Millenial Employees Perception Related to Workload, Work Life Balance, Challenge Leadership on Happiness at Work Case Study Kuningan Area South Jakarta

Diyah Ayu Aprita Sari[1*], MC Oetami Prasadjaningsih[2]

[1)]Perbanas Institute, Faculty of Economy and Business, email: diyah.ayu36@perbanas.id
2)Perbanas Institute, Faculty of Economy and Business, email: oetami@perbanas.id

*Corresponding Author: Diyah Ayu Aprita Sari

Abstract: The purpose of this study is to analyze the perception millenial employees about workload, work life balance and challange leadership on happiness at work. This study used quantitative data types with the population of this study are employees worked in Kuningan Area South Jakarta. The sample used in this study are 100 respondents. The methode used for data collection is by used a questionnaire distribution technique trough google form. The analysis technique in this study used the inner model andouter model test wich were processed and analyzed using SmartPLS software which is equipped with variable descriptions of each respondent's characteristics. The results of this study showed that the workload had a significant effect on happiness at work, work life balance had a significant effect on happiness at work, challenge leadership had a significant effect on happiness at work, workload had no significant effect on challenge leadership, work life balance had a significant effect on leadership. Concequently millenials do not query about workload but work life balance are the primary reason, and challange leadership to experience hapiness at work.

Keywords: Workload, Work Life Balance, Challenge Leadership and Happiness at Work

INTRODUCTION

Currently, Indonesian employees or the workforce are almost dominated by generation Y or millennials. It was recorded by BPS (Central Bureau of Statistics) regarding the results of the 2021 population census, stating that the millennial generation dominates the majority of Indonesia's population with a proportion of 25.87% and the most distribution on Java Island (BPS, 2021). According to William and Neil, the millennial generation is people born from 1980-2000, known as generation Y (Budiati et al., 2018). Meanwhile, according to Hidayatullah et al. (2018), the millennial generation isa modern generation that lives at the turn of the millennium. The millennial generation has the characteristics of being creative, informative, passionate, upholding freedom, critical, and brave (Budiati et al., 2018).

Millennials are also known as a generation that often changes workplaces. According to Novi Triputra in Deloitte Magazine (2019), millennials are known as a generation with a high turnover rate of 10%. This millennial generation is a challenge for companies, where companies must understand how to improve the performance of millennial generation employees by reducing turnover and making millennials happier at work.

Reporting from Covid-19 Job Report by Jobstreet.com (2020) revealed that many currently working employees are no longer happy with their jobs. As a result, the per cent unhappiness has increased from 4% to 33%. Furthermore, based on data quoted from The Global Economy.com (2021) regarding the Happiness Index Survey, the happiness index in Indonesia in 2021 has decreased from the previous year, namely 5.24% and Indonesia is in 87th position, which can be called the country with a moderate happiness rate, tending to be low. Several factors affect employee happiness at work, including workload, work life balance and leadership.

Workload is directly related to employees, so organisations or companies need to understand. Mahani et al. (2020) revealed that happiness at work has a relationship with workload. Workload that exceeds the ability of an employee's body results in discomfort, fatigue and unhappiness. Apart from workload, there is another factor: work life balance. According to Yap and Badri (2020), one thing that makes millennials happy at work is the balance between personal life and work. In addition, leadership is also one of the factors of happiness at work. According to Isa et al. (2019) leaders play an important role in determining employee happiness. Leadership style that is appropriate and acceptable to millennial employees will positively affect employee happiness.

Happiness is one of the things favoured by the millennial generation. This generation at work does not only think about money but also looks for something cool to be proud of and a healthy work environment (Delloite, 2019). This makes companies adapt to the millennial generation's characteristics to maximize their potential in achieving company targets.

One way to treat millennial employees to achieve company goals and targets is to set workloads by employee abilities. In addition, companies must also realise that work-life balance for employees is very important so employees are happy at work and there is no desire to change jobs. As well as the need for leaders who can adapt to the mindset and lifestyle of the millennial generation.

Leadership criteria millennials need is leadership that always innovates, is creative and can use technology. That way, millennial employees will give their best to achieve company goals (Peramesti & Dedi, 2018). This research was conducted to analyse the influence of workload, work life balance and challenge leadership on happiness at work of millennial employees who work in e-commerce/startup, call centre, banking and insurance/pialang companies in the Kuningan area, South Jakarta.

