

Gen Z Generation: Does Job Hopping Matter

Kholis Nur Arifin
Nina Fitriana*
Reny Yuniasanti

*Faculty of Psychology
Universitas Mercu Buana Yogyakarta*

¹Corresponding e-mail:[nina@mercubuana-yogya.ac.id]

The rise of Gen Z in the workplace has become a cause for concern in the last few years for organizations because of its characteristic of changing jobs frequently, a behaviour labeled as job hopping. Job hopping creates problems for organizations due to its strong relation with a detrimental higher turnover rate. Indonesia faces its challenge as Gen Z enters the world of work with domination. Qualitative research using a phenomenological approach was conducted to explore a comprehensive explanation of the job hopping phenomenon among Gen Z employees in Indonesia. Data was collected through in-depth interviews and observations with six (6) participants. Thematic analysis using the reflexive method utilizing NVivo12 Plus software resulting diverse but coherent reasons for job hopping, including motivational forces, personality characteristics, and social media influence. There are two main processes of job hopping behaviour, with four (4) types of movement cycles. Participants have a rather positive view and perception of job hopping and are experiencing more positive impacts, both career-wise and personal.

.

Keywords: career, Gen Z, job hopping, movement cycles

Gen Z refers to a group who was born between 1995-2012 (Codrington & Grant-Marshall, 2004; Oblinger & Oblinger, 2005; Onesto, 2022). Gen Z is known as the “digital generation” (Kronos Incorporated, 2019). Gen Z-ers are the first generation in the world that have never lived a world without the internet (Katz et al., 2021). Gen Z is also a ‘digital’ generation who doesn’t see barriers between the virtual and real world (Stillman & Stillman, 2017). It is because Gen Z has already known technology and has lived close to advanced gadgets since they were born, therefore affected by Gen Z characteristics and personality (Andrea et al., 2016; Wijoyo et al., 2020)

Stillman and Stillman (2017) explained that Gen Z enters the world of work with excitement and passion for future success. That makes sense because Gen Z has brilliant innovation and strong principles of financial stability that make Gen Z will continuously strive for success (Deloitte, 2022). Gen Z is also known as a very independent generation with so many accessible digital platforms such as YouTube to self-taught themselves on so many things (Stillman & Stillman, 2017)

The characteristics Gen Z possess shows that they are a unique generation with many extraordinary potential, specifically in digital innovation (Stillman & Stillman, 2017). The rise of Gen Z, therefore, should

be a beneficial addition to companies and organizations. However, Desai and Lele (2017) found that Gen Z shows a fast movement across organizations and is ready for sudden changes when Gen Z doesn't like the workplace. 35% of Gen Z will not tolerate if they are being forced to work when they don't feel so because Gen Z value workplace flexibility as essential (Kronos Incorporated, 2019).

Gen Z is a generation who performs the highest job movement than older generations, with a percentage as high as 134% higher than in 2019 and indicates the highest plan or hope to leave their job in less than 6 months and has the clearest job-hunting agenda than other generations (LinkedIn, 2022). Similarly, Hanina (2022) who collected survey data from 211 Gen Y & Gen Z respondents found that 30,4% respondents has changed jobs for at least twice and 29,1% respondents has changed jobs more than 3 times with the longest tenure of 6-12 months. The data shows that almost half of the Gen Y and Gen Z changed their jobs at least twice with a work duration of 6-12 months.

Interviews conducted online for the preliminary study with two Gen Z on October 5, 2022 and January 12, 2023, who live in Indonesia, found that each individual has voluntarily changed organizations/companies by at least four companies with the longest tenure of 2 years and the shortest tenure of 7 months in the first subject, and had moved by 5 companies with the longest tenure of 1 year in the second subject. The data supports evidence that changing jobs frequently is a phenomenon that often happens for Gen Z individuals in Indonesia, even in a very short tenure, that is under 1 year of working duration. Further, each of the individuals explained that the movements were intended, it is an effort to advance their career and none of the individuals perceived the behavior with a negative

perspective along with the positive impacts they currently receive.

This behavior of frequently changing jobs is known as job hopping (Lake et al., 2018). The phenomenon was first discussed by Ghiselli (1974) using the term 'hobo syndrome'. Yuliawan and Himam (2007) also have a different term, namely grasshopper in explaining the job hopping phenomenon. Philip (2017) explained there are three main elements of job hopping, that is the changes are rational, job changes are voluntary, and job changes has happened frequently. Lake et al. (2018) on the other hand revealed that there are two motives for job hopping, namely the escape motive and the improvement motive.

This job hopping phenomenon has emerged as a new norm for the younger generation and has been a global concern for many years Horn (2015) and is a serious problem because it leads to high turnover rates (Ghazali et al., 2018). High turnover rates are concerning because turnover has a strong effect on work performance, product quality, service, and company profitability (Belete, 2018). Furthermore, Haider et al. (2015) explained that organizations not only experience financial losses but also the motivation and productivity of other employees will also be greatly affected if the organization/company has a high turnover rate.

Job hopping is a tool to achieve career success (Yuliawan & Himam, 2007) such as self-fulfillment and work-life balance (Darokah & Malute, 2012). A person moves due to motivational factors, basic need factors, and supporting factors (Yuliawan et al., 2007). Meanwhile, Woo (2011) found that the characteristics of individuals who have a level of openness to experience are more likely to exhibit 'hobo syndrome' in individuals, while impulsivity is not associated with 'hobo' tendencies. Similarly, Saleem et al. (2016) added that there are two types of job hopping, the first type is related to the goal of creating new

experiences while the second type is related to the normative values of the younger generation who accept turnover as appropriate.

Krishnan (2012) revealed that job satisfaction is clearly related to employee intention to remain in a company on the job hopping phenomenon in India. Bansal (2014) also revealed that the job hopping phenomenon at various management levels in the IT and Telecom industry in North India is more common in the private sector than in the public sector. Steenackers & Guerry (2016) found that the frequency of job hopping will decrease as individuals age according to a study in Belgium.

In Indonesia, Gusvita et al. (2023) revealed that millennial employees have a moderate level of job hopping intention. Larasati and Aryanto (2019) revealed that there are intrinsic and extrinsic factors that influence individuals to do job hopping. Danar and Franksiska (2019) on the other hand found that professionalism has no effect on job hopping, but partially professionalism and job hopping have a positive effect on career development in hospitality, banking and cooperative employees in Salatiga City. Prihaningrum and Purba (2021) explains that career adaptability has a positive but insignificant effect and predicts job hopping intention by 0.002% in Generation Y workers.

Pramono and Tukiran (2021) found that there is a significant negative effect of perceptions of organizational support and psychological capital on turnover intention or job hopping behavior in millennial teachers. Similarly, Putri et al. (2022) also revealed a significant negative relationship between psychological capital and job hopping intention in millennial workers of PT.X. Meanwhile, Leovani (2022) found that job hopping has a significant impact on the career development of millennials in Palembang City.

