Generation Y and Higher Education: The *Other* Y2K

SALLY NIMON

Planning & Assurance Services

The University of South Australia

Abstract

The technological developments of the late 20th century opened up a whole vista of possibilities, both social and professional, that transformed millions of lives around the world. However, for the Millennial Generation, or people born in or after 1980, it also had a profound effect on shaping how they view and interact with their world: their perspectives, their attitudes and their visions for the future. Some of these represent a sharp deviation from those who have preceded them, and raise a range of important issues that are already confronting employers, administrators and teachers as they enter the workforce and higher education. This article uses an integration format to explore the Australian Millennial customer of higher education at the dawn of the 21st century: how to attract them, how to retain them and how to help them negotiate and forge the brave new world of the future.

Keywords: Millennial Students, Impact on higher education

Background

The Millennial Generation, or Generation Y, represents the latest cohort of young people to reach tertiary education age. The distinctively different attitudes and characteristics of this group, identified in young people in the United States and Britain as well as Australia, have sparked much popular debate and academic comment in recent years as business and academia question how best to manage the challenges and potential that they represent. This article will use an integrated methodology to explore some of the characteristics of this new group of Australian tertiary students, how they differ from their predecessors, and how these differences might impact on interactions with higher education providers.

What is a Millennial?

Debate about this generation begins with such fundamentals as what to call them. Howe and Strauss (2000, pp. 6, 10–11) list no fewer than ten terms in common use ranging from *Generation X*[2] to the *Echo Boom*, finally settling on *Millennials* as a term popular among the generation itself. Defining birthdates also vary. Huntley (2006, p. 2) argues the starting point as 1982, as do Howe and Strauss (2000, p. 4); Weiler (2004, p. 6) and Krohn (2004, p. 325) define it as 1980, and Freestone and Mitchell (2004, p. 123) set it as 1977. However, the critical factor in understanding a generation's characteristics and behaviour is less a fixation on an exact starting point and more the realisation of how social perspectives, values and practices within a given period influence and shape the outlook of those who were at a formative age at the time.

Millennial Characteristics

The arrival of the Millennial generation coincided with the development of a number of new technologies that rapidly infiltrated Australian society, transforming many aspects of social and professional life. The rise of the personal computer and introduction of the World Wide Web (WWW) in the 1980s and 1990s, accompanied by mobile phones and the development of instant messaging technologies, created an unprecedented capacity for instantaneous interaction, both with the local community and the wider world beyond. As long ago as 1998 the Australian Bureau of Statistics was reporting a strong growth in home internet use (ABS, 1998), with 60% of Australian households having home internet access and 92% of children aged 5 to 14 years having computer access by 2005/2006 (ABS, 2006, p. 6). While the impact of these technologies was by no means limited to Millennials, they were the first generation for whom they did not represent a departure from a previous way of life. Consequently, the effect of these technologies have significantly shaped the way that Millennials interact with other people and with information, and mark them as distinctly different from generations that learned to negotiate their way in society prior to these developments. It should be noted, however, that some data suggests that access to technology in Australia has been primarily a metropolitan phenomenon (ABS, 1998, p. 4). While few, if any, studies have addressed the differences between Generation Y-ers born in rural and metropolitan areas, it is logical to assume that the extent of the traits may vary depending on such factors.

Perhaps the most predictable effect on people born after 1980 has been on attitudes towards technology itself. To Baby Boomers (defined by Freestone and Mitchell, 2004, p. 123, as those born between 1946 and 1964) and even Generation X-ers

(born between 1965 and 1979, Freestone and Mitchell, 2004, p. 123) phenomena such as mobile phones and the internet represent tools that, while useful, are not essential. Millennials, however, consider them as inseparable from their daily existence as the clothes they wear or the food they eat. To Skiba (2005, p. 370), Generation Y is the 'connected' generation, always in contact with each other and the world around them via email, mobile or internet. Indeed Huntley (2006, p. 16) notes that a Millennial's mobile is a great deal more than just a phone; it is a device through which they flirt, work, socialise and express their individual personality through make, ring tone and colour. Some even view it as an extension of themselves — to some a mobile is 'like my right arm' (Huntley, 2006, p. 17). Similarly, the internet has provided the opportunity for self-expression on a truly global scale, with the advent of chat rooms, personal webpages and instant messaging. Games such as *Second Life*® even allow reinvention of the physical self through the use of personal avatars, allowing an unprecedented degree of control over appearance that can be continually updated or adapted. In other words, in the hands of the Millennials these technologies have been transformed from the simple tools of the Baby Boomer into devices through which they experience and interact with their world.

