



Employee Retention Factors Affecting Generation X And Y Personnel In The IT Sector.

Sanjana kaushik^{1*}, Dr.Mamta Gaur²

^{1*}Research Scholar, Galgotias University, Assistant professor in Satyug Darshan Institute of Engineering and technology, sanjanakaushik90@gmail.com

²Professor, Galgotias University, mamtagaur@galgotiasuniversity.edu.in

***Corresponding Author:** Sanjana kaushik

*Research Scholar, Galgotias University, Assistant professor in Satyug Darshan Institute of Engineering and technology, sanjanakaushik90@gmail.com

Abstract

This study aims to find out how often Gen X and Gen Y employees leave their jobs. According to Erving Goffman's theory of frame analysis, three key factors have been found to have an effect the way people work, social values, and personal values. Using the answers of 297 employees, the effect of these factors on how people act at work in terms of whether they want to leave or stay with the organization was evaluated in this study. A survey questionnaire was used to get the information. The Neural Network Analysis and the Binary Logistic Regression were used to look at the data and make sure that the Predictive Analysis of Generations X and Y was accurately find out. It was found that differences in personality and behaviour between Generation X and Generation Y cause Generation Y to leave jobs more often than Generation X. Based on the sample, the researchers also made predictions about the two Generations' plans to stay and leave.

Keywords:- Employee Retention, Generation X, Generation Y, Predictive analysis, Employee Engagement.

Introduction

When it comes to human resources and the accomplishment of corporate goals, the generation gap has emerged as one of the primary problems of businesses. Generation is commonly used to describe a cohort of people who have grown up during the same period of time and have similar cultural and social experiences (; Smola and Sutton 2002; Kupperschmidt 2000; Weston 2006). Additionally, a 'generation' is comprised of people who have commonalities in terms of age, birth year, place of birth, conduct, personality type, and emotional state (Eletter et al. 2017). Time, however, has brought about an ever-increasing number of generations that have progressed. In most modern workplaces, employees span multiple generations. There are generational gaps that have been observed to have a wide range of effects on business outcomes. It has been found that employees of different generations often have strong negative feelings towards one another, as stated by Russell and Patrick (2017). Scholars have also noted that workers of various

generations often draw incompatible assumptions and interpretations. Unfortunately, there are times when younger workers must report to their elders. Workers from previous generations often find themselves reporting to those from the current or subsequent generation. Generational differences can arise when members of different generations have some but not all of the same characteristics, such as attitudes and feelings. These situations have the potential to spark arguments at work. To achieve productive business results, it is important to understand the differences between the generations that must work together.

Employers nowadays are mostly hiring members of Generations X and Y Employees , as well as the newest Generation, Generation Z, with a small percentage of workers from the Baby Boomer generation. Researchers believe that Generation X and Y are the most prominent generations in the workplace. There needed to be a contrast made between the features of the two generations. With this method, we can better understand the key

distinctions between Generation X and Millennials. In reality, these traits could contribute to the development of laser-focused initiatives and the implementation of sound decisions with regard to which Generation should be given top priority as leaders within the firm.

Those who were born between the years 1960 and 1975, or possibly between the years 1960 and 1982, are classified as members of Generation 'X.' (Greene 2003; Skiba and Barton 2006; Patterson 2007; Vejar 2018 Smola and Sutton 2002; Sujansky 2004;). Most companies' upper and middle management are made up of members of Generation X. Hard labour, higher education, and financial success are highly valued by these workers (Wiant 1999). Gen X workers, according to Leibow (2014), are not interested in staying in one job for the sake of advancement or prestige, and instead value work-life balance above all else. Concurrently, those born between 1980 and 1995 make up the largest pool of qualified young workers in their twenties and thirties. They are members of Generation Y, sometimes known as Millennials (Pereira et al. 2017). Members of Generation Y are known to be self-reliant, ambitious, and self-assured. When compared to members of Generation 'X,' this cohort is extremely goal-oriented, with success and professional advancement being of paramount importance. It has been noted that Gen Y is more 'advanced' than Gen X in some respects. They are in more demand in the job since they take an active interest in the work they are given to do. So, it would be useful to determine what sets Generation Y apart from Generation X and what keeps millennials working for the same company.

The generational divide is an issue in almost every workplace. Employee productivity and the maintenance of a positive work environment at the workplace have both been shown to be impacted by the generational divide. The turnover rate among employees from Generation Y has been shown to be significantly greater than that of Generation X. Companies in the service and manufacturing industries have been hit most by this issue. So, it was important to figure out how to fix this issue and anticipate the high turnover rates that

will occur among members of Generation Y who are now employed in businesses.

According to ABC Private Limited's (a reputable service provider) 2018–2019 annual report, the percentage of employees in the age range of 26–40 was used to determine the resignation rate of Generation Y workers. Employee turnover rates for Generation X were also determined using age ranges of 41 to 65. As a result, the data suggests that Gen Y employees are more likely to leave their positions than Gen Xers are. As a result, the rate of resignation among Generation Y workers in 2018-2019 is higher than among Generation X workers.

This generational divide has a substantial effect on businesses, as predicted by the research and confirmed by the data collected thus far.

The findings of this research could be useful for companies as they work to keep workers from Generations X and Y. If millennials and members of Generation Y have faith in and stick with their current employer, and do their best to meet the company's needs, they may be able to advance in their careers and become more integral contributors. In some cases, it may not be possible for the business to meet every single one of its employees' demands. Workers, however, must strike a balance between what they want (in terms of career advancement and rewards) and what their employers can actually give them (in terms of perks and policies). Each worker must make up their own mind about whether or not they want to remain with the company. The best way ahead, however, appears to be a compromise between individual preferences and institutional requirements, which will serve to the benefit of both the employee and the business (organization).

Moreover, undergraduate researchers would benefit from this study because they would gain experience in conducting a research study that is relevant to a local context. Also, these researchers might become accustomed to both the qualitative and quantitative components of data collection and analysis. The research will also assist them improve their time management, statistical analysis, and thesis writing abilities. The researchers will benefit professionally and in the future from these enhanced skills. Future researchers will

benefit from this study by learning what kinds of solutions they should develop to keep present employees, especially members of Generation Y, in firms.

