

## Work engagement among millennial employees: The role of psychological capital and perceived organizational support

Nabila Ayu Gumilang, Indrayanti

Faculty of Psychology, Universitas Gadjah Mada, Indonesia  
Corresponding author: [indrapsi@ugm.ac.id](mailto:indrapsi@ugm.ac.id)

### ARTICLE INFO

#### Article history

Received November 25, 2021

Revised July 2, 2022

Accepted July 5, 2022

#### Keywords

millennial;  
perceived organization support;  
psychological capital;  
work engagement.

### ABSTRACT

Millennials, who have several values, perspectives, and habits different from previous generations, have dominated the profile of workers in Indonesia. Challenges and changes in the company require millennials to be engaged in their work. This study aimed to determine the work engagement of millennial employees through the role of psychological capital and perceived organizational support. The research participants were 225 millennial employees with a minimum working period of six months. The work engagement scale (UWES-17), Psychological Capital Questionnaire (PCQ), and Perceived Organizational Support Scale were used to collect the data. This research was conducted using quantitative methods and analyzed by multiple regression analysis. The results show that psychological capital and perceived organizational support simultaneously contribute to work engagement among millennial employees. Independently, psychological capital and perceived organizational support significantly predict work engagement. These findings indicate both personal factors and situational factors are needed to achieve work engagement. Thus, the finding represents the existence of positive psychological movement on work engagement through the lens of the psychological process mechanism at work.

### Introduction

Millennial employees never stop being talked about, given their vital role in today's workforce. Today's majority of working-age organizations are filled with millennials with all their distinctive characteristics, such as they have to deal with the superiority of the previous generation, global challenges, rapid technological advances, and digitalization in the workplace. Previously, [Robbins and Judge \(2019\)](#) conveyed that all of those changes would lead to situations of uncertainty, complexity, and even ambiguity. According to Central Statistics Agency (BPS), in 2018, the millennial generation was 88 million people or equivalent to 33.75%, followed by generation Z at 29.3%, generation X at 25.74%, and the combined generation of baby boomers and veterans at 11.27%. This number shows the high contribution of the millennial generation in shaping the structure of the current productive age population, of which 67.02% are productive age population and 50.36% are a millennial generation ([Susanti, 2020](#)). This condition is then called the demographic bonus. [Mulyati et al. \(2019\)](#) added that by 2020 the millennial generation would begin to dominate 75% of the workforce in Indonesia.

Millennials undoubtedly can be an opportunity, but they can also be a challenge for organizations in Indonesia. Research conducted by Nielson Indonesia and the IDN Research Institute in 2019 stated that the millennial generation would be male and female between 21

to 36 years old in 2020, divided into two categories: junior millennial (1992-1999) and senior millennial (1984-1991). The millennial generation are employees with positive personalities (Ramli & Soelton, 2019), high self-efficacy in their work abilities (Andrea et al., 2016; Howe & Strauss, 2007; Smith & Nichols, 2015), and high optimism (Howe & Strauss, 2007; Kowske et al., 2010) make them have good resilience (Akhir & Hamid, 2017). The millennial generation has nine main behaviors: internet addiction, cashless, intelligent and fast work, likes traveling, multitasking, indifference to politics, likes to share, low ownership of goods, and low loyalty (Utomo et al., 2019).

The current challenges in industries are complex and varied, from the availability of talent, technological advances, and diversity to the generation gap (Robbins & Judge, 2018). However, today's challenge is not only to retain talented employees but also to make employees engaged with their work. The behavior of individuals in organizations who feel engaged and fully involved in their work activities is called work engagement. Work engagement is a positive mental state of employees toward their work, characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption (Bakker, 2011; Bakker & Demerouti, 2014; Schaufeli, 2012). Kinicki and Fugate (2018) argued that positive employee behavior would significantly relate to individual and organizational consequences, such as job performance.

Work engagement is considered one of the highest concepts related to employee performance. Employees who are engaged in their work have some positive behavior, such as being more productive, generating new ideas and initiative, being more diligent, and not wasting much time on useless things to support the achievement of organizational goals (Holbeche & Matthews, 2012). The contribution that employees make to the organization is crucial. Organizations have no choice but to engage employees, not only in their bodies but also in their souls, to produce suitable output (Storey et al., 2019). Nikhil and Arthi (2018) stated that organizational success is determined by employees' contributions who have a high level of work engagement, the primary key to positive organizational behavior (Robbins & Judge, 2018). Employees with high work engagement will use their resources within themselves, such as optimism, self-efficacy, and active coping style, to help them manage and influence their work environment more successfully (Bakker & Demerouti, 2008).

