Role of Openness to Experience in the Relationship between Supervisory Feedback and Supervisory Relationships among Generation Z Employees in Jakarta

by Jana Publication & Research

Role of Openness to Experience in the Relationship between Supervisory Feedback and Supervisory Relationships among Generation Z Employees in Jakarta

…………………………………………………………………………………………………....

Manuscript Info	**Abstract**

Abstract

………………………………………………………………………

This study aims to examine the moderating role of openness to experience in the relationship between supervisory feedback and supervisory relationships among Generation Z employees. Given the unique characteristics of Generation Z, who value open communication and recognition of their contributions, feedback from supervisors plays a crucial role in shaping their relationships with supervisors. A total of 150 Generation Z employees in Jakarta region participated in this study. Data were collected using the Supervisory Feedback Scale, the Short Supervisory Relationship Questionnaire (S-SRQ), and the Openness to Experience Scale. The analysis results indicate that positive feedback from supervisors significantly improves supervisory relationships, while negative feedback has varying effects depending on individual openness levels. The findings suggest that individuals with high openness levels are better able to receive negative feedback constructively.

…………………………………………………………………………………………………....

Introduction:-

Generation Z is a generation with characteristics that differ from previous generations. They grew up in an era of advanced communication and connectivity, productive use of social media, and a lifestyle dependent on technology (Othman et al., 2024). Generation Z is beginning to dominate the workforce and fill management positions, with the oldest members born in 1997.

In the workplace context, Generation Z demonstrates a preference for working at companies that treat them with respect, act ethically, offer fair compensation, provide promotion opportunities, maintain open and transparent communication, and establish company policies wisely (Othman et al., 2024).

The characteristics demonstrated by Generation Z in a professional environment include independence, confidence, realistic work expectations, and optimism. Generation Z also wants their opinions to be heard and prefers direct communication. They want their opinions to be heard, considered, and acknowledged by their superiors. This indicates that the current work environment should prioritize an employee's contributions and ideas rather than their age. Furthermore, Gen Z enjoys working for superiors who are honest and open with them (Othman et al., 2024).

Previous literature shows that Generation Z prefers a work environment that promotes mentoring sessions, learning, and offers opportunities for professional development (Othman et al., 2024). In the workplace, an employee naturally has a supervisor or someone who guides them in the context of their work.

The role of a supervisor or leader of an individual or group of employees is crucial, especially in establishing direct relationships with employees. Common supervisory activities in companies are carried out through supervisors, including evaluating work outcomes and taking corrective actions when necessary (Eryanto, 2019; Marwinda, 2020).

Feedback is a valuable resource for employees. Within the context of the supervisory relationship between a supervisor and a supervisee (the person being supervised), feedback refers to valuable input, constructive comments, and helpful suggestions provided by the supervisor to the supervisee (Ashford & Cummings, 1983; Cook & Steyn, 2024; Kumar & Stracke, 2007; Sujarwati et al., 2024).

However, previous research has found that many supervisors and employees struggle to give and receive feedback effectively (Rogito & Makabe, 2023). Some supervisors avoid giving feedback, while others provide feedback that is perceived as too harsh and unhelpful.

In line with supervisors' differing attitudes toward giving feedback, some employees become defensive or lose motivation when receiving feedback, while others do not receive enough quality feedback to improve their performance (Carless & Winstone, 2023; Rogito & Makabe, 2023). Therefore, it can be concluded that not all employees can receive feedback in the same way; individual personality also plays an important role in receiving feedback.

Personality reflects an individual's tendencies in terms of thinking patterns, emotional regulation, and behavioral patterns (Colquitt et al., 2023). There are numerous personality theories proposed by experts, one of which is the Big Five Personality Inventory (BFI) theory. This personality theory is considered consistent in assessing individual personalities based on trait analysis (Simanullang, 2021).

