RSF Conference Proceeding Series: Business, Management and Social Science, Vol. 3 No. 3 (2023) https://doi.org/10.31098/bmss.v3i3.673

Check for updates

Research Paper

Adapting the Supportive Work Environment Measurement Tool: Assessing Organizational Support in Generation Z

Shanty Komalasari[1]*, Segar Handoyo[1], Nuri Herachwati[1]
[1] Postgraduate School Universitas Airlangga, Indonesia

Received : August 7, 2023	Revised : August 10, 2023	Accepted : August 11, 2023	Online : September 5, 2023

Abstract

A supportive work environment is an environment that makes employees feel comfortable working and supports employee retention. A supportive work environment in the workplace consists of a desirable climatic environment, healthy and mutually constructive relationships between colleagues and superiors and available organizational support. A supportive work environment has four dimensions: perceived climate, peer group interaction, supervisory support, and organizational support. Using instruments with different cultural backgrounds requires an adaptation process so that the measurement results are valid and reliable. Still, until now, there has yet to be any research on the adaptation of supportive work environment measurement tools in Indonesia. This study aimed to obtain and test the standardized Indonesian version of the supporting work environment instrument. The adaptation process is carried out using the International Test Commission 2016 reference. The analysis model used is the Structural Equation Model / SEM; it can be concluded that according to theory, the dimensions of perceived climate, peer group interaction, supervisory support, and perceived organizational support have a good fit model with several omitted adjustments. It is explained that the resulting model can describe the actual conditions but with a few notes to consider.

Keywords *Adaptation Of Measurement Tools, Generation Z and A Supportive Work Environment*

INTRODUCTION

A well-planned HR management significantly impacts achieving organizational goals (Sholatiah et al., 2022). HR is a crucial factor in organizational development as it represents a valuable asset. Efficient management, including finance and HR, is necessary for effective human resource development. Sufficient and quality human resources are essential for achieving company goals (Lestari et al., 2023). Employee turnover can strengthen organizations. Before the 1980s, companies offered lifetime employment in exchange for high employee loyalty. Over time, different generations, including Generation Z (born between 1995 and 2010), emerged as digital natives with expertise in technology and multitasking capabilities (Zis et al., 2021). The rise of the Internet and digitization creates challenges, especially for mass media companies trying to integrate digital platforms to cater to Generation Z (Munsch, 2021). This intense competition, talent mobility, and shortage of managerial talent have made the organizational landscape increasingly worrying over the last decade.

The ongoing global recession and industrial downturn drive executive turnover across all sectors. As business conditions occasionally improve, industrial companies face fresh challenges in talent retention (Ghosh & Sahney, 2011). Talented individuals create intrinsic value, crucial for survival in intense competition. Workers from different generations also compete to reach their full potential, adding pressure that can be alleviated through a supportive work environment.

A supportive work environment (SWE) improves performance and employee retention. SWE encompasses a desirable climate, positive relationships between colleagues and superiors, and organizational support (Rhoades et al., 2001; Kennedy & Daim, 2010; Ghosh & Sahney, 2011). It is

Corresponding author's email: shanty.komalasari-2022@pasca.unair.ac.id

measured through climate perceptions, supervisory relationships, peer-group interaction, and perceived organizational support (POS) (Rhoades et al., 2001; Ghosh & Sahney, 2011). Boswell, Tully and Mills (2017) describe SWE as comprising components like peer supervision/support, barriers, and opportunities for applying learned behaviours at work. Different researchers have examined SWE in various aspects, such as adaptive support (e.g., language and culture training), career support (e.g., individual career plans, professional accomplishments), and financial support (e.g., compensation, incentives) (Kraemer et al., 2004). Meanwhile, Bhanthumnavin (2003) considers emotional support, informational support (work-related suggestions and feedback), and material support (Naz et al., 2020). For this study, the authors focus on four dimensions of SWE from various sources.