LITERATURE REVIEW
Workload
Workload is a set of interactions employees perceive within a certain period (Hart and Staveland in Tawarka, 2015). Hart and Staveland also revealed three indicators that determine workload: first task demands. This explain the extent to which employees will feel the demands of the tasks given to them beyond their abilities and jobs desk or not. Second effort or effort explains the extent to which employees feel that the demands of the tasks given are by their abilities so that the effort expended does not exceed their efforts. The last are performance which explains the extent to which employees feel that the targets given by the company are following the standards that have been set.

Work Life Balance

Work life balance is an important factor for every employee so that employees have a balanced quality of life in dealing with their families and balance at work. According to Fisher (2009), work life balance is an effort to achieve a balance at work and in his personal life. There are four dimensions of work life balance namely, work interference with personal life explains the extent to which work can interfere with his personal life, personal life interference with work explains the extent to which an employee's personal life can interfere with his work, personal life enhancement of work explains the extent to which personal life can have a good impact on his performance and work enhancement of personal life explains the extent to which his work can have a good impact on his life (Fisher,2009).

Challenge leadership

Leadership is the effort of a leader to realise individual or organisational goals. Challenge leadership is the ability of a leader to influence his subordinates into action, then turn the organisation's vision into reality and turn obstacles into innovations so that organisational goals can be achieved. There are five leadership practices, namely, model the way explaining how leaders can set an example in action and participate directly in existing tasks, inspire a shared vision explaining how leaders can inspire a shared vision and ideals in achieving agreed goals, challenge the process explaining how leaders can encourage subordinates to innovate, grow and improve and dare to face challenges, the challenge leadership process explains how leaders can encourage subordinates to innovate, grow and improve and dare to face existing challenges, enable others to act explains how leaders can build a sense of trust and relationships with their employees to take part in completing work and encourage the heart explains the extent to which leaders give appreciation and recognition to their subordinates to create morale (Kouzes & Posner, 2012).

Happiness at Work

According to Pryce-Jones (2010), happiness at work is the state of an employee working optimally with his best performance to achieve his potential so that it has a positive impact on the company. Some factors include happiness, namely, the in-outside factor explains the extent to which employees feel factors that are within themselves, such as the desire to be achieved, security and comfort at work and positive contributions to the company and the outside-in factor explains the extent to which employees feel the positive impact of company conditions on feedback on employees' growth desires.

RESEARCH METHODS

This research uses quantitative methods on millennial employees aged 21-39 years working in e-commerce/startup companies, call centres, banking and insurance / pialang in the Kuningan area of South Jakarta, totalling 100 employees. The sampling technique used is a non-random purposive sampling technique using the PLS-SEM analysis method through SmartPLS version 3 software.

RESULTS

Convergent Validity

Convergent validity determines the validity of each relationship between an indicator and a latent variable. The convergent validity of the measurement model with reflexive indicators is assessed based on the correlation between the item score/component score estimated with PLS software. Individual reflexive measures are considered high if they correlate more than 0.7. However, according to Chin in Ghozali (2021), a loading value of 0.5 to 0.6 is considered sufficient for early stage research from developing a measurement

scale.

Table 1. *Outer Loading*

Variable		Outer Loadings
Workload	X1.1	0.895
	X1.2	0.857
	X1.3	0.908
	X1.4	0.909
	X1.5	0.888
	X1.6	0.888
Work Life Balance	X2.1	0.760
	X2.2	0.840
	X2.3	0.864
	X2.4	0.792
	X2.5	0.825
	X2.6	0.785
	X2.7	0.808
	X2.8	0.778
Challenge Leadership	X3.1	0.882
	X3.2	0.920
	X3.3	0.895
	X3.4	0.736
	X3.5	0.813
	X3.6	0.755
	X3.7	0.819
	X3.8	0.855
	X3.9	0.786
	X3.10	0.867
Happiness At Work	Y1.1	0.808
	Y1.2	0.779
Variable		**Outer Loadings**
	Y1.3	0.871
	Y1.4	0.884

Source: *Output SmartPLS* data processing by author (2023)

The table 1 convergent validity test obtained the outer loading value for each variable indicator is greater than 0.7. It is mean that all indicators of each variable are valid.

