



## **1The Changing Trends in Workers Demographics: A Review of X, Y, and Z Generations in the Corporate World**

---

**TAMUNOMIEBI, Miebaka Dagogo PhD.**

Department of Management, Faculty of Management Sciences, Rivers, State University,  
Nkpolu-Oroworukwo, PMB 5080, Port Harcourt, Nigeria.

**Email:** [tamunomiebi.miebaka@ust.edu.ng](mailto:tamunomiebi.miebaka@ust.edu.ng)

---

**WOBODO, CHINONYE CHRIS**

Doctoral Candidate Department of Management, Faculty of Management Sciences, Rivers State  
University, Nkpolu- Oroworukwo, PMB 5080, Port Harcourt, Nigeria

**Email:** [chinonyewobodo@gmail.com](mailto:chinonyewobodo@gmail.com)

---

### **ABSTRACT**

*The employee's remains the life blood of the organization as its success or failure depends largely on their performance and commitment; and as such managers are saddled with the responsibilities of sourcing and acquiring the best of them irrespective of wherever they are located. Consequently, this result in a highly diverse workforce which if not properly managed can lead to a total failure of the organizational as a result of its inherent conflict tendency. In view of this, this study is billed to theoretically review the changing trend in workers demographic profiles through the lens of X, Y and Z generational cohorts. In the cause of extant literature review, we discovered that there is a great diversity between the different generational class and such dichotomy presents the organization with both competitive advantage as a result of varied talents and skills among the workforce and conflict tendencies due to differences in the value system and experiences encountered by each generation. However, in order to fully maximize the potentials benefits of diversity in a changing world of business, we critically determined some possible and potent strategies through which its associated challenges can be overcome. Finally, we conclude that through generational -friendly policies and strategies like acceptance of the uniqueness of each cohort, rapid knowledge transfer across cohort, diversity receptiveness training programs, synergy etc. a manager can transform the supposed differences into competitive advantage for the organization and recommended that for organizations to thrive in this new economic order, managers should recognize and accept that there is a unique ability inherent in every generational class necessary for its goal attainment.*

**Key Words:** Changing trend, demographic, generation XYZ, diversity

## INTRODUCTION

The current state of business environment is observed to be in a state of constant change and this change will always take varied dimensions such as evolutionary or revolutionary in nature. This is fundamentally so because organization is considered as an open system which relies on the dynamics of its operating environment to determine its operational pattern. Consequently, there is a great level of interdependency between the organization and the society at large and these interdependency portents that organizations harness their operational inputs such as technology, material resources and human resources from the environment while the society on the other hand depends on the outputs of the organization in terms goods and services for survival. Koontz and Weihrich (1999) are in support of this assertion when they stated that organization does not exist in isolation but are mutually dependent with its operating environment. Therefore, whatever that happens in the environment affects the organization positively or negatively. Regular environmental scanning is a necessary action to understand the happening in the environment.

Today, the society presents the organization with some unique managerial challenges of adapting to people who are different in their demographic such as race, region, gender, sexual orientation and age (Robbins, Judge and Vohra, 2017). However, beyond these demographics disparities, a major issue confronting the organization revolves more around how a generational difference between the workers affects the right mix of the entire organization's workforce. According to Cennamo and Gardner (2008) ageneration is considered as an observable group sharing birth years, age, location, and significant life experience at critical development stages. In line with this, organizational behavior literature reveals that there are basically four contemporary work generations that are living and working such as: (i) Baby Boomers (ii) the Gen X also known as

the millennials (iii) Gen Y and (iv) Gen Z. But for the purpose of this paper our interest is basically centered on X, Y and Z generation. In view of this great diversity, the different generations represented in the workforce today provide additional challenges and complexity for managers everywhere. This is because these generational differences can affect the trend in which corporations recruit and develop teams, deal with change, motivate, stimulate and manage employees, boost productivity, competitiveness and service effectiveness. Therefore organization's success and competitiveness depends on its ability to embrace diversity and realize the competitive advantages and benefits it provides. Just as GetSmarter(2018) stressed that with the presence of four different generations in the workplace, it tends to create difficulty and confusion understanding what they all need and where they are best utilized. Hence, Baby boomers, Gen X, Millennials and Gen Z each bring in a unique and valuable idea to the table but the only way to truly harness their potential is to understand their generational characteristics and values.

Based on these observations, this paper tends to critically determine the changing trend that today's contemporary managers' face in trying to synergistically blend the wealth of experience of the older generations, the creative and innovative tendencies of the younger generations in pursuit of the achievement of the organization's objectives. To achieve the purpose of this study, the following approaches was adopted: an introductory overview of the general workplace demographic, a critical review of X, Y and Z generation concept and their respective contributions in the workplace, the strategies in managing the challenges associated with the integration of all the generational cohort into a cohesive group, draw conclusion based on our observation and finally make relevant recommendations in relation to our finding.

