

GENERATION Z AS A RECIPIENT OF JOB OFFERS

Robert GOLEJ^{1*}, Magdalena BOROWSKA²

¹ Uniwersytet Ekonomiczny, Wrocław; robert.golej@ue.wroc.pl, ORCID: 0000-0003-4462-7035

² Uniwersytet Ekonomiczny, Wrocław; magdalena.borowska@ue.wroc.pl, ORCID: 0000-0001-5627-7058

* Correspondence author

Purpose: The purpose of the article is to define the areas of EB activity and the formation of employment offers aimed at Generation Z. An additional goal is to identify the dissimilarity of Generation Z's expectations resulting from employment status.

Design/methodology/approach: The study used an electronic questionnaire, distributed to a random sample of working and non-working students. The study was conducted on a sample of 234 Generation Z people, of whom 106 were non-working and 128 were working. The study was conducted in 2024. The collected data were subjected to basket analysis, r-Pearson correlation, and mathematical analysis.

Findings: The analysis indicates that special attention should be paid to issues of pay, work atmosphere, safe working conditions and equal treatment (fairness) when constructing Employee Value Proposition offers aimed at Zetas. The r-Pearson correlation analysis indicates that the EVP need to include: addition elements relating to the concept of fairness - for non-working Generation Z respondents and elements of autonomy and a culture of cooperation and helpfulness - for working Zetas.

Research limitations/implications: The study is not representative of the entire Gen Z population, but only of those studying, whether they are working or not. The study was conducted on a group of students, among whom those who are working do not have much professional experience, which means that their expectations shaped by the delivery of work are not stabilized.

Practical implications: The practical value of the research conducted lies in determining the basis for the formation of EB strategies and the content of job offers in the recruitment process corresponding to the expectations of Generation Z from the perspective of employed and non-employed people with higher education.

Originality/value: The article is addressed to researchers dealing with employee expectations and practitioners shaping working conditions, EB and recruiting generation Z employees. The value of the article is to identify the importance of factors shaping working conditions (including their most expected set) for generation Z for people working and not working.

Keywords: Generation Z, empowerment, employer branding, recruitment, job offers.

Category of the paper: research paper.

1. Introduction

The youngest participants in the labor market, born after 1996, belong to Generation Z, which is growing more resiliently in the labor force every year (Konkel, 2023). Trend studies conducted in foreign markets suggest that the Zetas will become the engine of economic growth in the next 10 years (Ławińska, Korombel, 2023). This generation presents different attitudes toward work, and has different preferences related to it than previous generations. This poses a challenge for employers, who should subordinate the process of acquiring these employees to their needs. The specific characteristics and preferences of this generation should prompt managers to build an employer brand that will be positively perceived by the Zetas. The idea, therefore, is to highlight unique aspects of the employment offering that will differentiate the company from its competitors, which, as indicated, should result in the ability to retain current employees and attract potential employees (Backhaus, Tikoo, 2004). This can be achieved by creating unique benefits for employees, which are referred to as the so-called “employer value proposition - EVP”. EVP is not only an appropriately tailored financial package, but also other important benefits promised to employees in connection with their work at a particular company (Edwards, 2010). The literature indicates that at work, Zetas value freedom, creativity, lack of monotony in the tasks assigned to them, seek diversity, are willing to go on foreign internships, experiment, want to learn about different cultures and new methods of work. Among the factors they look at when choosing a future employer are the prestige of the workplace, the ability to perform tasks with flexible working hours, or remote working (Konkel, 2023). The youngest generation of workers, Gen Zs, prioritize job security and do not change jobs because of disloyalty, but because employers are not meeting their needs or expectations (Ayoobzadeh, 2024). Since this is the case, the offers directed to the labor market should take into account these very needs. At the same time, it should be emphasized that within Generation Z there is a diversity of expectations based on education level, professional status or gender.

