

Counterproductive Work Behavior and Employee Performance in the Organizational Context in Indonesia

Neneng Milasari¹, Rahmawati², Safier Ramdani³, Murniadi⁴, Taswati Nova Wijyaningrum⁵

¹ Akademi Sekretari Manajemen Kencana Bandung

² Universitas Muhammadiyah Palopo

³ D3 Perpajakan, Universitas Muhammadiyah Prof DR Hamka

⁴ Universitas Muhammadiyah Tangerang

⁵ Institut Teknologi Statistika dan Bisnis Muhammadiyah Semarang

Article Info

Article history:

Received September, 2026

Revised September, 2026

Accepted September, 2026

Keywords:

Counterproductive Work Behavior;
Employee Engagement;
Employee Performance;
Human Resource Management;
Organizational Behavior

ABSTRACT

Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB) has become an important issue in organizational management because it can negatively affect employee effectiveness, workplace relationships, and organizational performance. This study aims to examine the influence of Counterproductive Work Behavior and Employee Engagement on Employee Performance within organizations in Indonesia. This research applies a quantitative approach using survey methods involving 175 employees from various organizational backgrounds. Data were collected through a structured questionnaire measured using a five-point Likert scale and analyzed using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 25. The analysis process involved validity testing, reliability testing, classical assumption testing, and multiple linear regression analysis to evaluate the proposed hypotheses. The results indicate that Counterproductive Work Behavior has a significant negative influence on Employee Performance, indicating that increased counterproductive behavior reduces employee performance levels. Meanwhile, Employee Engagement demonstrates a significant positive influence on Employee Performance, showing that stronger employee involvement and psychological attachment contribute to improved performance outcomes. The coefficient of determination ($R^2 = 0.510$) indicates that Counterproductive Work Behavior and Employee Engagement explain 51.0% of the variation in employee performance. This study provides empirical evidence that organizations need to reduce dysfunctional workplace behaviors while strengthening employee engagement strategies to improve sustainable employee performance.

This is an open access article under the [CC BY-SA](#) license.



Corresponding Author:

Name: Neneng Milasari

Institution: Akademi Sekretari Manajemen Kencana Bandung

Email: milaimmi2405@gmail.com

1. INTRODUCTION

In contemporary organizational environments, employee behavior has emerged as a critical determinant of

organizational effectiveness, competitiveness, and long-term sustainability. Organizations are increasingly challenged to manage productive employee contributions while simultaneously controlling workplace

behaviors that can disrupt operational processes, interpersonal relationships, and organizational outcomes. Among these concerns, counterproductive work behavior (CWB) has received considerable attention in organizational behavior and human resource management research. CWB refers to intentional employee actions that violate legitimate organizational interests and potentially harm the organization, its members, or both [1], [2]. These behaviors may take various forms, including absenteeism, misuse of organizational resources, deliberate reduction of work effort, interpersonal aggression, workplace deviance, and violations of organizational procedures. Although some forms of CWB may appear relatively minor when examined individually, their accumulation can generate substantial organizational consequences by reducing productivity, increasing operational costs, deteriorating workplace relationships, and weakening organizational effectiveness [1], [2]. Understanding why employees engage in such behaviors therefore represents an important organizational and scholarly concern.

The emergence of CWB is closely associated with the way employees perceive, interpret, and respond to their organizational environment. Excessive job demands, perceived injustice, ineffective management practices, limited organizational support, interpersonal conflict, and weak psychological attachment may create conditions under which employees develop unfavorable attitudes toward their work and organization. Employees experiencing persistent dissatisfaction or psychological disconnection may respond by withdrawing effort, violating organizational norms, or engaging in other dysfunctional workplace behaviors [3], [4], [5]. This perspective indicates that CWB should not be regarded merely as an isolated behavioral problem originating from individual characteristics. Rather, it represents a behavioral response that may emerge through the interaction between employees and their work environment. Consequently, organizations seeking to reduce CWB need to understand

the psychological mechanisms and organizational conditions associated with employee behavior instead of relying exclusively on disciplinary interventions [6], [7]. Such an understanding is particularly important because persistent counterproductive behavior may influence both individual work outcomes and the broader social environment within which employees perform their responsibilities.

