CHAPTER IV
RESEARCH RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Overview of Object / Subject of Research

1. Overview of Research Objects

Muhammadiyah was founded in Kampung Kauman in Yogyakarta, on 8 Dzulhijjah 1330 H or 18th November 1912 by Muhmmad Darwis, or better known as K. H. Ahmad Dahlan. He was an employee of the Sultan's Palace in Yogyakarta who worked as a preacher and seller. Seeing the condition of Muslims who were still practices something that are in the outside from the teaching of Islam, he was initiated to invite them to return to the teaching of Islam based on Al-Qur'an and Al-Hadits.

In the beginnng, this teaching was rejected by the society, but because of his perseverance and patience, his teachings were accepted by the society. His profession as a seller, strongly supports him to influence the society back to the teachings of Islam which are based o the Al-Qur'an and Al-Hadits, so in a shor time his teachings can reach society in the outside of Kauman.

Literally, Muhammadiyah means followers of the Prophet Muhammad. The used of the word Muhammad intends to connect the teachings and traces of the struggling from Prophet Muhammad. In terminologically, Muhammadiyah means the Islamic movement, the da'wah amar ma'ruf nahi munkar from Al-Qur'an and Al-Hadits. Muhammadiyah is an Islamic movement that carries out the mission of amar ma'ruf nahi munkar with the purpose of upholding the teaching of Islam, so it can realized the true Islamic society.

Muhammadiyah has several charitable businesses, namely: Muhammadiyah Kindegarten, Muhammadiyah Elementary School, Muhammadiyah Junior High School, Muhammadiyah Senior High School, Muhammadiyah University,

Muhammadiyah Boarding School, Muhammadiyah Hospital, Muhammadiyah orphanage, and etc.

Muhammadiyah Senior High School in Yogyakarta has seven schools, namely: SMA Muhammadiyah 1 Yogyakarta, SMA Muhammadiyah 2 Yogyakarta, SMA Muhammadiyah 3 Yogyakarta, SMA Muhammadiyah 4 Yogyakarta, SMA Muhammadiyah 5 Yogyakarta, SMA Muhammadiyah 6 Yogyakarta, dan SMA Muhammadiyah 7 Yogyakarta (Muhammadiyah, 2016).

2. Data Collection Results

The research subjects in this study were employees of SMA Muhammadiyah inYogyakarta City who had worked at the high school for at least 2 years and were not contract employees. Employees at SMA Muhammadiyah in Yogyakarta City participated as respondents in this study by filling out an offline questionnaire distributed on 23rd September to 4th October 2019, with 255 questionnaires. The number of questionnaires that returned after the questionnaire distributed was 206 questionnaires. To make it easier to identify respondent's data, the author grouped respondent's characteristics based on gender, age, and length of work. In the beginning the author distributed 255 questionnaires. The questionnaires returned to the author was only 139 questionnaires until 4th October 2019. In order to meet the required number of respondents, researcher returned to SMA Muhammadiyah in Yogyakarta City to remind the employees about questionnaires that had not been filled and had not returned. After the second visit, the writer got 67 questionnaires that were filled in. Then, the total questionnaire returned was 206 questionnaires.

3. **Description of Respondents**

To find out the characteristics of respondents in this study, the percentage analysis was used. The summary of the results of the descriptive statistical analysis that has been carried out is as follows:

a.Distribution of Respondents by Gender

Based on the primary data that has been processed, the results of the distribution of respondents by gender in this study can be seen in Table 4.1 below:

Table 4. 1
Distribution of Respondents by Gender

Category	Frequency	Percentage
Male	94	45.6%
Female	112	54.4%
Total	206	100%

Source: Appendix 3

From table 4.1 above it can be seen that from a total of 206 respondents, there were respondents who were female as many as 112 people or 54.4% and male as many as 94 people or 45.6%.

b.Distribution of Respondents by Age

Based on the primary data that has been processed, the results of the distribution of respondents by age in this study can be seen in Table 4.2 below:

Table 4. 2
Distribution of Respondents by Age

Age	
Millennial	50%
Non-Millennial	50%

Source: Appendix 3

From table 4.2 above it can be seen that from a total of 206 respondents, millennials are 50% or 103 respondents, and non millennials are 50% or 103 respondents.

c.Distribution of Respondents Based on Length of Work

Based on the primary data that has been processed, the results of the distribution of respondents based on the length of work in this study can be seen in Table 4.3 below:

Table 4. 3
Distribution of Respondents Based on Length of Work

Length of Work	
0-5 Years	83 people
6-10 Years	20 people
11-15 Years	13 people
16-20 Years	28 people
21-25 Years	34 people
26-30 Years	14 people
31-35 Years	10 people
36-40 Years	4 people

Source: Appendix 3

From Table 4.3 above it can be seen that from a total of 206 respondents, respondents who have worked for 0-5 years are 83 people, respondents who have worked for 6-10 years are 15 people, respondents who have worked 11-15 years are 12 people, respondents who have worked 16-20 years are 25 people, respondents who have worked 21-25 years are 33 people, respondents who have worked 26-30 years are 12 people, respondents who have worked 31-35 years as many as 22 people, and respondents who have worked for 36-40 years as many as 1 person.

a. **Instrument and Data Quality Test**

In this study, the instrument quality test used was a validity test and a reliability test. Good research must have validity and reliability tests as important provisions. By using a valid and reliable instrument in data collection, it is expected that research results will be valid and reliable.

1. **Validity Test**

The instrument validity test in this study used the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure from the Adequacy Sampling (KMO MSA) method. The desired value must be > 0.50 to be able to analyze the factors (Ghozali, 2012).

In this study there were 17 statements for the Employee Engagement variable, 4 statements for the Distributive Justice variable, 7 statements for the Procedural Justice variable, and 23 statements for the Religiosity variable with 206 respondents and were analyzed using the application of SPSS version 22. The results that obtained from testing the quality of instruments with Validity Test using KMO MSA can be seen in Table 4.4 below:

Table 4. 4
Validity Test Results

Variable	Item	KMO-MSA	Limit	Explanation
Employee Engagement	Vigor 1	0.684	> 0.50	Valid
	Vigor 2	0.511		Valid
	Vigor 3	0.511		Valid
	Vigor 4	0.702		Valid
	Vigor 5	0.562		Valid
	Vigor 6	0.611		Valid
	Dedication 1	0.696		Valid
	Dedication 2	0.724		Valid
	Dedication 3	0.648		Valid
	Dedication 4	0.711		Valid
	Dedication 5	0.642		Valid
	Absorption 1	0.511		Valid
	Absorption 2	0.735		Valid
	Absorption 3	0.730		Valid
	Absorption 4	0.692		Valid
	Absorption 5	0.598		Valid
	Absorption 6	0.772		Valid
Distributive Justice	Need 1	0.817		Valid
	Equity 1	0.888		Valid
	Equity 2	0.864		Valid
	Equality 1	0.902		Valid
Procedural Justice	Impartiality 1	0.678		Valid
	Impartiality 2	0.539		Valid

	Representativeness	0.547		Valid
	Consistently	0.583		Valid
	Correctability	0.668		Valid
	Accuracy	0.575		Valid
	Ethical Standard	0.550		Valid
Religiosity	Experiental 1	0.524		Valid
	Experiental 2	0.744		Valid
	Experiental 3	0.741		Valid
	Experiental 4	0.500		Valid
	Experiental 5	0.531		Valid
	Ideological 1	0.830		Valid
	Ideological 2	0.879		Valid
	Ideological 3	0.536		Valid
	Ideological 4	0.586		Valid
	Ritualistic 1	0.681		Valid
	Ritualistic 2	0.509		Valid
	Ritualistic 3	0.628		Valid
	Ritualistic 4	0.700		Valid
	Intellectual 1	0.569		Valid
	Intellectual 2	0.784		Valid
	Intellectual 3	0.769		Valid
	Intellectual 4	0.693		Valid
	Intellectual 5	0.670		Valid
	Consequential 1	0.715		Valid
	Consequential 2	0.693		Valid
	Consequential 3	0.670		Valid
	Consequential 4	0.826		Valid
	Consequential 5	0.801		Valid

Source: Appendix 4

The Validity Test Results in Table 4.4 for the four variables above, are known that all instruments of the four variables in this study for each instrument has a value greater than 0.50. Based on these results, the instruments in each of these research variables are valid, so they can be used in this study.

2. Reliability Test

Reliability test in this study used Cronbach Alpha (α). A variable can said good if it gives a Cronbach Alpha value > 0.70 (Nunnally, 1994) in (Ghozali, 2012).

