

Analyzing The Impact Of Job Stress, Job Insecurity, and Work Engagement On Job Performance During The COVID-19 Pandemic In The Aviation Industry

Aninda Puspa Paramita and Lily Sudhartio

Faculty of Economics and Businesses, University of Indonesia

Abstract. *The COVID-19 pandemic has devastated the global airline industry. In Indonesia alone, the industry suffered USD 8.225 billion loss in revenue and recorded a 50% drop in passenger demand in 2020 compared to the previous year. The low demand for air travel and no clear end to the pandemic has caused a double crisis, health and economic, affecting aviation industry employees on a personal level. This research aims to determine the impact of perceived COVID-19 pandemic concerns on job stress, work engagement, and job insecurity among aviation industry employees. It further explores the pandemic's impact on job performance. Using structural equation modeling (SEM) based on partial least squares (PLS), the research examined the data of aviation industry employees who work for various companies, including airlines, airports, and the Maintenance Repair Organization (MRO) in Indonesia. The results of this research show that perceived pandemic concerns create another layer of job insecurity and job stress and negatively impact work engagement. Work engagement positively impacts job performance. Therefore, as a result, perceived pandemic concerns have an indirect positive impact on job performance.*

Keywords: *Aviation Industry, COVID-19 Pandemic, Employment Uncertainty, Job Performance.*

1. Introduction

In the Indonesian archipelago, the aviation industry plays a major role in transportation and logistics and is vital to the nation's economy. Based on an International Air Transport Association (IATA) Report in 2019, there are three ways to measure air transport's impact on the economy: "the jobs and the spending generated by the national airlines and their supply chain, the flows of trade tourism, and investment resulting from users of all airlines serving the country, and the city pair connections that make these flows possible" (IATA, 2019).

In Indonesia, the aviation sector employs 115,000 people, and the industry supports approximately 4.2 million jobs from air transport and tourists arriving by air. Regarding spending, the industry supports a

total of 2.6% of Indonesia's GDP, or USD 24 billion (IATA, 2019).

However, with the arrival of the COVID-19 pandemic, the Indonesian aviation industry has taken a toll, like others across the world. The IATA's report in April 2020 stated the global Air Passenger and Air Cargo Volumes revenue passenger kilometers (RPKs) were falling by an unprecedented 52.9% year-on-year worldwide. The situation is dire in the Asia Pacific, where the revenue fell to USD 113 billion. Indonesia alone suffered a loss of USD 8.225 billion and recorded a 50% drop in passenger demand compared to the previous year (IATA, 2020).

As the pandemic continued, the decreased demand for air travel combined with government policies that encourage staying at home has made air travel virtually non-

existent. The lack of customers caused revenue loss for companies in the airline industry, leading to job insecurity for industry employees.

This study uses cognitive and affective job insecurities to analyze the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on aviation industry employees, who may experience both forms of job insecurity due to the pandemic. As previously studied, the effect of job insecurity expands beyond the employee's state of mind as it may impact their work performance and, ultimately, their employer's performance (Pienaar et al., 2013). Therefore, cognitive job insecurity can predict organizational and health-related outcomes, and affective job insecurity can be used to predict emotional exhaustion (Pienaar et al., 2013).

Beyond job insecurity, the pandemic affects aviation industry employees. As a novel disease with no known cure, the pandemic can cause uneasiness and even fear, especially for workers in service industries like aviation, who need to meet with their co-workers or customers on a daily basis (Yu et al., 2021).

This uneasiness and fear may result in stress due to the employees' greater likelihood of contracting the disease, the possibility of transmitting the disease to their immediate close ones, the uncertainty that the illness brings to the future of their employment, and others' perception of the fact that the employees can spread the disease (Yu et al., 2021). This stress will become another layer of job stress, compounding the stress that aviation industry workers will face during their routine work schedule (Petrilli et al., 2006). As the stress accumulates, it will negatively affect the employee's job attitude and performance, and ultimately negatively impact the employer (Hon et al., 2013).

The research will assess whether job performance during the pandemic is affected by job stress, job insecurity, and work engagement. Additionally, the research will assess the impact of perceived COVID-19 pandemic concerns as an additional layer of

stress for employees in the aviation industry, which can, in turn, impact job insecurity, job stress, and work engagement. The study will use questionnaires to gather information from aviation industry employees in Indonesia to examine whether pandemic concerns impacted employees' work performance. The data collected are important because Indonesia's present pandemic has no precedent, as the country was not affected as much during the SARS, MERS, and H5N1 epidemics.

The respondents for this research are aviation industry employees who work in various areas, such as airlines, the Maintenance Repair Organization (MRO), airports, aircraft manufacturing, and authority. The aviation sector includes airlines, airport operators, airport on-site enterprises (restaurants and retail), aircraft manufacturers, and air navigation service providers (IATA, 2019). Due to the novelty of the research, we believe that this research can be used to develop future strategies for managing aviation industry employees when similar events happen in the future.

2. Literature Study

A. Perceived Attributes of the COVID-19 Pandemic

According to Yu et al. (2021), interactions (e.g., conversations with customers, touching the personal objects of customers, etc.) can cause psychological pressure and chronic stress among workers in service industries, especially during the height of a pandemic. This can occur in the aviation industry, even though employees are not always in close contact with external customers. However, due to the nature of their work, which requires constant communication, often face-to-face, aviation industry employees need to be at their workplaces during their shift; thus, communicating with colleagues and co-workers can lead to a risk of exposure to disease.

The study by Yu et al. (2021) further found that the phenomenon of increased anxiety or stress among service industry employees can be observed during epidemic surges, such as SARS or MERS. These findings indicated that COVID-19 would have a similar impact on employees as it can be considered a novel disease.

The attributes of perceived COVID-19 pandemic concerns were classified using the qualitative methodology developed by Spiggle (1994). The concerns are classified into four groups: physical, psychological, financial, and social gaze concerns.

As in other sectors, aviation industry employees are feeling the impact of job-related stress. According to Beehr and Glazer (2001), there are several types of stressors, including environmental stressors, pressures, activities, or conditions. These stressors created burdens for the employees during their employment and cause aversive psychological, physiological, or behavioral reactions. Therefore, the presence of pandemic-related concerns adds another layer of job-related stress. Additionally, Parker and DeCotiis (1983) found that job stress can be regarded as a first-level impact on the company and job.

Moreover, frustration is a distinct second-level outcome or effect of job stress. Beyond frustration, there are also various levels of happiness among second-level outcomes, including organizational engagement, inspiration, and success. A study from Meynaar et al. (2021) showed that work engagement is relatively low compared to pre-pandemic conditions.

