

# **A Generational Preference for Preferred Work Arrangement and the Relationship With Employee Engagement and Turnover Intention**

**Christopher J. Muniz**  
**Wayland Baptist University**

**Janet S. Jones**  
**Wayland Baptist University**

**Samantha R. Murray**  
**Wayland Baptist University**

*The purpose of this study is to gain an understanding of generational preferred work arrangements and the impact on employee engagement and turnover intent. Through analysis of 252 participant responses, this study examined differences between generational cohorts currently in the workforce with regard to engagement, preferred work arrangement and turnover intention. Results indicated a difference in employee engagement among Baby Boomers, Millennials, and Generation Z workers, but no differences in preferred work arrangement and intent to stay with the organization. However, there was a difference in Generation X employees' preferred work arrangement and intent to stay.*

*Keywords: generational differences, preferred work arrangements, engagement, turnover intention*

## **INTRODUCTION**

At no other time has the workforce been so diverse and distinctive. Over time, employees devote a considerable amount of the day and even their lifetime to the workplace. The work environment becomes crucial to the individual's overall work experience. It becomes necessary for organizations to recognize and pay close attention to the multigenerational workforce they employ. Generational theory was built on the foundation that individuals born during an identical period, concurrently growing into maturity, are exposed to experiences driven by social, political, and cultural environments, leading to similar behaviors, beliefs, and preferences (Koksal, 2019). Life experiences and significant events have shaped individual perspectives, and the work environment must adapt to keep employees engaged and intending to stay with the organization (Lapoint & Liprie-Spence, 2017). The work environment contributes to several positive constructs that contribute to employee and organizational success. This study seeks to examine the preferences of a multigenerational workforce pertaining to preferred work arrangements, engagement and turnover intent.

## **LITERATURE REVIEW**

First introduced by Karl Mannheim in 1952, the generational theory was built on the foundation that individuals born during an identical period, concurrently growing into maturity, are exposed to experiences driven by social, political, and cultural environments, all leading to similar behaviors, beliefs, and preferences (Koksal, 2019). Generational theory champions the generations modeled by historical and social situations (Pilcher, 1994). The core of generational theory revolves around the socio-historic experience that individuals live through and the worldviews between the generations based on social influences. People within identical age groups residing in the same area are frequently exposed to and share the same experiences of social influences and historical events (Ertas, 2015). Strauss and Howe (2009) explain the recurring cycles of people perceiving the world, the values they tend to follow, and how social events persuaded these personas when they were born and raised.

Strauss and Howe (1991) popularized generational cohort theory by illustrating differences in the various generations since its inception. Identifying a group born in the same period of time, sharing the same social experiences, and living through significant life events is another alternative to explaining a generational cohort (Ting et al., 2018). Amayah and Gedro (2014) note that generational cohorts are shared by groups who have alike birth years, share monumental events, and experience current events as they pass through life together. In theory, individuals born during the same period and who are part of a distinctive generational cohort will often encounter related tendencies and cognitive styles (Pasko et al., 2021). Influences of life events and experiences individuals will encounter as they grow older will impact each member of each generational cohort.

Generation is a broad designation for individuals born and living in approximately the same period (Dimock, 2019). The term generation can also describe a 20-30-year average span (Dimock, 2019), which encompasses when a child is born, grows up, enters adulthood, and finally begins having children. Often, the word generation is used in conjunction with the word cohort. A cohort is differentiated by many factors related to life experiences (Ryder, 1985), not just dependent upon the timing of birth. Historical events and significant events can shape differences in people's values and attitudes within each cohort, defining moments for people who remain constant throughout their lifetime (Dharmesti et al., 2021; Eisner, 2005; Parment, 2013). Hence, each cohort has a unique structure of values that reflect the circumstances surrounding the unique historical event (Ryder, 1985). Occasions and other external forces form intrinsic behavior patterns that distinguish each generation from others (Jonck et al., 2017). Members of each generational cohort represent significant societal social changes occurring within the period and the values accentuated during the distinct periods (Twenge et al., 2010). Generational cohorts help clarify how views are differentiated across varying cohorts. Furthermore, generational cohorts can also impact the workplace, as four generations today occupy the workforce.

## **GENERATIONS IN THE WORKPLACE**

A group of individuals who share everyday life experiences, such as economic conditions and world events, are referred to as a generation (Hansen & Leuty, 2012). In the work environment today, there are currently five generations (Jones et al., 2019), with each generation having unique characteristics setting them apart from each other. However, only Baby Boomers, Generation X, Millennials, and Gen Z are discussed in this study. The years of the generations are not agreed upon by researchers as discovered through the literature review (Botha & Vera-Toscano, 2022; Cucina et al., 2018; De Coorman & Dries, 2012; Sesen & Donkor, 2023); nevertheless, for this study, each generation or generational cohort is defined as the following (Creighton & Hudson, 2001; Dimock, 2019): Baby Boomers (1946-1964), Gen X (1965-1980), Millennials (1981-1996), and Gen Z (1997-2012). The time spans chosen for the generational cohorts were selected because of their frequent usage in past literature reviews and studies.

### **Baby Boomers (1946-1964)**

The generation born between 1946 and 1964 is called the Baby Boomer Generation (Dimock, 2019; Rahardyan et al., 2023). The Baby Boomer's name was shaped by the rise in the birth rate after World War II. The years align relatively with Strauss and Howe's (1991) classification of the Baby Boomer era between 1943 and 1960. In 2023, the Baby Boomer generation occupied 16% of the labor force, and by the year 2032, the Baby Boomer generation age range will be 68 to 86 years (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2023). The results suggest that Boomers are exiting the workforce more slowly than the previous generation (traditionalists) (Fry, 2019). Significant events occurring during this generation were the Civil Rights Movement, John F. Kennedy and Martin Luther King Jr.'s assassinations, the Kent State University shootings (Lancaster & Stillman, 2002), and the Vietnam War. Baby Boomers were impacted by World War II, which their parents experienced (Francis & Hoefel, 2018), and what Baby Boomers themselves experienced during the Vietnam War (Zemke et al., 2022). During the coming years of age, and experiencing assassinations, war, the civil rights riot, Woodstock, and Watergate (Jones et al., 2018; Tolbize, 2008), and the first moon landing, these experiences produced a set of values, beliefs, and attitudes amongst the Baby Boomer generation. Furthermore, Boomers tried to induce social change through protests and riots with little to no fear of consequences (Strauss & Howe, 1991). Vietnam was a monumental moment for Boomers to actively protest and rebel against the institutions of previous generations (Codrington, 2008).

The continued presence of Boomers in the workplace still influences the work dynamics because of the behaviors and attitudes of the Boomer generation. According to Martin and Ottemann (2016), Baby Boomers are known for their hard work ethic and are labeled workaholics. In addition to having a high work ethic, Baby Boomers are ambitious and innovative and seek advancement opportunities and self-gratification (Hernaus & Vokic, 2014; Martin & Ottemann, 2016). This generation shows passion for being part of the workplace, is optimistic, and is driven by the organization's vision and strategy (Rahardyan et al., 2023). Boomers are aggressively loyal to their employer (Wong et al., 2008), yet have difficulty separating work from other priorities outside of the organization (Lester et al., 2012). Technology was seen as a commodity, and Boomers deemed work a profound part of life that brought contentment. Baby Boomers work hard to accomplish their goals. They desire to feel respected and valued for all they have accomplished.

In conclusion, Baby Boomers work hard while showing and respecting authority in the workplace. Seniority outranks merit with this generational cohort (Ahmad Reza et al., 2017). Their level of loyalty is elevated, and Baby Boomers expect their commitment to the organization to be recognized through promotions (Ahmad Reza et al., 2017). Job security is essential as Boomers experience frequent job changes resulting from a growing and altering workforce. Because Baby Boomers are incredibly loyal to their organization, they expect the organization to be loyal to them (Gursoy et al., 2008).

### **Generation X (1965-1980)**

Following the Baby Boomer generation is Generation X, who were born between 1965 and 1980 (Dimock, 2019; Rahardyan et al., 2023) around the beginning of new technological developments (Rahardyan et al., 2023). Strauss and Howe (1991) identified this generation as 13ers as they were the 13<sup>th</sup> generation in the United States, with the birth years ranging from 1961- 1981. As of 2021, the workforce was projected to comprise 35% of Generation X employees (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2023). Generation X is the generation that was exposed to computers and was more innovative than the Baby Boomer generation (Ida et al., 2021). In fact, Clark (2017) stated that the birth of the personal computer significantly influenced this generation. Generation X members may also be called Gen X or Gen Xers.

In their younger years, events that influenced the beliefs and attitudes of Generation X were the energy crisis of 1970, terrorist attacks at the 1972 Munich Olympics, the fall of communism, and witnessing the beating of Rodney King and the Los Angeles riots (Zemke et al., 2022). Other influential events were the AIDS epidemic, the first Iraq War, President Bill Clinton's sex scandal, and a major shooting in Littleton, CO. (Smola & Sutton, 2002). The economic climate was frail, and this generation experienced a time of uncertainty during the wrath of a stagnated job market and corporate downsizing (Jones et al., 2018).

“Generation X watched as America seemed to fail militarily, politically, diplomatically, and economically” (Zemke et al., 2022, p. 96). Gen Xers grew up in an era of parental absence, exposed to high parental divorce rates (Vejar, 2008; Wong et al., 2008), and their mothers or other female influences attained jobs traditionally reserved for the working man (Vejar, 2008). As a result, the “latchkey” kids phenomenon originated (Salahuddin, 2010, p. 2), and this generation learned to be pragmatic and independent (Lancaster & Stillman, 2002). Some might consider this generation to be independent individuals who care for themselves. Gen Xers have been described as born in a time of economic crisis where independence was necessary (Zabel et al., 2017), leading them to a life of living between home and other locations as young adults (Kupperschmidt, 2000).

Having been raised by Baby Boomers who are self-centered and workaholics, Generation X members had to learn to be practical, self-resourceful, and adaptive to change (Patterson, 2007). Smola and Sutton (2002) described the work ethic of this generation as Gen Xer’s indication of one’s worth in how hard they worked. Not only did they work toward the organization’s goals, but they also worked toward their own personal goals simultaneously (Wiant, 1999). Gen Xers bring to the workplace problem-solving skills, a high level of technical competency, the ability to accept change, and are comfortable with diversity (Kupperschmidt, 2000). Because Gen Xers were exposed to the era of technology, such as computers and mobile phones, they deemed technology as the way of life, emphasizing more on one’s work and social life (Kupperschmidt, 2000; O’Bannon, 2001). A work-life balance and flexible work options are key work strategies Gen Xers desire. Gen Xers work to provide a means to enjoy life, albeit their life outside the workplace is also essential (Ahmad Reza et al., 2017). Unlike Baby Boomers, seniority lacks relevance, and they do not have the patience to wait their turn for promotions and raises (Ahmad Reza et al., 2017). Prompt praise and recognition are expected (Gursoy et al., 2008). Generation X employees distrust big institutions and are less loyal to the organization (Ahmad Reza et al., 2017) than the loyal Baby Boomers. According to Adams (2000), Gen Xers are self-focused and self-protective in the workplace.

In summary, Gen Xers are a product of their own upbringing and witnessed their parents work much of the time (Day, 2023). This resulted in Gen X individuals becoming independent and self-sufficient. While core values differ amongst the generational cohorts, a work-life balance was of utmost value (Glass, 2007; Day, 2023). Ahmad Reza et al. (2017) mention Gen Xers as having the patience to wait their turn for promotions and raises (Day, 2023) and emphasize these individuals as goal-setters who prepare for advancements.

