Working Orientation Difference among Generation Y and Generation Z in Startup Companies: Case in Indonesia

Syarfina Mahya Nadila1*, Nadia Yovani2, Andhika Ajie Baskoro1

1Badan Riset dan Inovasi Nasional, Indonesia

2Universitas Indonesia, Indonesia

A R T I C L E   I N F O

A B S T R A C T

This study aims to analyze the differences in the work orientation of Generation Y and Generation Z workers in startup companies based on generational differences, gender, religion, property ownership, domicile, and office location. This research uses a quantitative approach with a survey method. The results of this study show that both Generation Y and Generation Z workers who work in Startups have the same work orientation regarding gender, religion, place of residence, ownership status, and office location. This research is expected to extend knowledge about the characteristics of Generation Y and Generation Z workers. In addition, this research is expected to become evidence-based to tailor specific regulations related to work orientation among Generation Y and Generation Z.

1. INTRODUCTION

Technological advances in the information field have brought many changes in the various aspects of society's life. Technology is also part of the economy. For example, a term in the economic sector is the digital economy. The concept of a digital economy was first discussed in the 1990s. At that time, the digital economy was defined as enabling interpersonal relationships through technological advances to carry out economic activities (Tapscott, 1996). In other words, the digital economy is defined as the wide variety of economic activities where digital information and knowledge utilization become crucial aspects of production (Asian Development Bank, 2018).

Moreover, the digital economy also pointed out the importance of technology utilization to create positive effects for society. From these two definitions, it can be concluded that the digital economy is an economic activity carried out by humans with the support of technological advances. The simplest example of the form of the digital economy is how we access e-commerce to shop to meet our daily needs.

The emergence of the digital economy is believed to be one of the foundations of the Startup phenomenon in various parts of the world, without exception in Indonesia. In 2023, data from Startup ranking shows that there are approximately 144,688 Startups that are located all over the world. Indonesia has at least 2,492 Startups operating in various sectors, placing Indonesia at the sixth rank as the country with the most Startups in the world. In terms of defining Startups, there are no clear definitions to define it. Previous studies showed that there are several aspects to defining Startups (Ehsan, 2021). In the prior 2000s, scholars defined Startups as firms or enterprises that were newly created. Thus, the Startups focused on the "newness" aspect (Carter et al., 1996; Freeman & Reed, 1983; Gudgin, 1978; Keeble, 2022). After the 2000s, many scholars add some aspects besides the newness aspects, such as innovation, risk or uncertainty, and growth aspect (Cho, 2009; Hernández & González, 2017; Krejcí et al., 2015; Ries, 2011; Steigertahl & Mauer, 2019). Thus, based on the previous studies, this study defines Startups as firms or enterprises that are newly founded by some individuals that focus on innovation and use technology to grow with some level of risk or uncertainty. Technology and organization cannot be separated from each other.

Inside of organization, human activity plays an important role. Humans are categorized into some generations nowadays. The organization itself can be separated based on its scale, smaller (e.g. Startup company) into the biggest one. The rapid growth of Startups worldwide brings the discussion related to the

*Corresponding author
E-mail addresses: syar014@brin.go.id

impact of Startups. Some studies showed that the emergence of Startups in the country directly impacts employment and production (Carree Martin A. and Thurik, 2003; Fritsch & Mueller, 2004). Regarding employment, there are also unique trends in Startup workers. Since Startups mainly work with innovation and technology utilization, it is no wonder that most workers come from specific generations, in this case, Generation Y and Generation Z. Moreover, Startups have a peculiarity; individuals and a group of individuals from young groups usually find them. In 2018, for example, out of 992 Startups in Indonesia, over 50% of Startups were founded by those in Generation Y (those who were born in 1981-1994). This condition then gives a new colour to the employment situation in Indonesia, considering that it is not only founded by the younger generation, but Startups are also usually filled with employees from the younger generation (KataData, 2019).

