

---

# Managing Generation Z: Eudaimonic Perspective

Ade Irma Anggraeni

*Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Jenderal Soedirman, Indonesia*

---

## Abstract

Psychological contracts are dynamic and manifested in the form of employer branding as an understanding of work orientation of Generation Z in the digital era. According to social exchange theory, this study aims to empirically examine the effect of psychological contracts on employee resilience, employee agility and proactive behaviour with eudaimonic workplace wellbeing as a mediating variable. The research was conducted on startup companies in Indonesia. The research model was tested using a structural equation modeling approach. This research contributes to explaining the mechanism for managing expectations of Generation Z through well-being, both intrapersonal and interpersonal aspects. The eudaimonic perspective becomes relevant to achieve alignment of Generation Z work orientation and job characteristics in the digital era.

---

## Keywords

**Agility, Eudaimonic Wellbeing, Psychological Contract, Proactive Behavior, Resilience**

---

## INTRODUCTION

The research of generation Z becomes a crucial topic in human resource management along with the efforts of an organization to build employer branding. This generation is starting to enter various organizations in increasing numbers and stronger effect (Balnonando, 2018). Not only large-scale organizations, small businesses with the aim of optimizing resources also strive to manage the employee value proposition so that they are able to maintain talented resources.

There are significant differences regarding the character of Generation Z when compared to the previous generation. Generation Z grows up in rapid technological developments and prioritizes social networking in communicating (Philip and Garcia, 2013). Employer branding which is a manifestation of a psychological contract needs to be developed in accordance with the motivational aspect that is able to encourage Generation Z employees. They are expected to develop skills and behaviours that fit the character of startup companies and they need to adapt and innovate continuously. The psychological contracts that are related to employability management aspects are important for employees to decide and stay in the organization through the mechanism of social exchange theory (Zafirovsky, 2005; Ng and Feldman, 2008).

Agarwal and Vaghela's research (2018) has explained that work life balance, co-workers,

tendency of helping others, career development and individual development are the main work values of Generation Z. Baldonado's research (2018) has proved that the components of career development, recognition, comfortable work environment, and giving greater responsibility to improve skills and knowledge are the expectations of generation Z employees. Due to the reasons, it is important for organizations to pay attention to these aspects in designing psychological contracts that appropriate for the work values of generation Z. These work values also agree with the concept of wellbeing developed by Ryan and Deci (2000).

The research of the psychological contracts effects on attitudes, behaviour and well-being has been previously conducted by Gracia et al (2007). De Cuyper's research (2011) has specifically examined the psychological contract that relates to employability on individual and organizational outcomes. However, Van der Vaart's (2014) research has given different results. His research explains that psychological contracts have no impact on wellbeing and individual intentions to leave the organization. It also explains that the insignificant effect of psychological contracts is caused by the issues related to the labour market, career and individual potential. It strengthens the research of Van de Vaart (2013) which has stated the need for consideration of demographic factors and the

fulfilment of psychological contracts in predicting individual wellbeing, attitude and behaviour. This statement agrees with the psychological contract concept proposed by Guest and Conway (2002) in considering the elements of wellbeing, individual background and the effect of organizational policies.

Generation Z really understands their needs, desires and expectations. A research by Ozkan and Solmaz (2018) has explained that dynamic and fun working conditions are the factors that motivate Generation Z to work. This research also explains that this generation has self-confidence, prioritizes team spirit, wants happiness and independence in the workplace. Generation Z looks the uncertainty aspect as a challenge. This condition is an opportunity as well as a challenge for organizations in managing generation Z. Kuntz et al (2016) has explained that organizations needs to invest in employee resilience for sustainable change. Due to this reason, intervention through organizational practices is needed. Cooper et al (2013) has explained that employee wellbeing is a powerful approach in building employee resilience. This statement agrees with Janssens's view (2003) which has stated that employees who perceive a balance of obligations among employees and an employer have higher job-related performance. Ruokolainen's research et al (2016) has provided empirical evidence regarding the psychological contract effects on employee wellbeing and in role performance at work.

Generation Z has an expectation of flexibility at work. Micoleta (2012) has explained that this generation focuses on a boundless career that emphasizes performance aspects. It is open to improvement and concerns on work and learning oriented. Arar and Oneren (2018) have concluded that Generation Z expects a flexible career, organizational structure, development opportunities, creative and innovative work, significant work, and work results-based performance appraisal. It is related to eudaimonic perspective in the concept of wellbeing. Eudaimonic wellbeing is measured using the psychological wellbeing construct developed by Ryff (1995). Eudaimonic wellbeing refers to the subjective evaluation of employees regarding the ability to develop and function optimally in the workplace. This concept is explained by social context theory and is divided into two dimensions. They are interpersonal and

intrapersonal (Keyes, 1998) which focuses on growth and development.

Seligman (2011) has explained that resilience is a key differentiator among employees who are able to recover and ones who fails to recover in a transforming situation. Braun et al (2017) has stated that in the context of change, organizational management needs to encourage employees to be more proactive, resilient and agile to be along with the organization's movements. Harvey et al (1999) suggests that employee agility and proactive behaviour are the main components needed by organizations to seize opportunities in unpredictable situations. This opinion agrees with the argument of Pulakos et al (2019) that employee agility is a crucial factor in organizational change. Parker and Collins (2010) have identified three categories of proactive behaviour. They are work, strategic and person-environment fit.

#### **AIM OF RESEARCH**

This research aims to examine the effects of psychological contracts on employee resilience, employee agility, employee proactive behaviour with eudaimonic wellbeing as a mediating variable. The research is conducted on a small-scale startup companies in Indonesia and involve Generation Z as the respondents.

#### **Employee Proactive Behaviour**

Proactive behaviour of employees was an initiative and focuses on the future by seeing opportunities and consequences simultaneously (Grant, et al, 2009). Proactive behaviour was an anticipatory self-initiated action that aimed to change and improve a condition (Parker and Collins, 2010). This behaviour was divided into three categories. They were proactive work behaviour, proactive strategic behaviour and proactive person-environment fit behaviour. Proactive work behaviour aimed to improve the organization's internal work processes, developed by the dimensions of taking charge, voice, implementing strategies, and problem prevention. Proactive strategic behaviour aimed to improve the organization's suitability with the internal environment. This behaviour was manifested in actions such as issue-selling, and the process of strategic observation of environmental conditions to anticipate new developments and opportunities to create competitive advantage. Proactive person-environment fit behaviour aimed to increase the suitability between

oneself and the organization which was measured using the dimensions of feedback seeking and career development negotiations. The management of Generation Z in the workplace was determined by the organization's ability to communicate with this generation efficiently, assisting them to be with the community and the habitual culture in the organization and encouraging them to be effective employees in the digital era (Elmore, 2014).

