

UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI PADOVA

Dipartimento di Scienze Economiche e Aziendali “M. Fanno”



**CORSO DI LAUREA TRIENNALE IN
ECONOMIA**

PROVA FINALE

**“FUTURE TIME PERSPECTIVE IN THE
LABOR MARKET: THE TREND OVER THE
LAST FIVE YEARS”**

Relatore: Chiar.ma prof.ssa Martina Gianecchini

Laureanda: Ludovica Vanzo

Matricola n. 2001683

Anno Accademico 2022 – 2023

DICHIARAZIONE DI AUTENTICITA'

Dichiaro di aver preso visione del "Regolamento antiplagio" approvato dal Consiglio del Dipartimento di Scienze Economiche e Aziendali e, consapevole delle conseguenze derivanti da dichiarazioni mendaci, dichiaro che il presente lavoro non è già stato sottoposto, in tutto o in parte, per il conseguimento di un titolo accademico in altre Università italiane o straniere. Dichiaro inoltre che tutte le fonti utilizzate per la realizzazione del presente lavoro, inclusi i materiali digitali, sono state correttamente citate nel corpo del testo e nella sezione 'Riferimenti bibliografici'.

I hereby declare that I have read and understood the "Anti-plagiarism rules and regulations" approved by the Council of the Department of Economics and Management and I am aware of the consequences of making false statements. I declare that this piece of work has not been previously submitted – either fully or partially – for fulfilling the requirements of an academic degree, whether in Italy or abroad. Furthermore, I declare that the references used for this work – including the digital materials – have been appropriately cited and acknowledged in the text and in the section 'References'.

Firma (signature) *Luca P. P. P.*

INDICE

INTRODUZIONE.....	2
1. PRIMO CAPITOLO	3
FUTURE TIME PERSPECTIVE AND ITS EFFECTS ON JOB – RELATED DECISIONS	3
1.1 INTRODUCTION	3
1.2 FUTURE TIME PERSPECTIVE: AN ANALYSIS	3
1.3 ANTECEDENTS AND OUTCOMES OF THE FUTURE TIME PERSPECTIVE	5
1.4 THE FUTURE TIME PERSPECTIVE AND PROACTIVE WORK BEHAVIORS	7
2. SECONDO CAPITOLO	13
THE INFLUENCE OF AGE AND GENERATION ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN JOB HOPPING AND FTP.....	13
2.1 INTRODUCTION	13
2.2 THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN AGE AND FTP	13
2.3 THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN AGE AND JOB HOPPING.....	17
2.4 THE INFLUENCE OF RECENT MACRO EVENTS ON FTP	19
3. TERZO CAPITOLO	22
EXPLORING JOB HOPPING: A CONCRETE ANALYSIS.....	22
3.1 INTRODUCTION	22
3.2 QUESTIONNAIRE ADMINISTRATION AND SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS.....	22
3.3 DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION.....	25
3.4 IMPLICATIONS FOR FIRMS AND EMPLOYEES	29
RIFERIMENTI BIBLIOGRAFICI	35
ALLEGATI	38

INTRODUZIONE

Negli ultimi anni, il fenomeno del job hopping, ovvero il frequente cambio di lavoro da parte dei dipendenti, ha acquisito una rilevanza sempre maggiore nel contesto lavorativo. La presente tesi si propone di esplorare la relazione tra la prospettiva temporale futura (Future Time Perspective, FTP) e il job hopping, analizzando sia l'aspetto teorico che pratico di questo fenomeno.

Attraverso una revisione della letteratura, sono state esaminate le teorie psicologiche e sociologiche che forniscono una base concettuale per comprendere il job hopping e la sua connessione con la FTP. Inoltre, sono state considerate le influenze di fattori come la soddisfazione lavorativa, l'adattamento organizzativo e le opportunità di carriera sul job hopping.

Per ottenere una testimonianza concreta e rilevante, è stato somministrato un questionario a un campione di lavoratori provenienti da diverse industrie e settori. Il questionario ha indagato sulle loro prospettive future, motivazioni e atteggiamenti nei confronti del job hopping. I dati raccolti sono stati analizzati in modo statistico per identificare eventuali correlazioni tra la FTP e il job hopping, nonché le principali motivazioni che stimolano le persone a cambiare lavoro. I risultati hanno confermato l'esistenza di una relazione significativa tra la FTP e il job hopping. I partecipanti con una FTP orientata verso il futuro sono risultati più inclini a considerare il job hopping come una strategia di carriera valida. Inoltre, sono emerse alcune motivazioni comuni che spingono i lavoratori a intraprendere il job hopping, come la ricerca di nuove sfide, l'acquisizione di competenze diverse e l'aspirazione a una maggiore soddisfazione lavorativa. In conclusione, questa ricerca contribuisce a una migliore comprensione del fenomeno del job hopping e sottolinea l'importanza di gestirlo in maniera opportuna per garantire un buon equilibrio aziendale. Gli esiti ottenuti possono essere utili per le organizzazioni nella gestione delle risorse umane e per gli individui nella pianificazione della propria carriera.

1. PRIMO CAPITOLO

FUTURE TIME PERSPECTIVE AND ITS EFFECTS ON JOB – RELATED DECISIONS

1.1 Introduction

The first part of this chapter aims to investigate the Future Time Perspective as conceived by Ruth Kanfer, Matt Betts, and Cort W. Rudolf in one of their latest studies. It must be underlined that there is still not a unique view or study regarding this theory and that the thesis of the authors is tentative in putting together all the related concepts previously analyzed by other scholars.

The second section of this chapter will be devoted to investigating the possible effects of this theory on motivation at work. We will see that behaviors such as job crafting, or job hopping can sometimes relate to an individual's Future Time Perspective.

This has some implications when managing the workplace, which should be adapted according to individual preferences and inner motivation.

I shall assist you through the comprehension of those concepts, trying to understand the economic implications of this psychological theory.

1.2 Future Time Perspective: an analysis.

According to a recent meta-analysis, Future Time Perspective has been defined as a **cognitive-motivational structure that focuses on an individual's tendency to anticipate and structure one's future** (D. Kooij et al., 2018). Alternatively, it could be defined as “the totality of the individual's views of his psychological future and psychological past existing at a given time” (D. Kooij et al., 2018, p. 1).

These two definitions are not mutually exclusive, although they have a slightly different shade of meaning.

According to the latter definition, two individuals with the same age and time left to live could have different perceptions of this time. One person could see the future as brimming

with fresh opportunities and experiences, whereas the other might see it as short and devoid of any potential. The latter definition does not involve any evaluation regarding how the individual is handling their future.

At the same time, the first conceptualization emphasizes a specific human behavior - the *individual tendency to anticipate and structure one's future*.

Just to reiterate, while the latter definition does not include any specification related to human behavior according to the perception of time, the former highlights the inclination toward managing and scheduling.

It is important to note that numerous other researchers have also formulated alternative definitions of Future Time Perspective throughout the years. To give some examples, FTP has been defined as:

- The extent to which individuals consider the potential distant outcomes of their current behaviors and the extent to which they are influenced by these potential outcomes (Strathman et al., 1994, p. 743);
- The timing and ordering of personalized future events (Wallace & Rabin, 1960, p. 229);
- A set of subjective expectations and beliefs held by a person about his future (Trommsdorff and Lamm, 1975, p. 343);
- A relatively general tendency to be concerned with future events (Kastenbaum, 1961, p. 217);
- The length of the future time span which is conceptualized (Wallace, 1956, p. 240).

In this research, however, all mention of Future Time Perspective will be referred to the conceptualization proposed at the very beginning of this chapter – that is, Future Time Perspective is a *cognitive motivational structure that focuses on an individual's tendency to anticipate and structure one's future* (D. Kooij et al., 2018).

But why might this theory be important for managing human resources within a firm? The way an individual perceives future time is believed to have a significant impact on their objectives, plans, and self-regulatory actions, which subsequently shape their achievements, adaptation, and overall well-being. Future Time Perspective may be an important link between personality traits and individual motivation and behavior. Moreover, future time also exerts its influence on various crucial outcomes within work

and education settings, such as job performance, proactive work behaviors, and academic performance. As the world faces increased globalization, competition, and uncertainty, the effect of future time perception on employee well-being becomes increasingly critical for human resources managers seeking to mitigate worker stress and maximize productivity (D. Kooij et al., 2018).

1.3 Antecedents and outcomes of the Future Time Perspective

As many psychological constructs, Future Time Perspective has some variables that influence it. The meta-analysis carried out by D. Kooij et al. (2018) had the aim of identifying and classifying those variables, commonly referred to as antecedents.

The main objective of this categorization was to gain insight into the connection between Future Time Perspective and various psychological and non-psychological variables.

In particular, they identified 3 broad classes of antecedents, analyzing the correlation between each of them and the individual's Future Time Perspective.

The first class of antecedents includes **sociodemographic factors**, specifically gender, socioeconomic status, and age.

Regarding **gender**, no specific hypothesis has been made. The previous studies on this specific antecedent were less consistent and without sufficient evidence regarding the association between gender and Future Time Perspective. The only association that was found emphasizes the fact that men have programs that spread into the future and are more focused on career-related issues, while women when planning future goals are more oriented toward work, family, and leisure (D. Kooij et al., 2018).