Research into the existing literature

Several prior studies have examined how different generations act in the workplace. These authors have examined the differences and similarities between the work styles of Generation X and Generation Y, as well as their impact on the workplace. Since Generation Y is predicted to leave the workforce at a higher rate than Generation X, the current study's authors set out to clarify the differences between the two generations' work methods, personal beliefs, and social ideals, as well as their conduct in the workplace.

Comparing the 'X' and 'Y' generations' traits

The focus of this analysis is on contrasting the generational differences between early and late-career professionals in order to better understand the factors that make each group unique. Table 1.1 contains the included data. Characteristics shared by both Generation X and Generation Y will be included and addressed in further depth below. The researchers have zeroed down on the differences in work habits between the two groups. Researchers used Erving Goffman's (1974) Frame Analysis Theory to make these distinctions. The differences between Generation X and Y can be seen in their approaches to work, their values as individuals, and their outlook on society as a whole. Generation X and Y's unique work habits prompted academics to zero in on issues of workplace adaptability, productivity, and information sharing. Personal characteristics such as mentorship and leadership, as well as social values such as respect and community involvement, were given special emphasis.

Styles of Work and Its Origins

The data suggests that members of Generation X are less interested in advancing their jobs than their predecessors because they value family and personal happiness more highly (Patterson 2007). In the workplace, they use sensible and effective measures to address issues that arise. Nonetheless, members of

Generation X are more likely to stay with a company if it has a flat organisational structure (Lyon et al. 2005). However, members of Generation Y either do not recognise or downplay the distinction between work and personal life (Anantatmula and Shrivastav 2012). In keeping with this, members of Generation Y are more committed to lifelong education than their predecessors (Lester et al. 2012). As a result, today's youth typically boast higher levels of education than their parents' generation. So, in comparison to their counterparts of previous generations, the vast majority of millennials have earned more advanced degrees or professional certifications (Williams 2000). So, members of Generation Y are more prepared to take on a wide range of obstacles and emerge victorious thanks to their familiarity with cutting-edge technologies and methods (Anantatmula & Shrivastav 2012). Compared to older generations, both Generation Y and Generation Z were raised with technology at home, and both Generation X and Generation Z are more comfortable with technology (Mahmoud et al. 2021a).

Flexibility

The term "workplace flexibility" is used to describe policies that give workers some leeway in determining when and where they do their duties (Obonyo 2018 and Omondi). Workers of Generation X are more willing to switch employment if doing so would result in a more favourable work-life balance (Glass 2007). Ritter (2014) claims that members of this generation are looking for more adaptable work arrangements so that they can strike a healthy work-life balance. In contrast, members of Generation Y are looking for more freedom in their professional lives. These workers think they can get more done in less time, so they demand flexibility in their scheduling even though they want to take on increasingly difficult assignments (Lloyd 2007). Success in an employee's career, according to Cogin (2011), may be measured by how well they are able to manage their time between work and other commitments. Previous studies have so validated the way in which the two generations embrace workplace flexibility to ensure efficient operations.

Work output

The actions of workers in the workplace are what constitute job performance; this includes not just how successfully workers complete their jobs but also how they behave in relation to each and every one of those activities (Fogaca et al. 2018). Those of Generation X are more prone to believe they should exert maximum effort even when they are not being watched, as stated by Wiant (1999). Furthermore, these workers try to accomplish both personal and corporate objectives. Nonetheless, when motivated, employees from Generation Y will work hard to achieve their goals. To this end, they find ways to have fun while still getting the task done well (Bencsik et al. 2016). As a result, members of Generation Y are skilled at collaborating with peers and interdisciplinary groups. Together, they think creatively, resourcefully, and collaboratively. Several people from this generation attempt to create value (Deloitte 2015). In this section, we'll examine the differences between the two generations in terms of their work habits and productivity.

Transfer of Information

The goal of knowledge sharing is to improve an organization's efficiency and effectiveness through better decision-making and the implementation of policies supported by evidence (Tsui et al. 2006). According to Ipe (2003), the major purpose of knowledge sharing is for an expert to teach others in their field. Also, the same author stressed the need of an employee's intrinsic motivation in order to accumulate a wealth of information that may be shared with others. Building a company culture that encourages employees to freely exchange information is a challenge. Individual employees' openness to information sharing is crucial, and employees' motivations play a role in shaping their willingness to do so (Akhavan et al. 2013). So, the nature of the working styles of Generations X and Y is influenced by knowledge exchange.

Integral Principles

Every employee in any given company has to interact with others who have various perspectives and worldviews. An employee may occasionally need to figure out how to act in a work setting with people who have widely

varying norms and values. On the one hand, Gen X workers are self-confident, enjoy working alone, and want little to no management. When it comes to doing their work, they are generally trustworthy and devoted to their respective fields (Jorgensen et al. 2003; and Tziner 2011). Because they've grown up in a more diverse culture, members of Generation Y are more open to and accepting of diversity of all kinds, cultural as well as personal and societal (Blain et al. 2008; Brown et al. 2009). For this reason, it is crucial to understand the unique set of values and traits that Generations X and Y bring to the workplace.

Mentoring

The concept of mentorship has been previously defined by other researchers. Nevertheless, the majority of these definitions are based on the one offered by (Kram 1985). The author defines mentoring as the process of establishing rapport between a more seasoned worker (the mentor) and a newer worker (the mentee). Patterson (2007) claims that individuals of Generation Y are eager to take on the role of mentor and learn new skills from more experienced colleagues or managers. As a result, members of Generation Y seek out mentors in order to gain more useful and satisfying insights, advice, and direction on how to achieve their goals (Bennett et al. 2012).

In addition, Kram (1985) confirmed that mentees benefit from role modelling since they are able to observe and absorb the mentor's every move. As a result, it is easy to see how mentorship ensures a steady stream of operations within a business. It is especially crucial if the company values and want to keep its younger employees, such as when they join. This can be accomplished if trainees are given more information about what is expected of them in the workplace. In this respect, mentoring can be useful.

