year has been reached, the cycle starts from the beginning. The key thing in the BQC model is transparency. Employees should always know what to expect and the reasons behind the valuations of every reward. Goals should also be set the way that they are equal to everyone. The goals should never be impossible or harder for some members of the team than for others. Discriminating or unfair goals are one of the easiest ways to destroy the trust and commitment employees have toward their organization, therefore managers should pay extra attention setting up goals that are
transparent and equal to everyone. Although this model may sound familiar to compensation plans organizations usually have, the difference is the utmost transparency and standardized system that works always the same way. It also allows employees to participate in decision-making process and make decisions that concern them.
7 CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The purpose of the study was to find how Millennials experience work motivation and trust in the workplace and can trust be seen as part of work motivation. The chapter of Conclusions and Implications is this study’s last chapter and it is concentrated, like the name refers, on conclusions and implications. Here I will interweave everything together and share the results summarized. Since this study has been made for academic and business fields, managerial implications will be also found. This chapter will also include domestic implications, which means that it will concentrate on integrating findings suitable for European culture and scrutinize how these results affect inside those boundaries. Then I will go evaluate this study’s reliability and validity, explain the limitations of the study, and naturally share suggestions for future researches.

7.1 Conclusions

First of all, I feel the need to remind that the Millennials I am describing here are specific and cannot be stereotyped to explain the behavior of every Millennial in the world. The Millennials I have researched are, first of all, from Western culture. They are also highly educated and are working in organizations that require proactive approach and creative solutions. In other words, the Millennials that are under my scope are the ones who work at professional or expert organizations. Millennials that are not meeting these features may or may not have the attributes that I am going to go through.

Generations has been studied a lot and in myriad perspectives. Many faculties throughout the world have had generations under their scope, trying to find social patterns, preferences, psychological attributes, or other generation-defining signs. The older the generation, the more studies have been made. Although, due to short existence of generation of Millennials (also called Generation Y), not many researches has done yet about them. Therefore, it was very clear to me that since I am Millennial myself and my social network is mainly Millennials, I was able to produce a study that investigates especially Scandinavian Millennials and how they perceive working world and work motivation. After all, Millennials are the biggest
cohort in the United States of America, and also probably the biggest in the whole Western world (Erickson, 2007). Therefore, understanding how Millennials experience business world and what motivates them to reach their goals and carry this world forward, is crucial for effective management. The research question was following:

*How Millennials experience work motivation and see trust as part of it.*

To answer that question, I found three theoretical approaches that were giving the backbone to the perspective. I also examined other generations that are still part of the working force, as well. It was important to include only generations that are working, because current organizations are formed from these people and work motivation systems are created by and for these generations. These generations are The Traditionalists, The Baby Boomers, and Generation X. They gave a good baseline where to compare Millennials. Finally, I organized a semi-structured interview where I interviewed four Millennials that all were coming from different backgrounds. I interviewed and recorded all of them individually via a telecommunication program Skype.

The conducted interview provided interesting results that are showing how Millennials value work motivation and how important they keep trust. I found it fascinating to realize how many qualitative features the interviewed Millennials listed. Based on the results, at least Scandinavian Millennials are not only valuing financial benefits but to also want to have a career that is constantly developing and changing. They are not afraid of losing job because they seem to be ready for changes. This is vastly different when compared to generations like The Traditionalists or The Baby Boomers. Also, Millennials seem to respect work communities where hierarchies and bureaucratic approach is not valued or minimized. Millennials seem to want a work environment where trust is important and responsibilities are divided more extensively. They are not looking for Tayloristic approach where employees are seen as part of the machine but a community where everyone is seen equal to others. Although Millennials may appear to be a more hedonistic generation than other generations, they are also very competitive and want everything to happen quickly. Millennials want their career to
be on the fast track, and if they notice that their career is stuck, they will look for other solutions like new employers that would enable them to continue their career development. Person D mentioned that if he finds himself staying too long in one position, he will immediately consider switching to another company that would allow him to advance in his career.

