

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.4038/ucr.v3i2.75>

University of Colombo Review (Series III),
Vol. 3, No. 2, 2022



A review of the literature on factors affecting organizational engagement of Millennials: Social identity and psychological entitlement perspectives

K. A. D. I. Udayangi¹ and G. A. T. R. Perera²

1. Assistant Registrar, Faculty of Graduate Studies, University of the Visual and Performing Arts, Sri Lanka
2. Senior Lecturer, Department of Management and Organization Studies, Faculty of Management and Finance, University of Colombo, Sri Lanka

ABSTRACT

Organizational engagement has only recently gained traction in research literature despite engagement being considered as a multidimensional construct encompassing engagement with the work, job or the organization. Organizational engagement of Millennials is crucial for organizational success today given that Millennials are the largest generational cohort in contemporary workforces and they are expected to lead the transformation of organizations at the onset of Fourth Industrial Revolution or Industry 4.0. Novel theoretical approaches that are applied in the case of employee or work engagement, such as the social identity perspective, appear to have been ignored in the case of organizational engagement. This article aims to present a narrative review of extant research literature on organizational engagement of Millennials relating to the theories and frameworks of engagement, and thereby to identify knowledge gaps and recommend future research directions and theoretical perspectives that may help fill these gaps. The literature review was conducted using Google Scholar, Emerald Insight, Research Gate and JSTOR and considered published empirical studies incorporating quantitative methods.

KEYWORDS:

Organizational engagement, Millennials, social identity theory, psychological entitlement, literature review

Suggested Citation: Udayangi, K. A. D. I. and Perera G. A. T. R. (2022). A Review of the Literature on Factors Affecting Organizational Engagement of Millennials: Social Identity and Psychological Entitlement Perspectives. *University of Colombo Review* (New Series III), 3(2), 99 - 121.

© 2022 The Authors. This work is licenced under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International Licence which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

✉ ishara.u@vpa.ac.lk, ravinda@mos.cmb.ac.lk

Introduction

Engagement is a work-related attitude which is sometimes conceptualized as a multidimensional construct and typically discussed under positive organizational behaviour (Bailey et al., 2017; Barrick et al., 2015; Robbins & Judge, 2013; Saks, 2006; So et al., 2021). Kahn (1990) conceptualized engagement as a function of three psychological conditions including psychological meaningfulness, psychological safety and psychological availability while Schaufeli et al. (2002) conceptualized engagement as the opposite of burnout. Employee engagement encapsulates engagement with the work as well as with the organization (Schaufeli et al., 2006; Schaufeli, 2013). Engagement is a prerequisite for organizational success (Suomäki et al., 2019). Engaged employees are more productive, creative, perform better, display their full selves within the job roles and serve as a key source of competitive advantage for organizations (Anitha, 2014; Bakker & Demerouti, 2008; Kahn, 1990, as cited in Saks & Gruman, 2014; Macey & Schneider, 2008).

Saks (2006) postulated that employee engagement comprises job and organizational engagement which are distinct from each other. Organizational engagement is defined as the harnessing of organization members' selves to their organizational roles (Saks et al., 2021). It is an emerging area of interest in contemporary research literature. According to So et al. (2021), organizational engagement is the most important factor among the four dimensions of employee engagement which comprises person, work, relation and organizational engagement. According to Fletcher et al. (2020), there is a gap in extant research literature regarding the particular contextual factors pertaining to engagement. Bakker and Albrecht (2018) suggest that more research should be conducted focusing on engagement in the context of specific demographic groups such as Millennials (Bakker & Albrecht, 2018).

Generational differences in the workplace are a popular area of interest in contemporary research literature (Anderson et al., 2016; Cattermole, 2018; Glazer et al., 2019; Hui et al., 2020; Milkman, 2017; Taylor, 2018; Thach et al., 2020). Millennials/ Generation Y are expected to comprise 75% of the global workforce by the year 2025 and they are considered a key human resource for organizations in adapting to the changes associated with the onset of Fourth Industrial Revolution or Industry 4.0, which involves cloud computing, smart technology, cyber-physical systems, artificial intelligence, internet of things (IoT) and digital transformation (Hershatter & Epstein, 2010; Omilion-Hodges & Sugg, 2019; Sarwono & Bernarto, 2020). Engaging and retaining Millennials is increasingly crucial for organizational success (Brant & Castro, 2019; Omilion-Hodges & Sugg, 2019). Yet, engaging and retaining Millennials seems to be a challenge for organizations as they are known to demonstrate unique work values, attitudes and behaviours in the workplace (Hui et al, 2020; Murphy, 2012; Njoroge et al., 2021; Schullery, 2013; Stewart et al., 2017). They rarely seem to attach themselves to the organizations that they work for and prioritize their personal goals above those of the organization (Chou et al., 2021; Mahmoud et al., 2020; Polat & Yilmaz, 2020; Seemiller & Grace, 2018).

The objective of this narrative review is to provide an overview of the extant research literature relating to factors affecting organizational engagement of Millennials and the

relevant theories and frameworks used in contemporary literature, thereby identifying the knowledge gaps. Moreover, future research directions and theoretical perspectives that may help fill these gaps are discussed.

Organizational Engagement

Organizational engagement is an emerging area of interest in contemporary research literature. Saks et al. (2021) reviewed 40 studies on organizational engagement, in what appears to be the first systematic narrative review focused on organizational engagement. Most of the studies reviewed by them had been published during the preceding five years (Saks et al., 2021). The antecedents of organizational engagement in extant literature are grouped into four categories that include individual differences, job-related resources, organizational-related resources and leadership (Albrecht et al., 2015). The antecedents of organizational engagement in extant literature as identified by Saks et al. (2021) based on their systematic narrative review are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1: Antecedents of organizational engagement

Category	Antecedents in extant literature
Individual differences	work ethic, age and experience, Big Five personality traits, public service motivation, locus of control
Job-related resources	motivation-enhancing practices, work design practices, psychological empowerment, employee voice, meaningfulness intervention
Organizational-related resources	social support, justice perceptions, corporate social responsibility (CSR), human resource practices, organizational climate, organizational structural factors
Leadership	ethical leadership, leader-member exchange (LMX), trust in senior management, emotional intelligence of managers

Source: Based on Saks, A. M., Gruman, J. A., & Zhang, Q. (2021).

Millennials/Generation Y

Millennials or Generation Y refers to those who were born between the years 1982 and 2000 (United States Census Bureau, 2015). The birth years of Millennials vary between the early 1980s and the mid-to-late 1990s but almost all sources agree that they were born before the year 2000 (Lyons & Kuron, 2014; Gabrielova & Buchko, 2021; Glazer et al., 2019).

