

# THE ROLE OF WORKPLACE WELL-BEING AND PSYCHOLOGICAL CAPITAL ON INNOVATIVE WORK BEHAVIOR IN GENERATION Z EMPLOYEES

Rahma Amelia Putri<sup>1</sup>, Ninawati<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Faculty of Psychology, Universitas Tarumanagara, Jakarta, Indonesia  
Email: rahma.705210058@stu.untar.ac.id

<sup>2</sup> Faculty of Psychology, Universitas Tarumanagara, Jakarta, Indonesia  
Email: ninawati@fpsi.untar.ac.id

Enter : 13-09-2024, revision: 17-10-2024, accepted for publication : 11-11-2024

## ABSTRACT

*In the world of work, technological developments support digitalization in all aspects of work, and this marks the birth of Generation Z, which has characteristics of being active, creative, ambitious, and capable of using advanced technology. The creativity possessed by Generation Z in the world of work refers to innovative actions in the workplace, known as innovative work behavior. It is essential to apply this behavior as one of the factors determining the company's success and supporting employee performance. This study aims to determine the internal and external factors influencing innovative work behavior in Generation Z employees, namely psychological capital and workplace well-being. This research is correlational quantitative research using regression analysis methods, participants were selected by convenience sampling, which amounted to 275 Generation Z employees who live in the Jabodetabek area. The research instruments used the Workplace Well-being Questionnaire (WWQ), Psychological Capital 12 Questionnaire (PCQ-12), and Innovative Work Behavior Scale. The regression test results show that workplace well-being and psychological capital play a role in innovative work behavior, with a contribution of 45%. In this study, psychological capital positively influences innovative work behavior. In contrast, workplace well-being has a negative role because there is one significant negative dimension to innovative work behavior, namely the intrusion of work into private life. Based on this, it is hoped that companies will pay more attention to the quality of the work environment and job demands so that employees can innovate well.*

**Keywords:** Workplace Well-being, psychological capital, innovative work behavior, Generation Z employees

## 1. PREFACE

There is no doubt that everyone these days experiences easy access to technology. Among them is the Internet network, which is still considered essential for society. Broad internet communication access will lead to the discovery of many excellent opportunities, including corporate development and industrial resource planning (Purba et al., 2021). It encourages the digitization of the workplace and can improve and enhance the work processes of current-generation employees (Fitri et al., 2023). Generation Z is a digital generation that has emerged due to the current surge in digitalization (Hastini et al., 2020).

Generation Z's main characteristics are high ambition and self-confidence (Pataki-Bittó & Kapusy, 2021). This generation is highly motivated to find their dream job and opportunities to develop their skills (Magano et al., 2020). Generation Z invests in their social media posts to find the right career path. Generation Z is building personal branding by relying on technology, which has an impact on their self-image and is also positive in the eyes of the company (Vițelar, 2019). It indicates that Generation Z is a very active generation that can use technology efficiently and creatively (Fitri et al., 2023).

With the creativity already inherent in Generation Z's characteristics, Generation Z has the mindset to innovate, which can improve their abilities (Hock-Doepgen et al., 2024). In the world

of work, the term creative behavior is referred to as innovative work behavior. This behavior is essential in the competitive world of work (Widiaristi & Etikariena, 2024). Furthermore, several studies stated that innovative work behavior owned by employees is an essential aspect of company excellence and can increase company development (Anderson et al., 2014; Eva et al., 2019; Shin et al., 2017; Wang et al., 2022). Therefore, innovation in the workplace can begin with individuals, as demonstrated by the importance of moral character and creative work practices (Widiaristi & Etikariena, 2024).

Innovative work behaviors are actions in which individuals generate, develop, and execute new ideas (Scott & Bruce, 1994). Completing the statement from Scott and Bruce (1994), De Jong and Den Hartog (2010) then developed the theory that innovative work behavior consists of four main dimensions. The first dimension is idea exploration, where individuals attempt to improve products, services, or processes in new or different ways. The second dimension is idea generation, where individuals create new ideas from a combination of existing information and concepts to solve problems or improve performance. The third dimension is idea championing, where individuals focus on establishing coalitions or seeking the support of others by promoting ideas so that they can help realize innovative ideas. The last dimension is idea implementation, where individuals make the new idea as part of their routine work processes and behaviors.

