

# Differences in work engagement and organizational commitment in retail work of Croatian generational cohorts

---

**Bačelić, Martina**

**Undergraduate thesis / Završni rad**

**2023**

*Degree Grantor / Ustanova koja je dodijelila akademski / stručni stupanj:* **RIT Croatia / RIT Croatia**

*Permanent link / Trajna poveznica:* <https://um.nsk.hr/um:nbn:hr:229:516566>

*Rights / Prava:* [In copyright](#) / [Zaštićeno autorskim pravom.](#)

*Download date / Datum preuzimanja:* **2023-10-02**

# RIT

---

*Repository / Repozitorij:*

[RIT Croatia Digital repository - Rochester Institute of Technology](#)

# Croatia



**Rochester Institute of Technology**

**Differences in work engagement and organizational commitment  
in retail work of Croatian generational cohorts**

**Martina Bačelić**

Tourism management, Rochester Institute of Technology Croatia

Dr. Vanda Bazdan

May 8<sup>th</sup>, 2023

## **Abstract**

This study measures the work engagement and organizational commitment of generational cohorts in Croatia working in retail. The survey was distributed to the members of three generational cohorts – Generation X, Generation Y and Generation Z, which are employed in retail stores in Croatia. Work engagement had 9-item questions, and was measured by three subcategories, each containing of three questions – absorption, dedication and vigor. Organizational commitment consisted of 23 questions and was measured through three subcategories – affective commitment (8 questions), continuance commitment (9 questions) and normative commitment (6 questions). Both work engagement and organizational commitment results are in decline with every younger generation. The participants are overall somewhat engaged in their work, while they are neutral on organizational commitment.

## **Keywords**

Generational cohorts, Generation X, Generation Y, Millennials, Generation Z, work engagement, absorption, dedication, vigor, organizational commitment, affective commitment, continuance commitment, normative commitment

## **Differences in work engagement and organizational commitment in retail work of Croatian generational cohorts**

This study measures the work engagement and organizational commitment of generational cohorts in Croatia working in stores. Due to their differences, having multiple cohorts working in the same environment can create commotion and confusion. The division of these generations allows the recognition of cohorts' similarities regarding their behavior and principles in their workplace and outside it. Measuring work engagement and job commitment could possibly help to understand the needs, demands and priorities of employees that belong to different generational cohorts. That could immensely help the employee managers and superiors to develop strategies that could raise employee satisfaction, and by that possibly raise employee engagement and commitment as well.

### **Work engagement**

According to Vermooten et al. (2019), work engagement has only recently begun to be used as a significant part of discussions and studies among business owners, managers, researches and others, so there is still no specified definition or a rule of what exactly is included into that term. Therefore, it is important for every researcher to define it before executing the further analysis. This study will implement the definition and measurement techniques of Schaufeli et. al. (2002), which describes work engagement as a "positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind". Implementing this term into researching employees' engagement into their work means measuring their attitudes towards their every-day tasks, and recognizing how fulfilling executing those tasks is for them. Employee engagement will be measured by a 9-item Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES). It will be determined by measuring employees' absorption, dedication and vigor. Employee absorption to their work states the amount of interest they show and attention they devote to their company and their every-day tasks at work. Employee dedication measures how involved an employee is in their work. It is a form of excitement to upgrade, innovate, or simply get the work done the best possible way for their company, which leaves them satisfied as well. It also includes how willing an employee is to work overtime and if they are

willing to seek additional learning opportunities in their workplace. Employees' vigor is the level of enthusiasm and investment in their work. It includes keeping a positive and energetic attitude, even in problematic situations and crisis.

There are arguments that business owners and/or managers are the ones that influence their employees' work engagement the most, while other arguments state that the level of work engagement is highly dependent on an individual's will, character and the way they were raised (Hoole & Bonnema, 2015). Regardless, business owners and managers have started to realize how important their employees' work engagement is, as it brings not only satisfaction to employee on a personal level, but for overall business as well.

### **Organizational commitment**

Organizational commitment could be defined as a sense of responsibility one has for a company they work for, as well as for its mission and goals (Bhat, 2023). That also includes a power to dedicate their skills and mind into the company and make themselves a valuable part of organization. Measuring job commitment helps determine loyalty of generational cohorts and willingness to stay at one job for a longer period of time. According to Wainwright (2022), organizational commitment can be divided into three factors. First factor is the affective commitment, which means how much a person wants to stay in the company. People exhibiting high affective commitment are satisfied with their jobs and they most likely feel like a valuable part of the team, which makes them synchronized with company's goals and advancements. This type of commitment is considered the most important one, as it is the only type that motivates employees to contribute honestly and meaningfully, which results the best for the company. The second kind is the normative commitment, which shows how much a person feels that they should stay in the firm. Reasons for this are mostly connected to having a fear of consequences of leaving. It may be that they feel responsible for their colleagues, which makes them feel guilty for leaving the job. The last one is called continuance commitment, which shows how long they feel they need to stay. Continuance committed workers are the ones that stay solely for the benefits of the job. It is most likely that they fear new jobs, as they believe they wouldn't have same benefits as they have on a current

