

The level of work engagement at generation z

Tingkatan work engagement pada generasi z

Suhaini, Reny Yuniasanti

Universitas Mercu Buana Yogyakarta
Jl. Ringroad Utara, Depok, Sleman, Yogyakarta

ARTICLE INFO:	ABSTRACT
Received: 2024-09-04 Revised: 2024-11-13 Accepted: 2024-11-15	Generation Z is a generation whose numbers dominate and some have entered the workforce so that it will be a new challenge for human resource management. The reason of this consider is to decide the level of work engagement in era Z. The subjects in this ponder measured to 100 era Z representatives. The subjects in this think about summed to 100 era Z workers. The examining procedure utilized was comfort inspecting. The inquire about strategy utilized is clear quantitative investigate strategy. Information collection in this think about utilized a work engagement scale that was orchestrated based on five viewpoints, to be specific vigor, devotion, retention. Expressive information examination strategies utilize comparison of theoretical cruel and observational cruel and test contrasts with One-Way ANOVA. The results showed work engagement in generation Z was in the high category.
Keywords: Work engagement, generation Z, employee	
Kata Kunci: Keterikatan kerja, generasi Z, karyawan	ABSTRACT Generasi Z merupakan generasi yang jumlahnya mendominasi dan sebagian telah memasuki dunia kerja sehingga akan menjadi tantangan baru bagi manajemen sumber daya manusia. Tujuan dilakukan riset berikut adalah guna mengetahui tingkatan <i>work engagement</i> pada generasi Z. Subjek pada riset ini jumlahnya 100 orang karyawan generasi Z. Teknik sampling yang digunakan adalah <i>convenience sampling</i> . Metode riset yang digunakan yaitu metode studi kuantitatif deskriptif. Pengumpulan data pada riset ini menggunakan skala <i>work engagement</i> yang dirancang sesuai lima aspek yaitu <i>vigor</i> , <i>dedication</i> , <i>absorption</i> . Teknik analisis data deskriptif menggunakan perbandingan <i>mean</i> hipotetik dan <i>mean</i> empirik serta pengujian perbedaan dengan <i>One-Way ANOVA</i> . Hasil riset memaparkan <i>work engagement</i> pada generasi Z ada dalam kategori tinggi.
	©2024 Jurnal Psikologi Tabularasa This is an open access article distributed under the CC BY-SA 4.0 license (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/)

How to cite: Suhaini, & Yuniasanti, R. (2024). The level of work engagement at generation Z. Jurnal Psikologi Tabularasa, 19(2), 253-263. doi: <http://doi.org/10.26905/jpt.v19.i2.14111>

1. INTRODUCTION

Since the emergence of generation theory, terms like Generation X, Y, and Z have become part of common discourse, particularly in relation to workplace characteristics. This understanding aims to foster mutual understanding between generations (Wijoyo et al., 2020). The Central Statistics Agency (2020) reported that Gen Z dominates the population at 27.94%,

followed by Millennials at 25.87%, Generation X at 21.88%, and Baby Boomers at 11.56%. The dominance of Gen Z over previous generations is a compelling topic for further discussion.

According to research by Dimock (2019) from the Pew Research Center, Gen Z was born between 1997 and 2012, a timeline echoed by Arum (2023). Similarly, Arista and Priyana (2023) define Gen Z as those born from 1997 to 2012, further categorizing them into students or early-career professionals. By 2020, most Gen Z members were still in school, while a portion had entered the workforce (Arum, 2023).

Gen Z is characterized by technological fluency, sociability, expressiveness, multitasking abilities, fast-switching tendencies, and a passion for sharing (Wijoyo et al., 2020). Having grown up in a modern, digital environment, Gen Z displays unique traits compared to other generations. At work, they are seen as creative, proactive, and updated, traits that many companies seek (Putri, 2023). Gen Z's exceptional potential, particularly in digital innovation and their drive to achieve financial stability, holds the promise of significant contributions and long-term benefits for organizations (Stillman & Stillman, 2017).

