

WORKING FOR FOREIGN UNITS IN THE HOME COUNTRY: A CHOICE FOR BALANCE LIFE OF GEN Z

TRABALHAR PARA UNIDADES ESTRANGEIRAS NO PAÍS DE ORIGEM: UMA ESCOLHA PARA O EQUILÍBRIO DA VIDA DO GEN Z

Nguyễn Thanh Hoàng

University of Social Sciences and Humanities (USSH), Vietnam National University of
Ho Chi Minh City (VNU-HCM)

E-mail: hoangnguyenfir@hcmussh.edu.vn

ABSTRACT

This study aims to determine Gen Z's intention to choose a working environment under the influence of their views on living and working. Some of the main motivations included in the test were those driven by Personal growth, Financial benefits, Psychological influence, and Social concerns. Results from 1073 responses from students born in 2000-2003 show that the majority of them choose to work for a foreign company based in the country with a balanced lifestyle between work and life. The main motives leading to this choice are self-development, a secure income, as well as the impact of peer pressure. This study has provided empirical evidence for educators and national administrators in formulating strategies to train high-quality human resources to meet labor market needs; simultaneously, with solutions to attract human resources for the country's internal and sustainable development. This research has contributed to enriching the theoretical array of Generation Z in a developing country, and the issue of labor quality in domestic and foreign units.

Keywords: Gen Z; Workplace intention; Motivations; Domestic; Foreign; FDI; Vietnam.

RESUMO

Este estudo visa determinar a intenção do General Z de escolher um ambiente de trabalho sob a influência de seus pontos de vista sobre a vida e o trabalho. Algumas das principais motivações incluídas no teste foram aquelas motivadas pelo crescimento pessoal, benefícios financeiros, influência psicológica e preocupações sociais. Os resultados de 1073 respostas de estudantes nascidos em 2000-2003 mostram que a maioria deles escolhe trabalhar para uma empresa estrangeira sediada no país com um estilo de vida equilibrado entre trabalho e vida. Os principais motivos que levam a esta escolha são o autodesenvolvimento, uma renda segura, assim como o impacto da pressão dos colegas. Este estudo forneceu evidências empíricas para educadores e administradores nacionais na formulação de estratégias para treinar recursos humanos de alta qualidade para atender às necessidades do mercado de trabalho; simultaneamente, com soluções para atrair recursos humanos para o desenvolvimento interno e sustentável do país. Esta pesquisa contribuiu para enriquecer o conjunto teórico da Geração Z em um país em desenvolvimento, e a questão da qualidade da mão-de-obra em unidades nacionais e estrangeiras.

Palavras-chave: Geração Z; Intenção de trabalho; Motivações; Nacional; Estrangeiro; IDE; Vietnã.

Introdução

Generation Z is a demographic group of people born in the late 1990s to early 2010s (Twenge, 2017). They are referred to as iGen (Twenge, 2017), Zoomers (Murmuration, 2022), or Gen Zers (Jackson, 2023). Most of the articles are called Gen Z.

Recently, scholars have paid attention to Gen Z because they are and will be the primary workforce in the 2030s- 2050s. The first wave of Gen Z has now entered the labor market, accounting for 40% of the workforce and consumers (CSP, 2020). However, Gen Z created an impact that shook and changed the view of contemporary society about work in general and workers in particular. If you are a technology user and have the ability to take technology to the next level, then you are Gen Z – that is, regardless of the physical age limits of workers (Morgan, 2016). With technology, many existing and traditional things will be disrupted. Technology has the power to change the world; while Gen Z is the master of technology. In other words, Gen Z is the main agent for the turning points of human development in the future. For Gen Z, technology is a tool. They have at least 10 hours daily for electronic devices (CSP, 2020). Therefore, the social network will be a vast unlimited office to work, to make money; a class that provides a huge amount of knowledge; and a place of communication where the power manifests itself through the influence of a personal brand (Koulopoulos & Keldsen, 2014). Gen Z is not interested in political power but preoccupied with social issues such as equality and diversity (Mahapatra et al., 2022). Gen Z's deep understanding and forward-looking concerns, both personal and social, break through stereotypes. Those are great challenges for employers, as well as social activists including education, and governance.

In the context of increasingly strong globalization, a world without borders is an inevitable trend. Today, the presence of international organizations and foreign direct investment (FDI) businesses has influenced the choice of a workplace for indigenous people, specifically Gen Z. Besides identifying the factors affecting Gen Z's intention to choose a workplace; The novelty of this study is to shed light on the

relationship between Gen Z's outlook on life and work environment choices. Concurrently, the study points out the distinct effects of each choice.

Research subjects focus on Gen Z in Vietnam, specifically Ho Chi Minh City - the largest economic center in Vietnam. Gen Z who are living and studying here also have more difficult survival experiences than their peers. However, most of them are students who come from other areas of Vietnam. Thanks to this diversity, the research results will be more representative. Together, Vietnam is a country with a fast growth rate and a stable economy that is resistant to risks such as the COVID-19 pandemic and the economic recession of 2007-2008. In just one generation, Vietnam rose from being one of the world's poorest countries in the 1980s to a low-middle-income status in 2009 (World Bank, 2022). Vietnam is considered one of the miracle development cases in the world (Baum, 2019).

This study aspires to contribute a chapter on the insight of young people born and raised in Vietnam. This is considered a feature of the Asia region - an area imbued with Eastern traditions and the most dynamic region in the world in the 21st century

The article consists of 5 parts. The next section presents a Literature review; Section 3 is Research methodology and Data; Section 4 provides Results and Discussion; Section 5 includes Conclusions, Limitations, and Further studies.

Literature review

Gen Z called digital natives, is a generation whose life has never been separated from technology. They are proficient in technology and turn technology into a tool for their lives. In which, the social network is their home, school, and workplace. Thus, the virtual world enveloped them; but perhaps because of that, they long to connect with the reality of society (CSP, 2020). They were witnesses to global risks such as the Global Financial Crisis (GFC) 2007-2008 and especially the recent COVID-19 pandemic. They had seen the freezing of outdoor activities; disconnection from the real world outside. They were also forced to witness the loss of loved ones. Therefore, Gen Z not only cares about themselves, but they also care about family, friends, and society. All these things impact any decision of Gen Z.

