

BAB V

PENUTUP

5.1. Kesimpulan

Sejalan dengan analisis dan pembahasan hasil pengujian hipotesis yang telah dilakukan maka dapat diajukan beberapa kesimpulan penting yaitu:

1. Adanya korelasi negatif antara keterikatan kerja dan kelelahan emosional, dengan koefisien korelasi $-0,432$. Sehingga semakin kuat rasa keterikatan karyawan terhadap pekerjaan mereka maka, semakin kecil kemungkinan mereka mengalami kelelahan emosional. Sebaliknya, jika keterikatan kerja rendah, risiko kelelahan emosional justru meningkat. Kekuatan hubungan ini tergolong sedang, menunjukkan bahwa keterikatan kerja memiliki dampak yang cukup signifikan terhadap tingkat kelelahan emosional. Dengan kata lain, pengujian hipotesis 1 diterima.
2. Adanya korelasi positif antara kelelahan emosional dan perilaku kontraproduktif di tempat kerja. Dengan kata lain, karyawan yang mengalami kelelahan emosional lebih rentan menunjukkan tindakan yang merugikan organisasi, seperti penurunan kualitas pekerjaan, peningkatan absensi, keterlambatan, atau bahkan sabotase. Dengan hal ini, pengujian hipotesis 2 diterima.

3. Adanya korelasi negatif antara keterikatan kerja dan perilaku kerja kontraproduktif, dengan koefisien korelasi $-0,535$. Hal ini mengindikasikan bahwa karyawan dengan tingkat keterikatan kerja yang tinggi cenderung tidak menunjukkan perilaku kontraproduktif, sementara karyawan dengan keterikatan kerja yang rendah justru lebih berpotensi melakukannya. Dengan hal ini, pengujian hipotesis 3 diterima.
4. Kelelahan emosional tidak berfungsi sebagai perantara hubungan antara keterikatan pada pekerjaan dan perilaku kontraproduktif di tempat kerja. Hal ini diperkuat oleh nilai sampel orisinal (O) $-0,075$, statistik-t $1,723$ ($\leq 1,96$), dan nilai P $0,085$ ($\geq 0,05$), sehingga hipotesis 4 ditolak dan tidak didukung.
5. *Conscientiousness* berperan sebagai faktor yang memperkuat atau memperlemah hubungan antara keterikatan pada pekerjaan dan kelelahan emosional. Hal ini dibuktikan dengan nilai sampel awal (O) sebesar $0,099$, statistik-t sebesar $2,299$ (lebih besar dari $1,96$), dan nilai signifikansi (P-value) sebesar $0,022$ (lebih kecil dari $0,05$). Berdampak pada keterikatan kerja terhadap kelelahan emosional bervariasi tergantung pada tingkat *Conscientiousness* yang dimiliki karyawan. Dengan ini, pengujian hipotesis 5 diterima.

5.2. Implikasi Penelitian

1. Implikasi Teoritis

Penelitian ini mendukung Model Tuntutan-Sumber Daya Kerja (JD-R) (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004) yang menyatakan bahwa faktor-faktor positif di

lingkungan kerja seperti keterikatan kerja dapat mengurangi kelelahan emosional dan perilaku negatif di tempat kerja. Selain itu, penelitian ini mengonfirmasi pentingnya teori kepribadian Lima Besar (*Big Five Personality Traits*) terutama sifat ketelitian (*conscientiousness*) dalam membentuk perilaku kerja melalui kemampuan pengendalian diri, disiplin, dan fokus pada tujuan (Tett & Burnett, 2003). Temuan bahwa kelelahan emosional tidak secara signifikan menjadi perantara dalam hubungan antar variabel menunjukkan bahwa ada faktor lain yang mungkin lebih berpengaruh seperti kepuasan kerja atau persepsi keadilan di organisasi. Hal ini memperkaya khazanah literatur yang ada.

