

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/379099403>

# Decoding gen Z employee profiles: revealing work values

Article in *Recherches en Sciences de Gestion* · February 2024

DOI: 10.3917/resg.159.0267

---

CITATION

1

READS

551

3 authors, including:



**Amira Sghari**

Faculté des Sciences Économiques et de Gestion de Sfax

26 PUBLICATIONS 68 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE



# Decoding gen Z employee profiles: revealing work values

Amira Sghari, Wafi Chtourou, Sarra Ghattas

DANS RECHERCHES EN SCIENCES DE GESTION 2023/6 (N° 159), PAGES 267 À 294  
ÉDITIONS ISEOR

ISSN 2259-6372

DOI 10.3917/resg.159.0267

Article disponible en ligne à l'adresse

<https://www.cairn.info/revue-recherches-en-sciences-de-gestion-2023-6-page-267.htm>



CAIRN.INFO  
MATIÈRES À RÉFLEXION

Découvrir le sommaire de ce numéro, suivre la revue par email, s'abonner...

Flashez ce QR Code pour accéder à la page de ce numéro sur Cairn.info.



Distribution électronique Cairn.info pour ISEOR.

La reproduction ou représentation de cet article, notamment par photocopie, n'est autorisée que dans les limites des conditions générales d'utilisation du site ou, le cas échéant, des conditions générales de la licence souscrite par votre établissement. Toute autre reproduction ou représentation, en tout ou partie, sous quelque forme et de quelque manière que ce soit, est interdite sauf accord préalable et écrit de l'éditeur, en dehors des cas prévus par la législation en vigueur en France. Il est précisé que son stockage dans une base de données est également interdit.

## **Decoding Gen Z Employee Profiles: Revealing Work Values**

Amira Sghari

Assistant Professor

ESSEC, University of Tunis

PRISME, LR18ES24

(Tunisia)

Wafi Chtourou

Professor

IHEC, University of Carthage

ECSTRA, LR11ES21

(Tunisia)

Sarra Ghattas

PhD Student

IHEC, University of Carthage

ECSTRA, LR11ES21

(Tunisia)

*This research tries to answer the question: Based on work values, are Gen Z employees homogeneous, or are there different profiles? A quantitative study via a questionnaire was administered online to active Gen Z employees through social media. A total of 152 employees responded to our questionnaire. Cluster analysis was carried out to verify the existence of one or more homogeneous groups according to their work values. The results show that the profiles of Gen Z are not homogeneous and have identified three*

*profile types: the civil servant-benevolent, the careerist, and the self-employed.*

**Keywords:** *Gen Z - Work values – Profile - Quantitative study - Cluster analysis.*

### **Comprendre les profils des employés de la Génération Z à travers leurs valeurs au travail**

*Cette recherche tente de répondre à la question : les salariés de la génération Z sont-ils homogènes ou y a-t-il des profils différents selon les valeurs du travail ? Une approche quantitative a été déployée via une enquête par questionnaire administrée en ligne auprès des employés actifs de la génération Z à travers les médias sociaux. Au total, 152 employés ont répondu à notre questionnaire. L'analyse typologique a été effectuée afin de vérifier l'existence d'un ou plusieurs groupes homogènes par rapport aux valeurs du travail. Les résultats montrent que les profils de la Gen Z ne sont pas homogènes et ont identifié trois types de profils : le fonctionnaire-bienveillant, le carriériste et l'indépendant.*

**Mots-clés :** *Gen Z - Valeurs au travail – Profil - Étude quantitative - Analyse par grappes.*

### **Comprender los perfiles de los empleados de la Generación Z a través de sus valores laborales**

*Esta investigación trata de responder a la pregunta: en función de los valores laborales, ¿los empleados de la Generación Z son homogéneos o hay diferentes perfiles? Se administró un enfoque cuantitativo a través de una encuesta de cuestionario de empleados activos de la Generación Z en línea a través de las redes sociales. Un total de 152 empleados respondieron a nuestro cuestionario. El análisis de conglomerados se lleva a cabo con el fin de verificar la existencia de uno o más grupos homogéneos en relación con sus valores de trabajo. Los resultados muestran que los perfiles de la Generación Z no son homogéneos y se han identificado tres tipos de perfiles: el funcionario-benevolente, el arribista y el independiente.*

**Palabras clave:** *Gen Z - Valor de trabajo – Perfil – estudio cuantitativo – Análisis de conglomerados.*

## Introduction

Generation Z also known as Gen Z, iGeneration or iGen, post-millennials, Digital Natives, and Facebook-generation are many qualifiers characterizing people born from 1995, who grew up in the digital age, and who joined the workplace from 2017 (e.g., Arar and Onerenb, 2018). They are heavily dependent on the digital world in almost every aspect of their lives (Goh and Lee, 2018). Moreover, social networks, vital for them, have induced an informal, individual, and straight way of communicating (Agarwal and Vaghela, 2018).

According to Agarwal and Vaghela (2018), studies show that Gen Z is not an extension of the Millennial. Indeed, Gen Z employees are more entrepreneurial, trustworthy, tolerant (Schawbel, 2014; Bridges, 2015) impatient, and agile than their predecessors (Bencsik et al., 2016). Moreover, they are more realistic about their work expectation, optimistic about the future (Bridges, 2015), more self-focused (Twenge, 2013), and accept diversity (Goh and Lee, 2018). Also, they are not afraid of continuous changes and look always for new challenges and impulses continuously (Bencsik et al., 2016). Hence, there are differences in work values compared to previous generations (Twenge et al., 2010).

Gen Z will dominate the market in the next few years. Employers will find themselves facing a generation that chooses a career of their interest and does not meet any requirements (Bencsik et al., 2016). Thus, it is crucial to understand the preferences of Gen Z to create a good working environment (Agarwal and Vaghela, 2018). These authors add that organizations should start focusing on how the workplace needs to adapt for this generation.

