

**MANAGING GENERATION Y: A STUDY OF
VARIOUS DIMENSIONS FOR SUSTAINABILITY
OF ORGANISATIONS IN INDIAN CONTEXT**

Synopsis of the Ph. D. Thesis

Submitted by

RAJNISH

Research Scholar

Faculty of Management Studies

FOMS/02

Under the guidance of

Dr. Sunita Upendra Sharma

Associate Professor

Faculty of Management Studies



M.S. Patel Institute of Management Studies

Faculty of Management Studies

The Maharaja Sayajirao University of Baroda

Vadodara-390002

NOVEMBER 2019

**MANAGING GENERATION Y: A STUDY OF
VARIOUS DIMENSIONS FOR SUSTAINABILITY
OF ORGANISATIONS IN INDIAN CONTEXT**

Synopsis of the Ph. D. Thesis

Submitted by

RAJNISH

Research Scholar

Faculty of Management studies

FOMS/02

(Rajnish)
Research Scholar

(Dr. Sunita Upendra Sharma)
Associate Professor
Research Guide



**M.S. Patel Institute of Management Studies
Faculty of Management Studies
The Maharaja Sayajirao University of Baroda
Vadodara-390002**

NOVEMBER 2019

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section	Title	Page
1	INTRODUCTION.....	1
	Problem Statement.....	2
	Rationale of the Study.....	2
2	LITERATURE REVIEW.....	4
	Generations.....	4
	Working Definition	4
	Gen Y Demography.....	8
	Gen Y General Characteristics.....	9
	Gen Y Professional Characteristics.....	9
	Organisational Sustainability.....	10
	Importance of Organisational Sustainability.....	11
	Objective of Research.....	12
	Hypotheses.....	13
3	RESEARCH METHODOLOGY.....	16
	Research Design.....	16
	Sampling Frame.....	16
	Target Population.....	16
	Basis of Stratification.....	16
	Sample Size.....	17
	Data Collection.....	17
	Data Source.....	17
	Tools for data Collection.....	18
	Instrument Validation Procedure.....	18
	Validity.....	18
	Reliability.....	19
	Statistical Tools and Technique.....	20
	Limitation	20
	Further Scope of Study.....	20
4	DATA ANALYSIS.....	22
	Test Statistics	22

	Result.....	23
5	REFERENCES.....	24
6	ANNEXURES.....	29
	Content Validity: Gen Y Characteristics.....	29
	Internal Consistency Report.....	30
	One Sample t-test	32
	SPSS Variable, Data view and t-test output ..	32

INTRODUCTION

Managing multigenerational workforces is an art in itself. Young workers want to make a quick impact, the middle generation needs to believe in the mission, and older employees don't like ambivalence (Carlson, Deloitte & Touche, 2009). With the entry of Generation Y (Gen Y) to the workplace, four different generations are working together. Numerous studies have examined core characteristics and management strategy of Gen Y (Brown et al., 2009; Volkert, 2009a, Volkert, 2009b; Carlson et al., 2009; Ethics Resource Centre, 2009). Nowadays, electronic universe has targeted various generations especially Gen Y in connection with not only business development strategies but also managing them for sustainable business strategies. They continue to live 24x7 digitally connected in a globalised world. Gen Y is the most technically literate, educated and ethnically diverse, and tend to have flexibility (Ethics Resource Centre, 2009). At the same time, it is also believed that Gen Y lack basic literacy fundamentals, have very short attention span and lack a strong work ethic. They are not loyal to employing organization (Ethics Resource Centre, 2009).

In India, as Gen Y has entered into economic activity and is going to add substantially in GDP, we find lack of research on how to manage Gen Y. This research gap on Gen Y with HRM aspects motivated this researcher to take research on "Managing Gen Y: A Study of Various Dimensions for Sustainability of Organisations in Indian Context". Sustainability of organisation on the other hand has various meaning to various researchers. In the changing political and economic contours of Indian business it is viable to understand the tenets of organisational sustainability with respect to India. The purpose of the study is to understand Gen Y's professional priorities and mindset that motivates them at work, how they view their roles and

responsibilities and what they want from employers so that those attributes can be decisive factor for the sustainability of the organisation while managing Gen Y.

The problem Statement

Of all the resources in the organisation the human resource is the most valuable resource as this resource alone makes all the assets of the organisation work for productivity. Organisation with thousands of humans with various attributes and characteristics work for common objectives of sustainability with success. Towards this common objective of sustainability of organisation the whole workforce work in tandem irrespective of caste, creed, gender, religion and most importantly the generation they belong to. Though, researchers highlight demographical attributes like age, gender, educational background and work experience to analyse the contribution of human resource in productive contribution to the organisation (Sengupta, 2011), the generational attribute remained as a silent factor mysteriously. In common parlance, we talk of generation gap when the two generations find it difficult to co-exist with common objective then why researchers could ignore such an important aspect with respect to the workforce where multigenerational workforce co-exist. Therefore, the challenges for the HR manager is to walk on two sided sword of organisational sustainability with success on one side and managing Gen Y in multigenerational HRM environment on the other side. The searching question for them is therefore “What are various dimensions of Gen Y that could be utilised for the sustainable success of the organisation?”

Rationale of the study

Human characteristics and human factor have been found as the key to sustainability. Thus, it can be inferred that without moulding human characteristics as

pro sustainability, it is not feasible to achieve sustainability. Therefore, it has become a compulsion to find out both undesirable and desirable generational characteristics of human being. After going through various literature pertaining to Generations, especially Gen Y, their strengths and weakness to make an organisation sustainable has been explored. The purpose of exploring generational characteristics is to strengthen their positive and mitigate negative ones.

Although, Gen Y's characteristics need to be checked empirically so as to utilise their traits for making an organisation sustainable. Thus, the purpose of this study is to collect data related to Gen Y's organisational, technical, professional and personal characteristics. Besides these traits, this study also seeks to explore their social, motivational and ethical orientation, and their values. The tools viz., questionnaire, structured interview and expert opinion to collect such data will be elaborately explained in "Research Methodology" part.