Although this behavior is widely practiced by the younger generation, basically this job hopping behavior still has various stigmas such as disloyalty, impatience, short attention span, less productivity and high possibility of turnover (Fan et al., 2015; Tsui et al., 1997). In addition, an individual who does job hopping may also be doubted to be employed by the organization/company, have low job security, and never feel satisfied with work (Larasati & Aryanto, 2019).

The explanation of the previous studies available shows that the job hopping phenomenon appears to be closely related to the younger generation including Generation Z. On the other hand, the amount of literature and research on the job hopping phenomenon discussed specifically on Gen Z employees who belong to the younger generation entering the workforce is very limited. This is in line with Stillman and Stillman (2017) who stated that organizations still lack attention to the presence of Generation Z in the workplace because they have not yet realized the need for a new generation in the workplace.

The only academic publication related to the phenomenon of job hopping in Generation Z employees with the context of the research location closest to Indonesia is a study by Zahari and Puteh (2023) using quantitative methods which found that motivational factors such as salary and benefits, interpersonal relationships, working conditions, recognition, career advancement and achievement can only predict job hopping intentions by 28.3% of Gen Z workers in Malaysia, while the remaining 71.7% are other factors that can be explored using qualitative research through observation and interviews to get a richer and deeper explanation.

Meanwhile, based on data from the Indonesian Central Bureau of Statistics (BPS, 2023) the labor force population in

Indonesia is dominated by residents in the Gen Z group. This research then becomes important to add insights regarding job hopping issues on Gen Z employees, considering that the workforce in a country is included in human resources which are an integral part of the organizational system (Fachrurazi et al., 2021) and a source of human-derived strength that can be utilized by organizations (Dewi & Harjojo, 2019).

Thus, this research aims to explore the following research questions:

- a. Why do Gen Z employees job hopping?
- b. How do Gen Z employees do job hopping?
- c. How do Gen Z employees perceive job hopping?
- d. What are the impacts of job hopping received by Gen Z employees both for personal and career?

Therefore, with this research, it is expected that the research findings can complement the discussion on the issue of job hopping among Generation Z employees comprehensively with in-depth data from the experienter's perspective.

Method

Participants

This research took place in Yogyakarta from March 25th, 2023 to June 22nd, 2023. Three Gen Z employees are included in this research as main participants with an addition of three significant others as informants. Participants were selected using criterion sampling, with the criteria that they must be a Gen Z employee who often changes jobs voluntarily. The first significant other is a close friend who lives together in a rented room with an MT participant, while the second and third significant others are close friends from their university days to the present of TH and R participants.

Instruments

This research uses qualitative research methods with a phenomenological approach (Creswell, 2007) to address the research objectives, namely the exploration of the job hopping phenomenon in Gen Z employees. The phenomenological approach is used to reduce the individual experiences of Gen Z employees towards job hopping into a description that explains the universal essence of job hopping on Gen Z employees (Murdiyanto, 2020). The description will be presented based on the

results of in-depth interviews and observational interviews that was conducted in both online and offline settings. Interviews are semi-structured that have guidance and observation guides that have been professionally tested.

The data obtained were analyzed using reflexive thematic analysis techniques (Braun & Clarke, 2021) with the help of the qualitative data processing application, NVivo 12 Plus, to extract some of the participants' personal experiences into coherent universal themes. There are 7 iterative steps used in the analysis process in this research, namely: familiarization, coding, theme building, theme review, defining and naming themes, interpreting themes, and reporting. Reflexive thematic analysis emphasizes subjective interpretation and depth of data, not accuracy and objectivity (Byrne, 2022). This analysis technique was chosen based on the nature of the data, which is a narrative statement of the participants' unique life experiences. Data validity on the other hand is conducted out using triangulation techniques, member checks, and adequacy of references.

Results

Three respondents in this study were male and aged 25, 26 and 28 years. They work as a marketing manager of 2 people and marketing customer support. Three significant others from this study, 2 male and 1 female. Two people are close friends from college and 1 close friend is from the same boarding house.

The results revealed three main motivational drives that contribute to Gen Z employees' job hopping, namely: 1) affective motivational drive, 2) long-term goal and value motivational drive, and 3) need motivational drive. This research also reveals the drive of Gen Z employees, although not all of them, to be able to work beyond the city where they currently work, Yogyakarta. Gen Z employees perceive greater opportunities for self-development to be available beyond the city of

Yogyakarta. Participant MT, for example, considers that Jakarta provides opportunities to continuously learn new things compared to the current city, Yogyakarta, which has a very limited industrial.

Participant TH also mentioned that other cities such as Jakarta and Bandung are considered more capable of providing a decent life, in the sense that they have a higher minimum wage, and have a culture that is more suitable for him who likes entertainment and fashion.

The results of this study suggest that the process of job hopping among Gen Z employees may vary from one process to another. We synthesized various individual job hopping processes of Gen Z employees into 4 types of movement cycles as described in Table 1 as follows :

Table 1

Different Cycle Types of Job Hopping

Main Process Characteristic	Unplanned Type	Planned Type 1 (Active)	Planned Type 2 (Latent)	Planned Type 3 (Exploratory)
Job Hopping Intention	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Main Goals	No clear goals	Career advancement	Career advancement	Seeking experiences
Negative Affects History	Yes, dominant.	Unaffected	Yes, partially.	Yes, partially.
Movement Ideation	Reactive	Proactive	Reactive	Reactive
Coping Measures	Yes, short period	Conditional	No	Yes
New Opportunity Searching	No	Actively searching	Actively & Passively	Actively
New Opportunity Evaluation	No	Continuously	Only when new opportunity available	Only when new opportunity available
Voluntary Turnover Behavior	Automatic (Irrational)	Self-controlled (Rational)	Self-controlled & Automatic (Rational)	Automatic (Rational)

The research results show various impacts received by Gen Z employees in their career

by doing job hopping as shown in Table 2 as follows:

Table 2

Career Impacts

No	Universal Impacts	Theme of	Description
1	Skills and Development	Experience	Job hopping leads to job insights, CV building, experience in trying and learning new things.
2	Increased Better Jobs	Salary and	Job hopping allows for increased salaries, due to pay slips that can be used as bargaining power, as well as getting better jobs.
3	Developing Connections		Job hopping offers the opportunity to get to know and connect with individuals in various fields, which helps build a wide range of work connections.
4	Career Discovery		Job hopping helped discover a preferred field of work, and established a career choice.

