
RESEARCH ARTICLE

Equal, but so much different: Examining socio-demographic differences of the employees in relation to organizational commitment, burnout and intention to leave

LAVINIA ȚÂNCULESCU-POPA

*Hyperion University, Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences Department of Psychology
The National University of Political Studies and Public Administration, Communication and Public
Relations Department*

Abstract

The current study was conducted among employees in various industries and sectors (N = 412) in Romania and examined how four socio-demographic groups differ with regards to three main organizational outcomes: organizational commitment, burnout and intention to leave. Multivariate analysis of variance showed that statistically significant differences exist between socio-demographic groups based on hierarchical level, sector of the employer, generation and perceived income level. Additionally, significant differences were shown at the dependent variables levels for certain socio-demographic groups. One of the most expected set of results relate to the differences between generations in terms of all variables included in the study. Like the other findings, but most of it, in a complete form, this highlight could help organizations in their endeavour to bridge the generational gap and propose a tailored organizational employee value proposition to their prospective targets.

Keywords

Managers vs. Non-Managers, Public vs. Private Sector Employees, Income Level, Generations, Burnout, Organizational Commitment, Intention to Leave

Introduction

As much as we like to be otherwise, people are contributing differently and, therefore, treated and rewarded differently, in spite of all the political correctness rules so much enforced these days in the organizational world. Authors have talked widely about this different contribution and reward ever since the Social Exchange Frame of theories was thoroughly critically analyzed by Richard M. Emerson in his 1976 seminal review. Emerson points out an important addition that George Homans, one of the main contributors to the creation of this frame of theories, completed

his set of three basic propositions to explain human behavior with two more. Those two propositions explain the concept of *value* as “the degree of reward” and are defined as *The Value Proposition* and *The Rationality Proposition* (Homans, 1974). Homan’s Value Proposition states that “The more valuable to a person is the result of his action, the more likely he is to perform the action.” (p. 25).

We can link this statement with the difference in the current level of total rewards packages (especially the performance base pay part) an employee in a management position receives in comparison with an employee from the same field, who does not

hold a management position, as well as the total rewards packages a civil servant receives in comparison with a peer from a private sector organization.

The current study seeks to investigate differences in a matrix comprised of four socio-demographic groups of employees and three organizational outcomes, namely burnout, organizational commitment and intention to leave. Burnout was considered both at the global factor and its facets' level. The organizational commitment is most meaningfully assessed using three separate facets, not as a single global factor, since the three facets of the construct are conceptually different (Allen & Meyer, 1996), including the subscales of the continuance commitment facet, namely the one indicating the high sacrifices required when leaving the organization and the availability of limited alternatives (Meyer, Allen & Smith, 1993). Intention to leave is measured and reported as a three items, single factor.

The four investigated socio-demographic categories are: hierarchical level of the employee (manager or non-manager), sector of the employer (private or public sector), age generation of the employee (Baby-Boomers, X-Generation or Y-Generation/Millennials) and the level of reported income. For the purpose of the current study, we take into consideration the financial expected results of an employee's actions, acknowledging that there are also other kinds of achievement motivators (Schuler, Thornton, Frintrup, Mueller-Hanson, 2004) and antecedents of the commitment at work (Jeong & Oh, 2017; Suman & Srivastava, 2012; Cohen, 1992). Practical potential implications outlined in this study are intended to have both an individual impact, on the employees themselves and also helps the organizations through their human capital professionals to better tailor their Employee Value Proposition and, in this way, to secure talent and save costs.

Differences between employees and their impact on the organizational outcomes

There is a full body of literature talking about the difference between employees and ways in

which those contributes to the performance of the organization and the shareholders' value creation and the actual gap between various employees in public and private sector, in management and non-management position, in any of the generation studied or amount of pay perceived.

To give just an example of such differences between employees working in public vs. employees working in private sector, in OECD countries, performance pay (namely performance bonus depending on the degree to which performance goals are achieved) is only a small part (up to 10%) of the civil servant's total pay (OECD, 1997).

Czech Republic case seem to be unique, since performance bonuses can be up to 100% of the salary for jobs in grades 9-12 and 40% for job grades 1-8. Average performance bonuses are about 25% of take-home pay and vary by each public institution (OECD, 2005).

However, when asked whether they knew of any employee in their organizations who had been rewarded for good performance in the preceding year, public officials taking part in a World Bank survey run in sixteen countries reported not knowing any rewards for good performance (Mukherjee & Gokcekus, 2001).

Comparing to the public sector, the private sector performance-related pay is ranging from the lowest 18% of salary in leisure and hospitality sector to 57% in information systems and to an even higher level of 67% of salary in financial activities sector (Gittleman & Pierce, 2013). One of the most significant finding is that the sector (private- versus public-sector organizations) has a moderating effect upon the pay satisfaction and the organizational commitment relationship (Cohen & Gattiker, 1994).

