

The Dimensions of Work Values in Islamic Social Financial Institutions Desired by Generation Y and Generation Z Digital Talents

Andi Hakim Kusuma¹, Ahmad Mukhlis Yusuf², Nur Hendrasto³

¹²³Institut Agama Islam Tazkia

Abstract. *Maintaining sustainability and existence of Islamic social financial Institution in digital era requires technology adoption and digital talent readiness. But considering scarcity of digital talent in Indonesia, Islamic social financial institution needs to attract digital talent, especially generation Y and generation Z, by understanding desired dimensions of work values to join Islamic social financial institution. Based on previous studies, quantitative method is used to determine dimensions of work values desired by generation Y and generation Z to join Islamic social financial institution. This research find that income, career, and role model become the most desired dimensions of work values by generation Y and generation Z digital talents to join Islamic social financial institution.*

Keywords: *Dimensions of Work Values, Digital Talent, Gen Y, Gen Z, Islamic Social Financial Institution*

Abstrak, *Menjaga keberlanjutan dan eksistensi institusi keuangan sosial Islam di era digital membutuhkan penguasaan teknologi dan kesiapan talenta digital. Namun mengingat kelangkaan talenta digital di Indonesia, institusi keuangan sosial Islam perlu menarik talenta digital, terutama generasi Y dan generasi Z, dengan memahami dimensi work value yang diinginkan agar mau bergabung dengan institusi keuangan sosial Islam. Berdasarkan penelitian sebelumnya, metode kuantitatif digunakan untuk menentukan dimensi work value yang diinginkan oleh talenta digital Gen Y dan Gen Z agar mau bergabung dengan institusi keuangan sosial Islam. Penelitian ini menemukan bahwa penghasilan, karir, dan suri teladan yang baik menjadi dimensi work value tertinggi yang diinginkan oleh talenta digital Gen Y dan Gen Z untuk bergabung dengan institusi keuangan sosial Islam.*

Kata Kunci : *Dimensi Work Value, Talenta Digital, Gen Y, Gen Z Institusi Keuangan Sosial Islam*

Introduction

Sustainability and existence of Islamic social financial institution is critical since it was proven to support government to face economy and health crisis during and recovery post-pandemic (Ascarya, 2022; Iskandar et al., 2020) and is important to solve many social problems, as well as to drive compliance of Sustainable Development Growth (SDG) (Antonio et al., 2021; Hudaefi, 2020; Mukhlisin et al., 2020). Maintaining sustainability and existence of Islamic social financial Institution in digital era requires technology adoption and digital talent readiness (bin Mislan Cokrohadisumarto, 2020; Magd & McCoy, 2014). Considering scarcity of digital talent in Indonesia, it is important to Islamic social financial institution to understand dimensions of work values desired by digital talents to join Islamic social financial institution.

In order to understand the work value, this research uses literature from the last 10 years as main reference which is complemented with older literature to provide more fundamental theory. Research related to work value were mostly conducted in English speaking countries, but lately some were also conducted in other countries (Kultalahti & Viitala, 2015; Papavasileiou & Lyons, 2015; M. Rafiki & Hartijasti, 2022; Twenge et al., 2010, 2012). Most research to determine the work values used quantitative method and no one specifically researched on digital talent and Islamic social finance institution. Therefore in this research, similar research method is conducted to understand work values which are desired by digital talent, especially gen Y and gen Z, to join Islamic social finance institution.

This research is aiming to measure and determine dimensions of work values desired by generation Y and generation Z digital talents to join Islamic social financial institution. The research is expected to provide valuable information for Islamic social financial institution to prepare internal capability to attract digital talent based on the desired work values. Furthermore, this research is also expected to provide opportunity to research on model for Islamic social financial institution to fulfil the work values.

Literature Review

Generation is group of people which born in the same period, face similar cultural context, and create new culture compared to previous culture (Campbell et al., 2015). The generation can be formed from two perspectives, which are social force perspective and group perspective. Social for perspective state that a generation was born from group of people which face similar historical experience (Lyons & Kuron, 2014), especially which occur in the process of maturity during 17-25 years old (Joshi et al., 2011). Group perspective state that a generation is group of people which born in the same period and have similar attitude or behavior (Lyons & Kuron, 2014).

