

Generational Motivation in Sustainable HR Management

Szilárd Malatyinszki, Habil^{1*}

¹ Associate Professor, Dean in Kodolányi János University, Faculty of Economics, address: 25 Rákóczi utca, Székesfehérvár, HU-8000, HUNGARY, malatyinszki.szilard@kodolanyi.hu, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1624-4902>

Associate Professor, in János Neumann University Faculty of Economics Department of Management and Business Law, 10 Izsáki út, Kecskemét HU-BA-6000, HUNGARY, malatyinszki.szilard@nje.hu

Doctoral Supervisor, John von Neumann University Doctoral School of Management and Business Administration, 10 Izsáki út, Kecskemét HU-BA-6000, HUNGARY, malatyinszki.szilard@nje.hu

*Corresponding Author: malatyinszki.szilard@gmail.com

Citation: Habil, S. M. (2025). Generational Motivation in Sustainable HR Management, *Journal of Cultural Analysis and Social Change*, 10(4), 2005-2017. <https://doi.org/10.64753/jcasc.v10i4.3116>

Published: December 10, 2025

ABSTRACT

Today, sustainability extends beyond its traditional environmental and economic interpretations and has become a key issue within human resource management as well. The long-term success and competitiveness of organizations increasingly rely on their ability to retain, develop, and motivate employees, with special emphasis on effectively managing generational differences. This study aims to investigate how the intentional development of managerial tools can support sustainable human resource practices, focusing on the distinct motivational drivers and value systems of various generations—Baby Boomers and Generations X, Y, Z, and Alpha. Worldwide trends show that employees' expectations regarding recruitment, selection, career development, and retention are becoming more diverse. Our research seeks to identify both the divergences and commonalities among these generational groups, as well as the strategies managers can apply to address their heterogeneous needs. To achieve this, the study employs a mixed-methods approach: it combines an extensive literature review with empirical data collection examining managerial motivation practices and their perceived effectiveness. The findings indicate that sustainable HR policy is grounded in the integration of generation-specific motivational techniques into organizational culture, alongside an adaptive, value-oriented reinterpretation of managerial roles. The study's practical relevance lies in its recommendations for developing a managerial toolkit that strengthens intergenerational collaboration and supports the long-term enhancement of employee engagement, satisfaction, and performance.

Keywords: sustainable HRM, generational diversity, employee motivation, managerial tools, organizational culture

JEL: J11, J24, M12, M54, Q01

INTRODUCTION

Today, multiple generations work together in the workplace, with different motivations, values, and work preferences. This diversity poses a challenge for organisations, but it also offers a strategic opportunity to strengthen innovation and knowledge sharing. Human resource sustainability is of paramount importance today, as organisations need to focus not only on short-term performance, but also on employee well-being, development and employability.

In order to properly manage intergenerational differences, the role of managers is becoming increasingly important: flexible work organisation, continuous feedback, psychological security and support for individual career paths all contribute to retention and commitment. If these management tools are not adapted to different expectations, turnover, burnout and knowledge loss may occur.

The aim of this study is to show how the conscious development of management tools can contribute to human resource sustainability through generational motivation management, thereby strengthening organisational resilience and long-term competitiveness.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Human resource sustainability (sustainable HRM) aims to ensure the long-term effectiveness of the organisation and the well-being, health and employability of its employees in a coordinated manner, combining economic, social and ecological dimensions (Ehnert, 2009; Kramar, 2014). The sustainable HRM approach complements traditional human resource management by focusing not only on short-term organisational performance, but also on the long-term preservation and development of employees' value-creating capabilities (Ehnert et al., 2016). The theory emphasises the importance of paradoxical management: the tensions between productivity and well-being goals must be kept in balance (Ehnert, 2009).

Key Concepts and Theoretical Framework

The managerial toolkit is the set of practices that support work organisation, communication, control, recognition, resource development, career and competence development, and work-life balance (Purcell & Hutchinson, 2007). Their conscious and adaptive application is a fundamental prerequisite for HR sustainability, as it directly influences motivation, commitment, burnout and retention (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017).

The Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) model is a central explanatory framework for workplace stress and motivation (Demerouti et al., 2001). According to the model, employee well-being depends on the balance between demands and resources. One of the key roles of management tools is to expand human resources (e.g. autonomy, feedback, support), which have a protective effect against burnout while increasing commitment (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017).

The alignment of organisational value preferences and individual motivations is supported by Schwartz's (2012) value theory, which captures a wide range of individual priorities (e.g. security, performance, self-direction) along universal value categories. Value-aligned leadership communication and recognition systems strengthen psychological fit (Person–Organisation Fit), which, according to numerous studies, is a significant predictor of commitment and turnover (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005).

Aligning the different motivational and value profiles of generations is particularly relevant given that Baby Boomers, Generations X, Y, Z and the soon-to-be-entering Generation Alpha have different socialisation experiences (Pînzaru et al., 2016). At the same time, meta-analyses point out that the impact of intergenerational differences on workplace attitudes is moderate and often mixed with age and career stage effects (Costanza et al., 2012; Rudolph et al., 2018). Therefore, sustainable management practices should focus on individual values, needs and life cycles rather than generational stereotypes.

The measurability and reporting requirements of human capital can be structured according to the ISO 30414 standard, which provides guidance on the organisational-level management of human capital performance indicators (e.g. turnover, training, internal mobility, health indicators) (International Organization for Standardization, 2018). This is complemented by ISO 45003, which summarises the management principles for addressing psychosocial risks, contributing to the sustainable assurance of employee well-being (International Organization for Standardization, 2021).

The literature increasingly recognises that inadequate management of human capital not only carries risks in terms of turnover and health, but also causes a strategic competitive disadvantage (Kramar, 2014; Ehnert et al., 2016). Research suggests that a sustainable HR approach provides a framework for preventing human resource depletion and maintaining employee health (Mariappanadar, 2014).

The impact of leadership practices on motivation and well-being is supported by several motivational and workplace psychology theoretical frameworks. Self-Determination Theory (SDT) is considered a classic because it outlines a clear relationship between intrinsic motivation and the satisfaction of three basic psychological needs: autonomy, competence and relatedness (Ryan & Deci, 2000). This is important in terms of the sustainability of managerial interventions, as an SDT-based leadership style promotes the durability of intrinsic motivation, as opposed to external control mechanisms (Deci et al., 2017).

The Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) **model** is a central explanatory model of workplace stress and commitment. According to this model, high job demands (e.g., time pressure, emotional strain) can lead to burnout, while job resources (e.g., managerial support, feedback, development opportunities) increase motivation and have a protective effect (Demerouti et al., 2001; Bakker & Demerouti, 2017). The key role of managers is not only to manage demands, but also to actively increase protective resources.