In a meta-analysis studying the link between organizational commitment and turnover, when age served as the career stage indicator, results showed that younger employees who report high levels of commitment may have a sharp decline shortly after a survey, causing a low organizational commitment-turnover relationship, while in the older employees case, even if reporting low levels of organizational commitment but may not leave their organization because, says the author: "of structural bonds, few

employment alternatives, and a desire for stability” (Cohen, 1993).

Another study show that there is a difference in the levels of organizational commitment between Gen X and Gen Y, namely that Gen X have higher normative commitment and affective commitment comparing with Y Gen-ers, that have higher levels of continuance commitment comparing with X-Gen-ers. (Patalano, 2008)

Also, rewards (actual and perceived) may be considered as important determinants of organizational commitment (Oliver, 1990; Cohen & Gattiker, 1994), while other studies show a weak relationship between pay and the level of income and organizational commitment and suggested that income and pay satisfaction may operate differently across various structural settings (Cohen & Lowenberg, 1990; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990).

In a meta-analysis studying the antecedents, the correlations and, most importantly, the consequences of the three types of engagement in organizations, it was argued that affective organizational commitment has the strongest and most desirable correlations with outcomes at the individual level (e.g., stress or personal-work life conflict) and at the organizational level (e.g., performance, participation, organizational citizenship behaviour), followed by normative commitment. The continuance commitment did not correlate or negatively correlate with the results at the individual or organizational level. Therefore, employees with a high degree of emotional commitment want to get involved in the work activity due to the fact that they are attached, feel identified or share values with the organization (Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch & Topolnytsky, 2002). It was, therefore, highlighted the importance the managers have in creating organizational commitment more than the non-managers (Clugston, Howell & Dorfman, 2000), mainly due to higher status and autonomy that managers perceive as well as the income – organizational commitment relationship that was argued to be stronger for managers than for non-managers (Cohen & Gattiker, 1994). Still, a study conducted by Yousef (2016) showed that employees were highly satisfied with supervision and co-

workers and had low satisfaction with pay and promotion facets of the job.

Therefore, we may conclude that pay could constitute an incentive only in some situations and just for some categories of the employees (Cohen & Gattiker, 1994). Other elements are valued more in the organization and contribute to them deciding to stay and deliver performant results for the organization. For instance, subjective value congruence correlates with employees' attitudes such as identification with the organization, job satisfaction, and the intention to stay in the organization. (Edwards & Cable, 2009).

On the other hand, studies had shown various negative health (e.g. depression) and organizational (e.g. absenteeism, intention to leave, performance, and quality of services) outcomes (for a review see Schaufeli and Enzmann, 1998). Montgomery, Peeters, Schaufeli & Den Ouden (2003) discuss the importance of social support and the relation between burnout and work-home interference. They concluded that social support from one's supervisor can have a positive effect on a manager's level of cynicism (decreasing) via positive interference. Also, comparing 1056 private sector and 557 public sector employees, Bogg and Cooper (1995) found that civil servants had the worse mental and physical health.

Even if the current literature speaks vastly about individual differences and how those can contribute to the organizational performance, there is no study that brings together three of the most important organizational outcomes and studies them in relation with the four socio-demographic characteristics we propose in the current study.

Study objectives and research questions

Objectives

The study aims to determine whether burnout and its facets, organizational commitment facets and intention to leave, considered as dependent variables differ in case of four socio-demographic groups: hierarchical level, form of property of the organization the person works in, generation and perceived level of income, as independent variables.

Research questions

Even if for certain relationships between the socio-demographic characteristics and the three main criterion variables there already exists literature (for instance for the relationship between two out of three generations considered in this study and the facets of organizational commitment or the hierarchical level and the level of burnout and its facets), this is not the case for all the possible combinations resulted from the presented 4 socio-demographic characteristics per 3 organizational outcomes matrix. Therefore, stating the hypotheses as directional would be inadequate, since not all the hypotheses can be grounded in previous work done. Consequently, we formulated the following research questions:

Research question 1: Is there a variance in the studied organizational outcomes (namely the facets of the organizational commitment, burnout and its facets and intention to leave) due a combined effect of the four independent variables?

Research question 2: Is there a variance in the studied organizational outcomes (namely the facets of the organizational commitment, burnout and its facets and intention to leave) due to hierarchical level?

Research question 3: Is there a variance in the studied organizational outcomes (namely the facets of the organizational commitment, burnout and its facets and intention to leave) due to form of property of the institution in which the employee works (sector of the employer)?

Research question 4: Is there a variance in the studied organizational outcomes (namely the facets of the organizational commitment, burnout and its facets and intention to leave) due the age (generation) of the employees?

Research question 5: Is there a variance in the studied organizational outcomes (namely the facets of the organizational commitment, burnout and its facets and intention to leave) due the level of income reported by the employees?