Internal and external factors can directly or indirectly cause this innovative work behavior at the workplace. A literature study conducted by Li and Zheng (2014) summarizes the main influencing factors of innovative work behavior employees, namely: (a) commitment to the company; (b) psychological capital; (c) company innovation atmosphere; (d) leadership; (e) social capital; and (f) job characteristics at the company. According to Amabile and Pratt (2016), internal factors from individuals play an essential role in innovative work behavior, namely personality or individual traits. Factors within the individual that facilitate innovative work behavior can be studied from a psychological perspective (West & Farr, 1989).

Psychological factors based on the theory of Luthans et al. (2007) refer to psychological capital. Psychological capital is defined as a condition of a person's positive psychological development which is characterized by: (a) having self-confidence (self-efficacy) to undertake and exert the effort necessary to succeed at challenging tasks; (b) instilling positive attributions (optimism) about current and future success; (c) persevere in achieving goals and direct the path towards the goal (hope) to be successful; and (d) when hit by problems and difficulties, individuals can survive and get back up (resilience) to achieve success. The higher the psychological capital, the stronger the individual's belief in their creativity (Chen et al., 2021). The results of quantitative research correlation tests conducted by Rulevy and Parahyanti (2018) on creative industry employees in Indonesia also show a positive and significant relationship between psychological capital and innovative work behavior in employees. The results of some of these studies explain that psychological capital is essential for further research because it plays a role in innovative work behavior and intention to innovate (Alshebami, 2021).

Apart from internal factors, external factors influence innovative work behavior in employees, according to research by Li and Zheng (2014), which is the condition or environment of the company. In relation to several studies, Generation Z wants good working relationships with colleagues, a supportive work environment, and superiors who recognize their contributions and ideas (Fodor & Jaeckel, 2018; Grow & Yang, 2018; Hampton & Welsh, 2019; Silinevica & Meirule, 2019). The phenomenon of a positive work environment that supports employees is known as workplace well-being. Workplace Well-being or well-being at work, according to

Danna and Griffin (1999), is closely related to health and well-being at work. The theory from Parker and Hyett (2011) divides workplace well-being into four dimensions, namely: (a) work satisfaction (satisfaction with work); (b) organizational respect for the employee (company respect for employees); (c) employer care (superior concern for employees); and (d) intrusion work into private life (work pressure to personal life). Workplace well-being is beneficial for companies to retain employees, create a satisfying work atmosphere, and encourage innovations (Nangoy et al., 2019; Salas-Vallina et al., 2017).

In addition, quantitative research conducted by Wang et al. (2022), which involved 319 Chinese employees, demonstrates a direct and positive relation between innovative work behavior and workplace well-being, so that workplace well-being may also be influenced by innovative work behavior. However, little research has examined components of workplace well-being against innovative work behavior. Based on previous phenomena related to the roles of psychological capital and workplace well-being in innovative work behavior, researchers want to know whether these two factors play a role in innovative work behavior, especially in Generation Z employees. Researchers took a research gap in workplace well-being where only some studies still discuss the role of workplace well-being against innovative work behavior. Researchers are interested in taking Generation Z as participants because companies are facing an industrial revolution where jobs will gradually be dominated by Generation Z.

## **2. RESEARCH METHOD**

### **Samples**

This research uses non-probability sampling with a convenience sampling technique where researchers consider taking samples that are easily accessible for data collection. The participants of this study were 275 Generation Z employees who live in Jabodetabek. Employees are selected based on their work experience, which is at least one year.

