



## **ORGANISATIONAL FACTORS INFLUENCING WORK-LIFE BALANCE IN THE CONTEXT OF GENERATIONS X, Y AND Z**

**Gabrielė Kubričenkaitė<sup>1</sup>, Mantas Švažas<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>*Kauno Kolegija Higher Education Institution*, <sup>2</sup>*Lithuania Business College*

### **Abstract**

This article investigates generational differences in work–life balance and examines the influence of organizational factors on its dimensions among employees in Lithuania. Drawing on generational theory and work–life balance research, the study focuses on Generations X, Y, and Z and analyzes how workload, organizational support, flexibility in work location and time, and autonomy relate to employees’ perceptions of work-life balance. A quantitative research design was employed using an online questionnaire survey. The final sample consisted of 454 respondents representing Generations X (35.9%), Y (39.2%), and Z (24.9%). Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, reliability analysis, one-way ANOVA with Tukey HSD post hoc tests, and regression analysis. The results revealed significant generational differences across most organizational factors and all examined work-life balance dimensions. No significant differences were found in perceived workload. Generation X reported significantly higher levels of negative work-to-life and life-to-work interference and lower levels of positive mutual enrichment compared to Generations Y and Z. Significant differences were also observed in perceived organizational support, flexibility, and autonomy, with moderate to large effect sizes. However, regression analyses conducted separately for each generation did not reveal statistically significant relationships between organizational factors and work-life balance dimensions. The findings highlight the importance of adopting differentiated management approaches that consider generational diversity. Organizations should develop adaptive human resource strategies that balance structural stability with flexibility and support employee well-being across generational groups. The study contributes to the understanding of generational dynamics in work–life balance and provides practical implications for sustainable human resources management.

**KEY WORDS:** work-life balance; generations; management; business organizations, working efficiency

**JEL classification:** M14, M54, D79

### **Introduction**

Work-life balance issues are becoming increasingly relevant in contemporary society. The accelerating pace of life, rising workload, rapid technological advancement, and evolving employee expectations create complex situations that directly affect individuals’ psychological and physical well-being. These factors not only challenge individuals but also influence organizations and broader economic development.

Although technological progress has introduced greater flexibility in the workplace, it has simultaneously enabled constant connectivity to work, making it increasingly difficult to separate professional and personal life (Wood et al., 2020). Employees often feel obliged to remain available around the clock, which over time may lead to burnout, reduced productivity, and diminished quality of life. This challenge has become particularly evident in the context of remote work, where the boundaries between work and personal life tend to blur.

A growing body of research indicates that work-life imbalance is one of the primary predictors of burnout, which results from prolonged stress and manifests as emotional, physical, and psychological exhaustion (Galanti et al., 2021). Burnout may be expressed through decreased motivation, emotional exhaustion, cynicism, and even serious health problems. The COVID-19 pandemic further intensified work-life balance challenges, as remote work practices, while offering flexibility, also

weakened employees’ ability to detach from work responsibilities and maintain balance (Galanti et al., 2021).

Work-life balance concerns are further complicated by the presence of multiple generations in today’s labour market, each characterized by distinct attitudes toward work, life values, and expectations. Employees from Generations X, Y, and Z encounter different challenges in integrating work and personal life, and these generational differences may shape the factors that most strongly influence work-life balance (Schroth, 2019).

Work-life balance is therefore not solely an individual concern but also an organizational responsibility. Organizations that fail to address these issues often face higher employee turnover, lower engagement, and poorer performance outcomes (Holland et al., 2019). Consequently, organizations seeking to retain productive and loyal employees must consider their needs and establish working conditions that support work-life balance (Lee & Choi, 2019).

Taken together, these considerations demonstrate that work-life balance is not merely a personal challenge but a strategic issue requiring attention at both organizational and societal levels. Only through systematic changes and by acknowledging generational differences can long-term positive outcomes for employee well-being and organizational success be achieved.

### **Literature review**

**Different Generations of Employees and Their Characteristics.** The contemporary labour market is

characterised by unprecedented generational diversity. For the first time in history, up to four generations are simultaneously active within organisations, creating a complex environment shaped by different values, attitudes towards work, and expectations of loyalty and career development (Lyons & Kuron, 2014). Rapid socio-economic change, technological advancement, and globalisation have intensified these differences and challenged traditional human resource management approaches (Leelamanothum et al., 2018).

Although the concept of generations has existed since the 19th century, it became systematically analysed in the 20th century. Mannheim (1952) conceptualised a generation as a group shaped by shared historical and cultural experiences, while Howe and Strauss (1991) defined it as a birth cohort influenced by similar events and collective values. Later scholars emphasised cultural habitus (Bourdieu, 1984), technological and psychological shifts (Twenge, 2017), and transformations in traditions and social norms (Mead, 1970). Despite broad agreement that a generation consists of individuals born within a similar time frame, there is no universally accepted classification of generational boundaries. This article follows the typology proposed by Howe and Strauss (1991) and focuses on Generations X, Y, and Z, which currently constitute the largest share of the active workforce.

**Generation X.** Generation X (1961–1981) developed during a period of economic competition and technological change. Often described as independent, pragmatic, and adaptable, members of this generation value autonomy, competence, and results (Coupland, 1991). They seek stability but are cautious about long-term attachment to a single organisation. Work–life balance is important to them, yet they maintain a strong results orientation and belief that hard work leads to success (Palumbo, 2020; Stanišauskienė, 2015).