Methodology

Participants

The study sample was formed of 412 Romanian employees ($M_{age} = 39.14$, $SD = 10.32$), 54,6% women. From them, 141 respondents (34,2%) are managers. 153 respondents (37,1%) work in public institutions. From the age (generation) point of view, we classified the respondents in three categories: Baby – Boomers: people born between 1944 and 1964, from which, our sample gathered 60 respondents (14,6%), Generation-X: people born between 1965 and 1979, from which, our sample gathered 187 respondents (45,4%) and Generation-Y/Millennials, people born between 1980 and 1994, from which, our sample gathered 165 respondents (40,0%). The self-reported level of income was classified in three groups: Low income level: 125 employees (30,3%) reported that they don't consider they earn enough and they face financial difficulties; Medium income level: 230 employees (55,8%) that consider that they earn enough to manage daily life without difficulties and a third category, High income level: 57 respondents (15,8%) that consider that they earn more than enough and are able to make savings. The respondents have completed an online survey, using a virtual testing platform. The recruitment of the participants and their inclusion were made on a voluntary, snowball basis, with confidentiality assurance. The data were collected between April and June 2019.

Measures

Organizational commitment (OC) was measured by the homonym Questionnaire (Meyer & Allen, 1997). Internal reliability coefficients ranged from $\alpha = .89$ for the subscale of Affective Commitment (AC) (6 items), to $\alpha = .88$ for Normative Commitment (NC) (6 items) and $\alpha = .81$ for Continuance Commitment (CC) (8 items). The CC has two subscales: CC-HHS (High Sacrifices Scale – 4 items) with $\alpha = .71$ and CC-LAS (Lack of Alternatives Scale – 4 items) with $\alpha = .72$. A 7-point scale was used with 1=Strongly Disagree and 7=Strongly Agree.

Burnout was measured by Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI, Schaufeli, Leiter,

Maslach & Jackson, 1996). Alpha Cronbach calculated on our sample (N=412) ranged from $\alpha = .89$ for the sub-scale of Exhaustion (5 items), to $\alpha = .84$ for the sub-scale of Cynicism (for 4 out of the 5 items; item 4: “I just want to do my job and not be bothered.” was removed from the analysis, due to decreasing the reliability of the sub-scale) and $\alpha = .81$ for the 6-items subscale of Professional Inefficacy. Answers ranged from (1) “never” to (7) “every day”.

The intention to leave (ITL), was assessed by using the three-item scale of Mobley, Horner & Hollingsworth (1978). ITL items were ranked on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from (1) Strongly disagree to (5) strongly agree, for which the Alpha Cronbach coefficient calculated on our sample (N=412) was $\alpha = .86$.

Data analysis

The design of this study was cross-sectional. The statistical analysis was carried out in SPSS. Multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used to determine the significance of differences between the organizational outcomes (organizational commitment, burnout and intention to leave) of different socio-demographic groups. MANOVA is the equivalent statistical method of analysis of variance (ANOVA) methods, used to cover cases where there is more than one dependent variable and where the dependent variables cannot simply be combined. Also, this method is used to identify whether changes in the independent variables, in our case, the socio-demographic

characteristics, have a significant effect on the dependent variables, in our case, organizational commitment, burnout and intention to leave. The assumptions for the multivariate analysis of variance were met. We observed both Pillai–Bartlett trace, the sum of the proportion of explained variance on the discriminant functions, similar to R^2 (Field, 2018, p.842) and Wilk’s Lambda. We choose to report the later, being the product of the unexplained variance on each of the variates (Field, 2018, p.843), to test the likelihood of the data under the assumption of equal population mean vectors for all groups. We used one-way analysis of variance when an effect was significant in MANOVA, to discover which dependent variables had been affected. ANOVA reflects the expression of the hypothesis tests of interests in terms of variance estimates (Muller & Fetterman, 2002). A Bonferroni-type adjustment was made to address the Type 1 error, uneven groups (Papa, 2010, p.218).

Results

Correlation Analysis

The best use of MANOVA is also seen when, apart from meeting the assumptions for the multivariate analysis of variance there is, also, a substantial correlation between the dependent variables (Kerlinger & Lee, 2000). The results presented in Table 1 show that apart from the Organizational Continuance Commitment, especially the Lack of Alternatives facet, the dependent variables correlate between themselves.