Schwartz's value theory provides a fundamental reference point for aligning organisational values and individual preferences (Schwartz, 2012). The model identifies ten universal basic values, the hierarchy of which varies from person to person and influences workplace decisions and organisational fit (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005). Managerial communication and recognition are effective when they take individual value preferences into account — for example, some employees prefer stability, while others prefer self-direction or innovation (Alkhlaifat & Koloszár, 2023)

The theory of **psychological safety** (Edmondson, 1999) places trust and a risk-free learning environment at the heart of teamwork. Psychological safety increases learning behaviour, reduces fear of mistakes and has a positive effect on innovation (Newman et al., 2017). This is particularly relevant in the case of generational diversity, as younger employees typically require more frequent feedback and a supportive, inclusive atmosphere (Pînzaru et al., 2016).

The phenomenon of a **multi-generational workforce** creates new organisational challenges. The Baby Boom, X, Y, Z and upcoming Alpha generations have different technological socialisation and attitudes towards work (Schroth, 2019). However, management literature urges caution: the effects of intergenerational differences on workplace attitudes are moderate (Costanza et al., 2012; Rudolph et al., 2018) and often overlap with the effects of age and career stage. This means that effective management should not tailor its measures solely on the basis of generational categories, but also on the basis of individual preferences, values and life stages (Parry & Urwin, 2011).

The focus on the measurability of human capital in organisations is also supported by standardisation efforts. The ISO 30414 standard provides guidance on reporting human capital, with indicators such as turnover, occupational health and internal mobility (International Organization for Standardization, 2018). ISO 45003 systematises the identification and management of psychosocial risks, with a particular focus on the role of managers (International Organization for Standardization, 2021). These frameworks are important for the development of sustainable, transparent practices (Koloszár, L., Bednárík, É., Erdős, F., Thinakaran, R., & Takáts, A, 2024)

Digital transformation and the spread of hybrid working further complicate the issue of managerial responsibility. Research shows that supporting flexible working increases autonomy and work-life balance, but without proper boundary management, it can lead to increased cognitive load (Chong et al., 2020). The conscious development of leadership tools therefore involves technological, communication and well-being competencies.

Intergenerational cooperation becomes sustainable when management practices integrate the satisfaction of psychological needs (SDT), the management of work environment resources (JD-R), value-based personalisation, and the creation of psychological security. Together, these contribute to organisational resilience, commitment and long-term human resource sustainability.

Generations in the Workplace – Evidence

Changes in the structure of the labour market over the past two decades have led to an increase in multigenerational coexistence in the workplace. Organisations now have Baby Boomers (born 1946–1964), Generation X (1965–1979), Generation Y/Millennials (1980–1994), Generation Z (1995–2009) and the Alpha generation (after 2010) (Schroth, 2019). The sociological basis of the generational concept is that different cohorts, socialised in the same historical and technological contexts, can develop different patterns of values and attitudes (Mannheim, 1952).

However, empirical studies show that the impact of intergenerational differences on workplace attitudes, motivations and performance is moderate and, in many cases, statistically insignificant (Costanza et al., 2012). Meta-analyses also indicate that narratives referring to generational differences are often exaggerated, and that most of the variance is actually explained by differences in age, career stage and individual characteristics (Rudolph et al., 2018). This carries an important message for managers: generational labelling is potentially misleading and can lead to stereotypes (Pankotay, F. M., & Koloszár, 2019).

The Baby Boom generation's attitude towards work is often characterised by loyalty, commitment and a need for stability (Parry & Urwin, 2011). Generation X is often more pragmatic, technologically adaptable and values autonomy (Lyons & Kuron, 2014). For Millennials/Generation Y, opportunities for development, feedback and meaningful work are key motivators (Myers & Sadaghiani, 2010). Generation Z's defining experience is socialisation interwoven with digitalisation, which increases the demand for rapid information processing and short feedback cycles (Schroth, 2019). Workplace research on Generation Alpha is limited at this stage, but predictions suggest that they will have a high dependence on technology and a preference for visual learning (Seemiller & Grace, 2019).

In terms of workplace attitudes, it has been repeatedly confirmed that generational differences only explain a small proportion of the variations in areas such as work performance, commitment or value preferences (Costanza et al., 2012). According to a critical review from 2018, generational comparisons are often distorted by methodological errors (different data sources, surveys conducted at different times) (Rudolph et al., 2018). This

highlights the need to consider the interaction between cohort, age and period effects when analysing generational phenomena (Costanza & Finkelstein, 2015).

In organisational practice, however, generational diversity is relevant because it can entail different levels of technological maturity, communication preferences and feedback needs (Myers & Sadaghiani, 2010). At the same time, research shows that individual value hierarchies — such as preferences for performance, security or self-direction — are stronger predictors of workplace behaviour than generational affiliation (Schwartz, 2012).

Managing a multigenerational workplace is particularly important due to labour shortages, an ageing population and the need for knowledge transfer (Eurofound, 2015). Key elements of the management toolkit include mentoring, knowledge sharing and flexible career planning, which promote intergenerational learning (Bencsik et al., 2016).

Intergenerational cooperation is effective when managers consciously manage communication differences, promote psychological safety and mitigate conflicts arising from stereotypes (Edmondson, 1999). This is consistent with diversity management theory, which states that well-managed diversity is an innovation advantage (Shen et al., 2009).

Generational differences exist, but they are not radical. Sustainable leadership is based on a personalised, value-based toolkit tailored to each stage of life, which reduces the risk of stereotypes and strengthens cooperation, retention and learning.

The Relationship between Management Tools and HR Sustainability

Managers play a key role in human resource sustainability as they directly influence employee motivation, well-being, commitment and workplace experience (Purcell & Hutchinson, 2007). According to the literature, managers are the "implementers" of HR practices, shaping perceptions and the organisational climate related to human capital (Bos-Nehles et al., 2013), so developing their toolkit is the basis for sustainable HRM (Erdős, F., Thinakaran, R., Firuza, B., & Koloszár, L., 2025)

A prerequisite for human resource sustainability is the protection and expansion of workplace resources, as described by the Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) model (Demerouti et al., 2001). Managers can influence both demands (e.g., workload, priorities) and resources (support, feedback, learning), which reduces burnout and increases commitment (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017; Schaufeli, 2017).