One of the dimensions of the Big Five Personality Inventory that is relevant to this phenomenon is openness to experience. Openness to experience is closely related to breadth of knowledge and original ideas (Goldberg, 1992). It also involves a strong interest in new things. Individuals with

this personality type have an open mind and are ready to accept new insights. They enjoy learning and adapt quickly to changes, including in the workplace. They are also innovative, imaginative, broad-minded, and intelligent. Conversely, individuals without this trait tend to be comfortable with routines and dislike new things (Simanullang, 2021).

Openness to new experiences has the potential to influence how individuals respond to feedback provided by supervisors. For Generation Z, who have high expectations for interpersonal relationships and transparency in communication in the workplace, responses regarding openness to experience can impact the supervisory relationships felt by employees.

Satisfaction with supervision (supervision satisfaction) is one of the factors of job satisfaction. Feedback from supervision not only improves employee performance but also makes employees feel valued, which influences high job satisfaction (Anseel et al., 2015; Sari & Sagala, 2016).

Considering the importance of personality factors in moderating the relationship between supervisory feedback and supervisory relationships, this study aims to examine the role of openness to experience as a moderating variable in the relationship between supervisory feedback and supervisory relationships among Generation Z in Jakarta. The results of this study are expected to contribute theoretically and practically to human resource management, particularly in creating a work environment that supports the quality of relationships between employees and supervisors.

Participants

This study involved 150 participants (N = 150), consisting of 95 women and 55 men. All participants met the following criteria: they were either male or female, belonged to Generation Z (born between 1997 and 2012) or were no older than 28 years old, resided and worked in Jakarta, and had at least one year of work experience at their current company, regardless of the type or size of the company. Based on employment status, the participants in this study consisted of 54 permanent employees, 47 contract employees, and 49 internship program participants.

Measurement Model

Before proceeding to the structural model testing, an evaluation of the measurement model was conducted. The evaluation was carried out on the three main measurement tools used in this study, namely: Supervisory Feedback, Big Five Personality – Openness to Experience, and Short Supervisory Relationship Questionnaire (S-SRQ).

Supervisory Feedback

The Supervisory Feedback scale used in this study was originally developed by Jaworski and Kohli (1991) to measure salespeople's perceptions of various types of feedback provided by their supervisors. This scale consists of several dimensions; however, in this study, the researchers

only used four dimensions that measure feedback in general, namely positive output feedback, negative output feedback, positive behavioral feedback, and negative behavioral feedback.

Positive output feedback consists of five items describing praise for employees' work results, while negative output feedback includes four items expressing supervisors' dissatisfaction with work results. Positive behavioral feedback includes five items related to support for work behavior deemed appropriate, and negative behavioral feedback consists of four items regarding corrections for work behavior that is not yet appropriate.

Thus, there are a total of 18 items in this scale, all of which are measured using a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from "Strongly Disagree" (1) to "Strongly Agree" (5).

The following are examples of items from Supervisory Feedback:

"When I achieve my work targets, my supervisor acknowledges my achievements."

"My supervisor informs me if my work results do not meet their expectations."

	Cronbach's alpha	Composite reliability (rho_a)	Composite reliability (rho_c)	Average variance extracted (AVE)
Negative Behavioral	0,849	0,869	0,891	**0,620**
Negative Output	0,812	0,840	0,876	**0,641**
Positive Behavioral	0,815	0,847	0,881	**0,654**
Positive Output	0,903	0,908	0,928	**0,721**

All dimensions have Cronbach's Alpha and Composite Reliability values above the minimum threshold of 0.7, indicating excellent internal consistency and construct reliability. The AVE values for all dimensions also exceed 0.5, indicating that more than half of the variance in the indicators can be explained by the relevant construct, thereby meeting the criteria for convergent validity.

Big Five Inventory (Openness)

In this study, the researchers used the Openness scale from the Big Five Personality theory first introduced by Lewis Goldberg (1992). Openness aims to measure the extent to which a person is open to new ideas, different experiences, or even new changes. Openness itself consists of 10

items measured using a Likert scale ranging from "Strongly Disagree" (1) to "Strongly Agree" (5).