Concurrently, a specific hypothesis has been made by D. Kooij et al. (2018) regarding **socioeconomic status**(SES) as an antecedent of the Future Time Perspective. In particular, researchers found a positive association between FTP and SES, as a high family income provides a broader vision of the future (Nurmi, 1987). However, as we will see later, this association becomes more complex when we consider the relationship between Future Time Perspective and motivation.

Concerning **age**, the hypothesis is that Future Time Perspective will show a curvilinear inverted U-shaped relationship with chronological age (D. Kooij et al., 2018).

This report was deduced by the fact that younger people showed an increasing Future Time Perspective over time, while older people showed a decreasing trend. As well as for

socioeconomic status, we will come back to this specific antecedent to deepen the analysis and understand if the relationship has changed after recent events such as the pandemic.

The second category of antecedents is made of **affective and personality traits**. In particular, a connection has been found with the Big 5 personality traits, which are extraversion, neuroticism, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness to experience. Specifically, the Big 5 personality traits are related to Future Time Perspective because they can determine an individual's decision-making and goal pursuit. Typically, individuals who are characterized by extraversion, openness to experience, conscientiousness, and agreeableness, are more likely to be promotion-focused, and therefore they might be higher on FTP.

On the contrary, individuals who are high on neuroticism are characterized by negative moods and are more focused on wrongdoings, failures, and punishments. Therefore, they might be lower on FTP.

The third and last category of antecedents includes **agentic traits**. With agentic traits, D. Kooij et al. (2018) refer to a subjective sense of potency for accomplishing one's goals. For example, locus of control, self-efficacy, and self-esteem are agentic traits. They are positively associated with Future Time Perspective because they influence the willingness of the individual to anticipate the future and to foresee prosperous scenarios.

It must be stressed that Future Time Perspective is distinct from personality, affective, and agentic traits. In fact, Future Time Perspective refers to differences in cognitive orientations, not in behaviors. In addition, Future Time Perspective refers to cognitions regarding the future, while affective traits typically refer to feelings and reactions to those feelings.

Now that we have explored all the antecedents of Future Time Perspective, we will see also the outcomes revealed by the meta-analyses. These outcomes are divided into 5 broad classes: **achievement-related outcomes, well-being, health behavior, risk-taking, and retirement planning**.

Individuals high on FTP will focus more on future rewards or on the future value that present events can have. In other words, an individual's FTP influences the perceived instrumentality of their actions and the valence of future outcomes (Costa et al., 2021). Therefore, as hypothesized in the meta-analysis, Future Time Perspective will have a positive relationship with achievement-related outcomes.

The relationship with well-being is intuitive: FTP will show a positive association with positive indices of well-being, and a negative association with negative indices of well-being because individuals lower on FTP maintain a less clear and more pessimistic view about their future (D. Kooij et al., 2018).

Also the relationship between the other outcomes and Future Time Perspective is quite linear and understandable.

FTP is positively associated with physical health-related behaviors because individuals high on Future Time perspective are more likely to evaluate the possible consequences of their present actions, such as using alcohol or drugs.

At the same time, FTP is positively associated with retirement-planning related outcomes. On the contrary, FTP is negatively associated with risk-taking: as stated by Zimbardo, individuals high on Future Time Perspective are more likely to consider both the positive and negative consequences of their present actions, and therefore they will be less willing to take risks.

This overview of the antecedents and outcomes of the Future Time Perspective is useful to analyze the role of this cognitive structure. As we have probably already understood, the Big 5 personality traits have an indirect effect on Future Time Perspective. At the same time, Future Time Perspective predicts achievement, well-being, health behavior, risk-taking, and retirement planning (D. Kooij et al., 2018). Therefore, we can conclude that FTP plays a **mediating role** between the Big 5 personality traits and the 5 categories of outcomes previously mentioned. FTP is suggested to have a significant impact on the process by which the levels of personality traits affect behavior, motivation, and adjustment. It serves as a cognitive-motivational framework that interprets personality in terms of behavior and adjustment.

1.4 The Future Time Perspective and proactive work behaviors

As we have seen so far, individuals' behaviors are shaped and conditioned by their perception of future time. This needs to be considered, particularly during this period, in which globalization, increased competition, and the transition to a service-based economy have resulted in uncertainty in organizations.

Furthermore, since there is an increase in temporary work and a decline in job security, individual employees are increasingly expected to take responsibility for managing their own careers (T. Kooij et al., 2017).

This means that workers are gradually more involved in proactive work behaviors, for example by asking for feedback or by striving for improving and establishing their routines.

In other words, employees that engage in proactive work behavior act to prevent future issues.

Workers, through their actions, attempt to establish job security or job satisfaction that their employment alone cannot offer.

For accuracy, job security is one's expectation about continuity in a job situation. It has to do with employee feelings over the loss of a job or loss of desirable job features such as lack of promotion opportunities, current working conditions, as well as long-term career opportunities (Akpan, 2013). Job satisfaction, on the other hand, is employees' cognitive, affective, and evaluative reactions toward their job. It is the general attitude towards one's job or the difference between the amount of rewards workers receive and the amount they believe they should receive (Robbins, 1998).

Both job security and job satisfaction are important when talking about organizational commitment.

As we were previously saying, employees try to reach job security and job satisfaction through proactive work behavior. A concrete example of proactive work behavior is certainly **job crafting**, which can be defined as the physical and cognitive change individuals make in the task or relational boundaries of their work (T. Kooij et al., 2017).

In several studies, Future Time Perspective is viewed as a motivational factor that precedes job crafting, thus linking it to our analysis.

Researchers argue that FTP is an important motivational antecedent of job crafting because the perception of time influences work motives, and employees will craft their job to make sure it fits with these motives (T. Kooij et al., 2017).

Nevertheless, individuals craft their jobs differently according to the type of Future Time Perspective by which they are characterized.

According to T. Kooij et al. (2017), we can distinguish between 2 different types of FTP. The first, called **open-ended Future Time Perspective**, is typical of individuals that see

the future as a long period full of new opportunities and possibilities. The second type of FTP is known as **limited Future Time Perspective**, and it is identifiable by individuals who see the future as full of constraints, limited possibilities, and restrictions.

Therefore, individuals with open-ended FTP tend to engage in job crafting by enhancing their access to structural and social job resources, while simultaneously meeting demanding job requirements that offer them rewards. Those employees will focus on acquiring knowledge, gathering information, and exploring newness. As stated by Koji and Van de Voorde (2011), open-ended FTP is positively associated with an increase in work-related growth motives, such as career advancement.

Conversely, individuals with limited FTP will focus on short-term positive emotions, and thus they engage in job crafting by reducing hindering job demands that cause distress (T. Kooij et al., 2017). Therefore, those employees will concentrate on balancing emotions and enhancing psychological wellness. They choose to stay within their comfort zone rather than challenge their knowledge or take challenges. Limited FTP, unlike open-ended FTP, is positively associated with an increase in generativity motives, that is teaching and sharing skills with younger generations.

In both cases, job crafting will allow an increasing match between the person and the job, and we could assume that for this reason, the performance of individuals and the organizational commitment might increase.

Nevertheless, as stated by T. Kooij et al. (2017), earlier studies on job crafting found that decreasing hindering job demands is not or even negatively associated with work engagement and job performance. This means that even if a person with limited FTP, by reducing challenges and by avoiding dealing with negative situations, will increase person-job fit, the increased match will not provide enhanced performance. In fact, the risk is that the crafted job might be less psychologically stimulating or may result in monotony, therefore bringing less work engagement.

As we have seen, job crafting can be different from one person to another, according also to the type of FTP that characterizes the individual. To conclude, there are different ways in which a person could craft their job. In particular, T. Kooij et al. (2017) distinguished 4 dimensions of job crafting:

- 1) Increasing the level of structural job resources, such as task variety, learning opportunities, and empowerment;
- 2) Increasing the level of social job resources, such as social support, supervisory coaching, and feedback;
- 3) Increasing the level of challenging job demands, such as by joining new projects, or by having higher levels of responsibility;
- 4) Decreasing the level of hindering emotional and cognitive job demands, which interfere with the capacity to accomplish work objectives, such as role conflict and emotional interactions.

From my standpoint, in addition to these 4 ways of performing job crafting, another method that could be adopted to increase the person-job fit is **job hopping**.

Job hopping refers to the pattern of frequently changing jobs or employers within a relatively short period, typically two to three years. It often involves moving from one organization to another rather than staying loyal to a single employer for a long period.

Job hopping cannot properly be considered a dimension of job crafting because it implies a change between different jobs, not a variation within the same job (as job crafting entails). However, through job hopping, employees can achieve similar results as through job crafting. In fact, several studies have delineated the mismatch between job and person as one of the main reasons for job hopping (Gian Jyoti Institute of Management and Technology, 2018).

The job hopping phenomenon is increasing over time, particularly among millennials, because it seems to provide further opportunities like financial gain or career advantage (Pandey, 2019). At this point, it is possible to guess a connection between open-ended Future Time Perspective and job hopping.

As individuals with open-ended FTP are more likely to envision their future as a long period full of new opportunities and possibilities, they are more likely to engage in job hopping if they perceive that they need more stimuli or more challenging tasks.

