

# The Mediating Effect of Organizational Commitment and Occupational Self-Efficacy on Work Engagement

Christine Winstinindah Sandroto<sup>1</sup> and Athalia Anabel Alamsyah<sup>2</sup>

Faculty of Economic and Business, Atma Jaya Catholic University of Indonesia,  
Jalan Jendral Sudirman No.51, RT.5/RW.4, Karet Semanggi, Setiabudi, Jakarta Selatan, Daerah Khusus Ibukota Jakarta 12930,  
Indonesia

## ARTICLE INFO

## ABSTRACT

### Keywords:

organizational commitment,  
occupational self-efficacy,  
millennial generation, work  
engagement.

### Kata Kunci:

komitmen organisasi,  
occupational self-efficacy,  
generasi milenial, work  
engagement.

Corresponding author:  
christine.wins@atmajaya.ac.id

The goal of this study is to determine the effect of occupational self-efficacy on work engagement in millennial-generation employees, with organizational commitment as a mediation variable. The population of this research includes members of the millennial generation working in Jabodetabek. The sample comprises 250 respondents; the sampling technique is non-random sampling using the convenience sampling technique. Data processing uses Macro Preacher & Hayes contained in SPSS verse 25, called PROCESS. The study results reveal that occupational self-efficacy has a significant effect on organizational commitment, and organizational commitment has a significant effect on work engagement. Occupational self-efficacy has a significant effect on work engagement, and organizational commitment mediates occupational self-efficacy and work engagement among millennial generation employees who work in Jabodetabek. The direct effect of occupational self-efficacy on work engagement is greater than the indirect effect.

SARI PATI

*Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui pengaruh occupational self-efficacy terhadap work engagement pada karyawan generasi milenial dengan organizational commitment sebagai variabel mediasi. Populasi dalam penelitian ini adalah generasi milenial yang bekerja di Jabodetabek. Sampel berjumlah 250 responden. Teknik pengambilan sampel yang digunakan adalah non random sampling dengan menggunakan teknik convenience sampling. Pengolahan data menggunakan Macro Preacher & Hayes yang terdapat pada SPSS versi 25 yaitu PROSES. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa occupational self-efficacy berpengaruh signifikan terhadap organizational commitment, dan organizational commitment berpengaruh signifikan terhadap work engagement. Occupational self-efficacy berpengaruh signifikan terhadap work engagement, dan organizational commitment memediasi pengaruh antara occupational self-efficacy dan work engagement pada karyawan generasi milenial yang bekerja di Jabodetabek. Pengaruh langsung occupational self-efficacy terhadap work engagement lebih besar dibandingkan pengaruh tidak langsung.*

Copyright © 2024 by Authors,  
Published by IRJBS.  
This is an open access article  
under the CC BY-SA License



## INTRODUCTION

Currently, most of the roles in the company, from staff to managers, have been occupied by Generation Y, often referred to as the millennial generation. Schiffman and Kanuk (2007) state that those born in the time range between 1977-1994 are said to be in the millennial generation, while according to Martin and Tulgan (2002), the millennial generation includes those born from the period between 1978-2000. This millennial generation has advantages over other generations, including an understanding of technological information (Hawakins et al., 2007).

Eisner (Horeczy et al., 2012) states that the presence of millennial employees in an organization raises organizational problems related to millennial employee engagement. Survey results show that 29% of millennial employees are engaged in their work and the company, while the remaining millennial employees have a low level of work engagement. This means that millennial employees are generally not involved in their work, which undoubtedly presents a problem for the company. The low level of work engagement can result in employee indifference to organizational issues. One of the causes of employees' indifference toward their work is their feelings of not being involved with their work and the company. Therefore, the behaviors of the millennial generation certainly have positive and negative impacts. The millennial generation tends to devote work efforts to their careers and not to the company in which they work (Chandler, 2015). However, this undoubtedly introduces a challenge and increased capital for companies and human resource managers when managing millennial employees and their involvement in their work. An employee who is engaged will increase their employee work engagement within the organization.

In addition to occupational self-efficacy, organizational commitment can increase one's work engagement. Meyer and Allen (1997) define organizational commitment as a psychological state that describes an employee's relationship

with the organization and as a reference point when an employee makes decisions to continue connection with the organization. Therefore, it can be concluded that the stronger a person's commitment, the more willing an employee will be to stay in the organization, work full-heartedly, and make more contributions. In contrast, if an employee's organizational commitment is low, they will expend little energy at work and exhibit low work engagement. Increasing work engagement requires self-efficacy beliefs that result in organizational commitment to improving employee work engagement.

This article examines employees from the millennial generation who work in Jakarta, Bogor, Depok, Tangerang, and Bekasi (Jabodetabek). Jabodetabek is a metropolitan area including Jakarta and its surroundings. The Provincial Government of DKI Jakarta has determined the cities of Bogor, Depok, Tangerang, and Bekasi as a buffer zone for Jakarta. This is due to the density of the city of Jakarta to accommodate all government, trade, and industrial activities (Jabodetabek, 2023). In this area, the millennial generation is expected to advance the country in various fields. As shown by the Central Bureau of Statistics, in 2020, the people born from 1981 to 1996 or currently aged 24-39 years in Jakarta represent the greatest proportion of the total population in Jakarta.