A generational cohort consists of individuals who, by reason of been born during the same time period, went through the same significant political, economic, technological and social phenomena during their developmental ages and therefore developed a similar a worldview equipped with similar values, beliefs and identities (Fisher & Crabtree, 2009; Glazer et al., 2019; Kupperschmidt, 2000). According to Twenge et al. (2010), generational

cohorts include the Silent Generation (born 1925 – 1945), Baby Boomers (born 1946 – 1964), Generation X (born 1965 – 1981), and Millennials/ Generation Y (born 1982 – 1999) and Generation Z (born after the year 2000). However, generational boundaries are not always clear-cut (Cennamo & Gardner, 2008; Taylor, 2018; Thach et al., 2020). Taylor (2018) postulated the existence of micro-generations born at the very end or the very beginning of a generation. Some of the varied birth years used to define generational boundaries in recent research literature are compiled in Table 2.

Table 2: Generational cohorts and relevant birth years

Authors	Birth Years Used to Define Generations			
	Silent Generation	Baby Boomers/ Boomers	Generation X	Millennials/ Generation Y
Twenge et al. (2010)	1925 – 1945	1946 – 1964	1965 – 1981	1982 – 1999
Meriac et al. (2010)		1946 – 1964	1965 – 1980	1981 – 1999
Jobe (2014)		1946 – 1964	1965 – 1979	1980 – 2000
Lyons & Kuron (2014)		1945 – early - to mid-1960s	early to mid-1960s – mid- to late 1980s	early 1980s and the late 1990s
Clark (2017)	Before 1946	1946 – 1964	1965 – 1980	1981 – 2000
Tsaur & Yen (2018)		1941 – 1960	1961 – 1980	1981 – 2000
Glazer et al. (2019)			mid-1960s and early-1980s	early-1980s and mid-1990s

Source: Developed by the authors

Millennials are dubbed “Generation Me” (Twenge, 2013); the entitled generation (Allen et al., 2015); the most praised generation (Anderson et al., 2016) and the first generation of “digital natives” (Milkman, 2017). They are called “job hoppers” due to their tendency for constantly changing their jobs (Seemiller & Grace, 2018). Chinese Millennials who happen to be products of China’s one-child policy are sometimes referred to as “little emperors” due to the sense of entitlement displayed by them (Zhao & Xu, 2019).

Millennials grew up amid globalization, 9/11 attacks and its aftermath, the war on terror, increased demographic diversity, concerns about global warming, the Great Recession, the Internet, social media and the rise of the Big Tech, that is, Microsoft, Google, Apple, Facebook and Amazon (Murphy, 2012; Ng et al., 2010). Millennials are deemed to be digital natives compared to the preceding generations, considering the fact that Baby Boomers and majority of the Generation X did not have access to the Internet during their formative years (DeVaney, 2015; Milkman, 2017). According to Milkman (2017), Millennials are a relatively progressive new political generation who often get involved

with social movements such as the Occupy Wall Street movement, the movement against sexual assault and Black Lives Matter movement.

Work Values of Millennials

The idea of work values stemmed from traditional Protestant ethics as acknowledged by Weber (Mohapatra & Sharma, 2010; Nadeem et al., 2019). Work values may influence people's behaviour and attitudes indirectly and hence affect employees' actions as well as their views, aspirations and choices in the workplace (De Cooman & Dries, 2012; Gursoy et al., 2013).

Employees who represent different generational cohorts tend to demonstrate significantly different work-related values, attitudes and behaviours (Pasko et al., 2020). Generational awareness has recently been recognized as a key competency for managers to be able to effectively engage subordinates from different generational cohorts (Boyle et al., 2018; Lowe et al., 2020; Rudolph et al., 2018). The majority of employees in contemporary workforces represent three generations including the Baby Boomers, Generation X and Millennials (Lu & Gursoy, 2016; Twenge et al., 2010). With the youngest members of the Baby Boomers generation nearing retirement age, Millennials are becoming the majority generation in workforces worldwide, resulting in what some authors consider to be a paradigm shift in the workforce demographics as Millennials demonstrate unique work values, traits, attitudes and behaviours in the workplace (Chou et al., 2021; Hui et al., 2020; Murphy, 2012; Naim & Lenka 2018; Njoroge et al., 2021; Schullery, 2013; Stewart et al., 2017).

The work values of Millennials are related to their propensity for utilitarianism, intrinsic work satisfaction, creativity, innovation, long term goals and challenging traditional norms (Hui et al., 2020). They value work-life balance, education, teamwork, job security and regular feedback (Anderson et al., 2016; Bresman & Rao, 2017; Durocher et al., 2016; Gursoy et al., 2013; Murphy, 2012; Pasko et al., 2020; Rosa & Hastings, 2018). The potential for career advancement is a priority for them (Pasko et al., 2020). Millennials value recognition, opportunities to be involved in the decision-making process and access to senior leadership of the organization (Gursoy et al., 2013; Pasko et al., 2020; Tirta et al., 2020). They demonstrate a preference for flexible work, leisure and relaxation (Chou et al., 2021; Murphy, 2012; Park & Gursoy, 2012; Tsaur & Yen, 2018; Twenge et al., 2010). They are likely to display relatively poor organizational citizenship behaviour (Gong et al., 2018).

Millennials demonstrate a notable dislike of bureaucracy (Gursoy et al., 2013; Pasko et al., 2020; Twenge & Campbell, 2008). They may violate dress codes and address everyone on a first-name basis due to their propensity for nonconformity (Twenge & Campbell, 2008). They may choose to leave organizations that endorse traditional bureaucratic style of management since they prefer an inclusive management style (Naim & Lenka, 2018). The quality of the leadership of the company is a vital concern for them (Arora & Dhole, 2019; Pasko et al., 2020).

Millennials were raised by Baby Boomers or the Generation X who were obsessed with their children's future, which resulted in Millennials growing up as unhappy high achievers with a tendency for job-hopping, who seek rapid career advancement (Chou et al., 2021; Gabrielova & Buchko, 2021; Mahmoud et al., 2020; Polat & Yilmaz, 2020; Sandeen, 2008; Seemiller & Grace, 2018). They have an inclination for pursuing graduate degrees and training opportunities (Goyal & Gupta, 2019; Rosa & Hastings, 2018). Millennial women tend to be more self-reliant, and they are more likely to reach top positions in the organizational hierarchy compared to the women of preceding generations (Twenge & Campbell, 2008).

