

TALLINN UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY

School of Business and Governance
Department of Business Administration

Elene Murvanidze

**UNDERSTANDING GENERATION Z AS A FUTURE
WORKFORCE AND ITS PERCEPTION OF THE
GLOBAL TRENDS IN ORGANIZATIONAL DESIGN**

Master's thesis

International Business Administration

Supervisor: Maris Zernand-Vilson
PhD

Tallinn, 2020

I hereby declare that I have compiled the thesis/paper independently and all works, important standpoints, and data by other authors have been properly referenced, and the same paper has not been previously presented for grading. The document length is 18,346 words from the introduction to the end of the conclusion.

Elene Murvanidze

(signature, date)

Student code: 184487TVTM

Student email address: murvanidzeelene@gmail.com

Supervisor: Maris Zernand-Vilson, PhD:

The paper conforms to requirements in force

.....

(signature, date)

Chairman of the Defence Committee: /to be added only for graduation theses/

Permitted to the defense

.....

(name, signature, date)

ABSTRACT

The primary purpose of this master's thesis is to understand Generation Z's core values towards the workplace, its expectations from the employers, and its perceptions towards the global trends of organizational design. Accordingly, there were set the following research questions: 1. What are the factors that Generation Z values the most at the workplace? 2. How does Generation Z perceive the global trends of organizational design: principles of Organizational Agility and Self-Management Organization?

In order to find the answers, the quantitative research method – self-administrated questionnaire conducted. The sample group of this thesis was Generations Z, people who already entered the labor market or are just about to appear there and soon represent a massive part of it. The vast majority of the participants were based in Georgia.

Based on the results, Gen Z is eager to set their ways to achieve the goals of their job, have the ownership of the processes, have the flexibility and freedom at the workplace. They are acceptable to be a part of the environment where processes are evolving fast, and so do their responsibilities, jobs, or possession to the teams. Additionally, they are enthusiastic about learning even from mistakes. The vast majority of the respondents admire the growth opportunities at the workplace, and compensations package is something they value quite a lot either. They prefer to have face to face communication at the workplace and have the chance to get feedback from the employer on a monthly basis.

Keywords: Generation Z, Organizational Design, Organizational Agility, Self-management Organization

Table of Contents

ABSTRACT	4
INTRODUCTION	6
1. OVERVIEW OF THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE	8
1.1. Concept of Generation	8
1.2. Introduction to all living generations.....	9
1.3. Understanding Generation Z as a future workforce	11
1.3.1. Workplace selection	11
1.3.2. Workplace management	12
1.3.3. Career development	14
1.4. Global trends in organizational design	15
1.4.1. Development of the organizational design	15
1.4.2. Organizational agility: change in place	16
1.4.3. The next step after agile: Self-management organization	18
2. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	23
2.1. Description of the sample group.....	23
2.1.2. Data collection and analysis method	25
3. RESEARCH RESULTS	27
3.2. Generation Z core values at the workplace	29
3.2.1. Feedback delivery frequency	32
3.3.2. Preferable communication channels at workplace	34
3.3.3. Gen Z's expectations towards the employers	35
3.4. Discussion and limitations.....	42
3.5. Recommendations	44
CONCLUSION	45
REFERENCES	48
APPENDICES	52
Appendix 1. Questionnaire	52
Appendix 2. SPSS Analysis of demographic block	56
Appendix 3. SPSS Analysis: Core values	59
Appendix 4. SPSS Feedback frequency and communication channels.....	61
Appendix 5. SPSS Analysis: Organizational Design	62
Appendix 6. A non-exclusive licence.....	64

INTRODUCTION

Generation Z, anyone born from the late 90th till the early 10th, was raised during the most accelerated era of technological progress in human history. It makes them the first cohort of true digital natives that grew up with the Internet, which used to dynamic and social communication from an early age. The oldest members of Generation Z have already entered into the labor market and soon represent a considerable part of it. Because of their high-tech upbringing, they are taking a new set of behaviors, expectations, and preferences into the workplace. Thus, Business leaders, HR professionals need to find out what Generation Z value the most at the workplace and accordingly identify their expectations towards the employers.

Gen Z is entering into the rapidly-evolving labor market where the old is breaking down, and the new system is taking shape just now. The massive changes over the last couple of years led the business world to redesign the organization to move faster, adapt quickly to succeed in a turbulent environment (De Smet & Aghina, 2015). These changes stand for the constant introduction of disruptive technology, stakeholders' quickly evolving demands, a war for talents, embrace dynamic career demands (Aghina, et al. 2018).. Consequently, it becomes crucial for employers to understand Gen Z's as a future workforce perception of the rising global trends of organizational design. This outcome could give some direction to the business leaders whether they need to accommodate the existing system or remain, and even further implement the tendencies. The global trends of organizational design reviewed in this thesis are the concepts from Organizational Agility and Self-Management Organization systems. In particular: goal setting, sense of ownership, decision-making process, adaptability, flexibility, and freedom at the workplace.

Based on the mentioned above, the study firstly aims to understand Generation Z as a future workforce. More particularly, it intends to identify Gen Z's expectations towards the employers and its core values at the workplace. Secondly, the study aims to reveal Gen Z's opinions about global trends in organizational design, more specifically, principles that apply to Organizational

Agility and Self-management organizations. Accordingly, it addresses the following research questions:

1. What does Generation Z value the most at the workplace?
 - Identify Gen Z's core work values
 - Understand Gen Z's expectations from the employer
2. How does Generation Z perceive the global trends of organizational design: principles of Organizational Agility and Self-Management Organization?

The purpose of this thesis is to generate recommendations to the employers on how they could attract and retain Gen Z based on the findings of their work values and revealed expectations towards the employer. Companies that considering redesigning their organizations to become more agile and adapt quickly, these findings help to understand how the future workforce perceives these tendencies and how comfortably they would feel in the environment assigned to the organizational agility or self-management organization principles.

In order to fulfill the aims mentioned above, the author stated the following key objectives:

1. Review the theoretical background and previous researches about Gen Z and the organizational design practices.
2. Develop a questionnaire based on the aims of the research.
3. Conduct a questionnaire with the representative of Gen Z.
4. Establish the research methodology and analyze the findings based on it.
5. Create recommendations for employers.

The thesis research approach was divided into three main chapters. In the first chapter, there will be reviewed the theoretical background of Generation Z and organizational design systems. It will briefly define generation concept, review all living generations before Gen Z, and will discuss in-depth Gen Z as a future workforce and existing researches about them. In the same part, there will be presented the principles that apply for the organizational agility and self-management organization principles, and the elements that will be studied in the research part. In the second chapter, the author will present the research methodology, introduce a sample group of the research, and the tools of how the findings will be analyzed. In the third chapter, the author will

cover the research data analysis. To summarize the findings, the author will present research results, revealed limitations of the study, and recommendations for future researches.

1. OVERVIEW OF THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE

1.1. Concept of Generation

Karl Mannheim, an influential German sociologist, contributed widely defining the term of Generation in his 1928 written book “Theory of generations”(translated into English in 1952 as "The Problem of Generations"). According to Mannheim, the socio-historical environment has remarkably influenced people, particularly in their youth. In the context of social sciences, it is worth to distinct Generation’s two meanings, firstly made by Mannheim. The naturalist meaning of it stands for the comparisons between different birth cohorts in the demographic, sociological, or psychological aspects (Kannike, Raudsepp, 2016). The other one – romantic-historical refers to the Generation in a narrower sense, includes only to the powerful elites who have a meaningful societal impact (Ibid).

In this research paper, the term of Generation will be used to describe the naturalist nature of different birth cohorts, individuals born around the same time who share distinctive social or historical life events during critical developmental periods. In this context, the factors related to the generational differences can be complicated. These are a range of external influences on human development, including the socio-cultural, political, and technological circumstances. Such forces are supposed to differentiate generations throughout the life cycle stages and are reflected in the perception of other generations as well as generational characteristics (Ibid).

Generational cohorts give researchers a tool to analyze changes in views over time (Dimock, 2019). They can find ways for how different experiences shape people’s view of the world. According to the president of Pew Research Center’s president, Michael Dimock, “while younger and older adults might have different views at a given moment, generational cohorts allow researchers to identify how today’s older adults felt about a given issue when they were young, besides describing how the trajectory of views may vary across generations” (Ibid.). Setting the bounds of generations is a useful tool for analysis, though, the researchers suggest that cohort

effects are linear rather than categorical and that it is crucial to think about these boundaries as guidelines, rather than substantial distinctions.

1.2. Introduction to all living generations

A unique mix of factors has defined six living generations because of the historical or social life experiences they went through.

The Greatest Generation, those who were born between 1901 – 1927, are the children of the World War I generation and at the same time, they were fighters in World War II (The Whys and Hows..., 2015). This experience led them to firm models of teamwork and formed a keen interest in personal morality. They are the only living generation that remembers life without radio, TV, airplanes, and most of them grew up without electricity, refrigerators, or air conditioning. Since they now represent roughly two percent of the adult population, Pew Research Center admits that they no longer generate the reports on the Greatest Generation (Ibid.).

Silent Generation is the children of the Great Depression and World War II and went through their early childhood during an era of conformity. They were born between 1928- 1945 (Lim, 2019). Hence, the label of “Silent” is not random, and it refers to their image as conformist and civic-minded. Men from this generation typically worked while women stayed home to raise children. Nevertheless, if women worked, it was only specific jobs like teachers, nurses. Usually, loyalty to the employer was a common thing, and once they got, job they kept it for life.

The Baby Boom generation began “when the war ended, and soldiers came home” (McIntosh-Elkins et al. 2007, 240). Accordingly, this is the Generation that occurred between 1946 and 1964. They grew up during the Civil Rights Movement and the Cold War. Their name refers to a period marked by a significant increase in birth rate, and it generally occurred in countries that experienced massive damage from the war and were suffering from dramatic economic hardships. Though, after the war, they settled in with a more convenient economic position allowing families to have a safe place to live, get an education, and start building families (Huss, 1990). They are quite active in social life, run the governments, and generally is one of the largest workforces so far.

Even though the exact boundaries of Generation X are not well-defined (McIntosh-Elkins et al. 2007, 240), it describes people who were born around from 1965 through 1980 (Kane, 2019). The

first name of this Generation was the baby bust, as this is the generation defined by the relatively low birth rates compared with the Baby Boom generation that preceded them and the Millennials that followed them (Jackson II, Hogg, 2010). X in the label refers to the lack of identity and mislead that members of Generation X felt. Generation X was raised in an environment where both parents worked, and usually, they were home alone. Consequently, “they are independent, resourceful and self-sufficient people” (Kane, 2019). They value freedom in the workplace and dislike authority, structured work hours, micro-management (Ibid.).

Generation Y that is known as Millennials too is the cohort after Generation X. According to the widely accepting defined ranges, they born between 1981 and 1996 (Rauch, 2018). Millennials, as they grew up with technologies, are tech-savvy. Usually, they are armed with various tech devices and keen on communication through email or different kinds of social media. Based on various research, they are achievement-oriented and have high expectations from their employers. More specifically, they tend to seek new challenges at the workplace and are not afraid to question authority (Kane, 2019).

Millennials have been the hot button topic of discussion for many years. However, as the next Generation Z starts entering the workforce in large numbers, attention is shifting to them. Nobody truly knows precisely how the term “Generation Z” came about, but it might be related to the natural progression from the previous cohort – Generation Y (Lim, Parker, 2020).

In different sources, there are slightly different explanations about the time ranges they were born. According to a Pew Research Center, 1996 is the last birth year for Millennials, and anyone born between 1997 to 2012 is part of a new generation Gen Z (Dimock, 2019). They believe that 1996 is a considerable break between Millennials and Gen Z for various reasons, including political, economic, and social factors. On the other Ernst and Young in its 2015 published report defining the age range as those born between 1997 and 2003 (EY, 2015, as cited in Lim, Parker, 2020), while the professor of Psychology at the San Diego State University - Jean Twenge initiates the 1995-2010 range (Twenge, 2017, as cited in Lim, Parker, 2020). Based on this conflicting discourse, it is hard to define the exact age range of generation, but it might not be so important. As the president of the Pew Research Center, Michael Dimock says that “generational boundaries are not an exact science and there is no agreed-upon formula for how long that span should be” (Dimock, 2019).

1.3. Understanding Generation Z as a future workforce

Generation Z is those who were born during the digital era, and this is the main thing that distinguishes them from other generations, the fact that their existence is more connected to electronics and the digital world. Hence, it is no surprise that Gen Z is more tech-savvy than any other generation. Usually, they feel comfortable using the Internet for work, research, and social targets (McLaren, 2019).