Specifically for a job, motivations such as Personal growth, Financial benefits, Psychological influences, and Social concerns will influence their choices.

Gen Z needs to know for sure “I am fine” before making a decision (Volpe, 2022). This means that own needs will be one of the top priorities. Gen Z is the generation that takes responsibility for their career development (CSP, 2020). They want to work for organizations where they can find value in work (Ghura, 2017), achieve goals (Kirchmayer & Fratričová, 2017) towards personal development (Hochreiter, 2022) through specialized learning subjects, improve skills, and experience challenging jobs (De Boer et al., 2021). Maturity for them to overcome challenges and find new opportunities. However, Gen Z is not addicted to work, but wants to “enjoy” work (Kirchmayer & Fratričová, 2017). Gen Z cares about their own needs as well as family and friends. Therefore, they tend to choose a comfortable, flexible working environment that gives them autonomy to be able to balance their lives (Chillakuri, 2020).

Today, the movement of trade, investment, finance, tourism, and labor takes place more quickly and easily on a regional and global scale. Gen Z, young people are not out of this natural movement and give them their nature to be open, receptive, and diverse (Francis & Hoefel, 2018). A multinational, multicultural, diverse working environment will satisfy their visionary needs (Gabriellova & Buchko, 2021).

Hypothesis 1: Personal growth motivations have a positive impact on Gen Z's workplace choices.

Besides satisfying the needs of personal development, financial benefits are one of the indispensable motivations when choosing a working unit. Gen Z values “I am fine”; therefore, a working environment that brings work stability (De Boer et al., 2021), security, and safety (Hochreiter, 2022) will be their priority. This security includes insurance (CSP, 2020) along with a good salary (Hochreiter, 2022) to give them financial freedom, independence, and the ability to pay for what they want: the stability of a house together with the flexibility of travel, discoveries for passions (Hochreiter, 2022; Volpe, 2022). Despite being very young, Gen Z plans for retirement very early. Therefore, they choose jobs with high incomes, which not

only meet living expenses but also have enough to save for retirement (De Boer et al., 2021). Financial security along with a career in self-development are the cornerstones of Gen Z's job choice.

Hypothesis 2: Financial benefits have a positive impact on Gen Z's workplace choices.

Generation Z is the generation born in a period of social and economic upheaval. During the 2007–2008 financial crisis, or Global Financial Crisis (GFC) crisis that occurred in the early 21st century, many families fell into dire circumstances. Especially, the COVID-19 pandemic made everything that was normal suddenly freeze; families separated; and many people died. This affects more or less the psychology of Gen Z. They are both influenced by the norms, traditional values, and opinions of society (Bencsik et al., 2016), and their freedom. As social media people, Gen Z uses virtual communication to connect with online communities as an important part of their lives (Mahapatra et al., 2022; Schroth, 2019). However, Gen Z craves to connect with the reality of society (CSP, 2020). They want to work in the real world, be vibrant, open to communicating from a good relationship with colleagues (Gabrielova & Buchko, 2021; Kirchmayer & Fratričová, 2018; Schroth, 2019; Sharma & Pandit, 2021). Along with the development of society, the nature of occupation also changes (Akkermans & Kubasch, 2017). Today, companies implement recruitment strategies by promoting their reputation to attract the attention of workers (Hochreiter, 2022; Insights, 2021). At the same time, it is easy to find websites that introduce “Future of work trends” as well as reports of mainstream organizations on future career trends (ILO, 2022; World Economic Forum, 2020). At the same time, peer pressure was found to have a positive effect on Gen Z's decision (Phạm et al., 2022; Silva et al., 2017). Therefore, it is assumed that work trends and peer pressure influence Gen Z's choice of work environment.

Hypothesis 3: Psychological influences have an impact on Gen Z's workplace choices.

Gen Z is not interested in politics, but they care deeply about social issues because they are witnesses of great social upheavals. They not only want to do

meaningful things to contribute to the betterment of society (SkillSurvey, 2019) but also want to build a sense of community, towards rebuilding institutions in a way that supports their vision for the future (Mahapatra et al., 2022). Gen Z is interested in contemporary social issues such as equality, democracy, and racism (Murmuration, 2022). They believe in equality in the workplace (Schroth, 2019); as well as advocate for gender flexibility (Francis & Hoefel, 2018). Not only care about humans, but Gen Z also has a high sense of responsibility toward natural resources. They are interested in global warming or climate change (Mihelich, 2013). They are at the forefront of promoting environmental protection and other sustainable development values (Rachmawati, 2019). Because of that, they tend to choose companies that care about social issues and perform social responsibility (Nguyen Ngoc et al., 2022). The units have active policies on contemporary issues such as equality, non-discrimination on gender or race, and ethnic groups (Gaidhani et al., 2019), and respect for differences (Pichler et al., 2021) will be their choices.

Hypothesis 4: Social concerns have a positive impact on Gen Z's workplace choices.

Many studies have found a link between training and occupation (Mamaqi et al., 2011); work efficiency (Elnaga & Imran, 2013); development at work (Fletcher et al., 2018). This study determines whether there is a relationship between Gen Z's college education and workplace choice. This study proposes three options for the working environment: a wholly domestic unit, a foreign unit based in the home country, and a foreign unit abroad. Therefore, the "international" nature in the field of study is assumed to have a positive relationship with the choice of an "international" working environment.

Hypothesis 5: A college education has a relationship with Gen Z's workplace choices.

If the generations of grandparents (baby boomers) and parents (Gen X) of Gen Z value loyalty and dedication to work, spending more time on work than on personal needs (Volpe, 2022), then Gen Z is concerned with work-life balance (WLB). They understand that WLB helps with psychological development, supports

mental health (Shiffer et al., 2018), and brings positive energy to life (Russo et al., 2016). This leads to job and family satisfaction (Chan et al., 2016). This satisfaction makes them happy. Gen Z expects a promotion at work, but they also care about vacations and personal time (De Boer et al., 2021). They appreciate a flexible and free working environment (Boudreau et al., 2015; Kirchmayer & Fratričová, 2018). Those that offer them this balance of income, stable work, and an open working environment will be their priority (ManpowerGroup, 2016). This study further aims to determine the relationship between work and life attitudes and choice of the working environment.