Leadership

An organisation needs leaders who can motivate their teams to accomplish their goals (Stoner et al. 2016). Organizational leadership research typically focuses on how top managers make an impact on the company as a whole and how their decisions shape the

company's culture and direction. Those of Generation Y who work in an environment that demands obedience to superiors learn, work together, and socialise quickly (Smola and Sutton 2002). Generation X, on the other hand, thinks that putting in a lot of effort pays off. It's important noting that they don't just put in long hours while their managers or captains are around. These workers consistently seek a middle ground between satisfying their employer's needs and furthering their personal ambitions (Wiant 1999). All of these things provide executives from the X generation a solid sense of direction, so they can steer their companies in the correct direction and make the kind of sound decisions that will propel them towards their long-term objectives (Daft 2005; Ireland and Hitt 1999).

Moral principles

It is detrimental for workers to sit alone and try to complete difficult tasks on their own, and social activity within the workplace is crucial for workers' well-being. Yet, differences in this respect have been noted between the generations X and Y in the workplace.

Generation Y workers, according to Kultalahti and Viitala (2014), are more likely to participate in extracurricular activities than their Generation X counterparts. Gen Y places a premium on autonomy, adaptability, mobility, general but shallow knowledge, success, creativity, and access to information in the workplace. Generation X, on the other hand, is known for its diligence, openness, respect for variety, curiosity, realism, and deference to authority (Bencsik et al., 2016). Ryan (2000) claims that Gen Y is the most socially engaged generation since the 1960s. For this reason, it is critical to defend the different societal values held by the two generations in the workplace.

Respect

Every community, no matter how large or small, requires its residents to treat one another with dignity and respect. Employees are expected to treat one another with dignity and fairness in the workplace. O'Grady (2017) defines respect as an essential component of healthy interpersonal relationships,

exemplified by a willingness to value and include others while seeking to maximise mutual benefit. It's also been observed that both the X and Y generations find solace and esteem among others who share their values. As a result, value matching facilitates the process of assigning individuals to groups (Kipnis and Childs 2004). According to Deloitte (2015), members of Generation X appreciate direction and demand to be treated with dignity on the job. Young adults today are trying to strike out on their own, and they value leaders who are transparent and honest about the challenges they face.

The term "community" is used to describe the bond that forms when a group of individuals trust each other, enjoy working together, and view teamwork as a positive means of getting things done (Zani and Cicognani, 2012). Since many members of Generation X's workforce are poor team players, personal ties are very important to them, according to Patterson (2007).

Individually, they frequently attempt to solve problems or complete tasks. In the workplace, people of Generation Y tend to prefer collaborative efforts, whether they take place in person or online. Teamwork, in their eyes, is the best method to get things done and keep moving forward on projects and endeavours (Cole et al. 2002; Howe and Strauss, 2000; Skiba and Barton, 2006). They value team member greetings and are careful to remember important dates like birthdays and anniversaries for their coworkers and team members.

Inappropriate Behaviour in the Workplace

According to Jagannathan (2014), workplace conduct or workplace attitude refers to the actions and attitudes of employees while on the job. There are noticeable differences in how each generation behaves, with Generation X typically being more reserved and laid-back than Generation Y, who tend to be more independent and goal-oriented. Typically, a large portion of a company's staff will exert themselves constantly for the sake of the company's success. Despite this, it's crucial to understand the factors that influence workers' decisions on whether to stay with or switch jobs inside an organisation. There is a

generational divide among firms, and it affects worker retention and turnover rates. So, the study's authors zeroed in on previous studies on Gen X and Y's intentions to stay or leave their respective employers.

Retention

It's a method of keeping workers with one company over an extended length of time or until a specific goal has been achieved (Das and Baruah 2013). When members of Generation X are committed to staying with their current employment, turnover due to a lack of professional advancement opportunities will decrease (Weston 2006). According to Goessling (2017), members of Generation X are more likely to stay with the same company for a long time if they find the work to be engaging and can choose their own pace. Generation Y, on the other hand, places a higher value on extrinsic incentives, and this is why many of them plan to remain in their current jobs (Twenge 2010). Extrinsic rewards have been further defined by these authors to include monetary compensation and other material benefits. The company hopes that by offering these perks, they will be able to keep their Generation Y workers. One study suggests that businesses might increase their retention rates by providing career counselling programmes for employees from Generation Y. (Lowe et al. 2011).

Absence of commitment to remain

Those who have already made up their minds to leave their jobs are said to have a "turnover intention" (Jacobs and Roodt 2007). According to Price (2001), employee turnover occurs when an individual leaves a company and joins another. Sutton (2002) and Smola however focuses on that the millennials are less devoted to their employers than previous generations. If employees do not find sufficient challenge in their existing positions, they may look elsewhere for employment. As a result, members of Generation Y place a higher value on objects associated with personal freedom than did their parents' generation, and they prefer to work in settings that allow them some measure of autonomy.

If these conditions aren't met, though, millennials may look elsewhere for

employment (Gardner, 2008 and Cennamo). As a result, individuals of Generation Y seek for opportunities for personal growth and professional challenge, and if they don't get either, they are likely to leave their current positions in search of more satisfying work (Queiri et al. 2014).

Methodology for Research

The SLIIT Business School Research Committee approved this study. Information was gathered from both online and paper forms. Nonetheless, the Google Form was favoured over the paper survey because of logistical constraints associated with delivering paper surveys to respondents in light of the current state of affairs in the country (Covid-19). Two parts made up the survey. The primary goal of the initial inquiry is to collect respondent personal information. Whereas the second part is designed to collect information on how different generations behave. The seven characteristics of flextime, job performance, information sharing, mentoring, leadership, community, and respect are used to quantify the independent variables. The retention and intention to leave of the two Generations 'X' and 'Y' serve as measures of the dependent variable.. The questions were created using a Likert scale with five points to measure each model variable, from (1) strong Agree to (5) strong disagree.

The researchers suggested using a quantitative approach to carry it out. All study elements were explained by the study population. A stratified sampling strategy was used by the researchers. Krejcie and Morgan's (1970) example guided the selection of the sample size. At the 95% confidence level, we decided to use a margin of error of 5%. It was determined that a sample size of 306 was necessary. But just 297 people responded, for a response rate of 7%. This kind of sampling helped acquire objective data. Thirty people participated in a pilot survey to test whether the questions were well-written and presented in a logical sequence. Email was used to disseminate the survey's web link to the participants. Researchers surveyed 297 workers from Generations X and Y at seven different international service sector corporations. Because that data collection was

restricted to a single point in time, the researchers here conducted a cross-sectional analysis. Given that the researchers are unsure of whether or not the variables are correlated, a cross-sectional study design was chosen for this investigation (Spector 2019). Mahmoud, et al. (2021b) state that cross-sectional research has a good reason to be used in a crisis (Wartime, Covid-19). Hence, a cross-sectional approach was taken for this investigation during the Covid era.