However, research by Yello (2019) reveals that Gen Z employees tend to have job tenures two-thirds shorter than previous generations. Similarly, Limon (2019) reports that Gen Z members are three times more likely to switch jobs, with 20% holding four or more positions in a short span. Hay Group data (in Yuniasanti et al., 2019) from 2018 indicates that among 700 employees across 19 countries, 192 million quit their jobs. This reflects a lack of commitment among Gen Z employees (Bencsik et al., 2016), often attributed to dissatisfaction with companies that fail to effectively develop their talents (Purba & Ananta, 2018).

This tendency suggests that Gen Z struggles with engagement in their work, posing challenges for companies that value employees with high work engagement. Engaged employees perform better, enjoy their work, and demonstrate higher productivity (Siskawaty, 2018). Addressing this issue requires companies to adopt strategies that effectively cater to Gen Z's needs and preferences.

Employees who are engaged with their work are referred to as work engagement. Work engagement is a state of self-fulfillment, positive thinking, and perspective toward work characterized by vigor, absorption, and dedication (Schaufeli et al., 2002). According to Schaufeli & Bakker (2004), work engagement is a condition in which a person has positive thoughts, allowing self-expression to function effectively during work. This expression can be observed in their physical efforts, cognitive abilities, and emotional investment. Bakker & Leiter (2010) stated that high work engagement can make employees more psychologically connected and increase their motivation to work. It also allows employees to feel valued and meaningful in their work, which enhances company performance. Performance will be more effective and efficient if employees possess work engagement (Yongxing et al., 2017). According to Kahn (1990), work engagement occurs when employees are fully involved in their work and express themselves physically, cognitively, and emotionally. Conversely, if

they are not engaged, they will withdraw physically, cognitively, and emotionally from their work.

A Gallup survey in 2023 revealed that 25% of employees in Indonesia are engaged, while 69% are not engaged, and approximately 6% are actively disengaged and detached from their work. Furthermore, a 2018 survey report by the Employee Engagement Survey of Universitas Indonesia (LPTUI) on civil servants showed that only 24% had good work engagement, while 76% had poor work engagement. Additionally, research conducted by Shabrina & Mardawati (2017) found that 30% of employees had high work engagement levels, while 70% had low work engagement levels. These findings demonstrate that many employees still lack sufficient work engagement in their jobs.

Based on the explanation above, the topic of work engagement among Generation Z in the workplace is still underexplored, making it necessary to determine the level of work engagement in Generation Z. In this regard, the discussion will focus on understanding the levels of work engagement among Generation Z.

2. METHODS

Data collection in the following research uses a scale method. A psychological scale is a measurement instrument designed based on the theoretical construct of the variable, consisting of two types of statements: favorable and unfavorable (Azwar, 2016). Data sampling employs the convenience sampling technique. According to Sugiyono (2017), convenience sampling is a type of non-probability sampling where the sample is selected based on subjects that are easiest to access or available at the time of data collection by the researcher. The characteristics of the subjects in this research are Generation Z employees aged 18-27 years. The total number of respondents obtained in this study is 100 individuals.

The instrument used in this research is the work engagement scale. The measurement instrument employed by the researcher is a Likert scale, referring to the aspects of the work engagement variable: vigor, dedication, and absorption by Schaufeli et al. (2002). Each question comprises four response options: STS (Strongly Disagree), TS (Disagree), S (Agree), and SS (Strongly Agree). The data analysis technique uses quantitative descriptive analysis, which is further processed using the SPSS data analysis program.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

Research data from the work engagement scale obtained hypothetical score data and empirical weight calculations. The description of the data weights of the related variables can be seen in table 1:

Table 1 Research Data Description

Variable	Hypothetical Data					Empirical Data			
	N	Mean	Scores		SD	Mean	Scores		SD
			Min	Max			Min	Max	
Work Engagement	100	32,5	13	52	6,5	39,85	28	52	5,370

