

Career Preferences of Late Millennials and Z in Indonesia: Job Mobility, Aspirations, and Value Priorities

Sulastri^{1*}, Mira Yona², Hanafi Siregar³, Hary Rangga⁴, and Nuur Faris Akram⁵

^{1,2,3,4,5} Universitas Riau Kepulauan, Indonesia

Journal of Economics and Management Sciences is licensed under a Creative Commons 4.0 International License.



ARTICLE HISTORY

Received: 10 April 26
Final Revision: 21 April 26
Accepted: 27 April 26
Online Publication: 30 June 26

KEYWORDS

Millennials, Generation Z, Career Preferences, Job Mobility, Work Values

KATA KUNCI

Milenial, Generasi Z, Preferensi Karier, Mobilitas Kerja, Nilai Kerja

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR

sulastri07081968@gmail.com

DOI

10.37034/jems.v8i3.433

A B S T R A C T

This study examines differences in career preferences between Generasi 90-an (late Millennials, 1990–1996) and Generation Z (1997–2005) in Indonesia, focusing on job mobility, aspirations, and value priorities. Drawing on national surveys, industry reports, and recent scholarly literature (2022–2026), the findings indicate that generational orientations are shaped by distinct socio-economic experiences. Generasi 90-an tend to prefer stable and linear career paths, prioritizing financial security, organizational commitment, and structured advancement within formal sectors such as corporations, civil service, and state-owned enterprises. In contrast, Generation Z exhibits higher job mobility, with average tenure of 1–2 years, alongside greater acceptance of hybrid work and gig-based arrangements. This cohort places stronger emphasis on work-life balance, personal development, and intrinsic motivation. Although both groups value competitive compensation, Generation Z integrates well-being and alignment of personal values more explicitly into career decisions. Evidence from Surakarta also suggests variations across regions and definitions. These findings underscore the importance of adaptive talent management strategies, including flexible career pathways, hybrid work systems, and cross-generational engagement to sustain workforce effectiveness.

A B S T R A K

Studi ini menganalisis perbedaan preferensi karier antara Generasi 90-an (Milenial akhir, 1990–1996) dan Generasi Z (1997–2005) di Indonesia dengan fokus pada mobilitas kerja, aspirasi, dan prioritas nilai. Berdasarkan sintesis survei nasional, laporan industri, dan literatur ilmiah periode 2022–2026, ditemukan bahwa orientasi karier kedua generasi dipengaruhi oleh pengalaman sosial-ekonomi yang berbeda. Generasi 90-an cenderung memilih jalur karier yang stabil dan linear, dengan penekanan pada keamanan finansial, loyalitas organisasi, serta kemajuan terstruktur di sektor formal seperti perusahaan, aparat sipil negara, dan BUMN. Sebaliknya, Generasi Z menunjukkan mobilitas kerja yang lebih tinggi, dengan rata-rata masa kerja 1–2 tahun, serta lebih terbuka terhadap sistem kerja hibrida dan skema berbasis proyek atau gig work. Kelompok ini juga menempatkan keseimbangan kehidupan kerja, pengembangan diri, dan motivasi intrinsik sebagai prioritas utama. Kedua generasi tetap menghargai kompensasi yang kompetitif, meskipun Generasi Z lebih eksplisit mengintegrasikan kesejahteraan dan keselarasan nilai pribadi dalam keputusan karier. Temuan kontekstual dari Surakarta mengindikasikan adanya variasi regional. Hasil ini menegaskan urgensi strategi manajemen talenta yang adaptif, fleksibel, dan inklusif lintas generasi.

1. Introduction

1.1. Research Background

The rapid digitalization and post-pandemic economic restructuring in Indonesia have profoundly reshaped workforce dynamics, creating distinct career preferences across generations. *Generasi 90-an* (those born in the 1990s, operationalized here as 1990–1996, representing the later segment of Millennials) matured during the recovery from the 1998 financial crisis and the reformasi era. This shaped their emphasis on economic stability, structured career progression, and organizational loyalty amid transitional uncertainties. In contrast, Generation Z (born 1997–2005), as true digital

natives, entered the labor market during heightened volatility, technological disruption, and shifting societal expectations toward flexibility, purpose, and well-being [1], [2]. These contextual differences manifest clearly in how each cohort perceives employment: *Generasi 90-an* views work primarily as a pathway to financial security and long-term stability, while Generation Z sees it as a flexible platform for personal exploration, meaningful impact, and integration of life priorities.

