

## The Difference in Perceptions of Hybrid Work Environment Between Generation X and Generation Y Educators in Private Higher Education Post-Covid-19 Pandemic

Dina Mellita & Ayu Lestari  
Universitas Bina Darma, Palembang, Indonesia  
[dinamellita@binadarma.ac.id](mailto:dinamellita@binadarma.ac.id)  
[ayu.lestari00@icloud.com](mailto:ayu.lestari00@icloud.com)

Naskah diterima tanggal \_\_\_\_\_, direvisi akhir tanggal \_\_\_\_\_, disetujui tanggal \_\_\_\_\_

### Abstrak

Institusi pendidikan tinggi sedang berusaha untuk memberikan lebih banyak fleksibilitas dan individualisasi, yang terutama diwujudkan melalui penggunaan teknologi baru dan diterapkan dalam lingkungan pembelajaran hibrida. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengidentifikasi perbedaan persepsi mengenai lingkungan kerja hybrid dalam hal pembelajaran hybrid antar pendidik perguruan tinggi swasta dari generasi X dan Y. Rancangan penelitian yang digunakan adalah rancangan penelitian studi komparatif kausal dengan menggunakan 2 variabel independent. Data yang digunakan dalam penelitian ini adalah data primer melalui kuesioner yang didistribusikan kepada 277 dosen perguruan tinggi swasta yang ada di Kota Palembang. Sebelum melakukan pengujian komparasi dilakukan uji normalitas dan uji homogenitas. Berdasarkan hasil uji normalitas diketahui bahwa sebaran data penelitian adalah tidak normal sehingga alat uji komparasi yang dilakukan dengan menggunakan uji statistik non parametrik. Berdasarkan hasil pengujian Mann Whitney U Test diketahui bahwa tidak terdapat perbedaan persepsi dalam lingkungan kerja hybrid antara Gen X dan Y pada hampir keseluruhan aspek lingkungan kerja hybrid. Hasil tersebut menunjukkan bahwa tidak ada gap antara generasi X dan Y dalam menerima lingkungan kerja baru yaitu sistem pembelajaran hybrid yang muncul selama pandemi. Hasil penelitian juga menyimpulkan bahwa kedua generasi sepakat bahwa lingkungan kerja hibrida, yang juga mempertimbangkan penggantian sebagian ruang kelas tatap muka dengan lingkungan pembelajaran online dan pemanfaatan teknologi, menciptakan pendidikan yang terjangkau, mudah diakses, dan berkualitas tinggi yang dapat diakses melintasi batas-batas negara dan berpotensi untuk membentuk basis pengetahuan standar yang dapat digunakan oleh masyarakat global

**Kata Kunci:** Lingkungan Kerja Hybrid, Generasi X, Generasi Y, Pembelajaran Hybrid, blended learning.

### Abstract

Educational institutions at the higher level are striving to offer increased flexibility and customization, primarily achieved by integrating new technologies within hybrid learning settings. This research aims to identify the differences in perceptions regarding the hybrid work environment in terms of hybrid learning among faculty members of private universities from Generation X and Generation Y. The research design used is a comparative causal study design using two independent variables. The data used in this study are primary data collected through questionnaires distributed to 277 faculty members of private universities in Palembang City. Before conducting the comparative analysis, tests for normality and homogeneity were performed. In accordance with the findings from the normality test, it is known that the data distribution is not normal, thus non-parametric statistical tests were used for the comparative analysis. Based on the results of the Mann-Whitney U Test, it is found that there is no significant difference in perceptions of the hybrid work environment between Generation X and Generation Y in almost all aspects of the hybrid work environment. These findings suggest that there is no discernible difference between Generation X and Generation Y in accepting the new work environment, namely the hybrid learning system that emerged during the pandemic. The outcomes additionally indicated that both Generation X and Generation Y shared the belief that a hybrid work environment, which incorporates substituting a portion of in-person classroom activities with online learning and technology integration, contributes to cost-effective, easily accessible, and excellent education that transcends geographical boundaries. This approach also holds the potential to establish a universally applicable knowledge foundation for the global community.

