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ABSTRACT

This study aims to identify the difference in young job applicants’ perception of employer attractiveness dimensions based on their demographic characteristics. The author examined a comprehensive measurement scale to assess employer attractiveness key value propositions through exploratory quantitative research. A judgmental sampling technique is used to select respondents from two well-known private universities operating in Egypt. A total of 400 questionnaires were distributed online among final-year undergraduate and graduate students. To assess the research hypotheses, non-parametric tests were employed. The findings indicated that when searching for an employer, the young generations give the highest importance to economic, social, development-interest, reputation and less importance to application-diversity and working environment attractiveness dimensions. On the other hand, the results revealed a statistically significant difference between the perceived importance levels of each dimension based on the respondents’ gender, education, and study program. The research results have several theoretical and practical implications, in which it addressed many limitations of previous studies on employer attractiveness. Moreover, the findings can be used to track young job seekers’ perception towards employers to provide Human Resource practitioners with valuable insights in managing their communication and recruitment strategies to attract talented job applicants.

1. Introduction

In the digital era, technology is transforming the way people live and socially interact with each other (Arriscado et al., 2019). Business intelligence, digitalization, and data analytics are realities of this new world (Arriscado et al., 2019). Moreover, many scholars view the emergence of the COVID-19 pandemic in Egypt as the most crucial challenge that the job market is facing now and have begun to investigate how it would affect employees’ employment choices (Rudolph and Zacher, 2020). In addition to the technological shifts and the COVID-19 pandemic, the world is now witnessing a generational shift in the workforce, as it is predicted that young workers will make up a large proportion of the global workforce soon (Duxbury and Ormsbee, 2020), especially in Egypt, where 75% of the citizens are under the age of 25, which makes it one of the countries with the youngest population (World Population Review, 2021). Employers need to deal with this turning point as young generations now see the world of work differently; therefore, it is time to forecast and monitor young workforce requirements and their shifting attitudes and expectations (Sharma, 2019). Thus, employers should go with the flow and ride the wave of change to maintain their competitive position in the market by getting a sufficient supply of competent and tech-savvy human capital; youth is the best match (Moore and Khan, 2020; Hira et al., 2021).

In an attempt to examine the factors that drive potential employees’ decisions to work for a specific employer, a lot of research has been done over the past decade to identify what makes employees choose a specific employer over others. It was noticed that scholars have mentioned that organizations are attempting to obtain the label of being an “attractive employer” to engage with more potentially interested employees. Most of the studies focused on an in-depth theoretical discussion of this concept and identified the critical dimensions of being an attractive employer (Berthon et al., 2005; Reis and Braga, 2016; Mbicik and Mificador, 2018). However, Berthon et al. (2005) indicated that there is no universal list of attractiveness dimensions that applies to all countries, industries, and organizations. Thus, many authors have suggested that employee backgrounds, gender, age, education, income, and work experience point to different attractiveness dimensions (Reis and Braga, 2016; Thirangama and Dileesha, 2020; Kismono and Rahayu, 2021). As individual preferences vary across different generations, a one-size-fits-all approach to applicants is unlikely to be effective (Schmidt et al., 2015). Therefore, it
is critical to investigate the demographic differences encountered in employer attractiveness (EA) (Thiranagama and Dileesha, 2020).

This research aims to identify the dimensions of employer attractiveness among youth and examine whether there is a statistically significant difference in the perceived importance level of each attractiveness dimension based on gender, education, and study program during the current pandemic and digitalized era. To achieve the aim of this research, this paper is organized as follows. A thorough literature review is conducted to serve as a foundation for the empirical research on employer attractiveness, and the different characteristics of the young generation are reviewed. Next, the methodological procedures are presented. Then, the empirical section starts with the research sample description, and employer attractiveness dimensions are identified through exploratory factor analysis. Afterward, the attractiveness dimensions based on the demographic variables are tested. Finally, the discussion and conclusion section summarizes the main research contributions, along with the limitations and implications for theory and practice.

2. Literature review

2.1. Employer attractiveness

Since Employer Attractiveness (EA) is a growing concept, many studies have included in-depth theoretical discussions about it and identified the main attributes of being an attractive employer (Lievens and Highhouse, 2003; Backhaus and Tikoo, 2004; Berthon et al., 2005; Reis and Braga, 2016; Eger et al., 2019; Ahamad, 2019). Berthon et al. (2005) defined EA as “the envisioned benefits that a potential employee sees in working for a specific organization” (p.149). Reis and Braga (2016) defined attractiveness as the “attitude or expressed general positive affect toward viewing an organization as a desirable entity with which to initiate some relationship” (p.105). It is a two-dimensional construct, where internal attractiveness is about current employees’ perception and external attractiveness is about external candidates’ perception of “the degree to which potential applicants and existing employees favorably perceive an organization, as a great place to work” (p.4) (Thiranagama and Dileesha, 2020). Based on these definitions, it is crucial for any employer to identify what attracts a potential applicant to work for a specific organization, which is the employer value proposition (EVP) (Mitčík and Mícudová, 2018). Which is defined by Botha et al. (2011) as “the unique set of attributes and benefits that will motivate target candidates to join a company and current employees to stay” (p.3). Botha et al. (2011) added that job applicants seek organizations that offer benefits that fit their needs and preferences, this necessitates the application of market segmentation techniques, including behavioural, demographic and psychographic segmentation, as it is about segmenting the employee population based on insights into their specific needs, to design the appropriate value proposition that addresses the needs and preferences of the job applicant, accordingly this will enhance employer attractiveness by differentiating an organization’s employment offers from that of other competitors (Moroko and Uncles, 2009). Therefore, to be an attractive employer for target applicants, it is crucial for employers to understand the kind of attributes that they should offer to attract their preferred job seekers (Alnaçaç and Alnaçci, 2012).

2.2. Employer attractiveness dimensions

Ambler and Barrow (1996) identified three main dimensions of attractiveness, which are “the set of functional, economic and psychological benefits provided by employment, and recognized with the employing company” (p.187). In the author’s view, the functional dimension is related to development activities, whereas the economic dimension is associated with monetary and material rewards, and the psychological dimension is connected to the sense of belonging, direction, and purpose. Later, Berthon et al. (2005) extended the work of Ambler and Barrow (1996) by developing 25 employer attractiveness attributes in their study on a sample of final year business students in a university located in Western Australia. They divided the 25 attractiveness attributes into five distinct attributes. Economic value (EV): assesses whether an organization offers above-average wages, good compensation package, and job security; social value (SV): assesses whether an organization has a good team spirit and respectable coworkers, as well as a positive and pleasant social environment; interest value (IV): assesses whether an employer provides innovative working practices; application value (AV): assesses whether there is opportunity to convey knowledge and apply expertise to others development value (DV): assess whether an organization offers career development and recognition opportunities.