position. This kind of employees may in time lose interest and be much less invested in their work than they should be. The three named forms prove that job commitment does not necessarily need to be connected to a specific company, job or working condition, but it rather differs in responsibility and consciousness of individuals. The measurement instrument for organizational commitment constructed by Meyer & Allen (1997) will be implemented in this research. The instrument contains affective, continuance, and normative commitment scales.

According to Singh and Gupta (2014), the level of job commitment has a direct influence on the amount of turnover in the business. It is common for people to consider a business with big amount of turnover to have bad working conditions or uncapable managing staff, but reality is that the business may not be at fault at all. That is what one can conclude when analyzing the term of job commitment and measuring it among workers.

Even though some experts argue that organizational commitment could be included as a part of overall work engagement (Hoole & Bonemma, 2015), there are significant differences that distinguish the two to have them valuated separately. Although one might say that commitment for the company grows with the engagement into one's work, that could be insignificant when talking about the employee turnover. Wainwright (2022) had a practical explanation to these differences, stating that employee engagement stands for their attitude towards their job, while job commitment stands for their attitudes towards the company they work for.

### **Generational cohorts**

Generational cohort can be defined as a group of people who were in late formative years while certain events happened in certain time in history (Hoole & Bonnema, 2015). They were developing through shared and mutual experiences, which would therefore mean that they are born, finish school, enter working world, start families and retire in approximately same time frame. According to Lyons and Kurton (2013), every generation of children's development of personalities and focus differed based on events and the state of the world and their country, as well as the stage of human development and evolution. Therefore, we can divide those people in different generations, based on the year they were

born in. The focus of this research will be the three generations that (due to their age) make most of the working world – Generation X, Generation Y and Generation Z.

### ***Generation X***

Generation X consists of people who are born between the year of 1965 to the year of 1980. According to DeForrest (2020), this was a unique and eventful time in the world history, as great changes and shifts in technology and science have happened in this period of time, such as alleged man's first moon landing and development of first modern computers.

They were young adults and children in the time of Croatian War of Independence, which makes them close participants of the war.

According to Plescia, independence is one of the biggest characteristics of this generation (as cited in DeForrest, 2020). This is connected to their childhood, as at that time a larger percentage of women were entering the workforce, and therefore their children were left to take care of themselves. That is why this generation got the nickname of “latchkey kids”, referring to a child being home while both of their parents are at work. This is the generation known as the first “rule breakers”. According to Smith (2021), even the name “X” of this cohort refers to them refusing to be defined. They popularized and enhanced the “anti-fashion” movement in their childhood and youth.

Generation X prefers less supervision in their workplace, as they have enhanced problem-solving skills, making them more independent and self-sufficient. (Herrity, 2023). They are considered practical and professional, and balance private life and work well, which has made them skilled at time management both in their work and private life (Beekman, 2011).

This generation was the first to view their work as temporary, which makes them the “first generation to live in an era without lifelong employment” (Beekman, 2011). Regardless, they are considered to be loyal to their company, as they do not tend to change jobs if they have a healthy relationship with their colleagues and superiors, and if job benefits align with their expectations. (Beekman, 2011, Herrity, 2023).

## ***Generation Y***

The generation that follows Generation X is called the Generation Y, or more popularly Millennials. Their birth years are from 1981 to 1996. Most of this generation was born before and during the Croatian War of Independence and are sometimes referred to as “children of war”.

According to Beekman (2011), what distinguishes this generation the most is that they are born in the era of computer and internet, and therefore were in contact with technology since early age. Due to that, Millennials are considered great multitaskers, but may often seem impatient, as they expect to accomplish a lot in a small period of time.

As stated in Fuscaldo (2023), Millennials today make up more than one-third of the workforce in the USA. This generation seeks a sense and a personal purpose in their jobs, and values “transparency and work-to-life balance over salary and title”. The reason for such characteristic may be the unbalanced economy through their childhood and youth, so they are more accepting of unemployment and low salaries, if they are doing what they are passionate about. They value recognition and mentorship at work, and appreciate new opportunities to learn, as they are in a constant need to develop more as a person.

This generation is considered to be hardworking and “willing to work wherever and whenever necessary” (Beekman, 2011). However, after COVID19, Fuscaldo has recognized this generation’s high desire to work remote whenever possible, as many of them find themselves more efficient. According to Fuscaldo, some HR experts agree with this statement, as millennials have their own way of getting things done. They say that their “accountability is not about sitting at a desk”, but rather the number of successes and tasks they have managed to accomplish.

