SILESIAN UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY PUBLISHING HOUSE

SCIENTIFIC PAPERS OF SILESIAN UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY 2026
ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT SERIES NO. 252

INTRA-GENERATIONAL DIVERSITY AMONG GENERATION Z REPRESENTATIVES – ANTECEDENTS OF POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE WORK EXPERIENCES

Monika KARCZEWSKA

University of Economics in Katowice; monika.karczewska@uekat.pl, ORCID: 0000-0002-3533-1083

Purpose: The aim of the study was to analyse the intra-generational variation among Generation Z representatives in terms of job crafting and to identify the relationship between the level of job crafting and positive and negative work experiences.
Design/methodology/approach: In order to address the hypotheses, set out in the article, a literature analysis and semi-structured interviews were conducted among Generation Z representatives.
Findings: The results of the study indicate intra-generational variation in the level and forms of job crafting among Generation Z representatives. Higher levels of job crafting fostered engagement, a sense of meaning and professional development, while a lack of organisational support increased the risk of overload and negative workplace experiences.
Research limitations/implications: This study is limited by its qualitative nature and the purposive sampling, which limits the possibility of generalisation of the results onto the entire population of Generation Z representatives. Despite these limitations, the study may inspire further analysis of intra-generational differences in relation to job crafting. In the future, it would be advisable to conduct research with a larger sample using quantitative methods and in-depth qualitative research, taking into account, for example, career stage or industry.
Practical implications: The research findings point to the need to create a work environment that fosters autonomy, competence development and relational support. Supporting job crafting activities can increase employee engagement, reduce overload and promote efficiency and job stability.
Originality/value: Research to date has mainly focused on intergenerational differences, while intra-generational variation is less recognised. The originality of the study consists in combining the concept of job crafting with an analysis of the intra-generational differentiation of Generation Z.
Keywords: Generation Z, job crafting, intra-generational differentiation.
Category of the paper: Research paper.

1. Introduction

Organisations are increasingly managing employees who represent up to four different generations simultaneously, adding to the complexity of human capital management processes. In recent years, Generation Z has become one of the emerging segments of the labour force. In many studies, Generation Z representatives are described as a relatively homogeneous cohort, characterised by high digital competence, innovation, need for flexibility, striving for work-life balance and sensitivity to psychological well-being issues (Oleksiak et al., 2019; Maj, Kasperek, 2020). Such an approach, however, leads to simplification, which in management practice may result in a mismatch between solutions and the real needs of employees.

The aim of this article is to identify and analyse the intra-generational variation of Generation Z representatives in terms of the ways they craft their work and the experienced positive and negative aspects of work. For the purposes of this study, the following hypotheses were formulated:

H1: Higher levels of job crafting in the area of structural resources are associated with higher levels of satisfaction, commitment and sense of purpose at work among Generation Z.

H2: Higher levels of job crafting in the area of social resources (feedback, relationships, support) are associated with more positive work experiences for Generation Z representatives.

H3: Limited opportunities to undertake job crafting activities are associated with higher levels of overload and negative work-related emotions among Generation Z.

H4: Lack of organisational support for job crafting increases the risk of negative work experiences.

2. Generation Z on the labour market

One of the criteria for classifying the different generations is demographics. Taking this into account, we can distinguish four basic categories of employees: 'Baby boomers', 'X', 'Y' and 'Z'. The temporal boundaries of a generation are not clearly established in the literature and vary according to the typology adopted. This article assumes, following other researchers (Bassiouni, Hackley, 2014; Hampton, Keys, 2017; Wiktorowicz, Warwas, 2016), that Generation Z includes people born in or after 1995. Generation Z is also referred to in the literature as Digital Natives, Multitasking (Generation M – multitasking), Connected Generation or Net Generation (Biernacki, 2014). Research on Generation Z often points to characteristics such as a high level of digital competence, an orientation towards rapid access

to information, greater sensitivity to issues related to psychological well-being and a need for flexibility in terms of time and place of work (Muster, 2020). They are characterised by their openness to dynamic, cross-border working environments and strongly personalised expectations of career and communication conditions, tailored to individual needs and preferences (Wawrzonek, 2023). Young people are mobile, multilingual and communicative, while at the same time they expect a high degree of autonomy, flexibility and the ability to craft their own time and place of work. Their propensity to change employment frequently is linked to labour market transformations, increasing individualisation of careers, flexibility and declining stability, as well as a limited willingness to conform to organisational demands over a prolonged time (Jankowiak, Czerwińska-Lubszczyk, 2024).