Following the Pew Research Center classification (Millennials: 1981–1996; Generation Z: 1997–2012), this study narrows the scope to comparable early workforce-entry cohorts, namely Millennials (1990–1996) and Generation Z (1997–2005). Individuals

within the transitional range (approximately 1995–1998) are recognized as having hybrid characteristics. For analytical consistency, they are assigned to the dominant generational category based on standard boundaries.

Existing literature on generational work values highlights consistent yet evolving patterns. *Generasi 90-an* in Indonesia tend to prioritize job security, organizational commitment, and linear career ladders shaped by experiences of economic instability. Meanwhile, Generation Z places greater emphasis on intrinsic motivators such as autonomy, work-life balance, supportive environments, and alignment with personal values. They often show openness to hybrid models, gig opportunities, or frequent role exploration [1], [3]. Regional studies further indicate that Gen Z exhibits comparatively higher job mobility and lower tolerance for value misalignment, although both generations continue to value competitive compensation and development opportunities within Indonesia's dynamic emerging market [2], [4].

This study is important because Generation Z is rapidly becoming the dominant segment of Indonesia's workforce, intensifying cross-generational management challenges for organizations and policymakers in an increasingly uncertain labor market. While prior research has examined generational traits, there remains a need for focused comparative analysis of career mobility patterns, work aspirations, and core value priorities tailored to Indonesia's unique socio-economic context [2], [3].

The purpose of this study is to compare career preferences between *Generasi 90-an* and Generation Z in Indonesia, with specific attention to (a) patterns of job mobility, (b) work aspirations, and (c) underlying value priorities. Through synthesis of secondary sources including national surveys and peer-reviewed literature, the analysis seeks to generate actionable insights that can inform human resource strategies, talent management practices, and policy development for a multigenerational Indonesian workforce.

1.2. Literature Review

Generational theory provides the foundational framework for understanding how shared historical and socio-economic experiences shape cohort-specific values, attitudes, and behaviors in the workplace. Karl Mannheim's theory of generations (1952) posits that a generation is formed not merely by chronological age but by individuals who experience the same significant historical events during their formative years, leading to a common worldview or "generational consciousness" [5]. Complementing this, Strauss and Howe's generational theory (1991) introduces a cyclical model of four recurring archetypes—Prophet, Nomad, Hero, and Artist—driven by societal turning points, where each generation reacts to the previous one [6], [7]. In the

context of work values, these theories explain why later Millennials (*Generasi 90-an*) and early-to-mid Generation Z exhibit distinct career orientations shaped by Indonesia's unique trajectory of economic crisis recovery, reformasi, rapid digitalization, and post-pandemic uncertainty [1], [3].

1.2.1. Characteristics of *Generasi 90-an* (Later Millennials, 1990–1996) in the Indonesian Context

Generasi 90-an, as the younger segment of Millennials, grew up during the recovery phase following the 1998 Asian Financial Crisis and the political transition of the reformasi era. This cohort internalized values of economic stability, structured career ladders, and organizational loyalty as mechanisms for achieving long-term financial security amid lingering uncertainty [2], [8]. In the Indonesian workplace, they tend to prioritize job security, extrinsic rewards such as competitive compensation and benefits, and linear progression within established organizations, often viewing work as a pathway to family responsibility and status [3], [9]. Studies indicate that while they seek to break cycles of extreme overwork inherited from previous generations, they maintain a strong work ethic and higher continuance commitment compared to younger cohorts, balancing ambition with pragmatic loyalty [10], [11].

1.2.2. Characteristics of Generation Z (1997–2005) in the Indonesian Context

Generation Z, true digital natives, entered adulthood amid technological acceleration, the COVID-19 pandemic, and heightened economic volatility. In Indonesia, they exhibit greater emphasis on intrinsic values, including autonomy, work-life balance, mental well-being, and meaningful work aligned with personal purpose [1], [12]. Surveys reveal that Indonesian Gen Z prioritizes flexibility (such as hybrid or remote arrangements), supportive environments, and rapid skill development, often showing openness to job mobility or side hustles to achieve financial independence and personal growth [13], [14]. Although they value competitive salaries (frequently ranking as the top factor), many express interest in stable public-sector or BUMN roles while demanding modern elements like inclusivity and reduced bureaucracy, reflecting a pragmatic blend of security-seeking and flexibility-seeking behaviors [2], [15]. High digital fluency further drives their preference for dynamic, purpose-driven roles over traditional hierarchies.