**Keywords:** Hybrid Work Environment, Generation X, Generation Y, Hybrid Learning, blended learning.

**How to cite (APA Style) :** Anandayu, R., & Muslim, A.B., (2021), Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet consectetur adipiscing elit. *Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan*, 21 (3), 2021. 110-121. doi:<https://doi.org/10.17509/jpp.v21i3.4xxxx>

## INTRODUCTION

The emergence of the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020 resulted in a transformation of the work system from offline to online. After the pandemic, the work system evolved into hybrid working, which combines *working in the office* (WFO) and *working from home* (WFH). It integrates the pre-COVID-19 remote work system with collaborative working methods that allow direct collaboration. In the higher education sector, hybrid learning has become an alternative learning method during the current pandemic and has become a preferred method for enhancing learning capacity in universities. Therefore, previous research has mostly focused on the effectiveness of hybrid learning during the pandemic only (Riyanda et al., 2022; Rusyada & Nasir, 2022; Sukiman et al., 2022; Sumandiyar et al., 2021). To enhance the capacity of hybrid learning, it is necessary to identify various dimensions within hybrid learning, particularly focusing on the aspects of the work environment and the individuals who are engaged in the hybrid work system.

Furthermore, as one of the future work models, it is important to map various elements that can enhance the strength of hybrid learning as part of hybrid working. One aspect of enhancing the capabilities of hybrid working is the dimension of the workers engaged in hybrid working, measured through the classification of the generations of workers involved in hybrid working. Previous research has measured the preferences for hybrid working based on gender, age, and position (Arntz, M., Yahmed, S. B., & Berlingieri, 2022). According to Nindyati (Nindyati, 2017), there are differences in job perceptions in the education sector between Generation X and Generation Y. Generation X includes individuals born between 1965 and 1990, currently ranging from 42 to 58 years old in 2023. This generation grew up and developed alongside rapidly advancing technology, although they did not experience such sophistication in their early years. On the other hand, Generation Y, also known as Millennials, includes individuals born between 1981 and 1996, ranging from 26 to 42 years old in 2023. Generation Z refers to those born between 1997 and 2012, currently aged between 8 and 23 years old.

Every generation possesses distinctive attributes that set them apart from one another, some studies already identify their characteristics. Y generations are often characterized as tech-savvy, a quality observed in many aspects of their lives (Bannon, S.; Ford, K.; Meltzer, 2011). For instance, they are the first generation to experience only a postdigital and globalizing world. The findings suggest that millennials who exhibit greater domain-specific innovativeness and opinion leadership demonstrate a more pronounced connection between their involvement in mobile technology purchase and usage, particularly in terms of impression-relevant and outcome-relevant factors (Eastman, J. K., Iyer, R., Liao-Troth, S., Williams, D. F., & Griffin, 2014). But compare with the Z generations, the Y generations considered more have anxiety to technology to earlier generations (Wood, 2013).

Previous research has also identified employment options for each generation. In this case, each generational cohort also has values and behaviors over their job choices. Through the dimensions of work value including extrinsic value, intrinsic value, leisure, altruistic and social rewards, it is known that Generation Y prioritizes the availability of free time in choosing a job compared to Generation X and Baby Boomers. Baby Boomers, on the other hand, prefer jobs that prioritize social rewards over Generations X and Y (Twenge, J. M., Campbell, S. M., Hoffman, B. J., & Lance, 2010). In another study, it was also found that Generation X initially valued jobs that prioritized extrinsic rewards including salary, bonuses, and benefits which at a later stage encouraged strong work beliefs in that

generation. The longer they work, the two generations reportedly emphasized intrinsic rewards together (Krahn, H. J., & Galambos, 2014).

As the concept of work and the workplace evolves, job choices are no longer confronted by these dimensions. The Covid-19 pandemic has changed the concept of a conventional workplace to a hybrid by incorporating elements of information technology and digitalization so that work preferences are also faced with the hybrid work environment. Likewise in the education industry, online and hybrid learning in the education sector has grown massively during the pandemic situation and is still applied in the post-pandemic situation. To increase learning capacity in the hybrid work environment, it is also necessary to identify how educators' perceptions from across generations respond to the hybrid work environment. This study aims to identify the perception of hybrid learning models as hybrid learning environments from the point of view of Generation X and Y. The dimensions and variables of the hybrid work environment in this study used the Quality of Work Life model (QWL) which was built by several researchers who described favorableness or unfavorableness of total job environment and working conditions that are excellent for people as well as for the economic health of the organization (Ouppara & Sy, 2012; Raziq & Maulabakhsh, 2015). At its core, QWL covers various factors connected to an individual's work quality, which entail the nature of tasks, the physical workplace conditions, the social atmosphere within the organization, the administrative framework, and the interconnection between one's work and personal life.

