

# Job Expectations of Generation Z: A Gender-Driven Perspective

*Sameeksha Madan*

Senior Research Fellow,  
Department of Commerce and Business Administration, University of Allahabad, Prayagraj

*Shefali Nandan*

Assistant Professor,  
Department of Commerce and Business Administration, University of Allahabad, Prayagraj

## ABSTRACT

Talent attraction and retention have become essential for modern-day organizations. Cohorts of Generation Z are potential employees and there is a need to understand their job expectations to attract and retain young talent. The study thus attempts to examine the job expectations of Generation Z students in India. The study identifies the factors of job expectations through exploratory factor analysis. Six aspects of a job were identified- growth and autonomy, enrichment, meaningfulness, development, economic and interest. The study also attempts to examine gender differences in job expectations. A strong correlation was observed in the rankings of job expectations factors by male and female respondents and no significant difference was identified in the job expectations between male and female students. The study adds new insights to the theory in the field. The findings have important implications for theory, policymakers and for managers.

***Keywords: Job expectations; Job characteristics; Generation Z; Gen Z; Gender differences***

## INTRODUCTION

In the modern business landscape, attracting and retaining a talented workforce is a critical concern for organizations (Hadi & Ahmed, 2018; Hongal & Kinange, 2020). The traditional employer-employee relationship is undergoing a significant shift (Ahmad et al., 2020), with the 'great attrition' trend persisting, as reported by Gartner, with the attrition rate soaring from 10% in 2020 to 20% in 2021 (Tandon, 2022). According to a survey by Adobe, 56% of individuals aged 18-24 plan to change jobs in the coming year (Wingard, 2021). Nowadays, people seek jobs that resonate with their personal beliefs, aspirations, and sense of purpose, reflecting a growing trend in job preferences (Chillakuri, 2020;

Albrecht et al., 2021). Job applicants now carefully assess organizations, considering their unique needs and preferences to determine a person-organization fit (Catano & Morrow, 2016). With increasing levels of loyalty becoming rare, employees are more prone to seeking new opportunities if their current jobs fail to meet their expectations (Lodberg, 2011; Hart & Baruch, 2022). Consequently, unmet job-related expectations pose significant costs and challenges for organizations.

Different generations exhibit distinct workplace priorities (Clark, 2017; Leslie et al., 2021; Ganguli et al., 2022). Recently, there has been a notable increase in research attention on Generation Z (or Gen Z) (Moles et al., 2023), typically defined as individuals born between 1997 and 2013 (Michael, 2019). Growing up in the digital age, Gen Z is recognized for its high tech-savviness, having experienced the rapid evolution of the internet, smartphones, and social media from an early age (Kahawandala et al., 2020; Puiu et al., 2022). This generation is now entering or soon entering the workforce.

Students entering the job market often have high expectations regarding work-related choices (Ng et al., 2010; Gabrielova, 2021). Failure by organizations to comprehend these preferences may lead to incongruity with their jobs, resulting in employee turnover (Koen et al., 2012; Liu & Raghuram, 2022). Younger employees tend to switch jobs more frequently than their older counterparts (Campione, 2015), necessitating a constant evaluation of college students' job expectations (Maloni et al., 2019). Understanding these expectations is crucial for organizations to successfully attract and retain this demographic. A collaborative study by the Network of Executive Women (NEW) and Deloitte underscores the importance of comprehending the needs of this new generation and formulating plans to facilitate their adjustment in the workplace (Mawhinney & Betts, 2020). Research conducted jointly by the Network of Executive Women (NEW) and Deloitte highlights the significance of understanding the requirements of this emerging generation and developing strategies to support their adaptation in the work environment (Mawhinney & Betts, 2020).

Research suggests significant gender-based differences in job expectations and career choices (Chullen et al., 2015; Arora & Dubey, 2020; Kuhn & Wolter, 2022). Addressing these variations is crucial for fostering a more equitable and inclusive work environment (Vaus & McAllister, 1991; Chullen et al., 2015; Arora et al., 2020).

Organizations must implement innovative strategies to integrate and retain their young, talented workforce. Comprehending the job expectations of potential employees empowers organizations to cultivate a performance-oriented work environment, solidifying a robust employer brand (Lievens & Slaughter, 2016). Proactively understanding the expectations of potential hires helps build and strengthen the employer brand strategically (Mishra & Sharma, 2021). A strong employer brand positively impacts both qualitative and quantitative aspects of job applications (Collins & Han, 2004). Additionally, opportunities for social contributions are valued by employees as a factor of job attractiveness (Madan, 2020). Aligning potential employees' desired job characteristics with organizational policies effectively enhances overall job satisfaction (Kong et al., 2015).

Numerous studies have examined employer expectations (Kavanagh & Drennan, 2008; Suleman, 2018; Szydło et al., 2021) and employee expectations (Houkes et al., 2003; Linden, 2015; Schiff & Leip, 2019, Nguyen Ngoc et al., 2022). However, there is a scarcity of research examining the gender-specific job expectations of Gen Z in the Indian context, as previous studies have predominantly concentrated on the United States and European nations. (e.g., Sagan et al., 2008; Maden et al., 2016; Toskin & McCarthy, 2021; Lassleben & Hofmann, 2023).

The present study is undertaken with two primary objectives. First, it seeks to assess the level of importance that Gen Z assign to job characteristics (i.e., exploring their job expectations). Second, the study aims to delve into potential gender differences that may exist in these job expectations.

## **Theoretical background**

### **Job Expectations**

Roizen & Jepson (1985) described expectations as the mental anticipation of something to happen, which is evident in the attitudes and consequent behaviours of employees. The term “job expectations” was defined as “values that individuals place on various potential job rewards, including both intrinsic and extrinsic types of remunerations” (Bartol, 1976, p. 368). Job expectations are essentially an individual's anticipation of achieving specific outcomes within a particular job (Greenhaus et al., 1983). These expectations reflect the extent of attractiveness associated with different dimensions of a job, including salary and perks, autonomy, achievement, teamwork, challenge, and prestige (Lyons et al.,

2010; Martin & Osterling, 2014). Analysing an individual's work preferences provides a means to measure these expectations (Arnoled, 2005).