Discussion

a. Three Main Motivational Drives

Affective motivational drive, long-term goal, and value motivational drive, and need motivational drive are the three main motivational drives that contribute to Gen Z employees' job hopping. In this research, we consider motivation as a cause, which although often hidden beneath behavior, is always present, controlling and directing human behavior (Bong et al., 2023). In this case, motivation is the cause, that encourages Gen Z employees to do job hopping, both explicitly conveyed and hidden in the narratives of Gen Z employees' experiences in job hopping recorded through interviews. Maertz and Griffeth, (2004) explain the causes of voluntary turnover as a causal process through a framework of eight motivational drives.

The descriptions of affective drives and long-term goal and value drives represent similar characteristics and qualities to the descriptions of affective drives and calculative drives in Maertz & Griffeth's (2004) study. However, there is a new motivational drive found in this study, which cannot be identified in the description of the eight motivational drives for job hopping described by Maertz & Griffeth (2004), namely the need drive.

The need drive found in this study explains one of the causes of Gen Z employees job hopping. This description explains that job hopping behavior in Gen Z employees is motivated by an urge to fulfill needs in the form of self-development and career acceleration at the beginning of a career to build career "provisions" by gathering work experiences through job hopping.

This description was obtained based on the statements of participants who still did not get consistency and clarity of long-term career goals at the beginning of their careers as reported by participants in interviews. Kulcsár et al. (2020) stated that at one point in an individual's life, a person will experience the career decision-making process. This career decision-making on the other hand is often seen as the most important decision a person will make (Bimrose & Mulvey, 2015; Gati & Tal, 2008).

The results of this study are in line with the stages of career development from Super (cited in Nurillah, 2017) which states that at the age of 25 to 44 years, individuals are in the formation stage of career development. This connection with one's experience when starting work, during this period the individual tries by trial and error to prove whether the choices and work decisions made during the exploration period are correct or not. Part of this time is the try-out period. Individuals may accept a job with the certainty that they will change jobs if they feel unsuitable. If it turns out that the individual has a positive experience or benefit from a job, his choice becomes stable, and he will include the choice of work as an aspect of his self-concept and the best opportunity to get job satisfaction.

However, with the rapid development of technology and modern advances in the 21st century, such as the increasing need for people working in the fields of science, technology, engineering and mathematics (Rottinghaus, Falk, & Jeong Park, 2018), and the possibility of many jobs being roboticized (Hakanen & Baker, 2017), it affects individuals in making career decisions, including Gen

Z employees who live closely with technology.

Then systemically, the rapid technological advancement also creates a gap between the experience and knowledge of the world of work during the college period and the demands of the real world of work. As Setiawan et al. (2019) have pointed out, there is a gap between the supply of human resources with minimal job availability and job requirements that do not match the quality of graduates experienced by higher education graduates. Thus, it creates its own challenges in the journey of a young person starting a career, adding to the anxiety and indecisiveness in determining a career.

The other side in seeing the cause of this career indecision problem is that it is possible for Gen Z employees who are still in their early adulthood and want to find a job that suits their potential, but because participants have not found their potential, confusion arises in finding a career that suits their potential (Novitasari & Yuliawati, 2019).

In the end, the career uncertainty faced by Gen Z employees, both consciously and unconsciously, motivates Gen Z employees to start exploring career paths independently, with the resources and opportunities they have, directing Gen Z employees to job hopping behavior, because job hopping behavior is considered as a tool in gathering the experiences and knowledge needed to start a career effectively.

This research also reveals the drive of Gen Z employees, although not all of them, to be able to work beyond the city where they currently work, Yogyakarta. Gen Z employees perceive greater opportunities for self-development to be

available beyond the city of Yogyakarta. Participant MT, for example, considers that Jakarta provides opportunities to continuously learn new things compared to the current city, Yogyakarta, which has a very limited industrial.

Participant TH also mentioned that other cities such as Jakarta and Bandung are considered more capable of providing a decent life, in the sense that they have a higher minimum wage, and have a culture that is more suitable for him who likes entertainment and fashion. Getting more wages can increase productivity so that it contributes to good work results and economic development (Carr et al., 2019).

Affective drive, further described by Maertz and Griffeth, (2004) as a hedonistic approach-avoidance mechanism, is an emotional response that causes psychological affect in the form of discomfort that encourages a person to leave the company. Similarly, in this study, affective drive is represented as negative emotions that arise at work such as discomfort and envy, as a result of negative emotional responses to factors in work and organizations, such as the environment, corporate culture and coworkers, which encourage Gen Z employees to move between jobs. This affective drive is also similar to the escape motive description by Lake et al. (2018), which reflects the quality of impulsivity as a negative emotional response to escape an unfavorable work environment immediately, or the 'hobo' in Ghiselli's (1974) perspective.

The third motivational drive, which is long-term goals and values in this study, represents the calculative drive by Maertz and Griffeth (2004) and the enhancement motive by Lake et al. This

motivational drive explains the reasons for Gen Z employees' job hopping as behavior driven by the urge to achieve sustainable long-term goals and values congruence, which in this study are represented as the objectives of career and salary advancement, high prestige job titles, creating their own companies, collecting funds, focusing on college, creating career shortcuts, saving money, surviving, learning new things, and seeking work-life balance.

The reasons for the goals to be achieved by job hopping on Gen Z employees are in accordance with the findings of Perdhana (2020) who explained the reasons for job hopping on employees in Indonesia are based on the objectives of increasing salaries, idealism and values, connections, as well as knowledge and expertise, and family factors. However, the reasons derived from family factors did not emerge at all in this study. This may be because Gen Z employees are not yet having families and the subjects in the study were Millennials.

The motivational drive to increase salary is also generally consistent with Kruse (2014) who stated that the desire to make more money is one of the reasons for job hopping. Long-term goals can be maintained and efforts can be directed to achieve goals due to rational calculations. Gen Z employees who job hop for this reason are usually already planning how job hopping will be utilized to support the achievement of long-term goals effectively.

b. Personality Characteristics and Social Media Influence

Naresh and Rathnam (2015) and Putri et al. (2022) in their studies believe that job hopping behavior is influenced by psychological factors. An individual's

personality is one of the determinants of job hopping behavior, in which people with an openness to new experiences have long been believed to have a higher tendency to display job hopping behavior (Woo, 2011). The results in this study show the consistency of previous research related to the influence of personality on job hopping behavior, that in the context of this study, personality characteristics that are enthusiastic about new things and experiences, averse to rules, and have multiple interests also contribute to job hopping behavior.

It is reasonable because by job hopping Gen Z employees can be exposed to many experiences and new things to continue to face, allowing Gen Z employees to explore jobs in various fields and companies. As revealed by Yuliawan and Himam (2007) that job hoppers have characteristics of always wanting to learn and face challenges because that way job hoppers can develop knowledge and abilities.