1.2.3. Previous Studies on Career Mobility, Aspirations, and Work Values

International and regional research consistently documents generational shifts in career patterns. Globally, Millennials often display moderate mobility focused on strategic advancement, while Gen Z demonstrates higher job-hopping tendencies driven by

value misalignment and desire for quick growth [5], [12]. In Indonesia, local studies highlight that *Generasi 90-an* emphasize organizational commitment and long-term tenure for stability, whereas Gen Z prioritizes work-life integration and frequent exploration of opportunities [3], [8]. Aspirations among *Generasi 90-an* center on financial security and status, while Gen Z seeks financial independence combined with meaningful impact and flexibility [1], [13]. Work value comparisons show *Generasi 90-an* leaning toward extrinsic factors and structured rewards, contrasted with Gen Z's stronger intrinsic orientation toward autonomy and well-being [4], [9], [10]. Cross-national insights further confirm that emerging-market contexts like Indonesia amplify these differences due to rapid urbanization and digital transformation [2], [15].

1.2.4. Synthesis and Identification of Research Gaps

The synthesized literature reveals a clear divergence: *Generasi 90-an* lean toward stability and linear careers shaped by post-crisis pragmatism, while Generation Z favors adaptability, balance, and purpose amid digital abundance [6], [12], [16]. However, most comparative studies either aggregate broad generational cohorts without narrowing life-stage comparability or rely heavily on Western samples, limiting applicability to Indonesia's socio-economic realities [2], [5], [8]. Few desk-research syntheses focus specifically on narrowed operational definitions (1990–1996 vs. 1997–2005) while integrating local survey data on mobility, aspirations, and priorities in the Indonesian labor market [13], [14], [15]. This study addresses these gaps by providing a focused comparative analysis tailored to Indonesia's multigenerational workforce challenges.

2. Research Method

This study employs a desk research design through secondary data analysis and a literature-based comparative approach. The objective is to systematically compare career preferences between *Generasi 90-an* (later Millennials, born 1990–1996) and Generation Z (born 1997–2005) in Indonesia, focusing on job mobility patterns, work aspirations, and core value priorities. This non-empirical method allows for efficient synthesis of existing evidence without primary data collection, enabling a broad overview of generational differences in the Indonesian labor market context.

Data were drawn from multiple credible sources published or released between 2022 and 2026 to ensure relevance to post-pandemic conditions and recent workforce trends. Primary data sources include:

- a. National surveys: Jakpat surveys on Gen Z characteristics and workplace preferences, Badan Pusat Statistik (BPS) National Labor Force Survey (Sakernas) reports on generational employment profiles.

- b. Peer-reviewed journal articles indexed in Scopus or Web of Science (WoS), focusing on generational work values, career mobility, and job expectations in Indonesia.
- c. Industry and research reports: Deloitte Global Gen Z and Millennial Survey 2025 (including Indonesia country profile), IDN Times Indonesia Millennial and Gen Z Report 2025, and related publications from Populix and other local research institutes.

Inclusion criteria covered sources that explicitly addressed career-related variables (mobility, aspirations, or work values), focused on Indonesian Millennials/*Generasi 90-an* or Generation Z, were published between 2022 and 2026, and provided comparable quantitative or qualitative evidence. Exclusion criteria removed studies that did not clearly differentiate generations, examined only non-Indonesian contexts without relevant comparison, were published prior to 2022, or lacked methodological transparency. This approach ensured that the analysis remained contextually relevant, empirically grounded, and aligned with recent developments.

Analysis was conducted using content analysis followed by comparative thematic analysis. Relevant texts, survey findings, and statistics were first coded into three main themes: (a) job mobility, (b) work aspirations, and (c) value priorities. Patterns within and across generations were then compared to identify convergences, divergences, and contextual explanations. Thematic mapping helped synthesize quantitative percentages (e.g., priority rankings from Jakpat and Deloitte) with qualitative insights from journal articles.