### **Employee Agility**

Employee agility referred to an individual's ability to quickly respond to environmental changes and adapted these changes to provide benefits to the organization (Sherehiy and Karwowski, 2014). The benefits included better customer service, learning and product quality improvement (Binti Safie et al, 2018). The efforts of building agility required individuals to have adequate information and capabilities to process that information. Agility was related to efforts of obtaining various information in unpredictable conditions. The research of employee agility was initiated by Breu et al (2002) and later developed by Muduli (2016). Discussions of employee agility developed in studies of enterprising social media as a basis for building collaboration (Leonardi, 2014). Employee agility meant the individual's capability to respond and adapt quickly toward unpredictable environmental changes and was able to provide benefits to the organization in these changing situations (Cai et al, 2018). Generation Z was a generation with adequate knowledge of technology (Bencsik, et al, 2016). This generation also tended to be more agile and highly motivated by new challenges because they grew up in a complex environment with high uncertainty (Geyer and Klein, 2015).

### **Employee Resilience**

The concept of resilience developed as an individual stable characteristic that referred to an individual's effective response to diversity (Rutter, 2006). Resilience was related to the combination of various assets and resources of individuals and their environment that facilitated the capacity of individuals to adapt diversity. Resilience, in the context of work, was related to the individual's ability to increase awareness and perform the ability to be more flexible, always made improvements and was ready to adapt to change (Coutu, 2002). Resilience, in the context of work, could be referred to the research of Luthans (2002)

in a discussion of positive organizational behaviour regarding the psychological capacity and positively oriented resources. This research then brought a review of human capital into psychological capital with dimensions of self-efficacy, trying to succeed in challenging goal-oriented jobs and resilience (Luthans, Youssef and Avolio, 2007).

The transformational perspective explained that employee resilience referred to the ability of employees to optimize resources, adapted and devoted energy to work. This perspective also emphasized that employee resilience could be manifested in stable or dynamic situations. It meant that the concept of employee resilience was an individual capability that did not just adapt in dynamic situations but continued to seek opportunities to develop in a stable situation (Tonkin et al, 2018). Individual resilience in the context of work was related to the combination of job challenges and learning from mistakes, the resources provided by the organization and could be developed in various work environments. Basically, the organization sought to find employees with a set of abilities and who were able to add value to the organization. Hochel and Wilson (2007) explained that the consequences of recruiting errors had an impact on high workload, frustration, ineffectiveness, damaged to organizational reputation, high turnover and wasted the organizational resources. The presence of Generation Z in the workplace was unique, especially in using technology to find information that supported its considerations in producing a solution (2011).

### **Eudaimonic Wellbeing**

The research of wellbeing was divided into two perspectives. They were hedonic and eudaimonic Ryan and Deci (2001). The hedonic perspective emphasized the aspect of good life while the eudaimonic perspective referred to the facilitation of individual potential regarding the aspects of growth and development. Eudaimonic developed from the concept of psychological well-being which Ryff (1998) divided into six dimensions of growth and development. The first three dimensions, such as self-acceptance, positive relations with others, and autonomy, were developed from the self-actualization and self-determination theory. The other three dimensions were mastery, purpose in life and personal growth. Eudaimonic wellbeing in the

workplace was defined as an objective evaluation of an individual's ability to develop and optimize the functions at work. The previous six dimensions were included by involving the specific attributes.

Keyes (1998) developed a social context theory to explain five determinants of individual wellbeing in the workplace, such as social integration, social acceptance, social contribution, social actualization and social coherence. All six dimensions of Ryff (1998) and five dimensions of Keyes (1998) were developed by Bartels (2019) to develop the concept of eudaimonic wellbeing in the workplace and divided into two dimensions. They were interpersonal and intrapersonal dimensions. The current presence of Generation Z in the workplace did not show any difference between employees who came from theoretical and practical educational backgrounds. (Gimbergsson and Lundberg, 2016). Theoretical-oriented individuals were self-actualization-oriented (Vanteenkiste et al 2007) while practical-oriented individuals were oriented to competence and autonomy (Deci and Ryan, 2000).

### **Psychological Contract**

Guest and Conway (2004) explained that the concept of psychological contract had developed significantly since the 1960s. Kotter (1973) interpreted this concept as an implicit contract between individuals and organizations within the framework of meeting the expectations of both parties. Herriot and Pemberton (1996) then explained the exchange mechanism that underlied the perception of both parties in the employment relationship. Furthermore, this concept contextually was developed by Rousseau and Schalk (2004). Generation Z characters had a tendency to access information quickly and wanted a work atmosphere that was able to facilitate the knowledge sharing process. This explanation was described in the research of Bencsik et al (2016), especially in an explanation of how this generation contributed to organizational success.

The findings of Freese et al (2011) confirmed that the effectiveness of the psychological contract was determined by the facilitation of the development of employee abilities and competencies within the organization. This condition made employees feel that the organization where they work could meet their expectations in career development. Employees had motivations to develop themselves if the demands of the job required

them to maximize all abilities. Herriot et al (1997) asserted that job features were able to motivate employees to master and develop their skills. Various and challenging job designs were able to encourage employees to master new skills to adapt to the demands of the job. Employees could work optimally in conducive work atmosphere (Rousseau, 1998).

Parmar (2014) asserted that employer branding aimed to create an environment that was capable of being a place to work that employees admired. Baldonado's research (2018) proved that Generation Z had expectations of a work environment that provided opportunities for learning through assignments, meaningful work and the presence of balance between work and personal life.

### **Effect of Psychological Contract on Eudaimonic Wellbeing**

Gracia (2017) confirmed the effect of psychological contracts on psychological wellbeing. Parzefall and Hakanen (2008) explained that when an organization fulfilled its promises and responsibilities to employees, energizes employees, so the process had a positive impact on employee wellbeing. The changing work environment currently met with the challenge of maintaining employee performance in the middle of the demands for technology adoption in a dynamic business environment. In addition, the changes of economic conditions played a role in changing the role of HR to focus more on employee wellbeing (Kowalski, 2017). Particularly, these challenges demanded that organizations provided opportunities for flexible working (Joyce et al, 2010) and the management of employees with different generational backgrounds (Wesolowski, 2014).