## METHOD

This research was conducted at a private university in Palembang City, using a Quantitative-Comparative Causal Research Design. This type of non-experimental research used to identify behavioral differences of a variable between two groups of research subjects (Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, 2012; Schenker, J. D., & Rumrill Jr, 2004). This quantitative research employed a non-experimental, causal-comparative research framework to investigate whether there are differing perceptions regarding hybrid work environments between individuals from Generation X and Generation Y.

The variable that is not influenced by other factors and is deliberately manipulated or selected in a study is referred to as the independent variable represent by cohorts generation which is X or Y generation. The dependent variable is defined as a hybrid working environment. The variable of the hybrid working environment in this research is adapted from the Quality of Work Life model used by Ouppara and Sy, as well as Raziq and Maubakssh. However, the indicators in the model are adjusted to the current conditions of the hybrid work environment. The variables of the hybrid working environment used in this study are health and safety, physical workspace, learning processes, meetings, transportation, technology, cost, coordination of working hours, and the need for recognition. The variable that is being measured and varies in a continuous manner is the dependent variable, while the independent variable is a discrete dichotomous variable at the nominal level. This setup is suitable for conducting an independent samples t-test for data analysis (Ritchey, 2008).

As understood from the literature, it is important to know the behavior hybrid working environment of every generational cohort. Not only intended for productivity but most importantly to prepare workers for possible movement in organizational hierarchy and job security. Thus, this study aims to examine the hybrid working environment across generations, specifically on X and Y. In this context, the following research question and hypothesis were developed:

1. Do Generation X and Y significantly have different perceptions of the health and safety aspect of the hybrid work environment

- Research Hypothesis 1 :* Generation X and Y have the same perception of the health and safety aspect of the hybrid work environment
2. Do Generation X and Y significantly have different perceptions of the physical space aspect of the hybrid work environment
- Research hypothesis 2 :* Generation X and Y have the same perception of the physical space aspect of the hybrid work environment
3. Do Generation X and Y significantly have different perceptions in the learning process aspect of the hybrid work environment
- Research hypothesis 3 :* Generation X and Y have the same perception of the learning process aspect of the hybrid work environment
4. Do Generation X and Y significantly have different perceptions in the meeting aspect of the hybrid work environment
- Research hypothesis 4 :* Generation X and Y have the same perception of the meeting aspect of the hybrid work environment
5. Do Generation X and Y significantly have different perceptions of the transportation aspect of the hybrid work environment
- Research Hypothesis 5 :* Generation X and Y have the same perception of the transportation aspect of the hybrid work environment
6. Do Generation X and Y significantly have different perceptions of the technical aspect of the hybrid work environment
- Research hypothesis 6 :* Generation X and Y have the same perception of the technical aspect of the hybrid work environment
7. Do Generation X and Y significantly have different perceptions of the cost aspect of the hybrid work environment?
- Research hypothesis 7 :* Generation X and Y have the same perception of the cost aspect of the hybrid work environment.
8. Do Generation X and Y significantly have different perceptions of the level of coordination aspect in the hybrid work environment
- Research Hypothesis 8 :* Generation X and Y have the same perception of the level of coordination aspect in the hybrid work environment
9. Do Generation X and Y significantly have different perceptions in the aspect of working hours in the hybrid work environment
- Research hypothesis 9 :* Generation X and Y have the same perception in the aspect of working hours in the hybrid work environment
10. Do Generation X and Y significantly have different perceptions in the aspect of the need for recognition in the hybrid work environment?
- Research Hypothesis 10 :* Generation X and Y have the same perception of the need for recognition in the hybrid work environment.

The data used in this research is primary data collected through a questionnaire distributed to 277 lecturers. The study's participants were selected from a convenience sample of private universities located in Palembang City. Given the extensive geographical area and the inclusion of numerous universities in the study, convenience sampling was employed as a form of non-probability sampling to ensure an adequate sample size. A convenience sample is applicable when limitations in the sampling process prevent the inclusion of every member from the target population in a study. Instead,

participants are chosen by the researcher, referred by others to the researcher, or voluntarily opt to partake in the study (Stratton, 2021).

To measure internal consistency reliability for the survey tool, Cronbach's alpha coefficient was calculated. The calculation involved summing up the questions within each sub-scale and subsequently dividing by the total count of items within the scale. All sub-scales of the variable surpass the established benchmark for a dependable instrument, which is 0.6. The distinct coefficients pertaining to each sub-scale are as follows: Health and Safety 0.692; Physical Space 0.739; Learning process 0.651; Meeting Aspect 0.832; Transportation 0.664; Technology 0.688; Cost 0.732; Level of Coordination 0.657; Work Hours 0.659; The need for Recognition 0.671.