After reflecting the interviews’ results to the theoretical background, Millennials seem to be more complex and maybe even unrealistic and contradictory with their wants, values, and desires. At the same time they want fast career development (and therefore hierarchical levels) but still to have a working environment that is non-competitive and friendly without much of a bureaucracy. However, the reason for Millennials’ conflicting approach to work life is not that they would be delusional but that they are in the middle of a crossroad of traditionalistic way of doing work and the new way of doing work. Millennials’ parents are from older generations that have taught them to respect values that are important for older generations but also taught them to appreciate Internet of Things and fast pace that it brings. Perhaps, generation or two after Millennials are more stabilized and standardized than Millennials ever were. Also, Millennials are still young and young age usually means more radical and idealistic approach about life and work. All in all, Millennials have some of the values the older generations have but mostly they desire faster life where work and spare time is amicably mixed, where trust is everything, and where hierarchy as a concept is redefined.

7.2 Managerial implications

As described in previous section, Millennials can be seen as fast paced generation. They are not willing to wait years for promotion and are ready to get their hands dirty for faster advancement in their careers. However, the current way many organizations are structured is not the best solution for Millennials. They surely require hierarchy and bureaucracy, but not in a way it is done today. Hierarchy and bureaucracy should be greatly redefined. Based on the interviews and theoretical evidence, Millennials want everyone to earn their places and positions. Managers need to earn their positions as well, not just get them because of the time they have spent in the company or because their own supervisor left the company or retired.
When managers have earned their position, it shows trust and he or she will be trusted. Millennials also value highly work environment that is comfortable and cozy, and where people are treated equally and appreciated. They value very highly social interactions like weekly feedback sessions and group activities, as well as working in teams. Feedback sessions should be seen as two-way street where manager and an employee can both give and receive feedback.

Based on the interviews, Millennials seem to see trust in the workplace coming from above and reflecting from employees back to managers. In other words, the initiative of showing trust should start from managers and towards their employees. In this case, Millennials are like mirrors that reflect shown trust back to managers. This means that they should not be seen as a source of trust. This makes a big difference in how trust should be shown and received in the workplace. One very distinctive finding was that Millennials are fine with the idea that spare time and work life can be mixed together seamlessly. However, this means that work needs to be meaningful and more project-like. Millennials’ fast pace can be good when actions require generic approach and flexibility, but it can be equally destroying if the work itself is dull and repeating. Contrary to older generations, Millennials seem to be ready to change their employers or establish their own companies quickly if the work itself is not meaningful or does not meet their preferences. This can prove to be a problem for companies that want to keep talents. Training to work that require expertise is expensive for companies and Millennials that are ready to move from one organization to another is flammable to companies that are providing the training. Therefore, the companies that realize this dilemma and solve it by creating jobs that are project-like, challenging, and lead to fast promotions or advancement in careers, are going to keep their talents a lot longer. After all, based on my study Millennials are still looking for commitment, so company that pays extra attention to Millennials’ requirements are going to get committed, flexible, and hardworking Millennial employees.

Against common knowledge, Millennials are looking for good pay and address the need for high salary on top of the motivation list, but that is not the whole truth. Based on the interviews and theoretical evidence, Millennials are especially looking for bonus based compensation models that would be layered and branched. In this
model there would be different levels of goals and rewards; not all of the rewards need to be money, though. Rewards should be defined together with Millennials, so that they could have a say on what motivates them and what not. When person can participate and even only pick the rewards from rewards list that he or she would like to pursue for, it is apt to create a motivation system that is effective on both individuals and on groups. Also, by allowing Millennials to participate on decision-making process that is concerning them, it shows that the management trusts them. Trust is highly important for Millennials and they seem to rather change the company than to stay in one where there is no trust or that the trust is lost. Repeatedly the interviewed Millennials expressed that when their supervisor is giving extra responsibility, they feel that it is a remarkable sign of trust. Trust creates commitment and commitment creates loyal employees. Since Millennials are ready to mix their free time and work time together, they are expecting to get a workplace that trusts them and creates a feeling that they belong there. Family-like feelings are very important for Millennials. They want to work in teams and have a transparent, friendly work environment where they don’t need to fear that their colleagues or managers would harm their career.

