



Deposited via The University of Sheffield.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/184628/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Huo, M.-L., Jiang, Z., Cheng, Z. et al. (2022) Restaurant employees' attitudinal reactions to social distancing difficulties : a multi-wave study. *Journal of Service Theory and Practice*, 32 (2). pp. 302-322. ISSN: 2055-6225

<https://doi.org/10.1108/jstp-08-2021-0180>

This author accepted manuscript is deposited under a Creative Commons Attribution NonCommercial 4.0 International (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>) licence. This means that anyone may distribute, adapt, and build upon the work for non-commercial purposes, subject to full attribution. If you wish to use this manuscript for commercial purposes, please contact permissions@emerald.com

Reuse

This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial (CC BY-NC) licence. This licence allows you to remix, tweak, and build upon this work non-commercially, and any new works must also acknowledge the authors and be non-commercial. You don't have to license any derivative works on the same terms. More information and the full terms of the licence here: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



Restaurant Employees' Attitudinal Reactions to Social Distancing Difficulties: A Multi-wave Study

Journal:	<i>Journal of Service Theory and Practice</i>
Manuscript ID	JSTP-08-2021-0180.R2
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	Social distancing, COVID-19, employability, work engagement, turnover intention, career regret

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Restaurant Employees' Attitudinal Reactions to Social Distancing Difficulties: A Multi-wave Study

Abstract

Purpose – Grounded in the job demands–resources theory, this study investigates how the difficulty in social distancing at work, resulting from the COVID-19 crisis, may lead to intention to quit and career regret and how and when these effects may be attenuated.

Design – Three-wave survey data were collected from 223 frontline service workers in a large restaurant company during the COVID-19 crisis.

Findings – The results show that difficulty in social distancing reduced employees' work engagement, and consequently increased their turnover intention and career regret. These relationships were moderated by external employability, such that the influence of difficulty in social distancing weakened as external employability increased.

Originality – Social distancing measures have been applied across the globe to minimize transmission of COVID-19. However, such measures create a new job demand for service workers who find it difficult to practice social distancing due to the high contact intensity of service delivery. This study identified personal resources that help service workers cope with the demand triggered by COVID-19.

Keywords: Social distancing; COVID-19; employability; work engagement; turnover intention; career regret

1. Introduction

Since the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic, social distancing measures have been implemented worldwide to minimize physical contact and reduce community viral transmission (Hoffman *et al.*, 2020). Social distancing refers to “reducing the frequency and proximity of contact between people to reduce the risk of spread of a disease” (Finsterwalder and Kuppelwieser, 2020; p. 1127). It is achieved in the work context via two primary measures: working from home and keeping a safe distance between individuals (Avdiu and Nayyar, 2020). In the services literature, Tortorella *et al.* (2020) found that social distancing did not have a negative effect on organizational performance in terms of service quality and service delivery. However, its impact on employee outcomes such as work- and career-related attitudes, in the service sector remains unknown. The present study argues that, regardless of its effectiveness in limiting the spread of the virus, social distancing rules (e.g., working from home, and keeping a distance of at least 1.5–2 meters from others) are difficult to fulfil for service employees working in high physical-proximity occupations (Mongey *et al.*, 2020).

A typical example is hospitality workers (e.g., restaurant employees), who are significantly affected by social distancing practices because the service delivery in this sector requires close physical contact between employees and customers (Gursoy *et al.*, 2021; Khoa *et al.*, 2021; Kotera *et al.*, 2021; Tuzovic and Kabadavi, 2021). Research has consistently shown that hospitality jobs cannot be performed from home and require face-to-face interactions in close proximity with others (see, e.g., Avdiu and Nayyar, 2020; Pouliakas and Branka, 2020; Yu *et al.*, 2021). Therefore, employees in this industry are likely to find it

1
2
3
4 difficult to practice social distancing (Mongey *et al.*, 2020). In line with the literature (e.g.,
5
6 Avdiu and Nayyar, 2020; Quinn *et al.*, 2011), hospitality employees' difficulty in social
7
8 distancing is defined as the difficulties in avoiding physical presence or face-to-face
9
10 communication at work. For example, Avdiu and Nayyar (2020) found that hospitality services
11
12 are not amenable to home-based work and thus employees must be based in the workplace to
13
14 perform their role. Similarly, other researchers have also reported that it is difficult for
15
16 hospitality workers to avoid face-to-face contact or close physical interactions at work
17
18 (Pouliakas and Branka, 2020). The low potential to work from home and the high face-to-face
19
20 contact at work co-occur in the food services industry (Avdiu and Nayyar, 2020). This
21
22 difficulty has negative implications for employee wellbeing (Tuzovic and Kabadayi, 2021).
23
24 For example, a survey-based study of 48,676 employees in Europe found that employees in the
25
26 catering or food service sectors have the highest risk of exposure to COVID-19 (Pouliakas and
27
28 Branka, 2020).