Generation Z is often treated as a homogenous segment requiring specific HR solutions such as flexible working, intensive feedback or development programmes (Schroth, 2019). The Oxford Economics report points to several characteristics of Generation Z representatives, singling out among them: agility (as the ease of absorbing information and the speed of response to emerging challenges); creativity; curiosity (as the willingness to use different forms of learning) (Oxford Economics, 2021).

Representatives of Generation Z show a willingness to combine values realised in their professional and private lives, treating career as an integral part of their lives. It is important for them to be able to pursue their passions (Piwowar-Sulej et al., 2025). They formulate expectations towards their employers that go beyond the aspect of remuneration and also include respect, a favourable working atmosphere, opportunities for development and effective use of their potential (Ławińska, Korombel, 2023).

The literature emphasises that Generation Z is not homogeneous but is characterised by an intra-generational variation due to different work experience, work status, career paths and individual and organisational resources (Benitez-Márquez et al., 2022; Scholz, 2019; Leslie et al., 2021). Work experiences can influence the fulfilment of work tasks, attitudes towards work or relationships in the work environment. Generational affiliation is not a clear explanation for differences in the quality of work experience. It is important to understand how Generation Z representatives actively co-create their working environment. This is the perspective presented by the concept of job crafting.

3. Job crafting – definition and meaning

The concept of job crafting refers to bottom-up, employee-initiated modifications to the way work is performed, the scope of tasks and the meaning given to them in order to increase job satisfaction and to make it more relevant to needs and abilities (Tims, Bakker, 2010; Oldham, Hackman, 2010). The term was introduced by Wrzesniewski and Dutton (2001), who pointed out that employees are not merely passive performers of work tasks, but active agents who co-shape their own work environment. In this view, work is an area of interaction between the demands of the job and the individual needs, values and competences of the employees. Researchers point to both organisational (e.g. level of autonomy, conditions conducive to innovation) and individual (e.g. propensity for proactive behaviour) determinants of job crafting (Kapica, Baka, 2021).

We can distinguish between different models of job crafting. The model developed by Wrzesniewski and Dutton (2001) assumes that employees craft their tasks (Task Crafting), interpersonal relationships (Relational Crafting) and the cognitive boundaries of their job role (Cognitive Crafting). By shaping their work experience, employees can increase the variety of tasks that make their work meaningful. In the area of interpersonal relationships, they can influence the quality and quantity of interactions. And the cognitive area of job crafting refers to the reinterpretation of its meaning and purpose (Berg et al., 2008).

The job crafting model proposed by Tims and Bakker (2010) captures job crafting as a process of modifying an employee's level of job-related demands and resources. The authors distinguished four basic forms of job crafting: increasing structural resources (e.g. competence development, increasing task variety, autonomy), increasing social resources (e.g. feedback, support), addressing professional challenges, and reducing impediments and excessive burdens. In this view, employees actively adapt their working environment to their needs and capabilities. Research shows a correlation between levels of job performance, job satisfaction or engagement (Rudolph et al., 2017).

The literature highlights various benefits following job crafting for both organisations and employees, which include: increased job engagement, job satisfaction, increased well-being, and an impact on employee productivity (Tims, Bakker, Derks, 2012; Boehnlein, Baum, 2020). The effectiveness of job crafting depends on the agency of employees, but also on the organisational culture of the business unit.

