

THE APPROACH TO THE WORK MOBILITY IN GENERATION Y – ENTHUSIASM FOR CHANGE

HANA STOJANOVÁ, PAVEL TOMŠÍK, EVA TESAŘOVÁ

Abstract

The access to human resources management by the various generations' categories becomes an actual topic as each generation is different from the other and requires different leadership approach. Understanding generational differences can help companies improve efficiency, sharing know-how and reduce staff turnover. The main objective of paper is mapping of approach of Gen Y to the work mobility. The partial objective is to compare needs, values and expectations of the Gen Y to changes in the labour market in Czech Republic and France.

The research was carried on samples of employed and potential job seekers aged 18–30 years, graduates of secondary and tertiary education in the Czech Republic and France. Primary data from the 170 returned questionnaires are processed by statistical methods of chi square contingency test and are interpreted in tables with absolute and relative frequency. They were set for the research purposes hypothesis concerning the existence of differences between Czech and French Gen Y, their satisfaction with conditions in the work environment and career possibilities in their country. The paper findings of serve as a foundation for employers, helping them to improve the adaptation process of Gen Y to the working environment.

Key words: human resources management, Generation Y, generational differences, work mobility, labour market.

Classification JEL: M12 – Personnel Management.

1. Introduction

Current economic demands and changing demographic curve of workforce development requires companies management attention focused to the generational issue.

The access to human resources management by the various generations' categories becomes an actual topic as each generation is different from the other and requires different leadership approach. There are different ideas about life, actions and ideas about career within the generation groups. Each generation is influenced by the political events, economic situation and the lifestyle prevailing during that period in which generations grew up.

Understanding generational differences can help companies improve efficiency, sharing know-how and reduce staff turnover. The workforce generated by Gen Y should form a 25% of the world population (*Gybson, 2010*).

2. Defining Generation Y

Generation Y, comprising people born between 1979 and 1999, the youngest living generation, which currently operates or just entering the labor market, is considered as the first global generation. Previous generations, were rather evolved independently within each state, and therefore it is difficult to find common features. Properties and general characteristics of the generation Y, unlike in preceding generations do not change depending on the area where they live. This generation Y is from early childhood surrounded by information and communication technologies, by the globalized world and by the ability to travel Thanks to this chance live in the world without barriers, generation Y proves grows of interest in international themes, language learning and international cultures and negotiating styles (*Kubátová & Kukelková, 2013*).

McCrinkle and Wolfinger have defined in their book *The ABC of XYZ: Understanding the Global Generations*, seven living generations: Generation of heroes, Generation of

builders, Babyboomers, Generation X, Generation Y, Z and Alfa. Of these seven, just the three generations Babyboomers, Generation X and Generation Y are economically active (*McCrindle & Wolfinger, 2009*). The term 'Generation Y' was coined in the journal 'Advertising Age'. This marketing trade magazine has been credited with first using the term in an editorial in August 1993, as a way to distinguish the group from Generation X (*Advertising Age, 1993*).

Definitions of who makes up Gen Y vary. Aite Group defines the term as anyone born between 1979 and 1990, or those between ages 21 and 31. Another method uses overlapping 20-year periods, such as baby boomers (1945–1965), Gen X (1961–1981) and Gen Y (1979–1999). This definition, used by Javelin, puts Gen Y consumers between ages 11 and 31. Various sources work with different names of this generation such as Internet or digital generation, Click generation, Millennials or Echo boomers. The current proportion of the percentage of Gen Y workers in organizations is characterized by Howe, Strauss as follows: 10% of Veterans, 44% of Baby Boomers, Generation X, 34% and 12% of Generation Y), (*Aite, 2009; Javelin, 2009; Constantine, 2010; Howe & Strauss, 2010, 1997*).

3. Features and characteristics of Gen Y according to work attitude

According to authors, the Generation Y is just the generations of optimists. These authors argues in their publication *Millennials Rising*, that in comparison with previous generations Gen Y are much more positive, not egocentric, more inclined to cooperate at the joint activities and team tasks. They believe in collective power (*Howe & Strauss, 2000; Fidelity Investments research, 201; Jayson & Puente, 2007*). Opinions on the general characteristics of Gen Y, diverges in the scientific community. Jean Twenge argues that this generation is egocentric and ambient world interests them only via their Facebook pages (*Twenge, 2012*).

Gen Y has developed a reputation for having elevated expectations and getting what they want. This is a generation that has grown up interacting with technology that evolves very quickly. This fact has fuelled their expectation of having all types of information at their fingertips and accessing it quickly and conveniently.

