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ABSTRACT

The popular mythology of Generation Y holds that the current generation of employees between twenty and thirty years of age have fundamentally different expectations about employment conditions from their older work colleagues. However, there is limited formal evidence of this distinction. Using a 2007 survey of post-graduation employment expectations of university students, this proposition was tested. It is found that Generation Y students do not have substantially different expectations about future employment conditions when compared to Generation X and Baby Boomer students. In some respects, Generation X- and Baby Boomer-aged cohorts may be more interested in the employment conditions usually attributed to Generation Y than those within the Generation Y-aged cohort.
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INTRODUCTION

The existence of an unruly, challenging-to-manage Generation Y is one of the dominant practitioner beliefs of our generation (Casben, 2007; Preston, 2007a, 2007b; Sensis, 2007). In the popular account, the expectations and behaviours of this group of employees represents a substantial challenge to management practice, requiring the adoption of new management approaches and employment practices to attract and retain these mercurial employees (Budd, 2008; Dinnell, 2007; Verret, 2000).

This new workforce is believed to have very different employment characteristics. They are ‘fussy job-hoppers’, with limited loyalty to a single employer, and single-minded in their
pursuit of career advancement and greater entitlements (Budd, 2008; Preston, 2007b; Select Appointments, 2006). Critics of Generation Y point to deficient skills and an inappropriate work attitude:

‘We found that almost 70 per cent of them [employers interviewed about Gen Y employees] reported dissatisfaction with the Gen Y employees’ performance, particularly in spelling, grammar [and] that they didn’t understand what constitutes appropriate corporate behaviour,” she said…”They also said that the communication skills of the Gen Y staff were disappointing and 37 per cent complained that they actually lacked professional skills, the acceptable technical skills they needed to do their job.” (Casben, 2007)

Others see Generation Y in a more balanced way: ‘They are ambitious, hardworking, transitional, technically savvy and reward driven. Basically, these workers want more and they want it faster. Gen Y expects perks like higher salaries, constant challenges and a changing and diverse workplace environment’ (Australian Experiential Learning Centre, n.d). Dinnell (2007) provides a useful summary of the key features of the apparent work practices of the Generation Y workforce:

- demand for professional growth and development
- a desire to reconcile their various life interests through work-life balance
- variety in work, with challenge and change
- social interaction within the workplace
- a desire for responsibility and input
- a wish for reward through income growth and recognition of their contribution
- a desire for appropriate workplace leadership.

At the heart of the practitioner Generation Y literature, and the starting point for this paper, is the belief that the Generation Y workforce – employees born between 1977 and 1992 – are significantly different in their approach to work and their expectations of work, to the generations that preceded them, Generation X, and fundamentally different to those of the Baby Boomer generation. By analysing a data set collected for another purpose, this paper
will look at a specific component of this debate: whether the generations have different expectations of what employment conditions their future employers should possess in order to attract their attention. This question is examined using a dataset of student preferences for post-graduation employment conditions designed and collected by a University Career Services unit.

The first section of this paper outlines the literature prior to the presentation of hypotheses in the second section; the third section sketches the method undertaken, while section four overviews the results. Section five discusses the findings of this paper, while the final section outlines the limitations of this research and provides a conclusion to the findings.

**OVERVIEW OF THE LITERATURE**

Despite the growing media coverage, the explosion of reports and practitioner accounts and ‘how to’ articles within the practitioner literature, there is negligible formal, peer reviewed evidence of the distinctiveness of this age-based cohort. Despite at least a half decade of popular usage of the term, academic research on the topic remains small and has fallen into three main types. First, there is the use of the Generation Y concept within consumer behaviour research in the academic discipline of Marketing. For these researchers, Generation Y is understood to be a new segment of the marketplace, with specific consumer preferences (Bakewell, Mitchell, & Rothwell, 2006; Cui, Trent, Sullivan, & Matiru, 2003; Martin & Turley, 2004; Stevens, Lathrop, & Bradish, 2005). In the second type of literature, reliant on the assumption of the existence of a distinct Generation Y, researchers are exploring the implications of this apparently distinct new group into such areas for teaching methodologies, library access preferences, recruiting and managing Generation Y employees, diversity management and technology adoption (Beaver & Hutchings, 2005; A. M. Broadbridge, G. A. Maxwell, & S. M. Ogden, 2007; Eisner, 2005; Jorgensen, 2003; McCrindle Research, 2006; McGuire, By, & Hutchings, 2007; Nimon, 2006; Rugimbana, 2007; Verret, 2000). In the third type of literature, though far smaller, there has been an attempt to make sense of the actual nature of the Generation Y phenomenon and to establish the analytical reliability of the
Generation Y distinction (Broadbent, Maxwell, & Ogden, 2007; Szamosi, 2006; Terjesen, Vinnicombe, & Freeman, 2007). Far more common are consultant reports that report on research assuming the existence of a distinctly different Generation Y (McCrindle Research, 2006; NAS Recruitment, 2006).

