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Abstract
Based on cognitive dissonance theory, this study aims to test good soldier syndrome regarding the relationship among compulsory citizenship behavior, job engagement, emotion regulation, and job performance so as to promote sustainable Human Resource Management (HRM). The sample, which applied the purposive sampling method, comprised 89 supervisors and 304 subordinates who work from 4-star and 5-star hotels in Taiwan. The results showed that the relevantly negative effect of employees’ performance is caused by compulsory citizenship behavior, that job engagement mediates the relationship between compulsory citizenship behavior and job performance, and that the indirect effect between compulsory citizenship behavior and job performance via job engagement is moderated by emotion regulation. Based on the findings of this study, this paper provides managerial implications, limitations of the current study, and future research suggestions.
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Introduction
In recent decades, many studies focused on the benefits brought by organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), which is an indicator of some pro-organization behaviors, such as willing to assume more responsibilities for the public good. OCB can promote increased organization performance, while even forming a positive organizational atmosphere and therefore increasing employee efficiency to reach organization goals (Organ, 1988). However, its effects can also represent a double-edged sword. When an organization overly emphasizes OCB, employees are not only assuming their own job responsibilities, but they also must take care of meeting their organizational expectations. For this reason, managers sometimes design their own OCBs. In such a case, managers are provided greater autonomy, which can also increase stress among employees when managers ask them to finish tasks beyond their professional capacity (Wattoo et al., 2020). If such a situation persists within an organization over time, the professional effectiveness of their employees can decrease. This phenomenon is called the “good soldier syndrome” (Bolino et al., 2004). However, in the research conducted on the outcomes of compulsory citizen behavior (CCB), Ahmadian et al. (2017) examined the relationship between CCB’s some organizational outcome such as work stress and job satisfaction. It suggests that CCB has positive correlation between CCB and work stress, organizational policy, intention to quit, and burnout; and negative correlation between CCB and innovativeness, job satisfaction, and job performance in different culture.

Moreover, the previous literature pointed out that high job engagement employees in the organization will bring high customer satisfaction, high productivity, and low work stress, low employee turnover (Riyanto et al., 2021). Therefore, job engagement will be a key role for the organization. Gruman and Saks (2011) indicated that job engagement described the psychological state in which employees brought themselves...
into the job role. Thus, employees can play an effective role in their own physiological, cognitive, and emotional perspectives. Thus, job engagement influences behavior, cognitive, and emotional elements (S. Li, 2021; Thomas & Allen, 2021). This study followed the definition set by D. R. May et al. (2004) of job engagement that employees’ psychological identity is related to behavior, cognition, and emotion. (Kahn, 1990) defined job engagement as an enriched, ambitious, prolonged, and widespread positive emotional state. Such a state is not concentrating on specific targets, behavior, or individuals. Kahn (1990) noted that, when an individual first takes on a role, he or she can face stress accompanied by the new responsibilities. Many previous studies, such as S. Li (2021) postulated that job engagement can positively influence job performance. Therefore, when an individual is enlisted to perform altruistic behaviors, the imbalance between his or her mental and physiological state can lead to job engagement decrease and ultimately influence job performance.

In addition, people can express various emotional responses according to life events they encounter. Emotions can also affect ways of thinking and behaviors. Emotional responses can arise automatically or after pervasive cognitive processes (Gross, 2002). Individuals showed different coping capacity and styles toward emotion. Emotion can play important roles during critical professional periods. Emotional coping styles can vary with different personality traits (Ng & Diener, 2009; Ong et al., 2006), gender (Coats & Blanchard-Fields, 2008), and cultural atmosphere (Butler, 2007). Emotional regulation can help mitigate the negative emotions and can increase individuals’ positive emotions to some extent. This is because human beings possess the tendency to avoid pain and seek happiness and automatically apply coping strategies (Pattas et al., 2021) to alleviate uncomfortable feelings (Wong & Law, 2002). Although extensive OCB research has been performed, very few studies have examined involuntary or compulsory OCB. Some studies about the relationships between OCB and job performance. Based on previous discussion, we link CCB to silence because there is a cultural specification in Taiwanese culture—when facing stressors, subordinates would rather avoid aggravating or ultimately terminating supervisor–subordinate relationships by using avoidant or passive coping strategies instead of acting out their anger on their supervisors or organizations. Therefore, it is likely that emotional regulation plays a role in the negative relationship between compulsory OCB and job performance through job engagement.

In fact, cognitive dissonance theory (CDT) can provide theoretical support for clarifying the relationship between the aforementioned three variables. Cognitive dissonance is the “uncomfortable feeling caused by simultaneously holding two contradictory cognitions” (Alfnes et al., 2010, p. 147). An important feature of cognitive dissonance is that the dissonance arousing behavior must be perceived as having been freely chosen, having little external justification, and entailing a commitment (Wichardt, 2012). For this reason, CDT can be used as a framework for this study. Through rigorous empirical research, this study provides a path for HRM professionals to enable managers to realize how CCB impact on employees’ job performance and supporting employee behaviors, or conversely, discouraging behaviors that are inappropriate for volunteerism. It also investigates the mechanism related to employees’ job performance, which in turn increases job engagement and willingness to work harder of employee. Finally, this study redefines the meaning of CCB and provide some theoretical and practical guidance for future research in the field and for better understanding this social behavior and its consequences.

**Theoretical Development and Hypothesizes**

**Compulsory Citizen Behavior**

A soundly operating organization should exhibit three criteria: behavior maintenance, in which organization members are willing to stay in the organization and execute their responsibilities; conformity behavior, in which members commit to fulfilling their responsibilities according to their role in the organization; and active behavior, with which members outperform the essential responsibility endorsed by the organization and actively achieve organizational goals (Katz, 1964). Smith et al. (1983) referred to the third above-mentioned behavior as organizational citizenship behavior. Organ (1988) redefined organizational citizenship behavior as members’ active behavior, not prompted by the organization. Furthermore, judge criteria is also excluded from the official rules; all are performed according to the individual’s free will, and it is helpful to apply the benefits to others and to increase organizational efficiency.

Previous OCB studies mainly focused on positive effects, such as the contribution to organizational performance. OCB has been very helpful in promoting performance and productivity and producing the desired amounts an organization seeks; it also has positive effects on performance appraisal, salary management, and promotion. However, there are still some drawbacks of OCB; for example, there is still one behavior in which a worker performs beyond his or her expected role. Employees can suffer from overwhelming stress in the work site or from supervisors because their behavior is compulsory, not involuntary.