Table 1. The dimensions of a supportive work environment

Dimensions	Dimension Interpretation	Symbol
Perceived Climate	Where an organization can create a conducive work environment and can overshadow all of its employees without exception	PC
Peer Group Interaction	Where there is positive interaction and relationship between colleagues, it can lead to work involvement.	PGI
Supervisory Support	Where the direct supervisor can show tenderness and sympathy for the opinions of employees and is also able to show gratitude	SR
Perceived Organizational Support	Perceived organizational support (POS) is shown by employees' trust that the organization will provide support and appreciate the contributions made.	POS

Changing times have led to extensive research on Supportive Work Environments (SWE) and Generation Z. Studies have developed instruments to modify SWE dimensions for readability, considering regional organizational cultures (Zis et al., 2021). Applying Social Exchange Theory, the research emphasizes its relevance at the individual level, where employer-worker interdependence influences job retention. Trust, work-life balance, a supportive work environment, and motivational relationships impact employees' sense of value (Yusliza et al., 2021). Good person-organization fit depends on employees' perception of organizational ethics, values, and behaviours (Yusliza et al., 2021). Crucial work environment sub-constructions include organization, supervision, and peer support (Dawson et al., 2015). Organizational and social support theories establish a relationship between support and affective commitment (Rhoades et al., 2001). An enabling midwifery environment involves various aspects (Dawson et al., 2015). Supportive work environments enhance performance and foster innovation (Naz et al., 2020). This study aims to test a measuring instrument for SWE among Generation Z, focusing on perceived climate, peer group interaction, supervisory support, and perceived organizational support.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Supportive Work Environment (SWE) is described as working conditions, including a favourable work environment, healthy and constructive relationships between colleagues and superiors, and the support provided by the organization (Naz et al., 2020). A supportive work

environment is a condition in the workplace where employees feel supported, valued, and empowered to achieve individual and company goals. A supportive work environment promotes employee well-being, collaboration, open communication, and professional development (Winata & Martdianty, 2022). The supportive work environment in this study can be understood as a work environment that is designed and arranged in such a way as to provide support and facilitate Generation Z employees in South Kalimantan, as well as promote employee welfare and productivity.

Kundu & Lata (2017) classify the four components that make up SWE, namely:

A. Perceived climate (PC) is where an organization can create a conducive work environment and accommodate all its employees without exception.
B. Peer group interaction (PGI), where there are interactions and positive relationships between colleagues so that they can lead to work involvement.
C. Supervisory support (SR), where the direct supervisor can show gentleness and sympathy for employees' opinions and can also show gratitude.
D. Perceived organizational support (POS) is shown by employees' trust that the organization will support and appreciate the contributions made.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study aims to test measuring instruments for assessing the supportive work environment in Generation Z. It involves dimensions of perceived climate, peer group interaction, supervisory support, and perceived organizational support. The research is quantitative, specifically ex-post facto research. The sample consists of 104 Generation Z individuals aged 13 to 28 who have worked in South Kalimantan. Snowball sampling, a non-probability sampling technique, was used due to the l region's limited availability of Generation Z employees. Data was collected using an online questionnaire via Google Forms, with 104 Generation Z employees from South Kalimantan participating in the study. The questionnaire was distributed for a week, from 21 to 28 May 2023. This research is a measuring instrument adaptation study supportive work environment (Rhoades et al., 2001; Kennedy & Daim, 2010; Ghosh & Sahney, 2011; Naz et al., 2020) gave rise to a four-factor structure with latently correlated dimensions, namely perceived climate, peer group interaction, supervisory support and perceived organizational support. So, in this study, the validity test will be carried out through four dimensions of a supportive work environment.

Research Procedure

Guidelines for translating and adapting test kits issued by Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing (American Psychological Association et al., 2014) are in the ITC Guidelines for Translating and Adapting Tests. This ITC guide is structured comprehensively because it explains the stages in test development, administration, and documentation. The steps for adapting the measuring instrument used in this study are ITC Guidelines for Translating and Adapting Test (Wardhani et al., 2022). The research process can be summarized in several key stages:

A. Precondition level: Researchers communicate via email, obtaining permission to proceed. They peer review with friends to assess construct suitability and measurement tool familiarity.
B. Test development level: The English version is translated to Indonesian using appropriate procedures, ensuring content equivalence. Evidence is provided to support the translation's validity and acceptance by all populations.
C. Synthesis level: Discussions between two translators facilitated by the researcher result in a draft of the Indonesian version, with cultural suitability considered.
D. Retranslation level: The Indonesian version is retranslated back to English by a relevant

translator.