So far, studies have been witnessed that explained various dimensions of employees belonging to Gen Y, but for foreign countries i.e., American, European and Australia. However, only few Indigenous studies have been witnessed concerning Gen Y in India, but not related to Gen Y at workplace. India has one of the youngest workforce in the world and trying to be tagged as “ Developed Country” with lots of enthusiasm and young talent boiling to show their prowess in various fields, it is desired to study Gen ‘Y’ as they are entering the workforce. This study therefore is targeted to explore various dimensions of this Gen ‘Y’ so that Indian organisations can be benefitted in long run that is going to be witnessed as an era of Gen Y and their contribution in the growth of Indian businesses with sustainable success.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Generations

Generation evolves from Latin word "Generatio", and dictionary meaning of generation is as, all of the people born and living at about the same time. Various authors and scholars have defined generation from various perspectives, viz., the Saeculum Perspective, Sociocultural and Life Event Perspective and, National and International event perspective.

Working Definition of Generation for this Research

After analysing the genesis of definitions for generation viz., Saecula perspective, Sociocultural and Life Events Perspective, and National and International Event Perspective, the researcher considers that saecula perspective, and national and international perspective definitions as more pertinent to a globalised world. Since scholars have studied generations empirically in different countries, and have labelled generations based on time period, but, not on the basis of specific location. The Generation is defined as "*group of people born in the same period irrespective of their experiences regarding social transformation and common life events*".

G.I. Generation

Abbreviation G.I. stands for "Government Issue" or "General Issue", used to describe the soldiers of the United States Army and airmen of the United States Army Air Forces and also for general items of their equipment (Wilton, 2009). They were born between 1901 and 24 (Strauss and Howe, 1991; Brokaw, 1998). But, according to Fry, Igielnik and Patten (2018) they were born before 1927. In India, it was a period of pre-independence era. In 2009, their population accounted for 0.3 % in India

(Statistical Report, 2009), and their population has remained approximately 1.3 million only in the year 2017 (Population Pyramid, 2017).

Traditionalists

Apart from being called as traditionalists (Murphy, 2007) they are also called Veterans, the Matures (Murphy, 2007) and, the Greatest Generation (Tolbize, 2008; Murphy, 2007). According to Strauss and Howe (1991) they were born between 1925 and 42, between 1925 and 45 (Howe, 2014b), between 1928 and 45 (Erickson, 2008), and before 1946 (Hagevik, 1999). They were brought up in a challenging time with life experiences that included WW II, great depression of 1930s, and in India in a pre-independence era. In India, their population accounted for 2.5% for the year 2009 (Statistical Report, 2009), and in the year 2017 they constitute less than 2% of Indian population (population Pyramid, 2017). People belonging to this generations are represented by Mr. Azim Premji chairman of Wipro Limited, Mr. Naresh Chandra and Mr. Euan McDonald (Non-Executive Director Vedanta Resources).

Baby Boomers

They were named as Baby Boomers because of massive increase in US population after end of World War II. It was evident in India too, as the decadal population growth prate accounted for 21.64% for 1951-61 and 24.8% for 1961-71 census (Census of India, 2011). Like previous generation, the birth year of Baby Boomers have been defined with different viewpoints. According to Howe (2014d) they were born between 1943 and 60. Blain (2008) defined their birth years from 1945 to 62, and Hagevik (1999) defined their birth years from 1946 to 60. However, studies viz., Ethics Resource Centre (2010) and Global Workplace Innovation (2010) concluded the birth year of Baby Boomers between 1946 and 64. In 2009, their

population in India accounted for 12.5% (Census of India, 2011) and, in the year 2017 they remained approximately 10% (Population Pyramid, 2017). Elder Baby boomers have already retired from workforce, but younger ones are still part of Indian workforce. They are idealistic (Carlson study, 2009; Millennial Leaders, n.d.), optimistic (Carlson Study, 2009), follow consensual and collegial leadership style (Global Workplace Innovation, 2010), therefore, they are loyal to one organisation (Kaye & Cohen, 2008). They encourage productivity (Kaye & Cohen, 2008) through teamwork (Carlson Study, 2009; Global Workplace Innovation, 2010), take minimum off, and pass their knowledge to succeeding generation (Kaye & Cohen, 2008; Erickson, 2008) to fulfil their personal gratification (Carlson study, 2009) at workplace. They are represented by Sunil Bharati Mittal, Anand Mahindra, Gautam Adani and Indira Nooyi Chanda Kochhar, Uday Kotak and Shikha Sharma.

Gen X

The term Generation X (Gen X) was coined by the Magnum photographer Robert Capa in the early 1950s to label the title for a photo belonging to youth entering their adulthood post WW II (Ulrich, 2003). The term, though coined in the 1950s, became synonymous with children of the 60s and the 70s after author Douglas Coupland used it in his novel Titled " Generation X: Tales of an accelerated culture" (Ulrich, 2013). They were born between 1961 and 81 (Strauss and Howe, 1991; Howe, 2014d; Kafil et al., 2012), but, according to Murphy (2007) their birth years range from 1965 to 80. However, Srinivasan (2012) defined their beginning birth year as 1961 or 1964 to 65, and closing as 1975 to 83. In India, their population including male and female in the year 2009 accounted for approximately 17.5 % (Statistical Report, 2009), and in 2017 they constitute approximately the same percentage in total population (Population Pyramid, 2017).