Social media influence, on the other hand, is a strong factor in the context of job hopping among Gen Z employees. As the first global generation to be born and live with internet technology in almost every aspect of Gen Z employees' lives (Karacsony, 2019), an important key in understanding and explaining why Gen Z does what it does and thinks what it thinks is to pay attention to how profound new digital technologies are stretching how humans are able to interact, in particular, communicate with others (Katz et al., 2021).

The widespread use of the internet makes it easier for a person to access information about a person or company (Slovenky & Ross, 2012). MT's statement in the interview explained how LinkedIn does not only function as a tool

to communicate with coworkers or connections, but also provides a lot of information about companies, and job vacancies available, seeing the compatibility of the skills possessed with the needs of the company, and ultimately provides a sense of encouragement to look for opportunities to improve their careers. This shows that the new technology, especially LinkedIn, is transforming the way Gen Z employees interact and communicate not only with their fellow workers but also with their employers, transcending traditional ways, as predicted by Katz et al. (2021) in their book "Gen Z, Explained".

In addition to the expanding forms of interaction and communication in the digital era, the use of social media is also a platform for expressing oneself online, for example, if one gets an achievement, a job promotion, a vacation to a beautiful place, and other "cool" experiences, which are believed to create a more favorable image of oneself (Mehdizadeh, 2010). However, these online self-representations often do not match reality as people can freely select and construct positive self-representations (Zhao, et al., 2008). When other users see this, they may spontaneously compare their own situation with what is posted on social media, if a person perceives that they are lacking in comparison, they may experience jealousy or have a negative self-evaluation.

For example, participant MT expressed his envious feelings when he viewed the posts of his friends who received promotions or new higher positions, because he thought he was more capable and deserved to get a similar position. It makes sense, because according to Stillman and Stillman (2017) generation Z has a high level of FOMO (Fear of

Missing Out). However, the type of envy that participant MT expressed is a type of benign envy (van de Ven, et al., 2009), because the realization of the arising inferior feelings, rather than expecting bad things to happen to others, instead inspires a motivation to further improve themselves (Graf, 2010). This is also in line with Generation Z's highly ambitious and competitive characteristics (Stillman & Stillman, 2017).

This effort to self-improve is manifested in the continuous search for new job opportunities in order to fill what is lacking, namely a high-profile job. It also seems that LinkedIn not only exposes 'fake' positive representations of other users' lives that cause jealousy, but also provides a hopeful outlook with many new opportunities from companies, recruiters, and HR.

In a study by Karácsony et al. (2020), they revealed that the habit of using social media has shifted the traditional way of job-searching behavior among the younger generation in this digital era by utilizing social media technology, and LinkedIn, in this case, one of the media that has features for performing online job searches through social media.

This is related to the increasing use of LinkedIn among recruiters and HR to find potential candidates because it can help them easily find suitable users with a single click and a keyword search (Fertig, 2013), and companies are increasingly using social networks to recruit potential talent (Stoughton, et al., 2013). This is a major change, as in the past it was challenging for companies to reach workers who were not actively seeking employment (Davison, et al., 2016). As stated by participants MT and AR, many new opportunities are

available and sprung up on LinkedIn. So that roughly 80% of new job opportunities are obtained from LinkedIn, as stated by participant MT.

In looking at the relationship between social media and Gen Z employees, we call it both the 'cause' and the 'cure'. Social media, especially LinkedIn, creates a space for perceptions of inadequacy that trigger the search for new opportunities (vacancies and job offers) and perceptions of hope, namely the new opportunities themselves (vacancies and job offers), to be present in one place simultaneously, encouraging changes in the behavior of Gen Z employees, in the context of this research, as actively seeking and changing jobs and companies, namely job hopping.

c. How do Gen Z Employees do Job Hopping?

d. Intentional and Non-Intentional Job Hopping

This research shows that job hopping as a behavior does not always involve intentions, or strategies to achieve certain goals, but also as a behavior that is formed by itself from voluntary turnover behavior that is sustained, even though frequent voluntary turnover does not involve a clear intention at the beginning.

This implies that the results of the study presented job hopping as two separate forms of behavior, namely unplanned job hopping (non-intentional), and planned job hopping (intentional). The discussion of job hopping often overlaps with voluntary turnover, the evidence of this research explains the difference between the dimensions of job hopping and voluntary turnover. Job hopping

behavior does not necessarily formed from the intention of job hopping itself, but can also be formed from the intention of turnover that is sustained, creating a cycle of voluntary turnover, and ultimately forming job hopping behavior.

As explained by Participant TH, the job hopping experience was not something that was deliberately and initially intended, in the sense that Participant TH never planned to change jobs frequently and repeatedly, and did not have a specific goal to be achieved by changing jobs frequently. It's just that there are factors at work that can foster frequent job-hopping behavior, such as psychological factor that is prone to being pressured and has many interests. These factors make it possible for TH to change jobs frequently, even without a specific long-term goal to be achieved by job hopping.

On the other hand, participant MT and participant AR explained that job hopping is a behavior that is acknowledged, preplanned, and believed to help achieve the goals they want to achieve. In this explanation, job hopping behavior is intentional behavior, because the actions taken are controlled by intentions in the form of mental representations of specific goals to be achieved (Gómez, 2020). Frequent job hopping, for MT and AR participants, is a strategic effort that is mobilized to achieve these specific goals, existing and emerging from the beginning of work.

Although job hopping can only be formed if there is a repeated voluntary turnover, and every voluntary move can be asserted as an intentional behavior because the process before resigning to finally leaving or switching organizations is directed by intention, however, one voluntary turnover behavior cannot account for job hopping

behavior, as well as the intentionality aspect in voluntary turnover does not necessarily make job hopping an intentional behavior as described in the research results.

Therefore, we concluded an argument based on the research results and theoretical support above, that job hopping behavior can be formed regardless of the presence or absence of job hopping intentions in Gen Z employees. In this sense, the occurrence of job hopping behavior can be formed through the intention of job hopping itself at first, or through voluntary turnover behavior that is preserved and occurs repeatedly with habituation which then accumulates into a job hopping behavior even though there is no clear intention of job hopping behavior at first.

4 Types of Movement Cycles

Based on these results, there are 4 main types of job hopping behavior. The first type, the unplanned type, is more in line with the 'hobo' type, which is described as switching job behavior without rational motives (Ghiselli, 1974; Khatri et al., 2001) and does not match the job hopping explained by Philip (2017) that job hopping is a fully rational behavior.

The next two types, namely active and latent types are more in line with the types of job hopping revealed by Philip (2017), Naresh & Rathnam (2015), Griffeth & Hom (2004) and Schmitt et al. (1984) that the job hopping behavior is based on rational motives to improve careers, and involves a process of evaluating which jobs are more profitable (Schmitt et al., 1984). However, in this study, the advancement type is differentiated based on its process characteristics. For the active type, the

job movements behavior is done proactively, i.e., the job movement occurs on the basis of a planned strategy. Whereas in the latent type, the job movement behavior is carried out reactively, which is a reaction to negative effects from work and organizational factors.