The term compulsory citizenship behavior (CCB) was used to describe employees’ compulsory participation in informal work activities or non-role-specific behavior under environmental and managerial stress (Vigoda-Gadot, 2006, 2007). In the case of OCB, no formal positive appraisal is awarded; some positive results can be obtained, such as social recognition and respect from others. Without these external pressures, employees will select not to take part in these activities; thus, CCB can lead to unofficial results which are detrimental toward organizational effects.
(Vigoda-Gadot, 2006). In an organization, it is likely to lead to negative outcomes, such as work stress, emotional burnout, turnover intention, job satisfaction, and within-role performance (Vigoda-Gadot, 2006). Two viewpoints exist regarding why employees need to adopt CCB. Firstly, there is no clear boundary for employees to define in-role and out-of-role work. The supervisor might not allow employees to clock out on time, and employees might believe that work efficiency during their limited office hours will be greatly beneficial to the organization. These individuals can possess contrary viewpoints; however, supervisors can use their power to force employees to adopt appearance of CCB. On the other hand, in the face of market competition, enterprises need to develop much more efficient and competitive means, via OCB, to facilitate organizational growth and enhance OCB to meet supervisors’ expectations. Sometimes, in such as case, employees are forced to perform OCB.

**Job Performance**

Job performance is a means to reach a goal or set of goals within a job, role, or organization, but not the actual consequences of the acts performed within a job, that is, job performance is not a single action but rather a “complex activity” (Campbell, 1990, p. 704). Borman and Motowidlo (1993) identified job performance to two main dimensions: task performance and contextual performance. Task performance refers to direct activities and indirect activities that are a formal part of a worker’s job (Conway, 1996). Task performance is seen as an encompassing dimension that also includes aspects such as task behavior (Park & Cho, 2020), role performance (Bakker et al., 2004), technical activities (Borman & Brush, 1993), and action orientation (Engelbrecht & Fischer, 1995). Contextual performance includes, among other items, interpersonal behavior (Park & Cho, 2020), organizational citizenship behavior (Fluegge, 2008), and extra role performance (Costa et al., 2021). Contextual performance concerns the broader organizational, social, and psychological environment in which a technical core must function (Jawahar et al., 2008); it includes activities such as volunteering for extra work and maintaining good interpersonal relationships (Conway, 1996). In summary, job performance has been an important issue in the study of organizational behavior. Still other studies have explored some antecedents of job performance, including abusive supervision, leader managerial style, and organizational commitment (Purwanto et al., 2021). They clarify the role these issues play in the advancement of organizational performance (Korman, 1977). Thus, managers should understand how to probe the solutions to encounter problems to increase job performance.

**CCB and Job Performance**

This study uses cognitive dissonance theory (CDT) to provide a good explanation for the relationship between CCB and job performance. Cognitive dissonance theory indicated that in most cases individuals’ inner cognition was congruent with external behavior. Cognitive inconsistency leads to a motivational state that promotes regulation, which comes mainly through a change of opinions or behaviors (Harmon-Jones, 2019), which means once the balance was lost, individuals would experience psychological distress. In order to eliminate the psychological distress, individuals would search for other psychological mechanisms for relief, such as psychological distress (Festinger, 1957). On the other hand, if perceived freedom will be threatened, the psychological resistance is aroused to rebuild the previous freedom psychological states, the rebel motivation is awakened, and individuals take action to, for example, reject the enforced behavior or to exercise contrary behaviors of the enforced ones (Brehm & Cole, 1966). These psychological reactions ultimately affect job performance.

Many studies have revealed that CCB originated from high-demand managerial engagement by authoritarian leaders and high social pressure (Vigoda-Gadot, 2007). Blumberg and Pringle (1982) provided a three-factor interaction job performance model: ability, willingness, and opportunity. All of these factors work together to influence job performance. The more constraints in place, the less likely employees are to achieve their job performance goals. Employees delayed their own job duties when they needed to do something beyond their job demands (Bolino, 1999). And employees felt frustrated and helplessness when helping other colleagues had become an obligation (Perlow & Weeks, 2002). “The common example of frustration in the workplace arose when I needed to help my colleagues and, in turn, I could not finish my work on time.” In such as case, there was a gap between the supervisor and employees’ view of job performance. A cross-level study by Podsakoff et al. (2009) verified that when CCB was not assigned to official job contents, no extra bonus was given for CCB, and was enforced by manager, the employee was less likely to devote him- or herself to non-official tasks and thereby to sacrifice his/her own tasks. These inferences are corroborated by the CDT, such as, Kruglanski et al. (2018) suggest that the evoked affect could differ depending on expectancy and desirability of outcomes. This assumption implies that disconfirmation of a positive expectancy generates a negative affect while the disconfirmation of a negative expectancy generates a positive affect.

To sum up, when employees involuntarily exercise non-official job tasks, they lose the autonomy to allocate their job content and finally influence the completion progress of their own job duties. Thus, this study hypothesized that, when employees exercise CCB, their job performance is decreased.

H1: There is a negative relationship between CCB and job performance.

**Mediating Effect of Job Engagement**

Job engagement was an important motivation construct during work (Hecht & Allen, 2005). It is also a key indicator to
judge employees’ job performance (Christian et al., 2011). Job engagement is a more stable psychological state (Schaufeli et al., 2002) which influences employees’ interaction with others, personal performance, and job role performance (Kahn, 1990). An organization can acquire competitive advantages over others and enhance its employees’ attitudes, behavior, and job performance through job engagement (Gruman & Saks, 2011). Previous studies proved that job engagement had a positive impact on job performance (X. Li et al., 2012). However, every event that happens on the work site can influence employees’ emotional state and therefore influence employees’ attitude and behavior (Purwanto et al., 2021). If negative emotional experiences continue to accumulate, job engagement can also be influenced. Based on cognitive dissonance theory, this study hypothesized that, as CCB arises, employees’ job engagement will be affected and lead to a decrease in job performance.

H2: Job engagement will mediate the relationship between CCB and job performance.

The Moderated Mediation Effect of Emotional Regulation

Emotional regulation model outline that when an individual perceives some event stimulation, he or she automatically increases his or her appraisal time to regulate the influence of the events (Ekman, 1992; Gross, 1999; Levenson, 1999; Plutchik, 1990). When an individual tries to appraise situational needs, he or she changes cognition and behavior and thereby influences emotional events, emotional strength, emotional duration, and emotional expression. The processes that change emotional states were referred to as emotional regulation (Gross & Muñoz, 1995), which is the abilities of an individual to respond appropriately to emotional expression and when an individuals’ emotion is disturbed, their attention, memory, social communication, and behaviors are all influenced (Cole, 1987). Moreover, emotion regulation is defined as monitoring, evaluating, and modifying internal and external emotion expression processes. The process included physiological, cognitive, and behavioral regulation processes (Thompson, 1994). Also, individuals’ emotional regulation could vary according to situational circumstances (Blanchard-Fields & Coats, 2008), and it can be divided into two elements: cognitive reappraisal and expressive suppression (Gross, 1999).