Job expectations are the characteristics that can be described as the individual's preferable needs and core beliefs related to the potential or current organization, team, role, and overall work environment that derive meaning to their career and life (Chen & Kao, 2012; Martin & Osterling, 2014), which act as a basis for employee satisfaction or dissatisfaction (Tomkiewicz et al., 2011). The job expectations domain can be classified as: extrinsic job expectations and intrinsic job expectations. Both the extrinsic and intrinsic factors have been extensively studied to assess their influence on job-related outcomes, including productivity, job engagement, innovation, and fulfilment (Watanabe & Kanazawa, 2009). Extrinsic job characteristics emphasizes the work environment, which includes external factors and job characteristics determined by the external processes or people (Neil & Snizek, 1987; Abu-Saad & Isralowitz, 1997). These include working conditions, relationships with colleagues, management, organizational and administrative policies, salaries, and job security (Lechner, 2018; Toskin & McCarthy, 2021). Intrinsic characteristics, on the other hand, include the activities involved in the job performance and opportunities provided for personal growth and self-fulfilment on the job (Voydanoff, 1980; Al-Zoubi, 2016). These characteristics encompass the work attributes defined by nature of responsibility and authority, task diversity, skills and independence, opportunities for self-improvement and development, as well as the feeling of accomplishment and pride (Gallagher & Einhorn, 1976; Johari & Yahya, 2016). Together these job characteristics can form as the basis for enhancing job attractiveness among potential employees when integrated into employer branding strategies (Pandita, 2021).

Over the years, numerous studies have examined job expectations, offering valuable insights into how these expectations evolve in response to changing work environments, societal shifts, and individual preferences. These studies have contributed significantly in understanding the complex interplay between job seekers, employers, and the changing dynamics of work. Initially, job expectations were primarily centered on conventional factors such as salary, job security, and basic benefits (Cable & Judge, 1994; Norris, 2003; Kalleberg, 2011). These early studies aimed to understand how these factors influenced an individual's decision to pursue a particular job or career. As the workplace landscape evolved, so did the focus of research on job expectations. Scholars

began to recognize the significance of intrinsic factors like job satisfaction, opportunities for skill development, the alignment of personal values with organizational culture, etc. (Zhang, 2020; Emanuelsson & Turesson, 2023; Nagy & Tomm, 2023). This shift led to a deeper understanding of how these factors contribute to an individual's overall job satisfaction and commitment. In recent years, the digital age and globalization have brought about new dimensions to job expectations. The rise of remote work, gig economy platforms, and flexible work arrangements has prompted researchers to investigate how these trends impact job expectations (Malik et al., 2021; Nandan & Madan, 2022). Factors like work-life balance, remote work options, and the ability to work on meaningful projects have gained prominence in the literature. Furthermore, the field of job expectations research has become more nuanced, considering individual differences such as age, gender, generational cohorts, and cultural backgrounds. Studies now explore how these factors shape unique job expectations and how organizations can tailor their offerings to attract and retain diverse talent.

### **Gen Z and job expectations**

The study of generational cohorts has become popular among researchers and social scientists in the recent times (Baker Rosa & Hastings, 2016; Rudolph et al., 2021). This can be attributed to the increasing awareness that generational differences, shaped by evolving societal, technological, and economic landscapes, play a crucial role in understanding cultural shifts, consumer behaviour, and the dynamics of a rapidly changing world (McKercher, 2023). The concept of 'generation' originates from the broader realm of sociology, particularly the study of generations and cohort analysis with the work of sociologists such as Karl Mannheim (1952), who introduced the concept of "generational units" in 1952. In the context of management research, understanding generational differences has become important as organizations strive to navigate the opportunities and challenges arising from managing a diverse and multigenerational workforce (Sobrino-De et al., 2019).

Mannheim (1952), with a focus on sociological dimensions, described generation as a cohort of individuals who experience similar historical events during their formative years, leading to the development of a shared generational consciousness. Strauss and Howe (1992), in their influential work "Generations: The History of America's Future, 1584 to 2069", defined a generation as a recurring cycle of archetypal personalities shaped by historical events. They proposed a cyclical model suggesting the recurring patterns of societal attitudes,

values, and behaviours within different generations. Thus, generation is a group of individuals who share similar cultural experiences, values, and attitudes influenced by the historical and social context during their developmental years. Emerging in an era defined by the prevalence of the internet and social media, Gen Z possesses unique value orientations shaped by collective experiences, including culture, behaviours, lifestyle, political landscape, economic circumstances, and technological advancements (Parker & Igielnik, 2020; De Witte, 2022). These unique dynamics shape Gen Z's preferences towards the workplace, which differ noticeably from those of their millennial counterparts (Francis & Hoefel, 2018). The earliest members of Gen Z have begun entering workforce (Holton & Fraser, 2015), prompting organizations and researchers to become interested in understanding their work-related preferences, behaviours, and expectations. The workplace preferences of Gen Z are shaped by their desire for financial stability, entrepreneurial mindset, and competitive nature (Benitez-Marquez et al., 2022). Gen Z demands flexibility, independence, transparency autonomy, in workplace settings, reflecting their entrepreneurial nature and desire for active participation and empowerment in the business environment (Leblanc, 2022; Ljungquist & Lund, 2023). Furthermore, work ethics of Gen Z are guided by a focus on learning, education, and career growth, demonstrating their eagerness to learn new things and their aversion to repetitive tasks (Iorgulescu, 2016).