### **Measurement**

The Workplace Well-being variable is measured using the Workplace Well-being Questionnaire (WWQ) measuring instrument consisting of 31 items that have been adapted into Indonesian and used by Gozali et al. (2024) with a Cronbach Alpha reliability value of 0.905. Psychological Capital variables are measured using the Psychological Capital 12 Questionnaire (PCQ-12) measuring instrument consisting of 12 items that have been adapted into Indonesian and used by Gozali et al. (2024) with a Cronbach Alpha reliability value of 0.879. Then, the Innovative Work Behavior variable is measured using the Innovative Work Behavior Scale measuring instrument consisting of 10 items adapted into Indonesian by Aditya and Saraswati (2024) with a Cronbach Alpha reliability value of 0.818.

### **Data collection and analysis**

This type of research is non-experimental correlational quantitative research with a regression analysis method. The data obtained by researchers based on the results of distributing questionnaires is processed using the IBM SPSS Statistics version 25.0 tool. Data originating from Google Forms is transferred to Google Spreadsheets to be tidied up and given some naming coding to make it easier for researchers to process data. Some technical data tests carried out include the outlier test, linearity test, normality test, multicollinearity test, heteroscedasticity test, the primary data analysis test with multiple linear regression, and descriptive data tests to determine the number of frequencies and percentages of data related to participants' data.

### 3. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

When viewed based on each independent variable, both produce a significant role on innovative work behavior (IWB) with a value of  $p = 0,000 < 0,05$ . These results are in line with previous research conducted by Wang et al. (11). The test results on the workplace well-being (WWB) variable show a significant value of  $p = 0,000 < 0,05$  with a beta value showing a negative number of  $-0,217$  ( $\beta = -0,217$ ). WWB variables still play a role and significantly affect IWB, it's just that the role is negative. Then, the test results on the psychological capital (PC) variable also show a significant role, namely  $p = 0,000 < 0,05$  with a positive beta value of  $0,787$  ( $\beta = 0,787$ ). It indicates that the effect of PC is positive on IWB; the higher the PC level, the higher the level of IWB. It is consistent with previous research on the role of PC on IWB by Tsegaye et al. (2020). Table 1 below will illustrate more clearly the results of the regression analysis.

**Table 1**  
*Multiple Linear Regression Test Results*

| Variable | Constant | Std. Error | $\beta$ | $p < 0,05$ | Description                              |
|----------|----------|------------|---------|------------|--|
| WWB      | 1,313    | 0,059      | -0,217  | 0,000      | There is a negative and significant role |
| PC       |          | 0,059      | 0,787   | 0,000      | There is a positive and significant role |

WWB: Workplace Well-being; PC: Psychological Capital

Next, the researchers conducted regression tests on the WWB and PC variables separately and looked at their value on IWB. The test results on the WWB variable obtained an  $R^2$  value of 0.079 or 7.9%, which means that the contribution of WWB to IWB is as much as 7.9%. As for the PC variable, it gets an  $R^2$  value of 0.422 or 42.2%, this means that the contribution of PC is greater than WWB. Based on this test, the PC variable is the most decisive role in IWB. Table 2 below will illustrate more clearly the results of contribution value of the independent variables.

**Table 2**  
*Contribution Test Results of the Coefficient of Determination*

| Variable | R     | $R^2$ | Adjusted $R^2$ | $\beta$ | $p < 0,05$ | Description |
|----------|-------|-------|----------------|---------|------------|-------------|
| WWB      | 0,281 | 0,079 | 0,075          | 0,281   | 0,000      | Significant |
| PC       | 0,650 | 0,422 | 0,420          | 0,650   | 0,000      | Significant |

WWB: Workplace Well-being; PC: Psychological Capital

Dimensional test results show that of the four dimensions of WWB, two have a significant role in IWB. The first dimension, namely work satisfaction (WS) or satisfaction with work, plays a positive and significant role in IWB with  $p = 0,000 < 0,05$  and a positive beta value of  $0,443$  ( $\beta = 0,443$ ). It aligns with research conducted by Aslan and Atesoglu (2021) where satisfaction with work creates opportunities to survive challenging job demands by contributing innovative ideas to the company, which ultimately leads to increased innovative work behavior. The second dimension is the intrusion of work into private life (IW), which plays a significant role in IWB with  $p = 0,000 < 0,05$ , but the effect is negative, characterized by a negative beta number of  $-0,200$  ( $\beta = -0,200$ ). The IW dimension is a dimension whose items are related to the interference