Beekman describes this generation as loyal, wary and respectful of the authority. However, Leading Effectively staff (2020), find them disloyal to the company compared to the generations before them, as however comfortable they are in a current job, they would easily leave it for a job with better benefits.



## ***Generation Z***

The last generation is called Generation Z, which are born from 1997 to 2010. This generation has only started entering the working world, and therefore their characteristics are yet to be fully defined (Swan, 2018). Most of this generation does not remember time before social media, as it was present in the early stages of their lives. According to Kaplan and Knight (2023), they grew up in the time of the extreme globalization, which makes this generation the most diverse in terms of ethnicity, race and religion. The biggest historical events of their childhood are considered to be the pandemic and climate change.

According to Swan (2018), they are considered to be a generation that grew up with most resources and wealth than any generation before them, which has infected their view of life. Kaplan and Knight (2023) consider this generation to be confident in their attitudes and wary of their worth. As they grew up in the time where unemployment percentages were low and the employment opportunities were high, their view on what job should be and what kind of principles and attitude to have towards their work and manager differs from other generations'. This may be why DeForrest (2020) reported that questioning authority and leaning towards activism is "the biggest defining and uniting factor for Gen Z". This generation tires to influence the change in any situation in which they recognize injustice. They are not afraid to speak their mind, as they value their opinion and are very strict in setting their own priorities. Swan believes this generation indicates a "rapidly changing society".

The big presence of technology in their lives enables them to quickly process and filter vast volumes of information, and they frequently have excellent communication skills. It has been discovered that this is, however, leading to a reduced attention span (Swan 2020). They are a generation with a high percentage of levels of education higher than high school, but most of this generation is taking their time in entering the actual workforce.

Kaplan and Knight (2023) explain this generation is considered to be "overly-demanding" and sensitive by their older colleagues and managers. They are considered to lack formal language skills and hierarchy awareness, which may just be related to their inexperience due to their young age. They

consider their opinion valuable, and feel like they should be able to offer it “to anyone at any time”. Boundaries are of great importance to them, as they are not attached to the company they work for emotionally. This is why they are considered a generation with “zero job loyalty”. The remote jobs and flexible working hours are becoming common with this generation, as they believe they can organize themselves the best by doing things in their own way.

### **Differences in work engagement and job commitment of generational cohorts**

Researchers have found significant difference in generational cohorts’ expectations of their workplace in terms of their attitude and importance of their job and work, their work values and acknowledgement preferences (Singh and Gupta, 2014). This means that employees of different age could get the same treatment at the workplace and understand it differently. This has created a great challenge for today’s managers, as they are first to understand every generation separately to be certain to approach them the right way. Singh and Gupta explain how every younger generation is less loyal. While previous generations considered a steady job a form of reward itself, this age’s cohorts value it less and less by a following cohort. While Generation X was the first to consider work temporary, Generation Y took that to the next level, showing less loyalty, but still valuing the benefits of a steady job. Lastly, Generation Z has fully changed the criteria for job satisfaction, and show very little to no loyalty regardless of benefits and working conditions.

Work engagement research that was conducted by Huber and Schubert (2019) with nurses showed that Generation Y is less appreciative of this working position than Generation X, considering it less valuable. However, they still showed that “striving for perfection” is more important to them than to Generation X.

The review of studies done by Lyons and Kuron (2013) concludes that, when compared to the former generations, Generation X and Y show higher normative commitment, while continuance commitment was the lowest for the Generation X. Regardless, Lyons and Kuron conclude that organizational commitment of generational cohorts is “almost always decreasing with successive generations”. The comparison between Generation X and Generation Y has shown that Generation Y

has a better work-life balance capability and finds it less challenging. Although, when compared to other studies, one can conclude that may be a cause of life-cycle event, and not the cohort's personality.

Some theories completely deny the existence of generational cohorts as such. King et al. (2019) believe generational cohorts are a cause of age-related stereotypes and meta-stereotypes, which has created the "artificial generational divides". They state that all the generational differences are simply based on the age differences between people, which always circles as the years go by. This theory explains that the youngest generations will always be more skilled with the newest inventions and trends, and the eldest generations will always be the most experienced and independent, so there is no great significance in the actual events and the time of birth, as well as the attitudes and values in the workplace. Schaufeli et. al. (2006) measured work engagement in 10 countries and showed no significant correlation with engagement and participants' age, which supports this theory.

### **Workers in retail industry**

The research of engagement and organizational commitment will be conducted specifically on retail workers in physical stores in Croatia. As a lower-level service job position, retail work has become less appreciated over the years, which was caused by many factors of working conditions, customer behaviors, management and workers themselves.