These five attributes extend those that Ambler and Barrow (1996) proposed, in which the interest value and social value correspond to the psychological dimension, diversity value and application value are represented by the functional dimension, and the economic value corresponds to the economic attribute. In 2011, Slager et al. extended the work of Berthon et al. (2005) to measure EA from the perspective of current employees working with an insurance provider. They partly applied the items developed by Berthon et al. (2005) and included three of their five dimensions: economic, development, and social values. However, the researchers added two other dimensions diversity and reputation values. Diversity refers to interesting job characteristics and is similar to interest value conceptualized by Berthon et al. (2005). However, Slager et al. added several items such as “challenging tasks” and a “variety of tasks.” It should be noted that challenging and interesting tasks, are among the most important predictors of job satisfaction (Backhaus and Tikoo, 2004). In addition to reputation value that was added to their dimensions, and it means working for an organization with a good brand image and reputation. Then, Dabiari et al. (2017) added two more dimensions to the list, in an attempt to identify seven employer value propositions that current, former, and potential employees care about when they evaluate employers. Management Role and Work-Life Balance (WLB) that were added to social, interest, application, development, and economic which correspond to the dimensions proposed by Berthon et al. (2005). The role of management is the attitude and behavior of managers/supervisors toward their employees that make employees choose to stay or leave an organization. Work/life balance is an attribute that determines the right balance between employees’ work and life, which helps them to work in harmony with all their duties. Sthapit et al. (2020) identified flexible working conditions as one of the important dimensions in the factors that influence EA.

2.3. Characteristics of young generations

Daniel et al. (2020) defined a generation as “an identifiable group that shares birth cohorts and significant political, social life events and experiences in the formative developmental phase in childhood and adolescence” (p.398). Dutta and Mishra (2021) added that “a cohort who has moved through time together, experiencing various critical factors and being at a similar age group is broadly termed as a generation” (p.1480). Each generational cohort is characterized by differences in individuals’ personalities, abilities, demographics, and work experience (Singh et al., 2020). Today’s workforce comprises four generational cohorts, Baby-boomers, Generation X, Generation Y, and Generation Z, the youngest. As each year passes, the Baby-boomers begin to retire, which makes cohorts Y and Z the largest generation in the workforce (Duxbury and Ormsbee, 2020). Aside from the detailed characteristics of each generation, this research focuses on the key features of the target audience, Generations Y and Z as illustrated in Figure 1. Generations Y and Z are the most important future potential job applicants, as they account for 75% of the Egyptian workforce (Galal, 2021); they have unique expectations about employment and are selective about the employers they decide to join. Therefore, understanding their perception is very crucial for employers to create an “attractive employer” image (Hira et al., 2021), especially during this period in
which researchers anticipate that the ongoing pandemic is likely to alter youth job preferences (de Haas et al., 2020). In 2021, approximately 24% of the Egyptian population, that is, around 24 million, were Generation Y members (Galal, 2021), emphasizing the significance of this generation in the Egyptian economy. Members of this cohort were born between 1981 and 1996 (Bejtkovský, 2018; Daniel et al., 2020). The ‘Y’ is from the English word youth. Generation Y is also referred to as Millennials or Millennials, Echo Boomers, Internet Generation, and Generation We. They are considered the first digital generation wave born into the world of technology (Bencsik et al., 2016). Compared with previous generations, members of Generation Y are more social, less independent, more community-oriented, seeking work-life balance (WLB), driven by technology, and considered multitaskers. Although they are easily bored, but they enjoy discovering and experimenting new approaches and solutions to problems (Mičík and Mičúdová, 2018). They prefer challenging work because it allows them to demonstrate their worth and boost their self-esteem (Zhao and Xu, 2020).

Mičík and Mičúdová (2018) also reported that quick career growth is one of the key attributes that motivate them to work. However, Bakaunaukiene et al. (2019) emphasized that work flexibility or the possibility to work remotely, is important to be able to manage their working time with family responsibilities, thereby enhancing work-life balance. Scholars disagree on Generation Y’s expectations toward salary. For some researchers, salary is considered less important than other attributes, whereas, for others, this generation is attentive to salary (Mičík and Mičúdová, 2018). The latter is consistent with the studies of Zhao and Xu (2020); Dutta and Mishra (2021), who stated that pay is the most important motivator for the millennial generation. When it comes to the most preferred communication network, Generation Y use social media networks very often to communicate (Bejtkovský, 2018), and they are continuously connected to digitally streamed data, such as Glassdoor or LinkedIn, to search for information quickly. Moreover, they rely on peer reviews on social media to build their perception of the organizational image and rankings in the market (Dutta and Mishra, 2021).

As for Generation Z, they were born between 1996 and 2010 (Daniel et al., 2020). They make up 51% of the Egyptian population (Galal, 2021). It will not be long before they dominate the workforce. Several names have been connected to this generational cohort, such as generation me, Gen Zers, Gen Tech, Gen Wii, NextGen (Dabirian et al., 2019), iGeneration, net generation (Bencsik et al., 2016), and generation C as they are always connected and blur the line between work and personal lives (Dabirian et al., 2019). Post-Millennials or True digital natives due to their ultra technology and social media savviness (Acheampong, 2021). Singh et al. (2020) stated that Facebook is the preferred social media platform for every age group, except Generation Z. This generation prefers YouTube, Snapchat, and Instagram. Furthermore, because they live in an era of thriving entrepreneurship, Generation Z is thought to be more innovative and entrepreneurial than previous generations (Acheampong, 2021).

Most of the traits that will define this generation are yet to emerge; however, some studies have claimed that Generation Z is a subset of Generation Y; thus, they share the same work values and characteristics. Conversely, some authors have argued that the post-Millennials have distinct features that differentiate them from previous generations (Acheampong, 2021). It is possible to argue that Generation Z is the first truly global generation; because they have been raised in a complex and uncertain environment, high-tech is in their blood (Bencsik et al., 2016). They have experienced global pandemics, and this experience has shaped their outlook about life, work, and the world in general, which have made them more embracing of change, adaptable, realistic, and highly driven (Acheampong, 2021), so they have different expectations towards workplaces (Bencsik et al., 2016). Acheampong (2021) believes that the digital-centric Generation Z is the most significant generational shift the workplace has ever encountered. In summary, understanding generational differences are important in designing the appropriate recruitment strategies that enable employers to successfully position themselves as attractive employers in the competitive landscape (Evertz and Süß, 2017). Thus, research about different generations’ expectations and work values is important and remains a growing area that must be addressed (Daniel et al., 2020).