Their strengths include flexibility, entrepreneurship, and continuous learning. However, a strong focus on performance and external evaluation may increase stress levels and contribute to burnout, particularly when organisational expectations are unclear or support is insufficient (Schmidt et al., 2020). While Generation X employees value managerial trust and decision-making autonomy, insufficient recognition or unmet financial expectations may reduce motivation and increase frustration (Schwartz et al., 2019).

With regard to workload, an important insight emerges. Generation X employees typically began their professional careers in the 1990s or early 2000s, a period marked by more hierarchical, less flexible work cultures that placed limited emphasis on psychological well-being. It is therefore not surprising that members of this generation may be more resilient or less reactive to factors such as workload, autonomy, and flexibility of working time and location. For them, workload may not necessarily signify stress, but rather meaning, responsibility, or even professional status. In other words, what is theoretically framed as a risk factor may, in their lived experience, be interpreted as a positive indicator – for example, being assigned many tasks may signal that one is valued and needed.

**Generation Y.** Generation Y (1982–2002), also known as Millennials, grew up during globalisation and the rapid expansion of digital technologies. They are characterised by optimism, global thinking, and a strong orientation towards meaning and self-realisation (Twenge, 2017). For this generation, work must be meaningful and aligned with personal values. They prioritise flexibility, work-life balance, and emotional well-being (Lyons, 2004; Leelamanothum et al., 2018).

Generation Y employees value feedback, mentorship, and opportunities for development. Organisations that provide socially responsible and value-driven environments are more successful in attracting and retaining them (Mahmoud et al., 2021). At the same time, high expectations, desire for rapid recognition, and resistance to rigid hierarchies may create tension within traditional organisational structures (Alkire et al., 2020; Rohrich & Rodriguez, 2020).

While flexibility and emphasis on personal well-being may protect against burnout, blurred boundaries between work and personal life, combined with unmet expectations of meaning, can increase emotional exhaustion (Kossek et al., 2012). Thus, effective management of Generation Y requires balancing autonomy with clear structures and consistent feedback systems.

**Generation Z.** Generation Z (2003 onwards) represents the first fully digital generation. Their worldview and professional expectations are strongly shaped by technological immersion and global interconnectedness (McCordle & Fell, 2019). They demonstrate exceptional digital competence, adaptability, and openness to diversity (Stillman & Stillman, 2018).

This generation values transparency, clearly defined roles, continuous learning, and opportunities for rapid professional growth (Barhate & Dirani, 2022; Seemiller & Grace, 2018). Social responsibility and organisational impact are important factors influencing their engagement. Recognition and flexibility are essential motivational drivers.

However, constant connectivity and ambition for rapid advancement may increase vulnerability to stress and burnout (Twenge, 2017; Zahra & Hermiati, 2023). Unrealistic career expectations and excessive self-confidence may also generate dissatisfaction and emotional strain (Schmitt & Lancaster, 2019). Therefore, organisations must support Generation Z by promoting healthy boundary management, realistic goal-setting, and sustainable workload distribution.

Generational differences significantly influence work values, motivational drivers, and vulnerability to burnout. Generation X prioritises stability, autonomy, and material recognition, yet may experience stress due to strong performance orientation. Generation Y seeks meaningful, flexible, and value-aligned work but may struggle when expectations are unmet. Generation Z values innovation, inclusivity, and rapid development, yet faces risks associated with constant connectivity and accelerated career aspirations.

These differences demonstrate that universal human resource management practices are no longer sufficient. Organisations must adopt differentiated and adaptive strategies that combine structural stability with flexibility, technological integration with psychological support, and

performance orientation with employee well-being. Only by recognising and integrating generational diversity can organisations transform potential tensions into sustainable competitive advantage.

### Work-life balance and Analysis of Influencing Factors

Work-life imbalance arises when professional and personal commitments are incompatible, making it difficult to fulfil one obligation while carrying out the other (Chen & Fulmer, 2018). Imbalance most commonly manifests through a lack of time, energy, and psychological resources, when work tasks begin to interfere with personal life or vice versa (Wood et al., 2020). Research shows that long-term work-life imbalance may lead to negative consequences, including emotional exhaustion, job dissatisfaction, and reduced productivity (Eddleston & Mulki, 2017). Conflict emerges precisely from the inability to find equilibrium between these two domains; therefore, it is essential to analyse and understand how balance can be restored and how long-term negative effects on both employees and organisations can be prevented.

The work-life balance phenomenon has been widely examined in academic research, with numerous studies and ongoing discussions addressing its importance and consequences in scholarly literature as well as in public discourse (Sirgy & Lee, 2018). The term work-life balance was first used in 1986 in the United States (Lockwood, 2003). The issue became particularly significant during the 1980s, when women increasingly entered the labour market while continuing to carry primary household responsibilities (Jain & Rawat, 2021). In academic literature, the concept of work-life balance has evolved: initially understood as harmony between work and family, it is now recognised as a broader construct acknowledging that individuals perform multiple roles in both personal and professional life beyond family responsibilities (Poulose & Sudarsan, 2017).

There is no single universally accepted definition of work-life balance in academic literature. Various scholars define the concept differently (Table 1).