The oldest members of Generation Z have already entered into the labor market, and by 2020 they will make up 20% of the workforce (Millennial Careers..., 2019). Because of their tech-savvy nature as well as the other political, economic, or social-cultural factors, they are bringing new skills, expectations, preferences, and behaviors into the workplace. Thus, understanding their mentality and what makes them tick can help the businesses to hire, engage, motivate, and manage them effectively. These should be the reasons why the interest towards them is increasing, and more reports or researches are creating about their characteristics or preferences. However, it should be noted that most researches are held in the USA.

1.3.1. Workplace selection

Gen Z grew up in an era when the giant social media companies such as Facebook, Snapchat, Twitter rose, and they see those platforms as an integral part of daily life. Thus, they have more resources than any previous generation when it is about researching companies and the information working there. Generation Z does not make any big decisions without reading the reviews first, and this habit translates to their job search, too (McLaren, 2019). The recent study held by the Dell technologies in 2018 from August to September, studied 12,000 Gen Z teens, revealed that for 91 percent of them, the technology offered by an employer would influence their job choice if faced with similar job offers. One of the respondents says that “The more technology you are familiar with, the more of an asset you can be to the company” (Dell Technologies, 2018). The survey results showed that 80 percent of the respondents want to work with cutting-edge technology, and they believe that technology and automation will create a more equitable work environment. Thus, employers should be authentic and present their brand. If the company’s website, job site, web, or mobile applications are poor, buggy, slow, or not optimized, this can turn Gen Z away.

One more important thing that affects Gen Zers' decision to workplace selection is the company’s level of diversity and inclusion, as the surveys show. Diversity and inclusions definitions vary

across generations. For example, Generation X and Baby Boomers tend to define diversity related to gender, race, and ethnicity (Jenkins, 2018). Whereas Millennials perceive it a bit differently, and they see it as an essential part of an inclusive culture that supports engagement, business growth, and competitiveness (Ibid). The same understanding applies to Gen Zers, who are identified as the most racially and ethnically diverse Generation yet in the US (Fry & Parker, 2018).

Based on the EY (2015) report, for the vast majority of Gen Z respondents, it is essential to work with people with diverse education and skill levels. To add it, they believe that having people from different cultures around is a crucial element to a team. Deloitte's study revealed that Gen Zers are skeptical about the companies' dedication to diversity and inclusion (Deloitte, 2019, as cited in Miserany, 2019). In particular, two-thirds of respondents presume that companies' words are not aligned with their actions to diversity and inclusion. Consequently, in order that the companies attract Generation Z, they need to show a transparent and data-driven approach (Miserany, 2019).

Gen Z in the USA were either teenagers or children during the Great Recession period (McLaren, 2019). As a result, this is a generation that tends to look for employers who can offer stability, security, and opportunity for growth. Based on the 2019 survey at the University of Georgia, the career office found that "the most desirable trait in a future employer was the ability to offer secure employment" (Piore, 2019), and job stability was nominated as the second most important one. The same results appeared in the recently polled 1,000 Gen Z held by the InsideOut Development on what they wanted from a potential employer (Martins, 2019). In fact, among the top career goals was to settle down in a secure and stable position. Moreover, they "would rather work at a stable job than one they are passionate about" (Ibid).

The observation of Gen Z activities on social media emphasizes how much they care about its privacy and security. For example, they prefer to share their activities through the stories that last only for 24 hours and then disappear from the public profile (Lim, Parker, 2020). Consequently, we could assume that Gen Z takes it seriously how its online privacy is documented and complying with data protection regulations over the recruitment or employment process.

1.3.2. Workplace management

Since Gen Z grew up in a digital environment full of interactions – likes, comments, reviews, it is not surprising that they appreciate the feedback culture a lot in the organizations. Based on EY

research, the absolute majority - 97 percent of respondents are keen to receive feedback on an ongoing basis or after finishing large tasks (Failure Drives Innovation..., 2018). As generations expert Ryan Jenkins admits, Gen Z is comfortable having multiple check-ins weekly for five minutes or less and the daily interaction with their managers. It might refer that yearly, quarterly performance reviews are no longer enough for Gen Z in the rapidly evolving work cycles.

The Internet has also given to Gen Z access to the numerous information and knowledge gaining opportunity that leads them to become more autonomous and “Googling things rather than asking for advice” (McLaren, 2019). Based on the various survey results, this mindset reflects in the way they think about work. In fact, according to the InsideOut Development survey (2019), Gen Z is confident in their ability to succeed, but there are areas where their confidence is dropping down (Martins, 2019). In particular, 54 percent of the respondents pursue that they are afraid to ask for help at the workplace. In the same survey, they admit that the thing they are worried the most “is being under too much pressure from their boss and not being good enough at their job” (Ibid.).

Gen Z is the first fully digital generation that has never been offline in the workplace (Christie, 2019). They are younger than Google, they are tech-savvy, but it does not necessarily mean that they need only high-tech solutions. Based on the EY survey, the overwhelming majority of the respondents want to have human elements at work. They prefer either working solely with innovative colleagues or with co-workers and new technologies. According to a recent survey of 4,000 respondents, human elements such as “supportive leadership” and “positive relationship at work” are the two most important job factors (Jenkins, 2018). The results of various surveys stress out that in-person communication is Gen Z’s preferred method of connecting in the workplace. In the survey held by Dell Technologies, the student of financial services says, “I would prefer meeting face-to-face with co-workers. If that is not an option, then a Skype meeting or conference call is best” (Dell Technologies, 2018).

Gen Z more than any predecessor, understands the existence of alternatives to the traditional 9-to-5 job (McLaren, 2019). They admire the work-life balance, but at the same time, they are ready to be flexible and work hard to succeed in the workplace (McLaren, 2019). Thus, offering more freedom, flexibility, openness to remote work options in a job should be highly attractive to Generation Z.

Their entrance into the workplace also increases the complexity of managing and working across generations. According to a survey of 1,400 Gen Z held by EY in 2018, seventy-seven percent of Gen Z admit that having a Millennial manager is their preference compare to Generation X or Baby Boomers (EY, 2018).

1.3.3. Career development

EY report (2018) says that the vast majority of Gen Z respondents believe it is more important to be seen as curious and open-minded than having a specific skill or expertise. They are not afraid of new challenges, and even further, they are excited about such opportunities. At the same time, they are not afraid to make mistakes, especially if they could learn from them.

According to the previously mentioned survey, an almost absolute majority of Gen Z respondents worried that “they lose time each day on tasks unrelated to their core job responsibilities” (InsideOut Development, 2019, as cited in Martins, 2019). Additionally, the results showed that around 75 percent of Gen Z respondents felt “they should be given a promotion in the first positions after only a year on the job, while another 32 percent believe that promotion should come within the first six months of work” (Ibid). According to the findings, Gen Z is concentrated on financial stability and aspects of the compensation. However, the study also revealed that in order to reach career goals, 88 percent of respondents are “willing to work harder and longer hours” (Ibid).

One more critical aspect for Gen Z to develop at the workplace is being a part of a learning culture. Employers need to identify the method of learning appealing to them. Based on the recent survey held by LinkedIn, these young workers feel that the skills required today are different from the skills crucial in past generations (Poague, 2018). Even though they understand the importance of soft skills, they assume that “technical hard skills are changing faster than ever and are more important in today’s workforce than soft skills” (Ibid). They are ready for changes and willing to gain new skills, mainly because nearly two-thirds of respondents firmly believe that their job “will not exist the same way after 20 years from now” (Ibid).

1.4. Global trends in organizational design

Based on the EY (2018) report, Gen Z is optimistic about the future at the workplace and believe that they will be better than their parents both financially and emotionally at work. Since they are entering into a rapidly evolving labor market with already existing systems in place, it is essential to review the global trends in organizational design to understand how they would adapt to them.

1.4.1. Development of the organizational design

For many decades the paradigm of machine organizations based on Henry Ford's and Frederick Taylor's ideas was a dominant approach. It supports hierarchical and specialization concepts (Aghina et al. 2018). Though, the machine paradigm faces new organizational challenges brought by digitalization. These challenges are expressed to some rising organizational trends and are transforming industries, economies, and societies. These changes stand for the quickly evolving environment with the stakeholders' increasing demand; the constant introduction of disruptive technology; increased volume of information that require handling complex collaboration; a war for talent that emphasizes to attract, hire, retain the top talents and consider skills, preferences, desires of different groups such as different generations (Ibid.).

Deloitte's 2019 Global Human Capital Trends Report based on a longitudinal survey of 10,000 participants across 119 countries, reviews what professionals today are assigning value to and what they feel are and would be the most significant opportunities and challenges to rise to in the next few years (Ghosh, 2019). They perceived that learning is the most important trend to prepare. Hawley Kane, Head of Organizational Talent and Leadership Development at Saba Software, says "For high-performing organizations, learning is not the outcome - it is the behavior that drives performance" (Ibid.).

Since the work, worker, and workplace changing, leaders and styles of leadership need to evolve as well. Sallyann Della Casa, Founder at GLEAC, stresses that workplaces "need to be employee-centric, there is no longer any specific size that fits all. Many workforces are now virtual, work at home is a normal day at the office, teams assemble and dis-assemble based on projects with no fixed roles or titles but instead matching competencies for project needs" (Ibid.). Hence, the leaders need to be able to deal with a workforce to build effective relationships and create a winning strategy every day. To add it, only 14 percent of executives assume that the traditional hierarchical structure makes their business highly effective. As an excellent alternative to it, they consider a

more flexible, team-centric model (Deloitte Insights, 2019). The systems that encourage more human interactions, transparency, flexibility to change the teams based on the needs.

We are in the transition period where the old is breaking down, but the new has not taken shape yet. Reviewing the tendencies of today's organizations is no debate that it is changing and being redefined, and the future of work would be born out of the present landscape at work (Ghosh, 2019). In the past, most organizations were designed for efficiency and effectiveness and oriented on the results. The Waterfall Model is an excellent example of this approach that emphasizes a logical progression of steps, where each phase depends on the deliverable of the previous ones and corresponds to a specification of tasks (waterfall model, 2019). Even though the waterfall system worked well for many years, in the rapidly changing world, instead of efficiency, successful organizations must be designed for speed, agility, and adaptability to compete and win in today's global business environment.

1.4.2. Organizational agility: change in place

The massive and sometimes devastating changes over the last couple of years led the business world to design organization for the speed, adaptability, and the traditional question "For whom do you work?" be replaced with the question "With whom do you work?" (Bersin et al. 2017). As a result, the new dominant paradigm of the agile organization has arrived to adapt those changes quickly and smoothly.

According to the McKinsey principal's Aaron De Smet's definition, "agility is the ability of an organization to renew itself, adapt, change quickly, and succeed in a rapidly changing, ambiguous, turbulent environment" (De Smet & Aghina, 2015). It gained popularity in a short time because of its capacity to create digital and non-digital products in a much faster way compared to before. Based on Aaron De Smet definition it is not incompatible with stability, quite contrary, it even requires a platform, where 18 things do not change and require dynamic capability, which stands for the ability to move fast. There might be some exceptions, for example, small start-ups where usually agile happens without stability, but as he said, "as soon as you get any sense of size or scale, you cannot be agile without some sense of stability" (Ibid.).

Traditional organizations are built around a static, siloed, structural hierarchy with a set mindset and vision that should be done. In contrast, agile organizations are characterized as a network of teams operating in rapid learning and decision-making cycles (Brosseau et al. 2019). They are

characterized as a network of teams operating in rapid learning and decision-making cycles (Ibid.). More specifically, in agile organizations commonly, there are product owners who inform the employees about the goal they need to pursue. However, there is nobody who tells them how to achieve. This approach gives employees the freedom to do what they are best in. In this paradigm, leaders need to let their employees go even if sometimes they make mistakes as then they could learn from them.

Transforming into an agile operating model is complex and comprehensive. Based on McKinsey's 2018 report, there are five trademarks of agile organizations, and the transformation should touch each of them: strategy, structure, people, process, and technology (Aghina et al. 2018). The whole strategy is about touches every facet of the organization. It simplifies reporting structures; leaders need to let their employees go even if sometimes they make mistakes as then they could learn from them (Ibid.).

In order that the company keeps the agility, teams should work on value-creating activities (Ibid.). They should be formed and disbanded quickly. It stands for the approach when select individuals for the team design to build a new product, feature or service for some particular time, and then disperse as team members and assign to new projects (Bersin et al. 2017). Cloud-based sales software company – Pipedrive's initiative is an excellent example of this approach.

