

# Workplace motivation and job satisfaction among generation Y in India

Stuti Sinha<sup>1</sup>, Swati Vispute<sup>2\*</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup>Symbiosis Institute of Management Studies, Symbiosis International (Deemed University), Khadki, Pune, Maharashtra, India

\*Corresponding author:  
swati.vispute@sims.edu

## Abstract

Employee work motivation and job satisfaction are dynamic and demanding goals for a business. It has been much more daunting in today's dynamic workforce. A business is a wonderful workspace that serves the expectations of each employee and motivates each one to achieve its objectives. The present research illustrates the desires and aspirations of various employees regarding work encouragement and satisfaction from the organization. The focus is on understanding specific characteristics, needs, and expectations of Generation Y, which in today's context are considered to be critical. There is also an emphasis on learning how and what motivates workers in Generation Y. In addition, racial and geographic diversity is often taken into consideration in this report. The company that recognizes the requirements and can help its workers improve is producing greater performance. In this analysis, a technique of the interview is used. A group of 254 workers from different backgrounds and ages is evaluated for the quantitative model. Any variables suggesting relevant HR behaviors are taken from earlier research in this report. In the study of human personal variations in organizational efficiency, the "locus of influence" aspect is often taken.

## Keywords

Employment Participation, Multiple markets and industries, Jobs happiness, Job achievement, Employee satisfaction

## Imprint

Stuti Sinha, Swati Vispute. Workplace motivation and job satisfaction among generation y in India. *Cardiometry*; Issue 22; May 2022; p. 251-257; DOI: 10.18137/cardiometry.2022.22.251257; Available from: [http://www.cardiometry.net/issues/no22-may-2022/workplace\\_motivation](http://www.cardiometry.net/issues/no22-may-2022/workplace_motivation)

## 1 Introduction

Generation cohorts are people born in crucial growth cycles that experience common social or historical developments, according to Schaie. The notion of 'demographic dividend' is one of the main explanations why in India we need to consider the characteristics of Gen Y. By 2025, Gen Y will make up almost 75% of the world's population, according to Catalyst [1]. India will be the smallest nation by 2021, with 64% of its working-age population, varying from 20-35, according to the Economic Survey (2013-14). ACCORDING TO DULIN, generation Y can leave organizations whether they are not involved or are not experienced in their role. In the years to come, hiring and maintaining 'Generation Y' workers would, therefore, be central to personnel policies and methods [2], according to Mitsakis & Talampekios.

When youth become part of the organization, Generation Y workers ought to be employed, inspired, and treated differently from previous generations, as stated by Huntley, Wey Smola & Sutton [3]. Each generation's special abilities and competencies are important to the company's survival, and they are abused by them, as stated by Millar, Dr. Vicki Culpin & Pološki Vokic. Generational variations in working styles and attitudes may contribute to disputes between generations that threaten organizational success, as McGuire, Todnem By, & Hutchings stated. Understanding this movement allows organizations to create strategies that are aligned with generation Y. This vast pool of talent will not only improve India's economic situation but also provide the developing nations with human resources in the future [4]. The Y generation research will also give workers around the valuable world guidance.

The second response to the idea of attendance was burnout studies. As compared, or as constructive, to the three aspects of burnout: fatigue, frustration, and sense of inefficiency, as stated by Maslach and Leiter and Maslach et al., Schaufeli et al. gave a new solution to workforce involvement, arguing that work dedication and burnout was independent of mind and inversely interrelated [5]. They described engagement by vigor, commitment, and absorption as an optimistic, satisfying, and work-related state of mind. Finally, concentration requires a degree to which an individual believes the time flies by rapidly

and has problems removing himself from work, as stated by Schaufeli et al.

As defined by Wellins and Concelman, Dedication is a mixture of engagement, allegiance, competitiveness, and possession.' As stated by Wellins and Concelman dedication is the illusory driving factor for workers to reach higher (or lower) efficiency."Whatever the perception or concept confusion, there is a strong consensus that a motivated workforce contributes to higher longevity and efficiency, lower tension, improved consumer loyalty, and more [6].

