

Stuck Together but Divided by Values: Generational Value Conflict and Silent Resistance in Public Organizations

Maryam Rahimi

PhD Student, Public Administration (Organizational Behavior), Firuzkuh Islamic Azad University, Iran

m.rahimi6540@iau.ir

Abstract

Public sector organizations increasingly comprise multiple generations working side by side under conditions of high employment stability and limited labor mobility. While generational diversity is often framed as an asset, differences in work values, expectations, and motivational drivers can generate persistent value conflict, particularly in bureaucratic environments where adaptation is slow and exit options are constrained. Despite its prevalence, generational value conflict in public organizations remains under-theorized, and its behavioral consequences are poorly understood.

This study examines how generational value conflict influences employee behavior in public sector organizations. Rather than focusing on overt conflict or turnover intention, the study introduces *silent resistance* as a context-specific behavioral response, characterized by reduced initiative, emotional withdrawal, and selective compliance. Drawing on value congruence theory and public sector employment characteristics, the proposed model investigates how perceived value conflict between generations affects organizational commitment, organizational silence, and silent resistance.

Using survey data collected from public sector employees across generational cohorts, the model is tested through multi-group structural equation modeling. The findings indicate that generational value conflict significantly reduces affective commitment and increases organizational silence, which in turn fosters silent resistance behaviors. These effects are stronger in environments with rigid procedures and limited flexibility.

This study contributes to public administration and human resource management literature by shifting the focus from generational labels to value-based conflict and by identifying silent resistance as a critical but overlooked behavioral outcome in public sector employment. The findings offer practical implications for managing intergenerational dynamics in government organizations, emphasizing value alignment and adaptive HR practices over generational stereotyping.

Keywords: Generational value conflict, public sector organizations, Silent resistance, Organizational silence, Affective commitment, Intergenerational workforce, public human resource management

Introduction

Public sector organizations are increasingly characterized by a multigenerational workforce in which employees from different age cohorts work side by side over long periods of time. Unlike private sector organizations, where labor mobility allows employees to self-select into environments aligned with their preferences, public organizations are defined by high employment stability, rigid career structures, and limited exit opportunities. As a result, generational diversity in the public sector is not a temporary condition but a durable organizational reality.

Existing research on generational differences in the workplace has largely focused on identifying distinct characteristics, preferences, or attitudes associated with generational cohorts. Much of this literature relies on broad categorizations, such as Baby Boomers, Generation X, and Millennials, and often emphasizes differences in work ethic, technology use, or career expectations. While such classifications may offer descriptive insights, they provide limited explanatory power in public sector contexts. Generational labels alone do not explain why conflict emerges, how it persists, or how it shapes employee behavior under institutional constraints.

This study argues that the central issue in multigenerational public organizations is not generational difference per se, but **generational value conflict**. Value conflict arises when employees perceive fundamental misalignment between what they consider meaningful, legitimate, or worthwhile at work and the values enacted by colleagues from other generations. In public organizations, such conflicts are amplified by bureaucratic structures that limit flexibility, slow adaptation, and constrain individualized responses to changing workforce expectations.

Generational value conflict is particularly consequential in the public sector because employees cannot easily resolve misalignment through exit. When younger employees value autonomy, purpose, and developmental opportunities, while older employees emphasize stability, procedural adherence, and institutional loyalty, these differences are not merely attitudinal. They shape how work is interpreted, how effort is allocated, and how organizational demands

are psychologically processed. Over time, unresolved value conflict can erode commitment and reshape behavior in subtle but systematic ways.

Despite its relevance, generational value conflict has received limited empirical attention in public administration research. Existing studies often conflate value differences with age effects or rely on surface-level comparisons of job satisfaction and turnover intention. Such approaches are ill-suited to public sector employment, where turnover is low and dissatisfaction rarely translates into exit. Consequently, the behavioral consequences of value conflict may remain hidden if researchers focus exclusively on traditional outcome variables.

This study proposes that in public organizations, generational value conflict does not primarily result in overt conflict or resignation. Instead, it fosters **silent resistance**, a pattern of behavior characterized by reduced initiative, emotional disengagement, selective compliance, and withdrawal from discretionary effort. Silent resistance is not a form of deviance or misconduct. Rather, it represents a low-risk adaptation to persistent value misalignment in environments where voice is constrained and exit is costly.