Research on this cohort remains limited (Barhate and Dirani, 2021). Indeed, so far researchers are concerned with Gen Y employees (e.g., Naim and Lenka, 2018; Torsello, 2019). According to Chillakuri (2020 b, p. 1279), “*the literature on Generation Z is at an emerging phase*”. Previous work focused on several themes such as the study of the different and more salient expectations and features of new generation Z compared to the previous ones and the ways of managing

them (Arar and Yuksel, 2015), their perceptions about working in the hospitality industry (Goh et Lee, 2018), their current habits in using smart technology, social media, and voice communication for personal communication (Janssen and Carradini, 2021), Gen Z students' career aspirations and their future employers' expectations (Barhate and Dirani, 2021), etc. The study of the work values of Generation Z remains little explored.

The literature presents Generation Z as a homogeneous set of people with the same characteristics and values without an empirical foundation. Agarwal and Vaghela (2018) tried to answer the question: how do the work values differ within different groups of Generation Z? As Gen Z was not available in the marketplace, this research was carried out with students at an Indian university. The division of the sample was based on gender. Thus, the literature is still silent on the homogeneity or not of generation Z employees' profiles. Then, this research tries to answer the question: Based on work values, are Generation Z employees homogeneous, or are there different profiles?

Tang (2019) highlights the need to consider the study context. Hence, to answer this question, an exploratory quantitative study was carried out among generation Z Tunisian employees.

## 1. – Theoretical framework

Work values are defined as the goals of what individuals pursue in their work and which in turn influence their choices and abilities (Ye, 2015). They predict what kind of attitude individuals have towards different work positions (Ye, 2015). The work values differ between generations (Dries et al., 2008; Ye, 2015) but it is important to understand if they differ between individuals within the generation itself (Jaskyte, 2014).

Recent research emphasizes the importance of five work values (intrinsic, extrinsic, altruistic, status/prestige, and social) (Cennamo and Gardner, 2008; Lyons et al., 2010; Twenge et al., 2010; Agarwal and Vaghela, 2018). Lyons (2003) developed an early version of a Work Value Scale (WVS) which was revised in 2010. According to the new version, social and altruistic values are combined under one value due to their similarity. This last scale, which offers four work values (extrinsic values, intrinsic values, prestige values (Status-Associated), and social/altruistic values) has

been mobilized in this research. The mobilized Work Value Scale (WVS) is provided in the appendix.

- **Extrinsic values**

Extrinsic work values correspond to tangible aspects, such as remuneration, social advantages, promotions, and job security (Lyons et al., 2006). They represent the main factors influencing individuals to work (Twenge et al., 2010). Sengupta (2015) emphasizes the importance of other aspects, namely: power, focus on status, hierarchical positions, and reward. Moreover, pursuits of a career, status, and power are important extrinsic values for employees (Vanteenkiste et al., 2007). With these extrinsic work values in particular high incomes employees are more satisfied (Malka and Chatman, 2003).

- **Intrinsic values**

The intrinsic work values concern mainly intangible rewards. They refer to interest in work, stimulating professional activities, a sense of achievement, continuous learning, and intellectual stimulation (Ros et al., 1999; Lyons et al., 2010; Twenge et al., 2010). Sengupta (2015) adds the importance of other values namely: development, self-actualization, challenging projects, and growth.

They are a source of individual well-being (Ryan and Deci, 2000) and ensure psychological satisfaction related to work (Lyons et al., 2006). Moreover, they significantly influence the motivation of the individual to work (Twenge *et al.*, 2010).

- **Social/altruistic values**

The pursuit of surpassing oneself values is expressed through the work's social and altruistic values. Social values concern the person's relationship with colleagues, supervisors, and other people (Lyons et al., 2006; Twenge, 2010). According to Ros et al. (1999), work promotes positive social relationships to contribute to society. Social values refer to leisure time, nurturing/fun environment, work-life balance, and preferring friendly co-workers (Lyons *et al.*, 2006).

Altruistic values refer to individuals who work to help others and get triggered by helping society through their work (Twenge et al., 2010). Employees with these values attach major importance to contributing to society and the ambition to help others (Twenge et al.,

2010). According to Lyons et al. (2006), altruistic values are valued by individuals who are stimulated to have a career in public service.

- **Prestige values**

Prestige values or status-associated refer to the influence and power that an employee has over others (Super, 1970). Thus, these values induce satisfaction and a feeling of superiority to employees who compare themselves to their collaborators (Ros *et al.*, 1999). Individuals who prioritize these values work in organizations that provide employees: achievement, advancement, status, recognition, and independence (Ros *et al.*, 1999). According to Cennamo and Gardner (2008), individuals who are attracted to hard work and achievement value status and extrinsic values, such as recognition of loyalty and commitment.

## **2. – Research method**

As this study aims to explore the work values of Gen Z, a quantitative study is adopted. A questionnaire intended for active Gen Z employees was administered online via social media without limiting ourselves to specific sectors or jobs. The objective is to verify whether Generation Z employees form a homogeneous group or rather several professional profiles can exist according to their perceptions of work values. Items measuring “work values” were drawn from the measurement scale of Lyons et al. (2010). They were evaluated on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Not at all important) to 5 (Essential). The respondent evaluates each item by answering the question: To what extent is this item a top priority for you in your work? The objective is to obtain an assessment of the work values of each respondent.

The questionnaire was first pre-tested with 15 employees. A total of 152 employees responded to our questionnaire. The characteristics of the sample are presented in Table 1 below.