E. Expert review level: Translation results are previewed by experts, focusing on constructs, ethics, culture, and language.
F. Readability test: A readability test is conducted to ensure an easy understanding of instructions and items in the questionnaire.
G. Data collection: The measuring instrument is administered online, ensuring ethical considerations and consent. Data is collected from Generation Z participants in South Kalimantan.
H. Data analysis: Questionnaire data is analyzed using reliability tests, item analysis, and validity tests through structural equation analysis (SEM).

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Findings

This study aims to test the measurement of a supportive work environment for Generation Z using the standardized Indonesian version, which involves perceived climate, peer group interaction, supervisory support, and perceived organizational support. Before using the measuring tool, a trial run is conducted to assess its feasibility. The translation process from English to Indonesian is done using a translator tool. After translation, the measuring instruments are tested for legibility and reliability using Cronbach's Alpha statistical method. A coefficient closer to 1 indicates a strong relationship based on the correlation criteria.

The reliability test on the scale and dimensions of the supportive work environment was conducted using Cronbach's Alpha coefficient in four dimensions. The Kaplan and Saccuzzo (2012) criteria were used to determine the instrument's reliability, where a value < 0.65 indicates reliability, and $\alpha < 0.65$ indicates unreliability. This study utilizes structural equation model analysis (SEM) to analyze the proposed research model. SEM is a statistical methodology that uses a confirmatory approach to conduct multivariate analysis based on occurring phenomena (Mueller & Hancock, 2018). SEM consists of two models: the measurement model, which defines how hypothetical variables are measured based on observed variables and describes tools such as reliability and validity, and the structural equation model, which defines the relationships between variables and describes unexplained variants. The researcher employed a complete structural model with observed variables to analyze the structural equation. The Lisrel output presents loading factors as composite indicators and factor value estimates. A loading factor close to or equal to 1 indicates a strong relationship, and this is known as a discriminant validity test to ensure that different constructs do not correlate.

Table 2. Loading Factor Before Elimination

	Supportive Work Environment
SWE1	0.710
SWE10	0.684
SWE11	0.831
SWE12	0.837
SWE13	0.773
SWE14	0.744
SWE15	0.758
SWE16	-0.287
SWE17	0.709
SWE18	0.560

SWE19	0.671
SWE2	0.767
SWE3	0.786
SWE4	0.533
SWE5	0.526
SWE6	0.445
SWE7	0.363
SWE8	0.631
SWE9	0.773

The convergent validity test is calculated based on the value of the loading factor or outer loading. Where is a valid indicator if the outer loading value is > 0.5. Thus, the results in the table above have variable indicators stating that items have a value <0.5, so they need to be excluded from the model.

Table 3. Loading Factor After Elimination

Supportive Work Environment	
SWE1	0.707
SWE10	0.695
SWE11	0.832
SWE12	0.842
SWE13	0.779
SWE14	0.745
SWE15	0.756
SWE17	0.704
SWE18	0.547
SWE2	0.777
SWE3	0.787
SWE4	0.530
SWE5	0.514
SWE8	0.643
SWE9	0.785

The convergent validity test is calculated based on the value of the loading factor or outer loading. Where is a valid indicator if the outer loading value is > 0.5. Thus, the results in Table 3 for all variables state that all items have a value of > 0.5, meaning that all indicators are valid or feasible in preparing first order and second order in the SEM model construct.