Table 4. 5
Reliability Test Result

Variable	Cronbach Alpha	Limit	Explanation
Employee Engagement	0.892		Reliabel
Distributive Justice	0.916	> 0.70	Reliabel
Procedural Justice	0.743		Reliabel
Religiosity	0.837		Reliabel

Source: Appendix 5

Reliability Test Results in Table 4.5 for the four variables above, are known that all the variables of the four variables in this study in each variable has a value greater than 0.70. Based on these results, the variables in this study are reliable, so they can be used in this study.

1. Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics results on the research variables are to determine the average of each indicator tested in the study, these results can be seen from the following table:

Table 4. 6
Descriptive Statistics of Employee Engagement Variable

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean
Vigor 1	206	2	5	4.08
Vigor 2	206	2	5	3.68
Vigor 3	206	1	5	3.59
Vigor 4	206	1	5	3.15
Vigor 5	206	2	5	3.71
Vigor 6	206	1	5	3.40
Dedication 1	206	2	5	4.27
Dedication 2	206	2	5	3.98
Dedication 3	206	2	5	3.63
Dedication 4	206	1	5	4.04
Dedication 5	206	1	5	3.45
Absorption 1	206	2	5	4.06
Absorption 2	206	1	5	2.58
Absorption 3	206	1	5	3.83
Absorption 4	206	1	5	3.24

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean
Absorption 5	206	1	5	3.40
Absorption 6	206	1	5	3.39
Rata – rata	206			3.61

Source: Appendix 6

In Table 4.6 above it can be seen that the descriptive statistics of respondents in providing an assessment of each instrument Employee Engagement variable has an average of 3.61 with a maximum score of 5 and a minimum of 1. This shows that the respondent's answer to the Employee Engagement variable is high.

Table 4. 7
Descriptive Statistics of Distributive Justice Variable

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean
Need 1	206	1	5	3.45
Equity 1	206	1	5	3.40
Equity 2	206	1	5	3.38
Equality 1	206	1	5	3.48
Rata-rata	206			3.42

Source: Appendix 6

In Table 4.7 above it can be seen that the descriptive statistics of respondents in assessing each instrument of the Distributive Justice variable has an average of 3.42 with a maximum score of 5 and a minimum of 1. This shows that the respondent's answer to the Distributive Justice variable is high.

Table 4. 8
Descriptive Statistics of Procedural Justice Variable

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean
Impartiality 1	206	1	5	3.47
Impartiality 2	206	1	5	3.36
Representativeness	206	2	5	3.46
Consistently	206	2	5	3.29
Correctability	206	1	5	3.02
Accuracy	206	1	5	3.40
Ethical Standard	206	1	5	3.54
Rata-rata	206			3.36

Source: Appendix 6

In Table 4.8 above, it can be seen that the descriptive statistics of respondents in giving an assessment of each instrument of Procedural Justice variable have an average of 3.36 with a maximum score of 5 and a minimum of 1. This shows that the respondents' answers to the Procedural Justice variable is high.

Table 4. 9
Descriptive Statistics of Religiosity Variable

	N	Minimum	Maksimum	Mean
Experiental 1	205	1	5	3.73
Experiental 2	206	2	5	4.21
Experiental 3	204	1	5	4.21
Experiental 4	206	1	5	3.17
Experiental 5	206	2	5	4.57
Ideological 1	206	3	5	4.91
Ideological 2	204	3	5	4.93
Ideological 3	206	1	5	4.84
Ideological 4	206	1	5	4.06
Ritualistic 1	206	1	5	3.68
Ritualistic 2	206	1	5	3.63
Ritualistic 3	206	1	5	3.06
Ritualistic 4	206	1	5	2.34
Intellectual 1	206	1	5	4.20
Intellectual 2	206	1	5	3.75
Intellectual 3	206	2	5	3.65
Intellectual 4	206	1	5	3.85
Intellectual 5	206	1	5	3.85
Consequential 1	206	1	5	4.22
Consequential 2	206	2	5	4.72
Consequential 3	206	1	5	4.15
Consequential 4	206	1	5	4.30
Consequential 5	206	2	5	4.32
Rata-rata	205			4.01

Source: Appendix 6

In Table 4.9 above, it can be seen that the descriptive statistics of respondents in assessing in each instrument of the Religiosity variable have an average of 4.01 with a maximum score of 5 and a minimum of 1. This shows that the respondent's answer to the variable Religiosity is high.