felt by employees at work, affecting personal life; therefore, the items are negative. Some participants in this study considered that their work interfered with their personal lives, and it was still challenging to divide time between work and personal life (difficult to maintain a work-life balance), thus weakening innovative work behavior. A similar thing is found in research conducted by Wibowo (2024) that a situation where someone is unable to manage time well between work and personal life will cause stress and result in a loss of dedication, enthusiasm, and work behavior in providing new ideas or innovations. Suppose the level of intrusion of work into private life is reduced, employees can maintain a work-life balance, focus more on work, and increase innovative work behavior. This is evidenced by research by Kim and Yun (2019) which states that individuals who maintain a work-life balance will have a high level of innovative work behavior. An overview of the regression test of the WWB dimension on IWB can be seen in Table 3.

**Table 3**  
*Regression Test Results of WWB Dimensions on IWB*

| Variable                            | Constant | Std. Error | $\beta$ | $p < 0,05$ | Description                                     |
|-------------------------------------|----------|------------|---------|------------|---|
| Work Satisfaction                   | 2,230    | 0,084      | 0,443   | 0,000      | <b>There is a positive and significant role</b> |
| Organizational Respect              |          | 0,077      | 0,057   | 0,574      | Not significant                                 |
| Employer Care                       |          | 0,064      | -0,028  | 0,747      | Not significant                                 |
| Intrusion of Work into Private Life |          | 0,038      | -0,200  | 0,000      | <b>There is a negative and significant role</b> |

After conducting regression tests of PC dimensions on IWB, three dimensions have a positive and significant role in increasing IWB: self-efficacy, hope, and resilience. The self-efficacy dimension that has a positive role on IWB is in line with research conducted by Siregar et al. (2022), where employees with high levels of self-efficacy will display highly innovative work behavior. The next dimension that plays a role in IWB is hope, which means that individuals desire to persevere and direct the path towards goals to succeed. These results align with research conducted by Namono et al. (2021) and Fatima and Khan (2017), which revealed that hope has a positive and significant effect on IWB. The next dimension affecting IWB is resilience, where individuals can rise amid difficulties and overcome challenges by innovating. It is in line with research conducted by Nwanzu & Babalola (2019), which explains that the ability of individuals to rise from challenges has a role in behavior that makes them more creative so that it can affect IWB. An overview of the regression test of the PC dimension on IWB can be seen in Table 4.

**Table 4**  
*Regression Test Results of PC Dimensions on IWB*

| Variable      | Constant | Std.<br>Error | $\beta$ | $p < 0,05$ | Description                              |
|---------------|----------|---------------|---------|------------|--|
| Self-Efficacy | 0,987    | 0,043         | 0,354   | 0,000      | There is a positive and significant role |
| Hope          |          | 0,063         | 0,266   | 0,000      | There is a positive and significant role |
| Resilience    |          | 0,053         | 0,162   | 0,008      | There is a positive and significant role |
| Optimism      |          | 0,047         | 0,029   | 0,644      | Not Significant                          |