**Table 1. Descriptive analysis of the sample**

	Number	%		Number	%
<b>Gender (n =152)</b>			<b>Type of contract</b>		
Male	64	42.1	Full-time	108	71.1
Female	88	57.9	Part-time	33	21.7
<b>Year of birth</b>			Temp worker	1	0.7
1995	105	69.1	Contractual	10	6.5
1996	21	21.1	<b>Actual status</b>		
1997	10	6.6	Senior	18	11.8
1998	2	1.3	Middle manager	38	25
1999	1	0.7	Employee	86	56.6
2000	2	1.2	Worker	1	0.7
+2001	0	0	Consultant / Freelance	9	5.9
<b>Level of education</b>					
Master	109	71.7	<b>Sector of activity</b>		
Licence/ Bachelor	40	26.3	Bank and insurance	24	15.8
Higher technician's certificate/Professional technician's certificate	2	1.3	Administration	2	1.3
High school	1	0.7	Study, consulting, insurance, accounting services	25	16.44
	<b>Bachelor's degree (BA)</b>		IT, communication and new technologies department	49	32.2
Yes	151	99.3	Tourism	10	6.56
No	1	0.7	Transport and logistics	5	3.3
	<b>Entering work</b>		Agricultural, food, distribution	3	2

			industries			
0-3 months		12	7.9	Oil industry	2	1.3
4-6 months		44	28.9	Automobile industry	3	2
6-12 months		48	32.58	Materials and construction industry	3	2
>1 an – 2 years		34	22.3	Health	5	3.3
> 2 years		14	9.21	Education	9	5.9
				Cultural production and industry activities	3	2
				Other	9	

Cluster analysis is carried out to verify the existence of one or more homogeneous groups according to their work values.

### 3. – Results

This section is divided into two subsections. The first one is devoted to the presentation of the descriptive analysis of variables. The second one is devoted to the presentation of cluster analysis which is carried out in two stages: a hierarchical analysis followed by a dynamic cloud method to identify the profiles of GenZ.

#### 3.1. Descriptive analysis of variables

Descriptive analysis of variables involves testing the unidimensionality of measurement scales and verifying their internal consistency. KMO test and Bartlett's sphericity test are performed before Principal Component Analysis (PCA). The tests, as well as the reliability, are summarized in Table 2 below.

**Table 2. Bartlett's sphericity test, KMO test and cronbach's alpha**

	<b>Bartlett's sphericity test</b>	<b>KMO test</b>	<b>Cronbach's alpha</b>
<b>Extrinsic value</b>	0	0.849	0.819
<b>Intrinsic value</b>	0	0.870	0.832
<b>Prestige values</b>	0	0.661	0.648
<b>Social value/ altruistic</b>	0	0.667	0.632

For all variables  $KMO > 0.5$  and Bartlett's sphericity of 0.000 ( $p < 0.05$ ), measurement scales are therefore factorizable (Kaiser, 1974). Cronbach's Alpha values show acceptable internal reliability of the scales (Nunnally, 1978). Thus, PCA is performed on all variables. Two criteria are taken into consideration for the PCA:

- **Communalities:** Items with a factorial contribution at least equal to 0.4 are retained.
- **Variance explained:** To retain the factor, the variance must be greater than 50%.

Table 3 below summarizes the factor structure of the variables.

**Table 3. Factor structure of the variables**

	<b>Items</b>	<b>Factorial contribution</b>	<b>Quality of representation</b>
<b>EXT</b>	EXT1	0.489	0.239
	EXT2	0.550	0.303
	EXT3	0.669	0.447
	EXT4	0.656	0.430
	EXT5	0.735	0.540
	EXT6	0.748	0.559
	EXT7	0.739	0.547
	EXT8	0.709	0.503
	EXT9	0.735	0.540
<b>Total variance explained</b>	45,644%		
	INT1	0.621	0.386

<b>INT</b>	INT2	0.766	0.587
	INT3	0.784	0.615
	INT4	0.610	0.372
	INT5	0.718	0.516
	INT6	0.511	0.261
	INT7	0.792	0.627
	INT8	0.799	0.638
<b>Total variance explained</b>	50,027%		
<b>PREST</b>	PREST1	0.714	0.509
	PREST2	0.670	0.449
	PREST3	0.521	0.272
	PREST4	0.814	0.663
<b>Total variance explained</b>	47,317%		
<b>SOCIAL/ALT</b>	SOCIAL/ALT1	0.738	0.350
	SOCIAL/ALT2	0.592	0.626
	SOCIAL/ALT3	0.791	0.545
	SOCIAL/ALT4	0.681	0.463
<b>Total variance explained</b>	49,607%		

The quality of representation of items EXT1 and EXT2 measuring the variable "extrinsic values" (EXT) is  $<0.4$ . The elimination of these items from the measurement scale allowed an improvement in the factor contributions and the qualities of representation of the items. The percentage of the explained variance increased from 45.644% to 52.219%. Cronbach's alpha is 0.843, indicating a high internal consistency level.

The quality of representation of items INT1, INT4 et INT6 measuring the variable "intrinsic values" (INT) is  $<0.4$ . The elimination of these items from the measurement scale allowed an improvement in the factor contributions and the qualities of representation of the items. The percentage of the explained variance increased from 50,027% to 62,015%.

Cronbach's alpha is 0.823, indicating a high internal consistency level.

The quality of representation of item PREST3 measuring the variable “Prestige values” (PREST) is  $<0.4$ . The elimination of this item from the measurement scale allowed a slight improvement in the factor contributions and the qualities of representation of the items. The percentage of the explained variance increased from 47,317% to 58,114%. Cronbach's alpha is 0.635, this is acceptable given the reduced number of items.

The quality of representation of item SOCIAL/ALTI measuring the variable “Social/ altruistic value” (SOCIAL/ALT) is  $<0.4$ . The elimination of this item from the measurement scale allowed a slight improvement in the factor contributions and the qualities of representation of the items. The percentage of the explained variance increased from 49,607 to 59,307%. Cronbach's alpha is 0.652, this is acceptable given the reduced number of items.

### 3.2. Cluster Analysis

The objective is to subdivide the overall sample of young workers of Generation Z into homogeneous sub-samples (classes). Individuals with similarities in work values will be grouped into a class (profile). Each class has a center representing a profile of Generation Z and each individual also has a center. The method consists of grouping the individuals where the distance between their center and the center of the class is as close as possible. Two methods are adopted using SPSS v.26 software: hierarchical cluster analysis (Shmueli *et al.*, 2007) and dynamic cloud method (McQueen, 1967).