This notion of connectivity has led to a number of key characteristics of the Millennial generation. As a group to whom familial fracturing through parental divorce has not been an uncommon experience, many are seeking and finding lasting relationships through their peers rather than their family. To Howe and Strauss (2000, p. 181) this 'closer peer bonding may be diminishing their need for close friendships with adults', a phenomenon which they argue can be traced back to the television programs of early childhood. *Barney and Friends*®, which debuted in 1992, is described as having an

emphasis on teamwork and what children have in common, as opposed to the Generation

X-ers' *Sesame Street*® with its focus on children as individuals (Howe & Strauss, 2000, p.

36). Huntley (2006, pp. 25–26) sees this as continuing through the popular culture

programs of their later childhood and teens, many of which reflect fractured and

dysfunctional families (*The Simpsons*™*, Married with Children, Everybody Loves

Raymond*) but solid and enduring peer friendships, which survive through almost

anything life can throw their way, whether natural or supernatural (*Friends,* the Harry

Potter© series*, Buffy the Vampire Slayer*). Together, these influences appear to have

created an almost tribal mentality, in which the group is taking on a new importance

equal to, or maybe stronger than, the individual. Huntley (2006, p. 28) notes that the pull

of the group can even override romantic and sexual relationships, noting the attitude that

'[t]ime spent with a boyfriend or girlfriend can feel like a distraction from the really

important task of socialising with your mates'. It may also partly explain why Generation

Y-ers are sometimes cynical towards what they are told by older generations, and often

refuse to take anything at face value. At the same time, they have grown up in a world in

which many of the things that their parents took for granted — lifelong relationships,

continual employment and home ownership — have faded and they have grown used to a

world of uncertainty and impermanence (Huntley, 2006, p. 15). As Sheahan (2005, p. 73)

states, 'why should they believe the traditional one-day-this-could-all-be-yours

motivational speeches when they have seen how rapidly change can occur and know the

likelihood is that nothing of the kind will happen?'

This notion of peers or friends does not have to be limited just to those with

whom they have had personal contact. Howe and Strauss (2000, p. 16) note that this is

the first generation to grow up perceiving itself as part of a global whole, due not just to the international dimensions of email and the WWW, but also to satellite television. Millennials are as used to seeing images of disasters occurring in far off places as they are their own neighbourhood, and the youth cultures of the United States are as familiar to them from television shows and music videos as that of their own backyard. This international outlook has combined with their personal experience of the transient nature of life to give this generation a strong focus on mobility, and it may be that in the long-term it is this that will prove to be the defining Millennial characteristic. Huntley (2006, p. 16) notes that it is a recurring theme throughout most aspects of their lives — in terms of travel, career and personal direction. Many authors note that Millennials are unlikely to stay with any one employer for long, particularly if they perceive that employer to be unresponsive to their needs. Elson-Green (2006, p. 7) has observed that many young people move on after only a year, and to Tandukar (2005) making a commitment to one employer will not prevent them from continuing to ensure there is not a better option somewhere else. Even if they like their role and position this is unlikely to be translated into loyalty to their employer. Huntley (2006, p. 18) suggests that 12 months may be the longest time frame to which Generation Y-ers are prepared to commit, and Sheahan (2005, p. 9), himself an older Y-er, notes that 'if there is a barrage of bad news … but the company seems disinterested in doing anything about it, Generation Y won't stay and watch the ship sink'.

Connectivity also appears to have had a profound impact on Millennial perceptions of and attitudes towards time. Used to instant messaging and Google™ searches, 'Millennials experience and expect immediacy' (Skiba, 2005, p. 370); as

Dobbins (2005, p. 8) notes, theirs is a '24/7' world. This has impacted on their attitudes and behaviour in several ways. Firstly, they are often reported as having short attention spans. Sheahan (2005, p. 63) refers to them as 'Stimulus Junkies', and warns employers that 'if you can't keep Generation Y entertained, you can't keep them'. Secondly, the perceptual border that had separated privacy from accessibility for previous generations appears to be fading. Huntley (2006, p. 35), an X-er, notes her shock at being contacted by one of the subjects of her Generation Y study late at night when 'at home in my pyjamas watching a DVD', with the clear expectation of an instant reply. Paradoxically, however, Huntley (2006, p. 38) also notes that the expectation that everyone will have a mobile phone, and therefore be contactable, has resulted in Millennials being less likely to be punctual than older generations.