Some authors describe the Gen Y relations to the money and property as very weak. This mistaken belief has been furthered by Gen Y themselves, seeking to set themselves apart from prior generations. Yet six in 10 of Gen Y said that making a lot of money is as important to them as it is to their parents, according to an Aite research. And almost 25 percent say it's more important. Just 15 percent said it was less so. About 75 percent of Gen Y moved money between accounts at least one time of the past half year, with 29 percent doing it six times or more. They also tend to check savings rates, with 53 percent checking them periodically, and 13 percent doing so weekly. Gen Y is the first generation to grow up entirely online, and from an early age they have extensively used personal computers, mobile phones, e-mail, video games and the Internet. About 97 % of them have a profile or page on Facebook or other social networking sites (*Aite, 2009; Constantine, 2010*).

About 35 percent have an Apple®, iPhone®, or iPod touch®. This is a generation that gravitates instinctively toward technology, whether they're using a mobile phone, downloading music or updating a Facebook page. Gen Y is quick to reject messaging with any hint of duplicity. This is a generation that has grown up with 24/7 news, including coverage of financial scandals and school shootings. Marketing to Gen Y will be 'tricky and nerve-racking', warns Javelin research result (*Javelin, 2009*).

The distinctive feature of this generation is unwillingness to sacrifice their interests and hobbies to his job. For Gen Y is no longer a major motivating financial evaluation criterion. Emphasis is placed on other bonuses and options of work-life balance that employers offer. Generation Y does not want to spend all their time working and sacrificing his life to the career, as was the case with the previous generation X.

The research of Families and Work Institute by the American Business Collaboration (2002) showed that generation Y are less work-centric than Baby Boomers (13% versus 22%), and more family-centric than Boomers (50% versus 41%), (*Families and Work Institute, 2002*).

The generation Y prefers flexible working hours and appreciates opportunity to work from home office or in dynamic organization. Gen Y workers are more flexible than previous generations. They are looking for work that is creative and bringing joy (*Kopecký, 2013*). When choosing a job they focus not only on interesting work itself but to the possibility for further professional development and self-realization. They refuse routine work (*Kubátová & Kukulková, 2013*) In the priorities forefront of this generation are situated personal life, relationships and family, which differs significantly from Generation X. One of the attributes of Gen Y is a new architecture of family, waived the classic stereotype of the father as breadwinner and mother as caregiver in household (*Kociánová, 2012*).

Gen Y has a sense of teamwork, fair play and teamwork, they want to have a chance discuss their work or consult with colleagues, yearn to be part of the project, those projects where they could learn something new and obtain benefits in personal development.

Formal relations are not considered as that beneficial as personal relationship. This generation is loyal to those they admire. However, their loyalty to the company is not quite significant. During their working life they want to try more jobs and employers. They do not want to be controlled, but coaching. They are willing to adapt to their employers' needs, but also expects the same from their employers. They do not afraid to express their opinion, they do not fear of criticism, prefer open communication. Their weak point may be an ignorance of their own ability limits (*Kubátová & Kukulová, 2013; Hospodařová, 2008; Kociánová, 2012*).

This generation is seemed to do not know exactly how should their careers look like, but they are much more demanding in their requirements for employers (*Vysekalová, 2011*). To obtain, motivate and retain the best employees will be necessary to deal with Gen Y employees alike, as a company treats its customers, in accordance with the process of 'internal customer service'. To create an attractive working environment for the Gen Y will be necessary to focus to the team, technology, friendship, fun, target orientation, motivation, optimism, growth, knowledge, innovation, and of course financial reward (*Kopecký, 2013*).

4. The Research

The main objective of paper is mapping of approach of Gen Y to the work mobility. The partial objective is to compare needs, values and expectations of the Gen Y to changes in the labour market in Czech Republic and France. The paper findings of serve as a foundation for employers, helping them to improve the adaptation process of Gen Y to the working environment.

Primary data from the questionnaires are processed by statistical methods of chi square contingency test and are interpreted in tables with absolute and relative frequency. Data were processed by Statistica software.

They were set for the research purposes hypothesis concerning the existence of differences between Czech and French Gen Y, their satisfaction with conditions in the work environment and career possibilities in their country.

The research was carried on samples of employed and potential job seekers aged 18–30 years, graduates of secondary and tertiary education in the Czech Republic and France. The questionnaire included filtering and identification questions. Due to these issues were excluded from the analysis, respondents who did not meet the required age of the sample and the relevant nationality. The final amount of obtained data sources was 170 respondents. In terms of national representation, the survey was attended by 102 Czech respondents and 68 French respondents whose answers were then compared.