With the expansion of IT industry post 1991 liberalization, and its resulting expansion of computer education, Gen X started becoming technology friendly (Ethics Resource Centre, 2010). Gen X is the first generation to grow up with computers and new age technology. Gen X reflected a shift from a manufacturing economy to a service economy (Kane, n.d.), and a drastic change in employment from the public to the private sector as an outcome of 1990s economic reforms (Bhalotra, 2002) because of job opportunity with high-status remunerations. Migration of Indian Institutes of Technology (IIT) graduates and other high-end professionals (brain drain) to US and western countries (Srivastava, 2015; Erickson, 2009) moulded their mind-set to adapt change and think globally (Carlson Study, 2009). Still, over 75% of 1980s IIT graduates immigrated to the United States (Erickson, 2009). With such opportunities in job market they are less committed to one employer (Ethics Resource Centre, 2010) and more willing to change jobs (Blain, 2008) to get ahead than previous generations. They are self-reliant (Tolbize, 2008; Becton, Walker and Jones, 2014; Blain, 2008), autonomous (Tolbize, 2008) and, more independent than their predecessor (Tolbize, 2008). Since, they have witnessed growth in economy from late 1980s to mid-1990s except 1991-92 (Nayar, 1998) and resulting expansion in job market (Bhalotra, 2002) they are optimistic and have a positive attitude (Carlson Study, 2009). It is during the time period of Gen X that concepts like flexi work hours (Carlson Study, 2009; Ethics Resource Centre, 2010), etc. were developed and implemented as HRM policies.

Gen Z

Like their other predecessor generations, Generation Z (Gen Z) has also been bestowed various names. There are various viewpoints regarding their starting birth year. Maximum age of this generation is 18 years in the year 2018 according to age boundary of Gen Z in this study and they are in schools and colleges. Presently i.e. in

the year 2018, this generational cohort constitutes 36.8% of Indian population and 33.7% of global population (Population Pyramid, 2018).

Gen Y

Gen Y has been bestowed with words like Millennials, Cyberkids, Non-nuclear family generation, 'Nothing is sacred' generation, Digital natives, Do or Die generation and Wannabes (Srinivasan, 2012; Tolbize, 2008). Time period of Gen Y has been a debatable issue for the want of consensus of various scholars. Scholars define the beginning of Gen Y as early as 1977 and as late as 1981 and, ending as early as 1994 and as late as 2002. Based on various research papers (Erickson, 2008; Carlson Study, 2009; Hagevik, 2009; Blain, 2008; Ethics Resource Centre, 2010) the researcher adopted age range for Gen Y as born between "1981 and 2000". However, for other interpretations and characteristics other studies were also considered in context of Gen 'Y'.

According to Population Pyramid (2018) in 2018, Gen Y constituted more than 33% global population and, in India they represented 36.4% of total population (based on approximate calculation by the researcher), therefore India is known as a Young country (Shivakumar, 2013). According to 2011 census literacy rate of India reached to 74.04 % from 64.8% in comparison to 2001 census because of growth in school enrolment and drastic decreasing dropouts from 2001 to 2014 (MoSPI, n.d.), certainly it was the young adulthood period of Gen Y. In FY 2012-13 they constituted more than 40% of our workforce (Youth Employment-Unemployment Scenario, 2012-13), and, by the year 2020 they will dominate the workplaces (Workforce 2020, n.d.). Gen Y is replacing Baby Boomers, they are going to be the future of the economy.

General Characteristics

Gen Y is confident (Blain, 2008; Carlson Study, 2009), optimistic and creative (Angeline, 2011) and, ambitious and achievement-oriented (Murphy, 2007). They continue to live with 24X7 digitally connected globalised world (Carlson Study, 2009). Gen Y is highly technologically proficient (Volkert, 2009a), as they grew up using personal computers and other digital devices. Gen Y is known for their technology savvy characteristics (Volkert, 2009a; Robert Half International, 2008; Volkert, 2009a & Brown et al., 2009), however, this technological impact may not apply equally to all Millennials. Considered most technically educated (Volkert, 2009a) and ethnically diverse (Blain, 2008; Saleh, n.d.), they tend to have a more flexible lifestyle (Carlson Study, 2009).

Professional Characteristics

Research reveals that Millennials value autonomy (Carlson Study, 2009; Volkert, 2009a), and reinforcement in their jobs. Millennials also crave for work-life balance, flexible work schedule, and are restless searcher for greener professional pasture (Volkert, 2009a). Millennials are adaptable to new technology (Angeline, 2011), excellent at integrating technology into workplace (Blain, 2008), demand immediate feedback and recognition, and expect to have multiple careers (Ethics Resource Centre, 2010; Angeline, 2011).

Gen Y employees consider high salary, good benefits and other compensation (Saleh, n.d.) as a motivational characteristic of their job, and have no problem moving on somewhere that will offer them these traits in a job because they expect it. If not satisfied, they are inclined to change jobs and/or companies more readily than previous generations (Hall, 1996; Arthur and Rousseau, 1996). They have high expectations of

their employers, seek out new challenges and are not afraid to question authority (Tolbize, 2008). Gen Y is highly inquisitive (Saleh, n.d.), wants meaningful and interesting work and a solid learning curve (Global Workplace Innovation, 2010) to utilise their skills and multiple competencies. They work better in team (Blain, 2008; Angeline, 2011) as they are highly socially networked. They are pragmatic (Robert Half International, 2008), and not loyal to employing organisation (Ethics Resource Centre, 2010). A detailed list of characteristics possessed by Gen Y has been attached as Annexure 1.

Organisational Sustainability

Sustainability and Sustainable Development are two different terms, both consisting Resource (the wise use and management of economic and natural resources), and Respect (respect for people and other living things) aiming to long term well-being for society and self (Blackburn, 2007). Organisations depend on limited resources, viz human resource, financial resource and environmental resources, for their success and existence. They manage these resources with time tested successful management practices (Petrini & Pozzebon, 2010), strategies (Wilson, Smith & Dunn, 2007), policies (OECD, 2001) and legal compliances.

In September 2000, during Millennium summit at Un Headquarters, New York, all 191 members of the United Nations committed to achieve eight goals by the year 2015 for sustainable development. These goals viz., eradicate extreme poverty and hunger, achieve universal primary education, promotion of gender equality and women empowerment, reduce child mortality, improve mental health, combat HIV/Aids, malaria and other diseases, environmental sustainability, and global partnership for development are called Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). World Summit on Sustainable Development (2002) with "Johannesburg Declaration

on Sustainable Development" containing reaffirmation towards sustainable development. Further, Conference on Sustainable Development (2012) resulted into focussed political outcome document "The Future We Want" containing 17 SDGs (Sustainable Development Goals). These SDGs are expansion of MDGs, aimed to function as a blueprint to achieve better and more sustainable future for all.