2. Implikasi Praktis

Bagi perusahaan, hasil penelitian ini memberikan landasan bahwa meningkatkan keterikatan kerja karyawan dapat menjadi cara efektif untuk mengurangi kelelahan emosional dan perilaku kontraproduktif. Manajemen dapat mempertimbangkan ketelitian sebagai salah satu aspek penting dalam proses rekrutmen dan seleksi karyawan mengingat dampaknya yang kuat dalam mengurangi kelelahan emosional. Organisasi disarankan untuk merancang kebijakan pengelolaan stres kerja dan program kesejahteraan karyawan untuk mencegah terjadinya kelelahan emosional.

5.3 Keterbatasan Penelitian dan Saran

Penelitian ini memiliki beberapa kelemahan yang perlu diperhatikan karena dapat memengaruhi keakuratan hasil dan penafsiran temuan, meliputi:

1. Penelitian hanya dilakukan pada satu perusahaan atau organisasi, sehingga penerapan hasil penelitian pada sektor atau industri lain perlu

dilakukan dengan hati-hati karena kemungkinan adanya perbedaan. Maka, disarankan untuk peneliti selanjutnya sebaiknya melibatkan lebih dari satu perusahaan atau sektor industri agar hasil yang diperoleh bisa diterapkan secara lebih luas. Dengan menggabungkan berbagai jenis organisasi, peneliti bisa menemukan perbedaan dan kesamaan dalam hasil yang muncul tergantung pada ciri-ciri perusahaan masing-masing. Mengkombinasikan metode penelitian kualitatif dan kuantitatif untuk memperoleh hasil yang lebih lengkap dan mendalam.

2. Penggunaan kuesioner sebagai metode pengumpulan data membuka peluang adanya bias akibat subjektivitas responden dalam memberikan jawaban. Diharapkan untuk studi lanjutan disarankan dapat memperkaya cara pengumpulan data dengan menggunakan teknik seperti wawancara mendalam, pengamatan lapangan, atau pendekatan gabungan (metode campuran). Melalui triangulasi data, potensi bias dari partisipan dapat dikurangi dan keabsahan temuan penelitian ditingkatkan.
3. Penelitian hanya berfokus pada *conscientiousness*, keterikatan kerja, kelelahan emosional, dan perilaku kontraproduktif, sehingga tidak mempertimbangkan faktor-faktor lain yang mungkin juga berperan, seperti gaya kepemimpinan, budaya perusahaan, atau rasa keadilan dalam bekerja. Diharapkan untuk studi selanjutnya dapat mengembangkan kerangka penelitian dengan menambahkan variabel-variabel lain yang penting, misalnya gaya kepemimpinan, budaya perusahaan, dukungan dari rekan kerja, atau pandangan tentang keadilan. Dengan demikian,

pemahaman yang lebih lengkap tentang faktor-faktor yang memengaruhi kinerja karyawan dapat diperoleh.

4. Desain penelitian yang bersifat *cross-sectional* atau jenis penelitian observasional yang menganalisis data dari populasi, atau sampel yang representatif, pada satu titik waktu tertentu yang tidak memungkinkan untuk mengidentifikasi hubungan sebab-akibat antarvariabel dalam jangka waktu tertentu. Diharapkan untuk penelitian selanjutnya sebaiknya mempertimbangkan rancangan longitudinal atau eksperimen untuk melacak perubahan hubungan antarvariabel dari waktu ke waktu dan memperkuat bukti hubungan sebab-akibat.

Saran untuk Perusahaan (PT Pasoka Sumber Karya):

1. Meningkatkan rasa memiliki dan semangat kerja karyawan. Organisasi perlu membangun suasana kerja yang kondusif, menghargai pencapaian, dan mendefinisikan dengan jelas sasaran yang harus dicapai setiap karyawan.
2. Melakukan upaya pencegahan terhadap kelelahan emosional. Perusahaan dapat menawarkan program pengelolaan stres, layanan konseling profesional, atau opsi cuti untuk pemulihan guna membantu karyawan menjaga kesehatan mental mereka.
3. Meningkatkan sifat bertanggung jawab dan disiplin pada diri karyawan. Melalui pelatihan mengenai disiplin, pengaturan waktu, dan akuntabilitas kerja, perusahaan dapat membantu karyawan

mengembangkan sifat bertanggung jawab yang terbukti dapat mengurangi kelelahan emosional.