Hypothesis 6: Attitudes towards living and working (WLB) have a relationship with Gen Z's workplace choices.

Table 1 below presents the criteria used in this study.

Table 1 – Criteria to measure Gen Z's motivations to choose a workplace

No.	Criteria	Acronym
Demographic variables		
Field of study in university		FoS
1	disciplines related to international nature to some extent	FRI
2	disciplines unrelated to international nature to some extent	FuRI
Views on work-life balance		IEWS
1	Spend more time at work ⁺	WPL
2	Spend more time on personal hobbies ⁺	PHB
3	Work hard while enjoying life (work+enjoy)	WLB
Dependent variable		
Workplace intention		CHOICE
1	Working for domestic units (pure domestic units such as state agencies, and domestic companies)	DO
2	Working for foreign units in the home country (e.g., foreign organizations/units, foreign direct investment (FDI) companies)	FD
3	Working abroad	FA
Independent variables		
Personal growth motivations		IND
1	Comfortable, flexible working environment, given autonomy	ICOM
2	Be fostered through work, gain more experience, upgrade and development	IDEV

3	Multicultural (global) environment	IGLO
4	Network expansion	INET
Financial benefits		ECO
5	Promotion opportunities	EPRO
6	Stable, Safe job	ESAF
7	Values of work: high standard	EVAL
8	Allowances and Insurance	EINS
9	Saving for Pension	EPEN
10	High salary	ESAL
Psychological influences		PSY
11	Influenced by traditional norms, values, and opinions of society	PTRA
12	Influenced by emerging job trends	PTRE
13	Peer-pressure	PPRE
14	Want to be connected with real life (colleagues, superiors, customers, community)	PCOM
Social Concerns		SOC
15	The unit cares about environmental protection and sustainable development values	SSUS
16	The unit has similar political and policy views on contemporary issues such as equality, and non-discrimination (e.g. gender, race, etc.)	SPOL
17	The unit has a strategy for the future of humanity	SHUM
18	Unit respects differences	SDIF

Source: author.

Research methodology

This study aims to determine the factors affecting Gen Z's intention to choose a workplace. Therefore, only Gen Z was invited to participate in the study. There is a difference in determining the exact start and end years of Generation Z. For example, (Tulgan, 2013) chose the years 1990 - 2000; (Twenge, 2017) identified Gen Z born between the mid-1990s and the early 2010s, specifically 1995-2012; (Francis & Hoefel, 2018) was filmed from 1995–2010; (Hecht, 2022) used the framework from 1997 to 2012. This study will apply the framework 1995-2012.

Since survey methods are often used to collect information about attitudes and behaviors (Mathers et al., 2007); survey participants will give their personal opinions in the form of a questionnaire. Therefore, this study applies a quantitative research method through a survey questionnaire.

As mentioned above, the purpose of the study is to determine the factors affecting the choice of a workplace; Therefore, the age limit from 18 to 27, corresponding to the year of birth between 1995 - 2004 was invited to participate in the survey. Questionnaire via Google form, posted on student forums of universities, mainly in Ho Chi Minh City and surrounding areas. The questionnaire also reached survey respondents via email sent to university clubs. Thus, the sample is randomly selected in the age group and mainly in the student group.

The questionnaire consists of two main parts: personal information and factors affecting the choice of workplace. Part 1 is personal information including questions about the field of study, schools, and views on work-life. Part 2 consists of questions arranged according to four factors that influence workplace choice (see Table 2). Questions are applied Likert scale with 05 levels from low to high (from 1 is strongly disagree to 5 is strongly agree).

In a sociological study with a relatively large population like this one (those born between 1995 and 2004), there are several ways to calculate the sample size. Referencing many authors, the smallest acceptable sample size is about 400 with a 95% confidence and a 5% error estimate (Krejcie & Morgan, 1970). During the survey period from February to March 2022, the total number of responses received was 1113. 40 responses were disqualified due to incorrect information and age restrictions. There were 1073 valid responses included in the analysis.

Data analysis techniques include data descriptive statistics, scale testing including reliability and validity tests, and multinomial logistic regression test on SPSS 20.

Results and discussion

DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS

The sample groups of characteristics described include age (AGE), the field of study (FoS), university (UNI), outlook on life and work (VIEWS), and choice of place of work (CHOICE).

In terms of age (AGE), the survey subjects are divided into two age groups: 1995-1999 are university graduates and 2000-2004 are university students and

high school students preparing for university. Of the 1073 people, 34 are in the 1995-1999 group and 1039 are in the 2000-2004 group. Among these, there are no high school students. Thus, the participants are between the ages of 2000-2003; corresponding to 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 4th-year students.

In terms of training majors (FoS), they are divided into two main groups. The group of industries with an "international nature" includes foreign languages (such as English, French, German, and Chinese), tourism, foreign trade, and international relations, accounting for about two-thirds of the total sample with a rate of 64.6% (equivalent to 693 people). Other majors (eg engineering, economics, medicine, and sociology) accounted for 35.4%.

Regarding universities (UNI), many cases belong to the University of Social Sciences and Humanities, Vietnam National University, Ho Chi Minh City (85.6%); the rest are students of member schools of Vietnam National University, Ho Chi Minh City such as the Polytechnic University, University of Sciences, International University, and some other schools such as RMIT University (Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology). There are 9 cases are overseas students.

Work-life perspective (VIEWS), 16% of respondents believe that they will spend more time at work (WPL); only 3.7% spend more time on personal hobbies (PHB); and the majority of 80.3% choose to balance life, work hard in parallel with enjoying life (WLB).

Regarding the choice of the workplace (CHOICE), 15.8% of people chose to work for a domestic unit (DO); while 75.6% chose to work for a foreign unit but at home (FD); and only a relatively small number of 8.6% choose to work abroad (FA). From the perspective of working at a unit with "foreign nature" (FD+FA), 84.2% chose, and from the position of "territory" (DO+FD), 91.4% chose to work in their home country.