To receive quality evaluation of the survey results would certainly be adequate if the target groups were represented in roughly the same number of respondents. This requirement for data collection was not met mainly by French respondents. It must therefore be noted that the compared groups are not equal, so the survey results should be interpreted with this in mind.

This study explores issues concerning access to the labor market. To find out preferred areas of work, were selected 10 most frequent responses for each target group. The Czech respondents prefer as the most popular field of economy, IT technology, engineering and construction. The French respondents prefer Informatics and IT followed by the economics and tourism. Among the reasons choosing these subjects provided amount of salary and job opportunities.

Table 1. Preferred areas of work (own study)

Preferred areas of work					
Czech Republic			France		
Answers	Absolute frequency	Relative frequency	Answers	Absolute frequency	Relative frequency
Economy	31	30%	IT	11	16%
Technique	18	18%	Economy	9	13%
IT	11	11%	Tourism	9	13%
HR and management	7	7%	Education	6	9%
Education	4	4%	Technique	5	7%
Finance	3	3%	Finance	5	7%
Marketing and Media	2	2%	HR and management	4	6%
Tourism	2	2%	Sport	4	6%
Sport	2	2%	Languages	4	6%
Design	2	2%	Marketing and Media	3	4%
Social	2	2%	Other	8	12%
Justice and Law	5	5%			
Construction industry	4	4%			
Other	6	6%			
Unspecified	3	3%			
<i>Total</i>	<i>81</i>	<i>100%</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>68</i>	<i>100%</i>

In response to the question „*What are you doing to increase your competitiveness in the labor market?*” the relative frequencies are calculated from the total number of respondents, therefore, 102 Czech and 68 French respondents. Because respondents could mark more than one answer, the total number of responses is greater than the number of respondents.

In both groups, more than half of the respondents answered that they studying foreign languages. The second most frequent response among Czech respondents was completing courses for professional development and traveling to abroad. For French respondents were second and third place vice versa in the ranking with Czech respondents.

The languages most commonly studied by the respondents are listed below. Both groups the most frequently study the English language. For the Czech respondents, English is followed by German. For the French respondents is a second language Spanish. Some respondents said they are studying more than one language. Below can be seen the structure of the respondents and the amount of them studying foreign languages.

Table 2. Activities to increase competitiveness on the labor market (own study)

Activities to increase competitiveness on the labor market				
Answers	Czech Republic		France	
	Absolute frequency	Relative frequency	Absolute frequency	Relative frequency
Language Learning	51	50%	40	59%
Courses for raising professional qualifications	45	44%	15	22%
Foreign experience	36	35%	22	32%
Retraining	9	9%	7	10%
Distance learning	6	6%	5	7%
Self-study	7	7%	0	0%
Nothing	14	14%	10	15%
<i>Total</i>	<i>168</i>	<i>165%</i>	<i>99</i>	<i>146%</i>

Czech respondents:

1 language 33 respondents;
 2 languages 16 respondents;
 3 languages 2 respondents;
 4 languages 2 respondents.

French respondents:

1 language 30 respondents;
 2 languages 6 respondents;
 3 languages 8 respondents;
 4 languages 2 respondents.

Table 3. List of studied languages (own study)

List of studied languages			
Czech Republic		France	
Answers	Absolute frequency	Answers	Absolute frequency
English	45	English	35
German	11	Spanish	11
French	7	German	9
Spanish	6	Other	6
Russian	5	Russian	5
Italian	3	Czech	4
Portuguese	1	Polish	2
Chinese	1	Italian	2
<i>Total</i>	<i>79</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>74</i>

To explore whether respondents can see sufficient employment opportunities in their area, can be find a noticeable difference between French and the Czech respondents. Czech respondents (75%), unlike the French respondents (49%) see in their surroundings potential job opportunities. Lack of the adequate jobs, French respondents commented by sentences: "The market is already saturated, sufficient demand is low, there are almost not job offer there," "Free jobs are not publicly available," or "Employers have too high expectations" and "If there are some job offers then are very poorly paid." The Czech respondents as reasons said that there is too many graduates, while the lack of opportunities.

Table 4. Sufficient employment opportunities in the area (own study)

Sufficient employment opportunities in the area				
Answers	Czech Republic		France	
	Absolute frequency	Relative frequency	Absolute frequency	Relative frequency
Yes	76	75%	33	49%
No	26	25%	35	51%
Total	102	100%	68	100%

The respondents' answer to the question whether they would change their residence because of employment were for both groups overwhelmingly positive. Czech respondents would be willing to relocate for work in amount of 72% and French respondents even up to 94%.