The last type, namely the exploratory type, is in accordance with the type of job hopping revealed by Saleem et al. (2016) which explains that job hopping is carried out based on the desire to explore new experiences. Furthermore, this study found a key process that has not been stated in previous studies, namely the coping measures process. In this process, Gen Z employees will try to make efforts and strategies to be able to remain in the organization/company when they experience dissatisfaction, rather than automatically leaving.

This study, therefore, found that Gen Z employees not only look for new opportunities, evaluate these new opportunities and leave to advance their careers or seek new experiences but also carry out strategies to be able to stay in the organization/job in some types of movements. Gen Z employees, typically, will only leave if the coping strategies are neither optimal nor effective in addressing the problems they face. In addition, this study notes that job hopping is performed not only at the beginning of a career but throughout their career, as a career path chosen by Gen Z employees.

2. How do Gen Z Employees perceive Job Hopping/Job Hoppers?

a. Perception towards Job Hoppers

Gen Z employees perceive job hoppers from two points of view. Gen Z employees do not always see job hoppers in a positive or negative light, it depends on the job hoppers' motives for job hopping in the first place.

1) Negative Perceptions

In general, Gen Z employees consider job hopping that is done without a plan and jumps because they only seek a sense of comfort without any positive impact as an immature job hopping behavior and a waste of time.

Movements for the purpose of merely seeking a sense of comfort without any clear career advancement or development goals are in accordance with the explanation of job hopping with escape motives according to Lake et al. (2018) which resonates with impulsivity and represents the description of job hopping as 'hobo syndrome' described by Ghiselli (1974).

It makes sense that Gen Z employees perceive job hoppers who job hop aimlessly and merely seek personal comfort with no development and self-improvement more negatively, given the various stigmas that exist.

2) Positive Perceptions

Furthermore, job hopping that is done with specific goals and strategies is initially considered as positive behavior and visionary, in addition, participant MT explained that employees, especially peer generations, are looking for more

than just money, participant AR further explained that people who job hop are people who have confidence in their abilities.

Based on the results of the study, job hoppers who job hopped based on clear goals for career development and advancement were viewed more positively by Gen Z employees. These job hoppers with clear goals are more in line with the explanation of job hopping with an advancement motive (Lake et al., 2018) and represent individuals with a protean or boundaryless career orientation (Defillippi & Arthur, 1994) with more positive characteristic resonances such as proactivity.

Thus, it makes sense that Gen Z employees perceive job hoppers who are doing job hopping with a clear strategy and goal more positively, given their inherent positive characteristics. However, even though there are two sides of viewpoints in perceiving job hoppers, Gen Z employees based on the results of the study based on the number of codings revealed that Gen Z employees tend to perceive job hoppers much more positively.

b. Perception towards Job Hopping as a Behavior

The research results show that all Gen Z employees consider the phenomenon or experience related to job hopping as quite positive. For Gen Z employees, the job hopping phenomenon is a common occurrence, especially in the Gen Z employee environment. Job hopping according to Gen Z employees should not be something that has a negative impact. On the contrary, one participant said that the job hopping experience is what shaped him today. Another participant said that job hopping helps career advancement, especially at the

beginning of a career, by gaining work experiences in several companies as a 'stepping stone'.

Loyalty is not something that Gen Z employees give for free but rather conditional. As stated by participant AR he will refuse to be loyal to a company or organization that is unable to provide a job with a healthy environment, both from the human factor and the job itself. Participant AR also emphasized that job hopping is a legitimate right for employees, as long as they do it without violating the rules, such as employment contracts and SOPs.

Job hopping is also an important process in the development of Gen Z employees' careers and selves, whereas if Gen Z employees had never done job hopping, their selves and careers would not be what they are now. This finding is similar to Perdhana et al. (2020) who found that job hopping is an important part of a person's career, because when an individual moves to a new place of work, knowledge and skills will be increasingly well developed.

Based on that explanation, it seems that Gen Z employees are more aware and selective in being loyal to the company. There are certain conditions that must be met so that Gen Z employees are able to be loyal to the company or organization where they work. Furthermore, in doing job hopping, a Gen Z employee is also not just searching and changing jobs but also taking into account the regulations and rules for both Gen Z employees as individuals and organizations. Based on the results of the study, we conclude that the job hopping phenomenon is perceived as a 'new pathway in a career'.

This preference for new career pathways and systems arising from the transition from linear, traditional career patterns to

nonlinear, multidirectional career patterns in Gen Z employees can be explained as a protean or boundaryless career system as a reflection of the new career system, with a more ambiguous employee-organization relationship (Granrose & Baccili, 2006).

Protean careers are described as individuals taking control of career management and development, individuals who are able to organize and craft knowledge, skills, and abilities to meet the ever-changing needs of the world of work, in line with individual self-fulfillment needs (Hall, 1996). Boundaryless career on the other hand is described by Arthur and Rousseau (1996) as career opportunities beyond the boundaries of a single employer/organization. An individual with a boundaryless career is more independent and not dependent on the rules of traditional organizational structures.

The positive attitude towards job hoppers and job hopping is probably due to the shifting norms in the new generation, as explained by Saleem et al. (2016) who explained job hopping as a collective norm. Horn (2015) further explained that job hopping is a new norm emerging in all younger generations entering the workforce, because Gen Z is not just looking for a high salary, but one of Gen Z's biggest aspirations is to get a dream job within 10 years.

Therefore, it can be concluded that despite its negative connotations, job hopping as a new way that offers the benefits of career "shortcuts" and reflects the protean and boundaryless career orientation among Gen Z employees, may shift the preference of traditional career norms that view career as a linear progression of responsibilities within a

single organization with a specific industry (Hall, 1976; Schein, 1978) that are closely associated with bureaucracy, hierarchy, control and external definitions of success (Hall, 1976; Kanter, 1989; Van Maanen & Barley, 1984), so that Gen Z employees' attitudes towards job hoppers and job hopping in general are found to be more positive.

3. What are the Impacts of Job Hopping Received by Gen Z Employees Both for Personal and Career?

a. Career Impacts

From all the career impacts expressed by Gen Z employees, none of them mentioned negative impacts, instead job hopping promotes career development for Gen Z employees. This finding is also supported by Leovani (2022) who revealed in his research that there is a significant effect of job hopping on career development in the millennial generation in Palembang.

This research reveals the impact of work connections that develop and are maintained to this day. This is possible because every time a job movement is made, Gen Z employees take efforts to maintain relationships with previous coworkers, so it is not uncommon for job offers to land from previous coworkers. This finding is similar to Perdhana et al. (2020) which in their research revealed the impact of increased work connections on participants who did job hopping.