The primary data in this study consists of the distribution of questionnaires to the teaching staff of private universities. In conducting the comparative testing of the differences in perceptions between Generation X and Generation Y in facing the hybrid work environment after the pandemic, several steps need to be taken. The first step is to test the normality of the data as part of the classical assumption test. This test is conducted to confirm whether the research data follows a normal distribution. It aims to identify the shape of the data distribution to determine its suitability for further data analysis. The assessment of normality can be conducted through the utilization of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk tests (Green, S. B., Salkind, 2014).

The next step is to perform Levene's test, which is used to test the homogeneity of variance across two or more groups of data (Warner, 2013). After conducting the normality and homogeneity of variance tests, comparative testing is carried out based on the results of the normality test.

## **FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION**

### **Findings**

The primary aim of this study was to investigate whether X and Y generations as educators from higher education would have different perception tendencies in the hybrid working environment. Before analyzing the differences in perception between the two generation groups, the characteristics of the respondents will be identified first. The demographic result of the research participants is presented in Table 1 below. From the 277 questionnaires distributed to lecturers from private universities, it was found that in terms of gender, male respondents had a lower participation rate (48%) compared to female respondents (53%) in completing the survey. In terms of generations, the distribution of Generation X among educators in private universities was higher than Generation Y.

Regarding employment status, there were more lecturers with permanent positions in private foundations compared to lecturers employed by PNSDPK (Civil Servants in Higher Education Service Institutions), who are assigned to teach in private universities within their respective regions. The majority of respondents had been working for 10 to 15 years, while the educational background of the respondents was predominantly at the Master's level. This is in line with the 2005 Law No. 14 concerning lecturers, which stipulates that lecturers must have a minimum academic qualification of a Master's degree.

**Table 1 Distribution of Respondents by Gender**

No	Demographic Variables	Frequency	%	
1	Gender	Male	133	48
		Female	144	52
2	Generation	X	116	42
		Y	161	58
3	Status	Foundation Lecturer	260	94
		PNSDPK	17	6
4	Education	Master	202	73
		Doctor	75	26
5	Length of Employment	>1year	8	3
		1-4 years	18	6,5
		5-9 years	65	23,5
		10-15 years	136	49
		<15 years	50	18

Before conducting data analysis, a normality test is performed as part of the classical assumption test. This is done to ensure that the obtained data follows a normal distribution, meaning there are no errors or deviations in the data distribution that would render it unsuitable for analysis. The importance of data normality is to enable the generalization of the research findings to the research population. Before conducting a t-test, the normality test is performed employing the Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk tests (Green, S. B., & Salkind, 2014). The criteria for normality tests through Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk are that if the p-value or significance level is less than 0.05, the data is not normally distributed. Conversely, if the p-value or significance level is greater than 0.05, the data is normally distributed. Derived from the outcomes of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk tests at Table 3, it is found that the significance values for all variables are less than 0.05. This indicates that the research data is not normally distributed. Therefore, to compare the two samples in this study, a non-parametric statistical test, the Mann-Whitney U test, will be used (Warner, 2013).

**Tabel 2 Normality Test, Kolmogorov-Smirnov dan Shapiro-Wilk**

No	Variables	Generation	Df	Kolmogorov-Smirnov		Shapiro-Wilk	
				Stat.	Sig.	Stat.	Sig.
1	Health and Safety	X	116	0.443	0.000	0.589	0.000
		Y	161	0.310	0.000	0.818	0.000
2	Physical Space	X	116	0.515	0.000	0.412	0.000
		Y	161	0.340	0.000	0.822	0.000
3	Learning Process	X	116	0.215	0.009	0.895	0.024
		Y	161	0.278	0.000	0.902	0.001
4	Meeting Aspect	X	116	0.402	0.000	0.688	0.000
		Y	161	0.302	0.000	0.875	0.000
5	Transportation	X	116	0.280	0.000	0.808	0.001
		Y	161	0.273	0.000	0.862	0.000
6	Technology	X	116	0.455	0.000	0.480	0.000

		Y	161	0.284	0.000	0.854	0.000
<b>7</b>	Cost	X	116	0.365	0.000	0.744	0.000
		Y	161	0.276	0.000	0.906	0.001
<b>8</b>	Level of Coordination	X	116	0.380	0.000	0.714	0.000
		Y	161	0.277	0.000	0.856	0.000
<b>9</b>	Work Hours	X	116	0.321	0.000	0.864	0.006
		Y	161	0.146	0.012	0.925	0.004
<b>10</b>	The need for recognition	X	116	0.191	0.036	0.923	0.086
		Y	161	0.220	0.000	0.903	0.001