One of the most influential factors in increasing Work Engagement for Millennials is occupational self-efficacy (Bakker, et al., 2008; Xanthopoulou, et al., 2009). Because high employee occupational self-efficacy leads to confidence in their ability to complete work, self-efficacy can affect a person's thoughts, feelings, and actions and affect the length of time and energy they devote to a task. (Bandura, 1999). In addition, Hirschi (2012) states that the relationship between occupational self-efficacy and work engagement is strong. Someone with higher occupational self-efficacy will be more involved in their work than someone who has low occupational self-efficacy.

Research that examines the topic of occupational self-efficacy, organizational commitment, and work engagement already exists (Liu & Huang, 2019), but there is no specific research on millennial generation employees. Based on this background, the current study examines the effect of occupational self-efficacy on work engagement in millennial generation employees with organizational commitment as a mediation variable.

### **Theoretical Background**

#### **Millennial Generation**

Upperschmidt (2000) defines a generation as a group of individuals who identify their contemporaries based on the similarity of that individual group's age, year of birth, events in life, and location, which significantly influence their growth phase. Howe and Strauss (2000) classify several types of generations based on the time of birth. Other researchers also widely put forward the division of ages with different labels for naming generations. According to Zemke, Raines, and Filipczak (2000), millennials are individuals born from 1980 to 2001. Howe and Strauss (2000) state that the millennial generation includes individuals born from 1982 to 2000. Meanwhile, according to Martin and Tulgan (2002), the millennial generation is born between 1978 and 2000. For this study, the author applies Martin and Tulgan's (2002) definition for the age of millennial generation respondents, thus the age limit that the author sets is from 21-42 years old.

According to Hammill (2005), people from different generations work together, which include the following categories: 1. Generation of Veterans: This generation was born during World War II, with a birth span between 1922 and 1945. This generation is also classified as seniors or traditionalists. The characteristics possessed by this generation of veterans are having a strong sense of responsibility and willingness to sacrifice for the company's good. They tend to work individually and follow orders, and the preferred form of communication for the veteran generation is formal (Hammill, 2005). This

generation has a strong work ethic and prefers discipline (Murphy, 2010). 2. Baby Boomers: This generation was born between 1946 and 1964. Good work ethic is the common characteristic of the baby boomer generation with the veteran generation. However, a difference from the veteran generation is that baby boomers prefer to work in groups rather than as individuals, communicate personally, and like to be involved in decision-making (Hammill, 2005). 3. Generation X: These individuals were born between 1965 and 1980. They prefer to do things their way (Murphy, 2010) and challenge other people. Generation X potentially conflicts with veterans because they expect to be valued (Hammill, 2005). People in Generation X see everyone as equals and tend to disobey rules, including in the work setting. Generation X employees want immediate feedback on how well they do (Hammill, 2005). 4. Generation Y or Millennials: Millennials were born between 1981 and 2000. The millennial generation perceives working as a tool to achieve goals and prefers to strike a balance between work and family life (Hammill, 2005). In the workplace, millennials have high expectations and seek meaning from their work (Choi, Lim, & Tan, 2016). Next is Generation Z (or "Gen Z"), those who were born between 1997 and 2012. This generation is labeled as a boundary-less generation. Gen Z has different hopes, preferences, and work perspectives that are considered challenging for the organization. The character of Gen Z employees is more diverse and global, and it influences the culture and attitudes of most people. As individuals who were raised with technology, Gen Z can take advantage of technological changes in various aspects of their lives. They use technology naturally (Rakhmah, 2021). Each group exhibits unique characteristics and approaches within the workplace.

Hornbostel et al. (2011) state that millennials want to be in an environment in which their contributions and talents are valued and differences are viewed with high respect. The primary characteristics of the millennial generation are as in the Table 1.

**Table 1. Basic Characteristics of the Millennial Generation**

Characteristics	Generation Millennial
Attitude toward risk	High risk tolerance
Communication Media	Email, internet, gadget
Attitude toward work-life balance	Try to integrate work and leisure
Degree of intellectual curiosity	Learning transferable skills
Core Values	Confidence, realism, extreme fun, social

Source: Hornbostel et al. (2011)

The table 1 shows that, at work, millennial employees have various essential characteristics, such as inherent core values of realism and confidence. The value of realism leads to the acknowledgment of actual reality, in which the millennial generation sees events in the context of the facts. In addition, they exhibit confidence, through which they have high self-certainty in doing tasks, a sense of desire to learn something, and an aspiration to take high risks.

Shah (2017) shows that millennials have unique characteristics in work engagement; namely, they feel pride and enthusiasm for work and feel happy when working continuously. Also, the millennial generation is mostly not tied to their work, an approach that can disrupt the workplace.

**Occupational Self-Efficacy**

According to Bandura (1977), self-efficacy is the belief that someone can produce specific results through their actions and behaviors. Riggoti, Schyns, and Mohr (2008) explain that occupational self-efficacy is a person’s perceived competence regarding their ability to successfully perform the tasks of their job.

Social cognitive theory, or social learning theory, is another term for self-efficacy, which refers to the belief in someone to carry out a task and duty. The higher the self-efficacy, the more confident an individual is in their ability to succeed. Thus, individuals with low self-efficacy are more likely to

decrease their efforts or give up altogether under challenging situations. In contrast, an individual with high self-efficacy will increase their effort in facing the challenge (Robbins & Judge, 2017). High occupational self-efficacy is related to a positive motivational state, such as work engagement (Chaudhary, Rangnekar, & Barua, 2012; Guarnaccia, et al., 2018).