Table 5. Willingness to change residence for employment (own study)

Willingness to change residence for employment				
Answers	Czech Republic		France	
	Absolute frequency	Relative frequency	Absolute frequency	Relative frequency
Yes	73	72%	64	94%
No	29	28%	4	6%
Total	102	100%	68	100%

To find out how far the respondents are willing to relocate, can be seen, that the same amount of 70% of Czech respondents as well as 70% of French respondents would be willing to relocate even to remote places and even on another continent.

Table 6. The maximum distance to which respondents are willing to move for work (own study)

The maximum distance to which respondents are willing to move for work				
Answers	Czech Republic		France	
	Absolute frequency	Relative frequency	Absolute frequency	Relative frequency
Change the city, but no more than 100 km from the present place of residence	5	5%	2	3%
Not mind to change place of residence but within the home country only	8	8%	9	13%
Not mind to move abroad, but only within the EU	9	9%	8	12%
Not mind to move to far distant or change of continent	51	50%	45	66%
Other answers	29	28%	4	6%
Total	102	100%	68	100%

The option to choose where the respondents want to live and work was preferred by 63% of Czech respondents and 53% of French respondents their home country.

Table 7. Preferred place for living/working (own study)

Preferred place for living/working				
Answers	Czech Republic		France	
	Absolute frequency	Relative frequency	Absolute frequency	Relative frequency
Home country	64	63%	36	53%
Abroad	38	37%	32	47%
<i>Total</i>	<i>102</i>	<i>100%</i>	<i>68</i>	<i>100%</i>

Interesting is also the selection among the countries which respondents in this survey prefer to live (Table 8). Naturally, Czech respondents put at the first position the UK; French respondents put at the first position the Czech Republic.

Table 8. Countries preferred by respondents to live (own study)

Countries in which respondents prefer to live			
Czech Republic		France	
Answers	Absolute frequency	Answers	Absolute frequency
UK	9	CR	9
USA	7	USA	6
Canada	5	UK	4
Austria	3	Australia	3
Sweden	3	Switzerland	3
France	2	Poland	2
Australia	2	Canada	2
Germany	2	Germany	2
Switzerland	2	Austria	1
<i>Total</i>	<i>35</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>32</i>

To the question „Do you think that abroad are better jobs than in the Czech Republic/in France.” Respondents of both nationalities preferred the answer that they do not believe that there are abroad better job opportunities. We have also asked in this question, what countries providing better jobs opportunities. Czechs most often mentioned Germany, French's mentioned Great Britain. Reasons: economic conditions and lower unemployment.

Table 9. Better jobs opportunities in home country or abroad (own study)

Better jobs opportunities in home country or abroad				
Answer	Czech Republic		France	
	Absolute frequency	Relative frequency	Absolute frequency	Relative frequency
In the Czech Republic/France	65	64%	35	51%
Abroad	37	36%	33	49%
<i>Total</i>	<i>102</i>	<i>100%</i>	<i>68</i>	<i>100%</i>

Furthermore, respondents were asked about their optimal working hours. The statutory weekly working time is of 40 hours in the Czech Republic, and 35 hours in France. Significant preferences were not displayed even for one possible answer.

Table 10. Optimal working hours (own study)

Optimal working hours				
Answer	Czech Republic		France	
	Absolute frequency	Relative frequency	Absolute frequency	Relative frequency
Shortened (less than 40 hours per week)	16	16%	20	29%
The possibility of 'Home Office'	27	26%	14	21%
Possibilities of a certain number of days off per year (e.g. Sick days)	29	28%	13	19%
Weekly working hours 40h/35h	30	29%	21	31%
<i>Total</i>	<i>102</i>	<i>100%</i>	<i>68</i>	<i>100%</i>

Within the research questions we focused on the verification of these hypotheses, examining the Gen Y relationships to the work mobility: H1: The preference of living abroad does not depend on the nationality of respondents. H2: The position of the respondents whether they find enough jobs opportunities in their area, is not conditional by population size in city which they live. H3: The willingness to change residence for work is not conditional by population size in city which they live. H4: The fact, that respondents can find enough jobs opportunities in their area, does not depend on the nationality of the respondents. H5: The assumption that respondents can find better work conditions in foreign countries, does not depends on their nationality. H6: Thinking they are abroad better jobs depends on the preference of the respondents live abroad.

Hypothesis 1: The preference of living abroad does not depend on the respondents' nationality

Table 11. Preference of living abroad (own study)

Preference of living abroad	The 2-dimensional table: The observed frequencies (hypotheses) The frequency of labelled cells > 10		
	Nationality (Czechs)	Nationality (French)	Lines (in total)
Home country	64	36	100
Abroad	38	32	70
<i>Total</i>	<i>102</i>	<i>68</i>	<i>170</i>

p -value = 0.20322 > 0.05

We do not reject the hypothesis (H1) of independence: both nationalities of the respondents prefer to live and work in their home country.