Description:

- N = Number of subjects
- Mean = Average
- Min = Lowest score
- Max = Highest score
- SD = Standard Deviation

Table 1 shows that the work engagement variable contains empirical and hypothetical score data, including maximum, minimum, standard deviation, range, and mean. From the analysis of the work engagement scale, the hypothetical data shows the lowest weight of $1 \times 13 = 13$, the highest weight of $4 \times 13 = 52$, a hypothetical mean of $(52 + 13) : 2 = 32.5$, a hypothetical range of $52 - 13 = 39$, and a standard deviation of $(52 - 13) : 6 = 6.5$. Meanwhile, the empirical data analysis reveals a minimum score of 28, a maximum score of 52, an average score of 39.85, and a standard deviation of 5.370. This indicates a difference between the two means. The difference suggests that Generation Z has a relatively high level of work engagement.

Table 2 Work Engagement Scale Score Categorization

Categories	Formulas	Scores	N	Percentages
High	$X > (\mu + 1\sigma)$	$X > 39$	58	58%
Medium	$\mu - 1\sigma \leq X < \mu + 1\sigma$	$26 \leq X \leq 39$	42	42%
Low	$X < (\mu - 1\sigma)$	$X < 26$	0	0%
Total			100	100%

Description:

- X = X – Subject’s score
- μ = Mean
- σ = Standard Deviation

In the following work engagement variables are categorized into 3, namely low, medium, and high. The results of the categorization according to the standard deviation and mean hypothetically obtained results, namely high categorization worth (58%) (58 subjects), medium category worth (42%) (42 subjects), and low category (0%) (0 subjects).

Table 3 Subject Categories By Age

Age	N	Mean	Categories
18 – 21 years	4	37,25	Medium
22 – 30 years	96	39,96	High
Total	100	39,85	High

The level of work engagement at generation z
Suhaini, Reny Yuniasanti

The average work engagement score for subjects aged 22-30 years had an average score of 39.96 and subjects aged 18-21 years had an average score of 37.25.

Table 4 Subject Categories by Gender

Gender	N	Mean	Categories
Male	26	41,77	High
Female	74	39,18	High
Total	100	39,85	High

The average work engagement of male subjects had an average score of 41.77, while the second most common score for female subjects was 39.18.

Table 5 Subject Categories Based on Education

Education levels	N	Mean	Categories
High school/ vocational school	18	37,33	Medium
Diploma (4 years)	4	42,50	High
Diploma (3 years)	10	40,50	High
Bachelor	65	39,89	High
Masters	3	48,33	High
Total	100	39,85	High

The average work engagement score for subjects with an education at the Masters level has a maximum average score of 48.33, then the second subject with an education at the D4 level has an average score of 42.50, then the third subject with an education at the D3 level has an average score of 40.50, then the fourth subject with an education at the S1 level has an average score of 39.89, then the last subject with an education at the SMA/SMK level has an average score of 37.33.

Table 6 Subject Categories by Occupation

Occupations	N	Mean	Categories
Private	83	39,96	High
Non-Private	17	42,24	High
Total	100	39,85	High

The average work engagement of subjects with non-private jobs had a maximum average score of 42.24, while subjects with private jobs had an average score of 39.36.

Table 7 Subject Categories Based on Years of Work

Years of Work	N	Mean	Categories
> 6 months	24	39,42	High
6 months - 1 year	14	40,21	High
1 year - 2 years	33	40,33	High
< 2 years	29	39,48	High
Total	100	39,85	High

The average work engagement score for subjects with a work period of 1 year - 2 years had the highest average score of 40.33, followed by the second with a work period of 6 months - 1 year with an average score of 40.21, the third with a work period of > 2 years with an average score of 39.48 and the last with a work period of < 6 months with an average score of 39.42.