Discriminant Validity

Discriminant Validity is to test that each latent variable is not confused by respondents who answer the questionnaire based on other latent variable questions. This test uses the cross loading value. According to Chin, cited by Ghozali (2021) if the cross loading value of the indicator on the variable is the largest compared to other variables, the data is said to be valid.

Table 2. *Discriminant Validity*

Indicator	Variable			
	Workload (X1)	Work Life Balance (X2)	Challenge Leadership (X3)	Hapiness at Work(Y)
X1.1	0.895	0.689	0.571	0.475

X1.2	0.857	0.641	0.576	0.456
X1.3	0.908	0.801	0.681	0.602
X1.4	0.909	0.792	0.668	0.561
X1.5	0.888	0.689	0.556	0.467
X1.6	0.888	0.688	0.629	0.481
X2.1	0.732	0.760	0.570	0.528
X2.2	0.771	0.840	0.674	0.672
X2.3	0.762	0.864	0.638	0.649
X2.4	0.673	0.792	0.615	0.561
X2.5	0.554	0.825	0.639	0.696
X2.6	0.531	0.785	0.571	0.712
X2.7	0.589	0.808	0.758	0.728
X2.8	0.604	0.778	0.744	0.816
X3.1	0.717	0.815	0.882	0.769
X3.2	0.504	0.590	0.920	0.728
X3.3	0.662	0.761	0.895	0.791
X3.4	0.666	0.793	0.736	0.827
X3.5	0.637	0.696	0.813	0.620
X3.6	0.452	0.559	0.755	0.694
X3.7	0.768	0.708	0.819	0.607
X3.8	0.433	0.570	0.855	0.739
X3.9	0.486	0.706	0.786	0.808
X3.10	0.399	0.504	0.867	0.712
Y1.1	0.483	0.615	0.780	0.808
Y1.2	0.441	0.603	0.726	0.779
Y1.3	0.497	0.784	0.705	0.871
Y1.4	0.495	0.787	0.720	0.884

Source: Output SmartPLS data processing by author (2023)

Based on table 2, it can be seen that each indicator value of the yellow cross loadings variable has a higher loading value than the indicators for other variables. It mean that the indicators in the study have good discriminant validity in compiling their respective variables.

Outer Model Analysis (**Reliability Test**)

The reliability test is carried out to measure the construct to show the instrument's accuracy, accuracy and consistency. There are two methods of measuring the reliability of a construct with reflexive indicators : Cronbach alpha and composite reliability. The test criteria state that if the composite reliability is > 0.7 and Cronbach alpha is > 0.6, the variable is declared reliable discriminant validity of the measurement model with reflection indicators is assessed based on Cross Loading measurements.

Table 3. Variable Realibility

Variabel	Cronbach's Alpha	Composite Reliability	Average Variance Extracted (AVE)
Workload (X1)	0.948	0.959	0.794
Work Life Balance (X2)	0.923	0.937	0.651
Challenge Leadership (X3)	0.951	0.958	0.697
Hapiness at Work (Y)	0.863	0.903	0.709

Source: Output SmartPLS data processing by author (2023)

Based on table 3, the Cronbach alpha value for each variable is greater than> 0.6. This shows that each variable has a high reliability value. And the composite reliability value for each variable is greater than 0.7. And likewise, the overall average variance extracted value above 0.5. This show that each variables are reliable.

Inner Model Analysis
R-Square

The structural model is assessed using PLS by considering the R value^2 on each endogenous latent variable as the predictive power of the structural model. Changes in the value of R^2 are used to explain the effect on certain exogenous latent variables on endogenous latent variables, whether they have a substantive effect or not. The value of R^2 is explained by the size of the model, namely strong (0.75), moderate (0.50) and weak (0.25). The PLS result of R^2 presents the amount of *variance of the* construct described by the model (Chin in Ghozali, 2021).

Table 4. R-Square Score and R-Square Adjusted

Variable	R Square	R Square Adjusted
Hapiness at work	0.858	0.853
Challenge Leadership	0,662	0,655

Source: Output SmartPLS data processing by author (2023)

Based on the table above, the value of R2 for the happiness at work variable is 0.858, which means it is in the strong category. While the R value for the leadership variable is 0.662 and is in the moderate or moderate category.

Goodness of Fit

The goodness of fit value known from the Q-Square value has the same meaning as the R-square value in a linear regression analysis where the higher the Q-Square value, the better the model can be said or fit with the data.