2. Classic Assumption Test

The results of the classic assumption test on the research variables are to determine whether there is a correlation between the dependent and independent variables, find out the inequality of the variance from one observation to another observation, and whether in the regression model the confounding variable or residual has a normal distribution or not, the results can be seen from the table following:

Table 4. 10
Multicollinearity Test Results

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	,584	,309		1,890	,060		
	DJ	,178	,049	,247	3,643	,000	,632	1,582
	PJ	,356	,080	,321	4,447	,000	,556	1,800
	R	,305	,086	,219	3,537	,001	,759	1,318

a. Dependent Variable: EE
Source: Appendix 7

In Table 4.10 above it can be seen that the multicollinearity test results give a tolerance value of more than 0.10 and a VIF with a value of less than 10. This shows that there is no correlation between the independent variables in this study.

Table 4. 11
Heteroscedasticity Test Results

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	,608	,184		3,311	,001		
	DJ	-,012	,029	-,035	-,399	,690	,632	1,582
	PJ	-,016	,048	-,032	-,344	,731	,556	1,800
	R	-,044	,051	-,069	-,862	,390	,759	1,318

a. Dependent Variable: AbsUt

Source: Appendix 7

In Table 4.11 above it can be seen that the results of the heteroscedasticity test give a significant value of more than 0.05 using the Glejser Test. This shows that there is no similarity in variance from one observation residual to another.

Table 4. 12
Normality Test Result

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		Unstandardized Residual
N		206
Normal Parameters[a,b]	Mean	,0000000
	Std. Deviation	,42059639
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	,044
	Positive	,044
	Negative	-,040
Test Statistic		,044
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		,200[c,d]

a. Test distribution is Normal.

b. Calculated from data.

c. Lilliefors Significance Correction.

d. This is a lower bound of the true significance.

Source: Appendix 7

In Table 4.12 above it can be seen that the normality test results with Kolmogorov Smirnov Test give a significant value of more than 0.05 which is equal to 0.2. This shows that the confounding or residual variables have a normal distribution.

3. Research Results (Hypothesis Test)

1. Testing the Effect of Independent Variables on Dependent Variables

According with the model developed in this study, the data analysis tool used is Regression Analysis, which is operated using the SPSS application.

Table 4. 13
Model Summary

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	,644[a]	,414	,405	7,203

a. Predictors: (Constant), R, DJ, PJ

Source: Appendix 8

Table 4. 14
ANOVA

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	7407,889	3	2469,296	47,593	,000[b]
	Residual	10480,519	202	51,884		
	Total	17888,408	205			

a. Dependent Variable: EE

b. Predictors: (Constant), R, DJ, PJ

Source: Appendix 8

Table 4. 15

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients	Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.

		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	9,921	5,251		1,890	,060
	DJ	,758	,208	,247	3,643	,000
	PJ	,864	,194	,321	4,447	,000
	R	,225	,064	,219	3,537	,001

a. Dependent Variable: EE

Source: Appendix 8

Based on the results of multiple linear regression, can obtained equation models, as follows:

EE = 9.921 + 0.758 DJ + 0.864 PJ + 0.225 R

EE = Employee Engagement

DJ = Distributive Justice

PJ = Procedural Justice

R = Religiosity

A constant of 9.921 means that if the independent variables (distributive justice, procedural justice, and religiosity) are considered as a constant, then the average employee engagement is 9.921.

The coefficient of distributive justice is 0.758, means that if distributive justice increases as many as 1%, then employee engagement increases as many as 0.758%.

The coefficient of procedural justice is 0.864, means that if procedural justice increases as many as 1%, employee engagement increases as many as 0.864%.

The coefficient of religiosity is 0.225, means that if religiosity increases as many as 1%, employee engagement increases as many as 0.225%.

According to the results of the multiple regression test, can be obtained an adjusted R square is 0.405, means that the variation of employee engagement can be explained by the distributive justice, procedural justice and religiosity variables as many as 40.5% and the remaining 59.5% is explained by other factors outside the model.

ANOVA or F test results show that the calculated F value is 47.593 with a significance of 0.000. Because the significance value is below 0.05, it can be said that the regression model can be used to predict employee engagement or distributive justice, procedural justice, and religiosity together to influence employee engagement.