This research uses group perspective because it is more objective and can determine generation more clearly, which are generation Y which born between 1980-1994 and generation Z which born between 1995-2012 (Maloni et al., 2019). These generations have similarity in terms of technology savvy, information seeker, quick learner, and work life balance. But, these generation also have some differences, such as generation Y is more individualistic, focus on self-achievement and on short-term growth, whereas generation Z is more collaborative, focus on long-term impact and sustainability (Francis & Hoefel, 2018; Gentile et al., 2012; Goh & Okumus, 2020; Maloni et al., 2019; Ng & Parry, 2016; Twenge et al., 2010).

These generations have different work values since they have different needs. Work value is an element which transforms needs into motivation. Motivation itself is derived from the Latin term “movere” which means to move and consists of two elements, which are what goals are driving someone to move and why someone chooses certain way to achieve the goals (Parks & Guay, 2009). The way taken by someone to achieve the goals is influenced by their values (Ariza-Montes et al., 2017).

Some literature already researched work value differences between generation Y and generation Z. Some literature showed that generation Y have relatively homogenous work value dimension, such as learning and

development, attractive and challenging assignment, task variety, social interaction, leader behavior, work time flexibility, and work life balance (Edmunds & Turner, 2005). But another literature showed that generation Y in different countries have different work values. In Finland, financial, career, and long-term employment are not considered as main value (Kultalahti & Viitala, 2015). In Germany, Canada, New Zealand, and Brazil, intrinsic and social work value dimension are more important than extrinsic and prestige. But, in United Arab Emirates (UAE) is the opposite (Papavasileiou & Lyons, 2015).

Furthermore in United States of America (USA), extrinsic and leisure work value dimension of generation Y are higher than intrinsic, altruistic, and social (Gentile et al., 2012; Twenge et al., 2010). For generation Z in USA, extrinsic, intrinsic, and stability work value dimension are more important than supervision, social, altruistic, and leisure (Maloni et al., 2019). Similar research in Indonesia showed the opposite findings. Generation Y and generation Z in Indonesia define intrinsic, altruistic, and social work value dimension as more important than extrinsic and leisure (M. Rafiki & Hartijasti, 2022).

Although different literature used different work value dimensions, this paper uses work value dimension based on basic human theory which also aligned with Islamic value which might be used in Islamic social financial institution as shown in Tabel 1 (Khan et al., 2010; Ros, 1999). Related to research method, most of the research used quantitative method through survey with 5 likert-scale (M. Rafiki & Hartijasti, 2022; Twenge et al., 2010, 2012), although there was 1 research which used 6 likert-scale (Papavasileiou & Lyons, 2015). The survey results were analyze based on mean, median, and standard deviation to define the most desired work value dimension. Similar quantitative method is also used in this research.

Table 1. Work Value Dimension

Work Value Dimension	Goal	Value	Islamic Ethic
Intrinsic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intangible impact which shows inherent interest to the work • Opportunity to do other things outside the work • Support to their noble believe 	Hedonism, Stimulation, Self-Direction, Tradition	Al-Ikhlash and Haqûq Al-'Ibad
Extrinsic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tangible impact from organization to its employees • Long-term work stability • Prestige from the work 	Achievement, Power, Security	Al-'Adl and Ifa Al-'Aqd
Social	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Willingness to help other and contribute to society • Have strong interaction with other employees • Have attentive and supportive leader 	Universalism, Benevolence, Conformity	Al-Ukhuwwah, Al-Ihsân, and Al-Ta'âwun

Method

This research uses similar quantitative method used in previous studies (Papavasileiou & Lyons, 2015; M. Rafiki & Hartijasti, 2022; Twenge et al., 2010, 2012). Quantitative data used in this research are primary data using 5 likert-scale which indicates respondent preference to indicators of work value dimension. The data will be gathered from population which have criteria as follows:

1. Moslem and willing to contribute in growing Islamic social finance through Islamic social financial institution
2. Born in 1980-1994 for generation Y or 1995-2012 for generation Z
3. Have been working or at least studying in last semester of higher education (undergraduate)
4. Have or at least studying digital skills

Considering that this research population is nation-wide which population number is unknown, so the number of samples are determined using Isaac and Michael table, which are 272 respondents. The data will be gathered using Google Form which is distributed through social media.

The gathered data is analyzed using model and descriptive analysis. Model analysis is performed using software SPSS to analyze validity and reliability of the questions. Meanwhile descriptive analysis is performed using software Microsoft Excel to analyze respondent characteristic and work value dimension.