Psychological safety is a key element: it promotes open communication about mistakes, risk-taking and learning (Edmondson, 1999). This creates an inclusive climate in multigenerational teams (Newman et al., 2017), while empathy and respectful communication strengthen innovation and collective learning (Carmeli et al., 2010).

Flexible work arrangements and support for hybrid and home-based work increase autonomy, which is a fundamental psychological need (Ryan & Deci, 2000). In contrast, micromanagement weakens intrinsic motivation (Deci et al., 2017). Control over work improves work-life balance, thereby strengthening retention (Chong et al., 2020).

Continuous feedback and recognition develop a sense of competence, strengthen organisational identity and reduce turnover (Aguinis, 2019). Generations Y and Z in particular need feedback that supports their development (Myers & Sadaghiani, 2010).

Skill development and internal mobility are the basis of organisational resilience (Van den Broek et al., 2021): they reduce burnout and increase retention (Aguinis & Kraiger, 2009).

The effectiveness of the management toolkit is reinforced by the **ISO 30414** and **ISO 45003** standards, which promote the transparent management of human capital and psychosocial risks (International Organisation for Standardisation, 2018; 2021).

According to diversity management theory, managers play a key role in integrating diverse groups. Inclusive practices – participation, openness, acceptance – increase team performance, while stereotypical leadership can lead to conflict (Shen et al., 2009; Rudolph et al., 2018).

The conscious development of leadership tools therefore contributes to HR sustainability through several mechanisms:

- Resource expansion (JD-R),
- Satisfaction of psychological needs (SDT),
- Creating an inclusive climate (psychological safety),
- Career development and increased employability,
- Harnessing innovation from diversity.

The combined application of these measures reduces turnover in the long term, mitigates burnout, increases productivity, and promotes the development of sustainable workplace ecosystems.

Results of Secondary Analysis

Based on a review of the secondary literature, it can be concluded that the conscious development of management tools has a positive impact on many dimensions of human resource sustainability, particularly in the areas of employee well-being, commitment, retention, employability and innovation. Five main themes emerged from the thematic analysis: (1) expanding workplace resources, (2) flexible working and work-life balance, (3) psychological safety and an inclusive climate, (4) continuous feedback and development, and (5) diversity and intergenerational learning.

Expanding Workplace Resources (JD-R Model)

Most of the studies examined are based on the **Job Demands–Resources (JD-R)** model (Demerouti et al., 2001), according to which expanding workplace resources — such as managerial support, autonomy and learning opportunities—reduces the risk of burnout while increasing motivation and commitment (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017; Schaufeli, 2017). Secondary sources consistently emphasise that a lack of resources leads to high turnover, especially among younger generations (Lyons & Kuron, 2014).

Flexible Working and Work-Life Balance

The spread of hybrid and flexible forms of work is one of the most significant responses of organisations to demographic and technological changes. Research shows that flexible working increases the sense of autonomy, thereby promoting intrinsic motivation (Ryan & Deci, 2000) and job satisfaction (Chong et al., 2020). Supporting work-life balance is particularly relevant for Generations Y and Z, who consider it a prerequisite for organisational commitment (Myers & Sadaghiani, 2010). From a sustainable HRM perspective, flexible working can be identified as a protective factor against burnout (Aguinis, 2019).

Psychological Safety and Inclusive Climate

Psychological safety is key to creative behaviour, learning and risk-taking (Edmondson, 1999). The secondary literature consistently shows that respectful communication, an error-free learning environment and leaders who encourage participation contribute to the sustainability of human capital (Newman et al., 2017). A psychologically safe environment is particularly important in heterogeneous, generationally diverse teams where different communication preferences emerge (Bencsik et al., 2016).

Continuous Feedback and Competence Development

The literature emphasises that continuous, constructive feedback increases the sense of competence, supports learning and contributes to maintaining commitment (Aguinis & Kraiger, 2009). This factor is particularly important for younger generations, who are highly motivated to develop and prefer short feedback cycles (Schroth, 2019). Investments in training and development also measurably improve retention and performance (Van den Broek et al., 2021).

Diversity and Intergenerational Learning

According to diversity management theory, the innovation potential arising from diverse perspectives represents a competitive advantage (Shen et al., 2009). Secondary analysis shows that through intergenerational mentoring, knowledge sharing and flexible career planning, organisations are able to meet the life stage-specific needs of their employees (Bencsik et al., 2016). At the same time, generational stereotypes can have a negative impact on team dynamics, which is why an inclusive leadership climate is a critical factor (Rudolph et al., 2018).

Emergent Patterns in the Literature

A comparison of sources reveals three consensus patterns:

- the need for personalisation: the impact of generational differences is small, so a value- and life-cycle-based approach is more effective (Parry & Urwin, 2011);
- well-being as a strategic factor: psychological health has been elevated to a strategic level, as reflected in the ISO 45003 standard (International Organisation for Standardisation, 2021);
- Employability as a sustainability indicator: competence development and internal mobility are key to retaining human capital (Van den Broek et al., 2021).

METHODOLOGY, DATA SOURCES

The study was based on an **explanatory-descriptive, cross-sectional** design, in which we combined primary questionnaire data collection with a systematic secondary literature review. The operationalisation of the variables was based on **Self-Determination Theory (SDT)** (Ryan and Deci, 2000), the **Job Demands–Resources (JD–R) model** (Demerouti et al., 2001; Bakker and Demerouti, 2017), **psychological safety** (Edmondson, 1999) and

Schwartz's theory of values (Schwartz, 2012). The conceptual framework for measuring and reporting HR sustainability was guided by the **ISO 30414 (2018)** and **ISO 45003 (2021)** recommendations.

Sampling and Recruitment

The primary survey was conducted using **non-probability, convenience** sampling among Hungarian employees and managers via online channels. The total sample **size** was **$N \approx 147$** , with a generational distribution covering the Baby Boomer, X, Y (Millennial) and Z cohorts (cohort boundaries followed the conventions in the literature; see Schroth, 2019). The purpose of the sampling was to explore **comparative patterns**, not to make population-level estimates; accordingly, the results are suitable **for analytical generalisation** but limited in terms of statistical generalisation (Costanza et al., 2012; Rudolph et al., 2018).

The questionnaire contained closed (Likert 1–7) and open items in four blocks:

1. **Motivational and incentive preferences** (e.g., pay, flexible working, recognition, development; SDT- and JD–R-aligned items).
2. **Management practices** (frequency of feedback, flexibility in the use of tools, generational sensitivity, signs of psychological safety).
3. **Workplace outcomes** (satisfaction, enthusiasm/engagement indicators, intention to change jobs).
4. **Open question** on "applicable incentive tools" (qualitative categorisation).