A team in Pipedrive decided to upgrade already existing internal structure and processes and design them in an agile way to deliver solutions faster. The resulting model they designed is quite close to the development model of Nokia combined with the ideas from Spotify, Facebook, and Google (Anikin, 2019). It is organized around the product areas and is aligned with engineering Tribes and corresponding units in Product and Design. Each Tribe holds expert knowledge of its product area and can have up to 20 software engineers that report to the engineering manager. They cooperate with product managers responsible for a particular part of the product. Tribes organize themselves into smaller teams called Mission Teams, concentrate on a single business goal, and containing a Product Manager, Designer, and developers. The Mission Team exists until either the business goal is met, or the deadline is ended. The mission is led by a Mission Lead, engineer from the tribe volunteering for this role. All member of the Missions needs to postpone other duties and focus on the mission goal for allotted periods (Ibid.). Once the missions are done, they return to Launchpad. The purpose of it is to support missions through the research process

for upcoming missions, help the Missions in delivering and integrating processes. Additionally, improve quality and handle smaller tasks and bugs (Ibid.).

As CTO of Pipedrive points out, the benefits of these changes are visible. First of all, the allocation of resources is better. Each project has enough resources not more or not less, and the other either is on other Missions or the Launchpad. Secondly, concentrating on one problem at a time result in faster and higher quality solutions. Increased focus and faster outcomes boost motivation and increase happiness among the teams. Additionally, the freedom of choice working on the projects people are more effective, happy, and productive.

These changes cannot happen without people with the right mindset and without proper technologies. Managers should provide vision and should coach, inspire people rather than direct them. Challenge and innovation opportunities should be a part of the culture. Additionally, the organizations should have the proper tools to support an agile way of working based on requirements. As fast delivery is vital, automation of the processes is a good, proven strategy. When it comes to Gen Z, the above conditions are other things that were revealed in InsideOut research results. More than 75 percent of survey respondents said that “their boss’s ability to coach is important to them—a quarter even saying that coaching is the most important thing a manager can do” (InsideOut Development, 2019)

1.4.3. The next step after agile: Self-management organization

In the beginning, the principles of the agile methodology created in the software industry because the production of software is rapid. Hence, usually, it is implemented in the IT department, which creates tensions with the other teams who still use the traditional method (Graber, 2017). For instance, the agile team might require budgeting more often than the other departments, which increases the feeling of unfairness in such an environment. As a result, the leaders of many organizations still need to use the old, centralized mindset they have always had. Thus, even though the positive impact of agile methodology is visible in results, it has some limitations, and it cannot adequately deal with the increasing complexity (Ibid.).

The transition toward a more agile workplace creates a new context, where the freedom to act mindset applies not only to some special teams but for the whole organization when the next logical step after agile arrives - self-management organization (Ibid.). For self-management, it is not enough to take hierarchy out. It needs to grow a system of distributed authority, which requires

upgrading almost all existing management practices and structures in order to operate and make the things that managers usually do. It starts with the belief that the top-down system cannot produce the best possible outcomes, and additional layers of hierarchy create a more limited number of people making critical decisions (Roberts, 2019). It requires to have clear objectives and frequent reporting, an influential culture of responsibility and accountability (Gerritsen, 2019). Feedback culture should be the core value not only over the change process but also as a tool for measuring and improving performance. It is complicated in the absence of a management layer, but it should be measured and guided by colleagues (Ibid.)

Self-management organization is also about the ability of personal leadership that stands for the enthusiasm to reach goals and take initiatives (Ibid.). According to Doug Kirkpatrick, an organizational change consultant, self-management is the organizational philosophy based on two simple principles - individuals should not use force against other people or property and that individuals should take responsibilities and commitments they have made to others (Hastie, 2018). These two principles are the fundamentals of law and the basement of a peaceful society, and applying the same principles for the work people can become engaged, collaborative, and high-performing as Kirkpatrick says (Ibid). However, self-managing employees need clearly defined boundaries on which decisions they can have full ownership, how they keep track of alignment and direction.

1.4.3.1. Holacracy

There are different methods for a company to become more self-managed and self-organized; Holacracy is one of them. It is a new way of structuring and running an organization that radically replaces some practices of the traditional management system (Van de Kamp 2014). Instead of top-down power distributions, it gives individuals and teams freedom, the power to make changes, to innovate, and to have a voice while still staying aligned to the organization's purpose. There are many companies successfully using different ways of self-managing, though considering Holacracy's pre-build, out-of-the-box options, it is one of the most publicly well-known (Holacracy and Self-organization 2020). Even though it can be implemented for any organization regardless of size, sector, or industry, in practice, usually small or medium-sized companies in tech-industry adopted this framework (Van de Kamp 2014).

Holacracy is an operating system that immediately provided a set of rules, processes, guidelines that organizations can use to become self-managed and self-organized (Holacracy and Self-

organization 2020). It even has its constitution, which documents the core rules, structure, and processes of the Holacracy Organizational Operating System (Holacracy constitution 2020). It is a portable document that can be adopted in many ways. The term Holacracy origin is from the term of holarchy, firstly used by Arthur Koestler. He defines a "holon" as "a whole that is a part of a larger whole" and a "holarchy" as "the connection between holons" (Robertson 2015, 38, as cited in Höglund, 2015). Accordingly, it is a hierarchy of self-regulating holons which function both as autonomous wholes and as dependent parts.

One of the most significant differences from the traditional organizational system is the fact that employees do not carry job titles. Therefore, there are no management titles either (Van de Kamp 2014). Each role has a descriptive name and at least has one from the following: "Purpose" that stands for an "unrealizable goal that the Role will pursue or express on behalf of the organization (Holacracy constitution 2020); "Domains" that refers for the things that "Role may exclusively control and regulate as its property, on behalf of the Organization" (Ibid.); "Accountabilities" which are "ongoing activities of the organization that the role will enact" (Ibid.). Holacracy constitution says, "Roles" are defined by the teams and are updated regularly in order to adapt to the fast-evolving needs of the organization. Holacracy distinguishes the roles and people who fill them since one individual can hold multiple roles at any given time.

In Holacracy, there are Circles - the holons that structure the various roles. According to the Holacracy Constitution, each Circle has its governance and the power to define, amend or remove the Circle's roles, Circle's policies, and "hold elections for the Circle's Elected roles" (Holacracy constitution 2020). Each Circle has a defined governance process to created and update its own roles and policies. Besides Governance Meetings, each Circle also has tactical meetings, usually occurred weekly, and is focused on the operations work of the Circles (Tactical Meetings..., 2020.) The main aim of them is to identify issues raised weekly and find solutions to remove the obstacles to move forward and achieve the goals in the best way (Ibid.). Even though each member filling a role has autonomy and authority to make decisions, putting policies and internal processes are essential to clarify boundaries that everyone knows what freedom they have.

1.4.3.2. Evolutionary worldview – Teal Paradigm

It is difficult to reveal an exact beginning of organizations operating according to the teal idea (Wyrzykowska, 2020). After careful determination, we could mention the works of Edwards Deming (Deming, 1996, cited in Ibid). The tips offered by Deming were presented in 14 Deming

Principles and initiated aspects such as building the relationship with suppliers, quality, human capital management (Wyrzykowska, 2020). Frederic Laloux contributed massively in forming the contemporary perception of teal organizations with his book called *Reinventing Organizations* (2015). Analyses of teal organizations are based on the classification of how people come together to get work done through the evolution of organizations with five significant stages of management (Wyrzykowska, 2020). Frederic assigns each stage its colors that he borrowed from Integral Theory.

Laloux ends his classification with the evolutionary worldview that per his definition is the future of management opens radical new possibilities and gives it Teal color. Frederic states the idea that effective function is possible without a traditional hierarchy that replaces self-regulation and self-management (Wyrzykowska, 2020). Teal organizations come with three breakthroughs: self-management, wholeness, and evolutionary purpose, and thinks that it will fundamentally challenge management as we know it (Laloux, 2014).

- Self-management – operate effectively without the hierarchy and with self-management ability: take responsibility, and flexibility to adapt to current challenges.
- Wholeness – bring to work who you are, separation of professional and private life.
- Evolutionary purpose – Seen organizations as a living organism, where people are listened and based on it reveal the purpose it wants to achieve every day.

Teal organizations set up structures where people have high autonomy and are accountable for coordinating with others (Laloux, 2012). Power and control no longer tied to the specific positions of high management roles, and they are embedded throughout the organizations (Ibid.). Another breakthrough encourages employees to reclaim their inner wholeness. It creates an environment where people have the freedom to fully express themselves that bringing innovation, passion, and creativity to work (Ibid.). When it comes to evolutionary purpose, it is based on the agile practices that respond to the world and are asking from them (Ibid.).

The transformation process from a traditional company to the teal model requires a fundamental social change on the company and individual levels (Holwek, 2018, cited in Wyrzykowska, 2020). Based on research held by Laloux studying several organizations where teal paradigm has already been working, he realized that there are only two necessary conditions for developing a Teal

organization (Ibid.). First of all, top leadership must have "an integrated world view and psychological development consistent with the Teal paradigm" (Laloux, 2012). Furthermore, the mindset of the organization owners to understand and embrace the Teal paradigm concept (Ibid.). Teal organization concept is attracting businesses and scientists as it might become our future, but it is still a massive experiment (Wyrzykowska, 2020)

2. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

In this chapter, the author describes the research design and how the respondents were selected. The study was designed as a self-administered questionnaire survey of the representatives of Generation Z. It was intended to capture the views of Gen Zers towards the global trends in organizational design who are already entered into the workplace or will enter very shortly.

2.1. Description of the sample group

As there are various opinions regarding the Gen Zers age ranges, the research stuck to a definition that they are people born between 1995 to 2010 (Twenge, 2017, as cited in Lim, Parker, 2020). Since the main purpose of the research was to understand Gen Z's opinions about the organizational design trends and their values at the workplace, the sample group were either people already entered into the labor market or are just about to enter there. Consequently, the individuals were chosen aged between 16 to 25 years old. Since some respondents (only three) were under 18 years old, it was needed to investigate the ethical principles post factum as the questionnaire reached them through social media. Various sources indicated that it is preferable to get parental consent (Lenhart, 2013). However, as it was an online survey without any sensitive questions, the findings of the research were stored in line with data protection legislation, and any reporting of the data were done in a way that ensures that individual responses cannot be identified, the author decided not to remove these three responses.

Since questionnaire distribution was more natural using personal connections, because of the author's background, the overwhelming majority of the respondents are based in Georgia. However, the part of an initial plan was to have two sample groups in regard to locations: from Georgia and Estonia. However, the plan has changed because of the global changes caused by the COVID 19 developments that reflected in this thesis' data collections process too. People who supposed to be respondents of the survey faced some life or career challenges. Consequently, the author decided not to reach those people in order not to overwhelm them further.

The questionnaire was developed in the English language since it should be distributed to different locations (as a part of the initial plan). Accordingly, participants were checked only for age and English language level in order to participate in the survey.

2.2. Methodology description

The quantitative research method was chosen as it allowed the author to research multiple people at once and analyze responses by using statistical methods. The questionnaire form is attached in Appendix 1.

The self-administrated questionnaire was developed and piloted by conducting three surveys with the representatives of cohort Z and professional researchers. According to the researchers' feedback, three questions were removed. They were aiming to understand Gen Z's preferences over the recruitment process that are already researched previously. Considering the main research area of the thesis, three new questions were added about the global trends of organizational design. Based on the feedback from Gen Z's, the instruction of the first question has changed as it caused confusion. This feedback was particularly valuable, as in case the same confusion would come up in the research process, it would be impossible for the author to provide additional explanations to each participant.

The question started with the introduction of the author and the aim of the research. Along with it, there was a note on privacy that informed the respondents that participation was anonymous and volunteering. Moreover, the data collected from the survey will be treated in line with data protection legislation, and the focus of this survey was not on individuals but on patterns of responses. They were warned that the data collected with this questionnaire might be used in presentations and articles, within and outside of the school. The respondents also had an opportunity to indicate their emails to get the research findings once available.

The questionnaire consisted of 20 questions that divided into three blocks: Gen Z's core work values and expectations from the employers as well as its desirable communication forms and frequency of feedback at work; Gen Z's perceptions regarding the global trends of organizational design; background questions. All questions were mandatory except the one open-ended question about Gen Z's expectations from the current or future employers.

The first block aimed to identify Gen Z's core values at the workplace and its expectations from the current or future employers and finding their preferred methods of communication at work and

the frequency of feedback from the direct managers. Overall it consisted of three closed and one open-ended questions.