### **Gender and job expectations**

Gender and sex, though commonly used interchangeably, are distinct concepts with differing meanings (Lips, 2020). While gender encompasses an individual's self-representation as male or female, as well as how social institutions respond to them based on their identification (Howard et al., 2017), the term sex pertains to the biological characteristics that differentiate males from females (Spence & Buckner, 2012). This study uses the term 'gender' as it reflects a broader social, cultural, and psychological aspects of identity beyond biological differences.

Both, males, and females undergo varied life experiences and gender conditioning, and it is crucial to acknowledge and consider these differences in understanding their job expectations (Marini et al., 1996; Aslam et al., 2016). Job expectations associated with long-range career goals such as advancement and responsibility were rated significantly higher by male respondents (Nie et al., 2012; Chullen et al., 2015). There have been contradictory findings in the studies concerning the preferences of males and females. Several studies reported that

females tend to place greater value on extrinsic job expectations (Zou, 2015; Pacheco & Webber, 2016), while others indicate that males prioritize extrinsic factors in their job preferences (Frankel et al., 2006). De Vaus and McAllister (1991) in their study examined the gender differences in the job orientation of European workers and revealed that men place greater importance on both intrinsic and extrinsic job expectations and are more satisfied than women. Voydanoff (1980) investigated the associations between intrinsic and extrinsic job characteristics and found that self-expression, an intrinsic factor, was perceived as the most important for both men and women. Extrinsic factors such as role strain was given more importance by females, while men preferred factors like financial rewards and promotions. Elizur (1994) examined the perceptions on work values for men and women of different nationalities, covering Hungary, Israel, and the Netherlands and found that females attached higher priority to factors like recognition, relations with co-workers and superiors, esteem, security, working conditions, and meaningfulness of job as compared to males. In contrast, males rated influence, independence, authority, and salary structure higher as compared to females. Donohue and Heywood (2004) concluded that females attach higher importance to interpersonal relationships, leisure time, etc., as compared to males, who put greater focus on extrinsic job rewards like salaries (Konrad et al., 2000; Magee, 2015). Women prefer to work with organizations that create inclusive cultures that provide support to career, help maintain balance between personal and professional responsibilities, and strengthen a sense of belongingness (Deloitte, 2022). However, only a limited number of studies have identified that there are similarities in the preferences of males and females with respect to job attributes (Brief et al., 1977; Konrad et al., 2000; Seehuus, 2023). Given the premise that conventional gender roles and stereotypes influences their work value preferences and job expectations of male and female Gen Z talents, we posit the following hypothesis:

*H1: A significant difference exists in the job expectations between Gen Z males and females.*

### **Methodology**

This study utilized the Work Values Inventory by Manhardt (1972) to assess job characteristics preferred by Gen Z students in India. The instrument consisted of twenty-five items related to desired job characteristics, reworded for relevance to Indian participants. A five-point Likert scale (1 = not important, 5 = very important) was employed. Widely used in measuring job expectations of

university students (Beutell & Brenner,1986; Abu-Saad & Isralowitz, 1997; Konrad et al., 2000; Yang & Hung, 2017; Karriker et al., 2021), the scale ensures effective measurement.

A sample of final-year postgraduate students from two central universities in different Indian states, falling within the Gen Z demographic, was surveyed for this research. These students, actively seeking future employment opportunities, possess valuable skills making them desirable to employers. The respondents had an average age of 22 years.

Data collection used a dual approach: distributing questionnaires in person and utilizing a web-based Google Forms questionnaire sent via email and social networks. Convenience and snowball sampling techniques bolstered participant numbers. Data were gathered from January to June 2023, with 400 distributed questionnaires, yielding 308 valid responses after eliminating incomplete or unengaged ones. Of the participants, 161 (52.3%) were male, and 147 (47.7%) were female.

Data validity and reliability assessment revealed non-normal distribution of variables (Shapiro–Wilk and Kolmogorov–Smirnov tests,  $p > 0.05$ ). As a result, non-parametric tests were selected for the analysis. The data underwent descriptive statistics, exploratory factor analysis, Spearman's rank correlation, and Mann-Whitney U test using SPSS 25.0. Spearman rank correlation determined similarity in job characteristic rankings between genders, while the Mann–Whitney U test assessed significant differences in responses between male and female students.

### **Data Analysis**

An exploratory factor analysis (EFA) validated the relationship between factors and items, elucidating the underlying data structure. This statistical method analyzes interrelationships among survey items, grouping them into factors based on correlations' strength (Hair et al., 2010). EFA investigates the potential underlying structure of unrelated variables without imposing a predefined structure on the outcome.

A construct requires a coefficient alpha above the 0.7 threshold for acceptability (Nunally, 1978). The Cronbach's alpha coefficient for the overall scale reliability was 0.897. Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) statistics, assessing data appropriateness for EFA (Table 1), included KMO measure of sample adequacy, Bartlett's test of Sphericity, and variance explained (Hair et al., 2003). A KMO value exceeding 0.6 is deemed appropriate (Kaiser and Rice, 1974), and the derived value of 0.873



was accepted. The significant Bartlett's sphericity test ( $p < 0.05$ ) indicated ample correlations among variables, supporting further factor analysis (Hair et al., 2006).

**Table 1: KMO and Bartlett's Test**

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.873
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	2376.305
	Df	300
	Sig.	.000

Principal component analysis (PCA) with varimax rotation grouped 25 items into 6 factors, explaining a total of 54.67% variance. Following Stevens' (1992) recommendation of a .40 cut-off for minimum loading, all 25 items, with factor loadings above .4, were retained.