## Demographic Characteristics of the Workplace

Organizations as a social institution depend largely on the skills and expertise of its employable men and women from different backgrounds to translate their mission and vision to reality. In view of this, Cekada (2012) opines that employers of labor are now redirecting their focus from sole use of aging workforce to issues related to the current need of a changing mix of employees. However, because of the short supply associated with acquiring the right mix of these able men and women from different cohorts, organizations tend to go within and outside their operational environment to acquire them. This is because the salient role they play towards the organization's overall performance cannot be miscalculated. They can make the organization if effectively managed and utilized as well as mar the organization's mission and objective if taken for granted. However, the quest by organizational leaders to ensure accurate mix of competencies (workforce) brings about high level of diversity within the organization. According to Gomez-Mejia, David and Cardy (2010) diversity is associated with the individual characteristics that make people different from one another. Furthermore, Greenberg (2004) defines diversity as the variety of differences between people in an organization. This goes to say that as humans we are all bound by nature to be different in our psychological and physiological composition.

Although, scholars have advanced that in today's business operational standard driven by the great influence of globalization, managers can actually leverage from the similarities and dissimilarities among the workforce to better the performance of the organization. For instance Beardwell and Claydon (2007) assert that if diversity is appropriately managed, it has the potentials to provide the organization with a powerful competitive advantage which stimulates creativity and imparts flexibility into the organization. Again, Fredman (2001) in his observation

confirmed that diversity is a recognizable source of creativity and innovation which can provide a basis for competitive advantage. In view of this, Robbins et al (2017) alarmed that in some instances managers tend to forget that they need to recognize and cash into these differences or demographic to maximize the potentials inherent in them. It therefore becomes very crucial to identify and underscore the various demographics characteristics that distinguish one individual from the other. According to Robbins et al, (2017) there two fundamental forms of diversity prevalent in the workplace today and these encompass surface level diversity and deep level diversity while Aydan (2016) grouped them as primary and secondary diversity.

Surface-level demographic is concerned with those individual worker's traits that are perceptible to us as well as those around us, such as age, gender, race, ethnicity, disability and sexual orientation. According Robbins et al., (2017) these obvious differences in people does not really determine the ways and manner in which they think or feel, but may only trigger certain stereotypes or perception and if this is not effectively managed by adopting fair employment practices to attract and retain talent, it will rob the organization of the immeasurable unique benefits and contributions each of these demographic group have to offer in the pursuit of the organization's goal. On the other hand, deep-level diversity tends to evaluate individual differences beyond their physiological attributes. This means that at the first point of acquaintance with other people at the workplace, one may be swayed to judge others on the basis of their surface-level formation differences but as they get to know each other through formal and informal interaction, they tend to discover and realize that there are certain qualities in them that are also in others such values, beliefs, problem-solving skill, attitudes etc. that need to be embraced.

Furthermore, Riordan and Shore (1997) also reiterate on this assertion when they posit that one of the prevalently observed phenomena in human interpersonal relationship is the tendency for

one individual to be attracted to other similar individuals. Harrison et al., (2002) added that surface-level traits only affect our relationships and interactions with other people early in our acquaintance with them, but however, as we journey along with them, the negative perceptions of surface-level qualities in them are automatically supplanted by deep-level traits such as similarity in values and attitudes. They went further to suggest that age, race, and gender differences are also stronger predictors of employee turnover during the first few weeks or months of engagement in an organization. The implication of this is that individuals who are different from others may feel isolated during their early tenure when their surface-level demographic are different to the rest members of the organization, but these effects are sure going to vanish over time as people stay longer and get to know each other better.

### **Generation X Workers**

Generation X workers are considered as employees within an organization that were born between 1965 and 1975 (Reisenwitz & Iyer 2009). Frandsen (2009) in his view asserts generation X are people born around 1965 to 1980. Yet and Krahn and Galambos (2014) describe Generation X as population born during the period of 1966 to 1980. Furthermore Hennessey (2017) in his recent article stated that the Generation X is seen as a bridge between the analog generation of the mid-twentieth century and the digital generation of the early twenty-first century. In view of this disparity, this paper adopt Generation X cohort age bracket as those birthed from 1965 to 1980 and this will imply that the youngest of this cohort will be 38 years and the oldest 57 years old respectively. Today, they form part of every organization's workforce and exhibit a behavioral pattern that is slightly different from other generations. Just as generational literature indicates that the Gen-Xers were actually born during the prerevolutionary moment of technology such as cell phones, the internet as well as social media (Eastman & Liu,

2012; Young, Sturts, Ross, & Kim, 2013) and as human being with adaptive capacity to synchronize and adjust to changes within their environment, the influence of all these changes in the midst of their adaption also tend to shape and mode their perceptions and value system in line with dominant issues and expected response at that time and place. In fact, we can safely say that they are the last analog set of human generation. Hennessey (2017) observed that this set of generation as result of their unique experiences is more conservative in nature than the Gen Yers and less partisan than the baby boomers.