The tidal wave of practitioner and academic Generation Y literature exists against the backdrop of largely ignored but ongoing debates within sociology about the relative effectiveness of generation-based analysis and of life-span analysis (Alwin & Krosnick, 1991; Arsenault, 2004; Barber, 2004; Gans & Silverstein, 2006; McMullin, Duerden Comeau, & Jovic, 2007; Stockard & O'Brien, 2002; Whittier, 1997). Several decades of this literature, primarily aimed at understanding the changes in value systems in the post-war period as the Baby Boomers age and Generation X employees move onto the centre stage, has not strongly supported the use of generation-based models of age-based cohorts.

Scholarly accounts of the Generation Y employee

Despite the volume of literature, little systematic research into the actual employment preferences of Generation Y has been undertaken. What does exist is primarily anecdotal, a re-working of the frustration of managers or perspectives offered by a consultant. After a review of the practitioner literature, (A. Broadbridge, G. A. Maxwell, & S. Ogden, 2007) identified Generation Y’s apparent preferences and expectations of employment arrangements of future employers and personal career development. (Terjesen et al., 2007) employed an inductive approach to the identification of Generation Y’s work preferences. Students were asked to identify desired attributes for three organisations, and then to rank the three organisations according to that attribute. Over several iterations, increasingly accurate and robust descriptive attributes were identified to describe the expectations and rankings of the student participants. The general findings of this research can be seen as corresponding to the items in the scale used in the survey to measure student employer expectations (Table 1).
HYPOTHESES

The popular argument is that the Generation Y cohort has different expectations of its future employers than the preceding generations. Accordingly, if the Generation Y-aged cohort fits the Generation Y thesis, their preferences will be distinctly and statistically different from those in the Generation X and Baby Boomer-aged cohorts. The first hypothesis is concerned with the threshold question of ascertaining whether a difference in employment preference exists between the generations: do people of Generation Y age actually have different employment preferences?

H1: That students of the Generation Y age group will demonstrate significantly different employment preferences to students of the Generation X and the Baby Boomer age cohorts.

Whereas Hypothesis 1 is concerned with the threshold question of whether a generational difference exists, Hypothesis 2 is concerned with the direction of the difference. If the Generation Y thesis is correct, then Generation Y-aged cohort students are more likely to desire employment conditions attributed to Generation Y than non-Generation Y students.

H2: That Generation Y-aged students will rate Generation Y employment attributes more highly than non-Generation Y students.

If Generation Y is a distinct group within the working population then this distinctiveness will be apparent if clustering is undertaken. If Generation Y is distinctly different to other generations, then Generational Y-aged cohort students will be over-represented in clusters characterised by Generation Y attributes.

H3. In the Generation Y-oriented cluster, Generation Y age cohort students will be more disproportionally highly represented.
METHOD

Sample

This paper reports on a secondary analysis of a data set created by Career Counselling staff of a University Careers office. This data was collected as part of a project of ascertaining student expectations of employer job offers after a request by the local human resource management professional association for insight into student employment preferences.

The data was collected through an online survey conducted in September 2007 using the University student email system, inviting them to participate in an online survey. Students who participated were eligible for a prize draw. International students, both onshore and offshore, were excluded from the mailout, to minimise a major source of cultural heterogeneity. Potentially 18,500 students could have been accessed. It is difficult to work out the effective population size: no records were kept of the number of emails rejected because of full mailboxes or of how many students would have ordinarily accessed their email within the time period of the survey.