Tabel 6. Goodness of Fit Score

Variabel	SSO	SSE	Q² (=1-SSE/SSO)
Hapiness at Work	400.000	166.318	0.584
Challenge Leadership	1000.000	554,123	0,446

Source: Output SmartPLS data processing by author (2023)

Based on the table above, the Q-square value for the Hapiness at Work variable is 0.589 and the leadership variable is 0.446, so it can be concluded that this research model has a fairly fit performance against the data.

Hypothesis Test

The significance of the estimated parameters provides very useful information about the relationship between the research variables. To assess the significance of the prediction model in structural model testing can be seen from the T-statistic value between the independent variable and the dependent variable in the bootstrapped Path Coefficient table. The criteria for assessing this T-statistic can be seen if the T-statistic> 1.96 at the P-value significance level of 0.05 (Hair et al. in Ghozali, 2021). The following are the significance criteria or t-statistic:
1. If the t-statistic value is more than 1.96 or > 1.96 and the P-Values show less than

0.05 or < 0.05, then the path coefficient is said to be significant and the hypothesis can be accepted.
2. If the t-statistic value is less than 1.96 or < 1.96 and the P-Values value shows more than 0.05 or P-Values> 0.05, the path coefficient is said to be insignificant and the hypothesis is rejected.

Table 7 *Path Coefficient*

	Original Sample	*Sample Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*T Statistics*	*P Values*
Workload -> Hapiness at Work	-0.365	-0.364	0.083	4.375	0.000
Work Life Balance -> Hapiness atWork	0.638	0.629	0.119	5.360	0.000
Workload -> Challenge Leadership	0,104	0,069	0,134	0,777	0,437
Work Life Balance -> Challenge Leadership	0,728	0,764	0,118	6,163	0,000
Challenge Leadership -> Hapiness at Work	0.603	0.611	0.073	8.216	0.000
Workload -> Challenge Leadership -> Hapiness at Work	0,063	0,038	0,083	0,760	0,448
Work Life Balance -> Challenge Leadership ->Hapiness at Work	0,439	0,470	0,110	3,986	0,000

Source: Output SmartPLS data processing by author (2023)

Based on table 7, it can be concluded that several hypotheses are accepted and significant because they have t-statistic values of more than 1.96 or > 1.96 and P-values show numbers less than 0.05 or < 0.05. However, it is slightly different in the workload hypothesis on happiness at work which has a negative original sample value. And also different in the workload hypothesis to happiness at work and the workload hypothesis to happiness at work through leadership which has a P-value above 0.05 it can be concluded that both hypotheses are not significant.

DISCUSSION

The analysis results of the Workload variable have a significant negative effect on Happiness at Work. These results follow research conducted by Pujotomo et al. (2020). Based on the hypothesis test results, a direct effect shows that the Workload variable significantly affects Happiness at Work. The Workload charged to employees must follow employees' abilities to create happiness at Work. Research by Mahawati et al. (2021) says Workload is the volume of Work imposed on labor in the form of both physical and mental and is their responsibility. That way employees who have light physical and mental workloads will have high happiness at Work so that their performance increases.

This is also encouraged by the findings of Yuridha (2022), reducing employee workload can increase their job happiness. Because employees will be happier if given fewer tasks and more free time. So it can be proven that the lower the Workload felt by millennial employees in the Kuningan Area, South Jakarta, the more they feel happy at Work and the better their performance.

Contrary to generation X employees or generations above generation Y, who have different characteristics from millennials, namely having high loyalty to the company where they work. It can be said that this generation tends to be happy if given a high workloadbut still following their abilities and it is normal to do work that exceeds working hours. This generation also says work is so important and not boring that they choose work and sacrifice personal interests (Chandra et al., 2017).

Whereas millennials are very calculating about their Workload. The less it is, the more free time they have for their personal life. Most millennial employee respondents in this study work in e-commerce/startup companies and insurance/brokerage companies. After further research, some respondents have workloads that exceed their abilities, especially in insurance/brokerage companies. Millennial employees who work in insurance/brokerage companies say that their workload are often increased. Leaving them with no free time for their personal lives. If the workloadis high, it will reduce the level of happiness of millennial employees at Work.

Likewise, with the work-life balance variable, this research follows research conducted by Jannah and Suryani (2020) that the work life balance variable significantly affects happiness at work. This shows where the existence of work life balance plays a role and affects happiness at Work. When the balance between life and Work can be achieved, it will bring happiness to oneself and one will feel more satisfied with their Work. This proves that millennial employees who work in the Kuningan Area, South Jakarta, want a balance between life and Work. If it is all balanced, they will be happy at Work and can achieve company targets easier.