An organization's ability to achieve its goals and increase long-term stakeholder value by integrating economic, environmental and societal opportunities in its strategies (adapted from "Symposium on Sustainability-Profiles in Leadership", NYC Oct 2001). According to Savitz, Andrew and Weber (2007), a company is sustainable when it generates profits for shareholders, protects the environment, and improves the lives of the people with whom it interacts. Peterson (2009) defines "Organizational Sustainability as the ability for a group of persons to endure the internal and external pressures of a culture, through change and innovation, as they endeavour to deliver their specific products". To do that one needs a lens or a model through which you can evaluate the organisation.

Considering all these definitions, economic (Symposium on Sustainability, 2001; Dyllick and Hockerts, 2002; Savitz et al., 2007), environmental and societal (Symposium on Sustainability, 2001; Savitz et al., 2007) concern is found to be significant for organisational sustainability.

Importance of Organisational Sustainability

Constructing "The show me the money model" to attain economic business values through sales and cost factor, Blackburn (2007) highlighted factors viz., (i) Reputation and brand strength, (ii) Competitive, effective and desirable products and services, new markets (iii) Productivity (iv) Operational burden and interferences (v)

Supply chain costs (vi) Cost of capital and, (vii) Legal liability, which affect sustainability programme. Thus, sustainability is necessary for any entity irrespective of its size, sector, nature, location and ownership. It is very difficult to judge the sustainability of an organisation by seeing its financial and technological performance only, as sustainability is an ongoing process and combination of numerous sustainability factors. Each sustainability factor is equally important at appropriate stage according to its priority.

Objectives of the Research

Based on research problem, the main objective of the study is “To explore various dimensions of Gen Y’s characteristics for organisational sustainability in Indian context”.

To achieve the main objective of the study, the sub-objectives are framed as under-

- To establish new insights into various dimensions that characterise the workforce belonging to Gen Y in India.
- To explore Gen Y’s expectations, preferences and attitude towards work and organisations they work for.
- To identify challenges and opportunities presented by the entry of Gen Y to work place and exploring their attributes as a decisive factor for formulation of strategies to manage intergenerational implications of Gen Y.
- To expound various parameters to establish sustainability of an organisation.
- To explore the relationship between various dimensions of Gen Y and sustainability of companies.
- To recommend the ways and means to utilise various dimensions of Gen Y to increase sustainability of organisations.

Hypotheses

To explore the above objectives and in consultation with the review of literature following hypotheses were framed.

H₀1: There is no association between Gen Y working in various sectors and their consideration while opting first job.

H_a1: There is an association between Gen Y working in various sectors and their consideration while opting first job.

H₀2: There is no association between gender of Gen Y and their consideration while opting first job.

H_a2: There is an association between gender of Gen Y and their consideration while opting first job.

H₀3: There is no association between birthplace strata of Gen Y and their consideration while opting first job.

H_a3: There is an association between birthplace strata of Gen Y and their consideration while opting first job.

H₀4: There is no association between state/ UT of Gen Y they belong to and their consideration while opting first job.

H_a4: There is an association between state/ UT of Gen Y they belong to and their consideration while opting first job.

H₀5: There is no association between Gen Y's education level and their consideration while opting first job.

H_a5: There is an association between Gen Y's education level and their consideration while opting first job.

- H₀6: There is no association between branch/ discipline of study of Gen Y and their consideration while opting first job.
- H_a6: There is an association between branch/ discipline of study of Gen Ys and their consideration while opting first job.
- H₀7: There is no association between years of experience of Gen Ys and their consideration while opting first job.
- H_a7: There is an association between years of experience of Gen Ys and their consideration while opting first job.
- H₀8: There is no association between designation of Gen Ys and their consideration while opting first job.
- H_a8: There is an association between designation of Gen Ys and their consideration while opting first job.
- H₀9: There is no variation among various sectors on various factors for consideration of first job.
- H_a9: There is a variation among various sectors on various factors for consideration of first job.
- H₀10: There is a correlation of 1.0 among all the factors for consideration of first job by Gen Y.
- H₀10: The correlation among all the factors is less than 1.0 for consideration of first job by Gen Y.

For independent variables viz., sector, gender, birth place strata, the state/ UT they belong to, education level, branch/ discipline of study, their experience and designation, hypotheses have been framed and tested for all other factors, preferences and characteristics mentioned in the objective of the research.

Such hypotheses related to consideration for opting current profession, motivating factors considered by them to continue their present job, and factors considered for switching over their job has been framed.

Further, hypotheses related to their consideration of factors to learn new skills and attitude, and types of training they want has been framed. Hypotheses related to characteristics of their professional team, their feelings at workplace, and their opinion towards trade unions has also been framed. Again, hypotheses to find their order of preference w.r.t usages of ICT and mobile gadgets, factors considered for creating a sense of belongingness and, factors affecting their morale has also been framed. Hypotheses related their job satisfaction at workplace, seeking and providing autonomy, their dependency on digital technology, comfort with such technology and willingness to learn new technology has been framed. To find out characteristics such as innovative, inquisitiveness, entrepreneurial, awareness, highly socially networked, questioning authority, seeking and providing immediate feedback and, communicates easily hypotheses has been framed. All the hypotheses will be tested after getting appropriate no. of responses from each strata.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design

Descriptive research enables to get insights into a phenomenon and sanctions a basis for decision-making. Further, it deals with the study of status and is widely used in education, and the behavioural sciences. Thus, considering the objective of the study to describe characteristics of Gen Y cohort aimed to specific predictions, features and narration of their characteristics at workplace and, methods of data collection, analysis and inferences, a descriptive research design has been adopted.