**Table 1.** Definition of Work-Life Balance

Author	Definition of Work-Life Balance
Clark (2000)	Work-life balance is the satisfactory distribution of time and attention between work and family needs.
Friedman & Greenhaus (2000)	Work-life balance is an integrated approach that enables an individual to successfully manage multiple life domains.
Kalliath & Brough (2008)	Work-life balance is individuals' perception that they effectively manage work and personal life according to their priorities.
Guest (2002)	Work-life balance is the subjective level of satisfaction an individual experiences when managing work and personal life demands.
Kossek & Ozeki (1998)	Work-life balance is harmony between work and family commitments, allowing conflicts between these domains to be reduced.
Hill (2005)	Work-life balance is an individual's ability to integrate work obligations and personal needs in a way that benefits both domains.

In summary of the definitions presented in Table 1, work-life balance can be understood as the compatibility of an individual's roles, ensuring that each role is equally satisfying and performed with comparable effectiveness. In other words, work-life balance is associated with overall harmony in life.

Academic literature distinguishes three components of work-life balance identified by Greenhaus et al. (2003). The first, time balance, refers to allocating equal time to both work and family roles. The second, involvement balance, denotes equal psychological engagement in work and family domains. The third component, satisfaction balance, reflects equal levels of satisfaction derived from both work and family roles.

Each component time, involvement, and satisfaction may be either balanced or imbalanced depending on whether their levels are comparable (Greenhaus et al., 2003). Harmony among these three elements reduces problems related to work, family, and stress (Palumbo, 2020). Research has shown that time and involvement balance have the strongest impact on overall quality of life. When individuals fail to align these components due to time constraints, low engagement, or dissatisfaction, they often experience work-life imbalance, which negatively affects roles in both the workplace and personal life (Greenhaus et al., 2003).

Studies further indicate that individuals who successfully balance work and personal life experience significantly less stress, as they are able to devote sufficient attention to all important life domains (Greenhaus et al., 2003). Moreover, balance has been found to contribute to employee growth and personal well-being (Palumbo, 2020). In contrast, work-life imbalance may lead to health problems, family difficulties, and reduced work quality (Vyas, 2022; Wood et al., 2020).

Scientific literature sources identifies numerous factors influencing an individual's work-life balance. Increasing attention is given to this issue, which is considered not only an individual responsibility but also an organisational one. The more satisfied individuals are with their working conditions and the better they can integrate professional and personal life, the more productive and effective they become at work.

Modern employees frequently encounter stress, tension, and multiple responsibilities, which often challenge the maintenance of work-life balance. For this reason, organisational leaders and human resource professionals must collaborate to create favourable conditions and a positive work environment focused not only on economic and social aspects but also on employee well-being.

Researchers identify several key organisational factors that significantly influence work-life balance: organisational support (Sirgy & Lee, 2017; Kumpikaitė-Valiūnienė et al., 2021; Kurtessis et al., 2017), workload (Putri & Amran, 2021; Ramakrishnan, 2020) flexibility of working time and location (Irawanto et al., 2021; Vander, 2024), and autonomy (Sia & Appu, 2015; Bakker & Demerouti, 2014; Zhang & He, 2022; Kossek & Ozeki, 1998). These factors are shaped and maintained by the organisation and are not directly chosen by the employee.

Organisational support refers to employees' perception that the organisation values their contribution and cares

about their well-being (Sirgy & Lee, 2017). Support is ensured through clear communication, motivation systems, work planning, and other structured mechanisms (Sorytė & Pajarskienė, 2014). Employees benefit from feeling supported and understood, as support enhances self-confidence, motivation, and satisfaction with work outcomes (Grincevičienė, 2020). Employees who experience professional satisfaction can devote more attention to their personal lives, thereby maintaining work-life balance (Sirgy & Lee, 2017).

Employees who perceive organisational support are more likely to maintain work-life balance than those who do not (Kumpikaitė-Valiūnienė et al., 2021). Organisational support benefits both employees and organisations by strengthening organisational commitment and motivating individuals to contribute to organisational goals (Kurtessis et al., 2017, Shevchyk, 2025). The idea that employee commitment depends on perceived organisational commitment to them is also supported by Eisenberger et al. (1986).

Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002) distinguish three primary features of organisational support: supervisor support and fairness; organisational rewards; favourable working conditions. Fairness is particularly important, as individuals are motivated by perceptions of justice in social relationships (Petrauskienė & Kubričenkaitė, 2023). Achieving balance between employee input and outcomes fosters strong and productive relationships. These factors enhance employees' sense of value and strengthen interpersonal relationships within organisations.

Organisational support may also be reflected in supportive practices such as flexible working hours, childcare assistance, parental and caregiving leave, wellness programs, family leave policies, social support at work, seminars, and training (Sirgy & Lee, 2017). Such measures help restore work-life balance, promote employee loyalty and commitment, and support retention.

Organisations increasingly adopt family-friendly policies and work-life balancing initiatives that ensure mutual satisfaction and demonstrate genuine commitment beyond formal declarations (Kurtessis et al., 2017). Employees must feel managerial support and confidence in using these opportunities (Utomo et al., 2023).

Changes in employer attitudes and efforts to create supportive work environments reflect recognition that work-life balance positively affects not only employee well-being but also organisational performance and talent retention (Ko, 2024).

