THE IMPACT OF GENERATIONAL DIVERSITY ON EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT AND ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT

Muxtorova Maftuna Saidmurod qizi
Manager Professional Development Centre (MDIST)

Abstract

This study investigates how generational diversity influences employee engagement and organizational commitment among HR managers in Uzbekistan. Using a positivist correlational design, data from 100 HR managers across sectors revealed neutral perceptions of diversity practices (M=2.61-3.21), low scale reliabilities ($\alpha<0.3$), negligible correlations (r<0.13), and non-significant regression effects ($R^2=0.055$). Exploratory factor analysis identified five factors explaining 62.8% variance, indicating multidimensional constructs. Findings challenge direct impacts, urging refined measures and contextual strategies like mentoring. Null results highlight measurement issues and Uzbekistan's emerging HR maturity, offering practical insights for inclusive policies.

Introduction

In the contemporary global and increasingly interconnected labor market, the existence of a multigenerational workforce, as noted by Lima and Rahman (2025), has emerged as a defining characteristic of organizational demographics. For the first time in history, four separate generational cohorts Baby Boomers (born 1946 - 1964), Generation X (1965 - 1980), Millennials (1981 - 1996), and Generation Z (1997 - 2012) are concurrently employed in the same professional settings. Organizations can gain from the distinct perspectives, experiences, and talents that individuals of varying ages provide when several generations collaborate. Every generation is molded by its distinct social, economic, and technological experiences, which affect its perspectives on work, leadership expectations, communication preferences, and career ambitions. In Uzbekistan,

_____

rapid economic shifts amplify these dynamics, with Gen Z entering amid Boomer retirements, challenging HR to boost engagement and commitment for retention and performance. Despite subjective awareness, empirical evidence remains scarce, especially locally, where generalized strategies yield high turnover and low morale.

This article tests five hypotheses:

H1 (diversity impacts engagement), H2 (diversity impacts commitment), H3 (engagement influences commitment), H4 (satisfaction mediates diversity-commitment), H5 (leadership moderates diversity-engagement). The theoretical framework posits generational diversity and leadership as independents, satisfaction and engagement as mediators, and commitment as dependent. Uzbekistan's context emerging diversity policy frames null expectations, advancing theory by questioning stereotypes.

Methods

Research Design and Philosophy

A positivist paradigm prioritized quantifiable phenomena, aligning with Saunders' Research Onion for objectivity. Correlational design examined natural relationships without manipulation, ideal for hypothesis testing per Putri et al. (2025). This non-experimental approach assessed links among variables via surveys, ensuring replicability.

Participants and Sampling

Target: 100 HR managers from Uzbekistan's banking, services, education, and manufacturing sectors, selected via convenience sampling for accessibility through LinkedIn, Telegram, and networks. Krejcie-Morgan (1970) considers n=100 sufficient for populations >1,000 at 95% confidence ($\pm10\%$ error). Diversity across firm sizes mitigated bias, though generalizability limits persist.

Data Collection

A structured online questionnaire used 5-point Likert scales (1=Strongly Disagree, 5=Strongly Agree): 4 items on generational diversity (e.g.,

_____

"Organization has multi-generational employees"), 3 on engagement (e.g., "Employees enthusiastic about work"), 3 on commitment (e.g., "Loyalty across generations"). Distributed electronically for efficiency.

Analysis Procedures

SPSS conducted descriptives (means, SD), reliability (Cronbach's α ≥0.70 threshold), Pearson correlations, multiple regression (demographics controlled. Limitations: self-report bias, cross-sectional causality gaps, low reliabilities addressed via cautious interpretation.

Results

Descriptive Statistics

HR managers reported moderate diversity practices (overall M=2.61, SD=1.27-1.42), neutral engagement/commitment (M=2.89-3.21). Balanced demographics: even age/gender splits, varied experience.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics for Key Items.