The presence of Generation Z in the workplace who wanted flexibility in carrying out their work was a key factor in the psychological contract component. Dewe and Cooper (2012) stated that the development of communication technology facilitated employee expectations regarding work flexibility. Particularly, the development of the gig economy encouraged employees to expect flexibility and precarious work. The changes in job management needed to provide significant benefits in increasing autonomy for employees, which could encourage performance and employee wellbeing (Parker, 2003). Baldonado's research (2018) recommended the

importance of organizations providing growth opportunities, providing responsibility, and a pleasant work environment for Generation Z.

#### **Effect of Psychological Contract on Employee Resilience**

Guest (2017) explained that there were main aspects of wellbeing, such as psychological, physical and social functioning. The researches on human resource management and employee resilience explained that there were several aspects that organizations could develop in order to encourage employee resilience, including developing social support, assistance and development programs and flexible work arrangements (Bardoel, 2014). The regulatory focus perspective explained that employees were divided into two types. One who focused on changing the status quo and another one maintained the status quo. Generation Z character, that had an orientation to promotion focus, had the expectation of the availability of self-development opportunities within the organization. This speciality agreed with the contemporary perspective on the concept of employee resilience which focused on a transformational and change-oriented view (Carvalho and Areal, 2015).

Psychological contracts were built to provide social support for employees to develop dynamic abilities in dealing with the change. Social support from supervisors and co-workers had an effect on employee resilience (Bruque et al, 2016). This finding confirmed the findings of Warner and April (2012) which proved the effect of social support on resilience. Employees, who received support, were proven to have greater resources to invest in the organization and showed networking-oriented resilience behaviour (Malik and Nilakant, 2016). Psychological contract was also related to the availability of performance feedback. The existence of this feedback was a signal that the organization was focused on sustainable individual development (Meneghel et al, 2016) and was a critical resource in building employee resilience (Kuntz, 2017).

#### **Effect of Psychological Contract on Employee Agility**

Employee agility was a behaviour developed from the concept of contextual performance. Agile behaviour showed an interest in learning, completing work, development and social relations. This concept was a learning-based view and readiness to change

(Locascio et al, 2016); Holt and Vardaman (2013). Organizations needed to give opportunities to develop themselves that supported the actualization of their abilities in the work to encourage individuals to become sustainable learners (Frimousse, 2019). The concept of employee agility appeared from an organizational strategy that required a speed in responding to business changes that were full of uncertainty, but it required constant adaptation to new requirements, conditions and processes by employees (Parker, 2007). Galindo's research (2017) explained that effective human resource management for startup companies emphasized several aspects including knowledge, challenges, informality, involvement and delegation. Employees were encouraged to be involved in solving collective problems and able to manage themselves in terms of delegation of responsibilities. Employee agility was the main key in innovative programs developed by entrepreneurs. Generation Z had a tendency to think as an entrepreneur compared to Generation Y, was more optimistic and aware of opportunities in technological developments (Peterson, 2014). This generation tended to expect flexibility in the workplace and was more likely to adopt the concept of a boundless career.

#### **Effect of Psychological Contract on Employee Proactive Behaviour**

Psychological contract was an important concept in career perspective. There were various changes in employment relationships along with the development of career expectations. The protean career research explained that organizations played a role in providing growth and development opportunities to employees (Hess et al, 2009). Assumptions of socio-cognitive career theory explained that individual career development was in interpretive schemes and resource and institutional principles (Duberley et al, 2006). The career contexts based on reciprocal exchange and negotiation significantly impacted proactive behaviour (Lam, 2014). The research of Parker and Coolins (2010) also contributed to explaining contextual factors that influenced proactive behaviour.

Proactive behaviour of employees was needed by organizations in building capabilities to create a bright future, especially in innovating products, services and transforming in business models and organizational change (Batistic et al, 2016). Organizational contextual factors became

relevant in building proactive behaviour which was specifically described by Lepak and Snell (1999) in a research on HR configuration. Mossholder's research et al (2011) explained that an employee relationship, that was open-ended obligations, was needed to encourage proactive employee behaviour. Other contextual factors related to communal sharing climate had also been shown to contribute to the proactive behaviour of employees (Lengnick-Hall and Lengnick-Hall, 2003). Knowledge development activities were implemented by the organization were prerequisite conditions for employees to behave proactively (Freese and Fay, 2001). Job design was flexible which facilitated opportunities to participate in decision making and a high autonomy stimulated employees to be more confident in acting (Fuller Jr et al, 2010).

#### **Effect of Eudaimonic Wellbeing on Employee Resilience**

Autonomy was an explanation for the concept of self-actualization in eudaimonic wellbeing. Guest (2007) explained that human resource management, that focused on encouraging employee wellbeing, needed to invest some efforts to design engaging work. It was expected to be able to encourage the perception of autonomy and challenges at work. This research also contributed to explaining job design mechanisms that facilitated positive social interactions, communication channels and participatory management in promoting employee wellbeing. This finding agreed with the research of Youssef and Luthans (2005) which explained that the implementation of human resource management in a positive psychology frame was able to encourage employee wellbeing. Baldonado's research (2018) explained that achievement and self-development were the main work motivations for Generation Z.

#### **Effect on Eudaimonic Wellbeing on Employee Agility**

The findings of Sheheriy and Karwowski (2014) explained that the eudaimonic wellbeing component, autonomy, had a significant impact on employee agility. Other factors that had an impact on employee agility sharing included the process of sharing information with colleagues and the support given to colleagues in activities and work (Breu et al, 2002). Collaborating and sharing information were key resources for employee

agility. Employees, with agile behaviour and a positive attitude towards learning and self-development, had the ability to solve problems, felt comfortable with new ideas and were willing to accept new responsibilities (Plonka, 1997). The findings of Baldonado (2018) proved that responsibility at work, the meaning of work and opportunities for self-development were motivational factors for generation Z.

#### **Effect of Eudaimonic Wellbeing on Employee Proactive Behaviour**

Fritz and Sonnentag (2009) explained that positive affect increased energy, attention and optimism which were important in encouraging proactive behaviour. This argument confirmed the findings of Den Hartog and Belschak (2007) which showed that there was a positive affect on proactive behaviour. Furthermore, Paeker (2007) explained that proactive behaviour required a form of individual choice to allocate his efforts in challenging goals. Positive affect also had an impact on this selection process. This condition was confirmed by the findings of Iles and Judge (2005) which stated that positive affect was associated with higher and more challenging goals. The research by Schuler et al (1993) explained that individuals with a high learning orientation tended to perform proactive behaviour.