Specifically, the millennial generation's low loyalty makes them tend to move around like fleas (Gallup, 2016). A survey conducted by Dale Carnegie Indonesia in 2016 found that only 25% of the millennial workforce in Indonesia is in the fully engaged category. Moreover, Rigoni and Nelson (2016) conducted Gallup research and found that less than a third of millennial generation employees fully engage with their work. Robbins and Judge (2018) add that low employee engagement has become a concern for most world organizations, where only 17%-29% of employees have a high engagement in their work. Employees with low work engagement will exhibit behaviors such as; withdrawing from the work environment, skipping work, providing minimal effort, quickly experiencing fatigue, harming organizational productivity, and high employee turnover rates (Holbeche & Matthews, 2012; Nikhil & Arthi, 2018).

Previous research shows that personal resource is one of the driving factors of employee engagement (Constantini et al., 2017). A personal resource is a positive self-evaluation that relates to resilience and refers to an individual's ability to control themselves and impact their environment (Hobfoll et al., 2003). The personal resource includes self-efficacy, optimism, and emotional stability (Schaufeli, 2012). Later, some personal resources of millennials would foster the achievement of organizational goals (Akhir & Hamid, 2017; Andrea et al., 2016; Howe & Strauss, 2007; Kowske et al., 2010; Ramli & Soelton, 2019; Smith & Nichols, 2015). Some personal resources are self-efficacy, optimism, and resilience, which relate to understanding psychological capital (Luthans et al., 2007). Therefore, psychological capital is often categorized as a personal resource because it has a similar concept (Luthans et al., 2007; Nikhil & Arthi, 2018) that would increase positive work-related outcomes such as engagement and well-being (Constantini et al., 2017).

---

Psychological capital is a relatively new concept in organizational behavior and is part of the positive psychology movement (Kinicki & Fugate, 2018). Sweetman and Luthans (2010) argued that psychological capital could encourage employees' intrinsic motivation and, therefore, can trigger a crucial component in developing employee work engagement. Luthans et al. (2007) defined psychological capital as a positive self-condition with hope, efficacy, resilience, and optimism characteristics. The psychological capital dimension has a high stability level over a long time. However, the dimension of psychological capital has the capability and flexibility to develop, so it can be said that psychological capital is not like a psychological construct that tends to be relatively stable and difficult to change (Constantini et al., 2017). Furthermore, Luthans et al. (2007) prove that the components of the psychological capital dimension will be more accurately measured together than when each component stands alone.

The dimensions of psychological capital indicate a conceptual relationship with work engagement (Sweetman & Luthans, 2010). Employees who believe in their ability to master tasks and can understand well their work context (efficacy) are optimistic about what will happen to them (optimism), have high hopes (hope), and are resilient when faced with challenges (resilience) would internalize themselves to achieve organizational goals without experiencing distraction (absorption), investing their efforts to achieve goals (vigor), and have a high identification of what they do (dedication) (Sweetman & Luthans, 2010). High psychological capital values in employees can increase the potential values of employees. By then, employees will be more flexible and easier to adapt to dealing with various things when meeting their work demands, so psychological capital has a role in stimulating employee work engagement (Avey et al., 2010; Constantini et al., 2017; Joo et al., 2016; Simons & Buitendach, 2013).

The role of psychological capital is considered a significant predictor of various links to employee performance outcomes. Each dimension can optimize employee potential to help organizational performance (Paek et al., 2015). However, psychological capital that has a positive relationship to work engagement is not alone in generating employee work engagement (Ilvonda & Faraz, 2020; Indrianti & Hadi, 2012; Rara, 2019; Wardani & Anwar, 2019). According to Schaufeli and Bakker (2004), in their JD-R model theory, work engagement is not only influenced by personal resources, in this case, psychological capital, but also job resources.

Further, Schaufeli (2012) conveyed that job resources are defined as some functional aspects of the job to achieve work goals, reduce job demands, or stimulate personal growth and development (e.g., job control, performance feedback, and social support from colleagues). Later on, Kinicki and Fugate (2018) identified key drivers of work engagement that consist of two factors, personal factors (personality, positive psychological capital, human and social capital) and situational factors (job characteristics, leadership, organizational climate, and environment stressor). Due to the context of millennials, they need a supportive and trusting relationship with the manager and a positive climate at work to feel engaged (Christian et al., 2011). Thus, in this study, perceived organizational support is assumed to represent an individual's perception of the existence of social support at work.

Perceived organizational support is a form of job resource (Tan et al., 2020). Perceived organizational support is an employee's perception of how the organization provides support to employees and the extent to which the organization is prepared to assist when employees need it (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Matoori (2017) research found a positive and significant relationship between psychological capital and perceived organizational support and work engagement.

Perceived organizational support is an external factor influencing employee motivation at work (Kolodinsky et al., 2018). When employees receive support from the organization, employees will have a sense of obligation to reciprocate the support; not only that, but employees will also feel part of the organization, so there is an incentive to play a more active role in the organization (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). The basic concept of perceived organizational support is a reciprocal relationship between the giver and the recipient (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Perceived organizational support can increase employee work engagement (Bano et al., 2015; Dai & Qin, 2016; Mufarrikhah et al., 2020; Mujiasih, 2015; Tan et al., 2020). When organizations provide support to their employees, indirectly, the organization has met the socio-emotional needs of employees (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Employees who feel support from the organization will feel that the organization values their contributions and cares about their welfare (Robbins & Judge, 2018), especially millennials who are hungry for feedback and like interpersonal relationships with their co-workers (Smith & Nichols, 2015).