Hierarchical cluster analysis involves gradually agglomerating (combining) the two closest groups until there is only one group left at the end, consisting of all the data groups. Three clusters are identified. To improve the result obtained, the second type of clustering method (Zhang *et al.*, 1996) is carried out, namely: dynamic clouds. This method uses the calculation algorithm « K-Means » which involves randomly selecting K initial centroids where K is a user-defined number of desired clusters  $c_1, c_2, \dots, c_k$  ( $k = 3$ , and  $c_i$  represents the center of a class) (McQueen, 1967). Subsequently, each point belonging to a data set would be associated with the nearest centroid. The highest value cluster centers relate to a specific class (Table 4).

**Table 4. Final cluster centers**

<b>Final cluster centers</b>	<b>Class 1 n= 8</b>	<b>Class 2 N=87</b>	<b>Class 3 N=52</b>
EXT3	4	3	2
EXT4	2	4	4
EXT5	2	3	5
EXT6	3	5	4
EXT7	3	5	4
EXT8	4	5	5
EXT9	2	3	4
INT2	2	5	4
INT3	2	4	5
INT5	4	5	2
INT7	2	4	4
INT8	3	4	3
PREST1	3	4	4
PREST2	5	3	2
PREST4	2	4	5
SOCIAL/ALTRUI2	3	4	4
SOCIAL/ALTRUI3	5	2	3
SOCIAL/ALTRUI4	5	2	3

The ANOVA analysis is performed on the classes to check whether the difference between the types of profiles is statistically significant. The results in table 5 show that the selected profiles are different for all values ( $p < 0$ ).

**Table 5. Inter-class ANOVA**

<b>ANOVA</b>	<b>Cluster</b>		<b>Error</b>		<b>F</b>	<b>Sig.</b>
	<b>Medium square</b>	<b>ddl</b>	<b>Medium square</b>	<b>ddl</b>		
EXT3	26,946	2	1,072	149	25,136	,000
EXT4	19,272	2	,788	149	24,471	,000
EXT5	15,436	2	,814	149	18,954	,000
EXT6	20,825	2	,563	149	37,018	,000
EXT7	31,113	2	,554	149	56,131	,000

EXT8	21,738	2	,668	149	32,564	,000
EXT9	21,928	2	,751	149	29,197	,000
INT2	20,952	2	,430	149	48,712	,000
INT3	13,444	2	,752	149	17,876	,000
INT5	27,683	2	,415	149	66,705	,000
INT7	22,813	2	,556	149	41,006	,000
INT8	15,201	2	,663	149	22,911	,000
PREST1	10,476	2	,598	149	17,531	,000
PREST2	10,218	2	,936	149	10,911	,000
PREST4	15,697	2	,817	149	19,225	,000
SOCIAL/ALTRUI2	10,762	2	,767	149	14,024	,000
SOCIAL/ALTRUI3	15,767	2	,955	149	16,503	,000
SOCIAL/ALTRUI4	22,449	2	1,208	149	18,589	,000

The results show the existence of 3 types of profiles that we call respectively:

**The civil servant-benevolent** (class 1 - 8 individuals (5.2%).

They have the following work values:

- Prestige value: Power to organize and lead a team
- Social/altruistic values: Social interaction and Helping individuals
- Extrinsic value: Job security

**The careerist** (class 2 - 87 individuals (57,23%)). They have the following work values:

- Intrinsic values: Career advancement, Self-fulfilment, Interest in work, and Continuous learning
- Extrinsic values: Access to information, Good salary, and Recognition
- Social/altruistic value: Fun environment
- Prestige value: Have an impact on the organization

**The self-employed** (class 3 - 52 individuals (34,2 %)) with the following work values:

- Intrinsic value: Diversification in the work
- Prestige value: Being able to influence the results of the organization
- Extrinsic values: Flexible schedule with personal life, Work-life balance, and Cooperative supervisor.

## 4. – Discussion

The objective of this article is to deepen the understanding of Generation Z drawing their work values. Contrary to the mainstream literature, the results show that the profiles of Generation Z are not homogeneous and have identified three profile types: civil servant-benevolent, careerist, and self-employed.

### 4.1. Civil servant-benevolent

According to this profile type, the employee tends to favor the **power to organize and lead a team (prestige value)**. Gen Z believes that teamwork leads to productive work and the achievement of organizational goals (Barhate and Dirani, 2021). Iorgulescu (2016) claims that the need to work in a large team is a top priority. Gen Z prefers a good, friendly, and cheerful team (Fodor and Jäckel, 2018). In the same vein, Goh and Lee (2018) emphasize the importance of team spirit.

Although the researchers mentioned above emphasize the importance of teamwork, some articles reported Gen Z's preference for working individually. Indeed, the ready access to technology makes Gen Z more individualistic in interpersonal interaction (Chicca and Shellenbarger, 2018; Twenge, 2017). Several authors claim that Gen Z prefers to work alone and rely on themselves (Puiu, 2017; Silinevica and Meirule, 2019). According to Barhate and Dirani (2021), "*Gen Z suffers from being a team member, especially when the team is ineffective and not achieving its goals at a pace satisfactory to Gen Z*". These authors add that Gen Z may prefer to work alone to achieve goals but still crave teamwork and social contact to achieve holistic professional goals. Leon (2020) claims that this generation is more suited to virtual teamwork.

There is a divergence in the findings: some authors say Gen Z prefers to work individually, and others claim they want to work as a team. This divergence is thus declined at the second and third work values, namely social interaction and helping individuals (altruistic values). Indeed, several authors claim that relationships at work are essential to Gen Z (Fodor et al., 2018; Grow and Yang, 2018; Hampton and Welsh, 2019). According to Hampton and Welsh (2019), Gen Z employees want to build good working relationships and social contact with their co-workers. They need to feel socially

supported by others at work (Pichler et al., 2021). In this context, Barhate and Dirani (2021) emphasize the importance of collaboration that would allow Gen Z to meet both organizational and personal goals.