In summary, we reveal that emotional regulation is highly connected to the social context in which a human being lives. Individuals can refine, change, and manage his or her emotion. During the processes, emotional modification could via cognitive behavior change to alleviate previous sensory experiences, physiological response, or behavior expression. Therefore, this study used the definition of emotional regulation by Gross (1999), in which an individual employs cognitive reappraisal and expresses surprise to change his or her understanding of emotional events after stimulation. Expessed surprise turns into the self-control process to inhibit emotional behavior. Variables in emotional regulation include gender, job engagement, and emotional burnout.

Based on aforementioned discussion, when external pressure was applied, the voluntary status was lost. Negative effects were aroused, such as work dissatisfaction and work burnout. On the other hand, under a free-will situation, the expressed OCB would make employees unhappy and experience burnout (Vigoda-Gadot, 2006, 2007). By exploring a salesperson’s job stress and emotional regulation and their relationship with job performance. The results indicated that employees exhibited the fewest conflicts and share market strategy, and thus increased their own knowledge and created higher values (Mulki et al., 2015; Narver & Slater, 1990).

Therefore, emotion was the most powerful resource for individuals and for employees to achieve performance goals (Halbesleben & Bowler, 2007) because emotional intelligence could moderate performance (Mulki et al., 2015). Within this process, emotional perception arose prior to emotion understanding, later forming emotional regulation and improved job performance. Emotional regulation had positive relationships with job performance. According to cognitive dissonance theory (Festinger, 1957), when there were conflicts of cognition and behaviors, psychological distress arose, which then led to emotional exhaustion. In order to decrease the incongruence of cognition and behavior, individuals searched for resources to overcome this problem. These resources included object resources, conditions, personal characteristics, and energy (either extrinsic or intrinsic). Our study hypothesized that emotional regulation would moderate CCB toward job engagement and job performance’s indirect relationships. However, there are two main emotion regulation strategies, cognitive reappraisal and expressive inhibition, which have emotional, cognitive, social, and physiological effects. Its findings suggest that cognitive reappraisal is a good mood-regulating strategy, while expressive inhibition has many negative consequences (Gross & John, 2003).

When the service personnel expressed emotional rules set by the organization and executed CCB at the same time, the individual elicited negative feelings and psychological energy burnout. In a word, the CCB process could be affected by one’s emotional regulation. Those employees who have a higher level of emotional regulation are more likely to recognize, appraisal, and process situational constraints in a more appropriate manner and more likely to reframe it as a challenge and to positively respond to it.

Therefore, this study hypothesized that when employees work with CCB, emotional regulation moderates relationships between emotional regulation and CCB, between CCB and job engagement, and between job engagement and job performance (Figure 1).
H3: Emotional regulation moderates the relationship between CCB and job performance through job engagement.
H3-1: Cognitive reappraisal decreases the negative indirect effect of CCB on job performance through job engagement.
H3-2: Expressive inhibition increases the negative indirect effect of CCB on job performance through job engagement.

Method

Participants
Questionnaires were distributed to employees of 4-star and 5-star hotels in Taiwan. According to the Tourism Bureau of Taiwan, there are 105 4-star and 5-star rated hotels. Participants were recruited from these hotels to examine the relationships among CCB, job engagement, emotional regulation, and job performance. Participants qualified for the study if they had worked in the hotel for at least 3 months, and their supervisors were asked to complete questionnaires regarding their respective employees.

Instruments
This study used 5-point Likert-type questionnaires as study instruments. For the requirements of this study, we used dyad design to distribute the questionnaire. The employees and their supervisors were paired to complete the questionnaires. The questionnaire contained four subcategories: compulsory citizenship behavior, job engagement, emotional regulation, and job performance. The demographic information of participants was also included. Supervisors were asked to complete the job performance section and demographic information, while employees filled in the CCB, job engagement, emotional regulation, and demographic information section. A pretest was administered to ensure the validity and reliability of the questionnaires.

CCB items were adopted from (Vigoda-Gadot, 2007). There were five items, for example, “I think my company places pressure on me to do extra work” and “I think the company will ask employees to work overtime without reimbursement.”

The Job Engagement Questionnaire was adopted from Schaufeli (2006) Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES). We used the short form by X. Li et al. (2012), which comprised nine items. The first three items measured vigor, the following three items measured dedication, and the last three items were used to measure absorption.

Emotional regulation questionnaires were adopted from Emotion Regulation Questionnaire (ERQ; Gross & John, 2003). There are 10 items to measure emotional regulation: cognitive reappraisal (e.g., “When I expect perceived positive emotion, I would like to change what I am thinking of now”) and expressive inhibition (e.g., “I do not express my emotion outwardly”).

Job performance were adopted from questionnaires (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993). This questionnaire had two subcategories: task performance and context performance. There are 14 items; the first 8 items measured task performance, such as, “I finish the task following the guidance,” and the latter 6 items measured context performance, such as, “I can take care of details of the job and deal with them carefully.”

Control Variables
Previous study showed that demographical variables influence employees’ behavior (Zhao et al., 2013). Therefore, the employees’ gender and time with the job were used as control variables.

Survey Administration
In order to prevent serious common-method problems, this study used the employee-supervisor paired method to administer the questionnaires. The questionnaires were sent directly to the hotel with return postage included. Participants sent them back directly via postal mail. The follow-up procedure was completed 2 weeks after the questionnaires had been sent to ensure a certain percentage of returned questionnaires.

Data Analysis
Mediation effect. The hierarchical multiple linear regression method was employed to test the mediation hypothesis and reveal the relationships among CCB, job engagement, emotional regulation, and job performance. The mediation effect of job engagement was tested according to the suggestion procedures proposed by Baron and Kenny (1986). When the independent and mediating variables were served as predictors at the same time, the independent variable influence could decrease. This can arise in two possible situations: if the independent variable maintains a significant enough statistical relationship with the dependent variable, this mediation model is called the partial mediation model. On the other
hand, once the relationship between the independent variable and dependent variable did not maintain prediction relationships, this model became a full mediation model. To test these mediation relationships, Hayes’s (2013) process software model was employed for mediation analysis.

**Moderated mediation.** As aforementioned, process model provided conditional process modeling, which could be employed in our study to examine the moderated mediating model of the study (Hayes, 2013).

**Results**

This study surveyed employees of 4- and 5-star hotel employees and their supervisors as participants. One supervisor was paired with two to four subordinates as a dyad set. We originally distributed 126 sets of questionnaires, and 89 valid questionnaires were returned. There were 89 supervisor questionnaires and 304 subordinate (employee) questionnaires. The survey included 38 males (42.7%) and 51 females (57.3%); most supervisors ranged from 31 to 41 years old (48.3%), while the age category of 51 and above represented the lowest percentage (5.6%). Regarding educational background, most supervisors had college degrees (64%), while those with high school diplomas or lower degrees composed the lowest portion (11.2%). Position title was mostly “manager” of “chef” (37.1%); they also most often came from the restaurant department (39.2%), and most had worked for 9 years (29.2%).