Demographic variables: **age/cohort, gender, position (manager/non-manager), sector, company size**, and work organisation characteristics (e.g. home office option).

Procedure and Data Collection

Data collection was conducted using an **online self-completion** form (general questionnaire platform). Responses were **voluntary and anonymous**; participants were provided with a brief data management information sheet and a description of the purpose of the survey. The typical completion time was ~ 10 –15 minutes. The sample included both **managers** and **employees**, allowing for analysis of managerial tools and employee perceptions **from two** perspectives.

Data Cleaning and Analysis Strategy

During data cleaning, missing values were handled item by item (listwise/pairwise approach depending on the analysis), and extreme outliers were excluded after content verification.

In addition to descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation, distributions), we performed group comparisons (differences by generation). We coded the responses to the open-ended questions using thematic content analysis (inductive category formation, double coding principle) and summarised them using proportions/frequencies.

We used the interpretative framework of SDT, JD-R and psychological safety indicators as a theoretical anchor (Ryan and Deci, 2000; Demerouti et al., 2001; Edmondson, 1999). We interpreted the intergenerational comparison with caution, given the meta-analytic evidence indicating moderate effects and cautioning against confounding with age/career stage effects (Costanza et al., 2012; Rudolph et al., 2018; Parry and Urwin, 2011).

The internal consistency of the scales should be checked using classic indicators (e.g., Cronbach's α); this chapter describes the procedure, and numerical indicators are provided by a re-run analysis of the primary data file. Content validity was ensured through theoretical mapping (SDT, JD–R, psychological security), while construct validity was ensured by examining the convergence of converging items.

The research was conducted in accordance with ethical principles: voluntary participation, anonymous responses, and the right to withdraw at any time. Data management: GDPR-compliant, we reported only at an aggregate level and did not collect any data that could be used for identification. Summary of data sources

1. **Primary Source:** Our own questionnaire survey "Generational Motivation Management" (2025), **$N \approx 147$** , online self-completion; quantitative (Likert) and qualitative (open-ended questions) items.
2. **Secondary Sources:** Theoretical and empirical literature on HR sustainability, motivation and generational differences: **SDT** (Ryan and Deci, 2000), **JD–R** (Demerouti et al., 2001; Bakker and Demerouti, 2017), **psychological safety** (Edmondson, 1999), **Schwartz values** (Schwartz, 2012), **generational evidence and critiques** (Lyons and Kuron, 2014; Costanza et al., 2012; Rudolph et al., 2018; Parry and Urwin, 2011; Schroth, 2019), and **ISO 30414/45003** frameworks (International Organisation for Standardisation, 2018; 2021).

Methodological Limitations

Due to convenience sampling and cross-sectional design, causal conclusions **are limited**, and generational differences may be confounded by **age/career stage** effects (Costanza et al., 2012; Rudolph et al., 2018). Coding open-ended questions requires **qualitative judgement**; reproducibility should be increased through double coding

and a code book. Detailed indicators of the reliability of scale results can be provided by re-running the primary data.

Results of our Primary Research

Today, it is typical for multiple generations to work together in the workplace, and different age groups represent different values, motivational needs, and work styles (TeamGuide, 2023). This study examines generational differences in motivational and incentive preferences, differences in management practices, and generational workplace satisfaction and output indicators. We also look at the motivation and incentive management of managers by age group and how each generation experiences the use of organisational incentive tools. Finally, we analyse what incentive tools each generation would prefer if they were free to decide on their introduction. The conclusions may contribute to the development of management tools, with particular regard to incentive management tailored to the needs of different generations.

Motivation and Incentive Preferences by Generation

Both the survey results and the literature point to significant differences in what motivates each generation in the workplace. Members of Generation X (approx. 1965–1979) were socialised in a stable, predictable environment and value clear structures, secure, stable jobs and traditional benefits (TeamGuide, 2023; Kőműves et al., 2023). They are often characterised by loyalty and discipline, and they value compliance with company rules and status within the hierarchy (HR Portál, 2010). Competitive pay plays a key role in their motivation – according to research, Generation X still has a "salary man" attitude and values financial recognition and status (HR Portal, 2010). However, according to their own , many are only moderately satisfied with the ratio of their salary to their performance (respondents rated the proportionality of their salary to their performance at an average of ~4.25 on a scale of 1 to 7). At the same time, job stability is one of the most important motivating factors for Generation X employees – on average, they rated the importance of a secure, long-term job as 5.7 (on a scale of 7). This is consistent with the fact that Generation X employees are generally more loyal and less prone to frequent job changes than younger employees (Kőműves et al., 2023).

In contrast, Generation Y (Millennials, born between approximately 1980 and 1995) grew up in an era of rapid change and digitalisation, which shaped their motivational preferences. Personal development and career advancement opportunities are particularly important to them: in the survey, 57% of Generation Y respondents strongly agreed that promotion and professional advancement strongly motivate them (average score of 6.0 out of 7). In addition, they want to enjoy their workplace and expect modern, flexible working conditions (HR Portal, 2010). Members of Generation Y greatly value freedom and work-life balance – based on their responses, they rated flexible working hours and the possibility of remote working at an average of 6.1–6.3 in terms of motivation (on a scale of 7). Continuous feedback and recognition are also important motivators for them. According to the survey, 30% of Generation Y respondents mentioned in an open-ended question that they would welcome non-financial recognition or team membership (e.g. public praise, community experiences) as incentives. At the same time, Millennial employees also demand competitive salaries: although salary is not always the primary motivation for younger generations, according to domestic research, members of Generations Y and Z can be motivated more than their older counterparts with higher salaries and good working conditions (Kőműves et al., 2023). In our survey, more than a third of Y respondents mentioned financial incentives (salary, bonuses) as their preferred tool. Generation Y therefore expects autonomy and flexible conditions, but also security and support – they want to shape their jobs to suit their own lifestyles (HR Portál, 2010; TeamGuide, 2023). An important difference is that the unconditional loyalty characteristic of previous generations is lacking in Generation Y: they are less loyal and are quick to move on if their expectations are not met or if they receive a better offer (HR Portal, 2010). This is supported by the survey: Generation Y agrees on average at a level of 2.73 with the statement that they "are considering changing jobs within six months" (for Generation X, this is 2.67, while for Generation Z it is much higher, at 3.66). In other words, younger people are more willing to change jobs and less loyal, which is an important consideration when developing motivational strategies.