The purpose of the article is to define the areas of EB activity and the formation of employment offers aimed at Generation Z. An additional goal is to identify the dissimilarity of Generation Z's expectations resulting from employment status. In order to achieve the purpose of the paper, a survey was conducted, the results of which are described in the article. Data analysis was conducted using in-depth analysis and r-Pearson correlation assessment. A basket method was also used to take a deeper look at the problem at hand.

2. Importance of Employer Branding (EB) in attracting Generation Z employees

Lloyd (2002) understands by EB the sum of the efforts a company makes to communicate to current as well as future employees that it is creating an attractive and desirable workplace. It is a key element in building competitive advantage and attracting attractive employees. Employee acquisition usually consists of fixed elements, such as recruitment, selection and adaptation activities aimed at integrating the employee into the company's structure (Mikolajczak). The activities undertaken here should take into account the specifics of the target group that the employer is interested in hiring. The group of interest to us are representatives of Generation Z. It is pointed out that they are able to search and process information quickly, are creative, are able to work in teams, are not afraid to change their place of employment, while they connect finding a new one with their specific skills and qualifications (Ulrych, 2022, p. 69). Zetas think about their careers from an early age, they willingly participate in internships or apprenticeships, thanks to which they make decisions quite quickly regarding the realization of their professional path (Lipinski, Koczy, 2023). Zetas, when undertaking specific activities, take care to plan them effectively in time (Szymczyk), they value the opportunity to maintain a balance between work and private life hence the importance for them of flexible working hours. It guarantees freedom of work, increases free time, which is particularly important for Zetas (Konkel, 2023). Often their loyalty is dictated by meeting their expectations by the employer so the challenge for employers is to keep them in the organization for the long term. Zetas are referred to as the generation without the “loyalty gene” (Żarczyńska-Dobiesz, Chomątowska, 2016).

3. Methodology

For the survey, an electronic questionnaire was used, made available to a random sample, which is considered to be the student community. In this way, the research was limited to people with higher education. The survey was conducted on a sample of 234 Generation Z people, of which 106 were non-working and 128 were working. The research was conducted in 2024. From a cognitive perspective, we can observe the evolution of expectations expressed by people with higher education from being not employed to being employed

The survey, in addition to the label questions, included 2 series of questions with 23 questions each (see Table 1). The first series dealt with the positive perspective, which is important. The second series dealt with a negative perspective, which is irrelevant. The questions were 0/1. To find out the profiles of expectations, in-depth data analysis and

basket analysis were conducted, and the r-Pearson correlation method was used to find out the variables that distinguish the profiles of expectations. Table 1 shows detailed results on the expectations of Generation Z respondents, broken down by working and non-working.

Another research method used in the study is the r-Pearson correlation method. In this study, the independent variable is work situation (current). I work denotes 1, I don't work denotes 0. And the dependent variables are the survey questions illustrated in Table 1.

It should be noted that correlation analysis considers the relationship between variables. It does not identify the significance or numerosity of responses. The analysis was carried out for all responses, in the perspective of the variable professional situation. Table 2 shows the obtained results of the correlation analysis for the entire sample.

Another method used to verify the hypotheses was basket analysis. The basic basket is a set containing YES responses in the area of, pay adequate to the duties performed and, at the same time, a good working atmosphere. These two variables were chosen as the foundation of the basket due to the fact that they are the most significant variables in the eyes of the respondents. Responses from the surveyed range were selected for this basket. Table 3 illustrates the basket thus constructed.

4. Research

The results of the in-depth analysis can be divided according to three criteria: the importance given to each variable in the working and non-working groups, the difference in these expectations, and the difference in the cross-section of significant, insignificant.

In the first perspective, we can separate (the marking means that the feature has the indicated value for one of the groups):

- Most significant variables represented by more than 50% of respondents:
 - Wages adequate to the duties performed.
 - Good atmosphere at work.
 - For not working - Equal treatment.
- Variables important more than 30% less than 50%.
 - Safe and hygienic working conditions.
 - For not working - Transparent rules of promotion.
 - For working - Help from superiors and co-workers.
 - For working - Equal treatment.
 - For working - Efficient flow of information "top-down", "bottom-top".
- Variables of average weight more than 10% less than 30%:
 - Employment protection.
 - Training at the employer's expense.