The Pearson correlation of variables is shown in Table 1. CCB and job performance (self-report) are negatively correlated ($r = -0.113$, $p < .05$), which is in line with H1. CCB is also negatively correlated with job engagement ($r = -0.207$, $p < .01$). According to Ashford and Tsui (1991), the correlation coefficients are all below .75 and VIF is 2.5 much smaller than 10. This indicates that there is no serious multicollinearity problems among variables. Therefore, it is suitable to perform hierarchical linear regression to further identify the relationships among these variables.

**Overall Model Fit**

This study used confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) to ensure questionnaire validity. Regarding overall CFA, factor loadings for each item fall between 0.45 and 0.88. For overall fit indexes, $\chi^2/df$ is 2.54, which is acceptable (Doll et al., 1994). NNFI is 0.95, IFI is 0.95, CFI is 0.95, and RMSEA is 0.071; all are acceptable. SRMR is 0.061, which is below 0.10 (Hu & Bentler, 1999). The whole model is at an acceptable level.

**Common Method Variance**

The questionnaires were distributed using a dyad model: supervisors and subordinates were paired together to decrease the CMV problems. Later, Harman’s one-factor testing method was used to examine CMV. The result showed that every item totally explained 64.912% of the variance. The first factor explained 29.269% variance, which was far below 50%. Therefore, the CMV problem is not salient.

**CCB and Job Performance**

As Model 1 shows in Table 2, the control variables (gender, seniority) explain the 2.1% job performance (self-report) variance. In Model 2, when CCB is added to the model, the overall explained variance is 3.6%, which is 1.5% higher than in Model 1. This indicated that CCB has a significant negative relationship with job performance (self-reported; $\beta = -0.126$, $p < .05$), but no significant relationships with other factors affected job performance ($\beta = -0.028$, $p > .05$). The higher the CCB, the lower job performance (self-reported). H1 is thus supported.

**Mediating Effect of Job Engagement**

The results are shown in Table 3. Using job engagement as a mediator, the indirect effect is $-0.068$. The 95% confidence interval is $[-0.109, -0.028]$. This indicated that the mediating effect is statistically significant. Thus, job engagement indicates a full mediation effect between CCB and job performance. Therefore, H2 is supported.

**Moderated Mediation Effect of Emotional Regulation**

When there is a mediating effect through either path on the mediating model, whether direct, indirect, or both, affected by

---

### Table 1. Means, Standard Deviations, and Pearson Correlation.

|       | M     | SD    | 1     | 2     | 3     | 4     | 5     |
|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 1. CCB| 2.24  | 0.83  |       |       |       |       |       |
| 2. Job engagement | 4.38  | 1.00  | $-0.207^{**}$ |     |       |       |       |
| 3. Cognitive reappraisal | 4.87  | 0.75  | $-0.111$ | $0.324^{**}$ |       |       |       |
| 4. Expressive inhibition | 4.31  | 0.95  | $-0.027$ | $0.177^{**}$ | $0.513^{**}$ |       |       |
| 5. Job performance (self report) | 3.77  | 0.45  | $-0.113^*$ | $0.565^{**}$ | $0.318^{**}$ | $0.293^{**}$ |       |
| 6. Job performance (other report) | 2.87  | 0.61  | $-0.029$ | $0.079$ | $0.101$ | $0.044$ | $0.109$ |

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. 

---
one other moderating variable, there is moderating effect in the mediation model (Edwards & Lambert, 2007; Muller, 2005). This indicated moderation variable moderated the relationship from the independent to mediation variable or from the mediation variable to the dependent variable. This study examines the moderated mediating effect using methods suggested by earlier literature (Edwards & Lambert, 2007; Muller, 2005).

First, CCB can predict job performance. Second, the interaction between CCB and emotional regulation can predict job engagement. Third, job engagement can predict job performance. Lastly, we employ Hayes’s (2013) model in process program to analyze the moderated mediation effect. Then, using the bootstrapping method to verify, we examine the moderation variable’s indirect effects of the independent variable on the dependent variable through the mediation variable in the above and below one-standard deviation. That is, the emotional regulation’s effects on the indirect effect of CCB to job performance through job engagement at one standard deviation above and below the mean. The 95% confident interval by Bootstrap is also estimated.

Moderation Effect of Cognitive Reappraisal

The effect of CCB on job performance was verified. The result indicated that CCB negatively predicted job performance ($\beta = -0.126$, $p < 0.05$). As showed in Table 4, the interaction of CCB and cognitive reappraisal did not significantly predict job engagement ($\beta = -0.009$, $p > 0.05$); however, the interaction between job engagement and cognitive reappraisal negatively predicted job performance (self-reported; $\beta = -0.049$, $p < 0.05$). Next, job engagement positively predicted job performance ($\beta = 0.232$, $p < 0.05$). As shown in Table 4, when cognitive reappraisal is low (one standard deviation below the mean), the

| Table 2. Hierarchical Regression Analysis of CCB to Job Performance. |
| --- | --- |
| DV: job performance (self report) | DV: job performance (other report) |
| Model 1 | Model 2 | Model 1 | Model 2 |
| Control variables | | | |
| Sex | 0.018 | 0.007 | 0.004 | 0.002 |
| Seniority | | | | |
| 3 months–1 year | — | — | — | — |
| 1–3 years | 0.044 | 0.059 | 0.058 | 0.061 |
| 3–5 years | 0.104 | 0.116 | 0.034 | 0.037 |
| 5–7 years | 0.108 | 0.116 | -0.018 | -0.016 |
| 7–9 years | -0.06 | -0.054 | -0.039 | -0.037 |
| 9 years and above | 0.049 | 0.068 | -0.037 | -0.033 |
| Independent variable CCB | | -0.126* | -0.028 |
| $F$ | 1.056 | 1.587 | 0.43 | 0.4 |
| $R^2$ | .021 | .036 | .009 | .009 |
| Adj $R^2$ | .001 | .013 | -.011 | -.014 |
| $\Delta R^2$ | .021 | .015* | .009 | .001 |

Note. --- = Dummy coding reference group. *$p < 0.05$.

95% confidence interval is $[-0.114, 0.013]$. When cognitive reappraisal is high (one standard deviation above the mean), the 95% confidence interval is $[-0.096, 0.008]$. This indicated that, when cognitive reappraisal is high or low, it will affect the indirect relationships between CCB and job performance through job engagement. Thus, employees with high cognitive reappraisal strategies decrease the indirect effect from CCB to job performance through job engagement. Therefore, hypothesis $H3-1$ was supported.