There is a significant expense of not coping with involvement. As observed by Crabtree, the 2013 Gallup study on US employees revealed, with a loss measured in US company efficiency at an annual basis of \$450 and \$550 US, that 70% of jobs are not engaged or deliberately disengaged [7]. An organization may offer the greatest incentive scheme, recruitment and growth strategy, and HR policies; but people cannot improve their behavior or learn successfully if they do not feel better for themselves. It is not easy to gain employee engagement and dedication. The team is not ignorant. You know when the situations are correct and when to give anything to the business; therefore, it is assumed that workers' participation in the companies is both psychological and physical throughout their various positions [8]. Employee loyalty is often defined as a dedication to the company in sentiment and analytical terms, as observed by Shaw and Fairport and often the degree of the workers' interest in their jobs, as observed by Frank et al. The dedication of the workers is "one move up from engagement," as reported by Robinson et al. However, it is possible to deduce that employee dedication is not anything new, but just a particular theme or that "traditional wine in a new flask" might be named, as observed by Saks [9].

In a new study performed by Tower Watson in 50 businesses over a one-year cycle, net profits rose by 19% and earnings per share (EPS) by about 28%, with a strong incentive for workers. Conversely, low-level employees have endured a fall in net profits by about 32% and EPS by 11%, as researched by McConnell. A recent study carried out by the Harvard Business Review (HBR) has also increased the loyalty of workers of several businesses. The bottom line is improved by organizational success and growth [10]. Moreover, a report covering 17 multinationals found that 80% of workers became more active and less willing to quit in the short term, as researched by Hui et al. In addition,

more comprehensive studies in multiple markets and industries will help companies realize the true value of employee involvement in their field [11].

### 1.1 Similar constructs

Employee participation is commonly overlooked in common respects, such as work satisfaction, encouragement, corporate engagement, and the actions of OCB. Jobs happiness is a feeling of position and duties in a business that contributes to a healthy emotional condition as a consequence of employment or work experience. According to Paullay et al., work motivation is the product of a systematic appraisal of the capacity to fulfill needs and is related to a person's professional identification as an employee. Employment participation is the degree of emotional attention, commitment, and interaction with one's actual role, as researched by Paullay et al., which, in addition to cognition, includes strong employee participation [12]. As a precedent to employee engagement, May et al. described the commitment as being a state of participation that involves a positive and relatively complete commitment to key issues relating to self-employment, as researched by Brown. Thus, dedication should be differentiated from job activity, as job alone instead of the organization is the job engagement [13].

### 1.2 Job satisfaction

The mental condition encompasses the entire variety of feelings, whether they be optimistic or harmful, as researched by Zhang, Yao, & Cheong. Job happiness can, therefore, also be characterized as enjoyment or dissatisfaction of employees during their jobs. Moreover, satisfaction with the job can also be defined as a good feeling for jobs or work experience, as researched by Tutuncu & Kozak. In turn, Fisher concluded that work satisfaction is a form of attitude and attitudes that typically involve two components: an affective (feeling and emotional) component and a cognitive (comparison, judgment, and belief) [14]. Employment satisfaction can be seen by a chain reaction that motivates a need to be fulfilled. This chain incorporates various influences or rewards that motivate or encourage an individual to perform, as researched by Marzuki, Permadi & Sunaryo. Maslow's early theory of motivation, Maslow's hierarchy of needs, had given a foundation for further research on human-motivating causes. The hypothesis indicates that human desires focus on needs starting from the lowest to the highest degree in

an ascending scale. The ladder rises from lower levels to higher needs such as physiological needs, stability, social need, self-esteem, and upgrading. Persons cannot pass to the higher stage before all requirements are fulfilled at the lower level [15]. If a range of conditions is fulfilled, they are no longer a guiding factor, as researched by Marzuki. The motivation-hygiene principle of Herzberg is also a hypothesis that applied to the relevant literature. This Herzberg hypothesis has also been known as a hypothesis of two variables. Herzberg's philosophy of incentive hygiene emphasizes two factors that are not part of the same continuum: pleasure and unhappiness. The contrary is no happiness with employment; also, disappointment with jobs is not frustration with education. Herzberg identified two need groups; the motivators refer to individual needs for psychological development and job-related progress, including appreciation, advancement, etc. [16] Another category identified as the Hygiene Element relates to essential human biological needs, such as employment, healthcare, working standards, etc., as studied by Marzuki, Permadi, & Sunaryo. Hygiene defines how much job discontent is avoided by an individual, as studied by Zhang, Yao & Cheong. Literature also refers to work success and corporate efficiency or other significant work attitudes and activities such as absenteeism, attrition, and lawsuits, as studied by Zhang, Yao & Cheong. The literature explains how necessary a job satisfactorily is to function [17].