Furthermore, workplace tension can result in negative attitudes and behaviors among service industry workers and negatively affect businesses. As stated by Hon et al. (2013), workplace tension has a negative impact on employees' workplace mood and efficiency in general, as well as the company's performance. The impact of this work-related stress has been studied and found to be of

importance (Hon & Chan, 2013; Kim et al., 2015). Additionally, the attributes of perceived COVID-19 pandemic factors have been found to positively affect job stress (Yu et al., 2021).

A study conducted by Meynaar et al. (2021) that measured burnout, resilience, and work engagement among Dutch intensivists during the wake of the COVID-19 crisis found an increased risk for burnout among the intensivists. This increased risk affects intensivists' resilience and work engagement. If there is an increase in risk, it would mean that there would be a decrease in resilience and work engagement. Therefore, we present the first hypotheses as follows:

H1: Attributes of perceived COVID-19 pandemic concerns have a positive effect on job stress.

H2: Attributes of perceived COVID-19 pandemic concerns have a negative effect on work engagement.

B. Job Insecurity

Job insecurity, according to Witte (1999), is the fear of job loss and unemployment. Greenhalgh and Rosenblatt (1984) were the first to define job insecurity (Pienaar et al., 2013), which they describe as workers' lack of willingness to work if the permanence of their jobs is threatened (Greenhalgh & Rosenblatt, 1984). According to Hartley et al. (1990), job insecurity is the difference between an employee's confidence level depending on their background and the level of assurance desired (Rosenblatt & Ruivo, 1996). Job insecurity can negatively impact employees' psychological and physiological well-being and cause stress (Ashford et al., 1989; Pienaar et al., 2013). As a result of job insecurity, employees have adverse responses to their work (Dereli, 2012).

Many scholars identify job insecurity as employees' hope that they can continue to work (Davy et al., 1997; Hartley et al., 1990; Heaney et al., 1994; Sverke et al., 2002; Witte, 2010), while others define job insecurity as employees' assessments of the likelihood of losing their job in times of crisis (Hartley et al., 1990; Mohr, 2000). Chen and Eyoun (2021) studied whether the fear of COVID-

19 positively affects job insecurity. The pandemic brought forth uncertainty for employees in the aviation industry, whether in the form of employment or a decrease in income. Therefore, it can be hypothesized that:

H3: Attributes of perceived COVID-19 pandemic concerns have a positive effect on job insecurity.

C. Job Stress

A study by Tongchaiprasit and Ariyabuddhiphongs (2016) described job stress as an adverse physical or emotional reaction when work conditions do not correspond to employees' skills, finances, and desires. According to Akgunduz and Eryilmaz (2018) and Hon et al. (2013), job stress harms overall job results. In other words, job stress is a negative influence that causes physical and emotional harm to workers and significantly impacts job performance and business success. A study from Tuckey et al. (2015) and a meta-analysis by Crawford et al. (2010) found that job stress has a significant and negative effect on work engagement; thus, we can hypothesize that:

H4: Job stress has a positive effect on work engagement.

H5: Job stress has a negative effect on job performance.

D. Job Insecurity and Job Performance

Studies have shown that job insecurity is related to job performance (Aguar-Quintana et al., 2021), and work engagement is also related to job performance (J, 2014; Medlin & Green, 2009). Greenhalgh and Rosenblatt (1984) reported that employees with higher job insecurity are likely to have reduced work engagement. Similarly, according to Wang et al. (2015), job insecurity is considerably negatively associated with job performance and work engagement. Getahun Asfaw and Chang (2019) argued that perceived job insecurity is directly related to decreased work engagement. Karatepe et al. (2020) claimed that job insecurity directly hinders employees' work engagement, and Shin and Hur (2020) concurrently found that job insecurity depletes employees' physical, psychological, and mental energy, negatively influencing their health and well-being and thereby inducing

decreased engagement. A study by Jung et al. (2021) further shows that job insecurity caused by COVID-19 has a significant influence on reducing work engagement.

The implication is that employee job performance can reflect an organization's reliability and growth (LePine et al., 2002). Many studies define job performance as the level of productivity of a single employee compared to subordinates' various job-related habits and outcomes. Thus, we can assume that:

H6: Job insecurity has a negative impact on work engagement.

H7: Job insecurity has a negative impact on job performance.

E. Work Engagement

A study conducted by Schaufeli et al. (2006) defined work engagement as an optimistic and satisfying work-related mental state characterized by vigor, commitment, and absorption. Employee engagement is one of the primary determinants of high standards of job performance, as several studies have consistently shown (Kotzé et al., 2014; Schneider et al., 2009). Thus, it can be hypothesized that:

H8: Work engagement has a positive impact on job performance.

3. Methodology

A. Sample and Procedure

In this study, researchers used primary data methods in collecting data to be analyzed (Black & Babin, 2019). The data were collected using a quantitative method and with closed-ended question techniques in the form of a 6-point Likert scale, in which 1 means strongly disagree and 6 means strongly agree. The indicator measuring tool for each construct is modified from using a scale of 1–5 and 1–7 to a scale of 1–6 because of the possibility that respondents use the midpoint answer as a solution when answering unfamiliar, ambiguous, or socially-undesirable survey items (Maeso, 2011). Thus, we used a 6-point Likert scale for the following reasons:

1) to ensure continuity between questionnaires for a more accessible statistical analysis and 2) to avoid core bias in odd-numbered scales where respondents appear to select the median choice as a neutral answer. Prior to data collection, pre-testing was conducted. The questionnaire was distributed through a mobile platform messenger and self-administered by the respondents using the online form facility.

B. Measures

This study uses one dependent variable, three independent variables, and one mediating variable. The dependent variable, namely job performance; one mediating variable, attributes of COVID-19 pandemic; and three independent variables, namely job stress, job insecurity, and work engagement.

Job performance was measured using two dimensions, namely, contextual performance and task performance. Contextual performance was measured using a 15-item scale, while task performance was measured using an 8-item scale (Borman & Motowidlo, 1997; Shang et al., 2016).

The attributes of the COVID-19 pandemic were measured using four dimensions: physical concerns (PC), psychological concerns (PSC), financial concerns (FC), and concerns regarding social gaze (CRS). PC was measured using a 5-item scale, PSC using a 7-item scale, FC using a 4-item scale, and CRS using a 4-item scale. A total of 20 items was thus used to measure the attributes of the

COVID-19 pandemic, as developed by Yu et al. (2021).