Table 8 Subject Categories Based on Domicile

Domicile	N	Mean	Categories
Java	48	39,96	High
Borneo	34	38,62	Medium
Sumatera	10	43,60	High
Sulawesi	5	40,20	High
Bali and Lesser Sunda Islands	3	39,00	High
Total	100	39,85	High

The average work engagement score for subjects residing in Sumatra has the highest mean score of 43.60. Following that, subjects residing in Sulawesi have a mean score of 40.20. Next, those residing in Java have a mean score of 39.96. In fourth place, subjects residing in Bali and Nusa Tenggara have a mean score of 39.00. Lastly, those residing in Kalimantan have an average score of 38.62.

DISCUSSION

This research aims to determine the level of work engagement in Generation Z. Based on the study conducted, the majority of hypothetical data shows that 58 subjects (58%) have a high level of work engagement, while 42 individuals (42%) have a moderate level. It can be concluded that work engagement in Generation Z falls into the high category.

The first aspect of work engagement is vigor. Vigor refers to a condition characterized by high energy and strong mental resilience when performing job tasks. Individuals with vigor are more energetic, enthusiastic, and committed to their work. According to statement number seven, "I strive to give my best at work," 44% of subjects answered "very appropriate," and 56% answered "appropriate." This indicates that Generation Z has enthusiasm and

determination in their work as well as mental resilience in performing their tasks (Schaufeli et al., 2002). Additionally, for statement number ten, "I feel happy with my current job," 27% of subjects answered "very appropriate," and 61% answered "appropriate." This implies that Generation Z possesses high energy levels at work, making them feel happy in their roles (Schaufeli et al., 2002).

The second aspect of work engagement is dedication. Dedication involves a strong sense of involvement in work, enthusiasm, pride in the job, and feeling inspired and challenged while working. According to statement number eight, "The work I do inspires me," 33% of subjects answered "very appropriate," and 60% answered "appropriate." This indicates that Generation Z feels inspired and challenged in their work (Schaufeli et al., 2002). Furthermore, for statement number eleven, "I am proud of the work I do," 32% of subjects answered "very appropriate," and 60% answered "appropriate." This reflects that Generation Z takes pride in their involvement at work (Schaufeli et al., 2002).

The third aspect of work engagement is absorption. Absorption refers to being fully attentive and engaged in work, with individuals feeling that time passes quickly and preferring not to leave their tasks. According to statement number three, "Time flies when I am working," 29% of subjects answered "very appropriate," and 55% answered "appropriate." This suggests that Generation Z perceives time as passing quickly while they are working (Schaufeli et al., 2002). Additionally, for statement number nine, "I am very focused when working," 20% of subjects answered "very appropriate," and 64% answered "appropriate." This indicates that Generation Z pays full attention to their work, allowing them to concentrate effectively (Schaufeli et al., 2002).

In line with the age demographics, a one-way ANOVA test yielded $F = 0.977$ with $p = 0.325$. According to the one-way ANOVA rule, $p < 0.050$ indicates a variable showing significant engagement differences among analyzed groups, while $p \geq 0.050$ means no significant differences are present.

Thus, it can be understood that there is no significant difference between work engagement levels and the age of the subjects, but there are differences in the average work engagement levels among Generation Z. The work engagement score in the high category corresponds to subjects aged 22-30 years, while those in the moderate category are aged 18-21 years.

According to Santrock (2012), individuals aged 18-21 years are in the late adolescence phase, where there is a need for independence and identity formation. Individuals in this phase are still in the exploration stage, where they seek career paths that align with their interests and abilities and begin planning for the future (Santrock, 2010). Meanwhile, individuals aged 22-30 years enter the early adulthood period, where they focus more on career development and financial independence (Santrock, 2012). This aligns with Fatharani & Riasnugrahani (2022), who state that work engagement tends to be higher in older age groups compared to younger ones, as older individuals have more work experience, which leads to stronger attachment to their jobs (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004).