Factor 1 had 06 items loading on it and was labelled as '**growth and autonomy aspect**'. It emerged as the most important factor that explained 29.22 per cent of the total variance. The second factor had 05 items loading on it and was labelled as '**enrichment aspect**'. It explained the 6.69 per cent variance. The third factor comprised 04 items and was named as '**meaningfulness aspect**'. It explained a 5.25 per cent variance. Factor 4 was named as '**development aspect**' and comprised of 03 items explaining 4.96 per cent variance. Factor 5 comprising of 03 factors was named as '**economic aspect**', which explained a 4.49 per cent variance. While Factor 6 labelled as '**interest aspect**', explained 4.02 per cent variance. The reliability of the factors was analysed by checking internal consistency with the help of the Cronbach alpha coefficient (Cronbach, 1951). Results of the EFA and reliability are presented in Table 2.

**Table 2: Factor analysis and Reliability values**

S. No.	Factors	Items	Factor loadings	Reliability (Chronbach alpha)
1.	Growth and autonomy aspect	Provides comfortable working conditions	.588	0.765
		Permits advancement to higher responsibility	.499	
		Permits working independently	.525	
		Permits you to work for superiors you admire and respect	.653	
		Permits a regular routine in	.514	

		time and place of work		
		Requires meeting and speaking with many other people	.608	
2.	Enrichment aspect	Involves working with congenial associates	.604	0.723
		Provides ample leisure time off the job	.617	
		Provides change and variety in duties and activities	.410	
		Is intellectually stimulating	.719	
		Has clear-cut rules and procedures to follow	.517	
3.	Meaningfulness aspect	Makes a social contribution by work you do	.588	0.745
		Gives you the responsibility for taking the risk	.797	
		Requires working on important problems of the overall organizations	.432	
		Requires supervising others	.541	
4.	Development aspect	Has Uniqueness	.539	0.603
		Makes use of your specific educational background	.732	
		Encourages continued development of knowledge and skills	.663	
5.	Economic aspect	Provides job security	.730	0.584
		Provides the opportunity to earn a high income	.712	
		Rewards good performance with recognition	.474	
6.	Interest aspect	Satisfies your cultural and aesthetic interests	.410	0.510
		Permits you to develop your own methods of doing work	.707	
		Provides a feeling of accomplishment	.547	

Two non-parametric tests, Spearman Rank Correlation and Mann Whitney, assessed gender differences in job expectations. Spearman rank order correlation determined if men and women attributed similar importance levels to job expectation factors based on rank order. Mean scores for each of the six factors were computed and ranked separately for male and female responded (Table 3). Both male (mean=1.91) and female (mean=2.03) respondents prioritized the 'meaningfulness aspect' as the most important (i.e., ranked no. 1/6). The 'development aspect' was of the lowest importance for both male (mean=1.38)

and female respondents (mean=1.45), ranking at the sixth position. The 'enrichment aspect' was the second most significant factor for females and the third for males. 'Growth and autonomy' were the second most important for males and the fourth for females. The 'interest aspect,' third for females, ranked fourth for males. The 'economic aspect' held the fifth position for both genders.

**Table 3: Gender differences in mean ratings on job expectations**

Factors post EFA	Female (n=147)			Male (n=161)			Total		
	Rank	Mean	Std. Deviation	Rank	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Growth and autonomy aspect	4	1.7948	.66411	2	1.8354	.61378	1.8160	308	.63758
Enrichment aspect	2	1.8673	.65052	3	1.8335	.64817	1.8497	308	.64845
Meaningfulness aspect	1	2.0340	.77672	1	1.9146	.69659	1.9716	308	.73713
Development aspect	6	1.4535	.56124	6	1.3892	.47322	1.4199	308	.51725
Economic aspect	5	1.4649	.55662	5	1.5135	.58094	1.4903	308	.56906
Interest aspect	3	1.8163	.69919	4	1.7992	.64472	1.8074	308	.67022

Spearman's rank correlation coefficient, utilized to explore the relationship between two variables (Zar, 1972), yields a higher score indicating increased association or strength (Sedgwick, 2014). The obtained coefficient of 0.829, comparing rank orders of job characteristics by male and female respondents, signifies a highly significant and strong association in the importance attributed to these job characteristics by both genders (Table 4).

**Table 4: Spearman's rho Correlations**

	Spearman's rho					
	Female ranks			Male ranks		
	Correlation Coefficient	Sig. (2-tailed)	N	Correlation Coefficient	Sig. (2-tailed)	N
Female ranks	1.000	.	6	.829*	.042	6
Male ranks	.829*	.042	6	1.000	.	6

\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

To assess gender-based differences in job expectations, a Mann-Whitney test analyzed standard deviations for each factor. No significant differences were found in job expectations for male and female respondents across all six factors ( $p > 0.05$ ) (Table 5). Consequently, the alternate hypothesis was rejected, indicating no significant differences in Gen Zs' job expectations between genders.

**Table 5: Results of Mann-Whitney U test**

S. No.	Factor	Sig. <sup>a,b</sup>
1	Growth and autonomy aspect	.447
2	Enrichment aspect	.586
3	Meaningfulness aspect	.190
4	Development aspect	.625
5	Economic aspect	.625
6	Interest aspect	.983

## DISCUSSION

This study aimed to explore Gen Z job expectations and assess gender differences. Organizations seek unique talent, and individuals also desire distinct attributes in an organization (Huang & Markov, 2020). The six identified factors represent the job expectations of Indian students, serving as determinants of job attractiveness.