Model analysis is performed with two kind of tests, which are validity test and reliability test. Validity test uses r value and Sig (2-tailed) value as indicators and reliability test uses Cronbach Alpha indicator. r value and Sig (2-tailed) value indicators are used to measure validity by comparing calculated r value and table r value, which the calculated r value must be higher than table r value. Moreover, Sig (2-tailed) value also must be lower than significance level. Meanwhile Cronbach Alpha indicator is used to measure reliability based on consistency of respondent answer to the question from time to time. The result can be considered as reliable if the Cronbach Alpha value more than 0.60.

Table 2. Indicators of Work Value Dimension

Work Value Dimension	Indicator
Intrinsic	• I1: Work which can learn new relevant skill
	• I2: Work which can maximize possessed skill, ability, and creativity
	• I3: Work which can spare enough time to other things in life
	• I4: Work which do not have too much pressure

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I5: Work which have noble goals aligned with Islamic values • I6: Work which have Islamic work environment
Extrinsic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • E1: Work which provide opportunity to earn better income • E2: Work which have good career opportunity • E3: Work which have high status and prestige • E4: Work which have long-term security
Social	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • S1: Work which provide opportunity to directly help society or other people • S2: Work which provide opportunity to interact and collaborate with many people • S3: Work which have good leader as role model

Descriptive analysis is performed by calculating Mean, Median, and Standard Deviation value for each indicators of work dimension value measured by 5 likert-scale starting from strongly agree up to strongly disagree. The work value dimension desired by digital talent generation Y and generation Z are the dimension which in average have “agree” value. Indicators used in this research are mainly based on previous studies (Papavasileiou & Lyons, 2015; M. Rafiki & Hartijasti, 2022; Twenge et al., 2010, 2012). But since this research emphasizes on digital transformation and Islamic social finance, so the indicators are sharpened to incorporate the two aspects. Related to digital transformation, leadership values and top management support are critical to drive digital transformation and attract digital talent (Cahyadi et al., 2020; Hendrasto et al., 2021; Kultalahti & Viitala, 2015). And related to Islamic practice, Islamic practice on strategy, human resource management, and organization are also critical in driving performance (A. Rafiki & Wahab, 2013). Therefore, leader as role model, Islamic noble goals at

work, and Islamic environment are added into the indicators. Table 2 shows overall indicators used in this research.

Results and Discussion

Research data is collected in 2 weeks period from 23 October 2023 up to 3 November 2023 with total 315 respondent with characteristic shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Respondent Characteristic

Characteristic	Population	Percentage
Generation	315	100%
Generation Y	186	59%
Generation Z	129	41%
Gender	315	100%
Male	221	70%
Female	94	30%
Origin	315	100%
Jabodetabek	203	64%
Java island outside Jabodetabek	72	23%
Outside Java island	40	13%
Education	315	100%
Senior high school	33	10%
Diploma degree	10	3%
Bachelor degree	171	54%
Master degree	95	30%
Doctoral degree	6	2%
Job status	315	100%
Not working	44	14%

Permanent employee	171	54%
Non-permanent employee	95	27%
Entrepreneur	6	5%
Year of experience	315	100%
<1	2	1%
1-3	57	21%
4-6	60	22%
7-9	54	20%
10-12	45	17%
13-15	39	14%
>15	13	5%
Job level	315	100%
Staff	154	57%
Supervisor	42	15%
Manager	49	18%
Senior manager	13	5%
Director	13	5%
Institution	315	100%
Government	39	14%
Foreign private company	9	3%
National private company	72	27%
State owned enterprise	129	48%
Own company	21	8%

Based on validity test, calculated r values of all questions are above table r value which is 0.093 and Sig (2-tailed) value of all questions are below significance level 10% so it can be concluded that all questions are valid. And based on reliability test, overall Cronbach's Alpha value, which is 0.799, are above 0.6 and also above table r value 0.093 so it also can be concluded that the questionnaire is reliable.

Based on Table 4, it can be concluded that digital talent generation Y and generation Z have balanced work value dimension preference since the mean value of all dimensions (intrinsic, extrinsic, social) are relatively similar. This conclusion is also applied for each generation Y and generation Z, respectively. Despite of slight differences in social dimension, which have higher mean value for digital talent generation Y than generation Z. It is reasonable since generation Z grows in higher digital adoption era which require less social interaction than generation Y.