In general, the rate of choosing to work for a foreign unit (FD+FA) of the "international nature" disciplines (FRI) reaches 89.5% (80.6 + 8.9), much higher than the other group (FuRI). Although the rate is lower, students of other majors also choose to work for foreign companies (FD+FA) with a high rate of 74.5% (66.3 + 8.2). If it is noted that choosing to work at home (DO + FD) compared to working abroad (FA), this rate is very high in both groups and is almost equal. The

proportions are 91.1% (10.5+80.6) and 91.8% (25.5+66.3), respectively, in the group FRI and FuRI.

Thus, hypothesis 5 is confirmed. Students who are trained in fields of an “international nature” (such as foreign languages, tourism, foreign trade, and international relations) are more likely to choose to work for foreign units than students in other fields (such as technology, economics, medicine, pharmacy, and sociology). Details are in Table 2.

Table 2 – FoS * CHOICE Crosstabulation

Count		CHOICE			Total
		domestic units (DO)	foreign units in the home country (FD)	Working abroad (FA)	
FoS	related to international nature (FRI)	73 (10.5%)	559 (80,6%)	61 (8,9%)	693
	unrelated to international nature (FuRI)	97 (25,5%)	252 (66,3%)	31 (8,2%)	380
Total		170	811	92	1073

Source: Author.

In all three groups of lifestyles (WPL, PHB, and WLB), the choice of working for a foreign unit in the home country (FD) always accounts for a high proportion. If comparing between 2 groups working for domestic units (DO) and purely working abroad (FA), the rate of choosing to work for domestic units (DO) of all 3 groups is higher. Interestingly, 25% of people have the opinion that spending more time on personal hobbies (PHB) is the highest rate of choosing DO; 76.8% of people have the opinion that working hard in parallel with enjoying life (WLB) is the highest rate of choosing FD; and 10.7% of people have the opinion that spends more time at work (WPL) is the highest rate of choosing FA. Thus, hypothesis 6 is confirmed that the majority of students who choose to work in FD are also the majority with work hard in parallel with enjoying life (WLB) views. See details in Table 3.

Table 3 – VIEWC * CHOICEC Crosstabulation

Count		CHOICE			CHOICE
		Domestic units (DO)	Foreign units in the home country (FD)	Working abroad (FA)	
VIEWS	Spend more time at work (WPL)	30 (17.4%)	124 (72.1%)	18 (10.7%)	172
	Spend more time on personal hobbies (PHB)	10 (25%)	26 (65%)	4 (10%)	40
	Work hard while enjoying life (WLB)	130 (15.1%)	661 (76.8%)	70 (8.1%)	861
Total		170	811	92	1073

Source: Author.

INSTRUMENT TESTING

Reliability test

Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficient method is used to eliminate inappropriate variables because these variables can generate spurious coefficients (Hoang Trong & Chu Nguyen Mong Ngoc, 2008). Based on Cronbach's Alpha coefficient > 0.6 (the larger the alpha, the higher the confidence) eliminate the observed variables that do not contribute to the description of the concept to be measured. The observed variables with Corrected Item-Total Correlation < 0.3 will be excluded because these observed variables are not reliable, affecting the research results (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). Table 4 summarizes the results of testing the reliability of the scale.

Table 4 – Summary of reliability tests

No.	Factor	Acronym	Cronbach alpha	Excluded items
1	Personal growth motivations	IND	0.829	Comfortable, flexible working environment, given autonomy (ICOM)
2	Financial benefits	ECO	0.745	
3	Psychological influences	PSY	0.714	be connected with real life/community (PCOM)
4	Social Concerns	SOC	0.837	

Source: Author.

Validity test

The exploratory factor analysis (EFA) method is used to find out how many significant factors are in the total variables after removing the nonconforming measures in the variables (Hoang Trong & Chu Nguyen Mong Ngoc, 2008).

The dataset is accurate when the following conditions are satisfied:

- KMO coefficients (Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin) 0.5 and 1 are sufficient conditions for factor analysis to be appropriate
- Bartlett's test has Sig. < 0.05
- Total Variance Explained \geq 50%
- The factors with Eigenvalue 1 are kept in the analytical model
- Factor loading must be greater than 0.3 to 0.4 with a minimum of 350 survey samples as a condition for the variable to be considered for retention (Hair et al., 2010).

The results in Table 6 show that the scale is accurate with a KMO value of 0.88; Sig. equal to 0.000 (< 0.05). The measurement items are classified into four groups in Table 5. These are the four new factors used to test the hypotheses.

Table 5 – KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.	.880
Approx. Chi-Square	6063.378
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	df
	120
	Sig.
	.000

Source: Author.

The results of the rotation matrix in Table 6 show that 16 observed variables are grouped into 4 new factors as follows:

Table 6 – Rotated Component Matrix^a

	Component			
	1	2	3	4
SPOL	.781			
SHUM	.764			
SSUS	.763			
SDIF	.677			
INET		.782		
IDEV		.747		
IGLO		.698		
EPRO		.531		
EINS			.756	
ESAF			.693	
EPEN			.664	
EVAL			.544	
ESAL			.465	
PTREN				.836
PTRA				.789
PPRE				.744
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.				
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.				
a. Rotation converged in 7 iterations.				

Source: Author.

With the results from the above two tests, the scale completely meets the requirements of reliability and validity.

HYPOTHESIS TESTING

Repeatedly, the dependent variable in this study is the intention to choose a workplace. This is a nominal variable with 3 options: (1) Working for a domestic unit (DO); (2) Working for a foreign entity in the home country (FD); and (3) Working abroad (FA). Therefore, the test applied is multinomial logistic regression.

The Goodness-of-Fit results are intended to explain the fit of the data to the research model. The smaller the Chi-square value, the better the model fits; at the same time Sig must be $\geq 5\%$ (UCLA, 2018). Table 7 shows that the Chi-Square reaches 1411,450 and sig. equivalent to 0.76. Therefore, this is a suitable model.

Table 7 – Goodness-of-Fit

	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Pearson	2016.348	2062	.760
Deviance	1411.450	2062	1.000

Source: Author.

The Likelihood Ratio Test aims to determine if the independent variables have a statistically significant effect on the dependent variable. Table 8 shows that the variables of IND (sig. equivalent to .000), ECO (sig. equivalent to .095), and PSY (sig. equivalent to .016) have an impact on the intention to choose a workplace.