Although they prefer in-person communication (Schawbel, 2014; Goh and Lee, 2018), their hyperconnection to social media caused them a deficit in social skills necessary for good face-to-face communication (Combs and Twachtman, 2019). According to Pichler et al. (2021), Gen Z seems prone to individualism in terms of learning, communication, and interpersonal interaction. In the same vein, Leon (2020) adds that Gen Z spends more time alone. Hence, they are less likely to enjoy the camaraderie (Twenge, 2017) and more likely to be anxious that the group members will not perform their tasks (Schlee et al., 2020).

The last work value of the civil servant-benevolent profile is **job security (extrinsic value)**. This is explained by the importance of supportive work conditions for Gen Z employees (Shore and Shore, 1995). Indeed, they are very attracted to job security due to being raised in the uncertain economic times of the Great Recession era (Iorgulescu, 2016).

Only 8 individuals (5.2%) represent the profile of the **civil servant-benevolent**. They want to lead a group and emphasize the importance of the social aspect (social interaction and mutual aid) and safety at work. This result could be explained by the fact that these respondents could be seniors of Gen Z who are very influenced by Gen Y.

#### 4.2. Careerist

The concept of "careerist" appeared in the work of Bencsik et al. (2016) who mentioned that the young people of Gen Z have different expectations in their workplaces to emphasize their potential since they have an excellent level, especially in both technological and linguistic fields. The **intrinsic values** of these employees mainly concern **continuous learning** and **career advancement** while having an **interest in the work**, and a feeling of **self-fulfillment**. Gen Z prefers informal learning methods that are both autonomous and cooperative (Barhate and Dirani, 2021). In the same vein, Grow and Yang (2018) demonstrate that Gen Z's attraction to organizations will allow learning through networking since they favor the combination

of autonomy in learning. This ensures career development (Barhate and Dirani, 2021). Indeed, Gen Z employees expect to continually learn to successfully advance their careers (Iorgulescu, 2016). Hence, employers must deal with a generation that will choose a career of their interest (Bencsik *et al.*, 2016). Moreover, they have strong career desires (Bencsik *et al.*, 2016; Deloitte, 2019). Career advancement opportunities in an organization are considered the top priority of Gen Z individuals (Iorgulescu, 2016; Parry and Battista, 2019). Leon (2020) highlights the importance of career resilience for Generation Z. Moreover, Bohdziewicz (2016) emphasizes the preference for Generation Z employees to build links by principles of network or evolve according to a lateral career rather than a hierarchical career.

In addition to a rapid career progression, Gen Z employees feel a strong sense of entitlement to good job assignments (Parry and Battista, 2019) perceived achievements, and self-realization (Silinevica and Meirule, 2019).

The *extrinsic values* of a careerist profile are *access to good information* as well as the benefit of *recognition and a good salary*. Gen Z employees approve of the need to be informed and to have their ideas heard and acknowledged (Bridges, 2015). They desire the managers not to hide information, to listen to their ideas, and to value their opinions (Schawbel, 2014). Besides, they would need gratification for a job well done (Deloitte, 2019) to keep them “motivated and engaged in the workplace making it an effective retention strategy for organizations” (Barhate and Dirani, 2021). In the same vein, Wayne and Casper (2012) emphasize the importance of attractive compensation. Accordingly, companies such as IBM, Google, Amazon, Microsoft, and Deloitte attract employees by offering a good pay and work environment (Glassdoor, 2019).

The last work value of a careerist profile is *working in a fun environment* (social/altruistic value). Indeed, a friendly work environment is important for Gen Z employees (Bridges, 2015). For this reason, some multinational companies consider the “work environment” as an important factor in attracting staff (Glassdoor, 2019).

### 4.3. Self-employed

According to **the self-employed profile**, the employee would like to *influence the results of the organization (prestige value)*. In addition, it tends to favor *diversification in the work (intrinsic value)*. This could be explained by the fact that this generation was born and raised with technology, which has favored very skilled “multitasking” employees (Bridges, 2015; Combs and Twachtman, 2019). In the same vein, Levickaite (2010) states that this technologically literate generation has been shaped to multitask.

Finally, the *extrinsic values* of a **self-employed profile** are a *cooperative supervisor*, a *flexible schedule with a personal life*, and a *Work-life balance*. Research shows that Gen Z workers need social support from supervisors (Chillakuri, 2020 a) and a flexible schedule (Bridges, 2015; Glassdoor, 2019). Also, Gen Z is expected to have a work-life balance (Wayne and Casper, 2012; Bohdziewicz, 2016; Arar and Onerenb, 2018; Fodor and Jäckel, 2018; Hampton and Welsh, 2019).

Several studies have shown that this generation likes to work with flexible times (Mitchell, 2008). Boone et al. (2020, p.200) emphasize the importance of flexitime which is a “*scheduling system that allows employees to choose their hours, within certain limits*”. In their surveys, Deloitte (2019) and Puiu (2017) show that employees expect to choose their work hours and want a *work-life balance*. Indeed, working flexibly provides an opportunity for workers to set their daily programs with other family members (Boone et al., 2020). Thus, organizations that promote and promise work-life balance are more likely to attract and retain Gen Z employees (Fodor and Jäckel, 2018; Barhate and Dirani, 2021). Otherwise, Gen Z might exert pressure on organizations to facilitate work-life balance (Bohdziewicz, 2016).