Determination Test (R Square)

The "R square" calculation determines how much the independent variables, financial inclusion and financial literacy, influence sustainable development and social capital mediation. The percentage of the dependent variable that the independent variables can explain is determined through this test. The value of 0 for R2 indicates that there is no effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable, so none of the examined variables succeeded in translating the variation of the dependent variable. Suppose the value of R2 = 1 indicates that the influence exerted by the independent variable on the dependent variable is perfect. In that case, the independent variable

can translate 100% (fully) of the variation in the dependent variable. If the value of R2 is less than 1, this indicates that the independent variable cannot translate 100% (fully) of the variation in the dependent variable.

Table 4. R Square Latent Variable

	R-square	R-square adjusted
Supportive Work Environment	0.429	0.423

The statistical output above shows that the amount of R Square in a supportive work environment is 0.429, which means 42.9%.

Composite Reliability, Cronbach Alpha, Average Variance Extracted

The outer model can also be measured based on the results of the construct reliability or the composite reliability value, which is the choice for the Cronbach Alpha test to determine convergent validity in the reflective model. The variation in composite reliability values is around 0–1. In an exploratory study, the value was 0.6–0.7 with confirmatory research. Meanwhile, the composite reliability value > 0.9 indicates a small error.

The AVE test is known to be based on convergent values and convergent validity. The results of the AVE test itself will explain each latent factor in the model. It can be stated as strong if the AVE is > 0.5 and the AVE value is required > the cross-loading correlation value. If the magnitude of AVE < 0.5 means it has a high error rate. The Cronbach Alpha test can explain convergent validity, with Cronbach Alpha criteria > 0.8 included in a good scale, and> 0.7 means that it is included in the scale that has been accepted. Greater than 0.6 is included in a scale that has a low estimate.

Table 5. Composite Reliability, Cronbach Alpha, Average Variance Extracted

	Cronbach 's alpha	Composite reliability (rho_a)	Composite reliability (rho_c)	The average variance extracted (AVE)
Supportive Work Environment	0.931	0.943	0.939	0.514

Discriminant validity is a way to compare the AVE value of each part with the correlation of other constructs in a model. If the AVE value > the correlation of all other constructs, it means that there is good discriminant validity. It is recommended for the magnitude of the measuring value > 0.5. As per the table above, all construct variables yield values > 0.5, meaning that all indicators in the construct are valid or by the discriminant and convergent validity requirements in establishing SEM modelling.

Composite reliability is part of an indicator that calculates variables with good composite reliability if the value is ≥ 0.7. As for testing the reliability of the composite, evaluation can be carried out through two types of measurements, namely Cronbach's Alpha and internal consistency. Based on the results of the table above, the magnitude of the composite reliability of all constructs, namely > 0.7, is very good. This means that all the variables in constructing the constructed model are reliable. Meanwhile, the Cronbach Alpha test results for all constructs yielded > 0.8, meaning that all constructs comply with the reliability test requirements with Cronbach Alpha.

Discussion

Globalization increases employee turnover, requiring revisions to traditional HR procedures. This turnover leads to losing highly skilled staff (Yusliza et al., 2021). A supportive work environment fosters a positive climate, encouraging employee togetherness (Timothy &

Kevin, 1988; Naz et al., 2020). It benefits employees and employers (Tripathi & Kalia, 2022). External forces affect the organizational environment and impact performance and resources (Ladwig et al., 2022): Broad stress organization, supervision, and peer support as key sub-constructions. Organizational and social support theories link support to employee commitment (Rhoades et al., 2001). Naz et al. (2020) confirm that a supportive work environment enhances employee association with the organization, improving performance and fostering innovation.

HR is the organization's vital asset due to the diverse intelligence, thoughts, skills, and behaviours of humans, leading to effective changes (Wiig, 2012). Effective HR management is crucial for organizational development (Rahmatillah et al., 2022). With Generation X (age 57-42), Generation Y/Millennials (age 41-26), and Generation Z (age 25-15) in the current workforce demographics, planning to supervise Generation Z early is essential for thriving in a competitive industrial world (Business 2 Community, 2018). Generation Z (1996-2010) is known for its unique attributes like adaptability, collaboration, and eagerness to explore innovative approaches to problem-solving (Andrea et al., 2016). They prefer multiple jobs and adaptable work environments. Generation Z's technological proficiency facilitates the quick achievement of company targets (Komalasari et al., 2022).