Sampling Frame

Target Population

In this study, Gen Y managerial cadre employees presently working in both public and private sector has been considered as respondents. For selection of these respondents, a stratified purposive sampling technique has been adopted. Further, target respondents have been selected by sample organisation according to organisation's convenience.

Basis of Stratification

The stratification of target population in this study is being carried out on the basis of type of organisations they are working for. In this sampling frame, preference of selecting sample companies is based on company's market capitalisation, and their consent for study.

	Public Sector Companies (BSE/ NSE Listed)	Private Sector Companies (BSE/ NSE Listed)
Manufacturing	Sample Companies (HO/ RO or major operation in Gujarat)	Sample Companies (HO/ RO or major operation in Gujarat)
Service	Sample Companies (HO/ RO or major operation in Gujarat)	Sample Companies (HO/ RO or major operation in Gujarat)

Table 1: Stratification of Population

Sample Size Determination

To determine sample size statistical formulae have been used. Population is finite for such companies, further there is a homogeneity in terms of their socioeconomic background. To conduct such studies in social science, significance level is .05 i.e., 5% margin of error is considered (Ary, Jacobs, and Razavieh, 1996). With the help of statistical formulae at 5% margin of error, Krejcie and Morgan (1970) suggested following sample size.

Finite population Continuous measurement	117.09
Finite population Categorical measurement	277.56
Infinite population Continuous measurement	2964
Infinite population Categorical measurement	384 .16

Table 2: Determination of Sample Size

Thus, considering this table for a finite population 278 is appropriate sample size for this study. To avoid incomplete/ invalid responses, 20% oversampling will be carried out. Therefore, approximately 330 responses are required to conduct this study. However, a sample size of 400 will be considered for this study.

Data Collection

Data Source

To conduct this study both primary and secondary data have been considered. The Source of primary data is responses from Gen Y managerial cadre employees from both public and private sector industries. In addition, expert interviews with industry expert is being conducted to explore and compare employer's viewpoint. Further, secondary data have been collected from government websites, government reports, books, journals and dailies.

Tools for data Collection

To conduct this study a questionnaire has been administered to the target population. In data collection instrument both measurement scales, continuous (Summated Rating Scale) and categorical (Binary, MCQs and Rank Order Scale) have been used. The mode of data collection is a hard copy form distributed among target population. In addition to this form of data collection method, a google link has been sent through e-mail or with the help of other Information and Communication Technology (ICT) devices as per respondents' choice. Further, expert interviews for qualitative analysis is being carried out to get more insight into Gen Y characteristics.

Instrument Validation Procedures

Validity

To validate the Data Collection Instrument, expert opinion in addition to guiding teacher and departmental research committee has been sought. Because, this study is about Gen Y characteristics at workplace, expert from Faculty of Education and Psychology (Prof. Urmi Biswas), Prof. R.S. Srivastava (Department of Statistics) and, industry expert (Mr. Sudhir Sethi) have been consulted. This instrument of data collection fulfils all the validity criteria i.e., content, construct and criterion. A content validity table has been attached as annexure 1, which enlist all items pertaining to Gen Y's characteristics affecting organisational sustainability. All the items enlisted in annexure 1 have been covered in the instrument. For Sampling validity, statistical method of sample selection has been considered. Construct validity has been verified by experts.

Reliability

Reliability denotes the consistency of a measurement. There are various ways to measure consistency, but, test-retest reliability (over time), internal consistency (across time) and, split half are key methods. To measure the internal consistency of constructs, Cronbach Alpha has been carried with the help of received responses as a pilot test. Responses were selected randomly from bunch to find out internal consistency in pilot study. For such test, SPSS software has been used. Cronbach α normally ranges between 0 and 1, however, George and Mallery (2003) suggested a rule of thumb as “ $\alpha >0.9$ - Excellent, $\alpha >0.8$ -Good, $\alpha >0.7$ - Acceptable, $\alpha >0.6$ - Questionable, $\alpha >0.5$ -Poor and, $\alpha <0.5$ -Unacceptable”. Table 1 shows the internal consistency of constructs used in instrument.

Construct	No. of Variables	Instrument	Cronbach's Alpha
Team player	6	Likert Summated Rating Scale	0.902
Distracted and Destructible	5	Likert Summated Rating Scale	0.906
Opinion towards Trade Unions	5	Likert Summated Rating Scale	0.856

Table3: Internal Consistency of Constructs

To check internal consistency of construct Opinion towards Trade Unions, reverse coding has been done for item_4 Provoke their members unnecessarily, and Item_5 are hurdle to productivity as follows, 1 as 5, 2 as 4, 4 as 2, and 5 as 1. Further, coding for item_1 play a constructive role, item_2 are necessary to protect their rights, and item_3 educate their members have been done directly.

* Please refer annexure 2 for Internal Consistency Reports.

Statistical Tools and Techniques

While carrying out data analysis descriptive statistics has been used to reveal respondents profile. Scales like nominal, ordinal, interval and ratio were used to get responses from respondents. Hence, inferential tests like t-test for conducting pilot study of 30 samples has been carried out.

Parametric tests like z- test, ANOVA, Multiple Regression Analysis, Factor Analysis and Principal Component Analysis and, nonparametric tests viz., K-S test, χ^2 test, and other appropriate statistical tests will be conducted. Further, Pearson's r and Spearman ρ will be carried out to establish correlation for parametric and non-parametric tests respectively. After getting all the responses, other appropriate statistical tools and techniques may be applied in addition to above said.

Limitations

This study is related to Gen Y employees only of BSE/ NSE listed public and private sector companies engaged in manufacturing/ non-manufacturing (service) activities. This study excludes those government organisations which are not engaged in profit maximisation business. Thus, characteristics of Gen Y managerial cadre employees of such organisation may vary. This study is limited to organisations having Registered/Head Office or major operation in Gujarat state only, however sample consists of employees from other states too. Managerial cadre employees have been considered as target population and this study excludes shop floor employees.