Career discovery as a result of working experience in various fields and or industries also appears as a career impact in the job hopping experience of Gen Z employees. It is possible because through job hopping, Gen Z employees

may explore more fields of work so that Gen Z employees can better recognize jobs that match their interests and skills.

In addition, in this study, Gen Z employees also reported the impact of improved skill specialties and experience as well as getting increased salaries and better jobs. The statement reveals that the work and salary obtained, in general, always experience an increase for the better, which is also supported by the findings in the study by Fan et al. (2015), Philip (2017), Larasati and Aryanto (2019), and Danar and Franksiska, (2019).

b. Personal Impacts

Previous research suggests that career adaptability is a factor that can predict job hopping (Prihaningrum & Purba, 2021). This is due to career adaptability being utilized as a tool for employees to perform career mobility (Ito & Brotheridge, 2005), facilitating career development and helping the process of adapting to responsibilities (Haibo et al., 2018). However, Prihaningrum and Purba (2021) research results suggest that career adaptability has no effect on job hopping intentions.

In this study, based on the results obtained, adaptability emerged as an impact of job hopping, not as a predictor. Participants reported that their experiences in various fields of work, and various companies with various people and cultures made them more adaptable to facing changes and challenges in the work environment. This finding makes sense and is in line with Savickas & Porfeli (2012) who state that an individual needs to continuously gain insight into one's own characteristics and the complexity of the work environment through various personal experiences. Job hopping, on

the other hand, is one of the strategies that can be utilized to continuously gain a variety of personal experiences, especially in work.

In addition, Gen Z employee reported that they personally experienced increased insight and a broader perspective at work as a result of their job hopping behavior. This is makes sense, because by job hopping a person indirectly conducts career exploration, while exploration plays a role in insight development (Hartung et al., 2008; Schmitt-Wilson & Welsh, 2012; Schultheiss, et al., 2005) and specifically career exploration has an impact on perceptions of job knowledge and actual job knowledge (Ferrari et al., 2015) and is related to the amount of career information and career decision self-efficacy (Cheung & Arnold, 2014).

Conclusion

Gen Z employees' career commitments and attachments are more directed to themselves, not to the organization. Career pathways are also more self-determined and self-managed by individual Gen Z employees, reflecting the norms of nonlinear/multidirectional career systems, namely protean careers and the boundaryless career. Gen Z employees do job hopping because of affective motivation, need motivation, long-term goals and values, having personality characteristics such as liking new things and having many interests, and the influence of social media as a result of the rapid development of internet technology. Job hopping in Gen Z Employees was found to be an intentional and non-intentional behavior with 4 types of movement cycles based on the main motives and processes. Participants viewed job hopping and job hoppers in a rather positive and supportive light. This finding shows a

shift in traditional career norms in young generations entering the workforce, that they not only have linear career orientations and attitudes but also nonlinear/multidirectional career patterns by job hopping. Meanwhile, participants did not report any negative impacts received

References

- Andrea, B., Gabriella, H. C., & Tímea, J. (2016). Y and Z Generations at Workplaces. *Journal of Competitiveness*, 8(3), 90–106. <https://doi.org/10.7441/joc.2016.03.06>
- Bong, M., Reeve, J., & Kim, S.-I. (2023). *Motivation Science*. Oxford University Press, Incorporated. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780197662359.001.0001>
- BPS. (2023). *Statistik Indonesia 2023*. Badan Pusat Statistik.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2021). *Thematic Analysis: A Practical Guide*. SAGE Publications.
- Byrne, D. A worked example of Braun and Clarke's approach to reflexive thematic analysis. *Qual Quant* 56, 1391–1412 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-021-01182-y>
- Cheung, R., & Arnold, J. (2014). The Impact of Career Exploration on Career Development among Hong Kong Chinese University Students. *Journal of College Student Development*, 55(7), 732–748. <https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2014.0067>
- Codrington, G., & Grant-Marshall, S. (2004). *Mind the Gap*. Penguin Books.

- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing among Five Approaches* (2nd Edition). SAGE Publication.
- Danar, R. P., & Franksiska, R. (2019). Job Hopping sebagai Intervening pada Pengaruh Profesionalisme Terhadap Perkembangan Karir. *Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan dan Pembelajaran*, 3(3).
- Darokah, M., & Malute, D. (2012). The Meaning of Career Success among Job-Hopper in The Boundaryless Career (Phenomenological Research). Dalam *Journal of Educational, Health and Community Psychology* (Vol. 1, No. 1).
- Davison, H.K., Bing, M.N., Kluemper, D.H., Roth, P.L. (2016). Social Media as a Personnel Selection and Hiring Resource: Reservations and Recommendations. In: Landers, R., Schmidt, G. (eds) *Social Media in Employee Selection and Recruitment*. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-29989-1_2
- Defillippi, R. J., & Arthur, M. B. (1994). Special Issue: The Boundaryless Career. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* (Vol. 15, No. 4).
- Deloitte. (2017). *The 2017 Deloitte Millennial Survey Apprehensive millennials: seeking stability and opportunities in an uncertain world*. <http://millennialbranding.com/2014/2015-millennial-majority-workforce-study/>
- Deloitte. (2022). *Striving for Balance, Advocating for Change: The Deloitte Global 2022 Gen Z & Millennial Survey*.
- Desai, S. P., & Lele, V. (2017). Correlating Internet, Social Networks and Workplace – a Case of Generation Z Students. *Journal of Commerce and Management Thought*, 8(4), 802. <https://doi.org/10.5958/0976-478X.2017.00050.7>
- Dewi, D. P., & Harjoyo. (2019). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia* (E. Junaedi, Ed.). UNPAM Press. www.unpam.ac.id
- Evans, J. St. B. T., & Over, D. E. (2013). *Rationality and Reasoning*. Psychology Press. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203027677>
- Fachrurazi, Rinaldi, K., Jenita, Purnomo, Y. J., Harto, B., & Dwijayanti, A. (2021). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia (Teori dan Konsep)*. Yayasan Cendikia Mulia Mandiri.
- Fan, X., De Varo, J., & Devaro, J. (2015). *Does Job Hopping Help or Hinder Careers? The Signaling Role of Work History*. www.cepar.edu.au
- Ferrari, L., Ginevra, M. C., Santilli, S., Nota, L., Sgaramella, T. M., & Soresi, S. (2015). Career exploration and occupational knowledge in Italian children. *International Journal for Educational and Vocational Guidance*, 15(2), 113–130. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10775-015-9299-1>
- Gati, I., Tal, S. (2008). Decision-Making Models and Career Guidance. In: Athanasou, J.A., Van Esbroeck, R. *International Handbook of Career Guidance*. Springer, Dordrecht. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-6230-8_8
- Garner, B. A., & Black, H. C. (2009). *Black's law dictionary*. 9th ed. St. Paul, MN, West.
- Ghiselli, E. E. (1974). Some Perspectives for Industrial Psychology. *American*