Examination of Data

The researchers started their investigation with a reliability and validity check. In the end, they used three different types of analysis to get at their conclusion.

Tests of reliability and validity yielded the following results.

The SPSS statistical package was used to analyse the survey's quantitative data. After that, they were able to establish the research's credibility and validity. The coefficient of dependability (Cronbach's alpha) was found to be 0.827. The obtained co-efficient value, however, suggested that the findings of the investigation were quite credible. Generation X and Y employees from a cross-section of service industry organisations made up the 297 respondents to the poll. With these responses, we were able to determine the Cronbach's alpha. Cronbach's alpha for the variables in this analysis was calculated to be 0.827. Researchers checked the reliability of their survey's sample using KMO and Bartlett values. 0.727 was found to be the value shared by KMO and Bartlett.

The primary goal of this research is to identify, using the study's sample, which employees are most likely to remain with their respective companies. Researchers recoded responses in order to achieve this goal, combining mean values of exit intention and retention replies into a single scale. In order to derive the predicted analysis of the workers based on these data, the researchers followed three key analysis investigations.

Prediction using descriptive statistics was the initial way of analysis. According to the findings, the average generation 'X' worker has a value of 3.5052, whereas the average generation 'Y' worker has a value of 1.9494.

The majority of 'X'er respondents disagree with statements about their likely departure, as seen by their responses. In contrast, most members of Generation Y who participated in the study gave answers of either "Strongly Agree" or "Agree" when asked about statements about their intent to leave the company. So, it has been determined that members of Generation Y are more likely to voluntarily leave their employers than members of Generation X.

Researchers obtained samples of data from which to draw their conclusions. When looking at the sample as a whole, however, the mean numbers given for lower bound and higher bound, 3.4171 and 3.5932 respectively, indicate that Generation 'X' respondents Disagree to leave the organisations. Yet, when it comes to employees of the Generation Y, the mean values for the lower bound and upper bound are 1.8364 and 2.0624, respectively, indicating that these workers still Strongly Agree or Agree to leave their firms.

And as indicated in Table the researchers also calculated the precise number of employees who will remain with the company based on their sample.

	Frequency	Percentage
0 = Retain	149	50.2
1 = Leave	148	49.8
Total	297	100.0

Researchers predicted employee turnover by assigning a value of '0' to those who would remain with the company and a value of '1' to those who would depart. As a result of these results, we know that only 149 of the 297 employees in the sample will remain with the same company, while the remaining 148 will quit.

Regression Analysis of Binary Data The researchers also used Binary Logistic Regression to make predictions about which of the two generations of workers would stay and which would eventually leave. The outcomes are presented in Table44.

Table 4 shows the results of a predictive analysis using Binary Logistic Regression for the X and Y generations. (Data generated by the SPSS Binary Logistic Regression Test).

	Leave or retention	Percentage correct	
	Leave	Retention	
<i>Step 1</i>			
Leave retention	86	63	57.7
Overall percentage	48	100	67.6
			62.6

^aThe cut value is .500

Based on the findings of Table shows that , it can be predicted the number of employees who will retain; i.e. out of the 149 employees who retain, only 57.7% employees will retain within the organizations. On the other hand, it

can be predicted the number of employees who will leave: i.e. out of the 148 employees who leave, only 67.6% will leave the organizations. Hence, it is seen that the percentage values of intention to leave is higher than that of the value of retention of the employees at the workplaces.

Neural network analysis

Nevertheless, it was needed to predict with more accuracy to find who will retain and leave. Hence, the researchers followed neural network analysis to continue the prediction.

Table 5 Predictive analysis of generations X and Y using neural network analysis.
(Source: SPSS Neural Network Test Output)

	Cross Entropy Error	51.033
Training	Percent Incorrect Predictions	8.4%
	Stopping Rule Used	1 consecutive step(s) with no decrease in error^a
	Training Time	0:00:00.22
Testing	Cross entropy error	22.167
	Percent incorrect predictions	8.8%

Leave or Retain is the dependent variable.

Error estimates are calculated using data from the testing sample Using stratified sampling, the researchers used 70% of their data set for training and 30% for testing. It follows that 8.4% of inaccurate predictions were made during training, and 8.8% were made during testing. That is to say, the accuracy of the prediction is 91.6% in the training set and 91.2% in the testing set.

This analysis approach is likely more precise than the Binary Logistic Regression. This prompted the researchers to keep their eye on the predictions of workers, and they've provided some more context for their findings.

Table 6 Predictive analysis of generations X and Y using neural network analysis. (Source: SPSS Neural Network Test Output)

Sample	Observed	Predicted		
		.00	1.00	Percent correct
Training	.00	84	15	84.8%
	1.00	2	102	98.1%

Sample	Observed	Predicted		
		.00	1.00	Percent correct
Testing	Overall Percentage	42.4%	57.6%	91.6%
	.00	36	6	85.7%
	1.00	1	37	97.4%
	Overall Percentage	46.3%	53.8%	91.3%

Leave or Retain (as the dependent variable)

Data shows that 98.1% of the training set will be dropped, whereas 85.7% of the testing set will be dropped.

So, it can be shown that researchers have been able to accurately forecast whether or not an employee from Generation X or Y will be leaving the company by using Neural network analysis.

Discussion

The primary aim of this study is to identify the prognostic The primary goal of this study is to do a prospective examination of how Gen X and Y will perform in the workplace. Hence,

the researchers polled 297 workers from various companies. Hence, they made sure their data was legitimate and trustworthy. Researchers used SPSS to run a reliability analysis and a KMO analysis to get there. The KMO results were 0.727, and the total dependability was assessed to be 0.827. It was determined from these values that the data set acquired is genuine and dependable, allowing us to move forward with more analysis techniques towards our research goal.