The internal work environment is another factor that significantly impacts employee innovation and creativity (Çokpekin & Knudsen, 2012; Birdi et al., 2016). In a supportive work environment, employees can create, utilize and implement new ideas, thus improving their performance (Phuong et al., 2021). Usually, employees are supported by the organization through benefits, compensation and necessary resources. Previous research has suggested that a supportive work environment and employees' perceptions of this support are the basis of innovative work behaviour (Prieto & Pérez-Santana, 2014). Referring to the research results above, the learning agility measuring tool, which originally consisted of 25 items, has changed to 18 items because some of the item correlation test results show invalid item results.

CONCLUSIONS

This research aims to adapt a measuring instrument for the supportive work environment in Indonesia for Generation Z. The instrument measures four dimensions: perceived climate, peer group interaction, supervisory support, and perceived organizational support, with good validity and reliability. The sample size should be increased for a better fit to improve its effectiveness. Some items exhibit correlation issues and can be removed without affecting the accuracy of the SEM calculations.

Understanding a supportive work environment for Generation Z is crucial, especially in the era of Society 5.0, with multiple generations coexisting. Future research can focus on enhancing the supportive work environment for Generation Z employees and organizations, providing valuable insights for further studies. Cross-cultural studies using this tool can also benefit Generation Z employees and help companies improve employee performance. Improving the supportive work environment is essential in Industrial and Organizational Psychology in Indonesia.

REFERENCES

Andrea, B., Gabriella, H. and Tímea, J. (2016) 'Y and Z Generations at Workplaces', 8(3), pp. 90–106. https://doi.org/10.7441/joc.2016.03.06.

Association, A. E. R. *et al.* (2014) 'Standards for educational and psychological testing', *(No Title)*.

Bhanthumnavin, D. (2003) 'Perceived social support from supervisor and group members' psychological and situational characteristics as predictors of subordinate performance in Thai work units', *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 14(1), pp. 79–97.

Birdi, K., Leach, D. and Magadley, W. (2016) 'The relationship of individual capabilities and

environmental support with different facets of designers' innovative behaviour', *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 33(1), pp. 19–35.

Boswell, C., Tully, J. and Mills, T. (2017) 'Mindfulness training: Building a supportive environment'.

Broad, M. L. and Newstrom, J. W. (1992) *Transfer of Training: Action-Packed Strategies To Ensure High Payoff from Training Investments.* ERIC.

Çokpekin, Ö. and Knudsen, M. P. (2012) 'Does organizing for creativity lead to innovation?', *Creativity and innovation management*, 21(3), pp. 304–314.

Ghosh, K. and Sahney, S. (2011) 'Impact of organizational sociotechnical system on managerial retention: A general linear modelling approach', *Journal of Modelling in Management*, 6(1), pp. 33–59. doi: 10.1108/17465661111112494.

Kaplan, R. M. and Saccuzzo, D. P. (2012) 'Pengukuran Psikologi: Prinsip, penerapan, dan isu', *Jakarta: Salemba Humanika*.

Kennedy, E. and Daim, T. U. (2010) 'A strategy to assist management in workforce engagement and employee retention in the high tech engineering environment', *Evaluation and program planning*, 33(4), pp. 468–476.

Komalasari, S. *et al.* (2022) 'Prinsip Character of A Leader pada Generasi Z', *Philanthropy: Journal of Psychology*, 6(1), pp. 77–91.

Kraemer, G. W., Lord, W. D. and Heilbrun, K. (2004) 'Comparing single and serial homicide offenses', *Behavioral Sciences \& the Law*, 22(3), pp. 325–343.

Kundu, S. C. and Lata, K. (2017) 'Effects of supportive work environment on employee retention: Mediating role of organizational engagement', *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 25(4), pp. 703–722. doi: 10.1108/IJOA-12-2016-1100.