Twenge (2013) argues that Millennials are less empathetic and more selfish compared to preceding generations. They are more confident, assertive, individualistic and entitled, with remarkably lesser need for social approval and higher levels of self-esteem, narcissism, anxiety and depression (Gabrielova & Buchko, 2021; Harvey & Dasborough, 2015; Twenge & Campbell, 2008; Twenge, 2013). Others have suggested that Millennials are not necessarily more selfish or narcissistic nor are they motivated by financial rewards alone and instead look for careers that offer intrinsic fulfillment (Arnett, 2013; García et al., 2018; Greatwood, 2016; Hui et al., 2020).

Getting Millennials to be engaged in the organization seems to be challenging since they have an inclination to leave an organization if they feel that their needs are not being fulfilled, resulting in employee turnover (Glazer et al., 2019; Greatwood, 2016). According to Saks (2006), turnover intentions are negatively related to organizational engagement. A few researchers have concentrated on employee engagement of Millennials. For instance, researchers have recently highlighted the importance of information technology with regards to the employee engagement of Millennials (Cattermole, 2018; Jha et al., 2019). Reverse mentoring, where a Millennial acts as a mentor to an older mentee such as a Baby Boomer may help retain Millennials as they may feel recognized (Murphy, 2012). According to Raza et al. (2017), rewards and recognition, training and development as well as leadership support are related to the employee engagement of Millennials.

Generational Identity of Millennials

According to generational cohort theory, a generational cohort has distinctive characteristics and their integration forms a generational identity which can be considered as a social identity based on the fact that it is socially constructed (Joshi et al., 2010; Lyons et al., 2019). Generational identity is characterized by shared values (Khan et al., 2021; Lyons & Schweitzer, 2017). The degree to which individuals identify with a specific social group shows how likely they are to endorse the customs and values of that social group (Porck et al., 2019).

Millennials tend to display an inherent affiliation with their generational cohort (Kahn et al., 2021). Accordingly, the generational identity of Millennials is characterized by their shared values while the extant literature reiterates that Millennials demonstrate unique work values (Hui et al., 2020; Murphy, 2012; Naim & Lenka, 2018; Njoroge et al., 2021; Pasko et al., 2020; Schullery, 2013).

Psychological Entitlement

Psychological entitlement refers to a prevalent sense of deservingness that makes an individual feel he/she is more deserving of rewards etc. compared to others (Campbell et al., 2004). Millennials have been characterized as an entitled generation in extant literature (Allen et al., 2015; Credo et al., 2016; Harvey & Dasborough, 2015; Twenge & Campbell, 2008; Twenge, 2013). Researchers have postulated that entitlement, which is a component of narcissism as well as narcissism itself are related to employee engagement (Andreassen et al., 2012; Brummel & Parker, 2015; Credo et al., 2016; Joplin et al., 2021). Andreassen et al. (2012) propose that individuals who display narcissistic traits are likely to display higher levels of employee engagement since their long-term goals, self-esteem and desire for rapid career advancement result in them being workaholics. According to others, entitled employees have a skewed sense of deservingness making them display lower levels of employee engagement (Credo et al., 2016; Joplin et al., 2019).

Method

Considering that organizational engagement is an emerging area of interest and that the first narrative review on organizational engagement has been published recently by Saks et al. (2021), as well as the fact that the literature search did not provide any extant research focused specifically on the factors affecting organizational engagement of Millennials, a systematic meta-analysis on factors affecting organizational engagement of Millennials was not an option at this juncture. Instead, a narrative review approach was used.

The literature review was conducted using databases and search engines including Google Scholar, Emerald Insight, ResearchGate and JSTOR. The keywords used included organizational engagement, organization engagement, Millennials, Generation Y, social identity theory, psychological entitlement, work values, work values of Millennials.

The Boolean search operator of “AND” was used to search for literature, as in organizational engagement “AND” Millennials, organization engagement “AND” Millennials, organizational identification “AND” organizational engagement, moral identity centrality “AND” organizational engagement, psychological entitlement “AND” Millennials, work values “AND” Millennials etc.

The inclusion criteria for this review included being an empirical study incorporating quantitative methods and published in a journal, utilizing one or more of the theories or frameworks related to engagement and/or considering organizational engagement as distinct from other constructs/dimensions of engagement. Studies that were included in the systematic narrative review by Saks et al. (2021) were excluded since the antecedents of organizational engagement in extant literature as identified and categorized by Saks et al. (2021) were summarized in Table 1.

Results

The 14 studies that met the inclusion criteria and did not meet the exclusion criterion were then grouped into two based on whether organizational engagement is considered as

distinct from the construct of employee engagement/other dimensions of engagement or not. The two groups of studies are presented in Tables 3 and 4 respectively. The study by Frare and Beuren (2021) was included as a borderline case as they have utilized a mixed methods approach (PLS-SEM and fsQCA) using a sample of 187 employees. Moreover, the study by Credo et al. (2016) was also included as a borderline case as they have considered the effect of entitlement and narcissism although they haven't specifically referred to any of the theories or frameworks related to engagement.

The six studies that met the inclusion criteria and did not meet the exclusion criterion and also considered organizational engagement as distinct from other dimensions of engagement are mentioned in Table 3. Except for the study by Saks (2006), all other studies mentioned in Table 3 have been published since 2015.

Table 3: Studies that considered organizational engagement as distinct from other constructs/ dimensions of engagement

Study	Theories/ frameworks used	Research Design	Organizational engagement	Other dimension(s) of engagement	Factors affecting organizational engagement
Barrick et al. (2015)	Kahn's Theory of Engagement Resource management theory	Quantitative survey	Yes	Collective organizational engagement	Motivational work Designs, HRM practices, CEO transformational leadership
Frare & Beuren (2021)	Social Identity Theory	Mixed methods approach	Yes	No	Corporate reputation, Employee-company identification
Rai & Chawla (2021)	Job-Demands Resources Framework	Quantitative survey	Yes	Work engagement	Job resources, Job demands, Work engagement
Rai & Maheshwari (2020)	Job-Demands Resources Framework	Quantitative survey	Yes	Work engagement	Job characteristics, Work engagement
Saks (2006)	Social Exchange Theory	Quantitative survey	Yes	Employee engagement Job engagement	Perceived organizational support, Procedural justice

Study	Theories/ frameworks used	Research Design	Organizational engagement	Other dimension(s) of engagement	Factors affecting organizational engagement
So et al. (2021)	Self- determination theory Person- environment fit	Quantitative survey	Yes	Employee engagement and its four dimensions (person, work, relation and organization)	Extrinsic and intrinsic motivation Person-organization fit.

Source: Developed by the authors

The factors affecting organizational engagement as per Table 3 mostly include organizational-related factors (motivational work designs, HRM practices, corporate reputation, perceived organizational support, procedural justice) and job-related factors (job resources, job demands).