With an unadjusted response rate of approximately 3.2%, 583 usable responses were received. Such a response rate would suggest that the data offers limited generalisability; however, in this case the data has several characteristics that make it useful for this analysis. First, the characteristics of the sample are reflective of the broader population. Although the sample has a disproportionately high representation of female students (68% of the sample, against 58% of the population), and students from the Division of Engineering (21.3% in this sample against 13.2% of the population), this is of negligible consequence to the explanatory power of the dataset. As will be described later in this paper, student employment preferences are clustered into distinct types. Chi-square analysis suggests that the cluster preferences of students are not significantly different between the genders ($\chi^2(4) = 4.387$, $p = 0.356$, ns) or the Divisions ($\chi^2(12) = 20.167$, $p = 0.055$, ns). Secondly, the sample of 583 is sufficiently
large to ensure that the data would be normally distributed, with the mean and as explained by
the central limit theorem. The mean and standard deviation of the sample is likely to match
that of the broader population.

**MEASURES**

The survey instrument asked a range of questions such as study motives, work experience and
job search approach. Of relevance to this study are the questions related to the employment
expectations of the students. Respondents were asked to rank nine employer attributes in
order of preference, from 1 (the highest priority) to 9 (the lowest priority). Respondents were
asked to rank the following employer attributes: ‘What are you looking for in employment
once you graduate? In order of priority: High salary; flexible work arrangements; travel
opportunities; job satisfaction and interest; ongoing training and development; sociable work
culture; work-life balance; opportunities for advancement with the company; opportunities for
advancement beyond the company’. Each of these questions fits within the model of
Generation Y developed by Broadbridge et al. 2007b and Terjesen et al. 2007, and are thus
appropriately used for the evaluation of Generation Y employment preferences.

*Generation-based age cohorts.* This study distinguishes between students of the Generation Y
age group, born between 1977 and 1992, and the Generation X (born 1962 to 1976) and Baby
Boomers (born 1946-1961) generations. At the time of data collection, the Generation Y
cohort would include all people under the age of 30, and the Baby Boomer cohort will include
all respondents 45 years and older.

In addition, respondents were asked a range of socio-demographic questions, such as age
(classified in five-year bands), gender, whether the student had a full-time or part-time
enrolment, domestic or international student, and length of work experience.
Analytic procedures

As the data in this sample was primarily ranked data, non-parametric tests were used to establish statistical significance. Kruskal-Wallis tests were used to test for significance between several independent groups; and as there were only three independent groups, Bonferroni correction-adjusted Mann-Whitney tests were used to provide post hoc tests. Z-scores were used to transform the ranked preference data around mean rankings, simplifying the interpretation of clusters. Hierarchical clustering techniques were used to identify the likely number of clusters, while non-hierarchical techniques were used to generate different cluster solutions. Data analysis was undertaken using SPSS 14.0. Missing values were deleted listwise.

RESULTS

Age-related differences in desired employment conditions

There was no clear evidence supporting Hypothesis 1 or 2. Table 1 reports on the results of Kruskal-Wallis testing of the statistical difference in the ranking of the nine employment conditions between Generation Y, X and the Baby Boomer age cohorts. If Generation Y was distinctly different to Generation X and the Baby Boomers, then there would be a distinctly different ranking between the three age-based cohorts across the nine employment conditions.

[Table 1 about here]

The three age cohorts had similar rankings for all but two employment conditions. In these two employment conditions, Generation Y-aged respondents ranked ‘flexible work arrangements’ and ‘work-life balance’ lower than the Generation X and Baby Boomer respondents (Table 1).
Table 1 provides interesting evidence on intergeneration ranking of employment conditions. Where there is a significant difference between the generations, it appears that the older generations have a greater preference for that employment condition. Further, Baby Boomers prize employment flexibility, work-life balance and work satisfaction more highly than both Generation X and Y. Based on this data, Generation Y has less of a desire for interesting work, work-life balance or employment flexibility than Generation X or Baby Boomers.