Table 1. Means, Standard Deviations and Intercorrelations of the study variables

Variables	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1 AC	5.17	1.39	-									
2 NC	4.67	1.45	.72**	-								
3 CC	4.47	1.16	.27**	.34**	-							
4 HHS	4.59	1.32	.35**	.40**	.89**	-						
5 LAS	4.34	1.29	.13**	.20**	.89**	.58**	-					
6 BURN	2.15	0.88	-.61**	-.45**	-.06	-.11*	.01	-				
7 EXH	2.51	1.21	-.48**	-.35**	-.06	-.09	-.02	.83**	-			
8 CYN	1.95	1.14	-.59**	-.44**	-.05	-.12*	.04	.90**	.66**	-		
9 PI	1.99	0.91	-.41**	-.27**	-.02	-.05	.01	.67**	.25**	.48**	-	
10 ITL	2.18	1.05	-.71**	-.63**	-.17**	-.25**	-.05	.54**	.47**	.56**	.24**	-

Note. N = 412, AC = Affective Commitment; NC = Normative Commitment; CC = Continuance Commitment; HHS- High Sacrifices Scale; LAS: Lack of alternatives Scale; BURN = Burnout (Global Factor); EXH = Exhaustion; CYN = Cynicism; PI = Professional Inefficacy; ITL = Intention to Leave; * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

MANOVA

The results of the MANOVA analyses are provided in Table 2.

There was a difference between managers and non-managers when considered jointly the variables organizational commitment (with its facets), burnout (with its facets) and intention to leave, Wilk's $\Lambda = .881$, $F(8, 403) = 6.83$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .12$. Also, for the same jointly considered variables, there was a significant difference between employees

working in public and private sectors, Wilk's $\Lambda = .945$, $F(8,403) = 2.94$, $p = .003$ and partial $\eta^2 = .05$, people from the three studied generations: Wilk's $\Lambda = .830$, $F(16, 804) = 4.92$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .09$ and with the three level of reported income: Wilk's $\Lambda = .885$, $F(8,403) = 3.16$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .09$. We are going to consider in interpreting the effect size, Cohen's guidelines (1988), where $\eta^2 = .01$ indicates a small, $\eta^2 = .06$ a medium and $\eta^2 = .14$ a large effect size.

Table 2. *Multivariate tests for the four demographic groups*

Variable	Value	F	df	Error df	p	Partial Eta Squared
Hierarchical Level	.881	6.83 ^a	8.00	403.00	<.001	.12
Sector of the Employer	.945	2.94 ^a	8.00	403.00	.003	.05
Generation	.830	4.92 ^a	16.00	804.00	<.001	.09
Level of reported income	.885	3.16 ^a	8.00	403.00	<.001	.09

^aExact statistic

These results support positively answering to *Research Question 1*. Still, various levels of effect sizes can be observed in terms of differences related to the jointly observed organizational outcomes, from small to medium in the case of sector of the employer to medium, for generation and level of

reported income, to medium high in case of hierarchical level contribution.

A separate ANOVA was conducted for each dependent variable (see Tables 3, 4, 5 and 7), with each ANOVA evaluated at an alpha level of .025.

Table 3. *ANOVA – Test of Between-Subject Effects for Hierarchical Level*

Variable	Mean Square	F	df	Df Error	p	Partial Eta Squared
AC	49.09	27.06	1	410	<.001	.06
NC	45.01	22.41	1	410	<.001	.05
CC	.03	.02	1	410	.876	.00
HHS	2.09	1.20	1	410	.274	.00
LAS	3.27	1.98	1	410	.160	.00
BURN	4.06	5.28	1	410	.022	.01
EXH	.49	.33	1	410	.563	.00
CYN	2.44	1.87	1	410	.172	.00
PI	14.29	17.93	1	410	<.001	.04
ITL	11.97	11.05	1	410	.001	.03

Note: AC = Affective Commitment; NC = Normative Commitment; CC = Continuance Commitment; HHS- High Sacrifices Scale; LAS: Lack of alternatives Scale; BURN = Burnout (Global Factor); EXH = Exhaustion; CYN = Cynicism; PI = Professional Inefficacy; ITL = Intention to Leave.

From Table 3 we see that there was a difference between managers and non-managers on total level of Burnout, with non-managers ($M=2.22$) scoring higher than managers ($M=2.01$), but with a low partial $\eta^2 = .01$. The differences are related to the Professional Inefficacy area of the Burnout construct, where the difference between non-managers ($M=2.13$) and managers ($M=1.73$) is higher than in the global Burnout factor, with a partial $\eta^2 = .04$. Also, there is a significant difference between employees at different hierarchical level on Affective Commitment, managers ($M=5.65$) scoring higher than non-managers ($M=4.93$) with a medium effect size $\eta^2 = .06$ and on Normative Commitment, also managers ($M=5.13$) scoring higher than non-managers ($M=4.43$), with a partial $\eta^2 = .05$. Finally, in the Intention

to leave area, non-managers have a higher mean ($M=2.30$) than managers ($M=1.94$), the effect size being between small and medium with a partial $\eta^2 = .03$. All estimated marginal means were generated by SPSS.

These results partially answer to *Research Question 2*. The hierarchical level accounts for differences between managers and non-managers, with medium effect sizes in the case of Affective and Normative Commitment, with small to medium effect sizes in the case of Professional Inefficacy and Intention to Leave and with a small effect size in the case of the global factor of Burnout. No differences were found in case of the Exhaustion, Cynicism or Continuance Commitment (with its sub-facets) between managers and non-managers.