Generation Z (those born after 1996) has grown up entirely in a digitalised, "instant" world. They reject rigid rules and hierarchies, demanding quick feedback, personalised communication and a high degree of flexibility instead. Good working conditions and appreciation play a prominent role in their motivation. A 2024 domestic study found that for Generation Z, an above-average working environment, work-life balance, and continuous encouragement and recognition are significantly more important than for older generations (Kőműves et al., 2023). In our survey, Generation Z respondents also rated the role of flexibility very highly, with an average score of nearly 5.9 indicating that flexible working arrangements increase their motivation, and an average score of 4.9 indicating that it is important for them to be able to choose where they work (e.g. home office). Interestingly, however, the youngest respondents are slightly less attached to working from home than Generations X and Y: while Boomers and Gen Xers rated the importance of location-independent work almost at the maximum (average

6.5 and 5.6, respectively), Generation Z rated it at 4.9 on average. This may suggest that many members of Generation Z take digital work opportunities for granted or, as career starters, are looking for the community office experience. However, the most important incentive for them is a competitive base salary. Several studies have shown that salary is one of the most important factors for Generation Z in the labour market (), even more so than for older generations (Kórmúves et al., 2023). In the open-ended question of our survey, nearly 60% of Generation Z respondents mentioned financial incentives (salary increases, bonuses, financial benefits) as the primary tool to motivate themselves or their team. In addition, Gen Zers would welcome opportunities for development and training: 21% mentioned incentives of this kind (e.g. further training, career path assurance). However, they placed less emphasis on public praise or team building (only ~14% mentioned this), which suggests that although recognition is important to them (Kórmúves et al., 2023), they expect it in the form of specific feedback and financial advancement rather than formal certificates of recognition or celebrations. Generation Z's motivation is determined by quick successes, competitive pay and work-life balance – and if they do not get these, they are extremely mobile and easily change jobs (Kórmúves et al., 2023). Indeed, they are the least afraid of losing their jobs, so this factor does not bind them to an employer (they are less demotivated by the fear of losing their jobs) (Kórmúves et al., 2023).

Generational Differences in Management Practices

The different generational backgrounds of managers are reflected not only in their own motivations, but also in their leadership styles and practices. It is important to emphasise that employees from different generations also require different leadership approaches, so managers need to take these differences into account in order to lead effectively.

Generation X managers have mostly become leaders within traditional corporate structures, so they tend to have a more formal, hierarchical approach. They set clear goals, expectations and responsibilities, and in return expect the same from their superiors. Stability and predictability are important to Generation X leaders, and they strive to create this within their own teams, often employing a controlling but empathetic leadership style. According to our survey data, members of Generation X rated giving regular feedback on their colleagues' performance at a moderately high level (average agreement of 5.2), which suggests that they pay attention to formal evaluation. However, they are relatively less likely to consciously differentiate between generations in the incentives they use – they only agreed with the statement "I pay attention to the fact that different generations need different incentives" at a level of ~5.1 (while younger managers agreed much more). Generation X managers largely use conservative incentive management tools: they are less likely to feel that they can use flexible, innovative tools (only 4.0 on average agreed that "I have the opportunity to use flexible incentive tools"). This may also be related to the fact that they feel that the organisation does not provide clear guidelines for incentive management – Generation X respondents were less satisfied with the organisational framework (average satisfaction with the incentive system was 3.9). At the same time, the strength of Generation X managers lies in their reliability and consistency: in the eyes of their subordinates, they represent "experienced stability", demanding respect but in return being loyal to their team. Generation X managers tend to have a more controlling (autocratic) style, but with sufficient experience, they can become more empathetic. As subordinates, Generation X also requires personal, human contact with their boss, but within clear boundaries (TeamGuide, 2023).

Generation Y leaders are already advocates of coaching and flexibility. According to their own admissions, it is important for them to play a supportive, developmental role. In the survey, a remarkably high proportion of managers under the age of 40 (Generation Y and younger) agreed that "it motivates them to contribute to the development of their colleagues" (the average score for Generation Y respondents was 5.98 on a 7-point scale, compared to 5.66 for Generation X). They find joy in the success of their team – Y leaders rated "the success of my team motivates me the most" at 6.0, which is higher than the rating given by older leaders. Coaching or democratic leadership styles are particularly effective in their case: Y leaders typically give their subordinates autonomy, involve them in decisions, and at the same time help them with regular feedback (TeamGuide, 2023). The survey data reflect this: Generation Y respondents most strongly agreed with "giving regular feedback" (average 5.44) and "willingly using new forms of motivation if it increases team performance" (5.66). This suggests that younger managers are more open to innovative incentive tools than their older colleagues. In addition, they are more aware of generational differences: Y leaders strongly agreed (5.7) that it is worth motivating employees from different generations in different ways – that is, they flexibly change their leadership tools depending on the composition of the team. On the employee side, Generation Y also demands this type of leadership: they expect managers to lead them with a flexible, partnership-based approach, ensuring "freedom within boundaries". Continuous development and training are important to them, so managers who mentor them and offer career paths can elicit greater commitment from them. At the same time, Generation Y managers may also face challenges: they are often at the middle management level in the current workplace hierarchy, and many of them feel that their room for manoeuvre is limited. According to our survey, Generation Y respondents feel below average that they

"have room for manoeuvre in motivating their colleagues" (only ~3.96 on a scale of 1-7) and they strongly feel that certain tools for motivating their teams are lacking (they agreed with this statement at a level of 5.1, which, since it is reverse coded, means that the majority of them really do feel that effective motivational tools are lacking). This frustration may indicate that Y leaders would like to innovate, but do not always receive enough support from above to do so. As one respondent put it, "A day off could be an incentive, but it's not an option at all for us" – in other words, even if they see flexible rewards as effective, they are useless if the organisational framework is rigid.

Generation Z is still young in leadership roles – even the oldest members of Generation Z are just entering the labour market at the management level. At the same time, some are already trying their hand at start-ups as project managers. They prefer a "partnership-based, democratic approach". Generation Z leaders (or future leaders) place their trust in their colleagues, while "always being ready to support them" – this is a new dimension of coaching, where the leader is more of a facilitator. Although few respondents in this age group identified themselves as leaders in the survey, those who did reported that they consider the motivation and commitment of their colleagues to be very important. Generation Z leaders agreed with an average score of 5.83 that they "are happy to use various incentive tools to keep their colleagues motivated" and rated "the development and success of the team motivates them most as leaders" at 5.67. This puts them practically on par with Generation Y leaders in this regard. It seems that the youngest leaders are extremely open to new methods and tools and place great emphasis on the satisfaction of their team – they consider a positive team atmosphere to be even more important than financial incentives. Interestingly, they are the ones who feel most strongly that the organisation provides an appropriate framework for incentive management (Generation Z leaders agreed with this statement with an average score of 5.33, while Generation X and baby boomer leaders scored only around 4.0). This may indicate that young managers mostly work in modern organisations where the creative use of incentives is already common practice (e.g. tech companies, start-ups), or they simply view the situation more optimistically. As employees, Generation Z has a clear expectation of a "partner" leader: they do not accept an autocratic style, they want fast, honest communication and space for their own ideas. The leader who will be successful with them is one who gives them trust and does not micromanage (TeamGuide, 2023), while always providing support when needed.