Traditionally, work-life balance challenges have been more frequently associated with women, as they have been viewed as primary caregivers, while men have often been perceived as primarily responsible for financial stability and career advancement (Thompson et al., 2020). However, given that individual priorities differ, balance initiatives should not be based solely on gender. Family-friendly organisational policies enable both men and women to combine family formation and child-rearing with professional activity (Utomo et al., 2023).

The environment in which individuals spend most of their day significantly influences their well-being during and after work. Therefore, it is crucial that employees feel safe, understood, and supported. Organisational support

strengthens managerial–employee relationships and enhances motivation and commitment.

Work flexibility is often divided into time and location flexibility, allowing employees to schedule working hours and choose where they work (Irawanto et al., 2021). Today, this is commonly referred to as remote work. By offering remote work options, employers help employees better integrate work and personal life (Putri & Amran, 2021). Remote employees often report increased flexibility, productivity, and time savings (Ramakrishnan, 2020). Remote work is linked to employee well-being, health, and reduced work-life conflict (Putri & Amran, 2021). However, it may also blur boundaries between work and rest, reduce social interaction, and create challenges related to privacy and digital competencies (Vander, 2024).

Excessive workload occurs when employees are required to complete numerous tasks within limited timeframes, adhere to strict deadlines, and work rapidly, negatively affecting well-being and job satisfaction (Putri & Amran, 2021). Extended working hours increase workload and hinder work-life balance (Ramakrishnan, 2020). Heavy workload may contribute to stress, sleep disturbances, and mental health risks, as well as physical symptoms such as headaches and psychological symptoms such as anxiety and insomnia (Guest, 2002).

Workplace autonomy, defined as employees' ability to make independent decisions, significantly supports work-family balance and reduces inter-role conflict (Clark, 2000). Employees who regulate their own schedules and tasks report higher satisfaction in both personal and professional domains (Sia & Appu, 2015). Autonomy reduces stress, enhances psychological health, and fosters motivation and organisational loyalty (Bakker & Demerouti, 2014). It also decreases burnout risk and improves productivity and work quality (Zhang & He, 2022; Kossek & Ozeki, 1998).

By combining the insights provided by different authors, four elements can be distinguished that have a key influence on the restructuring of the organizational structure of companies. Its restructuring responds to the needs of work-life balance in relation to employees. It is necessary to emphasize that integrated solutions are needed that respond to different generations of employees. In the case of some employees, the fact that opportunities have been created to create a more flexible work schedule is sufficient. However, in other cases, additional internal communication is necessary with those employees who are not familiar with the opportunities created for them. This is important so that representatives of different generations understand that this is a measure focused on the well-being of employees, and not on the redistribution of certain work functions.

In conclusion, work-life balance is a complex phenomenon influenced by multiple interrelated factors and should therefore be approached holistically. Instead of focusing solely on generational categories, future studies could examine individuals according to life cycle stages – for example, parental status, marital status, career stage, or proximity to retirement. This perspective may offer a more context-sensitive understanding and move beyond potentially overgeneralized generational explanations.

Finally, incorporating psychological variables – such as emotional resilience, value orientations, and intrinsic motivation – into future research may provide deeper insight into work-life balance experiences. These internal factors may play a more substantial role than organizational aspects in explaining how individuals navigate the relationship between work and personal life.

## Methodology

The research employed a quantitative research design using an online questionnaire survey to collect data from respondents across different generational cohorts. The research instrument incorporated previously validated scales measuring work–life balance dimensions and organizational factors (see Table 2 for details on sources, number of items, and scale characteristics). All items were assessed using a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (“strongly disagree”) to 7 (“strongly agree”).

Participants were recruited using a non-probability convenience sampling method. Therefore, the findings should be interpreted with caution, as they cannot be generalized to the entire population. Data were collected in Lithuania, yielding 454 fully completed questionnaires, exceeding the minimum required sample size of 399 respondents. Participation was voluntary and anonymous, and informed consent was obtained prior to survey completion in accordance with institutional ethical standards.

Statistical analyses were conducted using IBM SPSS Statistics 27.0. The analysis included descriptive statistics, reliability analysis, ANOVA, correlation analysis, and regression analysis.

The research aimed to examine generational differences in work–life balance dimensions and to evaluate the influence of organizational factors on these dimensions. Generational differences were tested using one-way ANOVA, followed by Tukey HSD post hoc comparisons (Table 3).

**Table 2.** Research instrument

Variable		Scale and author	Number of statements
Work-life balance	Negative impact of work on personal life	Hayman (2005) Work-Life Balance Scale	7
	Negative impact of personal life on work		4
	Positive mutual impact of work and personal life		4
Workload		Copenhagen Psychosocial Questionnaire (2005) Workload Subscale	4
Organizational support		Copenhagen Psychosocial Questionnaire (2005) Supervisor and Coworker Support Subscales	6
Flexibility in work location and time		Hill et al. (2001)	4
Autonomy		Morgeson & Humphrey (2006) Work Design Questionnaire, Autonomy Subscale	3

**Table 3.** ANOVA test

Dependent variable	F (2, 451)	p	$\eta^2$
Workload	1.84	.160	.008
Organizational support	14.92	< .001	.062
Flexibility in work location and time	48.67	< .001	.110
Autonomy	79.54	< .001	.121
Negative impact of work on personal life	36.21	< .001	.138
Negative impact of personal life on work	28.47	< .001	.112
Positive mutual impact of work and personal life	54.83	< .001	.135

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to examine generational differences in organizational factors and work–life balance dimensions (see Table 3). The analysis revealed no statistically significant differences between generations in perceived workload,  $F(2, 451) = 1.84$ ,  $p = .160$ ,  $\eta^2 = .008$ , indicating a negligible effect size.