Item	N	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Multi-generational employees	100	3.17	1.27	1	5
Addresses generational differences	100	2.79	1.33	1	5
Diversity creates communication challenges	100	2.99	1.34	1	5
Received diversity training	100	1.50	0.50	1	2
Employees enthusiastic about work	100	2.91	1.37	1	5
Engagement varies by generation	100	2.94	1.41	1	5
Engagement strategies by generation	100	3.21	1.42	1	5
Loyalty regardless of generation	100	2.89	1.41	1	5
Younger generations more likely to leave	100	3.10	1.33	1	5
Encourages long-term commitment	100	3.11	1.38	1	5

_____

Reliability Analysis

Scales showed poor consistency: Generational Diversity α=0.233 (4 items), Engagement α=-0.023 (3 items), Commitment α=0.242 (3 items, 1 reverse-coded). Negative α signals item inconsistency.

Table 2: Scale Reliabilities.

Scale	Items	Cronbach's α
Generational Diversity (GD)	4	0.233
Engagement (ENG)	3	-0.023
Organizational Commitment (COM)	3	0.242

Correlation Analysis

Weak links: GD-ENG r=0.130, GD-COM r=-0.075, ENG-COM r=0.091 (all p>0.05).

Table 3: Pearson Correlations.

	GD_Scale	ENG_Scale	COM_Scale
GD Scale	1	0.130	-0.075
ENG Scale	0.130	1	0.091
COM Scale	-0.075	0.091	1

Regression Analysis

Commitment model: R^2=0.055, Adj. R^2=0.004, F=1.096, p=0.368. GD B=-0.177 (p=0.280), ENG B=0.122 (p=0.223). VIF>10 signals multicollinearity.

_____

Table 4: Regression Coefficients (Commitment). Demographics controlled.

Predictor	B	SE	t	p	CI Lower	CI Upper
Constant	3.224	0.709	4.548	0.000	1.835	4.614
GD	-0.177	0.163	-1.081	0.280	-0.497	0.144
ENG	0.122	0.100	1.219	0.223	-0.074	0.317

Factor Analysis

EFA yielded 5 factors (62.8% variance): Factor 1 (practices, loadings 0.465-0.754), Factor 3 (engagement), Factor 4 (communication challenges), Factor 2 (commitment, mixed loadings). Items fragmented beyond three constructs.

Discussion

Results reject all hypotheses: no significant diversity effects on engagement (H1) or commitment (H2), weak engagement-commitment link (H3), untested mediation/moderation (H4/H5) due to poor data. Neutral descriptives suggest awareness without action; low α reflects multidimensionality - diversity spans practices, conflicts, training - not unidimensional scales.

These null findings mean generational stereotypes oversimplify: individual factors (career stage, culture) dominate in Uzbekistan's context, resonating Westover (2025) critiques. Unlike Alshaabani et al. (2021) strong effects, local emerging HR (e.g., limited training, M=1.5) explains divergences. Weak positive GD-ENG (r=0.13) hints at potential with better implementation, per Eng & Phanasan Kohsuwan (2025).

Practically, diversity alone yields no gains - firms must adopt mentoring, inclusive policies. For Gen Z/Millennials, prioritize growth; Boomers, stability. HR in Uzbekistan should invest in validated tools (UWES, Meyer-Allen) for robust insights. These principles reinforce the organization's dedication to fostering an inclusive and respectful culture (Adam and Alfawaz, 2025). Zulkarnain et al. (2025) discovered that organizational retention improved when inclusive HR policies explicitly considered generational differences. The current

_____

study's conclusions diverge from previous research, as neither diversity nor engagement shown a significant effect on commitment. A contextual reason is that in Uzbekistan, institutional strategies for generational diversity are still developing, and employees may not yet view them as significant factors influencing workplace outcomes.