## Conclusion

The purpose of this research is to explore whether Gen Z employees in companies have the same professional values or there are rather different profiles. A cluster analysis of 152 employees is carried out to verify the existence of one or more homogeneous groups about their work values. The results show that the profiles of

Gen Z are not homogeneous and have identified three profile types: the civil servant-benevolent, the careerist, and the self-employed. The different work values according to each profile category are summarized in table 6 below:

**Table 6. Work values according to Gen Z profile categories**

	<b>The civil servant-benevolent</b>	<b>The careerist</b>	<b>The self-employed</b>
<b>Extrinsic values</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Employment Security</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have a good salary</li> <li>• Advance in career</li> <li>• Have the recognition of a job well done</li> <li>• Obtain good information to work</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have a flexible schedule with personal life</li> <li>• Have a work-life balance</li> <li>• Have a supervisor-cooperative</li> </ul>
<b>Intrinsic Values</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have an interest in the job</li> <li>• Continuous and “connected” learning</li> <li>• Feel a real self-fulfillment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have diversification in the work (multi-tasking)</li> </ul>
<b>Social values/altruistic</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Individualistic but open to social interactions</li> <li>• Enjoy helping individuals</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Work in a friendly environment (good-natured atmosphere)</li> </ul>	
<b>Prestige values</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ability to organize and lead a friendly and cheerful team</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have a significant impact in the organization</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Be able to influence the results of the organization</li> </ul>

Employees of the civil servant-benevolent profile represent 5.2% of the total sample. This group of individuals shares the professional values of Generation Y. This result could be explained by the fact that these respondents could be seniors of Gen Z who are very influenced by Gen Y. Employees of the careerist profile represent 57,23% of the total sample. This group does not attach importance to power and job security and differs from employees of the first profile mainly by their desire for continuous learning and belonging to a fun working environment. Finally, 34.2% of employees represent the self-employed profile. This group of individuals prioritizes work-life balance.

This research has theoretical and managerial contributions. At the theoretical level, the results of this research call for the design of a differentiated policy for the management of training and careers for the three categories of profiles of Generation Z. However, despite this differentiation, it should not lose sight of maintaining an overall coherence of the training and career management policy at the level of the organization. Indeed, according to Bulut and Maraba (2021, p.1), *« although it does not mean that each person in the same generational cohort thinks in the same line and has the same values or beliefs exactly, there is a general pattern in way of behaving and thinking due to breathing the same atmosphere in terms of place and time »*.

In addition, this policy, which is both differentiated and coherent, should be accompanied by regular monitoring of the evolution of the three categories of Gen Z profiles. Indeed, the weight given to the different values can change over time and the passage from one category to another could occur.

At the managerial level, this categorization of employees would allow leaders to consider these values when recruiting. Indeed, the proposed profile categories attract leaders' attention to consider the different values specific to each candidate when recruiting. Therefore, it's recommended that managers draw up a mapping of employees recruited according to their work values. Such mapping allows them to manage groups of individuals within the organization in a personalized way. For example, they mobilize different employee motivation factors according to their profile categories. Thus, they adopt situational leadership adapted to the professional values of the employee profiles. This mapping will also be used in implementing career management adapted to the different employees within the

organization. Indeed, for careerists, for example, it is always necessary to think of making them progress on two dimensions at the same time:

- The technical dimension to allow them to flourish in the exercise of their functions and to remain up to date at the technological level.
- The functional dimension to access higher positions with more responsibilities and thus meet the characteristic: ***"Have a significant impact in the organization"***.

However, the self-employed are more interested in flexibility in the working hours and the way working (e.g., four days by week with partly remote) to satisfy one of their extrinsic values: ***"Have a work-life balance"***. Particular attention must be given to managing their career by allowing them to evolve technically in their field or in fields allowing them to give meaning to their work. Such career management will allow considering job rotations to promote the diversification of their tasks, remote work, and management by objectives to ensure some flexibility. Technological evolution and the assignment to new functions in line with this evolution would allow them to create more value for the organization and thus satisfy their prestige value: ***"Be able to influence the results of the organization"***.

Notwithstanding these contributions, this study has limitations. The first relates to the non-homogeneity of the respondents. Indeed, given the limited number of Gen Z employees who have just entered the workforce, we did not limit our study to a particular industry. This could influence our results.

The second limitation concerns the not considering variables that could influence the results, essentially gender. Thus, we recommend in future research to carry out this same study by studying employees of Generation Z working in the same company or a particular activity sector. Also, we recommend integrating control variables such as gender and culture. A qualitative study via interviews with Gen Z employees belonging to the same company or activity sector is also recommended to understand the needs of each profile group.

REFERENCES

- Agarwal, H., & Vaghela, P. S. (2018). Work values of gen z: Bridging the gap to the next generation. *National Conference on Innovative Business Management Practices in 21st Century*.
- Arar, T., & Öneren, M. (2018). Role of talent management in career development of Generation Z: a case study of a telecommunication firm. *International Academic Journal of Social Sciences*, 05(01), 28–44. <https://doi.org/10.9756/iajss/v5i1/1810004>
- Arar, T., & Yuksel, I. (2015). How to manage Generation Z in business life? *Journal of Global Economics, Management and Business Research*, 4(4), 195–202.
- Barhate, B., & Dirani, K. M. (2021). Career Aspirations of Generation Z: A Systematic Literature review. *European Journal of Training and Development*, 46(1/2), 139–157. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ejtd-07-2020-0124>
- Bencsik, A., Juhász, T., & Horváth-Csikós, G. (2016). Y and Z generations at workplaces. *Journal of Competitiveness*, 6(3), 90–106. <https://doi.org/10.7441/joc.2016.03.06>
- Bohdziewicz, P. (2016). Career anchors of representatives of Generation Z: Some conclusions for managing the younger generation of employees. *Human Resource Management*, 6(113), 57–74.
- Boone, L. E., Kurtz, D. L., & Berston, S. (2020). *Contemporary business* (14th ed.). John Wiley & Sons.
- Bridge, T. (2015). *5 ways the workplace needs to change to get the most out of Generation Z*. Retrieved June 20, 2020, from <http://www.fastcoexist.com/3049848/5-ways-the-workplace-needs-to-change-to-get-the-most-out-of-generation-z>
- Bulut, S. (2021). Generation Z and its perception of work through habits, motivations, expectations preferences, and work ethics. *Psychology and Psychotherapy: Research Study*, 4(4). <https://doi.org/10.31031/pprs.2020.04.000593>
- Cennamo, L., & Gardner, D. (2018). Generational differences in work values, outcomes and personas/organization value fit. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 23(3), 180–184.
- Chawbel, D. (2014). *Gen Z Employees: The 5 attributes you need to know*. Retrieved June 20, 2018, from <http://www.entrepreneur.com/article/236560v>
- Chicca, J., & Shellenbarger, T. (2018). Connecting with Generation Z: Approaches in Nursing education. *Teaching and Learning in Nursing*, 13(3), 180–184. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.teln.2018.03.008>