Table 8 – Likelihood Ratio Tests

Effect	Model Fitting Criteria	Likelihood Ratio Tests		
	-2 Log Likelihood of Reduced Model	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Intercept	1423.599 ^a	.000	0	.
SOC	1424.065	.466	2	.792
IND	1479.405	55.806	2	.000
ECO	1428.314	4.715	2	.095
PSY	1431.814	8.215	2	.016
VIEWS	1426.568	2.969	4	.563

The chi-square statistic is the difference in -2 log-likelihoods between the final model and a reduced model. The reduced model is formed by omitting an effect from the final model. The null hypothesis is that all parameters of that effect are 0.

a. This reduced model is equivalent to the final model because omitting the effect does not increase the degrees of freedom.

Source: Author.

The Parameter Estimates in Tables 9 and Table 10 provide more detail when placed in a comparative relationship between the three options (CHOICE). We need to know that, holding the other regressors constant, a positive coefficient of one regressor indicates increased odds of favoring the other choice compared with the reference choice. A negative coefficient of an explanatory variable implies that the odds of favoring the reference choice are greater than that of the other choices. The

odds ratio indicates how much the reference plan is preferred over another (UCLA, 2018).

In this study, DO and FA were selected as reference category variables, respectively.

The reference category: Working for domestic units (DO)

a) DO and FD comparison:

The coefficient $B=0.52$ means that when the influence of IND increases by one unit, the log (odds) increases by about 0.52 for FD choice compared to DO choice. When setting IND in relation to VIEWS, log (odds) is -0.105 ($B=-0.105$) reduced for FD choice compared to DO choice if objects move from WLB to WPL. In other words, if IND increases, the possibility of choosing FD is higher than DO; at the same time, if there is an increasing shift from WLB to WPL, the probability of choosing DO increases compared to FD.

b) DO and FA comparison:

The coefficient $B=0.918$ means that when the influence of IND increases by one unit, the log (odds) increases by about 0.918 for FA choice compared to DO choice. When setting IND with VIEWS, log (odds) is 0.272 ($B=0.272$) increased for FA choice compared to DO choice if objects move from WLB to WPL. In other words, if IND increases, the possibility of choosing FA is higher than DO; at the same time, if there is an increasing shift from WLB to WPL, the probability of choosing FA increases compared to DO.

Table 9 – Parameter Estimates (reference category: DO)

CHOICE ^a	B	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% Confidence Interval for Exp(B)	
							Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Working for foreign units in the home country (FD)	Intercept	1.706	.102	282.283	1	.000		
	SOC	.054	.089	.366	1	.545	1.056	.886 1.258
	IND	.520	.087	35.432	1	.000	1.682	1.417 1.995
	ECO	.093	.086	1.171	1	.279	1.098	.927 1.300
	PSY	.123	.090	1.870	1	.171	1.131	.948 1.348
	[VIEWS=1]	-.105	.234	.203	1	.652	.900	.569 1.423
	[VIEWS=2]	-.329	.402	.668	1	.414	.720	.327 1.583
Working abroad (FA)	[VIEWS=3]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.	.
	Intercept	-.700	.164	18.274	1	.000		
	SOC	.013	.130	.010	1	.920	1.013	.785 1.308
	IND	.918	.142	41.903	1	.000	2.504	1.896 3.306
	ECO	-.122	.129	.897	1	.344	.885	.687 1.140
	PSY	-.172	.135	1.610	1	.204	.842	.646 1.098
	[VIEWS=1]	.272	.349	.610	1	.435	1.313	.663 2.602
[VIEWS=2]	.298	.637	.220	1	.639	1.348	.387 4.693	
[VIEWS=3]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.	.	

a. The reference category is: Working for domestic units.
 b. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

Source: Author.

The reference category: Working abroad (FA)

a) FA and FD comparison:

The results of Table 11 shows that only the variable SOC (sig=0.699) has no statistical relationship while IND (sig=0.001), ECO (sig=0.044), and PSY (sig=0.009) all have a statistical relationship with "FA choice" versus "FD choice".

For IND, the coefficient B=-0.398 means that when the influence of IND increases by one unit, the log (odds) decreases by about 0.398 for FD compared to FA.

For ECO, the coefficient B=0.216 means that when the influence of ECO increases by one unit, the log (odds) increases by about 0.216 for FD compared to FA.

For PSY, the coefficient $B=0,294$ means that when the influence of PSY increases by one unit, the log (odds) increases by about 0,294 for FD compared to FA.

When setting IND, ECO, and PSY in relation to VIEWS, log (odds) is reduced by 0.378 ($B=-0.378$) for FD compared to FA if objects move from WLB to WPL.

Table 10 – Parameter Estimates (reference category: FA)

CHOICE ^a	B	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% Confidence Interval for Exp(B)		
							Lower Bound	Upper Bound	
Intercept	2.406	.140	297.187	1	.000				
SOC	.041	.106	.150	1	.699	1.042	.847	1.282	
Working for foreign units in the home country (FD)	IND	-.398	.121	10.799	1	.001	.672	.530	.852
	ECO	.216	.107	4.038	1	.044	1.241	1.005	1.531
	PSY	.294	.112	6.911	1	.009	1.342	1.078	1.672
	[VIEWS=1]	-.378	.290	1.696	1	.193	.685	.388	1.210
[VIEWS=2]	-.627	.566	1.228	1	.268	.534	.176	1.619	
[VIEWS=3]	0 ^b	.	.	0	

a. The reference category is: Working abroad.
 b. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

Source: Author.

From the results of the three comparison pairs, the results show that: IND has an influence on all three workplace choices. As the influence of IND grows, Gen Z tends to choose to work for a foreign unit in the home country (FD) or work abroad (FA). ECO and PSY only affect the choice between working for a foreign unit based in the home country (FD) and working entirely abroad (FA). When ECO and PSY are met higher, Gen Z tends to choose to work in the country but with a foreign unit (FD) instead of working abroad (FA).

In general, personal development motivation (hypothesis 1), financial benefits (hypothesis 2), and psychological impact (hypothesis 3) are accepted to have a positive impact on workplace choice. While social concerns are not statistically related to workplace choice, hypothesis 4 is rejected.