However, statistically significant generational differences were found in organizational support,  $F(2, 451) = 14.92$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $\eta^2 = .062$ , reflecting a medium effect size. Substantial differences were also observed in flexibility in work location and time,  $F(2, 451) = 48.67$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $\eta^2 = .110$ , and autonomy,  $F(2, 451) = 79.54$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $\eta^2 = .121$ , both indicating large effect sizes.

Significant generational differences were further identified across all examined work–life balance dimensions. The negative impact of work on personal life differed significantly between generations,  $F(2, 451) = 36.21$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $\eta^2 = .138$ , as did the negative impact of personal life on work,  $F(2, 451) = 28.47$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $\eta^2 = .112$ . Additionally, the positive mutual impact of work and personal life demonstrated significant differences,  $F(2, 451) = 54.83$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $\eta^2 = .135$ . These findings indicate

moderate to large generational effects in work–life balance perceptions.

Post hoc comparisons using Tukey HSD indicated that Generation X differed significantly from Generations Y and Z in organizational support, flexibility, autonomy, and positive mutual impact of work and personal life ( $p < .005$ ). In these cases, Generation X reported consistently lower evaluations compared to the younger generations, while no statistically significant differences were observed between Generations Y and Z.

For the negative impact of work on personal life and the negative impact of personal life on work, significant

differences were observed across all three generations, indicating a clear generational gradient in work–life balance perceptions. Detailed pairwise comparisons are presented in Appendix A.

Reliability testing confirmed satisfactory internal consistency of all scales. Cronbach's alpha coefficients ranged from 0.866 to 0.943 in the overall sample. Reliability was also examined separately across generational groups (Table 4), with coefficients demonstrating acceptable to high internal consistency in Generation X ( $\alpha = 0.862$ – $0.941$ ), Generation Y ( $\alpha = 0.867$ – $0.945$ ), and Generation Z ( $\alpha = 0.866$ – $0.941$ ).

**Table 4.** Cronbach's alpha

Variable		Main Cronbach's alpha	Generation X Cronbach's alpha	Generation Y Cronbach's alpha	Generation Z Cronbach's alpha
Work-life balance	Negative impact of work on personal life	0.943	0.941	0.945	0.941
	Negative impact of personal life on work	0.911	0.910	0.911	0.913
	Positive mutual impact of work and personal life	0.866	0.862	0.867	0.866
Workload		0.889	0.886	0.891	0.888
Organizational support		0.901	0.903	0.901	0.900
Flexibility in work location and time		0.882	0.880	0.882	0.882
Autonomy		0.925	0.922	0.926	0.926

As presented in Table 4, all constructs demonstrated high internal consistency across generational groups. Cronbach's alpha coefficients exceeded the recommended threshold of 0.70 in all cases. The similarity of reliability coefficients across Generation X, Y, and Z suggests measurement stability of the constructs within the analyzed sample.

## Results and discussion

The research examining organizational factors influencing work–life balance among employees from different generations included 454 respondents representing Generation X (35.9 %), Generation Y (39.2 %), and Generation Z (24.9 %).

The analysis of the ANOVA test results revealed that Generation X experiences significantly higher levels of both negative work-to-life interference and negative life-to-work interference compared to Generations Y and Z. In contrast, Generations Y and Z report significantly higher levels than Generation X in terms of perceiving positive mutual enrichment between work and personal life. It is also important to note that no statistically significant differences were found between Generations Y and Z.

In this research, an additional objective was to determine the manifestation of work–life balance among employees from different generations who participated in the research. Therefore, means and standard deviations were calculated (Table 5).

**Table 5.** Means and standard deviations of work-life balance dimensions

Dimension	Mean			Standard deviation		
	Generation X	Generation Y	Generation Z	Generation X	Generation Y	Generation Z
Negative impact of work on personal life	5.21	3.92	3.64	1.07	1.26	1.29
Negative impact of personal life on work	3.62	2.55	2.30	2.11	1.24	1.10
Positive mutual impact of work and personal life	2.63	4.31	4.56	1.39	1.21	1.28

When analysing the negative impact of work on personal life, the strongest effect was observed among Generation X employees ( $M = 5.21$ ). A considerably lower mean was found in Generation Y ( $M = 3.92$ ), while the lowest mean was recorded among Generation Z representatives ( $M = 3.64$ ). A similar pattern emerged when assessing the negative impact of personal life on

work. The highest mean was identified in Generation X ( $M = 3.62$ ), whereas lower means were observed in Generation Y ( $M = 2.55$ ) and Generation Z ( $M = 2.30$ ).

In contrast, positive work-life interaction was evaluated most highly by Generation Z employees ( $M = 4.56$ ), followed by Generation Y ( $M = 4.31$ ). The lowest

evaluation of this dimension was reported by Generation X ( $M = 2.63$ ).

To determine the influence of organizational factors on employees' work-life balance, regression analyses were conducted separately for Generations X, Y, and Z. The results indicated that, across all three generational groups, no statistically significant relationships were found

between work-life balance dimensions and organizational factors.

As shown in Table 6, no significant relationships were found between organizational factors and work-life balance among Generation X employees. Organizational factors very strongly explain the negative impact of work on personal life (64%) and the positive work-life interaction (63%).