Huta's research (2013) showed that meaningfulness, positive affect and neighbourhood to other individuals. Previously, Martin et al (1993) proved that positive affect provided self-regulatory benefits that could encourage individuals to persist in acting proactively. Baldonado's research (2018) recommended the need for knowledge and skill development opportunities for Generation Z in the workplace. Isen's (1999) findings showed that positive affect encouraged the assessment process if it involved a consideration of important value works. The important value works agreed with the concept of eudaimonic orientation (Huta, 2017). Proactive behaviour was interpersonal behaviour that was influenced by the reactions of other individuals in a change-oriented work environment. The findings of Ashford et al (1998) proved that positive relationships with co-workers had an impact on individual proactive actions. The concept of positive relationships with others was described by Ryff (1989) as an intrinsic goal in relationships and community. This concept agreed with the concept of

eudaimonic personality development (Baueur and Adams, 2008) which involved aspects of interdependence. This concept agreed with the terminology of psychological selection and optimal experience in creating social growth (Delle Fave et al, 2011).

**Effect of Eudaimonic Wellbeing in mediating Psychological Contract effect on Employee Resilience, Employee Agility and Employee Proactive Behaviour**

Madsen and Desai (2010) explained that a positive organizational approach had an impact on employee resilience. Kuntz (2017) identified the influence of organizational factors that had an impact on employee resilience. Resilience was a construct that arose from the need for developmental feedback (Chiaburu et al, 2006) which was one of the orientations in eudaimonic values.

The positive behaviour of employees, especially in the context of changing business environments also required organizations to build a learning atmosphere so that employees could respond to the challenges of change (Putz, 2012). This atmosphere encouraged employees to feel safe both in sharing values, taking risks and expressing opinions (Edmonson, 1999). The experiences of learning atmosphere within the organization encouraged employees to be more proactive because feedback from the organization focused on activities and behaviour, and not on personal aspects. (Caniels and Baaten, 2018).

Organizations also needed to manage employees to develop new skills and an agile mind set to handle crisis situations (Paul et al, 2019). This research provided five recommendations for employees management, for instance maintaining expertise and skills, empowering human resources, focusing on individual values, encouraging collaboration and providing space for experimentation. This concept agreed with the value of eudaimonic in the concept of wellbeing. Based on the explanation of the concept and formulation of the hypothesis above, the research framework was developed as follows:

Thus, the hypothesis of this study can be formulated as follows:

- H1. Effect Psychological Contract on Eudaimonic Wellbeing
- H2. Effect Psychological Contract on Employee Resilience
- H3. Effect Psychological Contract on Employee Agility

H4. Effect Psychological Contract on Employee Proactive Behaviour

H5. Effect Eudaimonic Wellbeing on Employee Resilience

H6. Effect Eudaimonic Wellbeing on Employee Agility

H7. Effect Eudaimonic Wellbeing on Employee Proactive Behaviour

H8. Effect Eudaimonic Wellbeing in mediating Psychological Contract effect on Employee Resilience, Employee Agility and Employee Proactive Behaviour

**METHODS**

The population of this research was Generation Z employees who worked at startup companies in Indonesia. The sample of this research was non-probability sampling using purposive sampling technique. There were 300 respondents as the samples. The primary data collection method of this research was carried out by a survey method. The questionnaire format of the study used closed statements, supported by open questions that required short answers from respondents to obtain more answers detailly. The questions of the questionnaire were made using a scale of 1-10. It described the respondents' ratings from a scale of 1 for the strongly disagree criteria and a scale of 10 strongly agree criteria. Data analysis was performed using Structural Equation Modeling (SEM).

The first step of developing the theoretical model was to explain the constructs used in the research model in the form of dimensionalization variable. This research used five constructs, such as psychological contract, eudaimonic wellbeing, employee resilience, employee agility and employee work behaviour. The operational definitions of these constructs were presented as follows: Eudaimonic wellbeing was an individual's subjective evaluation of his or her ability to develop and optimize functions in the work environment (Bartels et al, 2019). The indicators of this research model referred to the instrument which was divided into two dimensions. They were the interpersonal and intrapersonal dimension.

Proactive behaviour was an anticipatory self-initiated action that aimed to change and improve a condition (Parker and Collins, 2010). The indicators of the research model development were based on the categories of proactive work behaviour, proactive strategic behaviour and proactive person-environment fit behaviour.

Employee resilience referred to an individual's ability to develop awareness and capability to be more flexible, improvement-oriented and adaptive (Coutu, 2002). The indicators of this research were developed by Winwood (2012) including living authentically, finding your calling, maintaining perspective, managing stress, building social and staying healthy.

Employee agility referred to an individual's ability to quickly respond to environmental changes and adapt these changes to provide benefits to the organization (Sherehiy and Karwowski, 2014). The indicators of the research used the instrument developed by Braun et al (2017) consisted of five aspects including responsiveness, quickness, competence, adaptability and cooperativeness.

Psychological Contract referred to the employee's perception of an implicit agreement between himself and the organization that contained of shared responsibilities between the two parties. This definition referred to the formulation of the psychological contract concept proposed by Rousseau (1995). The indicators of the research included six aspects related to job content, career development, social atmosphere, organizational policy, work-life balance and rewards developed by Freese, Schalk and Croon (2008).

## RESULT AND DISCUSSION

300 questionnaires were distributed. These questionnaires were given to employees who worked at the startup companies in Indonesia. It took a week to sharing and collecting back the questionnaires. There were 221 questionnaires returned back to the researchers. Then, those questionnaires were filtered and checked for the data completeness. After that, there were some incomplete questionnaires in filling out the data so that they couldn't be included for the next analysis stage. Thus, there were 192 questionnaires that could be processed.

This research had recorded that there were 34 startup businesses. They involved 3 educational businesses, 6 event organizer businesses, 4 computer assembly businesses, 2 beauty businesses, 9 coffee shop businesses, 6 graphic design businesses and 4 travel agency businesses. The total was 34 types of businesses. 13 of them had established for more than 3 years. Based on the results of interviews, the business owners recruited employees from the community of friends and achieved the

recommendations regarding specific skills and work experience from these employees.