Good motivation system should have a valid compensation model attached or integrated. For this reason, I created a compensation model named “Branched, Quarter-year Compensation Model” (later called the BQC model) that is integrated to organization’s motivation system and that tackles the dilemmas Millennials’ have previously had. This model is based on the interviewees’ answers, theoretical evidence, and on my personal experience and deduction processes. The BQC model has two sides, Compensation Structure and Compensation Checkpoints; Compensation Structure defines the recurrence of goals and rewards, Compensation Checkpoints define when to reward. This model is, just like the name refers, cyclic that lasts one quarter-year until it starts again. The key point is transparency and employees personal participation. When employees are allowed to participate, it is apt to increase trust and therefore work motivation, which will lead to better work performance. However, it is important to realize that this model is functioning properly only in knowledge-based businesses, like in consulting or in other expert businesses. The reason for this is that this model requires management to have a
certain level of trust with their employees, and not every industry or business field has this benefit.

7.3 Reliability and validity

Reliability and validity are an important part of any academic study. Reliability is evaluating how well the study’s empirical part can be repeated (Hirsjärvi, Remes, Sajavaara, 1997). Validity, on the other hand is evaluating the chosen research method’s ability to measure what is supposed to measure (Hirsjärvi, Remes, Sajavaara, 1997). Naturally, qualitative research and quantitative research have different tools to measure reliability and validity. Since this study is a qualitative research, I am going to utilize measuring methods that are common in quantitative research.

Reliability in this study is measured by analyzing how well the interview could be repeated. Also, it needs to be considered how well another researcher would get the same results if he or she would interview the same interviewees. Semi-structured interview as a research method is quite common in quantitative researches, possibly because it provides controllable but relaxed environment where interviewees can share their thoughts within certain frameworks given by the researcher. It is also easy to record, but above all it can be easily repeated and therefore gain similar results in every interview round. This study is no different; the interviews I conducted could be repeated very easily and if the interviewees are the same, should also their answers be the same. Interviews in this case were all held privately, so that group thinking would be minimized and personal thoughts and thinking would be emphasized. Thus, I believe that who ever would conduct this interview again, utilizing the same equipment and not directing his or her interviewees to think in certain ways, should get similar results.

Validity in this study is measured by evaluating how proper the research method itself was to measure what was supposed to be measured. As it was with reliability, semi-structured interviews are popular in qualitative researches also because of their
ability to measure properly research questions like the one in this study. When a researcher wants to know how some certain age or culture group perceive and experience specific matters, interview that allow the interviewees to describe and give deductive responses, is offering a proper solution. Semi-structured interview is not limiting the interviewee to give answers what the researcher wants to hear but to allow him or her to freely describe and talk about the matter at hand, within the given framework. In semi-structured interview the interviewer’s job is to observe and state the questions, not to guide his or her interviewee to any specific direction or biasing the answers. In this study, semi-structured interview was a perfect option in many ways. Although it is time consuming to organize interviews, find valid interviewees, and to make transcripts from recordings, it is academically good method. I feel that just like reliability, also validity is good in this study.