Physical store workers are considered to be the "face of the business" (Stolpe, n.d.), and are what directly effects the customer satisfaction and loyalty. Therefore, an argument could be made that the most successful stores are the ones that "place value in employee engagement" and emphasize the relationship between themselves, their company and the workers. This means that, in order for physical store's business to be successful, one must prioritize enhancing their employees' engagement, which would lead to a motivated and satisfied employee, which would ultimately lead to employee's commitment to the organization.

Having highly engaged retail workers has become a greatly significant topic to managers and owners, as, according to Osman (2017), disengaged and uncommitted workers cause the great turnover in the retail industry worldwide, which is growing rapidly every year. Stolpe (n.d.) considers managers

to be highly responsible for high turnover, as he states that a “third of retail workers receive no formal training”. This makes them less understandable of company’s goals and norms, making their job seem less significant. Another problem that rises due to the lack of employee training is the neglect of the store operations, as there is no explanation of expectations to execute them properly, which leads to the company without established norms and standards. Another problem Stolpe has stated is the lack of communication between the management and retail workers all together, as in most cases retail workers aren’t at all directly communicating to management and therefore are not aware of what the company stands for, nor the components of their own role within that company.

The increasing popularity of online shopping creates another problem for physical retail shops. However, Stolpe (n.d.) argues that physical stores are not in a real danger of extinction, as even largely successful online stores such as Amazon all strive to have physical stores as well. The reason for this is that, regardless of the accessibility of online stores, people are still in the search for a live experience and prefer shopping in person (Khairwal, 2022), which is directly connected to physical store workers.

Due to the ongoing problems in the retail industry, this research focuses on work engagement and organizational commitment of generational cohorts working in such stores. Workers from all types of stores are taken into consideration, regardless of its type and size.

## **Research Method**

### ***Participants***

This research was conducted on the participants that work in retail stores in Croatia, and that are between the age of 18 and 65. The data was collected in two ways – by distributing questionnaire in paper form or as an online Google form. The total number of collected surveys that fitted the participant criteria and had valid data was 198. The number of female participants was 139 (70.20%), which makes them the majority of the participants. The number of male participants was 49 (24,75%), while 10 (5,05%) of the participants chose to keep their gender anonymous. The number of participants that belong to the Generation X was 85 (44%). The number of Generation Y participants was also 85 (44%), while Generation Z had the least participants, 24 (12%).

## ***Materials***

The primary goal of this research is to measure the difference in work engagement and job commitment of different Croatian generational cohorts working in stores. The data was collected by a questionnaire. The questionnaire contains nine questions about employee work engagement, which was measured by a 9-item Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) (Schaufeli et. al., 2002). It contains statements such as “I am proud of the work that I do”, which ultimately allowed to measure employees’ absorption, dedication and vigor. The questionnaire contains 23 questions about employee’s work commitment originally made by Meyer, J. P. & Allen, N. J. (1997). Among the 22 questions, 8 are used to measure affective commitment, such as “I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization”. Nine questions are used to measure continuance commitment, such as “Too much of my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my organization right now”. Survey contained 6 questions to measure normative commitment, one of which was “I would feel guilty if I left my organization now”. Both work engagement and organizational commitment surveys were originally in English language. Due to the need for Croatian participants, the survey was translated to Croatian language. The answers to work engagement and organizational commitment are measured in a Likert scale from 1 to 7, 1 meaning “Strongly disagree”, and 7 meaning “Strongly agree”. In addition to these measures, there are 10 questions about demographics of the participants’ gender, age, years spent in the current organization, the total period of their work experience, their current work position, the type of the store, the size of the store, their level of education, the country of birth and the country of residence. The questions are in this exact order, but there are no visible categories in the survey.

## ***Procedures***

The data was collected from the retail workers that were born and still live and work in Croatia. The data was collected with convenience sampling method. Surveys were given out both in person and online by the Google forms link through social media networks and e-mail. The participants were assured of their anonymity, and neither their names, nor the names of the stores in which they were employed were recorded.

## Results

### *Scale data*

The assessment of validity of questions was determined by calculating Cronbach's alpha for each of the categories of the questionnaire. The two larger categories are divided to Work engagement and Organizational commitment. Work engagement consisted of 9 questions in total ( $\alpha=0.93$ ). Organizational commitment included 23 question items ( $\alpha=0.86$ ), and was divided into three categories – Affective, Continuance and Normative commitment. Affective commitment was measured with 8 items ( $\alpha=0.74$ ). The category of Continuance commitment had 9 items ( $\alpha=0.75$ ). Normative commitment category consisted of 6 items ( $\alpha=0.78$ ).