Based on the results of statistical data processing, employee characteristics could be grouped into age, education, gender and length of work experiences. Based on age, there were 85 male respondents and 107 female respondents. Most of the respondents had graduated from high schools and vocational schools level, 83 respondents (43%). 30 respondents (16%) were from undergraduate education level, 79 respondents (41%) were from middle experts. Most of the respondents that had worked in the business for less than 1 year were 94 respondents (49%). The respondents who had worked between 2-3 years were 47 respondents (24%) and the others that had worked for more than 3 years were 51 respondents (27%).

Based on the analysis, the Cronbach alpha value for each construct and the loading factor value for each question item is above 0.6. Meanwhile, the variance extract value is greater than the critical value, which is 0.5. The value of construct reliability is above 0.7 while the value of discriminant validity is above 0.7.

## SEM Analysis

The next analysis is a full model of SEM analysis to test the models and hypotheses developed in this research. The results of the chi-square calculation show a value that is smaller than the chi-square table with a significant degree 5%. Then the probability value shows a value that is above 0.05 so that it can be concluded to be good. Furthermore, the GFI value is greater than 0.9 so it can be categorized to be good. The TLI value is greater than 0.90 so it can be categorized to be good. The CMIN/DF value is under 2.00 so it can be concluded to be good and the RSMEA value is far under the standard value 0.08 so that the overall model can be categorized to be fit.

## Hypothesis Test

The last stage is testing the hypotheses that have been proposed. Hypothesis testing is based on data processing using SEM analysis by analyzing the value of the critical ratio and the probability of data processing results. The required value is above 1.96 for the critical ratio and below 0.05 for the probability.

Hypothesis 1 of the research is that psychological contract has a positive effect on eudaimonic wellbeing. Based on the results of

data analysis, it is known that *cr* value for the affective relationship between these two constructs is 2.674 with a probability 0.000. Thus it can be determined that hypothesis 1 is supported.

Hypothesis 2 of the research is that psychological contract has a positive effect on employee resilience. Based on the results of data analysis, it is known that *cr* value for the affective relationship between these two constructs is 2.318 with a probability 0.000. Thus, it can be determined that hypothesis 2 is supported.

Hypothesis 3 of the research is that psychological contract has a positive effect on employee agility. Based on the results of data analysis, it is known that *cr* value for the affective relationship between these two constructs is 2.126 with a probability 0.000. Thus it can be determined that hypothesis 3 is supported.

Hypothesis 4 of the research is that psychological contract has a positive effect on employee proactive behaviour. Based on the results of data analysis, it is known that *cr* value for the affective relationship between these two constructs is 3.785 with a probability 0.000. Thus it can be determined that hypothesis 4 is supported.

Hypothesis 5 of the research is that eudaimonic wellbeing has a positive effect on employee resilience. Based on the results of data analysis, it is known that *cr* value for the affective relationship between these two constructs is 2.785 with a probability 0.000. Thus it can be determined that hypothesis 5 is supported.

Hypothesis 6 of the research is that eudaimonic wellbeing has a positive effect on employee agility. Based on the results of data analysis, it is known that *cr* value for the affective relationship between these two constructs is 2.063 with a probability 0.00. Thus it can be determined that hypothesis 6 is supported.

Hypothesis 7 of the research is that eudaimonic wellbeing has a positive effect on employee proactive behaviour. Based on the results of data analysis, it is known that *cr* value for the affective relationship between these two constructs is 2.384 with a probability 0.000. Thus it can be determined that hypothesis 7 is supported.

the indirect relationship of psychological contract on employee resilience, employee agility and employee proactive behaviour has a greater coefficient than the direct relationship. Thus, it can be determined that

hypothesis 8 which states that there is an effect of eudaimonic wellbeing in mediating the effect of psychological contracts on employee resilience, employee agility and employee proactive behaviour is supported.

## DISCUSSION

Testing the first hypothesis proved the effect of psychological contract on eudaimonic wellbeing. This finding confirmed the results of research by Gracia et al (2017); Parzefall and Hakanen (2008); (Kowalski, 2017) and (Joyce et al, 2010) regarding the fulfillment of the promise to create a flexible work environment, especially in managing employees with various generations of backgrounds. Generation Z employees interpret it as a fulfillment of their expectations and work values, especially in the intrapersonal aspects that support self-development and autonomy.

Testing the second hypothesis proved the effect of psychological contracts on employee resilience. These finding confirmed the results of Guest (2017); Carvalho and Areal (2015) and Kuntz (2017) mainly concerned the fulfillment of psychological and social aspects. The fulfillment of the Generation Z employees expectations regarding the feedback explains that the transformational approach is relevant in encouraging employees to focus on developing themselves in dynamic situations. Testing the third hypothesis proved the effect of psychological contracts on employee agility. This finding confirmed the results of research (Kayes (2015); Holt and Vardaman (2013); Frimousse (2019) and Peterson (2014). It is related to the existence of learning opportunities for Generation Z employees in the form of delegation and challenging assignments so that they are able to respond to business dynamics effectively. This condition is interpreted as an opportunity to develop self-confidence and the ability to find solutions and be adaptive to new ways that need to be mastered quickly.

Testing the fourth hypothesis proved the effect of the psychological contract on employee proactive behaviour. This finding confirmed the results of Lam's research (2014); Paker and Collins (2010); and Mossholder (2011) regarding career perspectives and contextual approaches in employment relationships as the basis for employees in developing employees' proactive capabilities. The existence of career development is interpreted by employee Z as an organizational effort to manage knowledge-based resources that provide benefits for both parties so that

employees are more confident to participate in achieving organizational progress.

Testing the fifth hypothesis proved the effect of eudaimonic wellbeing on employee resilience. This finding confirmed research by Baldonado (2018) and Guest (2007) which explained the work motivation of Generation Z related to self-development and self-activation as the components of eudaimonic wellbeing, due to it was the basis for employees to build resilience behaviour.

Testing the sixth hypothesis proved the effect of eudaimonic wellbeing on employee agility. This finding confirmed the research results of Sheheriy and Karwowski (2014) and Baldonado (2018) which explained that autonomy, meaningfulness of work and knowledge sharing as the components of eudaimonic wellbeing which were the work values of Generation Z. These values encourage Generation Z to have a positive view of various forms of learning and challenging assignments.

Testing the seventh hypothesis proved the effect of eudaimonic wellbeing on employee proactive behaviour. This finding confirmed the results of Fritz and Sonnentag (2009); Den Hartog and Belschack (2007); Huta (2013); Iles and Judge (2005); Martin et al (1999) regarding the concept of positive affect in a review of eudaimonic wellbeing and its effect on employee proactive behaviour.