Ethical considerations for secondary data research primarily involve proper attribution and avoidance of misrepresentation. Findings are presented objectively without fabrication or selective bias. Limitations of this approach include reliance on existing data quality and availability, potential publication bias toward significant differences, and the inability to establish causality or control for confounding variables such as regional disparities within Indonesia. Despite these constraints, the method provides a robust, cost-effective foundation for generational comparison and highlights areas needing future primary research.

3. Results and Discussion

This section presents the synthesized findings from secondary sources, including national surveys (Jakpat, BPS Sakernas), Deloitte Global Gen Z and Millennial Survey 2025 (Indonesia profile), IDN Times Indonesia Millennial and Gen Z Report 2025, and peer-reviewed studies. Findings are organized into three main themes: job mobility patterns, work aspirations, and core value priorities. Comparisons highlight differences between *Generasi 90-an* (later Millennials, 1990–1996) and Generation Z (1997–2005) in the Indonesian context.

3.1. Patterns of Job Mobility

Generasi 90-an (later Millennials, born 1990–1996) display relatively stable and linear patterns of job mobility. Shaped by the economic recovery following the 1998 Asian Financial Crisis and the reformasi period, this cohort tends to prioritize longer tenure within organizations to build experience, seniority, and financial security. Job changes are typically strategic, often motivated by opportunities for promotion, higher salary, or improved benefits rather than frequent exploration. They show stronger organizational commitment and a preference for structured, formal-sector employment with ideal early-career tenure ranging from 3 to 5 years or more [8], [10].

In contrast, Generation Z (born 1997–2005) exhibits significantly higher job mobility and adaptability. National surveys indicate that many Indonesian Gen Z plan to leave their current role within 12–24 months if expectations regarding growth, balance, or alignment are not met. Average early-career tenure is notably shorter, often 1–2 years, with 31–60% considering or actively engaging in job hopping as a deliberate strategy for better opportunities [12], [17]. This mobility is driven by a desire for rapid skill development, flexibility, and value congruence, amplified by comfort with digital platforms that facilitate easier transitions into gig work, freelance, or hybrid roles. Approximately 35% of Gen Z prefer Work from Anywhere (WFA) arrangements, and 32% favor hybrid models, contributing to greater sectoral or role fluidity compared to previous cohorts [12], [13].

Additional analysis from workforce studies shows Generation Z has a higher intention to job-hop than *Generasi 90-an* or older groups, with mean job-hopping intention scores notably elevated among the youngest cohort. This reflects lower tolerance for misalignment

and a pragmatic view of careers as exploratory rather than lifelong commitments within a single organization [18].

Distinct preferences in employment sectors further illustrate mobility differences. *Generasi 90-an* lean toward stable, formal-sector roles that offer long-term security and structured progression. They show stronger inclination toward established corporations, government positions (PNS), or state-owned enterprises (BUMN), viewing these as pathways to reliable income, benefits, and status. Data from labor force surveys indicate that Millennials dominate certain formal sectors such as wholesale and retail trade, services, and sales roles, with a notable presence in stable civil service or SOE/BUMN positions that provide consistent income and perceived security [8], [19].

Generation Z, while also valuing stability, demonstrates a more pragmatic and diversified approach. Many express interest in BUMN or government-linked roles for security, yet they combine this with openness to private sector dynamism, startups, freelance/gig economy, and even non-governmental organizations (NGOs) that align with personal values or offer flexibility. Surveys reveal that Gen Z is more likely to engage in informal, contract-based, or entrepreneurial paths early in their careers, with higher participation in digital-enabled roles and side hustles. A notable portion prefers corporations over pure startups for stability but demands modern elements such as reduced bureaucracy and skill development opportunities within those settings. Interest in mission-driven or socially relevant sectors (e.g., NGOs) is also evident among segments seeking meaningful impact alongside financial goals [12], [20]. Table 1 summarizes key mobility and sector preference indicators synthesized from recent Indonesian sources.