### **Millennials (1981-1996)**

Millennials were born between 1981 and 1996 (Dimock, 2019). Various researchers and sources slightly differ; however, the consensus remains that Millennials were born in the 1980s and early 1990s (Strauss & Howe, 2009). As of 2021, Millennials were estimated to comprise 40% of the workforce (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2023). Significant events that transpired and influenced this generation included the second Iraq War (Operation Desert Storm), the attacks on 9/11, and America’s first elected African-American president (Zabel et al., 2017). Other events included the coming of the Digital Age, where the internet and wireless technology rapidly grew, the O.J. Simpson trial, the Oklahoma City bombing, the mass school shooting at Columbine High School, and unethical corporate behavior (Enron/WorldCom) (Ferry, 2023). Millennials grew up in the fast-paced era of technology, where information was quickly accessed (Jones et al., 2019; Twenge et al., 2010) and heavy social media utilizers (Urbain et al., 2013). The digital age seemed to be the most significant event influential to Millennials compared to previous generations. The growth of the internet was monumental for this generation due to all the technological advancements (Cennamo & Gardner, 2008; Jones et al., 2018). Millennials are connected and wired to the world 24/7.

The characteristics that best describe the Millennial cohort are confidence, team and achievement-oriented, and conventional (Howe & Strauss, 2000). Much like Gen Xers, they are technologically savvy (Hill, 2004), have strong moral values, are street smart (Zemke et al., 2022), and value the importance of diversity (Zabel et al., 2017). More than other generations, Millennials value a work-life balance. With the advancement of technology, there is freedom to work from any location and still collaborate in a team-

oriented environment (Lancaster & Stillman, 2002). Work-life balance is a priority for this cohort as it promotes physical and mental health. Millennials value job security less than previous generations (Hart, 2006) and strongly need to understand the reasoning behind decision-making (Wong et al., 2008). Thus, Millennials lean on learning opportunities for career development (Zemke et al., 2022).

In conclusion, millennials are optimistic about the future. They are great collaborators and favor teamwork (Ahmad Reza et al., 2017). Millennials are independent, confident, and self-expressive, and they like to be recognized and respected for all they put forth in their work (Ahmad Reza et al., 2017). This cohort is a challenger of the status quo and wants to move beyond the typical workplace norms, such as the dress code, standard workday, and even the employee-supervisor relationship (Gursoy et al., 2008). The job description is just a guide typically rejected by the notion of having to stay with the role.

### **Gen Z (1997-2012)**

Generation Z was born between 1997 and 2012 (Dimock, 2019). Various researchers and sources differ slightly; however, the consensus remains that Generation Z cohort members were born between the late 1990s and the 2010s. This cohort is also referred to as iGen, and Gen Z. Twenge (2017) developed the term iGen to refer to this generation born after 1995 after the internet became heavily available. Significant formative events that transpired and influenced Generation Z were terrorism, continued financial and economic crises, and the impacts of climate change (Seemiller et al., 2019). This generation continues to experience the implications of school shootings (Dorsey & Villa, 2020). Gen Z is known for being the first generation of digital natives (Chomqtowska et al., 2021), bound to constant internet and smartphone access (Chillakuri, 2020; Lanier, 2017). Generation Z is the first generation to be globally connected and highly aware of technology and information (Rahardyan et al., 2023). Technology has not only influenced how they live and work but has also formed a new set of values, aspirations, and fears that will guide their approach to future challenges and opportunities (Chomqtowska et al., 2021). Exposure to smartphones, social justice movements, social media, and the culture of being reared led to how Gen Z will approach the work environment.

Gen Zers will be the youngest generation in the workplace and will be different than previous generations; however, some similarities will exist with Gen Xers (Schroth, 2019). Gen Zs will shun the traditional 40-hour work week and replace it with flexibility or freelance contract work (Wiedmer, 2015) and expect a flexible work schedule (Chillakuri, 2020). Research conducted by Dorsey and Villa (2020) before COVID-19 found that Gen Z prioritized flexible work schedules over compensation. Plus, Gen Z expects employers to allow for flexibility in where and how they work (Chillakuri, 2020). Like Gen Xers, Generation Z seeks opportunities to learn and grow and believes career success is defined by work-life balance and purpose in their work (Pataki-Bittó & Kapusy, 2021).

In summary, Rafiki and Hartijasti (2022) concluded that Gen Z placed a higher importance on intrinsic, extrinsic, social, and leisure work values compared to Baby Boomers, Gen X, and Millennials. In addition, Gen Z employees have higher expectations of compensation and rewards (Rafiki & Hartijasti, 2022); however, they still expect a non-traditional work arrangement. Compared to their predecessor cohorts, Generation Z grew up in a fully connected technological environment, impacting how they work and interact with people, creating challenges for the less technologically savvy (Chomqtowska et al., 2021).

## **WORK ARRANGEMENTS**

Flexible work arrangements (FWA) have become a common trend and workplace practice that has been incorporated into the culture of many organizations, especially following the COVID-19 pandemic of 2019 (McDaniel et al., 2021). Organizations can implement FWAs in three elements: flexible work schedule, flexibility in the number of hours worked, and flexibility in the place of work (Akmalia & Adhitama, 2023). Work arrangements have become a popular movement and a form of rational work for employees. FWA means that employees can work from anywhere, and FWA practices allow companies to adapt to the work environment (Akmalia & Adhitama, 2023). A positive work environment consists of all the factors regarding the job, including the facilities where the work is completed and in a comfortable workplace

(Danish et al., 2013). Organizations incorporating FWA into their culture are aware of changing work patterns and that flexibility benefits employees with work-life balance and overall productivity (Andriani et al., 2023). Many employees are becoming vocal about workplace location preferences as they expect greater flexibility. This study will focus on FWA from the scope of place of work.

Adapting work arrangements and the effects employees gain have received considerable scholarly attention (Hill et al., 2008). Organizations that allow flexible work practices fulfill the necessary human need for autonomy (Deci & Ryan, 1995) when employees have control over their preferred work location (Kim et al., 2023). Working in one's preferred location should, at a minimum, benefit employees by making them feel their preferences and needs are being met (Kristof, 1996). Through reciprocity, organizations that give employees resources they value will satisfy their needs and prompt a desire to reciprocate an advanced return on employee engagement (Eisenberger et al., 2001). According to Kim et al. (2023), when employees are assigned their preferred work location, organizations receive valuable outcomes from employees, such as engagement, job satisfaction, and trust. Furthermore, an employee's intent to leave could be perceived by their control over their preferred work arrangement (Gerdenitsch et al., 2015). Several work arrangements exist, and this literature review will describe work arrangements as traditional, hybrid, and telecommuting.

### **Traditional**

The traditional office setting was a foundational cornerstone of an organization's corporate culture and professional life. It incorporates a physical workspace within a brick-and-mortar building where employees gather to fulfill their professional duties. The most obvious characteristic of a traditional work environment is that the employees are physically located and work in a dedicated space (Hill et al., 2003). The word traditional can be used interchangeably with the term onsite, as traditional work refers to work carried out in a formal work setting (onsite), such as an office (Gillet et al., 2021). Traditional work environments typically exist when there is a presence and physical access to fellow co-workers and management (Hill et al., 2003). Rapert and Wren (1998) describe the traditional work environment as having inclusive policies, work roles, an organizational hierarchy, and an administrative support system. Employees are typically required to work fixed hours within the day. The daily commute from home to the office is a routine part of the day that can either be short or lengthy. In this setting, face-to-face communication is the primary mode of communication and can include one-on-one, formal meetings, or team discussions.

### **Hybrid**

Hybrid work arrangements combine traditional in-office work and out-of-office remote work (Cook et al., 2020). This combined strategy allows employees to work from the office or another remote location, which may include a home or coworking location (Krajčik et al., 2023). Annanya and Hemakumar (2023) explained the hybrid work model as a blend of the physical work arrangement with a remote work system some days, then switching to full days in the office. Stasila-Sieradzka et al. (2023) describe various formats of a hybrid model: a) the at-will model – employees select the best-fit work arrangement; b) the split work model – splits the work week up by working in-office 2-3 days a week and working remote 2-3 days a week; c) shift work – employees work in a variation of arrangements, e.g., evening shifts at home and day shifts onsite; and d) week-by-week - employees alternate weekly working from home or onsite. The critical concept behind the hybrid model is the blended working arrangement of working onsite and off-site, allowing employees the same capabilities to perform the same job duties and interact with co-workers through digital technologies.

### **Telecommuting**

The term telecommuting was first devised in the early 1970s to explain working away from the typical physical location of an office and utilizing telephonic communications (Nilles et al., 1976). Working outside of the traditional brick-and-mortar office at other places is referred to by a variety of names, such as remote work, virtual work, telework, or telecommuting (Charalampous et al., 2019; Vartiainen & Hyrkkänen, 2010). Telecommuting is working away from the office's physical location where employees substitute

some, if not all, of their working hours to work at home and complete tasks using technological means (Allen et al., 2015). Wontorczyk and Rożnowski (2022) often refer to telecommuting as remote in this generalized world of widespread internet and computerization. In a contemporary environment, telecommuting allows employees to work from home rather than at an office (Allen et al., 2015; Nilles, 1992). Allen et al. (2015) reviewed several studies to define telecommuting as employees working away from any location other than the office for a few hours a day to a full day or a full-time basis, using technological equipment to complete work activities. Telework may also mean working from an alternative location rather than just working from home; hence, the objective is to move the work to the workers rather than moving the workers to the work (Hill et al., 2003; Nilles, 1992). This study will use telecommuting to reference the home as the primary work venue. Despite the various work arrangements, working remotely has advantages and disadvantages.

### **Hybrid (Remote Aspect) and Telecommuting: Advantages and Disadvantages**

Technological advances have enabled remote work arrangements, connected work environments, and continued work productivity (Felstead & Henseke, 2017). The edge in emerging tools has allowed individuals to perform their daily tasks at any location, allowing them to work remotely. Online collaboration tools have advanced, allowing individuals to communicate virtually. Organizations have invested in and adapted technology to help bridge the gap between remote locations and traditional offices. However, working in a remote work environment has both advantages and disadvantages. Differing studies on remote work have shown both positive and negative effects. Organizations experienced higher employee satisfaction and increased productivity, and employees seemed more rejuvenated (De Menezes & Kelliher, 2016). Less or no commute increased the time given to the organization by almost an extra workday compared to those who work daily in the traditional office setting (Subramaniam et al., 2013). With the help of telecommuting, employees can balance their work-family relationships, leading to increased job satisfaction (Nilles, 1992). Some studies found that telecommuting increased productivity because employees experienced fewer distractions in the workplace (Lindström et al., 1996), which typically can be exacerbated by coworker interactions or unplanned meetings. Reduced stress levels and increased motivation are benefits of remote work (Lupton & Haynes, 2000). Telecommuting assists in reducing employee commuting costs and alleviates the hassle of commuting altogether (Teo & Lim, 1998). Organizationally, telecommuting has social advantages, lower absenteeism, reduced overhead, and lower turnover (Iscan & Naktiyok, 2005).

While several advantages of remote work prevail, disadvantages exist. Research has shown that individuals perceive opportunities for promotions are less (Illegems et al., 2001), and the most reported disadvantage of telecommuting is focused career growth and development (Iscan & Naktiyok, 2005). The lack of career growth and development resulted from reduced visibility in the traditional office setting. Individuals' interaction is less, and reduced visibility from their direct supervisor or other leaders may likely hinder advancement and developmental opportunities. Some studies have found negative impacts from remote work, including decreased productivity, increased costs, and missed deadlines (Hunsicker, 2023).