Within this behavioral framework, employee engagement represents an important psychological condition that may explain differences in employees' workplace attitudes and performance. Employee engagement describes the extent to which employees invest cognitive, emotional, and behavioral energy in performing their organizational roles. Highly engaged employees generally demonstrate stronger enthusiasm, dedication, involvement, persistence, and willingness to contribute toward organizational objectives [8], [9]. Their psychological connection with work can encourage discretionary effort and constructive workplace behavior beyond formal job requirements. In contrast, low engagement may be accompanied by emotional detachment, reduced motivation, diminished organizational attachment, and withdrawal from work responsibilities. These conditions may create a behavioral environment in which counterproductive tendencies become more likely. Examining employee engagement together with CWB is therefore important because the two constructs represent contrasting dimensions of workplace behavior: engagement reflects constructive psychological investment in work, whereas CWB represents behavior that potentially undermines organizational functioning [8], [9], [10]. Investigating these dimensions simultaneously provides a more comprehensive explanation of how positive and negative employee experiences may shape organizational outcomes.

Employee performance constitutes a central outcome through which these behavioral and psychological conditions become organizationally consequential. Employee performance is fundamental to

organizational success because employees translate organizational resources, strategies, and capabilities into measurable work outcomes. However, performance is not determined solely by technical competence or formal job requirements. Psychological attachment, motivation, workplace attitudes, behavioral choices, and the quality of employee–organization relationships can substantially affect employees' willingness and ability to perform effectively. CWB may undermine performance by diverting time and resources from productive activities, reducing task efficiency, generating interpersonal tension, and creating unfavorable working conditions [11], [12], [13]. Employee engagement, conversely, may improve performance by strengthening concentration, persistence, work involvement, and commitment toward achieving organizational goals [8], [9]. Examining CWB and employee engagement as predictors of employee performance therefore provides a theoretically coherent framework for understanding how contrasting behavioral and psychological conditions contribute to differences in individual work outcomes.

The relevance of these relationships becomes increasingly important within the Indonesian organizational context, where organizations operate amid intensified competition, digital and organizational transformation, changing employment arrangements, and evolving employee expectations. These developments require organizations to maintain employee productivity while simultaneously creating work environments capable of sustaining constructive attitudes and reducing dysfunctional behavior. Nevertheless, organizational culture, leadership practices, employment relationships, and employee expectations may shape behavioral responses differently across institutional and cultural contexts. Although previous research has associated CWB with adverse organizational outcomes and has generally demonstrated a positive association between employee engagement and performance, these relationships have frequently been examined

independently or within organizational environments outside Indonesia. Consequently, empirical understanding of how CWB and employee engagement jointly explain employee performance within Indonesian organizations remains insufficiently developed. This limitation creates an important research gap because examining positive and negative employee behaviors within a unified analytical framework may reveal whether employee performance is influenced primarily by the presence of constructive psychological involvement, the absence of harmful workplace behavior, or the simultaneous contribution of both factors.

Against this background, the present study examines the influence of counterproductive work behavior and employee engagement on employee performance within Indonesian organizations. The study contributes to organizational behavior and human resource management literature by integrating a negative behavioral construct and a positive psychological construct within a single explanatory model of employee performance. Rather than examining CWB or employee engagement in isolation, this approach provides a more balanced assessment of how dysfunctional behavior and constructive work involvement operate as distinct predictors of individual performance. Empirically, the study seeks to determine the effect of CWB on employee performance, assess the effect of employee engagement on employee performance, and evaluate the relationships among these constructs within the Indonesian organizational setting. From a managerial perspective, the findings are expected to provide a stronger basis for developing human resource practices that identify and reduce counterproductive behavior while cultivating employee engagement as a mechanism for improving workforce effectiveness. The study therefore extends current understanding of employee behavior by positioning performance as an outcome of both detrimental behavioral tendencies and constructive psychological involvement within a context that remains

comparatively underrepresented in the existing literature.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 *Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB)*

Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB) refers to intentional employee actions that violate organizational norms and potentially harm the organization or its members, including absenteeism, misuse of resources, reduced work effort, noncompliance, interpersonal conflict, and disruptive behavior. CWB is often influenced by perceptions of unfair treatment, excessive workload, limited organizational support, and weak organizational commitment [1], [2]. From the perspective of Social Exchange Theory, employee–organization relationships are based on reciprocity, meaning that fair treatment, support, and recognition may encourage positive behavior, whereas unfavorable treatment can trigger withdrawal or counterproductive actions. Previous studies have generally linked CWB with lower productivity, weaker cooperation, reduced task performance, and diminished commitment, making its management important for improving employee effectiveness and maintaining a constructive work environment [14], [15], [16].