Differently from the past, people do not think about changing their job only because of the low pay structure in their current job, but also because they look for career advancement, job security, freedom in the workplace, organizational reputation, higher position, and self-development (Viakarina & Pertiwi, 2022).

It is not hard to tell that this tendency has some implications for organizational structure and that it should be taken into consideration when managing human resources.

We will deepen our analysis of this tendency to understand how much it is influenced by the individual's Future Time Perspective.

In particular, we will try to explore if the aptitude toward job hopping is only typical of younger generations and if those generations are characterized by a peculiar future time perception, also in the light of recent events such as the pandemic.

2. SECONDO CAPITOLO

THE INFLUENCE OF AGE AND GENERATION ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN JOB HOPPING AND FTP

2.1 Introduction

This chapter is intended to deepen the relationship between age, generation, Future Time Perspective, and Job-Hopping tendency.

As we analyzed previously, age might influence an individual's FTP. We will try to investigate more in detail how age influences FTP in the workplace and to understand if job hopping tendency is in some way related to people's age and generation.

Subsequently, we will examine the impact of recent global events on individuals' Future Time Perspectives and career plans.

2.2 The relationship between age and FTP

As seen in the previous chapter, age is one of the antecedents of FTP. It is important to deepen the analysis of this antecedent because, at any given point in an individual's life, the anticipated amount of time left to live may shape behavior and affect it in important ways (Schulz and Heckhausen, 1996, p. 703).

In adolescence, a stronger focus on future orientation is linked to favorable developmental outcomes, such as academic achievement (Schechter & Francis, 2010), and serves as a protective factor against engaging in maladaptive behaviors (Chen & Vazsonyi, 2011). Throughout adulthood, a broader future time perspective (FTP) has been found to be associated with a larger social network (Lang, 2000), while a more limited FTP is connected to better emotion regulation (Kellough & Knight, 2012). FTP also exhibits associations with specific personality traits. For instance, individuals with a more expansive FTP tend to score higher on the conscientiousness trait. Moreover, younger adults who reported a restricted future orientation were more likely to score higher on neuroticism.

The initial hypothesis was that Future Time Perspective has a curvilinear inverted U-shaped relationship with chronological age (D. Kooij et al., 2018). This assumption means that the future is perceived as more limited by older adults, while younger adults tend to envision it as more open, regardless of how optimistic, depressed, or healthy a person is (Chui & Diehl, 2014).

For accuracy, Zacher and Frese (2009) suggested that age presented a negative relationship with the **remaining time** and **remaining opportunities**, two distinct dimensions of occupational FTP¹.

The remaining time is a more objective dimension since it relies on a pre-defined retirement age range.

At the same time, remaining opportunities refer to the options, plans, and goals that individuals have for their professional future. Undoubtedly, this factor is contingent upon individuals' attitudes, perceptions, and, notably, their age. Older workers not only have a limited perspective regarding plans and goals, but they are also less interested in joining development activities (Zacher & Frese, 2009).

While the remaining time is always characterized by a negative relationship with age, remaining opportunities can depend also on two job characteristics. In other words, there are two job characteristics that may influence the association between age and remaining opportunities at work. These two job characteristics are **complexity** and **control**, which are positively related to remaining opportunities (Zacher & Frese, 2009).

Job complexity is the degree to which the work involves difficulty, necessitates advanced skills, and entails mental exertion. For older employees who want to maintain a focus on work-related opportunities, job complexity is an important resource, because it gives them the possibility to use their increased knowledge and expertise pertaining to their work domain. Employees cannot properly use and transfer their experiential education if they have low-complexity jobs, while they are required to collaborate and share their knowledge with their co-workers.

¹ Occupational FTP refers to the application of FTP specifically within the context of the workplace. It is typically assessed through questionnaires that incorporate additional items or modifications to standard FTP questionnaires, specifically tailored to capture the occupational dimension.

Thus, high-complexity jobs should provide a better fit with older employees' changed capabilities and preferences than the attributes of low-complexity jobs (Chung-Yan, 2010).

At the same time, job control refers to the range of decision options available in the work environment (Chung-Yan, 2010), and to the ability to have an influence on various dimensions of work, such as the sequence and pace, content of goals, quantity and quality of production, techniques and strategies, working conditions, and feedback (Zacher & Frese, 2009).

These two variables, therefore, act as mediators between age and remaining opportunities, so that older employees are better able to maintain a focus on opportunities if they are in high complexity and high control jobs than if they are in low complexity and low control jobs (Chung-Yan, 2010).

The reason why employees should perceive more remaining opportunities in high-complexity jobs is that such roles provide them with different and plentiful possibilities, including the autonomy to make decisions regarding task execution. Moreover, we propose that these work attributes become particularly valuable resources as workers advance in age. Jobs with elevated complexity and control give older employees additional ways to compensate for age-related declines in resources, such as physical strength and cognitive processing abilities. For instance, having a greater number of decision possibilities within their roles allows older workers to adapt their tasks to align with their capabilities and preferred work methods. Furthermore, heightened complexity and control enable older workers to effectively leverage and transfer their accumulated knowledge and work experience (Kanfer & Ackerman, 2004). Consequently, favorable work characteristics should mitigate the negative correlation between age and perceptions of available opportunities within the workplace. Conversely, restricted job roles often necessitate resources that are more susceptible to the effects of aging, such as physical strength, while offering limited prospects for task modification for older workers. Thus, low job complexity and control are likely to reinforce the adverse association between age and remaining opportunities at work (Chung-Yan, 2010).

In addition to job complexity and job control, we have also to consider that variability in aging may influence individuals' development over time and, therefore, their focus on opportunities or on limitations. For example, a person aged 40 could look like 25 years

old in terms of ability and motivation, while another could resemble a 60 years old at the same age. In this regard, it is important to notice that there is not a pre-determined age at which a worker becomes an “older worker”. Instead, the precise moment of transitioning into an older worker is contingent upon the individual’s personal development, job demands, and the prevailing norms within the organization, industry, and country where the worker is situated (Beier et al., 2022).

The *lifespan development theory* recognizes this variability and highlights 3 classes of influence on individual development over time: normative age-graded influences, normative history-graded influences, non-normative influences.

Normative age-graded influences category encompasses biological and environmental elements that impact the aging process and various aspects of an individual’s capabilities, including physical and cognitive abilities, motivation, disposition, and personality traits. It is important to note that although these personal attributes generally follow an age-related pattern, there are significant individual differences within these variables. In contrast to personal attributes, normative age-graded environmental factors are cultural events that tend to occur during specific stages of development, such as marriage, the intersection of work and family demands in mid-career or mid-life, and retirement in later stages or older ages (Beier et al., 2022).

The second category is *normative history-graded influences*, which pertains to the influences on development associated with particular historical periods, such as wars, famines, or global recessions. These influences are especially significant during late adolescence or early adulthood, which are critical years for identity formation. Crises like wars and pandemics, such as the COVID-19, occurring during these formative periods can delay work socialization, reduce work opportunities and salaries, and ultimately impact long-term career growth. It is crucial to recognize these historical influences without endorsing the notion of “generations”. Categorizing individuals based on broad age groups can lead to age-related stereotypes and biases, as different people are affected differently by the same event based on their location, resources, and other factors. The lifespan development perspective acknowledges that the impact of historical events varies based on an individual’s attributes and circumstances (Beier et al., 2022).

The third category is *non-normative influences*, which are unique and often unexpected life events that hold significant meaning for individuals but are experienced differently

by different people. These influences can be positive, such as experiencing a strong sense of community during childhood, or negative, such as coping with a severe illness or the loss of a spouse. In the context of workplace aging, non-normative influences can include chance encounters leading to job offers or negative experiences like being robbed while working. These idiosyncratic events can exert a distinct and non-predictable influence on a person's career trajectory, as well as on an employee's work outcomes and well-being (Beier et al., 2022).

It should be emphasized that the three categories of lifespan development are interconnected. For instance, the typical changes in cognitive abilities and motivation that occur with age can impact an individual's perception of the effort required to search for employment following job loss due to a pandemic, or to acquire new skills for a sudden job opportunity (Beier et al., 2022).

2.3 The relationship between age and Job Hopping

As mentioned in the previous chapter, Job Hopping can be related to an individual's Future Time Perspective, but we have not yet analyzed if this tendency is truly related to age.

However, before doing so, a more precise analysis of the Job Hopping concept is necessary. The first thing that must be highlighted is that Job Hopping implies changing companies, not changing jobs. Therefore, it is an inter-organizational transition.

In addition, we should consider that Job Hopping tendency refers to a voluntary behavior, not to something determined by necessity. For example, if people have to change job because the company they worked for went out of business, they are not considered to be job hoppers.

Nevertheless, in defining job hopping we will only consider the voluntary inter-organizational transitions. It should be mistaken neither for turnover nor for job changes. In fact, turnover refers to withdrawing from a single organization, and job changes include both intra- and inter-organizational transitions (Steenackers & Guerry, 2016).

The Job Hopping phenomenon is becoming increasingly important for employers. Sometimes, new people joining the organization can be the source of fresh ideas, new perspectives, and alternative solutions. However, many times the departure of an

employee might be associated with negative consequences. According to Human Capital Theory (Becker, 1964), the investments made in human capital result in enhanced future productivity. Therefore, when an employee departs from an organization, it can lead to a potential loss of knowledge and expertise, thereby incurring intangible costs for the organization. These costs can be related, for example, to the amount of time and money spent to look for a new employee to cover the vacancy, to the training of a new employee regarding firm-specific knowledge, to the initial loss of efficiency due to the fact that beginners are not able to perform at their best as soon as they enter in a company.