The 2020 Indonesian Population Census data shows that Indonesia's population is 270,20 million people. Of this number, more than a quarter are Generation Y. Generation Y consists of individuals born between 1981-1996. The population of Generation Y is 69,38 million people or 25,87%. Following that, those born between 1965-1980, or Generation X, amount to 58,65 million people or 21,88%. Then, 31,01 million people (11,56%) were born between 1946-1964, referred to as the Baby Boomer generation. Furthermore, the generation with the smallest representation is the pre-Boomer or those born before 1945, numbering 5,03 million people or 1,87%. Post Gen Z is the generation with the second smallest population, namely 29,17 million people or 10,88%. Post-Gen Z refers to those born after 2013. Lastly, the generation with the highest representation is Generation Z, those born between 1997-2012, totalling 74,93 million people or 27,94% (Central Bureau of Statistics, 2021). Data from the 2020 population census also indicates that the majority of the productive-age population in Indonesia is Generation Y, at 37,23%. This is followed by Generation X at 30,21%, Generation Z at 21,62%, and lastly, Baby Boomers at 10,94% (Central Bureau of Statistics, 2022). Current demographic conditions show that Indonesia's population is dominated by the productive-age groups of Generation Y, Generation X, Generation Z, with a small portion from the Baby Boomer generation. Although the majority of Indonesia's population comes from Generation Z, most of Generation Z are still school-age children.

With the emergence of realities about the domination of Generation Y and workers in Startup in Indonesia, it becomes interesting to see the work orientation differences between Generation Y and Generation Z. In discussing the concepts related to work orientation, previous studies found that several dimensions affect a person's work orientation. Some studies show that three main dimensions contribute to a person's performance, the three dimensions are job, career, and calling (Dekas & Baker, 2014; Lan et al., 2013; Mantler et al., 2022; Park et al., 2021; Pitacho et al., 2019; Wei et al., 2021). The job dimension focuses on how a job is done to meet an individual's life needs. In the career dimension, individuals see their work to continue to develop. While on the calling dimension, work is seen as a container of soul calling influenced by numerous factors, such as social and cultural backgrounds, religion, and education.

Several studies related to work orientation have been done. A study in Mongolia showed that the dimension of calling is the greatest dimension of its contribution to determining the orientation of workers (Park et al., 2021). Furthermore, studies in North America show that workers who make their work a calling tend to have stronger loyalty and bond with their work (Mantler et al., 2022). In other studies, the career aspect became the most prominent dimension, as many found in workers in China (Lan et al., 2013). The socialization factor also plays a significant role in determining the individual's work orientation. One study found that the socialization factors derived from the father determined the child's work orientation as he grew up. That is, the child who tends to have a work orientation that is dominated by the job dimension is the result of the socialization of the father who has an orientation of work that is predominantly by the work dimension, as well as with the child with work orientations that are dominated by the career and calling dimensions tend to get socialization from a father that dominates the same work Orientation (Dekas & Baker, 2014).

In addition to the three dimensions of work orientation mentioned above, some studies also show that two other dimensions contribute to the individual's working orientation. In addition to the job, career, and calling dimensions, two other dimensions contributing to work orientation are social embeddedness and busyness (Willner et al., 2020) . Social embeddedness is defined as an individual's attachment within an organization or where they work. Busyness is defined as a mechanism or way by an individual to fill his or her working time and stay in busy conditions. One study showed differences in individual work orientation based on five dimensions. The study further found differences in work orientations between three countries, namely Italy, Israel, and Switzerland (Lipshits-Braziler et al., 2021). Additionally, the studies discovered that Italian and Israeli workers scored higher than Swiss workers on the three dimensions of job orientation (calling, social embedding, and career). The studies also discovered that the

calling factor was associated with higher levels of job satisfaction, career satisfaction, and work engagement among Israeli, Italian, and Swiss workers.

From the overview of several studies that have been done, most studies still use the concept of work orientation that focuses on either three or five aspects (job, career, calling, social embeddedness, and busyness) (Dekas & Baker, 2014; Lan et al., 2013; Lipshits-Braziler et al., 2021; Mantler et al., 2022; Park et al., 2021; Pitacho et al., 2019; Wei et al., 2021; Willner et al., 2020). However, there has been limited exploration of work orientation issues from the perspectives between both generations, Generation Y and Generation Z, especially on how each person give meaning to their job or work. In its development, a concept of work orientation developed by Watson (2012)sees work orientation as an inherent meaning in individual work and influences how individuals think and act. In contrast to the concept of work orientation that focuses on three or five dimensions, Watson focused on two aspects in looking at individual work orientations, namely employee input and employee reward. The employee input dimension refers to a condition that relates to the conditions of an individual to perform a job inherent in an individual. The employee input dimension consists of some indicators, namely physical effort, mental effort, initiative, responsibility, impairment, and compliance. In contrast, employee reward refers to aspects resulting from the dynamics in employee inputs. The Employee reward dimension has some indicators specifically money, job satisfaction, personal 'growth', social reward, security, power, status, and career potential. To the best of our knowledge, not many studies have used the Watson's concept to examine the concept of work orientation. Seeing the concept of work orientation from Watson's perspective becomes crucially important because it looks at the orientation of work on how individuals define their work based on what they give (input) and what they get from it. (reward). In summary, Watson concept used sociological lens to see how person give meaning to their work or job.