4. Pada saat proses seleksi, pertimbangkan juga aspek kepribadian ini untuk memastikan perusahaan memiliki sumber daya manusia yang lebih kuat dalam menghadapi tekanan kerja. Perusahaan perlu memperkuat rasa keadilan dalam organisasi, keterbukaan kebijakan, dan komunikasi yang efektif untuk menghindari ketidakpuasan kerja yang dapat memicu perilaku tidak produktif.
5. Menyediakan jalur komunikasi resmi (seperti sistem pelaporan pelanggaran atau wadah aspirasi karyawan) juga dapat menjadi cara untuk menyalurkan kekecewaan karyawan tanpa harus melalui tindakan negatif.
6. Menciptakan lingkungan kerja yang positif dan saling mendukung. Perusahaan dapat mendorong kolaborasi tim, mempererat hubungan sosial antar karyawan, dan mempromosikan keseimbangan antara pekerjaan dan kehidupan pribadi. Lingkungan kerja yang positif akan meningkatkan rasa memiliki dan mengurangi dampak buruk dari kelelahan emosional.

DAFTAR PUSTAKA

- Aguinis, H., & Burgi-Tian, J. (2021). *Talent management challenges during COVID-19 and beyond: Performance management to the rescue*. *Business Research Quarterly*, 24(3), 233–242. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2340944420942596>
- Ahmed, N. S., Al-Khaled, R. A., & Salem, M. S. (2024). Toxic leadership and workplace deviance among nurses: The mediating role of emotional exhaustion. *BMC Nursing*, 23(14), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12912-024-02308-x>
- Alarcon, G. M., Edwards, J. M., & Menke, L. E. (2021). Student burnout and engagement: A meta-analysis and theoretical critique of the literature. *Educational Psychology Review*, 33, 439–476. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-020-09505-1>
- Bakker, A. B., & Wang, Y. (2020). *Self-undermining behavior at work: The negative effects of high work engagement*. *The Career Development International Journal*, 25(5), 454–469. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CDI-06-2019-0151>
- Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Sanz-Vergel, A. I. (2021). *Burnout and work engagement: The JD–R approach*. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 8, 389–411. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-012420-055512>
- Bennett, R. J., & Robinson, S. L. (2000). Development of a measure of workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(3), 349–360. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.85.3.349>
- Bowling, N. A., & Eschleman, K. J. (2010). Employee personality as a moderator of the relationships between work stressors and counterproductive work behavior. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 15(1), 91–103. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0017326>
- Chen, H., Richard, O. C., Boncoeur, D., & Ford, D. (2020). *Work engagement, emotional exhaustion, and counterproductive work behavior: The moderating roles of conscientiousness and emotional stability*. *Journal of Business Research*, 114, 30–41. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.03.025>
- Christian, M. S., Garza, A. S., & Slaughter, J. E. (2011). Work engagement: A quantitative review and test of its relations with task and contextual performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 64(1), 89–136. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2010.01203.x>
- Cohen, A. (2018). *Counterproductive work behaviors: Understanding and predicting deviant workplace behavior*. Palgrave Macmillan.