The next prerequisite test before conducting a comparative analysis is the homogeneity test. The homogeneity test is performed to identify whether the research data is homogenous or heterogeneous. The homogeneity test is conducted using Levene's test. The criteria for the homogeneity test state that if the p-value or significance level is less than 0.05, the data has non-homogeneous variances. Conversely, if the p-value or significance level is greater than 0.05, the data has homogeneous variances. Based on the results of Levene's test for variance homogeneity in this hypothesis, it is shown that the presented data is homoscedastic or has equal variances, as the F value is greater than 0.05.

**Table 3 Test of Homogeneity (Lavene Test)**

No	Variables	Lavene Test		
		T	F	Sig
<b>1</b>	Health and Safety	2.723	0.923	0.340
<b>2</b>	Learning Process	6.459	0.001	0.981
<b>3</b>	physical space	19.728	5.455	0.022
<b>4</b>	meeting aspect	5.639	0.009	0.923
<b>5</b>	Transportation	3.706	0.913	0.343
<b>6</b>	Technology	12,512	0.719	0.399
<b>7</b>	Cost	0.151	0.471	0.495
<b>8</b>	Level of Coordination	2.788	0.070	0.795
<b>9</b>	Work Hours	10.215	2.500	0.118
<b>10</b>	The need for recognition	3.956	0.747	0.390

Although the research data is homogeneous, it is known that the normality assumption for conducting comparative analysis through parametric statistics is not met. Therefore, to identify whether there are differences in perception between Generation X and Generation Y in the hybrid work environment, a non-parametric test is conducted. The Mann-Whitney U test is used as a non-parametric statistical test for conducting the comparison without considering the requirements of normality, homogeneity, and data outliers (Warner, 2013).

**Table 4 Mann-Whitney U Test**

No	Variable	X	Y	Z	P
		Mean Rank	Mean Rank		
<b>1</b>	Health and Safety	38.61	34.07	-1.039	0.299

2	Learning Process	32.55	36.85	-0.863	0.388
3	physical space	42.61	32.24	-2.379	0.017
4	meeting aspect	34.84	35.80	-0.202	0.840
5	Transportation	31.45	37.35	-1.209	0.227
6	Technology	38.82	33.98	-1.080	0.280
7	Cost	33.20	36.55	-0.673	0.501
8	Level of Coordination	36.39	35.09	-0.269	0.788
9	Work Hours	29.64	38.19	-1.663	0.096
10	The need for recognition	31.48	37.34	-1.156	0.248

The results of the Mann-Whitney U test comparison in Table 5 show that only one hypothesis related to the physical workspace has a p-value smaller than the critical value of 0.05. This indicates that there is a difference in perception across X and Y generation in the hybrid work environment in terms of the physical workspace. For other variables, it is known that the obtained p-values are larger than the critical value, indicating acceptance of the null hypothesis (H<sub>0</sub>), which means there is no difference in perception in the hybrid work environment between Gen X and Y in the overall aspects except for the physical workspace.

## Discussion

The first construct of this research was perceptions about the health and safety aspect of the hybrid working environment between the X and Y generations. The result showed that both generation have the same perception of the health and safety aspect of the hybrid work environment. From the data analysis, the first and second hypothesis states that there is a difference in perception over X and Y generation regarding the health and safety, and physical aspect of the hybrid work environment. Based on the results presented in Table 5, it is known p value is greater than 0.05 which means the null hypothesis failed to be rejected. It is found that both generations felt favorably about the health and safety aspect of a hybrid work environment. A recent study found that hybrid working creates a second workplace for both generations either at their home or at any other location they wish to work from. Higher education institutions must ensure that educators have comfortable and adequate equipment and supplies, including providing the necessary tools, infrastructure, and digital security at home. By providing and ensuring suitable facilities and environments, educators can avoid diseases related to musculoskeletal disorders (Grzegorzcyk, M., Mariniello, M., Nurski, L., & Schraepen, 2021).

The second research hypothesis declared that there is a difference in perception between Generation X and Y regarding the physical space in the hybrid work environment. The survey results show that generations X and Y each have different preferences when it comes to physical space. The physical space preferences desired by Generation Y are more oriented to the availability of meeting rooms, audio-visual equipment, and separate workspaces. In Generation X, educators prefer to accept any form of workplace support that has been provided by the institution. This indicates that Generation Y prefers a space to work and do learning that is lifetime learning. In previous research, related to opportunities for growth, it was found that Generation Y was described as a generation that has the intention to learn and develop somewhere higher than the previous generation (Gallup, 2016).