2.4. Employer attractiveness and individual differences

There is a growing number of studies on employer brand attractiveness aim to identify potential job seekers’ needs, expectations, motives, and work values for organizations to be aware of and consider them in designing an attractive employer value proposition. Kismono and Rahayu (2021) surveyed (150) business school graduating students from Indonesia to test the differences between the respondents’ characteristics based on their career goals. Using the attractiveness dimensions proposed by Berthon et al. (2005). The results showed that organizations with a good reputation and offer innovative products and services as well as secure employment are significantly more important to women than men. However, experienced workers demand a higher work/life balance compared to those who do not have much working experience. This is because those who do not have working experience are categorized as young and single; thus, they have not seen the need to balance their work and life yet. Conversely, those who have work experience are already in the
settled position, both within the company and their family life. In relation to educational background, the study results revealed that respondents with a high need for achievement are motivated by getting hired by a successful, reputable organization, which signifies one’s superior competence over others.

Thiranagama and Dileesha (2020) conducted a study on (370) potential job seekers to test employer attractiveness dimensions based on demographic differences in Sri Lanka using the scale of Berthon et al. (2005). The results indicated that economic value (EV) was the most appealing dimension to males, whereas application value (AV) was the least appealing one. Females are more attracted to social value (SV) and less attracted to development value (DV) and interest value (IV). For young and middle-aged respondents, economic value appeals to them more, whereas they have the least attraction to development and application values. Experienced employees show more attraction to economic value and have the least attraction to application value. Eger et al. (2019) surveyed 281 university business students from two faculties of Economics in the Czech Republic to assess employer attractiveness using the scale developed by Berthon et al. (2005). They found that Czech business students placed SV as the most important factor. The second-most important factors were interest value (IV) and economic–development values together (E-DV). On the other hand, females perceive social value (SV), application value (AV), economic–development values (E-DV), and application value (AV) as significantly more important than males. Only interest value (IV) was perceived to be equally important for both genders.

Dabirian et al. (2017), who stated that one of the most crucial attributes that young employees emphasize when considering an employer is education and career development opportunities. This is also consistent with the study of Baum and Kabst (2013), who conducted a cross-cultural study of business students and found that the main drivers of attractiveness in the German labor market are career and development opportunities as well as working atmosphere; compensation is the least driver in selecting an employer. Furthermore, Alnaqiq and Alnaqiq (2012) studied 600 potential employees to determine the attractiveness dimensions using Berthon et al. (2005) scale and examined their perceived importance levels on the respondents’ age, gender, and current employment status. The findings revealed a significant difference between males and females in the perceived importance of application, social and market values (equivalent to interest); females were attracted to these values more than males. However, they found no significant difference in their perception of economic value and workplace environment, and neither did they find any significant difference based on the age or the current employment status.

The theoretical review reveals that there is no single standard list of employer attractiveness dimensions that an employer value proposition should compile that can be applied to all countries (Bakanaukiene et al., 2017, 2019). Moreover, if “blueprints” for attractive dimensions existed, any attempt to copy others would not provide a unique competitive edge (Moroko and Uncles, 2008). Prioritization of attractiveness attributes will differ based on different demographic characteristics, culture, and educational background of the job applicant (Reis and Braga, 2016; Eger et al., 2019), so it is crucial to understand these attributes from the perspective of national contexts and demographic characteristics to design an authentic, unique, and appealing attributes to attract targeted employees, as stated by Sharma (2019).

Moreover, the reviewed literature used the same kinds of participants (business students), which limits their results to business students. Therefore, there is a need for more research that includes respondents from different disciplines (e.g., engineering, medicine, and arts), as proposed in several studies (Berthon et al., 2005; Baum and Kabst, 2013; Eger et al., 2019; Dutta and Mishra, 2021; Kismono and Rabayu, 2021). Moreover, the majority of studies on employer attractiveness are mainly based on a sample of university students rather than current employees (Papavasileiou and Lyons, 2015; Eger et al., 2019), however Alnaqiq et al. (2014) suggested that further studies should include individuals who have work experience and field expertise to get a more in-depth understanding of employer attractiveness. Therefore, to increase the generalizability of this research results, it involves young working professionals and students who are about to graduate from three different disciplines (business, engineering, and pharmacy). Based on the thorough analysis of the literature, the following hypotheses are proposed:

H1. There is a statistically significant difference in the perceived importance of employer attractiveness dimensions based on gender.

H2. There is a statistically significant difference in the perceived importance of employer attractiveness dimensions based on education.

H3. There is a statistically significant difference in the perceived importance of employer attractiveness dimensions based on study program.

3. Research methodology

3.1. Participants and data collection method

To verify the previous findings from the literature review and get a clearer understanding of the young generation’s perception of the workplace in Egypt, an exploratory quantitative research is conducted using a non-probability judgmental sampling technique. Due to accessibility, time, and cost constraints respondents are selected from two well-known private universities that are well known and established early in the educational sector in Egypt. Following the study of Sekaran and Bougie (2010), the target sample is 400 respondents. A total of 200 questionnaires were distributed online among final-year undergraduate students in three faculties (business administration, engineering, and pharmacy) with a large number of enrolled students. This was done to reach a good variety of respondents from different disciplines, who are about to graduate in a few months and will join the job market soon, representing Generation Z. In addition, 200 questionnaires were distributed online to students that have graduated from the same universities and faculties who completed their educational process a few years ago and already have experience with finding and selecting an employer, representing Generation Y. 303 complete and valid questionnaires were received, with a total response rate of 76%. In collecting and analyzing the research data, an ethical consent was obtained from all the respondents who participated in answering the questionnaire.

