Dear Editor, dear reviewer,

thank you very much for your valuable remarks concerning my paper “INTERESTING TASKS, INDEPENDENCE OR IMPORTANCE TO SOCIETY? - THE VOCATIONAL EXPECTATIONS OF GENERATION Y”.

I am happy to have implemented your suggestions:

Reviewer 1:

1. *The conclusion section is the weakest part of the paper. Some concepts, such as CRS strategies, are mentioned for the first time in the conclusion which weakens the overall coherence of the paper. The previous research is not focused on questions related to attracting the best prospective workers nor it analyses the relationship between the employees' value systems and company's success. Yet, recommendation of the paper are pointed in that direction.*

I reformulated the conclusion section and stated the scientific claims. Recommendations to companies are formulated more openly according to the results of the paper and the loop is closed to the introduction by citing Klaffke & Parment again who state that human resources management increasingly focuses on the question of “how to bind members of generation Y to companies?” However, the term “CSR strategies” was eliminated in order to not open a new concept.

Limitations and suggestions for further research were moved from the discussion to the conclusion. A sentence about open questions was added.

Reviewer 2:

1. *Author/s needs to revisit abstract in order to explain:*

*Objectives of the paper should be clearly stated. Methods used in the paper should be explained. Results of the research. Main conclusions should be debriefed in 1-2 sentences.*

The abstract was reformulated, objectives were stated and the methods explained. Results of the research are shortly given and the main conclusion is briefly stated.

1. *Suggestion for reorganization of chapter 3, 4 and 5 into Methodology. It is not usual that authors specify the methodology in that author/s do. In Operationalization author/s could organize chapter according to dependent and independent variables. 4.1 Dependent 4.2. Independent and than bold the name of scale/variables.*

Sections 3 to 5 were reorganized into one “Methodology” section with subsections for the data set, operationalization and the description of statistical methods. The “Operationalization” section was organized according to dependent and independent variables with the name of the variables printed in bold letters.

1. *Chapter 4.4. - What are the reasons for coding Realschule as reference value?*

It is explained why “Realschule” was used as a reference value.

1. *Sentence before Table 2.*

*How did you calculate the change of mean? In methodology you claim that it is ordinal scale on which is inappropriate to calculate mean. If you still calculate mean the explanations in brackets are unclear: (change of the mean by b =0,15? what is b in calculation the change of the mean? Which test it is used. In Methodologies you are mentioning parametric test but you needs to put exact explanation of used methods.*

Thank you very much for noticing. In fact, I noticed this independently also when preparing a presentation out of the paper: “b” does not make any sense here. “b” normally denotes regression coefficients, which is not meant here. I deleted “b” and just stated: “Change of the mean by 0,15). The parametric test just was the standard t-test which I noted in the “Statistical methods” section as well as in the heading of Table 2.

1. *In chapter 6. Results one of the sentence is starting Table 4). This phenomenon Pleas read it one again.*

The sentence was reformulated.

1. *Limitation of the study is missing*

I added a sentence about the limitation of the study to the years 2000 to 2013 because of restriction of the data set.

I believe that, through the integration of your suggestions, the quality of this article has been improved. Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,