Table 4. ANOVA – Test of Between-Subject Effects for Sector of the Employer

Variable	Mean Square	F	df	Df Error	p	Partial Eta Squared
AC	.32	.42	1	410	.519	.00
NC	.42	.29	1	410	.591	.00
CC	.42	.32	1	410	.571	.00
HHS	.17	.20	1	410	.653	.00
LAS	8.81	4.61	1	410	.032	.01
BURN	28.00	13.66	1	410	<.001	.03
EXH	2.16	1.62	1	410	.204	.00
CYN	1.33	.76	1	410	.383	.00
PI	3.20	1.94	1	410	.165	.00
ITL	.32	.42	1	410	.519	.00

Note: AC = Affective Commitment; NC = Normative Commitment; CC = Continuance Commitment; HHS- High Sacrifices Scale; LAS: Lack of alternatives Scale; BURN = Burnout (Global Factor); EXH = Exhaustion; CYN = Cynicism; PI = Professional Inefficacy; ITL = Intention to Leave

There was a difference between employees working in public and in the private sectors only on the total level of Burnout, with employees working in public sector ($M=2.19$) scoring higher than employees working in private sector ($M=2.13$), but with a rather small to medium effect size of $\eta^2 = .03$, $p<.001$. In the Continuance Commitment’s dimension of perceived Lack of Alternatives, the employees from public sector ($M=4.45$) find difficult to leave the current job due to perceived lack of alternatives in the job market than employees working in private sector

($M=4.27$), the effect size is rather small $\eta^2 = .01$, $p=.032$. The other investigated differences between the public and private sector’s employees were found not be significant, according to the data included in Table 4. Considering these data, the *Research Question 3* is partially answered.

Table 5 presents that for all the studied dependent variables, there are differences between generations. Data support answering *Research Question 4*, namely there are differences between all the organizational outcomes studied due to the the generation.

Rather larger effect sizes are obtained in the case of Affective Commitment and Burnout (as a global factor), $\eta^2 = .10$ and medium to large effect sizes are seen in the case of Exhaustion ($\eta^2 = .08$) and Normative Commitment ($\eta^2 = .07$). Medium effect sizes

are seen in the case of Cynicism and Professional Inefficacy ($\eta^2 = .06$). Last, small to medium effect sizes were seen related to Continuance Commitment ($\eta^2 = .04$) and its facets, as well as to the Intention to Leave ($\eta^2 = .03$).

Table 5. ANOVA – Test of Between-Subject Effects for Generation

Variable	Mean Square	F	df	Df Error	p	Partial Eta Squared
AC	39.49	22.62	2	409	<.001	.10
NC	29.19	14.74	2	409	<.001	.07
CC	9.98	7.70	2	409	.001	.04
HHS	11.39	6.74	2	409	.001	.03
LAS	8.66	5.34	2	409	.005	.03
BURN	15.62	22.22	2	409	<.001	.10
EXH	22.51	16.63	2	409	<.001	.08
CYN	15.49	12.52	2	409	<.001	.06
PI	10.67	13.65	2	409	<.001	.06
ITL	7.81	7.25	2	409	.001	.03

Note: AC = Affective Commitment; NC = Normative Commitment; CC = Continuance Commitment; HHS- High Sacrifices Scale; LAS: Lack of alternatives Scale; BURN = Burnout (Global Factor); EXH = Exhaustion; CYN = Cynicism; IP = Professional Inefficacy; ITL = Intention to Leave

To illustrate these differences, we included in Table 6, the means and standard deviations for

all three generations reported for each of the dependent variables.

Table 6. Descriptive Statistics for the Dependent Variables in relation to the Generations

DEPENDENT VARIABLE	1944-1964 BABY_BOOMERS (N=60)		1965-1979 X_GEN (N=186)		1980-1994 Y_GEN (N=165)		Total	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
	AC	5.95 ^a	1.01	5.34 ^b	1.34	4.70 ^c	1.39	5.17
NC	5.41 ^a	1.22	4.77 ^b	1.48	4.29 ^c	1.38	4.67	1.45
CC	4.84 ^a	1.04	4.56 ^b	1.15	4.22 ^c	1.16	4.47	1.16
HHS	4.99 ^a	1.24	4.70 ^b	1.26	4.33 ^c	1.36	4.59	1.32
LAS	4.69 ^a	1.15	4.43 ^b	1.35	4.11 ^c	1.23	4.34	1.29
BURN	1.75 ^c	.71	1.99 ^b	.74	2.47 ^a	.97	2.15	.88
EXH	2.01 ^c	.97	2.33 ^b	1.13	2.89 ^a	1.27	2.51	1.21
CYN	1.50 ^c	.77	1.82 ^b	1.02	2.25 ^a	1.30	1.95	1.14
PI	1.76 ^c	.84	1.82 ^b	.77	2.27 ^a	1.01	1.99	.91
ITL	1.86 ^a	.92	2.09 ^b	1.07	2.40 ^a	1.04	2.18	1.05

Note: AC = Affective Commitment; NC = Normative Commitment; CC = Continuance Commitment; HHS- High Sacrifices Scale; LAS: Lack of alternatives Scale; BURN = Burnout (Global Factor); EXH = Exhaustion; CYN = Cynicism; PI = Professional Inefficacy; ITL = Intention to Leave; a-the highest score, b – the medium score, c – the lower score for the variable.