3.2. Instrument development

Berthon et al. (2005) scale was adapted for measuring the employer attractiveness with some modifications to set this scale according to the Egyptian culture for respondents to understand it easily. These dimensions included economic, social, application, development, and interest value. In addition, Dabirian et al. (2017) expanded on Berthon et al. (2005) work by including two dimensions; management and work-life balance. Besides the two additional dimensions identified by Schlager et al. (2011), reputation and diversity. A total of 9 dimensions were used to measure employer attractiveness among the young generation, the resulting survey consisting of 44 items for all the dimensions. Data were collected using a self-administered online questionnaire that included the demographic questions, and respondents were then instructed by asking the following question at the beginning: “after your graduation or when you decide to change your current job, please indicate how important are the following factors when selecting potential employers”. Responses were given on a five-point Likert scale (1 = “not at all important”; 5 = “extremely important”).

3.3. Data analysis

An exploratory factor analysis was used to identify the employer attractiveness dimensions among the young generation. Then, a
nonparametric Mann–Whitney test was employed to identify the factor scores between females and males from young generation. Followed by the nonparametric Kruskal–Wallis test to examine whether there are statistically significant differences in attractiveness dimensions are observed based on education and study program. A post hoc analysis of the test results is used to compare the attractive dimensions’ importance levels. The data were analyzed by using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software version 20.

4. Results

4.1. Demographics of the research sample

Table 1 showed that the total number of respondents was 303, in which 53% of the research sample with age level less than 25 years, while 47% were between the age of 25 and 40, 34% males and 66% females; while 31% of the respondents were still in their final year of graduation, 35% got their bachelor degree, and 34% completed their postgraduate studies, 49% of the respondents from Business program, 35% Engineering program, 16% Pharmaceutical program.

4.2. Reliability and validity of the instruments

First, Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) is conducted, in which Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) ensures the suitability of data for factor analysis, in which the recommended minimum KMO value is 0.5 (Hadi et al., 2016).

The results revealed that the KMO value is 0.934, indicating that the data is suitable for factor analysis. Then to determine the strength of the relationship to determine the multivariate normality of a set of distributions, Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity was employed. Simultaneously, it tests the null hypothesis that the original correlation matrix is an identity matrix. If the significance value is less than 0.05, this indicates that the data did not produce an identity matrix and is thus multivariate is normal and acceptable for further analysis (Pallant, 2005). The results revealed that Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity value is significant at p less than 0.05, indicating that the correlation between items is sufficient to conduct the factor analysis. Subsequently, a principal component analysis with varimax rotation and a factor extraction according to the MINEIGEN criterion was employed, and Table 2 revealed that seven factors were extracted with eigenvalues greater than one and accounted for a cumulative value (68.84%) of the variation in the sample data. Ten items were eliminated because they did not have good loading around those factors; therefore, 44-items were reduced by those10-items, this left with a 34-items scale to be analyzed with values greater than 0.5, this reflects that all the items are converged on for their respective factors, and convergent validity is ensured. After the validity is assessed, the reliability of the scales is checked, and if the values for Cronbach alpha coefficient are greater than 0.70, it lies within the acceptable range as stated by (Sekaran and Bougie, 2010). Cronbach’s alphas for each factor derived from the 34-items scale were greater than 0.7, then all items attributed to the different factors had high item-to-total correlations. Showing that all the items used in each construct are reliable and consistent for measuring employer attractiveness dimensions.

4.3. Descriptive statistics for demographic variables

Descriptive statistics were conducted using SPSS to examine its central tendency (mean), variability (standard deviation) to test the distribution pattern of data.

The mean scores for each attractiveness dimension are shown in Table 3. In general, respondents have positive perceptions of each dimension, as all the mean scores are above the midpoint 3. First, females had given slightly higher ratings than males do. It is observed that females assign greater value to social, development-interest and economic values. Males, in turn, prioritize economic, social and development-interest values respectively.

However, the undergraduate respondents had slightly higher ratings, followed by postgraduate than those with a bachelor's degree. In which undergraduate respondents value more social, development-interest and management-work/life balance values. As for those with bachelor's degree; it is noticed that they give more importance to economic, development-interest and social values. While respondents with postgraduate degree emphasized the importance of economic, social then development-interest values respectively.

Finally, young generation from business study program emphasize on social, development-interest and management-work/life balance values. As for those from engineering study program; it is noticed that they give more importance to economic, social and development-interest values. Young generation from pharmaceutical study program assign greater value to development-interest, economic and social values. The lowest mean score for all the respondents is for reputation, application-diversity and working environment values.

4.4. Testing research hypotheses

H1. There is a statistically significant difference in the perceived importance of employer attractiveness dimensions based on gender.

H2. There is a statistically significant difference in the perceived importance of employer attractiveness dimensions based on education.

H3. There is a statistically significant difference in the perceived importance of employer attractiveness dimensions based on study program.

4.4.1. Testing hypothesis 1

To test the significant difference in the perceived importance of employer attractiveness dimensions among young job seekers based on gender (H1), the data was divided into two samples. The first one comprises female scores, and the other one is male scores for each attractiveness dimension. According to Eger et al. (2019), due to the non-normality of all sample couples, the non-parametric Mann–Whitney U test was employed. All the basic parameters were calculated for every sample and factor. The results are reported in Table 4 in which the Mann-Whitney U test results show that there is a statistically significant difference in male and female perceptions for all employer attractiveness dimensions with p values less than 5% and 10% except for working environment (U = 14850, p = 0.182), where the p value is greater than 5%.

As for the sub-items in each dimension, the results revealed that females attach higher importance to attractiveness dimensions than males. In this case, the majority of items across all dimensions are significant at p values less than 5% and 10%, except for (Q1) competitive packages, (Q2) high job security, (Q6) organization reputation, (Q12) respectful and pleasant work atmosphere, (Q26) empowering environment, (Q29)
| Items Rotated Component Matrix | Variance explained | α  |
|-------------------------------|--------------------|----|
| Application and Diversity (A-DV) |                    |    |
| Q38: An organization that provides you an opportunity to apply what you have learned | 0.758 | 12.992 | 0.894 |
| Q39: Acceptance and belonging (you feel part of the company) | 0.738 |     |    |
| Q41: An organization that promotes a good variety of work activities | 0.724 |     |    |
| Q42: Working with team members from diverse personalities, backgrounds, and experiences | 0.655 |     |    |
| Q37: An organization that provides you an opportunity to teach others what you have learned | 0.619 |     |    |
| Q43: Working on challenging but achievable tasks | 0.556 |     |    |
| Q36: A Meaningful job that provides you a chance to apply the knowledge and skills you have to give back to society | 0.542 |     |    |
| Management and WLB (M-WLBV) |                    |    |
| Q20: An Organization that offers a flexible work schedule that enables you to be successful on and off the job | 0.700 | 12.772 | 0.868 |
| Q21: An Organization that encourages employees’ balance between work and personal life | 0.674 |     |    |
| Q18: A supervisor who is committed to a high-quality work | 0.598 |     |    |
| Q17: A supervisor who understands your job needs | 0.580 |     |    |
| Q16: Supportive and encouraging supervisor | 0.542 |     |    |
| Q22: Opportunity to work remotely when appropriate to meet personal needs | 0.542 |     |    |
| Reputation (RV) |                    |    |
| Q8: Leading, well-known, prestigious brand in the market | 0.802 | 9.304 | 0.848 |
| Q6: Good organizational reputation in the market | 0.739 |     |    |
| Q7: Good brand name to have on a resume | 0.720 |     |    |
| Q9: An Organization that is innovative and dynamic | 0.568 |     |    |
| Working Environment (WEV) |                    |    |
| Q33: An Organization that support a healthy lifestyle | 0.814 | 9.137 | 0.825 |
| Q34: Funny working environment | 0.732 |     |    |
| Q35: Working in an exciting environment | 0.548 |     |    |

