

LEVEL 7 ASSESSMENT SPECIFICATION

Student name:	Chow Sau Kuen, Teresa	Student ID number:	1812884
Programme:	DBA		
Module:	Approaches to Research and Academic Communication		
Module code:	SBPD7001	Contribution to Overall Module Assessment (%):	100%
Lecturer:	Dr Millissa Cheung	Internal Verifier:	
Assignment Title:	Portfolio	Word count (or equivalent):	7500 (+/- 10%)
Submission deadline:	26 August 2019	Return date of provisional marks & written feedback:	30 September 2019
Submission method:	All written assessments, where practical and possible, must be submitted via Turnitin unless otherwise instructed by the Lecturer. (Please DO NOT put this assessment specification into Turnitin or it will match many similarities with other students' submissions.) Alternative submission method (if applicable): Late submission of the assessment will result in a late penalty mark. Penalties for late submission: Up to one week late, maximum mark of 50%. Over one week late, 0%. Only the Extenuating Circumstances Panel may approve a change to submission dates.		
Academic honesty / referencing:	Academic honesty is required. In the main body of your submission you must give credit to authors on whose research and ideas your work is based. Append to your submission a reference list that indicates the books, articles, etc. that you have used, cited or quoted in order to complete this assessment.		

Title: Generational Difference in Workplace

Name: Teresa Chow

Student No: 1812884

DBA of UWTSD

PART A

Table of Contents

Contribution to Overall Module Assessment (%):.....	1
PART A.....	3
Table of Contents	3
1) Abstract.....	5
2) Introduction.....	5
3) Generational Differences	6
4) Work Value.....	7
5) Work Attitudes.....	10
6) Organization	12
7) Paradigm Shift	15
a) Organization Structure	15
b) Globalization.....	16
c) HR initiatives	16
i) Company Culture.....	16
ii) Work-life balance.....	16
iii) Long term engagement	16
iv) Meaningful job.....	16
8) Further Recommendation for the Subject.....	17
a) Other demographics.....	17
b) Stereotype	17
c) Globalization	17
d) Contemporary Organization structure	17
9) Gap Analysis.....	17
PART B – CRITIQUE	19
1) Background.....	19

2) Format and Content	20
3) Research Question	20
4) Literature Review	20
5) Methodology.....	21
a) Validity and Reliability	21
b) Data collection and Sampling	21
c) Qualitative and Quantitative Methods.....	22
d) Scale and Questionnaire.....	22
e) Confidentiality	22
f) Hypothesis.....	23
g) Statistics Test	23
h) Findings	23
i) Usage of English and Grammar	23
j) Structure.....	23
6) Gap Analysis.....	24
a) Ground Theories.....	24
i) Motivation theories:.....	24
b) Knowledge Sharing and Transfer	24
c) Research Design.....	25
d) Geographic Region and Industry	25
e) Generational effect	25
f) Other Generations	25
g) HR Challenges and Initiatives	25
7) Conclusion	26
Bibliography.....	27
Table 1: Summary on Generational Difference	30
Table 2: Summary of Articles	31

1) Abstract

With the increasing numbers of Gen Y and Gen Z entering the workforce which was dominated by Veterans and Baby Boomers, multigenerational workforce has made and changed workplace relationship and corporate practices. The workplace conflict and the retirement of Baby Boomers are two big challenges in today's organizations. The dynamics of multigenerational workplace which consists of 4 generations while each of them has unique life experiences, work values, work attitudes and generational characteristics inevitably create dilemma in communication, collaboration and corporate synergy. This study is separated into two parts. The first part is a critical review of eleven research paper to elaborate and to understand generational differences from epistemological and ontological perspectives. The second part is a detailed discussion from one research paper to criticize the content, context, methodology, format etc. in order to show the understanding of research philosophy and ethical issues. This paper aimed to understand the generational difference in workplace. The research question posed in this examination of workplace generational difference is: Are there any differences in work value and work attitude between generations? If yes, what's the implication of these generational difference for the organizations

2) Introduction

In today's workplace all over the world, it is the first time in modern history that 4 generations are in the workforce. Interactions among different generations would appear to have miscommunication due to lack of mutual understanding among them. In view of organization operation, it affects the overall efficiency, effectiveness and overall productivity under work conflict. As such, successfully managing different generations would give profound contribution for organization sustainability and HRM practices.

The retirement of Baby Boomers would be a challenging issue in coming decade. Gen Z are entering the workforce progressively. A clear understanding of the work values in new generations and the differences between theirs and previous cohorts are of importance to shape the work environment and form the strategies for multigenerational workplace.

Understanding and incorporating the values of younger generations that bring to work place are essential for organizations which want to remain competitive in business performance as well as in

attracting talented workers. This paper enhances knowledge and understanding of the challenges originated from generational differences in work values, work attitude and the impact on organization. Leaders, Human Resources management and managers would prepare for the organizational change initiatives. It also provides different studies from theoretical to practical levels which enable management to gain insight on generational differences and the unique characteristics of different generations, namely Veteran, Baby boomers, Generation X, Generation Y and Generation Z, in order to motivate employees and to capitalize the benefits of generational diversity to induce creativity and innovation for higher productivity of the organization,

Keywords: Generational Differences, Work Values, Work Attitude

3) Generational Differences

Generation refers to “a group of people or cohorts who share birth years and experiences as they move through time together (Kupperschmidt, 2000, p. 66). According to Mannheim, Other than birth years, a generation often called a cohort, consisting people of similar age in a similar location experiencing similar social, historical and life events. Important events such as disasters, wars, and revolutions while these events had strong effect in the preadult years such as childhood and adolescents of formative period. These sets of values and goals formed value systems whereas older generations were already solidified. (Mannheim, 1970) With the shared experiences of key social events at critical life developmental stages, it tended to form similar values, attitudes and behaviours which significantly affect the or expectation about work and life (Smola and Sutton, 2002)

In workplace, each generation has its own preferences in values, attitudes, behaviour, leadership, team members, organizational structure etc. Management and HRM professions need to understand the differences and the ways to motivate them in order to bring out their unique competencies and abilities for employees’ engagement and commitment to the organizations. The classification of birth years has many versions while the difference is only in couple years variation. For easy understanding, below classification will be used in this paper to support the findings.

Veteran: 1922-1946, Boomer: 1946-1966, Generation X: 1967-1979, Generation Y: 1980-1995, Generation Z: 1996-2015

For easy referencing, a summary of generational traits, work value and attitude, key life events and corporate strategies to motivate different generations are depicted in Table 1.

Are there any difference in work value and work attitude between generations and how's the implications on organization will be discussed in following context.

4) Work Value

Work values has been defined as “the outcomes people desire and feel they should attain through work” (Twenge et al. 2010). According to Dose, work value directly influenced the work attitudes and behaviour (Dose, 1997). In recent decades, the employment of multiple generations created communication and understanding obstacles, resulted in lower perceived trust and respect level which may lead to intergeneration conflict and tensions (Jun et al. 2018). The causes of the conflict include various aspects whereas most of them are rooted by work value difference

As Parry and Urwin discussed in their study, national culture posed an impact on generational values, attitudes and behaviours (Parry and Urwin, 2011). Mannheim in her generational cohort theory also described that similar life events and experiences would be a factor to form generation. In this section an analysis on work value conflict with GMPM model for resolution will be discussed, followed by a study to explore the extrinsic value and intrinsic value. Since different countries would have their own history and events in that specific locations, a study in southern hemisphere and a study in Asian country will be discussed to understand the differences of work value of different cultural background.