- Psychologist*, 29(2), 80–87.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/h0036077>
- Gómez, J.-C. (2020). Intentionality. Dalam *Encyclopedia of Animal Cognition and Behavior* (hlm. 1–9). Springer International Publishing.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-47829-6_1678-1
- Graf, L. (2010). Conceptualizing Envy for Business Research. *Advances In Business-Related Scientific Research*, 1(2), pp. 129-164.
- Griffeth, R. W., & Hom, P. (2004). *Innovative Theory and Empirical Research on Employee Turnover*.
- Gusvita, S., Gusrini, V., Pohan, R., & Hadiyani, S. (2023). Job Hopping Intention On Millennial Employees. *International Journal of Progressive Sciences and Technologies (IJPSAT)*, 36(2), 172–176.
- Haibo, Y., Xiaoyu, G., Xiaoming, Z., & Zhijin, H. (2018). Career Adaptability With or Without Career Identity: How Career Adaptability Leads to Organizational Success and Individual Career Success? *Journal of Career Assessment*, 26(4), 717–731.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1069072717727454>
- Hall, A. A., Morgan, B., & Redelinguys, K. (2022). The relationship between job-hopping motives and congruence. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 48.
<https://doi.org/10.4102/sajip.v48i0.1938>
- Hanina, Tyas. (2022). [Infografis] Fenomena Job Hopping Kaum Millennials. Masih Ada Stigma?. IDN Times.
<https://www.idntimes.com/life/car>
- eer/tyas-hanina-1/fenomena-job-hopping-bagi-kaum-millennials
- Hartung, P. J., Porfeli, E. J., & Vondracek, F. W. (2008). *Career Adaptability in Childhood*. Wiley.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-0045.2008.tb00166.x>
- Hasibuan, M. S. P. (2005). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia* (Revisi). Bumi Aksara.
- Hollingworth, P. (2016). *The Light and Fast Organisation: A New Way of Dealing with Uncertainty*. John Wiley & Sons Australia.
- Horn, D. (2015). *Job-Hopping: The New Norm*. Whitepapers Corporate.
https://cdn2.hubspot.net/hubfs/368586/Whitepapers_Corporate/Job-Hopping_The_New_Norm_08.2015/Job-Hopping_Whitepaper_07.2015.pdf
- Ito, J. K., & Brotheridge, C. M. (2005). Does supporting employees' career adaptability lead to commitment turnover, or both? *Human Resource Management*, 44(1), 5–19.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.20037>
- Iverson, R. D., & Deery, M. (1997). Turnover culture in the hospitality industry. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 7(4), 71–82.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/J.1748-8583.1997.TB00290.X>
- Karácsony, P., Izsák, T., & Vasa, L. (2020). Attitudes of Z Generation to job Searching Through Social Media. *Interdisciplinary Approach to Economics and Sociology*, 13(4), 227–240.
<https://doi.org/doi:10.14254/2071-789X.2020/13-4/14>
- Katz, R., Ogilvie, S., Shaw, J., & Woodhead, L. (2021). *Gen Z, Explained*. University of Chicago Press.

- <https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226814988.001.0001>
- Khatri, N., Fern, C. T., & Budhwar, P. (2001). Explaining employee turnover in an Asian context. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 11(1), 54–74. <https://doi.org/10.1111/J.1748-8583.2001.TB00032.X>
- Kronos Incorporated. (2019). *Full Report: Generation Z in the Workplace*. <https://workforceinstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/Full-Report-Generation-Z-in-the-Workplace.pdf>
- Kulcsár, V., Doborean, A., & Gati, I. (2020). Challenges and difficulties in career decision making: Their causes, and their effects on the process and the decision. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 116. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2019.103346>
- Lake, C. J., Highhouse, S., & Shrift, A. G. (2018). Validation of the Job-Hopping Motives Scale. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 26(3), 531–548. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1069072717722765>
- Larasati, A., & Aryanto, D. B. (2019). Job-Hopping and the Determinant Factors. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, 395. <https://doi.org/10.5829/idosi.wasj.2017.2308.2314>
- Leovani, E. (2022). The Impact of Job Hopping on Career Development of The Millennial Generation. *Jurnal Keuangan dan Bisnis*, 20(1), 84–92.
- LinkedIn. (2022). *US Workforce Confidence Index*. LinkedIn Workforce Confidence Index. <https://economicgraph.linkedin.com/workforce-data/us-workforce-confidence-index>
- Mack, O., Khare, A., Kramer, A., & Burgartz, T. (2016). *Managing in a VUCA World* (O. Mack, A. Khare, A. Krämer, & T. Burgartz, Ed.). Springer International Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-16889-0>
- Maertz, C. P., & Griffeth, R. W. (2004). Eight Motivational Forces and Voluntary Turnover: A theoretical synthesis with implications for research. *Journal of Management*, 30(5), 667–683. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jm.2004.04.001>
- Mannheim, K., & Kecskemeti, P. (1952). The Problem of Generations. Dalam *Essays on the Sociology of Knowledge* (1st Edition, hlm. 276–320). Routledge.
- Mehdzizadeh, S. (2010). Self-presentation 2.0: Narcissism and self-esteem on Facebook. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, 13(4), 357–364. <https://doi.org/10.1089/cyber.2009.0257>
- Mulvey, R. and Bimrose, Jenny 2015. Exploring career decision-making styles across three European countries. *British Journal of Guidance and Counselling*. 43 (3), pp. 337-350.
- Murdiyanto, E. (2020). *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif (Teori dan Aplikasi disertai Contoh Proposal)*. Universitas Pembangunan Nasional.
- Nandram, S. S., & Bindlish, P. K. (2017). Managing VUCA Through Integrative Self-Management. Dalam S. S. Nandram & P. K. Bindlish (Ed.), *Management for Professionals*. Springer