Thus, it seems clear that referring to personal resources and job resource factors that affect work engagement, psychological capital, and perceived organizational support are considered to affect employee work engagement jointly. Therefore, this study examines how psychological capital and perceived organizational support will jointly affect work engagement in millennial employees. Psychological capital and perceived organizational support represent personal and situational factors that should be examined simultaneously. This study would like to figure out the contribution of four components of psychological capital and two aspects of perceived organizational support to provide a profound portrayal of Indonesian millennial employees. Even though Luthans et al. (2007) conveyed that all components should be measured together than each component standing alone. Finally, the context of study in millennials also becomes added value since this specificity is essential considering that Indonesian employees' demographic posture is currently being flooded with millennial employees with all their characteristics and uniqueness. Furthermore, the organization can use the study result as a consideration in human resource policy-making regarding work engagement in millennial employees, particularly in Indonesia.

## Method

### *Research Design*

The research was conducted using a quantitative approach. A survey method that uses attitude tendencies or opinions from a particular population sample (Creswell, 2014) was applied in this study.

### *Participants*

The population of this study is Indonesian millennial employees who work permanently in many institutions in Indonesia. The study used the convenience sampling technique and proposed the characteristic of the respondents as follows. Firstly, permanent employees born in 1980 – 2000 are millennials (Howe & Strauss, 2000). Secondly, those who have worked for at least six months assumed new employees are experiencing a stage of exploration in their career and likely have practiced psychological experience during their working life (Super, 1980).

Table 1 shows the demographic data of 225 millennial employees in Indonesia with an age range of 22 – 37 years (mean = 28; SD = 3.75). Most of the research participants were female, with 154 employees (68.4%), and most of the participants had worked for more than three years, as many as 125 employees (55.6%). A total of 183 employees (81.3%) have

completed their last education at the Bachelor's level, and most work in the private sector, as many as 146 employees (64.9%).

Table 1  
*Demographic Data*

Category	Description	Frequency	Percentages
Gender	Female	154	68.4%
	Male	71	31.6%
Tenure	6 month – 1 year	13	5.8%
	1 – 2 years	74	32.9%
	2 – 3 years	13	5.8%
	≥ 3 years	125	55.6%
Educational Background	Diploma 1	1	0.4%
	Diploma 3	11	4.9%
	Diploma 4	5	2.3%
	Bachelor	183	81.3%
	Master	25	11.1%
Work sector	Private	146	64.9%
	State Owned Enterprises	39	17.3%
	Civil servant	30	13.3%
	Professional	10	4.4%

### *Instruments*

Data was collected online through Google Forms, shared via LinkedIn private messages and WhatsApp group forwarding messages. Data were collected by using a Likert scale with five alternative answers. This research involves three variables: work engagement as a dependent variable, psychological capital, and perceived organizational support as the independent variables.

Work engagement is a positive state that employees feel when working, indicated by vigor, dedication and absorption. The Indonesian version of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES-17) as the scale compiled by [Schaufeli et al. \(2006\)](#), which consists of 17 items, was used to measure work engagement. The UWES is on a Likert scale with five answer choices, ranging from 1 = very dissatisfied to 5 = very appropriate. The Indonesian version of UWES-17 has an item discrimination power between .557-.843 and a Cronbach's Alpha value of .950. The higher the score obtained by the individual indicates that the individual has a high level of work engagement, and vice versa.

Psychological capital is a positive psychological condition characterized by efficacy, optimism, hope, and resilience. Psychological capital was measured using the Psychological Capital Questionnaire (PCQ) adapted from the Psychological Capital Questionnaire (PCQ) scale previously developed by [Luthans et al. \(2007\)](#) and consists of 16 items ([Fithria, 2018](#)). The PCQ scale is on a Likert scale with five answer choices, ranging from 1 = very dissatisfied to 5 = very appropriate. The PCQ scale has an item discrimination power of .427-.880 and a Cronbach's Alpha value of .930. The higher the score obtained by the individual indicates a high level of psychological capital and vice versa.

Perceived organizational support is an employee's view of the organization regarding the extent to which the organization values employee contributions (appreciation for employee contribution) and provides support and care for welfare, including rewards, training, promotions, and wages (the organization's concern for the welfare of employee). Perceived organizational support is measured using a scale developed by [Purwaningrum et al. \(2020\)](#), based on [Eisenberger et al. \(1986\)](#), which consists of 16 items. The perceived organizational support scale is a Likert scale with five answer options, ranging from 1 = very

dissatisfied to 5 = very appropriate. The perceived organizational support scale has an item discrimination power between .497-.862 and a Cronbach's Alpha value of .904. The higher the score obtained by the individual indicates a high perceived organizational level and vice versa.