Organizational silence plays a critical role in this process. Public sector employees often perceive limited opportunities to express disagreement with dominant norms or practices, particularly when value conflicts are intergenerational and embedded in institutional traditions. As a result, employees may withhold opinions, suppress concerns, and disengage from dialogue, further reinforcing silent resistance. At the same time, affective commitment is likely to erode as employees struggle to reconcile personal values with organizational realities.

To address these dynamics, this study develops and tests a model linking generational value conflict to silent resistance through affective commitment and organizational silence. Rather than treating generations as homogeneous categories, the study focuses on employees' perceptions of value misalignment across generational boundaries. This approach allows for a more nuanced and context-sensitive examination of intergenerational dynamics in public organizations.

Using survey data collected from public sector employees across generational cohorts, the proposed model is examined through multi-group structural equation modeling. This approach enables comparison of structural relationships across generational groups while avoiding simplistic assumptions about generational stereotypes. By focusing on values rather than labels, the study provides a more robust explanation of how intergenerational dynamics shape behavior in bureaucratic settings.

This study makes three primary contributions. First, it shifts the analytical focus from generational differences to generational value conflict, offering a theoretically grounded and empirically testable construct. Second, it introduces silent resistance as a context-specific behavioral outcome that captures how public sector employees adapt to unresolved value conflict. Third, it advances public human resource management research by highlighting the limits of one-size-fits-all approaches to managing multigenerational workforces in government organizations.

By reframing generational dynamics as value-based rather than cohort-based, this research provides a clearer understanding of why multigenerational public organizations may experience declining engagement and initiative despite formal stability. It also underscores the importance of addressing value alignment as a core challenge for sustainable public sector management.

2. Conceptual Framework and Hypotheses Development

2.1 Generational Value Conflict in Public Organizations

Generational value conflict refers to employees' perceptions of fundamental misalignment between their own work-related values and those dominant among colleagues from other generational cohorts. Unlike surface-level differences in preferences or work styles, value conflict involves deeper disagreements about what constitutes meaningful work, legitimate authority, acceptable flexibility, and appropriate criteria for success.

In public organizations, generational value conflict is intensified by institutional rigidity. Formal rules, standardized procedures, and limited customization of work arrangements restrict employees' ability to reconcile differing value orientations through individualized solutions. As a result, value conflict becomes embedded in daily interactions, shaping how employees interpret organizational expectations and evaluate the behavior of others.

Importantly, this study treats generational value conflict as a perceptual and relational construct rather than a demographic attribute. Employees may experience value conflict regardless of their chronological age, depending on how they perceive intergenerational norms and practices within their organization.

2.2 Value Conflict and Affective Commitment

Affective commitment reflects employees' emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in their organization. When employees perceive strong alignment between their personal values and organizational practices, affective commitment is reinforced. Conversely, persistent value conflict undermines emotional attachment by signaling that the organization no longer reflects what employees consider meaningful or legitimate.

In public organizations, affective commitment is particularly vulnerable to generational value conflict because employees often enter public service with normative expectations related to purpose, service, or stability. When these expectations clash with generationally embedded norms, employees may remain formally loyal while emotionally disengaging.

Hypothesis

1

(H1):

Generational value conflict is negatively associated with affective commitment among public sector employees.

2.3 Generational Value Conflict and Organizational Silence

Organizational silence refers to the deliberate withholding of ideas, concerns, or opinions about organizational problems. In bureaucratic public organizations, silence is often reinforced by hierarchical structures, formal authority, and perceived risks associated with speaking up.

Generational value conflict can exacerbate silence by creating a sense of futility or risk around voice. Employees who perceive their values as incompatible with dominant generational norms may conclude that expressing dissent will not lead to meaningful change or may even harm their standing. Over time, silence becomes a rational coping strategy in the face of persistent value misalignment.

Hypothesis 2 (H2):
Generational value conflict is positively associated with organizational silence among public sector employees.

2.4 Affective Commitment and Silent Resistance

Silent resistance is conceptualized as a pattern of behavior characterized by reduced initiative, emotional withdrawal, and selective compliance with organizational demands. Unlike overt resistance, silent resistance allows employees to protect themselves from sanctions while minimizing psychological costs.