Gallup's research stated to Branham that organizations' improved staff loyalty hit 86% consumer reviews, 76% more financial performance, 44% more output, and 78% more safety records. The bosses should then take note of employee satisfaction at work. The unhappiness of employee employment may contribute to disasters in a company that seriously impacts everyday jobs, which may involve loss of engagement in their tasks, pause in arriving at work, mild-to-serious isolation, and reduced job efficiency [18]. All this can contribute to the departure of workers from the company, which creates a high turnover of employees, as studied by Gregory. In the case of non-employees, the company's efficiency and expenses would most definitely be affected, as studied by Tutuncu & Kozak. Employers have the challenge of empowering workers and achieving strong employee satisfaction. Therefore, managers need to consider the factors influencing employee satisfaction. By recognizing the causes, businesses should make effective adjustments to avoid

dissatisfaction among workers and low employee satisfaction, as studied by Dawal & Taha. The research suggested job satisfaction as the explanatory dependent variable [19].

## 2 Literature review

"New" job trends, such as the fewer profession boundaries, as studied by Tams & Arthur, evolve within this generation and this specific group, as studied by Lyons & Kuron. , you choose to collaborate with CSR, which is good for the business. Workers see work/life balance choices of this generation as a significant measure of an individual's work efficiency, career success, workplace fulfillment, and engagement, and as a necessity for ethical decision-makers, as recorded by Smith. However, suppose they are compelled to prioritize friends and family, as recorded by Crum packer & Crum packer, over jobs. In that case, Gen Y partners struggle early in their marriages with dual-career problems, as recorded by Clarke. However, while members of Generation Y are attempting to reconcile their jobs with their lives, their dedication to job achievement would lead them to jobs more and more long hours and miserable ties with their job and life, as recorded by Sturges & Guest. Continued learning and growth at work, fascinating, demanding, and complex assignments, social interactions, and the actions of managers shared stability about jobs and schedules. As recorded by Vicki Culpin, Carla Millar, Kai Peters, and Kultalahti & Viitala, a decent job and living standards are essential factors for these activities. Generation Y stressed schooling and confidence in the expertise and abilities of the workers, as recorded by Smola & Sutton. Generation Y representatives gain respect and recognition in their roles [20]. They are also described as optimistic and impatient and promised immediate benefits, including lounge, advancement, and pay, as recorded by Gursoy, Maier & Chi. The social importance of generation Y is more influential, in an evaluator study by Altimier, Wong, Gardiner, Lang, & Coulon. In certain fields, including multi-tasks, the Y generation reacts to visual stimuli. It extracts knowledge more efficiently than older generations. They are less capable of communicating face-to-face and deciphering nonverbal messages, in an evaluator study by Smola & Sutton.

Studies project that millennials are very willing to climb the corporate ladder and strongly need to interact with an organization that visually enhances self-definition (an important individual, particularly

considered an objective of introspection or reflection) differentiates them from others. Strong brands attract Gen-Y, who represents their choices of profession. This collection is strongly empirical, straightforward, and unambiguous. They appreciate communicating at work and providing a friendly, joyful, and accessible culture at work. They are inspired by introducing learning and growth systems and studying all under their banner to strengthen their competencies [21]. Single research by Singh, Bhandarker, Rai, and Jain about the preference for personal importance for Generation Y in India revealed that personal and social growth values are highly important in terms of how people view their workplace characteristics.

## 2.1 Generational theory

The word 'generation' has two essential components. Firstly, a traditional place in the historic periods and, secondly, "a distinct understanding of the historic status formed by what occurred and witnessed back then," in an evaluator study by Strauss & Howe. These two things relate to a general individual that renders people in their attributes, feelings, beliefs, and faith identical to an age. Although the seminal thesis of Strauss & Howe in Anglo-American countries on generational theory (1991) was validated, recent research in several other non-American countries has expanded this analysis, which indicates that generational theory is applicable in India. In the Indian background, there are relatively few findings on generational theory [22].