Scyns and Collani (2002) define occupational self-efficacy as a person’s belief in their abilities and competencies to perform effectively and succeed across various tasks within the job and situation. Employees with high self-efficacy, optimism, resilience, and esteem can be engaged in their work. Rigotti, Schyns, and Mohr (2008) state that, in an organizational context, the concept of occupational self-efficacy is very relevant, because employees with high occupational self-efficacy set challenging targets for themselves and can face obstacles for an extended time.

Bandura (2009) describes four self-efficacy processes: cognitive, affective, motivational, and selection processes. Four sources can develop a person’s level of self-efficacy, namely: mastery experiences, verbal persuasion, vicarious experience, and physiological and affective state.

The study of occupational self-efficacy (Pethe, Chaudhari & Dhar, 1999) has identified that occupational self-efficacy consists of six factors: confidence, command, adaptability, personal effectiveness, individuality, and positive attitude.

### ***Organizational Commitment***

According to Jahanbakhshian, Assadi, and Nejad (2015), organizational commitment grounds an employee's self-identity; it forms the employee's loyalty to an organization. Luthans, Luthans, and Luthans (2015) suggest that organizational commitment is an employee attitude, manifest in their loyalty to the organization, and a continuous process through which members of the organization show their concern for the organization and the welfare and success of the organization.

According to Allen and Meyer (1990), there are three dimensions of organizational commitment: affective commitment, normative commitment, and continuance commitment. Employees remain members of the organization because of their awareness of what commitment to the organization should be. Affective commitment refers to emotional engagement through which employees identify with and engage in the organization and its goals. Second, continuance commitment is a calculation and exchange based on characteristics and relates to the costs of leaving the organization. Continuance commitment produces feelings within individuals; they tend to be in a bonded relationship with a company because it costs too much to leave the organization or find work elsewhere. Finally, normative commitment refers to an employee's willingness to stay with an organization. An individual tends to maintain current ties to the organization because of the belief that it is the proper thing to do. Based on this description, organizational commitment can identify the work engagement of employees in the organization, which includes indicators of affective, normative, and continuance.

### ***Work Engagement***

According to Schaufeli and Bakker (2010) and Na-Nan, Kanthong, and Joungrakul (2021), work engagement is defined as a positive motivational state with characteristics of vigor, absorption, and dedication. Vigor depicts a strong energy level and the tendency not to give up easily. Absorption is a state of real work in which employees find it

difficult to separate themselves from work. It is characterized by the feeling that time goes fast while working. Dedication indicates strong involvement with a heightened sense of pride and enthusiasm (Saks, 2006).

Kahn (1990) is one of the theorists of work engagement. He described that people with high work engagement are characterized by being fully engaged physically, cognitively, and emotionally in their work; it refers to the focus of employees' energy toward organizational strategy. Engaged employees work harder to improve their business than unengaged employees (Macey et al., 2009).

Schaufeli and Bakker (2004) identify several factors that can increase a person's level of work engagement: job demands consist of physical, social, and organizational aspects that are required to achieve a work target; job resources consist of physical, social, and organizational aspects through which employees can experience growth and development to achieve work targets; the salience of job resources consist of the application of job resources owned by a person; and personal resources are owned from within a person such as age and personality traits. Usually, this aspect is related to feeling happy and can influence the work environment by following the employees' wishes and abilities.

### ***Previous Studies***

Meyer et al. (2002) state that self-efficacy is related to organizational commitment and can predict an employee's organizational commitment. Employees demonstrate high organizational commitment if they are perceived as skilled in their duties (Park & Jung, 2015). People with strong self-efficacy can face challenging work. The stronger the employee's occupational self-efficacy, the stronger their organizational commitment. Furthermore, the same conclusion has been made by previous researchers. Meyer et al. (2002) state that occupational self-efficacy and organizational commitment have a positive relationship.

**H1:** Occupational self-efficacy significantly affects organizational commitment among millennial employees.

In addition to occupational self-efficacy, the results show that organizational commitment and work engagement have a positive relationship. Employees with high commitment tend to have a high level of organizational engagement. Highly engaged employees likely have a sense that they must respond to and repay the goodness of the organization. This finding is consistent with other studies (Swarnalatha & Prasanna, 2013; Geldenhuys, Laba, & Venter, 2014), explaining that organizational commitment positively affects work engagement. The greater the commitment of employees, the higher the level of employee engagement.

These results align with previous research that occupational self-efficacy increases employees' organizational commitment (McDonald & Siegal, 1992) and leads employees to increase their engagement in work (van Gelderen & Bik, 2016).

**H2:** Organizational commitment significantly affects work engagement for millennial employees.

Similar research has been carried out by Liu and Huang (2019). The study examines the impact of occupational self-efficacy on organizational commitment, which can indirectly affect work engagement in part-time students at a graduate school in China. The results show that occupational self-efficacy directly affects work engagement through organizational commitment as a mediator. Chaudhary, Rangnekar, and Barua (2012) also explain the effect of occupational self-efficacy on work engagement.