In management practice, generational differences are reflected in the way managers give feedback, how flexibly they handle incentives, and how well they align their management style with the needs of their subordinates. While older managers tend to try to motivate everyone in the same way (and take less account of individual or generational characteristics), younger managers consciously use personalised, generation-specific motivational tools. The communication style between generations also differs: Generation X is more inclined towards formal, written or hierarchical communication, while Generations Y and Z prefer fast, direct and informal communication (e.g. chat, instant feedback). Therefore, leadership training now focuses on how leaders can adapt to different generations and use flexible styles within their teams (TeamGuide, 2023).

RESULTS AND FINDINGS

Based on a sample of 147 people, the common laws of motivation and retention (meaningful work, fair and transparent rewards, flexibility, opportunities for development, visible recognition) apply to **all** generations, but **the weight** of each element differs. The picture is more about "differences in emphasis" than radically different needs. This is good news: the toolkit is fundamentally the same, it just needs to be fine-tuned.

Interpreting Generational Patterns

Generation X: Strongly security- and system-oriented. The high demand for stability and the importance of financial incentives are logical, but the moderate assessment of the wage-performance ratio is a source of tension. In other words, it is not the type of tool that is lacking, but a **transparent, consistent mechanism**.

Generation Y: Characterised by a "dual desire": **career + freedom**. They want advancement and flexible frameworks at the same time, while their willingness to change is noticeable. Their need for feedback and recognition is not a "nicety" but a **performance requirement**. If middle managers have little room for manoeuvre, commitment quickly evaporates.

Generation Z: Strong **wage realism** (money as a prerequisite for entry), accompanied by **rapid learning cycles** and personalised development. The lower valuation of home office is not a contradiction: for many of them, **community learning** and visible feedback are important as they start their careers. High enthusiasm + high mobility = high **retention risk** if the package is not well put together.

Based on the research, there are clear generational differences between leadership styles. Y and Z leaders tend to follow a coaching approach: they are flexible and open to new incentives, but often encounter organisational constraints that can stifle innovation. Generation X leaders, on the other hand, are advocates of stability and

predictability – this is a value, but if it is not accompanied by flexibility and targeted recognition, it can cause a lack of motivation among younger employees. In terms of satisfaction and loyalty, Generations Z and Y are more enthusiastic but more mobile, while Generation X is less mobile but more loyal. Loyalty is reinforced not by good morale, but by fair, transparent and flexible systems. The sense of recognition differs from generation to generation: Y and Z employees require more frequent feedback, while Generation X expects more formal, status-based recognition. Middle managers, especially Generation Y managers, often work with limited authority, even though they are key players in retention. However, without flexible tools and decision-making leeway, they cannot respond effectively to the diverse needs of their teams.

Opportunities for Leadership Utilisation

Portfolio thinking, not "one big button". Base layer: for everyone: clear salary principle + transparent performance-based pay. Personalised modules: flexible working hours/workspace, development framework, regular recognition rituals, extra days off, team experiences – combined on an individual basis.

- **Empowering Middle Managers:** provide a framework and a budget: annual team incentive budget (money + "experience"), mini-bonus authority, fast approval process. This allows managers to respond to signals in a timely manner.
- **Feedback Architecture: Y/Z:** more frequent, short-cycle check-ins (every 2–4 weeks) with specific competency goals. X: quarterly structured assessment, linking corporate and individual goals.
- **Development and Internal Mobility as Retention Tools:** Visible career path + mentoring programme + "project rotation" for Z/Y. Role clarification, status confirmation, expert careers for X.
- **Recognition, but "Translated into Language": Z:** immediate, specific micro-recognition (task level). Y: public recognition + career-related rewards. X: formal gestures recognising status and responsibility.

Qualitative Assessment of Our Research

Based on the results of the research, it can be said that the primary data and the secondary theoretical framework are consistent with each other: the triple logic of SDT–JD–R–psychological safety explains the patterns revealed well. The combination of closed and open questions allowed for a multifaceted interpretation of the data, as it provided both proportional statistical comparison and narrative depth to explore respondent preferences. However, the research also has its limitations. Due to convenience and cross-sectional sampling, causal relationships can only be established to a limited extent, and generational effects may be confounded with factors related to life stage and career phase. Due to the low number of Boomers in the sample, the conclusions that can be drawn from this are only indicative. In future research, it would be worthwhile to demonstrate the reliability of the scales (e.g. Cronbach's α) in detail and to apply multivariate controls (e.g. industry, company size) in order to refine the interpretation.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The results of the primary research highlight that although the incentive and motivation preferences of different generations differ, the basic needs – fair remuneration, opportunities for development, flexible working and visible recognition – are common to all age groups. The differences are more evident in the weighting and combination of individual tools and in the form of recognition. For **Generation X**, stability and predictability remain the main motivating factors, while for **Generation Y**, career development, opportunities for growth and regular feedback are of paramount importance. For **Generation Z**, competitive base pay, personalised development and immediate feedback are the key factors.

In terms of management practices, there are marked differences between **Generation X managers**, who represent a more directive, structured style, and **Generation Y and Z managers**, who take a more flexible, coaching approach. The latter are more open to new methods and digital tools, but in many cases they face organisational constraints and a lack of room for manoeuvre at middle management level, which hinders the effectiveness of incentive management. This can be particularly frustrating for Generation Y, who are sensitive to a lack of decision-making autonomy.

From the perspective of maintaining human resource sustainability, it is crucial to consciously expand workplace resources, create **psychological security**, and offer personalised career planning. This requires **an incentive architecture** that combines financial and non-financial elements, enables rapid management response, and is sensitive to the expectations of different generations.

Recommendations:

1. Develop a **transparent performance-based reward system** to increase the sense of fairness.
2. Provide **decentralised incentive frameworks** for managers, with mini-bonuses or experience frameworks.
3. Introduce **frequent, short feedback cycles** with generation-specific communication.
4. **Make career paths visible** with mentoring and project rotation opportunities.
5. **Develop a recognition protocol** that takes into account the value preferences and communication styles of different cohorts.