Coefficient of distributive justice variable is 0.758 and the t value is 3.643 with a significance of 0.000. This shows that distributive justice has a positive effect on employee engagement because the significance value is less than 0.05, then the results of this study is **support Hypothesis 1** which states that distributive justice (X_1) has a positive effect on employee engagement (Y) at SMA Muhammadiyah in Yogyakarta City.

Coefficient of procedural justice variable is 0.864 and the t value is 4.447 with a significance of 0.000. Because the significance value of procedural justice is less than 0.05, procedural justice has a positive effect on employee engagement, then the results of this study is **support Hypothesis 2** which states procedural justice (X_2) has a positive effect on employee engagement (Y) at SMA Muhammadiyah in Yogyakarta City.

Coefficient of religiosity variable is 0.225 and the t value is 3.537 with a significance of 0.001. Because the significance value of religiosity is less than 0.05, it can be said that the variable of religiosity has a positive effect on employee engagement, then the results of this study is **support Hypothesis 3** which states that religiosity (X_3) has a positive effect on employee engagement (Y) at SMA Muhammadiyah in Yogyakarta City.

2. **Results of Testing the Role of Millennial-Non-Millennial Moderate the Influence of Distributive Justice, Procedural Justice and Religiosity to Employee Engagement with Split Sample and Multiple Regression Analysis Techniques**

Table 4. 16
Milenial Summary

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	,688ª	,473	,457	,430

a. Predictors: (Constant), R, PJ, DJ

Source: Appendix 8

Table 4.16 shows the coefficient in the adjusted R square is 0.457 or 45.7%, which means that the distributive justive, procedural justice and religiosity variables can influence employee engagement with millennial as moderating variable as many as 45.7% and the rest is explained by other factors in the outside of the model as many as 54.3%.

Table 4. 17
Millennial Linear Regression Test Results

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	,150	,443		,339	,736
	DJ	,159	,081	,206	1,967	,050
	PJ	,448	,121	,370	3,693	,000
	R	,346	,123	,243	2,818	,006

a. Dependent Variable: EE

Source: Appendix 8

Based on the results of linear regression with millennial generation, the equation model is obtained, as follows:

EE = 0.150 + 0.159 DJ + 0.448 PJ + 0.346 R + ε

EE = Employee Engagement

DJ = Distributive Justice

PJ = Procedural Justice

R = Religiosity

A constant of 0.150 means that if the independent variables (distributive justice, procedural justice, and religiosity) are considered as a constant, the average of employee engagement is 0.150.

The coefficient of distributive justice in the millennial group is 0.159 means that if distributive justice increases as many as 1%, then the employee engagement in the millennial group increases as many as 0.159%.

The coefficient of procedural justice in the millennial group is 0.448 means that if procedural justice increases as many as 1%, then the employee engagement in the millennial group increases as many as 0.448%.

The coefficient of religiosity in the millennial group is 0.346 means that if religiosity increases as many as 1%, then the employee engagement in the millennial group increases as many as 0.346%.

Table 4. 18
Non Milenial Summary

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	,587[a]	,345	,325	,418

a. Predictors: (Constant), R, DJ, PJ

Source: Appendix 8

Table 4.18 shows the coefficient in the adjusted R square figure is 0.325 or 32.5%, which means that the distributive justive, procedural justice and religiosity variables can influence employee engagement with non millennial as a moderating variable as many as 32.5% and the rest is explained by other factors in the outside of the model at as many as 67.5%.

Table 4. 19
Non Millennial Regression Test Results

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1,138	,471		2,417	,017
	DJ	,180	,065	,271	2,782	,006
	PJ	,297	,111	,299	2,690	,008
	R	,224	,132	,161	1,691	,004

a. Dependent Variable: EE

Source: Appendix 8

Based on the results results of linear regression with non millennial generation, the equation model is obtained, as follows: results obtained by the equation model, as follows:

$EE = 1.138 + 0.180\ DJ + 0.297\ PJ + 0.224\ R$

EE = Employee Engagement

DJ = Distributive Justice

PJ = Procedural Justice

R = Religiosity

A constant of 1.138 means that if the independent variables (distributive justice, procedural justice, and religiosity) are considered as a constant, the average employee engagement is 1.138.

The coefficient of distributive justice in the non millennial group is 0.180, means that if distributive justice increases as many as 1%, then the employee engagement in the non millennial group increases as many as 0.180%.