Both the effect sizes and the calculated means show a rather sensible attitude the younger generation display. In terms of Burnout Y-Gen-ers report the higher score comparing with the older generation (Baby-Boomers) and the difference is valid when discussing about all the burnout facets, namely Exhaustion, Cynicism and Professional Inefficacy.

Also, an important finding is that results show medium to large effect size differences in terms of Affective and Normative Commitment, the older generation being the highest committed employees rather than the younger generation. One may say that this could be due to the lack of perceived alternatives or high sacrifices the old generation may need to do in order to find alternative employment opportunities. Effect

size wise, this represents rather a small possibility since the Continuance Commitment partial eta-square and its' facets', were rather small in intensity $\eta^2 = .03-.04$.

As presented in Table 7, there were reported differences between employees in the three categories of perceived level of income but not in the case of all studied dependent variables. This fact support partially answering *Research Question 5*, namely, differences were obtained in the Intention to Leave and the Organizational Commitment areas (except for the Affective Commitment), with rather smaller effect sizes ($\eta^2 = .02-.04$). No differences between the employees in the three categories of perceived level of income with regards to Burnout or any of its facets were found.

Table 7. ANOVA – Test of Between-Subject Effects for Perceived Level of Income

Variable	Mean Square	F	df	Df Error	p	Partial Eta Squared
AC	4.29	2.24	2	409	.108	.01
NC	8.71	4.18	2	409	.016	.02
CC	9.72	7.49	2	409	.001	.04
HHS	13.61	8.10	2	409	<.001	.04
LAS	8.54	5.27	2	409	.006	.03
BURN	.75	.97	2	409	.382	.00
EXH	.79	.54	2	409	.582	.00
CYN	1.98	1.52	2	409	.220	.01
PI	.21	.26	2	409	.774	.00
ITL	5.69	5.23	2	409	.006	.02

Note: AC = Affective Commitment; NC = Normative Commitment; CC = Continuance Commitment; HHS- High Sacrifices Scale; LAS: Lack of alternatives Scale; BURN = Burnout (Global Factor); EXH = Exhaustion; CYN = Cynicism; PI = Professional Inefficacy; ITL = Intention to Leave

The differences between the three categories of perceived income level are presented, in terms of means and standard deviations, in the Table 8. As can be seen, it is not the generation but rather the perceived level of income that explains differences in terms of normative and continuance commitment and its facets. For instance, people reported the low income level perceived that their costs related to leaving the

company would be higher in terms of sacrifices and risks of not finding alternative employment solutions, followed by people with high income level. The most balanced from this point of view would be people with medium income level. Still, interestingly enough, people with low income level are reporting the higher intention to leave.

Table 8. Means and standard deviations for the Dependent Variables found to have significant differences in relation to the three studied levels of perceived level of income

DEPENDENT VARIABLE	High Income Level (N=57)		Medium Income Level (N=230)		Low Income Level (N=125)		Total (N=412)	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
NC	5.04 ^a	1.44	4.72 ^b	1.39	4.40 ^c	1.53	4.67	1.45
CC	4.35 ^b	1.14	4.32 ^c	1.15	4.79 ^a	1.12	4.47	1.16
HHS	4.65 ^b	1.29	4.38 ^c	1.30	4.96 ^a	1.29	4.59	1.32
LAS	4.05 ^c	1.30	4.25 ^b	1.33	4.63 ^a	1.15	4.34	1.29
ITL	1.96 ^c	1.08	2.10 ^b	.99	2.42 ^a	1.11	2.18	1.05

Note: NC = Normative Commitment; CC = Continuance Commitment; HHS- High Sacrifices Scale; LAS: Lack of alternatives Scale; ITL = Intention to Leave; a-the highest score, b – the medium score, c – the lower score for the indicated variable.

Discussions and conclusions

We focused on the study of three of the main studied organizational results, namely organizational commitment, burnout and intention to leave and how are they manifesting in various groups of employees. One of the most important reason for which we crossed-examined the three selected organizational outcomes and the four demographic characteristics is due to the fact that an important amount of costs are associated with the lack of organizational commitment, higher levels of burnout or intention to leave (Schaufeli & Salanova, 2014; Loi, Hang-yue & Foley, 2006; Guchait & Cho, 2010). Also, it is important to note the increasing interest of the organizations to tailor their approach to various groups of professionals, if not even to have dedicated initiatives at the individual level.