Employees may also feel separated from peers and may experience isolation. Hence, the disadvantage of feeling no work companionship and no social interaction is highly likely (Kurland & Cooper, 2002). Some employees have expressed a decline in social connections, different treatment than peers in traditional offices, and different distractions (Pavlik, 2020), such as distractions from family members. Telecommuters may experience a lack of belonging and engagement due to everyday separation and the inability to keep up with career and company developments (Ward & Shabha, 2001). In reciprocity, supervisors may feel a sense or lack of control over remote workers. Some investigations suggested that for employees who work remotely away from their physical supervision, managers found it difficult to monitor their employees (Kurland & Cooper, 2002; Ward & Shabha, 2001). Despite the advantages and disadvantages of remote work, generational differences, and experiences will contribute to how employees succeed in their desired work arrangement. Understanding the dynamics and theories that set the foundation for generational cohorts and generational differences is essential.

## **EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT**

Although engagement has gained much attention and interest in business, it remains an evolving construct. Employees showing initiative and being motivated to work beyond the normal parameters of the job role through active engagement are the organizational pillars of the 21<sup>st</sup> century (Leiter & Bakker, 2010). Benefits prevail when organizations have engaged employees, and employees benefit through health and well-being (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). The following section on employee engagement will define and trace its inception, along with a review of the significance of employee engagement, generational differences, and ending with employee engagement and telecommuting/remote work.

### **Definition and Origin of Employee Engagement**

Employee engagement can be defined and explained from several different aspects. Obuobisa-Darko (2020) defines employee engagement as “a positive state of mind that results in employees’ willingness to put in all their efforts (cognitive, emotional, and physical) to facilitate the successful achievement of organizational goals” (p. 14). Engagement occurs when an emotional connection is established with other people (Makhmut et al., 2023). Engagement is a mental and expressive accord of fulfillment and immersing levels of involvement, drive, and efficacy (Maslach et al., 2001). Engagement also includes feelings of safety and meaningfulness, which connect personal fulfillment to work (Kahn, 1990). Many other common themes related to employee engagement include cultural norms, meaningfulness of work, well-being, and workplace relationships (Geldenhuis et al., 2014).

Engagement is encountered when employees are committed to their work (Bakker et al., 2007) and find passion in their work, which leads to a connection to the organization (Ellison, 2020). Three aspects of work engagement that contribute to a positive work-related state of mind are vigor, dedication, and absorption (Demerouti et al., 2001; Hadi & Johan, 2023). Schaufeli et al. (2002) consider vigor a positive affective work attribute mixed with solid physical and emotional energy levels. Dedication relates to pridefulness and meaning in one’s work, depicted by enthusiasm and inspiration (Ellison, 2020). Bakker et al. (2007) describe absorption as employees deeply immersed in their work resulting from high concentration levels. Vigor and dedication are core dimensions of engagement, while absorption results from engagement (Bakker et al., 2007).

Engagement theory is derived from the stipulation that employees working in the right situations will be engaged and performing in their job role (Kahn, 1990). Individuals with a high degree of engagement possess a high psychological state (Kahn, 1990). Deemed as a motivational construct, engagement is defined by Kahn as “the simultaneous employment and expression of a person’s preferred self in task behaviors that promote connections to work and to others, personal presence (physical, cognitive, and emotional), and active, full role performances” (Kahn, 1990, p. 700). Hence, the individual is psychologically, emotionally, and dynamically present when executing role expectations (Ford et al., 2015). Meaningfulness in the work an employee accomplishes develops a relationship between the organization and its employees (Kahn, 1990). Saks (2006) defines employee engagement as an optimistic emotion towards future work when the individual’s work generates meaning. Saks (2019) also emphasizes that the degree of engagement employees gain from their job and overall organizational support impacts their decision-making abilities. Conceptualizations exist across the literature in how common threads of engagement constructs have emerged.

### **Significance of Employee Engagement**

First, employee engagement involves how employees express themselves in their work activities related to their role (Christian et al., 2011). Employee engagement directly impacts employee commitment and performance (Nazir & Islam, 2017), especially when employees feel their work is safe and worthwhile (Popli & Rizvi, 2015). Furthermore, employee engagement is correlated with the individual’s performance and not attitude related to the characteristics of the job or organization (Maslach et al., 2001). Secondly, a motivational construct influences employee engagement because of how the employee allocates resources to appropriately complete work tasks (Rich et al., 2010). Finally, engagement is positive and leads to



influential benefits for both the organization and the employee (Christian et al., 2011). Benefits include mental resilience, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004).

#### *Benefits to the Organization and Employee*

Employee engagement is vital for any organization. Actively engaged employees attach themselves to and identify strongly with their job role (May et al., 2004). Engaged employees decide how they will work and, in the manner they do, will be fulfilled by their efforts. Engagement enables organizational success (Popli & Rizvi, 2015) and sustainability (Saratun, 2016), which impacts a company's financial performance through increased profitability (Suan Choo et al., 2013). Employee engagement is vital in achieving organizational goals (Cook, 2008), directly influences productivity, and positions a firm's competitive advantage (Lapoint & Liprie- Spence, 2017). Compared to less engaged employees, engaged employees generally are more likely to achieve higher productivity, which leads to company profitability, sound customer relationships, and less turnover (Pitt-Catsouphes & Matz-Costa, 2008).

Researchers on engagement have focused much effort on how employee engagement impacts employees, their work, and the company (Crowe & Gaytan, 2019). Engagement can lead to reduced absenteeism and improved efficiencies, and employees are less likely to leave an organization (Bhuvanaiah & Raya, 2014). Engaged employees become attached to their jobs, compared to disengaged employees (Crowe & Gaytan, 2019). Furthermore, engaged employees challenge themselves for continuous improvement to exceed performance expectations (Bhuvanaiah & Raya, 2014). Organizations that view the significance of employee engagement have employees who are more likely to contribute to organizational goals, reflecting their organizational commitment (Crowe & Gaytan, 2019). Studies have shown a relationship between an employee's level of engagement and organizational commitment (Crowe & Gaytan, 2019).

Multiple studies have expressed the positive effects of engaged employees, such as increased productivity, positive workplace culture, and organizational success (Crowe & Gaytan, 2019). As Kahn (1990) emphasized, organizations that encourage and promote support, trust, and cooperation experience increased productivity. A workplace climate built on support creates positive emotions and employees' ability to make emotional and psychological resources (Fredrickson, 2001), leading to higher commitment and organizational success (Harter et al., 2002). In addition, increasing workplace culture and climate created positive emotions such as acceptance and joy, leading to productive employees (Harter et al., 2002), and enhancing psychological environments led to productive employees who accomplished organizational goals (Kahn, 1990). Rich et al. (2010) highlighted the solid relationship between engagement and performance, showing that engagement was strengthened by job satisfaction, an intrinsic motivation. While organizations aspire to have engaged employees, generational similarities and differences impacted by life experiences are at the forefront.

#### **Employee Engagement: Generational Similarities and Differences**

The generational preference for employee engagement has been well-researched over the years (Gursoy et al., 2013). Researchers have found that different generations reported opposing reasons for engaging and disengaging in their work (Pech & Slade, 2006; Shuck, 2011). Research into engagement preferences by generational cohort revealed similarities and differences. Solidified by White (2011), Baby Boomers, Gen Xers, and Millennials all had common expectations from their employer, which consisted of: 1) challenging projects, 2) competitive pay, 3) advancement opportunities and growth and development opportunities, 4) fair treatment, and 5) work-life balance. However, Gen Z employees prioritized flexible work schedules over pay (Dorsey & Villa, 2020). The overall level of commitment from Baby Boomers, Gen Xers, and Millennials was similar. Millennials and Gen Z employees highly displayed an inclination for a work/life balance. Baby Boomers valued their personal ethics and integrity, while a flexible work schedule was a higher priority for Millennials (White, 2011).

Some might consider Gen Xers to be caring for themselves and independent, while Baby Boomers or their parents exposed themselves to real-world problems. Like Gen Xers, Generation Z seeks opportunities

to learn and grow and believes career success is defined by work-life balance and purpose in their work (Pataki-Bittó & Kapusy, 2021). Millennials believe in extrinsic rewards more than Boomers, although less than Gen X (Schullery, 2013). Each generational cohort values intrinsic rewards less than the previous generation (Schullery, 2013); however, intrinsic rewards are still a significant value related to their engagement.

Despite the various reasons employees may engage and disengage in their work, differences exist in the fulfilling work-related state of mind characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption between the generational cohorts. In a study by Kiiru-Weatherly (2017), comparisons uncovered that Baby Boomers had significantly higher vigor than Millennials, but not much higher than Gen Xers. Gen Xers had more increased vigor than Millennials, but not significantly higher. Baby Boomers had higher dedication than Millennials and Gen Xers (Kiiru-Weatherly, 2017). Kiiru-Weatherly (2017) also discovered in the study that dedication amongst the cohorts was not statistically significant. However, Baby Boomers had more absorption than Millennials and Gen X, yet the Gen Xers had higher absorption than the Millennials.

### **Employee Engagement and Telecommuting/Remote Work, Hybrid Work, and Onsite**

Before COVID-19, there were varied views on the advantages of working away from the traditional onsite setting. While some studies showed that working remotely from home increased performance (Allen et al., 2015), other researchers found that working remotely caused isolation and hindered knowledge sharing (Crandall & Gao, 2005). Lapiere et al. (2016) found that when working remotely from home was involuntary, there were negative implications for both work and family. Nevertheless, organizationally, the benefit is less overhead and increased productivity from employees benefiting from a work-life balance (Felstead & Henseke, 2017). According to Pass and Ridgway (2022), a digital presence cannot compensate for the complete corporate onsite experience as viewed from the co-worker's perspective. Furthermore, as telecommuting or working from home was mainly voluntary, previous research has been considered biased as those engaging in remote work were typically interested in it (Kaduk et al., 2019).

Engagement increased among employees who worked from home and sometimes in the office (Gallup, 2021). Due to the pandemic, employees have expressed increased attraction to this type of work arrangement (Pass & Ridgway, 2022), as many employees have adjusted their lives and adapted to this type of environment. Based on this adjustment, many organizations are taking a hybrid approach to working remotely and from the office after the pandemic (Sytych & Greer, 2020). While positive attention has been given to working in this type of work arrangement, not all experiences have been encouraging. Wang et al. (2021) claimed that work-home interference, ineffective communication, procrastination, and loneliness detracted employees from successful engagement. These inhibitors are impacted by four virtual work characteristics: social support, job autonomy, monitoring, and workload (Wang et al., 2021). The underlying factor that exists is employee self-discipline.

Research shows that each working practice or work arrangement has different advantages. Employees who work entirely onsite are not provided complete flexibility, job control, or autonomy (Fahriye et al., 2022). For some employees, entire onsite work is necessary for some occupations rather than a preference (Irawanto, 2020). Organizations that give employees more freedom and autonomy through working practices positively affect their perspectives on work and engagement (Fahriye et al., 2022). Employees can focus and fully concentrate more on their work when there is a work-life balance.

It is notably essential to understand that research has identified that remote work is not for all, even when it is not enforced (Pass & Ridgway, 2022). When employees have little choice in deciding their work arrangement, it may negatively impact their overall engagement (Carli, 2020). The present reality is that engagement is a well-documented topic in both the academic and practitioner scope; however, the impact of enforced work arrangement is under-theorized, potentially leading to an employee's intent to stay or leave the organization.

Based on this review, the following hypothesis is proposed:

*H1: There is a significant difference in employee engagement among Baby Boomers, Generation X, Millennials, and Generation Z employees. The null hypothesis indicates no significant difference in employee engagement among Baby Boomers, Generation X, Millennials, and Generation Z employees.*

## **TURNOVER INTENTION**

Turnover has been a popular subject for the last half-century because of the negative implications generated on organizations. Still today, companies are challenged with significant employee turnover. The challenge for any organization is to retain its employees to ensure organizational stability, continued growth, and, most importantly, profitability (Cloutier et al., 2015). Specific implications of employee turnover can lead to lower productivity and increased organizational administrative costs (Hom et al., 2017) because turnover is costly and inefficient (Hebenstreit, 2008). Employees' intent to leave their organization is a relatively strong indicator of definite turnover.