To get to their conclusion, the researchers used three distinct analyses. They began by using a descriptive analytic test to determine whether or not members of Generations X and Y planned to depart the company. As can be seen from the data, members of Generation Y are more likely to agree with the statement "I want to leave my job" than members of Generation X. After that, they used a second kind of analysis called binary logistics regression to foretell employee retention and turnover intent. The findings confirmed the predicted percentages of workers who will stay with their current employers and those who will depart. The researchers used neural network analysis as their third and last way of analysis to guarantee a high degree of accuracy for prediction. More correctly than the alternative study based on the number of employees who decided to retain and/or leave in the two Generations X and Y, this analysis projected the percentage values of employees who are likely to retain as well as depart the firm. The 297 participants used to calculate these results represent a representative sample.

Companies should give considerable thought to the generational differences in their workforce (Mahmoud et al. 2021c). According to Glass (2007), one of Generation X's most notable traits in the workplace has been its emphasis on results rather than processes. In addition, members of Generation X cannot subscribe to the egocentric "me" concept. They are considerate and thoughtful (Johnson 2010). In other words, millennials place a higher value on extrinsic regulation (both material and recognisable) than prior generations, while placing a lower value on extrinsic regulation (both social and

introjected) (Mahmoud et al. 2020a, b). According to previous research, this study indicated that members of Generations X and Y share commonalities in their work habits, morals, and ethics. Among the selected service sector companies in Sri Lanka, the average values of the independent variables nature of working styles, personal values, and social values show that employees of Generation 'X' have a greater emphasis on social values, while employees of Generation 'Y' place a greater emphasis on personal values.

Members of Generation X are more inclined to agree with Wiant's (1999) assertion that one should work hard even when one is not being watched. As an added bonus, these workers are aiming for both personal and corporate success. Members of Generation Y, on the other hand, place a higher value on freedom-related things than those of Generation X did, and they prefer to work in settings that give them autonomy. All of those results were replicated in the current study. The findings of this study suggest that Generations X and Y's different approaches to work have significant ramifications for how people behave in the workplace in Sri Lanka. As a result, it is clear that the employees of Generation X are the ones most impacted by the shift in the character of the workplace.

According to Weyland (2011), mentoring enables Generation Y workers to excel in their jobs by providing them with direction, encouragement, and feedback. Younger 'X'ers value hard work as a measure of success. They don't put in extra effort solely when their superiors or team captains are around. These workers relentlessly pursue both professional excellence and personal growth (Wiant 1999). Personal values also influence the actions of Generations X and Y in the workplace, according to the selected service sector organisations studied in this study. Generation Y workers are particularly vulnerable to this shift because of their own values.

Ryan (2000) argues that Gen Y is the most politically engaged generation since the 1960s. In addition, they contribute to the development of productive, pleasant, and technologically advanced places of employment. Leaders that are straightforward, honest, and upfront gain

the respect of Generation Y personnel (Arora and Dhole, 2019). About Generation X, the current researchers were able to uncover information from previous studies that offered conflicting perspectives on the importance of belonging to a community. The present researchers were able to determine that Generation Y employees are more sociable than Generation X employees by drawing on the previous literature. Moreover, it has been observed that, based on their sample, Generation X workers have been affected more than any other group by a single shift in social ideals. In other words, if Generation X workers are exposed to an increase of one unit in social values, they will adapt their conduct in the workplace sooner than Millennial workers.

People of Generation Y are often trying new things, both personally and professionally (Ruble 2013). When compared to other generations in the workforce, Generation Y has a greater turnover rate (Twenge 2006; Lancaster and Stillman 2003; Tulgan & Martin, 2001). According to Kerslake (2005), this is because members of Generation Y are prioritised in terms of their own ambitions. As a result of their commitment and the versatility of their skill sets, businesses are actively seeking to keep Generation X workers on staff. Despite these results, the present researchers have shown that, at least in the selected service sector organisations, employees of Generation Y are more likely to want to leave their jobs .

Conclusion and Recommendations

As a result of their data analysis and subsequent debate, the researchers came to a few conclusions about the future of Generation X and Y in the workplace.

Descriptive analysis was the initial kind of analysis used by the researchers to compare the likelihood of employees from Generation X and Y to resign. Workers in the Generation X cohort were found to have a mean value of 3.5052, whereas those in the Millennial cohort averaged 1.9494. To summarise, the majority of 'X' generation respondents indicated a desire to stay with the company, whereas the majority of 'Y' generation respondents indicated a desire to depart. In the selected service sector enterprises in Sri Lanka, it has

been found that employees from Generation Y are more likely to quit than those from Generation X.

The researchers used a second kind of analysis called Binary Logistic Regression to make predictions about which of the two generations of workers would be more likely to stay with the company or to depart. According to the data, just 57.7% of the 149 current employees will remain with the company. Yet, only 67.6% of the 148 departing workers are expected to leave their current employers. It follows that the percentage of employees planning to leave their jobs is greater than the percentage planning to stay.

The researchers also used Neural Network Analysis as a third type of analysis to continue their prediction with greater accuracy to figure out who will stay and who would go. According to the results, it was found that 84.8% of the training set would be retained and 98.1% would be dropped, while in the testing set, 85.7% would be retained and 97.4% would be dropped. As can be seen, the researchers were able to accurately forecast whether or not a person from Generations X and Y would be departing the business using Neural network analysis. Yet, these results allowed the researchers to conclude that employees of Generation Y are more likely to leave the selected private enterprises operating in the service sector in Sri Lanka than employees of Generation X.

The current research team predicted and compared the generations X and Y in private sector enterprises in Sri Lanka. Thus, experts advise subsequent researchers to base their studies on the upcoming Generations, such as Generation Z and Generation alpha. Despite the fact that the research issue was discovered in both service and industry sector firms, the focus of the present study was limited to those businesses that fall under the service umbrella. In light of this, future studies of the same research subject should broaden their scope to include the public sector and other industries and should increase the number of variables and participants studied.