Table 1. Patterns of Job Mobility and Preferred Sectors

Aspect	<i>Generasi 90-an</i> (Later Millennials)	Generation Z (1997–2005)
Average early-career tenure	3–5+ years (linear progression)	1–2 years (frequent transitions)
Job-hopping tendency	Moderate and strategic	High (31–60% consider leaving soon)
Primary reasons for leaving	Better salary or promotion	Work-life balance, growth, value misalignment
Preferred work arrangements	Structured, office-based	Hybrid (32%), WFA (35%), flexible/gig options
Preferred sectors	Formal sector, corporations, PNS, BUMN (stability-focused)	BUMN/government for security + private/startups/freelance/NGOs for flexibility & meaning
Sectoral inclination	Wholesale/retail, services, stable civil/BUMN roles	Diversified: BUMN + gig/digital + mission-driven

These patterns reflect differing formative contexts: economic pragmatism and recovery for *Generasi 90-an* versus digital disruption and post-pandemic volatility for Generation Z. While both cohorts value compensation and growth, Gen Z’s higher mobility and broader sectoral exploration indicate greater adaptability to Indonesia’s evolving, uncertain labor market [1], [2].

3.2. Work Aspirations

Generasi 90-an (later Millennials, born 1990–1996) primarily aspire to financial security, professional status, and long-term stability. Having matured during the post-1998 economic recovery and reformasi era, this cohort views work as a reliable pathway to achieve *kemandirian finansial* (financial independence), support family responsibilities, and attain social status. Their

aspirations often center on steady career progression within established organizations, with a strong preference for roles that offer clear advancement opportunities, competitive benefits, and job security. Many seek to break the cycle of extreme overwork from previous generations while maintaining a solid work ethic and commitment to structured career ladders in formal sectors [8].

In comparison, Generation Z (born 1997–2005) holds aspirations that blend financial independence with personal growth, flexibility, and work-life integration. According to the Deloitte Global 2025 Gen Z and Millennial Survey (Indonesia insights), 34% of Indonesian Gen Z cite achieving financial independence as their top career goal, closely followed by continuous learning and development as well as maintaining good work/life balance. Only 8% prioritize roles with direct societal impact, indicating a pragmatic focus on securing stability before pursuing more idealistic goals [12]. Many Gen Z express interest in stable positions such as BUMN or government-linked roles for security, yet they simultaneously demand rapid skill development, reduced bureaucracy, and opportunities for self-exploration [13], [20].

National surveys further reveal that Indonesian Gen Z actively explores diverse career paths, including entrepreneurship, freelance work, gig economy roles,

and poly-careers enabled by digital platforms. Around 51% prioritize career growth and personal ambitions, often delaying traditional life milestones to focus on self-development. However, a significant portion (up to 85% in some studies) reports difficulty in finding their “ideal” job, leading many to combine stable employment with side hustles or transition between sectors more fluidly than previous cohorts [17], [21].

Both generations share concerns over compensation and growth in Indonesia’s competitive job market, yet their approaches differ markedly. *Generasi 90-an* tend to pursue long-term aspirations within reliable institutional frameworks (corporations, PNS, or BUMN), emphasizing status and financial predictability. Generation Z, influenced by digital nativity and post-pandemic realities, adopts a more exploratory and multifaceted view of aspirations — treating work as a tool for both economic security and personal fulfillment. This is evident in their higher openness to changing industries or career paths: 16% of Gen Z in Indonesia reported no longer working in their originally intended field, often due to desires for better work/life balance, career growth, or flexible hours [12]. Table 2 presents the top career aspirations based on synthesized percentages from key surveys.

Table 2. Top Career Aspirations (Synthesized Percentages from Key Surveys)

Aspect	<i>Generasi 90-an</i> (Later Millennials)	Generation Z (1997–2005)
Financial independence / security	High priority (stable income & benefits)	34% (top goal)
Career growth & learning	Steady progression & expertise	High (continuous learning emphasized)
Work-life balance	Moderate (family responsibilities)	Very high (maintaining good balance)
Leadership / status	Valued for long-term advancement	Low (only ~6% prioritize leadership)
Meaningful / societal impact	Secondary	Low (8%)
Entrepreneurship / flexibility	Moderate	High (exploration of gig & side hustles)

The data illustrate a generational shift from linear, security-driven aspirations among *Generasi 90-an* to more dynamic, balance-oriented, and self-directed aspirations among Generation Z. While financial stability remains a shared foundation, Gen Z integrates well-being and rapid personal development more explicitly into their career vision, reflecting the influence of technological disruption and evolving labor market conditions in Indonesia [8], [12].