### Data Analysis

Multiple regression analysis with SPSS software was applied to data analysis. Regression analysis was used to see whether the predictor variables could predict the criterion variables. Regression analysis will produce an  $R^2$  value which indicates the proportion of variance of the criterion variables that the predictor as a whole can explain, and a  $\beta$  value indicating the role of each predictor.

### Results

The result of the regression analysis shows that psychological capital and perceived organizational support were both able to explain 47.9% of the variation in work engagement ( $R^2=.479$ ;  $F(2, 222)=109.907$ ;  $p<.001$ ) (see Table 2). Psychological capital significantly predicts work engagement ( $\beta=.507$ ;  $p<.001$ ), and perceived organizational support also predicts work engagement ( $\beta=.292$ ;  $p<.001$ ). Partially, each variable contributes as much as 32.5% for psychological capital and 15.4% for perceived organizational support to work engagement.

Table 2  
Result of Multiple Regression

Variables	Unstandardized Coefficient		Standardized Coefficients Beta	F	t
	B	Standard Error			
Constant	.964	4.349		101.907	.222
Psychological Capital	.694	.075	.507		9.303
Perceived Organizational Support	.295	.055	.292		5.349

Note: all variables have  $p<.01$  with  $R=.692$  and  $R^2=.479$

Furthermore, each aspect of psychological capital and perceived organizational support was elaborated to see its contribution to work engagement. Table 3 shows the results of multiple regression analysis on the psychological capital variable and shows that only the aspect of optimism contributes significantly to work engagement.

Table 3  
Result of Multiple Regression of Aspect of Psychological Capital toward Work Engagement

Variables	Unstandardized Coefficient		Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	p
	B	Standard Error			
Constant	1.575	4.407		.357	.721
Hope	.846	.454	.169	1.861	.064
Efficacy	-.075	.359	-.016	-.208	.835
Resilience	.503	.358	.111	1.404	.162
Optimism	2.418	.338	.492	7.157	<.001**

Note: \*\*for  $p<.001$

$R=.688$ ;  $R^2=.473$ ;  $F(4,220)=49.429$ ;  $p<.001$

Meanwhile, the perceived organizational support variable shows that only the aspect of the organization's concern for employees' welfare contributes significantly to work engagement. Table 4 shows the results of multiple regression of each aspect of perceived organizational support on work engagement.

Table 4  
*Result of Multiple Regression of Aspect of Perceived Organizational Support toward Work Engagement*

Variables	Unstandardized Coefficient		Standardized Coefficients Beta	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
	<i>B</i>	Standard Error			
Constant	32.351	3.239		9.989	<.001**
Appreciation	.166	.171	.097	.972	.332
Organization's concern	1.012	.221	.457	4.571	<.001**

Note: \*\*for  $p < .001$

$$R = .540; R^2 = .292; F(2,222) = 45.684; p < .001$$

Additional analysis using a t-test was performed to enrich the study's results. The results showed that there was a significant difference in work engagement between males and females ( $t[223] = 2.52; p < .05$ ) (see Table 5). Male ( $M = 64.20; SD = 10.23$ ) had higher work engagement than female ( $M = 60.53; SD = 10.11$ ). In more detail, which aspects of work engagement have the most role in male and female, it was found that only aspects of vigor ( $t[223] = 2.78; p < .01$ ) and dedication ( $t[223] = 2.52; p < .05$ ) different, while absorption was not different ( $t[223] = 1.53; p > .05$ ). Male ( $M = 22.47; SD = 4.18$ ) had higher vigor than female ( $M = 20.88; SD = 3.89$ ), and male ( $M = 19.90; SD = 3.57$ ) had higher dedication than female ( $M = 18.62; SD = 3.54$ ).

Table 5  
*Result of t-test Analysis of Work Engagement on Gender*

Variable/aspect	Group	N	Mean	SD	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
Work engagement	Male	71	64.20	10.23	2.52	223	.01*
	Female	154	60.53	10.11			
Vigor	Male	71	22.46	4.18	2.78	223	.01*
	Female	154	20.88	3.89			
Dedication	Male	71	19.90	3.57	2.52	223	.01*
	Female	154	18.62	3.54			
Absorption	Male	71	21.83	3.68	1.53	223	.13
	Female	154	21.04	3.58			

Note: \*for  $p < .05$

## Discussion

The results show a significant simultaneous effect between psychological capital and perceived organizational support on work engagement in millennial employees. The research

findings show that psychological capital and perceived organizational support can simultaneously predict 47.9% of work engagement in millennial employees. This result is in line with research conducted by [Alessandri et al. \(2018\)](#) on 420 employees, whereby the more psychological capital, the higher work engagement, which can predict employee performance. Also, [Lorente et al. \(2014\)](#) found that psychological capital as personal resources, according to the JD-R model concept, can increase employee intrinsic motivation and produce work engagement.

Work engagement is closely related to intrinsic motivation, including feelings of enthusiasm and a high level of activity, as it has benefits and meaning for him ([Nerstad et al., 2013](#)). It confirms the statement of [Sweetman and Luthans \(2010\)](#) that conceptually psychological capital characteristics correlate with work engagement. In this study, psychological capital acts as a personal resource that can increase employees' intrinsic motivation at work, triggering engagement in millennial employees.