The coefficient of procedural justice in the non millennial group is 0.297, means that if procedural justice increases as many as 1%, then the employee engagement in the non-mielnial group increases as many as 0.297%.

The coefficient of religosity in the non millennial group is 0.224 means that if religiosity increases as many as 1%, then the employee engagement in the non millennial group increases as many as 0.224%.

By comparing the value of R^2 for millennial regression is 0.473 and R^2 for non millennial regression is 0.345, it can be concluded that the millennial-non millennial variable is a moderating variable, so **hypotheses 4, 5, and 6 are proven and supported**. Based on the Coefficient of Standardized value on millennial respondents has a value of 0.206 and on non

millennial respondents has a value of 0.271, so the effect of distributive justice on employee engagement on non millennial respondents is stronger than millennial respondents. Based on the Coefficient of Standardized value on millennial respondents has a value of 0.370 and on non millennial respondents has a value of 0.299, so the effect of procedural justice on employee engagement on millennial respondents is stronger than non millennial respondents. Based on the Coefficient of Standardized value on millennial respondents has a value of 0.243 and on non millennial respondents has a value of 0.161, so the effect of religiosity on employee engagement on millennial respondents is stronger than non millennial respondents.

3. **Hypothesis Test**

1. **Distributive Justice Influence on Employee Engagement**
The first hypothesis in this study obtained a positive coefficient of 0.758 with a significance of 0.000, because the significance value is less than 0.05, **it can be concluded that hypothesis 1 is supported and accepted.**

The results of this study are in line with research by Ghosh & Rai (2014) who conducted research in the banking sector in India that used a sample of employees at the bank as many as 210 employees. Ghosh & Rai (2014) said that distributive justice has a positive effect on employee engagement.

The results of this study are supported by research from Azam (2007) who conducted research at health insurance companies in Bangladesh by using a sample of employees at the insurance company as many as 150 employees. Azam (2007) said that distributive justice has a positive effect on employee engagement.

The results of this study were supported by Handayani, Anggraeni, Andriyansah, Suharnomo, & Rahardja (2015) who conducted research at the Trade Office in Central Java by using a sample as many as 67 employees. Handayani et al. (2015) said that distributive justice has a positive effect on employee engagement.

The implication is SMA Muhammadiyah in Yogyakarta City should maintains distributive justice policies such as policies related to salary, promotion, and career development so the employee engagement can be maintained.

2. Procedural Justice Influences on Employee Attachment

The second hypothesis in this study gets a positive coefficient value of 0.864 with a significance of 0.000, because the significance value is less than 0.05, **it can be concluded that hypothesis 2 is supported and accepted.**

The results of this study are in line with research by Ghosh & Rai (2014) who conducted research in the banking sector in India using a sample of employees at the bank as many as 210 employees. Ghosh & Rai (2014) said that procedural justice has a positive effect on employee engagement.

The results of this study were supported by research by Alvi & Abbasi (2012) who conducted research in the banking sector in Pakistan using a sample of employees at the bank as many as 312 employees. Alvi & Abbasi (2012) said that procedural justice has a positive effect on employee engagement.

The results of this study are in line with the research from Tyler & Blader (2009) who conducted research in financial companies in the United States that used a sample of employees at the company as many as 1.350 employees. Tyler & Blader (2009) said that procedural justice has a positive effect on employee engagement.

The implication is SMA Muhammadiyah in Yogyakarta City should maintains procedural justice policies such as policies relating to the procedure of how a regulation is made, the procedure of how salary distribution, and involving employees when the procedure is made, so the employee engagement can be maintained.

3. Religiosity Influences on Employee Attachment

The third hypothesis in this study gets a positive coefficient value of 0.225 with a significance of 0.001, because the significance value is less than 0.05, **it can be concluded that hypothesis 3 is supported and accepted.**

The results of this study were supported by research by Moltafet, Mazidi, & Sadati (2010) who conducted research at Shiraz University using a sample as many as 301 lecturers. Moltafet et al. (2010) said that religiosity has a positive effect on employee engagement.

The results of this study are in line with research from Rezapour, Rezai, Hosseini, & Takalu (2016) who conducted research at Tehran University using a sample as many as 163 therapists. Rezapour et al. (2016) said that religiosity has a positive effect on employee attachment.

The results of this study are supported by research from Messarra (2014) which conducted research in private companies in Lebanon using a sample as many as 548 employees. Messarra (2014) said that religiosity has a positive effect on employee engagement.