Hirschi (2012) and Na-Nan, Kanthong, and Joungrakul (2021) find that occupational self-efficacy and work engagement have a strong relationship. Thus, those with high occupational self-efficacy are more likely to be engaged in their

daily work activities. The study yielded similar conclusions to the research conducted by Buric and Macuka (2018), which showed that occupational self-efficacy and employee work engagement have a positive relationship. This finding supports the assumption that occupational self-efficacy is an essential factor in predicting employee work engagement (Dagher, Chapa, & Junaid, 2015). Those with low occupational self-efficacy demonstrate passive behavior in the workplace; the effort expended is low and is likely to fail in the tasks assigned to them (Liu, Cho, & Putra, 2017)

**H3:** Occupational self-efficacy significantly affects work engagement in millennial employees.

**H4:** Organizational commitment mediates occupational self-efficacy and work engagement in millennial employees.

## **METHODS**

### **Sample and Data Analysis**

The population of this study comprises members of the millennial generation who are working in Jabodetabek; the exact number is unknown. The capital city of Indonesia is Jakarta, with a population of 10.56 million people. Of that number, 2.83 million (26.78%) are millennials born in 1978-2000 (Central Bureau of Statistics of DKI Jakarta Province, 2020).

The researcher targets those included in the respondents' criteria as the millennial generation born between 1978 and 2000. Researchers distribute questionnaires to millennial respondents aged 21-40 years. According to Roscoe (Sekaran, 2003), the number of participants in the ideal sample in a study is as follows: the sample size should be between 30 and 500 elements. If the sample is divided into sub-samples, then the minimum number of sub-samples must be 30 elements. In data processing, if the variable is more than or equal to three variables (multivariate analysis), then the sample size must be ten times greater than the number of variables to be analyzed, and for simple experimental research with tight control, the sample size can be between 10 and

20 elements. Based on this theory, the researchers distributed 281 questionnaires to the respondents, but the number of those that were completed and can be processed are as many as 250 questionnaires. The sampling technique used by the researchers in this study was non-random sampling, specifically a convenience sampling technique.

The demographics of female respondents are more dominant than male respondents. Female respondents are 55.6% (139 people). Meanwhile, male respondents represent 44.4% (111 people). The majority of respondents aged 21-24 years are 50.4% (126 people), then between 25 and 28 years (26.4%), and the rest are between 29 and 40 years old. In terms of marital status, most respondents, 76.4% (191 people), are unmarried. Furthermore, most respondents have an undergraduate education background at 90.0% (225 people). In terms of field of work, most respondents work in the financial sector, 40.4% (101 people), and others work in HR, marketing, IT, education, consulting, and others. The position of the majority of respondents as staff members is 72.41% (181 people), and the rest are at the managerial level. Finally, in terms of monthly income earned by millennial generation employees, the range between Rp 5,000,000 - Rp 10,000,000 dominate the sample at 56.0% (140 people), then Rp 10,000,000 - Rp 20,000,000 (23.2%), and the rest are between IDR 3,000,000 - IDR 5,000,000 (1 IDR equals about 0.000070 USD).

#### **Operationalization and Measure Validation**

The questionnaire is an instrument used to measure work engagement, occupational self-efficacy, and organizational commitment. The questionnaire, which was initially in English, is translated into Indonesian, which is the mother tongue of the respondents. The questionnaire begins with questions about the demographics of the respondents and then continues with items on the three variables studied, namely work engagement, occupational self-efficacy, and organizational commitment.

Occupational self-efficacy is a concept that comes from self-efficacy but in work. occupational self-efficacy is someone's belief in their incompetence and ability to do a job (Pethe, Chaudhary, & Dhar, 1999). To measure the occupational self-efficacy variable, the author uses the OSE scale developed by Pethe, Chaudhary, and Dhar (1999) on a 5-point Likert scale from (1) strongly disagree to (5) strongly agree. The questionnaire consists of 10 items. Examples of items are as follows: I can contribute to important decisions, I can develop the skills needed for the task when needed, and I can do my job independently. Each question item for the occupational self-efficacy variable is valid (correlation coefficient value between 0.431-0.663, significant at 0.05) and reliable (Cronbach's Alpha of 0.850).

The attitude regarding employee loyalty to the organization is called organizational commitment. It is a process that continues when organization members show their concern for the organization and its welfare and success (Luthans, Luthans, & Luthans, 2015). The authors use the organizational commitment survey (Meyer, Allen, & Smith, 1993) to measure the organizational commitment variable. A 5-point Likert scale measures the responses from (1) strongly disagree to (5) strongly agree. There are 14 items, which consist of three dimensions, namely affective, normative, and continuance commitment. The items included questions such as "I feel that I am a part of this company's family" (affective commitment), "It would be too costly for me to leave this company now" (continuance commitment), and "I think that people move from company to company too often" (normative commitment). Each question item for the organizational commitment variable is valid (correlation coefficient value is between 0.349-0.68, significant at 0.05) and reliable (Cronbach's alpha is 0.870).

Work engagement is a condition in which a person has positive thoughts to express himself physically, affectively, and cognitively in doing work (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). The work engagement variable is

measured by the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2003) using a 5-point Likert scale from (1) strongly disagree to (5) strongly agree. There are 12 items measured on three dimensions: vigor, dedication, and absorption. Examples of items include, “At work, I feel full of energy” (vigor), “Challenging work is what I like” (dedication), and “When I work, I forget everything around me” (absorption). Each question item for the work engagement variable is valid (correlation coefficient value between 0.355-0.730, significant at 0.05) and reliable (Cronbach’s alpha of 0.861).