In order to limit costs and avoid efficiency losses, a company should understand which variables are associated with them and how to manage them. In particular, according to the boundaryless career theory, there is a growing trend where a larger number of employees is actively participating in job hopping, especially the youngest generations in the current workforce. Hence, it is our assumption that managers would gain advantages by acquiring knowledge regarding the potential association between age and job hopping. The positive association between younger people and the positive tendency to be job hoppers has already been verified (Steenackers & Guerry, 2016), and it seems to be related to the job matching theory and the career development theory.

Based on the job matching theory (Jovanovic, 1979), every employee job-match possesses a certain unknown quality. The quality gradually becomes evident after the job is selected, and if employees are dissatisfied with this quality, they will actively search for better job matches. Considering that young individuals have a higher inclination to pursue the perfect job match, they tend to engage in job hopping more frequently compared to their older counterparts who have already found their ideal match. Consequently, this theory implies that employees undergo more frequent job changes during the early stages of their careers. This observation aligns with the career development theory (Super et al., 1996), which suggests that employees go through distinct phases during their career progression. In the initial exploration phase, individuals strive to clarify their career interests to make informed decisions regarding their career path. Consequently, young individuals in the exploration stage of their careers are more likely to switch companies (Steenackers & Guerry, 2016).

Moreover, there is an observable societal shift away from conventional career trajectories, characterized by upward mobility within a single organization, towards alternative career

models. One such emerging career path is referred to as the “boundaryless career”, where employees traverse the boundaries of multiple employers. Another concept is “protean career” wherein individuals assume responsibility for managing their own careers, with the organization primarily providing growth and development opportunities.

These newly emerging career formats align with generational values. The existing workforce is generally classified into three dominant generations: Baby Boomers (born between 1945 and 1964), Generation X (born between 1965 and 1979) and Generation Y (born since 1980, also known as Millennials), as highlighted in the literature by Becton et al. in 2014. In addition, we can highlight another generation, which is known as Gen Z and it includes people born between 1997 and 2012.

It is argued that Generation Y exhibits distinct expectations and experiences regarding their careers compared to older generations. Generation Y, more than any other generation, prioritizes freedom, flexibility, and has a lower inclination toward long-term employment expectations. While Generation X is also less likely to display loyalty to a specific company, they are considered to have different work values than Generation Y. On the other hand, Baby Boomers tend to exhibit organizational loyalty and typically follow more traditional career paths. Considering the arguments presented above regarding age groups, we can conclude that there is a negative correlation between age and job-hopping frequency. The older you are, the less you are likely to do job hopping and the more you tend to stay faithful to your business (Steenackers & Guerry, 2016).

Therefore, we have discovered that age is a variable connected not only to FTP but also to Job Hopping. This demonstrates a new specific trait in the labor market that needs to be considered for effective human resource management.

2.4 The influence of recent macro events on FTP

As we all know, the last few years have been characterized by some macro-events that have surely had an impact on the labor market.

The mandatory closures and lockdown measures have resulted in severe economic and financial repercussions, partially mitigated by government emergency assistance and other forms of economic intervention and support, such as stimulus checks. Except for certain sectors like healthcare, the majority of employees were compelled to stay at home. This prolonged period of isolation provided employees with an opportunity to

contemplate their work and ponder on how to embark on a new beginning once the pandemic era concludes (Formica & Sfodera, 2022).

This period has led to two important outputs related to the labor market: the Great Resignation and Quiet Quitting.

The Great Resignation started one year after the pandemic, in Spring 2021, when a lot of people were supposed to go back to work and many of them didn't. It refers to a phenomenon characterized by an increasing amount of people leaving their jobs.

Quiet Quitting, instead, refers to the employees' limited dedication to fulfilling their assigned responsibilities and their reluctance to undertake any tasks that are not explicitly outlined in their job descriptions. It also indicates a lack of investment in work-related activities. Consequently, quiet quitters exhibit disengagement in the workplace and show no inclination to exceed the expectations of their designated roles (Formica & Sfodera, 2022).

This concept can be related in some ways to the FTP, because as previously stated, the pandemic has led individuals to question their future more deeply, restuffing their priorities with significant implications for their career choices.

To this purpose, Deloitte has performed a survey between 2021 and 2022 to explore the view of Millennials and Gen Z about work and the world around them. The survey discovered that they are currently facing a period of great uncertainty and they are determined to create a better world after the pandemic. The unprecedented events of recent years have caused individuals worldwide to reassess their values, resulting indeed in the Great Resignation. According to this year's survey findings, the ongoing transformations in the workplace that Millennials and Gen Zs have been advocating for – such as improved compensation, greater flexibility, enhanced work-life balance, increased opportunities for learning and development, better support for mental health and well-being, and a stronger commitment from companies to create positive societal change- are also the very strategies that will enable employers to attract and retain skilled individuals. (*Deloitte Global 2022 GenZ and Millennial Survey*, 2022).

Even if job loyalty has slightly increased in the last years, four in ten Gen Zs and one in four Millennials are willing to resign from their positions within a span of two years. The first reason from whence flows the desire for change is pay, followed by work-life balance and opportunities for learning and development. Millennials and Gen Zs, in addition, will

also look for more flexible working and alignment with their values when searching for a new employer.

We should underline that pay is not only the first reason leading employees to change their jobs, but it is also the main cause of stress for them: they are worried about both their long-term financial futures and their day-to-day finances (*Deloitte Global 2022 GenZ and Millennial Survey, 2022*).

This demonstrates that individuals' Future Time Perspective (FTP) is currently influenced by various factors related to the macro environment that are beyond their control but indirectly affect everyone's choices and temporal orientation. In fact, individuals with an open FTP might be inclined to adopt a more cynical and less optimistic attitude toward future opportunities due to the obstacles presented by events such as the pandemic. For example, concerns about long-term finances are an additional factor that could negatively impact an individual's FTP, adding worries and leading to a more pessimistic outlook on the future.

In addition, this might also stimulate the job-hopping tendency, because younger generations are now affected by dissatisfaction and have had the time to reflect more about which are their priorities in the workplace. They will be, therefore, more likely to search for the perfect job-person match. There have been quite a number of studies revealing that this job-hopping phenomenon is most commonly carried out by Generation Y who only survives in their workplace for 1-3 years and then moves to other workplaces (Viakarina & Pertiwi, 2022b).

In conclusion, it can be affirmed that the COVID-19 pandemic has brought a fundamental shift in our perceptions of work and life, while also intensifying long-standing issues within industries, including dissatisfaction with working conditions, compensation, management, and leadership. Furthermore, it has accelerated the pace of change, acting as a catalyst for changes by accelerating them, not only as their source (Formica & Sfodera, 2022).

After this general overview regarding how age and recent events influence FTP and job-hopping tendency, the research will proceed with the practical analysis. The aim is to understand which generations are involved in this trend and how can companies face such changes within the labor market.

3. TERZO CAPITOLO

EXPLORING JOB HOPPING: A CONCRETE ANALYSIS

3.1 Introduction

As explained in the first two chapters, the Job Hopping phenomenon can have some really important implications for employers.

Employee retention is one of the main problems that firms have to face nowadays: there is a need for continuous satisfaction of employees, to stimulate their loyalty toward the company and to avoid the loss of skilled workers.

The trend of job hopping originated in America in the past but appears to have also spread to Europe in recent years.

In this chapter, a questionnaire administered to a sample of European people will be analyzed to understand the reasons behind this growing trend and to analyze the implications it may have for business organizations. In addition, a testimony of an HR Business Partner will be analyzed to explore the company's perspective on this matter as well.

3.2 Questionnaire administration and sample characteristics

In order to gather comprehensive data and insights for this study, a carefully designed questionnaire was employed as a primary data collection instrument. The questionnaire was strategically developed to capture key variables and gather relevant information from participants, facilitating a thorough examination on the research objectives.

As explained in the first chapter, the individuals' FTP has often been analyzed through questionnaires. There are plenty of questionnaires available in this regard. However, for the purpose of this research, the most suitable one appeared to be the Carstensen and Lang questionnaire (Lang & Carstensen, 2002), as it is useful for investigating not only general FTP, but also the tendency towards open FTP or limited FTP.

Nevertheless, the aim of the research was not only to analyze the FTP according to people's age but also to understand their tendency towards job hopping.

Hence, the survey was broadened by questions related to the socioeconomic status of individuals and to their attitude toward changing jobs.

Specifically, the form consists of a total of 22 questions: 5 pertaining to sociodemographic aspects, 10 derived from the Carstensen & Lang questionnaire, and 7 related to the past and future career choices of the sample.

Participants were asked to indicate anonymously their gender, age, actual occupation (study or work), how many years they have worked, and parents' education level. Then, after answering the questions regarding their FTP, they were asked: how many times they changed job in the last 5 years, the ideal length of time to stay in the same workplace, and their preference among a stable or a flexible employment contract, with more or fewer security and constraints in case of job change.