### *Descriptives*

The average score on the 7-point Likert scale for the category of work engagement (Table 1) was that the participants are somewhat engaged into their work ( $M=4.77$ ,  $SD=1.26$ ). The highest scored statement in the work engagement category was “I am immersed in my work” ( $M=5.64$ ,  $SD=1.40$ ), while the lowest was “When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work” ( $M=4.12$ ,  $SD=1.92$ ).

With ranking the category of overall organizational commitment (Table 2), the score on average was neutral for all participants ( $M=4.13$ ,  $SD=0.89$ ). The score for the affective organizational commitment (Table 3) was neutral as well ( $M=4.28$ ,  $SD=1.09$ ). The highest ranked reversed score statement was “I do not feel like "part of the family" at my organization.” ( $M=4.84$ ,  $SD=1.95$ ). The lowest ranked statement of the affective commitment was “I think I could easily become as attached to another organization as I am to this one”, which was reverse scored as well ( $M=3.38$ ,  $SD=1.71$ ). The subcategory of continuance commitment (Table 4) had a neutral participants' response as well ( $M=4.04$ ,  $SD=1.10$ ). The statement “Right now, staying with my organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire” had the highest average score ( $M=4.54$ ,  $SD=1.64$ ), while the statement “I am not afraid of what might happen if I quit my job without having another one lined up” had the lowest reversed score average ( $M=3.53$ ,  $SD=2.14$ ). Normative commitment (Table 5) scored a neutral average as well ( $M=3.97$ ,  $SD=1.24$ ). The statement with the highest scored average was “This organization deserves my loyalty”

( $M=4.36$ ,  $SD=1.85$ ). The statement with the lowest average score was “I would feel guilty if I left my organization now” ( $M=3.43$ ,  $SD=2.01$ ).

Measuring all participants’ work engagement and organizational commitment has shown that the workers who participated in this research are overall somewhat engaged into their work, and neutral on commitment to the organization.

### ***Comparison***

This study measures differences in work engagement and organizational commitment between Generation X, Generation Y and Generation Z. Participants from the Generation X category scored higher results both in work engagement and organizational commitment in all categories. The participants from the Generation Y had the next higher scores, while Generation Z scored the lowest for all the research categories.

There was a statistically significant difference recorded for age of participants of work engagement,  $F(2.132)=8.88$ ,  $p<0.001$ . The results show that the participants that belong to Generation X are somewhat engaged into their work ( $M=5.26$ ,  $SD=1.18$ ), while participants from Generation Y ( $M=4.49$ ,  $SD=1.21$ ) and Generation Z ( $M=4.15$ ,  $SD=1.26$ ) scored neutral.

The study has shown the significant difference for age participants in the category of organizational commitment as well,  $F(2.130)=6.13$ ,  $p=0.003$ . The Generation X is the most committed to the organization out of all three generations ( $M=4.34$ ,  $SD=0.88$ ). The Generation Y is the following highest score ( $M=4.01$ ,  $SD=0.86$ ), and the Generation Z is least committed to the organization ( $M=3.52$ ,  $SD=0.73$ ). Regardless, the results show that the participants of all generations are neutral regarding commitment to the organization.

There was a statistically significant effect recorded for subcategories of organizational commitment as well. Affective organizational commitment results,  $F(2.131)=5.57$ ,  $p=0.01$ , have shown the Generation X somewhat enjoys their job ( $M=4.56$ ,  $SD=1.19$ ), while Generation Y scored neutral ( $M=4.05$ ,  $SD=0.94$ ), but higher than the Generation Z ( $M=3.73$ ,  $SD=0.73$ ). The significant difference in

results of continuance organizational commitment has shown that same pattern amongst generations repeats,  $F(2.132)=2.15, p=0.12$ , as with every new generation the score is lower. Generation X ( $M=4.15, SD=1.10$ ) and Generation Y ( $M=4.03, SD=1.12$ ) resulted to be neutral on continuance commitment, while Generation Z ( $M=3.39, SD=0.85$ ) resulted to be slightly negative, meaning they do not stay in the organization because they fear the consequences of leaving. The statistically significant difference of normative commitment,  $F(2.133)=4.57, p=0.01$ , has shown neutral with the Generation X ( $M=4.35, SD=1.21$ ) and Generation Y ( $M=3.93, SD=1.25$ ). The results for Generation Z have shown that it does not stay on the job because of its security or benefits ( $M=3.39, SD=1.05$ ).

There were no significant differences in work engagement between genders. Regarding organizational commitment of participants' genders, the study has shown there was no statistically significant difference in affective commitment. There were significant effects on continuance commitment,  $F(2.132)=1.94, p=0.15$ , showing that male participants ( $M=3.96, SD=0.97$ ) feel less obligation for their boss or coworkers to stay in the organization than female participants ( $M=4.11, SD=1.15$ ). The difference between genders was statistically significant in normative commitment category,  $F(2.133)=3.13, p=0.05$ . Male participants ( $M=3.90, SD=1.03$ ) feel less obligated to stay in the organization due to job security and benefits than female participants ( $M=4.21, SD=1.30$ ).