The first statement of this block was a rank order question with eight close-ended statements that should be ranked on the scale from 1 to 8 in descending order according to the importance at the workplace. The second and third questions were multiple-choice statements about the desirable frequency of delivering feedback and the preferable ways to have communication at the workplace. They could indicate their unique answer, too, in both cases. The last statement of these sections was the only open-ended and optional question in the entire questionnaire. It aimed to get additional comments and thoughts regarding what Gen Zers are looking for from the current or future employers.

The second section of the questionnaire was revealing Gen Zers' perceptions towards the rising tendencies of organizational design. Each question of this section was generated in a way to reflect the global trends in organizational design: Organizational agility and Self-Management Organization principles. In particular: goal setting, ownership, decision-making process, flexibility, freedom, and adaptability at the workplace. It consisted of eight questions. All questions were measured on a Likert 5-point scale. Respondents should choose whether they strongly disagree, disagree, agree, strongly agree, or were neutral about them.

The questionnaire ended with a demographic block with questions about age, gender, location, level of education, employment status, current/future employment industry, the length of working experience if they have any. At the same time, respondents had an opportunity to indicate their emails in order to get a short summary of the final findings once available. As a sign of the gratitude for respondents' contribution to the work, the final note was the link of free online courses and free online tours of museums, operas, zoos and national parks that could be taken from home over the extraordinary time we globally experiencing related to Covid-19.

2.1.2. Data collection and analysis method

Self-administrated questionnaires were employed electronically through the online platform "Google Forms" and collected from April to May 2020. Since the respondents were from the Gen Z cohort and, therefore, with highly developed tech skills, it should be an easy and smooth process filling out the self-administrated electronic questionnaire with all necessary instructions insider.

Additionally, as they were based on different locations, it was easier to distribute the questionnaire via the Internet.

In order to increase the response rate, there were identified distribution methods to reach out to the target audience effectively and maintain the data quality at the same time. In fact, by using personal connections, the questionnaire has been shared as a direct message with Gen Zers using Facebook Messenger and LinkedIn. At the same time, it was posted on several closed Facebook groups where the vast majority of the members were bachelor's degree students, all instructions were provided, and all additional questions were answered too. Participation in the survey was completely anonymous and voluntary.

For analyzing the empirical data, results were gathered in the Google spreadsheet and then used SPSS, a software package to get statistical analysis. Each question from the survey was analyzed for the relation of percentage, frequency, central tendencies. For comparison of different groups, there was used statistical methods such as Independent t-test and ANOVA.

3. RESEARCH RESULTS

In the third chapter, there will be presented the research results and discussion around it. At the same, there will be identified the limitations of the research and will be revealed recommendations for future research topics.

A total number of the respondents who participated in the survey were 155 people, where eight responses have been removed because of misinterpretation of 1st question instruction (that was improved based on the findings); some participants were not the representatives of the cohort Z. Accordingly, the results of the research are based on 147 responses.

3.1. Results of demographic block

Based on gender, 52 (35.4%) respondents were male, and 94 (63.9%) respondents were female, 1 (0.7%) participant decided not to reveal its gender. Respondents in age from 16 to 25 years (M= 21.23, SD= 1.9) with the Mode of 21 (N=36, 24.5%). The oldest members of the respondents aged 25 (N=2, 2.0%) and the youngest contestants were aged 16 (N=2, 2.0%). The age variable was grouped into four smaller groups to ease the further manipulations.

Table 1 Age and Gender statistics

Age	Number of respondents	Percentage
<=18	15	10.2
19 - 20	29	19.7
21 - 22	64	43.5
23+	39	26.5
Gender		
Male	52	35.4
Female	94	63.9

The respondents were obliged to share the location they are currently based. The overwhelmed majority of the respondents based in Georgia – 142 (96.6%), and the rest were from Estonia, Egypt, and the United States.

Participants put their highest degree of the school they have completed. Responses based on the educational background looks like below:

- Basic school (grades 1-9) – 3 (2.0%)
- Upper-secondary general school (grades 10-12) – 58 (39.5%)
- Vocational education – 3 (2.0%)
- Bachelor's degree – 79 (53.7%)
- Other (please specify) – 3 (2.0%)

Results were also collected based on their employment status, where they could apply several responses from the suggested list and could have indicated their responses too. It worth mentioning that nine respondents ticked more than one answer, while the rest of them indicated single responses. Six people out of nine, who applied more than one answer are students and paid employed at the same time.

Table 2. Responses visualized based on respondent's employment status

Employment status	Frequency	Percentage
Paid Employment	73	49.7
Self-employed	9	6.1
Volunteer	4	2.7
Intern (paid or unpaid)	14	9.5
Student	76	51.7
Military	0	0
Other	2	1.4

Respondents also had to share the employment industry that describes the best their current or future employment industry. The top three industry participants chose: “Business, sales and tourism” (N=39, 26.5%), “Science, engineering, and construction” (N=28, 19.0%), “Accountancy, finance and insurance” (N=24, 16.3%).

Gen Zers had to share about the length of their working experience too. According to the results, the vast majority of them have no working experience (N=43, 29.3%). Six years of working experience was the biggest one among the responses and has been put only by three participants (2%). The participants have divided into four groups accordingly.

Table 3 Length of experience

Years of experience	Frequency	Percentage
No experience	43	29.3
Some experience: <=1	38	25.9
More than 1 up to 2	39	26.5
More than 2 years'	27	18.4

Based on the observation, the assumptions in regard to the age and working experience were made. In fact, the opinion that as the older participant is, the bigger the working experience they have. This assumption was checked by using Pearson's Correlations coefficient to explore the strength of the relationship between them. Based on the results, age and period of the working experience correlation coefficient is 0.546. The direction of these two variables is positive that means that "as one variable increases, so does the other" (Pallant, 2011). The strength of the relationship between age and working experience is large since $r=0.546$ and it is between 0.5 to 1.0 (Cohen, 1988, as cited in Pallant, 2011). Since the sample is large ($N=+100$), the relationship between the variables is the statistical significance (Pallant, 2011). More detailed tables are attached in Appendix 2.

3.2. Generation Z core values at the workplace

The questions in the first block aimed to evaluate Gen Zers' core values at the workplace as well as their preferences when it comes to feedback delivery frequency from the manager and their preferred methods for communication with colleagues.

The first question was about the value about the workplace, where they should have ranked eight factors on the scale from one to eight in the descending count, where 1 referred to the most critical factor and 8 to the least important. In order to get the ranked places, there was performed Friedman test in SPSS as it is used to measure analysis of variance by ranks. In particular, the test compares the mean ranks between the related groups and indicates how the groups differed. Based on the results of 147 responses, the most important factor for Gen Z revealed a "Career opportunity" with the 2.61 mean rank, where the 2nd most important factor was "Compensations package" that stands for the salary and benefits package together with the 3.09 mean rank, following "Team atmosphere" with the mean rank of 3.61. Whereas bottom two, the least important factors are "The chance to make an impact" with the 5.71 mean rank and "Culture of recognition" with a 5.78 mean rank.

Table 4 Ranked core values according to their importance for Gen Z.

Core values	Mean rank
Career opportunity	2.61
Compensation	3.09
Team atmosphere	3.61
Work environment	4.41
Flexible schedule	5.34
Company reputation	5.45
The chance to make an impact	5.71
Culture of recognition	5.78

In order to be checked the relationship between the core values results with the other independent variables, an Independent-samples T-test has been performed. It is used to compare the mean score “on some continuous variables, for two different groups of participants” (Pallant, 2011). In our case, this test was conducted to compare the core value ranking scores for males and females. Based on the results, no significant difference revealed. The findings are below:

- There was no significant difference in scores for males (M = 3.31, SD = 2.28) and females (M = 2.96, SD = 1.8; t (87) = .96, p = .342, two-tailed) in regards with Compensation. The magnitude of the differences in the means (mean difference = .35, 95% CI: -.38 to 1.1).
- There was no significant difference in scores for males (M = 2.77, SD = 2.28) and females (M = 2.54, SD = 1.94; t (144) = .64, p = .53, two-tailed) in regards with Career opportunities. The magnitude of the differences in the means (mean difference = .23, 95% CI: -.48 to .932).
- There was no significant difference in scores for males (M = 3.9, SD = 1.94) and females (M = 3.46, SD = 1.7; t (144) = 1.43, p = .154, two-tailed) in regards with Team atmosphere. The magnitude of the differences in the means (mean difference = .45, 95% CI: -.17 to 1.06).
- There was no significant difference in scores for males (M = 4.35, SD = 1.84) and females (M = 4.43, SD = 1.81; t (144) = -.253, p = .801, two-tailed) in regards with Work

environment. The magnitude of the differences in the means (mean difference = $-.08$, 95% CI: $-.7$ to $.54$).

- There was no significant difference in scores for males ($M = 5.37$, $SD = 1.82$) and females ($M = 5.31$, $SD = 1.84$; $t(144) = .18$, $p = .858$, two-tailed) in regards with Flexible schedule. The magnitude of the differences in the means (mean difference = $.06$, 95% CI: $-.57$ to $.68$).
- There was no significant difference in scores for males ($M = 5.73$, $SD = 1.83$) and females ($M = 5.8$, $SD = 1.87$; $t(144) = -.21$, $p = .834$, two-tailed) in regards with Culture of recognition. The magnitude of the differences in the means (mean difference = $-.07$, 95% CI: $-.7$ to $.57$).
- There was no significant difference in scores for males ($M = 5.37$, $SD = 2.1$) and females ($M = 5.94$, $SD = 2.1$; $t(144) = 1.02$, $p = .342$, two-tailed) in regards with the chance to make an impact. The magnitude of the differences in the means (mean difference = $-.6$, 95% CI: $-.1.3$ to $.14$).
- There was no significant difference in scores for males ($M = 5.5$, $SD = 2.41$) and females ($M = 5.43$, $SD = 2.3$; $t(144) = 1.02$, $p = .342$, two-tailed) in regards with the company reputation. The magnitude of the differences in the means (mean difference = $.05$, 95% CI: $-.8$ to $.83$).

To explore the relationship between the age and core values, a one-way between-groups analysis of variance was conducted. ANOVA says whether there “are significant differences in the mean scores on the dependent variable across the three groups” (Pallant, 2011), there was also used Post-hoc tests to find out where these differences lie. Based on the results, no statistically significant difference revealed at the $p < .05$ level in core values scores for the four age groups: Compensation $F(3, 143) = .47$, $P = .7$; Career Opportunities $F(3, 143) = .4$, $P = .75$; Team atmosphere $F(3, 143) = 1.2$, $P = .31$; Work environment $F(3, 143) = 1.1$, $P = .36$; Flexible schedule $F(3, 143) = .84$, $P = .47$; Culture of recognition $F(3, 143) = .59$, $P = .63$; Chance to make an impact $F(3, 143) = 2.2$, $P = .1$; Company reputation $F(3, 143) = .43$, $P = .73$.

One-way ANOVA method described above was used to explore the impact of employment industry on core values ranking results. Based on the results, no statistically significant difference found at the $p < .05$ level in core values scores for the six employment industry: Compensation $F(6, 140) = 1.2$, $P = .26$; Career Opportunities $F(6, 140) = .52$, $P = .8$; Team atmosphere $F(6, 140) = .6$, $P = .7$; Work environment $F(6, 140) = .62$, $P = .72$; Flexible schedule $F(6, 140) = 1.61$, $P = .15$;

Culture of recognition $F(6, 140) = 1.9, P=.1$; Chance to make an impact $F(6, 140) = .65, P=.7$; Company reputation $F(6, 140) = .73, P=.63$.

Based on the result of the length of working experience impact, no statistically significant difference found at the $p < .05$. As for the other variables, there was not a statistically significant difference at the $p < .05$ level: Compensation $F(4, 142) = 1.4, P=.26$; Career Opportunities $F(4, 142) = 2.34, P=.17$; Team atmosphere $F(4, 142) = 1.23, P=.3$; Work environment $F(4, 142) = .3, P=.9$; Flexible schedule $F(4, 142) = 1.2, P=.31$; Chance to make an impact $F(4, 142) = .16, P=1.0$; Company reputation $F(4, 142) = 1.1, P=.36$.

Based on the result of the education level relationship impact, no statistically significant difference found at the $p < .05$ level in core values scores for the six-employment industry: Compensation $F(4, 141) = 1.85, P=.32$, Career Opportunities $F(4, 141) = 1.03, P=.4$, Team atmosphere $F(4, 141) = .532, P=.7$, Work environment $F(4, 141) = .8, P=.53$, Flexible schedule $F(4, 141) = 1.2, P=.32$, Culture of recognition $F(4, 141) = .5, P=.8$, Chance to make an impact $F(4, 141) = 1.4, P=.24$, Company reputation $F(4, 141) = 2.2, P=.1$. More detailed tables are attached in Appendix 3.