In addition, they were prompted to indicate what are the three most important factors in choosing a professional opportunity, what primarily motivates them to stay in their current job, what were the reasons that led them to change jobs in the past, and whether they believe the pandemic has influenced opportunities in their field of work (attachment 1).

Participants could choose among 11 items when answering the questions related to the features to be considered when changing or staying in a workplace. In particular, the possible options were: compensation, the content of work itself, stable employment contract, opportunities for professional growth, autonomy and potential for obtaining responsibilities, work environment and relationships with colleagues, work-life balance (ex: remote work), company reputation and importance, company values that align with mine, the possibility of having a social impact, other aspects to be defined.

In total, there were 156 participants ranging from 20 to 61 years, with an average age of 34,5 years. Most of them were female (56,13%). 110 participants out of 156 (70,5%) are workers, followed by 41 students and 5 people that are not involved in any activity at the moment.

The average number of years participants have been working is 16,44, ranging from a minimum of 1 year to a maximum of 44 years.

At the same time, 129 individuals (82,69%) have neither parents with a university degree, 15 of them (9,62%) have only one graduated parent, and 12 people (7,69%) have both parents with university degrees.

Once the data was collected, it was decided to divide the sample into 3 groups, following approximately the different generations described in the second chapter.

In particular, people ranging from 44 to 61 years were included in the Gen X category, individuals ranging from 27 to 43 years were considered part of the Gen Y or Millennials generation, while youngest people, from 20 to 26 years, formed the Gen Z category.

This demerger aimed to allow for correlating the responses with the age range of the participants, in order to identify similarities and differences related to the variable “age” and understand whether the changes in the labor market are derived solely from younger generations or not.

Gen Z and Gen X categories were characterized by a larger number of females (respectively, 60,9% and 58,1%), while Millennials were represented by a majority of male participants (52,1%).

Table 3.1- Gender frequency across groups

GENDER	GEN Z FREQ.	GEN Z %	MILL. FREQ.	MILL. %	GEN X FREQ.	GEN X %
MALE	25	39,1%	25	52,1%	18	41,9%
FEMALE	39	60,9%	23	47,9%	25	58,1%
NOT SPECIFIED	0	0,0%	1	2,0%	0	0,0%
TOT	64	100,0%	49	100,0%	43	100,0%

All the participants from Gen X are involved in work activities, as well as the majority of the respondents from Gen Y (91,8%). On the contrary, Gen Z was marked by a majority of students (59,4%).

Table 3.2 - Current Activity frequency across groups

CURRENT ACTIVITY	GEN Z FREQ.	GEN Z %	MILL. FREQ.	MILL. %	GEN X FREQ.	GEN X%
NOTHING	4	6,3%	1	2,0%	0	0,00%
STUDENTS	38	59,4%	3	6,1%	0	0,00%
WORKERS	22	34,4%	45	91,8%	43	100,00%
TOT	64	100,0%	49	100,0%	43	100,00%

In all three groups, there was a majority of people who have neither of their parents graduated. In particular, this was a clear outcome for Generation X, where all the participants declared not having either of their parents holding a university degree. The same goes for 83,7% of Millennials and 70,3% of Gen Z.

Table 3.3 - Parent's education frequency across groups

PARENTS' EDUCATION	GEN Z FREQ.	GEN Z %	MILL. FREQ.	MILL. %	GEN X FREQ.	GEN X%
0 GRADUATED	45	70,3%	41	83,7%	43	100,00%
1 GRADUATED	11	17,2%	4	8,2%	0	0%
BOTH GRADUATED	8	12,5%	4	8,2%	0	0%
TOT	64	100,0%	49	100,0%	43	100,00%

In regards to the preferred type of contract by the participants, the result was the same for all three groups, as they indicated a preference for a stable contractual form. However, the preference for this option over a flexible contract was less pronounced in the case of Gen Z.

Table 3.4 - Type of contract frequency across groups

TYPE OF CONTRACT	GEN Z FREQ.	GEN Z %	MILL. FREQ.	MILL. %	GEN X FREQ.	GEN X%
STABLE	38	59,4%	43	87,76%	32	74,42%
FLEXIBLE	26	40,6%	6	12,24%	11	25,58%
TOT	64	100,0%	49	100,00%	43	100,00%

The survey was spread through social media (specifically, LinkedIn and Instagram) and word of mouth. The respondents come from different industry sectors and professional backgrounds, as no screening was conducted during the administration of the questionnaire.

After this general data reorganization, some statistical analyses were performed to read and interpret them. We will now continue exploring the processes used and the results obtained.

3.3 Data analysis and interpretation

Having outlined the sample characteristics and the administration procedures of the questionnaire, the subsequent section delves into the comprehensive interpretation of the collected data. The data will be analyzed and interpreted section by section, shedding light on the key findings and providing valuable insights into the research objectives.

As we had anticipated, the first part of the questionnaire primarily focused on the aforementioned sociodemographic variables, that have already been exposed. Subsequently, we presented respondents with the 10 questions specified by the Carstensen & Lang questionnaire, aimed at investigating the tendency toward Open FTP or Limited FTP.

Participants were provided with statements, and they had to indicate whether they strongly agreed or strongly disagreed on a scale from 1 (disagreement) to 5 (agreement).

The first 7 items display thoughts and feelings typical of individuals with an Open FTP, while the last 3 items are related to individuals with a Limited FTP.

After collecting all the answers of this second section of the survey, the ANOVA analysis was performed. The acronym ANOVA stands for analysis of variance, and it is particularly useful when it comes to determining differences in the means of three or more groups (Kim, 2017).

The analysis was aimed at understanding if there were significant differences among the three generations regarding the perceived value of Open and Limited FTP. In other words, we wanted to understand if the differences among the means of the three generations were due to chance or were related to a different distribution of the variables within the groups. From the analysis, it was found that there are significant differences among generations concerning Open FTP, but not concerning Limited FTP. This conclusion was drawn by comparing the obtained p-value with the set significance level (0,05). When the p-value is smaller than the level of significance, the differences are considered significant as the alternative hypothesis ($m_1 \neq m_2 \neq m_3$) is accepted.

Table 3.5 - ANOVA Analysis for Open-ended FTP

ANOVA						
Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Between Groups	8,90965731	2	4,45482866	8,72763817	0,00025745	3,05516177
Within Groups	78,0954447	153	0,51042774			
Total	87,005102	155				

Table 3.6 - ANOVA Analysis for limited FTP

ANOVA						
Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Between Groups	2,76255321	2	1,3812766	2,20460934	0,11378551	3,05516177
Within Groups	95,8606662	153	0,6265403			
Total	98,6232194	155				

Once this result was discovered, it was important to understand which were the main sources of the differences among generations. It should be noted that the ANOVA analysis identifies if there are significant differences among the means of various groups, without defining where these differences come from. To identify the different average values, a T-test was performed. If $t \text{ Stat} < -t \text{ Critical two-tail}$ or $t \text{ Stat} > t \text{ Critical two-tail}$, we reject the null hypothesis. The null hypothesis refers to the fact that there are no significant differences among the means of Gen Z, Millennials and Gen X.

In our case, there were significant differences between the average value of Gen X and Millennials ($2,45 > 1,99$) and among the average values of Gen Z and Gen X ($3,66 > 1,99$).

This means that the observed difference between the sample means is convincing enough to say that the average perception of Open FTP between Gen Z and Gen X and between Millennials and Gen X differ significantly.

The ANOVA analysis has been performed for other two items of the last section of the questionnaire: ideal length of time in the same job and number of times workers have changed jobs in the last 5 years.

Regarding the ideal length of time in the same job, the ANOVA analysis produced a p-value equal to 0,00046. Since this is lower than the significance level (0,05), we accepted the alternative hypothesis (again, $m_1 \neq m_2 \neq m_3$) and performed a t-test to identify the source of these differences.

Table 3.7 - ANOVA Analysis for ideal length of time in the same workplace

ANOVA						
Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Between Groups	195,851768	2	97,925884	8,22183235	0,00046181	3,07585264
Within Groups	1357,79353	114	11,9104696			
Total	1553,6453	116				

The results obtained from the T-test suggested that, again, the major differences reside in the comparison between Gen Z and Gen X ($-2,26 < -1,99$), and between Millennials and Gen X ($-4,81 < 2,01$). We can conclude that the perception of the ideal length of time in the same workplace is different according to the generation one belongs to.

The same logic was applied to the answers related to the number of times respondents have changed jobs in the last 5 years. Even in this case, the p-value obtained by the ANOVA analysis was lower than the significance level.

Table 3.8 - ANOVA Analysis for number of jobs changed over the last 5 years

ANOVA						
Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Between Groups	35,1962992	2	17,5981496	12,2166466	1,68121E-05	3,0820145
Within Groups	152,693609	106	1,44050575			
Total	187,889908	108				

Therefore, we proceed by performing the T-test. The result highlighted significant differences in the number of times people changed jobs within the last 5 years.

Considering the responses collected from the questionnaire, we find that the Gen Z has an average work experience of 2.9 years, while the Gen X has an average work experience of 30 years. It is interesting to note that, despite the fact that the Gen Z has mostly entered the workforce less than 5 years ago, they have changed jobs more frequently than the Gen X over the past 5 years. In other words, even though a significant portion of the Gen Z has been working for less than 5 years, they have already changed jobs more frequently than many individuals from the Gen X.