The eight studies that met the inclusion criteria and did not meet the exclusion criterion and also did not consider organizational engagement as distinct from other dimensions of engagement are mentioned in Table 4. All studies mentioned in Table 4 have been published since 2014.

Table 4: Studies that did not consider organizational engagement as distinct from other dimensions of engagement

Study	Theories/ frameworks used	Research Design	Organizational engagement	Other dimension(s) of engagement	Factors affecting engagement
Albrecht et al (2018)	Job-Demands Resources Framework	Quantitative survey	No	Employee engagement	Organizational resources, Job resources, Organizational engagement climate
Credo et al. (2016)		Quantitative survey	No	Engagement	Narcissism, Entitlement
He et al (2014)	Social Identity Theory	Quantitative survey	No	Employee engagement	Moral Identity Centrality
He et al (2019)	Social Identity Theory	Quantitative survey	No	Employee engagement	Employees' admiration for their company

Study	Theories/ frameworks used	Research Design	Organizational engagement	Other dimension(s) of engagement	Factors affecting engagement
Iddagoda & Opatha, (2020)	Agency theory, Justice theory, theory of locus of control, ABC Model, Social Exchange Theory, Role theory, General Systems Theory	Quantitative survey	No	Employee engagement	High-performance work practices, Personal character, Leadership, Work–life balance
Joplin et al. (2021)	Kahn’s Theory of Engagement	Quantitative survey	No	Employee engagement	Employee entitlement
Mayuran, & Kailasapathy (2022).	Job-Demands Resources Framework, Social Exchange Theory, Conservation of Resources Theory	Quantitative survey	No	Employee engagement	Employer brand, Perceived organizational politics, Self-efficacy
Victor & Hoole (2017)	Social Exchange Theory Self- determination theory	Quantitative survey	No	Work engagement	Intrinsic rewards Extrinsic rewards

Source: Developed by the authors

Discussion

The Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) framework appears to be popular among contemporary researchers studying engagement (Albrecht et al., 2018; Mayuran & Kailasapathy, 2022; Rai & Chawla, 2021; Rai & Maheshwari, 2020). For instance, Rai and Chawla (2021) base their model for investigating the relationships between job demands, resources, engagement and satisfaction on the JD-R framework. However, JD-R framework has been criticized for neglecting heterogeneous contextual factors pertaining to engagement (Bailey et al., 2017).

Saks (2006) developed his framework of antecedents and consequences of employee engagement based on Social Exchange Theory. He is considered the first author to differentiate between job and organizational engagement, although the model developed by him did not differentiate between the antecedents of job and organizational engagement. According to the findings of Saks (2006), perceived organizational support influenced job engagement as well as organizational engagement while job engagement was influenced by job characteristics. Furthermore, organizational engagement was influenced by procedural justice. However, Social Exchange Theory has been criticized for its supposed theoretical imprecision and limited efficacy (Cropanzano et al., 2017). Extant literature suggests that reciprocity and rewards alone are not sufficient to engage employees (Victor & Hoole, 2017). For instance, Millennials are not necessarily motivated by financial rewards and instead look for career opportunities that provide them contentment (Greatwood, 2016).

Extant literature pertaining to engagement relies mostly on either the JD-R framework, despite the lack of empirical evidence indicating that engagement is enhanced by resources or reduced by demands, or the Social Exchange Theory, despite the premise that reciprocity and rewards alone are not sufficient to engage employees (Bailey et al., 2017; Victor & Hoole, 2017). Social identity theory has been applied with regards to engagement in recent literature (Frare & Beuren, 2021; He et al., 2014; He et al., 2019). For instance, according to He et al. (2014), moral identity centrality, which is derived from social identity theory, has a positive effect on employee engagement. Yet, it appears that the social identity perspective has not been applied in the case of organizational engagement except for the mediating role of employee-company identification considered by Frare and Beuren (2021).

Joplin et al. (2021) relied on Kahn's (1990) theory of engagement to suggest that the more entitled an individual is, less likely he/she may display engagement. According to them, the relationship between psychological entitlement and employee engagement is negative. According to Kahn's (1990) seminal article, engagement and disengagement at work is a function of three psychological conditions including psychological meaningfulness, psychological safety, and psychological availability. Workplaces that offer incentives for investing in oneself at work are more likely to result in psychological meaningfulness for the employees (Kahn, 1990, as cited in Saks & Gruman, 2014). Entitled individuals display poor engagement since they expect a disproportionate level of incentives irrespective of their actual merit (Joplin et al., 2021). Yet, despite the fact that Millennials have been widely characterized as an entitled generation, the relationship between their entitlement and organizational engagement seems to remain an unexplored area.

So et al. (2021) developed a measurement scale for employee engagement incorporating self-determination theory and person-environment fit. Their model incorporated four dimensions of employee engagement; person, work, relation and organizational engagement, and they recognized organizational engagement as the most important dimension of employee engagement. However, according to them, the sub-factors of organizational engagement are limited to pride, organization-fit and dedication.

Iddagodaa and Opatha (2020) conducted an empirical study in the Sri Lankan context in an attempt to fill the research gaps in employee engagement identified by Iddagoda and Opatha (2017), incorporating several theories such as Agency theory, Justice theory, theory of locus of control, ABC Model, Social Exchange Theory, Role theory and General Systems Theory. Likewise, Mayuran and Kailasapathy (2022) identified employer brand, perceived organizational politics and self-efficacy as factors affecting employee engagement in an empirical study conducted in the Sri Lankan context. However, there appears to be a dearth of empirical studies focused on organizational engagement conducted in the Sri Lankan context despite employee engagement being a popular area of interest among contemporary researchers (Iddagoda & Opatha, 2017; Iddagoda & Opatha, 2020; Mayuran & Kailasapathy, 2022).

Knowledge Gaps in Literature and Future Research Directions

According to Saks et al. (2021), majority of the antecedents of organizational engagement studied in extant literature fall into the category of organizational-related resources while only a few studies have considered individual differences. However, according to Bailey et al. (2017) who conducted a systematic review involving 214 studies pertaining to engagement, individual psychological states are the most often cited antecedents of employee engagement. Given that organizational engagement is considered a dimension of employee engagement, the predominantly cited antecedent of employee engagement which is individual psychological states warrants increased scrutiny with respect to organizational engagement (Bailey et al., 2017; Bakker & Albrecht, 2018; Saks, 2006; So et al., 2021).