Job stress was measured using two dimensions: time pressure and anxiety. Time pressure was measured using a 6-item scale, and anxiety was measured using a 7-item scale. A total of 13 items was used to measure job stress (Addae & Wang, 2006; Elangovan & Lin Xie, 2000; Glazer et al., 2004; Jamal, 2010; Min, 2013).

Job insecurity was measured using two dimensions: cognitive job insecurity (CJI) and affective job insecurity (AJI). CJI was measured using a 4-item scale, and AJI was measured using a 4-item scale (Akgunduz & Eryilmaz, 2018; Pienaar et al., 2013; Witte, 2010).

Work engagement was measured using a 17-item Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES), characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption, as developed by Schaufeli et al. (2006).

Control variables. Based on a review of the existing literature, this paper finds that demographic information and other relevant factors (company, age, domicile, gender, work experience, education, marital status, job position, income, and working hours) can affect the dependent variables. Therefore, these factors were controlled during the analysis. Table 1 shows the summary of the variables.

Table 1.
Summary of the Variables

No.	Indicator	Question's Indicator
Job Performance		
1	CP1	I always cooperate with my colleagues of the same team
2	CP2	I frequently show my patience during my working time
3	CP3	I frequently shoulder extra work for my company and colleagues
4	CP4	I used to follow operation procedure and work guidelines and avoid assuming my colleagues' work assignment
5	CP5	I wish my company could arrange for me to handle a challenging mission

Table 1. (Continued)
Summary of the Variables

No.	Indicator	Question's Indicator
6	CP6	I am always willing to help my colleagues complete a mission which has no relationship with me
7	CP7	I pay attention to important events to avoid unexpected incidences
8	CP8	I fully support my superiors' decisions
9	CP9	I have considered job ethics in my work
10	CP10	I have encouraged and supported my colleagues when they have encountered challenges
11	CP11	I have voluntarily solved problems in my company
12	CP12	I do control myself and obey the work codes in my company
13	CP13	I am willing to handle a difficult assignment from my company
14	CP14	I do shoulder extra work and am willing to help my colleagues and my team to improve their performance
15	CP15	In general, I am willing to help my colleagues and try to put myself in my company's shoes to consider the company's situation
16	TPJ1	I must complete work assignments according to standard operation procedure
17	TPJ2	I am familiar with the SOP of my work
18	TPJ3	I often plan and arrange my work progresss well
19	TPJ4	I have paid attention to sanitary and safety issues during my work
20	TPJ5	I always keep my workshop floor clean and tidy
21	TPJ6	I used to have my work tools and stationery in fixed places after I used them
22	TPJ7	My average working efficiency is high
23	TPJ8	In general, I can complete my work according to mycompany's request
Attributes of Perceived COVID-19 Pandemic Concerns		
1	PHC1	Additional work such as frequent cleaning and disinfecting of the shared equipment or articles is physically tiring
2	PHC2	Wearing a mask or safety equipment when attending to customers/co-workers is physically uncomfortable
3	PHC3	Washing more frequently and paying more attention to personal hygiene due to the epidemic increases physical fatigue
4	PHC4	The surge in customer complaints due to limited services increases physical fatigue
5	PHC5	Physical fatigue increases because a minimum number of employees are at work
6	PSC1	I am anxious that I might be infected by customers/co-workers
7	PSC2	I get anxious if the customers/co-workers I interact with are infected
8	PSC3	I worry about the high possibility that my family might also be exposed to the epidemic because I am prone to be exposed to and infected by the virus
9	PSC4	I worry that I might get infected by the virus and spread it to customers/co-workers
10	PSC5	I worry that I could get infected and the company will have to close because of me

Table 1. (Continued)
Summary of the Variables

No.	Indicator	Question's Indicator
11	PSC6	I provide passive care to customers/co-workers when I attend to them in order to minimize face-to-face contact due to the possibility of being infected
12	PSC7	I worry that customer satisfaction and company evaluations will be low because of passive care
13	FC1	I think I might lose my job because of the new epidemic
14	FC2	I think I might use up my vacation days because of the new epidemic
15	FC3	I think my income might decrease due to compulsory unpaid leave
16	FC4	I think the company might under-achieve its goals due to the new epidemic
17	CRS1	I think I might have problems in my interpersonal relationships because I refrain from or am absent from congregate meals or personal gatherings (e.g., family gatherings, weddings, and gatherings with friends)
18	CRS2	I worry about national or social isolation due to discrimination and rejection of specific countries or races due to the epidemic outbreak
19	CRS3	I feel ashamed to tell others that I work at my company
20	CRS4	When I was infected by the new virus, I felt awkward for being sick and as if I was guilty of something
Job Stress		
1	TP1	Working here makes it hard to spend enough time with my family
2	TP2	Working here leaves little time for other activities
3	TP3	I spend so much time at work that I can't even take a simple walk to relax
4	TP4	I feel like I never have a day off
5	TP5	I frequently get the feeling I am married to the institution
6	TP6	I sometimes dread the telephone ringing at home because the call might be job-related
7	AX1	There are lots of times when my job drives me right up a wall
8	AX2	My job gets to me more than it should
9	AX3	Sometimes when I think about my job I get a tight feeling in my chest
10	AX4	I have felt fidgety or nervous as a result of my job
11	AX5	I have too much work and too little time to do it
12	AX6	I feel guilty when I take time off from my job
13	AX7	Too many people at my level in the company get burned out by job demands
Work Engagement		
1	VI1	At my work, I feel bursting with energy
2	VI2	At my job, I feel strong and vigorous
3	VI3	When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work
4	VI4	I can continue working for very long periods at a time
5	VI5	At my job, I am very mentally resilient
6	VI6	At my work I always persevere, even when things do not go well
7	DE1	I find the work that I do full of meaning and purpose
8	DE2	I am enthusiastic about my job

Table 1. (Continued)
Summary of the Variables

No.	Indicator	Question's Indicator
9	DE3	My job inspires me
10	DE4	I am proud on the work that I do
11	DE5	To me, my job is challenging
12	AB1	Time flies when I am working
13	AB2	When I am working, I forget everything else around me
14	AB3	I feel happy when I am working intensely
15	AB4	I am immersed in my work
16	AB5	I get carried away when I am working
17	AB6	It is difficult to detach myself from my job
Job Insecurity		
1	CJI1	I am very sure that I will be able to keep my job.
2	CJI2	I am certain/sure of my job environment.
3	CJI3	I think that I will be able to continue working here.
4	CJI4	There is only a small chance that I will become unemployed.
5	AJI1	I fear that I might get fired.
6	AJI2	I worry about the continuation of my career
7	AJI3	I fear that I might lose my job
8	AJI4	I feel uncertain about the future of my job.