Hillman explored work value difference among 4 generations and the conflict between supervisors and co-workers which led to low efficiency and effectiveness, negative organization performance, low morale and increased turnover in the organization. The author based on work value conflict identified three major themes including communication, education/training and leadership, together with birth year cohort theory and age-related life stage theory to develop a conceptual framework Generational Management Practices Model (GMPM). This model provided a roadmap for managers to understand work value differences among different generation so as to make informed decisions about company strategies for a generationally diverse workplace. Under this framework, leaders assumed to have the understanding of generational differences in work value and behaviour while they must equip the skill through implementation of communication and educational practices in work place to develop strategies to foster a harmonized and productive work environment. It was believed that work value conflict would be mitigated if managers and employees were educated and well versed of about generational differences through enhanced listening and questioning skills (Hillman, 2014).

The second paper in work value is Twenge's generational differences test. The beauty of this research was that it used 16,507 samples examining U.S. high school seniors in 1976, 1991 and 2006

representing Baby Boomers, Gen X and Gen Y. Data collected across time by time lagged method; therefore, it isolated the generational differences from age differences. Around a decade ago, leading and high performance organizations had started to change the organizational practices to adapt to the work value of Gen Y, and now in Gen Z. Practices and policies based on work life balance, relaxation, leisure and volunteer activities have become the enticement for younger generation. In this research, intrinsic and extrinsic values would be examined as they were the perpetual distinction in work values as shared by scholars (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Porter & Lawler, 1968; Ryan & Deci, 2000). Five work values were tested to understand the preference of these values from different generations. The work values included leisure, extrinsic reward, intrinsic reward, altruistic reward and social reward. The findings in leisure (not working overtime) was that Gen X and Gen Y would place more value in it to attain work life balance compared to Boomers. Since the working hours in U.S. had been gradually increased, it explained why Gen X and Gen Y requested more leisure time. In extrinsic reward, Gen Y valued more than Boomers. It may cause by the lower career level in their jobs which received less monetary rewards. Together with findings in leisure, it turned out that Gen Y wanted more money but less work. Narcissistic traits of this generation were proved in this study. Surprisingly, the altruistic value had no significant generational differences. This contradicted to most of the assumption towards Gen Y's value. Intrinsic value resulted in decline over generation. This meant that Gen Y was not eager to search for meaningful job as what people believed. In social rewards from work, Gen Y was not good at seeking out friendship in work environment compared to other two generations. It may cause by the traits of technology savvy that Gen Y could maintain connection with their own friends and family outside workplace. Some measures were suggested by the author to manage intergenerational problems at work. For instance, HR professionals could consider deploying "compressed work weeks" that the employees could flexibility service 40 hours a week without strictly confined the office hours. Since the results showed that both Gen X and Gen Y treasured leisure time, the organization could incorporate holiday reward instead of bonuses. HR could also redesign the job scope and career growth plan for young generation so that they have more meaningful job to the company as they were looking for this contribution. Job rotation between departments would be an alternative for HR to formulate practices and job design to retain young generations (Twenge et al. 2010).

Another angle to understand work value in multigeneration is by person-organization values fit. Cinnamon and Gardner recruited 1422 employees from eight organizations in a southern hemisphere country, New Zealand, to participate this survey. The purpose of this research was to investigate the

differences in P-O values fit between different cohorts. Boomers, Gen X and Gen Y were tested with 3 hypothesis about their work value preferences in extrinsic, intrinsic, status, altruism, social and freedom work values. According to the authors, other than employees' preferences, organization also possessed and communicated value. Person-organization (P-O) value fit was to test how the employees and the organization aligned in their values. The organization with higher P-O fit would expect employees to have higher job satisfaction, organization commitment and lower intention to leave. The findings illustrated that there were no significant generational differences in perceived organizational values while significant generational differences were found in status and freedom in individual work values. This could be explained that younger cohort may weigh status heavier since higher status would help them progress upward in commercial world and increase marketability in their career. In view of freedom, Gen Y valued higher on it comparing to Gen X and Boomers. This result matched with the stereotype of Gen Y that they needed flexibility and autonomy in workplace. Since New Zealand was more or less similar to western culture, the findings were similar to that of U.S. and Europe (Cennamo & Gardner, 2008).

Last but not least, a Chinese context research from Chen & Lian was assessed to understand the work values of young generation and the generational difference of entire workforce. Chinese employees were categorized under 3 generations: Cultural Revolution (1949-1966), Transitional Generation (1967-1978), Millennial Generation (1979-1990). Although the names were different, the birth years were very closed to the classification of Baby Boomers, Gen X and Gen Y. The samples of this study were from organizations in Fujian Province in China with 1015 samples collected. Five work values were tested, namely altruism, leisure value, relationship reward, extrinsic and intrinsic rewards, and generation and age effect. Altruistic work rewards were tested because of the collectivism in communist party before social reform in 1978. As such, altruistic behaviour might be nurtured in older generation. For leisure value, due to the influence from western society after open-door policy, millennial was the one who valued freedom and leisure the most. Relationship award was considered to be part of the work motivation to connect with others in workplace to enhance work relationship building. In china, relationship with social members was one of the important assets in workplace. Yet, with the adaptive to technology in young generations, the relationship award decreased in new generations. In China, the perspectives of intrinsic and extrinsic rewards were different from that of western countries. Supposingly, young generation in China would focus on extrinsic rewards as China economy had experienced collectivism in early decades. Yet, with the one child policy and the penetration of western individualism, young Chinese employees looked for job that would bring

personal interests, self-growth and self-actualization. As such, extrinsic and intrinsic rewards would both increase in importance over generations. The last variable about generation versus age effects were tested to counter the possible bias effect by cross-sectional method. The results turned out to be similar to other western countries such as Cultural Revolution generation treated altruism more importantly than other two generations. Millennial valued both intrinsic and extrinsic rewards more than older generations. Other than these two variables, there were no significant difference in other work values. Regarding the generation and age effect, the outcome was that by regression, generation effect could predict two out of six factors which were extrinsic reward and altruism while age didn't predict any of the six factors. It showed that generation was more strongly related to work values than age (Chen & Lian, 2015).

To conclude, studies in work values showed that different work values are stemmed in each generation. Fundamental value differences could reflect directly in work relationship and job performance.

5) Work Attitudes

In previous section, work values have been discussed in detail. In most of the research, scholars always put work value and attitude together for analysis. To distinguish the values from attitudes, Rokeach claimed that attitudes could be considered as a lower level in the person's hierarchy of beliefs (Rokeach, 1973). Attitudes are people's beliefs on specific situation. Attitudes can be positive or negative while values are ways positive (Roe, 1981). Work values shape employee's perception of work leading to direct influence on work attitude and behaviour (Dose, 1997).

In recent research, very few work-attitude studies have been done in analysing between different generations. Most of the studies are either in literature review research on solely in Gen Yers. This would be another research gap for practitioners to investigate in the future. As such, there articles related to work attitudes but not limited to multi-generations are selected for discussion. It includes one of them from hospitality industry, one is using the kaleidoscope career model and the last one is to illustrate the effect of different generations on work behaviour.

Gursoy's study on work values and attitudes was a cross-sectional research of frontline staff in 50 U.S. hotels. 3 generations included Baby Boomer, Gen X and Gen Y were studied. Seven factor dimensions were used for the test. The results suggested that work values and attitudes were existed between three generations. Taken together, the findings illustrated that among three generations, Baby Boomers believed that "work" played a central role in their life and they were less comfortable to use technology as communication media compared to other two cohorts. Gen X was more aggressive in

striking for power to take charge of work activities. Interestingly, they could separate work and personal life clearly while work life balance was more important to them, same as Gen Y. For Gen Y, they were creative, technology savvy, uncompromised to conventional norms, eager for job recognition and coaching by supervisor. These attributes and differences in multi-generations would help management to form flexible policies and practices to different cohorts (Gursoy et al. 2013).