Hypothesis 2: The position of the respondents whether they find enough jobs opportunities in their area, is not conditional by population size in city which they live

We reject the hypothesis (H2) of independence; the contingency coefficient = 0.2377517 (the low dependence).

Table 12. Considered opportunity for employment (own study)

The Pivot Table The frequency of labelled cells > 10 (marginal totals are not labelled)			
You live in a city of:	Do you think it is in your area ample opportunity for employment (Yes)	Do you think it is in your area ample opportunity for employment (No)	Lines (in total)
By 1,999 inhabitants	7	6	13
2,000 – 9,999 inhabitants	5	3	8
Population of 10,000 – 99,999	14	17	31
Population of 100,000 – 499,999	63	21	84
More than 500,000 inhabitants	20	14	34
<i>All groups</i>	<i>109</i>	<i>61</i>	<i>170</i>

p -value = 0.03742 < 0.05

Hypothesis 3: The willingness to change residence for work is not conditional by population size in city which they live

According to results in Table 13, we do not reject the hypothesis (H3) of independence.

Table 13. Conditionality of changing work residence and city which respondents live in (own study)

Pivot Table The frequency of labelled cells > 10 (marginal totals are not labelled)			
You live in a city of:	Would you be willing to change your residence for work (Yes)	Would you be willing to change your residence for work (No)	Lines (in total)
By 1,999 inhabitants	8	5	13
2,000 – 9,999 inhabitants	6	2	8
Population of 10,000 – 99,999	25	6	31
Population of 100,000 – 499,999	66	18	84
More than 500,000 inhabitants	32	2	34
<i>All groups</i>	<i>137</i>	<i>33</i>	<i>170</i>

p -value = 0.11748 > 0.05

Hypothesis 4: The fact, that respondents can find enough jobs opportunities in their area, does not depend on the nationality of the respondents

Table 14. Conditionality of finding enough job and nationality of respondents (own study)

Pivot Table The frequency of labelled cells > 10 (Marginal totals are not labelled)			
Do you think that there is ample opportunity for employment in your area?	Nationality (Czech)	Nationality (French)	Lines (in total)
Yes	76	33	109
No	26	35	61
<i>All groups</i>	<i>102</i>	<i>68</i>	<i>170</i>

p -value = 0.00054 < 0.05

We reject the hypothesis (H4) of independence because of the contingency coefficient = 0.2564760 (the low dependence).

Hypothesis 5: The assumption, that respondents can find better work conditions in foreign countries, does not depend on their nationality

Table 15. Conditionality of finding better job and nationality of respondents (own study)

Pivot Table			
The frequency of labelled cells > 10 (Marginal totals are not labelled)			
Nationality	Do you think that you can find better work conditions in foreign countries? (Yes)	Do you think that you can find better work conditions in foreign countries? (No)	Lines (in total)
Czechs	65	37	102
French	35	33	68
All groups	100	70	170

p -value = 0.11172 > 0.05

We do not reject the hypothesis (H5) of independence.

Hypothesis 6: Thinking there are abroad better jobs depend on the preference of the respondents live abroad

Table 16. Finding better job abroad versus home country (own study)

Pivot Table			
The frequency of labelled cells > 10 (marginal totals are not labelled)			
Do you think that abroad are better jobs than in your home country?	If you had to choose where would you like to live and work (Abroad)	If you had to choose where would you like to live and work (Home country)	Lines (in total)
Yes	51	49	100
No	19	51	70
All groups	70	100	170

p -value = 0.00187 < 0.05

We reject the hypothesis (H6) of independence; the contingency coefficient = 0.2320589 (the low dependence).

5. Results and discussion

Respondents have chosen their specialization very rationally, in accordance with the current labor market demand. Czech respondents have preferred economics (38%), information technology (14%) and technical subjects (22%). The French respondents have preferred information technology (18%), economics (15%) and tourism (15%). These are the labour market fields with stable demand for jobs and thus the relatively low risk of unemployment. Characteristic of these fields is that their knowledge and or expertise cannot be tied to a specific country, and allow workers to work abroad.

To increase their competitiveness in the labor market Generation Y have preferred the foreign language learning (priority of English and German language), increasing of their expertise and gaining of foreign work experience. Just 14% of Czech and 15% of French respondents did not find necessary to develop their own know-how. Due to the declared

values of Generation Y, such as leisure time preferences, interests, hobbies and family/friend life before the professional sphere, these results can be surprising.