The most crucial factor, *growth and autonomy*, accounted for the maximum variance. Gen Z values working for organizations that prioritize employee development and autonomy, emphasizing independence and individuality (Iorgulescu, 2016). They seek learning opportunities, professional advice, and mentorship, preferring decentralized workplaces. The second factor, *enrichment*, reflects Gen Z's unique perspective on careers, emphasizing innovativeness, enriching jobs, and a congenial environment (Deloitte, 2020). They value intellectual stimulation, team learning, and work-life balance. *Meaningfulness*, the third factor, highlights Gen Z's preference for purpose-driven organizations and meaningful work, fostering deeper relationships and a strong sense of community (McKinsey & Company, 2020). The fourth factor, *development*, emphasizes both personal and professional growth, with Gen Z seeking opportunities for continuous learning and career progression (London, 2001). The fifth factor, *economic*, underscores the importance of compensation, benefits, job security, and recognition in job attractiveness for Gen Z (Chow & Ngo, 2002;

Kismono, 2021). While the sixth factor, *interest*, reflects Gen Z's creativity and desire for aesthetically pleasing work environments, where personal achievements and flexibility are paramount (Bjerke & Ind, 2015).

Male and female students demonstrated almost identical priorities in the ranking of job expectation factors. Both genders ranked 'meaningfulness aspect' as the most important and 'development aspect' as the least important. This suggests a shared preference for jobs that offer meaningful contributions and responsibilities over a focus on learning and development. The 'economic aspect' was ranked fifth by both genders, indicating a lower emphasis on extrinsic benefits like salary and rewards compared to intrinsic factors that provide inner satisfaction. This aligns with recent findings from Deloitte, reporting that Gen Z values challenging and meaningful jobs more than better-paying ones (Mawhinney & Betts 2020).

Minor discrepancies in rankings emerged for 'enrichment aspect' and 'interest aspect.' Female students ranked 'enrichment aspect' second, while males placed it third. For 'interest aspect,' females ranked it third, while males ranked it fourth. 'Growth and autonomy aspect' was ranked fourth by females and second by males, suggesting that males place higher importance on independence and the freedom to choose tasks and work conditions. Research indicates that males value comfortable working conditions and effective workplace communication more than females (Bredbenner, 2020).

An intriguing finding is that no significant differences were observed between male and female respondents in job expectations across all six factors. This contrasts with studies in other countries that have reported gender differences in job expectations (Tomkiewicz et al., 1994; Chullen et al., 2015; Arora & Dubey, 2020). This absence of distinction might be attributed to India's progress towards gender equality, with changing societal structures and more flexibility in gender roles. Shifts in the roles of both genders, females breaking barriers in male-dominated fields, and increased support from male counterparts in managing household responsibilities contribute to this trend. The evolving mindset of females, driven by higher education, has fostered self-confidence and empowerment, making them more economically independent (Chanana, 2022). Education, a strong predictor of decision-making power within households, has led to greater self-identity and career aspirations for females (Archana et al., 2010; Shetty & Hans, 2015). These factors likely contribute to the diminishing differences in preferences between male and female respondents in this study.

## CONCLUSION AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Organizations today face challenges in attracting, managing, and retaining talented employees. This study addresses these concerns by identifying the factors shaping job expectations and attractiveness for Gen Z in India, revealing six underlying factors. Valuable insights into preferences for various job expectation factors among both male and female students highlight remarkable similarity, indicating no significant differences in their job expectations. This trend is likely a result of societal changes and evolving gender roles in contemporary times. As Indian society progresses, the study emphasizes the diminishing differences in the perceptions of the younger generation regarding job conditions and roles. This understanding becomes essential for organizations aiming to build a robust employer brand and effectively retain the best young talent.

This study offers valuable insights for researchers and managers, identifying inherent factors of job expectations for Gen Z in India. The observed absence of significant gender differences challenges established theories in job expectations and gender studies, suggesting the need for future exploration of underlying social and cultural causes.

Managers play a crucial role in comprehending Gen Z's job expectations for effective talent attraction and retention, bolstering their employer brand. Understanding these needs allows organizations to prioritize job design and foster a retention-friendly work climate. Insights from this study can serve as a guide for managers in developing employer branding strategies aligned with Gen Z's preferred job attributes. The study highlights the diminishing gender differences, urging a reassessment of policies for attracting and retaining young talent. Additionally, these findings hold practical value for career counseling, aiding students in making informed career choices, given the significant influence of job expectations on career decisions.

Finally, the current study has several limitations, including: Its limited scope, with respondents from only two universities in India, may hinder a comprehensive representation of the population. Enhancing generalizability necessitates the inclusion of more universities and a larger sample size. While the research focuses on gender differences in job expectations, future studies could explore variations across other demographic variables like rural/urban background, ethnicity, family income, or parents' education levels. Identifying influencers of students' job expectations and studying cross-cultural differences

globally can offer a more nuanced understanding. Expanding the study beyond potential employees in universities to include personnel from various sectors would provide a holistic view of job expectations. Future research endeavours may explore the relationship between job expectations and other outcome variables such as job satisfaction, work engagement, and productivity.

## REFERENCES

- Abu-Saad, I., & Isralowitz, R. E. (1997). Gender as a determinant of work values among university students in Israel. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 137*(6), 749-763.
- Ahmad, A., Khan, M. N., & Haque, M. A. (2020). Employer branding aids in enhancing employee attraction and retention. *Journal of Asia-Pacific Business, 21*(1), 27-38.
- Albrecht, S. L., Green, C. R., & Marty, A. (2021). Meaningful work, job resources, and employee engagement. *Sustainability, 13*(7), 4045.
- Al-Zoubi, M. (2016). Work Values of Jordanian Fresh Graduates. *International Journal of Business and Management, 11*(7), 237.
- Arora, S., Dubey, V., & Vyas, S. (2020). Study of work values of Gen Z students. *International Journal of Technology and Globalisation, 8*(3-4), 240-265.
- Aslam, S., Mason, C., Zakria, A., & Farid, M. (2016). Gender perceptions: Employer branding through attractiveness, job characteristics and organizational attributes. *American Journal of Trade and Policy, 3*(2), 47-52.
- Baker Rosa, N. M., & Hastings, S. O. (2016). Managers making sense of millennials: Perceptions of a generational cohort. *Qualitative Research Reports in Communication, 17*(1), 52-59.
- Benitez-Marquez, M. D., Sanchez-Teba, E. M., Bermudez-Gonzalez, G., & Nunez-Rydman, E. S. (2022). Generation Z within the Workforce and in the Workplace: A Bibliometric Analysis. *Frontiers in psychology, 12*, 736820.
- Beutell, N. J., & Brenner, O. C. (1986). Sex differences in work values. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 28*(1), 29-41.
- Bredbenner, J. (2020). *Generation z: A study of its workplace communication behaviors and future preferences* (Doctoral dissertation, Wichita State University).