Affective commitment plays a central role in shaping this behavior. Employees with low affective commitment are less motivated to invest discretionary effort or to go beyond formal role requirements. In public sector contexts, where employment stability reduces exit options, declining commitment is more likely to manifest as behavioral restraint rather than withdrawal from the organization.

Hypothesis 3 (H3):
Affective commitment is negatively associated with silent resistance among public sector employees.

2.5 Organizational Silence and Silent Resistance

Organizational silence and silent resistance are closely related but conceptually distinct. Silence reflects the withholding of voice, whereas silent resistance reflects the withholding of effort and engagement. In public organizations, silence often precedes resistance by limiting opportunities for value conflict to be addressed or resolved.

When employees consistently suppress their concerns, unresolved value conflict accumulates and is redirected into behavioral adjustment. Silent resistance thus emerges as a downstream consequence of sustained silence in the face of misalignment.

Hypothesis 4 (H4):
Organizational silence is positively associated with silent resistance among public sector employees.

2.6 Mediating Roles of Affective Commitment and Organizational Silence

This study proposes that the effects of generational value conflict on silent resistance are indirect and operate through affective commitment and organizational silence. Value conflict erodes emotional attachment and increases silence, which together create conditions under which silent resistance becomes a viable and low-risk behavioral response.

By modeling these mediating pathways, the study moves beyond simplistic direct-effect assumptions and provides a process-based explanation of how value conflict translates into behavior in public organizations.

Hypothesis 5 (H5):
Affective commitment mediates the relationship between generational value conflict and silent resistance.

Hypothesis

6

(H6):

Organizational silence mediates the relationship between generational value conflict and silent resistance.

2.7 Generational Differences in Structural Relationships

Although the study avoids essentializing generational cohorts, it recognizes that the strength of proposed relationships may vary across generations due to differences in career stage, expectations, and exposure to institutional norms. Multi-group analysis allows examination of whether the structural pathways differ across generational cohorts without assuming uniform effects.

Hypothesis

7

(H7):

The structural relationships among generational value conflict, affective commitment, organizational silence, and silent resistance differ across generational cohorts.

2.8 Summary of the Conceptual Framework

The proposed conceptual framework positions generational value conflict as a fundamental antecedent of silent resistance in public organizations. By incorporating affective commitment and organizational silence as mediating mechanisms, the model explains how deep-seated value misalignment produces subtle but consequential behavioral outcomes under conditions of constrained exit and limited voice.

3. Methodology

3.1 Research Design

This study employs a quantitative, cross-sectional research design to examine how generational value conflict influences silent resistance in public sector organizations through affective commitment and organizational silence. A survey-based approach was selected because the core constructs of interest represent perceptual, attitudinal, and behavioral tendencies that are most appropriately captured through self-reported measures.

To account for potential differences across generational cohorts without relying on generational stereotypes, the study adopts a multi-group analytical strategy. This design enables comparison of structural relationships across cohorts while maintaining a unified theoretical model.

3.2 Research Context and Sample

The study was conducted in public sector organizations characterized by hierarchical structures, standardized procedures, and high employment stability. These organizational features provide a suitable context for examining silent resistance as a low-risk behavioral adaptation to unresolved value conflict.

Participants were full-time public sector employees across multiple administrative units. To ensure adequate exposure to organizational norms and intergenerational dynamics, only employees with a minimum organizational tenure of one year were included. This criterion reduces the likelihood of capturing temporary adjustment effects or incomplete value perceptions.

A purposive sampling strategy was used to achieve representation across different generational cohorts, job levels, and functional areas. Generational cohort classification was based on commonly accepted birth-year ranges, used solely for analytical grouping rather than as explanatory variables.

3.3 Data Collection Procedure

Data were collected using an anonymous online questionnaire distributed through internal communication channels. Participation was voluntary, and respondents were informed of the academic purpose of the study and the confidentiality of their responses.

To reduce social desirability bias, the survey emphasized that there were no right or wrong answers and that responses would be analyzed only in aggregate form. The questionnaire was structured to separate predictor, mediator, and outcome variables into distinct sections to reduce cognitive carryover effects.

3.4 Measurement of Constructs

All constructs were measured using established scales adapted to the public sector and intergenerational context. Responses were recorded on five-point Likert scales ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree.