(continued on next page)
Table 2 (continued)

| Items                                                                 | Rotated Component Matrix | Variance explained | α  |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|----|
| Social (SV)                                                           |                          |                    |    |
| Q10: Strong team spirit                                               | 0.705                    | 8.593              | 0.790 |
| Q11: Colleagues who are friendly, supportive, and encouraging         | 0.682                    |                    |    |
| Q12: Respectful and pleasant work atmosphere                          | 0.528                    |                    |    |
| Development and Interest (D-IV)                                       |                          |                    |    |
| Q13: An Organizational culture that is people-focused                 | 0.511                    |                    |    |
| Q29: Innovative employer that applies a novel and innovative work practice. | 0.774                    | 8.173              | 0.867 |
| Q23: An organization that recognizes and appreciates employees' efforts. | 0.635                    |                    |    |
| Q25: Good mentoring and coaching culture that encourages ongoing constructive feedback | 0.586                    |                    |    |
| Q24: Good opportunities for career-enhancing experience               | 0.571                    |                    |    |
| Q26: Empowering environment                                           | 0.558                    |                    |    |
| Q28: An organization that values and makes use of your creativity     | 0.516                    |                    |    |
| Economic (EV)                                                        |                          |                    |    |
| Q1: Competitive salary packages                                       | 0.774                    | 7.871              | 0.783 |
| Q2: High job security                                                 | 0.596                    |                    |    |
| Q3: Good promotion opportunities within the organization with good financial rewards | 0.587                    |                    |    |
| Q4: Attractive overall non-monetary compensation packages             | 0.513                    |                    |    |

Principal Component Analysis with Varimax Rotation and Kaiser Normalization.

Items with factor loadings < .5 are not shown in the table above.

Source: Author's calculation from SPSS.
innovative and dynamic organization, (Q38) opportunity to teach others, in addition to all the working environment items in which the test presented a high concordance in the importance of these items only between females and males at $p$ values more than 5%. Thus, null hypothesis is rejected for all the remaining significant items. Therefore, there is a significant difference in organizational attractiveness dimensions among males and females. Hypothesis 1 is supported.

### 4.4.2. Testing hypothesis 2
To test the significant difference in the perceived importance of employer attractiveness dimensions among young job seekers based on the educational level (H2), the Kruskal–Wallis test, and post-hoc analysis (multiple testing) were employed (Eger et al., 2019). A Kruskal-Wallis test results in Table 5 showed that there is a statistically significant difference in respondents' perception of employer attractiveness dimensions based on educational level were social value ($\chi^2(2) = 5.715, p = 0.037$), management-work/life balance ($\chi^2(2) = 5.781, p = 0.056$), working environment ($\chi^2(2) = 6.100, p = 0.047$) and application-diversity values ($\chi^2(2) = 11.250, p = 0.004$) with a $p$ values less than 5% and 10% except for economic value ($\chi^2(2) = 1.348, p = 0.510$), reputation value ($\chi^2(2) = 2.415, p = 0.299$), development-interest values ($\chi^2(2) = 1.909, p = 0.385$) with $p$ values greater than 5%.

As for the sub-items in each dimension, it can be seen that the perceived importance of most items differs for respondents according to their educational level at $p$ values less than 5% and 10%. A post-hoc analysis for the significant items depicts that the mean rank differences exist across respondents. In which the benefits that attract more candidates with a postgraduate degree are (Q1) competitive salary packages, (Q6) working in a good reputable organization with (Q13) people-focused culture, in addition to (Q38) having the opportunity to transfer knowledge to others.

For the undergraduate respondents, they emphasized on the importance of having (Q3a) good opportunity for promotions, (Q7) working with an organization that adds value to their resume, (Q9) an innovative and dynamic employer that encourages (Q10) strong team spirit, in addition to (Q16) working with a supportive supervisor (Q17) who understands their job needs and (Q18) is committed to high work quality; moreover, (Q21) an organization that encourages work/life balance, (Q24) offering a good career-enhancing experience, (Q28) values creativity and (Q41) promotes a healthy and (Q34) funny working atmosphere. Thus, the difference in perception between them was proved for most statements, which means that the null hypothesis is rejected for these statements. Therefore, H2 is supported.

### 4.4.3. Testing hypothesis 3
A Kruskal-Wallis test results from Table 5 showed that there is a statistically significant difference in respondents perception on employer attractiveness dimensions based on their study program (H3), in which reputation value ($\chi^2(2) = 9.629, p = 0.008$), social value ($\chi^2(2) = 6.477, p = 0.039$), management-work/life balance ($\chi^2(2) = 11.005, p = 0.004$) and application-diversity values ($\chi^2(2) = 8.315, p = 0.016$) dimensions with a $p$ values less than 5% except for economic value ($\chi^2(2) = 4.219, p = 0.121$), working environment ($\chi^2(2) = 3.075, p = 0.215$) and development-interest values ($\chi^2(2) = 3.366, p = 0.186$) dimensions with $p$ values greater than 5%.

As for the sub-items in each dimension, and after conducting the post hoc analysis for the significant items, it was observed that the mean rank differences exist across respondents from different study programs. Respondents from the business study program give the highest importance to (Q7) working for an employer with a good brand name, (Q9) which is innovative and dynamic, (Q13) organization with people-focused culture, in addition to (Q16) working with a supportive and encouraging supervisor, (Q17) who understands their job needs, they also emphasized on the importance of (Q22) working remotely, (Q25) having a good mentoring and coaching culture, and (Q38) have the opportunity to transfer their knowledge to others in the workplace, adding to the above is the importance of (Q42) working with diverse personalities (Q43) on challenging and achievable tasks.