In the context of Generation Z, the job crafting strategy makes it possible to identify the adaptive diversity of young workers. Differences in the level of autonomy, access to feedback, quality of relationships with superiors/co-workers, or opportunities for professional challenges can lead to different development of human capital in an organisation. From a human capital perspective, job crafting is the process through which organisational conditions shape the experiences of workers. A high level of job crafting promotes resource accumulation and

strengthens commitment, while limited access to job modification opportunities can lead to frustration, overload and burnout. Thus, job crafting diversity may be a determinant of diversity within Generation Z.

4. Methodology

The study was qualitative and carried out in the form of semi-structured interviews. The choice of this method resulted from the exploratory nature of the research problem and the need for an in-depth analysis of the subjective experience of work and ways of shaping it among representatives of Generation Z. People belonging to Generation Z, defined as those born since 1995 and having any work experience, were qualified for the study.

The research tool was a proprietary interview questionnaire. It included questions on the dimensions of job crafting: crafting structural resources, shaping social resources, addressing challenges and reducing impediments to work. Interviews were conducted in the form of according to a semi-structured interview guide, with flexibility to expand selected themes. The interviews were recorded and transcribed and then coded based on the main theoretical categories. In a further step, a comparative analysis was carried out to identify the level (low, medium, high) and forms of job crafting.

The research sample consisted of 15 representatives of Generation Z, including eight women and seven men. Respondents represented diverse industries and forms of employment (employment contract – 9 people, civil law contracts – 6 people). Respondents were recruited by purposive sampling. Interviews were conducted between 15.12.2025 and 10.01.2026.

5. Results

The analysis of the results focuses on identifying the level and forms of job crafting among Generation Z representatives and their relationship to positive and negative work experiences. Table 1 presents the level of autonomy and structural resources at work among the Generation Z representatives surveyed.

Table 1.
Level of structural resources crafting

Level of job crafting	Statements
high	"Yes, I had quite a lot of freedom. I decided myself in which order I did the tasks and was able to suggest my own solutions if I saw that something could be done better."(A); "Working with people tends to be very individual, so apart from having to keep specific records of the work with the client, the way in which this work is done is to some extent arbitrary, so I can say that I am indeed in control"(C); "Yes, I have often proposed other solutions myself and they have sometimes been implemented."(I); "Yes, sometimes I have proposed other solutions myself and they have been implemented."(L); "The scope of work was clearly defined and the main objective was to meet the hourly standard of orders. Nevertheless, I was able to organise the pace of work to some extent on my own to achieve the required results."(M); "Yes, I have had the opportunity to influence the way I do my work myself. I positioned the products and ingredients in places that were convenient for me, which allowed me to prepare orders more quickly and efficiently."(N
limited	"I was able to propose my own solutions when it did not interfere with the work of the team."(H); "I was able to shape my working style, but not my scope of work."(K); "I could influence small things, like the way I organised my own work."(Ł)
low	"In theory yes, but in practice I was rather expected to do everything according to procedures. Any attempt at change was rather frowned upon."(B) "Rather not. I had a clear indication of what to do and how to do it."(E); "Not so much. The work was highly automated and everything was predetermined."(F); "Rather not, everything was planned in advance"(J).
low → high	"At the beginning I had no influence, but over time, as I gained confidence, I was already able to propose my own ideas" (D); "It was rigid at first, but then I started to suggest changes myself and found that the supervisor was open to them."(G)

Source: own elaboration.

Some respondents were characterised by a high level of job crafting, manifested in a real influence on the way tasks are performed and the ability to initiate change, which was associated with a sense of agency and a positive evaluation of their own professional work. For some respondents, autonomy was incremental - increasing with experience and trust of superiors, indicating the dynamic nature of job crafting. In contrast, those operating in highly formalised and automated environments experienced limited job crafting and a sense of lack of influence.

In the light of the findings presented above, hypothesis H1 is partially confirmed. Higher levels of job crafting in the area of structural resources are associated with more positive work experiences, but this relationship remains contingent on organisational context and the availability of real opportunities to influence work.