The balanced work value dimension preference can be seen from negative and positive perspective. From negative perspective, it can be challenge for Islamic social financial institution since the institution need to build capability to fulfil all of work value dimension. But in other perspective, it can be positive since the Islamic social financial institution can compensate its weakness in one dimension with strength in the others to attract the digital talent.

Table 4. Descriptive Data

Dimension	Gen Y			Gen Z			Gen Y & Gen Z		
	μ	η	σ	μ	η	σ	μ	η	σ
Intrinsic	4.510	5.000	0.759	4.505	5.000	0.757	4.508	5.000	0.758
I1	4.602	5.000	0.625	4.535	5.000	0.694	4.575	5.000	0.655
I2	4.597	5.000	0.608	4.612	5.000	0.601	4.603	5.000	0.605
I3	4.651	5.000	0.597	4.674	5.000	0.684	4.660	5.000	0.634

I4	3.897	4.000	0.995	4.124	4.000	0.932	3.990	4.000	0.976
I5	4.618	5.000	0.725	4.543	5.000	0.693	4.587	5.000	0.713
I6	4.694	5.000	0.611	4.543	5.000	0.768	4.632	5.000	0.684
Extrinsic	4.341	5.000	0.940	4.340	5.000	1.056	4.341	5.000	0.989
E1	4.774	5.000	0.511	4.822	5.000	0.505	4.794	5.000	0.509
E2	4.672	5.000	0.600	4.814	5.000	0.510	4.730	5.000	0.569
E3	3.387	3.000	1.068	3.132	3.000	1.210	3.283	3.000	1.135
E4	4.532	5.000	0.727	4.598	5.000	0.702	4.559	5.000	0.718
Social	4.514	5.000	0.747	4.359	5.000	0.837	4.451	5.000	0.789
S1	4.559	5.000	0.630	4.442	5.000	0.725	4.511	5.000	0.673
S2	4.247	5.000	0.918	4.000	4.000	0.906	4.146	4.000	0.921
S3	4.737	5.000	0.559	4.636	5.000	0.736	4.695	5.000	0.639

Further analysis is performed for each indicators to better understand work value dimensions desired by generation Y and generation Z. The most desired dimension can be sequentially described as follows:

1. Work which provide opportunity to earn better income (E1), which this conclusion is also found for each generation Y and generation Z, respectively.
2. Work which have good career opportunity (E2), which this finding is similar with generation Z but different with generation Y. For generation Y, work which have good career opportunity (E2) is only fourth order of the most desired dimension.
3. Work which have good leader as role model (S3), which this finding is different both with generation Y (in second order) and generation (only in fourth order).
4. Work which can spare enough time to other things in life (I3), which this finding is different both with generation Y (only in fifth order) and generation (in third order).

5. Work which have Islamic work environment (I6), which this finding is different both with generation Y (in third order) and generation (only in eighth order).
6. Work which can maximize possessed skill, ability, and creativity (I2), which this finding is different both with generation Y (only in eighth order) and generation (in fifth order).
7. Work which have noble goals aligned with Islamic values (I5), dimana which this finding is similar with generation Z but different with generation Y (in sixth order).
8. Work which can learn new relevant skill (I1), which this finding is different both with generation Y (in seventh order) and generation (only in ninth order).
9. Work which have long-term security (E4), which this finding is different both with generation Y (only in tenth order) and generation (in sixth order).
10. Work which provide opportunity to directly help society or other people (S1), dimana which this finding is similar with generation Z but different with generation Y (in ninth order).

Table 5 shows Mean value of all respondent profile in general and all indicators of work value dimension. It can be concluded that the most desired work values in general are work which provide opportunity to earn better income (E1), work which have good career opportunity (E2), and work which have good leader as role model (S3). There is significant difference for Doctoral Degree which the most desired work values are work which have Islamic work environment (I6), work which have noble goals aligned with Islamic values (I5), and work which can maximize possessed skill, ability, and creativity (I2). For respondent who live in outside Java island, the most desired work values are work which have noble goals aligned with Islamic values (I5) and work which have Islamic work environment (I6) more than income and career. For entrepreneur, the most desired work values are work which can maximize

possessed skill, ability, and creativity (I2) and work which have Islamic work environment (I6) more than career and good leader. In the opposite, work which do not have too much pressure (I4), work which have high status and prestige (E3), and work which provide opportunity to interact and collaborate with many people (S2) are in general considered as the most undesired work values. But different conclusion is found for respondent who live outside Java island, Diploma degree, and Doctoral degree who still think that work which provide opportunity to interact and collaborate with many people (S2) is