### ***Correlations***

There was a strong correlation between the dedication subcategory of work engagement and the subcategory of affective organizational commitment,  $r(134)=0.71, p=<0.001$ , meaning that workers that are dedicated to their work stay in the organization because of the feeling of obligation to their coworkers or boss (Table 6).

No other work engagement and organizational commitment subcategories correlate between each other (Table 6).



## Discussion

The present study looked into the differences in work engagement and organizational commitment between generational cohorts working in retail in Croatia. The participants were members of three generational cohorts that make the most of the workforce today – Generation X, Generation Y and Generation Z. Work engagement was measured by three factors – absorption, dedication and vigor. Organizational commitment was categorized in three ways – affective commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment. As the retail industry is facing high problems with maintaining staff, and as the turnover gets higher every year, this research serves to find what are thoughts and behaviors of retail workers, and to possibly conclude the solution for managers and employees of retail industry.

Overall, the research participants believe they fit into the organization well and are aligned with the work obligations they are expected to execute. They value absorption into their work the most. However, they are more disconnected to the organization than to their work, as they could easily imagine themselves in another organization, receiving same or similar benefits. The results have shown that the participants do not fear of switching jobs. Their working at the current position is more of a wish than it is a necessity. Taking into consideration that more than 50% of the results came from paper-handed surveys, more than half of the participants are certain to work in the area of Dubrovnik-Neretva County, which, due to the high tourist season, has many various offers in different service job fields, that have a high problem of unemployment. Due to these reasons, it was expected to see slight to no correlation between work engagement and organizational commitment and their subcategories. These workers are aware of the possibilities and opportunities, and therefore stay in a certain organization because they wish to, rather than because of a necessity.

The results for both work engagement and organizational commitment have shown a clear pattern between generational cohorts, as with every younger generation the results are descending. This pattern can be recognized in other former researches (Huber and Schubert, 2019, Lyons and Kuron 2013, et. al.) that include Traditionalists (1928-1945), Baby Boomers (1946-1964), Generation X and Generation

Y. All results concluded that commitment to the organization is always lower with younger generations, while older generations value their work position and job security more. This supports the statement of Lyons and Kuron (2019), which says that organizational commitment is “almost always decreasing with successive generations”. This may be less about the cohort itself, and more about the stage of life the participants are in, which almost exclusively depends on their current age.

However, there was no large gap in the results between generations either. The overall score of work engagement was higher than the overall score of organizational commitment, meaning all generations do lean toward liking their job, but are not as enthusiastic or dedicated to the organization they work in. Due to the results of this research, the conclusion is that retail workers in Croatia are willing to work in retail, but they are not committed to the company they work for. Still, the results are overall neutral, which leaves space for managers and owners of retail shops to engage their workers into their jobs. Managers and owners should strive to make their employees feel as a valuable asset of a company or a company chain, by providing them with employee training and teaching them the importance of store operations. Communication should be improved as well, as it is mostly one of the most common factors of retail employees’ everyday job. Employees should have a good communication with management, as well as with other employees inside the store or the store chain. A large emphasis should be on a customer experience as well, which is rarely thought of in retail industry, as opposed to tourism industry. Retail store employees should work on providing a unique service as well, which should attract new customers, create customer loyalty, and even lead to store branding. All the reasons stated above increase retail employees’ work engagement, as they would feel like a valuable member of a company with a clear mission and goals. If an employee does feel engaged, their engagement into their work will ultimately lead to commitment to the organization as well.

### **Limitations**

This research had two limitations that have affected the final results. First one is getting a true image of overall Croatian retail workers, as the participants mostly work and live in Dubrovnik-Neretva

County. For further researches, there should be more participants from other parts of Croatia, to develop a full image of Croatian retail workers, rather than Dubrovnik-Neretva retail workers.

Another limitation to this research is that the number of Generation Z participants was low compared to other two generations.

### **Further research**

Future researchers should consider expanding their research to other branches of work as well, and possibly compare the data to find resemblances in behaviors.

A future researcher should conduct this study again when a few years pass, as there would be more Generation Z members in the workforce, as many of them are still too young.