Testing the eighth hypothesis proved the effect of eudaimonic wellbeing in mediating the effect of psychological contract on employee resilience, employee agility and employee proactive behavior. This finding confirmed the research results of Madsen and Desai (2010); Kuntz (2017); Chiaburu (2006); Putz (2012); Caniels and Baaten (2018) and Paul et al (2019) which explained that skill and skill development, collaborative pursuit of constructive feedback, were the main motivational elements of employees and agreed with the concept of eudaimonic wellbeing that could be managed by organizations and were able to form employee, resilience, employee agility and employee proactive behaviour in responding to dynamic situations.

This research describes the mechanism of the effect of eudaimonic wellbeing in the relationship among psychological contracts and employee resilience, employee agility and employee proactive behaviour. Eudaimonic wellbeing testing equally examines interpersonal and intrapersonal aspects so it can capture both motivational bases of

Generation Z. Employee resilience testing specifically uses the dimensions of living authentically, finding your calling, maintaining perspective, managing stress, building social and staying healthy to holistically explain the form of resilience at workplace. Testing employee proactive behaviour uses three categories including strategic, work and person-environment fit. Therefore, it is capable of explaining the proactive form of generation Z employees for the details. Testing employee agility specifically uses components of responsiveness, quickness, competence, adaptability and cooperativeness that contribute to explaining benefits for the startup companies. This research examines the psychological contract concept from the perception of generation Z employees. Future research shall need to consider measuring psychological contracts from the perspective of both parties from the organization and employees.

The psychological contract was a multi-perspective construct. There were several approaches in creating the dimensions of the psychological contract. Rousseau (2000) formed a psychological contract using two dimensions. They were the relational and transactional aspect based on the content approach. Psychological contracts could also be explained through an employee evaluative approach. It was the employee's perception of the fulfillment of a contract or the violation of a contract. Besides, content-based and evaluative-based, psychological contracts could also be explained through contract features including equality in exchange (balanced or unbalanced), contract level (individual or collective), scope (narrow or broad), time frame (long or short term relationship), contract clarity (explicit or implicit); formality (rules-based or trust-based) and negotiation (negotiated or determined). This research only focused on analyzing the effect of psychological contracts in reviewing flexibility contracts with a boundless career perspective.

## CONCLUSION

The results of this research explained the effect of eudaimonic wellbeing in the relationship among psychological contracts and employee resilience, employee agility and employee proactive behaviour. Social exchange theory underlied the relationship between the psychological contract concept as a form of employer branding on the motivation, attitudes and behavior of

Generation Z employees. Psychological contracts in the employment relationship review of this research were based on the context of flexible contracts that were relevant in adopting generation Z work value expectations. There was a primary difference among the contents from a contract, due to the changes in the workforce characteristics and the organization's efforts to manage human resources as the basis for competitive advantage. Currently the organizations have been focusing on efforts to develop employee wellbeing as a retention strategy that agrees with Generation Z. Their numbers are increasing along with the presence of startup companies that have specific designs and resources. Generation Z characters who prioritize boundless careers tend to be open to improvement and meaningfulness in their work. It agrees with the eudaimonic perspective in the concept of employee wellbeing. The management of psychological contracts that are oriented to flexibility, can encourage Generation Z employees to be more anticipatory, adaptive and solution-oriented in facing work challenges.

## REFERENCES

- Agarwal, H., & Vaghela, M. P. S. Work Values of Gen Z: Bridging the Gap to the Next Generation.
- Arar, T., & Öneren, M. (2018). Role of Talent Management in Career Development of Generation Z: A Case Study of a Telecommunication Firm. *International Academic Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(1), 28-44.
- Baldonado, A. M. Leadership and Gen Z: Motivating Gen Z Workers and Their Impact to the Future.
- Bardoel, E. A., Pettit, T. M., De Cieri, H., & McMillan, L. (2014). Employee resilience: an emerging challenge for HRM. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 52(3), 279-297.
- Bartels, A. L., Peterson, S. J., & Reina, C. S. (2019). Understanding well-being at work: Development and validation of the eudaimonic workplace well-being scale. *PLoS one*, 14(4).
- Batistič, S., Černe, M., Kaše, R., & Zupic, I. (2016). The role of organizational context in fostering employee proactive behavior: The interplay between HR system configurations and relational climates. *European Management Journal*, 34(5), 579-588.
- Bauer, J. J., McAdams, D. P., & Pals, J. L. (2008). Narrative identity and eudaimonic well-being. *Journal of happiness studies*, 9(1), 81-104.
- Bencsik, A., Horváth-Csikós, G., & Juhász, T. (2016). Y and Z Generations at Workplaces. *Journal of Competitiveness*, 8(3).
- Binti Safie, A., Arshad, M. R. M., & binti Idris, N. (2018, June). Acceptance Factor of Mobile Learning Application for Adult Learners in Life Long Learning Education. In *Journal of Physics: Conference Series* (Vol. 1019, No. 1, p. 012070). IOP Publishing.
- Braun, T. J., Hayes, B. C., DeMuth, R. L. F., & Taran, O. A. (2017). The development, validation, and practical application of an employee agility and resilience measure to facilitate organizational change. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 10(4), 703-723.
- Breu, K., Hemingway, C. J., Strathern, M., & Bridger, D. (2002). Workforce agility: the new employee strategy for the knowledge economy. *Journal of Information technology*, 17(1), 21-31.
- Bruque, S., Moyano, J., & Piccolo, R. (2016). OCB and external-internal social networks: Effects on individual performance and adaptation to change. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 27(1), 1-22.
- Caballer, A., Silla, I., Gracia, F., & Ramos, J. (2017). Current evidence concerning employment contracts and employee/organizational well-being among workers in Spain. In *Employment contracts and well-being among European workers* (pp. 153-175). Routledge.
- Cai, Z., Huang, Q., Liu, H., & Wang, X. (2018). Improving the agility of employees through enterprise social media: The mediating role of psychological conditions. *International Journal of Information Management*, 38(1), 52-63.
- Caniels, M. C. J., & Baaten, S. M. J. (2017). Organizational learning and resilience: how different proactive behaviors are linked to employee resilience. In *Product Development Management Association 2017: Annual Research Forum*.
- Carvalho, A., & Areal, N. (2016). Great places to work®: Resilience in times of crisis. *Human Resource Management*, 55(3), 479-498.
- Chiaburu, D. S., Baker, V. L., & Pitariu, A. H. (2006). Beyond being proactive: what (else) matters for career self-management behaviors?. *Career Development International*.
- Cooper, C., Flint-Taylor, J., & Pearn, M. (2013). Building resilience for success: A resource for managers and organizations. Springer.
- Coutu, D. L. (2002). How resilience works. *Harvard business review*, 80(5), 46-56.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological inquiry*, 11(4), 227-268.
- De Cuyper, N., Van der Heijden, B. I., & De Witte, H. (2011). Associations between perceived