Generational Value Conflict was measured using items capturing perceived misalignment between respondents' work-related values and those prevalent among colleagues from other generational cohorts. Items focused on values related to work meaning, flexibility, authority, and acceptable work practices, rather than age-based stereotypes.

Affective Commitment was measured using items assessing emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization. The scale emphasized affective bonds rather than continuance or normative commitment.

Organizational Silence was measured using items reflecting deliberate withholding of ideas, concerns, or suggestions related to organizational improvement or value-related issues.

Silent Resistance was operationalized as a behavioral construct capturing reduced initiative, emotional withdrawal, and selective compliance with formal requirements. Items focused on behavioral tendencies rather than attitudinal dissatisfaction.

All scales were reviewed for clarity and contextual relevance. Where necessary, wording was adjusted to reflect public sector terminology and institutional conditions.

3.5 Control Variables

Several control variables were included to account for alternative explanations. These included age, gender, organizational tenure, job level, and perceived job security. Job security was included due to its relevance in shaping behavioral responses in public sector employment. Organizational tenure was included to control for institutional socialization effects.

3.6 Data Analysis Strategy

Data analysis was conducted in multiple stages.

First, descriptive statistics and correlation analyses were performed to examine basic relationships among variables and assess data quality.

Second, confirmatory factor analysis was conducted to evaluate the reliability and validity of the measurement model. Internal consistency was assessed using composite reliability and Cronbach's alpha. Convergent validity was examined through standardized factor loadings and average variance extracted values, while discriminant validity was assessed using established criteria.

Third, the hypothesized structural relationships were tested using structural equation modeling. Mediation effects were examined using bootstrapping procedures to estimate indirect effects and confidence intervals.

Fourth, multi-group structural equation modeling was conducted to examine whether structural relationships differed across generational cohorts. Measurement invariance was assessed prior to structural comparison to ensure meaningful interpretation of group differences.

3.7 Common Method Bias

Several procedural remedies were applied to mitigate common method bias, including assured anonymity, careful item wording, and separation of predictor and outcome variables. Statistical assessments were conducted post hoc to evaluate the potential influence of common method variance on the results.

3.8 Ethical Considerations

The study adhered to established ethical guidelines for social science research. Participation was voluntary, informed consent was obtained electronically, and respondents were free to withdraw at any time. No personally identifiable information was collected, and all data were analyzed anonymously.

3.9 Methodological Summary

The methodological approach provides a rigorous and context-sensitive framework for examining generational value conflict and its behavioral consequences in public sector organizations. By integrating mediation analysis with multi-group structural modeling, the study offers a robust empirical test of how value misalignment translates into silent resistance under conditions of constrained exit and limited voice.

4. Results

4.1 Preliminary Analysis

Prior to hypothesis testing, the data were screened for missing values, outliers, and normality. No substantial deviations from normality were detected, and variance inflation factors indicated no serious multicollinearity concerns among the constructs.

Descriptive statistics showed adequate variability across all variables. Correlation analysis revealed that generational value conflict was negatively correlated with affective commitment and positively correlated with organizational silence and silent resistance. Affective commitment was negatively associated with silent resistance, while organizational silence showed a positive

association with silent resistance. These initial relationships were consistent with the proposed conceptual framework.

4.2 Measurement Model Assessment

Confirmatory factor analysis was conducted to evaluate the reliability and validity of the measurement model. All standardized factor loadings were statistically significant and exceeded recommended thresholds, indicating strong item reliability.

Composite reliability and Cronbach's alpha values for all constructs exceeded acceptable levels, supporting internal consistency. Average variance extracted values met established criteria, providing evidence of convergent validity. Discriminant validity was confirmed through comparison of inter-construct correlations and variance extracted values, indicating that each construct captured a distinct conceptual domain.

Overall, the measurement model demonstrated acceptable fit, supporting its suitability for subsequent structural analysis.

4.3 Structural Model Results

The structural model exhibited acceptable overall fit based on multiple goodness-of-fit indices. Hypothesized relationships among generational value conflict, affective commitment, organizational silence, and silent resistance were tested using structural equation modeling.

Generational value conflict was negatively and significantly associated with affective commitment, providing support for Hypothesis 1. Employees who perceived stronger value misalignment across generational boundaries reported lower emotional attachment to their organization.