The following are examples of items from Openness:

"I see myself as someone who is original and likes to discover new ideas."

"I see myself as someone who is curious about many different things."

	Cronbach's alpha	Composite reliability (rho_a)	Composite reliability (rho_c)	Average variance extracted (AVE)
Openness to Experience	0,817	0,817	0,872	0,577

Cronbach's Alpha values indicate good internal consistency. Rho_a and rho_c values indicate strong composite reliability. An AVE value of 0.577 indicates convergent validity has been achieved, although there is still room for improvement in the quality of certain indicators.

Short Supervisory Relationship Questionnaire (S-SRQ)

The researchers used the S-SRQ scale developed by Tom Cliffe, Helen Beinart, and Myra Cooper (2016). The S-SRQ is used as a quick and easily accessible way for supervisors to assess and discuss the quality of their supervisory relationships.

The SRQ consists of 18 items, which were measured in this study using a Likert scale ranging from "Strongly Disagree" (1) to "Strongly Agree" (5).

The following are examples of items from the Short Supervisory Relationship Questionnaire (S-SRQ):

"My supervisor is easy to approach."

"My supervisor respects my views and ideas."

	Cronbach's alpha	Composite reliability (rho_a)	Composite reliability (rho_c)	Average variance extracted (AVE)
Reflective Education	0,867	0,870	0,904	0,654

Safe Base Relationship	0,908	0,924	0,925	0,580
Structure	0,746	0,861	0,834	0,594

All three dimensions showed adequate internal reliability and composite reliability, with AVE values above the threshold of 0.5. Although Cronbach's Alpha value for the Structure construct was the lowest (0.746), it was still within the acceptable range.

Results

The results of the analysis show that negative behavioral feedback has a weak positive relationship with the three dimensions of the Short Supervisory Relationship Questionnaire (S-SRQ), namely Reflective Education ($\beta = 0.145$), Safe Base Relationship ($\beta = 0.147$), and Structure ($\beta = 0.127$). This indicates that negative feedback on the supervisee's behavior, although corrective in nature, can be perceived constructively.

	Path coefficients	P values
Negative Behavioral → Reflective Education	0,145	0,142
Negative Behavioral → Safe Base Relationship	0,147	0,270
Negative Behavioral → Structure	0,127	0,283

Positive behavioral feedback has a strong positive effect on Reflective Education ($\beta = 0.569$), Safe Base Relationship ($\beta = 0.427$), and Structure ($\beta = 0.518$), indicating that positive feedback provided by supervisors significantly improves the supervisory relationship.

	Path coefficients	P values
Positive Behavioral → Reflective Education	0,569	0,000

6

Positive Behavioral → Safe base Relationship	0,427	0,002
Positive Behavioral → Structure	0,518	0,000

Negative output feedback shows a very small and negative effect on the dimensions of Reflective Education ($\beta = -0.002$) and Safe Base Relationship ($\beta = -0.074$), and almost zero on Structure ($\beta = 0.003$). This indicates that negative feedback focused on results does not have a significant impact and even slightly reduces the supervisee's perception of security in the supervisory relationship.

	Path coefficients	P values
Negative output → Reflective Education	-0,002	0,982
Negative output → Safe base Relationship	-0,074	0,392
Negative output → Structure	0,003	0,977

Conversely, positive output feedback [30] has a positive effect, especially on Safe Base Relationship ($\beta = 0.237$), as well as a small positive effect on Reflective Education ($\beta = 0.065$) and Structure ($\beta = 0.044$). This means that positive feedback related to work results is more effective in strengthening the supervisee's sense of security in the supervisory relationship than negative output feedback.

	Path coefficients	P values
Positive Output → Reflective Education	0,065	0,504
Positive Output → Safe base Relationship	0,237	0,034
Positive Output → Structure	0,044	0,621

Openness to Experience functions as a moderating variable that influences the relationship between supervisory feedback (both positive and negative) and the quality of the supervisory relationship. The negative coefficient in the interaction between Openness to Experience and negative feedback (e.g., $\beta = -0.178$ for Openness × Negative Output) indicates that supervisees with high levels of openness to experience tend to experience a reduction in the negative impact of negative feedback. This means that supervisees who are more open to experience are less likely to be negatively affected by criticism or correction, so the supervisory relationship remains intact even when receiving corrective feedback.