3.3. Core Value Priorities

The most pronounced differences between *Generasi 90-an* (later Millennials, 1990–1996) and Generation Z (1997–2005) appear in their core value priorities at work. These priorities reflect distinct formative experiences: economic recovery and the need for stability among *Generasi 90-an* versus digital disruption, pandemic effects, and emphasis on personal well-being among Generation Z. *Generasi 90-an* tend to prioritize extrinsic and stability-oriented values. They place high importance on job security, competitive compensation, benefits packages, retirement security,

and structured organizational rewards. Organizational loyalty and continuance commitment remain relatively strong, as this cohort often weighs long-term costs before leaving a job. They value clear career ladders, recognition for contributions, promotion opportunities, and a stable work environment that supports family responsibilities. Studies indicate that benefits, promotion opportunities, work flexibility, and work location significantly influence their organizational commitment, while they maintain a pragmatic work ethic shaped by post-1998 crisis realities [3], [8], [22].

In contrast, Generation Z integrates both extrinsic and intrinsic values but places stronger emphasis on well-being, flexibility, and alignment with personal values. Salary and financial independence remain the top priority (approximately 64–71% in various surveys), yet they are closely followed by work-life balance, mental health support, autonomy, and a supportive, inclusive work environment. Gen Z shows lower tolerance for value misalignment and demands flexibility such as hybrid or Work from Anywhere (WFA) arrangements. They highly value continuous learning and

development, fair leadership, and work that allows integration of personal life without excessive stress. Although financial security is foundational, many Gen Z employees report higher job-related stress and anxiety, driving their focus on well-being [13], [21], [23].

Comparative analyses reveal that while both generations value compensation, *Generasi 90-an* lean toward structured rewards and long-term security, whereas Generation Z seeks a better “trifecta” of money,

meaning, and well-being. Gen Z is more likely to leave roles lacking flexibility or supportive culture, even with competitive pay. They also show greater openness to gig work or side hustles to achieve balance and personal growth. Notably, interest in BUMN roles persists among Gen Z for security reasons, but with added demands for modern practices, reduced bureaucracy, and opportunities for rapid skill development [12], [17]. Table 3 presents the top value priorities identified across the surveyed cohorts.

Table 3. Top Value Priorities

Priority Rank	<i>Generasi 90-an</i> (Later Millennials)	Generation Z (1997–2005)
1	Job security, financial stability & benefits	Salary & financial independence (~64–71%)
2	Organizational loyalty & structured rewards	Work-life balance & flexibility (high importance, often >50%)
3	Promotion opportunities & linear career progression	Supportive environment, learning & development (~51–57%)
4	Recognition & stable work environment	Autonomy, mental well-being & value alignment
5	Long-term commitment (continuance)	Inclusive culture & fair leadership

These findings are synthesized from national surveys (Jakpat, BPS) and international reports with Indonesian insights [12], [13]. The data consistently show a generational shift: *Generasi 90-an* emphasize stability and pragmatic loyalty shaped by economic transition, while Generation Z demands greater integration of personal well-being and flexibility amid digital and post-pandemic realities. Both cohorts share concerns over compensation in Indonesia’s competitive market, yet Gen Z’s stronger intrinsic orientation and lower tolerance for misalignment contribute to higher mobility.

3.4. Additional Insights and Contrasting Local Evidence on Job Mobility

While the synthesized national and multi-source data presented in Sections 4.1–4.3 indicate higher job mobility and exploratory tendencies among Generation Z compared with *Generasi 90-an* (later Millennials, 1990–1996), one recent localized primary study offers a contrasting finding that merits explicit consideration. A quantitative survey conducted in Surakarta City involving 399 employees (133 from each generation) using purposive sampling and ANOVA analysis. Their study measured *intensi job hopping* (job-hopping intention) across three generations with broader definitions: Generation X (1965–1980), Generation Y/Millennials (1981–1996), and Generation Z (1997–2012).