Future Scope of Study

This study shows the various dimensions of Gen Y. Such studies can be conducted to find Gen Y's characteristics w.r.t. various segments viz., unemployed youth, potential employees and college students as potential job aspirants. Further,

similar studies can be carried out for other generations, and a correlation with other generations can be established. Apart from finding out characteristic of workforce, studies for college students may be carried out to find out their expectations from their institutions.

DATA ANALYSIS

Based on same data for pilot study, the researcher conducted t-test for the construct ‘Team player characteristics’, as a question “My professional team at workplace has following characteristics”.

Construct	Items	Score	Max/ Min Score
Team player characteristics	1. Free flow of communication 2. Coordination 3. Collaboration 4. Trust 5. Freedom 6. Adaptability	1: SA 2: A 3: N 4: D 5: SD	No. of items* Score 6*5=30/ 6*1=6

Table 4: Team player characteristics

To find out Team-player characteristics among Gen Y at workplace null hypothesis and alternate hypothesis is formulated as follows

Null hypothesis: $H_0: \mu = \mu_0 = 3$

Alternate Hypothesis $H_a: \mu \neq \mu_0$ (i.e. $\mu < \mu_0 / \mu > \mu_0$)

Where, μ is sample mean, and μ_0 is hypothesised mean.

Population Mean (test value/ hypothesised mean: 3 (Neutral))

T-Test

One sample statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Mean	30	2.2222	.77600	.14168

One Sample t-test

Test value=3						
					95% Confidence Interval of the difference	
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Lower	Upper
Mean	-5.490	29	.000	-.77778	-1.0675	-.4880

Table 5: One Sample t-test Output

Here, population mean (μ_0): 3 Sample Mean (μ) 2.2222 Std. Deviation: .776
Sig. (2-tailed): 0 .000 α : 0.05 $\alpha/2$: 0.025

Result

Considering the Sig. (2-tailed) i.e., p-value and $\alpha/2$, $.000 < 0.025$, Null Hypothesis is rejected. Thus, Gen Ys demonstrate team player characteristics. Comparing Sample mean (2.2222) and Neutral value (3), it can be inferred that Gen Ys demonstrate agreement towards construct Teamwork effectiveness.

* Please refer annexure 3 for SPSS variable view, data view, and output view.

REFERENCES

- Angeline, T. (2011). Managing generational diversity at the workplace: expectations and perceptions of different generations of employees. *African Journal of Business Management*, 5(2), 249-255. doi: 10.5897/AJBM10.335
- Arthur, M.B. & Rousseau, D.M. (1996). *The Boundaryless Career: A New Employment Principle for New Organizational Era*, Oxford University Press, NY.
- Ary, D., Jacobs, L.C. and Razavieh, A. (1996). Introduction to Research in Education. *Harcourt Brace College Publishers*, Fort Worth.
- Becton, J.B., Walker, H.J. & Jones, A. (2014). Generational Differences in Workplace Behaviour. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*. 44, pp. 175–189
- Bhalotra, S. (2002). The Impact of Economic Liberalization on Employment and Wages in India. *University of Bristol, UK International Policy Group*, International Labour Office, Geneva.
- Blackburn, W. R. (2015). *The sustainability handbook*. London: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group. ISBN 978-1-138-99009-8
- Blain, A. (2008). The Millennial Tidal Wave: Five Elements That Will Change the Workplace of Tomorrow. *Journal of the Quality Assurance Institute*, 22(2), 11-13.
- Brokaw, T. (1998). *The Greatest Generation*. *Penguin Random House LLC*. United States of America.
- Brown, S., Carter, B., Collins, M., Gallerson, C., Giffin, G., Greer, J., Richardson, K. (2009). "Generation Y in the Workplace." Retrieved August 16, 2014 from [www.bushdev.tamu.edu/.../2009 GenerationYintheWorkplace.pdf](http://www.bushdev.tamu.edu/.../2009%20GenerationYintheWorkplace.pdf)
- Carlson, C., Deloitte & Touche Study. (2009). Traditionalists, Baby Boomers, Generation X, Generation Y (and Generation Z) Working Together- What Matters and How They Learn? How Different Are They? Fact and Fiction. *United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund Article*. Retrieved August 16, 2014

from

www.un.org/.../Designing%20Recruitment,%20Selection%20&%20Tale.

Census of India. (2011): *Provisional Population Totals*, Paper-1 of 2011, Registrar General, India.

Dyllick, Thomas. & Hockerts, Kai. (2002). Beyond the Business Case for Corporate Sustainability. *Business Strategy and the Environment*; Mar/Apr 2002; Published online in Wiley Interscience (www.wileyinterscience.com). DOI: 10.1002/bse.323.

Erickson, T. (2009). Generational Differences between India and the U.S. *Harvard Business Review*. Retrieved July 25, 2017 from <https://hbr.org/>.

Erickson, T.J. (2008). *Plugged in: The Generation Y Guide to Thriving at Work*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Press

Ethics Resource Centre, (2010). Millennials: Gen X and Baby Boomers: Who's Working at Your Company and What Do They Think about Ethics?" *Supplemental Research Brief*, Retrieved August 16, 2014 from www.ethics.org/files/u5/Gen-Diff.pdf.

George, D. & Mallery, P. (2003). *SPSS for Windows Step by Step: A Simple Guide and Reference. 11.0 Update (4th ed.)*. Boston: Allen and Bacon

Global Workplace Innovation. (2010). *Generation Y and the Workplace Annual Report*. Johnson Control. Retrieved August 16, 2014 from, www.johnsoncontrols.in/...workplace.../oxygenz/Oxygenz_Report_-_20

Hagevik, S. (1999). From Ozzie and Harriet to the Simpsons, generations in the workplace. *Environmental Health* 61 (9): 39.