The third hypothesis states that there is a difference in perception between Generation X and Generation Y regarding the learning process in a hybrid work environment. Both Generation X and Generation Y concurred that a hybrid working environment in higher education embodies a blended learning approach, wherein technology's role in education necessitates a careful harmony between



conventional and inventive teaching methods, with learner engagement playing a pivotal role in shaping the results (O'Byrne, W. I., & Pytash, 2015). As this discovery underscores the engagement of learners, the fourth hypothesis, positing no variance in perception between Generation X and Generation Y concerning the interactive component of the hybrid work environment, involved educators and students in their capacities as learners and contributors to the design of their online learning environments. In this regard, educators belonging to both generations share the perspective that they will cooperate to assess student data and utilize it to drive improvements in learning and teaching during the same study timeframe.

On the fourth, fifth, and ninth hypotheses, both generations also have the same perceptions. In this matter, both generations are in alignment with the meeting aspect, transportation, and work hours aspects. The hybrid and also the blended environment will create productivity and satisfaction among educators and also cost proved effective and more efficient. Moreover, these results are consistent with the previous studies (Dziuban, C., Graham, C. R., Moskal, P. D., Norberg, A., & Sicilia, 2018; Khalil, M. K., Abdel Meguid, E. M., & Elkhider, 2018; Lothridge, K., Fox, J., & Fynan, 2013; Müller, C., & Mildenerger, 2021). A hybrid work environment that integrates online learning in place of some traditional in-person classroom activities, along with technology utilization, results in cost-effective, easily accessible, and excellent education that transcends geographical boundaries. This approach also holds the potential to establish a universally applicable knowledge foundation for global utilization. Blended learning settings are not linked to subpar learning results; instead, they exhibit a level of effectiveness on par with traditional classroom teaching methods. Hence, this research advocates for higher education institutions to provide students with increased freedom concerning the timing and location of their study programs.

These results also indicate that there is no gap between Generation X and Generation Y in adapting to the new learning system during the pandemic. Known as a techno-savvy, flexible and unconventional generation, the Y generation bringing the characteristic into the workplace a load of cultural diversity, habits, and behaviors inhibited in the way they act, work, communicate, exchange, and relate to their environment, people and their management (Puybaraud, M., Russel, S., McEwan, A. M., Luessing, E., & Beck, 2010). However, the results of the study also prove that the X generation prioritizes opportunities to learn collaborative and more flexibly. The change in the work environment, where the learning process combines remote learning and technology, does not affect educators from Generation X. In this case, Generation X, whose previous work environment was conventional, can adapt to the hybrid work environment. These findings are also in line with previous research that describes the positive outcomes of remote work (Hill, E. J., Hawkins, A. J., Ferris, M., & Weitzman, 2001; Raišienė, A. G., Rapuano, V., & Varkulevičiūtė, 2021). However, in terms of technology, the findings of this study are not consistent with previous research that identified older workers as more supportive of technology and communication (Bannon, S.; Ford, K.; Meltzer, 2011; Eastman, J. K., Iyer, R., Liao-Troth, S., Williams, D. F., & Griffin, 2014; Taylor, 2018).

In terms of the coordination hypothesis, the amount of time dedicated to coordination activities and meetings rose, whereas uninterrupted work hours significantly decreased. Both educators from X and Y cohorts engaged in reduced networking with individuals and business units, both internally and externally, within the organization. This result verifies the foregoing study which indicates that coordination in the remote working environment will succeed with fewer individuals. In smaller teams, it might be easier to solve coordination and gain more productivity (Gibbs, M., Mengel, F., & Siemroth, 2021).

Regarding recognition, this study links this factor to employee engagement. Both generations also concur that participating in remote educational programs fosters a culture of openness, enabling employees to gain fresh ideas. Engagement initiatives stimulate employees' curiosity and encourage

their innovative and creative abilities. Examples of engagement practices for educators include virtual team meetings, online learning and development opportunities, and webinars featuring experts. Higher education institutions must prioritize the satisfaction and motivation of their educators by implementing engagement measures supported by technology, as this is vital for organizational growth.