C. Data Analysis Methods

The data analysis method in this study consisted of a measurement model analysis and structural model analysis using SmartPLS Software 3.3.3.

The data analysis method tested the hypotheses to determine whether the relationship between the independent and dependent variables is clear and reliable. The researcher used the structural equation modeling (SEM) method to test the hypotheses, which combines two statistical methods, namely, factor analysis and partial least squares (PLS) analysis, which is used for the simultaneous equation model.

Tests on the measurement and structural model were based on the guidelines provided by Hair Jr. et al. (2017), where the measurement model analysis is tested based on internal consistency criteria (Cronbach's alpha and composite reliability), convergent validity (loading factor and average variance

extracted), and Fornell-Lacker criterion.

The structural model analysis aims to analyze the relationship between all latent variables in the simplified conceptual model. The structural model analysis tests for R-squared, path coefficients, t-statistics, and predictive relevance.

4. Findings and Discussion

A. Respondent Profile

Data were collected from 303 aviation industry employees through a structured questionnaire. The researcher used 225 valid data for analysis. Table 2 shows the respondents' general profile, which summarizes company profile, age, domicile, gender, work experience, education, marital status, job position, income, and working hours.

Table 2.
Respondent Profile (Total N=225)

<i>No</i>	<i>Demographic</i>	<i>Responses</i>	<i>Responses</i>	
			<i>%</i>	<i>Number</i>
1	Company	Airline	26%	59
		Maintenance	Repair	54%
		Organization (MRO)		
		Others	20%	45
2	Age	Under 20 years	15%	34
		20–29 years	40%	91
		30–39 years	32%	71
		40–59 years	6%	14
		50–59 years	6%	13
		Above 60	1%	2
		3	Domicile	Tangerang
	Tangerang Selatan	12%		26
	DKI Jakarta	17%		38
	Bekasi	8%		17
	Bogor	6%		13
	Depok	4%		10
	Bandung	7%		16
	Other	7%		15
4	Gender	Male	63%	141
		Female	37%	84
5	Work Experience	Under 2 years	16%	35
		2–3 years	13%	30
		4–5 years	23%	51
		6–7 years	21%	47
		8–9 years	10%	22
		10 years and above	18%	40
6	Education	High school or equivalent	16%	36
		Diploma 1 or equivalent	2%	4
		Diploma 2 or equivalent	4%	9
		Diploma 3 or equivalent	8%	18
		Diploma 4 or equivalent	2%	5
		Bachelor's Degree or equivalent	55%	123
		Master's Degree or equivalent	13%	30
7	Marital Status	Single	42%	95
		Married	56%	125
		Divorced or widowed	2%	5
		8	Job Position	Director
	Vice President	1%		3
	Senior Manager	7%		16
	Manager or equivalent	20%		46
	Staff	68%		153
	Third Party	2%		5

Table 2. (Continued)
Respondent Profile (Total N=225)

No	Demographic	Responses	Responses	
			%	Number
9	Income	Under Rp 10.000.000	56%	127
		Rp 10.000.000–20.000.000	28%	63
		Rp 20.000.000–30.000.000	8%	17
		Rp 30.000.000–40.000.000	4%	8
		Rp 40.000.000–50.000.000	3%	6
		Rp 50.000.000 and above	2%	4
10	Working hours	Office Hours	80%	181
		Shift	20%	44

B. Measurement Model Analysis

The AVE (average variance extracted), Cronbach’s alpha, and composite reliability results for the attributes of perceived COVID-19 pandemic concerns and job performance were below the acceptable limit. To improve AVE, Cronbach’s alpha, and

composite reliability, the researcher removed 17 indicators below 0.7. However, the researcher did not remove all indicators <0.7 since 0.4 is still considered acceptable (F. Hair Jr et al., 2014). Thus, of the total 81 indicators, 64 indicators were used. Table 3 shows the final measurement model analysis.

Table 3.
Final Measurement Model Analysis

Variable	Dimension	Code	Convergent Validity		Internal Consistency	
			LF	AVE	CA	CR
			>0.4	>0.5	>0.6	>0.7
Job Performance	Contextual performance	CP7	0.66			
		CP9	0.68			
		CP10	0.80	0.53	0.82	0.87
		CP12	0.79			
		CP14	0.70			
		CP15	0.72			
		TPJ1	0.70			
	Task performance	TPJ2	0.74			
		TPJ3	0.71			
		TPJ4	0.75	0.70	0.91	0.93
		TPJ5	0.78			
		TPJ6	0.54			
		TPJ7	0.65			
		Attributes of Perceived COVID-19 Pandemic Concerns	Physical concerns	PHC1	0.78	
PHC2	0.78					
PHC3	0.68			0.58	0.82	0.87
PHC4	0.80					
PHC5	0.75					
Psychological concerns	PSC1		0.89			
	PSC2		0.92			
	PSC3		0.89	0.69	0.88	0.91
	PSC4		0.89			
	PSC5		0.49			

Table 3. (Continued)
Final Measurement Model Analysis

Variable	Dimension	Code	Convergent Validity		Internal Consistency					
			LF >0.4	AVE >0.5	CA >0.6	CR >0.7				
Attributes of Perceived COVID-19 Pandemic Concerns Job stress	Financial concerns	FC1	0.89	0.80	0.75	0.89				
		FC4	0.90							
	Concerns regarding social gaze	CRS1	0.84	0.72	0.60	0.83				
		CRS2	0.85							
		Time pressure	TP1				0.85	0.70	0.91	0.93
			TP2				0.89			
	TP3		0.86							
	TP4		0.86							
	TP5		0.79							
	TP6		0.76							
Anxiety	AX1	0.84	0.61	0.89	0.91					
	AX2	0.78								
	AX3	0.86								
	AX4	0.86								
	AX5	0.79								
	AX6	0.53								
	AX7	0.75								
Work Engagement	Vigor	VI1	0.83	0.56	0.83	0.88				
		VI2	0.90							
		VI3	0.88							
		VI4	0.42							
		VI5	0.63							
		VI6	0.74							
	Dedication	DE1	0.90	0.70	0.89	0.92				
		DE2	0.88							
		DE3	0.86							
		DE4	0.86							
		DE5	0.66							
	Absorption	AB1	0.70	0.56	0.84	0.88				
		AB2	0.71							
		AB3	0.68							
		AB4	0.86							
Job Insecurity	Cognitive job insecurity	AB5	0.78	0.57	0.75	0.84				
		AB6	0.76							
		CJI1	0.71							
		CJI2	0.79							
		CJI3	0.82							
		CJI4	0.70							
	Affective job insecurity	AJI1	0.70	0.67	0.84	0.89				
		AJI2	0.87							
		AJI3	0.87							
		AJI4	0.83							

*Note: All items of cognitive job insecurity are reversed. LF = loading factor; AVE = average variance extracted; CA = Cronbach's alpha; CR = composite reliability.