Connectivity has also had the effect of making some forms of crime much more accessible. Freestone and Mitchell (2004) investigated Millennial attitudes towards the ethics of certain internet-related misbehaviours of varying seriousness, ranging from credit card fraud to downloading free music. They hypothesised that since this generation had grown up with such easy-access technology, offering almost unprecedented capacity to engage in faceless crime, they may have developed somewhat flexible perspectives on the ethics of such behaviour. They found this to indeed be the case, with their Millennial sample proving permissive of activities such as downloading music or movie files, justifying it by arguing that they were doing no direct harm to sellers. This attitude was probably reinforced by the invisible nature of the economic or personal consequences of their actions. However, they also identified a further, perhaps more worrying, trend in which Millennials were able to turn the tables and actually cast *themselves* in the role of

victim, justifying electronic theft by arguing that they were unfairly subject to 'inflated software, music or movie prices, [and] blaming the industry for keeping prices artificially high' (Freestone & Mitchell, 2004, p. 126).

The technological advances of the 1980s and 1990s have also fundamentally affected the way in which students learn and conduct research. For older generations, sourcing information often meant physical travel to a library or locating a sufficiently knowledgeable individual. Time and effort had to be expended and the end result perceived as being of sufficient value to merit going through the process. The information obtained also tended to carry a certain degree of authority due to the source and effort required to obtain it — a book has to be good enough to be published and an expert has to invest years of training and research to achieve that status. However, the advent of the internet, bringing with it the ability to access vast quantities of information on a huge range of topics, has replaced traditional methods for this generation. Howe and Strauss (2000, p. 272) quote one 16-year-old Millennial as stating: 'Since being connected to the internet, I have not entered a library to do research for a school project'. Furthermore, it also appears to have fostered a new attitude towards information itself. Millennials have been noted to 'value … speed more than accuracy' (Oblinger & Oblinger, 2005, p. 2.6), an attitude that is clearly reflected in the comments of Tim, a Y-er who states that:

> One of the resources I absolutely love is *Wikipedia* …
> anyone can contribute to it. .. if I miss class one day and I
> find out the subject that was discussed, I can go home,
> search on *Wikipedia* and get some really good explanations.
> Sometimes *Wikipedia* will have explanations that are even
> better than the professor's. (Aviles et al., 2005, p. 20)

Note that one of the reasons Tim likes Wikipedia is the fact that 'anyone can contribute to it' (Aviles et al., 2005, p. 20). He is not concerned with its authenticity; indeed, in this quote he clearly equates the information obtained through Wikipedia with that provided by the professor, presumably an expert in the area. To an older person raised in more traditional methods of research the open source nature of Wikipedia may be perceived as reducing its value, given the lack of rigour or verification. But this does not appear to raise alarms for Tim. Rather, it is perceived as being an advantage, though the exact nature of what that advantage might be remains unclear.

The technologies that gave rise to connectivity have also meant that this generation has been saturated in marketing messages throughout their lives. Advertising has been an integral part of their daily experience in a way it was not for their parents and older Generation X siblings. Howe and Strauss cite a *Business Week* article which notes that today's infants are exposed to marketing almost from the moment of birth:

> By the time she's 20 months old, she will start to recognize
> some of the thousands of brands flashed in front of her each
> day. At age 7… she will see some 20,000 TV commercials
> a year. By the time she's 12, she will have her own entry in
> the massive data banks of marketers. (Howe & Strauss,
> 2000, p. 280)

While Howe and Strauss are writing from a US context, this country is little different. A recent study estimated that Australian Millennials are the direct target of 22,000 advertisements per year by the time they reach the age of 12, and that a third of parents reported a brand name as one of their Generation Y child's first words (Sheahan, 2005, p. 72). Consequently, they are described as being critical consumers who resent the hard sell and have become cynical about companies they perceive as trying to manipulate them

(Beard, 2003, p. 218; Wolberg & Pokrywczynski, 2001, p. 37). Furthermore, they are fickle consumers with little or no brand or company loyalty. They do not value longevity and will not bat an eyelid at abandoning one product for another at a moment's notice (Watt, 2002, p. 13; Wolberg & Pokrywczynski, 2001, p. 37). Nevertheless, a few marketing success stories have already emerged. Wolberg and Pokrywczynski (2001, p. 37) note that advertising campaigns that have achieved success with this generation have focused on humour, irony and the unvarnished truth, providing examples such as the Sprite™ campaign with the by-line 'Image is nothing. Thirst is everything'. Sheahan (2005, p. 73) agrees, noting that organisations that are up-front, tell the truth and deliver quality will excel in the Millennial market. This might also explain why phenomena such as the reality television show *Big Brother* have been so successful amongst this generation — it offers the illusion of providing unvarnished reality; it focuses on a group rather than any one individual; and it regularly consults its audience through SMS voting.