Turnover intention is "a mental decision prevailing between an individual's approach with reference to work to continue or leave the work" (Bothma & Roodt, 2013, p. 2). According to Ahmad (2018), employee turnover intentions are a cognitive response to working conditions that rouse the employee to potentially search for another job, ultimately leading to the intent to leave the company voluntarily. Dated research defines turnover as a "departure beyond organizational boundaries" (Macy & Mirvis, 1976, p. 224). Turnover intention can also be described as an individual's behavioral intention (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975). Researchers such as Lacity et al. (2008) have defined turnover intention as when an employee plans to exit the organization. Tett and Meyer (1993) believe the turnover intention is a conscious and willful intent to leave the organization. Harhara et al. (2015) emphasize that turnover intention is a literal measurement of understanding turnover before an employee voluntarily departs from the organization.

Several attempts were made to construct theoretical models for turnover intention; however, one leading model in the literature is the job resources-demands (JD-R) model (Rodríguez-Muñoz et al., 2014). The JD-R model presents turnover intention regarding available resources and job demands. Like the concept of supply and demand, employee fatigue prevails when demands are high, and resources are scarce to meet demands (Rodríguez-Muñoz et al., 2014). Once employee fatigue continuously builds, turnover intention begins to escalate. While this theoretical model is based on the physical impact on the employee, literature has recently focused on turnover intention models focused on conscious decision-making. Recent literature has focused more on turnover intention models consistent with a conscious decision-making process when employees consider their intent to be impacted by self-determination and organizational factors (Wikaningtyas et al., 2023). In a research study by Pamungkas et al. (2023), turnover intention is affected by workload, work stress, work-life balance, and work motivation. Furthermore, external factors like economic conditions play a role in an employee's subjectivity in forming an intent to leave (Demirtas & Akdogan, 2015). In addition, job fit and how well the individual fits in the organization and job role will influence turnover intent (Jutras & Mathieu, 2016).

### **Turnover Intention and Flexible Work Arrangements**

Flexible work arrangements are necessary for employees, especially when they have a voice in where they work. Hewlett (2014) published a systematic review regarding the importance of flexible work arrangements to employees and the need to implement such arrangements to retain a talented workforce. Outcomes from studies conducted by the Center for Talent Intervention showed that companies providing employees with the ability to partake in flexible work arrangements received greater employee engagement (Hewlett, 2014). Furthermore, employees who experience greater employee engagement exhibited stronger job satisfaction and had stronger intentions to stay with the organization, less negativity, and better mental health (Hewlett, 2014). Flexible work arrangements are critical tools employers use to attract and retain their workforce, reducing attrition.

O'Brien (2018) found that employees desired flexible working arrangements to gain affordable housing by working remotely in less expensive areas. An organization's capability to employ telecommuting practices improves job satisfaction and decreases turnover intentions (Ordóñez Parada, 2018). Work

arrangements and the change in employees' perception of technological advancements eased their life challenges; hence, employees were more likely to engage in voluntary turnover when organizations did not implement telecommuting practices (Rahman, 2020). Kaduk et al. (2019) conducted a study to provide insight into the differences between working remotely as a requirement and working remotely as a voluntary choice. To satisfy the needs of an employee, Ramakrishnan and Arokiasamy (2019) use the term flexible work practices, which gives employees flexibility in altering the length of their workday, scheduled workdays, and where their work is conducted. Kaduk et al. (2019) further elaborate on flexible work practices by assessing voluntary/aligned and involuntary/misaligned forms. Voluntary/aligned is when preference and physical location are the same, and involuntary/misaligned is when preference and physical location are different. The purpose of their study was to gain a better understanding of: 1) how common voluntary and involuntary forms of flexibility are, 2) which employees tend to report involuntary versus voluntary forms of flexible work practices, and 3) whether the two forms of flexibility have different associations with six well-being outcomes: work-family conflict, job satisfaction, turnover intention, employee burnout, perceived stress, and psychological distress. The researchers found that involuntary/misaligned flexible schedules and remote work were linked to higher stress levels, burnout, increased turnover intentions, and lower levels of job satisfaction. However, voluntary/aligned flexible options, including remote work, reflected the opposite results, such as less work-family conflict, decreased turnover intention, stress, and increased job satisfaction (Kaduk et al., 2019).

### **Generational Theory and Turnover Intention**

There is substantial literature on turnover intention and generational cohorts working in the corporate world. As Millennials and Gen Z employees rapidly enter the workforce, the corporate environment changes significantly. Some studies have indicated that turnover intention dominates among the Millennial and Gen Z cohorts (Kowske et al., 2010). In addition, other studies have revealed that Millennials and Gen Z are not rapidly leaving their job and report high job satisfaction levels (Twenge et al., 2010). Members of the older cohort generations, such as Baby Boomers and Gen X, are considered more committed to the organization they work for and are less likely to possess turnover intention (Johnson & Ng, 2016).

According to Kanchana and Jayathilaka (2023), job satisfaction is experienced when employees reach a self-fulfilling level of positive emotions, feelings, and attitudes on the job and overall workplace. Kim et al. (2016) found that satisfaction greatly impacted employee turnover regardless of the employee's generation. Unlike older employees, millennial employees typically do not foster a need to build loyalty with the organization, while turnover intentions appear significantly higher in new generations (Kanchana & Jayathilaka, 2023). More recent generations are more impatient with the organization than older generations; however, turnover intention remains low if their job satisfaction level is high enough (Kanchana & Jayathilaka, 2023). Millennials became known for their job-hopping patterns (Beka, 2021). Lake et al. (2018) studied the reasons behind the job-hopping patterns and discovered escape and advancement motives. Employees motivated to escape left the job because they disliked the work environment. On the reciprocal, individuals who exited the organization for advancement motives left their current job for career advancement opportunities (Lake et al., 2018).

While several factors account for why individuals intend to leave an organization, FWAs and differences in the generational cohorts tend to guide the decision-making as to when an employee may be experiencing symptoms of intending to leave the organization. Researchers have known over time that certain variables, such as the work environment, impact employee behavior (Kyriakidou & Ozbilgin, 2004). People placed in an environment that fits their needs or preferences are likelier to enjoy their work (Westerman & Yamamura, 2007). However, the reciprocal of unfit environment is true when employees are placed in a mismatched environment. Existing research on generational differences suggests that work environment preference likely exists within the cohorts. For example, Smola and Sutton (2002) indicated that younger employees were less loyal to the organization and took nothing as lasting forever. So, the outcome led to higher turnover intention and dissatisfaction when work preferences were not granted (Westerman & Yamamura, 2007). Fang et al. (2020) studied the relationship between work environment and turnover, as Millennials and Generation Z employees tended to have a higher frequency of employment

change. The findings suggest the need for further empirical studies regarding turnover intentions and their relationship to generational differences and work arrangements. Therefore, the following hypotheses are proposed:

**H2:** *There is a significant difference between Baby Boomers' preferred work arrangement (on-site, hybrid/flex, and telecommute/remote) and intent to stay with the organization. The null hypothesis indicates no significant difference between Baby Boomers' preferred work arrangement (on-site, hybrid/flex, and telecommute/remote) and intent to stay with the organization.*

**H3:** *There is a significant difference between Generation X's preferred work arrangement (on-site, hybrid/flex, and telecommute/remote) and intent to stay with the organization. The null hypothesis indicates no significant difference between Generation X's preferred work arrangement (on-site, hybrid/flex, and telecommute/remote) and intent to stay with the organization.*

**H4:** *There is a significant difference between Millennials' preferred work arrangement (on-site, hybrid/flex, and telecommute/remote) and intent to stay with the organization. The null hypothesis indicates no significant difference between Millennials' preferred work arrangement (on-site, hybrid/flex, and telecommute/remote) and intent to stay with the organization.*

**H5:** *There is a significant difference between Generation Z's preferred work arrangement (on-site, hybrid/flex, and telecommute/remote) and intent to stay with the organization. The null hypothesis indicates no significant difference between Generation Z's preferred work arrangement (on-site, hybrid/flex, and telecommute/remote) and intent to stay with the organization.*

## **METHOD**

### **Participants**

The study's population consisted of volunteer survey participants who work across the United States and whom SurveyMonkey® invited to participate in the questionnaire. The target population was full-time or part-time employees who work in an on-site, hybrid, or telecommuter work arrangement. The employee base includes Baby Boomers born between 1946 and 1964, Generation X born between 1965 and 1980, Millennials born between 1981 and 1996, and Generation Z born between 1997 and 2012, all of whom currently represent four of the five cohorts in the workplace today. To reach a 90% confidence level with a  $\pm 10\%$  error, 100 responses were required (Hair et al., 1995). To guarantee a minimum of 100 responses were received and increase the analysis' robustness, a minimum of 200 responses were requested. The SurveyMonkey® research team supplied survey takers with specific demographic criteria until the required 200 responses were obtained.

### **Measures**

The study used applicable and validated surveys from the appropriate literature. The 27-item e-survey instrument was administered via SurveyMonkey®. The questionnaire comprised five sections, with the first determining eligibility for the study. The second section collected the respondents' generational cohort. The third section collected respondents' preferred work arrangements. The fourth section is on work engagement, and the fifth is on turnover intent. The Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) is commonly utilized to measure work engagement and is focused on three factors, i.e. vigor, absorption, and dedication. The UWES "has an internal consistency ranging between  $\alpha = 0.80$  and  $\alpha = 0.90$ " (Schaufeli et al., 2006, p. 703). The Turnover Intention Scale (TIS) can predictively determine leavers and stayers, thereby "measuring turnover intention reliability ( $\alpha = 0.80$ ), confirming its criterion-predictive validity" (Bothma & Roodt, 2013, p. 10).

## RESULTS

A one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was implemented to determine whether there were any statistically significant differences between the means of two or more independent groups. The use of the one-way ANOVA aided this study by investigating the differences between generational cohorts and employee engagement, in addition to generational groups pertaining to the variables of preferred work arrangement and turnover intention. There was a significant difference in employee engagement amongst the generational groups,  $F(3,248) = 12.853$ ,  $p < .001$  (See Table 1, Appendix A). The results (See Table 2, Appendix A) also indicate engagement decreases with each generational cohort, ranging from a mean of 83.56 (Baby Boomers) to 62.47 (Generation Z) with different standard deviations (18.710 to 13.757). Tukeys post hoc test was generated to determine where the difference in engagement existed (See Table 3, Appendix A). There was an increase in engagement of Baby Boomers ( $M = 83.6$ ,  $SD = 16$ ) from the engagement of Millennials ( $M = 69.0$ ,  $SD = 15$ ), a mean increase of 14.6, 95% CI [-23.5, -5.8], which was statistically significant ( $p < .05$ ). There was an increase in engagement of Baby Boomers ( $M = 83.6$ ,  $SD = 16$ ) from the engagement of Generation Z ( $M = 62.5$ ,  $SD = 14$ ), a mean increase of 21.1, 95% CI [-33.6, -8.5], which was statistically significant ( $p < .05$ ).

Intent to stay with the organization varied as there was no significant difference in preferred work arrangements between Baby Boomers, Millennials, and Generation Z employees. However, for Generation X, there was a significant difference in preferred work arrangement and intent to stay with the organization (Tables 4-6, Appendix A). There was an increase in the impact of the on-site work arrangement on Generation Xers' turnover intention ( $M = 15.7$ ,  $SD = 5$ ) from the impact of the hybrid/flex work arrangement ( $M = 20.3$ ,  $SD = 5$ ), a mean increase of 4.6, 95% CI [1.9, 7.3], which was statistically significant ( $p < .05$ ). There was an increase in the impact of the on-site work arrangement on Generation Xers' turnover intention ( $M = 15.7$ ,  $SD = 5$ ) from the impact of the telecommute/remote work arrangement ( $M = 20.3$ ,  $SD = 4$ ), a mean increase of 4.6, 95% CI [1.4, 7.8], which was statistically significant ( $p < .05$ ).

## DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

The purpose of this research was to understand generational preferred work arrangements and their impact on employee engagement and intent to stay with the organization. According to Kim et al. (2023), when employees are assigned their preferred work location, organizations receive valuable outcomes from employees, such as engagement, job satisfaction, and trust. Furthermore, employees' intent to leave could be perceived by their control over their preferred work arrangement (Gerdenitsch et al., 2015). Because of this, it was hypothesized there was a difference in employee engagement among Baby Boomer, Generation X, Millennial, and Generation Z employees. Plus, there is a difference in preferred work arrangement and intent to stay with the organization.

Examining how the study findings fit with the existing evidence is necessary. Consistent with Hlongwane and Ledimo (2015), the generational cohorts differ in the dimensions of employee engagement. On the contrary, Abercrombie (2014) suggests no significant difference existed between Baby Boomers, Gen X, and Millennials. However, during past empirical research, Gen Z was fairly new to the workplace, so little research existed. Still, this current study suggests Gen Z employees, too, differ in engagement. Ultimately, human resource managers can develop engagement programs fit for all employees. However, the results of this current study suggest a significant difference in employee engagement among Baby Boomers, Gen X, Millennials, and Gen Z employees, along with a decrease in engagement with each generational cohort. Importantly, organizations should ensure leaders have a clear understanding of the unique attributes needed that drive employee engagement, particularly the unique attributes that may drive each of the generational cohorts to remain engaged while in the workplace. The research presented in this study on employee engagement adds to the generational research already built on the foundation of Generational Theory. Confirmation of the hypothesis is also extended that a significant difference in engagement exists between the generational cohorts.

Researchers have known over time that certain variables, such as the work environment, impact employee behavior (Kyriakidou & Ozbilgin, 2004). Existing research on generational differences suggests that work environment preference likely exists within the cohorts. For example, Smola and Sutton (2002) indicated that younger employees were less loyal to the organization and took nothing as lasting forever. So, the outcome led to higher turnover intention and dissatisfaction when work preferences were not granted (Westerman & Yamamura, 2007). Fang et al. (2020) studied the relationship between work environment and turnover, as Millennials and Generation Z employees tended to have a higher frequency of employment change. The current study challenged existing research and indicated no relationship between work arrangement and intent to stay with the organization between Baby Boomers, Millennials, and Gen Z employees. However, Gen X employees had a significant relationship between work arrangements and intent to stay with the organization.

Organizationally, it is necessary to understand that the older and younger generations may not differ in their preferred work arrangement or intent to stay with the organization because of age differences. For example, Generation Z employees are digital natives (Mohr & Mohr, 2017), yet Baby Boomers have remained in the workforce longer and learned the new digital ways. Despite the work arrangement, Baby Boomers, Millennials, and Gen Z employees occupy, leaders may not necessarily be threatened by their employees' intention to leave the organization for other work options comparable to their work preferences.

On the other hand, the results suggested for Generation Xers, there was a significant relationship between preferred work arrangement and intent to stay with the organization. There was an increase in the impact of the on-site, hybrid/flex, and telecommuter work arrangement on Generation X's turnover intention. This can mean employees are already looking for other employment opportunities that fit their preferences. Negative implications can exist for leaders as highly skilled workers begin to leave the organization.

## **FUTURE RESEARCH**

Future research can expand on the outcomes of this study. Researchers can duplicate the existing study and administer it in a different country to see if the findings would be different, possibly providing more understanding of generational differences. Secondly, adding a gender component to each generational cohort might reveal more insight into which gender within each generational cohort prefers a particular work arrangement, is more engaged, and is more likely to stay with the organization. Thirdly, future researchers can extend this research and examine how generational differences exist when employers decide on the employee's work arrangement, with no input from the employee.

## **REFERENCES**

- Abercrombie, B.A. (2014). *Multigenerational workforce satisfaction: Relationship between generational cohorts and employee engagement* (Publication No. 3641276) [Doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.
- Adams, S.J. (2000). Generation X: How understanding this population leads to better safety programs. *Professional Safety*, 45(1), 26. Retrieved from <https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/generation-x-how-understanding-this-population/docview/200457899/se-2>
- Ahmad, A. (2018). The relationship among job characteristics, organizational commitment, and employee turnover intentions: A reciprocation perspective. *Journal of Work-Applied Management*, 10(1), 74–92. DOI: 10.1108/JWAM-09-2017-0027
- AhmadReza, A.S., Abzari, M., Ali, N.I., & Fathi, S. (2017). Generational differences in job engagement: A case study of an industrial organization in Iran. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 49(3), 106–115. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ICT-10-2016-0068>
- Akmalia, & Adhitama, G.P. (2023). Flexible work arrangement factors that affect startup employees in new normal situation. *Journal of Application Business & Management / Jurnal Aplikasi Bisnis Dan Manajemen*, 9(3), 855–865. <https://doi.org/10.17358/jabm.9.3.855>

- Allen, T.D., Golden, T.D., & Shockley, K.M. (2015). How effective is telecommuting? Assessing the status of our scientific findings. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 16(2), 40–68. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1529100615593273>
- Amayah, A.T., & Gedro, J. (2014). Understanding generational diversity: Strategic human resource management and development across the generational “divide”. *New Horizons in Adult Education and Human Resource Development*, 26(2), 36–48. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nha3.20061>
- Andriani, R., Disman, D., Ahman, E., & Santoso, B. (2023). Empirical effects of work environment, job satisfaction, and work engagement on turnover intention in the hospitality industry. *Journal of Application Business & Management*, 9(1), 129–140. <https://doi.org/10.17358/jabm.9.1.129>
- Annanya, P., & Hemakumar, M. (2023). Hybrid work model and its association between team collaboration and team engagement. *Phronimos*, 3(2), 61–71. Retrieved from <https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/hybrid-work-model-association-between-team/docview/2843887601/se-2>
- Bakker, A.B., Hakanen, J.J., Demerouti, E., & Xanthopoulou, D. (2007). Job resources boost work engagement, particularly when job demands are high. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 99(2), 274–284. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.99.2.274>
- Beka. (2021). Restless workers looking for something better, survey says. *Central Penn Business Journal*, 1(1), 1–2. Retrieved from <https://www.proquest.com/trade-journals/restless-workers-looking-something-better-survey/docview/2589679604/se-2>
- Botha, F., & Vera-Toscano, E. (2022). Generational differences in subjective well-being in Australia. *Applied Research in Quality of Life*, 17(5), 2903–2932. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11482-022-10047-x>
- Bothma, C.F.C., & Roodt, G. (2013). The validation of the turnover intention scale. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, 11(1), 1–12. doi: 10.4102/sajhrm.v11i1.507
- Carli, L.L. (2020). Women, gender equality and COVID-19. *Gender in Management: An International Journal*, 35(7/8), 647–655. <https://doi.org/10.1108/GM-07-2020-0236>
- Cennamo, L., & Gardner, D. (2008). Generational differences in work values, outcomes, and person-organization values fit. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 23(8), 891–906. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940810904385>
- Charalampous, M., Grant, C.A., Tramontano, C., & Michailidis, E. (2019). Systematically reviewing remote e-workers’ well-being at work: A multidimensional approach. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 28(1), 51–73. <https://doi-org.waylandbu.idm.oclc.org/10.1080/1359432X.2018.1541886>
- Chillakuri, B. (2020). Understanding Generation Z expectations for effective onboarding. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 33(7), 1277–1296. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JOCM-02-2020-0058>
- Chomqtowska, B., Janiak-Rejno, I., & Żarczyńska-Dobiesz, A. (2021). The value of work in the life of representants of Generation Z – Autotelic or instrumental? *European Research Studies*, 24(4), 356–368. Retrieved from <https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/value-work-life-representants-generation-z/docview/2640099746/se-2>
- Christian, M.S., Garza, A.S., & Slaughter, J.E. (2011). Work engagement: A quantitative review and test of its relations with task and contextual performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 64(1), 89–136. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2010.01203.x>
- Clark, K.R. (2017). Managing multiple generations in the workplace. *Radiologic Technology*, 88(4), 379–396. Retrieved from <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/28298496/>
- Cloutier, O., Felusiak, L., Hill, C., & Pemberton-Jones, E. (2015). The importance of developing strategies for employee retention. *Journal of Leadership, Accountability and Ethics*, 12(2), 119–129. Retrieved from [http://www.na-businesspress.com/JLAE/Pemberton-JonesEJ\\_Web12\\_2\\_.pdf](http://www.na-businesspress.com/JLAE/Pemberton-JonesEJ_Web12_2_.pdf)
- Codrington, G. (2008, July). Detailed introduction to generational theory. *Tomorrow Today*. Retrieved from <https://tomorrowtodayglobal.com/>



- Cook, J., Mor, Y., & Santos, P. (2020). Three cases of hybridity in learning spaces: Towards a design for a zone of possibility. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 51(4), 1155–1167. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12945>
- Cook, S. (2008). *The essential guide to employee engagement: Better business performance through staff satisfaction*. Kogan Page Publishers.
- Crandall, W., & Gao, L. (2005). An update on telecommuting: Review and prospects for emerging issues. *S.A.M. Advanced Management Journal*, 70(3), 30–37. Retrieved from <https://waylandbu.idm.oclc.org/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/update-on-telecommuting-review-prospects-emerging/docview/231260559/se-2>
- Creighton, S., & Hudson, L. (2001). Participation trends and patterns in adult education: 1991 to 1999. *Education Statistics Quarterly*, 3(4), 15–18. Retrieved from <https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2002/2002607.pdf#page=15>
- Crowe, A., & Gaytan, J. (2019). Responding to generational differences in workplace engagement: Successful strategies for business managers. *Journal of Research in Business Education*, 59(2), 21–40. Retrieved from <https://jrbe.nbea.org/index.php/jrbe/article/view/25>
- Cucina, J.M., Byle, K.A., Martin, N.R., Peyton, S.T., & Gast, I.F. (2018). Generational differences in workplace attitudes and job satisfaction: Lack of sizable differences across cohorts. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 33(3), 246–264. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMP-03-2017-0115>
- Danish, R.Q., Ramzan, S., & Ahmad, F. (2013). Effect of perceived organizational support and work environment on organizational commitment: Mediating role of self-monitoring. *Advances in Economics and Business*, 1(4), 312–317. DOI: 10.13189/aeb.2013.010402
- Day, J. (2023). *Baby Boomers, Gen X, Millennials, and Gen Z teachers: A comparison of generational preferences for leadership practices* (Publication No. 30540085) [Doctoral dissertation, Purdue University]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.
- De Menezes, L.M., & Kelliher, C. (2016). Flexible working, individual performance, and employee attitudes: Comparing formal and informal arrangements. *Human Resource Management*, 56(6), 1051–1070. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.21822>
- Deci, E.L., & Ryan, R.M. (1995). Human autonomy: The basis for true self-esteem. In *Efficacy, agency, and self-esteem* (pp. 31–49). Springer US.
- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A.B., De Jonge, J., Janssen, P.P., & Schaufeli, W.B. (2001). Burnout and engagement at work as a function of demands and control. *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment & Health*, 27(4), 279–286. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40967145>
- Demirtas, O., & Akdogan, A.A. (2015). The effect of ethical leadership behavior on ethical climate, turnover intention, and affective commitment. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 130(1), 59–67. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-014-2196-6>
- Dharmesti, M., Dharmesti, T.R.S., Kuhne, S., & Thaichon, P. (2021). Understanding online shopping behaviors and purchase intentions amongst millennials. *Young Consumers*, 22(1), 152–167. <https://doi.org/10.1108/YC-12-2018-0922>
- Dimock, M. (2019). The generations defined. *Pew Research Center*. Retrieved from <https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2019/01/17/where-millennials-end-and-generation-z-begins/>
- Dorsey, J.R., & Villa, D. (2020). *Zconomy: How Gen A will change the future of business and what to do about it*. HarperCollins Publishers.
- Eisenberger, R., Armeli, S., Rexwinkel, B., Lynch, P.D., & Rhoades, L. (2001). Reciprocation of perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(1), 42–51. DOI:10.1037/0021-9010.86.1.42
- Eisner, S.P. (2005). Managing generation Y. *SAM Advanced Management Journal*, 70(4), 4–15. Retrieved from <https://www.proquest.com/docview/231242493?pq-riqsite=gscholar&fromopenview=true>