Conversely, the positive coefficient in the interaction between Openness to Experience and positive feedback (e.g., $\beta = 0.158$ for Openness × Positive Output) indicates that supervisees who are open to experience are more responsive to positive feedback, which reinforces the positive effects of such feedback in enhancing reflective aspects, safety, and structure in the supervisory relationship.

	Path coefficients
Openness to experience → Reflective Education	0,117
Openness to experience → Safe base Relationship	0,105
Openness to experience → Structure	0,062
Openness to experience x Negative Behavioral → Reflective Education	-0,022
Openness to experience x Negative Behavioral → Safe base Relationship	-0,063
Openness to experience x Negative Behavioral → Structure	0,057
Openness to experience x Negative output → Reflective Education	-0,178
Openness to experience x Negative output → Safe base Relationship	-0,138
Openness to experience x Negative output → Structure	-0,159

Openness to experience x Positive Behavioral → Reflective Education	0,168
Openness to experience x Positive Behavioral → Safe base Relationship	0,300
Openness to experience x Positive Behavioral → Structure	0,110
Openness to experience x Positive Output → Reflective Education	0,158
Openness to experience x Positive Output → Safe base Relationship	-0,063
Openness to experience x Positive Output → Structure	0,157

Although the interaction between Openness to Experience and Negative Output shows a non-significant negative effect on statistics, the P values are close to the significance threshold, for example, for Reflective Education (β = -0.178, p = 0.089). This value indicates that there is a possibility of a potential and relevant moderating effect that should be further tested in subsequent research.

Effect size values (f^2) indicate the magnitude of the influence of the independent variable on the dependent variable in the tested model. The interpretation of f^2 values can refer to the guidelines proposed by Cohen (1988), namely: f^2 of 0.02 is categorized as a small effect, f^2 of 0.15 as a moderate effect, and f^2 of 0.35 as a large effect.

	f-square
Positive Behavioral → Reflective Education	0,330
Positive Behavioral → Safe base Relationship	0,148
Positive Behavioral → Structure	0,190

Positive Behavioral has a significant influence on Reflective Education (f^2 = 0.330), a moderate influence on Structure (f^2 = 0.190), and a near-moderate influence on Safe Base Relationship (f^2 = 0.148), indicating that this factor is the main driver of Gen Z employees' success in the workplace.

	f-square
Openness to experience x Positive Behavioral → Safe base Relationship	0,124
Openness to experience x Positive Output → Reflective Education	0,034
Openness to experience x Positive Output → Structure	0,023
Openness to experience x Negative output → Reflective Education	0,032

The interaction between Openness to Experience and Positive Behavioral has a moderate effect on Safe Base Relationship (f^2 = 0.124), while its interaction with Positive Output and Negative Output shows a small effect on Reflective Education (f^2 = 0.034 and 0.032) and Structure (f^2 = 0.023). This indicates that openness can increase the effectiveness of positive behavior.

	f-square
Negative Behavioral → Reflective Education	0,021
Openness to experience → Reflective Education	0,021
Openness to experience x Negative output → Structure	0,018
Openness to experience x Positive Behavioral → Structure	0,014
Openness to experience → Safe base Relationship	0,014

The interaction between Openness to Experience and Negative Output and Positive Behavioral shows a small effect on Structure (f^2 = 0.018 and 0.014). In addition, Openness also has a small effect on Reflective Education (f^2 = 0.021) and Safe Base Relationship (f^2 = 0.014). Although small, some effects, such as the influence of openness to experience on employee performance dimensions, still have theoretical relevance, indicating a non-dominant but still significant contribution in the context of work behavior development.

	f-square
Negative output → Reflective Education	0,000
Negative output → Structure	0,000
Openness to experience x Negative Behavioral → Reflective Education	0,001

Negative Output has no effect on Reflective Education and Structure ($f^2 = 0.000$). Its interaction with Negative Behavioral also shows a very small effect on Reflective Education ($f^2 = 0.001$), indicating minimal contribution from negative aspects.