- Influence on the organization of working time.
- Organizing meetings, gatherings with the staff.
- Informing about important issues concerning the functioning of the company.
- Health benefits at the employer's expense.
- Programs for adaptation of new employees.
- Participation in decision-making processes.
- For not working - Protection (securing) of social benefits.
- For working - Transparent rules of promotion.
- For not working - Efficient flow of information "top-down", "bottom-top".
- For not working - Providing assistance to employees in a difficult situation.
- Variables of low importance-less than 10%:
 - For working - Protection (securing) of social benefits.
 - For not working - Providing assistance to employees in a difficult situation.
 - Mentoring programs for employees.
 - Organizing integration events.
 - Assistance with dismissals (outplacement).
 - Empowerment.
 - Formal procedures for expressing opinions.
 - Functioning of trade unions.

The second group of analyses concerned the identification of differences in the expectations expressed by working and non-working. Here we can separate (a check mark means that the factor is given greater importance by the group of employed people, a without a check mark means that the factor is given greater importance by the group of non-employed people):

- Large differences, 9.9% or more:
 - Equal treatment – not working.
 - Help from superiors and co-workers – working.
 - Employment protection – not working.
 - Influence on the organization of working time – working.
- Significant differences more than 5% and less than 9.9%:
 - Transparent rules of promotion – not working.
 - Efficient flow of information "top-down", "bottom-top" – working.
 - Wages adequate to the duties performed – working.
 - Informing about important issues concerning the functioning of the company – not working.
 - Providing assistance to employees in a difficult situation – not working.
 - Protection (securing) of social benefits – not working.
- Small differences of 1% to 5%:
 - Good atmosphere at work – working.
 - Safe and hygienic working conditions – not working.

- Training at the employer's expense – working.
- Organizing meetings, gatherings with the staff – not working.
- Health benefits at the employer's expense – not working.
- Programs for adaptation of new employees – not working.
- Participation in decision-making processes – working.
- Organizing integration events – working.
- Empowerment – working.
- Formal procedures for expressing opinions – working.
- Negligible differences of less than 1%:
 - Mentoring programs for employees- working.
 - Assistance with dismissals (outplacement) – not working.
 - Functioning of trade unions – not working.

The analysis indicates that special attention should be paid to issues of pay, work atmosphere, safe working conditions and equal treatment (fairness) when constructing pacy offers aimed at Zetas. Equal treatment is of particular importance to non-workers, as are unambiguous career paths or employment protection, which means seeking some kind of justice and fairness in the rules of career advancement. Here we observe an evolution of views because for employed people the importance of these three factors is somewhat declining. In contrast, autonomy-related aspects such as flexible working hours, support from superiors and co-workers or participation in decision-making play a greater role.

In the perspective of these results, it should be emphasized that the company, building its image as an employer, should emphasize building an organizational culture that has cooperation, helpfulness, fairness and autonomy at its core. Of course, as we have shown a certain difference should be characterized by job offers aimed at working and non-working Zetas.

An r-Pearson correlation analysis indicates that a statistically significant relationship is shown for working people, as a significant variable - flexible working hours, as a non-significant variable - holding meetings with the crew. So for them, announcements should include this information, and management solutions should reinforce autonomy. On the other hand, for non-employed Zetas, employment protection is important. On the other hand, the indications of non-significant expectations, and which are statistically significant, do not have much cognitive value due to the small number of answers given mainly by the non-employed.

The table 1 highlights the fields with significant differences between the expectations of those who work and those who don't.

Table 1.