- Ellison, S. (2020). *Assessing work engagement among UF/IFAS Extension Agents using the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale* (Order No. 28155037) [Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida]. ProQuest Central Dissertations & Theses Global.
- Ertas, N. (2015). Turnover intentions and work motivations of millennial employees in federal service. *Public Personnel Management, 44*(3), 401–423. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0091026015588193>
- Fahriye, O.U., Gozukara, E., & Tezcan, L. (2022). The moderating roles of remote, hybrid, and onsite working on the relationship between work engagement and organizational identification during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Sustainability, 14*(24), DOI: 10.3390/su142416828
- Fang, Y.C., Chen, J.Y., Zhang, X.D., Dai, X.X., & Tsai, F.S. (2020). The impact of inclusive talent development model on turnover intention of new generation employees: The mediation of work passion. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 17*(17), 6054–6055. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17176054>
- Felstead, A., & Henseke, G. (2017). Assessing the growth of remote working and its consequences for effort, well-being, and work-life balance. *New Technology, Work and Employment, 32*(3), 195–212. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ntwe.12097>
- Ferry, J.M. (2023). *Exploring perceptions of virtual meeting effectiveness: A multigenerational PLS-SEM approach* (Order No. 30634319) [Doctoral dissertation, University of Arizona Global Campus]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.
- Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1975). *Belief, attitude, intention and behavior: An introduction to theory and research*. Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Ford, D., Myrden, S.E., & Jones, T.D. (2015). Understanding “disengagement from knowledge sharing”: Engagement theory versus adaptive cost theory. *Journal of Knowledge Management, 19*(3), 476–496. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-11-2014-0469>
- Francis, D., & Hoefel, F. (2018, November 12). “True Gen:” Generation Z and its implications for companies. McKinsey Company. Retrieved from <https://www.mckinsey.com/industries/consumer-packaged-goods/our-insights/true-generation-z-and-its-implications-for-companies#>
- Fredrickson, B.L. (2001). The role of positive emotions in positive psychology: The broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions. *American Psychologist, 56*(3), 218–226. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.56.3.218>
- Fry, R. (2019). *Baby Boomers are staying in the labor force at rates not seen in generations for people their age*. Pew Research Center. Retrieved from <https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2019/07/24/baby-boomers-us-labor-force/>
- Gallup. (2021). *State of the Global Workplace 2021 Report*. Retrieved from <https://www.gallup.com/workplace/349484/state-of-the-global-workplace.aspx>
- Geldenhuis, M., Łaba, K., & Venter, C.M. (2014). Meaningful work, work engagement, and organizational commitment. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology, 40*(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajip.v40i1.1098>
- Gerdenitsch, C., Kubicek, B., & Korunka, C. (2015). Control in flexible working arrangements. *Journal of Personnel Psychology, 14*(2), 61–69. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1866-5888/a000121>
- Gillet, N., Huyghebaert-Zouaghi, T., Austin, S., Fernet, C., & Morin, A.J.S. (2021). Remote working: A double-edged sword for workers’ personal and professional well-being. *Journal of Management and Organization, 27*(5), 1060–1082. DOI: 10.1017/jmo.2021.71
- Glass, A. (2007). Understanding generational differences for competitive success. *Industrial and Commercial Training, 39*(2), 98–103. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00197850710732424>
- Gursoy, D., Chi, C.G.-Q., & Karadag, E. (2013). Generational differences in work values and attitudes among frontline and service contact employees. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 32*, 40–48. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2012.04.002>
- Gursoy, D., Maier, T.A., & Chi, C.G. (2008). Generational differences: An examination of work values and generational gaps in the hospitality workforce. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 27*(3), 448–458. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2007.11.002>

- Hadi, P., & Johan, A. (2023). The effect of perceived organizational support on career commitment: The mediating role of work engagement. *Calitatea*, 24(196), 148–155. <https://doi.org/10.47750/QAS/24.196.20>
- Hair, J.F., Anderson, R.E., Tatham, R.L., & Black, W.C. (1995). *Multivariate data analysis* (3<sup>rd</sup> Ed.). Macmillan.
- Hansen, J.I.C., & Leuty, M.E. (2012). Work values across generations. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 20(1), 34–52. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1069072711417163>
- Harhara, A.S., Singh, S.K., & Hussain, M. (2015). Correlates of employee turnover intentions in oil and gas industry in the UAE. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 23(3), 493–504. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-11-2014-0821>
- Hart, S.M. (2006). Generational diversity: Impact on recruitment and retention of registered nurses. *JONA: The Journal of Nursing Administration*, 36(1), 10–12. Retrieved from [https://journals.lww.com/jonajournal/citation/2006/01000/generational\\_diversity\\_impact\\_on\\_recruitment\\_and.4.aspx](https://journals.lww.com/jonajournal/citation/2006/01000/generational_diversity_impact_on_recruitment_and.4.aspx)
- Harter, J.K., Schmidt, F.L., & Hayes, T.L. (2002). Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(2), 268–279. doi: 10.1037//0021-9010.87.2.268
- Hebenstreit, R.K. (2008). A call to apply the principles of the enneagram in organizations to attract, retain, and motivate employees. *The Enneagram Journal*, 1(1), 4–21, 124. Retrieved from <https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/call-apply-principles-enneagram-organizations/docview/205936116/se-2>
- Hernaus, T., & Vokic, N.P. (2014). Work design for different generational cohorts. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 27(4), 615–641. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JOCM-05-2014-0104>
- Hewlett, S. (2014). Flextime is declining, but “flex around the edges” is up. *Harvard Business Review Digital Articles*, pp. 2–4. Retrieved from <https://hbr.org/2014/06/flextime-is-declining-but-flex-around-the-edges-is-up>
- Hill, E.J., Ferris, M., & Mårtinson, V. (2003). Does it matter where you work? A comparison of how three work venues (traditional office, virtual office, and home office) influence aspects of work and personal/family life. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 63(2), 220–241. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0001-8791\(03\)00042-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0001-8791(03)00042-3)
- Hill, J., Grzywacz, J.G., Allen, S., Blanchard, V.L., Matz-Costa, C., Shulkin, S., & Pitt-Catsouphes, M. (2008). Defining and conceptualizing workplace flexibility. *Community, Work, and Family*, 11(2), 149–163. doi: 10.1080/13668800802024678
- Hill, K.S. (2004). Defy the decades with multigenerational teams. *Nursing Management*, 35(1), 32–35. Retrieved from [https://journals.lww.com/nursingmanagement/abstract/2004/01000/defy\\_the\\_decades\\_with\\_multigenerational\\_teams.12.aspx](https://journals.lww.com/nursingmanagement/abstract/2004/01000/defy_the_decades_with_multigenerational_teams.12.aspx)
- Hlongwane, V.C., & Ledimo, O. (2015). Generational differences on work engagement levels of government healthcare institution employees. *Journal of Governance and Regulation*, 4(1), 1–9. Retrieved from <https://ijebhb.com/index.php/ijebhb/article/view/11>
- Hom, P.W., Lee, T.W., Shaw, J.D., & Hausknecht, J.P. (2017). One hundred years of employee turnover theory and research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102(3), 530–545. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000103>
- Hoole, C., & Bonnema, J. (2015). Work engagement and meaningful work across generational cohorts. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, 13(1), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajhrm.v13i1.681>

- Hunsicker, J. (2023). *Remote working arrangements in the context of employee engagement and motivation among remote and on-site employees: A quantitative comparison* (Order No. 30638100). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (2884075478). Retrieved from <https://www.proquest.com/dissertations-theses/remote-working-arrangements-context-employee/docview/2884075478/se-2>
- Ida, I., Zaniarti, S., & Ayuningtyas, N. (2021). Faktor prediktor financial management behavior generasi X. *Jurnal Muara Ilmu Ekonomi Dan Bisnis*, 5(1), 179–190. <https://doi.org/10.24912/jmieb.v5i1.11439>
- Illegems, V., Verbeke, A., & S'Jegers, R. (2001). The organizational context of teleworking implementation. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 68(3), 275–291. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0040-1625\(00\)00105-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0040-1625(00)00105-0)
- Irawanto, D. W. (2020). Unexpected and habit driven: Perspectives of working from home during the COVID-19 pandemic. *APMBA (Asia Pacific Management and Business Application)*, 8(3), 165–168. <https://doi.org/10.21776/ub.apmba.2020.008.03.1>
- Iscan, O.F., & Naktiyok, A. (2005). Attitudes towards telecommuting: The Turkish case. *Journal of Information Technology*, 20(1), 52–63. <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.jit.2000023>
- Johnson, J.M., & Ng, E.S. (2016). Money talks or millennials walk: The effect of compensation on non-profit millennial workers sector-switching intentions. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 36(3), 283–305. doi: 10.1177/0734371X15587980
- Jonck, P., van der Walt, F., & Sobayeni, N.C. (2017). A generational perspective on work values in a South African sample. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 43(1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajip.v43i1.1393>
- Jones, J.S., Murray, S.R., & Tapp, S.R. (2018). Generational differences in the workplace. *Journal of Business Diversity*, 18(2), 88–97. Retrieved from <https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/generational-differences-workplace/docview/2116336231/se-2>
- Jones, S., Chauhan, P., & Torabian, A. (2019). Working with different generations at the workplace: Challenges for leaders. *Effective Executive*, 22(4), 64–70. Retrieved from <https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/working-with-different-generations-at-workplace/docview/2330759508/se-2>
- Jutras, R., & Mathieu, C. (2016). Person-organization fit relationship with job satisfaction and turnover: The mediating influence of leader-member exchange. *Academy of Strategic Management Journal*, 15(1), 71. Retrieved from <https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/person-organization-fit-relationship-with-job/docview/1804900129/se-2>
- Kaduk, A., Genadek, K., Kelly, E.L., & Moen, P. (2019). Involuntary vs. voluntary flexible work: Insights for scholars and stakeholders. *Community, Work & Family*, 22(4), 412–442. doi:10.1080/13668803.2019.1616532
- Kahn, W.A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(4), 692–724. <https://doi.org/10.5465/256287>
- Kanchana, L., & Jayathilaka, R. (2023). Factors impacting employee turnover intentions among professionals in Sri Lankan startups. *PLoS ONE*, 18(2). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0281729>
- Kiiru-Weatherly, P. (2017). *Multigenerational workforce: Relationship between generational cohorts and employee engagement* (Publication No. 10254108). [Doctoral dissertation, Wilmington University]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.
- Kim, M., Knutson, B.J., & Choi, L. (2016). The effects of employee voice and delight on job satisfaction and behaviors: Comparison between employee generations. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 25(5), 563–588. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19368623.2015.1067665>
- Kim, M.S., Misra, K., & Phillips, J.M. (2023). Individual differences in reactions to work location decisions. *Organization Management Journal*, 20(1), 17–29. <https://doi.org/10.1108/OMJ-06-2021-1281>