He further stated that their behavior was immensely influenced by a childhood molded by broad-based domestic prosperity, dawdling but steady technological advancement, relative racial cohesion and social stability. And this is why they think and act differently from other generations in the workplace today just like every other cohort. It can be recalled that during their formative years in the organization, there was relatively no computer system as a means of carrying out technical tasks like drawing, designing, calculation, information storage, communication, and other high-tech related business activities. As most of these activities were manually done and as such made this generation in the workplace so technologically ignorant and unresponsive to the demand of today's information technology business driven atmosphere. Again, this heightened the incidences of poor synergy and cooperation between them and other generation like the Gen-Yers as they perceive them as old fox without tech-savvy orientation. On the other hand the Gen-Xers view the Gen-Yers as people with little or no patience in handling, work related issues, arrogant, self-centered and as a result find them incompatible to work with. Also, Watt (2010) concurred to this when he said that to effectively maximize the potentials inherent in the Gen-Yers, there is need for closer supervision on them owing to their less likely tendency to follow procedures without strict supervision.

Furthermore, the employers of labor are not left out in this debate as they have also argue that in the light of the current industrial situation, that the older generations like the Gen Xers have become very expensive to manage, more susceptible to health issues, cannot adequately adapt to workplace changes and new technology, perform more poorly than younger employees and are a poor return on training investment (Taylor, 2003; Davey, 2006; Davey and Cornwall, 2003 and McGregor & Gray,2002).Consequently NIWGW (2009) advocates that organizations should adopt reverse mentoring strategy instead of perceiving the Gen-Xers as poor performers as result of their poor technology friendliness. According to them, this strategy will allows the junior workers (GenYers) the Gen Xers to gain fresh innovative and creative insights and knowledge from the younger employees thereby improving and updating their procedural knowledge on the job and ultimately improve their performance as well hence, Beekman (2011) states, that no the workers' generational attitude and background, there is always something they have to offer.

It therefore means that to achieve this synergy, management must also make the junior worker to feel valued and appreciated for such gesture as we may consider it as a prosocial kind of behavior which does not only promote goal achievement but also enhance team and group cohesiveness.In congruence with this, Sanchez and Medkik (2004) suggested diversity receptiveness strategy as a way of maximizing the unique contribution of the Gen Xers in the midst of other generational workforce. They described it as an extension of diversity awareness in the organization. It focuses on making people to embrace the differences observable in others at the workplace. Furthermore,Behjat and Chowdhury (2012) added that a well thought out diversity receptiveness initiative will encourage a good relationship between individual, groups and the organization by improving communication, create and promote cultural sensitivity for



the overall social wellbeing of the system. In view of this, BIRKMAN (2018) alarmed that if this generational rift and stereotypes is left unchecked can hinder effectiveness. Just as effective use of gender and ethnic diversity initiatives can boost the productivity and effectiveness of an organization, preparing employees to appreciate generational differences can also benefit workplace teams.

### **Generation Y Workers**

Just as generation X workers exist in the organization with a unique behavioral tendency so also does the generation Yers. The generation Yers is just like every other generation in the workplace but what define them also lies in the period in which they were born. According to Parment (2013) Generation Y is described as a set human being born from 1977 to 1990. Tulgan and Martin (2001) attributed Generation Yers to individuals in the workplace born within 1978-1984. Reisenwitz and Iyer (2009) in their own observation maintain that Generation Yers is concerned with all persons born within 1977-1988. Frandsen (2009), states that it is the cohort born from 1981 to 2000. On the other hand, Parment (2009) in the midst of these divergent views suggests that there is no accurate detail or consensus as to who is included in the Generation Y cohort and as a matter of fact, it is not critical to know. But for the purpose of our interest in this paper, the Generation Yers is viewed as those in the organization born between the years 1981 to 2000. And this will simply indicate that the oldest of this group is in their 38 years and their youngest in their 19 years.