Analysis of expectations of Generation Z respondents by working and non-working generation

	Z (item)	Wages adequate to the duties performed	Good atmosphere at work	Equal treatment	Safe and hygienic working conditions	Transparent rules of promotion	Help from superiors and co-workers	Employment protection	Training at the employer's expense	Efficient flow of information "top-down", "bottom-top"	Influence on the organization of working time	Organizing meetings, gatherings with the staff	Informing about important issues concerning the functioning of the company	Health benefits at the employer's expense	Programs for adaptation of new employees	Providing assistance to employees in a difficult situation	Participation in decision-making processes	Protection (securing) of social benefits	Mentoring programs for employees	Organizing integration events	Assistance with dismissals (outplacement)	Empowerment	Formal procedures for expressing opinions	Functioning of trade unions
important																								
not working	106	84	89	56	40	36	29	28	25	24	17	17	17	13	13	13	12	11	9	6	1	1	0	0
working	128	110	113	55	46	34	49	14	36	39	36	15	13	13	14	8	20	5	11	10	1	7	2	0
total	234	194	202	111	86	70	78	42	61	63	53	32	30	26	27	21	32	16	20	16	2	8	2	0
not working	1	79,2%	84,0%	52,8%	37,7%	34,0%	27,4%	26,4%	23,6%	22,6%	16,0%	16,0%	16,0%	12,3%	12,3%	12,3%	11,3%	10,4%	8,5%	5,7%	0,9%	0,9%	0,0%	0,0%
working	1	85,9%	88,3%	43,0%	35,9%	26,6%	38,3%	10,9%	28,1%	30,5%	28,1%	11,7%	10,2%	10,2%	10,9%	6,3%	15,6%	3,9%	8,6%	7,8%	0,8%	5,5%	1,6%	0,0%
total	1	82,9%	86,3%	47,4%	36,8%	29,9%	33,3%	17,9%	26,1%	26,9%	22,6%	13,7%	12,8%	11,1%	11,5%	9,0%	13,7%	6,8%	8,5%	6,8%	0,9%	3,4%	0,9%	0,0%
difference not working-working		-6,7%	-4,3%	9,9%	1,8%	7,4%	-10,9%	15,5%	-4,5%	-7,8%	-12,1%	4,3%	5,9%	2,1%	1,3%	6,0%	-4,3%	6,5%	-0,1%	-2,2%	0,2%	-4,5%	-1,6%	0,0%
not important																								
not working	106	-2	-4	-4	-4	-10	-7	-12	-17	-10	-24	-21	-8	-16	-26	-16	-19	-28	-36	-62	-40	-17	-51	-65
working	128	-1	0	-4	-7	-7	-2	-12	-15	-15	-20	-46	-18	-34	-19	-25	-15	-33	-49	-74	-66	-14	-58	-87
total	234	-3	-4	-8	-11	-17	-9	-24	-32	-25	-44	-67	-26	-50	-45	-41	-34	-61	-85	-136	-106	-31	-109	-152
not working	1	-1,9%	-3,8%	-3,8%	-3,8%	-9,4%	-6,6%	-11,3%	-16%	-9,4%	-22,6%	-19,8%	-7,5%	-15,1%	-24,5%	-15%	-18%	-26,4%	-34%	-58,5%	-38%	-16%	-48%	-61%
working	1	-0,8%	0,0%	-3,1%	-5,5%	-5,5%	-1,6%	-9,4%	-11,7%	-11,7%	-15,6%	-36%	-14,1%	-26,6%	-14,8%	-19,5%	-11,7%	-25,8%	-38,3%	-57,8%	-51,6%	-11%	-45,3%	-68,0%
total	1	-1,3%	-1,7%	-3,4%	-4,7%	-7,3%	-3,8%	-10,3%	-13,7%	-10,7%	-18,8%	-28,6%	-11,1%	-21,4%	-19,2%	-17,5%	-14,5%	-26,1%	-36,3%	-58,1%	-45,3%	-13,2%	-46,6%	-65%
difference not working-working		-1,10%	-3,80%	-0,70%	1,70%	-3,90%	-5,00%	-1,90%	-4,30%	2,30%	-7,00%	16,1%	6,60%	11,5%	-9,7%	4,40%	-6,20%	-0,60%	4,30%	-0,70%	13,9%	-5,10%	-2,80%	6,70%

Source: own study.