2.2 *Employee Engagement*

Employee engagement refers to employees' psychological attachment, involvement, and commitment to their work and organization, reflected through energy, dedication, and active participation in achieving organizational goals. It includes emotional, cognitive, and behavioral dimensions that indicate employees' sense of belonging, understanding of organizational values, and willingness to invest effort in their responsibilities [8], [9], [17]. Based on the Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) Model, engagement tends to increase when employees receive adequate resources such as organizational support, effective

leadership, recognition, and development opportunities. Higher engagement is generally associated with stronger productivity, work quality, organizational commitment, and lower negative workplace behavior [18], [19], [20]. In the Indonesian context, employee engagement is increasingly important as employees place greater value on meaningful work, supportive leadership, and opportunities for growth.

2.3 *Employee Performance*

Employee performance refers to the level of achievement demonstrated by employees in completing assigned responsibilities and contributing to organizational objectives, commonly reflected through work quality, quantity, efficiency, reliability, and target attainment. Performance is shaped by individual factors, such as motivation, competence, psychological conditions, and work attitudes, as well as organizational factors, including leadership, organizational culture, reward systems, and the work environment [14], [21], [22]. From the Resource-Based View (RBV) perspective, employees constitute strategic resources that can generate competitive advantage when supported by appropriate capabilities, motivation, and effective management practices [23]. Employees with strong psychological attachment and positive work attitudes are more likely to invest greater effort and persistence, whereas counterproductive behavior may reduce performance through lower productivity, weaker cooperation, and inefficient use of organizational resources.

2.4 *Research Framework*

Based on the theoretical review, this study develops a research framework examining the influence of Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB) and Employee Engagement on Employee Performance. CWB is positioned as a negative behavioral factor that may reduce performance because behaviors such as delaying

tasks, violating workplace rules, misusing organizational resources, and creating interpersonal conflicts can disrupt work processes, lower productivity, weaken cooperation, and increase operational inefficiency [1], [2]. The negative relationship between CWB and performance can also be understood through behavioral consistency, as employees who frequently engage in counterproductive behavior may demonstrate lower responsibility and organizational commitment, which can hinder the achievement of performance expectations. Therefore, higher levels of CWB are expected to be associated with lower employee performance.

Employee Engagement, in contrast, is positioned as a positive psychological factor that may enhance employee performance. Engaged employees tend to demonstrate stronger motivation, greater effort, higher persistence, and deeper involvement in completing their responsibilities. According to the Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) Model, adequate job resources and organizational support can strengthen employee motivation and engagement, encouraging employees to invest greater effort, improve work quality, and contribute more effectively to organizational objectives [18], [19], [20]. Previous empirical findings have also shown that employees who feel psychologically connected to their work and organization are more likely to demonstrate productive behavior and maintain consistent performance. Based on these theoretical and empirical arguments, this study proposes that CWB negatively influences employee performance, whereas Employee Engagement positively influences employee performance.

H1: Counterproductive Work Behavior has a significant negative influence on employee performance

H2: Employee Engagement has a significant positive influence on employee performance.

3. RESEARCH METHODS

This study employed a quantitative explanatory research design to examine the influence of Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB) and Employee Engagement on Employee Performance within organizations in Indonesia. Data were collected through a structured self-administered questionnaire distributed to 175 employees selected using purposive sampling. Respondents were required to have work experience in an organizational environment and sufficient understanding of their workplace conditions and responsibilities. The questionnaire consisted of demographic information and measurement items assessed using a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree).

The study examined three variables: Counterproductive Work Behavior (X1), Employee Engagement (X2), and Employee Performance (Y). CWB was measured through indicators of misuse of organizational resources, noncompliance with procedures, intentional reduction of work effort, disruptive behavior, and negative workplace attitudes. Employee Engagement was assessed through work enthusiasm, emotional attachment, willingness to invest effort, responsibility toward organizational goals, and involvement in work activities. Employee Performance was measured through work quality, quantity, timeliness, effectiveness in achieving targets, and the ability to meet organizational expectations.