Millennials are by and large the children of working parents, the planned products of couples who established their careers before starting their families (Huntley, 2006, p. 11). The relatively older age of their mothers has meant that they have tended to have fewer siblings, and their births throughout the 1980s and 1990s coincided with a new social awareness of the importance of child protection (Huntley, 2006, p. 11). Together, these factors have created a generation that has been treasured, considered special since birth, and generally been more sheltered than its predecessors (Howe & Strauss, 2000, p. 13; Huntley, 2006, p. 9). This has fostered a number of distinctly Millennial attitudes and characteristics. Firstly, they are widely considered more optimistic and confident than the generations preceding them, especially when compared to the cynical and individualistic

Generation X-ers (Beard, 2003, p. 218; Huntley, 2006, p. 9; Wolberg & Pokrywczynski, 2001, p. 36). This optimism appears to have been strong enough to weather even critical events like September 11 and the Bali bombings (Huntley, 2006, pp. 2–4). They have been treated as individuals from a relatively young age and are used to having input into any decisions made about them (Hill, 2002, p. 62). Paradoxically, however, the unusual degree of protection that they have enjoyed has meant they have been shielded from previously routine childhood hurts — they have not been left to suffer if their choices were bad ones. Consequently, many have yet to learn some of the lessons that older generations already had at a comparable age. To Howe and Strauss (2000, p. 268) this focus on child safety has also resulted in a decreased emphasis on other aspects of child development, such as creativity and imagination. This can be seen quite clearly in their interactions with toys: as noted in *The Economist*, 'A generation ago most kids played with toys … Now toys are expected to play with kids' (Howe & Strauss, 2000, p. 268). It has also meant that many Millennials were raised by parents who, concerned with giving their child a strong self-esteem, emphasised the non-competitive aspects of life, encouraging participation over achievement (Hill, 2002, p. 61). Unfortunately, Hill (2002, p. 62) suggests that this 'praise-for-anything feedback' has led to a generation that has confused input (what they do) with output (what they achieve). Similarly, Sheahan (2005, p. 86) calls them the generation that 'separates effort from reward'. Consequently, many Millennials have not developed any concept of assessment against an externally imposed standard and thus in an educational context tend to believe that any work they hand up 'deserve[s]' to pass (Hill, 2002, p. 62). It also means that they are less used to relying on others' opinions in their decision-making processes and so may place less value on the

feedback of lecturers or tutors. This is consistent with the observation that Millennials tend to credit only that which they perceive as being *immediately* relevant — anything that fails this test is likely to be dismissed or forgotten (Sheahan, 2005, p. 12). Nevertheless, there is a plus side. Hill (2002, p. 63) notes that many Millennials rate internal rewards, such as personal fulfilment, higher than external ones, such as dollars. This is consistent with reports of an increase in volunteer activity among this generation, reflected in sources such as Australian Bureau of Statistics surveys and the Australian Democrat's 2005 Youth Poll, which found that 64% of young people viewed family as more important than money (Overington, 2006, p. 210; *Voluntary Work, Australia*, 2000, p. 3).

Discussion and Implications for Higher Education

The attitudes and characteristics of the Millennial generation pose a range of challenges for Higher Education providers seeking to attract and retain them. Take, for example, their perception of *immediacy*. To a Generation Y-er, an academic who provides an email address and mobile phone number may be perceived as providing tacit approval to contact them at any hour with associated expectations of instantaneous responses. Similarly, an academic who promises to provide a 'timely' response to queries may find that his or her assumed understanding of *timely* is wildly out of sync with that of the students. At an institutional level, universities need to be careful of marketing promises and how these might be interpreted. An advertised message of '24 hour access' may be intended to refer only to online materials and databases; to a Millennial it is more likely to imply continual access to *all* services, including academics. Immediacy also has implications for feedback given by Millennials to institutions through surveys and other

sources. Significantly, the contracted Millennial perception of time may mean that they not only expect an institutional response to their concerns, but that they expect it within a rapid time frame that institutions may not traditionally be structured to achieve.