Table 4 shows discriminant validity or the Fornell-Lacker criteria.

Table 4.

Construct Correlations, Square Root of AVE

	APC	JI	JP	JS	WE
APC	0.681				
JI	-0.329	0.635			
JP	-0.132	0.237	0.636		
JS	0.397	-0.342	0.068	0.762	
WE	-0.389	0.483	0.418	-0.180	0.658

*Note: APC = Attributes of perceived COVID-19 pandemic factors; JI = Job insecurity; JP = Job performance; JS = Job stress; WE = Work engagement.

C. Structural Measurement

The details of the coefficient path analysis can be seen in Table 5. The results show that the t-value for the effect of the attributes of perceived COVID-19 pandemic concerns on job stress is 4.362, on work engagement is -4.302, and on job insecurity is 6.561. The t-value result for the effect of job stress on work engagement is 0.809 and on job performance is 2.327. For job insecurity, the t-value result for the effect of job insecurity on work engagement is -5.518 and on job performance is -1.078. The t-value result for the effect of work engagement on job

performance is 5.289.

The result shows that the t-values for all variables are above 1.960, showing a significance level of 5%, except for the t-values of job stress on work engagement, which is 0.809, and the t-value of job insecurity on job performance, which is -1.078. The p-values also reflect the significance level, showing a 0.419 value for the effect of job stress on work engagement and a value of 0.281 for the effect of job insecurity on job performance.

Table 5.

Path Coefficient of Structural Model Analysis

Path	Path Coefficient	T-Value	P-Value
Attributes of Perceived COVID-19 Pandemic Concerns -> Job Stress	0.397	4.362	0.000
Attributes of Perceived COVID-19 Pandemic Concerns -> Work Engagement	-0.282	-4.320	0.000
Attributes of Perceived COVID-19 Pandemic Concerns -> Job Insecurity	0.329	6.561	0.000
Job Stress -> Work Engagement	0.075	0.809	0.419
Job Stress -> Job Performance	0.173	2.327	0.020
Job Insecurity -> Work Engagement	-0.416	-5.518	0.000
Job Insecurity -> Job Performance	-0.085	-1.078	0.281
Work Engagement -> Job Performance	0.405	5.289	0.000

A. Attributes of Perceived COVID-19 Pandemic Concerns on Job Stress (H1 Accepted)

This study result shows that the attributes of perceived COVID-19 pandemic concerns positively affect job stress. This can be seen from the t-value of 4.362, path coefficient of 0.397, and p-value of 0.000. With this result, hypothesis 1 is supported by the data, meaning that the higher the attributes of perceived COVID-19 pandemic concerns in the unit under study, the higher job stress measured by anxiety and time pressure in this study. This hypothesis confirms previous research by Yu et al. (2021), which found that pandemic concerns increased job stress.

B. Attributes of Perceived COVID-19 Pandemic Concerns on Work Engagement (H2 Accepted)

This study result shows that the attributes of perceived COVID-19 pandemic concerns negatively affect work engagement, with a t-value of -4.320, path coefficient of -0.282, and p-value of 0.000. With this result, hypothesis 2, which states that perceived COVID-19 pandemic concerns negatively affect work engagement, is supported by the data. This result supports the previous study conducted by Meynaar et al. (2021), which showed that work engagement among intensivists in the Netherlands might be affected by an increased risk of burnout. Thus, increased concerns about the COVID-19 pandemic will decrease work engagement.

C. Attributes of Perceived COVID-19 Pandemic Concerns on Job Insecurity (H3 Accepted)

This study result shows that the attributes of perceived COVID-19 pandemic concerns positively affect job insecurity. This can be seen by the t-value of 6.561, path coefficient of 0.329, and p-value of 0.000. With this result, hypothesis 3, which states that attributes of perceived COVID-19 pandemic factors positively affect job insecurity, is supported by the data. This result aligns with the previous study by Chen and Eyoum [28], which found that fear of COVID-19 is positively associated with job insecurity.

D. Job Stress on Work Engagement (H4 Rejected)

The research model shows that job stress had no significant impact on work engagement, with a t-value of 0.809, a path coefficient of 0.075, and a p-value of 0.419. With this result, hypothesis 4, which states that job stress positively affects work engagement, is not supported by the data. The hypothesis was based on a meta-analysis by Crawford et al. (2010) and Tuckey et al. (2015) that found that job stress has a beneficial effect and enhances employee engagement. However, our study supports the previous finding from Karatepe et al. (2018), which showed that stress such as time pressures and anxiety did not show any significant effects on work engagement.

E. Job Stress on Job Performance (H5 Rejected)

This study result shows that job stress positively affects job performance, with a t-value of 2.327, path coefficient of 0.173, and p-value of 0.020. With this result, hypothesis 5, which states that job stress negatively affects job performance, is not supported by the data.

Although a previous study from Yu et al. (2021) showed that job stress negatively affects job performance, our study finds that job stress positively affects job performance among aviation industry employees. Contrary to prior research (Crawford et al., 2010), the current findings show that the effects of job stress were non-significant or marginal at best, and the directions of influence were mixed. This result raises further questions about the nature of job stress, which has been questioned in other recent studies (Bakker & Sanz-Vergel, 2013; Karatepe et al., 2018; Webster et al., 2011).

F. Job Insecurity on Work Engagement (H6 Accepted)

This study result shows that job insecurity negatively affects work engagement. This can be seen from the t-value of -5.518, path coefficient of -0.416, and p-value of 0.000. With this result, hypothesis 6, which states that job insecurity negatively affects work engagement, is not supported by the data.

However, job insecurity positively affects work engagement is supported by the data. The results align with the previous longitudinal study by Mauno et al. (2007), where job insecurity is negatively related to each dimension of work engagement.

G. Job Insecurity on Job Performance (H7 Rejected)

The research model shows that job insecurity has no significant impact on job performance, with a t-value of -1.078, path coefficient of -0.085, and p-value of 0.281. With this result, hypothesis 7, which states that job insecurity has a negative influence on job performance, is not supported by the data.