The findings of this study suggest that organisations in the service industry should offer leadership development programmes to

members of both Generations X and Y. Mentoring programmes may help businesses of all sizes and across all generations improve the morale and productivity of their staff by identifying and addressing the unique challenges faced by each generation. Gen X workers should be kept abreast on industry news and encouraged to use their initiative in the workplace. The use of such methods aids workers in standing out, delivering exceptional results, and establishing their worth to their employers. In addition, managers are encouraged to build stronger relationships with their staff members if they want to reduce the likelihood that Generation Y workers will consider leaving their companies. Managers can serve as the link between employees and their companies, allowing the latter to improve the working conditions of the former by, for example, creating more pleasant and healthy offices and increasing the attractiveness of the latter's compensation and benefits packages. The goal is to increase the percentage of Millennials still with the company after two years. Because of this, businesses are more likely to accomplish their missions when human resources are handled strategically.

References

1. Akhavan P, Rahimi A, Mehralian G. Developing a model for knowledge sharing in research centers. *Vine*. 2013; 43(3):357–393. doi: 10.1108/VINE-06-2012-0020. [Cross Ref] [Google Scholar]
2. Anantatmula VS, Shrivastav B. Evolution of project teams for generation Y workforce. *Int. J. Manag. Proj. Bus.* 2012;5(1):9–26. doi: 10.1108/17538371211192874. [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
3. Arora, N., Dhole, V., Generation, Y.: Perspective, engagement, expectations, preferences and satisfactions from workplace; a study conducted in Indian context. *Benchmarking: An Int.l J.* **26**(5), 1378–1404 (2019). 10.1108/bij-05-2018-0132
4. Bencsik A, Juhasz T, Horvath-Csikos G. Y and Z generations at workplaces. *J. Compet.* 2016;6(3):90–106. doi: 10.7441/joc.2016.03.06. [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
5. Bencsik, A., & Machova, R. (2016). Knowledge sharing problems from the view point of intergeneration management. *ICMLG2016–4th International Conference on Management, Leadership and Governance* (p. 42). St Petersburg, Russia: Academic Conferences and Publishing limited.
6. Bennett J, Pitt M, Price S. Understanding the impact of generational issues in the workplace. *Facilities*. 2012;30(7/8):278–288. doi: 10.1108/02632771211220086. [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
7. Blain S, Queguiner B, Trull TW. The natural iron fertilization experiment KEOPS (KErguelen Ocean and Plateau compared Study): an overview. *Deep Sea Res. Part II*. 2008;55(5–7):559–565. doi: 10.1016/j.dsr2.2008.01.002. [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
8. Bova B, Kroth M. Workplace learning and generation X. *J. Work. Learn.* 2001; 13(02):57–65. doi: 10.1108/13665620110383645. [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
9. Brown, S., Carter, B., Collines, M., Gallerson, C., Giffin, G., Greer, J., Richardson, K. (2009). *Generation Y in the Workplace*.
10. Cennamo L, Gardner D. Generational differences in work values, outcomes and person-organization values fit. *J. Manag. Psychol.* 2008;23(8):891–906. doi: 10.1108/02683940810904385. [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
11. Cogin J. Are generational differences in work values fact or fiction? Multi-country evidence and implications. *Int. J. Human Resour. Manag.* 2011;23(11):1–27. doi: 10.1080/09585192.2011.610967. [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
12. Cole G, Smith R, Lucas L. The debut of generation Y in the American workforce. *J. Bus. Adm. Online*. 2002; 1(2):1–10. [Google Scholar]
13. Daft RL, Lane P. *The Leadership Experience*. 3. Mason, Ohio: Thomson/South-Western; 2005. [Google Scholar]
14. Das, B. L., & Baruah, M. (2013). Employee retention: a review of literature. *IOSR J. Bus. Manag.*, 14(2), 8–

16. Retrieved from <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/0fe1/bdfebc4272a68a87cb80edfa08103090297e.pdf>
15. Deloitte. (2015). The 2015 Deloitte Millennial Survey - Executive Summary. DTTL Global Brand & Communications.
16. Eletter S, Sulieman M, Ainaji L. Generational diversity and work values. *J. Hotel Bus. Manag.* 2017 doi: 10.4172/2169-0286.100156. [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
17. Fogaça N, Rego MC, Armond LP, Coelho FA. Job performance analysis: scientific studies in the main journals of management and psychology from 2006 to 2015. *Perform. Improv. Q.* 2018; 30(4):231–247. doi: 10.1002/piq.21248. [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
18. Glass A. Understanding generational differences for competitive success. *Ind. Commer. Train.* 2007; 39(02):98–103. doi: 10.1108/00197850710732424. [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
19. Goessling, M. (2017). Attraction and retention of generations X, Y and Z in the workplace. *Integrated Studies*, 66. Retrieved from <https://digitalcommons.murraystate.edu/bis437/66>
20. Goffman E. *Frame analysis : an essay on the organization of experience*. New York: Harper & Row; 1974. [Google Scholar]
21. Greene WH. *Econometric analysis*. 5. USA: Prentice Hall; 2003. [Google Scholar]
22. Han, D., & Su, X. (2011). Managing generation Y: recruiting and motivating. *International conference on management and service science (MASS)* (p. 4). IEEE.
23. Hannay, M., & Fretwell, C. (2011). The higher education workplace: meeting the needs of multiple Generations. *Res. Higher Educ. J.*, 10, 6–12. Retrieved from <http://eu.aabri.com/manuscripts/10709.pdf>
24. Howe, N., & Strauss, W. (2000). Millennials rising: the next great generation. Knopf Doubleday Publishing Group.
25. Ipe M. Knowledge sharing in organizations: a conceptual frame work. *Hum. Resour. Dev. Rev.* 2003; 2(4):337–359. doi: 10.1177/1534484303257985. [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
26. Ireland RD, Hitt MA. Achieving and maintaining strategic competitiveness in the 21st century: the role of strategic leadership. *Acad. Manag. Perspect.* 1999; 13(1):63–77. doi: 10.5465/AME.1999.1567311. [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
27. Jacobs E, Roodt G. The development of a knowledge sharing construct to predict turnover intentions. *ASLIB Proc.* 2007; 59(3):229–248. doi: 10.1108/00012530710752034. [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
28. Jagannathan A. Determinants of employee engagement and their impact on employee performance. *Int. J. Product. Perform. Manag.* 2014; 63 (3):308–323. doi: 10.1108/IJPPM-01-2013-0008. [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
29. Johnson SP. How Infants Learn About the Visual World. *Cogn. Sci.* 2010; 34(7):1158–1184. doi: 10.1111/j.1551-6709.2010.01127.x. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
30. Jorgensen P, Breitkreutz BJ, Breitkreutz K, Stark C, Liu G, Cook M, Tyers M. Harvesting the genome's Bounty: integrative genomics. *Cold Spring Harb. Symp. Quant. Biol.* 2003; 68: 431–444. doi: 10.1101/sqb.2003.68.431. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
31. Kerslake P. Words from the Ys. *New Zealand Manag.* 2005; 52:44–46. [Google Scholar]
32. Kim, S.W., Price, J.L., Mueller, C.W., & Watson, T.W.: The determinants of career intent among physicians at a US Air Force hospital. *Human Relations*, 49(7), 947–976 (1996)
33. Kipnis DG, Childs GM. Educating generation X and generation Y: teaching tips for librarians. *Med. Ref. Serv. q.* 2004; 23(4):25–33. doi: 10.1300/ j115