The implication is SMA Muhammadiyah in Yogyakarta City should maintains a religiosity policy such as policies related to not playing truant during working hours, not prolonging rest hours, not speeding up work hours, not coming late at work, and giving employees opportunities to worship and doing activities to strengthen religiosity such as recitation and group prayer, so the employee engagement can be maintained.

4. Millennial-Non-Millennial Moderate the Influence of Distributive Justice on Employee Engagement

The fourth hypothesis in this study obtained a Coefficient Standardized value for millennial respondents with a value of 0.206 positive, with a significance of 0.050 in the millennial group, where the significance value is equal to 0.05. For non millennial respondents with a value of 0.271 positive, with a significance of 0.006, where the

significance value is less than 0.05, **it can be concluded that hypothesis 4 is supported and accepted.**

The reasons why this is can occur are, millennial groups enjoy working in an organization that they follow, because of the welfare that they got while working in the organization (Septiani, 2018). In addition, the existence of role models in an organization that they follow can also trigger them to be engaged to their organizations (Usmani & Jamal, 2013). This role model can spur millennial employees to contribute more to their organization. If in an organization there is a role model that they can embrace, then they will be challenged to give the best to their organization. Another factor that causes distributive justice to have a significant effect on employee engagement to millennial is the stable emotion of millennial groups.

The results of this study are supported by research from Azam (2007) who conducted research at health insurance companies in Bangladesh by using a sample of employees at the insurance company as many as 150 employees. Azam (2015) said that distributive justice has a positive effect on employee engagement.

The results of this study were supported by Handayani, Anggraeni, Andriyansah, Suharnomo, & Rahardja (2015) who conducted research at the Trade Office in Central Java by using a sample of 67 employees. Handayani et al. (2015) said that distributive justice has a positive effect on employee engagement.

The results of this study are in line with research by Ghosh & Rai (2014) who conducted research in banking sector in India using a sample of employees at the bank as many as 210 employees. Ghosh and Rai (2014) said that distributive justice has a positive effect on employee engagement.

The results of this study are in line with previous research conducted by Saks (2006) who conducted research on various corporate sectors in America. They conducted a study using a

population as many as 102 employees. Saks (2006) used POS Theory which said that what can influence employee engagement is the characteristics of a job. Besides that what can influence employee engagement according to POS theory is procedural justice.

The results of this study are in line with research conducted by Farid, Iqbal, Ma, Gonzalez, Khattak, & Khan (2019) who conducted research in banking sector in Pakistan. They conducted a study used a population as many as 350 employees. Farid et al. (2019) said that there are other factors that can influence employee engagement such as the perception of the employee itself, and also the Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB).

The results of this study are in line with previous studies conducted by Ledimo & Hlongwane (2014) who conducted research in service companies in South Africa. They conducted this research used a population as many as 289 employees. Ledimo & Hlongwane (2014) said that distributive justice does not influence on employee engagement in their organizations. Another thing that can influence an employee to not be engaged by his organization is interactional justice.

The results of this study are in line with previous studies conducted by Usmani & Jamal (2013) who conducted research in banking sector in Pakistan. They conducted this research using a population as many as 250 employees. Usmani & Jamal (2013) said that there are other factors that can influence employee engagement in the organizations that he follow. This factor is job satisfaction. When an employee is satisfied with his work, he will be engaged in his organization.

The implication is SMA Muhammadiyah in Yogyakarta City should maintain distributive justice policies such as policies related to salary, promotion, career development so the employee engagement can be maintained.

5. **Millennial-Non-Millennial Moderate the Influence of Procedural Justice on Employee Engagement**

The fifth hypothesis in this study get the value of Coefficients Standardized for millennial respondents with a value of 0.370 positive, with a significance of 0.000 in the millennial group, where the significance value is less than 0.05. For non millennial respondents with a value of 0.299 positive, with a significance of 0.008, where the significance value is less than 0.05, **it can be concluded that hypothesis 5 is supported and accepted.**

The results of this study are in line with research by Ghosh & Rai (2014) who conducted research in banking sector in India using a sample of employees at the bank as many as 210 employees. Ghosh & Rai (2014) said that procedural justice has a positive effect on employee engagement in both millennial and non-millennial groups.