- Chillakuri, B. (2020a). Understanding Generation Z expectations for effective onboarding. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 33(7), 1277–1296. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jocm-02-2020-0058>
- Chillakuri, B. (2020b). Examining the role of Supervisor support on Generation Z's intention to quit. *American Business Review*, 23(2), 408–430. <https://doi.org/10.37625/abr.23.2.408-430>
- Combs, S., & Twachtman, C. (2019). *Birth of the multi-potentialities: Being undeclared in Generation Z*. Retrieved June 20, 2018, from <https://apps.nacada.ksu.edu>
- Deloitte. (2019). *The Deloitte global millennial survey 2019*. Retrieved September 20, 2021, from <https://www2.deloitte.com/global/en/pages/about-deloitte/articles/millennialsurvey.html>
- Dries, N., Pepermans, R., & De Kerpel, E. (2008). Exploring four generations' beliefs about career: Is "satisfied" the new "successful"? *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 23(8), 907–928. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940810904394>
- Fodor, M., & Jaeckel, K. (2018). What does it take to have a successful career through the eyes of Generation Z - based on the results of a primary qualitative research. *International Journal of Lifelong Education and Leadership*, 4(1), 1–7. <https://dergipark.org.tr/pub/ijlel/issue/39629/468944>
- Glassdoor. (2019). *The next generation of talent: Where Gen Z wants to work*. Retrieved September 20, 2021, from <https://www.glassdoor.com/research/studies/gen-z-workers/>
- Goh, E., & Lee, C. (2018). A workforce to be reckoned with: The emerging pivotal Generation Z hospitality workforce. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 73, 20–28. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2018.01.016>
- Grow, J. M., & Yang, S. (2018). Generation-Z enters the advertising workplace: Expectations through a Gendered lens. *Journal of Advertising Education*, 22(1), 7–22. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1098048218768595>
- Hampton, D., & Welsh, D. (2019). Work values of Generation Z nurses. *Journal of Nursing Administration*, 49(10), 480–486. <https://doi.org/10.1097/nna.0000000000000791>
- Iorgulescu, M. (2016). Generation Z and its perception of work. *Cross-Cultural Management Journal*, 18(1), 47–54.
- Janssen, D., & Carradini, S. (2021). Generation Z Workplace communication Habits and Expectations. *IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication*, 64(2), 137–153. <https://doi.org/10.1109/tpc.2021.3069288>
- Jaskyte, K. (2014). Individual and work values of nonprofit, public, and business employees: how similar or different are they? *Human*

- Service Organizations, Management, Leadership & Governance*.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/03643107.2013.866606>
- Kaiser, H. F. (1974). An index of factorial simplicity. *Psychometrika*, 39(1), 31–36. <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf02291575>
- Leon, R. (2020). *Strategies for Business Sustainability in a Collaborative Economy*. IGI Global.
- Levickaite, R. (2010). Generations x, y, z: How social networks form the concept of the world without borders (the case of Lithuania). *LIMES: Cultural Regionalistics*, 3(2), 170–183.
- Lyons, S., Duxbury, L., & Higgins, C. (2006). A comparison of the values and commitment of private sector, public sector, and parapublic sector employees. *Public Administration Review*, 66(4), 605–618. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2006.00620.x>
- Lyons, S., Higgins, C., & Duxbury, L. (2010). Work values: Development of a new 3-dimensional structure based on confirmatory smallest space analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 31(7), 969–1002.
- Lyons, S. T. (2003). *An exploration of generational values in life and at work* [Doctoral dissertation]. Carleton University, Ottawa, Canada.
- MacQueen, J. B. (1967). Some methods for classification and analysis of multivariate observations. In L. M. Le Cam & J. Neyman (Eds.), *Proceedings of the fifth Berkeley symposium on mathematical statistics and probability*.
- Malka, A., & Chatman, J. A. (2003). Intrinsic and Extrinsic work Orientations as Moderators of the Effect of Annual Income on Subjective Well-Being: A Longitudinal study. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 29(6), 737–746. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167203029006006>
- Mitchell, D. A. (2008). Generation Z: Striking the balance: Healthy doctors for a healthy community. *Australian Family Physician*, 37(8), 665–672.
- Naim, M. F., & Lenka, U. (2018). Development and Retention of Generation Y Employees: A Conceptual framework. *Employee Relations*, 40(2), 433–455. <https://doi.org/10.1108/er-09-2016-0172>
- Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory*. McGraw-Hill Companies.
- Parry, E. (2019). The Generation Z in Great Britain- High standards and demands. In C. Scholz & A. Rennig, *Generations in Europe: Inputs, Insights and Implications*. Emerald Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-78973-491-120191013>
- Pichler, S., Kohli, C., & Granitz, N. (2021). DITTO for Gen Z: A framework for leveraging the uniqueness of the new generation. *Business Horizons*, 64(5), 599–610. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2021.02.021>