In line with the gender demographic, a one-way ANOVA test showed $F = 4.654$ with $p = 0.033$. According to the one-way ANOVA rule, if $p < 0.050$, it indicates a significant difference in engagement between the analyzed groups. However, if $p \geq 0.050$, it means no significant difference.

Thus, it can be concluded that there is no difference in work engagement levels between genders in Generation Z. High work engagement scores are seen in both males and females. According to Drake (2012), there is no relationship between gender and the work engagement an individual has with their job.

Based on the educational demographics, a one-way ANOVA test yielded $F = 3.453$ with $p = 0.011$. According to the one-way ANOVA rule, if $p < 0.050$, it indicates a significant difference in engagement levels among the analyzed groups. On the other hand, if $p \geq 0.050$, it suggests no meaningful difference.

Thus, the conclusion is that there is a significant difference in work engagement based on education levels. High work engagement scores are seen in subjects with educational backgrounds of Diploma 3 (D3), Diploma 4 (D4), Bachelor's (S1), and Master's (S2). Mokhine & Geysers (2020) state that employees with higher education levels tend to have higher work engagement. Meanwhile, those in the moderate category are subjects with high school/vocational school (SMA/SMK) education. Hermawan (2017) states that workers with high school education tend to be less engaged with their work due to a lower theoretical understanding of the job they are performing.

Based on the job demographic, a one-way ANOVA test resulted in $F = 4.171$ with a p-value of 0.044. According to the one-way ANOVA rule, if $p < 0.050$, it indicates a significant relationship between the variables analyzed. Conversely, if $p \geq 0.050$, there is no significant difference among the groups analyzed.

Thus, the conclusion shows a significant difference between work engagement in Generation Z and job type. High work engagement scores are found in subjects working in both private and non-private sectors. This aligns with Schaufeli's (2002) theory that individuals with vigor, dedication, and absorption tend to have high work engagement.

Based on the work tenure demographic, a one-way ANOVA test yielded $F = 0.203$ with $p = 0.894$. According to the one-way ANOVA rule, if $p < 0.050$, it indicates a significant difference in work engagement among the analyzed groups. However, if $p \geq 0.050$, there is no significant difference.

Thus, the conclusion shows no significant difference between work engagement and work tenure in Generation Z. The work engagement scores for subjects with work tenure of under 6 months to over 2 years fall within the high category. According to Chaudhary & Rangnekar (2017), employees who are new to the company tend to view the company positively due to the novelty effect, resulting in high work engagement for those with less than 2 years of tenure. Furthermore, employees with over 2 years of experience tend to have greater work engagement due to accumulated experience, skills, and dedication to their job (Zamralita, 2017).

Based on the domicile demographic, the one-way ANOVA test showed $F = 1.747$ with $p = 0.146$. According to the one-way ANOVA rule, if $p < 0.050$, it indicates a significant relationship between the variables and the groups analyzed. Conversely, if $p \geq 0.050$, it indicates no significant difference.

Thus, the conclusion is that there is a difference in work engagement levels according to domicile, but it is not significant. Subjects from Sumatra, Sulawesi, Java, Bali, and Nusa Tenggara have high work engagement, while those from Kalimantan have moderate work engagement.