- Brief, A. P., Rose, G. L., & Aldag, R. J. (1977). Sex differences in preferences for job attributes revisited. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 62(5), 645.
- Cable, D. M., & Judge, T. A. (1994). Pay preferences and job search decisions: A person-organization fit perspective. *Personnel psychology*, 47(2), 317-348.
- Campione, W. A. (2015). Corporate offerings: Why aren't millennials staying?. *Journal of Applied Business & Economics*, 17(4).
- Catano, V. M., & Morrow Hines, H. (2016). The influence of corporate social responsibility, psychologically healthy workplaces, and individual values in attracting millennial job applicants. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science/Revue canadienne des sciences du comportement*, 48(2), 142.
- Chanana, K. (2022). Women and leadership: Strategies of gender inclusion in institutions of higher education in India. In *Strategies for Supporting Inclusion and Diversity in the Academy* (pp. 141-162). Palgrave Macmillan, Cham.
- Chen, C. H. V., & Kao, R. H. (2012). Work Values and Service-Oriented Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: The Mediation of Psychological Contract and Professional Commitment: A Case of Students in Taiwan Police College. *Social Indicators Research*, 107, 149-169.
- Chillakuri, B. (2020). Understanding Generation Z expectations for effective onboarding. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 33(7), 1277-1296.
- Collins, C. J., & Han, J. (2004). Exploring applicant pool quantity and quality: The effects of early recruitment practice strategies, corporate advertising, and firm reputation. *Personnel psychology*, 57(3), 685-717.
- Chow, I. H. S., & Ngo, H. Y. (2002). Gender differences in job attribute preferences and job choice of university students in China. *Journal of Applied Business Research (JABR)*, 18(2).
- Chullen, C. L., Adeyemi-Bello, T., & Xi, X. Y. (2015). Job expectations of Chinese college students: re-examining gender differences. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*.
- Clark, K. R. (2017). Managing multiple generations in the workplace. *Radiologic technology*, 88(4), 379-396.



- Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *psychometrika*, 16(3), 297-334.
- De Vaus, D., & McAllister, I. (1991). Gender and work orientation: Values and satisfaction in Western Europe. *Work and Occupations*, 18(1), 72-93.
- De Witte, M. (2022). Gen Z are not ‘coddled.’ They are highly collaborative, self-reliant and pragmatic, according to new Stanford-affiliated research.
- Donohue, S., & Heywood, J. (2004). Job satisfaction, comparison income and gender: Evidence from the NLSY. *International Journal of Manpower*, 25(2), 211-234.
- Elizur, D. (1994). Gender and work values: A comparative analysis. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 134(2), 201-212.
- Emanuelsson, C., & Turesson, J. (2023). The work values of Generation Z: A qualitative research explaining what Generation Z values and is attracted to in an employer.
- Frankel, R., Tomkiewicz, J., Adeyemi-Bello, T., & Sagan, M. (2006). Gender differences in job orientation: The case of Poland. *Cross Cultural Management: An International Journal*.
- Francis, T., & Hoefel, F. (2018). True Gen’: Generation Z and its implications for companies. *McKinsey & Company*, 12, 1-10.
- Gabrielova, K., & Buchko, A. A. (2021). Here comes Generation Z: Millennials as managers. *Business Horizons*, 64(4), 489-499.
- Gallagher, W. E., & Einhorn, H. J. (1976). Motivation theory and job design. *The Journal of Business*, 49(3), 358-373.
- Ganguli, R., Padhy, S. C., & Saxena, T. (2022). The Characteristics and Preferences of Gen Z: A Review of Multi-Geography Findings. *IUP Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21(2), 79-98.
- Greenhaus, J. H., Seidel, C., & Marinis, M. (1983). The impact of expectations and values on job attitudes. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 31(3), 394-417.
- Hadi, N. U., & Ahmed, S. (2018). Role of employer branding dimensions on employee retention: Evidence from educational sector. *Administrative sciences*, 8(3), 44.
- Hart, D., & Baruch, Y. (2022). The dynamics of diplomatic careers: The shift from traditional to contemporary careers. *Human Resource Management*, 61(2), 259-276.

- Hair, J. F., Anderson, R. E., Babin, B. J., & Black, W. C. (2010). Multivariate data analysis: A global perspective. *Pearson Upper Saddle River*, 7.
- Hair Jr, J. F., Bush, R. P., & Ortinau, D. J. (2003). *Marketing research*. McGraw-Hill/Irwin.
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., Anderson, R. E., & Tatham, R. (2006). Multivariate data analysis. *Uppersaddle River*.
- Harris, M. M., & Fink, L. S. (1987). A field study of applicant reactions to employment opportunities: Does the recruiter make a difference? *Personnel Psychology*, 40(4), 765-784.
- Holton, T., & Fraser, B. (2015). Generation Z and technology. *Toronto Research Center*.
- Hongal, P., & Kinange, U. (2020). A study on talent management and its impact on organization performance-an empirical review. *International Journal of Engineering and Management Research*, 10.
- Howard, L. M., Ehrlich, A. M., Gamlen, F., & Oram, S. (2017). Gender-neutral mental health research is sex and gender biased. *The Lancet Psychiatry*, 4(1), 9-11.
- Huang, K., Li, M., & Markov, S. (2020). What do employees know? Evidence from a social media platform. *The Accounting Review*, 95(2), 199-226.
- Iorgulescu, M. C. (2016). Generation Z and its perception of work. *Cross-Cultural Management Journal*, 18(01), 47-54.
- Johari, J., & Yahya, K. K. (2016). Job characteristics, work involvement, and job performance of public servants. *European Journal of Training and Development*.
- Kahawandala, N., Peter, S., & Niwunhella, H. (2020). Profiling purchasing behavior of Generation Z. In *2020 International Research Conference on Smart Computing and Systems Engineering (SCSE)* (pp. 155-160). IEEE.
- Kaiser, H. F., & Rice, J. (1974). Little jiffy, mark IV. *Educational and psychological measurement*, 34(1), 111-117.
- Kalleberg, A. L. (2011). Good jobs, bad jobs: The rise of polarized and precarious employment systems in the United States, 1970s-2000s. *Russell Sage Foundation*.
- Karl, M. (1952). The problem of generations. *Essays on the Sociology of Knowledge*, 276-322.