Ladwig, K.-H. *et al.* (2022) 'Mental health-related risk factors and interventions in patients with heart failure: a position paper endorsed by the European Association of Preventive Cardiology (EAPC)', *European Journal of Preventive Cardiology*, 29(7), pp. 1124–1141.

Lestari, D., Nasihah, R. and Komalasari, S. (2023) 'Role of Work Value to Organizational Commitment', in *Conference of Psychology and Flourishing Humanity (PFH 2022)*, pp. 293–301.

Mueller, R. O. and Hancock, G. R. (2018) 'Structural equation modeling', in *The reviewer's guide to quantitative methods in the social sciences*. Routledge, pp. 445–456.

Munsch, A. (2021) 'Millennial and generation Z digital marketing communication and advertising effectiveness: A qualitative exploration', *Journal of Global Scholars of Marketing Science*, 31(1), pp. 10–29.

Naz, S. *et al.* (2020) 'A Study in the Relationship Between Supportive Work Environment and Employee Retention: Role of Organizational Commitment and Person–Organization Fit as Mediators', *SAGE Open*, 10(2). doi: 10.1177/2158244020924694.

Phuong, N. D., Quynh, P. H. and Hien, H. T. T. (2021) 'Supportive Work Environment and Teacher's Innovative Work Behaviour: The Mediating Role of Informal Learning in Vietnam', *Review of Economics and Finance*, 19(2016), pp. 97–106. doi: 10.55365/1923.X2021.19.10.

Prieto, I. M. and Pérez-Santana, M. P. (2014) 'Managing innovative work behavior: The role of human resource practices', *Personnel Review*, 43(2), pp. 184–208. doi: 10.1108/PR-11-2012-0199.

Rahmatillah, V. A., Abidin, Z. and Komalasari, S. (2022) 'Pengaruh Religiusitas dan Komitmen Organisasi terhadap Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) pada Karyawan PT. Panca Teknik Banjarmasin', *Jurnal Al-Husna*, 3(1), pp. 1–14.

Rhoades, L., Eisenberger, R. and Armeli, S. (2001) 'Affective commitment to the organization: the contribution of perceived organizational support.', *Journal of applied psychology*, 86(5), p. 825.

Sholatiah, A., Lestari, R. P. and Komalasari, S. (2022) 'Teknik Dan Metode Rekrutmen Sebagai Penentu Hasil Kinerja Karyawan', *Jurnal Ecoment Global*, 7(2).

Timothy, T. B. and Kevin, J. F. (1988) 'Transfer of training: A review and directions for future research', *Personnel Psychology*, 41(1), pp. 63–105.

Tripathi, A. and Kalia, P. (2022) 'Examining the effects of supportive work environment and organizational learning culture on organizational performance in information technology companies: The mediating role of learning agility and organizational innovation', *Innovation: Organization and Management*, 00(00), pp. 1–21. doi: 10.1080/14479338.2022.2116640.

Wardhani, N. S., Sulastiana, M. and Ashriyana, R. (2022) 'Adaptasi Alat Ukur Learning Agility pada Karyawan untuk Meningkatkan Organizational Agility: Versi Bahasa Indonesia', *Psikologika: Jurnal Pemikiran dan Penelitian Psikologi*, 27(2), pp. 243–264.

Wiig, K. M. (2012) 'Knowledge management: an emerging discipline rooted in a long history', in *Knowledge horizons*. Routledge, pp. 3–26.

Winata, A. and Martdianty, F. (2022) 'Effects of Supportive Work Environment, Person-Organization Fit and Organizational Engagement on Digital Industry's Employees Turnover Intention'. doi: 10.4108/eai.27-7-2021.2316816.

Yusliza, M. Y. *et al.* (2021) 'Effects of supportive work environment on employee retention: the mediating role of person--organization fit', *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 53(3), pp. 201–216.

Zis, S. F. *et al.* (2021) 'Perubahan perilaku komunikasi generasi milenial dan generasi z di era digital', *Satwika: Kajian Ilmu Budaya Dan Perubahan Sosial*, 5(1), pp. 69–87.