In contrast, the concept of work orientation, which is divided into three or five dimensions that were previously widely used, suggests that the meaning of work does not lie in what the worker gives and gets from his or her work but in how the workers perceive their meaning towards their job which influenced by many aspects. Moreover, few studies look at differences in work orientation between generations, in this case between Generation Y and Generation Z, especially in Startups. Thus, this study introduces novelty by comparing work orientation between Generation Y and Generation Z in Indonesia by Watson (2012). This study expected to have contribution both in theoretical and practical aspect. In terms of theoretical aspects, this research is expected to enrich studies in Sociology of industry and Sociology of work. In practical terms, this research is expected to assist Startup companies, particularly in Human Resources departments, in mapping their employees based on the characteristics of work orientation among Generation Y and Generation Z.

2. METHOD

This study uses a quantitative approach by adding in-depth interviews to describe the findings from the survey results. This quantitative approach tested the theory by correlating the variables in this study (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). The data collected is quantitative data using a survey data collection technique with a web-based survey (Gaiser & Schreiner, 2009). This questionnaire consists of four sections. First is 'inform concern' section, where respondents are asked to provide information about their concerns. Second is the 'profile respondents' section. The third section focuses on work orientation in the input dimension, while the last section pertains to work orientation in the reward dimension. This questionnaire is in the form of an online survey that uses Google Forms as the survey distribution medium. The online survey is distributed via email, social media and group chat messenger.

Based on the time dimension, this research is a cross-sectional study. Cross-sectional is research conducted at one specific time only. The sampling technique used is non-probability sampling with the convenience sampling technique (Neuman, 2013). The non-probability sampling technique has the consequence that the result of this research cannot be generalized to the population. The non-probability sampling technique can be used, but when generalizing, conclusions can only be drawn at the sample level and cannot be generalized to the population level. The number of respondents in this study is 130 respondents, so the findings of this study can only be generalized to these 130 respondents. Criteria for determining the Startup population in this study were all Startup workers who were born from 2012 to 1981. The Startup workers intended to be respondents in this study were those working in digital Startup companies in Indonesia.

After finishing the online survey process, it carried 130 respondents, consisting of 73 Generation Y Startup workers and 57 Generation Z Startup workers. Quantitative data collection was carried out from June to October 2022. Following data collection, the data was processed and analysed with IBM SPSS

Statistics 21 software using a T-test. The T-test is used to determine the difference in means between two populations or independent data groups. The conditions for using the T-test are normal data distribution, both groups being independent and unrelated, and the variables being numeric and categorical (with only two groups) (Nuryadi et al., 2017). The decision to use the T-test as a tool is because the result of homogeneity and normality tested. In the conclusion, using the T-test will reveal the difference of work orientation between Generation Y and Generation Z whether both generations are same or different work orientation.

After the completion of the survey result, we proceeded with in-depth interviews with several informants in December 2022 to gain a better understanding of the T-test results. The informants in this study are those who have filled out the survey or those who have not filled out the survey but have the appropriate background criteria. There were six informants in this in-depth interview process: three from Generation Y (one male, two females) and three from Generation Z (one male and two females).

The study has five hypotheses that are described below:

H1: There is a difference in work orientation for Generation Y and Generation Z workers in the Startup sector

H2: There are differences in work orientation among male Generation Y workers and male Generation Z workers in the Startup sector.

H3: There are differences in work orientation among female Generation Y workers and female Generation Z workers in the Startup sector.

H4: There are differences in the work orientation of Generation Y workers who are Muslim and Generation Z workers who are Muslim in the Startup sector.

H5: There are differences in work orientation among Generation Y workers with family-owned residences and Generation Z workers with family-owned residences in the Startup sector.

H6: There is a difference in work orientation between Generation Y workers who domicile in Jakarta and Generation Z workers who domicile in Jakarta in the Startup sector.

H7: There is a difference in work orientation between Generation Y workers who have offices in Jakarta and Generation Z workers who have offices in Jakarta in the Startup sector.

This research is expected to add to the study of Generation Y and Generation Z workers in Indonesia. In addition, this research is expected to add to the study of work orientation from a different perspective by using the concept of work orientation from Tony J. Watson.

Validity Test

The validity test was conducted on 130 respondents. The r value of the table for 130 respondents was 0.171, with the significant level being 5%. The note's value is that the value of r is greater than the value of r in the table. The results of the validity test per question item show that there are two question items whose calculated r value is smaller than 0.171, namely question number 1 and number 10.