In the question of whether people see plenty of job opportunities in their area, can be found noticeable difference between French and Czech respondents. Czech respondents can see in amount of 75% them sufficient employment opportunities in their area, while the French respondents positively responded in amount of 49% only. Nearly half of French respondents declare their dissatisfaction with the employment opportunities in their area.

Verbal description of the problem is identical for both nationalities. Respondents state, in particular the labour market saturation, high expectations of employers, combined with very low wages and the lack of job opportunities for graduates. Very high number of respondents is willing to change their place of residence on employment. The 72% Czech respondents agreed with the change of residence, of French respondents even 94%. The question is how fundamental changes are they willing to do. As many as 70% of Czech and French respondents are willing to move outside their country and continent. However, if there will be a chance for appropriate labour conditions, then 63% of Czech and 53% French respondents would have chosen their home country for both work and private life.

Contrary to the previous answer, but both groups of respondents reported that 64% of Czech and 51% of French respondents doesn't believe that there would be better jobs opportunities abroad. From the above data is thus clear that just 9% of Czech respondents would move for the work from the other reasons than simply finding suitable work opportunities. For French respondents it would be 41% of them. The preferences of specific working hours or are not demonstrated in the respondents answers. The variants of working hours as are standard, shortened, home office have received approximately the same number of responses.

Discussion

The face of today's workforce is rapidly changing with four generations working side by side, the Veterans, Baby Boomers, Generation X and now Generation Y and employers cannot ignore the needs, desires and attitudes of this vast generation.

The total population was 10,516,125 in the Czech Republic in 2012. People of Generation Y were represented by the number 2,787,409 which set 26.51% in total Czech population. The total French population currently stands at 65,820,916 inhabitants. French Generation Y is represented by the number 15,122,458, i.e. 22.98% of the total French population (ČSÚ, 2013; Desplats & Pinaud, 2011).

By the research of Families and Work Institute the Generation Y are less work-centric than previous generations, as they do seem to place a higher value on leisure time (*Families and Work Institute, 2002*). Gen Y employees can bring many positive skills and traits to the workforce; however, their motivations and how they engage differ in comparison with older employees (Kim, Knight & Crutsinger, 2009, Jamrog & Stopper, 2002). The evidence suggests that these members of Generation Y are more similar than not to their more seasoned co-workers (Deal, Altman & Rogelberg, 2010; Kowske, Rasch & Wiley, 2010; Real, Mitnick & Maloney, 2010). The quantitative generational differences are much smaller than what we are generally led to believe (Waldrop & Grawitch, 2011). The numerous studies on Generation Y studies concur in the opinion that they are ambitious and goal-orientated, they view work as a means to access a lifestyle and to gain recognition. Millennials are efficient and self-sufficient; they have the power to access information instantly and they rely on this power. The internet provides access to a wealth of information that seems to know no boundaries. This generation prefers to communicate through e-mail text messaging, Twitter and Facebook and would choose webinars and online technology to traditional lecture-based presentations. Online platforms are making relocation more accessible and the spread of ideas

and opportunities of more fluid. Millennials have begun to expect the same level of connectedness, limitless access and control from their professional lives as well as their personal (*Maxwella & Broadbridgeb, 2014; Hauw & Vos, 2010*). Gen Y employees are motivated when given the freedom to work as they please. These employees do not want a manager telling them what to do at every second, but they do desire regular feedback. They prefer a guiding hand to a micromanager. Instead of the previous generation where the career ladder was fuelled by the ability to demonstrate, to concretely prove one's intelligence, knowledge and work ethic, for Generation Y progression has become a question of displaying potential and a willingness to learn.

The findings indicate that job characteristics have a critical mediating role on the relationships for Gen Y employees, suggesting a paradigm shift from passive to active employees who craft their jobs, roles, and selves within a retail organizational context (*Kim, Knight & Crutsinger, 2009*). Crant define proactive behavior exhibited by Gen Y individuals in organizations as occurred in an array of domains; as important because it is linked to many personal and organizational processes and outcomes; and as constrained or prompted through managing context (*Crant, 2000*). Millennials are known for extremely high expectations. By Smola and Sutton findings Millennials' expectations related to job content, career development, training, financial rewards, and job security are affected by generational influences, while their expectations related to work-life balance and social atmosphere are affected by contextual influences (*Smola & Sutton, 2002*).

They believe in their own self-worth and value enough that they're not shy about trying to change the companies they work for. This approach may lead to the disappointment and frustration, because of assumption that the offered jobs are less likely to be associated with GenY self-worth. They want jobs with flexibility, telecommuting options and the ability to go part time or leave the workforce (*Meier & Crocker, 2010; Armour, 2005; Balderrama, 2007*).