The reluctance of Millennials to engage in long-term planning may also pose considerable challenges. If Huntley is correct, and many Millennials are reluctant to commit any longer than 12 months in advance, this conflicts sharply with the traditional three to four year undergraduate degree structure. If we add to this the inherently mobile nature of this generation, their lack of institutional loyalty and the fact that they will not hesitate to vote with their feet if they feel unappreciated or dissatisfied, then it becomes apparent that universities cannot afford to rest on their laurels if they wish to be perceived as meaningful and relevant. While there is no current evidence to suggest that Millennials are reluctant to enter into tertiary education, it is likely that attempts to motivate them to continue their studies by focusing on degree outcomes and other long-term benefits may lack relevance or impact. Institutions may need to spend as much time focusing on the *immediate* benefits of obtaining an education as they do on the traditional long-term outcomes. It is likely to be of little use telling a Millennial that if they commit to four years of hard work now they will walk into a well paid job in the future when they are surrounded by the rapidly changing face of industry on a daily basis. However, if they believe that they will gain *current* personal fulfilment and satisfaction from their choice, irrespective of the long-term outcome, they may be more inclined to continue, especially if tangible rewards can also be obtained before the program of study is completed. This could take the form of opportunities for travel, networking, access to new technologies, or other incentives designed with the Millennial in mind.

The reliance of the Millennial generation on the internet as its primary data source has fostered an attitude towards information itself that could be highly problematic for tertiary institutions. Rigorous referencing and validation of sources are rarely featured in internet sites and, if Millennials do not have experience of properly referenced texts against which to judge these sites, it could inadvertently foster the impression that information in the public domain is no longer owned. Certainly, this appears to be reflected in comments from Millennials such as those mentioned in this article. Such an attitude might go a long way to explaining anecdotal reports that plagiarism is on the rise and suggest that its roots may go far deeper than just the ease with which the act can now be conducted. It suggests that Millennial students may simply not comprehend the basic foundation concepts of knowledge ownership, and therefore not consider the act of acquiring that information without acknowledgment to be wrong. Furthermore, the findings of Freestone and Mitchell (2004, p.126), which showed a Millennial capacity to re-cast themselves from the role of perpetrator of unethical (if not illegal) activity to victim of the greed of large corporations, could easily be transferred to an academic setting, where high workloads or the need to juggle study and a part-time job may be seen as justification for taking an easy option. Consequently, current approaches to educating students about plagiarism, such as a compulsory but single lecture in first year, or referral to a website on how to reference properly, may simply be dismissed by Millennials as irrelevant and outdated. Instead, it may be that universities need to completely rethink their approach to this problem and design a more detailed system of education that demonstrates the impacts of plagiarism, both on a personal and professional level.

The consequences of the social context in which Millennials were raised are also likely to be significant for higher education. The unusual emphasis on protection during their childhood, coupled with their expectation of influencing the decisions made about them, have resulted in a generation that is used to being catered to, and may not be as self-reliant as previous generations. They will want — indeed they will expect — to have input into their own educational decisions and are unlikely to accept that a situation is a given way simply because those older and wiser than they have deemed it should be so. At the very least, it is likely that students will need to understand the *point* of what they are being asked to do if they are to perceive it as being worth their while to invest the time and effort that is required. However, this alone is unlikely to be perceived as sufficient and they may still feel the need to exert their own influence. It is likely that solutions to this problem will lie in compromise.

More important, however, is the notion that this is a generation that has been raised in a largely competition-free environment. This can appear contradictory as they are certainly used to experiencing competition for *their* attention, in the form of marketing companies seeking their consumer dollar. However, they may have never been asked to extend this philosophy to themselves and their own output, and thus may not comprehend the notion of required levels of achievement to attain certain goals. Consequently, many believe that anything they hand up deserves at a minimum to pass, irrespective of its academic merit. This is extremely significant to higher education providers and could become the source of frustration for both students and academics. Anecdotal evidence suggests that these types of conflicts between students and academics are already occurring. Expectations will have to be carefully managed, and it is likely that

a far greater emphasis will need to be placed on required standards of achievement very early on in tertiary study to ensure that this message has been heard and understood before learning can proceed.