- v23n04_03. [PubMed] [Cross Ref] [Google Scholar]
34. Kram K. Mentoring at work: developmental relationships in organizational life. Foresman and Company: Scott; 1985. [Google Scholar]
 35. Krejcie RV, Morgan DW. Determining sample size for research activities. *Educ. Psychol. Measur.* 1970;30: 007–610. doi: 10.1177/001316447003000308. [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
 36. Kultalahti, S., & Viitala, R. (2014). Sufficient challenges and a weekend ahead - Generation Y describing motivation at work. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 27(4). doi:10.1108/JOCM-05-2014-0101
 37. Kupperschmidt BR. Understanding Generation X employees. *J. Nurs. Adm.* 1998;28(12):36–43. doi: 10.1097/00005110-199812000-00012. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
 38. Kupperschmidt BR. Multigeneration employees: strategies for effective management. *HealthProg.* 2000;19(1):65–76. doi: 10.1097/00126450-200019010-00011. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
 39. Lancaster LC, Stillman D, Mackay H. When generations collide: who they are, why they clash, how to solve the generational puzzle at work. New York: Collins Business; 2003. [Google Scholar]
 40. Leibow, C. (2014). Work/Life Balance for the Generations. Retrieved 10 07, 2020, from www.huffpost.com: https://www.huffpost.com/entry/worklife-balance-for-the-_1_b_5992766
 41. Leo J. The good-news generation. *U.S News World Rep.* 2003;135(15):65–76. [Google Scholar]
 42. Lester S, Standifer RL, Schultz NJ, Windsor JM. Actual versus perceived generational differences at work: an empirical examination. *J. Leadersh. Organ. Stud.* 2012; 19(3):341–354. doi: 10.1177/1548051812442747. [Cross Ref] [Google Scholar]
 43. Lloyd J. The truth about gen Y. *Mark. Mag.* 2007;112(19):12–22. [Google Scholar]
 44. Lowe D, Levitt K, Wilson T. Solutions for retaining generation Y employees in the workplace. *IEEE Eng. Manage. Rev.* 2011;39(2):46–52. doi: 10.1109/EMR.2011.5876174. [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
 45. Lyon K, Legg S, Toulson P. Generational cohorts. *Int. J. Diversity Organ., Commun. Nations.* 2005; 5(1):89–98. doi: 10.18848/1447-9532/CGP/v_05i01/38852. [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
 46. Mahmoud A, Reisel W, Fuxman L, Mohr I. A motivational standpoint of job insecurity effects on organizational citizenship behaviors: a Generational study. *Scand. J. Psychol.* 2020;62(2):267–275. doi: 10.1111/sjop.12689. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
 47. Mahmoud A, Reisel W, Grigoriou N, Fuxman L, Mohr I. The reincarnation of work motivation: millennials vs older generations. *Int. Sociol.* 2020;35(4):393–414. doi: 10.1177/0268580920912970. [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
 48. Mahmoud, A.B., Ball, J., Rubin, D., Fuxman, L., Mohr, I., Hack-Polay, D., Grigoriou, N. and Wakibi, A.: Pandemic pains to Instagram gains! COVID-19 perceptions effects on behaviours towards fashion brands on Instagram in sub-Saharan Africa: tech-native vs non-native generations. *Journal of Marketing Communications*, pp.1–25. (2021a)
 49. Mahmoud, A.B., Reisel, W.D., Fuxman, L., Hack-Polay, D.: Locus of control as a moderator of the effects of COVID-19 perceptions on job insecurity, psychosocial, organisational, and job outcomes for MENA region hospitality employees. *European Management Review.* (2021b).
 50. Mahmoud, A., Hack-Polay, D., Reisel, W., Fuxman, L., Grigoriou, N., Mohr, I., & Aizouk, R.: Who's more vulnerable? A Generational investigation of COVID-19 perceptions' effect on Organisational citizenship Behaviours in the MENA region: job insecurity, burnout and job satisfaction as mediators. *BMC Public Health.* 21(1). doi: 10.1186/s12889-021-11976-2 [PMC free article] [PubMed]