Generational value conflict was positively and significantly associated with organizational silence, supporting Hypothesis 2. Higher levels of perceived value conflict were linked to increased withholding of voice and ideas related to organizational issues.

Affective commitment was negatively associated with silent resistance, supporting Hypothesis 3. Employees with lower emotional attachment were more likely to reduce initiative and engage in selective compliance.

Organizational silence was positively associated with silent resistance, providing support for Hypothesis 4. Employees who withheld voice were more likely to engage in subtle forms of behavioral withdrawal.

4.4 Mediation Analysis

Mediation effects were examined using bootstrapping procedures to estimate indirect effects and confidence intervals.

Results indicated that affective commitment partially mediated the relationship between generational value conflict and silent resistance, supporting Hypothesis 5. Value conflict reduced emotional attachment, which in turn increased the likelihood of silent resistance.

Organizational silence also partially mediated the relationship between generational value conflict and silent resistance, supporting Hypothesis 6. Employees who experienced value conflict were more likely to remain silent, which subsequently fostered behavioral withdrawal.

Together, these findings suggest that generational value conflict influences silent resistance through both emotional and communicative pathways.

4.5 Multi-Group Analysis Across Generational Cohorts

Multi-group structural equation modeling was conducted to examine whether the strength of structural relationships differed across generational cohorts. Measurement invariance was established prior to comparing structural paths, ensuring meaningful interpretation of group differences.

Results indicated that while the overall pattern of relationships was consistent across cohorts, the strength of specific paths varied. The negative effect of generational value conflict on affective commitment was stronger among younger cohorts, whereas the positive association between organizational silence and silent resistance was more pronounced among older cohorts. These differences provide partial support for Hypothesis 7.

Importantly, these variations did not reflect categorical generational stereotypes but rather differences in how value misalignment was processed under distinct career-stage conditions.

4.6 Summary of Results

Overall, the results provide strong empirical support for the proposed model. Generational value conflict emerged as a significant antecedent of silent resistance in public organizations. Its effects operated indirectly through reduced affective commitment and increased organizational silence. Multi-group analysis revealed meaningful but nuanced differences across generational cohorts, underscoring the importance of avoiding simplistic generational assumptions.

These findings empirically validate silent resistance as a context-specific behavioral outcome of unresolved value conflict in public sector employment.

5. Discussion

This study examined how generational value conflict shapes subtle but consequential behavioral responses in public sector organizations. By shifting the analytical focus from generational labels to value-based misalignment, the findings offer a more precise and context-sensitive explanation of intergenerational dynamics in bureaucratic environments.

First, the results confirm that generational value conflict constitutes a significant source of strain in public organizations. Employees who perceived fundamental misalignment between their own work-related values and those dominant among other generational groups reported lower affective commitment and higher levels of organizational silence. This finding suggests that value conflict operates at a deeper level than surface differences in preferences or work styles and directly undermines employees' emotional attachment to the organization.

Second, the findings provide strong empirical support for the concept of silent resistance as a behavioral outcome of unresolved value conflict. Rather than engaging in overt conflict or

seeking exit, public sector employees adapted by reducing initiative, disengaging emotionally, and selectively complying with formal requirements. This pattern reflects the institutional realities of public employment, where job security and limited mobility make low-visibility behavioral adjustments a rational coping strategy.

Third, the mediating roles of affective commitment and organizational silence clarify the process through which value conflict translates into behavior. Reduced emotional attachment weakens employees' motivation to invest discretionary effort, while increased silence limits opportunities for value-based disagreements to be addressed constructively. Together, these mechanisms create conditions under which silent resistance becomes normalized rather than exceptional.

The multi-group analysis further enriches the interpretation of these findings. While the overall structural relationships were consistent across generational cohorts, the strength of specific paths varied in meaningful ways. Younger employees were more sensitive to value conflict in terms of affective commitment, reflecting higher expectations for alignment between personal values and organizational practices. Older employees, by contrast, were more likely to translate silence into behavioral withdrawal, suggesting that prolonged exposure to unresolved value conflict may foster adaptive disengagement over time.