- Contreras, F., & Espinosa, J. C. (2020). Work engagement, personal resources, and burnout among nurses: A structural equation modeling approach. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 76(12), 3451–3462. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.14428>
- Cooke, F. L., Cooper, B., Bartram, T., Wang, J., & Mei, H. (2020). *Mapping the relationships between high-performance work systems, employee resilience and engagement: A study of the banking industry in China*. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 31(22), 2885–2910. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2019.1695649>
- Credé, M., Tynan, M., & Harms, P. D. (2020). *Much ado about grit: A meta-analytic synthesis of the grit literature*. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 113(3), 492–511. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000260>
- Dalal, R. S. (2005). A meta-analysis of the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive work behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(6), 1241–1255. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.6.1241>
- Debets, T., Bakker, A. B., & Taris, T. W. (2022). Burnout and work engagement in healthcare: A longitudinal study among hospital staff. *Occupational Medicine*, 72(4), 245–252. <https://doi.org/10.1093/occmed/kqac012>
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2020). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. Springer.
- Evans, A. M., Meyers, M. C., Van De Calseide, P. P. F., & Stavrova, O. (2022). Extroversion and *conscientiousness* predict deteriorating job outcomes during enforced remote work. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/19485506211039092>
- Furnham, A., & Treglown, L. (2021). *The dark side of personality at work*. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 40, 83–88. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2020.09.002>
- Gao, Y., Shi, J., Niu, Q., & Wang, L. (2021). Work-family conflict and job burnout among Chinese teachers: The mediating role of psychological capital. *Current Psychology*, 40, 3592–3600. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-019-00242-3>
- Gino, F. (2020). *Understanding ordinary unethical behavior: Why people who value morality act immorally*. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 33, 157–162. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2019.08.010>
- Götz, F. M., Stieger, S., & Reips, U.-D. (2020). *Users of the Dark Triad traits use digital media differently: A meta-analytic review*. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 108, 106331. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2020.106331>
- Halbesleben, J. R. B., & Rathert, C. (2020). *Linking conscientiousness and emotional exhaustion: A conservation of resources view*. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 105(4), 460–472. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000432>

- Halbesleben, J. R. B., & Wheeler, A. R. (2008). The relative roles of engagement and embeddedness in predicting job performance and intention to leave. *Work & Stress*, 22(3), 242–256. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678370802383962>
- Hobfoll, S. E., Halbesleben, J., Neveu, J. P., & Westman, M. (2018). Conservation of Resources in the Organizational Context: The Reality of Resources and Their Consequences. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 5(1), 103–128.
- Howard, D. J., Pindek, S., & Krajcevska, A. (2021). *A multidimensional approach to understanding counterproductive work behavior: The roles of target, intention, and behavior type*. *Applied Psychology*, 70(2), 548–576. <https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12247>
- Junker, N. M. (2021). Longitudinal associations between work engagement and burnout: A latent growth modeling approach. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 94(1), 25–48. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12329>
- Kim, H. J., Shin, K. H., & Swanger, N. (2009). Burnout and engagement: A comparative analysis using the Big Five personality dimensions. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 28(1), 96–104. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2008.06.001>
- Kim, M., Woo, H., & Kim, Y. (2021). *How do conscientious workers respond to job stress? The role of self-regulation strategies in managing job demands and exhaustion*. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(4), 2070. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18042070>
- Klotz, A. C., & Bolino, M. C. (2020). *Bringing the dark side of personality to light: The neglected role of counterproductive work behavior in job performance ratings*. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 34(1), 36–52. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amp.2017.0141>
- Kuijpers, E., Pickett, J., Wille, B., & Hofmans, J. (2024). Does it pay off to act conscientiously, both now and later? Examining concurrent, lagged, and cumulative effects of state *conscientiousness*. *Journal of Risk & Uncertainty in Business*, 30(2), 98–115. <https://doi.org/10.1177/08902070221124705>
- Lee, S., Idris, M. A., & Tuckey, M. R. (2022). *Supervisory support and work engagement: A meta-analytic review*. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 37(2), 102–117. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMP-05-2021-0256>
- Liao, H., Liu, D., & Loi, R. (2020). *Looking at both sides of the social exchange coin: A multi-level review of leader–member exchange*. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 37(3), 753–780. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10490-018-9616-8>