According to Twenge and Campbell (2008), generational differences arise from either psychological or technological differences. Generational identity of Millennials, which is derived from generational cohort theory and social identity theory, is associated with the shared values of Millennials (Joshi et al., 2010; Khan et al., 2021; Lyons et al., 2019; Lyons & Schweitzer, 2017; Porck et al., 2019). Millennials have been widely characterized as an entitled generation with unique work values (Allen et al., 2015; Credo et al., 2016; Harvey & Dasborough, 2015; Hui et al., 2020; Murphy, 2012; Naim & Lenka, 2018; Njoroge et al., 2021; Pasko et al., 2020; Schullery, 2013; Twenge & Campbell, 2008; Twenge, 2013). However, there appears to be a dearth in extant literature of applications of social identity theory or the associated generational identity or generational work values perspectives to explore the factors affecting organizational engagement of Millennials.

Furthermore, despite widespread consensus among both researchers and practitioners that entitlement in the workplace is on the rise as Millennials are becoming the majority

generational cohort in workforces, relatively less research has focused on the topic of entitlement and its impact on workplace behaviour and attitudes, and even less research has taken into account the role of Millennials in this regard (Brant & Castro, 2019; Lee et al., 2019; Liu et al., 2022; Naseer et al., 2020; Zitek et al., 2021).

Limitations

Organizational engagement is only recently gaining traction in research literature and therefore, the authors had to rely on the limited recent literature available. In fact, the authors did not come across any studies that were focused specifically on factors affecting organizational engagement of Millennials. The discussion focusing on the theories used in the engagement literature required highlighting the criticisms directed at those theories in order to identify the knowledge gaps and thereby speculate on alternative theoretical perspectives. Therefore, the authors had to refer to sources other than the selected articles for this purpose, given that some of the sources that discussed these theories did not fall within the inclusion criteria, which were directed towards organizational engagement of Millennials. Moreover, the databases and search engines used may not be all-inclusive sources signifying that this review may not be an all-encompassing compilation of literature on organizational engagement of Millennials.

Conclusions

This review highlights the breadth and complexity of the literature and the numerous theoretical perspectives relating to the factors affecting organizational engagement of Millennials. The factors affecting organizational engagement as per extant literature are mostly organizational-related or job-related factors. However, individual differences as well as contextual factors such as social identity or generational identity and work values appear to have been overlooked in extant literature. This review highlights that, in the present context of increased interest in research on organizational engagement, novel approaches to research on engagement such as the application of social identity and psychological entitlement perspectives warrant further exploration in the context of Millennials/Generation Y who are a key human resource for organizations today.

References

- Albrecht, S., Breidahl, E., & Marty, A. (2018). Organizational resources, organizational engagement climate, and employee engagement. *Career Development International*, 23(1), 67-85.
- Albrecht, S. L., Bakker, A. B., Gruman, J. A., Macey, W. H., & Saks, A. M. (2015). Employee engagement, human resource management practices and competitive advantage: An integrated approach. *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance*, 2(1), 7-35.
- Allen, R. S., Allen, D. E., Karl, K., & White, C. S. (2015). Are Millennials Really an Entitled Generation? An Investigation into Generational Equity Sensitivity Differences. *Journal of Business Diversity*, 15(2), 14-26.

- Anderson, E., Buchko, A. A., & Buchko, K. J. (2016). Giving negative feedback to Millennials: How can managers criticize the “most praised” generation. *Management Research Review*, 39(6), 692-705.
- Andreassen, C. S., Ursin, H., Eriksen, H. R., & Pallesen, S. (2012). The relationship of narcissism with workaholism, work engagement, and professional position. *Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal*, 40(6), 881-890.
- Anitha, J. (2014). Determinants of employee engagement and their impact on employee performance. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 63(3), 308-323.
- Arnett, J. J. (2013). The evidence for generation we and against generation me. *Emerging adulthood*, 1(1), 5-10.
- Arora, N., & Dhole, V. (2019). Generation Y: Perspective, engagement, expectations, preferences and satisfactions from workplace; a study conducted in Indian context. Benchmarking: *An International Journal*, 26(5), 1378-1404.
- Ashforth, B. E., & Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. *Academy of management review*, 14(1), 20-39.
- Ashforth, B. E., Schinoff, B. S., & Brickson, S. L. (2020). “My Company is Friendly,” “Mine’s a Rebel”: Anthropomorphism and shifting organizational identity from “What” to “Who”. *Academy of Management Review*, 45(1), 29-57.
- Bailey, C., Madden, A., Alfes, K., & Fletcher, L. (2017). The meaning, antecedents and outcomes of employee engagement: A narrative synthesis. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 19(1), 31-53.
- Bakker, A. B., & Albrecht, S. (2018). Work engagement: current trends. *Career Development International*, 23(1), 4-11.
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands-resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(3), 309-328.
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2008). Towards a model of work engagement. *Career Development International*, 13(3), 209-223.
- Barrick, M. R., Thurgood, G. R., Smith, T. A., & Courtright, S. H. (2015). Collective organizational engagement: Linking motivational antecedents, strategic implementation, and firm performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 58(1), 111-135.
- Boyle, C. J., Gonyeau, M., Flowers, S. K., Hritcko, P., Taheri, R., & Prabhu, S. (2018). Adapting leadership styles to reflect generational differences in the academy. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 82(6), 641-643.
- Brant, K. K., & Castro, S. L. (2019). You can't ignore millennials: Needed changes and a new way forward in entitlement research. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 29(4), 527-538.
- Bresman, H., & Rao, V. D. (2017). A survey of 19 countries shows how generations X, Y, and Z are—and aren't—different. *Harvard Business Review*, 25, 1-8.

- Brummel, B. J., & Parker, K. N. (2015). Obligation and entitlement in society and the workplace. *Applied Psychology*, 64(1), 127-160.
- Bryman, A., & Cramer, D. (2012). *Quantitative data analysis with IBM SPSS 17, 18 & 19: A guide for social scientists*. Routledge.
- Campbell, W. K., Bonacci, A. M., Shelton, J., Exline, J. J., & Bushman, B. J. (2004). Psychological entitlement: Interpersonal consequences and validation of a self-report measure. *Journal of personality assessment*, 83(1), 29-45.
- Cattermole, G. (2018). Creating an employee engagement strategy for millennials. *Strategic HR Review*, 17(6), 290-294.
- Cennamo, L., & Gardner, D. (2008). Generational differences in work values, outcomes and person-organisation values fit. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 23(8), 891-906.
- Chou, S. Y., Bove, F., Ramser, C., & Han, B. (2021). Millennials as organizational citizens: Conceptualization and measurement development. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 161(5), 632-651.
- Clark, K. R. (2017). Managing multiple generations in the workplace. *Radiologic technology*, 88(4), 379-396.
- Conroy, S. A., Becker, W. J., & Menges, J. I. (2017). The meaning of my feelings depends on who I am: Work-related identifications shape emotion effects in organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 60(3), 1071-1093.
- Cornwell, T. B., Howard-Grenville, J., & Hampel, C. E. (2018). The company you keep: How an organization's horizontal partnerships affect employee organizational identification. *Academy of Management Review*, 43(4), 772-791.
- Credo, K. R., Lanier, P. A., Matherne III, C. F., & Cox, S. S. (2016). Narcissism and entitlement in millennials: The mediating influence of community service self efficacy on engagement. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 101, 192-195.
- Cropanzano, R., Anthony, E. L., Daniels, S. R., & Hall, A. V. (2017). Social exchange theory: a critical review with theoretical remedies. *Academy of Management Annals*, 11(1), 1-38.
- De Cooman, R., & Dries, N. (2012). Attracting generation y: How work values predict organizational attraction in graduating students in Belgium. *Managing the New Workforce: International Perspectives on the Millennial Generation*, 42-63.
- DeVaney, S. A. (2015). Understanding the millennial generation. *Journal of Financial Service Professionals*, 69(6), 11-14.
- Durocher, S., Bujaki, M., & Brouard, F. (2016). Attracting Millennials: Legitimacy management and bottom-up socialization processes within accounting firms. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, 39, 1-24.