Furthermore, the hypothesis results of Workload directly do not affect challenge leadership. This means that Workload is not the main variable in determining one's leadership. In line with the research of Sulastriningsih et al. (2018), which states that Workload has no significant effect, the amount of Workload given will not affect satisfaction in leadership. That way the Low or high Workload felt by millennial employees will not affect the leadership role.

The results of the work-life balance hypothesis on challenge leadership are significant. Unlikethe results of the workload hypothesis, this work life balance affects leadership. This showsthat the balance between personal life and work in millennial employees affects leadership roles. The results of this hypothesis also support Nwagbara's (2020) research that work life balance can affect leadership roles. With the balance between life and Work, leaders can provide the right policies. When work-life balance is fulfilled, it will allow leaders to anticipate all forms of obstacles, have a vision for the future and maintain flexibility.

The hypothesis results from challenge leadership support the findings of previous research by Isa et al (2019) which concluded that leadership significantly affects happiness at work. The role of the leader is very important in determining employee happiness. Leader who had good character, is firm and motivates employees to face challenges will make employees feel comfortable. The better the leadership style, the more happiness at work will be created. Terry & Leslie (2020) also say leadership is the natural growth of people united for one purpose in a group. This proves that leadership determines employee happiness at Work. The challenge leadership style matches the characteristics of millennial employees who set a good example at work such as always innovating, facing existing challenges, and having a vision and a strategic plan.

Workload has no effect on happiness at Work through challenge leadership. This shows that workload does not indirectly affect happiness at work through challenge leadership. Millennial employees with high or low workloads cannot always increase happiness at work if workload cannot influence their leadership. The results of the work life balance hypothesis on happiness at work through challenge leadership are positive and significant. This shows that millennial employees who have achieved a balance between their life and work will be able to affect their happiness at work if the balance can affect their leadership. This is a new finding that challenge leadership is an intervening variable between work life balance and happiness at Work.

CONCLUSIONS

1. Workload negatively and significantly affects happiness at work for millennialemployees in the Kuningan area, South Jakarta. This means that if the workload given is low for millennial employees, it will impact their happiness at work.
2. Work life balance has a positive and significant effect on happiness at work on millennial employees in the Kuningan area, South Jakarta with the highest original samplevalue among other variables. This follows the characteristics of millennials who prioritize balancing personal and work life.
3. Workload does not significantly affect challenge leadership in millennial employees in the Kuningan Area, South Jakarta. Workload has no impact on leadership roles.
4. Work life balance positively and significantly affects challenge leadership in millennial employees in the Kuningan Area, South Jakarta. Work-life balance has an impact on leadership roles.
5. Challenge leadership positively and significantly affects happiness at work formillennial employees in the Kuningan area, South Jakarta. Leadership roles have a positive impacton happiness at work
6. Workload does not significantly affect happiness at work through challenge leadership in millennial employees in the Kuningan area, South Jakarta. According to millennial employees, the workload on happiness is not determined by the role of leadership.
7. Work-life balance positively and significantly affects happiness at work through the challenge leadership of millennial employees in the Kuningan area, South Jakarta. Interesting findings: Work-life balance, if mediated by leadership factors, will affect happiness at work.

This research suggests that in the future, companies must pay attention to workload, work life balance, leadership and happiness at work for their employees, especially millennial employees who have different characteristics from previous generations.

REFERENCES

Badan Pusat Statistik (BPS). (2021). Hasil Sensus Penduduk Tahun 2020.

Budiati, I. , Yuni S. , Windhiarso P.A. , Sofaria A. , Henri A.R. , Putri L. , Nia S. , Aprilia I.P. & Valent G.S. (2018). Statistik Gender Tematik. Jakarta. Kementerian Pemberdayaan Perempuan dan Perlindungan Anak.

Chandra, D.O., Aida V.S.H., Dadang S.(2017). Kepuasan Kerja Generasi X dan Yterhadap Komitmen Kerja di Bank Mandiri Palembang. Jurnal Aplikasi Bisnis dan Manahemen, *3* (1)*,* 12-22.