- Liu, Z., Li, Y., Zhu, W., & He, Y. (2022). A meta-analysis of teachers' job burnout and Big Five personality traits. *Frontiers in Education*, 7, 822659. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2022.822659>
- Llorens, S., Schaufeli, W. B., & Salanova, M. (2021). *Individual and organizational predictors of work engagement: A multi-level study*. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 26(4), 357–370. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000274>
- Lubbadeh, M. T. (2021). The impact of burnout on counterproductive work behaviours: Evidence from the Jordanian banking sector. *Organizacija*, 54(1), 26–36. <https://doi.org/10.2478/orga-2021-0004>
- Luthans, F., & Youssef-Morgan, C. M. (2020). *Psychological capital and beyond*. Oxford University Press.
- Ma, W., Li, R. Y. M., Manta, O., & Alzuman, A. (2022). Learning burnout and its association with perceived stress, social support, and the Big Five personality traits in Chinese medical students during the COVID-19 pandemic. *BMC Psychiatry*, 22, 4453. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-022-04453-6>
- Mackey, J. D., Frieder, R. E., Brees, J. R., & Martinko, M. J. (2021). *Abusive supervision: A meta-analytic review and future research agenda*. *Journal of Management*, 47(6), 1480–1508. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206320959785>
- Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (2016). *Understanding the burnout experience: Recent research and its implications for psychiatry*. *World Psychiatry*, 15(2), 103–111. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.20311>
- Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (2021). *Burnout: A review of theory and measurement*. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 72, 397–422. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-071620-030921>
- Mazzetti, G., Guglielmi, D., Chiesa, R., & Mariani, M. G. (2021). *Work engagement and interpersonal relationships: A social support perspective*. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 643386. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.643386>
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (2020). *The Five-Factor Theory of Personality*. In John, O. P., Robins, R. W., & Pervin, L. A. (Eds.), *Handbook of Personality: Theory and Research* (4th ed.). Guilford Press.
- Montani, F., Setti, I., Sommovigo, V., & Giorgi, G. (2020). *Who responds creatively to role ambiguity? The role of proactive personality and anxiety*. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(14), 5106. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17145106>
- Montano, D., Reeske, A., Franke, F., & Hüffmeier, J. (2022). *Leadership, social support and work engagement: A meta-analysis*. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 43(3), 251–271. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2545>

- Muris, P., Otgaar, H., Meijer, E., & Raine, A. (2022). *The dark triad personality traits and workplace deviance: A meta-analytic review*. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 190, 111539. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2022.111539>
- Ni, Y., Zhang, L., & Wang, J. (2024). A job demands–resources model for nurses' burnout in the post-COVID-19 context: The mediating role of work engagement. *BMC Nursing*, 23(45), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12912-024-01121-z>
- Olsen, E., Fu, Y., & Jensen, M. (2024). The influence of remote work on personality trait–performance linkages: A two-wave longitudinal study. *Administrative Sciences*. Advance online publication.
- Park, R., Lee, H. W., & Song, D. (2021). *When and why does high work engagement backfire? The dark side of work engagement*. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(5), 2417. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18052417>
- Penney, L. M., Hunter, E. M., & Perry, S. J. (2021). *Personality and counterproductive work behavior*. In S. M. Vough et al. (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Workplace Deviance*. Oxford University Press.
- Perera, H. N., & DiGiacomo, M. (2021). *The role of personality in occupational well-being: A systematic review and research agenda*. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 94(4), 837–861. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12360>
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., & Bachrach, D. G. (2007). Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management*, 33(3), 474–529. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206307300810>
- Qureshi, M. A., Rasli, A. M., & Zaman, K. (2021). Impact of loss of psychological resources on deviant workplace behavior: Testing the COR theory. *Current Psychology*, 40(3), 1102–1114.
- Roberts, B. W., Luo, J., Briley, D. A., Chow, P. I., Su, R., & Hill, P. L. (2020). *A systematic review of personality trait change through intervention*. *Psychological Bulletin*, 146(7), 512–547. <https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000223>
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2020). *Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation from a self-determination theory perspective: Definitions, theory, practices, and future directions*. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 61, 101860. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2020.101860>
- Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21(7), 600–619. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940610690169>