There is far more expectation and anticipation in occupying a managerial role at the beginning of a millennials' career than there ever has been from previous generations. Unlike the respectful, authority-bound workers that precede them, Generation Y strives to collaborate, to help create the rules. This generation is driving trends in the workforce including those in global mobility and relocation. This group of individuals is far more likely to relocate for a job opportunity. Trends that employees continue to see Gen Y seek out in a company are that it is goal oriented, values education, embraces multi-tasking and group work, and allows for a well-rounded work/life balance (*Szamosi, 2006; Wheatley, 2012*). To combat the needs of Gen Y, managers can clearly define expectations, provide constant feedback, embrace the value of technology and consider flexible schedules (*Meier & Crocker, 2010*). Gen Y employees are still in their formative years, allowing time for them to develop appropriate work-related habits and skills (*Jamrog & Stopper, 2002*).

6. Conclusions and directions for future research

The paper addresses respondents' preference to find appropriate and adequate evaluate the work opportunities in their own country. Given the current state of the labor market and local job offers that were assessed by respondents as insufficient and unsatisfactory, however, they accept or even they plan the option of relocation or moving for job opportunities. Here can be noted one of the key characteristics of Generation Y, which is a global mobility approach without any physical or informational boundaries or barriers of a particular country or continent.

The direction for future research can be seen in the question searching whether the Generation Y expressed affinity for moving abroad can be expected as to live and work abroad at some point in their lives, or in permanent and irreversible relocation.

References:

- [1] Advertising Age. (1993). *Editorial: Generation Y*. August 30, 1993, p. 16.
- [2] Aite Research Group. (2009). *Engaging Gen Y: Cultivating a New Generation of Banking Customers*. September, 2009, p. 1.
- [3] Armour, S. (2005). Generation Y: They've Arrived at Work with a New Attitude. *USA Today*. (online). [cit. 2015-03-06]. Available at: http://www.usatoday.com/money/workplace/gen-y_x.htm.
- [4] Balderrama, A. (2007). *Generation Y: Too Demanding at Work?* CNN.com. 2007. (online). [cit. 2015-03-06]. Available at: <http://www.cnn.com/2007/LIVING/worklife/12/26/cb.generation/>.
- [5] Constantine, G. (2010). *Tapping into Generation Y: Nine Ways Community Financial Institutions Can Use Technology to Capture Young Customers*. (online). [cit. 2014-11-20]. Available at: https://www.firstdata.com/downloads/thought-leadership/geny_wp.pdf.
- [6] Crant, J. M. (2000). Proactive Organizational Behavior. *Journal of Management*, 26(3), 435–462.
- [7] ČSÚ. (2013). *Počet obyvatel podle pohlaví a jednotek věku: Demografické ročenky 2010–2012 [Population by Age and Sex: Demographic Yearbook 2010–2012]*. (online). [cit. 2014-10-18]. Available at: http://www.czso.cz/csu/redakce.nsf/i/casova_rada_demografie.
- [8] Deal, J. J., Altman, D. G. & Rogelberg, S. G. (2010). Millennials at Work: What We Know and What We Need to Do (If Anything). *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 25, 191–199.
- [9] De Hauw, S. & De Vos, A. (2010). Millennials' Career Perspective and Psychological Contract. Expectations: Does the Recession Lead to Lowered Expectations? *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 25(2), 293–302.
- [10] Desplats, M. & Pinaud, F. (2011). *Manager la génération Y: Travailler avec les 20-30 ans*.
- [11] Families and Work Institute (n.d). (2002). *Generation and Gender in the Workplace. The American Business Collaboration*. (online). [cit. 2015-02-18]. Available at: <http://www.familiesandwork.org/site/research/reports/genandgender.pdf>.
- [12] Fidelity Investments research. (2013). *"The Five Years Later" study*. (online). [cit. 2015-3-21]. Available at: <http://www.fidelity.com/inside-fidelity/individual-investing/fidelity-research-finds-gen-y>.
- [13] Gibson, R. (2013). *Generation Y Demographics*. (online). [cit. 2015-02-18]. Available at: <http://www.generationy.com/demographics/>.
- [14] Hospodařová, I. (2008). *Kreativní management v praxi [Creative Management in Practice]*. Praha: Grada. 130 p. ISBN 978-80-247-1737-1.
- [15] Howe, N. & Strauss, W. (2010). *Generational Archetypes*. In: *Life Course Associates* (online). [cit. 2014-10-23]. Available at: <http://www.lifecourse.com/about/method/generational-archetypes.html>.
- [16] Howe, N. & Strauss, W. (1997). *The Fourth Turning: An American Prophecy*. New York: Broadway Books. ISBN 978-076-7900-461.
- [17] Howe, N. & Strauss, W. (2000). *Millennials Rising: The Next Great Generation*. New York: Vintage Books. 432 p. ISBN 0-375-70719-0.
- [18] Jamrog, J. J. & Stopper, W. J. (2002). The Coming Decade of the Employee. *Human Resource Planning*, 25(3), 5–11.
- [19] Jayson, S. & Puente, M. (2007). *Gen Y Shaped, Not Stopped, by Tragedy*. USA Today. (online). [cit. 2015-3-21]. Available at: http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/news/nation/2007-04-17-millennials_N.htm.
- [20] Javelin Strategy & Research. (2009). *Marketing to Gen Y: New Rules for Engaging and Attracting Younger Customers*. March 2009, 6, 7.
- [21] Kim, H. J., Knight, D. K. & Crutsinger, Ch. (2009). Generation Y Employees' Retail Work Experience: The Mediating Effect of Job Characteristics. *Journal of Business Research* 62, 548–556.
- [22] Kocianová, R. (2012). *Personální řízení: východiska a vývoj [Personnel Management: Starting Points.]*. 2nd Edition. Praha: Grada. 149 p. ISBN 978-80-247-3269-5.
- [23] Kopecký, L. (2013). *Public Relations: dějiny – teorie – praxe [Public Relations: History – Theory – Practice]*. Praha: Grada. 238 s. ISBN 978-80-247-4229-8.