29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37 The adverse effects of the COVID-19 crisis vary across service sectors (Bartsch *et al.*,
38
39 2021), depending on the level of customer demand for the service (Tuzovic and Kabadayi,
40
41 2021), with the hospitality industry being one of the hardest-hit service industries (Japutra and
42
43 Situmorang, 2021; Tuzovic and Kabadayi, 2021). The pandemic has caused a significant drop
44
45 in customer demand for hospitality services (Mele *et al.*, 2021), leading to a considerable
46
47 decline in revenue (Gursoy and Chi, 2020) and massive job losses (Cajner *et al.*, 2020). [The](#)
48
49 [adverse impact of COVID-19 on the sector has not only led to existing employees' negative](#)
50
51 [attitudes and behaviors, such as anxiety and fear related to COVID-19 infection \(Gursoy *et al.*,](#)
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

2020; Khoa *et al.*, 2021), career change intention (Bufquin *et al.*, 2021; Chen and Chen, 2021), job dissatisfaction (Kang *et al.*, 2021), job insecurity (Hu *et al.*, 2021), and absenteeism (Karatepe *et al.*, 2021), but also reduced the attractiveness of hospitality as an industry for prospective workers such as hospitality students (Birtch *et al.*, 2021). The negative occupational attitudes triggered by the COVID-19 crisis are likely to hinder the revival of the industry because they effect employee work-related behaviors and the delivery of customer services (Yu *et al.*, 2021).

Against this backdrop, we believe that it is timely to investigate the mechanisms through which the challenges resulting from COVID-19 influence existing hospitality employees' psychological states and how to minimize this influence. The present study, using three-wave survey data from the service sector in China, examines how difficulty in social distancing impacts hospitality workers' turnover intentions and career regret (e.g., regret about having chosen to enter the current profession or industry). We focus on the difficulty in social distancing because it is one of the most significant health and business challenges facing hospitality organizations and an important cause of this service sector's financial downturn in the context of COVID-19 (Hao *et al.*, 2020). Despite the considerable individual and organizational costs associated with the difficulty in social distancing, "no study has examined the impact created by social distancing during a pandemic on service organizations" (Tuzovic and Kabadayi, 2021, p. 146). Moreover, extant research has mainly focused on the impact of social distancing on increased unemployment rates (Gupta *et al.*, 2020) and improved COVID-19 transmission control (Zhang *et al.*, 2020). There is no empirical research examining the