Thus, job insecurity has no proven effect on job performance, which supports the previous study from Aguiar-Quintana et al. (2021), in which job insecurity is found to have significant indirect effects instead. Previous empirical study findings on the connection between job insecurity and job performance have been conflicting. Although several kinds of research show a negative relationship between job insecurity and job performance (Cheng & Chan, 2008; Gilboa et al., 2013; Lu et al., 2014), other researchers believe that job insecurity has the opposite effect on job performance, in that it motivates workers to work harder and be absent less frequently to become more necessary and useful to the business. Our results confirm that during the COVID-19 pandemic, employees' job insecurity did not affect their job performance.

Furthermore, our findings may assist in explaining why some writers contend that natural disasters might alter the influence of job insecurity on job performance. Qin and Jiang (2011) described this phenomenon by stating that when a person is coping with the loss of a relative or another individual as a

result of a natural catastrophe, they have a strong sense of survivor's guilt, which may cause them to be more persistent and courageous in their job. The situation might explain why, during the COVID-19 pandemic, employees' job insecurity did not affect their job performance. Although many individuals have died due to COVID-19, the "survivor employees" are eager to contribute more to the organization's goals by following the instructions and obligations stated in their job descriptions. Simultaneously, implementing procedures and laws controlling the reopening of tourist and transportation services to enhance employee and tourist security may motivate staff to work harder. Thus, in the context of high unemployment due to the global economic crisis, we assume employees will maintain their task performance level to protect their jobs (Aguiar-Quintana et al., 2020).

H. Work Engagement on Job Performance (H8 Accepted)

The research model shows that work engagement significantly impacts job performance, with a t-value of 5.289, path coefficient of 0.405, and p-value of 0.000. With this result, hypothesis 8, which states that work engagement positively impacts job performance, is supported by the data. This result is consistent with Kotzé et al. (2014) and Schneider et al. (2009), who found that work engagement positively impacts job performance. A previous study from J (2014) similarly found that employee engagement significantly impacts employee job performance.

I. Path Analysis

Table 6 shows the total effect, and the highest path coefficient is COVID-19 Pandemic Concerns > Work Engagement > Job Performance.

Table 6.
Total Effect (Selected)

Path	Path Coefficient	T-Value	P-Value	Result
Perceived COVID-19 Pandemic Concerns -> Job Stress --> Job Performance	0.069	2.055	0.040	Significant
Perceived COVID-19 Pandemic Concerns -> Work Engagement --> Job Performance	-0.114	-3.202	0.001	Significant
Perceived COVID-19 Pandemic Concerns -> Job Insecurity --> Work Engagement --> Job Performance	-0.055	-3.280	0.001	Significant
Perceived COVID-19 Pandemic Concerns -> Job Insecurity --> Job Performance	-0.028	-1.053	0.292	Not Significant
Perceived COVID-19 Pandemic Concerns -> Job Stress --> Work Engagement --> Job Performance	0.012	0.746	0.456	Not Significant

5. Conclusion

From the results of the data analysis and previous discussion, the conclusions from this research are as follows: (1) Perceived COVID-19 pandemic concerns negatively affect work engagement; (2) Perceived COVID-19 pandemic concerns positively affect job stress and job insecurity; (3) Job stress has no significant effect on work engagement and negatively affects job performance; (4) Job insecurity negatively affects work engagement and has an indirect effect on job performance; and (5) Work engagement has a positive influence on job performance.

The study found that the perceived COVID-19 pandemic concerns have several effects on aviation industry employees in Indonesia. To increase performance, employees must have high work engagement. To increase work engagement, employers need to minimize

employees' insecurity by managing employees' stress and minimizing concerns about the COVID-19 pandemic, including physical, physiological, financial, and social gaze concerns. Therefore, while the threat of unemployment and increased job stress due to the pandemic cause a feeling of job insecurity, it is not considered significant enough to negatively impact employees' job performance and work engagement.

In this study, psychological concerns were considered the most substantial factors among the attributes of perceived COVID-19 pandemic concerns. The findings indicated that when a pandemic happens, employees face mental stress while performing their jobs because they must interact with people from various places, including their customers and co-workers. This situation increases their anxiety.

Financial concerns were identified as the second-strongest factor among the attributes of perceived COVID-19 pandemic concerns. According to the findings, during the pandemic, aircraft mainly were grounded and not operating, resulting in the number of customers dropping substantially or customers not being able to pay the company. This situation made employees highly anxious about the financial losses associated with job insecurity.

The third most substantial factor was related to physical concerns. In other words, it was discovered that there is considerable concern regarding whether employees' health can be assured and protected during pandemics since they regularly come into close contact with co-workers and customers, as most employees continue to work from the office.

The fourth and last factor was defined by concerns regarding the social gaze. This study's findings showed that personnel in the aviation sector might face a negative social gaze. Work engagement can be influenced not only by COVID-19 pandemic factors but also by many factors that need to be studied in the future, such as performance management.

The top management and managers must develop strategies to reduce job insecurity due to the COVID-19 infection risk for customers and co-workers. To address this issue, managers should develop contingency plans that include a comprehensive implementation procedure that adheres to the government's health guidelines. As a result, during the COVID-19 pandemic, employees' job insecurity should have no impact on job performance; they should make a greater effort to meet regularly to assess the situation, examine alternative preventative measures, and adhere to contingency plans to decrease the risk of infection.

From the management perspective, the author believes that the situation that the company and employees face is not a significant threat at the moment. However, as the pandemic continues, there will no longer be subsidies by

the government, nor will there be revenue for the companies. Therefore, this situation will increase the risk of unemployment, job insecurity, and, finally, work performance and engagement. In conclusion, the aviation industry must find another source of income to stop the loss of money from the company. As of research limitations, the data were obtained from self-reported questionnaires, and social desirability bias may influence the results to a certain extent. The research focused on the aviation industry's resources in Indonesia. The technical constraints that the author faced in writing this research include time and resource constraints. Limitations in time prevent the development of new measures to be used in this research. In addition, as mentioned in the data collection section, this research uses a convenience sampling method that may not represent the whole population of aviation employees.

It might be more accurate if future researchers add the information and communications technology variable to the research, as this variable might be important and related to the pandemic crisis and the nature of Indonesian industries, specifically the aviation industry. Additionally, other populations can be explored, such as hospital workers or pharmacy workers.