- Fisher, T. F., & Crabtree, J. L. (2009). Generational cohort theory: Have we overlooked an important aspect of the entry-level occupational therapy doctorate debate? *American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 63(5), 656-661.
- Fletcher, L., Bailey, C., Alfes, K., & Madden, A. (2020). Mind the context gap: a critical review of engagement within the public sector and an agenda for future research. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 31(1), 6-46.
- Flint, D. J., Signori, P., & Golicic, S. L. (2018). Corporate Identity Congruence: A meanings-based analysis. *Journal of Business Research*, 86, 68–82.
- Frare, A. B., & Beuren, I. M. (2021). Effects of corporate reputation and social identity on innovative job performance. *European Journal of Innovation Management*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJIM-02-2021-0071>
- Gabrielova, K., & Buchko, A. A. (2021). Here comes Generation Z: Millennials as managers. *Business Horizons*, 64(4), 489-499.
- García, G. A., Gonzales-Miranda, D. R., Gallo, O., & Roman-Calderon, J. P. (2018). Employee involvement and job satisfaction: a tale of the millennial generation. *Employee Relations: The International Journal*, 41(3), 374-388.
- Glazer, S., Mahoney, A. C., & Randall, Y. (2019). Employee development's role in organizational commitment: a preliminary investigation comparing generation X and millennial employees. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 51(1), 1-12.
- Gong, B., Greenwood, R. A., Hoyte, D., Ramkissoon, A., & He, X. (2018). Millennials and organizational citizenship behavior: The role of job crafting and career anchor on service. *Management Research Review*, 41(7), 774-788.
- Goyal, P., & Gupta, P. (2019). Millennials: Understanding and Attracting Them to Higher Education. In *New Age Admissions Strategies in Business Schools* (pp. 251-263). IGI Global.
- Greatwood, M. (2016). How to counter the growing disengagement with engagement programs: use “dream management”. *Development and Learning in Organizations: An International Journal*, 30(2), 15-17.
- Gruber, M., & Fauchart, E. (2011). Darwinians, Communitarians and Missionaries: The Role of Founder Identity in Entrepreneurship. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(5), 935–957.
- Gruber, M., & MacMillan, I. C. (2017). Entrepreneurial behavior: A reconceptualization and extension based on identity theory. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 11(3), 271-286.
- Gursoy, D., Chi, C. G. Q., & Karadag, E. (2013). Generational differences in work values and attitudes among frontline and service contact employees. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 32, 40-48.
- Harvey, P., & Dasborough, M. T. (2015). Entitled to solutions: The need for research on workplace entitlement. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 36(3), 460-465.

- Harvey, P., & Martinko, M. J. (2009). An empirical examination of the role of attributions in psychological entitlement and its outcomes. *Journal of organizational behavior: the international journal of industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, 30(4), 459-476.
- He, H., Chao, M. M., & Zhu, W. (2019). Cause-related marketing and employee engagement: The roles of admiration, implicit morality beliefs, and moral identity. *Journal of business research*, 95, 83-92.
- He, H., Zhu, W., & Zheng, X. (2014). Procedural justice and employee engagement: Roles of organizational identification and moral identity centrality. *Journal of business ethics*, 122(4), 681-695.
- Hershatter, A., & Epstein, M. (2010). Millennials and the world of work: An organization and management perspective. *Journal of business and psychology*, 25(2), 211-223.
- Hogg, M. A., Terry, D. J., & White, K. M. (1995). A Tale of Two Theories: A Critical Comparison of Identity Theory with Social Identity Theory. In *Social Psychology Quarterly* (Vol. 58, Issue 4, p. 255).
- Hornsey, M. J. (2008). Social identity theory and self-categorization theory: A historical review. *Social and personality psychology compass*, 2(1), 204-222.
- Hui, L., Qun, W., Nazir, S., Mengyu, Z., Asadullah, M. A., & Khadim, S. (2020). Organizational identification perceptions and millennials' creativity: testing the mediating role of work engagement and the moderating role of work values. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 24(5), 1653-1678.
- Huseman, R. C., Hatfield, J. D., & Miles, E. W. (1987). A new perspective on equity theory: The equity sensitivity construct. *Academy of management Review*, 12(2), 222-234.
- Iddagoda, Y. A., & Opatha, H. H. D. N. P. (2017). Identified research gaps in employee engagement. *International Business Research*, 10(2), 63-73.
- Iddagoda, Y. A., & Opatha, H. H. D. N. P. (2020). Relationships and mediating effects of employee engagement: An empirical study of managerial employees of Sri Lankan listed companies. *Sage Open*, 10(2), 1-22.
- Jha, N., Potnuru, R. K. G., Sareen, P., & Shaju, S. (2019). Employee voice, engagement and organizational effectiveness: a mediated model. *European Journal of Training and Development*, 43(7/8), 699-718.
- Jobe, L. L. (2014). Generational differences in work ethic among 3 generations of registered nurses. *The Journal of Nursing Administration*, 44(5), 303-308.
- Joplin, T., Greenbaum, R. L., Wallace, J. C., & Edwards, B. D. (2021). Employee entitlement, engagement, and performance: The moderating effect of ethical leadership. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 168(4), 813-826.