## 2.2 P-O fit theory

The integrative evaluation of person-fit (P – O fit) concepts and measures has been carried out by Kristof, describing P-O fit as "compatibility among people and organizations that occurs when at least one company provides for what the others need or have similar fundamental characteristics or both." P-O fit theory was introduced to clarify the need to consider generation Y characteristics for a strong organizational P-O match. Fitness to P – O benefit is connected to organizationally appropriate results, in an evaluator study by Cooper-Thomas, Van Vianen & Anderson; Dawis & Lofquist; Westerman & Cyr. Generation Y workers are the core feature of most companies, in an evaluator study by Rigoni & Adkins.

## 3 Research methodologies

The purpose of this analysis is to recognize the reasons for employee interaction with the multi-gen-

erational and diverse workforce, which ensures that people of several various ages, races, academic history, and gender can recognize the purpose and criteria. The findings of this study would inspire people to invest in the organization and enable an increasingly global and international workforce to be handled more efficiently.

### 3.1 Sample

The research was composed of survey workers from numerous private and government agencies. Employees vary because their age demographic is significant. These workers come from numerous countries. All workers earn basic tuition, though some have a degree in engineering or even post-graduate school. Online surveys were used to gather data for the analysis.

In the current analysis, the online approach is used for the collection of data. The explanation for using these two methods is as first conceptualized in the current study; workers are of various age classes, such as young adults are digitally competent and familiar with the media. A questionnaire studied previously in the Agrawal and Ojha research has been hired. Pilot research with 150 respondents checked the questionnaire and assessed its reliability. Factors were considered to be acceptable for their stability and authenticity, even in terms of interpersonal ties. Finally, the present analysis hired 100 questionnaires. The duties and positions of the interviewees span from general assistants, assistants, managers, administrators, and managing director. This study conceptualized that the degree of dedication amongst workers may differ when various generations function concurrently. The study was focused on numerous classes of age as 21-34 y (Gen Y). In terms of (a) 95% level of confidence and (b) 5 % error margin, the sample obtained satisfies the normal demand of sufficiency of the study.

Since the above seven multi-item variables were utilized in the first analysis of the sequence, it was determined to reassure before utilizing the data produced in this research. We used two criteria as a consistent test for every system to consider a component. First of all, the Cronbach's alpha coefficient should be equivalent and/or greater than 0.60 for the measure. If the cut-off point can be met, the item(s) can be discarded by removing one or more item(s). Second, the average association of items should be equivalent to or greater than 0.30 for the eventually preserved collection of items. Applying all criteria, variables were



reduced from 8 to 7. The cumulative amount of their components declined from 39 to 35, as outlined below.

## 4 Analysis and findings

Table 1 includes a description of the key outcomes of this analysis. The employee participation calculation demonstrates the workers' degree of commitment. They are committed (32.25%) as far as commitment is concerned, which indicates that employees enjoy the type of work they are then allocated. They enjoy accountability and challenges; they regard employment as a source of social identification, a platform for self-expression, and for attaining success in life. In certain instances, honesty, diligent work, and dignity are known to be the golden keys to success in your profession. Third, but not least, they consider that a decent career is a compliment.

The workers often demonstrate an internal locus of influence with a very large mean value of 96.56%. Persons with this attribute assume that everything they experience in existence (whether positive or bad) is the product of their endeavor. Many citizens feel that they would have to bring in good work and additional time to benefit, such as a raise, a raise in salaries, etc. In terms of its six dimensions, one of them is very fine,

about the internal perceptual environment of the organization, which is a citizenship activity of the company (98.5%). Three others are ranked strong out of the five remaining lengths. They are ships of an employee disposition (96.8%) and power locus (96.56%), and compensation and benefits (92.24%). There are respectable scores of 88.4% and 86.75% on the other two metrics-objectivity and job growth.

The participants have a strong degree of constructive internal regulation locus. The six-dimensional scores for the organizational environment range dramatically from good (98.5%) to poor (86.75%).

As Table 2 shows, the vector locus of control is the principal indicator of employee engagement. In addition to the data platform, we have obtained details on staff profiles under six headings: era, race, training level, job period, jobs, and citizenship. The relationship between the six variables and employee engagement was tested with the help of difference-of-mean tests (t). In all these analyses, there has been no statistically relevant correlation except age. It can be argued that the involvement of workers in the context of the workforce we studied does not impact their population; their job satisfaction levels and predictors, therefore, vary following the age of the job.