In the following section, the approach of Generation Z representatives in terms of shaping social resources was analysed. Table 2 presents the formation of relationships with superiors and colleagues.

Table 2.
Variation in the level of social resource formation.

Level of job crafting	Development of social resources	Relationships with superiors, colleagues
high	"Yes, I've tried to communicate my expectations clearly." (A); "Yes, I initiated conversations when disagreements arose."(D); "Yes, I encouraged the sharing of ideas."(H); "I was trying to build a good atmosphere in the team."(Ł); "I kept in touch with both foremen and people working in the same position as me. Communication within the team was not difficult and colleagues were helpful when problems arose." (M); "Yes, I have been taking steps to improve collaboration and communication within the team. I have tried to communicate clearly about the progress of the work, to offer more comfortable organisation of tasks and to help colleagues in more difficult moments."(N)	"I felt part of the team and had the feeling that we were all in the same boat."(A); "The supervisor was really interested in my development, not just my performance."(D); "The team helped me a lot when I started my work."(H); "The team was very close-knit."(Ł); "The atmosphere at work was normal and correct. The team was international, which was an interesting experience. The work was stressful at times, but relationships with my coworkers were good."(M); "Relationships with superiors and coworkers were good, there was mutual support. Coworkers helped me in more difficult moments and supervisors gave clear instructions and ensured a good working atmosphere."(N)
limited	"Sometimes, but rather informally." (B); "Relationships were satisfactory.(E)	"Co-workers were very helpful, but the relationship with the boss was rather cold."(B) "Relationships were satisfactory but quite superficial."(E)
low	"I currently have a close-knit team of colleagues, no matter who I am working with on any given day, the day passes in a pleasant atmosphere. As far as supervisors are concerned, I could expect more support and cooperation based on mutual respect and appreciation of efforts."(C); "There was a lack of openness in the team, everyone tended to look after their own interests."(F); "No, the communication was rather one-sided."(G); "Rather not – everyone worked separately."(I); "Rather not – I was concentrating on my work."(J); "I didn't have the space to change anything."(K); "Rather not – I stuck to my tasks and didn't get involved with the team."(L)	"I am not a conflict-prone person and I generally just try not to aggravate the situation if problems arise."(C); "No, I thought that was more the role of the supervisor."(F); "The relationship with the boss was correct, but rather formal."(G); "The supervisor often gave me feedback and was interested in how I was doing."(I); "The atmosphere was tense"(J); "Relationships were neutral, neither bad nor good.(K); "I felt I could make mistakes and learn without fear."(L)

Source: own elaboration.

About a third of the respondents were actively engaged in social job crafting, building cooperation and initiating communication. Low levels of activity were associated with neutral or formal relationships, often limited by organisational barriers. At the same time, isolated cases indicate that positive relationships can also occur when the individual's agency is low. The results obtained are consistent with the literature, which indicates that only some employees actively form relationships at work, while the rest function in an adaptive or withdrawn mode (Wrzesniewski, Dutton, 2001; Pichler, Kohli, Granitz, 2021).

Respondents with high levels of job crafting described the relationships as supportive and conducive to development, while those with low levels were more likely to function in conditions of formalised relations and limited support. This confirms hypothesis H2, according to which a higher level of job crafting is associated with more positive work experiences for representatives of generation Z. This is also confirmed by previous research by Hauk, Zwardoń-Kuchciak, (2025); Deci, Ryan, (2013).

Another dimension of job crafting analysed was taking on additional tasks and professional challenges, the results are presented in Table 3.

Table 3.
Taking on additional tasks as a manifestation of job crafting.