Table 2.*The r-Pearson correlation matrix for age groups in the working/non-working category*

	Work situation (current), Pearson's r Generation Z	
	IMPORTANT	NOT IMPORTANT
Mentoring programs for employees	0.002	0.045
Salary commensurate with the duties performed	0.088	-0.049
Good atmosphere in the workplace	0.063	-0.145*
Employment protection	-0.201**	-0.032
Influence on the organization of working time	0.144*	-0.089
Safe and sanitary working conditions	-0.019	0.040
Efficient flow of information "top-down", "bottom-up"	0.088	0.037
Assistance from superiors and co-workers	0.115	-0.130*
Training at the expense of the employer	0.051	-0.063
Transparent rules for promotion	-0.080	-0.076
Health benefits at the employer's expense	-0.033	0.139*
Equal treatment	-0.098	-0.018
Adaptation programs for new employees	-0.021	-0.122
Organizing meetings, gatherings with the crew	-0.063	0.178**
Participation in decision-making processes	0.062	-0.088
Formal procedures for expressing opinions	0.084	-0.028
Informing on important issues concerning the functioning of fi	-0.088	0.103
Organizing team-building events	0.042	-0.007
Empowerment	0.124	-0.075
Protecting (securing) social benefits	-0.128	-0.007
Providing assistance to employees in difficult situations	-0.105	0.058
Assistance with layoffs (outplacement)	-0.009	0.138*
Functioning of trade unions	-0.072	0.069

Source: own study.

Another method used in the study is basket analysis. The basic basket consisted of 75% working and 65% non-working. Using it, it was determined that those who value a good working atmosphere and the adequacy of pay to work, whether from the working or non-working group, at a similar level value equal treatment, safe working conditions, transparent promotion criteria. Working people value the help of superiors and influence over working time significantly higher, noted the concept of empowerment.

Table 3.*Basket analysis for respondents born after 1996*

	Total		I work		I don't work	
Salary adequate to the duties performed==1, Good atmosphere in the workplace==1 and	234		128		106	
Important	abundance	support	abundance	support	abundance	support
Salary adequate to the duties performed	165	71%	96	75%	69	65%
Good atmosphere in the workplace	165	71%	96	75%	69	65%
Equal treatment	77	33%	38	30%	39	37%
Safe and hygienic working conditions	56	24%	31	24%	25	24%
Assistance from superiors and co-workers	53	23%	35	27%	18	17%
Transparent rules for promotion	51	22%	28	22%	23	22%
Training at the employer's expense	43	18%	26	20%	17	16%
Efficient flow of information "top-down," "bottom-up"	40	17%	26	20%	14	13%
Influence on the organization of working time	39	17%	28	22%	11	10%

Cont. table 3.