- Puiu, S. (2017). Generation Z – an educational and managerial perspective. *Young Economists Journal/Revista Tinerilor Economisti*, 14(29), 62–72.
- Ros, M., Schwartz, S. H., & Surkiss, S. (1999). Basic individual values, work values, and the meaning of work. *Applied Psychology*, 48(1), 49–71. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.1999.tb00048.x>
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination Theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 68–78. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066x.55.1.68>
- Schlee, R. P., Eveland, V. B., & Harich, K. R. (2020). From Millennials to Gen Z: Changes in student attitudes about group projects. *Journal of Education for Business*, 95(3), 139–147. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08832323.2019.1622501>
- Sengupta, A., Bamel, U., & Singh, P. (2015). Value Proposition Framework: Implications for Employer Branding. *DECISION*, 42(3), 307–323. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40622-015-0097-x>
- Shmueli, G., Patel, N. R., & Bruce, P. C. (2007). *Data mining for business intelligence: Concepts, Techniques, and Applications in Microsoft Office Excel with XLMiner*. Wiley.
- Shore, L. M., & Shore, T. H. (1995). Perceived organizational support and organizational justice. In R. S. Cropanzano & K. M. Kacmar, *Organizational politics, justice, and support: Managing the social climate of the workplace* (pp. 149–164). Westport, Quorum.
- Siliņēviča, I., & Meirule, L. (2019). Generation Z enters into the Latvian business environment. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 1(11), 97–107. <https://doi.org/10.17770/lner2019vol1.11.4317>
- Super, D. E. (1970). *Work values inventory*. Houghton Mifflin, Boston.
- Tang, F. (2019). A critical review of research on the work-related attitudes of generation Z in China. *Social Psychology and Society*, 10(2), 19–28. <https://doi.org/10.17759/sps.2019100203>
- Torsello, D. (2019). Generation Y workers: An empirical framework for cultural and organizational aspects. *Employee Relations*, 41(6), 1330–1347.
- Twenge, J. M. (2010). A review of the empirical evidence on generational differences in work attitudes. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 25(2), 201–210. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-010-9165-6>
- Twenge, J. M. (2013). The evidence for generation me and against generation we. *Emerging Adulthood*, 1(1), 11–16. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2167696812466548>
- 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--and What That Means for the Rest of Us*. Simon and Schuster.

- Twenge, J. M., Campbell, S. M., Hoffman, B. J., & Lance, C. E. (2010). Generational differences in work values: leisure and extrinsic values increasing, social and intrinsic values decreasing. *Journal of Management*, 36(5), 1117–1142. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206309352246>
- Vansteenkiste, M., Neyrinck, B., Niemicc, C. P., Soenens, B., De Witte, H., & Van Den Broeck, A. (2007). On the relations among work value orientations, psychological need satisfaction and job outcomes: a Self-determination Theory approach. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 80(2), 251–277. <https://doi.org/10.1348/096317906x111024>
- Wayne, J. H., & Casper, W. J. (2012). Why does firm reputation in human resource policies influence college students? The mechanisms underlying job pursuit intentions. *Human Resource Management*, 51(1), 121–142. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.21461>
- Ye, L. (2015). Work values and career adaptability of Chinese university students. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 43(3), 411–421. <https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2015.43.3.411>
- Zhang, T., Ramakrishnan, R., & Livny, M. (1996). BIRCH: An efficient data clustering method for very large databases. *ACM SIGMOD Record*, 25(2), 103–114.

**Appendix**  
**The Lyons Work Values Survey (LWVS)**  
**Revised 25-item Format**

Lyons, S. (2003). An exploration of generational values in life and at work. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Carleton University, Ottawa, ON, Canada.

**INSTRUCTIONS:**

The following questions deal with the various factors that people consider to be important in their work. People use these factors in making important decisions about their jobs and careers. They are not all considered to be equally important and different people place importance on the different factors. Please read each of the items listed in the section below and indicate HOW IMPORTANT each would be to you in deciding whether to accept a potential job or stay in a job. Please try to think about jobs in general, rather than your actual current job.

Not at all important	Somewhat important	Important	Very Important	Absolutely essential
1	2	3	4	5

1. Having **BENEFITS** (e.g. vacation pay, health/dental insurance, pension plan, etc.) that meet your personal needs
2. Doing work that makes a **SIGNIFICANT IMPACT** on the organization
3. Having the **AUTHORITY** to organize and direct the work of others
4. Working on tasks and projects that **CHALLENGE** your abilities
5. Having management that provides timely and constructive **FEEDBACK** about your performance
6. Working with agreeable and friendly **CO-WORKERS** with whom you could form friendships
7. Working in an environment that is lively and **FUN**
8. Having the opportunity to **CONTINUOUSLY LEARN** and develop new knowledge
9. Having the assurance of **JOB SECURITY**

10. Having **HOURS OF WORK** that are convenient to your life
11. Doing work that you find **INTERESTING**, exciting and engaging
12. Having the **FREEDOM** to make decisions about how you do your work and spend your time
13. Working in an environment that allows you to **BALANCE** your work life with your private life and family responsibilities
14. Having access to the **INFORMATION** you need to do your job
15. Doing work that is **PRESTIGIOUS** and regarded highly by others
16. Doing work that affords you a good **SALARY**
17. Doing work that provides change and **VARIETY** in work activities
18. Working where **RECOGNITION** is given for a job well done
19. Doing work that allows you to **USE** the **ABILITIES** you have developed through your education and experience
20. Having the opportunity for **ADVANCEMENT** in your career
21. Doing work that provides you with a personal sense of **ACHIEVEMENT** in your accomplishments
22. Doing work that allows for a lot of **SOCIAL INTERACTION**
23. Having the ability to **INFLUENCE** organizational outcomes
24. Working for a **SUPERVISOR** who is considerate and **SUPPORTIVE**
25. Doing work that allows you to **HELP PEOPLE**

### Work Value Indices

Based on: Lyons, S., Higgins. C., & Duxbury L. (2010). Work values: Development of a new 3-dimensional structure based on confirmatory smallest space analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 31, 969–1002

<b>Instrumental</b>	<b>Cognitive</b>
Benefits (BEN)	Challenge (CHA)
Feedback (FBK)	Continuously Learn (CLN)
Job security (SEC)	Freedom (FRE)
Hours of work (HRS)	Variety (VAR)
Balance (BAL)	Use Abilities (ABI)
Information (INF)	Advancement (ADV)
Salary (SAL)	Achievement (Ach)
Recognition (REC)	Interesting work (INT)
Supportive Supervisor (SSU)	
<b>Social/Altruistic</b>	<b>Prestige</b>
Co-workers (COW)	Impact (IMP)
Fun (FUN)	Authority (AUT)
Social Interaction (SOC)	Prestigious (PRE)
Help People (HLP)	Influence (IFL)