References

- Addae, H. M., & Wang, X. (2006, 2006/11). Stress at work: Linear and curvilinear effects of psychological-, job-, and organization-related factors: An exploratory study of trinidad and tobago. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 13(4), 476-493. doi: 10.1037/1072-5245.13.4.476
- Aguilar-Quintana, T., Araujo-Cabrera, Y., & Park, S. (2020). The sequential relationships of hotel employees' perceived justice, commitment, and organizational citizenship behaviour in a high unemployment context. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 35, 100676.

- Aguiar-Quintana, T., Nguyen, T. H. H., Araujo-Cabrera, Y., & Sanabria-Díaz, J. M. (2021). Do job insecurity, anxiety and depression caused by the COVID-19 pandemic influence hotel employees' self-rated task performance? The moderating role of employee resilience. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 94. doi:10.1016/j.ijhm.2021.102868
- Akgunduz, Y., & Eryilmaz, G. (2018). Does turnover intention mediate the effects of job insecurity and co-worker support on social loafing? *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 68, 41-49. doi:10.1016/j.ijhm.2017.09.010
- Ashford, S. J., Lee, C., & Bobko, P. (1989). Content, cause, and consequences of job insecurity: A theory-based measure and substantive test. *Academy of Management Journal*, 32(4), 803-829.
- Bakker, A. B., & Sanz-Vergel, A. I. (2013, 2013/12/01/). Weekly work engagement and flourishing: The role of hindrance and challenge job demands. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 83(3), 397-409. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2013.06.008
- Beehr, T. A., & Glazer, S. (2001). *A cultural perspective of social support in relation to occupational stress. In Exploring theoretical mechanisms and perspectives.* Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Black, W., & Babin, B. J. (2019). *Multivariate data analysis: Its approach, evolution, and impact.* In *The Great Facilitator* (pp. 121-130). Springer.
- Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1997, 1997/06/01). Task Performance and Contextual Performance: The Meaning for Personnel Selection Research. *Human Performance*, 10(2), 99-109. doi:/10.1207/s15327043hup1002_3
- Chen, H., & Eyoun, K. (2021). Do mindfulness and perceived organizational support work? Fear of COVID-19 on restaurant frontline employees' job insecurity and emotional exhaustion. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 94. doi:10.1016/j.ijhm.2020.102850
- Cheng, G. H. L., & Chan, D. K. S. (2008, 2008/04). Who Suffers More from Job Insecurity? A Meta-Analytic Review. *Applied Psychology*, 57(2), 272-303. doi:10.1111/j.1464-0597.2007.00312.x
- Crawford, E. R., LePine, J. A., & Rich, B. L. (2010). Linking job demands and resources to employee engagement and burnout: A theoretical extension and meta-analytic test. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(5), 834-848. doi:10.1037/a0019364
- Davy, J. A., Kinicki, A. J., & Scheck, C. L. (1997). A test of job security's direct and mediated effects on withdrawal cognitions. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, 18(4), 323-349.
- Dereli, B. (2012). The Concept Of Job Insecurity And The Study On Job Insecurity Perceptions Of The Bank Employees According To Their Demographic Characteristics. *Istanbul Commerce University Journal of Social Sciences*, 21(1), 237-256.
- Elangovan, A. R., & Lin Xie, J. (2000). Effects of perceived power of supervisor on subordinate work attitudes. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 21(6), 319-328. doi:10.1108/01437730010343095
- F. Hair Jr, J., Sarstedt, M., Hopkins, L., & G. Kuppelwieser, V. (2014). Partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM). *European Business Review*, 26(2), 106-121. doi:10.1108/EBR-10-2013-0128
- Getahun Asfaw, A., & Chang, C.-C. (2019, 2019/04/03). The association between job insecurity and engagement of employees at work. *Journal of Workplace Behavioral Health*, 34(2), 96-110. doi:10.1080/15555240.2019.1600409
- Glazer, S., Stetz, T. A., & Izso, L. (2004). Effects of personality on subjective job stress: a cultural analysis. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 37(3), 645-658. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2003.10.012
- Greenhalgh, L., & Rosenblatt, Z. (1984, 1984/07). Job Insecurity: Toward

- Conceptual Clarity. *Academy of Management review*, 9(3), 438-448. doi: 10.5465/amr.1984.4279673
- Hair Jr, J. F., Sarstedt, M., Ringle, C. M., & Gudergan, S. P. (2017). *Advanced issues in partial least squares structural equation modeling*. Sage publications.
- Hartley, J., Jacobson, D., Klandermans, B., & Van Vuuren, T. (1990). *Job insecurity: Coping with jobs at risk*. Sage Publications Ltd.
- Heaney, C. A., Israel, B. A., & House, J. S. (1994). Chronic job insecurity among automobile workers: Effects on job satisfaction and health. *Social science & medicine*, 38(10), 1431-1437.
- Hon, A. H., Chan, W. W., & Lu, L. (2013). Overcoming work-related stress and promoting employee creativity in hotel industry: The role of task feedback from supervisor. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 33, 416-424.
- Hon, A. H. Y., & Chan, W. W. (2013, 2013/03/04). The Effects of Group Conflict and Work Stress on Employee Performance. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, 54(2), 174-184. doi: 10.1177/1938965513476367
- Hon, A. H. Y., Chan, W. W. H., & Lu, L. (2013, 2013/06). Overcoming work-related stress and promoting employee creativity in hotel industry: The role of task feedback from supervisor. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 33, 416-424. doi: 10.1016/j.ijhm.2012.11.001
- IATA. (2020). <https://www.iata.org/en/pressroom/pr/2020-04-24-01/>
- IATA. (2019). The Importance of Air Transport to Indonesia. Retrieved 01 June, from
- J, A. (2014). Determinants of employee engagement and their impact on employee performance. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 63(3), 308-323. doi:10.1108/ijppm-01-2013-0008
- Jamal, M. (2010). Burnout among Canadian, Chinese, Malaysian and Pakistani employees: An empirical examination. *International Management Review*, 6(1).
- Jung, H. S., Jung, Y. S., & Yoon, H. H. (2021, Jan). COVID-19: The effects of job insecurity on the job engagement and turnover intent of deluxe hotel employees and the moderating role of generational characteristics. *Int J Hosp Manag*, 92, 102703. doi: 10.1016/j.ijhm.2020.102703
- Karatepe, O. M., Rezapouraghdam, H., & Hassannia, R. (2020). Job insecurity, work engagement and their effects on hotel employees' non-green and nonattendance behaviors. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 87, 102472.
- Karatepe, O. M., Yavas, U., Babakus, E., & Deitz, G. D. (2018, 2018/08/01/). The effects of organizational and personal resources on stress, engagement, and job outcomes. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 74, 147-161. doi: 10.1016/j.ijhm.2018.04.005
- Kim, S. S., Im, J., & Hwang, J. (2015, 2015/07). The effects of mentoring on role stress, job attitude, and turnover intention in the hotel industry. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 48, 68-82. doi: 10.1016/j.ijhm.2015.04.006
- Kotzé, J., van der Westhuizen, S., & Nel, E. (2014). The relationship between employees' experience of performance management and work engagement within a South African organisation. *Journal of Psychology in Africa*, 24(6), 475-479.
- LePine, J. A., Hollenbeck, J. R., Ilgen, D. R., Colquitt, J. A., & Ellis, A. (2002, 2002/05). Gender Composition, Situational Strength, and Team Decision-Making Accuracy: A Criterion Decomposition Approach. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 88(1), 445-475. doi: 10.1006/obhd.2001.2986
- Lu, C.-q., Wang, H.-j., Lu, J.-j., Du, D.-y., & Bakker, A. B. (2014). Does work engagement increase person-job fit? The role of job crafting and job insecurity. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 84(2), 142-152.