#### 4. CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

Based on the regression test results in this study, the two independent variables, namely WWB and PC, play a significant role in the IWB of Generation Z employees. Among these two independent variables, PC is the most influential on IWB, supported by the value contribution and three of its four dimensions that have a positive and significant role in innovative work behavior. The WWB variable also has a role in IWB, it's just that its role is negative. However, work satisfaction is another dimension of WWB that plays a positive role in IWB. This positive dimension indicates that participants in this study tend to think that work interferes with their personal lives, but they are still satisfied with the work. The work provides its meaning for each of them. To overcome the negative value of WWB, the company needs to provide full support to employees. Employees who feel supported and heard by the company will increase motivation and be able to create innovative ideas to solve problems (Wibowo, 2024). Furthermore, the variable of workplace well-being in this study plays a negative role in innovative work behavior. Then, further research is expected to use other variables to change the strength of the variable to positive. The variable is called a moderator, which is defined by Baron and Kenny (1986) as a variable that affects the strength of the relationship between the independent variable and the dependent variable. The criteria for variables that function as moderators are: (a) have a significant role in influencing the independent variable, and (b) have a significant role in influencing the dependent variable (Baron & Kenny, 1986). In this study, one variable that can be used as a moderator in future studies is psychological capital. This is supported by several previous studies that state that psychological capital affects the psychological well-being of employees at work (Chawla & Sharma, 2019; Sun et al., 2022). In addition, psychological capital also positively affects employees' innovative work behavior (Kumar et al., 2022; Ratnaningsih et al., 2016). In connection with the characteristics of Generation Z that are concerned with work-life balance, future research is suggested to examine innovative work behavior, especially on flexible work systems. In addition, to face the industrial revolution, the target participants are suggested to be more specific, such as art workers or technology-related jobs such as IT staff, engineers, and others, then the place of data collection is suggested to companies that are more specific in using innovation such as companies in the technology field.

#### Acknowledgement

The authors would like to thank all those who have supported this research, the lecturers of the Faculty of Psychology of Universitas Tarumanagara who have shared their knowledge, the dean of the Faculty of Psychology of Universitas Tarumanagara, the research participants who have

taken the time to fill out the questionnaire voluntarily, and other parties who cannot be mentioned one by one.

## REFERENCE

- Aditya, J., & Saraswati, K. D. H. (2024). Peran work passion terhadap innovative work behavior dimoderasi work-life integration pada pekerja kreatif di jabodetabek. *Jurnal Inspirasi Bisnis Dan Manajemen*, 7(2), 163. <https://doi.org/10.33603/jibm.v7i2.8833>
- Alshebami, A. S. (2021). The influence of psychological capital on employees' innovative behavior: mediating role of employees' innovative intention and employees' job satisfaction. *SAGE Open*, 11(3). <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440211040809>
- Amabile, T. M., & Pratt, M. G. (2016). The dynamic componential model of creativity and innovation in organizations: Making progress, making meaning. In *Research in Organizational Behavior* (Vol. 36, pp. 157–183). JAI Press. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.riob.2016.10.001>
- Anderson, N., Potočník, K., & Zhou, J. (2014). Innovation and creativity in organizations: A State-of-the-Science review, prospective commentary, and guiding framework. *Journal of Management*, 40(5), 1297–1333. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206314527128>
- Aslan, M., & Atesoglu, H. (2021). The effect of innovation and participation as workplace values on job satisfaction and the mediating effect of psychological ownership. *SAGE Open*, 11(4), 215824402110615. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440211061530>
- Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator–mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51(6), 1173–1182. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.51.6.1173>
- Chawla, S., & Sharma, R. R. (2019). Enhancing women's well-being: The role of psychological capital and perceived gender equity, with social support as a moderator and commitment as a mediator. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01377>
- Chen, W., Zhu, X., Sun, S., Liao, S., & Guo, Z. (2021). The impact of employees' psychological capital on innovative work behavior: The chain mediating effect of knowledge donating and knowledge collecting. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.761399>
- Danna, K., & Griffin, R. W. (1999). Health and well-being in the workplace: A review and synthesis of the literature. *Journal of Management*, 25(3), 357–384. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639902500305>
- De Jong, J., & Den Hartog, D. (2010). Measuring innovative work behaviour. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 19(1), 23–36. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8691.2010.00547.x>