Sullivan and other scholars studied differences between Baby Boomers and Gen X, of which Kaleidoscope Career Model (KCM) was applied. Data obtained from 982 professionals in U.S.A. Same as Gursoy's study, this was also a cross-sectional design which failed to capture the influence of aging process. KCM was a relatively new career theory to describe how individuals made decisions and changed their patterns of career by rotating the three mirrors, namely authenticity, balance and challenge. Authenticity was the alignment between internal beliefs, external behaviours and the value of the organization. Balance was the equilibrium between work and non-work demands which included family, relatives, and personal desires. Challenge represented one's pursuit for challenging duties and career advancement. Results explained that in terms of authenticity and balance, Gen X had significantly higher desire than Boomers. It implied that Gen X had a better matching in their own objectives against organization goals. Similar to other studies, Gen X put more weight on work life balance than Baby Boomers. With respect to challenging desire, both generations were found entitling same interest (Sullivan et al. 2009)

Becton's research in 2014 got a sample of 8040 in two organizations in United States to test if the stereotypes of different generations really existed in workplace. 3 generations were investigated including Baby Boomers, Gen X and Gen Y. Job mobility behaviours, compliance with work rules and policies, and willingness to work overtime were measured among generations. Taken together, the results were par with stereotypes that Baby Boomers exhibited fewer job mobility and changed fewer jobs in last 5 years comparing to Gen X and Gen Y. The most frequent cohort to change jobs was Gen Y. In compliance with work rules and policies, Baby Boomers again was the cohort that respected authority and compliant to rules more than other cohorts. This aligned with the general characteristics of younger generations which were higher in individualism such as self-esteem and narcissism (Twenge, 2010). For working overtime, Gen X was assumed to be the cohort that most valued work life balance. The findings were again same as the stereotype. Gen Y and Baby Boomers had no difference in willingness to work overtime. With such big data backup, the results in this study would deem to have important implications. In this test, the author added "relative age" as one of the control

variables. In view of job mobility, it indicated that the increase in age in the younger generation has greater effect than in older generation (Becton et al. 2014).

Concluded 3 studies in work attitudes, all authors posited one common limitations. They suggested the practitioners should look into life stage or career stage effect, together with gender, race, ethnicity or culture might also cause variation in testing results other than generation effect alone.

6) Organization

Different perspectives on generational difference in work value and work attitude were assessed whereas they are more on individual basis, the discussion below would be focused on how intergenerational differences make changes in organization level.

Organization loyalty and commitment which are the key factors affecting the overall productivity of an organization will be studied first. Then, knowledge sharing in organization and intergenerational difference on organization implication would be posited at last.

Brody and Rubin believed that different generations would react differently on organizational loyalty by insecurity, restructured workplace temporalities and technological access to the work place. These kind of new economy practices in workplace would affect the loyalty of older cohort who used to be working under their standard format. This cross-sectional test was done by 1857 people in different positions in selected industries, organizational commitment was examined to check out organization loyalty level of Baby Boomer and Generation X. First of all, insecurity represented the uncertain “job security” in today’s business world. With more and more young generations getting into the business world, misunderstanding led to generational conflicts while older generation may not be able to enjoy “seniority” and stayed in the company till retirement. Downsizing was the variable to represent insecurity. The result showed that downsizing received negative effect to loyalty in both generations. With the restructured temporalities from 9 to 5 to 7/24 economy, Boomers reacted negatively to changing temporality while young generations were prepared for this working pattern under fast-paced and high-pressure environment. Yet, young cohorts would feel negative if the overtime work was not informed in advance and not having enough time to complete work. Loyalty on the other hand was correlated positively to having control over working hours and regular schedule. Regarding technology, it was surprised to learn that Boomers spent more time to respond to emails outside of working hours. Yet, it didn’t mean that they were positively correlated to work commitment. Although technology created accessibility to work issues without physical boundary, Boomers responded negatively to handle work issues outside normal working hours and showed decreasing loyalty while Gen X just

reacted opposite. Last but not least, autonomy and advancement opportunities which were control variables showed strong positive effects on loyalty in both cohorts. Management and HR professionals could consider incorporating factors that contribute to positive effects into HRM strategies for organization (Brody and Rubin, 2011).

Another topic that are also related to organizational loyalty is the commitment level of different generation. Carver and Candela studied the nursing industry which was in serious labour shortage. According to the authors, organizational commitment was a concept not only for recruitment and retention, it was about intrinsic job satisfaction and motivation which brought the effect of increase productivity and decrease turnover to promote a positive work environment. In this qualitative article, Veterans, baby Boomers, Gen X and Y were being studied. Veterans were the group that valued rewards and recognition from job satisfaction. This was the cohort who always drove for excellence. The phrase “live to work” was used to define Baby Boomers while “work to live” was to describe Gen X. Work life balance was the motto of Gen X. For Gen X, growth opportunity would be the most effective way to motivate them. Gen Y wanted their work to be meaningful and preferred to work in teams. Flexible working hours and work arrangements were what they preferred. This generation was good team players and wanted to make a difference in the world. To enhance the commitment level of young generation, the nursing managers needed to develop creative and specific strategies such as flexible scheduling, job-sharing, child care benefits and job recognition. To motivate them to commit to the job, nursing managers needed to support them with work life balance, challenging duties with technology skill, and being treated with respect. After all, it was essential to enhance the commitment of nurses while low levels of employee commitment would experience decline in performance indicators (Carver and Candela, 2008)

Maryam stated that each organization had its valuable knowledge that would need to pass over to colleagues in order to reduce repeated mistake, retain valuable knowledge and facilitate individual and organization growth. However, due to different learning and communication preferences, methods used by different generations varied in providing and receiving knowledge. Maryam posited the knowledge sharing connection (KCS) could be practised to connect employees and shared the knowledge on job-related tasks. The sum of the connection would influence the knowledge sharing network and finally reaching knowledge transfer of an organization. As Baby Boomers preferred structured learning methods such as verbal and text driven materials while younger generations would use digital and instant messaging, the alignment and preferences of methods employed in knowledge sharing would be pivotal to the connection success. The result showed that the generation did not

affect much in knowledge transfer method although they were different among generations (Maryam et al. 2013). As knowledge transfer is important in the sustainability of an organization, a further study will be discussed in Part B of this study.

Reisenwitz and Rajeshiyer studied the intergenerational difference and their implication on organization with 401 respondents in Gen X & 396 samples in Gen Y. They tested between Gen X and Y on their overall satisfaction of internet, volunteerism, brand loyalty, work orientation and risk aversion. It turned out that Gen Y had greater satisfaction with internet than Gen X as they were well-versed with technology while it became part of their lives. As studies always mentioned that Gen Y was more altruistic, the result showed that there were no significant difference between two generations in volunteer-orientation. In brand loyalty, Gen X had greater loyalty towards brands while it could be interpreted as corporate brands and applied to organization as well. In terms of work orientation, Gen X was communication and media savvy who valued self-development. Gen Y was multitasked and looked for practical benefits such as job stability, career satisfaction and salary. Interestingly, Gen Y needed mentoring and immediate attention from supervisor. For risk aversion, Gen X was scepticism and risk avoidance while Gen Y was also risk-averse but more self-assured. Based on above comparison between Gen X and Gen Y, the implications on organizations were clearly described whereas management and HR professionals should deeply appreciate both generational differences and similarities at work to motivate, communicate and synergize different cohorts for company success (Reisenwitz and Rajeshiyer, 2009).

The discussions on work value, work attitude and organization implications demonstrate that the landscape of the workplace evolve quickly in past decades. Each additional generation entering the workforce bring unique qualities and present new challenges and opportunities to the organization. Leaders and HR professionals should be mindful of the differences between employees in each cohort as they relate to productivity and leadership. Some studies claimed that management should not confined to generation specific policies but need to formulate strategies to deal with individuals to understand their needs and motivation factors.