1
2
3
4 effect of social distancing difficulty on work experiences and career attitudes among service
5
6 employees who are required to be in the workplace to perform their jobs. Addressing this
7
8 research gap is important, because without such knowledge we cannot directly identify targeted
9
10 job or personal resources that offset detrimental consequences of social distancing rules to
11
12 support service workers. From a conceptual level, researchers (e.g., Finsterwalder, 2020;
13
14 Tuzovic and Kabadayi, 2021) have uniformly predicted that social distancing will have
15
16 negative implications for employees and their wellbeing, particularly in service organizations.
17
18 As a result, scholars (e.g., Donthu *et al.*, 2021; Sajtos *et al.*, 2021; Tuzovic and Kabadayi, 2021)
19
20 have called for future research looking into employee outcomes of social distancing in the
21
22 service industry.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 We conceptualize and empirically test a model to explore how and when difficulty in
31
32 social distancing influences hospitality employees' turnover intention and career regret (Figure
33
34 1). Drawing upon the job demands–resources (JD-R) theory (Demerouti *et al.*, 2001), we
35
36 investigate a novel mediation process (i.e., work engagement) that links the difficulty in social
37
38 distancing, as a hindrance job demand caused by COVID-19, to increased turnover intention
39
40 and career regret. Work engagement is considered the mediator because it has been recognized
41
42 as an immediate consequence of various job characteristics (e.g., Schaufeli and Bakker, 2004)
43
44 and a predictor of career-related outcomes (e.g., Barnes and Collier, 2013; Laschinger, 2012).
45
46 As JD-R theory also underscores the role of personal resources in handling undesired
47
48 demanding situations (Bakker and Demerouti, 2014), we further argue that one's perceived
49
50 external employability could serve as a personal resource to buffer the negative influence of
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 difficulty in social distancing. Perceived external employability is usually defined as
5
6 employees' perceived ease of finding new employment with another employer in the external
7
8 job market (De Cuyper *et al.*, 2012). Extending this concept to our context, it means the extent
9
10 to which employees perceive that they are also employable outside of the hospitality industry.
11
12 It is considered as a moderator because such a positive self-evaluation strengthens employees'
13
14 perceptions of job resources, such as job control and mastery at work (Presti *et al.*, 2020). As
15
16 a result, employees tend to focus more on job resources than job demands (Xanthopoulou *et*
17
18 *al.*, 2007) thereby perceiving hindrance demands to be less threatening and more manageable.
19
20 This positive cognitive evaluation helps ameliorate the detrimental effects of job demands (e.g.,
21
22 difficulty in social distancing). Based on JD-R theory, we anticipate that as perceived external
23
24 employability increases, hospitality workers will be more psychologically capable of managing
25
26 the demands associated with difficulty in social distancing and, as a result, demonstrate less
27
28 withdrawal behaviors (e.g., be more engaged at work), and subsequently more willing to stay
29
30 and become positive about their occupational choices.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40
41 -----
42 INSERT FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE
43 -----
44

45 The current study contributes to the literature in important ways. First, it is a timely
46
47 attempt to empirically explore the process through which difficulty in social distancing during
48
49 a pandemic can shape the work and career attitudes of service employees. Exploring the work
50
51 engagement-based mediation mechanism extends recent contextual frameworks (e.g., Tuzovic
52
53 and Kabadayi, 2021), which highlight detrimental effects of social distancing practices on
54
55 employee wellbeing in service industries, by revealing downstream implications on hospitality
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 employees' attitudes toward their careers. In doing so, our study goes beyond the current,
5
6 prevalent focus on job insecurity (Wilson *et al.*, 2020) and the economic recession (Nicola *et*
7
8 *al.*, 2020) to offer finer-grained explanations of hospitality workers' attitudes to their vocation.
9
10
11 Second, we confirm perceived external employability as a boundary condition that alleviates
12
13 the harmful effects of difficulty in social distancing on employees' work engagement and, in
14
15 turn, on turnover intention and career regret. We enrich JD-R theory (Demerouti *et al.*, 2001)
16
17 by verifying perceived external employability as a personal resource that offsets the negative
18
19 impact of job demands. This responds to the continuing call for empirical support for the
20
21 moderating role of personal resources in the JD-R model (Tremblay and Messervey, 2011).
22
23 Our identification of the buffering role of perceived external employability also contributes to
24
25 the service management literature which has mainly focused on identifying direct effects of the
26
27 COVID-19 crisis on career attitudes (e.g., Bufquin *et al.*, 2021; Yu *et al.*, 2021).
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 **2. Hypothesis development**

37 *2.1. Difficulty in social distancing and employee attitudes: Work engagement as a mediator*