Moderated Mediation Effect of Expressive Inhibition

Firstly, CCB negatively predicted employees’ self-rated job performance ($\beta = -0.126$, $p < 0.05$). As shown in Table 5, The interaction of CCB and expressive inhibition did not predict
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Job engagement (β = −.089, p > .05). At the same time, the interaction of job engagement and expressive inhibition did not predict job performance as well (β = −.002, p > .05). These results indicated that expressive inhibition cannot moderate the indirect relationship from CCB to job performance; therefore, H 3-2 was not supported.

Discussion and Suggestions

Discussion

Relationship between CCB and job performance is negative. When employees exercised CCB, it had negative effect on their job performance. CCB came from an employee who faced external or managerial stress; it was involuntary to perform an unofficial job task or non-role-based behavior (Vigoda-Gadot, 2006, 2007). From an employee’s perspective, one must complete a task that does not involve his or her work and thus delay his or her job duties. This represented increased workload. The results echoed the previous hypothesis. According to cognitive dissonance theory, when supervisors assigned employees extra work and the employees were psychological resistant, it caused cognitive dissonance. When cognitive dissonance occurred, individuals tried to align cognition or behavior to balance the incongruence of their behavioral and cognitive state. CCB caused negative effects for an organization or enterprise, such as the effect on quality and quantity of work products and delays in work.

On the other hand, CCB’s effect on job performance was not reflected in supervisors’ evaluation on their subordinate’s job performance. This could be because self-reporting style CCB did not appear at the time when employees completed the questionnaires. Employees could perceive CCB at a later time. Furthermore, supervisors evaluate job performance and might not rely only on CCB; other factors could involve the diluted influence of CCB. This was a possible reason for the insignificant results.

Job engagement mediates the relationships between CCB and job performance. Previous studies mostly clarified the relationship between CCB and other variables, while the antecedents and consequences of CCB were examined as well. Previous literature indicated that supervisors’ leadership behavior and their subordinates’ later job performance was connected to their psychological factors (Zhao et al., 2013). When CCB occurred among them, impact were observed not only on job performance, but also on the employee’s psychological well-being. Earlier studies indicated that

Table 4. Moderated Mediation Model With Cognitive Reappraisal.

| Control variable | Job engagement (self-rated) | Job performance (self-rated) |
|------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Sex              | −0.154                     | 0.041                      |
| Seniority        |                            |                            |
| 3 months–1 year  |                            |                            |
| 1–3 years        | 0.117                      | 0.043                      |
| 3–5 years        | 0.223                      | 0.080                      |
| 5–7 years        | 0.115                      | 0.143                      |
| 7–9 years        | 0.049                      | −0.135                     |
| 9 years and above| 0.175                      | 0.039                      |
| Independent variable | −0.227***                 | 0.002                      |
| CCB              |                            |                            |
| Mediation variable |                            | 0.232***                   |
| Job engagement   |                            |                            |
| Moderation variable | 0.399***                   | 0.084**                    |
| Cognitive reappraisal |                        |                            |
| Interaction      | −0.009                     |                            |
| CCB × cognitive appraisal |                  |                            |
| Job engagement × cognitive reappraisal | 0.049* |                            |

Cognitive reappraisal Bootstrap indirect effect Boot SE Boot LL Boot UL

−1 SD         −0.059                  0.032  −0.114  0.013
M             0.052                  0.017  −0.087  −0.019
+1 SD         −0.045                  0.022  −0.096  −0.008

Note. N = 304; CI = confidence interval; Bootstrap sample size is 5,000; UL = upper limit estimation; LL = lower limit estimation.
*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.
Job engagement can positively influence job performance (Albrecht, 2012; X. Li et al., 2012). This was because organizational members brought themselves into their own job roles; this illustrates the connection between identity, behavior, and emotional issues.

The results revealed that job engagement could fully mediate the relationships between CCB and job performance. The higher the CCB, the lower the job engagement was, this then influenced job performance. As cognitive dissonance theory mentioned, an individual can experience psychological distress such as anxiety when encountered with external enforce pressure. Therefore, the psychological imbalance states occurred. People tended to search for balance by means of psychological resistance or behavior change. Thus, job engagement would be resisted to prevent the bad influence the organization had brought to them or to escape a bad situation. At this stage, job performance would decrease.

Emotional regulation moderated the indirect relationships of CCB to job performance through job engagement. Previous studies did not verify the direct relationships between CCB and job performance, while studies showed that CCB would influence employees’ psychological and behavior states. When subordinates’ authentic feelings were incongruent with their supervisors’ observations, it likely resulted in job performance appraisal errors. Thus, emotional regulation was employed as a moderator to reveal the relationship between CCB and other fields. The results indicated the partially moderated effects of emotional relation on the indirect relationships of CCB and job performance.

Emotional regulation was divided into antecedent-focus and response-focus strategies according to the time points that emotional regulation aroused (Gross, 1998). If cognitive reappraisal occurred ahead of emotional response, the antecedent-focus strategy implies that the expressive inhibition response modification occurred after the emotion formation, emotional response, and response-focus strategies used. Study results showed that high cognitive reappraisal employees would decrease CCB by means of the indirect effect from job engagement and job performance, while expressive inhibition would not moderate the indirect relationships between CCB and job performance. Cognitive reappraisal was the interpretation of emotional events; emotional, behavior, or physiological expressions in certain circumstances could also be an influence. Such an influence could lead to cognitive interpretation of emotional events, such as telling oneself to calm down. On the other hand, expressive inhibition did not strengthen the relationship between job engagement and job performance as we previously hypothesized. This could be because expressive

### Table 5. Moderated Mediation of Expressive Inhibition.

|             | Control variable | Mediation variable | Moderation variable | Interaction |
|-------------|------------------|-------------------|---------------------|-------------|
|             | Job performance  |                   |                     |             |
| CCB         |                |                   |                     |             |
| Sex         | -0.116          | 0.062             |                     |             |
| Seniority   |                  |                   |                     |             |
| 3 months–1 year | --             | --                |                     |             |
| 1–3 years   | 0.149           | 0.067             |                     |             |
| 3–5 years   | 0.264           | 0.085             |                     |             |
| 5–7 years   | 0.086           | 0.132             |                     |             |
| 7–9 years   | -0.001          | -0.136            |                     |             |
| 9 years and above | 0.248     | 0.050             |                     |             |
| CCB         | -0.257***       | -0.001            |                     |             |
| Job engagement | 0.237***       |                   |                     |             |
| Expressive inhibition | 0.178**     | 0.096***          |                     |             |
| Interaction |                  |                   |                     |             |
| CCB × expressive inhibition | -0.089     | -0.025            |                     |             |
| Job engagement × expressive inhibition | -0.002     |                   |                     |             |

| Expression inhibition | Bootstrapping indirect effect | Boot SE | Boot LL | Boot UL |
|-----------------------|------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|
| -1 SD                 | -0.041                       | 0.033   | -0.100  | 0.030   |
| M                     | -0.061                       | 0.019   | -0.098  | -0.023  |
| +1 SD                 | -0.081                       | 0.026   | -0.138  | -0.036  |