7) Paradigm Shift

The paradigm shift of workplace has begun since four generations are working side by side. Different values, experiences, styles and activities may create misunderstandings and frustrations. Organization can choose between continue keeping the traditional management practices or challenge the prevalent status quo at the conventional workplace. In order to sustain the competitiveness of the company, there is a need for management to understand and consider seismic shift for company practices and HRM initiatives.

a) Organization Structure

Gen Y and Z are more carefree and look for flexible policies in the organization. Many organizations still want to use training, system or rewards to address problems they encounter in multigenerational work conflict. Nevertheless, is it really the work conflict problem? Or, it is time for management and HR professionals to start exploring the root of the people management challenges?

In most of the startups, flat hierarchy has been broadly practiced. This works well in industries that embrace creativity such as technologies or marketing agencies. Since 2015, a sizable online retailer Zappos has implemented Holacracy, a flat organization structure without managers, to cater for the young generations and changing paradigm of employment market (Reingold, 2016). A no manager flat organization structure would help speeding up the decision making and knowledge transfer. Since younger generations prefer team-oriented culture and treasure fringe benefits more than monetary reward such as flexible hours, onsite laundry in the office, pets allowed, free food and massage chairs etc. are now practising in Zappos might be an organizational structure that leaders can consider. Although this concept is yet to be familiar with the commercial world as it is really a giant changing game in the company, it is suggested to trial this structure in some cool and cutting edge projects that are big enough but not harmful to the company even though it was failed. Aggressive Gen Y & Z can work under one facilitator so that they can feel intrinsically motivated and bring out innovative and creative ideas. This kind of culture can be promoted to help retain young generations in any organizations, especially high performance one.

b) Globalization

Other than collaborating multigeneration to minimize work conflict, globalized organization could move one level up by leveraging their employee's diversity, experiences and expertise to strengthen the manpower competence by fostering creativity, efficient, diversify culture to cater for the needs of stakeholders and to contribution to the organization.

c) HR initiatives

i) Company Culture

In the past, the role of HR was to recruit, retain and engage workers. However, the multigeneration workforce has changed the paradigm. Other than recruitment and retention, HR should more concentrated in fostering a fun, innovative, and respectful culture to engage to young generations. Besides, the changing expectation of employees make it imperative for HR department to start channel the energy to the objective of employee empowerment and engagement.

ii) Work-life balance

One of the key traits in young generations is their demand on work-life balance. In order to retain potential workforce and build their engagement in the organization, the HR head may need to consider the need of replacing repetitiveness duties and workload by Artificial Intelligence. This would then balance work hours and bring the best out of the workforce.

iii) Long term engagement

As the job attachment of Gen Y and Z are much shorter than that of earlier generations, the HRM might need to reflect if they need to retain all young generations by feeding what they need or accepting the fact that these new generations would not stay long. This is another paradigm shift in HR practices. However, if the characteristic of Gen Y and Z are changing different jobs in order to gain experience and exposure without job insecurity concerns, leaders of the organization would think about the solution to the ever-demanding labour market.

iv) Meaningful job

Training, work skills and knowledge upgrade have long been the added benefits provided by HR. With the changing paradigm, the young generations would look for contribution to the company and the society as one of their mission. Instead of providing numerous work related trainings, HR could start considering to organize volunteer job to young generations to increase their self-motivation to the company and the society.

In a nut shell, the above approaches in organization and HR perspectives could be viewed as paradigm shift from the focus of the organizational objectives to the growth and development of individuals.

8) Further Recommendation for the Subject

As a natural extension of above studies, more research efforts should be put in linking boarder other related perspectives.

a) Other demographics

Other than generations, same workplace diversity can extend to gender, culture, ethnicity etc to make the research all conclusive about the multigenerational workforce.

b) Stereotype

Researchers could look into the stereotype effect in generational conflict and how significant it contributes to the organization ineffectiveness. This kind of study is yet to be done and could be further explored.

c) Globalization

Due to globalization, multi-cultural difference would be another topic to incorporate into intergenerational differences for a holistic view to HRM strategies

d) Contemporary Organization structure

To cope with the unique characteristics of the new workforce from Gen Y and Gen Z, leaders could consider to gradually applying new organization structure such as flat structure – Holacracy. Holacracy is a structure which has been used by the largest online footwear company, Zappos. The setup of the organization is in flat layer (no manager), project-based operations, with power distributed among employees. Flexible working hours, good fridge benefits and playful and fun culture are fit into Gen Y and Gen Z's generational traits. Moving forward, this kind of organizational structure would be an option for young generations

9) Gap Analysis

After reviewing the research in previous section, for my best understanding, no study completely supported were difference across five generations. Apart from that, the research of Gen Z to compare with two or more generations are scant. This limits the understanding and assessment of the youngest cohort in the workplace.

One of the perspectives that are seldom assessed by researches is knowledge sharing and transfer. As more and more Veterans and Baby Boomers are retiring, there is a potential risk of losing critical organizational knowledge. This kind of knowledge is valuable and impactful to the organization. HR professionals should plan ahead to prepare for the knowledge transfer.

In short, knowledge sharing and transfer targeting young generation such as Gen Y & Z would close the gap and enrich the literature on the subject, and contribute to the researchers for their understanding, developing, leveraging for better solution to the productivity of the organization.

PART B – CRITIQUE

The Article –Y and Z Generations at Workplaces

1) Background

In the topic of generational difference, an article is chosen to fill the gap of part A. This article is focused on analysing the unique characteristics of Gen Y and Gen Z while the theme is on knowledge sharing and knowledge transfer. To achieve knowledge sharing, trust and teamwork were needed in order to connect the organization to cope with the competitive business landscape. The research question: “how to approach the new generations from the view of HR?” was stated in the abstract. The success of knowledge sharing and transfer were depended on the culture of the organization and the management know-how to develop trust.

In the literature review, characteristics of Gen Y and Gen Z, HR challenges were heavily emphasised whereas, knowledge sharing and teamwork were also mentioned in a table format.

The methodology that the author used was mixed method research i.e. integrating qualitative method by focus groups and interviews, together with quantitative method by questionnaire for data collection and analysis. The ontology of this article is in relativism which derived from a research question. Since the author deployed qualitative and quantitative research method, the epistemology used both EMIC perspective by interview and focus group and ETIC perspective by questionnaire distribution. 410 questionnaire received and statistics analysis was done by SPSS for descriptive statistics, khi-square test and ANOVA analysis.

In the study, the author collected the demographic information from the participants. The age that involved in the survey was from 18-64 years old. Instead of evaluating the result by generation, the author evaluated the result by age group for easy classification. Questions included assessing the relationship between age, education and size of the company, understanding the stereotype of Gen Z, finding the best motivation tool for young generation, and discovering the most popular age group to work along etc. The result was that Gen Z was seen to be too much confident, creative, job and career autonomy and, not very committed to work hard. They were concerned about the job position more serious than other generations. Money and career opportunities would give them higher motivation than intrinsic rewards.

The findings concluded that HR needs to adapt new measures to cope with the needs and unique preferences of new generations in order to retain Gen Y and Z. This kind of changes will ultimately affect the company culture and create management challenges.