Table 1. Reliability Test Result

Reliability	n	130
	Cronbach's Alpha	0.878
	N of Items	38
Homogenity	Levene Statistic	0.177
	df	1
	df2	128
	Sig.	0.676
Normality (Kolmogorov-Smirnov)	Statistic	0.780
	Df	130
	Sig.	0.051

Source: Calculation done by authors.

Reliability tests were conducted to determine the consistency of the questionnaires used in this study (Yusuf, 2016). Cronbach's Alpha value is 0.878. This value is close to 1, so the instrument used has high consistency. Next, homogeneity and normality tests are carried out to determine whether the T-test can be used in this study and what type of test could be used. The homogeneity test is carried out to ascertain whether the data comes from the same or homogeneous data group (Nuryadi et al., 2017). The homogeneity test results showed a result of 0.676. This value is greater than 0.05, so the data obtained is homogeneous. Meanwhile, normality tests are carried out to see the distribution of data normality (Nuryadi et al., 2017). The results of the normality test using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test show that if the significance value of

0.051 is greater than 0.05, then the scattered data is normal. Based on this normality test, the parametric T-test that can be used is the T-test because the data is unpaired, homogeneous, and normally distributed

3. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Respondent and Informant Characteristics

This study used questionnaires and interviews in the data collection process. While distributing questionnaires, this study managed to capture 130 respondents. In the in-depth interview process, six informants were successfully interviewed. The characteristics of respondents and informants in this study are presented in the Table 2.

Table 3. Socio-Demographic Characteristics of Research Subjects (n=130)

Characteristics	n	Percentage (%)
Generation		
Y	73	56.2
Z	57	43.8
Sex		
Male	48	37
Female	82	63
Religion		
Islam	109	83.8
Protestant	9	6.9
Catholic	5	3.8
Buddha	2	1.5
Not Choosing	5	3.8
Property Status		
Rent	24	18.5
Owner	21	16.2
Family ownership	85	65.3

Source: Calculation done by authors

The number of respondents from Generation Y and Generation Z is different. Generation Y respondents are higher than Generation Z respondents, namely 56.2% for Generation Y respondents and 43.8% for Generation Z respondents. Most respondents were Muslims, with 83.8%. Most of the respondents' property ownership status is family owned. Apart from that, 44% of respondents domicile in Jakarta. The rest respondents' domicile across several areas such as Bogor, Depok, Tangerang, South Tangerang, Gunung Kidul, Bandung, Cimahi, Malang, Cianjur, Tulungagung, Padang, Yogyakarta, Semarang, Tasikmalaya, South Kalimantan, Surabaya, Central Java, Probolinggo, Purwakarta, Pekan Baru, Nganjuk and Ngawi. For respondents' office locations, 48.5% of respondents have offices in Jakarta. The remaining office locations are Bogor, Depok, Tangerang, Bekasi, Bandung, Malang, Yogyakarta, Bali, East Kalimantan, West Karawang, and Work from Anywhere.

3.3 T-test of work orientation

The test used in this study is the T-test to test the working orientation of Generation Y and Generation Z. The decision to use the T-test is because the data obtained is eligible to perform the T-test. Moreover, the data is also normally distributed; the two generations in the study are unpaired, and the scale is considered an interval scale (Nuryadi et al., 2017). The Table 3 shows the T-test results of the T-test work orientation of Generation Y and Generation Z start-up workers:

Table 3. T-Test Result of Working Orientation of Generation Y and Generation Z

Number of Hypothesis	Work Orientation Generation Y and Generation Z (T-test)	Sig.	Description
1	Work Orientation	0.707	Similar
2	Male	0.451	Similar
3	Female	0.209	Similar
4	Islamic Religion	0.994	Similar
5	Property Status (Family ownership)	0.515	Similar
6	Domicile in Jakarta	0.172	Similar
7	Office in Jakarta	0.335	Similar

Source: Calculation done by authors.

H1: There is a difference in work orientation for Generation Y and Generation Z workers in the Startup sector

The number of respondents to the T-test of different work orientations from Generation Y and Generation Z was 130 respondents. Generation Y respondents were 73 or 56.2%, and Generation Z respondents were 57 or 43.8%. The T-test results show that there is no difference (0.707) in the work orientation of Generation Y and Generation Z workers in start-ups. Both generations interpret work in the same way, both in the input and reward dimensions. The results of interviews with several informants found a similarity between Generation Y and Generation Z in the input and reward dimension. From the input dimension, both generations work with flexible working hours. Moreover, both generations prefer to work on time and always try to complete their work according to the set time. Generation Y and Generation Z workers emphasize physical and mental effort indicators in the employee input dimension.