In fact, Gen Z changed job on average 2,2 times in the last 5 years, Millennials 1,3 times and Gen Z 0,6 times.

In this case, the t-test indicated significantly different means among all three generational groups (attachment 2).

The results of this statistical analysis suggested that, probably, the theories exposed in the first two chapters were true. In fact, until now, all the items are more or less correlated to the generation affiliation and supported the fact that younger people are more likely to engage in job hopping tendencies and to have an Open FTP (Gen Z scored an average of 3,6 points when asking questions related to Open FTP, while Millennials scored 3,4 and Gen Z 3,0).

To further how FTP influences the individuals' career choices, we analyzed the correlation between FTP and ideal job tenure.

The correlation analysis between Open FTP and ideal job tenure (-0.311) reveals a moderate negative correlation. This indicates that employees with an open future perspective, inclined towards seizing new opportunities, tend to have a lower ideal job tenure. It is possible that these employees are more inclined to explore alternative career paths or seek challenges and professional growth outside their current job.

On the other hand, the correlation between Limited FTP and ideal job tenure (-0.013) shows a very weak correlation. This suggests that having a limited future perspective, where individuals perceive only obstacles and constraints, does not significantly impact the desire for long-term job tenure. It implies that a pessimistic attitude or limited expectations regarding the future do not strongly influence the intention to remain in a particular job.

As the questionnaire continued with questions about the most important features of the workplace when searching, remaining or changing jobs, a statistical analysis was

performed also concerning these elements. In this case, the Chi-squared method was used. This statistical method aimed at investigating whether there is correlation or dependence among the generation affiliation and the most relevant features of the workplace. The null hypothesis was that there is no association between generation or age and the variables that influence the choice when searching, staying, or changing jobs. The alternative hypothesis was that there is association between generation or age and the variables that influence the choice when searching, staying, or changing jobs.

Such correlation was only observed in the case of motivations that drive people to stay in the same job. This means that the characteristics of the workplace that increase employee retention are correlated with generation affiliation, and therefore, the age of the individual. Again, in this case the results were discovered by confronting the p-value with the significance level (0,05). The p-value was lower than 0,05 only when we analyzed the questions “what are the 3 elements that mostly motivate you to stay in your current workplace?” ($0,035 < 0,05$). Therefore, we accepted the alternative hypothesis, concluding that there are significant differences related to age when staying loyal to an employer (attachment 3).

3.4 Implications for firms and employees

The results obtained have some relevant implications for firms and their employees. The questionnaire has been useful to better understand employee’s points of view: in particular, it was interesting to observe how, unlike the reasons that drive people to change jobs, the motivations for employees to stay in the company are correlated with age. Before delving into these considerations, however, it would be valuable to also have a business’ perspective on this matter.

To this purpose, I asked an HR Business Partner to express her opinion regarding this phenomenon, to understand if businesses are aware of it and how they are trying to manage it.

As she said, more and more people nowadays show their willing to gain expertise rather than staying loyal to one single company. At the same time, young people have more opportunities for their careers, for example thanks to the fact that they can travel much more easily or utilize technology to handle potential relocations with greater ease.

Therefore, companies will face an increasingly significant challenge in retaining employees within the organization. While diverse experiences can bring different perspectives to the company and thus be beneficial, a resource that frequently changes jobs can result in high costs and a waste of invested energy in their training. It is therefore crucial for the company to understand how to foster employee loyalty for a duration that avoids excessive costs and does not harm the business. In fact, the departure of crucial employees for the company results in various expenses such as recruitment, training, and general administration costs. Additionally, there are indirect costs to consider, including decreased productivity and competitiveness, which can impede the growth and success of businesses (Gialuisi & Coetzer, 2013).

As revealed by the questionnaire reasons why people decide to leave a company or to stay within it, are different among employees.

For example, younger people tend to give more importance to growth when looking for a new professional opportunity, while millennials and gen X will prioritize compensation. This is quite intuitive even from a logical perspective, considering that the majority of individuals belonging to the same generation are in similar life stages. It is logical to understand how a twenty-year-old, for example, may prioritize professional growth over salary. Unlike millennials, for instance, twenty-year-olds are less likely to have a family to support and still have their entire future ahead of them. Therefore, their ambitions and preferences are also influenced by the life stage they are currently in.

This could lead to the conclusion that the variables under consideration are likely correlated not only with the individual's generation but also with their age itself. Basically, Gen Z' preferences will change over time even if they are still members of Gen Z: probably, the determinant of these preferences is not membership in a particular generation with its own ideology and characteristics, but rather belonging to a specific age group.

Specifically, it is true that the identified variables differ among individuals. However, while the reasons for employees changing jobs or the characteristics they consider when seeking employment are randomly distributed and not correlated with age – as indicated by the questionnaire results – the distribution of the characteristics deemed important for job retention appears to be influenced by the individual's age group. In other words, the reasons for employees changing jobs are completely individual and not dependent on age

but on individual preferences, whereas the factors influencing loyalty to the company seem to correlate with the age group they belong to.

This could have relevant implications for the business. In fact, it means that the retention plan could be partially standardized based on age groups. From the discussion with the HR Business Partner, it emerged that despite the widespread use of engagement surveys and retention plans in many companies, they often tend to be too generic and disconnected from individual needs. In other words, there doesn't always seem to be a tangible response to these initiatives, as the standardization of these practices makes them less tailored to individual requirements. For this reason, it might be useful to fragment them based on age groups, allowing for more personalized solutions without considering individual preferences - which would make the practice unsustainable. By doing so, we could potentially see a decrease in employee attrition and greater loyalty towards the company from the start of their employment, without having to resort to last-minute measures to prevent the loss of valuable talent. From a corporate perspective, I believe these considerations will become increasingly important and meaningful in a world full of new opportunities, where diversified experiences seem to hold more value than lifelong employment.

RIFERIMENTI BIBLIOGRAFICI

BIBLIOGRAFIA E WEBGRAFIA

- AKPAN, C. (2013). Published by European Centre for Research Training and Development UK (www.ea-journals.org) 82 JOB. . . *ResearchGate*.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/338801398_Published_by_European_Centre_for_Research_Training_and_Development_UK_wwwea-journalsorg
- AXELRAD, H., DRIZIN, R., MALUL, M., & ROSENBOIM, M. (2020). Does future time perspective predict motivation to learn? *International Journal of School and Educational Psychology*.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/21683603.2020.1813667>
- BEIER, M. E., KANFER, R., KOOIJ, D., & TRUXILLO, D. M. (2022). What's age got to do with it? A primer and review of the workplace aging literature. *Personnel Psychology*, 75(4), 779–804. <https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12544>
- CHUI, H. C., & DIEHL, M. (2014). Measuring Future Time Perspective across Adulthood: Development and Evaluation of a Brief Multidimensional Questionnaire. *Gerontologist*, 54(6), 1075–1088.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/geront/gnu076>
- CHUNG-YAN, G. A. (2010). The nonlinear effects of job complexity and autonomy on job satisfaction, turnover, and psychological well-being. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 15(3), 237–251.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0019823>
- COSTA, G., GUBITTA, P., & PITTINO, D. (2021). *Organizzazione aziendale. Mercati, gerarchie e convenzioni+connect*.
- *Deloitte Global 2022 GenZ and Millennial Survey*. (n.d.). Deloitte Italia.
<https://www2.deloitte.com/it/it/pages/about-deloitte/articles/deloitte-global-2022-gen-z-and-millennial-survey---deloitte-italy---about.html>

- FORMICA, S., & SFODERA, F. (2022). The Great Resignation and Quiet Quitting paradigm shifts: An overview of current situation and future research directions. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 31(8), 899–907. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19368623.2022.2136601>
- GIALUISI, O. (2011). Employee retention practices in small businesses: A proposed study. *Small Enterprise Research*, 18(2), 152 - 154. <https://doi.org/10.5172/ser.2011.18.2.152>
- GIALUISI, O., & COETZER, A. (2013). An exploratory investigation into voluntary employee turnover and retention in small businesses. *Small Enterprise Research*, 20(1), 55–68. <https://doi.org/10.5172/ser.2013.20.1.55>
- Gian Jyoti Institute of Management and Technology. (2018, March 9). *E-JOURNAL VOLUME 4 ISSUE 2 | Gian Jyoti Institute of Management and Technology*. <https://www.gjimt.ac.in/e-journal-volume-4-issue-2/>
- HENRY, H., ZACHER, H., & DESMETTE, D. (2017). Future Time Perspective in the Work Context: A Systematic Review of Quantitative Studies. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 08. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00413>
- KOOIJ, D., KANFER, R., BETTS, M., & RUDOLPH, C. W. (2018). Future time perspective: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 103(8), 867–893. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000306>
- KOOIJ, D., KANFER, R., BETTS, M., & RUDOLPH, C. W. (2018). Future time perspective: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 103(8), 867–893. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000306>
- KOOIJ, T., TIMS, M., & AKKERMANS, J. (2017). The influence of future time perspective on work engagement and job performance: the role of job crafting. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 26(1), 4–15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432x.2016.1209489>
- LANG, F. R., & CARSTENSEN, L. L. (2002). Time counts: Future time perspective, goals, and social relationships. *Psychology and Aging*, 17(1), 125–139. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0882-7974.17.1.125>
- PANDEY, D. L. (2019). Job Hopping Tendency in Millenials. *NCC Journal*, 4(1), 41–46. <https://doi.org/10.3126/nccj.v4i1.24733>