- International Publishing.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-52231-9>
- Naresh, B., & Rathnam, B. V. (2015). Job Hopping In Software Industry With Reference To Select Software Companies: A Study. *International Journal of Recent Research Aspects*, 2, 38–45.
- Nguyen, P. (2021). Determinants of Job Hopping Behavior: The Case of Information Technology Sector. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3818661>
- Novitasari, N. D., & Yuliawati, L. (2019). Hubungan Antara Presence Of Purpose Terhadap Career Indecision Making Pada Fresh Graduate Di Surabaya. *Psychopreneur Journal*, 3(2), 47–54.
- Nurillah, S.A.L (2017). Program bimbingan karier untuk meningkatkan kematangan karier mahasiswa. *Journal of Innovative Counseling: Theory, Practice and Research*, 1 (1), 67-85.
- Oblinger, Diana., & Oblinger, J. L. (2005). *Educating The Net Generation*. EDUCAUSE.
- Onesto, A. (2022). The New Employee Contract. Dalam *The New Employee Contract*. Apress. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4842-8054-6>
- Özkan, Mustafa & Yilmaz, Betül. (2015). The Changing Face of the Employees – Generation Z and Their Perceptions of Work (A Study Applied to University Students). *Procedia Economics and Finance*. 26. 476-483. [10.1016/S2212-5671\(15\)00876-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2212-5671(15)00876-X).
- Perdhana, M. S., Sawitri, D. R., & Khafsin, I. A. (2020). Job-Hopping in Indonesia: A Phenomenological Study. Dalam *Contemporary Issues on Business, Development and Islamic Economics in Indonesia* (pp. 3–18).
- Philip, N. (2017). *Master Thesis Human Resource Studies Job-Hopping: Does it benefit or detriment careers?*
- Pramono, R., & Tukiran, M. (2021). *Media Informasi Pendidikan Islam Job Hopping Behaviour and Turnover Intention on Millennial Teachers: A Closer Look to Their Antecedents*. 20(2), 130–144. <https://doi.org/10.29300/atmipi.v20.i2.5697>
- Pranaya, D. (2014). Job-hopping – An Analytical Review. *Journal of Research in Business Management*, 2(4), 2321–2886. <http://www.impactjournals.us/index.php/download/archives/2-78-1396890610-ABS%20-%208.%20Manage-JOB-HOPPING%20-%20AN%20ANALYTICAL%20REVIEW-D.%20Pranaya.pdf>
- Prihaningrum, S. H., & Purba, H. P. (2021). Career Adaptability dan Job Hopping Intention: Peran Career Satisfaction di PekerjaGenerasi Y. *Bulerin Riset Psikologi dan Kesehatan Mental*, 1(1), 883–891.
- Putri, V. T., Yuniasanti, R., & Fitriana, N. (2022). Psychological Capital Dan Job Hopping Pada Pekerja Generasi Millenial PT. X. *PSIKOSAINS (Jurnal Penelitian dan Pemikiran Psikologi)*, 17(1), 13. <https://doi.org/10.30587/psikosains.v17i1.4563>
- Raja, A. S. (2021). Business Research in the VUCA World. *Ushus Journal of Business Management*, 20(1), v–xvi.

- <https://doi.org/10.12725/ujbm.54.0>
- Rivers, D. L. (2018). *A Grounded Theory of Millennials Job-Hopping* [Dissertation]. Walden University.
- Rottinghaus, P. J., Falk, N. A., & Park, C. J. (2018). Career Assessment and Counseling for STEM: A Critical Review. *The Career Development Quarterly*, 66(1), 2-34.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/cdq.12119>
- Saleem, T., Noor, R., & Jalil, A. (2016). Hobo Syndrome: A Cross-Organizational Mobility in Banking, Health and Development Sector. *Journal of Rawalpindi Medical College (JRMCM)*, 20(3), 225-229.
<https://www.researchgate.net/publication/312974337>
- Savickas, M. L., & Porfeli, E. J. (2012). Career Adapt-Abilities Scale: Construction, reliability, and measurement equivalence across 13 countries. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 80(3), 661-673.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2012.01.011>
- Schmitt, N., Gooding, R. Z., Noe, R. A., & Kirsch, M. (1984). Metaanalyses of Validity Studies Published Between 1964 and 1982 and The Investigation of Study Characteristics. *Personnel Psychology*, 37(3), 407-422.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1984.tb00519.x>
- Schmitt-Wilson, S., & Welsh, M. C. (2012). Vocational knowledge in rural children: A study of individual differences and predictors of occupational aspirations and expectations. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 22(6), 862-867.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2012.06.003>
- Schultheiss, D. E. P., Palma, T. V., & Manzi, A. J. (2005). Career Development in Middle Childhood: A Qualitative Inquiry. *The Career Development Quarterly*, 53(3), 246-262.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-0045.2005.tb00994.x>
- Setiawan, W. V., Andi, F. M., & Puspitaningrum, A. (2019). The Challenges of Student in Indonesia After College graduates with Career Choice Start: Evidence from Ten Private Universities in Jakarta. *The Winners*, 20(2).
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.21512/tw.v20i2.5674>
- Steenackers, K., & Guerry, M.-A. (2016). Determinants of Job-Hopping: an Empirical Study in Belgium. *International Journal of Manpower*, 37(3), 494-510.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/IJM-09-2014-0184>
- Stillman, D., & Stillman, J. (2017). *Gen Z @ Work: How the Next Generation Is Transforming the Workplace*. Harper Collins Publisher.
- Sugiyono. (2013). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D*. Alfabeta.
- Susan, E. (2019). Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia. *Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan Islam*, 9(2), 952-962.
- Tsui, A. S., Pearce, J. L., Porter, L. W., & Tripoli, A. M. (1997). Alternative Approaches to the Employee-Organization Relationship: Does Investment in Employees Pay Off?. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40(5), 1089-1121.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/256928>
- VandenBos, G. R. (Ed.). (2015). *APA dictionary of psychology (2nd ed.)*.

- American Psychological Association.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/14646-000>
- van de Ven, N., Zeelenberg, M., & Pieters, R. (2009). Leveling Up and Down: The Experiences of Benign and Malicious Envy. *Emotion*, 9(3), 419–429. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0015669>
- Wijoyo, H., Indrawan, I., Cahyono, Y., Handoko, A. L., & Santamoko, R. (2020). *Generasi Z & Revolusi 4.0*. CV. Pena Persada.
- Woo, S. E. (2011). A Study of Ghiselli's Hobo Syndrome. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 79(2), 461–469. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2011.02.003>
- Yuen, S. H. (2016). *Examining the Generation Effects on Job-Hopping Intention by Applying the Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB)*. http://commons.ln.edu.hk/psy_etd/6
- Yuliawan, T. P., & Himam, F. (2007). The Grasshopper Phenomenon: Studi Kasus Terhadap Profesional yang Sering Berpindah-pindah Pekerjaan. *Jurnal Psikologi*, 34(1), 76–88. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.22146/jpsi.7090>
- Zahari, S. N. S., & Puteh, F. (2023). Gen Z Workforce and Job-Hopping Intention: A Study among University Students in Malaysia. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 13(1). <https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarbss/v13-i1/15540>
- Zhao, S., Grasmuck, S., & Martin, J. (2008). *Identity construction on Facebook: Digital empowerment in anchored relationships*. Elsevier BV. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2008.02.012>