Together, these measures can contribute to increasing employee satisfaction and commitment, reducing turnover, and creating a sustainable, resilient, and cross-generational workplace ecosystem.

REFERENCES

- Aguinis, H. & Kraiger, K. (2009) 'Benefits of training and development for individuals and teams, organisations, and society', *Annual Review of Psychology*, 60, pp. 451–474.
- Aguinis, H. & O'Boyle, E. (2014) 'Star performers in twenty-first-century organisations', *Personnel Psychology*, 67(2), pp. 313–350.
- Aguinis, H. (2019) *Performance management for dummies*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Alfes, K., Shantz, A., Truss, C. & Soane, E. (2013) 'Linking perceived HRM practices, employee engagement and individual performance', *Human Resource Management Journal*, 23(2), pp. 157–174.
- Alkhlaifat, O. K., & Koloszár, L. (2023). The effectiveness of lean management applying process: Case study on Jordan Electricity Distribution Company. *International Journal of Productivity and Quality Management*, 38(4), 464. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJPQM.2023.130185>
- Bakker, A.B. & Demerouti, E. (2017) 'Job Demands–Resources Theory: Taking Stock and Looking Forward', *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 22(3), pp. 273–285.
- Bencsik, A., Horváth-Csikós, G. & Juhász, T. (2016) 'Y and Z Generations at Workplaces', *Journal of Competitiveness*, 8(3), pp. 90–106.
- Bos-Nehles, A.C., Van Riemsdijk, M.J. & Looise, J.K. (2013) 'Employee perceptions of line management performance: applying the AMO theory', *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 24(4), pp. 749–770.
- Carmeli, A., Reiter-Palmon, R. & Ziv, E. (2010) 'Inclusive leadership and employee involvement in creative tasks in the workplace: The mediating role of psychological safety', *Creativity Research Journal*, 22(3), pp. 250–260.
- Chong, S., Huang, Y. & Chang, C.-H. (2020) 'Supporting interdependent telework employees: A moderated–mediation model linking daily COVID-19 task setbacks to next-day work withdrawal', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 105(12), pp. 1408–1422.
- Collings, D.G., Mellahi, K. & Cascio, W.F. (2019) 'Global talent management and performance in multinational enterprises', *Journal of World Business*, 54(4), 100–113.
- Costanza, D.P. & Finkelstein, L.M. (2015) 'Generationally based differences in the workplace: Is there a there there?', *Industrial and Organisational Psychology*, 8(3), pp. 308–323.
- Costanza, D.P., Badger, J.M., Fraser, R.L., Severt, J.B. & Gade, P.A. (2012) 'Generational differences in work-related attitudes: A meta-analysis', *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 27(4), pp. 375–394.
- Crawford, E.R., Lepine, J.A. & Rich, B.L. (2010) 'Linking job demands and resources to employee engagement and burnout', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(5), pp. 834–848.
- Deci, E.L. and Ryan, R.M. (2000) 'The "What" and "Why" of Goal Pursuits: Human Needs and the Self-Determination of Behaviour', *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), pp. 227–268.
- Deci, E.L., Olafsen, A.H. & Ryan, R.M. (2017) 'Self-Determination Theory in work organisations', *Annual Review of Organisational Psychology and Organisational Behaviour*, 4, pp. 19–43.
- Deloitte (2024) *Global Gen Z and Millennial Survey*. Deloitte Insights. Available at: <https://www2.deloitte.com/> (Downloaded: 24 October 2025).
- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A.B., Nachreiner, F. & Schaufeli, W.B. (2001) 'The Job Demands–Resources model of burnout', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), pp. 499–512.
- Edmondson, A. (1999) 'Psychological safety and learning behaviour in work teams', *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44(2), pp. 350–383.
- Ehnert, I. (2009) *Sustainable Human Resource Management: A Conceptual and Exploratory Analysis*. Berlin: Springer.
- Ehnert, I., Harry, W. & Zink, K.J. (eds.) (2016) *Sustainability and Human Resource Management: Developing Sustainable Business Organisations*. Berlin: Springer.