- Eva, N., Meacham, H., Newman, A., Schwarz, G., & Tham, T. L. (2019). Is coworker feedback more important than supervisor feedback for increasing innovative behavior? *Human Resource Management*, 58(4), 383–396. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.21960>
- Fatima, A., & Khan, M. A. (2017). Do hope foster innovative work behavior through employee engagement and knowledge sharing behavior? A conservation of resources approach using MPLUS tool. *Business & Economic Review*, 9(4), 183–214. <https://doi.org/10.22547/ber/9.4.9>
- Fitri, F., Aiman, R., Angelica, C., Putri, N., & Saraswati, K. (2023). Career adaptability : Studi deskriptif pada karyawan Gen Z. *Jurnal Ilmiah Psyche*, 17(1). <https://doi.org/10.33557/jpsyche.v17i1.2510>
- Fodor, M., & Jaeckel, K. (2018). What does it take to have a successful career through the eyes of Generation Z - Based on the results of a primary qualitative research. *International Journal on Lifelong Education and Leadership*, 4(1), 1–7.
- Gozali, V. A., Zamralita, Z., & Lie, D. (2024). Workplace wellbeing and work engagement among generation z employees in PT X: The role of psychological capital as a moderator. *Biopsikososial Jurnal Ilmiah Psikologi Fakultas Psikologi Universitas Mercubuana Jakarta*, 8(1), 50. <https://doi.org/10.22441/biopsikososial.v8i1.23750>
- Grow, J. M., & Yang, S. (2018). Generation-Z enters the advertising workplace: Expectations through a gendered lens. *Journal of Advertising Education*, 22(1), 7–22. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1098048218768595>
- Hampton, D., & Welsh, D. (2019). Work values of Generation Z nurses. *Journal of Nursing Administration*, 49(10), 480–486. <https://doi.org/10.1097/NNA.0000000000000791>
- Hastini, L. Y., Fahmi, R., Lukito, H., Program, M., Ilmu, D., & Unand, M. (2020). Apakah pembelajaran menggunakan teknologi dapat meningkatkan literasi manusia pada Generasi Z di Indonesia? *Jurnal Manajemen Informatika (JAMIKA)*, 10. <https://doi.org/10.34010/jamika.v10i1>
- Hock-Doepgen, M., Montasser, J. S., Klein, S., Clauss, T., & Maalaoui, A. (2024). The role of innovative work behavior and organizational support for business model innovation. *R and D Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/radm.12671>
- Kim, T., & Yun, S. (2019). The impact of hotel employees' work-life balance on innovative behavior : Focusing on the mediating of quality of life. *Journal of Tourism Management Research*, 23(3), 41–60. <https://doi.org/10.18604/tmro.2019.23.3.3>
- Kumar, D., Upadhyay, Y., Yadav, R., & Goyal, A. K. (2022). Psychological capital and innovative work behaviour: The role of mastery orientation and creative self-efficacy. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 102, 103157. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2022.103157>



- Li, X., & Zheng, Y. (2014). The influential factors of employees' innovative behavior and the management advices. *Journal of Service Science and Management*, 07(06), 446–450. <https://doi.org/10.4236/jssm.2014.76042>
- Luthans, F., Avolio, B. J., Avey, J. B., & Norman, S. M. (2007). Positive psychological capital: Measurement and relationship with performance and satisfaction. *Personnel Psychology* (Vol. 60). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2007.00083.x>
- Magano, J., Silva, C., Figueiredo, C., Vitória, A., Nogueira, T., & Dinis, M. A. P. (2020). Generation Z: Fitting project management soft skills competencies—A mixed-method approach. *Education Sciences*, 10(7), 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci10070187>
- Namono, R., Kemboi, A., & Chepkwony, J. (2021). Enhancing innovative work behaviour in higher institutions of learning: The role of hope. *World Journal of Entrepreneurship Management and Sustainable Development*, ahead-of-print(ahead-of-print). <https://doi.org/10.1108/wjemsd-07-2020-0073>
- Nangoy, R., Hamsal, M., Setiadi, N. J., & Pradipto, Y. D. (2019). The roles of employee work well-being on innovative work behaviour mediated by organisational commitment. *International Journal of Economics and Business Research*, 18(3), 314. <https://doi.org/10.1504/ijebr.2019.10023693>
- Nwanzu, C. L., & Babalola, S. S. (2019). Psychological capital, task autonomy and innovative work behaviour among public organisation employees. *International Journal of Work Organisation and Emotion*, 10(4), 322. <https://doi.org/10.1504/ijwoe.2019.106892>
- Parker, G. B., & Hyett, M. P. (2011). Measurement of well-being in the workplace: The development of the work well-being questionnaire. *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, 199(6), 394–397. <https://doi.org/10.1097/NMD.0b013e31821cd3b9>
- Pataki-Bittó, F., & Kapusy, K. (2021). Work environment transformation in the post COVID-19 based on work values of the future workforce. *Journal of Corporate Real Estate*, 23(3), 151–169. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JCRE-08-2020-0031>
- Purba, N., Yahya, M., & Nurbaiti. (2021). Revolusi industri 4.0: Peran teknologi dalam eksistensi penguasaan bisnis dan implementasinya. In *JPSB* (Vol. 9, Issue 2). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.26486/jpsb.v9i2.2103>
- Ratnaningsih, I. Z., Prasetyo, A. R., & Prihatsanti, U. (2016). Predicting innovative behavior among employees in a manufacturing company: The role of psychological capital. *ANIMA Indonesian Psychological Journal*, 31(2), 84–90. <https://doi.org/10.24123/aipj.v31i2.567>
- Rulevy, D. F., & Parahyanti, E. (2018). Hubungan psychological capital dan perilaku kerja inovatif di industri kreatif: Studi pada karyawan perusahaan XYZ. *Journal Psikogenesis*, 4(1), 99–113. <https://doi.org/10.24854/jps.v4i1.521>