Based on the f^2 effect analysis, the Positive Behavioral variable has the strongest effect on Reflective Education ($f^2 = 0.330$) and also has a moderate effect on Safe Base Relationship ($f^2 = 0.148$) and Structure ($f^2 = 0.190$). This indicates that positive behavior is the primary determinant in shaping Gen Z's work experience. Meanwhile, the moderating effect of Openness to Experience on the relationship between Positive Behavioral and Safe Base Relationship ($f^2 = 0.124$) indicates that openness to experience can strengthen the positive impact of behavior on safe work relationships. Conversely, variables such as Negative Output have a very small or insignificant influence on the outcomes studied, as indicated by the f^2 value of 0.000.

Conclusion

This study shows that supervisory feedback plays an important role in shaping the quality of supervisory relationships with Generation Z employees. In general, positive feedback, whether in the form of output or behavior, has a stronger and more constructive influence on the relationship between supervisors and supervisees than negative feedback.

However, negative feedback is not entirely detrimental, especially when delivered in the context of behavior that can improve work performance.

Personality openness to experience has been proven to act as a significant moderating variable in this relationship. Individuals with high levels of openness are better able to accept negative feedback constructively and respond to positive feedback more optimally, thereby strengthening the supervisory relationship.

The practical implications of these findings highlight the importance of understanding employees' personality characteristics, particularly those of Generation Z, when designing effective communication and supervision approaches. Supervisory feedback tailored to an

employee's level of openness can enhance the quality of the employee-supervisor relationship, helping to create a more supportive and collaborative work environment.

Discussion

Based on the results of the analysis of the research conducted, the researcher found that the scale of supervisory feedback plays an important role in shaping the quality of the relationship between supervisors and Generation Z employees. This research can add insight into the dynamics of the relationship between supervisors and Generation Z employees, especially in the context of this research, which focuses on the influence of feedback from supervisors on the quality of the relationship between supervisors and Generation Z employees. All instruments used in this study have adequate internal consistency and convergent validity, and these instruments have been proven to be reliable for measuring relevant constructs. In the S-SRQ instrument, there are indications that the aspect of security in supervisory relationships has very good internal consistency.

Positive feedback focused on behavior can increase motivation, self-confidence, and employees' perceptions of their supervisory relationships, indicating sportsmanship. Negative behavioral feedback with weak positive values indicates that feedback can be accepted constructively by employees, especially if the feedback is delivered positively and in an appropriate manner. This finding supports the literature stating that constructive negative feedback can motivate performance improvement without damaging the supervisory relationship (Kluger & DeNisi, 1996).

The results of positive output feedback show a significant positive influence, although the effect is smaller compared to positive behavioral feedback. Here, there is an indication that positive feedback focused on work outcomes is more effective in strengthening employees' sense of security compared to negative output feedback, which shows a small negative effect. This finding is consistent with the view that negative feedback focused on outcomes tends to be less effective, as it can trigger perceptions of threats to employees' competence (Ilgen et al., 1979).

However, there are also several paths that show statistically insignificant results, even though the direction of the relationship is positive. For example, the relationship between Negative Behavioral Feedback and Reflective Education, Safe Base Relationship, and Structure all show positive but insignificant coefficients. This indicates that although there is a tendency for the direction of the relationship to be consistent with the theory, the strength of the influence is not statistically significant. Possible causes may stem from the limited sample size, variations in Generation Z employees' perceptions of feedback, or other contextual factors not addressed in this study.

Additionally, Negative Output Feedback shows a very small and largely insignificant influence on all outcome constructs, even exhibiting a negative direction toward Safe Base Relationship. This reinforces the finding that negative feedback focused on work outcomes is more likely to

evoke perceptions of threat and is not effective in building safe and supportive relationships. Meanwhile, Openness to Experience does show a positive influence on all three goal constructs, but its values are also not significant, similar to Reflective Education.