- Joshi, A., Dencker, J. C., Franz, G., & Martocchio, J. J. (2010). Unpacking generational identities in organizations. *Academy of management review*, 35(3), 392-414.
- Khan, S., Fazili, A. I., & Bashir, I. (2021). Constructing generational identity through counterfeit luxury consumption. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 31(3), 415-437.
- 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). Multigeneration employees: strategies for effective management. *The health care manager*, 19(1), 65-76.
- Lee, A., Schwarz, G., Newman, A., & Legood, A. (2019). Investigating when and why psychological entitlement predicts unethical pro-organizational behavior. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 154(1), 109-126.
- Liu, W., Zhu, Y., Chen, S., Zhang, Y., & Qin, F. (2022). Moral decline in the workplace: unethical pro-organizational behavior, psychological entitlement, and leader gratitude expression. *Ethics & Behavior*, 32(2), 110-123.
- Lowe, J. B., Barry, E. S., & Grunberg, N. E. (2020). Improving Leader Effectiveness Across Multi-Generational Workforces. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 14(1), 46–52.
- Lyons, S., & Kuron, L. (2014). Generational differences in the workplace: A review of the evidence and directions for future research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 35(S1), S139-S157.
- Lyons, S. T., & Schweitzer, L. (2017). A qualitative exploration of generational identity: Making sense of young and old in the context of today's workplace. *Work, Aging and Retirement*, 3(2), 209-224.
- Lyons, S. T., Schweitzer, L., Urick, M. J., & Kuron, L. (2019). A dynamic social-ecological model of generational identity in the workplace. *Journal of Intergenerational Relationships*, 17(1), 1-24.
- Macey, W. H., & Schneider, B. (2008). The meaning of employee engagement. *Industrial and organizational Psychology*, 1(1), 3-30.
- Mahmoud, A. B., Fuxman, L., Mohr, I., Reisel, W. D., & Grigoriou, N. (2020). “We aren't your reincarnation!” workplace motivation across X, Y and Z generations. *International Journal of Manpower*, 42(1), 193-209.
- Mayuran, L., & Kailasapathy, P. (2022). To engage or not? Antecedents of employee engagement in Sri Lanka. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 60(3), 584-607.
- Mell, J. N., DeChurch, L. A., Leenders, R. T. A., & Contractor, N. (2020). Identity asymmetries: An experimental investigation of social identity and information exchange in multiteam systems. *Academy of Management Journal*, 63(5), 1561-1590.
- Men, L. R., O'Neil, J., & Ewing, M. (2020). Examining the effects of internal social media usage on employee engagement. *Public Relations Review*, 46(2), 1-9.

- Meriac, J. P., Woehr, D. J., & Banister, C. (2010). Generational differences in work ethic: An examination of measurement equivalence across three cohorts. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 25(2), 315-324.
- Milkman, R. (2017). A new political generation: Millennials and the post-2008 wave of protest. *American Sociological Review*, 82(1), 1-31.
- Mohapatra, M., & Sharma, B. R. (2010). Study of employee engagement and its predictors in an Indian public sector undertaking. *Global business review*, 11(2), 281-301.
- Mostafa, A. M. S., & Shen, J. (2019). Ethical leadership, internal CSR, organisational engagement and organisational workplace deviance. In *Evidence-based HRM: A Global Forum for Empirical Scholarship*. Emerald Publishing Limited.
- Murphy, W. M. (2012). Reverse mentoring at work: Fostering cross-generational learning and developing millennial leaders. *Human Resource Management*, 51(4), 549-573.
- Nadeem, K., Akram, W., Ali, H. F., Iftikhar, Y., & Shamshad, W. (2019). The relationship between work values, affective commitment, emotional intelligence, and employee engagement: A moderated mediation model. *European Online Journal of Natural and Social Sciences*, 8(3), pp-469.
- Naim, M. F., & Lenka, U. (2018). Development and retention of Generation Y employees: a conceptual framework. *Employee relations*, 40(2), 433-455.
- Naseer, S., Bouckennooghe, D., Syed, F., Khan, A. K., & Qazi, S. (2020). The malevolent side of organizational identification: Unravelling the impact of psychological entitlement and manipulative personality on unethical work behaviors. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 35(3), 333-346.
- Ng, E. S., Schweitzer, L., & Lyons, S. T. (2010). New generation, great expectations: A field study of the millennial generation. *Journal of business and psychology*, 25(2), 281-292.
- Njoroge, R., Ndirangu, A., & Kiambi, D. (2021). Leading Millennial Generation towards Engagement in Organizations. *PAC University Journal of Arts and Social Sciences*, 3(1), 45-55.
- Omilion-Hodges, L. M., & Sugg, C. E. (2019). Millennials' views and expectations regarding the communicative and relational behaviors of leaders: Exploring young adults' talk about work. *Business and Professional Communication Quarterly*, 82(1), 74-100.
- Opsal, T. D. (2011). Women disrupting a marginalized identity: Subverting the parolee identity through narrative. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 40, 135-167.
- Owens, T. J., Robinson, D. T., & Smith-Lovin, L. (2010). Three faces of identity. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 36, 477-499.
- Park, J., & Gursoy, D. (2012). Generation effects on work engagement among US hotel employees. *international journal of Hospitality Management*, 31(4), 1195-1202.

- Pasko, R., Maellaro, R., & Stodnick, M. (2020). A study of millennials' preferred work-related attributes and retention. *Employee Relations: The International Journal*, 43(3), 774-787.
- Piening, E. P., Salge, T. O., Antons, D., & Kreiner, G. E. (2020). Standing together or falling apart? Understanding employees' responses to organizational identity threats. *Academy of Management Review*, 45(2), 325-351.
- Polat, S., & Yilmaz, Y. (2020). Barriers to intergenerational learning: a case of a workplace in Turkey. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 41(3), 431-447.
- Porck, J. P., Matta, F. K., Hollenbeck, J. R., Oh, J. K., Lanaj, K., & Lee, S. M. (2019). Social identification in multiteam systems: The role of depletion and task complexity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 62(4), 1137-1162.
- Rai, A., & Chawla, G. (2021). Exploring the interrelationship among job resources, job demands, work and organizational engagement. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 71(5), 1916-1934.
- Rai, A., & Maheshwari, S. (2020). Exploring the mediating role of work engagement between the linkages of job characteristics with organizational engagement and job satisfaction. *Management Research Review*, 44(1), 133-157.
- Raza, S., Ansari, N., Humayon, D. A. A., Hussain, M. S., & Aziz, K. (2017). Factors affecting millennials employee engagement in government sector. *International Journal of Management Excellence*, 10(1), 1195-1200.
- Riessman, C. K. (2003). Performing identities in illness narrative: Masculinity and multiple sclerosis. *Qualitative Research*, 3, 5-33.
- Riketta, M. (2005). Organizational identification: A meta-analysis. *Journal of vocational behavior*, 66(2), 358-384.
- Rosa, N. M. B., & Hastings, S. O. (2018). Managing millennials: Looking beyond generational stereotypes. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 31(4), 920-930.
- Rudolph, C. W., Rauvola, R. S., & Zacher, H. (2018). Leadership and generations at work: A critical review. *Leadership Quarterly*, 29(1), 44-57.
- Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of managerial psychology*, 21(7), 600-619.
- Saks, A. M., & Gruman, J. A. (2014). What do we really know about employee engagement? *Human resource development quarterly*, 25(2), 155-182.
- Saks, A. M., Gruman, J. A., & Zhang, Q. (2021). Organization engagement: a review and comparison to job engagement. *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance*, 9(1), 20-49.
- Sandeén, C. (2008). Boomers, Xers, and Millennials: Who Are They and What Do They Really Want from Continuing Higher Education? *Continuing Higher Education Review*, 72, 11-31.