**The clustering of employment condition preferences**

The previous results suggest the weakness of the Generation Y thesis. Hypothesis 3 tests the proposition of the difference of Generation Y in another way. If Generation Y exists, then it will be apparent as a distinct and major cluster(s) of respondents, both in numbers and their employment preferences. Here we use the data analysis technique of clustering to establish the existence of distinctly different types of student expectations which existed within the sample. Clustering is a technique used to partition a dataset into statistically distinct groups, maximising the internal homogeneity of the various groups, while seeking to maximise the heterogeneity between the groups. As a non-parametric approach, the various techniques of clustering can be applied to ranked data. In order to simplify data analysis, the ranked data was centered around the mean ranking using z-scores, prior to the cluster process.

A combination of hierarchal and non-hierarchal clustering techniques identified the existence of five distinct types of post-graduation employment expectations. Table 2 reports on the mean rankings. Figure 1 provides a diagrammatic perspective into the different types of employment expectations within the student sample. The various clusters are described below, with an impressionistic description of the attributes of the cluster members,
The five clusters can be loosely grouped into two types. The first group, representing about 55% of the sample, is made up of clusters 1, 2 and 5, all of which fit into permutations of the Generation Y employment attributes.

**Cluster 1: Show me the money! I want to spend it on my time off! (191 students)**
These students have a particularly short-term career planning horizon. Their first priorities are to obtain a good income and have flexible work arrangements in a job they enjoy and that gives them some satisfaction.

**Cluster 2: I want to see the world; getting ahead in my career will help with that (71 students)**
Similar to the previous group, this group of students has a short-term career planning horizon. The priority for these students is to obtain travel opportunities; career opportunities for advancement are important, perhaps as a means of assisting their travel plans. These students also rank a sociable work environment highly.

**Cluster 4: I am in a hurry and I want everything, now (50 students)**
This group of students is perhaps the closest to the archetypal Generation Y employee. These people want employment benefits, training, opportunities and flexibility.

The second group, made up of clusters 3 and 5, constitute about 45% of the sample, and represent different versions to employment conditions than those accounted for in the practitioner literature.

**Cluster 3: Getting ahead by trading off short-term benefits for longer-term benefits (117 students)**
The members of this cluster are committed to acquiring as much career development as possible. These students are prepared to trade off income, travel, flexibility and work-life
balance for the opportunity to position themselves for advancement within and beyond their first employer.

Cluster 5: Quality of life is the main thing, and happy to trade off wages and career advancement (153 students)

This group is primarily concerned about the quality of their life – their satisfaction at work, and their ability to manage their life out of work.

If clusters 1, 2 and 4 represent variations on Generation Y work expectations, and clusters 3 and 5 represent non-Generation Y expectations, then it can be assumed that a disproportionate number of Generation Y cohort students will fall into the first category. Figure 2 suggests otherwise. Although there is a significant difference between the age cohorts in their cluster membership ($\chi^2 (8) = 36.223, p < 0.001$), the actual distribution of membership is quite remarkable.

Table 3 about here

Figure 2 about here

About 55% of all surveyed students seek the employment conditions of the sort attributed to Generation Y. The distribution of Generation X and older respondents into the first two clusters reflects their proportion in the sample. However, in cluster 4, the archetypal Generation Y cluster, it appears that the Generation Y students are less interested in these employment characteristics than their older classmates. In proportional terms, Generation
X aged students are almost 50% more likely to expect Cluster 4 conditions from their future employers, and the Baby Boomers are almost 80% more interested.

Similarly for Generation Y cohort students seeking the employment conditions of Clusters 3 and 5, Generation Y job seekers are almost two-and-a-half times more likely to opt for the delayed gratification/career-development strategy of Cluster 3 than Generation Y aged students, and almost four times more likely than Baby Boomers. Post-Generation Y cohort job seekers are significantly more likely to desire quality of life-related employment conditions than their younger counterparts – as evidenced by Cluster 5. Hypothesis 3 is not supported.

**DISCUSSION, LIMITATIONS AND CONCLUSION**

This paper has tested whether three age-based cohorts of students have significantly different expectations of the type of employment conditions that they would prefer an employer to offer. Drawing on the limited literature, a description of Generation Y employment preference was created and compared against the specific questions asked in the dataset. In order to identify distinct groups of employment preferences between the generations, the data was analysed using a variety of clustering techniques. Five distinct clusters were apparent. Three of these clusters, presenting 55% of the respondents, could be classified as Generation Y in terms of their attributes. If Generation Y was a distinct cohort, distinct from its predecessors, it could be expected that Generation Y should be much more highly represented in these clusters. Such a difference was not apparent in the data analysis: non-Generation Y students may be even more likely to expect Generation Y conditions than the actual Generation Y-aged cohort.