Note. N=304. CI = confidence interval; Bootstrap sample size is 5,000; UL = upper limit estimation; LL = lower limit estimation. **p < .01. ***p < .001.
inhibition tries to inhibit the emotional expression that is happening or will be happening, which might lead to the passive interaction of emotion and social interaction. This required the consumption of much more cognitive resources that would be harmful to one’s psychological health. However, we tried to go beyond the ideas presented in these studies and achieve several goals. The first goal is to provide a path for HRM professionals to enable managers to realize how CCB impact on employees’ job performance and supporting employee behaviors, or conversely, discouraging behaviors that are inappropriate for volunteering. By monitoring such mechanism and through emotional regulation to encourage positive reciprocity, which in turn increases job engagement and willingness to work harder (He et al., 2019). Employees should control the response of such signals of unwilling behavior by using the coping strategies to alleviate uncomfortable feelings; on the other hand, managers should promote and recognize volunteer efforts and support a culture that encourages positive reciprocal norms; on the other hand, they should discourage negative reciprocal attitudes by preventing and condemning retaliatory behavior. The second goal of this paper is theoretically to suggest how the mechanism relate to employees’ job performance. Finally, we propose to redefine the meaning of CCB and provide some theoretical and practical guidance for future research in the field and for better understanding this social behavior and its consequences.

Limitations of the Study

Limitation from the instruments. Instruments used in this study were mainly adopted from other countries. Some cultural differences and language metaphor resided in the questionnaires were inevitable. We tried our best to validate the instruments to make them both meet the original psychological and physiological stress and thus achieve the best results and performance both individually and organizationally. Moreover, organizations should clearly declare the job role, job content, and related information during employee selection.

Sampling limitation. This study tried to distribute questionnaires to employees’ representative of 4- and 5-star-rated hotels in Taiwan. However, some hotels were not willing to participate in the study. In such a case, there were potential representative insufficiencies in the sampling. Furthermore, the contacts for the hotels were representatives of the human resource management department. Participants were asked to seal the questionnaires and then send them back. Social desirability expectations can influence participants when completing the questionnaires.

Suggestions

Change leadership style, treat everyone equally. Previous studies reveal that supervisors’ leadership styles influence employee voluntary or involuntary to exercise organizational citizenship behaviors (Zhao et al., 2013). Some studies indicated that abusive leadership resulted in CCB. Organizations should decrease abusive leadership by means of human resource management systems. However, HRMS with sustainability has common features the association with positive results for employees (Ferreira-Oliveira et al., 2020). After all, the goal of sustainable HRM is regenerating and developing social, economic, and human resources that contribute to organizations’ sustainable competitive advantage (Hong, 2019; Kramar, 2014). For instance, an appropriate interview process during recruiting should be considered to filter out possible bad factors. Furthermore, a 360-degree feedback system could be implemented to increase supervisor-level personnel’s “self-awareness” and enhance their leadership effectiveness. An organization could also teach manager personnel to apply appropriate management styles, encourage positive communication, and prevent blame or other negative methods to treat their subordinates, and instead use respectful, trustful, supportive ways to maintain quality managerial styles. An anonymous communication channel should be established in an organization to make subordinates’ voices heard by manager-level leaders. This is one measure to help employees feel respected and also show organizations’ sincere authenticity toward their employees. This could also decrease CCB and increase employees’ sense of belonging and mutual trust between organizations and their employees.

Clear power and responsibility definition, decrease work pressure. Facing competition pressure from the market and under limited resources, organizational leaders might treat their employees unfairly to meet organizational goals. When employees receive too many jobs and these jobs are beyond their original workload, they may feel exhausted, anxious, and even angry and decrease their attention and thinking ability. Before assigning jobs, supervisors should consider their employees’ ability and give each person the most appropriate job complexity and quantity to relieve their psychological and physiological stress and thus achieve the best results and performance both individually and organizationally.

Moreover, organizations should clearly declare the job role, job content, and related information during employee
recruiting and clearly describe everything the job position should consist of in the contract to give job applicants a clear picture of the organization and the job by means of the realistic job preview (RJP) technique to ensure employees' accountability (Kuo et al., 2021).

**Implementation of employee assistance program (EAP).** The hospitality industry has been a very important service industry in Taiwan. To maintain customers' loyalty and service quality, organizations should develop a standard procedure for service personnel when they conduct their service actions (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993). Thus, employees in the hospitality industry should provide their professional aptitude and enthusiasm to meet the organization's service rule. Thus, employees must modify individuals' emotional and psychological states to meet the job requirement. Sometimes adjustment processes can cause psychological burnout. When organizations face the employees' authentic feelings, appropriate supports should be provided to alleviate their psychological stress during emotional modification while facing customers (Brotheridge & Lee, 2002).

On the other hand, some measures can be applied to encourage employees, such as using positive thinking to transform passive emotions faced in the working situation to help employees feel safe and supported and restore more resources to deal with problems either on the work or in daily life (Grant et al., 2007).

Recently, more and more enterprises have implemented a series of employee-assistance programs to prevent and help to deal with problems employees may come across. Hopefully, with the EAP system, employees work safety, and labor and management can reach a harmonious state. Earlier studies indicated that a major cause of employees' health problems was the job itself and related sources of pressure (Ganster & Rosen, 2013). If problems can be diminished from the source, some side issues, such as legal working hours, career counseling, and workload, should be considered to maintain psychological and physiological balance. It would be helpful to encourage employees to learn from professional third parties regarding how to face tough situations and apply problem solving and thereby decrease their pressure and emotional distress and increase job engagement and job performance.

**Suggestions for future research**

**Relationships between CCB and supervisor's job performance appraisal.** There was no significant relationship between CCB and supervisors' job performance appraisal. This could be because too many factors influence supervisors' appraisal, such as stereotype, halo effect, and CCB, and they did not account for a significant portion at this point. Thus, in the future studies, more control variables or covariates can be considered.

**More mediators and moderators can be considered.** This study examined the moderated mediating effect of emotional regulation on CCB and job performance. The results showed that cognitive reappraisal had an effect, while expressive inhibition did not. The results also showed that expressive inhibition strategy can disperse individuals' interactions with the external environment; therefore, some interaction-related issues, such as social interaction, worksite friendships, EAP, and even other behaviors related to emotional regulation should be considered. Organizational issues that related to emotional regulation, such as organizational culture, climate, power, and politics can also be considered for future study.

**Study of other industries or departments in organizations.** Previous study results were widespread across many industries. CCB can arise in all other industries and departments. Owing to possible professional features in hospitality industry, emotional regulation was an important focus in the service industry; in other industries, emotional regulation with CCB may not be an important issue. Therefore, the extension of this study to other industries or departments still awaits further study.