Employment protection	25	11%	11	9%	14	13%
Organizing meetings, meetings with the crew	22	9%	11	9%	11	10%
Informing on important issues concerning the functioning of the company	20	9%	11	9%	9	8%
Participation in decision-making processes	19	8%	12	9%	7	7%
Adaptation programs for new employees	14	6%	9	7%	5	5%
Health benefits at the employer's expense	13	6%	6	5%	7	7%
Organizing team-building events	13	6%	8	6%	5	5%
Providing assistance to employees in difficult situations	12	5%	5	4%	7	7%
Mentoring programs for employees	10	4%	6	5%	4	4%
Protection (security) of social benefits	6	3%	0	0%	6	6%
Empowerment	5	2%	5	4%	0	0%
Assistance with layoffs (outplacement)	2	1%	1	1%	1	1%
Formal procedures for expressing opinions	1	0%	1	1%	0	0%
Functioning of trade unions	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Not important						
Functioning of trade unions A	109	47%	65	51%	44	42%
Organizing team-building events A	96	41%	57	45%	39	37%
Formal procedures for expressing opinions A	84	36%	46	36%	38	36%
Assistance with layoffs (outplacement) A	77	33%	52	41%	25	24%
Mentoring programs for employees A	61	26%	34	27%	27	25%
Protection (security) of social benefits A	48	21%	30	23%	18	17%
Organizing meetings, gatherings with the crew A	47	20%	32	25%	15	14%
Health benefits at the expense of the employer A	34	15%	25	20%	9	8%
Influence on the organization of working time A	32	14%	17	13%	15	14%
Adaptation programs for new employees A	30	13%	15	12%	15	14%
Providing assistance to employees in difficult situations A	28	12%	18	14%	10	9%
Participation in decision-making processes A	20	9%	9	7%	11	10%
Employment protection A	18	8%	8	6%	10	9%
Empowerment A	18	8%	10	8%	8	8%
Efficient flow of information "top-down," "bottom-up" A	17	7%	12	9%	5	5%
Information on important issues concerning the operation of the company A	16	7%	12	9%	4	4%
Training at the employer's expense A	15	6%	7	5%	8	8%
Transparent rules for promotion A	12	5%	5	4%	7	7%
Safe and hygienic working conditions A	11	5%	7	5%	4	4%
Assistance from superiors and co-workers A	5	2%	1	1%	4	4%
Equal treatment A	5	2%	2	2%	3	3%
Salary adequate to the duties performed A	2	1%	0	0%	2	2%
Good atmosphere in the workplace A	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

Source: own study.

5. Discussion

As we indicated above within Generation Z, there is a variation in expectations due to, educational level, occupational status or gender. Thus, different studies find slightly different distributions of responses related to the needs of the younger generation. A study by Gajda (2017) found the following hierarchy of Zetas' needs. As many as 91% of respondents prioritized a high salary (which is consistent with our survey results, both among the working

and non-working population). In the referenced survey, one-time benefits and access to insurance and medical care were also found to be equally important (which our survey does not confirm). As in our survey, a significant majority (87%) expect a friendly and relaxed atmosphere in the workplace, which allows them to feel comfortable (90%). The surveys analyzed emphasize that job satisfaction, mutual help, and a sense of being appreciated and needed increase Zetas' commitment. Challenging, developing practical tasks are also important (72%), while 64% note the need for personal development and participation in additional training. As Saxena (2024) points out to meet the need for development, zetas expect modern solutions, traditional methods of training and development are not enough. Work-life balance remains crucial for 92% of respondents. At the same time, 82% say they are willing to change jobs if pay or organizational conditions are unsatisfactory. In Ratajczak's study (2020), Zetas' expectations of work turned out to be moderate and independent of the type of school they completed or their educational plans. Of key importance (as in our study) were adequate pay and a good atmosphere. In addition, respondents indicated the importance of employer respect and, somewhat surprisingly in this generational group in the context of Generation Z's frequent job changes, employment stability. It is worth pointing out that in our survey, non-workers were more likely to indicate the importance of employment protection than working people, which corresponds in some ways to this stability. Courses, a work contract, flexible hours and work-life balance were also important, the survey reads. One in ten students expected additional benefits (e.g., sports cards, movie tickets). In research. In terms of the importance of a good atmosphere, it is worth pointing out, following Wasiluk and Kojta (2023), that it is a factor that determines the younger generation to stay in the organization.

6. Summary

The cognitive value of the study lies in learning the profile of relevant and irrelevant expectations in the perspective of the employment status of the respondents. The results indicate a change in expectations due to work experience, although these changes are mostly not statistically significant. Job offers for Zetas starting out should emphasize, in addition to shared factors with working Zetas, elements relating to the concept of fairness. For working Zetas, on the other hand, the importance of elements of autonomy (influence over working hours, participation in decision-making processes) and a culture of cooperation and helpfulness should be emphasized. Of course, building an EP that suits Zetas requires interference with organizational culture and management systems.