In terms of employee reward, both generations think that the appreciation given by the Company is not only salary but also other awards such as appreciation given by the Company, which can be in the form of giving an award as the best employee or verbal appreciation. In addition, other incentives such as health insurance, medical check-ups, and opportunities for them to develop their capacity by attending online courses. In terms of salary, both generations feel their salary still needs to be commensurate with what they have done. They consider that they have worked optimally, sometimes even doing work beyond their obligations, but there is no extra payment. A supportive and enjoyable work environment is also a reward for them. A good working environment makes them like their work. In the employee reward dimension, Generation Y and Generation Z workers look at indicators of social rewards obtained other than money. Apart from that, a good work environment is also a reward for both generations.

Both generations also work with more flexible working hours that are not rigid or do not follow the specified working hours. In other research, the application of flexible working time in Generation Y can increase work motivation and work engagement (Setiyani et al., 2019). Somewhat different from Generation Y, although flexible time is one of the aspects seen when working, it is not the main one. Generation Z emphasizes more on workload because this will affect their work-life balance (Kirchmayer & Fratričová, 2018).

H2: There are differences in work orientation among male Generation Y workers and male Generation Z workers in the Startup sector.

Furthermore, the T-test of work orientation in Generation Y and Generation Z was conducted on the group of male respondents from Generation Y and Generation Z. All 48 respondents were male, or 37% of the 130 respondents. For Generation Y respondents, the number of male respondents was 30 out of 73 respondents. Meanwhile, Generation Z male respondents accounted for 18 out of 57 respondents. The result of the T-test is that the male respondent groups of Generation Y and Generation Z have the same work orientation (0.451).

Generation Y and Generation Z male workers interpret work regarding employee reward dimensions. Both generations feel that by working, they can increase their abilities. In this case, Generation Y and Generation Z male workers interpret work more as personal 'growth,' indicating the employee reward dimension.

H3: There are differences in work orientation between female Generation Y workers and female Generation Z workers in the Startup sector.

There were 82 female respondents or 63% of the 130 respondents. The number of Generation Y female respondents was 43 out of 73 Generation Y respondents. Meanwhile, the number of female respondents from Generation Z was 39 out of 57 Generation Z respondents. The result of T-Test is that the female respondent groups of Generation Y and Generation Z have the same work orientation (0.209).

Generation Y and Generation Z female workers interpret work as a form of self-respect in the form of self-actualization, self-development, and self-empowerment. Thus, these two generations interpret work more as personal 'growth.' Personal 'growth' is included as an indicator of employee rewards. The similarities in the meaning of work in both groups of men and women in Generation Y and Generation Z interpret work as a form of self-development, self-actualization, and self-empowerment. In Generation Y, the view of work as a form of self-actualization affects employee performance (Janah et al., 2022). Meanwhile, Generation Z considers self-actualization as one of the behaviors of Generation Z in the job market in addition to achievement, identity, and work (Silinevica & Meirule, 2019).

H4: There are differences in the work orientation of Generation Y workers who are Muslim and Generation Z workers who are Muslim in the Startup sector.

The T-test was also conducted on the group of Muslim respondents in both generations. The selection of Muslim groups in Generation Y and Generation Z is because most respondents in this study (83.8%) are Muslim. The number of Muslim respondents in Generation Y is 62 out of 73. Meanwhile, the number of Generation Z respondents who are Muslim is 47 respondents out of 57 respondents. The results of the T-test on work orientation in the Muslim respondent group in Generation Y and Generation Z are the same (0.994).

The findings of research conducted by Rożnowski & Zarzycka (2020) explain that there is a relationship between religiosity and work. In women's work, religiosity is a source of motivation, while in male workers, a high level of religiosity will reduce work engagement. The findings presented by Roznoswski and Zarzycka shows a connection between religiosity and a person's work. This research looks at work and religiosity from different aspects, not at the relationship but at the differences between Generation Y and Generation Z, namely the work orientation between Generation Y and Generation Z. The work orientation between Generation Y and Generation Z on the indicator of religiosity is the same.

The study of the relationship between religion and work values has been done by German sociologist Max Weber through his work *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. The point that can be taken from the studies conducted by Weber related to religion and work values is that the value contained in religiosity will more or less affect a person in carrying out his economic actions, one of which is action at work (Freund, 1998; Ritzer, 2015). The findings of this study are interesting in that Generation Y and Generation Z separate work and religiosity values.