**Longitudinal study required.** Due to time limitations, this study uses one short questionnaire. Studies regarding this issue using longitudinal scope is also expected. By using longitudinal study, the formation processes of CCB in the service industry along with emotional regulation processes can be further revealed.

**Acknowledgments**

We sincerely appreciate editors and reviewers to review our manuscript. Their insightful comments and suggestions will be really valuable and helpful for improving our work. We also sincerely thank Professor Hai Feng Yan for his valuable advice in the writing of our paper.

**Declaration of Conflicting Interests**

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

**Funding**

The author(s) disclosed receipt of the following financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article: This paper is supported by Social Science Foundation of Zhejiang Province, China (No. 20 NDJC215YB), and this paper is also granted by the National Social Science Fund of China (21&ZD184).

**ORCID iDs**

Tsang-Kai Hung https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5396-1698
Mu Tian https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0959-4290

**References**

Ahmadian, S., Azarshahi, S., & Paulhus, D. L. (2017). Explaining Donald Trump via communication style: Grandiosity, informality, and dynamism. *Personality and Individual Differences, 107*, 49–53.
Albrecht, S. L. (2012). The influence of job, team, and organizational level resources on employee well-being, engagement, commitment and extra-role performance: Test of a model. *International Journal of Manpower, 33*(7), 840–853.
Alfnes, F., Yue, C., & Jensen, H. H. (2010). Cognitive dissonance as a means of reducing hypothetical bias. *European Review of Agricultural Economics*, 37(2), 147–163.

Ashford, S. J., & Tsui, A. S. (1991). Self-regulation for managerial effectiveness: The role of active feedback seeking. *Academy of Management Journal*, 34(2), 251–280.

Ashforth, B. E., & Humphrey, R. H. (1993). Emotional labor in service roles: The influence of identity. *Academy of Management Review*, 18(1), 88–115.

Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Verbeke, W. (2004). Using the job demands-resources model to predict burnout and performance. *Human Resource Management*, 43(1), 83–104.

Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator–mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51(6), 1173–1182.

Blanchard-Fields, F., & Coats, A. H. (2008). Emotion regulation in interpersonal problems: The role of cognitive-emotional complexity, emotion regulation goals, and expressivity. *Psychology and Aging*, 23(1), 39–51.

Brehm, J. W., & Cole, A. H. (1966). Effect of a favor which reduces freedom. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 3(4), 420.

Brotheridge, C. M., & Lee, R. T. (2002). Testing a conservation of energy model: A multidisciplinary review. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 2(3), 51–63.

Bolino, M. C. (1999). Citizenship and impression management: Good soldiers or good actors? *Academy of Management Review*, 24, 82–98.

Bolino, M. C., Turnley, W. H., & Niehoff, B. P. (2004). The other side of the story: Reexamining prevailing assumptions about organizational citizenship behavior. *Human Resource Management Review*, 14(2), 229–246.

Borman, W. C., & Brush, D. H. (1993). More progress toward a taxonomy of managerial performance requirements. *Human Performance*, 6(1), 1–21.

Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. In N. Schmitt & W. C. Borman (Eds.), *Personnel selection in organization* (pp. 71–98). Jossey-Bass.

Brehm, J. W., & Cole, A. H. (1966). Effect of a favor which reduces freedom. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 3(4), 420.

Brotheridge, C. M., & Lee, R. T. (2002). Testing a conservation of resources model of the dynamics of emotional labor. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 7(1), 57.

Butler, E. A., Lee, T. L., & Gross, J. J. (2007). Emotion regulation and culture: Are the social consequences of emotion suppression culture-specific? *Emotion*, 7(1), 30–48.

Campbell, D. J. (1990). Modeling the performance predication problem in industrial and organization psychology. In M. D. Dunnette & L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organization psychology* (2nd ed., Vol. 1, pp. 687–732). Consulting Psychologists Press.

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.

Coats, A. H., & Blanchard-Fields, F. (2008). Emotion regulation in interpersonal problems: The role of cognitive-emotional complexity, emotion regulation goals, and expressivity. *Psychology and Aging*, 23(1), 39–51.

Cole, D. A. (1987). Utility of confirmatory factor analysis in test validation research. *Journal of consulting and clinical psychology*, 55(4), 584–594.

Conway, J. M. (1996). Additional construct validity evidence for the task/contextual performance distinction. *Human Performance*, 9(4), 309–329.

Costa, S., Daher, P., Neves, P., & Velez, M. J. (2021). The interplay between ethical leadership and supervisor organizational embodiment on organizational identification and extra-role performance. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 31(2), 214–225.

Doll, W. J., Xia, W., & Torkzadeh, G. (1994). A confirmatory factor analysis of the end-user consuming satisfaction instrument. *MIS Quarterly*, 18(4), 453–461.

Edwards, J. R., & Lambert, L. S. (2007). Methods for integrating moderation and mediation: A general analytical framework using moderated path analysis. *Psychological Methods*, 12(1), 1–22.

Ekman, P. (1992). An argument for basic emotions. *Cognition & Emotion*, 6(3–4), 169–200.

Engelbrecht, A. S., & Fischer, A. H. (1995). The managerial performance implications of a developmental assessment center process. *Human Relations*, 48(4), 387–404.

Ferreira-Oliveira, A. T., Keating, J., & Silva, I. (2020). Sustainable HRM as a pathway to sustainability—HRMS relevance on affective commitment through organizational trust. *Sustainability*, 12(22), 9443.

Festinger, L. (1957). *A theory of cognitive dissonance* (Vol. 2). Stanford University Press.

Fluegge, E. R. (2008). *Who put the fun in functional? Fun at work and its effects on job performance*. University of Florida.

Gansler, D. C., & Rosen, C. C. (2013). Work stress and employee health: A multidisciplinary review. *Journal of Management*, 39(5), 1085–1122.

Grant, A. M., Christianson, M. K., & Price, R. H. (2007). Happiness, health, or relationships? Managerial practices and employee well-being tradeoffs. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 21(3), 51–63.

Gross, J. J. (1998). Antecedent-and response-focused emotion regulation: Divergent consequences for experience, expression, and physiology. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74(1), 224–237.

Gross, J. J. (1999). Emotion regulation: Past, present, future. *Cognition & Emotion*, 13(5), 551–573.

Gross, J. J. (2002). Emotion regulation: Affective, cognitive, and social consequences. *Psychophysiology*, 39(3), 281–291.

Gross, J. J., & John, O. P. (2003). Individual differences in two emotion regulation processes: Implications for affect, relationships, and well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85(2), 348–362.

Gross, J. J., & Muñoz, R. F. (1995). Emotion regulation and mental health. *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice*, 2(2), 151.

Gruman, J. A., & Saks, A. M. (2011). Performance management and employee engagement. *Human Resource Management Review*, 21(2), 123–136.