Moreover, the presence of psychological capital contributes to the high work engagement of millennial employees ([Sutrisno & Parahyanti, 2018](#)). [Luthans et al. \(2007\)](#) stated that the components of psychological capital could theoretically actualize individual potential, especially in the workplace. Furthermore, the dimensions of psychological capital will build each other into resources and capital for each individual that can lead to work engagement and broaden employees' perspectives on their work environment ([Sweetman & Luthans, 2010](#)).

Perceived organizational support is a situational factor that can be felt by the presence of organizational concern and appreciation for employee contributions. The central concept in perceived organizational support is reciprocity or a reciprocal relationship. Employees who have a good perception of the organization will have a feeling of having to reciprocate the treatment of the organization; furthermore, employees will feel part of the organization, and therefore there is an incentive to play an active role in the organization ([Eisenberger et al., 1986](#)). Employees with a good perception of organizational support feel that the organization provides support, fairness, and care for the welfare of employees and appreciates their contribution to the organization, as well as fulfilling employee socio-emotional needs such as self-esteem. These feelings foster a sense of belonging to the organization and encourage a high contribution to the organization ([Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002](#)). In line with the above argument, workplace interactions that result in work engagement behavior are reciprocal relationships between employees and organizations, as stated in the concept of social exchange theory ([Yin, 2018](#)).

The findings of this research further emphasize that the psychological capital possessed by millennial employees needs to be juxtaposed with the organization's treatment of them in the form of concern and appreciation for their performance. Both of these things need to be addressed positively by the organization to foster enthusiasm and work dedication for millennial employees to positively enjoy every activity at work. Many peculiarities of millennials need to be facilitated in the workplace so that their potential is more optimal, such as high social needs where they like interpersonal relationships in their work environment. In addition, millennials also like openness in communication. They are happy with the appreciation and consistent feedback outside of the official assessments given by the organization periodically ([Stanimir, 2015](#)).

Furthermore, millennials also need challenges at work and desire to develop skills ([Smith & Nichols, 2015](#)). If employees perceive the organization as being able to provide these facilities, millennials will display more and their best abilities in helping to achieve organizational goals ([De Hauw & De Vos, 2010](#)). The existence of employees' perceptions of good organizational support will make them bond with their work activities, where they will devote their most extraordinary energy but still feel happy about their work. This finding also supports the empirical study of [Mufarrikhah et al. \(2020\)](#) on 300 permanent and non-permanent employees in Indonesia, resulting in perceived organizational support positively

affecting employee work engagement in organizations. The higher the employee's attachment to work, the higher the effectiveness of employees in the organization. Therefore, organizations need to provide support to employees who also have psychological capital to achieve work engagement.

Luthans et al. (2007) state that bringing all components of psychological capital at once rather than individually should need more attention. This study found that only the optimism component of psychological capital contributes to work engagement. Optimism is the component that needs to be considered by management since it could be ups and downs according to a particular situation. The more millennial employees become optimistic, the higher work engagement. Thus, the organization should provide a work environment that makes employees feel optimistic. Following the research finding, the organization's concern for employee welfare might be the choice to contribute to work engagement. The more organizations provide welfare, the higher the work engagement of millennial employees. As it turns, engagement from millennial employees tends to arise from organizational support in the shape of the support and care for welfare, including rewards, training, promotions, and wages, rather than appreciation for employee contribution. In short, it could be concluded that appreciation for employee contribution could not directly affect work engagement among millennial employees. However, an organization should still consider it as the default practice that should be implemented at work by considering that appreciation is one of the needs of millennials in the workplace. As a management implication, organizations need to support employees, especially millennials, through HR practice programs that provide awareness to them to implement their psychological capital in responding to work situations consistently.

In addition, the organization must accompany the emergence of this psychological capital and support from the organization in the form of concern and appreciation for the millennials' performance. Organizations must be sensitive that millennial employees who need feedback must be ensured to get feedback on their work. Millennial employees also need flexibility in their work, so organizations need to be level-headed, discussing flexibility opportunities openly with millennial employees. With the presence of this support, the hope that springs up, the self-confidence that grows strong, the resilience that is built firmly, and optimism for the future will genuinely manifest into a millennial employee who is full of enthusiasm at work, full of dedication, and always enjoys his work. Ultimately, work engagement would arise due to the simultaneous relationship between psychological capital and organizational support.