Directions for further research: the conclusions derived indicate, the importance of the issue of consistency of job offers with the shaped image of the company. It is also possible to ask whether the very form of the job announcement and the channels of transmission of this

information shape the image of the enterprise. Conducting research on Zetek's expectations from the perspective of different levels of education. A very interesting thread that emerges in the context of the conducted research is to conduct an analysis of the evolution of expectations with increasing work experience.

Limitation: the study was conducted on a group of students, among whom those in the workforce do not have much work experience, which means that their expectations formed through the provision of work are not fixed. The survey is not representative of the entire population of Generation Z, but only of the portion of it with higher education.

The practical value of the research conducted lies in determining the basis for the formation of EB strategies and the content of job offers in the recruitment process corresponding to the expectations of Generation Z from the perspective of employed and non-employed people with higher education.

References

1. Ayoobzadeh, M., Schweitzer, L., Lyons, S., Ng, E. (2024). A tale of two generations: a time-lag study of career expectations. *Personnel Review*, 53(7), pp. 1649-1665, doi: 10.1108/PR-02-2022-0101.
2. Backhaus, K., Tikoo, S. (2004). Conceptualizing and researching employer branding. *Career Development International*, 9(5), pp. 501-516, doi: 10.1108/13620430410550754
3. Edwards, M.R. (2010). An integrative review of employer branding and OB theory. *Personnel Review*, 39, pp. 5-23, doi: 10.1108/00483481011012809.
4. Gajda, J. (2017). Oczekiwania przedstawicieli pokolenia Z wobec pracy zawodowej i pracodawcy. *Prace Naukowe Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego We Wrocławiu*, 491, pp. 158-171, doi: 10.15611/pn.2017.491.15 ; oai:dbc.wroc.pl:39478.
5. Konkel, W. (2023). Oczekiwania młodego pokolenia na rynku pracy. *Zeszyty Studenckie „Nasze Studia”*, 13, pp. 224-238, Retrieved from: <https://czasopisma.bg.ug.edu.pl/index.php/naszestudia/article/view/9126>, 18.01.2025.
6. Ławińska, O., Korombel, A. (2023). *Pokolenie Z jako wyzwanie współczesnego zarządzania przedsiębiorstwem. Relacje, media społecznościowe i crowdsourcing*. Częstochowa: Wyd. Politechniki Częstochowskiej, pp. 1-141, doi: 10.17512/CUT/9788371939426.
7. Lipiński, F., Koczy, J. (2023). Zjawisko Quiet Quitting wśród polskich pracowników z pokolenia Z. *Academic Review of Business and Economics*, 4, pp. 54-72, doi: 10.22367/arbe.2023.04.04.
8. Lloyd, S. (2002). Branding from the inside. *BRW*, 24(10), pp. 64-66.

9. Mikołajczak, W. M. (2019). Nowe trendy w rekrutacji pracowników. *KNUV*, 4(62), pp. 70-88, doi: 10.34765/kn.0419.a06.
10. Ratajczak, J. (2020). Recruitment and motivation of Generation Z in the face of the employee's market. *Research Papers in Economics and Finance*, 4(1), pp. 37-50, doi: 10.18559/ref.2020.1.4.
11. Saxena, A. (2024). Mentoring at work: A talent development tool for Gen Y and Gen Z. *Development and Learning in Organizations*, 38(1), pp. 23-26. Retrived from: <https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/DLO-03-2023-0079/full/html>, 03.04.2025
12. Szymczyk, J. *Pokolenie Z na rynku pracy – charakterystyka*. Retrieved from: <https://poradnikprzedsiębiorcy.pl/-pokolenia-w-pracy-cz-4-pokolenie-z>, 18.01.25.
13. Ulrych, W. (2022). Potrzeba autonomii pracy wybranych przedstawicieli pokolenia Z w kontekście cech autonomii i praktyk informacji zwrotnej. *Zarządzanie Zasobami Ludzkimi*, 148(5), pp. 67-83, doi: 10.5604/01.3001.0016.0632.