The group ethic of Millennials is likely to have many different implications from a marketing perspective. Institutions or programs that successfully tap the need to belong are likely to carry more weight than those that have a more individual focus. The observation by Howe and Strauss (2000, p.181) that they look to bond with each other at the expense of adults means that they are more likely to pay attention to the messages their friends give them than those of traditional authorities. Consequently, using renowned professors or older past graduates to promote university programs may have less success than using Millennials themselves. Word of mouth and peer references may prove to be essential to the recruitment of this generation, making it vital that currently enrolled Millennials have a positive tertiary experience throughout their tertiary studies. However, institutions will need to realise that the interpretation of any marketing promises made may differ enormously between generations. Millennials want to be consulted; they will expect input into what they do. They will not accept at face value that more experienced people know better than they do — to date this has not been their collective world experience. Consequently, approaches that have satisfied past student bodies may simply not wash with Y-ers. Innovation and consultation are likely to be the key.

Conclusion

Australian Millennial tertiary students have been raised in an environment very different from that of their predecessors and this has fostered a distinct set of experiences, expectations and characteristics, many of which have significant implications for higher education. While it is not yet clear exactly what approaches *will* work with this group, there is sufficient evidence to suggest that practices that were successful with Baby Boomers and Generation X-ers are likely to fail with their children and younger siblings. Millennials are the future, both literally and figuratively, and it is worth our while to invest in ways to bring them to their full potential.

References

Australian Bureau of Statistics. (1998). *Home internet use grows strongly—ABS figures* (1998). Australian Bureau of Statistics Media Release. Retrieved August 10, 2007, from http://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/Previousproducts/8147.0Media%20Release1May%201998?opendocument&tabname=Summary&prodno=8147.0&issue=May%201998&num=&view=

Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2006). *Household use of information technology* (2006). Retrieved August 10, 2007, from http://www.abs.gov.au/Ausstats/abs@.nsf/0/acc2d18cc958bc7bca2568a9001393ae?OpenDocument

Aviles, K., Phillips, B., Rosenblatt, T., & Vargas, J. (2005). If higher education listened to me… *Educause Review,* September/October, 17–28.

Beard, F. K. (2003). College student attitudes toward advertising's ethical, economic, and social consequences. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *48*, 217–228.

Dobbins, K. W. (2005). Getting ready for the net generation learner. *Educause Review*, September/October, 8–9.

Elson-Green, J. (2006). Creating 2020 vision. *Campus Review, 16*(7), 6–7.

Freestone, O., & Mitchell, V.-W. (2004). Generation Y attitudes towards e-ethics and internet-related misbehaviours. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *54*, 121–128.

Hill, R. P. (2002). Managing across generations in the 21st century: important lessons from the ivory trenches. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, *11*(1), 60–66.

Howe, N., & Strauss, W. (2000). *Millennials rising: The next great generation*. New York: Vintage Books.

Huntley, R. (2006). *The world according to Y: Inside the new adult generation.* Crows Nest, Australia: Allen and Unwin.

Krohn, F. B. (2004). A generational approach to using emoticons as nonverbal communication. *Journal of Technical Writing and Communication*, *34*(4), 321–328.

Oblinger, D. G., & Oblinger, J. L. (2005). Is it age or IT: First steps toward understanding the net generation [Online book]. In D. G. Oblinger & J. L. Oblinger (Eds.), *Educating the Net Generation* (Chapter 2). Retrieved June 9, 2006, from http://www.educause.edu/ir/library/pdf/pub7101b.pdf

Overington, C. (2006). Howard's south park conservatives. In N. Carter (Ed), *The Howard factor: A decade that changed the nation* (pp. 208–213). Melbourne, Australia: Melbourne University Press.

Sheahan, P. (2005). *Generation Y: Thriving and surviving with generation Y at work.* Prahran, Victoria, Australia: Hardie Grant Books.

Skiba, D. J. (2005). The millennials: Have they arrived at your school of nursing? *Nursing Education Perspectives*, *25*(6), 370–371.

Tandukar, A. (2005, November 24). The gen-Y imperative. *Business Review Weekly* [Online version]. Retrieved June 9, 2006, from http://www.brw.com.au/freearticle.aspx?relId=16210 (subscription access only)

Voluntary Work, Australia. (2000). Australian Bureau of Statistics. Retrieved June 8, 2006, from http://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/DetailsPage/4441.02000?OpenDocument

Watt, C. (2002, July 5). Don't be a 'try-hard' when targeting youth. *B&T Weekly*, p. 13.

Weiler, A. (2004). Information-seeking behaviour in generation Y students: Motivation, critical thinking, and learning theory. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *31*(1), 46–53.

Wolberg, J., & Pokrywczynski, J. (2001). A psychographic analysis of generation Y college students. *Journal of Advertising Research*, *41*(5), 33–52.