- employability, employee well-being, and its contribution to organizational success: a matter of psychological contracts?. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 22(07), 1486-1503.
- Delle Fave, A., Brdar, I., Freire, T., Vella-Brodrick, D., & Wissing, M. P. (2011). The eudaimonic and hedonic components of happiness: Qualitative and quantitative findings. *Social indicators research*, 100(2), 185-207.
- Den Hartog, D. N., & Belschak, F. D. (2007). Personal initiative, commitment and affect at work. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 80(4), 601-622.
- Dewe, P., & Cooper, C. (2012). Well-being and work: Towards a balanced agenda. Springer.
- Duberley, J., Cohen, L., & Mallon, M. (2006). Constructing scientific careers: Change, continuity and context. *Organization Studies*, 27(8), 1131-1151.
- Edmonson, A. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behaviors in work teams. Retrieved Nov. 22, 2007.
- Elmore, T. (2014). How generation Z differs from generation Y. Retrieved July, 1, 2015.
- Galindo, M. G. (2017). Big Data within Service Organizations: Developing and Executing a Competitive Advantage-A Resource Based Perspective.
- Geyer, C., & Klein, T. (2016). Human Resources Strategies for Integrating Generation Z into Labor. *Journal of Competitiveness*, 8, 90-106.
- Gimbergsson, E., & Lundberg, S. (2016). Work values of Generation Z: A quantitative study explaining different groups of Generation Z's work values.
- Girvan, L., & Paul, D. (2017). Agile and Business Analysis: Practical guidance for IT professionals. BCS, The Chartered Institute for IT.
- Gracia, F. J., Silla, I., Peiró, J. M., & Fortes-Ferreira, L. (2007). The state of the psychological contract and its relation to employees' psychological health. *Psychology in Spain*.
- Grant, A. M., Parker, S., & Collins, C. (2009). Getting credit for proactive behavior: Supervisor reactions depend on what you value and how you feel. *Personnel Psychology*, 62(1), 31-55.
- Guest, D. E., & Conway, N. (2002). Communicating the psychological contract: an employer perspective. *Human resource management journal*, 12(2), 22-38.
- Guest, D. E. (2004). The psychology of the employment relationship: An analysis based on the psychological contract. *Applied psychology*, 53(4), 541-555.
- Guest, D. E. (2007). HRM and the worker: towards a new psychological contract?. *Oxford Handbook of Human Resource Management*, The, 128.
- Guest, D. E. (2017). Human resource management and employee well-being: Towards a new analytic framework. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 27(1), 22-38.
- Freese, C., Schalk, R., & Croon, M. (2011). The impact of organizational changes on psychological contracts. *Personnel Review*.
- Freese, M., & Fay, D. (2001). Personal Initiative: an active performance concept for work in the 21st century. In B. Staw & R. Sutton (Eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior* (vol. 23, pp. 133-187).
- Frimousse, S. (2019). Innovation and Agility in the Digital Age: Africa, the World's Laboratories of Tomorrow. John Wiley & Sons.
- Fuller Jr, J. B., Hester, K., & Cox, S. S. (2010). Proactive personality and job performance: Exploring job autonomy as a moderator. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 35-51.
- Harvey, C. M., Koubek, R. J., & Chin, L. (1999). Toward a model of workforce agility. *International journal of agile manufacturing*, 2(2), 203-218.
- Herriot, P., & Pemberton, C. (1996). Contracting careers. *Human relations*, 49(6), 757-790.
- Herriot, P., Manning, W. E. G., & Kidd, J. M. (1997). The content of the psychological contract. *British Journal of management*, 8(2), 151-162.
- Hess, N., Jepsen, D. M., & Dries, N. (2012). Career and employer change in the age of the 'boundaryless' career. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 81(2), 280-288.
- Holt, D. T., & Vardaman, J. M. (2013). Toward a comprehensive understanding of readiness for change: The case for an expanded conceptualization. *Journal of Change Management*, 13(1), 9-18.
- Huta, V. (2013). Pursuing eudaimonia versus hedonia: Distinctions, similarities, and relationships.
- Huta, V. (2017). Meaning as a subjective experience. *Journal of Constructivist Psychology*, 30(1), 20-25.
- Ilies, R., & Judge, T. A. (2005). Goal regulation across time: the effects of feedback and affect. *Journal of applied psychology*, 90(3), 453.
- Janssens, M., Sels, L., & Van den Brande, I. (2003). Multiple types of psychological contracts: A six-cluster solution. *Human Relations*, 56(11), 1349-1378.
- Joyce, K., Pabayo, R., Critchley, J. A., & Bambra, C. (2010). Flexible working conditions and their effects on employee health and wellbeing. *Cochrane database of systematic reviews*, (2).
- Keyes, C. L. M. (1998). Social well-being. *Social psychology quarterly*, 121-140.
- Kotter, J. P. (1973). The psychological contract: Managing the joining-up process. *California management review*, 15(3), 91-99.
- Kuntz, J., Connell, P., & Näswall, K. (2017). Workplace resources and employee