**Statistical Analysis**

We test using the Macro Preacher & Hayes model 4 created by Hayes (2013), which is contained in SPSS verse 25, called PROCESS.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

**Results**

**Analysis of the Simple Mediation Model (Preacher-Hayes)**

The authors conduct a path analysis test to test the mediation variable to determine how it affects the relationship between the independent and dependent variables using the Preacher-Hayes, using Model = 4; Y = work engagement; X = occupational self-efficacy; and M = organizational commitment.

We find a positive and significant effect of occupational self-efficacy on organizational commitment from the value of  $p = 0.0000 < \alpha = 0.05$  with a coefficient of 0.5833. Thus, it can be concluded that Hypothesis 1 is accepted; the occupational self-efficacy variable has a significant effect on the organizational commitment variable.

There is a positive and significant influence between organizational commitment on work engagement based on the p-value = 0.0000  $< \alpha = 0.05$  with a coefficient of 0.3906. We conclude that Hypothesis 2 is accepted; organizational commitment has a significant impact on work engagement.

Furthermore, there is a positive and significant effect between occupational self-efficacy and work engagement based on the value of  $p = 0.0000 < \alpha = 0.05$  with a coefficient of .7442.

The direct effect of occupational self-efficacy (independent variable), on work engagement (dependent variable) is significant with the p-value = 0.0000  $< \alpha = 0.05$  and a coefficient of 0.5164. So, we can conclude that Hypothesis 3 is accepted, which means occupational self-efficacy has a significant effect on work engagement.

**Table 2. Model Summary of Test Results**

Model	R	R-sq	MSE	F	df1	df2	P
Outcome OC	.3328	.1108	72.3172	30.8947	1.0000	248.0000	.0000
Outcome WE	.7259	.5270	23.1659	137.5911	2.0000	247.0000	.0000
Outcome WE (total effect model)	.5484	.3008	34.1060	106.6833	1.0000	248.0000	.0000

**Table 3. Test Results**

Model	Description	coeff	se	t	p	LLCI	ULCI
Outcome OC	Constant	23.9423	4.3451	5.5102	.0000	15.3843	32.5003
	OSE	.5833	.1049	5.5583	.0000	.3765	.7898
Outcome WE	Constant	4.3483	2.6055	1.6689	.0964	.7834	9.4801
	OSE	.5164	.0630	8.2008	.0000	.3924	.6404
	OC	.3906	.0359	10.8682	.0000	.3198	.4614
Outcome WE (total effect model)	Constant	13.7003	2.9840	4.5913	.0000	7.8231	19.5774
	OSE	.7442	.0721	10.3288	.0000	.6023	.8861



**Table 4. Direct Effect of X on Y**

Effect	SE	t	p	LLCI	ULCI
.5164	.0630	8.2008	.0000	.3924	.6404

**Table 5. Indirect effect of X on Y**

	Effect	Boot SE	BootLLCI	BootULCI
OC	.2278	.0475	.1405	.3287

From Table 5, we found the results of the indirect effect: occupational self-efficacy is an independent variable, work engagement is the dependent variable, and organizational commitment is the mediating variable. The output results produce  $BootLLCI = 0.1405$  and  $BootULCI = 0.3287$ , which means that the organizational commitment variable has a significant effect as a mediating variable. So, we can conclude that Hypothesis 4 is accepted. The influence between occupational self-efficacy and work engagement is mediated by organizational commitment.

The direct effect coefficient value obtained is 0.5164, which is more significant than the indirect effect coefficient value ( $0.5164 > 0.2278$ ). It shows that the direct effect of occupational self-efficacy has a more significant influence on work engagement than the indirect effect of organizational commitment, which acts as a partial mediation variable, namely complementary mediation. According to Zhao, Lynch, and Chen (2010), complementary mediation is a condition under which the independent and dependent variables directly affect the mediating variable.

**Discussion**

This study examined the influence of occupational self-efficacy on work engagement with organizational commitment as a mediating variable on millennial employees in Jabodetabek. The study results found that organizational commitment mediates the influence between occupational self-efficacy and work engagement for millennial employees. This finding is in line with Liu and Huang (2019) that occupational self-efficacy has

a positive effect on organizational commitment. Organizational commitment has a positive effect on work engagement, and occupational self-efficacy positively impacts work engagement. The influence of occupational self-efficacy toward work engagement mediates through organizational commitment. This finding aligns with van Gelderen and Bik (2016), who claim that self-efficacy increases organizational commitment and ultimately increases work engagement. Improvement in work engagement needs high occupational self-efficacy. This condition increases organizational commitment and finally increases the work engagement of employees (Liu & Huang, 2019).

This study shows that the direct effect of occupational self-efficacy on the work engagement of millennial employees in Jabodetabek is greater than the indirect effect. This means that the work engagement of millennial employees is more significantly influenced by occupational self-efficacy than passing through a mediator, organizational commitment. Companies in Jabodetabek must further improve the occupational self-efficacy of their employees because it is proven to increase work engagement. Buric and Macuka (2018) and Hirschi (2012) also emphasize that employees' self-efficacy and work engagement have a positive relationship and that self-efficacy can predict work engagement (Dagher, Chapa, & Junaid, 2015). Therefore, millennial employees in Jabodetabek with strong self-efficacy will be more engaged with their work. This means that occupational self-efficacy is an essential determinant of work engagement (Xanthopoulou et al., 2009).