Howe, N. (2014a). *The G.I. Generation and the "Triumph of the Squares" (Part 2 of 7)*. Retrieved May 22, 2017 from <https://www.forbes.com/>

Howe, N. (2014b). *The Silent Generation, "The Lucky Few" (Part 3 of 7)*. Retrieved May 22, 2017 from <https://www.forbes.com/>

Howe, N. (2014c). *The Boom Generation, "What a Long Strange Trip" (Part 4 of 7)*. Retrieved May 22, 2017 from <https://www.forbes.com>

- Howe, N. (2014d). *Generation X: Once Xtreme, Now Exhausted (Part 5 of 7)*. Retrieved May 22, 2017 from <https://www.forbes.com/>
- Howe, N. (2014e). *The Millennial Generation, "Keep Calm and Carry On" (Part 6 of 7)*. Retrieved May 22, 2017 from <https://www.forbes.com/>
- Howe, N. (2014f). *Introducing the Homeland Generation (Part 1 of 2)*. Retrieved May 22, 2017 from <https://www.forbes.com/>
- Kafil, B.A., Wageeh, A.N., Khanfar, N.M. & Kafil, N.M. (2012). A Multi-Generational Workforce: Managing and Understanding Millennials. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 7 (24).
- Kane, S. (n.d). *The Multigenerational Workforce: Getting Along with All Generations*. Retrieved from July 30, 2014 from <http://legalcareers.about.com/od/practicetips/a/GenerationX.htm>
- Kaye, B. & Cohen, J. (2008). Safe Guarding The intellectual Capital of Baby Boomers: When Transitioning Boomers into Retirement, *Loyalty Begets Loyalty. T+D* 62 (4), 30-33.
- Krejcie, R.V. & Morgan, D.W. (1970). Determining Sample Size for Research Activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30, 607-610
- Millennial Leaders, (n.d.). *Generation Y: Everything You Ever Wanted to Know About the Millennials*. Retrieved May 10, 2014 from http://www.millennialleaders.com/Gen_Y_Brownson.pdf
- Murphy, S.A. (2007). Leading a Multigenerational Workforce. *AARP Project*. NW, Washington. Retrieved July 12, 2017 from http://assets.aarp.org/www.aarp.org/_cs/misc/leading_a_multigenerationalworkforce.pdf
- Nayar, B. (1998). Political Structure and India's Economic Reforms of the 1990s. *Pacific Affairs*, 71(3), pp. 335-358. Retrieved August 10, 2018 from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2761414>
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2001). *Policies to Enhance Sustainable Development*. Retrieved June 3, 2015 from www.oecd.org/greenworth/1869800.pdf.

- Peterson, E. W. (2009). *Taming the squid: organizational sustainability--surviving the 21st century*. Greeley, CO: Chambers College Press.
- Petrini, M. & Pozzebon, M. (2010). *Integrating Sustainability into Business Practices: Learning from Brazilian Firms*. Retrieved Jun 22, 2014 from www.anpad.org.br/periodicos/peq-pdf/a-1119.pdf.
- Population Pyramid (2017....2019). Retrieved March 1, 2017 onwards from <https://www.populationpyramid.net>
- Robert Half International, (2008). What Millennials Workers Want: How to Attract and Retain Gen Y employees. Retrieved July 30, 2016 from www.rhi.com.
- Saleh, L. K. (n.d.): Managing to Manage Across Generations at Work, Retrieved from www.desjardinsfinancialsecurity.com, site visited on Aug, 12 2014.
- Savitz, Andrew. W. & Weber, K. (2007). The Sustainability Sweet Spot. *Environmental Quality Management*. Wiley Periodicals, Inc. Published online in Wiley InterScience www.interscience.wiley.com, site visited on September 23, 2014.
- Sengupta, S. (2011). An Exploratory Study on Job and Demographic Attributes Affecting Employee Satisfaction in the Indian BPO Industry. *Strategic Outsourcing: An International Journal*, 4(3), pp.248-273.
- Shrivastava, P. (2010). Pedagogy of Passion for Sustainability. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 9 (3). pp. 443-455
- Srinivasan, V. (2012). Multigenerations in the Workforce: Building Collaboration. *IIMB Review*, 24(1), 3-4. DOI: 10.1060/j.iimb.2012.01.009
- Statistical Report, (2009). Census of India Website: Office of the Registrar General & Census Commissioner, India. Retrieved from July 12, 2015 from <http://www.censusindia.gov.in/>
- Strauss, W., & Howe, N. (1991). *Generations: The history of America's future, 1584 to 2069*. New York: William Morrow.
- Symposium on Sustainability-Profiles in Leadership, (2001). Retrieved December 10, 2017, from http://www.corporatecomm.org/pdf/1001_morefield.pdf

- Tolbize, A. (2008, August 16). Generational Difference in the Workplace. Retrieved December 30, 2015, from https://rtc.edu/docs/2_Gen_diff_workplace.pdf.
- Ulrich, J. (2003). "Introduction: A (Sub) cultural Genealogy". In Andrea L. Harris. *GenXegesis: Essays on Alternative Youth*. p. 3. ISBN 9780879728625.
- Volkert, Charles A. Esq. (2009a). *How to Manage and Motivate Generation Y Employees?* Robert Half International. Retrieved September 10, 2014 from https://www.alanet.org/careers/articles/How_to_Manage_and_Motivate_Generation_Y_Employees.pdf.
- Volkert, Charles A. Esq. (2009b). *Managing a Cross-Generational Legal Workforce*. Retrieved September 10, 2014 from www.legal.rhi.mediaroom.com/file.../ACC_07_15_09_Managing+cross+gen.p.
- Wilson, C., Smith, B. & Dunn, P. (2007). *A Guide to Developing a Sustainability Strategy and Action Plan*. Retrieved June 5, 2015 from rpd-mohesr.com/uploads/custompages/Guide_to_sus_strategy.pdf.
- Wilton, D. (2009). G.I. Retrieved July 30, 2018 from <http://www.wordorigins.org/index.php/more/310/>
- Workforce 2020. (n.d.). Retrieved August 1, 2018 from <https://www.forbes.com/workforce-2020/>
- World Summit on Sustainable Development. Background Release. (2002, August 24). Retrieved November 10, 2017, from <http://www.un.org/events/wssd/summaries/envdevj1.htm>
- Youth Employment-Unemployment Scenario. (2012-13). *Labour Bureau*. Ministry of Labour & Employment, Government of India.