Several scholars have attributed different names and qualities to the Gen Yers. For instance, Wallace (2007) portrays them as technological liberate, independent and creative minded people. Reisenwitz and Iyer (2009) describe them as multimedia and multi-tasking driven

generation. However, due to their tech-savvy experience, they have a proper grasp of how the Internet and new technology works, as well as the drive for self-fulfillment (Parment 2009). They are very active and critical in evaluating every bit of information at their disposal and this affords them the capability to make decision faster than other generations before them. Although, Schullery (2013) suggests that they are usually unwilling to make unreserved efforts to anything they consider less-than-meaningful work and that they have earned a reputation of being entitled, rather than fight for something. In their perception about work, they see work as fun and see no clear dividing line between work and fun. And the implication of this is that they will tend to job-hop if not engaged (Schullery 2013).

Chartrand (2018) observed that the Gen-Yers unlike other generations believe that gone are the days when the focus of job-seeking was centered on the sole purpose of putting food on one's table. For them employment should bear an all-encompassing outlook where careers are also about exploring passions, peaking curiosities and living an experience. This means that the Gen Yers are also concerned about what the organization can offer them outside statutory benefits and rewards like paid vacation and insurance. Chartrand (2018) states that they are always in love with organizations that keep up with the trends and show appreciation to their workers through financial incentive as well as through other social events like end of year parties, happy hour, awards, recognition etc. Beyond their freak for social gratification, their career preferences also place high premium on flexible working system and work-life balance than every other generation (Watt, 2010).

Schawbel (2011) supports this assertion when stated that in less than no time the traditional eight-hour workday will disappear following the evidence that we are gradually reaching the tipping point in terms of workplace flexibility system, as employers are beginning to see the

wisdom of allowing employees like the Gen-Yers telecommute and otherwise tweak the usual 9-to-5 routine. Cohen (2017) puts that flexible working system is an alternative working arrangement which allows a worker certain liberty in choosing his or her time of resumption and closing from the organization, although the worker choice must fall within certain restrictions. Just as Arnold (2014) states that implementing flexible working system does not mean that flextime workers can just come to the workplace any time they please. It is therefore, just a way of tapping into the pool of talent and potential inherent in the Gen Yers. To the Gen-Yers, flexible working system is a major source of improved job autonomy. This mindset is therefore tied to the fact that they are characterized by self-reliant attitude to task performance and as well as entrepreneurial thinkers (Barron, Maxwell, Broadbridge & Ogden, 2007).

Furthermore, in the area of Gen-Yers perception on work-life balance, literature reveals that all generations have interest in work-life balance. But according to Watts (2010) the Gen-Yers are perceived higher in seeking work-life balance than their preceding generation. Clarke (2000) defined work-life balance as associated with the satisfaction and good functioning of the worker both at work and at home. A balanced work-life is particularly more important to the Gen-Yers due to their unique demographics make-up such as dual-earner couples, sole parents and individuals living alone tendencies (Casper, Weltman & Kwesiga 2007; Michel, Mitchelson, Kotrba, LeBreton & Baltes 2009). As such they seek greater flexibility at work to accommodate their unflinching loyalty to their lifestyle over their job. Broadbridge and colleagues (2007) observe that Gen-Yers seek more balanced lifestyles between their work and non-work-life simply because they enjoy being social, and also want to have fun at work. They went further to say that Gen-Yers always perceive flexibility work as one sure way to achieve work-life balance and most importantly they do not want their work to rule their lives.

Additionally, some scholars also argue that Gen-Yers perception towards what constitutes a balanced work-life varies from one individual to the other. For instance Nippert-Eng (1996) asserts that perceptual differences between employment and personal lifestyle can either be in terms of segregation or integration. This therefore means that Gen-Yers who feel that work should be a separated activity from their personal life perceive “segregation” as ideal work-life balance. On the other, those who feel that a balanced work-life is about proper blending of both work and personal life in such a manner that leisure and work is achieved at the same time is said to be favoring “integration” as the best means of achieving work-life balance.

### **Generation Z Workers (i Generation)**

Just like every other preceding generation (the boomers, Xers, and Yers), there is still a divergent opinion among scholars as to when Gen - Z cohorts were born. For instance, Addor, (2011) and Robert-Half (2015) proposed that the Gen-Z is a collection of all individuals born in the 1990s. Yet Williams (2010) as cited in Bolser (2015) specifically considered the Gen-Z group members as individuals born after the year 1995. But in this study we have adopted the definition offered by Poloski Vokic (2014) and that of Ozkan and Solmaz (2015) where they both agreed that the Gen-Z cohorts are exceptional children born in the year 2000. However, drawing from their age distribution, it becomes very obvious that majority of these individuals are just attaining their majority age and as a matter of fact are still under educational and every other entrepreneurial trainings; meaning that they are at the verge of taking over the workplace population in the nearest future. Today, literature has it that employers of labor already perceive them as exceptional future workforce due to their proficiency with technology and responsiveness to new ideas.