Table 1

Mean score, standard deviation and other descriptive statistics for each of the selected variables (N=250)

| S. No. | No. of Items Initially            | No. of Items Retained | Score Range | Cronbach's alpha | Mean Score | Std. deviation | Mean Score as % |
|--------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------|------------------|------------|----------------|-----------------|
| 1      | Engagement                        | 9                     | 1-27        | .77              | 32.25      | 4.31           | 119.44          |
| 2      | Locus of Control                  | 3                     | 1-9         | .73              | 8.69       | 2.02           | 96.56           |
| 3      | Career Development                | 4                     | 1-12        | .81              | 10.41      | 2.89           | 86.75           |
| 4      | Job Characteristics               | 5                     | 1-15        | .71              | 14.52      | 2.67           | 96.8            |
| 5      | Objectivity                       | 5                     | 1-15        | .72              | 13.26      | 3.23           | 88.4            |
| 6      | Pay & Benefits                    | 7                     | 1-21        | .81              | 19.37      | 4.22           | 92.24           |
| 7      | Organization Citizenship Behavior | 2                     | 1-6         | .78              | 5.91       | 1.48           | 98.5            |

X Score as % = Mean Score/Upper Limit of the Score Range x 100

Table 2

The critical predictors of employee engagement (N=250)

| Sl. No. | Predictor             | Zero-Order Correlation(A)     | Std. Beta Coefficient(β)       | Individual Contribution(A x B) |
|---------|-----------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1       | Locus of Control      | .451                          | .285(.01)                      | .123                           |
| 2       | Job Characteristics   | .499                          | .280(.01)                      | .140                           |
| 3       | Pay & Benefits        | .427                          | .151 (.050)                    | .064                           |
| 4       | Organization Behavior | .378                          | .145 (.022)                    | .055                           |
| 5       | Age                   | .191                          | .151 (.033)                    | .029                           |
|         | R <sup>2</sup> = .37  | Adjusted R <sup>2</sup> = .35 | F <sub>8, 103</sub> = 23.83 ** | DW = 2.0                       |

\*\*\* P<.001 \* P<.05

Other variables that influence employee work motivation are job characteristics  $\beta=.28$  (.01), pay and benefits  $\beta=.15$  (.05), and organization citizenship behavior  $\beta=.15$  (.02).

## 5 Discussion and conclusion

This analysis aims to define generation Y's mindset and driving factors in the Indian sense. The study of open-ended problems indicates multiple driving causes, life span, career expectations, and performance assessment for generation Y. Research shows that exciting jobs, decent working environments, high pay, and promising opportunities are mostly driving factors in generation Y. The latest literature is less aligned with the income demands of generation Y. Some researchers say that salaries do not matter more than other characteristics, like serving privacy, in an evaluator study by Eisner. Others say that salaries are significant, in an evaluator study by Hite & McDonald. Other aspects that inspire this group are work protection, prosperity, success, recognition, difficulties, and obligations.

The research was conducted to understand factors, which affect the involvement of employees among different workers. The survey contained 254 executives. The outcomes of this analysis overall are very compatible with the theoretical ideas addressed in the report. They have good figures on the attitude test and with the personal attribute. The five-dimensional mean scores vary from 86.75% (career development) to 98.5% (citizenship behavior of organization). This result shows that some procedures and activities in human resource management may be changed substantially. The psychological framework for understanding whether workers wish to cooperate more or less, whether they find their job appealing and whether they have ample money to do the job. In addition, where an individual enjoys socio-economic incentives and wishes the company to be returned in the form of a pledge, he is obligated to do so. In addition, an organization's climate has a major effect. If workers perceive a comfortable atmosphere, cooperation, and learning experiences, they prefer to remain with the business longer.