In response to the transition to remote work, institutions or university organizations have witnessed a surge in online meetings and the adoption of technology for monitoring and facilitating the learning process. However, voluntary visibility practices among educators have been absent. In the realm of Human Resources, "voluntary visualizing practices" refer to actions taken by employees to ensure they receive recognition from their superiors, such as working overtime. These actions are aimed at making themselves noticeable to their superiors (Delfino, G.F. & van der Kolk, 2021).

## CONCLUSION

This study aims to identify the differences in perception between Generation X and Generation Y regarding the hybrid work environment that emerged after the Covid-19 pandemic, particularly in the context of private higher education institutions. The results of the study indicate that Generation X and Generation Y have differing perceptions in only one variable related to the physical workspace or environment. However, for other variables, there are no differences in perception between Generation X and Generation Y regarding the hybrid work environment.

As an alternative learning model during the pandemic, the hybrid work environment, including hybrid learning, has become a new framework in the higher education work environment. To optimize hybrid learning, both Generation X and Generation Y educators need to have digital literacy and technological skills. With no significant differences in perception between generations regarding the hybrid work environment, the efficiency of hybrid learning in the work environment can be maximized by providing training to enhance hybrid learning simultaneously for all individuals, regardless of their generational background.

The results have demonstrated that educators either from X or Y generation can efficiently do hybrid working remotely, with no negative implications for their productivity or performance. Primarily, educators across both generations might potentially discover novel work processes that lead to an ultimate enhancement in productivity. The pandemic crisis has underscored the importance of establishing measures within the work environment to safeguard the well-being of educators and to ensure a seamless integration of remote and in-person teaching, with uniform treatment and career prospects for all. Nonetheless, the objective should be to support the establishment of adaptable working arrangements, guaranteeing equitable levels of security for both in-person and hybrid workers. This should also encourage alignment within the higher education sector and streamline geographical mobility for educators.

## REFERENCES

- Arntz, M., Yahmed, S. B., & Berlingieri, F. (2022). Working from home, hours worked and wages: Heterogeneity by gender and parenthood. *Labour Economics*, 76, 102169.
- Bannon, S.; Ford, K.; Meltzer, L. (2011). Understanding Millennials in the workplace. *The CPA Journal*, 81, 61–65.
- Delfino, G.F. & van der Kolk, B. (2021). Remote working, management control changes and employee responses during the COVID-19 crisis. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 34(6),

- 1376–1387. <https://doi.org/10.1108/AAAJ-06-2020-4657>
- Dziuban, C., Graham, C. R., Moskal, P. D., Norberg, A., & Sicilia, N. (2018). Blended learning: the new normal and emerging technologies. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 15, 1–16.
- Eastman, J. K., Iyer, R., Liao-Troth, S., Williams, D. F., & Griffin, M. (2014). The role of involvement on millennials' mobile technology behaviors: The moderating impact of status consumption, innovation, and opinion leadership. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 22(4), 455–470.
- Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education*. McGraw-Hill.
- Gallup, I. (2016). *How millennials want to work and live*.
- Gibbs, M., Mengel, F., & Siemroth, C. (2021). *Work from home & productivity: Evidence from personnel & analytics data on IT professionals* (No. 2021–56).
- Green, S. B., Salkind, N. J. (. (2014). *Using SPSS for Windows and Macintosh: Analyzing and understanding data (7th ed.)* (7th editio). Prentice Hall.
- Grzegorzczak, M., Mariniello, M., Nurski, L., & Schraepen, T. (2021). *Blending the physical and virtual: a hybrid model for the future of work* (No. 14/2021).
- Hill, E. J., Hawkins, A. J., Ferris, M., & Weitzman, M. (2001). Finding an extra day a week: The positive influence of perceived job flexibility on work and family life balance. *Family Relations*, 50(1), 49–58.
- Khalil, M. K., Abdel Meguid, E. M., & Elkhider, I. A. (2018). Teaching of anatomical sciences: A blended learning approach. *Clinical Anatomy*, 31(3), 323–329.
- Krahn, H. J., & Galambos, N. L. (2014). Work values and beliefs of 'Generation X' and 'Generation Y.' *Journal of Youth Studies*, 17(1), 92–112. <https://doi.org/DOI: 10.1080/13676261.2013.815701>
- Lothridge, K., Fox, J., & Fynan, E. (2013). Blended learning: efficient, timely and cost effective. *Australian Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 45(4), 407–416.
- Müller, C., & Mildenerger, T. (2021). Facilitating flexible learning by replacing classroom time with an online learning environment: A systematic review of blended learning in higher education. *Educational Research Review*, 34, 100394. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2021.100394>
- Nindyati, A. D. (2017). Pemaknaan loyalitas karyawan pada generasi x dan generasi y (Studi Pada Karyawan Di Indonesia). *Journal of Psychological Science and Profession*, 1(3), 59–66.
- O'Byrne, W. I., & Pytash, K. E. (2015). Hybrid and blended learning: Modifying pedagogy across path, pace, time, and place. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 59(2), 137–140. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/jaal.463>
- Ouppara, N. S., & Sy, M. V. U. (2012). Quality of Work Life Practices in a Multinational Company. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 40(032), 116–121. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.03.169>
- Puybaraud, M., Russel, S., McEwan, A. M., Luessing, E., & Beck, L. (2010). *Generation Y and the Workplace*.
- Raišienė, A. G., Rapuano, V., & Varkulevičiūtė, K. (2021). Sensitive men and hardy women: How do millennials, xennials and gen x manage to work from home?. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity*, 7(6), 106.
- Raziq, A., & Maulabakhsh, R. (2015). Impact of Working Environment on Job Satisfaction. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 23(October 2014), 717–725. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2212-5671\(15\)00524-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2212-5671(15)00524-9)
- Ritchey, F. (2008). *The Statistical Imagination: Elementary Statistics for the Social Sciences* (2 nd