The results showed a statistically significant difference in job-hopping intention across the three groups ($F(2,396) = 7.651, p = 0.001$). Post-hoc tests (Tukey HSD and LSD) revealed that Generation Y (Millennials) exhibited the highest intention (mean score = 92.30), followed by Generation Z (mean = 89.71), with Generation X recording the lowest (mean = 87.84). The difference between Generation Y and Generation X was significant, while differences involving Generation Z were not always statistically significant. The authors concluded that Millennials in Surakarta displayed the

strongest inclination toward job hopping among the three cohorts [23].

This finding appears contradictory to the broader national pattern synthesized in this desk research, where Generation Z consistently shows shorter average tenure (1–2 years), higher reported job-hopping rates (31–60%), and greater openness to hybrid/gig arrangements. Several methodological and contextual factors explain the divergence:

- Generational operationalization:** The aforementioned study employed wide generational brackets that include older Millennials (born as early as 1981), whereas the present study narrows focus to *Generasi 90-an* (1990–1996) — the later, more digitally immersed segment of Millennials — for greater life-stage comparability with early-to-mid Gen Z (1997–2005). Older Millennials may retain stronger job-hopping intentions shaped by earlier career experiences during economic recovery, whereas the narrower 1990–1996 cohort aligns more closely with national trends showing increased stability-seeking.
- Geographic and sample specificity:** The Surakarta study is confined to a single mid-sized Central Java city, where local labor market conditions, industrial composition (wholesale/retail/services dominance), and cultural factors may amplify Millennials’ mobility compared with the national synthesis drawn from Jakpat, BPS Sakernas, Deloitte Indonesia, and IDN Times data.
- Measurement focus:** Arlita and Sari measured intention via a 28-item Likert-scale questionnaire, whereas the present analysis integrates actual reported behaviors (tenure, resignation plans, preferred sectors) from multiple secondary sources. Intention does not always translate directly into behavior, especially in uncertain economic contexts.

This localized evidence does not invalidate the overall national pattern but enriches it by highlighting regional variation and the sensitivity of findings to cohort boundaries. It underscores the value of the narrowed operational definitions adopted in this study, which minimize cohort heterogeneity and better capture comparable early-career dynamics in Indonesia's evolving labor market. Future primary research could reconcile these perspectives through nationally representative samples using the same narrowed generational ranges.

4. Conclusion

Generasi 90-an (1990–1996) demonstrate relatively stable job mobility with linear career paths and preferred tenure of 3–5+ years, emphasizing financial security and status within formal structures such as corporations, civil service, and SOEs, alongside extrinsic values like job security, benefits, and organizational loyalty. Generation Z (1997–2005) exhibits higher mobility, with average tenure of 1–2 years, combining financial goals with work–life balance and personal development, and prioritizing intrinsic values such as flexibility and well-being. Evidence from Surakarta indicates regional variation. These patterns call for adaptive strategies, including hybrid work, flexible career pathways, and cross-generational mentoring.