Data were analyzed using SPSS version 25. Instrument quality was assessed through Pearson Product Moment validity testing and Cronbach's Alpha reliability testing, with a coefficient above 0.70 considered acceptable. Classical assumption tests covering normality, multicollinearity, and heteroscedasticity were conducted prior to multiple linear regression analysis. The regression model was expressed as $Y = \alpha + \beta_1X_1 + \beta_2X_2 + e$. Hypotheses were tested using the t-test to examine partial effects and the F-test to assess simultaneous effects at a significance level of 5% ($\alpha = 0.05$).

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Respondent Characteristics

This study involved 175 respondents who were employees working in various organizations in Indonesia. The demographic characteristics of respondents were

analyzed based on gender, age, education level, and working period. The demographic profile provides an overview of the respondents involved in evaluating Counterproductive Work Behavior, Employee Engagement, and Employee Performance.

Table 1. Respondent Characteristics

Characteristics	Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	96	54.9
	Female	79	45.1
Age	20–30 years	72	41.1
	31–40 years	61	34.9
	41–50 years	32	18.3
	>50 years	10	5.7
Education Level	Senior High School	28	16.0
	Diploma/Bachelor Degree	119	68.0
	Master Degree	28	16.0
Working Period	<3 years	54	30.9
	3–5 years	63	36.0
	6–10 years	38	21.7
	>10 years	20	11.4

Table 1 shows that the respondent profile is relatively balanced by gender, with male employees comprising 54.9% and female employees 45.1% of the sample. Most respondents are within the productive age range, particularly 20–30 years (41.1%) and 31–40 years (34.9%), indicating that the study is dominated by employees who are actively engaged in organizational activities and career development. In terms of education, the majority hold a diploma or bachelor's degree (68.0%), while senior high school and master's degree holders each account for 16.0%, suggesting a generally well-educated workforce capable of understanding organizational practices and workplace behavior. Regarding tenure, most

respondents have worked for 3–5 years (36.0%), followed by less than 3 years (30.9%), 6–10 years (21.7%), and more than 10 years (11.4%). This distribution indicates that the sample includes employees with varying levels of work experience, providing a broad basis for assessing perceptions of counterproductive work behavior, employee engagement, and employee performance.

4.2 Descriptive Statistics Analysis

Descriptive statistical analysis was conducted to identify the characteristics of each research variable. The analysis includes the minimum value, maximum value, mean, and standard deviation. The results are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics of Research Variables

Variable	N	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Deviation
Counterproductive Work Behavior (X1)	175	1.40	4.80	2.37	0.71
Employee Engagement (X2)	175	2.00	5.00	4.12	0.63
Employee Performance (Y)	175	2.20	5.00	4.18	0.58

Table 2 indicates that Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB) has a mean score of 2.37 with a

standard deviation of 0.71, suggesting that respondents generally report a relatively low level of counterproductive

behavior. Employee Engagement records a mean of 4.12 and a standard deviation of 0.63, indicating a high level of psychological involvement, enthusiasm, and commitment toward work. Employee Performance shows the highest mean score at 4.18 with a standard deviation of 0.58, reflecting generally strong performance among respondents. The relatively moderate standard deviations across all variables also indicate that respondent assessments are fairly consistent.

4.3 Validity Test

The validity test was performed using Pearson Product Moment correlation analysis. Each questionnaire item was evaluated based on the correlation between item scores and the total variable score. An item is considered valid when the correlation coefficient (r-count) exceeds the r-table value of 0.148 for 175 respondents at a significance level of 5%.

Table 3. Validity Test Results

Variable	Number of Items	Range of r-count	Result
Counterproductive Work Behavior	5	0.612–0.781	Valid
Employee Engagement	5	0.654–0.823	Valid
Employee Performance	5	0.671–0.846	Valid

Table 3 shows that all measurement items for Counterproductive Work Behavior, Employee Engagement, and Employee Performance meet the validity criteria. The r-count values range from 0.612 to 0.781 for Counterproductive Work Behavior, 0.654 to 0.823 for Employee Engagement, and 0.671 to 0.846 for Employee Performance. These results indicate that each item has an adequate

correlation with its respective construct, confirming that all questionnaire items are valid and appropriate for measuring the variables examined in this study.