## Reference list

- Beekman, T. (2011). Fill in the generation gap: In exploring the traits that distinguish the different generations within your workforce, you'll find some ideas regarding how you can get them to work together effectively. *Strategic Finance*, 93 (3), pp. 15+.
- Bhat, A. (2023, February 16). Commitment to work: Definition, importance and tips to improve work commitment. QuestionPro. Retrieved Feb 04, 2023, from <https://www.questionpro.com/blog/commitment-to-work/>
- DeForrest, C. (2020, December 6). How behavior changes through the generations. *Redwood Bark*. Retrieved Jan 24, 2023, from <https://redwoodbark.org/62735/culture/how-behavior-changes-through-the-generations/>
- Fuscaldo, D. (2023, February 21). Managing Millennials in the Workplace. *Business News Daily*. Retrieved Mar 05, 2023, from <https://www.businessnewsdaily.com/15974-millennials-in-the-workplace.html>
- Herrity, J. (2023, March 11). 4 Common Characteristics of Generation X Professionals. *Indeed*. Retrieved Mar 9, 2023, from <https://www.indeed.com/career-advice/career-development/generation-x-professional-characteristics>
- Hoff Kosik, A. (2023, February 15). 6 ways to attract Gen Z job seekers — and what they value most in companies. *Insider*. Retrieved Feb 20, 2023, from <https://www.businessinsider.com/what-companies-need-attract-gen-z-job-seekers-2023-2>
- Hoole, C., Bonnema, J. (2015). Work engagement and meaningful work across generational cohorts. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, 13 (1), 11 pages.
- Huber, P., & Schubert, H.J. (2019). Attitudes about work engagement of different generations: A cross-sectional study with nurses and supervisors. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 27 (7), 1341-1350.

- Kaplan, J., Knight, R. (2023, February 5). The millennial boss' guide to managing Gen Z, based on 5 stereotypes of the younger generation. *Insider*. Retrieved Feb 20, 2023, from <https://www.businessinsider.com/how-to-manage-gen-z-employees-guide-for-millennial-bosses-2023-2?inline-endstory-related-recommendations=>
- Khairwal, D. (2022, June 7). Retail workers biggest challenges. *ShineLearning*. Retrieved Apr 3, 2023), from <https://learning.shine.com/talenteconomy/career-help/retail-workers-biggest-challenges/>
- King, E., Finkelstein, L., Thomas, C., Corrington, A. (2019, August 01). Generational Differences at Work Are Small. Thinking They're Big Affects Our Behavior. *Harvard Business Review*. Retrieved Jan 24, 2023, from <https://hbr.org/2019/08/generational-differences-at-work-are-small-thinking-theyre-big-affects-our-behavior>
- Knight, R. (2023, February 20). I'm a millennial who manages Gen Z workers. The hardest thing about it is dealing with all their 'feelings about work'. *Insider*. Retrieved Feb 20, 2023, from <https://www.businessinsider.com/millennial-manage-boss-gen-z-workers-feelings-work-employees2023-2>
- Leading Effectively Staff (2020, November 17). 5 Truths About Millennials in the Workplace. *Center for Creative Leadership*. Retrieved Mar 07, 2023, from <https://www.ccl.org/articles/leading-effectively-articles/truths-about-millennials-in-the-workplace/>
- Lyons, S., Kuron, L. (2013). Generational differences in the workplace: A review of the evidence and directions for future research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. S139-S157.
- Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J. (1997). Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research, and application. *SAGE Publications, Incorporated*. 117-119.
- Nicola Vermooten, N., Boonzaier, B., Kidd, M. (2019). Job crafting, proactive personality and meaningful work - Implications for employee engagement and turnover intention. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 45 (0), a1567.

- Osman, B. (2017, October 30). Why retail really needs effective employee engagement. *Retail It*. Retrieved Apr 3, 2023), from <https://www.retailitinsights.com/doc/why-retail-really-needs-effective-employee-engagement-0001>
- Schaufeli, W.B., Bakker, A.B., Salanova, M. (2006). The measurement of work engagement with a short questionnaire. *Sage publications*. 701-716.
- Schaufeli, W.B., Salanova, M., González-Romá, V. & Bakker, A.B (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 3, 71-92.
- Singh, A., Gupta, B. (2014). Job involvement, organizational commitment, professional commitment, and team commitment. *Emerald Insight*, pp. 1192-1211.
- Smith, R. (2021, January 16). Generation X: History and Characteristics. Family Search Blog. Retrieved Feb 08, 2023, from <https://www.familysearch.org/en/blog/generation-x-characteristics-history>
- Stolpe, M. (n.d.). Why we need retail employee engagement now more than ever. *Bonfyre*. Retrieved Apr 3, 2023), from <https://bonfyreapp.com/blog/retail-employee-engagement>
- Swan, P. (2018, September 3). Generation Z. *Institute of Welsh affairs*. Retrieved Feb 09, 2023, from [https://www.iwa.wales/agenda/2018/09/generation-z/?gclid=Cj0KCQiAxbefBhDfARIsAL4XLRpgc0scNC3Gf3dfhO81MrjCDdKRX8pe8LsfNaSLawIoDH5vXe3kTGcaAhWmEALw\\_wcB](https://www.iwa.wales/agenda/2018/09/generation-z/?gclid=Cj0KCQiAxbefBhDfARIsAL4XLRpgc0scNC3Gf3dfhO81MrjCDdKRX8pe8LsfNaSLawIoDH5vXe3kTGcaAhWmEALw_wcB)
- The Strengths and Weaknesses of Every Generation in your Workforce. (2020, July 02). *Get Smarter*. Retrieved Jan 24, 2023, from <https://www.getsmarter.com/blog/career-advice/know-your-generationals/>
- Wainwright, B. (2022, November 3). What is employee commitment? *Effactory*. Retrieved Feb 04, 2023, from <https://www.effactory.com/knowledge/what-is-employee-commitment/>