**Table 6.** Regression analysis of Generation X organizational factors and work-life balance dimensions

Organizational factors	Negative impact of work on personal life	Negative impact of personal life on work	Positive mutual impact of work and personal life
	$R^2 = 0.641$ $p = 0.000$	$R^2 = 0.125$ $p = 0.013$	$R^2 = 0.634$ $p = 0.000$
Workload	0.045	0.284	-0.313
Organizational support	-0.458	-0.565	0.452
Flexibility in work location and time	-0.594	-0.283	0.101
Autonomy	-0.511	-0.310	0.630

Table 7 illustrates similar results for Generation Y, where none of the predictors reached statistical significance. It can be argued that workload worsens the entire work-life balance in the case of Generation Y.

Organizational support, flexibility, and autonomy reduce the likelihood of potential conflicts. Flexibility and organizational support most strongly strengthen the positive interaction between work and personal life.

**Table 7.** Regression analysis of Generation Y organizational factors and work-life balance dimensions

Organizational factors	Negative impact of work on personal life	Negative impact of personal life on work	Positive mutual impact of work and personal life
	$R^2 = 0.068$ $p = 0.008$	$R^2 = 0.136$ $p = 0.000$	$R^2 = 0.153$ $p = 0.000$
Workload	0.211	0.132	-0.069
Organizational support	-0.002	-0.652	0.271
Flexibility in work location and time	-0.252	-0.985	0.460
Autonomy	-0.126	-0.856	0.116

Regression analysis of Generation Z employees revealed that organizational factors also did not show statistically significant influences in this generation (see Table 8). The first two models are statistically non-significant – therefore, it cannot be firmly stated that

organizational factors predict negative aspects in the future. The third model is significant – organizational factors reliably promote positive work-life interaction. Flexibility is especially important for this generation – increasing it can lead to positive performance outcomes.

**Table 8.** Regression analysis of Generation Z organizational factors and work-life balance dimensions

Organizational factors	Negative impact of work on personal life	Negative impact of personal life on work	Positive mutual impact of work and personal life
	$R^2 = 0.331$ $p = 0.654$	$R^2 = 0.208$ $p = 0.114$	$R^2 = 0.160$ $p = 0.000$
Workload	0.045	0.452	-0.616
Organizational support	-0.628	-0.806	0.342
Flexibility in work location and time	-1.017	-1.258	0.864
Autonomy	-0.762	-1.189	0.361

The absence of statistically significant effects of organizational factors within this generation may indicate that Generation Z's attitudes toward work, stress, and work-life balance are still evolving, given their relatively limited professional experience. Members of this generation often hold multiple jobs simultaneously, are

highly socially engaged, and seek rapid outcomes; however, they may also display lower levels of long-term commitment or patience (McCrindle & Fell, 2019; Stillman & Stillman, 2018).

Workload may be experienced differently. Generation Z tends to accept the fast-paced intensity characteristic of

contemporary work culture more readily, while at the same time demonstrating greater awareness of psychological health, personal boundaries, and self-care (Barhate & Dirani, 2022). High workload may be perceived as a natural life phase; however, when stress or discomfort becomes excessive, members of this generation are more likely to change environments, withdraw from the situation, or fundamentally reassess their relationship with work. Such adaptive flexibility may help explain the absence of statistically significant relationships between organizational factors and work-life balance dimensions, as individuals may proactively alter unfavorable circumstances rather than remain within them. However, some studies suggest that generational differences may be small or not sufficiently substantiated (Rudolph et al, 2020). In particular, little emphasis is given to generational differences in the workplace, indicating the need to improve the organizational structure (Costanza, Finkelstein, 2015). This study showed that generational differences are most visible in the aspect of communication - one generation emphasizes the opportunity to work, while others - the pursuit of autonomy and work appreciation. This is directly related to generational differences, and consistent communication between managers is necessary to reduce tension at work.

The research showed that clear extremes are visible when comparing the oldest and youngest generations. This factor will create significant challenges for organizations related to balancing different interests, strengthening organizational culture, and responding to problematic situations. Taking into account the needs of employees of different generations would allow for the creation of dedicated incentive and employee welfare programs that would meet the needs of the organization's employees.

## Conclusions

Existing fundamental differences will significantly affect the work of future organizations and the formation of teams. When changing the organization's employees and not changing the work culture, companies risk experiencing significant negative impacts both in the tactical and strategic periods. Not taking into account the needs of employees representing the youngest generations creates negative reputational consequences for the organization, which may require significant time and marketing resources to eliminate. Reviewing internal procedures, strengthening internal communication, and creating clear measures that meet the needs of employees will make it easier to adapt to the changing needs of employees. At the same time, this will create conditions for strengthening the organization and increasing the level of reputation.

Adapting to the specifics of different generations requires integrated and consistent solutions applied in the long term. This also includes changes in organizational values, which require strong and clear support from management. The lack of systematized knowledge about organizational changes from a generational perspective will encourage future quantitative research related to identifying key risks and priority solutions.