DISCUSSION

Personal growth motivations (IND)

Personal growth motivations (IND) are widely agreed this is one of the important reasons for the difference in workplace choice of Gen Z (see Table 11). The factors Network expansion (INET), fostered through work, gaining more experience, upgrade, and development (IDEV), "Promotion opportunities (EPRO), and Multicultural (global) environment (IGLO) are important influencing factors. There is a slight difference, for the group that chooses to work for a domestic unit (DO), the factor Being fostered through work, gaining more experience, upgrade, and development (IDEV) is the most appreciated. Similarly, the Multicultural (global) environment (IGLO) factor has less impact. Overall, this result is completely consistent with previous studies showing Gen Z is interested in the future (De Boer et al., 2021; Volpe, 2022), they are open to diversity and eager to experience/learn by working (Francis & Hoefel, 2018) to gain experience, develop themselves (GenZ Observatory, 2021), to achieve goals (Gaidhani et al., 2019).

Table 11 – Descriptive Statistics^a (IND factor)

CHOICE		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Working for domestic units (DO)	CHOICE	170	1.00	.000
	INET	170	3.98	.835
	IDEV	170	4.09	.801
	IGLO	170	3.83	.955
	EPRO	170	3.92	.919
	Valid N (listwise)	170		
Working for foreign units in the country (FD)	CHOICE	811	2.00	.000
	INET	811	4.43	.730
	IDEV	811	4.35	.747
	IGLO	811	4.17	.839
	EPRO	811	4.23	.760
	Valid N (listwise)	811		
Working abroad (FA)	CHOICE	92	3.00	.000
	INET	92	4.59	.596
	IDEV	92	4.51	.602
	IGLO	92	4.34	.881
	EPRO	92	4.39	.726
	Valid N (listwise)	92		

a. No statistics are computed for one or more split files because there are no valid cases.

Source: Author.

Financial benefits (ECO)

If the Mean of IND variables shown above has a majority value of 4 or more, then ECO has a Mean majority that is close to 4. This shows that IND values are the top priority, above all financial factors.

In terms of financial benefits (ECO), a high salary (ESAL) is not the leading element, but items of insurance (EINS), and saving for retirement (EPEN) have a strong impact. Although the item that promotes the value of work (EVAL) has a positive impact, it is the factor with the lowest Mean value of the 5 components of financial benefits. For the group that chose to work for domestic units (DO), the safety item (ESAF) has the highest influence (see Table 12). This result is completely consistent with previous studies. The Concordia survey (Volpe, 2022) found that 65% of respondents think salary is important, but 70% want health insurance, and 35% plan to save for retirement. This shows that life security is highly valued and so a secure job with a stable income will be the choice of Gen Z (De Boer et al., 2021; Gaidhani et al., 2019).

Table 12 – Descriptive Statistics^a (*ECO factor*)

CHOICE		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Working for domestic units (DO)	CHOICE	170	1.00	.000
	EINS	170	3.79	.972
	ESAF	170	3.86	.925
	EPEN	170	3.82	.959
	EVAL	170	3.51	.981
	ESAL	170	3.57	.966
	Valid N (listwise)	170		
Working for foreign units in the home country (FD)	CHOICE	811	2.00	.000
	EINS	811	4.02	.850
	ESAF	811	3.94	.844
	EPEN	811	4.04	.871
	EVAL	811	3.65	.905
	ESAL	811	3.85	.963
	Valid N (listwise)	811		
Working abroad (FA)	CHOICE	92	3.00	.000
	EINS	92	3.98	.926
	ESAF	92	3.65	.999
	EPEN	92	4.00	.877
	EVAL	92	3.47	1.084
	ESAL	92	3.75	1.183
	Valid N (listwise)	92		

a. No statistics are computed for one or more split files because there are no valid cases.

Source: Author.

Psychological influences (PSY)

Reviewing the studies on Gen Z's motivation to choose a place to work, the psychological effects have not been exploited much. This study examines the impact of three psychological factors Influenced by traditional norms, values, and opinions of society (PTRA), Influenced by emerging job trends (PTRE), and Peer-pressure (PPRE) on the choice of students.

Table 13 shows that in all three workplace choices (DO, FD, FA), Generation Z is under pressure from friends (PPRE) with the average value being 3.08, 3.38, 3.13 respectively; in which the FD group is affected the most. This group is also most affected by emerging employment trends (PTREN). Meanwhile, PTRA influenced the higher DO group (see Table 15). This result is quite interesting for further studies. In general, Gen Z in Vietnam is quite similar to the assessment that Gen Z is a more individualistic generation than previous generations, the culture is more self-centered and less communicative (Wingo, 2019). However, the group that chooses DO is more influenced by traditional norms, values, and social attitudes.

Table 13. Descriptive Statistics^a (PSY factor)

CHOICE		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Working for domestic units (DO)	PTRA	170	2.82	1.108
	PTREN	170	2.62	1.015
	PPRE	170	3.08	1.112
	Valid N (listwise)	170		
Working for foreign units in the home country (FD)	PTRA	811	2.76	1.097
	PTREN	811	2.79	1.095
	PPRE	811	3.38	1.109
	Valid N (listwise)	811		
Working abroad (FA)	PTRA	92	2.58	1.303
	PTREN	92	2.47	1.279
	PPRE	92	3.13	1.344
	Valid N (listwise)	92		

a. No statistics are computed for one or more split files because there are no valid cases.

Source: Author.

The above results support the hypothesis that IND, ECO, and PSY have a positive impact on workplace choice; while, SOC has no statistical relationship. The results also support the hypothesis that Gen Z tends to choose to work in an international environment. In particular, those with international nature training

tend to be higher for this choice. However, the option of working for foreign units based in the home country is dominant. The view of balancing life between work and enjoying life has the maximum choice rate.

Conclusion, limitations, further study

Personal development motivations, financial benefits, and psychological influences have an important impact on Gen Z's choice of workplace. Work-life balance is a dominant aspect of workplace choice. Therefore, working in an international environment right at home is a top priority for Gen Z.