- Karriker, J. H., Chullen, C. L., Adeyemi-Bello, T., & Xi, X. Y. (2021). Gender and Generation: Job Expectations of Chinese Professionals and Students amid Complexity and Change. *The Journal of Applied Business and Economics*, 23(2), 196-209.
- Kavanagh, M. H., & Drennan, L. (2008). What skills and attributes does an accounting graduate need? Evidence from student perceptions and employer expectations. *Accounting & Finance*, 48(2), 279-300.
- Kismono, G., & Rahayu, N. L. (2021). Employer brand attractiveness: the effect of demographic variables on career goals. *Jurnal Siasat Bisnis*, 91-110.
- Koen, J., Klehe, U. C., & Van Vianen, A. E. (2012). Training career adaptability to facilitate a successful school-to-work transition. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 81(3), 395-408.
- Kong, H., Wang, S., & Fu, X. (2015). Meeting career expectation: can it enhance job satisfaction of Generation Y?. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*.
- Konrad, A., Corrigan, E., Lieb, P., & Ritchie, J. (2000). Sex differences in job attribute preferences among managers and business students. *Group and Organization Management*, 25(2), 108-131.
- Kuhn, A., & Wolter, S. C. (2022). Things versus people: Gender differences in vocational interests and in occupational preferences. *Journal of economic behavior & organization*, 203, 210-234.
- Lassleben, H., & Hofmann, L. (2023). Attracting Gen Z talents: Do expectations towards employers vary by gender?. *Gender in Management: An International Journal*, 38(4), 545-560.
- LeBlanc, J. (2022). *Workplace Environment and Leadership Preferences of Generation Z* (Doctoral dissertation, Northcentral University).
- Lechner, C. M., Sortheix, F. M., Obschonka, M., & Salmela-Aro, K. (2018). What drives future business leaders? How work values and gender shape young adults' entrepreneurial and leadership aspirations. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 107, 57-70.
- Leslie, B., Anderson, C., Bickham, C., Horman, J., Overly, A., Gentry, C., ... & King, J. (2021). Generation Z perceptions of a positive workplace environment. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 33, 171-187.

- Lievens, F., & Slaughter, J. E. (2016). Employer image and employer branding: What we know and what we need to know. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, vol 3, 3, 407-440.
- Linden, S. (2015). *Job expectations of employees in the millennial generation* (Doctoral dissertation, Walden University).
- Lips, H. M. (2020). Sex and gender: An introduction. *Waveland Press*.
- Liu, X., & Raghuram, S. (2022). The effects of latent withdrawal profiles on employee turnover, destinations and job performance. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 32(2), 384-405.
- Ljungquist, S., & Lund, S. (2023). Gen Z@ Work: A Changing Management Situation: A Qualitative Study of Generation Z in a Remote Working Environment from a Management Perspective.
- Lodberg, R. (2011). Employer Branding. På opdagelse i en ny branding-disciplin. *Håndbog i strategisk public relations*. Red. Henrik Merksel. *Samfundslitteratur*, 2, 157-178.
- London, M. (2001). Leadership development: Paths to self-insight and professional growth. *Psychology Press*.
- Lyons, S. T., Higgins, C., & Duxbury, L. (2010). Work values: Development of a new three-dimensional structure based on confirmatory smallest space analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 31, 969-1002.
- Madan, S. (2020). Role of corporate social responsibility in employer branding: A conceptual overview. *Innovative and Futuristic Practices in Business and Management*, 160-182.
- Maden, C., Ozcelik, H., & Karacay, G. (2016). Exploring employees' responses to unmet job expectations: The moderating role of future job expectations and efficacy beliefs. *Personnel Review*.
- Magee, W. (2015). Effects of gender and age on pride in work, and job satisfaction. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 16(5), 1091-1115.
- Malik, R., Visvizi, A., & Skrzek-Lubasińska, M. (2021). The gig economy: Current issues, the debate, and the new avenues of research. *Sustainability*, 13(9), 5023.
- Maloni, M., Hiatt, M. S., & Campbell, S. (2019). Understanding the work values of Gen Z business students. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 17(3), 100320.