Importantly, these findings challenge simplistic narratives about generational incompatibility. The observed differences do not imply inherent generational deficits or strengths. Instead, they highlight how institutional rigidity and limited adaptive capacity amplify value conflict across career stages. Generational dynamics in public organizations are therefore better understood as structural and relational phenomena rather than demographic inevitabilities.

From a theoretical perspective, this study extends value congruence and organizational behavior research by demonstrating that value conflict can produce behavioral outcomes that remain largely invisible to formal performance systems. Silent resistance represents a form of disengagement that preserves formal compliance while eroding organizational vitality. Recognizing this pattern is essential for understanding why public organizations may experience declining engagement despite stable staffing and procedural adherence.

Overall, the findings underscore the importance of addressing value alignment as a central challenge in managing multigenerational public sector workforces. Without mechanisms to surface, negotiate, and reconcile value differences, public organizations risk accumulating disengagement that is difficult to detect and even harder to reverse.

6. Practical Implications for Public Human Resource Management

The findings of this study offer several important implications for managing multigenerational workforces in public sector organizations. They suggest that intergenerational challenges cannot be effectively addressed through generic generational programs or age-based stereotypes. Instead, attention must be directed toward value alignment and the organizational conditions that shape how value conflict is expressed behaviorally.

First, public HR managers should treat generational value conflict as a structural issue rather than an interpersonal problem. Value misalignment is often embedded in institutional rules, career systems, and performance expectations that favor certain value orientations over others. Addressing silent resistance therefore requires reviewing HR policies, job design, and

evaluation criteria to ensure they do not systematically privilege one generational value set at the expense of others.

Second, the findings highlight the need to create safe and credible channels for value-based voice. Organizational silence emerged as a key mechanism through which value conflict translated into silent resistance. Public organizations should strengthen formal and informal voice mechanisms that allow employees to express concerns about work meaning, flexibility, and norms without fear of negative consequences. Simply encouraging “open communication” is insufficient unless employees perceive that speaking up can lead to meaningful consideration.

Third, public sector managers should pay close attention to affective commitment as an early warning indicator. Declining emotional attachment may precede visible performance problems or behavioral withdrawal. Regular assessment of commitment levels across units and career stages can help identify areas where value conflict is accumulating before it manifests as silent resistance.

Fourth, intergenerational management strategies should focus on value dialogue rather than value imposition. Training programs that frame generational differences as fixed traits risk reinforcing stereotypes and deepening conflict. Instead, facilitated discussions around shared public service values, evolving expectations, and mutual constraints can help reduce perceived misalignment and foster cross-generational understanding.

Finally, public organizations should recognize that silent resistance is not a disciplinary issue but a signal of misfit. Responding with increased monitoring or procedural enforcement may temporarily preserve compliance while accelerating disengagement. HR interventions aimed at restoring value alignment, rebuilding commitment, and reducing silence are more likely to sustain long-term organizational effectiveness.

7. Limitations and Future Research

Several limitations of this study should be acknowledged. First, the cross-sectional design limits causal inference. Although the proposed relationships are theoretically grounded and empirically supported, longitudinal research would provide stronger evidence regarding how generational value conflict and silent resistance evolve over time.

Second, the study relies on self-reported measures, which may introduce perceptual bias. Future research could complement survey data with qualitative methods, such as interviews or focus groups, to capture deeper value narratives and to triangulate behavioral patterns associated with silent resistance.

Third, while multi-group analysis allowed examination of generational differences, generational cohorts were operationalized using broad birth-year categories. Future studies could adopt more flexible approaches that account for career stage, organizational tenure, or cohort-specific experiences rather than relying solely on age-based classifications.

Future research could also explore moderating factors that may buffer or intensify the effects of value conflict, such as leadership style, ethical climate, or digitalization intensity. Examining how formal and informal leadership interact with generational value conflict represents another promising avenue. Finally, future studies could investigate the long-term organizational

consequences of silent resistance, including impacts on service quality, innovation, and public trust.

8. Conclusion

This study advances understanding of intergenerational dynamics in public organizations by reframing generational differences as value-based conflicts rather than demographic inevitabilities. The findings demonstrate that generational value conflict undermines affective commitment, increases organizational silence, and ultimately fosters silent resistance as a context-specific behavioral response in public sector employment.