Annexure1: Gen Y Characteristics: Content Validity

<p>Organisational:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Expectations for all-round development ○ interaction among colleagues ○ Wants less Red tapism and organisational hierarchy ○ High expectations of their employers ○ Open and direct communication ○ Job satisfaction at workplace 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Teamwork ○ Job hoppers ○ Likes interesting work ○ Question authority ○ Demands immediate feed back ○ Feel more productive ○ Not loyal to employer
<p>Technical:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Most technically educated ○ Technology savvy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Technology dependent ○ Access information easily
<p>Professional:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Integrate technology into workplace ○ Perceived high skills and multiple competencies ○ Looking for career advancement opportunities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Achievement oriented ○ Multi-tasking ○ Entrepreneurial ○ Career flexibility ○ Learning and personal growth
<p>Motivational:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Lured towards increased pay ○ Want a boss with pleasant personality ○ Utilise free time for own requirement ○ Associate more the type of work they do 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ ○ Recognition ○ Decent work environment ○ Want to learn different skills and competencies ○ Mutual respect and trust
<p>Social:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Interconnected ○ Ethnically diverse ○ Highly socially networked ○ Empathetic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Collaborative ○ Tolerant ○ Communicates easily ○ Flexibility
<p>Values:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Value autonomy ○ Equality ○ Work-life balance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Justice ○ Freedom ○ Social responsibility
<p>Personal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Accept challenges ○ Inquisitiveness ○ Pragmatic ○ Leadership traits ○ Lacks basic literacy fundamentals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Daring ○ Innovative ○ Confident ○ Ambitious ○ Distracted ○ Destructible ○ Impatient

Annexure2: Instrument Reliability (Internal Consistency) Report

RELIABILITY

```

/VARIABLES=Item1_Communication Item2_Coordination Item3_Collaboration Item
/SCALE('ALL VARIABLES') ALL
/MODEL=ALPHA.

```

→ **Reliability**

[Teamwork_reliability]

Scale: ALL VARIABLES

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	30	100.0
	Excluded ^a	0	.0
	Total	30	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.902	6

RELIABILITY

```

/VARIABLES=Helplessness Anxiety Forget Emotional Lacks_Attn
/SCALE('ALL VARIABLES') ALL
/MODEL=ALPHA.

```

→ **Reliability**

[Distracted_Reliability]

Scale: ALL VARIABLES

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	30	71.4
	Excluded ^a	12	28.6
	Total	42	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.906	5

File Edit View Data Transform Insert Format Analyze Direct Marketing Graphs Utilities Add-ons Window Help

Output

- Log
- Reliability
 - Title
 - Notes
 - Active Dataset
 - Scale: ALL VARIABLES
 - Title
 - Case Processing S
 - Reliability Statistics
- Log

```

RELIABILITY
/VARIABLES=Item1_play Item2_Necess Item3_Edu Item4_Provk Item5_Hrd1
/SCALE('ALL VARIABLES') ALL
/MODEL=ALPHA.

```

→ **Reliability**

[Distracted_Reliability]

Scale: ALL VARIABLES

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	30	71.4
	Excluded ^a	12	28.6
	Total	42	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.856	5

DATASET NAME TU_Opinion_Reliability.

Annexure 3: One sample t-test (team player)

SPSS: Variable View

	Name	Type	Width	Decimals	Label	Values	Missing	Columns	Align	Measure	Role
1	Res_Id	String	12	0		None	None	10	Left	Nominal	Input
2	Communication...	Numeric	8	0		{1, Strongly ...	None	10	Right	Ordinal	Input
3	Coordination	Numeric	8	0		{1, Strongly ...	None	9	Right	Ordinal	Input
4	Collaaboration	Numeric	8	0		{1, Strongly ...	None	10	Right	Ordinal	Input
5	Trust	Numeric	8	0		{1, Strongly ...	None	9	Right	Ordinal	Input
6	Freedom	Numeric	8	0		{1, Strongly ...	None	8	Right	Ordinal	Input
7	Adaptability	Numeric	8	0		{1, Strongly ...	None	8	Right	Ordinal	Input
8	Total	Numeric	8	2		None	None	10	Right	Nominal	Input
9	Mean	Numeric	8	2		None	None	10	Right	Scale	Input
10											

SPSS: Data View

	Res_Id	Communication	Coordination	Collaaboration	Trust	Freedom	Adaptability	Total	Mean
1	GNFC HR 4	1	1	1	1	3	2	9.00	1.50
2	GNFC HR 3	1	2	2	2	2	3	12.00	2.00
3	INOX K9	1	1	1	1	1	1	6.00	1.00
4	INOX D2	1	3						
5	INOX D5	1	2						
6	INOX K1	1	2						
7	INOX K4	1	3						
8	GSFC 6	1	1						
9	GSFC4	1	3						
10	GSFC 8	1	3						
11	GNFC HR1	1	2						
12	GNFC P2	1	1						
13	GNFC P4	1	3						
14	GNFC P8	1	3						
15	PANS 4	1	2						
16	PANS 8	1	2						
17	PANS 16	1	2	2	2	2	2	11.00	1.83
18	PANS 10	1	1	1	1	2	1	7.00	1.17
19	GNFC DC 17	1	1	1	1	1	4	9.00	1.50
20	GNFC DC 5	1	1	1	1	3	3	10.00	1.67
21	GNFC P1	2	2	2	2	2	2	12.00	2.00
22	GNFC P6	4	4	4	4	4	4	24.00	4.00

SPSS: T-test output

T-TEST
 /TESTVAL=3
 /MISSING=ANALYSIS
 /VARIABLES=Mean
 /CRITERIA=CI (.95) .

→ T-Test
 [OS_t_test_teamwork]

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Mean	30	2.2222	.77600	.14168

One-Sample Test

	Test Value = 3				
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference Lower Upper
Mean	-5.490	29	.000	-.77778	-1.0675 - .4880