Consequently, as they prepare to launch into the labor market with a slightly higher information technology orientation than that of their Gen-Yers counterpart, they hope to dominate in every aspect of their work life. According to Swartz (2018) this is because they perceive themselves as the most educated and technology-savvy group ever to seek employment; this is probably because they were born and bred during the period of globalization and technological breakthrough across national frontiers. They were born into the digital world where access to information across the globe is just matter of click of the button and this defined their unique personality and perception toward other generations. They have no knowledge of any world without the internet and that influenced their communication pattern in such a way that even when on the go, they are either surfing the net, chatting or video calling which in any case gives them larger up-to-date information on past and current realities than the previous generations. No wonder, Glass (2007) addressed them as “generation me” while Ozkan and Solmaz, (2015) called them “Net- Generation or digital natives”. To them, learning is a sweet sensation based on their accessibility to real-time online information without having to crack their brain too much like other generation did.

In terms of work related expectations and dispositions, the Gen-Zers according to Robert-Half (2015) hold that the Gen-Zers have array of expectations and varied behavioral pattern which managers must continually observe and monitor. This is because some of which may be harmful to the organization’s functionality while others may be beneficial to them as well. For instance, they observe that an average Gen-Zers wish to work for a minimum of four organizations during their service years and this implies that they have job-hopping tendencies even in the midst of adequate reward and compensation by their current organization. And as a manager, such a wishful or voluntary turnover will create a shocking loss of human capital especially after a huge

training and development commitment on such worker. Again they are also demanding for a more generous pay than prior generations within their organization since they see themselves as the king of the new era. In the midst all these differences, scholars have also spotted out that there is no much disparity between the Gen-Zers and their immediate past generation (G-Yers). The likes of Wood (2013) states Gen-Zers shares a number of related qualities with Gen-Yers, mainly in the area of their ability to synchronize trends of the global world and to utilize the latest technologies.

Compared to the preceding Gen-Yers multi-tasking prowess, Gen-Zers has been tilted to have even a greater capacity to carry out multiple activities at the same time, while being more productive (Ozkan & Solmaz, 2015). They are pretty able to do this better than other generations because they sleep and wake-up with flexibility-driven technological tools from birth which other generations find very awkward to use. Just like the Gen-Yers, the Gen-Zers look forward to a more balanced work-life where everything that gives them satisfaction can be integrated into the physical workplace work environment. In other words they want to work in an organization where work is not out rightly separated from leisure. Accordingly, Haynes (2008) explains that a well-laid out physical workplace environment is a necessary ingredient for employee retention especially the Gen-Zers if they perceive the immediate workplace surroundings as fulfilling their intrinsic, extrinsic and social needs.

### **Strategies in managing the challenges associated with the integration of Gen-Xers, Gen-Yers and Gen-Zers trend in the workplace**

As stated earlier, diversity is a necessary aspect of organizational strategy to tap into a pool of requisite talents that will translate the organization's mission to reality. However, despite the

unimaginable benefits and contributions each generational class has to bring bear for the success of the organization, they also present the manager with herculean task of managing and adapting to each group's needs and aspiration. And where a manager fails to understand the dynamics of each group's behavioral tendencies, the end point is usually chaotic; chaotic in that some deviant behavior such as alienation, sabotage, absenteeism, voluntary turnover intention, knowledge hoarding etc. may start creeping into the minds of such group which if not properly managed will not only lead to poor group performance but the organization as a whole. On the other hand, Amaram (2007) assert that when the organization adopts a group friendly diversity management strategy, employees in each generational category will appreciate all the positive benefits it brings such as motivation, knowledge and skill transfer, creativity and better decision making and thus become agents for organization growth. This is because each generation has its own set of expectations, needs, values and working styles (Collie, 2018).

Therefore in doing this organizational managers must first of all recognize the uniqueness of each generational category in term of their behavior, value system and general perception about each other. ). Just as Kultalahti and Viitala (2014) also hinted that dissimilarities in values and concepts about the organizations, work ethics, goal orientation, and professional life expectations if not managed translates into problematic situation. So, understanding these issues is very sacrosanct in the unification of diverse minds at the workplace; hence attitude theory suggests that an individual's behavior towards a given object or event (person or group) is a function of his or her attitudes about that object or event (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975). This assertion therefore clarifies why the behavior and perception of one generational class on other generations is absolutely different. It is therefore this disparity in behavior that every manager must try to understand if they must maximize whatever each generational class has to offer. Sanchez and

Medkik (2004) in bid to provide further insight in the unification of diverse generational class at workplace suggests that the idea of diversity receptiveness strategy should be utilized by manager as a tool for behavior modification .This is because a diversity receptive individual is trained to understand and acknowledge observable differences between him and other people as a natural phenomenon that does require stereotyping but an opportunity to for exchange of values and experience for the greater good of selves and the organization as a whole.