The results of this study are supported by research from Alvi & Abbasi (2012) who conducted research in the banking sector in Pakistan using a sample of employees at the bank as many as 312 employees who have a wide variety of ages from ages 24 - 46. Alvi & Abbasi (2012) said that procedural justice has a positive effect on employee engagement.

The results of this study are in line with the research of Tyler & Blader (2009) who conducted research in financial companies in the United States using a sample of employees in these companies as many as 1.350 employees who have an age range of 25-50. Tyler & Blader (2009) said that justice procedural justice has a positive effect on employee engagement.

The implication is SMA Muhammadiyah in Yogyakarta City should maintains procedural justice policies such as policies relating to the procedure of how a regulation is made, the procedure of how salary distribution, and involving employees when the procedure is made so that employee engagement can be maintained and can generalize participants from millennial and non millennial groups.

6. Millennial-Non Millennial Moderate the Influence of Religiosity on Employee Engagement

The sixth hypothesis in this study obtained a Coefficient Standardized value for millennial respondents with a value of 0.243 positive, with a significance of 0.006 in the millennial group, where the significance value is less than 0.05. For non millennial respondents with a value of 0.161 positive with a significance of 0.004, where the significance value is less than 0.05, **it can be concluded that hypothesis 6 is supported and accepted.**

The results of this study are caused by a high religious value in a person followed by the ability of that person to have good morals (Dawkins, 2006). When a person has a high value of religiosity, he has possibility to has a good vertical relationship and has a good horizontal relationship. This can cause a relationship between an employee and people in his organization is good, and cause the employee subsequently has a good engagement to the organization.

This was also stated by Aini (2015)A, who said that people can be engaged to their organizations because of the existence of well-being in their lives. Well-being means here is psychological well-being. People who have psychological well-being reflected in their behavior will give better responses or feedback, can give positive assessments as well, and flexible.

This research is in line with research conducted by Campbell and Putnam in Farid et al. (2019), they said that religious participation is a form of cultural capital that encourages togetherness and engagement. Scholars see religious affiliation as a gateway to other social networks, for gathering information and for increasing engagement, encouraging participants to join other voluntary (non-religious) associations (Greeley, 1997); (Putnam, 2000); (Wilson and Musick, 1997) in (Farid et al. 2019).

This is supported by research conducted by Nwachukwu, Zufan, & Chladkova (2016), they said that religiosity, high-performance work practices and employee engagement are important concepts that need to be tested. The same was expressed by Roof (2015) in (Nwachukwu et al. 2016) which stated that the relationship between religiosity, spirituality and employee engagement have a good relationship.

The results of the study different from the research conducted by Truss, Alfes, Delbridge, Shantz, and Sone (2014) in (Nwachukwu et al. 2016), which stated that religiosity had no effect on employee engagement. Truss et al. (2014) conducted research in several countries in the world, namely: Philippines, South Africa, United States, Canada, Germany, Australia, France, Britain, Hong Kong, Japan, and Sweden. In the research of Truss et al. (2014), religiosity is a dimension of the existing cultural capital in the country. This cultural capital refers to the dimension of culture that has a tendency for the function of human resource management in a country in assessing employee engagement.

The results of this study are also different from Bakar, Cooke, & Muenjohn (2016), which stated that the lack of engagement to employees is caused by one of the roles of religiosity that is not fulfilled. The role of religiosity is being happy, being proactive, focusing on positive matters, high internal control and conscientiousness, the concept of the ummah-connecting with others, and work as moral obligation. Religiosity can trigger someone to be happy. Being happy means that when someone has a strong faith in his religion, it will bring his own happiness to that person and can be engaged to the organization that he follows. Being happy when working is not only doing a job that seems to make the worker feel happy, but also can make other people happy.

The results of this study different from Mecheo (2016), who conducted his research at a fueling station in Libya, using a population as many as 60 employees, showing that

religiosity does not influence a person to work hard. Mc Cleary (2005) in Mecheo (2016) said that someone who has a high level of religion, will not spend the rest of his time for secular life or worldly life. The person tends to spend the rest of his time worshiping to his God. That person will also not want to spend the rest of his life working hard in this world. When someone does not work hard in an organization so that he will not be engaged to the organization that he follows.

The implication is SMA Muhammadiyah in Yogyakarta City should maintains a religiosity policy such as policies relating to not playing truant during working hours, not prolonging rest periods, not speeding up working hours, and not coming late when working.