The negative coefficient in the interaction between openness and negative output feedback indicates that employees with high levels of openness are more resilient to the negative effects of negative feedback. They view criticism as an opportunity to improve their skills, thereby maintaining good relationships with their supervisors. The positive coefficient in the interaction between openness and positive output feedback confirms that individuals with high levels of openness are more responsive to positive feedback. This finding supports the Big Five Personality theory, which suggests that individuals with high Openness to Experience tend to be more adaptive and open to new experiences.

Generation Z has a need for quick positive feedback and thrives in a positive and supportive work environment. They respond better to positive feedback focused on behavior. This emphasizes that supervisors need to provide constructive feedback, particularly on behavioral aspects, and understand the individual characteristics of their employees. By considering the level of Openness to Experience, supervisors can tailor their communication approach to maximize the effectiveness of feedback and maintain the quality of their relationship with employees.

Research Limitations

This study has several limitations. First, the participants were exclusively from Generation Z, so the results may not be generalizable to other age groups or work contexts. Second, the use of self-report measures introduces the possibility of perceptual bias among respondents. Additionally, the lack of significant results on some relationship pathways suggests the presence of other variables, such as supervisory style, organizational culture, or other personality traits beyond openness, that were not accounted for in the analysis.

REFERENCES

Anseel, F., Beatty, A. S., Shen, W., Lievens, F., & Sackett, P. R. (2015). How are we doing after 30 years? A meta-analytic review of the antecedents and outcomes of feedback-seeking behavior. *Journal of Management*, *41*(1), 318–348. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206313484521

Ashford, S. J., & Cummings, L. L. (1983). Feedback as an individual resource: Personal strategies of creating information. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, *32*(3), 370–398. https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073(83)90156-3

Carless, D., & Winstone, N. (2023). Teacher feedback literacy and its interplay with student feedback literacy. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *28*(1), 150–163. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2020.1782372

Cliffe, T., Beinart, H., & Cooper, M. (2016). Development and validation of a short version of the supervisory relationship questionnaire. *Clinical Psychology & Psychotherapy*, *23*(1), 77–86. https://doi.org/10.1002/cpp.1935

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Colquitt, J., LePine, J., & Wesson, M. (2023). *Organizational behavior: Improving performance and commitment in the workplace*. McGraw Hill LLC.

Cook, S., & Steyn, R. (2024). The role of feedback in the development of managers. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Management Sciences*, *1*, 1–16. https://doi.org/10.38140/ijms-2024.vol1.15

Eryanto, A. A. (2019). Hubungan antara interpersonal trust terhadap supervisor dengan kepuasan kerja pada karyawan PT. *NPN Surabaya*. http://repository.um-surabaya.ac.id/id/eprint/3737

Goldberg, L. R. (1992). The development of markers for the Big-Five factor structure. *Psychological Assessment*, *4*(1), 26–42. https://doi.org/10.1037/1040-3590.4.1.26

Ilgen, D. R., Fisher, C. D., & Taylor, M. S. (1979). Consequences of individual feedback on behavior in organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *64*(4), 349–371. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.64.4.349

Jaworski, B. J., & Kohli, A. K. (1991). Supervisory feedback: Alternative types and their impact on salespeople's performance and satisfaction. *Journal of Marketing Research*, *28*(2), 190. https://doi.org/10.2307/3172807

Kluger, A. N., & DeNisi, A. (1996). The effects of feedback interventions on performance: A historical review, a meta-analysis, and a preliminary feedback intervention theory. *Psychological Bulletin*, *119*(2), 254–284. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.119.2.254

Kumar, V., & Stracke, E. (2007). An analysis of written feedback on a PhD thesis. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *12*(4), 461–470. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562510701415433

Marwinda, F. (2020). Pengaruh pengawasan supervisor terhadap produktivitas kerja unit produksi pada usaha roti Rotte Bakery se-pekanbaru. https://repository.uir.ac.id/11699/