Table 5. Mean and Rank of Each Respondent Profile in General and Work Value Indicators

Profile	I1		I2		I3		I4		I5		I6		E1		E2		E3		E4		S1		S2		S3	
	μ	rank	μ	rank	μ	rank	μ	rank	μ	rank	μ	rank	μ	rank	μ	rank	μ	rank	μ	rank	μ	rank	μ	rank	μ	rank
Gen Y	4.602	7	4.597	8	4.651	5	3.897	12	4.618	4	4.694	3	4.774	11	4.672	4	3.387	13	4.532	10	4.559	6	4.247	12	4.737	2
Gen Z	4.535	9	4.612	5	4.674	3	4.124	11	4.543	14	4.543	7	4.822	7	4.814	2	3.132	13	4.598	6	4.442	15	4.000	12	4.636	4
Male	4.597	8	4.624	6	4.674	4	3.955	12	4.602	5	4.665	5	4.774	12	4.710	2	3.335	13	4.553	9	4.534	8	4.172	11	4.710	3
Female	4.521	9	4.553	7	4.628	4	4.074	12	4.553	13	4.553	6	4.840	3	4.777	2	3.160	13	4.574	5	4.457	14	4.085	11	4.660	3
Jabodetabek	4.655	5	4.645	6	4.690	4	3.941	12	4.542	15	4.611	7	4.837	4	4.783	2	3.315	13	4.579	8	4.483	12	4.167	11	4.739	3
Outside Jabodetabek	4.417	10	4.569	8	4.667	5	4.141	11	4.694	2	4.694	3	4.806	8	4.694	2	3.125	13	4.592	6	4.514	9	3.944	12	4.583	7
Outside Jawa	4.450	9	4.450	8	4.500	7	3.975	12	4.625	3	4.625	4	4.550	16	4.525	6	3.400	13	4.400	10	4.650	2	4.400	11	4.675	1
Senior High School	4.515	7	4.545	6	4.788	3	4.061	11	4.485	16	4.333	10	4.848	2	4.848	2	2.636	13	4.562	5	4.636	3	4.000	12	4.485	8
Diploma Degree	4.700	5	4.800	3	4.700	4	4.100	12	4.600	8	4.400	9	4.800	9	4.800	2	2.700	13	4.400	8	4.200	16	4.400	10	4.700	6
Bachelor Degree	4.579	9	4.608	6	4.661	5	4.029	12	4.602	6	4.684	4	4.825	6	4.754	2	3.363	13	4.600	8	4.474	13	4.105	11	4.690	3
Master Degree	4.558	8	4.568	6	4.600	5	3.894	12	4.568	10	4.642	3	4.716	15	4.632	4	3.389	13	4.484	10	4.547	7	4.200	11	4.779	1
Doctoral Degree	4.833	7	5.000	2	4.833	6	3.833	12	5.000	1	5.000	1	4.833	5	4.833	5	3.833	13	4.833	9	4.833	1	4.833	10	4.667	11
Not Working	4.591	6	4.614	4	4.841	3	4.159	11	4.568	11	4.500	10	4.909	1	4.932	1	2.932	13	4.512	9	4.568	5	4.136	12	4.614	5
Permanent Employee	4.561	8	4.556	9	4.632	6	3.889	12	4.602	7	4.667	4	4.784	10	4.731	3	3.421	13	4.635	5	4.485	11	4.123	11	4.749	2
Non Permanent Employee	4.595	7	4.655	4	4.643	5	4.084	12	4.571	9	4.619	6	4.762	13	4.679	3	3.250	13	4.524	9	4.512	10	4.214	11	4.679	2
Entrepreneur	4.6	6	4.8	1	4.562	5	4.125	10	4.562	12	4.688	3	4.750	14	4.438	9	2.938	13	4.062	11	4.625	4	4.062	12	4.438	8

important. Beside, for Diploma degree, work which provide opportunity to directly help society or other people (S1) is considered as not important. Meanwhile for entrepreneur, work which have long-term security (E4) is also considered as not important.