- Koksal, M.H. (2019). Differences among baby boomers, Generation X, millennials, and Generation Z wine consumers in Lebanon: Some perspectives. *International Journal of Wine Business Research*, 31(3), 456–472. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJWBR-09-2018-0047>
- Kowske, B., Rasch, R., & Wiley, J. (2010). Millennials' (lack of) attitude problems: An empirical examination of generational effects on work attitudes. *Journal of Business & Psychology*, 25(2), 265–279. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-010-9171-8>
- Krajčič, M., Schmidt, D.A., & Baráth, M. (2023). Hybrid work model: An approach to work–life flexibility in a changing environment. *Administrative Sciences*, 13(6), 150. <https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci13060150>
- Kristof, A.L. (1996). Person-organization fit: An integrative review of its conceptualizations, measurement, and implications. *Personnel Psychology*, 49(1), 1–49. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.1996.tb01790.x
- Kupperschmidt, B.R. (2000). Multigeneration employees: Strategies for effective management. *The Health Care Manager*, 19(1), 65–76. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00126450-200019010-00011>
- Kurland, N.B., & Cooper, C.D. (2002). Manager control and employee isolation in telecommuting environments. *The Journal of High Technology Management Research*, 13(1), 107–126. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1047-8310\(01\)00051-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1047-8310(01)00051-7)
- Kyriakidou, O., & Ozbilgin, M. (2004). Individuals, organizations and careers: A relational perspective. *Career Development International*, 9(1), 7–11. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13620430410518101>
- Lacity, M.C., Iyer, V.V., & Rudramuniyaiah, P.S. (2008). Turnover intentions of Indian IS professionals. *Information Systems Frontiers*, 10, 225–241. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10796-007-9062-3>
- Lake, C.J., Highhouse, S., & Shrift, A.G. (2018). Validation of the Job-Hopping Motives Scale. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 26(3), 531–548. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1069072717722765>
- Lancaster, L., & Stillman, D. (2002). *When generations collide*. Harper Business.
- Lanier, K. (2017). 5 things HR professionals need to know about Generation Z: Thought leaders share their views on the HR profession and its direction for the future. *Strategic HR Review*, 16(6), 228–290. <http://doi.org/10.1108/SHR-08-2017-0051>
- Lapierre, L.M., Van Steenberg, E.F., Peeters, M.C., & Kluwer, E.S. (2016). Juggling work and family responsibilities when involuntarily working more from home: A multiwave study of financial sales professionals. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 37(6), 804–822. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2075>
- Lapoint, P.A., & Liprie-Spence, A. (2017). Employee engagement: Generational differences in the workforce. *Journal of Organizational Psychology*, 17(5), 118–128. Retrieved from <https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/employee-engagement-generational-differences/docview/1967314710/se-2>
- Lassiter, V. (2020). *The differences in job satisfaction, engagement, and dedication between full-time remote and non-remote employees* (Publication No. 28150737). [Doctoral dissertation, Trevecca Nazarene University]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.
- Lee, C.C., Aravamudhan, V., Roback, T., Lim, H.S., & Ruane, S.G. (2021). Factors impacting work engagement of Gen Z employees: A regression analysis. *Journal of Leadership, Accountability and Ethics*, 18(3), 147–159. Retrieved from <https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/factors-impacting-work-engagement-gen-z-employees/docview/2561986429/se-2>
- Leiter, M.P., & Bakker, A.B. (2010). *Work engagement: A handbook of essential theory and research*. Taylor & Francis. Retrieved from [https://www.google.com/books/edition/Work\\_Engagement/IZJ5AgAAQBAJ?hl=en&gbp=1&dq=Work+engagement:+A+handbook+of+essential+theory+and+research.&pg=PP1&printsec=frontcover](https://www.google.com/books/edition/Work_Engagement/IZJ5AgAAQBAJ?hl=en&gbp=1&dq=Work+engagement:+A+handbook+of+essential+theory+and+research.&pg=PP1&printsec=frontcover)
- Lester, S.W., Standifer, R.L., Schultz, N.J., & Windsor, J.M. (2012). Actual versus perceived generational differences at work. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 19(3), 341–354. doi:10.1177/1548051812442747

- Lindström, J., Rapp, B., & Lindström, J. (1996). On costs in teleworking. *International Transactions in Operational Research*, 3(1), 51–63. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-3995.1996.tb00035.x>
- Lupton, P., & Haynes, B. (2000). Teleworking—the perception-reality gap. *Facilities*, 18(7/8), 323–328. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02632770010340726>
- Macy, B.A., & Mirvis, P.H. (1976). A methodology for assessment of quality of work life and organizational effectiveness in behavioral-economic terms. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 21(2), 212–226. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2392043>
- Makhmut, K.D.I., Armanu, & Kurniawati, D.T. (2023). Mediating employee engagement at the Pratama Tax Services Office in East Java III: The effect of employee engagement and organizational culture on employee performance. *International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science*, 12(1), 110–120. DOI: 10.20525/ijrbs.v12i1.2270
- Martin, T.N., & Ottemann, R. (2016). Generational workforce demographic trends and total organizational rewards which might attract and retain different generational employees. *Journal of Behavioral and Applied Management*, 16(2), 91–115. Retrieved from <https://jbam.scholasticahq.com/article/1160-generational-workforce-demographic-trends-and-total-organizational-rewards-which-might-attract-and-retain-different-generational-employees>
- Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W.B., & Leiter, M.P. (2001). Job burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52(1), 397–422. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.397>
- May, D.R., Gilson, R.L., & Harter, L.M. (2004). The psychological conditions of meaningfulness, safety, and availability and the engagement of the human spirit at work. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 77(1), 11–37. <https://doi.org/10.1348/096317904322915892>
- McDaniel, B.T., O'Connor, K., & Drouin, M. (2021). Work-related technoferece at home and feelings of work spillover, overload, life satisfaction, and job satisfaction. *International Journal of Workplace Health Management*, 14(5), 526–541. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJWHM-11-2020-0197>
- Mohr, K.A., & Mohr, E.S. (2017). Understanding Generation Z students to promote a contemporary learning environment. *Journal on Empowering Teaching Excellence*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.15142/T3M05T>
- Nazir, O., & Islam, J.U. (2017). Enhancing organizational commitment and employee performance through employee engagement: An empirical check. *South Asian Journal of Business Studies*, 6(1), 98–114. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SAJBS-04-2016-0036>
- Nilles, J. (1992). Teleworking: Working closer to home. *Technology Review*, 85(3), 56–62. Retrieved from <https://www.proquest.com/magazines/teleworking-working-closer-home/docview/195341992/se-2>
- Nilles, J.M., Carlson, F.R., Gray, P., & Hanneman, G. (1976). Telecommuting—An alternative to urban transportation congestion. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics*, 6(2), 77–84. doi: 10.1109/TSMC.1976.5409177
- O'Bannon, G. (2001). Managing our future: The generation X factor. *Public Personnel Management*, 30(1), 95–110. <https://doi.org/10.1177/009102600103000109>
- O'Brien, J. (2018). “Flexible work” the new normal for fourth industrial revolution: Hays. Retrieved from <https://www.cio.com/article/213688/flexible-work-the-new-normal-for-fourth-industrial-revolution-hays.htm>
- Obuobisa-Darko, T. (2020). Ensuring employee task performance: Role of employee engagement. *Performance Improvement*, 59(8), 12–23. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pfi.21929>
- Ordóñez Parada, A.I. (2018). Factors that influence job satisfaction of teleworkers: Evidence from Mexico. *Global Journal of Business Research*, 12(1), 41–49. Retrieved from <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3210868>
- Pamungkas, W., Nadia, T.B., Haryanto, R., & Gundai, W. (2023). Factors affecting millennials' job turnover intention during the implementation of work from home. *Revista de Cercetare Si Interventie Sociala*, 80, 139–160. Retrieved from <https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/factors-affecting-millennials-job-turnover/docview/2845456820/se-2>

- Parment, A. (2013). Generation Y vs. Baby Boomers: Shopping behavior, buyer involvement and implications for retailing. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 20(2), 189–199. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2012.12.001>
- Pasko, R., Maellaro, R., & Stodnick, M. (2021). A study of millennials' preferred work-related attributes and retention. *Employee Relations*, 43(3), 774–787. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ER-05-2020-0224>
- Pass, S., & Ridgway, M. (2022). An informed discussion on the impact of COVID-19 and “enforced” remote working on employee engagement. *Human Resource Development International*, 25(2), 254–270. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13678868.2022.2048605>
- Pataki-Bittó, F., & Kapusy, K. (2021). Work environment transformation in the post COVID-19 based on work values of the future workforce. *Journal of Corporate Real Estate*, 23(3), 151–169. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JCRE-08-2020-0031>
- Patterson, C.K. (2007). The impact of generational diversity in the workplace. *Diversity Factor (Online)*, 15(3), 17–22. Retrieved from <https://www.proquest.com/trade-journals/impact-generational-diversity-workplace/docview/213963610/se-2>
- Pavlik, A. (2020). Humanize the experience, be flexible when it comes to remote working arrangements. *The Successful Registrar*, 20(4), 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tsr.30717>
- Pech, R.J., & Slade, B. (2006). Employee disengagement: Is there evidence of a growing problem? *Handbook of Business Strategy*, 7(1), 21–25. doi: 10.1108/10775730610618585
- Pilcher, J. (1994). Mannheim's sociology of generations: An undervalued legacy. *British Journal of Sociology*, 45(3), 481–495. <https://doi.org/10.2307/591659>
- Pitt-Catsouphes, M., & Matz-Costa, C. (2008). The multi-generational workforce: Workplace flexibility and engagement. *Community, Work and Family*, 11(2), 215–229. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13668800802021906>
- Popli, S., & Rizvi, I.A. (2015). Exploring the relationship between service orientation, employee engagement and perceived leadership style: A study of managers in the private service sector organizations in India. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 29(1), 59–70. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jsm-06-2013-0151>
- Rafiki, M., & Hartijasti, Y. (2022). Generational differences in dimensions of work values of Indonesian permanent employees. *Advances in Economics, Business, and Management Research*, 647, 298–304. <https://doi.org/10.2991/aebmr.k.220304.039>
- Rahardyan, T.M., Bakri, M.R., & Utami, A. (2023). Generation gap in fraud prevention: Study on Generation Z, Generation X, millennials, and boomers. *International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science*, 12(3), 361–375. <https://doi.org/10.20525/ijrbs.v12i3.2566>
- Rahman, S.M. (2020). Relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intention: Evidence from Bangladesh. *Asian Business Review*, 10(2), 99–108. <https://doi.org/10.18034/abr.v10i2.470>
- Ramakrishnan, S., & Arokiasamy, L. (2019). Flexible working arrangements in Malaysia: A study of employee performance on white-collar employees. *Global Business and Management Research*, 11(1), 551–559. Retrieved from <https://www.proquest.com/docview/2236125482?pq-origsite=gscholar&fromopenview=true>
- Rapert, M.I., & Wren, B. M. (1998). Reconsidering organizational structure: A dual perspective of frameworks and processes. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 10(3), 287–302. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40604200>
- Rich, B.L., LePine, J.A., & Crawford, E.R. (2010). Job engagement: Antecedents and effects on job performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(3), 617–635. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2010.51468988>
- Rodríguez-Muñoz, A., Sanz-Vergel, A.I., Demerouti, E., & Bakker, A.B. (2014). Engaged at work and happy at home: A spillover–crossover model. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 15, 271–283. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-013-9421-3>
- Ryder, N.B. (1985). The cohort as a concept in the study of social change. In *Cohort analysis in social research: Beyond the identification problem* (pp. 9–44). Springer. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4613-8536-3\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4613-8536-3_2)