We found that, when considering the entire sample, professional inefficacy is highly negatively correlated with the affective commitment and mildly connected with normative commitment while not at all connected with the continuance commitment and its facets.

When discussing about the various considered groups, the significant difference between managers and non-managers on total level of Burnout, particularly, in the Professional Inefficacy area as well as in the affective commitment and normative commitment. We also found that non-

managers have a higher intention to leave than managers.

We believe that the results of the current study bring a foundation for the organizations to tailor better human capital policies in relation with the various groups of professionals.

Also, the results gives to the human capital practitioners some important insights such as the ones related to the level of perceived burnout which are found to be higher in non-management rather than in managers, somehow counterintuitive considering the amount of increased responsibilities management has comparing to the non-management. However, it is well possible that an associated perceived lack of job resources (such as autonomy) could lead the non-managers to perceiving that they do not deliver at a good-enough level and their professional efficacy is greatly diminished.

Recruiters are also informed by the current study results that is more difficult to find suitable professionals from the public sector interested in new opportunities on the market since those individuals perceive that, in fact, there are not so many real opportunities for them to experience a change in their career. Maybe among the only reasonable competitive advance the private sector companies could bring to a public sector employee in order to attract them would be the perceived level of Burnout, since the public sector professionals perceive that they are more stressed than their peers in the private sector.

Another important point on the HR agenda is an optimal right-sizing of the total rewards packages such as the companies to ensure proper attraction and retention of talent and prevent, in this way, talent loss, secure institutional memory and save to the costs associated with the loss of investment in human capital, additional recruitment and training as well as negative effects on productivity (Țânculescu, 2015; Weisberg & Kirschenbaum, 1991).

An even more important finding supporting the dedicated approach that companies need to take for various groups of employees and in various situations can be identified regarding the age of the participants, meaning that for all the studied dependent variables, there are differences between generations. One of the most important challenge companies are facing at the moment is to bridge the generational gap. This study brings light in the elements the young generation perceive as most disturbing for them comparing older generation and how those behaviors can be transformed from difficulties to opportunities to develop new practices and policies adapted to meet both young and senior professionals' needs.

For instance, we found that the organizational commitment is declining as the age decreased, namely the most committed employees are the Baby Boomers and not only from the continuous commitment point of view. They may not be perceiving as many opportunities on the market as the younger generation, but they are also the most affective and normative committed to the company. Counter-intuitively and rather counter-naturally, the most burned-out are the employees from the youngest generation and also, they are the ones expressing the higher intention to leave. Also the younger generation obtain the higher level of professional inefficacy comparing with the other two considered generations.

Last but not least, money are not all, at least not all the times. As poor or as wealthy as you perceived yourself to be, if you want to be affectively committed to the organization, you are. And, unfortunately, irrespective of the perceived level of income, burnout and its facets can affect both poor and rich.

Differences between organizational outcomes when analyzing the three groups from the perceived income point of view occur when considering the normative and continuance commitment as well as the intention to leave. To illustrate with an example, as much as the lack of alternatives on the market are perceived by employees with perceived low income, the higher is their intention to leave. That means that the fact that the fear of not finding a job outside of the company is lower than their intention to leave the company, most probably to find a better paid job.

The limitations of the study include the fact that the results were obtained solely through self-report questionnaires, which increase the possibility of contamination of the reported relationships through common method variance. Another limitation of this study could be seen in the transversal design that impair us to draw causal inferences. Also, even if the study had a medium size large sample (N=412), the sub-sets of samples were, at times uneven, like in the situation of the group of people reporting higher level of income or in the situation of the Baby-Boomers participating in the study.

As future research, one possible important study paths would focus on the differences considering other demographic characteristics such as tenure or working experience, for the companies to be able to derive much more adapted solutions to increase achievement motivation and reduce employees' attrition as well as enriched, redesigned positions as a result of applying more adapted, tailored approaches for the employees.

References

- Allen, N.J. & Meyer, J.P. (1996) Affective, Continuance, and Normative Commitment to the Organization: An Examination of Construct Validity. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 49, 252–276
- Bogg, J. & Cooper, C. (1995). Job Satisfaction, Mental Health, and Occupational Stress among Senior Civil Servants. *Human Relations*, 48, 327-341.
- Clugston, M., Howell, J. P. & Dorfman, P. W. (2000). Does cultural socialization predict multiple bases and foci of commitment? *Journal of Management*, 26, 5–30.
- Cohen, A. (1993). Organizational Commitment and Turnover: A Meta-Analysis. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 36(5), 1140-1157, DOI: 10.2307/256650