Again, through diversity receptiveness advocacy, the various stereotyping views held by each generational class against the othersthat tends to impinge on effective team cohesion and synergy can be turned into competitive advantage for the organization. For instance, the Gen-Xers is perceived by both the Gen-Yers and Gen-Zers as some sort of incompatible fox who are rarely ready to synchronize and embrace rapid changes going at the workplace even though they are technology friendly to an extent, and as such are already praying and wishing them fast retirement so they can take over the mantle of leadership. On the other the Gen-Xers unabatedly perceives the Gen-Yers and the Gen-Zers as selfish, self-entitled and uncontrollable multi-taskers whose capacity to carry out different task at the same time can jeopardize their possibility of remaining relevant in the system irrespective of their wealth of experience which the younger generations like Gen-Yersand Gen-Zers does not have. In this regard, Teclaw, Osatuke, Fishman, Mooreand Dyrenforth (2014) warned that employers and human resource managers must recognize the growing implications of working with multigenerational group. This is as such sheer ignorance can have far-reaching implication on the entire organization.

Still in line with the forgoing, Ferri-Reed (2013) reassured that both generations can actually work together effectively depending the strategy adopted;while Lester (2012) give credence to this observation, they also stated in clear terms that such collaboration can only be achieved if



the potential tensions , conflicts and stereotypes that may arise as a result disparities in generational views is understood and respected by each member group, otherwise it will affect the entire organizational dynamics. This means that the manager has a lot to do to ensure that no cohorts' values and aspiration is undermined. Equal opportunity must be given and allow each generation's voice to be heard hence each generation no matter how technological savvy or technological ignorant has something unique to offer that may change the fortunes of the organization.

Again Rajput et al. (2013) shared that despite the difference in generational values, each generation has something unique to learn from each other especially because of the tendency for varied skill set. It therefore implies that through acceptance of each other's work style, strength and weaknesses, deficient knowledge can be effectively transferred from one generational class to the other without the display of ethnocentric attitude. For instance, the older generation like the Gen-Xers is known for their wealth of experience over other generation which is why they are characterized by high level of independency in their task performance. They have a good grasp of the organization's procedural knowledge and as a result, make little or less mistake in the discharge of their duties. On the other hand, the new entrants such as the Gen-Yers and Gen-Zers can also shape the knowledge of the Gen-Xers through providing newer skills and techniques due to their technological expertise. Their high-tech skill makes them more creative and innovative over other Gens. Literature also establishes that they enjoy working in group and in open-space. In view of these distinct qualities across generation, we make bold to say that through adequate knowledge management strategy each generational class will have a better understanding of their interdependencies and learn to work together more effectively.

## **Conclusion**

Having reviewed the behavioral dynamics of the various generational classes that dominate today's workplace environment, we understood that each cohort is usually known and identified through certain behavioral traits which set them apart from others. However, what define and shape these behavioral disparities outside age distribution revolves more around the event and changes that took place at that particular time. As some were birthed during times of great economic depression while others were birthed during the times of economic prosperity. Again, some witnessed civil wars and other cross-ethnic crisis that other generations never had to encounter. Furthermore, some generations were discovered to be born following the period of emergence technology, yet others were born during the period in which the said emergence technology has become a dominant aspect of societal existence. Consequently, we discovered that these disparities create a great deal of hitches in maintaining interpersonal and group relationship among the generational cohorts which if not approached and managed by the manager will ultimately lead to loss of the entire benefits inherent utilization of diverse workforce.

In view of this, we discovered that despite the varying perception and stereotypical behavior held by each generational cohort against the other, a manager can still make optimal use of such pool of talents depending on how efficacious his generational workforce integration and unification strategy is. We observed that through generational -friendly policies and strategies like acceptance of the uniqueness of each cohort, rapid knowledge transfer across cohort, diversity receptiveness training programs, synergy etc. a manager can transform the supposed differences into competitive advantage for the organization. In congruence with these discoveries, we therefore conclude that owing to the rapid changes going on at the workplace as a result of internal and external forces, generational diversity if effectively harnessed will continuously play

a pivotal role in retaining and creating different methods and techniques through which organization can solve organizational problems as they surface in different context and situation. A mixture of generations is particularly important because of the tendency of organizational problem to manifest either as programmed and non-programmed as requires knowledge of experienced and growing generational class to solve.