On the other hand, respondents from the engineering study program value more working for employers with (Q4) attractive non-monetary compensation package, (Q12) having a respectful and pleasant work atmosphere, (Q28) an organization that values their creativity, and (Q33) promotes a healthy organizational lifestyle. Thus, the null hypothesis is accepted only for the remaining statements. Since there is a significant difference between the respondents’ perceptions based on their study program on some items. Therefore, H3 is partially supported.

## 5. Discussion and implications
In this research, the author examined a comprehensive measurement scale for the employer attractiveness construct. The identified dimensions are as a result of refinement and extension of previous studies (Berthon et al., 2005; Schlager et al., 2011; Dabirian et al., 2017) that classified employer attractiveness into the application, social, development, interest, economic, diversity, reputation, management, and work/life balance. After conducting exploratory factor analysis, these nine dimensions of attractiveness were reduced to seven dimensions, including one newly added dimension, termed the working environment. The findings reveal that all the attractiveness dimensions appeared to be

---

**Table 3. Mean scores for demographic variables and attractiveness dimensions.**

| Variable       | N   | EV M | SD | RV M | SD | SV M | SD | M-WLB M | SD | D-IV M | SD | WEV M | SD | A-DV M | SD |
|----------------|-----|-----|----|------|----|------|----|---------|----|--------|----|-------|----|--------|----|
| Gender         |     |     |    |      |    |      |    |         |    |        |    |       |    |        |    |
| Male           | 104 | 4.23| .560| 3.98 | .692 | 4.20 | .542| 3.99    | .685| 4.19   | .583| 3.64    | .864| 3.92    | .704|
| Female         | 199 | 4.33| .657| 4.23 | .698 | 4.39 | .640| 4.33    | .644| 4.36   | .593| 3.79    | .907| 4.15    | .664|
| Education Level|     |     |    |      |    |      |    |         |    |        |    |       |    |        |    |
| Undergrad.     | 94  | 4.30| .521| 4.18 | .642 | 4.46 | .413| 4.38    | .529| 4.40   | .455| 3.95    | .788| 4.24    | .544|
| Bachelor       | 107 | 4.23| .759| 4.04 | .793 | 4.18 | .779| 4.11    | .797| 4.22   | .699| 3.58    | .981| 3.92    | .751|
| Postgrad.      | 102 | 4.37| .555| 4.23 | .655 | 4.35 | .537| 4.18    | .640| 4.31   | .580| 3.72    | .858| 4.06    | .698|
| Study Program  |     |     |    |      |    |      |    |         |    |        |    |       |    |        |    |
| Business       | 148 | 4.30| .542| 4.28 | .612 | 4.39 | .433| 4.33    | .576| 4.39   | .490| 3.79    | .837| 4.20    | .586|
| Engineering    | 108 | 4.32| .745| 4.03 | .800 | 4.28 | .818| 4.18    | .745| 4.22   | .700| 3.75    | 1.010| 3.95    | .711|
| Pharmacy       | 47  | 4.21| .580| 3.98 | .679 | 4.20 | .529| 3.95    | .738| 4.22   | .603| 3.56    | .768| 3.92    | .832|

EV(economic value), RV(reputation value), SV(social value), M-WLB(management and work-life balance), D-IV(development and interest values), WEV(working environment value) and A-DV(application and diversity values).

Source: Author's calculation from SPSS.
relevant for the respondents' understudy. The mean scores values demonstrate the significance of the employer attractiveness dimensions in the recruitment process. This is consistent with the studies of Deal et al. (2010) and Reis and Braga (2016), who emphasized the importance of paying attention to all employees. However, it is crucial for employer value proposition to concentrate on specific dimensions based on target audiences' characteristics rather than concentrating on all dimensions simultaneously (Ambler and Barrow, 1996). The significance of individual factors differs based on the candidates' demographics. This explains the classification done based on gender, education, and study program to highlight the expectations prioritized by each group. From this point, the current research examines whether differences in the respondents' perception of employer attractiveness emerged based on their demographics.

First, a comparison was made between males and females, revealing that the factors that attract them to a specific employer are significantly different. The females considered social, development-interest and economic values more crucial than other values. This is consistent with the studies of Alnaçık and Alnaçık (2012) and Eger et al. (2019), who stated that females considered social value significantly on the top priority in employer attractiveness. For males, they place more emphasis on economic, social and development-interest in that respective order. For both genders, the least important dimensions are reputation, application-diversity and working environment. This observation is in line with the results of (Thiranagama and Dileesha, 2020) who stated that economic value was the most appealing dimension to males, while females are more attracted to social value. This can be justified by the argument that males are more concerned about the financial gain they can achieve from working with a specific employer because they are the main financial source of a family and have a greater obligation on their current and future earnings. However, females are more concerned about opportunities to interact with others in a collaborative environment

### Table 4. Mann-Whitney test for gender scores across attractiveness factors.

| Dimension                        | Q   | Gender Mean Rank | Mann–Whitney U | Overall Dimension |
|----------------------------------|-----|------------------|----------------|-------------------|
|                                  |     | Male N = 104     | Female N = 199  |                   |
| Economic Value                   | Q1  | 161.64           | 146.96         | 9345.50           | 8741.500*         |
|                                  | Q2  | 145.80           | 155.24         | 9703.000          |                   |
|                                  | Q3  | 137.88           | 159.38         | 8879.000*         |                   |
|                                  | Q4  | 123.67           | 166.81         | 7401.500*         |                   |
| Reputation Value                 | Q6  | 146.46           | 154.90         | 9771.500          | 7943.500*         |
|                                  | Q7  | 123.01           | 167.15         | 7333.500*         |                   |
|                                  | Q8  | 136.72           | 159.99         | 8758.500*         |                   |
|                                  | Q9  | 135.10           | 160.83         | 8590.500*         |                   |
| Social Value                     | Q10 | 133.00           | 161.93         | 8372.000*         | 12991.500*        |
|                                  | Q11 | 128.81           | 164.12         | 7936.500*         |                   |
|                                  | Q12 | 146.84           | 154.70         | 9811.000          |                   |
|                                  | Q13 | 138.73           | 158.93         | 8968.000*         |                   |