- SCHULZ, R., & HECKHAUSEN, J. (1996). A life span model of successful aging. *American Psychologist*, 51(7), 702–714. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066x.51.7.702>
- STEENACKERS, K., & GUERRY, M. (2016). Determinants of job-hopping: an empirical study in Belgium. *International Journal of Manpower*, 37(3), 494–510. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ijm-09-2014-0184>
- VIAKARINA, D., & PERTIWI, K. (2022). Millennial’s Perspective of Job-Hopping Phenomenon and The Impact of Covid-19 Pandemic. In *Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Economics, Business and Economic Education Science, ICE-BEES 2021, 27-28 July 2021, Semarang, Indonesia*. <https://doi.org/10.4108/eai.27-7-2021.2316832>
- ZACHER, H., & FRESE, M. (2009). Remaining time and opportunities at work: Relationships between age, work characteristics, and occupational future time perspective. *Psychology and Aging*, 24(2), 487–493. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0015425>

ALLEGATI

ATTACHMENT 1 – QUESTIONNAIRE’S STRUCTURE AND QUESTIONS

FATTORI SOCIODEMOGRAFICI

Quanti anni hai?

Di che sesso sei?

Femmina

Maschio

Studi o lavori?

Lavoro

Studio

Al momento non sono impegnato

Se lavori, da quanto tempo lavori? (inserire il numero di anni)

Qual è il livello di scolarità dei tuoi genitori?

Entrambi laureati

Nessun laureato

Solo uno/a dei due laureato/a

FUTURE TIME PERSPECTIVE SCALE

(Indicare il grado di accordo o disaccordo con le affermazioni proposte, laddove 1=completamente in disaccordo e 5=completamente d'accordo)

Nel mio futuro mi attendono molte opportunità

Penso che mi porrò molti nuovi obiettivi per il futuro

Il mio futuro è pieno di possibilità

Ho la maggior parte della mia vita davanti

Il mio futuro mi sembra infinito

In futuro, potrei fare ciò che voglio

Mi rimane ancora molto tempo nella vita per sviluppare nuovi progetti

Ho la sensazione che il tempo stia per finire

Ho solo poche possibilità per il mio futuro

Man mano che cresco, inizio a sentire che il tempo ha un limite

FUTURE TIME PERSPECTIVE E SCELTE LAVORATIVE

Quante volte hai cambiato lavoro negli ultimi 5 anni? (Se sei uno studente, lascia il campo vuoto)

Quale pensi sia il tempo di permanenza ideale nello stesso posto di lavoro? (numero di anni)

Per la tua prossima esperienza professionale, preferiresti:

- 1) Una forma contrattuale stabile (es: contratto di lavoro a tempo indeterminato) che offre maggiori sicurezze
- 2) Una forma contrattuale flessibile (es: contratto di lavoro a tempo determinato, collaborazione...) che ha minori vincoli nel caso di cambio di lavoro

Quando hai cercato (o cercherai) lavoro, quali sono i tre elementi più importanti per scegliere un'opportunità professionale?

- 1) Retribuzione
- 2) Contenuto del lavoro in sé
- 3) Contratto di lavoro stabile
- 4) Possibilità di crescita professionale
- 5) Autonomia e possibilità di ottenere responsabilità
- 6) Ambiente di lavoro e rapporti con i colleghi
- 7) Equilibrio tra lavoro e vita privata (es: smart working...)
- 8) Reputazione ed importanza dell'azienda
- 9) Valori aziendali che corrispondono ai miei
- 10) Possibilità di avere un impatto sociale
- 11) Altro

Se lavori, cosa ti spinge principalmente a rimanere nel tuo attuale posto di lavoro (indica fino a tre elementi)?

- 1) Retribuzione
- 2) Contenuto del lavoro in sé
- 3) Contratto di lavoro stabile
- 4) Possibilità di crescita professionale
- 5) Autonomia e possibilità di ottenere responsabilità
- 6) Ambiente di lavoro e rapporti con i colleghi
- 7) Equilibrio tra lavoro e vita privata (es: smart working...)
- 8) Reputazione ed importanza dell'azienda
- 9) Valori aziendali che corrispondono ai miei

10) Possibilità di avere un impatto sociale

11) Altro

Se hai già lavorato, quali sono i motivi principali per i quali hai cambiato lavoro (indica fino a 3 elementi)?

1) Contenuto del lavoro in sé poco motivante

2) Retribuzione bassa o non adeguata

3) Contratto di lavoro con condizioni precarie

4) Mancanza di crescita professionale

5) Bassa autonomia e possibilità di ottenere responsabilità

6) Cattivo ambiente di lavoro e rapporti con i colleghi

7) Scarso equilibrio tra lavoro e vita privata (es: smart working)

8) Problemi con la reputazione ed importanza dell'azienda

9) Valori aziendali che non corrispondevano ai miei

10) Impossibilità di avere un impatto sociale

11) Altro

Se lavori, pensi che la pandemia abbia influenzato il tuo futuro lavorativo in termini di opportunità di lavoro all'interno del tuo settore?

1) Sì, penso che abbia aumentato le opportunità di lavoro nel mio settore

2) Sì, penso che abbia diminuito le opportunità di lavoro nel mio settore

3) Non ha avuto alcun impatto sulle opportunità di lavoro nel mio settore

4) Sono ancora uno studente

ATTACHMENT 2 – T-TESTS

HOW MANY TIMES DID YOU CHANGED JOB OVER THE LAST 5 YEARS?

(GEN Z- MILLENNIALS) t-Test: Two-Sample Assuming Unequal Variances

	<i>Variable 1</i>	<i>Variable 2</i>
Mean	2,21052632	1,125
Variance	2,61988304	1,38829787
Observations	19	48
Hypothesized Mean Difference	0	
df	26	
t Stat	2,65783137	
P(T<=t) one-tail	0,00663588	
t Critical one-tail	1,70561792	
P(T<=t) two-tail	0,01327176	
t Critical two-tail	2,05552944	

(MILLENNIALS - GEN X) t-Test: Two-Sample Assuming Unequal Variances

	<i>Variable 1</i>	<i>Variable 2</i>
Mean	1,125	0,57142857
Variance	1,38829787	0,9825784
Observations	48	42
Hypothesized Mean Difference	0	
df	88	
t Stat	2,42019175	
P(T<=t) one-tail	0,00878421	
t Critical one-tail	1,66235403	
P(T<=t) two-tail	0,01756843	
t Critical two-tail	1,98728986	

(GEN Z - GEN X) t-Test: Two-Sample Assuming Unequal Variances

	<i>Variable 1</i>	<i>Variable 2</i>
Mean	2,21052632	0,57142857
Variance	2,61988304	0,9825784
Observations	19	42
Hypothesized Mean Difference	0	
df	24	
t Stat	4,08140926	
P(T<=t) one-tail	0,00021443	
t Critical one-tail	1,71088208	
P(T<=t) two-tail	0,00042885	
t Critical two-tail	2,06389856	

WHAT'S THE IDEAL LENGTH OF TIME WITHIN THE SAME WORKPLACE?

(GEN Z- MILLENNIALS) t-Test: Two-Sample Assuming Unequal Variances

	<i>Variable 1</i>	<i>Variable 2</i>
Mean	5,32352941	6,64102564
Variance	8,64823529	18,65722
Observations	51	39
Hypothesized Mean Difference	0	
df	64	
t Stat	-1,6367189	
P(T<=t) one-tail	0,05329887	
t Critical one-tail	1,66901303	
P(T<=t) two-tail	0,10659774	
t Critical two-tail	1,99772965	

(MILLENNIALS- GEN X) t-Test: Two-Sample Assuming Unequal Variances

	<i>Variable 1</i>	<i>Variable 2</i>
Mean	6,64102564	8,64814815
Variance	18,65722	8,32336182
Observations	39	27
Hypothesized Mean Difference	0	
df	64	
t Stat	-2,2629739	
P(T<=t) one-tail	0,01351895	
t Critical one-tail	1,66901303	
P(T<=t) two-tail	0,02703789	
t Critical two-tail	1,99772965	

(GEN Z - GEN X) t-Test: Two-Sample Assuming Unequal Variances

	<i>Variable 1</i>	<i>Variable 2</i>
Mean	5,32352941	8,64814815
Variance	8,64823529	8,32336182
Observations	51	27
Hypothesized Mean Difference	0	
df	54	
t Stat	-4,8094777	
P(T<=t) one-tail	6,2674E-06	
t Critical one-tail	1,67356491	
P(T<=t) two-tail	1,2535E-05	
t Critical two-tail	2,00487929	

OPEN ENDED FTP

(GENZ- MILLENNIALS) t-Test: Two-Sample Assuming Unequal Variances

	<i>Variable 1</i>	<i>Variable 2</i>
Mean	3,60714286	3,43731778
Variance	0,34985423	0,4161634
Observations	64	49
Hypothesized Mean Difference	0	
df	99	
t Stat	1,43735908	
P(T<=t) one-tail	0,07688459	
t Critical one-tail	1,66039116	
P(T<=t) two-tail	0,15376919	
t Critical two-tail	1,98421695	