References

- [1] Zahra, Y., Handoyo, S., & Fajrianti, F. (2025). A comprehensive overview of Generation Z in the workplace: Insights from a scoping review. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, *51*, 2263. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajip.v51i0.2263>
- [2] Rani, I. H., Jalih, J. H., & Widayati, L. A. (2022). Indonesian Generation Z work expectation and intention to apply for job: Role of social media. *Quantitative Economics and Management Studies*, *3*(2), 193–206. <https://doi.org/10.35877/454RI.qems831>
- [3] Mayowan, Y., Astuti, E. S., Utami, H. N., & Prasetya, A. (2025). The interplay of work values, job satisfaction and intention to stay among millennials in Indonesia. *Cogent Business & Management*, *12*(1), 2581345. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2025.2581345>
- [4] Wu, A. F., Gintir, J., Setyawati, I., & Herlina, M. G. (2026). Factors influencing work system preferences: A study of Generation X, Y, and Z employees. *TEC Empresarial*, *21*(1), 54–72.
- [5] Rudolph, C. W., Rauvola, R. S., Costanza, D. P., & Zacher, H. (2021). Generations and generational differences: Debunking myths in organizational science and practice and paving new paths forward. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, *36*(6), 945–967. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-020-09715-2>
- [6] Strauss, W., & Howe, N. (1991). *Generations: The history of America's future, 1584 to 2069*. William Morrow.
- [7] Twist, A. V. E. D. V., & Newcombe, S. (2021). Strauss–Howe generational theory. In J. Crossley & A. Lockhart (Eds.), *Critical dictionary of apocalyptic and millenarian movements*.
- [8] Hakam, D. F., Haryadi, F. N., Indrawan, H., Hanri, M., Hakam, L. I., Kurniawan, O., & Purnomoadi, A. P. (2024). Analyzing current trends in career choices and employer branding from the perspective of millennials within the Indonesian energy sector. *Energies*, *17*(11), 2570. <https://doi.org/10.3390/en17112570>
- [9] Utami, A., Triady, M., Suci, N., & Rumondang. (2018). Working values preferences among Gen X, Y and baby boomers in Indonesia. *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities*, *26*, 95–105.
- [10] Emilisa, N., Yudhaputri, E. A., & Thermalista, G. I. (2022). Differences in millennial employees' protean career attitude, passion for work and turnover intention in Indonesia and Malaysia. *International Journal of Organizational Innovation*, *15*(2), 215–231.
- [11] Herachwati, N., Suhariadi, F., Gunawan, S., & Ekowati, D. (2019). Work Life Balance of Generation-Y in Indonesia. In *2016 International Conference of Organizational Commitment (2019 ICOI)* (pp. 484–493). International Association of Organizational Innovations, USA/Atlantis Press. <https://doi.org/10.2991/icoi-19.2019.85>
- [12] Deloitte. (2025). Global Gen Z and millennial survey 2025. Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu Limited. Retrieved from <https://www.deloitte.com/global/en/issues/work/genz-millennial-survey.html>
- [13] IDN Research Institute, & Populix. (2025). Indonesia millennial and Gen Z report 2025. IDN Times. Retrieved from <https://cdn.idntimes.com/content-documents/indonesia-millennial-genz-report-2025.pdf>
- [14] Syahlidi, G., Videlya, V., & Meliani, D. R. (2026). Identifying the Dominant Factors of Gen Z's Job Satisfaction through the Integration of Empirical Findings: Systematic Literature Review. *Socius: Jurnal Penelitian Ilmu-Ilmu Sosial*, *3*(7), 237–248. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18628219>
- [15] Rosdiana, R., Hariani, S., & Pramudena, S. (2026). Understanding the future of investment: An analysis of millennials and Generation Z. *Future Business Journal*, *12*, 16. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s43093-026-00724-w>
- [16] Mannheim, K. (1952). The problem of generations. In P. Kecskemeti (Ed.), *Essays on the sociology of knowledge* (pp. 276–322). Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- [17] Jakpat. (2024). Understanding Gen Z: Preference in the workplace. Retrieved from <https://insight.jakpat.net/understanding-gen-z-preference-in-the-workplace/>
- [18] Badan Pusat Statistik. (2024). Survei Angkatan Kerja Nasional (Sakernas) Kota Surakarta 2024. BPS Kota Surakarta.
- [19] Putra, R. H., & Dewi, A. S. (2025). Generation Z and the reality of employment in Indonesia: A problematic portrait of the youngest workforce. *Priviet Social Sciences Journal*. <https://journal.privietlab.org/index.php/PSSJ/article/view/781>
- [20] Sidiq, S. A., & Poerwita, S. F. (2025). Generation Z in the workplace: How work-life balance and job satisfaction drive turnover intention in Indonesia. *International Journal of Environmental Sciences*, *11*(3), 45–62.
- [21] Ratnaningtyas, A., & Nuryanto, P. D. (2025). Komitmen organisasi: Studi perbandingan pada pekerja milenial dan Gen Z. *Seminar Nasional dan Call for Papers PSGESI LPPM UWP*, *12*(1), 56–64. <https://doi.org/10.38156/gesi.v12i1.441>
- [22] Asria, K. A., Juniwati, J., Ramadhan, R., Rosnani, T., & Mayasari, E. (2025). Retention of Gen Z Employees: The Impact of Rewards, Career Development, and Job Satisfaction. *eCo-Buss*, *7*(3), 1623–1637. <https://doi.org/10.32877/eb.v7i3.1796>
- [23] Arlita, E., & Sari, P. O. (2025). Intensi job hopping pada generasi X, Y dan Z di Kota Surakarta. *PENG: Jurnal Ekonomi dan Manajemen*, *3*(1), 966–976. <https://doi.org/10.62710/v0opa567>