What is concerning is that up to 84.2% of Gen Z respondents want to work for foreign units, and only the remaining 15.8% want to work for a purely domestic unit. Then, who will work for domestic units? If this trend is increasing, domestic units will face more and more difficulties in staffing. They face competitive pressure not only in recruiting but also retaining quality workers compared to foreign units, especially FDI enterprises. However, from a territorial perspective, although Gen Z chooses to work for a foreign unit, they tend to stay in their home country. 91.4% of respondents chose to work in their home country. This feature creates a lot of room for domestic units in terms of labor recruitment if the units can meet individual needs. When the choice of workers is in favor of the international environment, the pressure of shortage of quantity and quality of labor favors domestic enterprises. Labor (factors K and H) is still a resource affecting the output (Y) in developing countries. This can affect the development of the country based on national internal resources. In the next 10 - 20 years, this young generation will become the main labor force of the country; If the country's managers do not have appropriate personnel policies, the brain drain may become more serious.

The results of this study provide practical insights into the attitudes and needs of future workers. Understanding the ethos and expectations of Gen Z is about understanding the nation's future owners. To build high-quality human resources, national administrators need to develop reasonable remuneration policies at domestic units. In addition, domestic units need to focus on training and fostering human resources, making changes in the office culture environment to match the

characteristics and personality of Gen Z. At the same time, educational managers also need to have certain studies on the lifestyle and thoughts of Generation Z today. From there, provide training programs suitable to reality, providing the necessary knowledge for the young generation.

Since the goal of the study is to explore Gen Z's workplace options, the respondents are mainly students, they are only part of Gen Z. Furthermore, survey respondents are mainly living and studying in Ho Chi Minh City; therefore, this result may not be generalized to represent Gen Z of Vietnam.

Although only a very small percentage with 3.7% of people have the view to spending more time on personal hobbies (PHB); However, up to 25% of people in this group choose to work for a domestic unit (DO). Learning about the relationship between individualists and the choice to work for domestic units will be an additional exploration of the personnel issue of domestic units.

The fact that Gen Z chooses a job due to peer pressure is also a psychological issue that needs to be explained to help the younger generation be confident with their choices.

Acknowledgement

Thanks to Lê Tú Anh, Ngô Tiểu Hy, Cung Hồng Lợi, Nguyễn Lý Kim Ngân, and Huỳnh Hoàng Vy for assisting with data collection.

REFERÊNCIAS

- Akkermans, J., & Kubasch, S. (2017). #Trending topics in careers: a review and future research agenda. In *Career Development International* (Vol. 22, Issue 6). <https://doi.org/10.1108/CDI-08-2017-0143>
- Baum, A. (2019). Vietnam's Development Success Story and the Unfinished SDG Agenda. *IMF Working Paper, WP/20/31*. <https://www.imf.org/-/media/Files/Publications/WP/2020/English/wpiea2020031-print-pdf.ashx>
- Bencsik, A., Horváth Csikós, G., & Juhász, T. (2016). Y and Z generations at workplaces. *Journal of Competitiveness*, 8(3). <https://doi.org/10.7441/joc.2016.03.06>
- Boudreau, J., Jesuthasan, R., & Creelman, D. (2015). Lead the Work: Navigating a World Beyond Employment. In *Lead the Work: Navigating a World Beyond Employment*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119176282>
- Chan, X. W., Kalliath, T., Brough, P., Siu, O. L., O'Driscoll, M. P., & Timms, C. (2016). Work-family enrichment and satisfaction: the mediating role of self-efficacy and work-life balance. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 27(15). <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2015.1075574>
- Chillakuri, B. (2020). Understanding Generation Z expectations for effective onboarding. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 33(7). <https://doi.org/10.1108/JOCM-02-2020-0058>
- CSP. (2020). *Generation Z in the Workforce*. Concordia University Saint Paul (CSP). <https://online.csp.edu/resources/infographic/generation-z-in-the-workforce/>
- De Boer, P., Bordoloi, P., Dallmann, J., & Hengshen, L. (2021). Generation Z work values: A cross-national analysis. *Cross-Cultural Business Conference 2021*.
- Elnaga, A., & Imran, A. (2013). The Effect of Training on Employee Performance. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 5(4). <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/234624593.pdf>
- Fletcher, L., Alfes, K., & Robinson, D. (2018). The relationship between perceived training and development and employee retention: the mediating role of work attitudes. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 29(18). <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2016.1262888>
- Francis, T., & Hoefel, F. (2018). "True Gen": Generation Z and its implications for companies. *McKinsey & Company*.

Gabrielova, K., & Buchko, A. A. (2021). Here comes Generation Z: Millennials as managers. *Business Horizons*, 64(4). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2021.02.013>
Gaidhani, S., Arora, L., & Sharma, B. K. (2019). Understanding the Attitude of Generation Z Towards Workplace. *International Journal of Management, Technology And Engineering*, 9(1), No. 2804. <https://www.ijamtes.org/gallery/333jan19ijamte-1552.pdf>

GenZ Observatory. (2021). *3 motivational levers behind Gen Z's choices in the workplace*. The Choice, ESCP School. <https://thechoice.escp.eu/tomorrow-choices/3-motivational-levers-behind-gen-zs-choices-in-the-workplace/>

Ghura, S. A. (2017). A Qualitative Exploration of the Challenges Organizations Faces while Working with Generation Z Intrapreneurs. *Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation in Emerging Economies*, 3(2). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2393957517711306>

Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2010). Multivariate Data Analysis. In *Vectors*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpharm.2011.02.019>

Hecht, E. (2022, September 2). What years are Gen X? What about baby boomers? When each generation was born. *USA TODAY*. <https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/2022/09/02/what-years-gen-x-millennials-baby-boomers-gen-z/10303085002/>

Hoang Trong, & Chu Nguyen Mong Ngoc. (2008). *Analyzing research data with SPSS, Part 1 and Part 2*. Hong Duc.

Hochreiter, I. (2022). *Attracting and Recruiting Generation Z on Social Networking Sites* [Johannes Kepler University Linz]. <https://epub.jku.at/obvulihs/download/pdf/8013599?originalFilename=true>

ILO. (2022). *World Employment and Social Outlook: Trends 2022*. ILO. <https://doi.org/10.54394/dspl5113>

Insights, E. (2021). Reengineering the Recruitment Process. *Harvard Business Review*, 99(2).