4.4 Reliability Test

Reliability testing was conducted using Cronbach's Alpha coefficient. A variable is considered reliable when the Cronbach's Alpha value exceeds 0.70.

Table 4. Reliability Test Results

Variable	Cronbach's Alpha	Standard Value	Result
Counterproductive Work Behavior	0.824	0.70	Reliable
Employee Engagement	0.871	0.70	Reliable
Employee Performance	0.889	0.70	Reliable

Table 4 shows that all research variables meet the reliability criteria, as their Cronbach's Alpha values exceed the minimum threshold of 0.70. Counterproductive Work Behavior records a reliability coefficient of 0.824, Employee Engagement 0.871, and Employee Performance 0.889. These values indicate strong internal consistency among the measurement items for each construct, confirming that the questionnaire instruments are reliable and suitable for further statistical analysis.

4.5 Classical Assumption Test

a. Normality Test

The normality test using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov method produced a Z value of 0.842 and an Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) value of 0.478. Since the significance value is greater than 0.05, the residuals can be considered normally distributed. This result indicates that the regression model satisfies the normality assumption and is therefore appropriate for further regression analysis and hypothesis testing.

b. Multicollinearity Test

Table 5. Multicollinearity Test Results

Independent Variable	Tolerance	VIF	Result
Counterproductive Work Behavior	0.842	1.188	No Multicollinearity
Employee Engagement	0.842	1.188	No Multicollinearity

Table 5 shows that both Counterproductive Work Behavior and Employee Engagement have tolerance values of 0.842 and VIF values of 1.188. Since the tolerance values are greater than 0.10 and the VIF values are below 10, the regression model does not indicate a

multicollinearity problem. This result confirms that the independent variables are not excessively correlated and can be included simultaneously in the regression analysis.

c. Heteroscedasticity Test

Table 6. Heteroscedasticity Test Results

Variable	Sig. Value	Result
Counterproductive Work Behavior	0.624	No Heteroscedasticity
Employee Engagement	0.713	No Heteroscedasticity

Table 6 indicates that the significance values for Counterproductive Work Behavior and Employee Engagement are 0.624 and 0.713, respectively. Since both values are greater than 0.05, there is no indication of heteroscedasticity in the regression model. This finding confirms that the residual variance is relatively constant across

observations, indicating that the model satisfies the homoscedasticity assumption and is suitable for further regression analysis.

4.6 Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

Multiple regression analysis was conducted to examine the influence of Counterproductive Work Behavior and Employee Engagement on Employee Performance.

Table 7. Regression Analysis Results

Variable	Regression Coefficient (β)	t-value	Sig.
Constant	1.245	3.821	0.000
Counterproductive Work Behavior (X1)	-0.286	-4.537	0.000
Employee Engagement (X2)	0.521	8.214	0.000

Based on Table 7, the regression results indicate that Counterproductive Work Behavior has a negative regression coefficient of -0.286, while Employee Engagement has a positive coefficient of 0.521. This means that higher levels of counterproductive behavior are associated with lower employee performance, whereas stronger employee engagement is associated with improved performance. The direction of these coefficients is consistent with the proposed research framework, which positions CWB as a detrimental

behavioral factor and Employee Engagement as a positive psychological factor influencing employee performance.

The hypothesis testing results further confirm that both relationships are statistically significant. Counterproductive Work Behavior has a significant negative effect on Employee Performance ($\beta = -0.286$; $t = -4.537$; $p < 0.001$), supporting H1, which indicates that behaviors such as reduced work effort, rule violations, and disruptive actions can weaken employee

performance. Employee Engagement has a significant positive effect on Employee Performance ($\beta = 0.521$; $t = 8.214$; $p < 0.001$), supporting H2, indicating that employees with stronger involvement,

commitment, and psychological attachment to their work tend to achieve higher performance outcomes.

4.7 Coefficient of Determination

Table 8. Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error
1	0.714	0.510	0.504	0.407

The coefficient of determination (R^2) value is 0.510, indicating that Counterproductive Work Behavior and Employee Engagement collectively explain 51.0% of the variation in Employee Performance. The remaining 49.0% is influenced by other factors outside this research model, such as leadership style, organizational culture, compensation, motivation, and job satisfaction.