Level of job crafting	Statements
high	"The new challenges were a source of satisfaction for me."(A); "I took on extra tasks because I saw that I could learn something, and that motivated me a lot."(B) "The new projects made the work more interesting."(D); "Yes, because I wanted to show what I was capable of, and that motivated me a lot."(F); "New projects made the work less monotonous."(H); "The new challenges gave me a sense of moving forward."(K); "The extra tasks gave me satisfaction."(L); "When I had the opportunity to develop, I was more committed." (Ł); "Yes, the challenge was to perform above the standard, which was linked to the possibility of a bonus."(M)
limited	"Yes, there have been times when I have taken on additional tasks outside my formal job description."(N
low	"The nature of my work and the meticulous scrutiny of the ways in which I perform my duties does not provide opportunities for additional challenges, but I feel that I am an important part of the team."(C)
high → low	"I took on extra tasks, but without support this quickly became a burden."(E); "Over time, the excess of extra tasks made me lose energy to work."(G); "Over time, these additional responsibilities started to cause burnout."(I); "It was exciting at first, but then it turned into an overload."(J)

Source: own elaboration.

The analysis of statements regarding taking on additional tasks and challenges was associated with an increase in satisfaction, motivation and a sense of meaningful work. At the same time, the analysis revealed intra-generational variation. In the absence of adequate structural and social resources, the challenges led to overload and an energy loss. These results support hypothesis H1, indicating that the positive effect of undertaking challenges is conditional and dependent on the availability of resources. This is also confirmed by other studies (Kasprzak, Michalak, Minda, 2017).

To deepen the analysis of respondents' negative work experiences, the most frequently cited work burdens and impediments were juxtaposed with the organisation's responses to attempts to reduce them (Table 4).

Table 4.
The workload experienced and the organisation's response to attempts to reduce it

person	negative experiences	reaction of the organisation
A	"Lack of flexibility in working hours."	"I've been given more flexibility at work."
B	"Over-reporting."	"The reaction was rather indifferent."
C	"The most demotivating thing is unfair treatment from superiors/employers. This gives a sense of lack of support and makes it difficult to solve even small problems, because there is no one you trust to assess the situation correctly."	"It's hard to say whether there have been any reactions – the rule is that the superior is always right."
D	"Excessive control."	"The organisation was rather reluctant to change."
E	"The unclear communication within the team was very tiring."	"A meeting was held to discuss this."
F	"The lack of feedback meant that I didn't know if I was doing something right."	"I got more support after reporting problems."
G	"I found the lack of a clear development path very demotivating."	"The supervisor took the matter seriously."
H	"Lack of work-life balance."	"They said that I had to adapt."
I	"Lack of opportunity to express one's own opinion."	"I was listened to, but with no real follow-up."
J	"Lack of support in difficult situations."	"I have received real support."
K	"Too little feedback."	"Changes have only been partially implemented."
L	"Too few people in the team, too much work."	"Minor adjustments have been made."
Ł	"The feeling that my work doesn't matter."	"I have been given the tools to do a better job."
M	"The most taxing part was the physical fatigue associated with the nature of the warehouse work."	"The organisation took a neutral approach to these activities and allowed employees to organise their own work, as long as the standards were met."
N	"The most aggravating elements of the job for me were the fast pace and the heavy physical workload."	"The organisation responded positively – the shift managers were very supportive, joining in the work themselves, helping to allocate tasks and supporting the team."

Source: own elaboration.

Respondents whose attempts to change were met with indifference or resistance (B, C, D, H, I, M,) were more likely to experience feelings of lack of influence, frustration and helplessness. In contrast, in cases where the organisation provided real support or implemented changes (A, F, G, J, Ł, N), the negative effects of burden were clearly reduced. The results indicate that negative work experiences are not solely due to the level of demands, but to the relationship between workload and organisational support. These results provide support for hypotheses H3 and H4, indicating that low levels of job crafting and lack of organisational support foster an increase in overload and negative emotions among Generation Z representatives. This is also confirmed by the literature (Bednarska-Wnuk, 2018).

6. Conclusion

The aim of this article was to analyse intra-generational variation among Generation Z representatives in the context of job crafting and to identify the relationship between the level of job crafting and experienced aspects of work. The qualitative analysis carried out showed that the work experience of young workers is not homogeneous and cannot be explained solely by generational affiliation. The level of individual agency and the availability of organisational resources are crucial.