Self-efficacy is a factor that shapes behavior (Luszczynska, Gutiérrez-Doña, & Schwarzer (2005). Employees with high self-efficacy have mastery experience (Bandura, 2009). According to Lent and Brown (2013), occupational self-efficacy includes the competence and ability of employees to perform tasks, display occupation-relevant behaviors, and consider the consequences of successful task performance. Occupational self-efficacy is an employee's belief in the importance of performing a specific job (Wang et al., 2015), and it allows respondents to carry out work confidently and effectively (Na-Nan, Kanthong, & Joungrakul, 2021).

Self-efficacy can predict a person's job choice (Lent & Brown, 2013). Occupational self-efficacy affects how employees aspire to career development (Lent & Brown, 2013; Garriott et al., 2013). Employees will be motivated to act when they believe that they can generate job demands and achieve their career goals (Bandura, 2009). It means that millennial employees in Jabodetabek with high occupational self-efficacy will have high competence, mastery experience, work, and career success beliefs.

Respondents with low levels of self-efficacy who face obstacles in their work tend to reduce their effort in achieving their goals (Bandura, 2009). Meanwhile, employees of the millennial generation with high occupational self-efficacy behave in a way that will produce rewards from the organization, and this will increase their self-efficacy (Hartman & Barber, 2019). Respondents with strong occupational self-efficacy can expend effort to achieve their goals and face work difficulties and challenges. Thus, the high occupational self-efficacy of employees will lead to higher work engagement and facilitate goal attainment (Xanthopoulou, Bakker, & Fischbach, 2013).

Occupational self-efficacy can affect careers and decisions made by employees (Hartman & Barber, 2019). Employees choose to engage in activities that they perceive as competent (Lent & Brown, 2013).

Those with high occupational self-efficacy choose more challenging tasks with bright career prospects and increased work engagement (Hartman & Barber, 2019).

Millennial generation employees in Jabodetabek with high, strong occupational self-efficacy are motivated to pursue their goals in their jobs. This motivation is intrinsic. They are confident that they can fulfill their job demands, ultimately leading to increased work engagement (Luthans & Youssef, 2007). It is then expected that companies in Jabodetabek can improve employee occupational self-efficacy. Efforts to increase occupational self-efficacy can be made using training, development, and coaching so that millennial employees can develop their abilities. If employees have high occupational self-efficacy, they feel confident in their ability to complete the assigned tasks, which will increase employee work engagement to be involved in work and the company. Employees with high self-efficacy dedicate their time to work wholeheartedly without counting working hours, are proud of their work, and perceive it as challenging (Na-Nan, Kanthong, & Joungrakul, 2021).

Millennial employees like a job challenge because they are confident in their abilities. We conclude that the millennial generation is fully dedicated to work. Still, on the one hand, this millennial generation does not want to do the same thing continually. In addition, companies can increase work engagement by involving employees in company decisions at their respective levels and improving their commitment within a company. Companies should consider developing training programs focused on improving employees' belief in self-efficacy in the workplace to increase their organizational commitment. Jobs assigned to millennial employees should involve technology because millennials grew up with technology as the basis of their worldview (Burke, 2015).

76.7% of respondents were aged 21-28 years in this study. According to Hartman and Barber

(2019), In the 20-to-30-year age range, occupational self-efficacy is stronger than in other age groups; various issues such as career choice include more options. Future research can examine and compare respondents from different generations and use other mediating variables, such as trust. Organizational commitment is used as the dependent variable, and work engagement is used as a mediating variable. Because several studies suggest that work engagement positively affects organizational commitment (Nazir & Islam, 2017; Schaufeli & Baker, 2004), future research could also examine the topic of gender in a specific business context.

#### **MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS**

Based on the study results, companies in Jabodetabek must pay attention to the work engagement of millennial generation employees who currently fill positions within the company. It is crucial to create work engagement because those engaged in working will devote more time and business to the organization's progress and will be willing to involve themselves to achieve work success. Especially in the coming years, the millennial generation will increasingly dominate key positions. Work engagement can be increased by improving occupational self-efficacy. Increased occupational self-efficacy occurs because employees believe they have the

competencies and abilities needed at work. For this reason, companies must continually update employee competencies and abilities to prepare for changing work demands. Moreover, Jabodetabek is a barometer of business and industrial progress in Indonesia, where technological advances and changes are first implemented in many companies in Jabodetabek.

Occupational self-efficacy can also affect work engagement through organizational commitment. The increased occupational self-efficacy for employees in Jabodetabek can increase organizational commitment (more loyal employees feel part of the organization) and ultimately increase employee work engagement.