- Eurofound (2015) *New forms of employment*. Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg.
- Erdős, F., Thinakaran, R., Firuza, B., & Koloszár, L. (2025). The Rise of AI in Tourism—A Systematic Literature Review. *Geojournal of Tourism and Geosites*, 60(2 supplement), 1254–1265. <https://doi.org/10.30892/gtg.602spl22-1498>
- Francis, T. and Hoefel, F. (2018) 'True Gen: Generation Z and its Implications for Companies', McKinsey & Company (Insights).
- Gartner (2023) *Future of Work Trends*. Gartner Research Note. Available at: <https://www.gartner.com/> (Downloaded: 24 October 2025).
- Hackman, J.R. & Oldham, G.R. (1976) 'Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory', *Organizational Behaviour and Human Performance*, 16(2), pp. 250–279.
- Harter, J.K., Schmidt, F.L. & Hayes, T.L. (2002) 'Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, engagement, and performance', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(2), pp. 268–279.
- Herzberg, F. (2003) 'One More Time: How Do You Motivate Employees?', *Harvard Business Review*, 81(1), pp. 87–96. (Originally: 1968, *HBR* 46, pp. 53–62.) Available at: <https://hbr.org/2003/01/one-more-time-how-do-you-motivate-employees> (Downloaded: 24 October 2025).
- Hofstede, G. (2001) *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviours, Institutions, and Organisations Across Nations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- HR Portal (2010) 'How can members of different generations be motivated?' Available at: <https://www.hrportal.hu/hr/hogyan-motivalhatoak-a-kulonbozo-generaciok-tagjai-20100804.html> (Downloaded: 24 October 2025).
- International Organization for Standardization (2018) *ISO 30414: Human resource management — Guidelines for internal and external human capital reporting*. Geneva: ISO.
- International Organization for Standardization (2021) *ISO 45003: Psychological health and safety at work — Guidelines for managing psychosocial risks*. Geneva: ISO.
- Koloszár, L., Bednárík, É., Erdős, F., Thinakaran, R., & Takáts, A. (2024). User experience testing methods: Conclusions from the literature. *Edelweiss Applied Science and Technology*, 8(5), Article 5. <https://doi.org/10.55214/25768484.v8i5.1843>
- Kőműves, Z., et al. (2023) 'Analysis of generational differences in the competitive sector'. Available at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/373660113_GENERACIOS_KULONBSEGEK_ELEMZESE_A_VERSENYSZFERABAN (Downloaded: 24 October 2025).
- Kramar, R. (2014) 'Beyond strategic human resource management: is sustainable human resource management the next approach?', *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 25(8), pp. 1069–1089.
- Kristof-Brown, A.L., Zimmerman, R.D. & Johnson, E.C. (2005) 'Consequences of individuals' fit at work: A meta-analysis of person–job, person–organisation, person–group, and person–supervisor fit', *Personnel Psychology*, 58(2), pp. 281–342.
- Kuvaas, B. (2006) 'Work performance, affective commitment, and work motivation: The roles of pay administration and pay level', *Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, 27(3), pp. 365–385.
- Lepak, D.P. & Snell, S.A. (2002) 'Examining the human resource architecture: The relationships among human capital, employment, and HR configurations', *Journal of Management*, 28(4), pp. 517–543.
- London, M. & Smither, J.W. (1995) 'Can multi-source feedback change perceptions of goal accomplishment, self-evaluations, and performance-related outcomes?', *Personnel Psychology*, 48(4), pp. 803–839.
- Lyons, S.T. & Kuron, L.K.J. (2014) 'Generational differences in the workplace: A review of the evidence and directions for future research', *Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, 35(S1), pp. S139–S157.
- Lyons, S.T. and Kuron, L.K.J. (2014) 'Generational Differences in the Workplace: A Review of the Evidence and Directions for Future Research', *Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, 35(S1), pp. S139–S157.
- Mannheim, K. (1952) *Essays on the Sociology of Knowledge*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Mariappanadar, S. (2014) 'Sustainable human resource management: The sustainable and harmful impacts of human resources practices on people and the environment', *Journal of Business Ethics*, 119(1), pp. 13–35.
- Myers, K.K. & Sadaghiani, K. (2010) 'Millennials in the workplace: A communication perspective on millennials' organisational relationships and performance', *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 25(2), pp. 225–238.
- Newman, A., Donohue, R. & Eva, N. (2017) 'Psychological safety: A systematic review of the literature', *Human Resource Management Review*, 27(3), pp. 521–535.
- Ng, E.S.W., Schweitzer, L. and Lyons, S.T. (2010) 'New Generation, Great Expectations: A Field Study of the Millennial Generation', *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 25(2), pp. 281–292.
- Pankotay, F. M., & Koloszár, L. (2019). *Lean Management in the Hotel Sector—Opportunities and Threats*. Proceedings of the 9th Business & Management Conference, Prague. 9th Business & Management Conference, Prague. <https://doi.org/10.20472/BMC.2019.009.004>

- Parry, E. & Urwin, P. (2011) 'Generational differences in work values: A review of theory and evidence', *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 13(1), pp. 79–96.
- Pinzaru, F., Zbucea, A., Vițelar, A., Nistoreanu, B., Perju, A. & Bălan, M. (2016) 'Millennials at work: Investigating the specificity of Generation Y versus other generations', *Management Dynamics in the Knowledge Economy*, 4(2), pp. 173–192.
- Purcell, J. & Hutchinson, S. (2007) 'Front-line managers as agents in the HRM–performance causal chain', *Human Resource Management Journal*, 17(1), pp. 3–20.
- PwC (2023) *Workforce Hopes and Fears Survey*. PricewaterhouseCoopers. Available at: <https://www.pwc.com/> (Downloaded: 24 October 2025).
- Rudolph, C.W., Rauvola, R.S. & Zacher, H. (2018) 'Generational differences in the workplace: Psychological, mythological, and methodological considerations', *Work, Aging and Retirement*, 4(2), pp. 130–149.
- Ryan, R.M. & Deci, E.L. (2000) 'Self-Determination Theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being', *American Psychologist*, 55(1), pp. 68–78.
- Own research (2025) 'Generational motivation management' – questionnaire database of 147 respondents, internal analysis (October 2025).
- Schaufeli, W.B. (2017) 'Applying the Job Demands–Resources model', *Organizational Dynamics*, 46(2), pp. 120–132.
- Schroth, H. (2019) 'Are you ready for Gen Z in the workplace?', *California Management Review*, 61(3), pp. 5–18.
- Schwartz, S.H. (2012) 'An Overview of the Schwartz Theory of Basic Values', *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture*, 2(1), pp. 1–20.
- Seemiller, C. & Grace, M. (2019) *Generation Z: A century in the making*. New York: Routledge.
- Shen, J., Chanda, A., D'Netto, B. & Monga, M. (2009) 'Managing diversity through human resource management: An international perspective and conceptual framework', *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 20(2), pp. 235–251.
- Shore, L.M. et al. (2011) 'Inclusion and diversity in work groups: A review and model for future research', *Journal of Management*, 37(4), pp. 1262–1289.
- Sturges, J. (2008) 'All in a day's work? Career self-management and the management of the boundary between work and non-work', *Human Resource Management Journal*, 18(2), pp. 118–134.
- TeamGuide (2023) 'Leadership styles and generational differences: How to effectively lead members of generations X, Y and Z?' Available at: <https://teamguide.hu/vezetoi-stilusok-es-generacios-kulonbsegek-hogyan-vezesd-hatekonyan-az-x-y-es-z-generacio-tagjait/> (Downloaded: 24 October 2025).
- Turban, D.B. & Lee, F.K. (2007) 'The role of personality in mentoring relationships', *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 70(2), pp. 246–262.
- Twenge, J.M., Campbell, S.M., Hoffman, B.J. and Lance, C.E. (2010) 'Generational Differences in Work Values: Leisure and Extrinsic Values Increasing, Social and Intrinsic Values Decreasing', *Journal of Management*, 36(5), pp. 1117–1142.
- Van den Broek, J., Boselie, P. & Paauwe, J. (2021) 'Multilevel Sustainable HRM: The role of leadership', *Human Resource Management Review*, 31(2), 100742.
- Van Vianen, A.E.M. (2000) 'Person–Organisation Fit: The match between newcomers' and recruiters' preferences for organisational cultures', *Personnel Psychology*, 53(1), pp. 113–149.
- Wayne, S.J., Shore, L.M. & Liden, R.C. (1997) 'Perceived organisational support and leader–member exchange: A social exchange perspective', *Academy of Management Journal*, 40(1), pp. 82–111.
- Yam, K.C. et al. (2018) 'Why so serious? A laboratory and field test of the consequences of failing to be humorous at work', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 103(3), pp. 317–329.
- Zhang, X. & Bartol, K.M. (2010) 'Linking empowering leadership and employee creativity: The influence of psychological empowerment, intrinsic motivation, and creative process engagement', *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(1), pp. 107–128.