- Saks, A.M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 21*(7), 600–619. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940610690169>
- Saks, A.M. (2019). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement revisited. *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness, 6*(1), 19–38. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JOEPP-06-2018-0034>
- Salahuddin, M.M. (2010). Generational differences impact on leadership style and organizational success. *Journal of Diversity Management, 5*(2), 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.19030/jdm.v5i2.805>
- Saratun, M. (2016). Performance management to enhance employee engagement for corporate sustainability. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Business Administration, 8*(1), 84–102. <https://doi.org/10.1108/apjba-07-2015-0064>
- Schaufeli, W.B., & Bakker, A.B. (2004). Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 25*(3), 293–315. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.248>
- Schaufeli, W.B., & Bakker, A.B. (2004). Utrecht work engagement scale: Preliminary manual. *Occupational Health Psychology Unit, Utrecht University, 26*(1), 1–60. Retrieved from [https://www.wilmarschaufeli.nl/publications/Schaufeli/Test%20Manuals/Test\\_manual\\_UWES\\_English.pdf](https://www.wilmarschaufeli.nl/publications/Schaufeli/Test%20Manuals/Test_manual_UWES_English.pdf)
- Schaufeli, W.B., Bakker, A.B., & Salanova, M. (2006). The measurement of work engagement with a short questionnaire. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 66*(4), 701–716. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164405282471>
- Schaufeli, W.B., Salanova, M., González-Romá, V., & Bakker, A.B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 3*, 71–92. doi: 10.1023/A:1015630930326
- Schroth, H. (2019). Are you ready for Gen Z in the workplace? *California Management Review, 61*(3), 5–18. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0008125619841006>
- Schullery, N.M. (2013). Workplace engagement and generational differences in values. *Business Communication Quarterly, 76*(2), 252–265. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1080569913476543>
- Seemiller, C., Grace, M., dal Bó Campagnolo, P., Mara da Rosa Alves, I., & Severo de Borba, G. (2019). How Generation Z college students prefer to learn: A comparison of U.S. and Brazil students. *Journal of Educational Research and Practice, 9*(1), 349–368. <https://doi.org/10.5590/JERAP.2019.09.1.25>
- Sesen, H., & Donkor, A. A. (2023). Job crafting, job boredom and generational diversity: Are millennials different from Gen Xs? *Sustainability, 15*(6), 5058. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15065058>
- Shuck, B. (2011). Four emerging perspectives of employee engagement: An integrative literature review. *Human Resource Development Review, 10*, 304–328. doi: 10.1177/1534484311410840
- Smola, K.W., & Sutton, C.D. (2002). Generational differences: Revisiting generational work values for the new millennium. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 23*(4), 363–382. doi: 10.1002/job.147
- Stasiła-Sieradzka, M., Sanecka, E., & Turska, E. (2023). Not so good hybrid work model? Resource losses and gains since the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic and job burnout among non-remote, hybrid, and remote employees. *International Journal of Occupational Medicine and Environmental Health, 36*(2), 229–249. <https://doi.org/10.13075/ijomeh.1896.02026>
- Strauss, W., & Howe, N. (1991). *Generations: The history of America's future, 1584 to 2069*. William Morrow.
- Strauss, W., & Howe, N. (2009). *Millennials rising: The next great generation*. Knopf Doubleday Publishing Group.
- Suan Choo, L., Mat, N., & Al-Omari, M. (2013). Organizational practices and employee engagement: A case of Malaysia electronics manufacturing firms. *Business Strategy Series, 14*(1), 3–10. <https://doi.org/10.1108/17515631311295659>
- Subramaniam, G., Maniam, B., & Ali, E. (2013). Do flexible working arrangements impact working women's well-being? *Journal of Academy of Business and Economics, 13*(2), 79–84. <https://doi.org/10.18374/jabe-13-2.8>



- Sytch, M., & Greer, L.L. (2020). Is your organization ready for permanent WFH? *Harvard Business Review*. Retrieved from [https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Maxim-Sytch/publication/355360427\\_Is\\_Your\\_Organization\\_Ready\\_for\\_Permanent\\_WFH/links/616c1cf-d039ba2684453f995/Is-Your-Organization-Ready-for-Permanent-WFH.pdf](https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Maxim-Sytch/publication/355360427_Is_Your_Organization_Ready_for_Permanent_WFH/links/616c1cf-d039ba2684453f995/Is-Your-Organization-Ready-for-Permanent-WFH.pdf)
- Teo, T.S., & Lim, V.K. (1998). Factorial dimensions and differential effects of gender on perceptions of teleworking. *Women in Management Review*, 13(7), 253–263. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09649429810237105>
- Tett, R. P., & Meyer, J. P. (1993). Job satisfaction, organisational commitment, turnover intention and turnover: Path analyses based on meta-analytic findings. *Personnel Psychology*, 46(2), 259–293. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1993.tb00874.x>
- Ting, H., Lim, T.Y., de Run, E.C., Koh, H., & Sahdan, M. (2018). Are we Baby Boomers, Gen X and Gen Y? A qualitative inquiry into generation cohorts in Malaysia. *Kasetsart Journal of Social Sciences*, 39(1), 109–115. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.kjss.2017.06.004>
- Tolbize, A. (2008). Generational differences in the workplace. *Research and Training Center on Community Living*, 5(2), 1–21. Retrieved from [https://dWashingtonllc.com/pdf/generational\\_differences\\_workplace.pdf](https://dWashingtonllc.com/pdf/generational_differences_workplace.pdf)
- Twenge, J. (2017). *iGen: Why today's super-connected kids are growing up less rebellious, more tolerant, less happy—and completely unprepared for adulthood*. Atria Paperback.
- Twenge, J.M., Campbell, S.M., Hoffman, B.J., & Lance, C.E. (2010). Generational differences in work values: Leisure and extrinsic values increasing, social and intrinsic values decreasing. *Journal of Management*, 36(5), 1117–1142. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920630935224>
- U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2023). *Civilian labor force by age, sex, race, and ethnicity*. Retrieved from <https://www.bls.gov/emp/tables/civilian-labor-force-summary.htm>
- Urbain, C., Gonzalez, C., & Gall-ely, M., Le. (2013). What does the future hold for giving? An approach using the social representations of Generation Y. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 17(3), 159–171. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nvsm>
- Vartiainen, M., & Hyrkkänen, U. (2010). Changing requirements and mental workload factors in mobile multi-locational work. *New Technology, Work, & Employment*, 25(2), 117–135. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-005X.2010.00243.x>
- Vejar, C. (2008). Generation Y: Educational considerations. *EBSCO Research Starters*, pp. 1–5.
- Wang, B., Liu, Y., Qian, J., & Parker, S.K. (2021). Achieving effective remote working during the COVID-19 pandemic: A work design perspective. *Applied Psychology*, 70(1), 16–59. <https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12290>
- Ward, N., & Shabha, G. (2001). Teleworking: An assessment of socio-psychological factors. *Facilities*, 19(1/2), 61–71.
- Westerman, J.W., & Yamamura, J.H. (2007). Generational preferences for work environment fit: Effects on employee outcomes. *Career Development International*, 12(2), 150–161. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13620430710733631>
- White, M. (2011). *Rethinking generational gaps in the workplace: Focus on shared values*. Retrieved from <https://www.kenan-flagler.unc.edu/executivedevelopment/about/~media/C8FC09AEF03743BE91112418FEE286D0.ashx>
- Wiant, C.J. (1999). Are you listening to your employees? *Journal of Environmental Health*, 62(3), 51–52. Retrieved from <https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/are-you-listening-your-employees/docview/219716076/se-2>
- Wiedmer, T. (2015). Generations do differ: Best practices in leading Traditionalists, Boomers, and Generations X, Y, and Z. *Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin*, 82(1), 51–58. Retrieved from <https://www.proquest.com/openview/712ca7200529c4e38d54bde5a0a7257f/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=47978>

Wikaningtyas, S.U., Tjahjono, H.K., Suprihanto, J., & Muafi. (2023). Turnover intention model: Self-determination theory approach: Acces la Success. *Calitatea*, 24(194), 166–176. <https://doi.org/10.47750/QAS/24.194.20>

Wong, M., Gardiner, E., Lang, W., & Coulon, L. (2008). Generational differences in personality and motivation: Do they exist and what are the implications for the workplace? *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 23(8), 878–890. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940810904376>

Wontorczyk, A., & Rożnowski, B. (2022). Remote, hybrid, and on-site work during the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic and the consequences for stress and work engagement. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(4). <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19042400>

Zabel, K.L., Biermeier-Hanson, B., Baltes, B.B., Early, B.J., & Shepard, A. (2017). Generational differences in work ethic: Fact or fiction? *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 32(3), 301–315. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-016-9466-5>

Zemke, R., Raines, C., & Filipczak, B. (2022). *Generations at work: Managing the clash of Veterans, Boomers, Xers and Nexters in your workplace* (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.). HarperCollins Leadership.

## APPENDIX

**TABLE 1**  
**RESULTS OF ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE (ANOVA)**

	SS	df	MS	F	Sig.
Between Groups	10814.268	3	3604.756	12.853	< .001
Within Groups	69553.585	248	280.458		
Total	80367.853	251			

**TABLE 2**  
**DESCRIPTIVES**

95% Confidence Interval for								
	N	Mean	Std. Dev	Std. Error	Mean		Min	Max
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Baby Boomers	36	83.56	16.040	2.836	77.78	89.35	42	102
Gen X	106	79.39	18.710	1.817	75.78	82.99	0	102
Millennials	95	68.96	15.093	1.549	65.88	72.03	34	102
Gen Z	19	62.47	13.757	3.156	55.84	69.10	22	79
Total	252	74.71	17.894	1.127	72.49	76.93	0	102

**TABLE 3  
MULTIPLE COMPARISONS – TUKEY HSD**

(I)	(J)	Mean Difference	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Baby Boomers	Gen X	4.176	3.378	.604	-4.56	12.91
	Millennials	14.605*	3.423	<.001	5.75	23.46
	Gen Z	21.089*	4.850	<.001	8.54	33.63
Gen X	Baby Boomers	-4.176	3.378	.604	-12.91	4.56
	Millennials	10.429*	2.366	<.001	4.31	16.55
	Gen Z	16.913*	4.172	<.001	6.12	27.70
Millennials	Baby Boomers	-14.605*	3.423	<.001	-23.46	-5.75
	Gen X	-10.429*	2.366	<.001	-16.55	-4.31
	Gen Z	6.484	4.209	.415	-17.37	4.40
Gen Z	Baby Boomers	-21.089*	4.850	<.001	-33.63	-8.54
	Gen X	-16.913*	4.172	<.001	-27.70	-6.12
	Millennials	-6.484	4.209	.415	-17.37	4.40

\* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

**TABLE 4  
RESULTS OF ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE (ANOVA)**

	SS	df	MS	F	Sig.
Between Groups	463.522	2	231.761	9.449	< .001
Within Groups	2526.327	103	24.527		
Total	2989.849	105			

**TABLE 5  
DESCRIPTIVES**

	N	Mean	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Min	Max
			Std. Dev	Std. Error				
On-site	31	15.71	5.386	.967	13.73	17.69	6	30
Hybrid/Flex	50	20.30	5.084	.719	18.86	21.74	6	29
Telecommute	25	20.32	4.028	.806	18.66	21.98	13	29
Total	106	18.96	5.336	.518	17.93	19.99	6	30

**TABLE 6**  
**MULTIPLE COMPARISONS – TUKEY HSD**

(I)	(J)	Mean Difference	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
On-site	Gen X	-4.590*	1.132	<.001	-7.28	-1.90
	Millennials	-4.610*	1.331	.002	-7.78	-1.44
Hybrid/Flex	On-site	4.590*	1.132	<.001	1.90	7.28
	Telecommute	-.020	1.213	1.000	-2.90	2.86
Telecommute	On-site	4.610*	1.331	.002	1.44	7.78
	Hybrid/Flex	.020	1.213	1.000	-2.86	2.90

\* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.