4.8 Discussion

The findings confirm that Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB) has a significant negative influence on Employee Performance, indicating that employees who engage in harmful workplace behaviors tend to demonstrate lower effectiveness in completing their responsibilities. Behaviors such as reduced work effort, rule violations, misuse of organizational resources, and interpersonal disruption can interfere with task accomplishment and weaken workplace cooperation. This result supports the view that CWB represents an important behavioral risk for organizations because its consequences extend beyond individual performance and may also affect team coordination and organizational efficiency [1], [2].

The negative effect of CWB highlights the importance of organizational mechanisms designed to prevent dysfunctional behavior before it becomes embedded in workplace routines. Organizations need to strengthen ethical standards, ensure procedural fairness, improve communication, and create supportive working conditions that reduce

dissatisfaction and behavioral withdrawal. Effective leadership is also important because employees who perceive greater support, fairness, and recognition are generally less likely to respond through counterproductive actions. These findings suggest that reducing CWB requires preventive human resource practices rather than relying solely on disciplinary measures after negative behavior occurs [14], [21].

Employee Engagement, in contrast, was found to have a significant positive influence on Employee Performance. Employees with stronger psychological involvement, commitment, and enthusiasm toward their work tend to invest greater effort, demonstrate higher persistence, and contribute more actively to organizational objectives. This result is consistent with the Job Demands–Resources perspective, which explains that adequate organizational resources can strengthen motivation and engagement, leading to improved performance outcomes [8], [9], [17]. In practical terms, organizations should strengthen engagement through supportive leadership, recognition, career development opportunities, meaningful work, and employee participation in organizational processes.

The combined contribution of CWB and Employee Engagement explains 51.0% of the variation in Employee Performance, indicating that both negative behavioral tendencies and positive psychological attachment are important determinants of workplace outcomes. This finding implies that improving employee performance

requires a balanced human resource strategy that simultaneously controls counterproductive behavior and strengthens employee engagement. Within the Indonesian organizational context, managers should therefore integrate behavioral monitoring, fair organizational practices, supportive leadership, employee development, and recognition systems to create healthier work environments and sustain stronger employee performance.

5. CONCLUSION

This study confirms that Counterproductive Work Behavior has a significant negative effect on Employee Performance, while Employee Engagement has a significant positive effect. These findings indicate that harmful workplace behaviors

can reduce employee effectiveness, whereas stronger psychological involvement, motivation, and commitment can improve performance. The regression model explains 51.0% of the variance in Employee Performance, showing that behavioral and psychological factors play substantial roles in shaping workplace outcomes. The study contributes empirical evidence from the Indonesian organizational context and suggests that organizations should reduce counterproductive behavior while strengthening employee engagement through supportive workplace practices, recognition, and employee involvement. Future research may extend the model by incorporating variables such as leadership style, organizational culture, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and workplace well-being.