Deloitte.com. (2019). Generasi Millenial dalam Industri 4.0: Berkah bagi Source Daya Manusiaatau Ancaman?. Diperoleh dari https://www2.deloitte.com/content/dam/Deloitte/id/Documents/about-deloitte/id-about-dip-edition-1-chapter-2-id-sep2019.pdf

Fisher, B. d. (2009). Beyond Work and Family: A Measure of Work/Nonwork Interference and Enhancement. Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 12 (1), 441 – 456

Ghozali, I. (2021). Partial Least Squares Konsep Teknik dan Aplikasi menggunakan Program SmartPLS 3.2.9 untuk Penelitian Empiris. Semarang: Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponogoro.

Hidayatullah, S., Waris, A., Devianti, R. C., Sari, S. R., Wibowo, I. A. & PW, P. M. (2018). Perilaku generasi millenial dalam menggunakan aplikasi *go food*. Jurnal Manajemen & Kewirausahaan, *6* (2), 240-249.

Isa, K., Tenah, S., S., Atim, A. & Jam, A., M. (2019). Leading Happiness: Leadership and Happiness at a Workplace. International Journal of Recent Technology and Engineering, *8* (3), 6551 – 6533.

Jannah, F. & suryani, I. 2020. Pengaruh Work Life Balance terhadap Kebahagiaan yang

dimediasi oleh Self – Esteem pada Karyawan Sektor Perbankan Kota Banda Aceh. Jurnal Manajemen Inovasi, *11* (1), 124 -137.

Jobstreet   (2020).   Covid   19   Job   Report.   Diperoleh   dari www.jobstreet.co.id/en/cms/employer/wp-content/themes/jobstreet employer/assets/report/covid-19-job-report-id/JobStreet-COVID-19-JOB-REPORT-INDONESIA-FINAL-27082020.pdf

Kouzes, J., & Posner, B. (2012). Thae Leadership Challenge. California: Wiley.

Mahani, D.S., Isa M. & Reny I. (2020). Beban Kerja Mental dan Pendapatan dengan Kebahagiaan di Tempat Kerja pada Dosen di Universitas Jember. Jurnal Ikesma, *16* (1), 16 – 26

Mahawati, E., I. Yuniwati, R.Ferinia, P.P.Rahayu, T.Fani, A.P. Sari, R.A. Setijaningsih, Q. Fitriyatinur, A.P. Sesilia, I. Mayasari, I.K. Dewi, S. Bahri. (2021). Analisis Beban Kerja dan Produktivitas Kerja. Medan: Yayasan Kita Menulis.

Nwagbara, U. (2020). Institutions and organisational work-lifebalance (WLB) policies and practices: Exploring the challenges faced by Nigerian female workers. Jorunal of Work-Applied Management, 43

Peramesti, N., P., D. & Dedi K.. (2018). Kepemimpinan Ideal pada Era Generasi Millenial. Jurnal Manajemen Pemerintahan, *10* (1), 73-84.

Pryce-Jones, J. (2010). Happiness at work: Maximizing your psychological capital for success. USA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Pujotomo, I., Sasmoko, A. Bandur, & Nugroho J. S. (2020). The Effect of Workloads on Work Satisfaction with Work Structure as a Variable of Mediation. Indian of Journal of Public Health Research and Development, *11* (1), 1844 – 1847.

Sulastriningsih, R., D., Komalasari, Y. & Handayani, R., D. (2018). Beban Kerja dan Kepemimpinan Transformasional Implikasinya pada Kepuasan Kerja Karyawan. Ecodemica journal, *2*(2), 156-163

Tarwaka. (2015). Ergonomi Industri Dasar-Dasar Pengetahuan Ergonomi Dan Aplikasi di Tempat Kerja. Surakarta: Harapan Press

Terry. G.R. & Leslie W.R. (2020). Dasar – Dasar Manajemen (Ed. Revisi). Jakarta : Bumi Aksara.

The Global Economy.com. 2021. Indonesia: Happiness Index. Diperoleh dari www.theglobaleconomy.com/Indonesia/happiness.

Yap, W.M. & Siti K.Z.B. (2020). What Makers Millenials Happy in Their Workplace?. Asian Academy of Management Journal, *25* (1), 103 – 121.

Yuridha, R. (2022). Pengaruh Beban Kerja, Stres Kerja dan Job Crafting terhadap Kepuasan Kerja Karyawan. Sibatik Journal, *1* (9), 1781-1791.