4. CONCLUSION

Based on the results of this research, the conclusion indicates that the work engagement level of Generation Z is categorized as high. There are differences in work engagement levels according to age, gender, education, work tenure, and domicile, but these differences are not significant. Recommendations include that organizations should strive to maintain high work engagement among Generation Z employees. Future researchers could consider using more recent references on work engagement for further studies.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Arista, D. A., & Priyana, Y. (2023). Analisis kesejahteraan psikologis dalam kaitannya dengan kesiapan dunia kerja pada generasi-z(studi kasus mahasiswa tingkat akhir di salah satu perguruan tinggi swasta di sukabumi). *Jurnal Psikologi Dan Konseling West Science*, 1(1), 1-8.
<https://wnj.westsciencepress.com/index.php/jpkws/article/view/178/406>
- Arum, L. S., Zahrani, A., & Duha, N. A. (2023). Karakteristik generasi z dan kesiapannya dalam menghadapi bonus demografi 2030. *Accounting Student Research Journal*, 2(1), 59-72. <https://doi.org/10.62108/asrj.v2i1.5812>
- Atieq, M. Q., Basid, R. A., & Jayanti, T. (2023). Gamification pada perusahaan: dampaknya pada tingkat engagement karyawan generasi z. *Bisnis: Jurnal Bisnis Dan Manajemen Islam*, 11(1), 73-92.
<https://doi.org/doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.21043/bisnis.v11i1.19462>
- Badan Pusat Statistik (BPS). (2020). *Hasil sensus penduduk 2020*. Badan pusat statistik (bps). [Hhttps://demakkab.bps.go.id/news/2021/01/21/67/hasil-sensus-penduduk-2020.html](https://demakkab.bps.go.id/news/2021/01/21/67/hasil-sensus-penduduk-2020.html)
- Bakker, A. B., & Leiter, M. P. (2010). *Work Engagement: A Handbook Of Essential Theory And Research*. Psychology Press.
- Bencsik, A., Juhász, T., & Csikos, G. Dr. H. (2016). Y and z generations at workplaces. *Journal Of Competitiveness*, 6(3), 90-106. doi: 10.7441/joc.2016.03.06
- Dimock, M. (2019). *Defining generations: where millennials end and generation z begins*. <https://www.pewresearch.org/shortreads/2019/01/17/where-millennials-end-and-generation-z-begins/>

- Drake, T. J. (2012). *Assessing employee engagement: a comparison of the job engagement scale and the utrecht work engagement scale* [thesis]. Colorado State University.
- Gallup. (2023). State of the Global Workplace Report: Why Does Employee Engagement Research Matter? <https://www.gallup.com/394373/indicator-employee-engagement.aspx>
- Fatharani, T., & Riasnugrahani, M. (2022). Panggilan keterikatan kerja dan kepuasan kerja pada guru. *Aksara: Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan Nonformal*, 08(1), 313–324. <http://dx.doi.org/10.37905/aksara.8.1.313-324.2022>
- Firamadhina, F. I. R., & Krisnani, H. (2020). Perilaku generasi z terhadap penggunaan media sosial tiktok: tiktok sebagai media edukasi dan aktivisme. *Share: Social Work Jurnal*, 10(2), 199–208. <https://doi.org/10.24198/share.v10i2.31443>
- Fitriatus, S. D., Khusniya, F., Ardiansyah, M. N., & Mualimin. (2024). Peranan manajemen sumber manusia dalam organisasi. *Jurnal Ilmiah Multidisiplin*, 1(4), 365–373. <https://doi.org/10.62017/merdeka.v1i4.1391>
- Hadi, S. (2015). *Metodologi riset*. Fakultas Psikologi UGM.
- Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy Of Management Journal*, 33(4), 692–724. <https://doi.org/10.2307/256287>
- Limon, M. (2019). *Why are so many millennials and gen z job-hopping?* <https://observatory.tec.mx/edu-news/why-are-so-many-millennials-and-gen-z-job-hopping>.
- Lockwood, N. R. (2007). Leveraging employee engagement for competitive advantage. *Society For Human Resource Management Research Quarterly*, 1, 1–12.
- LPT UI. (2018). *Laporan hasil survei keterikatan pegawai*. Laporan hasil survei keterikatan pegawai universitas indonesia.
- Manalu, A. R., Thamrin, R., Hasan, M., & Syahputra, D. (2021). Pengaruh work engagement terhadap kinerja pegawai bpjs ketenagakerjaan. *Journal Economics And Management(Jecma)*, 1(02), 42–49. <https://doi.org/10.46772/jecma.v1i02.376>
- Mokhine, P., & Geyser, I. (2020). The impact of demographic influences on work engagement for front of house female hotel employees. *African Journal Of Hospitality*, 9(5), 842–855. <https://doi.org/10.46222/ajhtl.19770720-55>
- Nurhalizah, S. S., & Mulyani, I. (2024). Kontribusi kualitas kehidupan kerja terhadap keterlekatan karyawan pada generasi z. *Jiip (Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Pendidikan)*, 7(3), 2650–2656. <https://doi.org/10.54371/jiip.v7i3.3866>
- Psychological Association, A. (2018). *Stress in America™ Generation Z*. <https://www.apa.org/news/press/releases/stress/2018/stress-gen-z.pdf>
- Purba, S. D., & Ananta, A. N. D. (2018). The effects of work passion, work engagement and job satisfaction on turn over intention of the millennial generation. *Jurnal Manajemen Dan Pemasaran jasa*, 11(2), 263–274. <http://dx.doi.org/10.25105/jmpj.v11i2.2954>
- Putra, Y. S. (2016). Theoretical review/ : teori perbedaan generasi. *Among makarti*, 9(18), 123–134. <http://dx.doi.org/10.52353/ama.v9i2.142>