REFERENCES

- [1] Y. Griep, T. Vantilborgh, and ..., "The relationship between psychological contract breach and counterproductive work behavior in social enterprises: Do paid employees and volunteers differ?," *Econ. Ind. ...*, 2020, doi: 10.1177/0143831X17744029.
- [2] H. Chen, O. C. Richard, O. D. Boncoeur, and D. L. Ford Jr, "Work engagement, emotional exhaustion, and counterproductive work behavior," *J. Bus. Res.*, vol. 114, pp. 30–41, 2020.
- [3] P. K. Jain, M. Jain, and R. Pamula, "Explaining and predicting employees' attrition: a machine learning approach," *SN Appl. Sci.*, vol. 2, no. 4, pp. 1–11, 2020, doi: 10.1007/s42452-020-2519-4.
- [4] A. R. Syamsuri, "Employee performance determination with creativity, work experience and engagement: Empirical study," *Int. J. Sci. Technol. Manag.*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 588–597, 2022.
- [5] F. Zhu and A. Newman, "One size does not fit all: organizational rewards, managerial experience, and employee retention in entrepreneurial new ventures," *Entrep. Theory Pract.*, vol. 47, no. 5, pp. 1788–1815, 2023.
- [6] N. Nawaz, V. Gajenderan, M. Manoharan, and S. Parayitam, "Disentangling the relationship between transformational leadership and work engagement: Employee empowerment as a mediator and work experience and gender as moderators," *Cogent Bus. Manag.*, vol. 11, no. 1, p. 2291851, 2024.
- [7] Q. Xu, "Study on the Impact of Employee Diversity and Inclusive Management on Organizational Performance," *Sci. J. Econ. Manag. Res.*, vol. 6, no. 7, pp. 9–13, 2024, doi: 10.54691/q1zzq579.
- [8] G. R. Nagiah and N. Mohd Suki, "Linking environmental sustainability, social sustainability, corporate reputation and the business performance of energy companies: insights from an emerging market," *Int. J. Energy Sect. Manag.*, 2024, doi: 10.1108/IJESM-06-2023-0003.
- [9] Sajad Ahmad Bhat and Priyanka Patni, "A review: Impact of motivation and toxic work around job culture," *World J. Adv. Res. Rev.*, vol. 17, no. 3, pp. 747–751, 2023, doi: 10.30574/wjarr.2023.17.3.0463.
- [10] E. Amoako-Asiedu and T. Obuobisa-Darko, "Leadership, employee engagement and employee performance in the public sector of Ghana," 2017.
- [11] S. K. Singh and A. N. El-Kassar, "Role of big data analytics in developing sustainable capabilities," *J. Clean. Prod.*, 2019.
- [12] D. W. S. Renwick, T. Redman, and S. Maguire, "Green human resource management: A review and research agenda," *Int. J. Manag. Rev.*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 1–14, 2013.
- [13] H. Xie and T. C. Lau, "Evidence-Based Green Human Resource Management: A Systematic Literature Review," *Sustain.*, vol. 15, no. 14, 2023, doi: 10.3390/su151410941.
- [14] I. A. Wong, S. Xu, S. H. G. Chan, and M. He, "A cross-level investigation of the role of human resources practices: Does brand equity matter?," *Tour. Manag.*, vol. 75, pp. 418–426, 2019, doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2019.04.013.
- [15] N. Mubarak, J. Khan, R. Yasmin, and A. Osmadi, "The impact of a proactive personality on innovative work behavior: the role of work engagement and transformational leadership," *Leadersh. Organ. Dev. J.*, vol. 42, no. 7, 2021, doi: 10.1108/LODJ-11-2020-0518.
- [16] S. M. Daniali *et al.*, "Predicting Volatility Index According to Technical Index and Economic Indicators on the Basis

- of Deep Learning Algorithm," 2021. doi: 10.3390/su132414011.
- [17] N. Setyaningsih and L. C. Nawangsari, "The Influence of Organizational Culture and Employee Engagement on Turnover Intention With Job Satisfaction as Mediating Role," *Int. J. Innov. Sci. Res. Technol.*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 277–286, 2021.
- [18] T. W. Taris, "Chapter Five - Workplace engagement and motivation," vol. 10, A. J. B. T.-A. in M. S. Elliot, Ed., Elsevier, 2023, pp. 179–213. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.adms.2022.11.005>.
- [19] M. C. J. Caniëls, J. H. Semeijn, and I. H. M. Renders, "Mind the mindset! The interaction of proactive personality, transformational leadership and growth mindset for engagement at work," *Career Dev. Int.*, vol. 23, no. 1, 2018, doi: 10.1108/CDI-11-2016-0194.
- [20] J. N. Scanlan and M. Still, "Relationships between burnout, turnover intention, job satisfaction, job demands and job resources for mental health personnel in an Australian mental health service," *BMC Health Serv. Res.*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 1–11, 2019.
- [21] R. L. Mathis and J. H. Jackson, *Human Resource Management : Personnel Human Resource Management*, vol. 13, no. January 2019. 2016.
- [22] L. P. E. Swandini, "Lingkungan Kerja Dan Motivasi Kerja Karyawan Hotel Matahari Beach Resort & Spa.," *Prospek J. Manaj. dan Bisnis*, vol. 2, no. 2, p. 139, 2021, doi: 10.23887/pjmb.v2i2.27306.
- [23] S. N. Elidemir, A. Ozturen, and S. W. Bayighomog, "Innovative behaviors, employee creativity, and sustainable competitive advantage: A moderated mediation," *Sustain.*, vol. 12, no. 8, 2020, doi: 10.3390/SU12083295.