- Cohen, A., & Gattiker, U. (1994). Rewards and Organizational Commitment across Structural Characteristics: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 9(2), 137-157.
- Cohen, A., & Lowenberg, G. (1990) A reexamination of the side-bet theory as applied to organizational commitment: A meta-analysis. *Human Relations*, 43, 1015-1050.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences (2nd ed.)* (Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum)
- Edwards, J. & Cable, D. (2009). The Value of Value Congruence. *The Journal of applied psychology*, 94, 654-677. DOI: 10.1037/a0014891.
- Emerson, R.M. (1976). The Social Exchange Theory. *Annual Review of Sociology* 2(1), 335-362, DOI: 10.1146/annurev.so.02.080176.002003.
- Field, A. (2018). *Discovering Statistics Using IBM SPSS Statistics* (5th Ed.). London, UK: Sage Publications, 736-775.
- Gittleman, M, Pierce B.(2013) How Prevalent is Performance-Related Pay in the United States? Current Incidence and Recent Trends. *National Institute Economic Review* 226(1): R4-R16. DOI:10.1177/002795011322600102
- Guchait, P., & Cho, S. (2010). The impact of human resource management practices on intention to leave of employees in the service industry in India: the mediating role of organizational commitment. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 21(8), 1228-1247
- Homans, G. (1974). *Social Behavior*, revised Ed., New York: Harcourt-Brace, 25-44.
- Jeong, M. & Oh, H. (2017). Business-to-business social exchange relationship beyond trust and commitment. *International Journal of Hospitality Management* 65, 115-124. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijhm.2017.06.004.
- Kerlinger, F. N. & Lee, H. B. (2000). *Foundations of behavioral research* (4th Ed). Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt College Publishers.
- Loi, R., Hang-yue, N. & Foley, S. (2006). 'Linking Employees' Justice Perceptions to Organizational Commitment and Intention to Leave: The Mediating Role of Perceived Organizational Support, *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 79, 101-120.
- Mathieu, J. E., & Zajac, D. M. (1990). A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates and consequences of organizational commitment. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108: 171-194.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J., & Smith, C. A. (1993). Commitment to organizations and occupations: Extension and test of a three component conceptualization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(4), 38-551.
- Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L. & Topolnysky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 61, 20-52.
- Montgomery, A.J., Peeters, M.C.W., Schaufeli, W.B. & Den Ouden, M. D. (2003). Work-Home Interference among Newspaper Managers: Its Relationship with Burnout and Engagement. *Anxiety, Stress & Coping*, 16, 195-211. DOI: 10.1080/1061580021000030535
- Muller, K.E. & Fetterman, B.A. (2002). *Regression and ANOVA: An integrated approach using SAS® Software*. Cary, NC: SAS Institute Inc & John Wiley & Sons Inc.
- Mukherjee, R. & Gokcekus, O. (2001) *Living with Political Patronage: Civil Service Reform Options When Patronage Cannot be Eliminated*. Draft PREM Note, The World Bank.
- Patalano, C (2008). *A study of the relationship between generational group identification and organizational commitment: Generation X vs. Generation Y*. Nova Southeastern University, ProQuest Dissertations Publishing, 2008. 3301306.
- Popa, M. (2010). *Statistici multivariate aplicate în psihologie [Multivariate Statistics Applied in Psychology/Multivariate Statistics Applied in Psychology]*. Iasi, Polirom, 207-264.
- Schaufeli, W.B. & Enzmann, D. (1998). *The Burnout Companion to Study and Research: A Critical Analysis*. Taylor & Francis, London.
- Schaufeli, W.B. & Salanova, M. (2014). Burnout, boredom and engagement at the workplace. In Peeters, M., de Jonge J., & Taris, T. (eds.), *People at work: An Introduction to Contemporary Work Psychology*. Chichester, Wiley-Blackwell, 293 – 320.
- Schuler, H., Thornton, G.C., Frintrup, A., Mueller-Hanson, R. (2004). *Achievement Motivation Inventory. Manual*. Oxford: Hogrefe & Huber Publisher.
- Suman, S., & Srivastava, A. K. (2012). Antecedents of Organisational Commitment across Hierarchical Levels. *Psychology and Developing Societies*, 24(1), 61–83. DOI: 10.1177/097133361102400103.
- Țânculescu, L. (2015) *Impactul factorilor de personalitate înțeleși în cheia teoriei celor cinci mari factori de personalitate asupra angajamentului organizațional. PhD Thesis (unpublished)*. UBB, Cluj-Napoca.
- Weisberg, J.& Kirschenbaum, A. (1991). Employee Turnover Intentions: Implications from a National Sample. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 2(3), 359–375.
- Yousef, D. A. (2016). Organizational Commitment, Job Satisfaction and Attitudes toward Organizational Change: A Study in the Local Government. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 40(1), 77-88 DOI: 10.1080/01900692.2015.1072217
- ***OECD.(1997) *Trends in public sector pay in OECD countries*. Paris: OECD-Publishing
- ***OECD (2005) *Performance-related pay policies for government employees*, Paris: OECD-Publishing