- resilience: The role of regulatory profiles. Career Development International.
- Kowalski, T. H., & Loretto, W. (2017). Well-being and HRM in the changing workplace.
- Lam, C. F., Spreitzer, G., & Fritz, C. (2014). Too much of a good thing: Curvilinear effect of positive affect on proactive behaviors. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 35(4), 530-546.
- Lengnick-Hall, M. L., & Lengnick-Hall, C. A. (2003). HR's role in building relationship networks. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 17(4), 53-63.
- Lepak, D., & Snell, S. (1999). The strategic management of human capital: determinants and implications of different relationships. *Academy of Management Review*, 24(1), 1-18.
- Leonardi, P. M. (2014). Social media, knowledge sharing, and innovation: Toward a theory of communication visibility. *Information systems research*, 25(4), 796-816.
- Locascio, J., Khurana, R., He, Y., & Kaye, J. (2016, May). Utilizing employees as usability participants: exploring when and when not to leverage your coworkers. In *Proceedings of the 2016 CHI conference on human factors in computing systems* (pp. 4533-4537).
- Luthans, F. (2002). The need for and meaning of positive organizational behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, 23(6), 695-706.
- Luthans, F., Avolio, B. J., Avey, J. B., & Norman, S. M. (2007). Positive psychological capital: Measurement and relationship with performance and satisfaction. *Personnel psychology*, 60(3), 541-572.
- Madsen, P. M., & Desai, V. (2010). Failing to learn? The effects of failure and success on organizational learning in the global orbital launch vehicle industry. *Academy of management journal*, 53(3), 451-476.
- Malik, A., & Nilakant, V. (2016). Knowledge integration mechanisms in high-technology business-to-business services vendors. *Knowledge Management Research & Practice*, 14(4), 565-574.
- Martin, L. L., Ward, D. W., Achee, J. W., & Wyer, R. S. (1993). Mood as input: People have to interpret the motivational implications of their moods. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 64(3), 317.
- Meneghel, I., Salanova, M., & Martínez, I. M. (2016). Feeling good makes us stronger: How team resilience mediates the effect of positive emotions on team performance. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 17(1), 239-255.
- Micoleta, J. (2015). Generation Z Teens Stereotyped as „Lazy and Unaware“.
- Mossholder, K. W., Richardson, H. A., & Settoon, R. P. (2011). Human resource systems and helping in organizations: A relational perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 36(1), 33-52.
- Muduli, A. (2016). Exploring the facilitators and mediators of workforce agility: an empirical study. *Management Research Review*.
- Ng, T. W., & Feldman, D. C. (2008). The relationship of age to ten dimensions of job performance. *Journal of applied psychology*, 93(2), 392.
- Ozkan, M., & Solmaz, B. (2015). The changing face of the employees—generation Z and their perceptions of work (a study applied to university students). *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 26, 476-483.
- Parker, S. K. (2003). Longitudinal effects of lean production on employee outcomes and the mediating role of work characteristics. *Journal of applied psychology*, 88(4), 620.
- Parker, S. K. (2007). That is my job' How employees' role orientation affects their job performance. *Human Relations*, 60(3), 403-434.
- Parker, S. K., & Collins, C. G. (2010). Taking stock: Integrating and differentiating multiple proactive behaviors. *Journal of management*, 36(3), 633-662.
- Parmar, A. (2014). The role of HR department in employer branding at public and private sector. *Journal of Human Resources Management and Labor Studies*, 2(2), 201-225.
- Peterson, H. (2014). Millennials Are Old News-Here" s Everything You Should Know about Generation Z. *Business Insider*.
- Philip, T., & Garcia, A. (2013). The importance of still teaching the iGeneration: New technologies and the centrality of pedagogy. *Harvard Educational Review*, 83(2), 300-319.
- Plonka, F. E. (1997). Developing a lean and agile work force. *Human Factors and Ergonomics in Manufacturing & Service Industries*, 7(1), 11-20.
- Pulakos, E. D., Kantrowitz, T., & Schneider, B. (2019). What leads to organizational agility: It's not what you think. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 71(4), 305.
- Putz, D., Schilling, J., & Kluge, A. (2012). Measuring organizational climate for learning from errors at work. In *Human fallibility* (pp. 107-123). Springer, Dordrecht.
- Rousseau, D. M. (1998). The 'problem' of the psychological contract considered. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, 19(S1), 665-671.
- Ruokolainen, M., Mauno, S., Diehl, M. R., Tolvanen, A., Mäkikangas, A., & Kinnunen, U. (2018). Patterns of psychological contract

- and their relationships to employee well-being and in-role performance at work: longitudinal evidence from university employees. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 29(19), 2827-2850.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American psychologist*, 55(1), 68.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2001). On happiness and human potentials: A review of research on hedonic and eudaimonic well-being. *Annual review of psychology*, 52(1), 141-166.
- Ryff, C. D. (1989). Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning of psychological well-being. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 57(6), 1069.
- Ryff, C. D. (1995). Psychological well-being in adult life. *Current directions in psychological science*, 4(4), 99-104.
- Ryff, C. D., & Singer, B. (1998). *The role of purpose in life and personal growth in positive human health*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Schuler, H., Farr, J. L., & Smith, M. (1993). The individual and organizational sides of personnel selection and assessment. *Personnel selection and assessment: Individual and organizational perspectives*, 1-9.
- Shore, L. M., Tetrick, L. E., Taylor, M. S., Shapiro, J. A. M. C., Liden, R. C., Parks, J. M., ... & Rousseau, D. M. (2004). The employee-organization relationship: a timely concept in a period of transition research in personnel and human resources management.
- Seligman, M. E. (2011). Building resilience. *Harvard business review*, 89(4), 100-106.
- Sherehly, B., & Karwowski, W. (2014). The relationship between work organization and workforce agility in small manufacturing enterprises. *International Journal of Industrial Ergonomics*, 44(3), 466-473.
- Tonkin, K., Malinen, S., Näswall, K., & Kuntz, J. C. (2018). Building employee resilience through wellbeing in organizations. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 29(2), 107-124.
- Van der Vaart, L., Linde, B., & Cockeran, M. (2013). The state of the psychological contract and employees' intention to leave: The mediating role of employee well-being. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 43(3), 356-369.
- Van der Vaart, E., & Hemelrijk, C. K. (2014). 'Theory of mind' in animals: ways to make progress. *Synthese*, 191(3), 335-354.
- Vansteenkiste, M., Neyrinck, B., Niemiec, C. P., Soenens, B., De Witte, H., & Van den Broeck, A. (2007). On the relations among work value orientations, psychological need satisfaction and job outcomes: A self-determination theory approach. *Journal of occupational and organizational psychology*, 80(2), 251-277.
- Warner, R., & April, K. (2012). Building personal resilience at work. *Effective executive*, 15(4), 53.
- Wesolowski, P. (2014). Melding a multi-generational workforce. *Human Resource Management International Digest*.
- Wilson, J. M., Dalton, E., Scheer, C., & Grammich, C. A. (2010). *Police recruitment and retention for the new millennium*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation.
- Youssef, C. M., & Luthans, F. (2005). A positive organizational behavior approach to ethical performance. *Positive psychology in business ethics and corporate responsibility*, 1-22.
- Zafirovski, M. (2005). Social exchange theory under scrutiny: A positive critique of its economic-behaviorist formulations. *Electronic journal of sociology*, 2(2), 1-40.