Table 6 shows Mean value of all respondent profile which already working and all indicators of work value dimension. It can be concluded that the most desired work values in general are work which provide opportunity to earn better income (E1), work which have good career opportunity (E2), and work which have good leader as role model (S3). There are some differences for respondent who have been working for 13-15 years, more than 15 years, Director level, and working in government institution. For respondent who have been working for 13-15 years and working in government institution, work which have noble goals aligned with Islamic values (I5) and work which have Islamic work environment (I6) are more important than career and good leader. Similar with respondent who already working for more than 15 years, which consider work which have noble goals aligned with Islamic values (I5) and work which have Islamic work environment (I6) more important than income and career. For Director level, work which can maximize possessed skill, ability, and creativity (I2) and work which have Islamic work environment (I6) more than career and good leader are more important than career and good leader. In the opposite, work which do not have too much pressure (I4), work which have high status and prestige (E3), and work which provide opportunity to interact and collaborate with many people (S2) are in general considered as the most undesired work values. There is slight difference for respondent who work in foreign private company and own company which consider work which do not have too much pressure (I4) is still important. Furthermore, for respondent who work in foreign private company consider work which have noble goals aligned with Islamic values (I5) and work which have Islamic work environment (I6) as not important.

Table 6. Mean and Rank of Each Respondent Profile Which Already Working and Work Value Indicators

Profile	I1		I2		I3		I4		I5		I6		E1		E2		E3		E4		S1		S2		S3	
	μ	rank	μ	rank	μ	rank	μ	rank	μ	rank	μ	rank	μ	rank	μ	rank	μ	rank	μ	rank	μ	rank	μ	rank	μ	rank
0-3 years	4.583	9	4.767	3	4.650	4	4.117	11	4.633	7	4.600	7	4.817	5	4.783	2	3.267	13	4.600	8	4.450	12	4.050	12	4.633	6
4-6 years	4.467	7	4.433	8	4.500	6	4.000	12	4.433	13	4.550	4	4.733	14	4.700	2	3.417	13	4.525	5	4.417	14	4.133	11	4.633	3
7-9 years	4.574	7	4.481	10	4.630	5	3.870	12	4.611	9	4.648	4	4.778	8	4.667	3	3.315	13	4.556	8	4.500	9	3.963	11	4.796	1
10-12 years	4.489	8	4.578	6	4.644	3	3.886	12	4.422	14	4.600	5	4.667	16	4.600	4	3.533	13	4.511	7	4.467	11	4.244	11	4.689	1
13-15 years	4.718	7	4.667	9	4.744	5	3.846	12	4.821	3	4.846	2	4.872	3	4.692	8	3.205	13	4.615	10	4.744	1	4.436	11	4.769	4
> 15 years	4.846	6	5.000	2	4.769	7	4.077	12	4.923	2	5.000	1	4.846	4	4.769	8	3.154	13	4.692	9	4.538	7	4.231	11	4.923	4
Staff	4.519	9	4.565	7	4.662	4	4.013	12	4.591	10	4.630	5	4.773	11	4.727	2	3.279	13	4.556	8	4.494	10	4.110	11	4.701	3
Supervisor	4.690	5	4.571	8	4.595	6	3.810	12	4.405	15	4.571	7	4.786	7	4.690	2	3.595	13	4.690	4	4.333	15	4.024	11	4.690	3
Manager	4.592	9	4.612	6	4.531	10	3.917	12	4.755	5	4.735	4	4.776	9	4.633	5	3.490	13	4.592	8	4.612	5	4.408	11	4.816	1
Senior Manager	4.692	7	4.769	4	4.692	8	3.846	12	4.538	11	4.769	3	4.769	13	4.692	6	3.077	13	4.769	5	4.615	4	4.231	11	4.769	1
Director	4.615	6	4.923	1	4.692	4	4.154	10	4.615	8	4.769	3	4.769	12	4.615	5	2.923	13	4.000	11	4.615	3	3.923	12	4.385	9
Government Institution	4.475	10	4.575	8	4.575	9	4.225	12	4.800	4	4.800	1	4.700	15	4.700	4	3.550	13	4.625	7	4.700	2	4.375	11	4.675	6
State Owned Enterprise	4.667	6	4.620	8	4.620	9	3.844	12	4.636	6	4.682	5	4.775	10	4.721	3	3.434	13	4.698	4	4.504	8	4.194	11	4.767	2
National Private Company	4.431	9	4.514	6	4.694	4	3.972	12	4.472	12	4.583	5	4.792	6	4.694	3	3.125	13	4.493	7	4.417	13	4.056	11	4.694	2
Foreign Private Company	4.667	5	4.556	6	4.778	4	4.000	9	3.778	16	3.889	10	5.000	2	4.778	3	3.778	13	4.444	7	4.111	16	3.778	12	4.778	2
Own Company	4.400	9	5.000	3	4.800	6	5.000	4	5.000	1	4.800	7	5.000	1	5.000	2	3.000	13	4.200	11	4.600	6	3.800	12	4.200	10

Meanwhile for respondent who work in its own company, work which have long-term security (E4) is considered as not important.