Drawing from our conclusion, we recommend the following:

- i) That for organizations to thrive in this new economic order, managers should recognize and accept that there is a unique ability inherent in every generational class necessary for its goal attainment.
- ii) That policies and strategies should be put in place to mitigate possible clash of values and stereotypical behavior of one generation against the other so as to avoid workplace generational war which has the capacity to distort the functionality of the organization.
- iii) That managers in a bid to foster cross-generational harmony and cohesion should regularly hold training and seminars programs within the organization to progressively remind each cohort the needs and benefits of working together as a unique but interdependent generations.

## REFERENCES

- Amaram, D. I. (2007). Cultural diversity: Implications for workplace management. *Journal of Diversity Management*, 4 (2), 1-6.
- Aydan, O. (2016). The effect of diversity management on job satisfaction and individual performance of teachers, *Educational Research and Reviews*, 11(3), 105-112.
- Behjat, S., & Chowdhury, M. S. (2012). Emotional intelligence, self-efficacy and diversity receptiveness of university students: A correlation study. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 2 (2), 301-312.
- Beardwell J. & Claydon T. (2007). *Human resource management – A Contemporary approach*, Prentice Hall, Essex.
- Birkman (2018). How generational differences impact organizations and teams  
Accessed from: <https://birkman.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/Generational-Differences-PDF.pdf>, 14/9/2018.
- Barron P., Maxwell, G., Broadbridge, A. & Ogden, S. (2007). Careers in hospitality management: Generation Y's experiences and perceptions, *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 14(2), 119-128.
- Bolser, K. & Gosciej, R. (2015). Millennials: Multi-generational leaders staying connected. *Journal of Practical Consulting*, 5 (2), 1-9.
- Broadbridge A. M., Maxwell, G. A. & Ogden, S.M. (2007). Experiences, perceptions and expectations of retail employment for Generation Y, *Career Development International*, 12(6), 523-544
- Clarke, J., Arnold, J., Coombs, C., Hartley, R. & Bosley, S. (2010). Retention, turnover and return—A longitudinal study of allied health professionals in Britain, *Human Resource Management Journal*, 20 (2), 391-406.
- Casper W.J., Weltman, D. & Kwesiga, E. (2007). Beyond family-friendly: The construct and measurement of singles-friendly work culture, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 70(3), 478-501.
- Cekada, T. L. (2012). Training a multigenerational workforce: Understanding key needs and learning styles. *Professional Safety*, 57 (2), 40-44.
- Cennamo L & Gardner D (2008). Generational differences in work values, outcomes and person organization values, *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 23(8), 891-906
- Davey, J. (2006). The labour market, in implications of population ageing – opportunities and Risks. Boston and Davey (eds.). *Institute of Policy Studies, Victoria University, Wellington*.

- Davey, J. & Cornwall, J. (2003). Maximizing the potential of older workers, NZIRA Future proofing New Zealand Series, *New Zealand Institute for Research on Ageing, Victoria University, Wellington*.
- Eastman, J. K., & Liu, J. (2012). The impact of generational cohorts on status consumption: An exploratory look at generational cohort and demographics on status consumption. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 29(1), 93-102.
- Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1975). *Belief, attitude intention and behavior: An introduction to theory and research*. USA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company
- Florian, K., Stephan, B. & Heike B. (2013). Organizational performance consequences of age diversity: Inspecting the role of diversity-friendly HR policies and top managers' negative age stereotypes, *Journal of Management Studies*, 50 (3), 413-443.
- Frandsen, B. M. (2009). Leading by recognizing generational differences, *Long-Term Living*, 58(2), 34-35.
- Fredman, S. (2001). Equality a new generation? *Industrial Law Journal*, 30(2), 50-62.
- Haynes, B. P. (2008). The impact of office comfort on productivity. *Journal of Facilities Management*, 6 (3), 37-51.
- GetSmarter (2018). The strengths and weaknesses of every generation in your workforce Accessed from <https://www.getsmarter.com/career-advice/people/know-your-generational> 16/9/2018.
- Greenberg, J., (2004). Workplace diversity: Benefits, challenges and solution. Alphameasure Inc. Accessed from <http://www.alphameasure.com>, 15/9/2018.
- Gomez-Mejia, David, B. & Cardy, L. (2010). *Managing human resources*, Pearson Education, Prentice Hall.
- Harrison, D. A., Price, K. H., Gavin, J. H., & Florey, A. T. (2002). Time, teams, and task performance: Changing effects of surface- and deep-level diversity on group functioning. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45 (3), 1029–1043.
- Hennessey, M. (2017). Zero hour for Generation X: With baby boomers fading and millennials asserting themselves, it's time for Gen X to step. Accessed from <https://www.city-journal.org/html/zero-hour-generation-x-15332.html>, 15/9/2018.
- Krahn, H. J. & Galambos, N. L. (2014). Work values and beliefs of Generation X and Generation Y. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 17(1), 92-112.
- Kultalahti, S., & Viitala, R. L. (2014). Sufficient challenges and a weekend ahead – Generation Y describing motivation at work. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 27(4), 569-582.