#### **CONCLUSIONS**

The following are the conclusions of the research results from examining millennial generation employees in Jabodetabek. We found that occupational self-efficacy has a significant influence on organizational commitment. Organizational commitment has a significant impact on work engagement. Occupational self-efficacy has a significant effect on work engagement, and organizational commitment mediates occupational self-efficacy and work engagement among millennial employees. ■

---

REFERENCES

---

- Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63(1), 1-18.
- Badan Pusat Statistik Provinsi DKI Jakarta [Central Bureau of Statistics DKI Jakarta]. (2020). [online] Available from: <https://jakarta.bps.go.id> [accessed 20 Sept 2020].
- Bakker, A. B., Schaufeli, W. B., Leiter, M. P., & Taris, T. W. (2008). Work engagement: An emerging concept in occupational health psychology. *Work & Stress*, 22(3), 187-200.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 191.
- Bandura, A. (1999). Social cognitive theory: An agentic perspective. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 2(1), 21-41.
- Bandura, A. (2009), "Cultivate self-efficacy for personal and organizational effectiveness", in Locke E.A. (Ed.), *Handbook of Principles of Organization Behavior*, Blackwell, Oxford, (2), 179-200. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405164047>
- Burić, I., & Macuka, I. (2018). Self-efficacy, emotions and work engagement among teachers: A two-wave cross-lagged analysis. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 19(7), 1917-1933.
- Burke, K. (2015). How to bridge the generation gap. *Government Executive*, 1.
- Chaudhary, R., Rangnekar, S., & Barua, M. K. (2012). HRD climate, occupational self-efficacy and work engagement: A study from India. *The Psychologist-Manager Journal*, 15(2), 86-105.
- Chandler, N. (2015). Millennials, entrepreneurs and the Hungarian workplace of the future. *Vezetéstudomány / Budapest Management Review*, 46(11), 15-24.
- Choi, S. L., Lim, Z. Y., & Tan, W. C. (2016). Analysis of the relationship between leadership styles and affective organizational commitment. *International Journal of Management, Accounting & Economics*, 3(10), 572-598.
- Dagher, G. K., Chapa, O., & Junaid, N. (2015). The historical evolution of employee engagement and self-efficacy constructs: An empirical examination in a non-western country. *Journal of Management History*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMH-05-2014-0116>
- Gallup. (2016). *What Millennials Want From Work and Life*. <https://www.gallup.com/workplace/236477/millennials-work-life.aspx>
- Garriott, P. O., Flores, L. Y., Prabhakar, B., Mazzotta, E. C., Liskov, A. C., and Shapiro, J. E. (2013). "Parental support and underrepresented students' math/science interests: the mediating role of learning experiences", *Journal of Career Assessment*, 22(4), 1-15.
- Geldenhuis, M., Łaba, K., and Venter, C. M. (2014). Meaningful work, work engagement and organisational commitment. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 40(1), 1-10, 10.4102/sajip.v40i1.1098
- Guarnaccia, C., Scrima, F., Civilleri, A., & Salerno, L. (2018). The role of occupational self-efficacy in mediating the effect of job insecurity on work engagement, satisfaction and general health. *Current Psychology*, 37, 488-497. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-016-9525-0>
- Hammill, G. (2005). Mixing and managing four generations of employees. *FDU Magazine online*, 12(2), 5-15.
- Hartman, R. L., and Barber, E. G. (2019). Women in the workforce: the effect of gender on occupational self-efficacy, work engagement and career aspirations. *Gender in Management: An International Journal*.
- Hawkins, D. I., Mothersbaugh, D. L., and Best, R. J. (2007). *Consumer Behavior Building Marketing Strategy*. New York., MacGraw Hill.
- Hayes, A. F. (2013). *Introduction to Mediation, Moderation, and Conditional Process Analysis: A Regression-Based Approach* (Series Editor's Notes by Little, DT), The Guilford Press.
- Hirschi, A. (2012). Callings and work engagement: moderated mediation model of work meaningfulness, occupational identity, and occupational self-efficacy. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 59(3), 479.
- Horeczy, A., Lalani, A., Mendes, G., Miller, M., Samsa, L., & Scongack, T. (2012). Leadership Preferences of Generation Y. *Littrell, RF, Yurtkoru, ES, Kepir Sinangil, H., Durmuş, B., Katrinli, A., Atabay, RG, Günay, G. & Güneri Çangarli, B. (2013). Explicit leader behaviour preferences: Turkish and cross-national sample comparisons. Journal of Management Development*, 32(6), 606-628.
- Hornbostel, B., Kumar, P., & Smith, R. (2011). My generation, employee engagement across four distinct generation. For public release.
- Howe, N., & Strauss, W. (2000). *Millennials rising: The next great generation*. Vintage.
- Jabodetabek, (2023). [https://p2k.unkris.ac.id/en3/3073-2962/Jabodetabek\\_28136\\_p2k-unkris.html](https://p2k.unkris.ac.id/en3/3073-2962/Jabodetabek_28136_p2k-unkris.html)
- Jahanbakhshian, P., Assadi, R., & Nejad, F. (2015). Providing a conceptual model on organizational silence behavior based on organizational culture, organizational climate and organizational commitment components in service firms. *Management and Administrative Sciences Review*, 4(2), 438-448. Retrieved from <http://oaji.net/articles/2015/352-1436005558.pdf>
- Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(4), 692-724