2) Format and Content

The topic of the article was about Gen Y and Gen Z at workplaces. The objective of the article was to look into the characteristics of Gen Y and Gen Z and urgently preparing the work environment for these two young generations. The authors also mentioned about the necessity of knowledge sharing by teamwork and trust built within the culture of the organization so that it can sustain and gain success. Nevertheless, the key theme about knowledge sharing was only mentioned in abstract and introduction without structurally analysed nor detail explained in other context. From the statistics test, the questionnaires and the variables being tested were mainly for the characteristics of Gen Y and Gen Z comparing against older generations such as baby boomers and Gen X or against themselves. The test didn't mention about how these personal traits related to knowledge sharing. In the conclusion session, the key focus was on the cooperation of Gen X and Y together with the urgency of HR to start preparing for the challenges to deal with younger generations. As a reader, the content and the structure of this article were not that coherent with the theme of knowledge sharing.

3) Research Question

The research question "how to approach the new generations from the view of HR" was stated in the abstract. In a first glance, the question was not specific enough to make the reader understand what this research was going to examine. For instance, the word "approach" was too board and vague that it didn't directly express the meaning nor the action of the article. It was difficult for readers to understand what this article was going to test or to explain. In fact, the aim of the article was to understand some characteristic of Gen Y and Z in the workplace and comparing them baby boomers and Gen X. The author didn't go into detail and provide solid solutions to HR. The research question was considered to be half way answered the research question.

4) Literature Review

The literature review in this article included subjects like characteristics of Gen Y and Gen Z, HR challenges, teamwork and knowledge sharing. In overall five above subjects, only 10 references were used. On average, 2 references per subject. Among 10 references, 3 of them were from the author's previous papers.

Regarding subjects like knowledge sharing, trust and teamwork, there were no definition to explain the concepts on each of them. That gave the readers the impression that the article was about the work traits of Gen Y and Gen Z alone instead of the aforementioned focuses in knowledge sharing and so forth.

The literature review also failed to reference other studies that had been done in similar topics. The review couldn't show that the author was fully filling the gap of previous studies to support the research.

In view of synthesizing and paraphrasing, the structure of the literature review was not well organized. For instance, in the first paragraph of literature review, the author didn't make any citation but mainly to list out more than 5 questions to elaborate why it was necessary to deal with the topic of generation differences. This was not a common style in literature review. Besides, most of the concepts didn't have ground theory nor literature to backup. Another example was that the author used half page to explain the HR challenges without supporting from any literature. For paraphrasing, the author exactly copied the wordings from reference literature although some of them were the author's previous paper.

5) Methodology

This article applied inductive approach and used mixed method of quantitative research by distributing questionnaire and qualitative research by in-depth interviews and focus group.

a) Validity and Reliability

There was no validity mentioned in the article. Since the article was not based on ground theory in deductive approach, there was a chance of having validity research error that the research was not measuring what the author intended to measure. In view of reliability, there was no indication in calculating Cronbach Alpha figure. As such, there is a risk of internal inconsistency in reliability.

b) Data collection and Sampling

410 questionnaires received without information of response rate as the author didn't report how many questionnaires he did send out. The sample collection method was by sending out questionnaire thru internet. The participants then fill out the form anonymously. The article didn't mention which country the samples were exactly from and there was no reporting on sampling procedure and process. The author was using snowball method to connect to participants. Ostensibly, there was a risk of common method bias that the participants would have chances to fill out questionnaire in both dependent variables and independent variables.

One interesting point was that the author didn't mention about which country, which company or which industry sector that this research was targeting and measuring by the samples. Since different cultural background would form different generational traits, it is important to understand the originality of the samples.

c) Qualitative and Quantitative Methods

In respect of qualitative method, the author didn't report the procedure on how to handle the interview and focus groups. Under this situation, there might be a chance of common method bias due to unknown process and procedure. The questionnaire that the author prepared might be too long or the wordings were ambiguous so that there were chances to have wrong answers provided by participants. Besides, if the interview was hosted together with some authorities or the bosses, the participants might provide desirable answers which again having common method bias. In quantitative method, first, the author didn't provide information to readers to explain what he was going to measure. Second, the author didn't mention the reasons for hypothesis statements. As such, the reader would be very confusing when reading the content and the testing results.

d) Scale and Questionnaire

The questionnaire was in Likert scale and developed by author without ground theory support; therefore, there was no construct validity. There were 3 opened questions asked while the rest (didn't mention the quantity) was in closed questions. Nominal and metric scales were used. As there was no detail information about the format and context of the questionnaire, there might have chance to make the common method bias. Common method bias appears if questions are too long, common anchor in Likert scale, leading questions and inadequate response options in questions.

e) Confidentiality

From the article, the author just used couple sentences to explain the survey. Procedure and survey handling method after evaluating were not described in detail. Risk of disclosing personal information would be happened if the author didn't pay extra attention on it. The author also failed to report if consent letters were sent to participants beforehand nor the purpose of the survey was clearly explained to participants during the survey process. If not, it would violate the research ethnics.

f) Hypothesis

There was no information about the hypothesis development process and the reasons for the hypothesis statement. Neither null hypothesis nor alternative hypothesis were shown in the article. As such, it was difficult for reader to understand the testing purposes and what to measure.

g) Statistics Test

Relatively simple information posited in statistics findings. 80% of the result were in descriptive statistics and most of them were reported in ranking. Although the author reported in methodology that Khi square and ANOVA were used, the information stated in the article was very selective with only one or two questions were using these methods. The rest would mainly report in ranking statistics.

h) Findings

Research question was answered by exploring Gen X and Gen Z work preferences while there was no solid HR initiatives suggested by the author to cope with the HR and management challenges to face the unique requirements of these generations.

i) Usage of English and Grammar

The usage of English in this article was not professional. First of all, lots of grammatical mistakes. Second, indirect English was used. For instance, the author used “every second respondent” and “every seventh respondent” to illustrate the figures which could be written in number or in percentage. Third, the most serious problem was that the poor English was applied in explaining the statistics result. One of the questions was to measure the “age consistency”. From the wordings, readers might think that the author was talking about cohort in same age group. However, after reading the rest of the paragraph, the author was talking about “different age group”. Some more phrases that give ambiguous meaning including “expecting competencies” and “changing communication”. They were used to explain the ways that could “lead the change in the handling of generation Z and Generation Y” (Bencsik and Juhasz, 2016).

j) Structure

The overall structure was poorly organized. The idea was jumping back and forth. The content and context were not well-developed while most of the points without in depth analysis nor recommended proposal.

6) Gap Analysis

This article answers part of the research question which is to understand the characteristics of younger generation so that HR could prepare the work environment for these generations; however, the result of the testing was not fully supported due to plenty of unknown procedures in the research design which gives validity and reliability puzzles.

As such, in future studies, researchers are suggested to incorporate other influential contextual factors to better modify the conceptualization and recommendation in this subject. The factors are discussed in the rest of this paper.

a) Ground Theories

i) Motivation theories:

It is suggested to implant some ground theories to support the validity of the research. Since the purpose of the article is to provide a work environment for employees to work happily at workplace in order to better contribute to the organization, motivation theories would be a choice for researchers to incorporate in this article. Motivation theories such as Herzberg's Two Factor's theory (Herzberg et al. 1959) could be used to identify the motivating factors such as growth and advancement opportunities, recognizing the achievements which give positive outcomes to employees whereas hygiene factors such as salary increment, job security and improvements in working conditions would cause job discontent and job dissatisfaction. Other alternative theory includes intrinsic and extrinsic motivations (Deci and Ryan, 1985) to elaborate the needs of internal fulfilment versus external rewards are another broadly used theories. Self-determination theory is also an option which are more specific in differentiating between autonomous and controlled motivation and put emphasis on the "relative strength" of the two motivations (Deci and Ryan, 2014; Gagne and Deci, 2005) would also help supporting the development of the model and framework. Models and theories in work values could also be included to make the research more holistic.