3.2.1. Feedback delivery frequency

The second statement was about the feedback delivery frequency from the direct manager. Respondents could pick only one response based on their preferences. Based on the 147 results, the preferable feedback frequency revealed monthly feedback with 58 (39.6%) responses, following weekly feedback with 18 (32,1%) responses. Whereas “multiple check-ins during the week”, “I don’t want to get it” and the response “others” was indicated by one respondent (1.8%) each. Respondents who ticked the graph “other”, specified that he/she wants to get it daily.

Table 5 Feedback delivery frequency from the direct manager

Feedback	Frequency	Percent
Monthly	58	39.5
Weekly	46	31.3
Quarterly	15	10.2
Biweekly	15	10.2
Yearly	5	3.4
Multiple check-ins	5	3.4

No feedback	2	1.4
Daily	1	0.7

To explore the relationship between the gender, Independent-samples T test was conducted. Based on the outcome, there was no significant difference in scores for males ($M = 3.69$, $SD = 1.32$) and females ($M = 3.64$, $SD = 1.3$; $t(144) = .96$, $p = .24$, two-tailed) in regards with Feedback frequency choice.

In order to reveal the relationship with the length of working experience, cross-tabulation created. Based on the finding, the most desirable frequency is monthly delivery for people: without experience ($N=18$, 40.9%), up to one year ($N=13$, 35.1%), more than one up to 2 years' experience" ($N=18$, 46.2%). The only exception was people with more than two years experience the preferences divided between the weekly ($N=9$, 33.3%) and monthly basis ($N=9$, 33.3%) answers.

When it comes to age groups, which was divided into four levels, the findings reversed quite similar trends as it is shown in the total numbers. In fact, among the participant "18 or fewer years old" the most popular answer turned out monthly basis feedback ($N=6$, 40%), it was the same among people aged between 19-20 years old ($N=12$, 41.4%) and respondent with 23+ years old the tendency remained too ($N= 19$, 48.7%). The only exception was the group "between 21-22 years old that at the same time was the biggest group with 65 participants. In this group, as the most popular answer nominated weekly basis feedback ($N=23$, 36%), following with a small difference "Monthly" choice with 21 answers (32.8%).

Based on the outcome, also the same tendency remained in the employment industry. In fact, "Agriculture, animals and food" representatives, the most popular answer turned out monthly basis feedback ($N=6$, 60%). It was the same among people from: "Medical, Wellbeing and Sport" ($N= 7$, 46.7%); "Accountancy, Finance, and Insurance" ($N=10$, 41.7%); "Business, sales, and tourism" ($N=17$, 42.5%). However, the findings were a bit different in other groups and "weekly" basis feedback turned out the preferable frequency: "Science, Engineering, and Construction" respondents ($N=9$, 32.1%); "Creative arts, Fashion and Media" ($N=5$, 38.5%); "Government, Law and Education" ($N=8$, 47.1%). More detailed tables are attached in Appendix 3.

3.3.2. Preferable communication channels at workplace

The third question of the first block was about the preferable method for communication at the workplace, where respondents could have indicated one or more responses according to their preference. Based on the results, revealed that the preferable method is face-to-face communication with the 122 responses (83.0%), following the email with the 75 responses (51.0%). Two respondents have chosen the answer “other,” and both answers referred the same that “any methods are fine based on the context.”

Table 6 Preferable communication channels at the workplace

Communication channel	Frequency	Percent
Face-to-face	122	83
Email	75	51
Instant messaging	45	30.6
Phone call	43	29.0
Video chat	28	19.0
Social collaboration	28	19.0
Text messaging	19	12.9
Other	2	1.4

Since respondents could check all answers that apply, Multiple Response Crosstabs procedure was performed to explore what percentage of representatives from each sex, educational level, age group, length of experience, employment industry uses which channels more often.

Using the Crosstabulation function of SPSS, the findings were compared the same way as the previous question’s findings. Based on the outcome, in all age groups, face to face communication method is the most popular one: “18 and less” (N=10, 68%), “19-20 years old” (N=21, 72.4%), “21-22 years old” (N=54, 84.4%), “23 and above” (N=37, 95%).

The same tendency remained regarding the length of working experience. In each level, the most popular answer was face to face communication: no experience (N=35, 82.0%), some experience

up to 1 year (N=30, 83.0%), more than 1 to 2 years' experience (N=33, 84.6%), more than two years' experience" (N=24, 92.0%).

The same tendency remained in employment industry: "Agriculture, animals and food" (N=8, 80%), "Science, Engineering and Construction" (N=22, 79%), "Medical, Wellbeing and Sport" (N= 13, 86.7%); "Creative arts, Fashion and Media" (N=11, 84.6%); "Government, Law and Education" (N=16, 94.1%) "Accountancy, Finance, and Insurance" (N=22, 91.7%); "Business, sales, and tourism" (N=30, 75.0%). When it comes to gender comparison, also face to face communication is the most popular method for both males (N=44, 85%) and females (N=77, 82%).

When it comes to educational background, in all levels face to face communication was the most popular channel. Here are some findings from the most prominent two groups from this variable: "Upper secondary general school" (N=43, 74.1%); "Bachelor's degree (N=43, 89.9%); the preferable method remained face to face communication in all groups based of the employment status. Here are some findings from the biggest two groups from this variable: "Paid employment" (N=64, 87%), "Student" (N=63, 83%). More detailed tables are attached in Appendix 3.

3.3.3. Gen Z's expectations towards the employers

The only optional and open-ended question in the whole questionnaire was the question for additional comments and thoughts on what Generation Z is looking for the current or future employer. Even though not everyone indicated their thoughts, more than half of the respondents, 75(46.0%), provided their thoughts and comments on what they are looking for the employers. Their thoughts were analyzed and grouped into seven variables, where the most prominent groups were "no response" with 72 (49.0 %) and "other" that covered some unique comments with 31 responses (20.0 %).

Among the unique comments were: the higher competition on the labor market between the employers; allowing home office opportunity; friendly, informal relationship with the manager, for example, when sometimes they could even "go out and drink together on Fridays." Moreover, they want that their voices would be heard and be encouraged innovation and the entrepreneurial mindset. One respondent expressed that he does not want to waste his time at the workplace in doing nothing. The other responses were about the importance of transparency, stability, and safety, recognition, physical workspace, company brand image, and caring for environmental sustainability.

The rest responses grouped into the following variables: “Freedom at the workplace,” “Respect, trust and honesty,” “Growth opportunity,” “Compensation,” “Straightforward feedback,” “Learning opportunity.” Among the mentioned responses, the most popular turned out the “Growth opportunity|” that reflected the findings from the 1st section; the second most popular answer was about respect and honesty from the employer.

Table 7 What Gen Z is looking for employer

Communication channel	Frequency	Percent
No comment	72	46.0
Other	31	20.0
Growth opportunity	21	13.0
Respect, trust and honesty	11	7.0
Freedom at the workplace	8	5.1
Compensation	5	3.2
Straightforward Feedback	5	3.2
Learning opportunity	4	3

3.3. Generation Z perceptions in regards to global trends

In order to identify Generation Z's perceptions towards the global trends in the organizational design, the whole separate block with eight questions was created. Each question of this section was developed in a way to mirror the global trends in organizational design: Organizational agility and Self-Management Organization principles. More specifically: goal setting, ownership, decision-making process, flexibility, freedom, and adaptability at the workplace. All questions were measured on a Likert 5-point scale. Respondents should choose whether they strongly disagree, disagree, agree, strongly agree, or were neutral about them.

In order to determine the findings, descriptive statistics were performed. It involved obtaining descriptive statistics on these variables. These descriptive statistics include the mean, standard of

deviation, range of score, Skewness, and Kurtosis. At the same time, the frequencies of the responses were performed to obtain how many people gave each response. Additionally, as in the previous cases, the other statistical methods were performed to explore relationships with other variables.

The first question from the 2nd block was about managing approach if Gen Z prefers to get the bigger picture and then manage themselves the ways to achieve the goals. Based on the answers, respondents' opinions are a bit polarized (Mean = 3.1, SD = 1.13) with the idea that they want to be a part of the organizations where they would be informed in regards to the goals, and then they would manage the other steps themselves. In fact, 73 (49.7%) respondents agree and 39 (26.5%) strongly agree with the statement and 27 (18.4%) are neutral towards it. Skewness that is "an indication of the symmetry of the distribution" (Pallant, 2011) on this question, is negative (-.71), which indicated that the scores clustering at the right-hand side of a graph of distribution (Pallant, 2011). Kurtosis that "provides information about the 'peakedness' of the distribution" (Pallant, 2011) on this question is positive (.54) that indicated "the distribution is rather peaked (clustered in the center), with long thin tails too" (Pallant, 2011).

The second question of the section was about the importance of ownership. According to the answers, respondents' opinions are a bit polarized (Mean = 3.7, SD = .9). 71 (48.3%) respondents agree, and 24 (16.3%) strongly agree with the statement, while 40 (27.2%) are neutral towards it. Skewness is negative (-.5) that indicated that the scores clustering at the right-hand side of a graph of distribution (Pallant, 2011), whereas Kurtosis is positive (-.03) stands for "a distribution is relatively flat" (Pallant, 2011).

The third question of the section was about the decision-making process if anyone in the company should be able to make any kind of decision if there is nobody who has a rational objection. Based on the answers, respondents' opinions are polarized (Mean = 3.1, SD = 1.13). In fact, 44 (29.9%) respondents agree and 14 (9.5%) strongly agree with the statement, whilst 47 (32.0%) are neutral towards it, 27 (18.4 %) disagree and 15 (10.2 %) strongly disagree with it. Skewness is negative (-.23) that indicated that the scores clustering at the right-hand side of a graph of distribution (Pallant, 2011), whereas Kurtosis is negative (-.7) to stands for "a distribution is relatively flat" (Pallant, 2011).

The fourth question of the section was about changing the meeting concepts and instead of planning, having them based on the needs. According to the answers, respondents' opinions are a bit polarized (Mean = 3.43, SD = 1.0). 66 (44.9%) respondents agree, and 15 (10.2%) strongly agree with the statement, while 36 (24.5 %) are neutral towards it, 27 (18.4 %) disagree with it. Skewness is negative (-.41), which indicated that the scores clustering at the right-hand side of a graph of distribution (Pallant, 2011), whereas Kurtosis is negative (-.53) to stands for "a distribution is relatively flat" (Pallant, 2011).

The fifth question of the section was about the freedom to plan the vacation without having limited day-offs over the year. Based on the answers, respondents' opinions are a bit polarized (Mean = 3.5, SD = 1.0). 57 (38.8%) respondents agree, and 21 (14.3%) strongly agree with the statement, while 44 (29.9%) are neutral towards it, 20 (13.6 %) disagree, and 5 (3.4 %) strongly disagree with it. Skewness is negative (-.4), which indicated that the scores clustering at the right-hand side of a graph of distribution (Pallant, 2011), whereas Kurtosis is negative (-.3) to stands for "a distribution is relatively flat" (Pallant, 2011).

The sixth question of the section was about making mistakes and learning from them. Based on the answers, respondents' opinions are a bit polarized (Mean = 4.2, SD = .9). 60 (40.8%) respondents agree, and 64 (43.5%) strongly agree with the statement, while 13 (8.8%) are neutral towards it, and 8 (5.4 %) disagree with it. Skewness is negative (-1.3), that indicated that the scores clustering at the right-hand side of a graph of distribution (Pallant, 2011), whereas Kurtosis is positive (2.00) that indicated "the distribution is rather peaked (clustered in the center), with long thin tails too" (Pallant, 2011).

The seventh question of the section is about evolving the roles and job titles regularly as the organization changes. Based on the answers, respondents' opinions are a bit polarized (Mean = 4.0, SD = 1.0). 75 (51.0%) respondents agree, and 3 (2.0%) strongly agree with the statement, while 35 (23.8%) are neutral towards it, and 15 (10.2 %) disagree with it. Skewness is negative (-.7), that indicated that the scores clustering at the right-hand side of a graph of distribution (Pallant, 2011), whereas Kurtosis is positive (.32) that indicated "the distribution is rather peaked (clustered in the center), with long thin tails too" (Pallant, 2011).

The eight and last question of the section was about the team's formation. Based on the answers, respondents' opinions are a bit polarized (Mean = 3.5, SD = 1.0). In fact, 66 (44.9%) respondents

agree and 15 (10.2%) strongly agree with the statement, whilst 45 (30.6%) are neutral towards it, 18 (12.2 %) disagree and 3 (2.0 %) strongly disagree with it. Skewness is negative (-.5), which indicated that the scores clustering at the right-hand side of a graph of distribution (Pallant, 2011), whereas Kurtosis is negative (-.05) to stands for "a distribution is relatively flat" (Ibid).