- Manhardt, P. J. (1972). Job orientation of male and female college graduates in business. *Personnel Psychology*, 25(2), 361-368.
- Marini, M. M., Fan, P. L., Finley, E., & Beutel, A. M. (1996). Gender and job values. *Sociology of Education*, 49-65.
- Martin, K., & Osterling, M. (2014). *Value Stream Mapping: How to Visualize Work and Align Leadership for Organizational Transformation*. New York: Mc Grow Hill.
- Mawhinney, T., & Betts, K. (2020). Understanding Generation Z in the workplace. *Deloitte Insights*, 24.
- McKercher, B. (2023). Age or generation? Understanding behaviour differences. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 103, 103656.
- Mishra, H., & Sharma, A. (2021). The role of employer branding in the creation of powerful corporate brands. In *Employer Branding for Competitive Advantage: Models and Implementation Strategies* (pp. 33-50). CRC Press.
- Moles, K., Robinson, L., Levine, L., & Chiaraluce, C. (2023). COVID-19, Creative Conflict, and the Seven Cs: A Social Diagnosis of Digital Communication Platforms for Gen Z/Gen T. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 00027642231155372.
- Nagy, D., & Tomm, S. J. (2023). Thriving Or Surviving? A Study of Job Satisfaction Among Gen Z.
- Nandan, S., & Madan, S. (2022). Challenges and Concerns of Work from Home during Covid-19 Pandemic in India: An Exploratory Study. *South Asian Journal of Management*, 29(4).
- Neil, C. C., & Snizek, W. E. (1987). Work values, job characteristics, and gender. *Sociological Perspectives*, 30(3), 245-265.
- Nie, T., Lian, Z., & Huang, H. (2012). Career exploration and fit perception of Chinese new generation employees: Moderating by work values. *Nankai Business Review International*.
- Nguyen Ngoc, T., Viet Dung, M., Rowley, C., & Pejić Bach, M. (2022). Generation Z job seekers' expectations and their job pursuit intention: Evidence from transition and emerging economy. *International Journal of Engineering Business Management*, 14, 18479790221112548.
- Norris, P. (2003). Is there still a public service ethos? Work values, experience, and job satisfaction among government workers. *For the people: Can we fix public service*, 72-89.

- Pacheco, G., & Webber, D. (2016). Job satisfaction: how crucial is participative decision making?. *Personnel Review*, 45(1), 183-200.
- Pandita, D. (2021). Innovation in talent management practices: creating an innovative employer branding strategy to attract generation Z. *International Journal of Innovation Science*.
- Parker, K., & Igielnik, R. (2020). On the cusp of adulthood and facing an uncertain future: What we know about Gen Z so far.
- Puiu, S., Demyen, S., Tănase, A. C., Vărzaru, A. A., & Bocean, C. G. (2022). Assessing the Adoption of Mobile Technology for Commerce by Generation Z. *Electronics*, 11(6), 866.
- Tandon, R., (2022). Great Resignation or Great Reimagination: A talent map for 2022. *Economictimes*, <https://economictimes.indiatimes.com/>
- Roizen, J., & Jepson, M. (1985). *Degrees for Jobs: employer expectations of higher education*. Open University Press.
- Rudolph, C. W., Rauvola, R. S., Costanza, D. P., & Zacher, H. (2021). Generations and generational differences: Debunking myths in organizational science and practice and paving new paths forward. *Journal of business and psychology*, 36, 945-967.
- Schiff, M., & Leip, L. (2019). The impact of job expectations, workload, and autonomy on work-related stress among prison wardens in the United States. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 46(1), 136-153.
- Sedgwick, P. (2014). Spearman's rank correlation coefficient. *Bmj*, 349.
- Seehuus, S. (2023). Gender differences and similarities in work preferences: Results from a factorial survey experiment. *Acta Sociologica*, 66(1), 5-25.
- Shetty, S., & Hans, V. (2015). Role of education in women empowerment and development: Issues and impact. *Role of Education in Women Empowerment and Development: Issues and Impact*.
- Sobrino-De Toro, I., Labrador-Fernández, J., & De Nicolás, V. L. (2019). Generational diversity in the workplace: Psychological empowerment and flexibility in Spanish companies. *Frontiers in psychology*, 10, 1953.
- Spence, J. T., & Buckner, C. (2012). Masculinity and femininity: Defining the undefinable. In *Gender, power, and communication in human relationships* (pp. 105-138). Routledge.
- Stevens, J. (1992). *Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

- Strauss, W., & Howe, N. (1992). *Generations: The history of America's future, 1584 to 2069. New York: HarperCollins.*
- Suleman, F. (2018). The employability skills of higher education graduates: insights into conceptual frameworks and methodological options. *Higher Education, 76*(2), 263-278.
- Szydło, R., Wiśniewska, S., Tyrańska, M., Dolot, A., Bukowska, U., & Koczyński, M. (2021). Employer Expectations Regarding the Competencies of Employees on the Energy Market in Poland. *Energies, 14*(21), 7233.
- Tomkiewicz, J., Brenner, O. C., & Damanpour, F. (1994). Gender differences in job orientation: have they changed?. *Journal of Global Business, 5*, 65-76.
- Tomkiewicz, J., Frankel, R., Sagan, M., & Wang, C. (2011). Comparing job expectations of Chinese male and female college students. *Chinese Management Studies, 5*(1), 111-120.
- Toskin, K., & McCarthy, R. V. (2021). Information technology work value differences. *Journal of Computer Information Systems, 61*(4), 305-313.
- Voydanoff, P. (1980). Perceived job characteristics and job satisfaction among men and women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 5*(2), 177-185.
- Watanabe, S. & Kanazawa, Y. (2009). A Test of personality-based view of intrinsic motivation. *Japanese Journal of Administrative Science, 22*(2)
- Wingard, J. (2021). The great resignation': Why Gen Z is leaving the workforce in droves... and what to do about it. *Forbes.*
- Yang, J. S., & Hung, H. V. (2017). Happy workers value effort, sad workers value reward. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 28*(11), 1591-1624.
- Zar, J. H. (1972). Significance testing of the Spearman rank correlation coefficient. *Journal of the American Statistical Association, 67*(339), 578-580.
- Zhang, S. (2020). Workplace spirituality and unethical pro-organizational behaviour: The mediating effect of job satisfaction. *Journal of Business Ethics, 161*, 687-705.
- Zou, M. (2015). Gender, work orientations and job satisfaction. *Work, employment and society, 29*(1), 3-22.