Editisi). McGraw-Hill.

- Riyanda, A. R., Agnesa, T., Wira, A., Ambiyar, A., Umar, S., & Hakim, U. (2022). Hybrid learning: alternatif model pembelajaran di masa pandemi covid-19. *Jurnal Basicedu*, 6(3), 4461–4469. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.31004/basicedu.v6i3.2794>
- Rusyada, H., & Nasir, M. (2022). Efektivitas Penerapan Hybrid Learning Pasca Pandemi Covid-19 di Sekolah Dasar. *Jurnal Basicedu*, 6(2), 1712–1723. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.31004/basicedu.v6i2.2275>
- Schenker, J. D., & Rumrill Jr, P. D. (2004). Causal-comparative research designs. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation*, 21(3), 117–121.
- Stratton, S. J. (2021). *Population Research : Convenience Sampling Strategies*. August. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049023X21000649>
- Sukiman, Sri, H., & Puspo, R. (2022). NThe pattern of hybrid learning to maintain learning effectiveness at the higher education level post-COVID-19 pandemic. *European Journal of Educational Research*, 11(1), 243–257.
- Sumandiyar, A., Genggong, M. S., Nanda, I., & Fachruddin, S. (2021). The effectiveness of hybrid learning as instructional media amid the COVID-19 pandemic. *Jurnal Studi Komunikasi*, 5(3), 651–664.
- Taylor, M. K. (2018). Xennials: a microgeneration in the workplace. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 50(3), 136–147.
- 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/https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206309352246>
- Warner, R. M. (2013). *Applied statistics: From bivariate through multivariate techniques*. CA: SAGE Publications.
- Wood, S. (2013). Generation Z as consumers: trends and innovation. *Institute for Emerging Issues: NC State University*, 119(9), 7767–7779.



**JURNAL PENELITIAN PENDIDIKAN**  
Lembaga Penelitian dan Pengabdian kepada Masyarakat  
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia  
Jl. Dr. Setiabudhi 229, Bandung 40154, Indonesia  
Telp/Fax. (+62) 22 2013163 ext. 33056, email: [jpp@upi.edu](mailto:jpp@upi.edu)

Bandung, 31 July 2023

**Letter of Acceptance**

To: Dina Mellita & Ayu Lestari

I am formally writing to inform you that your manuscript entitled **"THE DIFFERENCE IN PERCEPTIONS OF HYBRID WORK ENVIRONMENT BETWEEN GENERATION X AND GENERATION Y EDUCATORS IN PRIVATE HIGHER EDUCATION POST-COVID-19 PANDEMIC"** has completed and passed the review and editing processes in the **"Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan"**, a Sinta (S3) indexed Journal. The manuscript will be published in **Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan** Vol. 23 No. 2.

The correspondence between the editorial team and the authors shall be sent to Ayu Lestari at [ayu.lestari00@icloud.com](mailto:ayu.lestari00@icloud.com), as the corresponding author, and please use the email for contacting us.

Thank you for your contribution to the **Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan**.

Best regard,



Dr. Eka Prihatin, M.Pd  
Editor-in-Chief  
Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan  
Lembaga Penelitian dan Pengabdian kepada Masyarakat  
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia  
Jl. Dr. Setiabudhi 229 Bandung 40154