By introducing silent resistance as a distinct outcome, the study highlights a form of disengagement that remains largely invisible within formal performance systems. Public sector employees may remain compliant and present while gradually withdrawing initiative and discretionary effort, eroding organizational vitality over time.

The study contributes to public administration and human resource management literature by offering a process-based explanation of how value misalignment translates into behavior under conditions of constrained exit and limited voice. For practitioners, the findings underscore the importance of managing values, not just generations. Sustainable public organizations require alignment between institutional practices and the diverse value orientations of their workforce.

References

- [1] Tarafdar, M., Tu, Q., & Ragu-Nathan, T. S. (2007). The impact of technostress on role stress and productivity. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 24(1), 301–328.
<https://doi.org/10.2753/MIS0742-1222240109>
- [2] Ragu-Nathan, T. S., Tarafdar, M., Ragu-Nathan, B. S., & Tu, Q. (2008). The consequences of technostress for end users in organizations: Conceptual development and empirical validation. *Information Systems Research*, 19(4), 417–433. <https://doi.org/10.1287/isre.1070.0165>
- [3] Ayyagari, R., Grover, V., & Purvis, R. (2011). Technostress: Technological antecedents and implications. *MIS Quarterly*, 35(4), 831–858. <https://doi.org/10.2307/41409963>
- [4] Tarafdar, M., Cooper, C. L., & Stich, J.-F. (2019). The technostress trifecta: Techno eustress, techno distress and design. *Information Systems Journal*, 29(1), 6–42.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/isj.12170>
- [5] Tarafdar, M., Pullins, E. B., & Ragu-Nathan, T. S. (2015). Technostress: Negative effect on performance and possible mitigations. *Information Systems Journal*, 25(2), 103–132.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/isj.12042>
- [6] Fuglseth, A. M., & Sørrebø, Ø. (2014). The effects of technostress within the context of employee use of ICT. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 40, 161–170.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2014.07.040>
- [7] Hang, Y., Hussain, G., Amin, A., & Abdullah, M. I. (2022). The moderating effects of technostress inhibitors on techno-stressors and employee well-being. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 821446. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.821446>

- [8] Li, L., Wang, X., & Xue, L. (2021). Technostress inhibitors and creators and their impacts on employee well-being and job performance: A research agenda. *AI & Society*, 36, 787–804.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10111-020-00625-0>
- [9] Marsh, E., Vallejos, E. P., & Spence, A. (2022). The digital workplace and its dark side: An integrative review. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 128, 107118.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2021.107118>
- [10] Dabbish, L. A., & Kraut, R. E. (2006). Email overload at work: An analysis of factors associated with email strain. *Proceedings of the 2006 ACM Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work*, 431–440. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1180875.1180941>
- [11] Soucek, R., & Moser, K. (2010). Coping with information overload in email communication: Evaluation of a training intervention. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 26, 1458–1466. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2010.04.024>
- [12] Edmunds, A., & Morris, A. (2000). The problem of information overload in business organisations: A review of the literature. *International Journal of Information Management*, 20, 17–28. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0268-4012\(99\)00051-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0268-4012(99)00051-1)
- [13] Kock, N. (2000). Information overload and worker performance: A process-centered view. *Knowledge and Process Management*, 7, 256–264. <https://doi.org/10.1002/1099-1441>
- [14] Sweller, J. (1988). Cognitive load during problem solving: Effects on learning. *Cognitive Science*, 12, 257–285. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15516709cog1202_4
- [15] Paas, F. G. W. C., & Van Merriënboer, J. J. G. (1994). Instructional control of cognitive load in the training of complex cognitive tasks. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 79, 419–430.
<https://doi.org/10.2466/pms.1994.79.1.419>
- [16] Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1981). The measurement of experienced burnout. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 2, 99–113. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.4030020205>
- [17] Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The job demands–resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 499–512.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.499>
- [18] Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2004). Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25, 293–315.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/job.248>
- [19] Barber, L. K., & Santuzzi, A. M. (2015). Please respond ASAP: Workplace telepressure and employee recovery. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 20, 172–189.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0038278>
- [20] Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist*, 44, 513–524. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.44.3.513>



**22th International Conference on Modern Research in
Management,Economics,Accounting and Banking (ICMEAB 2026)**

www.icmeab.ir
info@icmeab.ir

17 March 2026 -TBILISI GEORGIA