The high level of job crafting fostered engagement, a sense of meaningful work and development. Taking on challenges had a developmental function for employees, but only with the right organisational support. In the opposite situation, it could lead to a decrease in motivation and the inability to reduce work-related constraints could increase the risk of negative work experiences.

Research has shown that intra-generational variation in Generation Z, may result from the differences in the level of job crafting and organisational conditions in workplaces.

In the future, it seems reasonable to extend the research by using a larger research sample and employing quantitative methods, which would allow verification of the results obtained on a more representative population of Generation Z members. This could also be complemented by qualitative research, e.g. in the form of in-depth interviews, which would enable a better understanding of the motivations and ways in which Generation Z employees craft their work.

References

1. Bassiouni, D., Hackley, C. (2014). Generation Z Children's Adaptation to Digital Consumer Culture: A Critical Literature Review. *Journal of Customer Behaviour*, *13(2)*, 113-133, https://doi.org/10.1362/147539214X14024779483591
2. Bednarska-Wnuk, I. (2018). Job crafting w kreowaniu współczesnego środowiska pracy a wyzwania dla zarządzania zasobami ludzkimi. *Prace Naukowe Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego we Wrocławiu, 512*, 26-35, https://doi.org/10.15611/pn.2018.512.02
3. Benitez-Márquez, M.D., Sánchez-Teba, E.M., Bermúdez-González, G., Núñez-Rydman, E.S. (2022). Generation Z within the workforce and in the workplace: A bibliometric analysis. *Frontiers in Psychology, 12, 736820,* https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.736820
4. Berg, J.M., Dutton, J.E., Wrzesniewski, A. (2008). *What is job crafting and why does it matter.* Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Justin-Berg-4/publication/266094577_What_is_Job_Crafting_and_Why_Does_It_Matter/links/542a720d0cf27e39fa8e925c/What-is-Job-Crafting-and-Why-Does-It-Matter.pdf, 22.01.2026.

5. Biernacki, M. (2014). Social media – komunikacja ze studentami rachunkowości z pokolenia Z. *Folia Pomeranar Universitatis Technologiae Stentinensis, Oeconomica, 311(75)*2, 7-20.
6. Boehnlein, P., Baum, M. (2020). Does job crafting always lead to employee well-being and performance? Meta-analytical evidence on the moderating role of societal culture. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 33*(2), 1-39, https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2020.1737177.
7. Deci, E.L., Ryan, R.M. (2013). The importance of autonomy for development and well-being. In: B. Sokol, F.M.E. Grouzet, U. Muller (Eds.), *Self-regulation and autonomy: Social, developmental, educational, and neurological dimensions of human contact* (pp. 19-46), https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139152198.005
8. Hampton, D., Keys, Y. (2017), Generation Z Students: Will They Change Our Nursing Classrooms? *Journal of Nursing Education and Practice, 7(4),* 111-115, https://doi.org/10.5430/jnep.v7n4p111.
9. Hauk, M., Zwardoń-Kuchciak, O. (2025). Cechy pracy a dobrostan zawodowy. *Human Resource Management/Zarządzanie Zasobami Ludzkimi*, *161*(2), 33-52, https://doi.org/10.5604/01.3001.0055.1977.
10. Jankowiak, N., Czerwińska-Lubszczyk, A. (2024). Pokolenia na rynku pracy-podejście teoretyczne. *Systemy Wspomagania w Inżynierii Produkcji, 13*(2), 123-134.
11. Kapica, Ł., Baka, Ł. (2021). Czym jest job crafting? Przegląd koncepcji teoretycznych dotyczących kształtowania pracy. *Medycyna pracy, 72*(4); https://doi.org/10.13075/mp.5893.01115.
12. Kasprzak, E., Michalak, M., Minda, M. (2017). Kwestionariusz kształtowania pracy–KKPracy. Polish adaptation of the tool. *Psychologia społeczna, 12(4),* 459-475, https://doi.org/10.7366/1896180020174308.
13. Ławińska, O., Korombel, A. (2023). Pokolenie Z jako wyzwanie współczesnego zarządzania przedsiębiorstwem. *Relacje, media społecznościowe, crowdsourcing*. Częstochowa: Wydawnictwo Politechniki Częstochowskiej, 18.
14. Leslie, B., Anderson, C., Bickham, C., Horman, J., Overly, A., Gentry, C. et al. (2021). Generation Z perceptions of a positive workplace environment. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal, 33*, 1-17. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10672-021-09366-2
15. Maj, J., Kasperek, N. (2020). The Influence of Corporate Social Responsibility on the Attractiveness of Employers in the Perception of Generation Z. In: A. Michałkiewicz, W. Mierzejewska (Eds.), *Contemporary Organisation and Management* (pp. 241-251). Łódź University Press.
16. Muster, R. (2020). Pokolenie „Z" na współczesnym rynku pracy w opiniach pracodawców. *Humanizacja pracy*, *1*, 131-146.