It is important to maintain the autonomy of work to choose when and where to function in an evaluator study by Weyland. Opportunities for self-growth and utilization of their abilities are relevant to them. Also, Plew indicated that workers of Generation Y search for work to leverage their talents. They demon-

strated that in their workplace, they need to be relevant and respected. They are searching for a participatory representative who understands, responds to, and works with them in an evaluator study by Beck & Wade. Research also reveals that workers in Generation Y tend to do their job, benefiting them. They assign considerable emphasis to make the planet a better place through their work. In an evaluator study by Hurst & Nice, Spiro finds that Generation Y needs to "immediately affect initiatives, in which they engage and requires immediate fulfillment and an incentive for excellence." After identifying the job and creating information, you tend to operate together on team-based initiatives and activities, in addition to continuous constructive reinforcement and evaluations of the individual success in the workplace for the most part, according to Miller et al. The millennial workers require protection and security at work. They are more community-focused and operate in teams. Therefore, the previous research proposed that businesses ought to concentrate on developing a friendly and enjoyable environment at work, according to Rai, and giving them the chance to collaborate with their colleagues by text messages, video messenger, and blogging, according to Skiba & Barton. Table 1 displays life conditions, performance metrics, passion for the job, and driving generation Y variables.

The two noticeable markers of workplace frustration are high unemployment and poor efficiency. Therefore, all companies must recognize the variables that affect work satisfaction properly. Organizations should identify the effects in advance through recognizing the causes and taking steps to help and improve employee happiness. Employee satisfaction is the long-term remedy for retaining creativity and growing success and efficiency to support and improve an enterprise.

## Statement on ethical issues

Research involving people and/or animals is in full compliance with current national and international ethical standards.

## Conflict of interest

None declared.

## Author contributions

The authors read the ICMJE criteria for authorship and approved the final manuscript.

## References

1. S. Agrawal, R. P. Ojha, Employee engagement in the new business horizon, (Article in Press), (2016).
2. L. Altimier, Leading a new generation. *Newborn and Infant Nursing Reviews*, 6(1), 7–9, (2006).
3. S. P. Brown, A meta-analysis and review of organizational research on job involvement, *Psychological Bulletin*, 120(2), 235–255, (1996).
4. D. M. Cable, J. R. Edwards, Complementary and supplementary fit: a theoretical and empirical integration. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(5), 822, (2004)
5. M. Clarke, Dual careers: the new norm for Gen Y professionals? *Career Development International*, 20(6), 562–582, (2015).
6. S. P. Eisner, Managing generation Y. *SAM Advanced Management Journal*, 70(4), 4, (2005).
7. S. Elo, H. Kyngäs, The qualitative content analysis process. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 62(1), 107–115, (2008).
8. J. Ferri-Reed, The keys to engaging millennials. *The Journal for Quality and Participation*, 33(1), 31, (2010).
9. F. D. Frank, R. P. Finnegan, C. R. Taylor, The race for talent: Retaining and engaging workers in the 21st century”, *Human Resource Planning*, 27(3), 12-25, (2004).
10. J. Gilbert, The Millennials: A new generation of employees: A new set of engagement policies, *Ivey Business Journal* (2011).
11. A. Glass, Understanding generational differences for competitive success. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 39(2), 98–103, (2007).
12. G. Hofstede, *Culture and Organisation: Software of the Mind*, Intercultural Cooperation and its Importance for Survival. London: Harper Collins Business, (1997).
13. B. Little, P. Little, Employee engagement: Conceptual issues, *Journal of Organizational Culture, Communication, and Concept*, 10(1), 111-120, (2006).
14. E. A. Locke, M. S. Taylor, Stress, coping, and the meaning of work in Brief, A. and W.R. Nord (Eds) *Meanings of Occupational Work*, 135-170, (1990).
15. McConnell Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: A meta-analysis, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(2), 268-279, (2011).
16. J. P. Meyer, N. J. Allen, *Commitment in the Workplace: Theory Research, and Application*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, (1997).
17. S. Shaw, D. Fairhurst, Engaging a new generation of graduates, *Education \_Training*, 50(5), 366-378, (2008).
18. W. Shih, M. Allen, Working with generation-D: Adopting and adapting to cultural learning and Change, *Library Management*, 28(1/2), 89-100, (2007).
19. K. W. Smola, C. D. Sutton, Generational differences: Revisiting generational work values for the new millennium, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23, 363- 382, (2002).
20. S. Sonnentag, Recovery, work engagement, and proactive behavior: A new look at the interface between non-work and work, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 518-28, (2003).
21. M. A. West, *Effective teamwork: practical lessons from organizational research*, IIIrd Edition, The Work Foundation, BPS Blackwell, London, (2012).
22. A. Weyland, Engagement and talent management of Gen Y, *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 43(7), 439-445, (2011).