Kirchmayer, Z., & Fratričová, J. (2017). On the verge of Generation Z: Career expectations of current university students. *Proceedings of the 29th International Business Information Management Association Conference - Education Excellence and Innovation Management through Vision 2020: From Regional Development Sustainability to Global Economic Growth*.

Kirchmayer, Z., & Fratričová, J. (2018). What motivates generation Z at work? Insights into motivation drivers of business students in Slovakia. *Proceedings of the 31st International Business Information Management Association Conference, IBIMA 2018: Innovation Management and Education Excellence through Vision 2020*.

Koulopoulos, T., & Keldsen, D. (2014). *The Gen Z effect: the 6 forces shaping the future of business*. Bibliomotion, Inc.

Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining Sample Size for Research Activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30(3), 607–610.

Mahapatra, G. P., Bhullar, N., & Gupta, P. (2022). Gen Z: An Emerging Phenomenon. *NHRD Network Journal*, 15(2), 246–256.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/26314541221077137>

Mamaqi, X., Miguel, J., & Olave, P. (2011). The relationship between employability and training. *World Academy of Science, Engineering, and Technology*, 80.

ManpowerGroup. (2016). *Millennial Careers: 2020 Vision: Facts, Figures and Practical Advice from Workforce Experts*. [Milwaukee, Wisconsin]: ManpowerGroup.
https://www.manpowergroup.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/MillennialsPaper1_2020Vision.pdf

Mathers, N., Fox, N., & Hunn, A. (2007). Surveys and questionnaires: The NIHR RDS for the East Midlands / Yorkshire & the Humber. *National Institute for Health Research*.

Mihelich, M. (2013). *Another Generation Rises: Looking Beyond the Millennials*. [Www.Workforce.Com](http://www.Workforce.Com).

Morgan, J. (2016, July). Generation Z and the 6 Forces Shaping the Future of Business Put aside all the discussion of millennials for now. It's time we start thinking about Generation Z. *Inc.* <https://www.inc.com/jacob-morgan/generation-z-and-the-6-forces-shaping-the-future-of-business.html>

Nguyen Ngoc, T., Viet Dung, M., Rowley, C., & Pejić Bach, M. (2022). Generation Z job seekers' expectations and their job pursuit intention: Evidence from transition and emerging economy. *International Journal of Engineering Business Management*.
https://doi.org/10.1177_18479790221112548

Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). The Assessment of Reliability. *Psychometric Theory*, 3, 248–292.
[https://www.scirp.org/\(S\(i43dyn45teexjx455qlt3d2q\)\)/reference/ReferencesPapers.aspx?ReferenceID=1960143](https://www.scirp.org/(S(i43dyn45teexjx455qlt3d2q))/reference/ReferencesPapers.aspx?ReferenceID=1960143)

Phạm, H., Trần, A., Trần, C., Nguyễn, H., Nguyễn, A., & Đỗ, M. (2022). Ảnh hưởng của áp lực đồng trang lứa đến quyết định lựa chọn trường đại học của học sinh, sinh viên. *Kinh Tế và Dự Báo/ Economy and Forecast Review, March*.
<https://sti.vista.gov.vn/tw/Lists/TaiLieuKHCN/Attachments/339556/CVv139S92022074.pdf>

Pichler, S., Kohli, C., & Granitz, N. (2021). DITTO for Gen Z: A framework for leveraging the uniqueness of the new generation. *Business Horizons*, 64(5). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2021.02.021>

Rachmawati, D. (2019). Welcoming Gen Z in Job World. *Proceeding Indonesia Career Center*.

Russo, M., Shteigman, A., & Carmeli, A. (2016). Workplace and family support and work–life balance: Implications for individual psychological availability and energy at work. *Journal of Positive Psychology*, 11(2). <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2015.1025424>

Schroth, H. (2019). Are you ready for gen Z in the workplace? *California Management Review*, 61(3). <https://doi.org/10.1177/0008125619841006>

Sharma, P., & Pandit, R. (2021). Workplace Expectations of GenZ towards Factors of Motivation. *Studies in Indian Place Names (UGC Care Journal)*, 40(Special Issue-08). https://www.researchgate.net/publication/353362324_Workplace_Expectations_of_GenZ_towards_Factors_of_Motivation

Shiffer, D., Minonzio, M., Dipaola, F., Bertola, M., Zamuner, A. R., Vecchia, L. A. D., Solbiati, M., Costantino, G., Furlan, R., & Barbic, F. (2018). Effects of clockwise and counterclockwise job shift work rotation on sleep and work-life balance on hospital nurses. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 15(9). <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph15092038>

Silva, S. C. e, Machado, J. C., & Cruz, M. (2017). The influence of WOM and Peer Interaction in the Decision-Making Process of Generation Z within the family. *International Journal of Marketing, Communication and New Media, Special Number 2 – Marketing and Digital Business*, 106–136.

SkillSurvey. (2019). *The Future of Work and Generation Z: The data you need for more strategic recruiting*. EBK-041. https://www.hci.org/system/files/2020-02/EBK_041__Future_of_Work_and_Generation_Z.pdf

Tulgan, B. (2013). Meet Generation Z: The second generation within the giant " Millennial " cohort. *RainmakerThinking, Inc*.

Twenge, J. M. (2017). *iGen: Why today's super-connected kids are growing up less rebellious, more tolerant, less happy—and completely unprepared for adulthood (and what that means for the rest of us)*. Atria Books.

UCLA. (2018). Multinomial Logistic Regression | SPSS Annotated Output. In *Institute for Digital Research and Education* (Vol. 2, Issue 2).

Volpe, J. Della. (2022). *Looking Forward with Gen Z*.

Wingo, J. L. (2019). Book review: iGen: Why today's super-connected kids are growing up less rebellious, more tolerant, less happy—and completely unprepared for adulthood (and what that means for the rest of us). *Christian Education Journal: Research on Educational Ministry*, 16(1).
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0739891318819505a>

World Bank. (2022). *Tổng Quan về Việt Nam/ Vietnam Overview*. World Bank.
<https://www.worldbank.org/vi/country/vietnam/overview>

World Economic Forum. (2020). The Future of Jobs Report 2020. In *The Future of Jobs Report* (Issue October).
https://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_Future_of_Jobs_2020.pdf