7.4 Limitations of the study

Since this study is officially a Master’s thesis, it has followed the guidelines that are common for Master’s theses in general. This means that it has its limitations as well. As in many studies similar to this particular one, time is one major limitation. Also financial limitations are common in this level of academic work, and my study is no different either. If there had been financial resources available, more time for more thorough empirical investigation, and more researchers participating and giving their knowledge for support, the study would have been more thorough and comprehensive, as well. Naturally, since the interviewees were all Finnish nationals, it will give a quite narrow perspective about Millennials, in general. Also, if the amount of interviewees would have been larger and from different nationalities and from cultural and political backgrounds, findings could have been more encompassing as well. One limitation is also the circumambient of delivered theoretical framework. If there had been larger and more thorough theory base about Millennials and other generations, the study itself would have had better quality in its theoretical evidence. Finally, the last limitation is the researcher’s current experience in conducting academic work. If I had been more experienced, it would have probably affected positively on this study and its results, as well.
7.5 Propositions for future researches

For future researches, this topic would provide myriad propositions and approaches. This subject itself is constantly evolving and the older Millennials grow, the more there are possibilities and perspectives. Millennials are one of the largest age cohorts in the world and in the middle of the crossroad old and new way of doing business. This should provide endless amounts of possible topics.

However, some of the recommendations for future studies that came to my mind during the process are the followings:

- *Is there difference between men and women on how they appreciate financial compensations?*
- *Difference between industries on how they see trust or work motivation.*
- *How effective the Branched, Quartile Compensation System is in business life*
- *How Millennials’ political and cultural backgrounds affect on their motivation and does their motivational preferences differ*
- *How Millennials’ values and preferences change over time*

Especially interesting would be a research that would measure Millennials’ motivational values and preferences over time. Naturally, this could not be a topic for Master’s theses, but in academic perspective this would be interesting to find out. It would also provide valid information on how human’s behavior change over time and does fundamental, profound values change with other values.
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APPENDIX

Appendix 1

Here are semi-structured interview’s structure and themes. The interview is divided into three segments that are called Parts. Each of the Parts represents one sub-theme. First part is about work motivation, second part is about trust in a workplace, and the last one is about future enhancements in work motivation. This interview is done individually to every interviewee. It is important to notice that some of the questions will purposefully overlap or repeat each other.

Part I. Work Motivation

1. Describe, what work motivation is?

2. Share your experiences of work motivation

3. Do you feel that work performance and work motivation are related to each other?

4. How important the existence of work motivation in work environment is for you? Which one is more important in work motivation, quality or volume?

5. Your opinion: What features belong to effective work motivation?

6. Does employee’s age matter when effective work motivation system is designed?

7. Do you have experiences from effective or ineffective work motivators?

8. Have you heard your same aged friends’ or colleagues’ experiences of effective or ineffective work motivators?

9. Does promotions affect on work motivation? Does your motivators change due the promotion?
10. How work motivation models could be improved to be more effective to Millennials and should some of the current methods of work motivation change or remove?

11. Could the lack of work motivation practices improve work performance?

12. How much you think work motivation affects on organization’s performance?

**Part II. Trust in a Workplace**

1. What trust in a workplace means?

2. What trust in a workplace means to you?

3. How much you experience trust in your own working community?

4. Does trust affect on your work performance and/or on your comfort in your working community?

5. How do you feel the existence or the lack of trust affect on your work motivation?

6. In your opinion: Can trust and effective work motivation be related to each other?

7. Could trust have negative impacts on work performance or work motivation?

8. How do you think your supervisor should show that he or she trusts his or her employees?

9. How do you think your supervisor’s employees should show that they trust their supervisor or the organization?

10. Could once lost or broken trust be regained to its former levels and if could, what would be the methods?
11. Let’s assume that there are two (fictive) companies A and B that are cooperating on daily basis. Could there be trust among the people of these two companies, even though there would be no trust between the companies?

12. Let’s assume that there are two (fictive) companies A and B that are cooperating on daily basis. Could there be trust between the two companies, even though there would be no trust among their people?

**Part III. Enhancements**

1. If you would be allowed to design a work motivation system that would be perfect for you, what methods and/or practices you would use?

2. If you would be allowed to decide what methods or practices should be removed or change in the current work motivation system of your organization, what would they be?

3. Do you believe that your perfect work motivation system (that was created in the first question of Part Three) would fit well to other people in your organization too, no matter from what generation they would be?