(MILLENNIALS- GEN X) t-Test: Two-Sample Assuming Unequal Variances

	<i>Variable 1</i>	<i>Variable 2</i>
Mean	3,43731778	3,02325581
Variance	0,4161634	0,85901869
Observations	49	43
Hypothesized Mean Difference	0	
df	74	
t Stat	2,45397	
P(T<=t) one-tail	0,00824085	
t Critical one-tail	1,66570689	
P(T<=t) two-tail	0,01648169	
t Critical two-tail	1,9925435	

(GENZ - GENX) t-Test: Two-Sample Assuming Unequal Variances

	<i>Variable 1</i>	<i>Variable 2</i>
Mean	3,60714286	3,02325581
Variance	0,34985423	0,85901869
Observations	64	43
Hypothesized Mean Difference	0	
df	65	
t Stat	3,66048913	
P(T<=t) one-tail	0,00025335	
t Critical one-tail	1,66863598	
P(T<=t) two-tail	0,00050671	
t Critical two-tail	1,99713791	

LIMITED FTP

(GEN Z- MILLENNIALS) t-Test: Two-Sample Assuming Unequal Variances

	<i>Variable 1</i>	<i>Variable 2</i>
Mean	2,71875	2,4829932
Variance	0,54750882	0,52806122
Observations	64	49
Hypothesized Mean Difference	0	
df	104	
t Stat	1,6956277	
P(T<=t) one-tail	0,04647412	
t Critical one-tail	1,65963744	
P(T<=t) two-tail	0,09294824	
t Critical two-tail	1,98303753	

(MILLENNIALS- GEN X) t-Test: Two-Sample Assuming Unequal Variances

	<i>Variable 1</i>	<i>Variable 2</i>
Mean	2,4829932	2,41860465
Variance	0,52806122	0,85763504
Observations	49	43
Hypothesized Mean Difference	0	
df	79	
t Stat	0,36735467	
P(T<=t) one-tail	0,35716838	
t Critical one-tail	1,66437141	
P(T<=t) two-tail	0,71433676	
t Critical two-tail	1,99045021	

(GEN Z- GEN X) t-Test: Two-Sample Assuming Unequal Variances

	<i>Variable 1</i>	<i>Variable 2</i>
Mean	2,71875	2,41860465
Variance	0,54750882	0,85763504
Observations	64	43
Hypothesized Mean Difference	0	
df	76	
t Stat	1,77791302	
P(T<=t) one-tail	0,03970908	
t Critical one-tail	1,66515135	
P(T<=t) two-tail	0,07941816	
t Critical two-tail	1,99167261	

ATTACHMENT 3 – CHI SQUARED TESTS AND CORRELATION

Chi-squared_SEARCH

OBSERVED	retribuzione	contenuto	contratto	crescita	autonomia	ambiente	equilibrio	reputazione	valori	impatto soc.	altro	TOTALE
gen z	44	33	10	48	18	30	31	7	11	9	0	241
millennials	33	19	13	24	15	22	32	4	5	3	0	170
gen x	22	15	12	22	20	18	15	1	6	1	1	133
TOTALE	99	67	35	94	53	70	78	12	22	13	1	544

EXPECTED	retribuzione	contenuto	contratto	crescita	autonomia	ambiente	equilibrio	reputazione	valori	impatto soc.	altro
gen z	43,8584559	29,6819853	15,5055147	41,6433824	23,4797794	31,0110294	34,5551471	5,31617647	9,74632353	5,75919118	0,44301471
millennials	30,9375	20,9375	10,9375	29,375	16,5625	21,875	24,375	3,75	6,875	4,0625	0,3125
gen x	24,2040441	16,3805147	8,55698529	22,9816176	12,9577206	17,1139706	19,0698529	2,93382353	5,37867647	3,17830882	0,24448529

(O-E)^2/E	retribuzione	contenuto	contratto	crescita	autonomia	ambiente	equilibrio	reputazione	valori	impatto soc.	altro
gen z	0,0004568	0,37090584	1,95483302	0,97030034	1,2788869	0,03296184	0,36576521	0,53332723	0,16126129	1,82366612	0,44301471
millennials	0,1375	0,17929104	0,38892857	0,98351064	0,14740566	0,00071429	2,38525641	0,01666667	0,51136364	0,27788462	0,3125
gen x	0,20070243	0,11634682	1,3853419	0,041928	3,82734749	0,04587177	0,86858053	1,27467566	0,07177285	1,49294156	2,33471086

X^2	24,9366207
df	20
p-value	0,20

NULL HYPOTHESIS: there is no association between generation or age and the variables that influence the choice when searching job
 ALTERNATIVE HYPOTHESIS: there is association between generation or age and the variables that influence the choice when searching job
 p value>0,05= there are no significant differences related to age when looking for a job

Chi-squared_RETAIN

OBSERVED	retribuzione	contenuto	contratto	crescita	autonomia	ambiente	equilibrio	reputazione	valori	impatto soc.	altro	TOTALE
gen z	13	13	5	14	7	22	10	4	2	2	0	92
millennials	9	12	18	18	17	26	18	6	1	2	2	129
gen x	14	13	14	7	24	15	13	2	6	1	0	109
TOTALE	36	38	37	39	48	63	41	12	9	5	2	330

EXPECTED	retribuzione	contenuto	contratto	crescita	autonomia	ambiente	equilibrio	reputazione	valori	impatto soc.	altro
gen z	10,0363636	10,5939394	10,3151515	10,8727273	13,3818182	17,5636364	11,430303	3,34545455	2,50909091	1,39393939	0,55757576
millennials	14,0727273	14,8545455	14,4636364	15,2454545	18,7636364	24,6272727	16,0272727	4,69090909	3,51818182	1,95454545	0,78181818
gen x	11,8909091	12,5515152	12,2212121	12,8818182	15,8545455	20,8090909	13,5424242	3,96363636	2,97272727	1,65151515	0,66060606

(O-E)^2/E	retribuzione	contenuto	contratto	crescita	autonomia	ambiente	equilibrio	reputazione	valori	impatto soc.	altro
gen z	0,87513175	0,54645656	2,73877079	0,89948313	3,04350296	1,12057218	0,17897747	0,12806324	0,10329381	0,26350461	0,55757576
millennials	1,82854123	0,5485479	0,86464202	0,49769068	0,16576815	0,07651599	0,24281442	0,3653277	1,80241954	0,00105708	1,89809725
gen x	0,37408952	0,01602505	0,25890119	2,68562905	4,18482068	1,62167282	0,0217261	0,97281068	3,08281902	0,25701974	0,66060606

X^2	32,8828741
df	20
p-value	0,03475265

NULL HYPOTHESIS: there is no association between generation or age and the variables that influence the choice of staying loyal to an employer
 ALTERNATIVE HYPOTHESIS: there is association between generation or age and the variables that influence the choice of staying loyal to an employer
 p value<0,05= there are significant differences related to age when staying loyal to an employer

Chi-squared_CHANGE

OBSERVED	retribuzione	contenuto	contratto	crescita	autonomia	ambiente	equilibrio	reputazione	valori	impatto soc.	altro	TOTALE
gen z	11	14	5	7	5	8	6	0	4	2	1	63
millennials	22	14	8	16	6	16	16	0	7	2	2	109
gen x	15	10	6	16	9	8	5	2	3	1	3	78
TOTALE	48	38	19	39	20	32	27	2	14	5	6	250

EXPECTED	retribuzione	contenuto	contratto	crescita	autonomia	ambiente	equilibrio	reputazione	valori	impatto soc.	altro
gen z	12,096	9,576	4,788	9,828	5,04	8,064	6,804	0,504	3,528	1,26	1,512
millennials	20,928	16,568	8,284	17,004	8,72	13,952	11,772	0,872	6,104	2,18	2,616
gen x	14,976	11,856	5,928	12,168	6,24	9,984	8,424	0,624	4,368	1,56	1,872

(O-E)^2/E	retribuzione	contenuto	contratto	crescita	autonomia	ambiente	equilibrio	reputazione	valori	impatto soc.	altro
gen z	0,09930688	2,04383626	0,0093868	0,81375499	0,00031746	0,00050794	0,09500529	0,504	0,06314739	0,43460317	0,17337566
millennials	0,05491131	0,3980338	0,00973636	0,05928111	0,84844037	0,30062385	1,51851716	0,872	0,13152294	0,01486239	0,14505199
gen x	3,8462E-05	0,29054791	0,00087449	1,20679027	1,22076923	0,39425641	1,3917113	3,03425641	0,42843956	0,20102564	0,67969231

X^2	17,4386251
df	20
p-value	0,62433566

NULL HYPOTHESIS: there is no association between generation or age and the variables that influence the choice when searching job
 ALTERNATIVE HYPOTESIS: there is association between generation or age and the variables that influence the choice when searching job
 p value>0,05= there are no significant differences related to age when changing job

Correlation

	IDEAL LENGHT	OPEN FTP		IDEAL LENGHT	LIMITED FTP
IDEAL LENGHT	1		IDEAL LENGHT	1	
OPEN FTP	-0,31082196	1	LIMITED FTP	-0,012811009	1