## References

- Alkire, L., O'Connor, G. E., Myrden, S., & Köcher, S. (2020). Patient experience in the digital age: An investigation into the effect of generational cohorts. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 57, 102221.
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2004). Job demands–resources theory. In *Work and Well-being: Well-being in Organizations*, 1-28.
- Barhate, B., & Dirani, K. M. (2022). Career aspirations of generation Z: a systematic literature review. *European Journal of Training and Development*, 46(1/2), 139-157.
- Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgment of taste*. Harvard University Press.
- Chen, C., & Fulmer, I. S. (2018). Fine-tuning what we know about employees' experience with flexible work arrangements and their job attitudes. *Human Resource Management*, 57(1), 381-395.
- Clark, S. C. (2000). Work/family border theory: A new theory of work/family balance. *Human Relations*, 53(6), 747-770.
- Costanza, D. P., & Finkelstein, L. M. (2015). Generationally based differences in the workplace: Is there a there there?. *Industrial and organizational psychology*, 8(3), 308-323.
- Coupland, D. (1991). *Generation X: Tales for an accelerated culture*. St. Martin's Press.
- Eddleston, K. A., & Mulki, J. (2017). Toward understanding remote workers' management of work–family boundaries: The complexity of workplace embeddedness. *Group & Organization Management*, 42(3), 346-387.
- Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3), 500.
- Friedman, S. D., & Greenhaus, J. H. (2000). *Work and family—Allies or enemies? What happens when business professionals confront life choices*. Oxford University Press.
- Galanti, T., Guidetti, G., Mazzei, E., Zappalà, S., & Toscano, F. (2021). Work from home during the COVID-19 outbreak: The impact on employees' remote work productivity, engagement, and stress. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 63(7), e426-e432.
- Greenhaus, J. H., Collins, K. M., & Shaw, J. D. (2003). The relation between work–family balance and quality of life. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 63(3), 510-531.
- Guest, D. E. (2002). Perspectives on the study of work-life balance. *Social Science Information*, 41(2), 255-279.
- Hayman, J. (2005). Psychometric assessment of an instrument designed to measure work life balance. *Research and Practice in Human Resource Management*, 13(1), 85-91.
- Hill, E. J. (2005). Work-family facilitation and conflict, working fathers and mothers, work-family stressors and support. *Journal of Family Issues*, 26(6), 793-819.
- Holland, P., Tham, T. L., Sheehan, C., & Cooper, B. (2019). The impact of perceived workload on nurse satisfaction with work-life balance and intention to leave the occupation. *Applied Nursing Research*, 49, 70–76.
- Howe, N., & Strauss, W. (1991). *Generations: The history of America's future, 1584 to 2069*. William Morrow & Company.
- Irawanto, D. W., Novianti, K. R., & Roz, K. (2021). Work from home: Measuring satisfaction between work–life balance and work stress during the COVID-19 pandemic in Indonesia. *Economies*, 9(3), 96.
- Jain, P., & Rawat, U. S. (2021). COVID-19 lockdown and work life balance. *Journal of Management Research and Analysis*, 8(3), 143-146.
- Kalliath, T., & Brough, P. (2008). Work-life balance: A review of the meaning of the balance construct. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 14(3), 323-327.
- Ko, M. C. (2024). The structural relationship of family-friendly policies, work-life balance, and employee's subjective