- Maeso, E. D. (2011). Successfully using HPT internationally: An international performance model. *Performance Improvement*, 50(3), 18-21.
- Mauno, S., Kinnunen, U., & Ruokolainen, M. (2007, 2007/02). Job demands and resources as antecedents of work engagement: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 70(1), 149-171. doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2006.09.002
- Medlin, B., & Green, K. W. (2009). Enhancing performance through goal setting, engagement, and optimism. *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, 109(7), 943-956. doi: 10.1108/02635570910982292
- Meynaar, I. A., Ottens, T., Zegers, M., van Mol, M. M., & Van Der Horst, I. C. (2021). Burnout, resilience and work engagement among Dutch intensivists in the aftermath of the COVID-19 crisis: A nationwide survey. *Journal of critical care*, 62, 1-5.
- Meynaar, I. A., Ottens, T., Zegers, M., van Mol, M. M. C., & van der Horst, I. C. C. (2021, 2021/04/01/). Burnout, resilience and work engagement among Dutch intensivists in the aftermath of the COVID-19 crisis: A nationwide survey. *Journal of Critical Care*, 62, 1-5. doi: 10.1016/j.jcrc.2020.11.010
- Min, J. (2013). The Relationships Between Emotional Intelligence, Job Stress, and Quality of Life Among Tour Guides. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 19(10), 1170-1190. doi: 10.1080/10941665.2013.839459
- Mohr, G. B. (2000). The changing significance of different stressors after the announcement of bankruptcy: A longitudinal investigation with special emphasis on job insecurity. *Journal of organizational behavior*, 21(3), 337-359.
- Parker, D. F., & DeCotiis, T. A. (1983, 1983/10/01/). Organizational determinants of job stress. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 32(2), 160-177. doi: 10.1016/0030-5073(83)90145-9
- Petrilli, R. M., Roach, G. D., Dawson, D., & Lamond, N. (2006). The sleep, subjective fatigue, and sustained attention of commercial airline pilots during an international pattern. *Chronobiology international*, 23(6), 1357-1362.
- Pienaar, J., De Witte, H., Hellgren, J., & Sverke, M. (2013). The cognitive/affective distinction of job insecurity: Validation and differential relations. *Southern African Business Review*, 17(2), 1-22.
- Qin, X., & Jiang, Y. (2011). The impact of natural disaster on absenteeism, job satisfaction, and job performance of survival employees: An empirical study of the survivors in Wenchuan earthquake. *Frontiers of Business Research in China*, 5(2), 219-242.
- Rosenblatt, Z., & Ruvio, A. (1996). A test of a multidimensional model of job insecurity: The case of Israeli teachers. *Journal of organizational behavior*, 17(S1), 587-605.
- 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.
- Schneider, B., Macey, W. H., Lee, W. C., & Young, S. A. (2009). Organizational service climate drivers of the American Customer Satisfaction Index (ACSI) and financial and market performance. *Journal of Service Research*, 12(1), 3-14.
- Shang, K.-C., Chao, C.-C., & Lirn, T.-C. (2016). The application of personality traits model on the freight forwarding service industry. *Maritime Business Review*, 1(3), 231-252. doi: 10.1108/mabr-09-2016-0021
- Shin, Y., & Hur, W.-M. (2020). When do job-insecure employees keep performing well? The buffering roles of help and prosocial motivation in the relationship between job insecurity, work engagement, and job performance. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 36(4), 659-678. doi: 10.1007/s10869-020-09694-4
- Spiggle, S. (1994, 1994/12). Analysis and Interpretation of Qualitative Data in Consumer Research. *Journal of consumer*

- research, 21(3), 491. doi: 10.1086/209413
- Sverke, M., Hellgren, J., & Näswall, K. (2002). No security: A meta-analysis and review of job insecurity and its consequences. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 7*(3), 242-264. doi: 10.1037/1076-8998.7.3.242
- Tongchaiprasit, P., & Ariyabuddhiphongs, V. (2016). Creativity and turnover intention among hotel chefs: The mediating effects of job satisfaction and job stress. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 55*, 33-40. doi: 10.1016/j.ijhm.2016.02.009
- Tuckey, M. R., Searle, B. J., Boyd, C. M., Winefield, A. H., & Winefield, H. R. (2015, Apr 2015). Hindrances are not threats: Advancing the multidimensionality of work stress. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 20*(2), 131-147. doi: 10.1037/a0038280
- Wang, H.-j., Lu, C.-q., & Siu, O.-l. (2015). Job insecurity and job performance: The moderating role of organizational justice and the mediating role of work engagement. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 100*(4), 1249-1258. doi: 10.1037/a0038330
- Webster, J. R., Beehr, T. A., & Love, K. (2011, 2011/10/01/). Extending the challenge-hindrance model of occupational stress: The role of appraisal. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 79*(2), 505-516. doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2011.02.001
- Witte, H. D. (1999). Job insecurity and psychological well-being: Review of the literature and exploration of some unresolved issues. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 8*(2), 155-177.
- Witte, H. D. (2010). Job Insecurity and Psychological Well-being: Review of the Literature and Exploration of Some Unresolved Issues. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 8*(2), 155-177. doi: 10.1080/135943299398302
- Yu, J., Park, J., & Hyun, S. S. (2021). Impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on employees' work stress, well-being, mental health, organizational citizenship behavior, and employee-customer identification. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management, 1-20*. doi: /10.1080/19368623.2021.1867283