b) Knowledge Sharing and Transfer

Since the subject of the article is about knowledge sharing and transfer, it can be classified as one of the organizational learning topics. Researchers can consider incorporating Knowledge Creation Theory (Nonaka, 1994) to explain the definition, benefit and impact of knowledge sharing and transfer which are to enhance the performance and increase the organizational knowledge sharing practices (Sanaei, 2013). Beyond implanting theory, the author could also make recommendation on knowledge sharing such as reverse mentoring which is to pair up a young, junior employee as

the mentor to share knowledge with senior colleague as the mentee. This gives opportunity for them to better communicate and understand each other while at the same time raising the self esteem of the mentors (Murphy, 2012).

c) Research Design

In this research, the design of interview and questionnaire were not mentioned by the author which brings the likelihood of common method bias. Likewise, the researchers should pay more attention in preparing a step-by-step description in research paper and try to avoid research ethnic problems and common method bias.

d) Geographic Region and Industry

This article didn't method which country nor which industry that the samples from which it cause confusion to the readers. It is suggested to segment the samples and to define the specific industry and country that the researchers target to study.

e) Generational effect

Researchers can further disentangle if generational effect or age-diversity or career stage differences are the topics they are going to investigate. As most of the studies in work values, work motivation or commitment of work might cause by age differences, career position difference rather than purely in generational differences, there is a need for researchers to look into detail before making assumption. Theories such as Generational Theory (Mannheim, 1970) could also be considered as one of the assessments. As most of the studies are in cross-sectional rather than in longitudinal approach, it is difficult for researchers to identify if the effect is from generation or from age-based effect, this area of research would need more in-depth studies to continue.

f) Other Generations

Future academic research can include more generations such as Gen X, Baby Boomers and Veterans to present an overarching view of all workforces. This would be the gap analysis as very few papers are including Gen Z and Veterans at the same context.

g) HR Challenges and Initiatives

Practical HR practices and recommendation could be included in the discussion to give insight to management and HR managers. Strategies such as increasing manpower and resources to mentor young generations, the extension of retirement age in the company due to labour scarcity, evaluating and re-arranging job context of the old and young generations improve person organization fit, preparing establishment of the knowledge sharing systems and network, and conducting training such as reverse mentoring to improve understanding of the generations and

multi-generational diversity training to provide insight and background for different generations could be proposed to leaders and management for the betterment of the organizations.

7) Conclusion

The increasing participation of young generation workforce and the rising complexity of managing age-diverse employees bring the urgency and necessity of the leaders to re-evaluate their HR policies and practices in order to address imminent HR challenges such as retention, motivation and talent development. In this paper, work value, work attitude and the implications on organization of different generations are evaluated. The generational differences that resulted in work conflict negatively affect overall productivity of the organization. Different approaches from eleven articles are shortlisted to pinpoint this subject in a more holistic way. Finally, gap analysis of this subject is identified while knowledge sharing approach targeting younger generation of Gen Y and Gen Z are critiqued in detail. Upon analysing the article, a detailed suggestion was made to researchers and HR managers for further exploration in this concern.

Organization and management should consider revisiting company strategies from organizational paradigm of achieving company performance objective to the development and growth of individual and collaboration of teams in order to achieve the long term goal for success in the future.

Bibliography

- Becton, J.B., Walker, H.J. and Jones-Farmer, A. (2014) 'Generational differences in workplace behavior', *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 44(3), pp. 175-189.
- Bencsik, A., Horváth-Csikós, G. and Juhász, T. (2016) 'Y and Z Generations at Workplaces', *Journal of Competitiveness*, 8(3), pp. n/a. doi: 10.7441/joc.2016.03.06.
- Brody, C.J. and Rubin, B.A. (2011) 'GENERATIONAL DIFFERENCES IN THE EFFECTS OF INSECURITY, RESTRUCTURED WORKPLACE TEMPORALITIES, AND TECHNOLOGY ON ORGANIZATIONAL LOYALTY', *Sociological Spectrum*, 31(2), pp. 163-192. doi: 10.1080/02732173.2011.541341.
- Carver, L. and Candela, L. (2008) 'Attaining organizational commitment across different generations of nurses', *Journal of nursing management*, 16(8), pp. 984-991. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2834.2008.00911.x.
- Cennamo, L. and Gardner, D. (2008) 'Generational differences in work values, outcomes and person-organisation values fit', *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 23(8), pp. 891-906. doi: 10.1108/02683940810904385.
- Chen, J. and Lian, R. (2015) 'Generational differences in work values in China.(Report)', 43(4), pp. 567. doi: 10.2224/sbp.2015.43.4.567.
- Cogin, J. (2012) 'Are generational differences in work values fact or fiction? Multi-country evidence and implications', *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 23(11), pp. 2268-2294. doi: 10.1080/09585192.2011.610967.
- Deci, E.L. and Ryan, R.M. (2014) *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. Softcover reprint of the original 1st ed. 1985 edn. New York: Springer Science+Business Media.
- Dose, J.J. (1997) 'Work values: An integrative framework and illustrative application to organizational socialization', *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 70(3), pp. 219-240. doi: 10.1111/j.2044-8325.1997.tb00645.x.
- Dwyer, R.J. and Azevedo, A. (2016) 'Preparing leaders for the multi-generational workforce', *Journal of Enterprising Communities: People and Places in the Global Economy*, 10(3), pp. 281-305. doi: 10.1108/JEC-08-2013-0025.
- Gursoy, D., Chi, C.G. and Karadag, E. (2013) 'Generational differences in work values and attitudes among frontline and service contact employees', *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 32(1), pp. 40-48. doi: 10.1016/j.ijhm.2012.04.002.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B. and Snyderman, B.B. (1959) *Theæ motivation to work*. 2. ed. edn. New York: Chapman & Hall.
- Hillman, D.R. (2014) 'Understanding Multigenerational Work-Value Conflict Resolution', *Journal of Workplace Behavioral Health*, 29(3), pp. 240-257. doi: 10.1080/15555240.2014.933961.
- Karen Wey Smola and Charlotte D. Sutton (2002) 'Generational Differences: Revisiting Generational Work Values for the New Millennium', *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23(4), pp. 363-382. doi: 10.1002/job.147.

- Kupperschmidt, B.R. (2000) 'Multigeneration Employees: Strategies for Effective Management', *The health care manager*, 19(1), pp. 65-76. doi: 10.1097/00126450-200019010-00011.
- Mannheim, K. (1970) 'The problem of generations', *Psychoanalytic review*, 57(3), pp. 378-404.
- Murphy, W.M. (2012) 'Reverse mentoring at work', *Human resource management*, 51(4), pp. 549-573. doi: 10.1002/hrm.21489.
- Nonaka, I. (1994) 'A Dynamic Theory of Organizational Knowledge Creation', *Organization Science*, 5(1), pp. 14-37. doi: 10.1287/orsc.5.1.14.
- Parry, E. and Urwin, P. (2011) 'Generational Differences in Work Values: A Review of Theory and Evidence', *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 13(1), pp. 79-96. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2370.2010.00285.x.
- Porter, L.W., Lawler, E.E. and III (1968) *Managerial attitudes and performance*. Homewood, Ill: Irwin.
- Reingold, J. (2016) 'The Zappos experiment', (4, 173), 206.
- Reisenwitz, T.H. and Iyer, R. (2009) 'Differences in Generation X and Generation Y: Implications For The Organization And Marketers.', *Marketing management journal*, 19(2).
- Roe, R.A. (1996) *The failing redistribution between men and women*. Oldendorff Research Institute. Available at: <https://www.narcis.nl/publication/RecordID/oai:tilburguniversity.edu:publications%2F4dcf7fc4-10d8-4936-8cc2-c58a9bf3c198> (Accessed: .
- Rokeach, M. (1973) *Theæ nature of human values*.
- Ryan, R.M. and Deci, E.L. (2000) 'Self-Determination Theory and the Facilitation of Intrinsic Motivation, Social Development, and Well-Being', *American Psychologist*, 55(1), pp. 68-78. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.68.
- Sanaei, M., Javernick-Will, A.N. and Chinowsky, P. (2013a) 'The influence of generation on knowledge sharing connections and methods in construction and engineering organizations headquartered in the US', *Construction Management and Economics*, 31(9), pp. 991-1004. doi: 10.1080/01446193.2013.835490.
- Sanaei, M., Javernick-Will, A. and Chinowsky, P. (2013b) 'The influence of generation on knowledge sharing connections and methods in construction and engineering organizations headquartered in the US', *Construction Management and Economics*, 31(9), pp. 991-1004. doi: 10.1080/01446193.2013.835490.
- Sullivan, S.E., Forret, M.L., Carraher, S.M. and Mainiero, L.A. (2009) 'Using the kaleidoscope career model to examine generational differences in work attitudes', *Career Development International*, 14(3), pp. 284-302. doi: 10.1108/13620430910966442.
- Terry Wiedmer (2015) 'Generations Do Differ: Best Practices in Leading Traditionalists, Boomers, and Generations X, Y, and Z', *Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin*, 82(1), pp. 51.
- Twenge, J.M., Campbell, S.M., Hoffman, B.J. and Lance, C.E. (2010) 'Generational Differences in Work Values: Leisure and Extrinsic Values Increasing, Social and Intrinsic Values Decreasing', *Journal of Management*, 36(5), pp. 1117-1142. doi: 10.1177/0149206309352246.