The results of this study indicate differences in work engagement by gender, where males have a higher level of work engagement than females. It is in line with the results of previous research by Banihani et al. (2013), which stated that gender affected work engagement where males had a higher level of work engagement than females. A similar study conducted by Mache et al. (2014) also shows that men have a significantly higher work engagement than females. However, this finding is inconsistent with the results of research by Gulzar and Teli (2018) on 123 respondents, which showed that females had higher engagement levels than men. These differences in findings indicate a study that leads to a cultural context. The significantly higher work engagement of males in Indonesia is due to culture and customs in Indonesia, in which males play an important role as the family head and in family income so that their level of work engagement will tend to be higher if compared to with female (Wardani et al., 2020). In particular, each aspect of work engagement was re-elaborated and yielded information that, in the context of this research, the difference between males and females lies in the aspect of vigor and dedication. In contrast, there is no difference between the two in the absorption aspect. Male are more enthusiastic and show dedication in

---

their work compared to females. Therefore, the assumption of gender roles in Indonesian culture above makes sense in the context of this research.

The limitations of this study are the unproven aspects of psychological capital as a driver of engagement, in contrast with the results of previous studies that the four aspects of psychological capital consisting of hope, efficacy, resilience, and optimism are critical in generating engaged behavior (Constantini et al., 2017; Grover et al., 2018; Joo et al., 2016; Simons & Buitendach, 2013). It may be caused by the variety of participants from organizations such as public servants, private companies, state-owned enterprises, and professionals. Moreover, online data collection means that the researcher does not have complete control over the understanding of the subject, even though instructions for processing have been included. Future research needs to address the limitation of this study to genuinely portray the role of psychological capital and perceived organizational support on the emergence of engaged behavior, including notions to examine only one organizational context or several organizations with similar HR practices and the work environment. Further investigation is also needed regarding the limitation of this study. It is essential to explore whether the limitation is related to Indonesian culture or whether optimism is individually the keyword for other psychological aspects.

## Conclusion

This study further confirms the role of psychological capital and perceived organizational support on work engagement in millennial employees. Specifically, in the context of millennial employees, this study framework can confirm that hope, self-efficacy, resilience, and optimism for the future need to be accompanied by support from the organization to enable them to carry out their work with vigor, dedication, and absorption. However, during elaborating on aspects of psychological capital, where if done individually, only the optimism aspect contributes significantly to work engagement, although the contribution value is smaller than when it involves all aspects in the model. In addition, the aspect of optimism seems to dominate the model, even on aspects of perceived organizational support. Therefore, HR practitioners need to be more concerned with optimism in the contribution of personal and situational factors to work engagement among millennials.

## Acknowledgment

The authors acknowledge the Faculty of Psychology, Universitas Gadjah Mada, for the research grant for this study.

## Declarations

**Author contribution.** NAG and II design the study, collect, analyze the data and discuss the result before submitting it; afterward, the revision is under II's responsibility as a corresponding author.

**Funding statement.** RTA Grant funded this study from the Faculty of Psychology, Universitas Gadjah Mada (No.5388/UN1/FPSi/UP4/PT.02/2021)

**Conflict of interest.** The authors declare no conflict of interest.

**Additional information.** No additional information is available for this paper.

## References

Akhir, R. M., & Hamid, N. R. (2017, October 18-20). Gen Y in workplace: An exploratory study. [Paper Presentation]. *The 7th Annual International Conference (AIC)*. Banda

## Aceh

- Alessandri, G., Consiglio, C., Luthans, F., & Borgogni, L. (2018). Testing a dynamic model of the impact of psychological capital on work engagement and job performance. *The Career Development International*, 23(1), 33–47. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CDI-11-2016-0210>
- Andrea, B., Gabriella, H. C., & Timea, J. (2016). Y and Z generations at workplaces. *Journal of Competitiveness*, 8(3), 90–106. <https://doi.org/10.7441/joc.2016.03.06>
- Avey, J. B., Luthans, F., & Youssef, C. M. (2010). The additive value of positive psychological capital in predicting work attitudes and behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 36(2), 430–452. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206308329961>
- Bakker, A. B. (2011). An evidence-based model of work engagement. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 20(4), 265–269. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721411414534>
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2008). Towards a model of work engagement. *Career Development International*, 13(3), 209–223.
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2014). Job demands-resources theory. In P. Y. Chen, & C. L. Cooper. In *Work and wellbeing: A complete reference guide* (pp. 37–64). John Wiley & Sons, Inc. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118539415.wbwell019>
- Banihani, M., Lewis, P., & Syed, J. (2013). Is work engagement gendered? *Gender in Management*, 28(7), 400–423.
- Bano, S., Vyas, K., & Gupta, R. (2015). Perceived organizational support and work engagement: A cross generational study. *Journal of Psychosocial Research*, 10(2), 357–364.
- Christian, M. S., Garza, A. S., & Slaughter, J. E. (2011). Work engagement: A quantitative review and test of its relations with task and contextual performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 64(1), 89–136. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2010.01203.x>
- Constantini, A., Paola, F. D., Ceschi, A., Sartori, R., Meneghini, A. M., & Fabio, A. D. (2017). Work engagement and psychological capital in the Italian public administration: A new resource-based intervention programme. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 43(0), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajip.v43i0.1413>
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative & mixed methods approach*. (4th ed.). Sage.
- Dai, K. L., & Qin, X. Y. (2016). Perceived organizational support and employee engagement: Based on the research of organizational identification and organizational justice. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, 4(12), 46–57. <https://doi.org/10.4236/jss.2016.412005>
- De Hauw, S., & De Vos, A. (2010). Millennials' career perspective and psychological contract expectations: Does the recession lead to lowered expectations? *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 25(2), 293–302. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-010-9162-9>
- Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3), 500–507. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.71.3.500>
- Fithria, W. S. (2018). Psychological well being pada pekerja ditinjau dari psychological capital, workplace spirituality, dan work-life balance [Psychological wellbeing among workers in terms of psychological capital, workplace spirituality, and work-life balance]. [Master Thesis, Universitas Gadjah Mada]. University Repository. <http://etd.repository.ugm.ac.id/penelitian/detail/166051>
- Gallup. (2016). *How millennials want to work and live*. Gallup, Inc.