Table 8 Gen Z's perceptions of the global trends in organizational design

Global trends	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
Achieving goals independently	1	7	27	73	39
Sense of ownership	1	11	40	71	24
Power of decision making	15	27	47	44	14
Sense of flexibility	3	27	36	66	15
Sense of freedom	5	20	44	57	21
Learning even from mistakes	2	8	13	60	64
Changing jobs	3	15	35	75	19
Team changing	3	18	45	66	15

Using the Crosstabulation function of SPSS, the findings were compared the same way as the previous question's findings. Based on the outcome from age groups, Face to face communication method is the most popular one: "18 and less" (N=10, 68%), "19-20 years old" (N=21, 72.4%), "21-22 years old" (N=54, 84.4%), "23 and above" (N=37, 95%).

Achieving goals independently: it was compared with the groups of gender, age, length of working experience, employment status, employment industry. In each case, almost the same tendencies revealed as they were presented in the total outcome. Thus, there will be reviewed only differences below, in fact:

- On the "Employment Industry" crosstabulation, the 2nd most popular answer from the "Business, Sales and Tourism" sector turned out "Neutral" (N=9, 23%) instead of "Strongly Agree" which got five responses (13%).

Sense of ownership: it was compared with the other above-mentioned variables. In each case, almost the same tendencies revealed as they were presented in the total outcome. Thus, there will be reviewed only differences below, in fact:

- On the “Employment Industry” crosstabulation, the 2nd most popular answer from the “Business, Sales and Tourism” sector turned out “Strongly Agree” (N=10, 25%) instead of “Neutral” which got six responses (15%).
- On “Employment status” crosstabulation, the 2nd most popular answer from the “Paid employment” level turned out “Strongly Agree” (N=17, 23%) instead of “Neutral,” which got 13 responses (18%).

The variable of decision making was compared with the other above-mentioned variables. In each case, almost the same tendencies revealed as they were presented in the total outcome. Thus, there will be reviewed only differences below, in fact:

- On “Length of working experience” crosstabulation, the 1st most popular answer from “Without experience” turned out “Agree” (N=17, 39%) instead of “Neutral” that got 14 (32%) and the same tendency revealed for “Up to 1-year experience”.
- On “Employment industry” crosstabulation, the 1st most popular answer from “Science, Engineering and Construction”, “Medical, Wellbeing, and Sport” turned out “Agree” instead of “Neutral”: in the first case (N=10, 36%) and the 2nd one (N=6, 40%).
- On “Age groups” crosstabulation, the 1st most popular answer from “18 and below”, “Between 19 – 20 years old” revealed “Agree” instead of “Neutral”: in the first case - N=17, (47%) and the 2nd one - N=9 (31%).
- On “Educational background” crosstabulation, the 1st most popular answer from “Upper secondary general school” revealed “Agree” (N=21, 36%) instead of “Neutral” that got 16 responses (28%).

The variable about flexibility was compared with the other above-mentioned variables. In each case, almost the same tendencies revealed as they were presented in the total outcome. Thus, there will be reviewed only differences below, in fact:

- On “Length of working experience” crosstabulation, the 2nd most popular answer from “More than 1 to 2 years’ experience” turned out “Disagree” (N=10, 26%) instead of “Neutral” that got 6 (15%).
- On “Age groups” crosstabulation, the 1st most popular answer from “18 years old and less” turned out “Neutral” (N=8, 53%) instead of “Agree” that got 4 (27%). As for the group of

“23 years old and more”, the 2nd most popular answers revealed, “Disagree” (N=10, 26%) instead of Neutral that got five responses (13%).

The variable of freedom was compared with the other variables mentioned above. In each case, almost the same tendencies revealed, and the differences were not found.

The variable about learning from the mistakes was compared with the other variables, as mentioned earlier. In each case, almost the same tendencies revealed as they were presented in the total outcome. Thus, there will be reviewed only differences below, in fact:

- On “Employment Industry” crosstabulation, the 1st most popular answer from “Medical, Wellbeing and Sport” turned out “Agree” (N=8, 53%) instead of “Strongly Agree” that got 4 (27%).
- On “Age groups” crosstabulation, the 1st most popular answer from “More than 19 to 20 years old” turned out “Agree” (N=15, 52%) instead of “Strongly Agree” that got 11 (38%).
- On “Educational background” crosstabulation, the 1st most popular answer from “Bachelor’s degree” turned out “Agree” (N=36, 46%) instead of “Strongly Agree” that got 33 (42%).

The variable about changing jobs was compared with the other variables, as mentioned above. In each case, almost the same tendencies revealed as they were presented in the total outcome. Thus, there will be reviewed only differences below, in fact:

- On “Employment Industry” crosstabulation, the 2nd most popular answer from “Self employment” turned out “Strongly Agree” (N=4, 44%) instead of “Neutral” that got no responses. As for the group of “Science, Engineering and Construction” turned out “Neutral” (N=12, 8%) instead of “Agree” that got 8 (29%).

The variable about team changing from the mistakes was compared with the other above-mentioned variables. In each case, almost the same tendencies revealed as they were presented in total outcome. Thus, there will be review only differences below, in fact:

- On “Employment Industry” crosstabulation, the 1st most popular answer from “Science, Engineering and Construction” turned out “Neutral” (N=12, 43%) instead of “Agree” that got 8 (29%).

More detailed tables are attached in Appendix 4.

3.4. Discussion and limitations

This study conducted to understand Generation Z as a future workforce: its core values at the workplace and expectations from the employers. Secondly, the aim of it was to explore Gen Z's perceptions of the global trends of organizational design.

Based on the findings of 147 respondents' answers, for Generation Z, among the top three values at the workplace are career opportunities, stable and reasonable compensation package, and the team atmosphere over there. The tendency of these findings nicely matched with the previously conducted research reviewed in the literature review part.

Respondents have ranked eight values on a scale from 1 to 8, and as the three bottom places nominated: company reputation, chance to make an impact, and culture of recognition in descending order.

Respondents had a chance to express their thoughts regarding their expectations from the employer through the open-ended question. Based on the outcome, some responses repeated the findings from the core values. They expressed the importance of career opportunities again and the compensation part. The other findings stand for the desire for higher competition among employers in the labor market. Furthermore, the respondents are expecting from the employers to be allowed to take home office, friendly relationships with the manager. Some of the participants wanted their ideas to be listened to and considered.

As a part of the research, there identified the preferable method for Gen Z for having communication on their job. Based on the findings, among the top three most popular ways of communication are face to face, email, and instant messaging. In contrast, the least popular answer was text messaging. It worth to mention that some respondent even mentioned that they are ready

to use any methods whatever apply the best in the context and with people they need to communicate.

As a part of the research, there revealed the preferable frequency of feedback delivery from the direct manager. According to the outcome, monthly basis feedback got the most responses, following weekly and quarterly basis ones. It worth to be mentioned that the findings do not align with the previously contacted research results reviewed before. In the previous research, multiple quick check-ups from the direct manager are the preferable approach for Gen Z.

The data collected by the study supports the fact that overall, Generation Z's perceptions of organization design elements matched with the global trends. More specifically, Gen Z is acceptable to set their ways to achieve the goals of their job and have ownership of the processes. The vast majority of them are up to have flexibility and freedom as a part of their job. They are keen on being a part of the rapidly evolving environment where their tasks and responsibilities are evolving the same way too. They are enthusiastic about learning even from mistakes. These findings respond to the global trends of organizational trends that are already in place – Organizational Agility and Self-management Organization principles.

The study also has some limitations that might have affected the results. The vast majority (%) respondents were from Georgia, and it is likely that the forces such as the socio-cultural, economic influenced on the findings, especially as there was not possible to compare the results with the Generation Z responses from the other locations. As an initial plan, it supposed to have two sample groups regarding locations: from Georgia and Estonia. The author believed that the comparison of these two countries' findings could be interesting since both of them have a similar historical past about be a part of the Soviet Union. However, the present is different, considering economic developments. However, the plan did not work out because of the tremendous global changes caused by the COVID 19 developments globally. The recent changes reflected in this thesis' data collections process too. People who supposed to be respondents of the survey faced some challenges, such as losing a job. Consequently, the author decided not to reach those people in order not to overwhelm them further.

3.5. Recommendations

Since the main aim of the research was to understand Generation Z as a future workforce, the primary audience for whom the recommendations based on the findings should be interesting for are employers, business leaders, HR professionals. In other words, people responsible for attracting, hiring, retaining the top talents at the workplace as well as people responsible for building organizational design.

Based on the research outcome, the author brings suggestions to t employers:

- Research results showed that employers need to create a career path for Gen Z and then promote this opportunity to attract and retain them at the workplace;
- Along with the career opportunities, employers should promote their compensation package even from the beginning of the cooperation since it might be a turning point for Gen Z;
- The work environment is an critical factor for Gen Z at the workplace. However, they put various meanings in it: friendly relationship with the manager; supportive approach; transparent, honest and respectful communication between the team members;
- Employers should create face to face communication opportunity for Gen Z, but suggest various communication channels too based on the context and needs;
- Generation Z admires feedback culture at the organization. However, it should be noted that the research results do not agree. They'd prefer to get straightforward communication from the employers. Based on the research results, they prefer monthly basis feedback delivery that did not match the previous findings that say that multiple check-ins on a weekly basis is the preferable method for them.
- Employers that already implemented organizational agility or self-management organization are safe regarding Gen Z dependence with the concepts apply for them. Furthermore, companies that consider redesigning their organizational systems; these findings could be additional approval to make it happen. In particular, these stand for the goal setting, sense of ownership, decision-making process, adaptability, flexibility, and freedom at the workplace.

CONCLUSION

This thesis aimed to understand Generation Z's core values towards the workplace, its expectations from the employers, and its perceptions towards the global trends of organizational design. In order to achieve the goal, stated two research questions to find answers:

1. What does Generation Z value the most at the workplace?
2. How does Generation Z perceive the global trends of organizational design: principles of Organizational Agility and Self-Management Organization?

As a summary of the theoretical overview, the author found that Gen Z because of its tech-savvy mindset, taking a new set of behaviors, expectations, preferences at the workplace that revealed through the various researches, such as workplace selection, workplace management, career path. Based on the finding, the author decided to study Gen Z's core work values and expectations towards the current or future employers. To add it, as Gen Z would need to adapt to the systems already in place, the author decided to review the current global trends in organizational design and connect these two topics regarding how this cohort perceives come elements of it.

In order to fulfill the aims mentioned above, the author developed the research methodology and conducted research using a self-administrated questionnaire. The findings generated based on the findings of 147 respondents' answers. Since the primary purpose of the research was to understand Gen Z's opinions about the organizational design trends and their values at the workplace, the sample group were either people already entered into the labor market or are just about to enter there.

Based on the findings, for Generation Z, among the top three values at the workplace are career opportunities, stable and reasonable compensation package, and the team atmosphere over there. The tendency of these findings nicely matched with the previously conducted research reviewed in the literature review part. Respondents have ranked eight values on a scale from 1 to 8, and as the three bottom places nominated: company reputation, chance to make an impact, and culture of recognition in descending order.

Respondents had a chance to express their thoughts regarding their expectations from the employer through the open-ended question. Based on the outcome, some responses repeated the findings from the core values. They expressed the importance of career opportunities again and the compensation part. The other findings stand for the desire for higher competition among employers in the labor market. Furthermore, the respondents are expecting from the employers to be allowed to take home office, friendly relationships with the manager. Some of the participants wanted their ideas to be listened to and considered.

As a part of the research, there identified the preferable method for Gen Z for having communication on their job. Based on the findings, among the top three most popular ways of communication are face to face, email, and instant messaging. In contrast, the least popular answer was text messaging. Some respondents are even ready to use various tools based on the needs raised from the environment.

According to the outcome, the desirable frequency of feedback delivery from the direct manager is a monthly basis following a weekly and quarterly basis. It worth to be mentioned that the findings do not align with the previously contacted research results reviewed before. In the previous research, multiple quick check-ups from the direct manager are the preferable approach for Gen Z.

The data collected by the study supports the fact that overall, Generation Z's perceptions of organization design elements match with the global trends. They are eager to set their ways to achieve the goals of their job and have ownership of the processes. They admire the flexibility and freedom in their environment reflected in planning the meeting or taking unlimited vacation days. They are tolerable being a part of the environment where processes are evolving fast, and so do their responsibilities and tasks. Even changing the possession of teams is acceptable for them. Gen Z is enthusiastic about learning even from mistakes. These findings respond to the global trends of organizational trends that are already in place – Organizational Agility and Self-management Organization principles.