The level of work engagement at generation z

Suhaini, Reny Yuniasanti

- Putri, P. K. Cara mendapatkan hati gen z si pengisi angkatan kerja masa kini. *Ppm manajemen*. Diakses tanggal 16 Juni 2024 dari <https://ppm-manajemen.ac.id/cara-mendapatkan-hati-gen-z-si-pengisi-angkatan-kerja-masa-kini/>
- Santrock, J. W. (2010). *Life-Span Development* (Edition 13). Mcgraw-Hill Higher Education.
- Santrock, J. W. (2012). *Life-Span Development* (Edisi 14). Mcgraw-Hill Higher Education.
- Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2004). Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: a multi-sample study. *Journal Of Organizational Behavior*, 25. doi: 10.1002/job.248
- Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., Roma, V. G., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: a two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach. *Journal Of Happiness Studies*, 3, 71–92.
- Shabrina, I. T., & Mardiawan, O. (2017). Studi deskriptif work engagement pada karyawan pt. Silkargo indonesia cabang bandung divisi marketing dan operasional. *Prosiding Psikologi*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.29313/.v0i0.7245>
- Siskawaty. (2018). Peran keterikatan kerja dan keterikatan organisasional terhadap kinerja karyawan. *Jurnal Manajemen Bisnis Dan Kewirausahaan*, 02(5), 77–84. <https://doi.org/10.24912/jmbk.v2i5.4892>
- Stillman, D., & Stillman, J. (2017). *Genz@Work/ : How the next generaion transforming the workplace* (1st Ed.). Harper Collins.
- Sugiyono. (2017). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, Dan R&D*. Alfabeta.
- Wijoyo, H., Indrawan, I., Cahyono, Y., Handoko, A. L., & Santamoko, R. (2020). *Generasi z & revolusi industri 4.0* (pertama). Penerbit CV. pena persada.
- Yello. (2019). The 2019 yello recruiting study: meet generation z. *Yello recruiting*. <https://yello.co/resource/white-paper/generation-z-recruiting-study/>
- Yudiani, E. (2017). Work engagement karyawan pt. Bukit asam persero ditinjau dari spiritualitas. *Psikis-Jurnal Psikologi Islami*, 3(1). <https://doi.org/10.19109/psikis.v3i1.1390>
- Yuniasanti, R., Abas, N. A. H., & Hamzah, H. (2019). Employee turnover intention among millennials: the role of psychological well-being and experienced workplace incivility. *Humanitas Indonesian Psychological Journal*, 16(2), 74–85. <http://dx.doi.org/10.26555/humanitas.v16i2.12544>
- Zamralita. (2017). Gambaran keterikatan kerja pada dosen-tetap ditinjau dari karakteristik personal. *Jurnal Muara Ilmu Sosial, Humaniora, Dan Seni*, 1(1), 338–345. <https://doi.org/10.24912/jmishumsen.v1i1.374>
-