In this analysis there is no clear or outstanding distinction between Generation Y, X and Baby Boomers in terms of their expectations of employment conditions. If the Generation Y
archetype does exist, it may be as popular (if not more) to the Baby Boomer-aged cohort than to those of the Generation Y-aged cohort. A potential criticism of this paper could be that it assumes that a Baby Boomer or Generation X person who is studying an undergraduate degree possesses typical characteristics of their age group. It could be argued that someone who has returned to undergraduate study is, in some way, out of touch with the concerns of their generation, or is following a non-standard progression through the usual life-course. Several arguments can be made against this proposition. First, despite the aging of household formation patterns, household formation still occurs, irrespective of study patterns. If household formation does follow the trend, then it may be assumed that the expectations and needs of students are influenced by their changing domestic requirements. It could be argued that the onset of typical household formation and the need to improve income earning potential may see some return to study. From this perspective, the student has enrolled into undergraduate study because of their typicalness. Second, in several professions – nursing, marketing and human resource management, for example, an undergraduate qualification is increasingly necessary for career progression. Thus, a person whose career may have started at a time before formal qualifications were needed may have then undertook study later in life to enable promotion or increase in employability. Thirdly, the data was collected at an institution that has a high proportion of mature-age and second-chance learners. These are people who may be undertaking career change or, perhaps, seeking to commence a career. This is an interesting empirical question which this research is unable to answer, but there are prima facie arguments as to why this is not likely to be a major analytical problem. This paper is also hamstrung by the relative absence of prior peer reviewed research into the form and nature of the Generation Y, X and Baby Boomer distinction. As a secondary analysis of a data collection designed and undertaken for different reasons, this paper has used the existing practitioner literature to develop a classification system to distinguish between the apparent characteristics of the generations in order to interrogate a dataset.
Further research is needed. Given the limitations of the survey instrument and the sample, further investigation is required to establish the nature of Generation Y and its existence. Secondly, further research into the broader issues of cross-generational management is also needed: could the apparent Generation Y phenomena be merely this era’s version of an ongoing inter-generational discussion first reported by Socrates?¹

¹ “The children now love luxury; they have bad manners, contempt for authority; they show disrespect for elders and love chatter in place of exercise. Children are now tyrants, not the servants of their households. They no longer rise when elders enter the room. They contradict their parents, chatter before company, gobble up dainties at the table, cross their legs, and tyrannize their teachers.” (http://www.online-literature.com/forums/showthread.php?t=17788; accessed June 19, 2008)
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### Table 1
**Intergenerational Comparisons of Preferences for Specific Employment Conditions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Condition</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>X, Y</th>
<th>Y, BB</th>
<th>X, BB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High salary</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible working arrangements</td>
<td><strong>X&gt; Y</strong></td>
<td><strong>BB&gt;Y</strong></td>
<td>* n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel opportunities</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction and interest</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing training and development</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociable work culture</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-life balance</td>
<td><strong>X&gt; Y</strong></td>
<td><strong>BB&gt;Y</strong></td>
<td>* n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for advancement within the company</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for advancement beyond the company</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X > Y denotes that Generation X ranked the employment condition more highly than Generation Y;
* p < 0.05;
** p < 0.01

### Table 2
**Z-Score Means for the Cluster Centres**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High salary</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible working arrangements</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel opportunities</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction and interest</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>-2.03</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing training and development</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
<td>-0.87</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociable work culture</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>-0.65</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-life balance</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.54</td>
<td>-0.62</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for advancement within the company</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>-0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for advancement beyond the company</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of sample</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3
**Age-Group Distribution Across Clusters (%)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>Y %</th>
<th>X %</th>
<th>BB %</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generation Y characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation X characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1. *Five different types of employment preference.*

![Figure 1](image1.png)

Figure 2. *Cluster membership by generation (%)*