* and ** denote p-value of t-statistic less than 5% and 10% respectively.
| Table 5. Kruskal–Wallis test for the different levels of education and study program across attractiveness dimensions. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Dimension | Q | Education Mean Rank | $\chi^2$ | Overall Dimension | Study program Mean Rank | $\chi^2$ | Overall Dimension |
| | | | Under-graduate N = 94 | Bachelor N = 107 | Post-Graduate N = 102 | | Bus. N = 148 | Eng. N = 108 | Phar. N = 47 |
| Economic Value | Q1 | 126.56 | 154.84 | 172.47 | 15.865* | 1.348 | 142.01 | 162.73 | 158.81 | 4.462 | 4.219 |
| | Q2 | 155.12 | 141.32 | 160.33 | 3.391 | 5.019** | 171.81 | 136.31 | 125.68 | 18.063* |
| | Q3 | 167.68 | 148.14 | 141.60 | 5.594** | 159.75 | 148.59 | 135.43 | 3.613 |
| | Q4 | 158.21 | 147.66 | 150.83 | 0.893 | 156.83 | 157.07 | 125.13 | 6.210* |
| Reputational Value | Q5 | 141.17 | 146.01 | 168.26 | 6.354* | 2.415 | 158.46 | 145.97 | 145.50 | 1.836 | 9.629* |
| | Q6 | 167.41 | 147.78 | 150.93 | 1.017 | 1.369 | 159.53 | 149.40 | 134.26 | 3.625 |
| | Q7 | 163.67 | 133.14 | 161.02 | 8.778* | 167.29 | 140.06 | 131.27 | 10.419* |
| Social Value | Q8 | 175.45 | 139.11 | 143.91 | 11.947* | 5.715** | 156.34 | 147.64 | 148.34 | 0.858 |
| | Q9 | 165.36 | 143.43 | 148.68 | 4.081 | 150.57 | 159.65 | 138.93 | 2.321 |
| | Q10 | 151.97 | 147.78 | 156.46 | 0.788 | 153.77 | 158.77 | 130.87 | 5.279** |
| | Q11 | 159.14 | 134.42 | 163.86 | 7.974* | 158.69 | 154.36 | 125.50 | 6.146* |
| Management and Work-Life Balance value | Q12 | 166.94 | 153.37 | 136.79 | 7.265* | 5.781** | 169.69 | 141.18 | 121.16 | 16.825* |
| | Q13 | 170.96 | 143.03 | 143.94 | 8.253* | 173.78 | 141.47 | 107.60 | 29.443* |
| | Q14 | 179.70 | 138.43 | 140.71 | 15.509* | 157.33 | 154.23 | 130.07 | 4.046 |
| | Q15 | 153.88 | 149.63 | 152.75 | 0.148 | 154.57 | 155.36 | 136.18 | 2.086 |
| Development and Interest value | Q16 | 167.87 | 138.27 | 151.77 | 7.360* | 1.909 | 156.80 | 149.85 | 141.82 | 1.022 |
| | Q17 | 156.58 | 144.69 | 155.45 | 1.266 | 158.99 | 154.20 | 124.91 | 6.004* |
| | Q18 | 156.90 | 151.09 | 148.44 | 0.772 | 1.909 | 155.68 | 150.08 | 144.83 | 1.022 |
| | Q19 | 168.88 | 151.76 | 136.70 | 8.506* | 160.50 | 141.87 | 148.53 | 3.749 |
| | Q20 | 162.15 | 142.92 | 152.18 | 2.900 | 165.67 | 140.69 | 134.94 | 8.636* |
| | Q21 | 151.73 | 146.13 | 158.40 | 1.185 | 161.71 | 139.79 | 149.49 | 4.571 |
| | Q22 | 165.15 | 139.89 | 152.58 | 4.946** | 152.75 | 160.69 | 129.66 | 4.901** |
| | Q23 | 159.01 | 146.23 | 155.20 | 0.865 | 157.20 | 147.43 | 146.12 | 1.189 |
| Working Environment value | Q24 | 156.05 | 149.18 | 151.23 | 0.350 | 159.05 | 150.20 | 133.95 | 3.288 |
| | Q25 | 157.23 | 140.43 | 159.31 | 3.506 | 159.07 | 149.61 | 135.22 | 2.999 |
| | Q26 | 160.11 | 135.79 | 161.65 | 6.466* | 159.05 | 150.20 | 133.95 | 3.288 |
| | Q27 | 186.29 | 133.28 | 140.04 | 24.136* | 161.31 | 141.37 | 147.11 | 4.102 |
| | Q28 | 175.89 | 132.60 | 150.33 | 14.105* | 162.73 | 140.86 | 143.80 | 4.987** |
| | Q29 | 166.19 | 145.50 | 145.75 | 4.000 | 163.03 | 142.22 | 139.74 | 5.282** |
| | Q30 | 167.93 | 140.36 | 149.53 | 5.702** | 160.29 | 147.69 | 135.81 | 3.666 |

* and ** denote p-value of t-statistic less than 5% and 10% respectively.
This reflects the psychological, and sociological differences between both genders. On the other hand, these results are not consistent with that of (Daniel et al., 2020) who found that gender does not influence young generation's preferences for a certain organization, and with Sharma (2019) who found that male respondents gave more importance to interest value.

Second, a comparison was made between respondents from different educational levels. The findings reveal that undergraduate respondents prefer social, development-interest, management-work/life balance, economic, application-diversity, reputation, and working environment, respectively. It can be seen that the social value offered by an employer is very appealing to undergraduate respondents. This difference may be because inexperienced respondents are young and prefer to have social relationships at work (Alnæck and Alnæck, 2012). The postgraduate respondents value economic, social, development-interest, reputation, management-work/life balance, application-diversity, and working environment. In this context, experienced employees (corresponding to postgraduate respondents) are more attracted to the employer's economic value. Which is consistent with (Thiranagama and Dileesha, 2020) who stated that experienced employees show more attraction to economic value. This may be because of their previous work experiences and comparing potential employers to their previous employer when joining a new organization to earn more salary and compensation (Alnæck and Alnæck, 2012). The literature suggested that education influences the perceived importance of the economic dimension as highly-educated employees emphasize rewards, such as promotions and salary (Eccles et al., 1994).