- Salas-Vallina, A., Alegre, J., & Fernandez, R. (2017). Happiness at work and organisational citizenship behaviour: Is organisational learning a missing link? *International Journal of Manpower*, 38(3), 470–488. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJM-10-2015-0163>
- Scott, S. G., & Bruce, R. A. (1994). Determinants of innovative behavior: A path model of individual innovation in the workplace. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(3), 580–607. <https://doi.org/10.5465/256701>
- Shin, S. J., Yuan, F., & Zhou, J. (2017). When perceived innovation job requirement increases employee innovative behavior: A sensemaking perspective. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 38(1), 68–86. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2111>
- Silinevica, I., & Meirule, L. (2019). Generation Z enters into the latvian business environment. *Latgale National Economy Research*, 1(11), 97. <https://doi.org/10.17770/lner2019vol1.11.4317>
- Siregar, Z. M. E., Supriadi, Y. N., Pranowo, A. S., Ende, N., & Harahap, N. J. (2022). A multidimensional approach in examining the role of self-efficacy on innovative work behavior: Evidence from the creative industry. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 20(2), 588–597. [https://doi.org/10.21511/ppm.20\(2\).2022.48](https://doi.org/10.21511/ppm.20(2).2022.48)
- Sun, B., Guo, H., Xu, L., & Ding, F. (2022). How does teachers' psychological capital influence workplace well-being? A moderated mediation model of Ego-Resiliency and Work-Meaning cognition. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(22), 14730. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph192214730>
- Tsegaye, W. K., Su, Q., & Malik, M. (2020). The quest for a comprehensive model of employee Innovative Behavior: The creativity and innovation theory perspective. *The Journal of Developing Areas*, 54(2). <https://doi.org/10.1353/jda.2020.0022>
- Vițelar, A. (2019). Like Me: Generation Z and the use of social media for personal branding. *Management Dynamics in the Knowledge Economy*, 7(2), 257–268. <https://doi.org/10.25019/mdke/7.2.07>
- Wang, H., Chen, X., Wang, H., & Xie, M. (2022). Employee innovative behavior and workplace wellbeing: Leader support for innovation and coworker ostracism as mediators. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1014195>
- West, M. A., & Farr, J. L. (1989). Innovation at work: Psychological perspectives. *Social Behaviour*, 4(1), 15–30.
- Wibowo, T. S. (2024). Impact of work-life balance and work engagement on innovation work behavior. *Indonesian Journal of Business Analytics*, 4(1), 171–180. <https://doi.org/10.55927/ijba.v4i1.8054>

Widiaristi, M. S., & Arum Etikariena. (2024). Innovative work behavior of Gen Z employees: Comparison between companies using flexible work arrangements with those using WFO. *Jurnal Psikogenesis*, 12(1), 31–45. <https://doi.org/10.24854/jps.v12i1.4064>