- Sandström, K. (1990). Confronting deadly disease: The drama of identity construction among gay men with AIDS. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 19, 271–294.
- Sarwono, R., & Bernarto, I. (2020). Leading millennials to 4.0 organization. *Management Science Letters*, 10(4), 733-740.
- Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., & Salanova, M. (2006). The measurement of work engagement with a short questionnaire: A cross-national study. *Educational and psychological measurement*, 66(4), 701-716.
- Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., González-Romá, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness studies*, 3(1), 71-92.
- Schullery, N. M. (2013). Workplace engagement and generational differences in values. *Business Communication Quarterly*, 76(2), 252-265.
- Seemiller, C., & Grace, M. (2018). *Generation Z: A century in the making*. Routledge.
- Smaliukiene, R., & Bekesiene, S. (2020). Towards sustainable human resources: How generational differences impact subjective wellbeing in the military? *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 12(23), 1–21.
- Smith, C., Halinski, M., Gover, L., & Duxbury, L. (2019). Generational Differences in the Importance, Availability, and Influence of Work Values: A Public Service Perspective. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, 36(2), 177–192.
- Snow, D. A., & Anderson, L. (1987). Identity work among the homeless: The verbal construction and avowal of personal identities. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 92, 1336–1371.
- So, B. H., Kim, J. H., Ro, Y. J., & Song, J. H. (2021). Developing a measurement scale for employee engagement: a validation study in a South Korean context. *European Journal of Training and Development*. 46(5/6), 585-606.
- Stanton, R. (2017). Communicating with employees: Resisting the stereotypes of generational cohorts in the workplace. *IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication*, 60(3), 256-272.
- Stets, J. E., & Burke, P. J. (2014). The development of identity theory. In S. R. Thye & E. J. Lawler (Ed.), *Advances in group processes*. Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Stets, J. E., & Serpe, R. T. (2013). Identity theory. In R. T. Serpe (Ed.), *Handbook of social psychology*. (pp. 31-60). Springer, Dordrecht.
- Stewart, J. S., Oliver, E. G., Cravens, K. S., & Oishi, S. (2017). Managing millennials: Embracing generational differences. *Business Horizons*, 60(1), 45-54.
- Stryker, S., & Burke, P. J. (2000). The past, present, and future of an identity theory. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 63(4), 284–297.
- Suomäki, A., Kianto, A., & Vanhala, M. (2019). Work engagement across different generations in Finland: a qualitative study of Boomers, Yers and Xers. *Knowledge and Process Management*, 26(2), 140-151.

- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (2004). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In J. T. Jost & J. Sidanius (Ed.), *Political Psychology* (pp. 276-293). Psychology Press
- Tang, N., Wang, Y., & Zhang, K. (2017). Values of Chinese generation cohorts: Do they matter in the workplace?. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 143, 8-22.
- Taylor, C. R. (2018). Generational research and advertising to millennials. *International Journal of Advertising*, 37(2), 165-167.
- Thach, L., Riewe, S., & Camillo, A. (2020). Generational cohort theory and wine: analyzing how gen Z differs from other American wine consuming generations. *International Journal of Wine Business Research*, 33(1), 1-27.
- Tirta, A. H., & Enrika, A. (2020). Understanding the impact of reward and recognition, work life balance, on employee retention with job satisfaction as mediating variable on millennials in Indonesia. *Journal of Business & Retail Management Research*, 14(3), 88-98.
- Trepte, S., & Loy, L. S. (2017). Social Identity Theory and Self-Categorization Theory. In P. Rössler (Ed.), *The International Encyclopedia of Media Effects* (pp. 1–13). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Tsaur, S. H., & Yen, C. H. (2018). Work–leisure conflict and its consequences: Do generational differences matter? *Tourism Management*, 69, 121-131.
- Turner, J. C., & Oakes, P. J. (1986). The significance of the social identity concept for social psychology with reference to individualism, interactionism and social influence. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 25(3), 237-252.
- Twenge, J. M., & Campbell, S. M. (2008). Generational differences in psychological traits and their impact on the workplace. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 23(8), 862-877.
- Twenge, J. M., Campbell, S. M., Hoffman, B. J., & Lance, C. E. (2010). Generational differences in work values: Leisure and extrinsic values increasing, social and intrinsic values decreasing. *Journal of Management*, 36(5), 1117-1142.
- Twenge, J. M. (2013). The evidence for generation me and against generation we. *Emerging Adulthood*, 1(1), 11-16.
- United States Census Bureau. (2015, June 25). Millennials Outnumber Baby Boomers and Are Far More Diverse, Census Bureau Reports. Retrieved June 14, 2021 from <https://www.census.gov/newsroom/press-releases/2015/cb15-113.html>
- Urlick, M. J. (2012). Exploring generational identity: A multiparadigm approach. *Journal of Business Diversity*, 12(3), 103-115.
- Victor, J., & Hoole, C. (2017). The influence of organisational rewards on workplace trust and work engagement. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, 15(1), 1-14.
- Weeks, K. P., & Schaffert, C. (2019). Generational Differences in Definitions of Meaningful Work: A Mixed Methods Study. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 156(4), 1045–1061.

- Wey Smola, K. W., & Sutton, C. D. (2002). Generational differences: Revisiting generational work values for the new millennium. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, 23(4), 363-382.
- Zhao, Y., & Xu, Q. (2019). Understanding the achieving styles of Chinese millennials and implications on HRM policy: A life course perspective. *International Journal of Manpower*, 41(3), 303-317.
- Zhu, J., Tatachari, S., & Chattopadhyay, P. (2017). Newcomer identification: Trends, antecedents, moderators, and consequences. *Academy of Management Journal*, 60(3), 855-879.
- Zitek, E. M., & Schlund, R. J. (2021). Psychological entitlement predicts noncompliance with the health guidelines of the COVID-19 pandemic. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 171, 1-10.