Halbesleben, J. R., & Bowler, W. M. (2007). Emotional exhaustion and job performance: The mediating role of motivation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(1), 93–106.
Harmon-Jones, E. (2019). *Cognitive dissonance: Reexamining a Pivotal theory in psychology*. American Psychological Association.

Hayes, A. F. (2013). *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regression-based approach*. Guilford Publications.

He, P., Peng, Z., Zhao, H., & Estay, C. (2019). How and when compulsory citizenship behavior leads to employee silence: A moderated mediation model based on moral disengagement and supervisor–subordinate guanxi views. *Journal of Business Ethics, 155*(1), 259–274.

Hecht, T. D., & Allen, N. J. (2005). Exploring links between poly-chronicity and well-being from the perspective of person–job fit: Does it matter if you prefer to do only one thing at a time? *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 98*(2), 155–178.

Hong, G., & Kim, E. (2019). How to attract talented expatriates? *Journal of International Business, 91*(19), 5373.

Hu, L. T., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal, 6*(1), 1–55.

Jawahar, I. M., Meurs, J. A., Ferris, G. R., & Hochwarter, W. A. (2008). Self-efficacy and political skill as comparative predictors of task and contextual performance: A two-study constructive replication. *Human Performance, 21*(2), 138–157.

Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal, 33*(4), 702–724.

Katz, D. (1964). The motivational basis of organizational behavior. *Behavioral Science, 9*(2), 131–146.

Korman, A. K. (1977). *Organizational behavior*. Prentice Hall.

Kramar, R. (2014). Beyond strategic human resource management: Is sustainable human resource management the next approach? *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 25*(8), 1069–1089.

Kruglanski, A. W., Jasko, K., Milyavsky, M., Chernikova, M., Webber, D., Pierro, A., & Di Santo, D. (2018). Cognitive consistency theory in social psychology: A paradigm reconsidered. *Psychological Inquiry, 29*(2), 45–59.

Kuo, C. C., Ni, Y. L., Wu, C. H., Duh, R. R., Chen, M. Y., & Chang, C. (2021). When can felt accountability promote innovative work behavior? The role of transformational leadership. *Personnel Review*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-03-2021-0174

Levenson, R. W. (1999). The intrapersonal functions of emotion. *Cognition & Emotion, 13*(5), 481–504.

Li, S. (2021). Linking servicescape and customer engagement: An investigation in the hotel context. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 94*, 102880.

Li, X., Sanders, K., & Frenkel, S. (2012). How leader–member exchange, work engagement and HRM consistency explain Chinese luxury hotel employees’ job performance. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 31*(4), 1059–1066.

May, D. R., Gilson, R. L., & Harter, L. M. (2004). The psychological conditions of meaningfulness, safety and availability and the engagement of the human spirit at work. *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology, 77*, 11–37.

Mulki, J. P., Jaramillo, F., Goad, E. A., & Pesquera, M. R. (2015). Regulation of emotions, interpersonal conflict, and job performance for sales people. *Journal of Business Research, 68*(3), 623–630.

Muller, D., Judd, C. M., & Yzerbyt, V. Y. (2005). When moderation is mediated and mediation is moderated. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 89*, 852–863.

Narver, J. C., & Slater, S. F. (1990). The effect of a market orientation on business profitability. *Journal of Marketing, 54*(4), 20–35.

Ng, W., & Diener, E. (2009). Personality differences in emotions: Does emotion regulation play a role? *Journal of Individual Differences, 30*(2), 100–106.

Ong, A. D., Bergeman, C. S., Bisconti, T. L., & Wallace, K. A. (2006). Psychological resilience, positive emotions, and successful adaptation to stress in later life. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 91*(4), 730.

Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good solder syndrome*. Lexington Books.

Park, S., & Cho, Y. J. (2020). Does telework status affect the behavior and perception of supervisors? Examining task behavior and perception in the telework context. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 33*(7), 1326–1351.

Patias, N. D., Von Hohendorff, J., Cozzer, A. J., Flores, P. A., & Scorsolini-Comin, F. (2021). Mental health and coping strategies in undergraduate students during COVID-19 pandemic. *Trends in Psychology, 29*(3), 414–433.

Perlow, L., & Weeks, J. (2002). Who’s helping whom? Layers of culture and workplace behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior, 23*(4), 345–361.

Plutchik, R. (1990). Emotions and psychotherapy: A psychoevolutionary perspective. In R. Plutchik & H. Kellerman (Eds.), *Emotion, psychopathology, and psychotherapy* (pp. 3–41). Academic Press.

Podsakoff, N. P., Whiting, S. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & Blume, B. D. (2009). Individual-and organizational-level consequences of organizational citizenship behaviors: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*(1), 122.

Purwanto, A., Hidayat, D., & Asbari, M. (2021). Work-family conflict disaster: From organizational commitment to job satisfaction. *International Journal of Social and Management Studies, 2*(1), 86–92.

Riyanto, S., Endri, E., & Herlisha, N. (2021). Effect of work motivation and job satisfaction on employee performance: Mediating role of employee engagement. *Problems and Perspectives in Management, 19*(3), 162–174.

Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., & Salanova, M. (2006). The measurement of work engagement with a short questionnaire: A cross-national study. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 66*(4), 701–716.

Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., González-Romá, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory factoranalytic approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 3*(1), 71–92.

Smith, C. A. O. D. W. N. J. P., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 68*(4), 653–663.
Thomas, C. L., & Allen, K. (2021). Driving engagement: Investigating the influence of emotional intelligence and academic buoyancy on student engagement. *Journal of Further and Higher Education, 45*(1), 107–119.

Thompson, R. A. (1994). Emotion regulation: A theme in search of definition. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 59*(2–3), 25–52.

Vigoda-Gadot, E. (2006). Compulsory citizenship behavior in organizations: Theorizing some dark sides of the good soldier syndrome. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior, 36*(1), 77–93.

Vigoda-Gadot, E. (2007). Redrawing the boundaries of OCB? An empirical examination of compulsory extra-role behavior in the workplace. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 21*, 377–405.

Wattoo, M. A., Zhao, S., & Xi, M. (2020). High-performance work systems and work–family interface: Job autonomy and self-efficacy as mediators. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources, 58*(1), 128–148.

Wichardt, P. C. (2012). Norms, cognitive dissonance, and cooperative behaviour in laboratory experiments. *International Journal of Social Economics, 39*(5), 342–356.

Wong, C. S., & Law, K. S. (2002). Development of an emotional intelligence instrument and an investigation of its relationship with leader and follower performance and attitudes. *Leadership Quarterly, 13*, 243–274.

Zhao, H., Peng, Z., Han, Y., Sheard, G., & Hudson, A. (2013). Psychological mechanism linking abusive supervision and compulsory citizenship behavior: A moderated mediation study. *The Journal of Psychology, 147*(2), 177–195.