Conclusion

In general, all work value dimensions (intrinsic, extrinsic, and social) are equally important for digital talent generation Y and generation Z. In more detail for each indicator of work value dimension, top three indicators which are considered as most desired work value both for generation Y and generation Z are work which provide opportunity to earn better income (E1) and work which have good career opportunity (E2). It is reasonable since the main objective of having work is to earn income for life and income usually has positive correlation with career. But for the third most desired work value, generation Y prefer more on work which have good leader as role model (S3) while generation Z prefer more on work which can spare enough time to other things in life (I3). The last three work value which are not desired by digital talent generation Y and generation Z are work which do not have too much pressure (I4), work which have high status and prestige (E3), and work which provide opportunity to interact and collaborate with many people (S2). Therefore, it can be concluded that digital talent generation Y and generation Z do not really care about pressure, prestige, and interaction at work.

This finding is aligned with previous studies in USA, UEA, and some of Asia region that extrinsic work value dimension is considered as the most important (Maloni et al., 2019; Papavasileiou & Lyons, 2015; Twenge et al., 2010, 2012), although it is different with previous study in Indonesia which showed that extrinsic work dimension was lower than others (M. Rafiki & Hartijasti, 2022). Besides, for other work value indicators, such as learning and development, attractive and challenging assignment, task variety, social interaction, leader behavior, work time flexibility, and work life balance (Kultalahti & Viitala, 2015).

References

- Antonio, M. S., Ali, M. M., & Jebel Firdaus. (2021). The Role of Zakat in Overcoming Inflation and Unemployment: Revisiting the Trade-Off Theory. *ICR Journal*, 12(1), 73-97. <https://doi.org/10.52282/icr.v12i1.822>
- Ariza-Montes, A., Arjona-Fuentes, J. M., Han, H., & Law, R. (2017). Employee responsibility and basic human values in the hospitality sector. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 62, 78-87. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2016.12.001>
- Ascarya, A. (2022). The role of Islamic social finance during Covid-19 pandemic in Indonesia's economic recovery. *International Journal of Islamic and Middle Eastern Finance and Management*, 15(2), 386-405. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IMEFM-07-2020-0351>
- bin Mislan Cokrohadisumarto, W. (2020). The Role of the Human Capital and Network in Maintaining the Sustainability of IMFI in the Digital Era: An Islamic Perspective. In L. Barolli, F. K. Hussain, & M. Ikeda (Eds.), *Complex, Intelligent, and Software Intensive Systems* (Vol. 993, pp. 966-971). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-22354-0_92
- Cahyadi, W., Mukhlisin, M., & Pramono, S. E. (2020). PENGARUH DUKUNGAN MANAJEMEN PUNCAK TERHADAP KUALITAS SISTEM INFORMASI AKUNTANSI PADA PERUSAHAAN ASURANSI SYARIAH. *JURNAL AKUNTANSI DAN BISNIS: Jurnal Program Studi Akuntansi*, 6(1), 66-76. <https://doi.org/10.31289/jab.v6i1.2995>
- Campbell, W. K., Campbell, S. M., Siedor, L. E., & Twenge, J. M. (2015). Generational Differences Are Real and Useful. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 8(3), 324-331. <https://doi.org/10.1017/iop.2015.43>
- Edmunds, J., & Turner, B. S. (2005). Global generations: Social change in the twentieth century. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 56(4), 559-577. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-4446.2005.00083.x>
- Francis, T., & Hoefel, F. (2018). 'True Gen': Generation Z and its implications for companies.
- Gentile, B., Twenge, J. M., Freeman, E. C., & Campbell, W. K. (2012). The effect of social networking websites on positive self-views: An experimental investigation. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 28(5), 1929-1933. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2012.05.012>
- Goh, E., & Okumus, F. (2020). Avoiding the hospitality workforce bubble: Strategies to attract and retain generation Z talent in the hospitality