- [24] Kowske, B. J., Rasch, R. & Wiley, J. (2010). Millennials' (Lack of) Attitude Problem: An Empirical Examination of Generational Effects on Work Attitudes. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 25, 265–279.
- [25] Kubátová, J. & Kukulková, A. (2013). *Interkulturní rozdíly v pracovní motivaci generace Y: příklad České republiky a Francie [Intercultural Differences in Working Motivation of Generation Z: Example of Czech Republic]*. Olomouc: Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci. 128 p. ISBN 978-80-244-3961-7.
- [26] Maxwell, G. A. & Broadbridge, A. (2014). Generation Y Graduates and Career Transition: Perspectives by Gender. *European Management Journal*, 32(4), 547–553.
- [27] McCrindle, M. & Wolfinger, E. (2009). *The ABC of XYZ: Understanding the Global Generations*. Sydney: UNSW Press. ISBN 174-22-3035-0.
- [28] Meier, J. & Crocker, M. (2010). Generation Y in the Workforce: Managerial Challenges. *The Journal of Human Resource and Adult Learning*, 6(1), 68–79.
- [29] Real, K., Mitnick, A. D. & Maloney, W. F. (2010). More Similar than Different: Millennials in the U.S. Building Trades. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 25, 303–313.
- [30] Szamosi, L. T. (2006). Just What Are Tomorrow's SME Employees Looking for? *Education + Training*, 2006, 48(8/9), 654–665. ISSN 0040-0912.
- [31] Smola, K. W. & Sutton, Ch. D. (2002). Generational Differences: Revisiting Generational Work Values for the New Millennium. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23, 363–382.
- [32] Twenge, J. (2012). *Millennials: The Greatest Generation or the Most Narcissistic?* *The Atlantic*. [online]. [cit. 2014-10-08]. Available at: <http://www.theatlantic.com/national/archive/2012/05/millennials-the-greatest-generation-or-the-most-narcissistic/256638/>.
- [33] Vysekalová, J. (2011). Chování zákazníka: jak odkrýt tajemství „černé skříňky“ [Behavior of Customer: How to Disclose the Secret of „Black Box“]. Praha: Grada. 356 p. ISBN 978-80-247-3528-3.
- [34] Waldrop, J. S. & Grawitch, M. J. (2011). *Millennials – Who Are They, Really?* (online). [cit. 2015-02-8]. Available at: <http://www.apaexcellence.org/resources/goodcompany/newsletter/article/240>.
- [35] Wheatley, D. (2012). Work-Life Balance, Travel-to-work, and the Dual Career Household. *Personnel Review*, 41(6), 813–831.

Addresses of authors:

Ing. Hana STOJANOVÁ, Ph.D.
Mendel University in Brno
Zemědělská 1
613 00 Brno
Czech Republic
e-mail: hana.stojanova@mendelu.cz

Prof. Ing. Pavel TOMŠÍK, CSc.
Mendel University in Brno
Zemědělská 1
613 00 Brno
Czech Republic
e-mail: tomsik@mendelu.cz

Ing. Eva TESAŘOVÁ
Mendel University in Brno
Zemědělská 1
613 00 Brno
Czech Republic