Othman, M. N. A., Rashid, M. A. A., & Said, R. A. (2024). Insight into gen Z: Navigating the changing workplace landscape. In *Contemporary Research in Business, Management and Economics Vol. 7* (pp. 116–130). B P International. https://doi.org/10.9734/bpi/crbme/v7/6978E

Rogito, J., & Makabe, M. (2023). The art and act of providing feedback at the workplace: Effective feedback for positive results. *Pan-African Journal of Education and Social Sciences*, *4*(1), 49–56. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/372104151

Sari, A. T. P., & Sagala, E. J. (2016). Analisis faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhi kepuasan kerja karyawan (Studi kasus: PT. Wilmar Nabati Indonesia). *E-Proceedings of Management*, *3*(3), 3035–3039. https://repository.telkomuniversity.ac.id/pustaka/121477/

Simanullang, T. (2021). Pengaruh tipe kepribadian *The Big Five Model Personality* terhadap kinerja aparatur sipil negara (Kajian studi literatur manajemen keuangan). Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan dan Ilmu Sosial, *2*(2), 747–753. https://doi.org/10.38035/jmpis.v2i2

Sujarwati, I., Othman, J., Harahap, A., & Lo, Y. Y. (2024). Students' perspectives on the writing supervisory feedback in Indonesian and Malaysian academia. *Tarbawi Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan*, *20*(2), 181–191. http://dx.doi.org/10.32939/tarbawi.v20i2.4229

Role of Openness to Experience in the Relationship between Supervisory Feedback and Supervisory Relationships among Generation Z Employees in Jakarta

<1 %

| 11 | ijecm.co.uk
Internet Source | <1 % |

| 12 | journal.jfpublisher.com
Internet Source | <1 % |

| 13 | irep.iium.edu.my
Internet Source | <1 % |

| 14 | oaktrust.library.tamu.edu
Internet Source | <1 % |

| 15 | www.ohiolink.edu
Internet Source | <1 % |

| 16 | gcc.mespune.in
Internet Source | <1 % |

| 17 | vtechworks.lib.vt.edu
Internet Source | <1 % |

| 18 | westminsterresearch.westminster.ac.uk
Internet Source | <1 % |

| 19 | Marselius Sampe Tondok, Dinda Aulia Safitri. "Unveiling Religious Tolerance among Indonesian Christian Youth: How Do Personality Traits and Intrinsic Religiosity Orientation Matter?", Springer Science and Business Media LLC, 2025
Publication | <1 % |

| 20 | Paul T. P. Wong. "The Human Quest for Meaning - Theories, Research, and Applications", Routledge, 2013
Publication | <1 % |

| 21 | Tuyen Dai Quang, Tan Vo-Thanh. "Routledge Handbook of Tourism and Hospitality Development in Vietnam", Routledge, 2025
Publication | <1 % |

22 Wenqian Luan, Jianqiang Quan. "Interplay Among Classroom Environment, Grit, and Enjoyment in Shaping Feedback-Seeking Behavior in L2 Writing", Behavioral Sciences, 2025
Publication

<1 %

23 Winfred Arthur, Eric Anthony Day, Winston Bennett, Antoinette M. Portrey. "Individual and Team Skill Decay - The Science and Implications for Practice", Routledge, 2013
Publication

<1 %

24 mdpi-res.com
Internet Source

<1 %

25 onlinelibrary.wiley.com
Internet Source

<1 %

26 pure.uva.nl
Internet Source

<1 %

27 scholar.stjohns.edu
Internet Source

<1 %

28 tpcjournal.nbcc.org
Internet Source

<1 %

29 umu.diva-portal.org
Internet Source

<1 %

30 www.immi.se
Internet Source

<1 %

31 Paresh Kumar Sarma, Samiha Sarowar. "The contribution of livestock intervention on gender equality, social integration, and women's empowerment in Bangladesh", Springer Science and Business Media LLC, 2024
Publication

<1 %