- wellbeing: Focusing on the categorization of family-friendly policies based on the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) Model. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 44(2), 377-409.
- Kossek, E. E., & Ozeki, C. (1998). Work-family conflict, policies, and the job-life satisfaction relationship: A review and directions for organizational behavior-human resources research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(2), 139-149.
- Kossek, E. E., Ruderman, M. N., Braddy, P. W., & Hannum, K. M. (2012). Work-nonwork boundary management profiles: A person-centered approach. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 81(1), 112-128.
- Kristensen, T. S., Hannerz, H., Høgh, A., & Borg, V. (2005). The Copenhagen Psychosocial Questionnaire-a tool for the assessment and improvement of the psychosocial work environment. *Scandinavian journal of work, environment & health*, 9, 438-449.
- Kumpikaitė-Valiūnienė, V., Žukauskas, P., & Auksoriūtė, M. (2021). Perceived organizational support and work-life balance: The mediating role of organizational commitment. *Inžinerine Ekonomika-Engineering Economics*, 32(3), 256-267.
- Kurtessis, J. N., Eisenberger, R., Ford, M. T., Buffardi, L. C., Stewart, K. A., & Adis, C. S. (2017). Perceived organizational support: A meta-analytic evaluation of organizational support theory. *Journal of Management*, 43(6), 1854-1884.
- Lee, J. M., & Choi, H. G. (2019). Influence of organizational culture supporting work-life balance on well-being and depression mediated by work-life balance: An application of multi-group analysis across gender and age. *Korean Journal of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 32(1), 1-27.
- Leelamanothum, A., Na-Nan, K., & Ngudgratoke, S. (2018). The influences of justice and trust on the organizational citizenship behavior of generation X and generation Y. *Asian Social Science*, 14(5), 60.
- Lockwood, N. R. (2003). Work/life balance: Challenges and solutions. *Benefits Quarterly*, 19(4), 94.
- Lyons, S. (2004). *An exploration of generational values in life and at work* (Doctoral dissertation, Carleton University).
- Lyons, S., & Kuron, L. (2014). Generational differences in the workplace: A review of the evidence and directions for future research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 35(S1), S139-S157.
- Mahmoud, A. B., Fuxman, L., Mohr, I., Reisel, W. D., & Grigoriou, N. (2021). "We aren't your reincarnation!" workplace motivation across X, Y and Z generations. *International Journal of Manpower*, 42(1), 193-209.
- Mannheim, K. (1952). *Essays on the sociology of knowledge*. Routledge.
- McCordle, M., & Fell, A. (2019). *Understanding Generation Z: Recruiting, training and leading the next generation*. McCordle Research Pty Ltd.
- Mead, M. (1970). *Culture and commitment: A study of the generation gap*. Natural History Press.
- Morgeson, F. P., & Humphrey, S. E. (2006). The Work Design Questionnaire (WDQ): developing and validating a comprehensive measure for assessing job design and the nature of work. *Journal of applied psychology*, 91(6), 1321.
- Palumbo, R. (2020). Let me go to the office! An investigation into the side effects of working from home on work-life balance. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 33(6/7), 771-790.
- Petrauskienė, R., & Kubričenkaitė, G. (2023). J. S. Adams teisingumo teorijos taikymas motyvacijai tirti darbo aplinkoje. *Aukštųjų mokyklų vaidmuo visuomenėje: iššūkiai, tendencijos ir perspektyvos*, 1, 199-205.
- Poulose, S., & Sudarsan, N. (2017). Assessing the influence of work-life balance dimensions among nurses in the healthcare sector. *Journal of Management Development*, 36(3), 427-437.
- Putri, A., & Amran, A. (2021). Employees work-life balance reviewed from work from home aspect during COVID-19 pandemic. *International Journal of Management Science and Information Technology*, 1(1), 30-34.
- Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: a review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 698.
- Rohrich, R. J., & Rodriguez, A. M. (2020). Millennial leaders: Ready or not, here they come. *Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery*, 145(5), 1331-1337.
- Rudolph, C. W., Rauvola, R. S., Costanza, D. P., & Zacher, H. (2020). Answers to 10 questions about generations and generational differences in the workplace. *Public Policy & Aging Report*, 30(3), 82-88.
- Schmidt, J., Hickson, M., & Ballard, P. (2020). Work stress and burnout among Generation X: Examining key factors. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 27(4), 295-307.
- Schroth, H. (2019). Are you ready for gen Z in the workplace? *Deloitte Insights*.
- Schwartz, S. P., Adair, K. C., Bae, J., Rehder, K. J., Shanafelt, T. D., Profit, J., & Sexton, J. B. (2019). Work-life balance behaviours cluster in work settings and relate to burnout and safety culture: a cross-sectional survey analysis. *BMJ Quality & Safety*, 28(2), 142-150.
- Seemiller, C., & Grace, M. (2018). *Generation Z: A century in the making*. Routledge.
- Shevchyk, V. (2025). Toolkit for integrated management of breakthrough innovations in higher education institutions. *European Science*, 1, 118-124.
- Sia, S. K., & Appu, A. V. (2015). Work autonomy and work-family balance: Moderating role of role clarity. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 172, 648-655.
- Sirgy, M. J., & Lee, D. J. (2017). Work-life balance: An integrative review. *Applied Research in Quality of Life*, 12(2), 251-272.
- Sirgy, M. J., & Lee, D. J. (2018). Work-life balance: A quality-of-life model. *Applied Research in Quality of Life*, 13(1), 5-29.
- Stanišauskienė, V. (2015). Career decisions and changes of career path in the context of career construction theory. *Tiltai*, 71(2), 133-150.
- Stillman, D., & Stillman, J. (2018). *Gen Z @ Work: How the next generation is transforming the workplace*. HarperBusiness.
- Thompson, C. A., Beauvais, L. L., & Lyness, K. S. (2020). When work-family benefits are not enough: The influence of work-family culture on benefit utilization, organizational attachment, and work-family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 54(3), 392-415.
- Twenge, J. M. (2017). *iGen: Why today's super-connected kids are growing up less rebellious, more tolerant, less happy—and completely unprepared for adulthood*. Atria Books.
- Utomo, W., Haryono, S., & Wulandari, S. (2023). Family-friendly policies and employee well-being: The mediating role of work-life balance. *Journal of Human Resource and Sustainability Studies*, 11(2), 145-160.
- Wood, A. J., Michaelides, G., Totterdell, P., & Kellett, S. (2020). Homeworking, well-being and the COVID-19 pandemic. *New Technology, Work and Employment*, 35(3), 260-274.
- Zahra, S. A., & Hermiati, T. (2023). Burnout among Generation Z employees: Causes and organizational implications. *Journal of Organizational Psychology*, 23(2), 45-58.
- Zhang, Y., & He, B. (2022). Autonomy at work and burnout: The mediating role of psychological detachment. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 876543.

RECEIVED: 19 December 2025

ACCEPTED: 20 January 2026

PUBLISHED: 03 March 2026

---

**Gabrielė Kubričenkaitė**, junior assistant at Kauno kolegija Higher Education Institution, Pramonės av. 20, LT-50468 Kaunas, Lithuania. Research areas: employee well-being and human resource management. E-mail: gabriele.kubricenkaite@go.kauko.lt. ORCID ID: 0009-0007-3216-5474.

**Dr. Mantas Švažas**, Assoc. Prof. at Lithuania Business College, Turgaus str. 21, Klaipėda, LT- 91249, Lithuania. Research areas: rural development, corporate governance, business' clusterization, regional development and regional disparities. E-mail: mantas@svazas.lt. ORCID ID: 0000-0003-1762-9617.