51. Martin, C. A.: From high maintenance to high productivity What managers need to know about Generation Y. *Industrial and commercial training*, 37(1), 39–44. Retrieved from <https://www.deepdyve.com/lp/emerald-publishing/from-high-maintenance-to-high-productivity-what-managers-need-to-know-n2BI6NiyHB>
52. Megginson D, Robert R. *Coaching and Mentoring: Theory and Practice*. s.l.: SAGE Publications Ltd; 2004. [Google Scholar]
53. Meier, J., Crocker, M. & F, S.: Generation Y in the workforce: managerial challenges. *J. Human Resour. Adult Learn.*, 6(1): 68–78.
54. O'Grady E. 'Learning to be more human': perspectives of respect within prison education in an irish young offenders institution. *J. Prison Educ. Reentry*. 2017;4(1):4–16. doi: 10. 15845/jper.v4i1.1010. [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
55. Omondi, A. A., & Obonyo, P. K. (2018). Flexible work schedules: a critical review of literature. *Strategic J. Bus. Change Manag.* 5(4), 2069–2086. Retrieved from <http://strategicjournals.com/index.php/journal/article/view/1002>
56. Park J, Gursoy D. Generation effects on work engagement among U.S hotel employees. *Int. J. Hosp. Manag.* 2012; 31(4):1195–1202. doi: 10.1016/j.ijhm.2012.02.007. [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
57. Patterson, C. K. (2007). Generational diversity—the impact of generational diversity in the workplace. *Divers. Factor*, 15(3), 17–22. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/233612050_Generational_Diversity__The_Impact_of_Generational_Diversity_in_the_Workplace
58. Pereira V, Malik A, Howe-walsh L, Munjal S, Hirekhan M. Managing yopatriates: a longitudinal study of generation Y expatriates in an Indian multinational corporation. *J. Int. Manag.* 2017;23(2):151–165. doi: 10.1016/j.intman.2016.11.002. [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
59. Price JL. Reflections on the determinants of voluntary turnover. *Int. J. Manpow.* 2001;22(7):600–624. doi: 10.1108/EUM00000000006233. [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
60. Queiri A, Yusoff WF, Dwaikatt N. Generation-Y employees' turnover: work-values fit perspective. *Int. J. Bus. Manag.* 2014; 9(11):199–213. doi: 10.5539/ijbm.v9n11p199. [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
61. Raines, C. (2002). *Managing Millennials*. Retrieved 08 15, 2020, from [http:// www. Generationsatwork.com/articles/millennials.html](http://www.Generationsatwork.com/articles/millennials.html)
62. Ritter, N. (2014). Multiple generations in today's workplace. *Best Integrated Writing*, 1, 1–6. <https://corescholar.libraries.wright.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1017&context=biw>
63. Ruble, M.: Managing generational differences in organizations. In: *Presentation at the meeting of Central Iowa Chapter of SHRM*. s.l.:West Des Moines, IA (2013).
64. Rusell, C., & Patrick, A. (2017). *Millennials Through The Looking Glass: Workplace Motivating Factors*. *J. Business Inq.* 16(2), 131–139. Retrieved from [http://www.uvu.edu/ woodbury/ jbi/ volume16](http://www.uvu.edu/woodbury/jbi/volume16)
65. Ryan M. Gerald Celente: he reveals what lies ahead. *Parade Mag.* 2000;10:22–23. [Google Scholar]
66. Sayers R. The right staff from X to Y: generational change and professional development in future academic libraries. *Libr. Manag.* 2007;28(8/9):474–487. doi: 10.1108/01435120710837765. [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
67. Shragay D, Tziner A. The Generational effect on the relationship between job involvement, work satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behavior. *Revista De Psicología Del Trabajo y De Las Organizaciones*. 2011; 27(2):143–157. doi: 10.5093/tr2011v 27n2a 6. [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
68. Skiba DJ, Barton AJ. Adapting your teaching to accommodate the net generation of learners. *Online J. Issues Nurs.* 2006; 11(2):15–25. doi: 10.3912

- /OJIN.Vol11No02Man04. [PubMed]
[CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
69. Smola WK, Sutton DC. Generational differences: revisiting generational work values for the new millennium. *J. Organ. Behav.* 2002;23(4):363–382. doi: 10.1002 /job.147. [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
 70. Spector PE. Do not cross me: optimizing the use of cross-sectional designs. *J. Bus. Psychol.* 2019;34(2):125–137. doi: 10.1007 /s10869-018-09613-8. Cross Ref] [Google Scholar]
 71. Stoner, J. A., Freeman, R. E., & Gilbert, D. R. (2016). *Management* (6th ed.). New Delhi, India: Jay Print Pack (Pvt) Ltd.
 72. Sujansky, J. (2004). Leading a multi-generational workforce. *Occupat. Health Safety*, 73(4), 16–18. Retrieved from <https://ohsonline.com/Articles/2004/04/Leading-a-Multigenerational-Workforce.aspx> [PubMed]
 73. Tayyab, S., & Tariq, N. (2001). Work values and organizational commitment in public and private sector executives. *Pak. J. Psychol. Res.* 16(3–4), 95–112. Retrieved from <http://www.pjpr.nip.edu.pk>
 74. Tsui, L., Chapmen, S. A., Schnirer, L., & Stewart, S. (2006). *A handbook on knowledge sharing: strategies and recommendations for researchers, policy makers and service providers*. Community–University Partnership for the Study of Children, Youth and Families (CUP).
 75. Tulgan B, Martin CA. *Managing generation Y : global citizens born in the late seventies and early eighties*. Amherst: Hrd Press; 2001. [Google Scholar]
 76. Twenge, J.M.: *Generation Me: Why Today's Young Americans Are More Confident, Assertive, Entitled--and More Miserable Than Ever Before*. s.l.:Simon and Schuster (2006)
 77. Twenge JM. A review of the empirical evidence on generational differences in work attitudes. *J. Bus. Psychol.* 2010; 25(2):201–210.doi: 10.1007/s10869-010-9165-6. [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
 78. UNJSPF. (2009). *Overcoming generational gap in the workplace, traditionalists, baby boomers, Generation X, Generation Y (and Generation Z) working together*. United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund.
 79. Vejar, C. (2018). *Generation Y: Educational considerations*. EBSCO Research Starter, 1–5.
 80. Weston, M. J. (2006). Integrating generational perspectives in nursing. *Online J. Issues Nurs.* 11(2), 12–22. Retrieved from <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/17201576/> [PubMed]
 81. Weyland A. Engagement and talent management of Gen Y. *Ind. Commer. Train.* 2011;43(7):439–445. doi: 10.1108/00197851111171863. [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
 82. Wiant CJ. Are you listening to your employees? *J. Environ. Health.* 1999;62:51–52. [Google Scholar]
 83. Williams M. Interpretivism and generalisation. *Sociology.* 2000;34(2):209–224. doi: 10.1177/S0038038500000146. [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
 84. Zani, B., & Cicognani, E. (2012). Sense of community in the work context. A study on members of a co-operative enterprise. *Global J. Commun. Psychol. Pract.* 3(4), 1–8. Retrieved from <https://www.gjcpp.org/pdfs/2012-Lisboa-079.pdf>
 85. Zemke R, Raines C, Filipczak B. *Generations at work : managing the clash of veterans, boomers, xers, and nexters in your workplace*. New York: Amacom Press; 2000. [Google Scholar]
 86. Zemke R, Raines C, Filipczak B. *Generations at work : managing the clash of veterans, boomers, xers, and nexters in your workplace*. 2. New York: American Management Association; 2013. [Google Scholar]