## Tables

Table 1: Descriptive statistics for means of UWES category

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
UWES AB 2	194	1	7	5,64	1,397
UWES AB 3	194	1	7	5,28	1,526
UWES DE 3	194	1	7	4,88	1,804
UWES AB 1	194	1	7	4,84	1,700
UWES VI 2	193	1	7	4,69	1,638
UWES VI 1	194	1	7	4,56	1,748
UWES DE 1	194	1	7	4,55	1,719
UWES DE 2	193	1	7	4,38	1,898
UWES VI 3	194	1	7	4,12	1,921
Valid N (listwise)	192				

Table 2: Descriptive statistics for means of all categories of organizational commitment

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
AC 2	134	1,00	6,50	4,2668	1,09110
NC 2	136	1,17	7,00	4,0784	1,24258
CC 2	135	1,00	7,00	4,0362	1,09632
Valid N (listwise)	133				



Table 3: Descriptive statistics for mean of affective organizational commitment category

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
AC 5	194	1	7	4,84	1,950
AC 8	194	1	7	4,68	1,956
AC 6	194	1	7	4,56	2,005
AC 3	193	1	7	4,25	1,948
AC 1	193	1	7	4,19	2,130
AC 2	194	1	7	4,09	1,939
AC 7	194	1	7	4,06	1,869
AC 4	194	1	7	3,38	1,712
Valid N (listwise)	192				

Table 4: Descriptive statistics for mean of continuance organizational commitment category

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
CC 5	194	1	7	4,54	1,635
CC 2	194	1	7	4,30	1,922
CC 4	194	1	7	4,26	1,912
CC 3	194	1	7	4,08	2,042
CC 8	194	1	7	4,02	2,019
CC 6	194	1	7	3,88	2,017
CC 9	193	1	7	3,82	1,789
CC 7	194	1	7	3,76	1,941
CC 1	193	1	7	3,53	2,143
Valid N (listwise)	192				

Table 5: Descriptive statistics for mean of normative organizational commitment category

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
NC 4	194	1	7	4,36	1,853
NC 6	194	1	7	4,22	1,955
NC 5	194	1	7	4,21	1,992
NC 1	194	1	7	3,85	1,988
NC 2	194	1	7	3,72	1,943
NC 3	194	1	7	3,43	2,007
Valid N (listwise)	194				

Table 6: Correlation statistics for all categories

		UWES2	UWES VI	UWES AB	UWES DE	COMMIT 2	AC 2	CC 2	NC 2
UWES2	Pearson Correlation	1	,897**	,816**	,941**	,615**	,696**	,270**	,509**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,002	0,000
	N	135	135	135	135	133	134	134	135
UWES VI 2	Pearson Correlation	,897**	1	,544**	,810**	,541**	,608**	,223**	,471**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,000		0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,009	0,000
	N	135	136	136	135	133	134	135	136
UWES AB 2	Pearson Correlation	,816**	,544**	1	,669**	,485**	,517**	,242**	,394**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,000	0,000		0,000	0,000	0,000	0,005	0,000
	N	135	136	136	135	133	134	135	136
UWES DE 2	Pearson Correlation	,941**	,810**	,669**	1	,606**	,713**	,255**	,480**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,000	0,000	0,000		0,000	0,000	0,003	0,000
	N	135	135	135	135	133	134	134	135
COMMIT 2	Pearson Correlation	,615**	,541**	,485**	,606**	1	,728**	,782**	,850**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000		0,000	0,000	0,000
	N	133	133	133	133	133	133	133	133
AC 2	Pearson Correlation	,696**	,608**	,517**	,713**	,728**	1	,231**	,515**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000		0,007	0,000
	N	134	134	134	134	133	134	133	134
CC 2	Pearson Correlation	,270**	,223**	,242**	,255**	,782**	,231**	1	,540**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,002	0,009	0,005	0,003	0,000	0,007		0,000
	N	134	135	135	134	133	133	135	135
NC 2	Pearson Correlation	,509**	,471**	,394**	,480**	,850**	,515**	,540**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	
	N	135	136	136	135	133	134	135	136