- workforce. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 33, 100603. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2019.100603>
- Hendrasto, N., Dharmawan, A. H., Sumardjo, S., & Mohammad Baga, L. (2021). Value-Based Leadership in Crowdfunding Digital Startup: A Qualitative Study in iGrow and KITABISA. *International Journal of Business and Applied Social Science*, 17-25. <https://doi.org/10.33642/ijbass.v7n5p3>
- Hudaefi, F. A. (2020). How does Islamic fintech promote the SDGs? Qualitative evidence from Indonesia. *Qualitative Research in Financial Markets*, 12(4), 353-366. <https://doi.org/10.1108/QRFM-05-2019-0058>
- Iskandar, A., Possumah, B. T., & Aqbar, K. (2020). Peran Ekonomi dan Keuangan Sosial Islam saat Pandemi Covid-19. *SALAM: Jurnal Sosial dan Budaya Syar-i*, 7(7). <https://doi.org/10.15408/sjsbs.v7i7.15544>
- Joshi, A., Dencker, J. C., & Franz, G. (2011). Generations in organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 31, 177-205. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.riob.2011.10.002>
- Khan, B., Farooq, A., & Hussain, Z. (2010). Human resource management: An Islamic perspective. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Business Administration*, 2(1), 17-34. <https://doi.org/10.1108/17574321011037558>
- Kultalahti, S., & Viitala, R. (2015). Generation Y – challenging clients for HRM? *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 30(1), 101-114. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMP-08-2014-0230>
- Lyons, S., & Kuron, L. (2014). Generational differences in the workplace: A review of the evidence and directions for future research: GENERATIONAL DIFFERENCES IN THE WORKPLACE. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 35(S1), S139-S157. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1913>
- Magd, H. A. E., & McCoy, M. P. (2014). Islamic Finance Development in the Sultanate of Oman: Barriers and Recommendations. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 15, 1619-1631. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2212-5671\(14\)00633-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2212-5671(14)00633-9)
- Maloni, M., Hiatt, M. S., & Campbell, S. (2019). Understanding the work values of Gen Z business students. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 17(3), 100320. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2019.100320>
- Mukhlisin, M., Tamanni, L., Azid, T., & Mustafida, R. (2020). Contribution of Islamic Microfinance Studies in Achieving Sustainable Development Goals. In A. Elzahi Saaid Ali, K. M. Ali, & M. Khaleequzzaman (Eds.), *Enhancing Financial Inclusion through Islamic Finance*, Volume I (pp.

51-79). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-39935-1_4

- Ng, E. S., & Parry, E. (2016). Multigenerational Research in Human Resource Management. In M. R. Buckley, J. R. B. Halbesleben, & A. R. Wheeler (Eds.), *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management* (Vol. 34, pp. 1-41). Emerald Group Publishing Limited. <https://doi.org/10.1108/S0742-730120160000034008>
- Papavasileiou, E. F., & Lyons, S. T. (2015). A comparative analysis of the work values of Greece's 'Millennial' generation. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 26(17), 2166-2186. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2014.985325>
- Parks, L., & Guay, R. P. (2009). Personality, values, and motivation. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 47(7), 675-684. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2009.06.002>
- Rafiki, A., & Wahab, K. A. (2013). Influences of Islamic Practices on Small Firm Performance: A Study in North Sumatera, Indonesia.
- Rafiki, M., & Hartijasti, Y. (2022). Generational Differences in Dimensions of Work Values of Indonesian Permanent Employees: 7th Sriwijaya Economics, Accounting, and Business Conference (SEABC 2021), Palembang, Indonesia. <https://doi.org/10.2991/aebmr.k.220304.039>
- Ros, M. (1999). Basic Individual Values, Work Values, and the Meaning of Work.
- Twenge, J. M., Campbell, S. M., Hoffman, B. J., & Lance, C. E. (2010). Generational Differences in Work Values: Leisure and Extrinsic Values Increasing, Social and Intrinsic Values Decreasing. *Journal of Management*, 36(5), 1117-1142. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206309352246>
- Twenge, J. M., Campbell, W. K., & Freeman, E. C. (2012). Generational differences in young adults' life goals, concern for others, and civic orientation, 1966-2009. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 102(5), 1045-1062. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0027408>