- Salanova, M., Llorens, S., & Acosta, H. (2021). *Work engagement as a response to adversity: Evidence from the COVID-19 pandemic*. *Current Psychology*, 40(12), 6115–6125. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-020-01151-w>
- Salmela-Aro, K., & Upadyaya, K. (2020). *Role of demands-resources in work engagement and burnout in different career stages*. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 119, 103229. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2020.103229>
- Sarwar, A., Imran, M. K., & Nisar, Q. A. (2020). *Does personality matter? The role of big five in predicting job stress and turnover intentions*. *International Journal of Organizational Leadership*, 9(1), 8–20. <https://doi.org/10.33844/ijol.2020.60276>
- Schaufeli, W. B. (2021). *The burnout enigma solved?* *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment & Health*, 47(4), 245–249. <https://doi.org/10.5271/sjweh.3950>
- Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2004). Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25(3), 293–315. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.248>
- Schaufeli, W. B., De Witte, H., & Desart, S. (2020). *Manual: Burnout Assessment Tool (BAT)*. KU Leuven.
- Scherer, L. L., Baysinger, M. A., & Kacmar, K. M. (2021). *The psychological underpinnings of counterproductive work behavior: A review and agenda for future research*. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 42(6), 726–743. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2512>
- Searle, R. H. (2022). *Toxic workplace culture and deviant behavior: A systems perspective*. *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance*, 9(3), 245–263. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JOEPP-12-2021-0274>
- Shankar, V., Sharma, A., & Yadav, A. (2024). How workplace ostracism leads to counterproductive work behavior: The parallel mediating roles of emotional exhaustion and felt accountability. *Journal of Management Development*, 43(2), 101–120. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMD-02-2024-0069>
- Shkoler, O., & Tziner, A. (2017). The mediating and moderating role of burnout and emotional intelligence in the relationship between organizational justice and work misbehavior. *Revista de Psicología del Trabajo y de las Organizaciones*, 33(2), 157–164. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rpto.2017.05.002>
- Shoss, M. K., Restubog, S. L. D., & Garcia, P. R. J. M. (2021). *The long arm of injustice: Unfairness at work and its impact across contexts*. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 42(7), 889–907. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2523>
- Sonnentag, S., & Niessen, C. (2020). *To detach or not to detach? Two experimental studies on the affective consequences of detaching from work during non-work time*. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, 560156. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.560156>

- Soto, C. J. (2021). *How replicable are links between personality traits and consequential life outcomes? The Life Outcomes of Personality Replication Project*. Psychological Science, 32(5), 693–707. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797621989731>
- Spector, P. E. (2020). *Counterproductive work behavior: What we know and what we need to know*. Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 13(1), 74–81. <https://doi.org/10.1017/iop.2019.88>
- Spector, P. E., Zhou, Z. E., & Che, X. X. (2021). *Counterproductive work behavior and the stressor–emotion model: A closer look at interactions*. Personnel Review, 50(6), 1443–1456. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-10-2020-0725>
- van Wijhe, C. I., Peeters, M. C. W., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2019). *Engaged and exhausted: The moderating role of recovery opportunities in the relationship between work engagement and emotional exhaustion*. Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 24(4), 453–463. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000121>
- Venkatesh V, Ganster DC, Schuetz SW, Sykes TA. Risks and rewards of conscientiousness during the COVID-19 pandemic. J Appl Psychol. 2021 May;106(5):643-656. doi: 10.1037/apl0000919. PMID: 34096739.
- Wilmot, M. P., & Ones, D. S. (2021). *A century of conscientiousness: A quantitative review of construct validity evidence*. Journal of Research in Personality, 90, 104046. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2020.104046>
- Witt, L. A., Burke, L. A., Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (2002). The interactive effects of conscientiousness and agreeableness on job performance. Journal of Applied Psychology, 87(1), 164–169. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.1.164>
- Wu, W. L., & Lee, Y. C. (2020). Job demands, engagement, and emotional outcomes: A conservation of resources perspective. Journal of Business Research, 114, 30–41. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.03.011>
- Yildiz, B., Alpan, L., & Sezen, B. (2020). How burnout leads to counterproductive work behaviors: The mediating role of emotional exhaustion and the moderating role of organizational support. Journal of Business Research, 111, 333–343.
- Zettler, I., Thielmann, I., Hilbig, B. E., & Moshagen, M. (2020). *The role of personality in predicting counterproductive work behavior: A meta-analysis of the HEXACO model*. Journal of Applied Psychology, 105(10), 1218–1247. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000473>
- Zhao, H., Liu, W., & Gao, B. (2020). The effects of work-related identity discrepancy on counterproductive work behavior: The mediating role of emotional exhaustion and the moderating role of supervisor incivility.

International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 17(16), 5747. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17165747>

Zhu, J., & Zhang, B. (2021). Workplace ostracism and counterproductive work behavior: The chain mediating role of anger and emotional exhaustion. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 761560. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.761560>