The study had some limitations, too, that might have affected the results. The vast majority (%) respondents were from Georgia, and it is likely that the forces such as the socio-cultural, economic influenced on the findings, especially as there was not possible to compare the results with the Generation Z responses from the other locations. As an initial plan, it supposed to have two sample

groups regarding locations: from Georgia and Estonia. The author believed that the comparison of these two countries' findings could be interesting since both of them have a similar historical past about be a part of the Soviet Union. However, the present is different, considering economic developments. However, the plan did not work out because of the tremendous global changes caused by the COVID 19 developments globally. The recent changes reflected in this thesis' data collections process too. People who supposed to be respondents of the survey faced some challenges, such as losing a job. Consequently, the author decided not to reach those people in order not to overwhelm them further.

This thesis focused more on the generation Z's perspective to understand their work values, expectations from the employers, as well as their perceptions towards the global trends of organizational design. However, in order to give more precise recommendations to the employers about Gen Z as a future workforce, future studies should go more in-depth and understand what they are looking for each stage of the cooperation, for example, regarding the brand image, recruitment, and employment process.

The sample group should be broader if the future studies will aim to generalize the findings globally. The author firmly believes that the economic, social-cultural local factors affect forming the generations and their perceptions, thus involving people from a different background (locations) that could prevent its effect on the findings.

Since the percent rate of Gen Z on the labor market is increasing rapidly, it would be easier to observe them directly at the workplace. Accordingly, in the future studies Gen Z's colleagues, direct manager involvement could contribute a lot in the process of understanding them better as a workforce. As well as, because Gen Z will gain more practical experience will be capable of sharing their thoughts from the practice rather than sharing their expectations based on the imaginations. Gen Z entering into the labor market means increasing generational diversity at the workplace, comparisons analysis between the generational workforce could lead to absorbing results.

REFERENCES

Aghina, W. Ahlback, K. De Smet, A. Lackey, G. Lurie, M. Muraka, M. Handscomb, C. (2018). The five trademarks of agile organizations. *McKinsey Quarterly*.

Anikin, S. (2019). *Scaling Pipedrive Engineering — From Teams to Tribes*. Retrieved from: <https://medium.com/pipedrive-engineering/scaling-pipedrive-engineering-from-teams-to-tribes-8f14fd92df8c> , Accessed on 9 March, 2020.

Bersin, J. Tiffany, M. Rahnema, A. and Durme, V. (2017). *The organization of the future: arriving now*. Retrieved from: www2.deloitte.com/insights/us/en/focus/human-capital-trends/2017/organization-of-the-future.html, Accessed on 10 March, 2020.

Brosseau, D. Ebrahim, S. Handscomb, C. Thaker, S. (2019). The journey to an agile organization. *McKinsey & Company*.

Christie. B. (2019). *Generation Z's Impact on the Future of Work*. Retrieved from: <https://worldatwork.org/workspan/articles/generation-z-impact-s-on-the-future-of-work> , Accessed on 9 of April, 2020.

De Smet, A. Aghina, W. (2015). *The keys to organizational agility*. *McKinsey & Company*. Retrieved from: <https://www.mckinsey.com/business-functions/organization/our-insights/the-keys-to-organizational-agility>, Accessed on 3 March, 2020.

Deoitte Insights (2019). *Leading the social enterprise: Reinvent with a human focus*. Retrieved from: https://www2.deloitte.com/content/dam/insights/us/articles/5136_HC-Trends-2019/DI_HC-Trends-2019.pdf , Accesses on 2 March, 2020

Dimock, M. (2019). *Defining generations: Where Millennials end and Generation Z begins*. Retrieved from <https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2019/01/17/where-millennials-end-and-generation-z-begins/>, Accessed on 17 March, 2020.

Failure Drives Innovation, According to EY Survey on Gen Z. PR Newswire. Retrieved from: <https://www.prnewswire.com/news-releases/failure-drives-innovation-according-to-ey-survey-on-gen-z-300714436.html>, Accessed on 25 April, 2020.

Fry, R. Parker, K. (2018). *Early Benchmarks Show 'Post-Millennials' on Track to Be Most Diverse, Best-Educated Generation Yet*. Retrieved from: <https://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2018/11/15/early-benchmarks-show-post-millennials-on-track-to-be-most-diverse-best-educated-generation-yet/> , Accessed on 21 February, 2020.

Gen Z is here. Are you ready? Dell Technologies. Retrieved from: <https://www.delltechnologies.com/en-us/perspectives/gen-z.htm> , Accessed on 26 of April, 2020.

Gen Z: The future has arrived. Dell Technologies. Retrieved from: <https://www.dellemc.com/en-us/collaterals/unauth/sales-documents/solutions/gen-z-the-future-has-arrived-executive-summary.pdf> , Accessed on 25 February, 2020.

Gerritsen, M. (2019). *Self-management: how to create a self-managed culture*. Retrieved from: <https://www.effactory.com/knowledge/self-management-how-to-create-a-self-managed-culture/> Accessed on 23 February 2020.

Ghosh, P. (2019). *Future of Work: 10 Key Trends for the Next 10 Years*. Retrieved from: <https://www.hrtechnologist.com/articles/digital-transformation/future-of-work-key-trends/>, Accessed on 24 February, 2020.

Graber, A.C. (2019). *Self-Management: The Next Step After Agile*. Retrieved from: <https://www.knowledgehut.com/blog/agile/self-management-the-next-step-after-agile> , Accessed on 26 February, 2020.

Hastie, S. (2018). *Managing in Organisations without Managers: Self-Management in Action*. Retrieved from: <https://www.infoq.com/news/2018/11/kirkpatrick-self-management/> , Accessed on 20 February, 2020.

HolacracyOne, L. L. C. *Holacracy Constitution*. Retrieved from: <https://www.holacracy.org/constitution#art14>, Accessed on 7 May, 2020.

HolacracyOne, L. L. C. *Tactical Meeting Overview*. Holacracy. Retrieved from: <https://www.holacracy.org/tactical-meetings> , Accessed on 7 May, 2020.

Huss, M. M. (1990). Pronatalism in the Inter-War Period in France. *Journal of Contemporary History*, Vol. 25, No. 1, 39-68.

Jackson II, R.L. Hogg, M. A. (2010). *Encyclopedia of Identity*. Vol. 1. Los Angeles: SAGE Publications Inc. 307

Jenkins, R. (2019). *How Generation Z Will Transform the Future Workplace*. Retrieved from: <https://www.inc.com/ryan-jenkins/the-2019-workplace-7-ways-generation-z-will-shape-it.html> , Accessed on 26 February, 2020.

Jenkins, R. (2019). *This Is How Generation Z Employees Want Feedback*. Retrieved from: <https://www.inc.com/ryan-jenkins/this-is-how-generation-z-employees-want-feedback.html> , Accessed on 28 March, 2020.

Kane, S. (2019). *Common Characteristics of Generation X Professionals*. Retrieved from: <https://www.thebalancecareers.com/common-characteristics-of-generation-x-professionals-2164682> , Accessed on 12 March, 2020.

- Kannike, A. Raudsepp, M. (2016). *Generations in Estonia: Contemporary Perspectives on Turbulent Times. Volume 5 of Approaches to Culture Theory*. Tartu, Estonia: University of Tartu.
- Laloux, F. (2015). *The Future of Management Is Teal. Strategy+Business*, 7-12.
- Laloux, F. (2016). *Reinventing organizations*. (1st ed.). Millis, Massachusetts, USA: Nelson Parker.
- Lenhart, A. (2013). *The challenges of conducting surveys of youth*. Retrieved from: <https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2013/06/21/the-challenges-of-conducting-surveys-on-youths/> , Accessed on 25 April, 2020.
- Lim, N. (2019). *Young Republicans trending more liberal than older conservatives*. Retrieved from: <https://www.washingtonexaminer.com/news/young-republicans-trending-more-liberal-than-older-conservatives-poll> , Accessed on 25 April, 2020.
- Lim, P. Parker, A. (2020). *Mentoring Millennials in an Asian Context: Talent Management Insights from Singapore*. UK: Emerald Group Publishing. 127 – 134.
- Martins, A. (2019). *Study Finds Gen Z Workers Expect Fast Track to Success*. Retrieved from: <https://www.businessnewsdaily.com/11331-gen-z-expects-fast-track-to-success.html> , Accessed on 25 April, 2020.
- McIntosh-Elkins, J. McRitchie, K. Scoones, M. From the silent generation to generation x, y and z: strategies for managing the generation mix. *ACM Digital Library*, 240 – 241.
- McLaren, S. (2019). *6 Gen Z Traits You Need to Know to Attract, Hire, and Retain Them*. Retrieved from: <https://business.linkedin.com/talent-solutions/blog/hiring-generation-z/2019/how-to-hire-and-retain-generation-z> , Accessed on 25 April, 2020.
- Miserany, K. (2019). *Trying to recruit Gen Z? Focus on D&I*. Retrieved from: <https://medium.com/@katiemiserany/trying-to-recruit-gen-z-focus-on-d-i-c5fc95f0645d>, Accessed on 25 April, 2020.
- Millennial Careers: 2020 Vision Facts, Figures and Practical Advice from Workforce Experts* (2019). ManpowerGroup. Retrieved from: http://www.manpowergroup.cl/wps/wcm/connect/manpowergroup/e8611255-2e23-4cce-8825-6d0f6b011691/MillennialsVision2020.pdf?MOD=AJPERES&CONVERT_TO=url&CACHEID=e8611255-2e23-4cce-8825-6d0f6b011691 , Accessed on 26 February, 2019
- Morgan, J. (2015). *The 5 Types of Organizational Structures: Part 1, The Hierarchy*. Retrieved from: <https://www.forbes.com/sites/jacobmorgan/2015/07/06/the-5-types-of-organizational-structures-part-1-the-hierarchy/#3a6c0e1a5252> , Accessed on 18 March, 2020.

Pallant, J. (2011). *SPSS Survival Manual*. Australia: Allen & Unwin. 103, 134-135, 283.

Pew Research Center (2015). *The Whys and Hows of Generations Research*.. Retrieved from: <https://www.people-press.org/2015/09/03/the-whys-and-hows-of-generations-research/> , Accessed on 20 February, 2020.

Piore, A. (2019). *Gen Zs are Anxious, Entrepreneurial and Determined to Avoid Their Predecessor's Mistakes*. Retrieved from: <https://www.newsweek.com/2019/06/28/gen-zs-are-anxious-entrepreneurial-determined-avoid-their-predecessors-mistakes-1443581.html>, 27th of April, 2020.

Poague, E. (2018). *Here Is Why Gen Z Believes That Learning Opportunities Are an Important Recruiting Tool*. Retrieved from: <https://business.linkedin.com/talent-solutions/blog/trends-and-research/2018/why-gen-z-believes-that-learning-opportunities-are-an-important-recruiting-tool>, Accessed 24th of February, 2020.

Rauch, J. (November 2018). *Generation next, Millennials will outnumber baby-boomers in 2019*. The Economist. Retrieved from: <https://web.archive.org/web/20190313195431/http://te.tbr.fun/generation-next> , Accessed 13th of March, 2020.

Roberts, G. *What Is Self Management? How Self Managed Teams Operate Without Hierarchy*. Retrieved from: <https://www.outseta.com/posts/what-is-self-management-how-self-managed-teams-operate-without-hierarchy> , Accessed 25th of February, 2020.

Van de Kamp, P. (2014) Holacracy – A Radical Approach to Organizational Design. *DataCite*, 13.

Wyrzykowska, B. (2020) Teal Organizations: Literature Review and Future Research Directions. *Central European Management Journal*, 27(4), 126 – 132.

Zappos insights. *Holacracy and Self-Organization*. Retrieved from: <https://www.zapposinsights.com/about/holacracy> , Accessed 7th of May, 2020.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1. Questionnaire

Hello there,

I'm Elene Murvanidze, an MBA graduate student at Tallinn University of Technology.

For my final project, I'm working on understanding Gen Z, anyone born from 1995 till the early 10th, as a future workforce. I want to know what you are looking for the current or future employer and understand your perceptions towards the global trends in organizational design. Your contribution will be highly appreciated and it will help us to generate recommendations for the employers on how to start preparing for having you at their workplaces.

Please take around 5 - 10 minutes to complete the survey.

In case of your interest, I'll be happy to share a short summary of the final findings once the results are available.

A note on privacy:

This survey is anonymous – you are not asked to identify yourself.

It is also confidential: the data will be stored in line with data protection legislation and any reporting of the data will be done in a way that ensures that individual responses cannot be identified.