H5: There are differences in the work orientation of Generation Y workers with family-owned residence and Generation Z workers with family-owned residence in the Startup sector.

Respondents with family residence ownership status were 85 respondents or 65.4% of the 130 respondents. For Generation Y respondents, the number of respondents with family residence ownership status was 37 respondents out of 73 respondents. Meanwhile, the number of Generation Z respondents with family ownership status was 48 respondents out of 57 respondents. The result of T-test show that Generation Y and Generation Z have the same work orientation in the group of respondents with family-owned housing status (0.515). Both generations feel that living with their parents makes them work harder than before in order to buy their own house or residence. The view of Generation Y and Generation Z that interpret work, one of which is to meet the needs of housing, is a form of fulfilling life needs (to support life). This perspective is included in the job dimension in other work orientation concepts, where in this work orientation concept, there are three dimensions, namely job, career, and calling (Bellah et al., 1985; Park et al., 2021; Wrzesniewski et al., 1997).

H6: There is a difference in work orientation between Generation Y workers who domicile in Jakarta and Generation Z workers who domicile in Jakarta in the Startup sector.

Forty-four respondents, or 33.8% of the 130 respondents, lived in Jakarta. For Generation Y respondents, the number of respondents living in Jakarta is 27 respondents out of 73 respondents. Meanwhile, the number of Generation Z respondents who live in Jakarta is 17 respondents out of 57 Generation Z respondents. The results of the T-Test show that work orientation between Generation Y workers who live in Jakarta and Generation Z workers who domicile in Jakarta in the Startup sector is the same.

H7: There is a difference in work orientation between Generation Y workers who have offices in Jakarta and Generation Z workers who have offices in Jakarta in the Startup sector.

The number of respondents with offices in Jakarta was 63, or 48.5% of the 130 respondents. In Generation Y, the number of respondents with offices in Jakarta was 35 out of 73. Meanwhile, the number of Generation Z respondents who have offices in Jakarta is 28 respondents out of 57 respondents. The results of the T-test show that the work orientation between Generation Y workers who have offices in Jakarta and Generation Z workers who have offices in Jakarta is the same.

The location of the house and office in the same area is a consideration for those working, contributing to the meaning of work for both generations. Generation Y and Generation Z deliberately work in the same area where they live to make their access more accessible and save time. For these two generations, ease of mobility is considered when working. They feel this makes them work better.

Area mobility is an indicator for Generation Y and Generation Z workers when looking at jobs. Distance is also considered by workers to interpret their work. Calculating the distance between home and

office is also an input factor in looking at a worker's work orientation. Research conducted by Spies (2006) shows a positive and linear correlation between job satisfaction and travel distance between residence and office. This research shows a relationship between travel distance and a person's work. This research also indicates a connection between the distance between home and office and a person's work orientation. The findings in this research explain that reasons such as ease of access and time savings are why Generation Y and Generation Z choose to work in the same area.

Apart from the results of the T-Test and several findings obtained in the interview stage, Informants revealed several other interesting findings during the interview session. These workers consider the Startup work system flexible, and someone can do work outside their mandatory job. Communication with superiors is also accessible, space is opened to provide ideas, and workers are given freedom to do their work. This kind of organizational structure leads to an organizational structure in the form of a network where the boundaries within the structure are not too clear. An organizational structure like this will give workers the freedom to complete their work. For this reason, the type of network organization will influence work orientation on the employee input dimension of its workers.

4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The result of this study is that Generation Y and Generation Z workers in start-ups have the same work orientation. These two generations have similar characteristics at work, such as not procrastinating, giving appreciation or rewards at work, providing incentives other than salary, and flexibility in working time. Male Generation Y and Generation Z workers in start-ups have the same work orientation. Female Generation Y and Generation Z workers in start-ups have the same work orientation. Moreover, there are also character similarities between male and female workers in Generation Y and Generation Z, such as the meaning of work as a form of self-development, self-actualization, and self-empowerment. Generation Y and Generation Z start-up workers who are Muslims have the same work orientation. These two generations both separate work and religiosity. Generation Y and Generation Z start-up workers with family-owned housing status have the same work orientation. Both generations have the view that by working, they can fulfill their life needs, one of which is to fulfill their housing needs. Generation Y and Generation Z domiciled in Jakarta, have the same work orientation. Generation Y and Generation Z have offices in Jakarta and have the same work orientation. These two generations consider access and ease of work, so choosing a place to live and work location becomes essential. The limitation of this study lies in the use of non-probability sampling techniques, which prevent conclusions from being drawn at the population level but can only be generalized at the sample level. Therefore, the findings of this study research can only be generalized to the 130 respondents. Nevertheless, the results of this study can serve as a reference point to initiate future research on work orientation, Generation Y, and Generation Z in Indonesia. This research can also serve as a reference and consideration for Human Resources Department of Start-up companies to understand the phenomenon of work orientation among Generation Y and Generation Z employees. For future research on the topic of work orientation between Generation Y and Generation Z, it is recommended to use probability sampling techniques to generalize the conclusions at the population level. Additionally, qualitative research approaches can be employed to describe the factors influencing work orientation among Generation Y and Generation Z.