- McGregor, J. & Gray, L. (2002). Stereotypes and older workers: the New Zealand experience, *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand*, 18(2), 163-177.
- Michel, J., Mitchelson, J., Kotrba, L., LeBreton, J. & Baltes, B. (2009) A comparative test of work-family conflict models and critical examination of work-family linkages, *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 74 (1), 199-218.
- Nippert- Eng, C.E. (1996). Home and work: *Negotiating boundaries through everyday life*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Niwgw. (2009). National integration working group for workplace, managing work force diversity: A toolkits for organizations, Accessed from <http://www.mom.gov.sg/~media/mom/documents/employment-practices/wdm/w,10/9/2018>.
- Ozkan, M., Solmaz, B. (2015). Mobile addiction of generation Z and its effects on their social lifes. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 205 (1), 92-98.
- Pološki Vokic, T.H.N. (2014). Work design for different generational cohorts. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 27 ( 4), 615-641
- Parment, A. (2009). *Generation Y*. Lund: Liber AB. 1:2 editions.
- Quinn, P. (2010). A multigenerational perspective on employee communication. *Risk Management Journal* 57(1), 34.-42.
- Rajput, N., Marwah, P., Balli, R., & Gupta, M. (2013). Managing a multi-generational workforce: Challenge for the millennial managers. *International Journal of Marketing and Technology*, 3 (2), 132-150
- Randall S. H. (2018). Perception vs. reality: 10 truths about the Generation -Y workforce  
Accessed from: <https://www.livecareer.com/career/advice/jobs/gen-y-workforce>, 17/9/2018.
- Reisenwitz, T. H. & Iyer, R. (2009). Differences in Generation X and Generation Y: Implications for the organization and marketers. *The Marketing Management Journal*, 19(2), 91-103.
- Riordan, C. M., & Shore, L. M. (1997). Demographic diversity and employee attitudes: An empirical examination of relational demography within work units. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(3), 342–358.
- Robert-Half (2015). Get ready for generation Z. Accessed from [https://www.roberthalf.com/sites/default/files/Media\\_Root/images/rhpdfs/rh\\_0715\\_wp\\_g](https://www.roberthalf.com/sites/default/files/Media_Root/images/rhpdfs/rh_0715_wp_g)
- Schawbel, D. (2011). The beginning of the end of the 9-to-5 Workday? Accessed from <http://business.time.com> , 16/9/2018.
- Sanchez, J. I., & Medkik, N. (2004). The effects of diversity awareness training on differential treatment. *Group and Organization Management*, 29(4), 517-536.

- Schullery, N. M. (2013). Workplace engagement and Generational differences in values, *Business Communication Quarterly*, 76(2), 252-265.
- Swartz, M. (2018). Generation Z is entering the workforce, Accessed from <https://hiring.monster.ca/hr/hr-best-practices/recruiting-hiring-advice/acquiring-job-candidates/generation-z-enters-the-workforce.aspx>, 10/9/2018.
- Taylor, P. (2003). Global ageing – meeting the business challenges, Paper prepared for symposium: An ageless workforce – opportunities for business, Sydney, 27th August.
- Teclaw, R., Osatuke, K., Fishman, J., Moore, S. C. & Dyrenforth, S. (2014). Employee age and tenure within organizations: Relationship to workplace satisfaction and workplace climate perceptions. *Health Care Manager*, 33 (2), 4-19.
- Tulgan, B. & Martin, C. A. (2001). *Managing Generation Y*. Amherst, Massachusetts: HRD PRESS. 1st edition.
- Watt, D. (2010). Different generations, same objectives, CA Magazine, 142(2) .Accessed from <https://cmao-ok.org/DocumentCenter/View/204>, 10/9/2018.
- Young, S. J., Sturts, J. R., Ross, C. M., & Kim, K. T. (2013). Generational differences and job satisfaction in leisure services. *Managing Leisure*, 18 (3), 152-170.

© GSJ