17. Oldham, G.R., Hackman, J.R. (2010). Not what it was and not what it will be: The future of job design research. *Journal of Organisational Behavior, 31*(2-3), 463-479*,* https://doi.org/10.1002/job.678.
18. Oleksiak, P., Rogozińska-Pawełczyk, A., Cewińska, J., Lubrańska, A., Striker, M. (2019). *Pokolenia wobec wartości i zagrożeń współczesnych organizacji*. Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.
19. Oxford Economics (2021). *Gen Z's Role in Shaping the Digital Economy, Economic Consulting Team Oxford Economics*. Retrieved from: https://oeservices.oxfordeconomics.com/publication/open/349239, 22.01.2026.
20. Pichler, S., Kohli, Ch., Granitz, N. (2021), DITTO for Gen Z: A framework for leveraging the uniqueness of the new generation, *Business Horizons, 64*(6), https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2021.02.021.
21. Piwowar-Sulej, K., Bąk-Grabowska, D., Grzesik, K., Zając, C. (2025). *Kompetencje pracowników w kontekście współczesnych wyzwań zarządzania*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego we Wrocławiu.
22. Rudolph, C.W., Katz, I.M., Lavigne, K.N., Zacher, H. (2017). Job crafting: A meta-analysis of relationships with individual differences, job characteristics, and work outcomes. *Journal of vocational behaviour, 102*(6), https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2017.05.008.
23. Scholz, C. (2019). The Generations Z in Europe – an introduction. In: C. Scholz, A. Rennig (Eds.), *Generations Z in Europe* (pp. 3-31). Bingley: Emerald Publishing Limited.
24. Schroth, H. (2019). Are you ready for Gen Z in the workplace? *California management review, 61*(3), https://doi.org/10.1177/0008125619841006
25. Tims, M., Bakker, A.B. (2010). Job crafting: Towards a new model of individual job redesign. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology, 36*(2), 1-9, https://doi.org/10.4102/sajip.v36i2.841
26. Tims, M., Bakker, A. B., Derks, D. (2012). Development and validation of the job crafting scale. *Journal of vocational behaviour, 80*(1), 173-186, https://doi.org/10.1016/ j.jvb.2011.05.009.
27. Wawrzonek, A. (2023). Pokolenie Zet jako „wymagający gracz" współczesnego rynku pracy. *Studia Edukacyjne, 71,* 75-92, https://doi.org/10.14746/se.2023.71.5.
28. Wiktorowicz, J., Warwas, J. (2016). Pokolenia na rynku pracy. In: J. Wiktorowicz, J. Warwas, M. Kuba, E. Staszewska, P. Woszczyk, A. Stankiewicz, J. Kliombka-Jarzyna (Eds.), *Pokolenia – co się zmienia? Kompedium zarządzania multigeneracyjnego* (pp. 19-37), Warsaw: Wolters Kluwer.
29. Wrzesniewski, A., Dutton, J.E. (2001). Crafting a job: Revisioning employees as active crafters of their work. *Academy of management review, 26*(2), 179-201, https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2001.4378011