After analyzing the sub-items under each employer attractiveness dimension, the results suggested that if employers want to attract applicants with a postgraduate degree, they need to craft employer value proposition around offering a competitive salary, creating people-focused culture, enhancing organization reputation in the market, and offer working opportunities to transfer knowledge and skills to others. To attract fresh graduates, they should emphasize on, strong team spirit, funny and healthy working environment, innovative and dynamic organization with a good brand name, a career-enhancing experience, opportunities for creativity, supportive supervisor, work/life balance policies and engaging in a variety of challenging tasks. This is consistent with the characteristics of generation Z specified by (Acheampong, 2021) and (Bencis et al., 2016). While on the other hand, these findings are in concordance with those of Kismono and Rahayu (2021), who stated that people with more experience are likely to have more knowledge, skills, and connections. Therefore, they will aim for a job with reputable organizations that offer high responsibility, and opportunities to demonstrate their skills and competencies in teaching others. Which is the opposite for people with less working experience.

Finally, a comparison was made between respondents from different study programs, indicating that Business students emphasize on social, development-interest, management-work/life balance, economic, reputation, respectively. This confirms the results of both Eger et al. (2019), who revealed that Czech business students attach the highest importance to the social dimension, followed by the interest dimension and Baum and Kabst (2013), who proved that development value is important for business students as well. For Engineering students, they emphasize on economic, social, development-interest, management-work/life balance, reputation. Pharmaceutical study program respondents attach high importance to development-interest, social, reputation, management-work/life balance, and the least importance for the three study programs are for application-diversity and working environment values. Presumably, this is because the three disciplines constitute the main body of university students and graduates; thus, the factors influencing their employer attractiveness perception are statistically significant due to their different labor market demands and job nature as they are from different disciplines and background.

After analyzing the sub-items under each employer attractiveness dimension, the results reveal that to attract potential employees from business study program, employers need to craft and communicate employer value proposition that emphasize on being innovative and dynamic, culture that is people-focused, working with a supportive supervisor, giving the opportunity for remote working, and working on a variety of challenging tasks. Those from the engineering discipline prefer getting promotion with good financial rewards and working in a respectful organization that values their creativity and encourages a healthy lifestyle more than respondents from other study programs.

6. Conclusion

It was concluded that if employers want to become more competitive and increase their attractiveness among young generations looking for a job, it is necessary to become more agile and technologically reinvent themselves to better highlight young job seekers’ perceptual differences in employer attractiveness dimensions, which offers a way for employers to develop the right balance of attractiveness attributes, that attract and retain the generation in question. Therefore, this research investigates the significant differences in the perceived importance level of young job seekers regarding employer attractiveness dimensions offered by organizations operating in Egypt during the pandemic era, since it has been proved that crises dramatically alter young job seeker preferences towards employers, the same is likely to occur during the pandemic era (de Haas et al., 2020). Previous studies on employer attractiveness and individual differences were reviewed to fulfill this research aim.

The research findings show that Youth in general attributes higher importance to social, economic, development-interest, followed by reputation, management-work life balance, and less importance to application-diversity and working environment. Moreover, there is a significant difference in the perceptions of young job seekers concerning the importance levels of different attractiveness dimensions based on the respondents’ gender, education, and study program. Theoretically, this research contributed to the knowledge that has practical implications for the HRM field in a way that added more substance to the academic theory in the employer attractiveness field and different viewpoints on young generations in Egypt. Previous studies call for future research has been taken under consideration, in addition to overcoming their research limitations. This research also focused mainly on millennial and Generation Z cohorts as many scholars have called for more studies to understand these generational cohorts work values better since these cohorts are expected to dominate the workforce soon (Duxbury and Ormsbee, 2020; Singh et al., 2020; Evertz and Süß, 2017; Daniel et al., 2020; Dutta and Mishra, 2021). It also contributed to the research by providing a categorization of the dimensions attracting young potential employees in addition to evaluating the sub-items under each dimension, to give more insights on the main items that attract young generations to a certain employer as proposed by (Eger et al., 2019) in their suggestion for future research.

In addition, the literature on generational differences originated mainly in western contexts and more developed countries (Kismono and Rahayu, 2021), which primarily ignored the developing countries where modernization has transformed the working practices and employment preference (Hira et al., 2021). Egypt is predicted to be one of the world’s largest economies with the youngest workforce (World Population Review, 2021). Therefore, the research results would be of great interest to employers and practitioners aiming to attract and retain young talents from developing countries. Moreover, it responded to the call of many scholars in investigating to what extent the current pandemic situation opens a new perspective on how the uncertainty and volatility in today’s job market reshape young generation career decisions (Aguinis et al., 2020; Porpiglia et al., 2020; Acheampong, 2021). Empirically, the research results from a pandemic point of view advance the knowledge in this emerging field by providing valuable insights for HR practitioners and employers on the attributes that evidently attract young applicants as well as attributes that rather counteract attraction or lack any relevance.
at all, so they can tailor their employer value proposition in line with the findings as it took place during the pandemic period.

7. Limitations and directions for future research

This research has several limitations. It focused only on final year students and graduates from the business administration, engineering, and pharmacy faculties, from two private universities operating in Egypt. This limits the research generalizability to other faculties in other private or public universities, as the preferences of their students and graduates might be different from the preferences of other respondents from various universities and other fields. Future studies can be extended to other private universities to include more students from different disciplines with the fact that the survey sample size was 400, but valid and complete responses were received from only 303 respondents, but a larger sample size would result in better insight. Moreover, the employed instrument (questionnaire) may have limitations usually related to forced-choice scales; for example, sometimes respondents assign higher scores to the assessed dimensions as they perceived all/some dimensions as positive/desirable, resulting in higher mean scores (Reis and Braga, 2016). Yet, this potential bias was mitigated by comparing generational cohorts that focused on differences between groups rather than on absolute results. Another aspect is the survey was cross-sectional, so it didn’t look at the attractiveness phenomena over time; so, there is room for a longitudinal study that could be conducted to examine if respondents’ selection of the preferred attractiveness attributes changed over time. As employer attractiveness attributes are dynamic, and respondent’s evaluation might alter over time due to the changes and unexpected circumstances that might occur. It is also suggested to conduct the survey focused on employer attractiveness dimensions on a wider population from other cultures, countries with different socioeconomic conditions as it is limited only to Generation Y and Z. Moreover, since this research is about studying the attractiveness dimensions of young generation towards future employers, future research could include candidates’ attraction outcomes such as job offer acceptance or career pursuit intention. Finally further investigation could consider demographic attributes like personality type, age category, academic ranking, previous work experience as this could lead to different insights.
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