5. REFERENCES

Asian Development Bank. (2018). *Understanding the Digital Economy: What Is It and How Can It Transform Asia?* https://www.adb.org/news/events/understanding-digital-economy-what-it-and-how-can-it-transform-asia

Bellah, R. N., Madsen, R. P., Sullivan, W. M., Swidler, A., & Tipton, S. M. (1985). *Habits of the Heart: Individualism and Commitment in American Life*.

Carree Martin A. and Thurik, A. R. (2003). The Impact of Entrepreneurship on Economic Growth. In D. B. Acs Zoltan J. and Audretsch (Ed.), *Handbook of Entrepreneurship Research: An Interdisciplinary Survey and Introduction* (pp. 437–471). Springer US. https://doi.org/10.1007/0-387-24519-7_17

Carter, N. M., Gartner, W. B., & Reynolds, P. D. (1996). Exploring start-up event sequences. *Journal of Business Venturing*, *11*(3), 151–166. https://doi.org/10.1016/0883-9026(95)00129-8

Central Bureau of Statistics. (2021). *Hasil Sensus Penduduk 2020*. https://www.bps.go.id/pressrelease/2021/01/21/1854/hasil-sensus-penduduk-2020.html

Central Bureau of Statistics. (2022). *Analisa Profil Penduduk Indonesia.* https://www.bps.go.id/publication/2022/06/24/ea52f6a38d391a557c5f/analisis-profil-penduduk-indonesia.html

Cho, Y. (2009). Successful IT start-ups HRD practices: four cases in South Korea. *Human Resource Management International Digest*, *17*(5). https://doi.org/10.1108/hrmid.2009.04417ead.006

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. SAGE Publications.

Dekas, K. H., & Baker, W. E. (2014). *Adolescent socialization and the development of adult work orientations* (pp. 51–84). https://doi.org/10.1108/S0277-283320140000025003

Ehsan, Z.-A. (2021). Defining a Startup - A Critical Analysis. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3823361

Freeman, R. E., & Reed, D. L. (1983). Stockholders and Stakeholders: A New Perspective on Corporate Governance. *California Management Review*, *25*(3), 88–106. https://doi.org/10.2307/41165018

Freund, J. (1998). *The Sociology of Max Weber* (Issue v. 3). Routledge.

Fritsch, M., & Mueller, P. (2004). Effects of New Business Formation on Regional Development over Time. *Regional Studies*, *38*(8), 961–975. https://doi.org/10.1080/0034340042000280965

Gaiser, T. J., & Schreiner, A. E. (2009). *A Guide to Conducting Online Research*. SAGE Publications.

Gudgin, G. (1978). *Industrial Location Processes and Regional Employment Growth*. Saxon House.

Hernández, C., & González, D. (2017). Study of the Start-Up Ecosystem in Lima, Peru: Analysis of Interorganizational Networks. *Journal of Technology Management & Innovation*, *12*(1), 71–83. https://doi.org/10.4067/S0718-27242017000100008

Janah, S. R., Qamari, I. N., & Nuryakin. (2022). The mediating role of self-actualization in increasing millennial employee performance. *EUREKA: Social and Humanities*, *5*, 31–38. https://doi.org/10.21303/2504-5571.2022.002518

KataData. (2019). *Startup di Indonesia Banyak Didirikan Anak Muda Usia 25-38 Tahun*. https://katadata.co.id/ariayudhistira/infografik/5e9a51a52ebde/startup-di-indonesia-banyak-didirikan-anak-muda-usia-25-38-tahun

Keeble, D. (2022). *Industrial Location and Planning in the United Kingdom*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003306221

Kirchmayer, Z., & Fratričová, J. (2018, April). *What Motivates Generation Z at Work? Insights into Motivation Drivers of Business Students in Slovakia*.