- Grover, S. L., Teo, S. T., Pick, D., Roche, M., & Newton, C. J. (2018). Psychological capital as a personal resource in the JD-R model. *Personnel Review*, 47(4), 968–984. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-08-2016-0213>
- Gulzar, S., & Teli, M. R. (2018). Gender and work engagement: A study of academic staff in higher education. *Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review*, 8(2), 1–3.
- Hobfoll, S. E., Johnson, R. J., Ennis, N., & Jackson, A. P. (2003). Resource loss, resource gain, and emotional outcomes among inner city women. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84(3), 632–643. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.84.3.632>
- Holbeche, L., & Matthews, G. (2012). *Engaged: Unleashing your organization's potential through employee engagement*. Jossey-Bass.
- Howe, N., & Strauss, W. (2000). *Millennials rising: The next great generation*. Vintage Books.
- Howe, N., & Strauss, W. (2007). The next 20 years: How customer and workforce attitudes will evolve. *Harvard Business Review*, 85(7–8), 41–52.
- Ilvonda, L. F., & Faraz. (2020). Urgensi modal psikologi dalam membangun keterikatan kerja karyawan penambangan [The urgency of psychological capital on building the work engagement among mining employees]. *Motiva Jurnal Psikologi*, 3(1), 10–18. <https://doi.org/10.31293/mv.v3i1.4796>
- Indrianti, R., & Hadi, C. (2012). Hubungan antara modal psikologis dengan keterikatan kerja pada perawat di instalasi rawat inap Rumah Sakit Jiwa Menur Surabaya [The relationship between psychological capital and work engagement among nurses in the inpatient installation of Menur Psychiat. *Jurnal Psikologi Industri Dan Organisasi*, 1(2), 110–115.
- Joo, B. K., Lim, D. H., & Kim, S. (2016). Enhancing work engagement: The role of psychological capital, authentic leadership, and work empowerment. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 37(8), 1117–1134. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-01-2015-0005>
- Kinicki, A., & Fugate, M. (2018). *Organizational behavior: A practical, problem-solving approach* (2nd ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.
- Kolodinsky, R. W., Ritchie, W. J., & Kuna, W. A. (2018). Meaningful engagement: Impacts of a “calling” work orientation and perceived leadership support. *Journal of Management and Organization*, 24(3), 406–423. <https://doi.org/10.1017/jmo.2017.19>
- Kowske, B. J., Rasch, R., & Wiley, J. (2010). Millennials’ (lack of) attitude problem: An empirical examination of generational effects on work attitudes. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 25(2), 265–279. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-010-9171-8>
- Lorente, L., Salanova, M., Martínez, I. M., & Vera, M. (2014). How personal resources predict work engagement and self-rated performance among construction workers: A social cognitive perspective. *International Journal of Psychology*, 49(3), 200–207. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ijop.12049>
- Luthans, F., Youssef, C. M., & Avolio, B. J. (2007). Psychological capital: Developing the human competitive edge. *Oxford University Press*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195187526.001.0001>
- Mache, S., Vitzthum, K., Wanke, E., A, D., Klapp, B. F., & Danzer, G. (2014). Exploring the impact of resilience, self-efficacy, optimism and organizational resources on work engagement. *Work*, 47(4), 491–500. <https://doi.org/10.3233/WOR-131617>
- Matoori, H. H. (2017). Investigating the relationship between psychological capital and perceived organizational support with work engagement among nurses. *Iranian Journal of Psychiatric Nursing*, 5(2), 45–51. <https://doi.org/10.21859/ijpn-05027>
- Mufarrikhah, J. L., Yuniardi, M. S., & Syakarofath, N. A. (2020). Peran perceived