- Kupperschmidt, B. R. (2000). Multi-Generation Employees: Strategies for Effective Management. *The Health Care Manager, 19*, 65-76.
- Lent, R. W., and Brown, S. D. (2013). Social cognitive model of career self-management: toward a unifying view of adaptive career behavior across the lifespan, *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 60*(4), 557-568.
- Liu, J., Cho, S. and Putra, E. D. (2017). The moderating effect of self-efficacy and gender on work engagement for restaurant employees in the United States, *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 29*(1). 624-642.
- Liu, E., and Huang, J. (2019). Occupational self-efficacy, organizational commitment, and work engagement. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal, 47*(8), 1-7.
- Luszczynska, A., Gutiérrez-Doña, B. and Schwarzer, R. (2005). General self-efficacy in various domains of human functioning: evidence from five countries. *International Journal of Psychology, 40*(2). 80-89. doi: 10.1080/00207590444000041.
- Luthans, F., Luthans B. C., & Luthans, K. W. (2015). *Organizational behavior: an evidence based approach*. 13 ed. Information Age Publishing, Inc.
- Luthans, F., & Youssef, C. M. (2007). Emerging positive organizational behavior. *Journal of Management, 33*(3), 321-349.
- Macey, W. H., Schneider, B., Barbera, K. M., & Young, S. A. (2009). Employee engagement: Tools for analysis, practice, and competitive advantage. Wiley-Blackwell. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444306538>
- Martin, C. A., and Tulgan, B. (2002). *Managing the generation mix: from collision to collaboration*. HRD Press.
- McDonald, T., & Siegall, M. (1992). The effects of technological self-efficacy and job focus on job performance, attitudes, and withdrawal behaviors. *The Journal of Psychology, 126*(5), 465-475.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research, and application*. Sage publications.
- Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J., & Smith, C. A. (1993). Commitment to organizations and occupations: Extension and test of a three-component conceptualization. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78*(4), 538-551.
- Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L., & Topolnytsky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 61*(1), 20-52.
- Murphy, S.A. (2010). Leading a multi-generational workforce. Retrieved from: [http://assets.aarp.org/www.aarp.org/\\_articles/money/employers/leading\\_multi-generational\\_workforce.pdf](http://assets.aarp.org/www.aarp.org/_articles/money/employers/leading_multi-generational_workforce.pdf) (accessed 22 April 2010).
- Na-Nan, K., Kanthong, S., & Joungrakul, J. (2021). An Empirical Study on the Model of Self-Efficacy and Organizational Citizenship Behavior Transmitted through Employee Engagement, Organizational Commitment and Job Satisfaction in the Thai Automobile Parts Manufacturing Industry. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity, 7*(170), 4-19.
- Nazir, O., & Islam, J. U. (2017). Enhancing organizational commitment and employee performance through employee engagement: an empirical check. *South Asian Journal of Business Studies, 6*(1), 98-114.
- Park, I. J., & Jung, H. (2015). Relationships among future time perspective, career and organizational commitment, occupational self-efficacy, and turnover intention. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal, 43*(9), 1547-1561.
- Pethe, S., Chaudhary, S., & Dhar, U. (1999). Occupational self-efficacy scale and manual. *Agra, India: National Psychological Corporation*.
- Rakhmah, D. N. (2021). Gen Z Dominan: Apa Maknanya bagi Pendidikan Kita. <https://pskp.kemdikbud.go.id/produk/artikel/detail/3133/gen-z-dominan-apa-maknanya-bagi-pendidikan-kita>. [accessed 28 Sept 2023].
- Rigotti, T., Schyns, B., & Mohr, G. (2008). A short version of the occupational self-efficacy scale: Structural and construct validity across five countries. *Journal of Career Assessment, 16*(2), 238-255.
- Robbins, S.P., & Judge, T. A. (2017). *Organizational Behavior*, 17<sup>th</sup> ed, Pearson International Edition.
- Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2003). Test manual for the Utrecht work engagement scale. *Unpublished manuscript, Utrecht University, the Netherlands, 3*, 44-52. Retrieved from <http://www.schaufeli.com>
- Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2003). Utrecht work engagement scale: Preliminary manual. *Occupational Health Psychology Unit, Utrecht University, Utrecht, 26*(1), 64-100.
- 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: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior, 25*(3), 293-315.
- Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2010). Defining and measuring work engagement: Bringing clarity to the concept. In A. B. Bakker (Ed.) & M. P. Leiter, *Work engagement: A handbook of essential theory and research* (pp. 10-24). Psychology Press.
- Schiffman, L. G., & Kanuk, L. L. (2007). *Reference Groups and Family Influences in Consumer Behaviour*, 10th edition, Prentice Hall: London.
- Schyns, B. & Collani, G. V. (2002). A new occupational self-efficacy scale and its relation to personality constructs and organizational variables. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 11*, 219-241.

- Sekaran, U. (2003). *Research Methods for Business: A Skill Building Approach*, 4<sup>th</sup> ed., John Wiley and Sons, New York.
- Shah, R. (2017). Work Engagement Among Millennials. *International Research Journal of Human Resources and Social Sciences*, 4(1), 276-287.
- Swamalatha, C., and Prasanna, T. S. (2013). Employee engagement: the concept. *International Journal of Management Research and Review*, 3(12), 3872-3880.
- van Gelderen, B. R., & Bik, L. W. (2016). Affective organizational commitment, work engagement and service performance among police officers. *Policing*, 39, 206–221.
- Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2009). Reciprocal relationships between job resources, personal resources, and work engagement. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 74, 235–244.
- Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A.B. and Fischbach, A. (2013), Work engagement among employees facing emotional demands: the role of personal resources. *Journal of Personnel Psychology*, 12(2), 74-84.
- Zemke R., Raines C., & Filipczak, B. (2000). *Generations at work: Managing the clash of Veterans, Boomers, Xers and Nexters in your workplace* (2nd Ed). American Management Association, New York, NY
- Zhao, X., Lynch Jr, J. G., & Chen, Q. (2010). Reconsidering Baron and Kenny: Myths and truths about mediation analysis. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 37(2).