Krejcí, M., Strielkowski, W., & Čabelková, I. (2015). Factors that influence the success of small and medium enterprises in ICT: a case study from the Czech Republic. *Verslas: Teorija Ir Praktika*, *16*(3), 304–315. https://doi.org/10.3846/btp.2015.521

Lan, G., Okechuku, C., Zhang, H., & Cao, J. (2013). Impact of Job Satisfaction and Personal Values on the Work Orientation of Chinese Accounting Practitioners. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *112*(4), 627–640. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-012-1562-5

Lipshits-Braziler, Y., Abessolo, M., Santilli, S., & Di Maggio, I. (2021). Work orientation questionnaire: measurement invariance and criterion validity among Swiss, Israeli, and Italian workers. *International Journal for Educational and Vocational Guidance*, *21*(1), 187–209. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10775-020-09436-1

Mantler, J., Campbell, B., & Dupré, K. E. (2022). Jobs, Careers, and Callings: Exploring Work Orientation at Mid-Career. *Journal of Career Development*, *49*(5), 1152–1167. https://doi.org/10.1177/08948453211022845

Neuman, W. L. (2013). *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. Pearson Education.

Nuryadi, N., Astuti, T. D., Sri Utami, E., & Budiantara, M. (2017). *Dasar-Dasar Statstk Penelitan*. Sibuku Media.

Park, J., Choi, Y., Chao, M. M., Beejinkhuu, U., & Sohn, Y. W. (2021). A Cultural Orientation Approach to Work Orientation: Mongolian Workers' Jobs, Careers, and Callings. *Journal of Career Development*, 089484532110408. https://doi.org/10.1177/08948453211040811

Pitacho, L. A., Palma, P., & Correia, P. (2019). Work orientation: Dimensionality and internal model. *Análise Psicológica*, *37*(4), 479–491. https://doi.org/10.14417/ap.1667

Yusuf, A. M. (2016). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif & Penelitian Gabungan*. Prenada Media.

Ries, E. (2011). *The Lean Startup: How Today's Entrepreneurs Use Continuous Innovation to Create Radically Successful Businesses*. Crown.

Ritzer, G. (2015). *Introduction to Sociology*. SAGE Publications.

Rożnowski, B., & Zarzycka, B. (2020). Centrality of Religiosity as a Predictor of Work Orientation Styles and Work Engagement: A Moderating Role of Gender. *Religions*, *11*(8), 387. https://doi.org/10.3390/rel11080387

Setiyani, A., Djumarno, D., Riyanto, S., & Nawangsari, L. Ch. (2019). THE EFFECT OF WORK ENVIRONMENT ON FLEXIBLE WORKING HOURS, EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT AND EMPLOYEE MOTIVATION.

International Review of Management and Marketing, *9*(3), 112–116. https://doi.org/10.32479/irmm.8114

Silinevica, I., & Meirule, L. (2019). GENERATION Z ENTERS INTO THE LATVIAN BUSINESS ENVIRONMENT. *Latgale National Economy Research*, *1*(11), 97. https://doi.org/10.17770/lner2019vol1.11.4317

Spies, M. (2006). Distance between home and workplace as a factor for job satisfaction in the North-West Russian oil industry. *Fennia - International Journal of Geography*, *184*(2), 133–149. https://fennia.journal.fi/article/view/3724

Steigertahl, L., & Mauer, R. (2019). *EU STARTUP MONITOR: 2018 Report*. http://startupmonitor.eu/EU-Startup-Monitor-2018-Report-WEB.pdf

Tapscott, D. (1996). *The Digital Economy: Promise and Peril in the Age of Networked Intelligence*. McGraw-Hill.

Watson, T. J. (2012). *Sociology, Work and Organisation*. Routledge.

Wei, S., He, Y., Zhou, W., Popp, J., & Oláh, J. (2021). Death Reflection and Employee Work Behavior in the COVID-19 New Normal Time: The Role of Duty Orientation and Work Orientation. *Sustainability*, *13*(20), 11174. https://doi.org/10.3390/su132011174

Willner, T., Lipshits-Braziler, Y., & Gati, I. (2020). Construction and Initial Validation of the Work Orientation Questionnaire. *Journal of Career Assessment*, *28*(1), 109–127. https://doi.org/10.1177/1069072719830293

Wrzesniewski, A., McCauley, C., Rozin, P., & Schwartz, B. (1997). Jobs, Careers, and Callings: People's Relations to Their Work. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *31*(1), 21–33. https://doi.org/10.1006/jrpe.1997.2162