Wey Smola, K. and Sutton, C.D. (2002) 'Generational differences: Revisiting generational work values for the new millennium', *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, 23(4), pp. 363-382.

Yang, J., Yu, C. and Wu, J. (2018) 'Work values across generations in China', *Chinese Management Studies*, 12(3), pp. 486-505. doi: 10.1108/CMS-12-2017-0357.

Table 1: Summary on Generational Difference

Summary of Generational Differences					
	Veterans (Between 1922-1946)	Baby Boomers (Between 1946-1966)	Generatoin X (Between 1967–1979)	Generation Y (Between 1980-1995)	Generation Z (Between 1996-2015)
Generational Traits	Patriotic	Idealistic	Skeptical	Globally oriented	Digital natives, technology savvy
	Loyal, hard work and sacrifice	Optimistic workaholics	Independent	Technology savvy	Bright with high ID, require less direction
	Conservative in spending	Competitive	Entrepreneurial	Creative	Accept diverse populatoins
	Value stability and commitment	Value personal health and well-being	Value friends and family	Value meaning and diversity	Connect with seamless world of friends
Work Value & Attitude	Prefer formalized work environment	Seek promotion by hard work	Result and achievement oriented	Confident, self assured	Driven by graphics and visuals
	Prefer Hierarchical structure	Strong determination - driven to success	Work life balance	Challenge authority, team oriented	Expect instant feedback
	Respect authority		Enjoy working independently	Multi-task, flexible, need immediate feedback	7/24 working attitude
	Highly committed to organization and the leaders			Seeking opportunity to contribute and grow	need flexibility in job and working hours
Key Life events	World Wall II	Vietnam War	Cold War	Fall of Berlin Wall	Financial Crisis
	Great Depressoin	Korean War	Launch of Space Shuttle	School Campus Violence	Use of Artifical Intelligence
		Moon Landing	More Women in Workforce	Trade Center Attacks	Global Ageing Issue
				SARS	
Corporate Strategies to meet their needs	Honor ceremonies	Value their contribution by giving tangible award	Outcome orientated	Job rotation	Project based activites
	Encourage continue contribution as consultant	Encourage continue contribution as consultant	Provide independent projects that allow creativity and challenge	Extended orientation if needed	Active learning opportunities
				Allocate team based project	Need supervisor to help them to evaluate resources
				Monthly meeting and evaluation	Faster promotion path
(Carver & Candela, 2008; Cogan, 2012; Dwyer & Azevedo, 2015; Terry, 2015)					
					Provide job oportunities which needs multi-task and technology experiences

Table 2: Summary of Articles

PART (A)		
1	Work Value	Generational differences in work values in China
2	Work Value	Generational differences in work values: leisure and extrinsic values increasing, social and intrinsic values decreasing
3	Work Value	Generational differences in work values, outcomes and person-organisation values fit
4	Work Value	Understanding multigenerational work value conflict resolution
5	Work Attitude	Generational differences in work values and attitudes among frontline and service contact employees
6	Work Attitude	Generational differences in workplace behaviour
7	Work Attitude	Using the Kaleidoscope creer model to examine generational differences in work attitudes
8	Organization	Attaining organizational commitment across different generations of nurses
9	Organization	Differences in generation X and generation Y: implications for the organization and marketers
10	Organization	Generational differences in the effects of insecurity, restructured workplace temporalities, and technology on organizational loyalty
11	Organization	The influence of generation on knowledge sharing connections and methods n construction and engineering organizations headquartered in the US
PART (B)		
12		Gen X and Gen Y at workplace

Generational Difference in Workplace

Journal: Gen Y and Gen Z at Workplace

7001: Teresa Chow
DBA of UWTSD

Abstract of the Article

Y and Z Generations at Workplaces

Bencsik Andrea, Horváth-Csikós Gabriella, Juhász Tímea

Abstract

At present, more and more researches deal with the characteristic features of generation Y and generation Z. As it is about the present and future generations, corporate success and the competitive operation are determined by the behaviour of these generations in the long-run. Researches justify that there are significant differences between the two generations despite the similarities. These differences appear rather emphasized in the corporate environment when several questions arise at workplaces in the process of cooperation – especially in the field of knowledge-sharing and knowledge transfer-regarding the characteristics of the two generations. Last year, the authors carried out a quantitative research by questionnaires in order to reveal what the managing of these two generations mean for the managers and also what difficulties occur when the two generations cooperate with each other and with elder generations as well. The main question of the research was how to approach the new generations from the view of HR? Although the research cannot be considered representative (410 respondents participated in the survey), it can give a picture about the examined issues. The hypothesis phrased by the authors was justified according to which of the HR activities have to adapt to the requirements of the new generations upon their appearance.

Reason for choosing this topic

- ▶ In today's organization, managing multigenerational workplace has been a key challenge for leaders
- ▶ In most of the organization, there are 4 generation cohorts working together. There are many demographic classifications. In general, we can classify as below:
 - Veterans 1922-1946
 - Baby boomers 1946-1966
 - Generation X 1967-1979
 - Generation Y 1980-1995
 - Generation Z 1995-2015

Reason for choosing generational differences

- ▶ All generations have unique competencies, personal traits, work values, life experience and all these affect their work attitudes, job expectation and commitment
- ▶ Different generations possess different work attitudes which lead to generational conflict that would hinder organization growth
- ▶ Understanding different generations and their preferences and expectation in workplace would help business to develop policies to harmonize the work environment and to improve job satisfaction
- ▶ How to align, synergize and collaborate all generations to increase the output and performance of an organization would be necessary for the success and the sustainability of an organization

Reason for choosing generational references

- ▶ Definition of Generation:
 - People that are grouped within a certain range of ages, location they live, and significant life events they experienced at critical developmental stages (Yusuf, Kian, 2013:97)
- ▶ Most of the topics are dealing with multi-generations like Boomers and Gen X while young generations, especially generation Z, are less being studied
- ▶ This study focused on generation cohort of Y and Z with emphasis on HR initiatives that help paving ways for future research to formulate HR strategies and talent management direction

The trend and direction of generational differences

Early days:

- ▶ In earlier days, generational differences studies were concentrated on psychology and sociology aspects specializing in personal traits, attributes, growth development etc.
- ▶ Regarding business researches, generational differences in past decades were focused on comparing generations of Boomers and Generation X or 3 cohorts together with Generation Y
- ▶ Regarding other work-related studies, topics have been covered subjects like work values, job satisfaction, motivation, organizational commitment, development and learning, leadership, attitudes towards leisure and changes etc.
- ▶ Papers are mainly from US or Europe countries

The trend and direction of generational differences

In 5-10 years

- ▶ In business side, new angles are included in analyzing generational differences:
 - Assess generation difference and age difference
 - Explore difference work behaviors are based on different generation or different career stage
 - More studies on work commitment, turnover intention and workplace conflict
- ▶ In recent year, studies are more on comparing Gen X and Y or Gen Y and Z. Most of the time, the research will compare Boomers, Gen X and Gen Y only. Very few researches were found to compare all 4 cohorts (boomers, Gen X, Gen Y, Gen Z) although more and more Gen Z studies have been posted.
- ▶ More papers are from Asian countries such as Malaysia, India, Japan and some in Greater China

Concepts related to Generational Differences



Summary of Articles

PART (A)		
1	Work Value	Generational differences in work values in China
2	Work Value	Generational differences in work values: leisure and extrinsic values increasing, social and intrinsic values decreasing
3	Work Value	Generational differences in work values, outcomes and person-organisation values fit
4	Work Value	Understanding multigenerational work value conflict resolution
5	Work Attitude	Generational differences in work values and attitudes among frontline and service contact employees
6	Work Attitude	Generational differences in workplace behaviour
7	Work Attitude	Using the Kaleidoscope creer model to examine generational differences in work attitudes
8	Organization	Attaining organizational commitment across different generations of nurses
9	Organization	Differences in generation X and generation Y: implications for the organization and marketers
10	Organization	Generational differences in the effects of insecurity, restructured workplace temporalities, and technology on organizational loyalty
11	Organization	The influence of generation on knowledge sharing connections and methods n construction and engineering organizations headquartered in the US
PART (B)		
12		Gen X and Gen Y at workplace

Proposed direction for Part A

- ▶ Research Question:

“Are there any differences in work value and work attitude between generations? If yes, what’s the implication of these generational differences for the organizations?”

Background

Y and Z generation in workplace (peer review)

- ▶ Research Question:
“HOW TO APPROACH THE NEW GENERATIONS FROM THE VIEW OF HR?”
- ▶ In 2017, more than 50% of the population in US will be in generation Y and Z. In 2020, Gen Y and Z in Hong Kong make up of 38% of population. In 2030, the business economy will be led by leaders of these two groups. There is an urgent need to understand their work preferences, expectation and generation traits in order to prepare for the work environment to fit into their work behavior
- ▶ According to the author, focus will be put on “knowledge-sharing” while it all depends on the culture of the organization and the management know-how to develop “trust”

Background

► Literature Review

- Characteristics of Generation Y, characteristics of Generation Z and HR Challenges, teamwork and knowledge sharing were discussed

► Methodology

- Quantitative (questionnaires) and qualitative (in-depth interviews and focus group)
- Inductive approach
- 410 questionnaire received.
- SPSS was used for descriptive statistics, Chi-square test and ANOVA
- Samples collected by snowball method and use 5 points Likert scale
- Evaluation of the answer was divided by age group instead of generation for easy analyzed

Critique - overview

Research Question

- Stated in the Abstract
- The research question was not specific enough

Gap Analysis

- Gap achieved: identified HR challenges based on findings in Gen Y and Gen Z characteristics
- Gap not achieved: no concrete recommendation on handling Gen Y and Gen Z expectation in HR perspective

Literature Review

- Focus on characteristics of Gen Y, Gen Z and HR challenge, teamwork and knowledge sharing
- Did not mention a lot about other articles in related topics
- Not well synthesized

Critique - Methodology

Validity and Reliability

- No validity mentioned
- No Cronbach Alpha indicated so there is a risk of internal inconsistency in reliability

Sampling

- Filled in questionnaire on the internet, anonymousNot mentioned about which country the samples from and no reporting on the sampling process
- Snowball method
- Risk of Common Method Bias

Quantitative and Qualitative

- Not mentioned about how to handle qualitative interview and focus groups and how many questionnaires were rejected after verification by qualitative interviews and focus group
- Quantitative statistics process and rationale were not clearly reported

Critique - Methodology

Data Collection

- Risk of common method bias since there was no detail description of data collection method. Risk of giving same group of participants answering questions of both dependant and independent variables
- 410 questionnaires received. Not mentioned about how many was sent. No response rate was reported

Questionnaire

- Questions developed by author, not theory based, no construct validity
- 3 open questions, others were closed questions
- No detail content of the questionnaire. Risk of common method bias for asking questions with ambiguity or leading questions and inadequate response options

Confidentiality

- Not mentioned about how to handle the information after evaluation, risk of information disclosure
- Not mentioned about the consent letter, violated research ethics
- Not mentioned about whether participants understood the purpose of the questionnaire, risk of research ethics

Critique - Methodology

Hypothesis

- Not mentioned about hypothesis development process
- Null hypothesis nor alternative hypothesis statements were not shown

Scale

- Closed questions used nominal and metric scales
- 5 points Likert scale

Statistics Result Reporting

- Very few information on statistics testing reporting with most of them were reported in descriptive statistics
- Very rough information about hypothesis setup and without explanation

Critique - Others

English, Grammar and Others

- Lots of grammatical mistakes
- Poor English by using abstract phrases such as “age consistency”, “expecting competencies”, “changing communication” in explaining statistical result
- Indirect English - every second respondent, every seventh respondent which can be written in numbers or percentage for easy study
- No Table 8 appeared in the study although it mentioned in the paper

Logic

- The flow of the paper was not quite logical with heavy emphasis on knowledge sharing, company culture and trust in introduction while the statistics testing were not directly related to it

Findings

- Research question was answered by exploring Gen Y and Gen Z work preferences
- No solid HR initiatives was concluded

Suggestion for the study

- ▶ Confine to specific country and industry to make it practical and meaningful
- ▶ To assess generational difference versus age difference
- ▶ To analyze generational difference versus career stage difference in work attitude, work commitment and turnover intention
- ▶ Compare Gen Y and Gen Z with Gen X and baby boomer for a full picture understanding
- ▶ Consider including work value in the research to understand different generation expectation and preferences
- ▶ Understand their barriers to work motivation and provide solid suggestion to improve job satisfaction for strategic HR initiative with management support and endorsement
- ▶ Use longitudinal study rather than cross sectional study for age difference and social perspective observation

Suggestion for the study

- ▶ Methodology
 - Check validity and reliability
 - Use grounded theories to support the framework and modelling of the research
 - Hypothesis statement should be clearly stated
 - Instead of descriptive statistics, more focus should be put on tests for measuring association and for comparison testing
 - Data collection process and questionnaire could be reported in the research
 - Interview and focus group setup should be clearly stated
 - Implement research ethics measures to protect confidentiality and for security

Other areas for further research in same subject

- A) Gen Z comparison studies: 3-4 generational difference including Gen Z will need to review
- B) Analysis the causation of different work behavior: i) generational difference ii) age difference iii) career stage difference
- C) Address the social perception and stereotypes issues in young generation
- D) Take into account that Generation is the product of social and historical context. Generation might be different from countries depends on the critical events that happened during their formative period (childhood and teenagers)
- E) longitudinal studies to observe long period of time to understand the effect of age difference and social perspective
- F) Deployment of flat organizational structure and self-managed setup with even power distribution to match with the needs and expectation of young generation e.g. Holacracy

Thank you