The focus of this survey is not on individuals but on patterns of responses across a large number of people.

The data collected with this questionnaire may be used in presentations and articles, within and outside of the school.

If you have any further questions, feel free to reach me out via email: murvanidzeelene@gmail.com

Thank you so much for taking the time to complete this survey!

All the best,

Elene Murvanidze

1. Please rank the following factors according to their importance for what you value most at the workplace in a way that each factor has one unique number.
You need to rank 8 factors from the first place to the 8th, where 1 - is the most important factor and 8 - the least important.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Compensation package (e.g. salary, benefits)								

Career opportunities in the company								
Team atmosphere								
Work environment								
Flexible schedule								
Culture of recognition								
The chance to make an impact								
Company reputation								

2. How often do you want to get feedback from your manager?

- a. I don't want to get it
- b. Yearly
- c. Quarterly
- d. Monthly
- e. Biweekly
- f. Weekly
- g. Multiple check-ins during the week
- h. Other (please specify the answer)

3. What are the most preferred methods of communication at work?

Please select all that apply.

- a. Face-to-face
- b. Phone call
- c. Email
- d. Text messaging
- e. Instant messaging (WhatsApp, Viber, Messenger)
- f. Video chat
- g. Social collaboration platforms (Slack, Atlassian Confluence, etc)
- h. Other (please specify the answer)

4. Please share your thoughts, additional comments: what are you looking for from your future or current employer?

5. I want to be a part of the organization where managers informed about the goals and then manage myself how to achieve them.

- a. Strongly disagree
- b. Disagree
- c. Neutral
- d. Agree
- e. Strongly Agree

6. I want to have a sense of ownership in the workplace: when taking action is not someone else's responsibility.

- a. Strongly disagree
- b. Disagree
- c. Neutral
- d. Agree
- e. Strongly Agree

7. I want to be a part of the organizations where any employees can make any decisions as long as no one has a rational objection.
 - a. Strongly disagree
 - b. Disagree
 - c. Neutral
 - d. Agree
 - e. Strongly Agree

8. Rather than having predefined times and agendas for meetings, I prefer to meet with my colleagues as needs arise.
 - a. Strongly disagree
 - b. Disagree
 - c. Neutral
 - d. Agree
 - e. Strongly Agree

9. Take unlimited paid time off is a fair request, as long as your work is done, and your manager approves.
 - a. Strongly disagree
 - b. Disagree
 - c. Neutral
 - d. Agree
 - e. Strongly Agree

10. Even the best plan can fail, but it is fine since you could learn from it..
 - a. Strongly disagree
 - b. Disagree
 - c. Neutral
 - d. Agree
 - e. Strongly Agree

11. I feel comfortable working in an environment, where roles and job titles evolve regularly as the organization changes.
 - a. Strongly disagree
 - b. Disagree
 - c. Neutral
 - d. Agree
 - e. Strongly Agree

12. I'm keen on working in an environment where teams could be formed and disbanded quickly depending on the issue to be addressed.
 - a. Strongly disagree
 - b. Disagree
 - c. Neutral
 - d. Agree
 - e. Strongly Agree

13. Age (full years)

14. Gender

- Female
- Male
- Prefer not to say

15. Where are you based?

.....

16. What is the highest degree or level of school you have completed?

- Basic school (grades 1-9)
- Upper-secondary general school (grades 10-12)
- Vocational education
- Bachelor's degree
- Other (please specify the answer)

17. What is your current employment status?

Please check any which apply

- Paid Employment
- Self-employed
- Volunteer
- Intern (paid or unpaid)
- Student
- Military
- Other (please specify the answer)

18. Which of the following best describes your current or future employment industry?

- Agriculture, animals and food
- Science, Engineering and construction
- Medical, wellbeing and sport
- Creative arts, fashion and media
- Government, law and education
- Accountancy, finance and insurance
- Business, sales and tourism
- Other (please specify the answer)

19. Working experience (full years; enter 0 if you haven't worked at all)

.....

20. Please indicate your email if you'd like to get a short summary of the final findings once the results are available.

.....

The link of questionnaire: <https://forms.gle/bd5wTuiKX2RybWuB7>

Appendix 2. SPSS Analysis of demographic block

Gender		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	52	35.4	35.4	35.4
	Female	94	63.9	63.9	99.3
	prefer not to say	1	.7	.7	100.0
	Total	147	100.0	100.0	

Age		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	18 and less	15	10.2	10.2	10.2
	19 - 20	29	19.7	19.7	29.9
	21 - 22	64	43.5	43.5	73.5
	23+	39	26.5	26.5	100.0
	Total	147	100.0	100.0	

Location		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Bahamas	1	.7	.7	.7
	Egypt	1	.7	.7	1.4
	Estonia	2	1.4	1.4	2.7
	Georgia	142	96.6	96.6	99.3
	US	1	.7	.7	100.0
	Total	147	100.0	100.0	

Educational level		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Basic school (grades 1-9)	3	2.0	2.1	2.1
	Upper-secondary general school (grades 10-12)	58	39.5	39.7	41.8
	Vocational education	3	2.0	2.1	43.8
	Bachelor's degree	79	53.7	54.1	97.9
	others	3	2.0	2.1	100.0
	Total	146	99.3	100.0	
Missing	99	1	.7		
Total		147	100.0		

Employment status		Responses		Percent of Cases
		N	Percent	
Employement.	Paid_Employement	74	41.3%	50.3%
	Self_employed	9	5.0%	6.1%
	Volunteer	4	2.2%	2.7%
	Intern	14	7.8%	9.5%
	Student	76	42.5%	51.7%
	Other	2	1.1%	1.4%
Total		179	100.0%	121.8%

Employment Industry		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agriculture, animals and food	10	6.8	6.8	6.8
	Science, Engineering and construction	28	19.0	19.0	25.9
	Medical, wellbeing and sport	15	10.2	10.2	36.1
	Creative arts, fashion and media	13	8.8	8.8	44.9
	Government, law and education	17	11.6	11.6	56.5
	Accountancy, finance and insurance	24	16.3	16.3	72.8
	Business, sales and tourism	39	26.5	26.5	99.3
	Other	1	.7	.7	100.0
	Total	147	100.0	100.0	

Working Experience		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Without experience	43	29.3	29.3	29.3
	Some experience but not more than 1 years'	38	25.9	25.9	55.1
	More than 1 year, but not more than 2 years' experience	39	26.5	26.5	81.6
	More than 2 years of experience	27	18.4	18.4	100.0
		147	100.0	100.0	

		Age	Working_exp
Age	Pearson Correlation	1	.546**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	147	147
Working_exp	Pearson Correlation	.546**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	147	147
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).			

Appendix 3. SPSS Analysis: Core values

Ranks	
	Mean Rank
Compensation	3.09
Carrer_opport	2.61
Team_atmosphere	3.61
Work_environment	4.41
Flexible_schedule	5.34
Recognition	5.78
Impact	5.71
Company_reputation	5.45

Test Statistics ^a	
N	147
Chi-Square	272.068
df	7
Asymp. Sig.	.000
a. Friedman Test	

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances	t-test for Equality of Means								
			F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
										Lower	Upper
Compensation	Equal var. assumed	6.264	.01	1.0	144	.309	.35	.343	-.328	1.028	
	Equal var. not assumed			1.0	87	.342	.35	.367	-.379	1.079	
Carrer oport.	Equal var. assumed	2.306	.13	.64	144	.527	.23	.357	-.479	.932	
	Equal var. not assumed			.61	92	.546	.23	.374	-.516	.970	
Team_atmosphere	Equal var. assumed	1.118	.29	1.4	144	.154	.45	.312	-.169	1.062	
	Equal var. not assumed			1.4	95	.170	.45	.323	-.194	1.087	

Work_environment	Equal var. assumed	.522	.47	-.3	144	.801	-.08	.314	-.700	.541
	Equal var. not assumed			-.3	104	.802	-.08	.315	-.705	.546
Flexible_schedule	Equal var. assumed	.073	.79	.18	144	.858	.06	.316	-.568	.682
	Equal var. not assumed			.18	107	.857	.06	.315	-.568	.682
Recognition	Equal var. assumed	.056	.81	-.2	144	.834	-.07	.321	-.701	.566
	Equal var. not assumed			-.2	108	.833	-.07	.318	-.698	.564
Impact	Equal var. assumed	.42	.52	-1.6	144	.116	-.57	.361	-1.284	.142
	Equal vari. not assumed			-1.6	106	.116	-.57	.360	-1.285	.143
Company_reputation	Equal var. assumed	.78	.38	.2	144	.928	.04	.399	-.753	.825
	Equal var. not assumed			.2	100	.930	.04	.407	-.771	.843

Appendix 4. SPSS Feedback frequency and communication channels

Feedback		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	I don't want to get it	2	1.4	1.4	1.4
	Yearly	5	3.4	3.4	4.8
	Quarterly	15	10.2	10.2	15.0
	Monthly	58	39.5	39.5	54.4
	Biweekly	15	10.2	10.2	64.6
	Weekly	46	31.3	31.3	95.9
	Multiple check-ins during the week	5	3.4	3.4	99.3
	Daily	1	.7	.7	100.0
	Total	147	100.0	100.0	

Communication forms		Responses		Percent of Cases
		N	Percent	
Comm_forms	Face_to_face	122	42.5%	85.9%
	Phone_call	43	15.0%	30.3%
	Text_mess	19	6.6%	13.4%
	Instant_mess	45	15.7%	31.7%
	Video_chat	28	9.8%	19.7%
	Social_collab	28	9.8%	19.7%
	Other_channel	2	0.7%	1.4%

Appendix 5. SPSS Analysis: Organizational Design

Goals setting		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly disagree	1	.7	.7	.7
	Disagree	7	4.8	4.8	5.4
	Neutral	27	18.4	18.4	23.8
	Agree	73	49.7	49.7	73.5
	Strongly agree	39	26.5	26.5	100.0
	Total	147	100.0	100.0	

Ownership		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly disagree	1	.7	.7	.7
	Disagree	11	7.5	7.5	8.2
	Neutral	40	27.2	27.2	35.4
	Agree	71	48.3	48.3	83.7
	Strongly agree	24	16.3	16.3	100.0
	Total	147	100.0	100.0	

Decision making		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly disagree	15	10.2	10.2	10.2
	Disagree	27	18.4	18.4	28.6
	Neutral	47	32.0	32.0	60.5
	Agree	44	29.9	29.9	90.5
	Strongly agree	14	9.5	9.5	100.0
	Total	147	100.0	100.0	

FlexiBility		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly disagree	3	2.0	2.0	2.0
	Disagree	27	18.4	18.4	20.4
	Neutral	36	24.5	24.5	44.9
	Agree	66	44.9	44.9	89.8
	Strongly agree	15	10.2	10.2	100.0
	Total	147	100.0	100.0	

Learning from the mistakes		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly disagree	2	1.4	1.4	1.4
	Disagree	8	5.4	5.4	6.8
	Neutral	13	8.8	8.8	15.6
	Agree	60	40.8	40.8	56.5
	Strongly agree	64	43.5	43.5	100.0
	Total	147	100.0	100.0	

Adaptability in jobs		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly disagree	3	2.0	2.0	2.0
	Disagree	15	10.2	10.2	12.2
	Neutral	35	23.8	23.8	36.1
	Agree	75	51.0	51.0	87.1
	Strongly agree	19	12.9	12.9	100.0
	Total	147	100.0	100.0	

Adaptability in teams		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly disagree	3	2.0	2.0	2.0
	Disagree	18	12.2	12.2	14.3
	Neutral	45	30.6	30.6	44.9
	Agree	66	44.9	44.9	89.8
	Strongly agree	15	10.2	10.2	100.0
	Total	147	100.0	100.0	

Appendix 6. A non-exclusive licence

A non-exclusive licence for granting public access to and reproducing the graduation thesis

I, Elene Murvanidze

1. Give Tallinn University of Technology a free of charge permission (non-exclusive licence) to use my creation: “Understanding Generation Z as a future workforce and its perception towards the global trends of organizational design”, supervised by Maris Zernand-Vilson.

1.1.to reproduce with the purpose of keeping and publishing electronically, including for the purpose of supplementing the digital collection of TUT library until the copyright expires;

1.2.to make available to the public through the web environment of Tallinn University of Technology, including through the digital collection of TUT library until the copyright expires. 2.

I am aware that the author will also retain the rights provided in section

1. 3. I confirm that by granting the non-exclusive licence no infringement is committed of the third persons’ intellectual property rights or the rights arising from the personal data protection act and other legislation.