Theoretically, fragmented factors advance knowledge: constructs are context-bound, urging nuanced models. Limitations (convenience sampling, cross-sectional) suggest future longitudinal, probability-sampled studies. Null results spotlight measurement pitfalls, benefiting global research.

Conclusion

The findings of this study reject all proposed hypotheses, revealing no significant effects of diversity practices on employee engagement (H1) or organizational commitment (H2), alongside a weak engagement-commitment relationship (H3). Mediation (H4) and moderation (H5) effects remain untested due to insufficient data variability, with neutral descriptives indicating awareness of diversity initiatives without corresponding behavioral impact. Low scale reliabilities ($\alpha < 0.70$) underscore the multidimensional nature of diversity—encompassing practices, conflicts, and training—challenging unidimensional measurement approaches. These null results challenge generational stereotypes, emphasizing individual factors like career stage and cultural context over cohort-based generalizations in Uzbekistan's emerging HR landscape. Diverging from Alshaabani et al. (2021)'s robust effects, local constraints such as limited diversity training (M=1.5) explain the discrepancies, though a weak positive gender diversity-engagement correlation (r=0.13) suggests untapped potential with improved implementation (Eng & Phanasan Kohsuwan, 2025). Echoing Westover (2025), the study highlights how constructs are context-bound, advancing theoretical nuance in diversity research.

Practically, diversity initiatives alone yield no gains in engagement or commitment; Uzbek firms should integrate mentoring, inclusive policies, and validated tools like the UWES or Meyer-Allen scales for reliable insights. Tailor strategies by generation—growth opportunities for Gen Z/Millennials, stability

_____

for Boomers—to enhance retention, as supported by Zulkarnain et al. (2025) and Adam and Alfawaz (2025). Limitations including convenience sampling and cross-sectional design call for future longitudinal, probability-based studies to address measurement pitfalls and contextual gaps, ultimately benefiting global HR scholarship.

References

1. Adam, N. and Alfawaz, A. (2025). Enhancing organizational performance: how gender diversity enhances employee engagement and commitment. Humanities and Social Sciences Communications, [online] 12(1). doi:https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-025-04441-7.

2. Alshaabani, A., Hamza, K.A. and Rudnák, I. (2021). Impact of Diversity Management on Employees' Engagement: The Role of Organizational Trust and Job Insecurity. Sustainability, 14(1), p.420.

3. Eng, K. and Phanasan Kohsuwan (2025). The Influence of DEI and Organizational Justice on Employee Engagement: A Comparative Study between Gen Y and Z. Human Behavior, Development and Society, 26(2), pp.221–233. doi:https://doi.org/10.62370/hbds.v26i2.278787.

4. Krejcie, R.V. and Morgan, D.W. (1970). Determining Sample Size for Research Activities. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 30(3), pp.607–610. doi:https://doi.org/10.1177/001316447003000308.

5. lima, S. akther and Rahman, M.M. (2025). Generational Diversity and Inclusion: HRM Challenges and Opportunities in Multigenerational Workforces. SSRN Electronic Journal. [online] doi:https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5330092.

6. Putri, L., Rezani, M.R. and Hermina, D. (2025). CORRELATIONAL RESEARCH DESIGN. Jurnal Riset Multidisiplin Edukasi, 2(6), pp.306–317. doi:https://doi.org/10.71282/jurmie.v2i6.456.

7. Westover, J.H. (2025). Leading the Multigenerational Workforce: Practical Strategies for Bringing Generations Together. Human Capital Leadership Review, 22(3). doi:https://doi.org/10.70175/hclreview.2020.22.3.5.

_____

8. Zulkarnain, S.N., Zakaria, R., Hussein, N., Dahalan, N.A., Abg Abdullah, D.N.M. and Samat, N. (2025). HR Practices and Employee Retention: A Study on Automotive Manufacturing Organizations in Malaysia. Information Management and Business Review, 17(2(I)S), pp.145–158. doi:https://doi.org/10.22610/imbr.v17i2(i)s.4581.