- organizational support terhadap work engagement karyawan [The role of perceived organizational support on employee work engagement]. *Gadjah Mada Journal of Psychology*, 6(2), 151–164. <https://doi.org/10.22146/gamajop.56396>
- Mujiasih, E. (2015). Hubungan antara persepsi dukungan organisasi (perceived organizational support) dengan keterikatan karyawan [The relationship between perceived organizational support with employee engagement]. *Jurnal Psikologi Undip*, 14(1), 40–51. <https://doi.org/10.14710/jpu.14.1.40-51>
- Mulyati, R., Himam, F., Riyono, B., & Suhariadi, F. (2019). Model work engagement angkatan kerja generasi millennial dengan meaningful work sebagai mediator {Millennial generation's work engagement model with meaningful work as mediator}. *Gadjah Mada Journal of Psychology*, 5(1), 34–49. <https://doi.org/10.22146/gamajop.47964>
- Nerstad, C. G. L., Roberts, G. C., & Richardsen, A. M. (2013). Achieving success at work: Development and validation of the Motivational Climate at Work Questionnaire (MCWQ). *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 43(11), 2231–2250. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jasp.12174>
- Nikhil, S., & Arthi, J. (2018). Perceived organisational support and work engagement: Mediation of psychological capital - a research agenda. *Journal of Strategic Human Resource Management*, 7(1), 33–40.
- Paek, S., Schuckert, M., Kim, T. T., & Lee, G. (2015). Why is hospitality employees' psychological capital important? The effects of psychological capital on work engagement and employee morale. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 50, 9–26. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2015.07.001>
- Purwaningrum, E. K., Suhariadi, F., & Fajrianthi. (2020). Participation and commitment to change on middle managers in Indonesia: The role of perceived organizational support as mediator. *Global Business Review*, 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0972150919892371>
- Ramli, Y., & Soelton, M. (2019). The millennial workforce: How do they commit to the organization? *International Journal of Business, Economics and Law*, 19(5), 7–18.
- Rara, P. G. (2019). Millennials in the workplace: The effect of psychological capital on work engagement with perceived organizational support as mediator. *Russian Journal of Agricultural and Socio-Economic Sciences*, 8(92), 219–226.
- Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: A review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 698–714. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.4.698>
- Rigoni, B., & Nelson, B. (2016, August 30). *Few millennials are engaged at work*. <https://news.gallup.com/businessjournal/195209/%20few-millennials-engaged-%20work.aspx?version=print>
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2018). *Essentials of organizational behavior* (14th ed.). Pearson.
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2019). *Organizational Behavior* (18th ed.). Pearson.
- Schaufeli, W. B. (2012). Work engagement. What do we know and where do we go? *Romanian Journal of Applied Psychology*, 14(1), 3–10.
- 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(3), 292–315. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.248>
- Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., & Salanova, M. (2006). The Measurement of Work

- Engagement With a Short Questionnaire: A Cross-National Study. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 66(4), 701–716. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164405282471>
- Simons, J. C., & Buitendach, J. H. (2013). Psychological capital, work engagement and organisational commitment amongst call centre employees in South Africa. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 39(2), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajip.v39i2.1071>
- Smith, T. J., & Nichols, T. (2015). Understanding the millennial generation. *Journal of Business Diversity*, 15(1), 39–47.
- Stanimir, A. (2015). Generation Y—characteristics of attitudes on labour market. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(2 S5), 22–28. <https://dx.doi.org/10.5901/mjss.2015.v6n2s5p22>
- Storey, J., Ulrich, D., & Wright, P. M. (2019). *Strategic human resource management: A research overview*. (1st ed.). Routledge.
- Super, D. E. (1980). A life-span, life-space approach to career development. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 16(3), 282–298. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791\(80\)90056-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791(80)90056-1)
- Susanti. (2020, January 7). *Sensus penduduk 2020, sensus era digital [2020 population census, digital age census]*. Retrieved April 2021, from <https://bandungkota.bps.go.id/news/2020/01/07/15/sensus-penduduk-2020--sensus-era-digital---.html>
- Sutrisno, M. B., & Parahyanti, E. (2018). The impact of psychological capital and work meaningfulness on work engagement in generation Y. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, 139, 53–58. <https://doi.org/10.2991/uipsur-17.2018.9>
- Sweetman, D., & Luthans, F. (2010). The power of positive psychology: Psychological capital and work engagement. In A. B. Bakker & M. P. Leiter (Ed.), *Work engagement: A handbook of essential theory and research* (pp. 54–68). Psychology Press.
- Tan, L., Wang, Y., Qian, W., & Lu, H. (2020). Leader humor and employee job crafting: The role of employee-perceived organizational support and work engagement. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.499849>
- Utomo, W. P., Lubis, U. Z., & Sudrajat, S. A. (2019). *Indonesia millennial report 2019*. Idn Research Institute.
- Wardani, L. M. I., & Anwar, M. S. (2019). The role of quality of work life as mediator: Psychological capital and work engagement. *Humanities & Social Sciences Reviews*, 7(6), 447–463. <https://doi.org/10.18510/hssr.2019.7670>
- Wardani, L. M. I., Wulandari, S., Triasti, P., & Sombuling, A. (2020). The effect of psychological capital on work engagement: Employee well-being as a mediator. *Test Engineering and Management*, 83, 17220–17229.
- Yin, N. (2018). The influencing outcomes of job engagement: An interpretation from the social exchange theory. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 67(5), 873–889. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPPM-03-2017-0054>