38
39
40
41
42 The JD-R model (Demerouti *et al.*, 2001) provides a reasonable theoretical lens for the
43
44 mediating role of work engagement in explaining the influence of difficulty in social distancing
45
46 on employee attitudes (e.g., turnover intention and career regret). It proposes that hindrance
47
48 job demands will divert individuals' attention away from work engagement (Xanthopoulou *et*
49
50 *al.*, 2013), the latter defined as "a positive, fulfilling, affective-motivational state of work-
51
52 related wellbeing" (Leiter and Bakker, 2010, p. 1). Job demands are "physical, social or
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 organizational aspects of the job that consume physical or mental effort and therefore induce
5
6 certain physiological and psychological costs” (Demerouti *et al.*, 2001, p. 501). Clearly, the
7
8 need to practice social distancing at work would consume individuals’ psychological attention
9
10 and create more pressure for hospitality workers. This is because this special circumstance
11
12 creates conflict in one’s mental model where they need to deal with two undesirable challenges:
13
14 one being the necessary but clumsy practice of social distancing, and the other being the
15
16 struggle to do this due to the low potential for remote work and the contact-heavy nature of
17
18 their jobs. Thus, in this context, difficulty in social distancing represents a hindrance demand
19
20 that depletes hospitality employees’ energy resources. Hindrance demands cost effort and
21
22 consume energy and are therefore perceived as obstacles to employees’ personal growth,
23
24 learning, and goal accomplishment (Crawford *et al.*, 2010). Research shows that, as hindrance
25
26 demands increase, employees are less motivated to devote efforts to coping with difficulties
27
28 and more likely to adopt a passive, disengaged style of coping (Crawford *et al.*, 2010).
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37
38 In line with this rationale, employees’ difficulty in social distancing as a hindrance
39
40 demand may prevent their work engagement. As mentioned earlier, hospitality jobs cannot be
41
42 done from home and necessitate high physical proximity (Avdiu and Nayyar, 2020). Both job
43
44 characteristics make it difficult for employees to comply with the exacting physical distancing
45
46 rules, thereby increasing their fear, anxiety and risk of COVID-19 exposure (Gursoy *et al.*,
47
48 2021; Khoa *et al.*, 2021; Pouliakas and Branka, 2020) and hindering their work goal
49
50 achievement. As a self-protection mechanism, employees are unwilling to invest effort into
51
52 coping with such a job hindrance because they believe that no reasonable amount of effort will
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 be adequate to overcome the hindrance (Crawford *et al.*, 2010). This cognitive appraisal
5
6 prompts employees to withdraw from the situation (Crawford *et al.*, 2010). The consequence
7
8 of this withdrawal behavior is work disengagement (Demerouti *et al.*, 2001). Overall, these
9
10 arguments suggest that difficulty in social distancing during COVID-19 may be overtaxing and
11
12 energy depleting among hospitality workers as they deal with the associated psychological
13
14 burdens and physical dangers. Under such circumstances, they are likely to disengage from
15
16 work to protect themselves from the strain of further energy depletion. Thus, we propose:
17
18
19
20
21

22 *Hypothesis 1:* Difficulty in social distancing is negatively related to employees' work
23
24 engagement.
25
26

27 Turnover intention is "a conscious and deliberate willfulness to leave the organization"
28
29 (Tett and Meyer, 1993, p. 262). Employees with high levels of work engagement are inclined
30
31 to be "more satisfied with their jobs, feel more committed to the organization and do not intend
32
33 to leave the organization" (Schaufeli and Salanova, 2008, p. 388). In line with this view,
34
35 evidence suggests that when employees are highly dedicated to their work (a key component
36
37 of work engagement), they more strongly identify with their current jobs (Halbesleben and
38
39 Wheeler, 2008) and perceive more job resources (Schaufeli and Salanova, 2008). The
40
41 abundance of existing job resources makes them less likely to leave. A key reason for this is
42
43 that changing jobs means that they will lose the current resources and need to reinvest their
44
45 time and energy elsewhere, and this is a risk that employees may be reluctant to take on
46
47 (Halbesleben and Wheeler, 2008). Reflecting these views, a survey study by Schaufeli and
48
49 Bakker (2004) has confirmed that work engagement is negatively related to employee turnover
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

intention.

Career regret is an enduring state of wishing that one had not chosen his or her present career (Budjanovcanin *et al.*, 2019). The careers literature has established that individuals' attitudes toward their career are driven by their experiences in and perceptions about their current work (e.g., Lee *et al.*, 2000). First, engaged employees believe that work is fun and therefore they are intrinsically motivated at work (Shimazu *et al.*, 2015). Research indicates that if employees feel happy and are intrinsically motivated, they are less likely to regret their job choices (Bellemare, 2015). In contrast, disengaged employees' lower vigor (an essential component of work engagement; Leiter and Bakker, 2010) will likely decrease their work and occupational interest and thus lead to career choice regret (Dyrbye *et al.*, 2020). These perspectives suggest a potential negative relationship between work engagement and career regret. In other words, work engagement tends to reduce career regret. Second, work engagement enables employees to retain or even enhance their sense of self-worth (Shamir, 1991). The development and maintenance of self-worth at work in turn prompts them to remain in their current occupation (Jiang *et al.*, 2020) and lowers the chance of regretting their occupational choice. This notion is supported by Laschinger (2012) who found that being engaged at work makes employees less likely to develop an intention to leave their current profession. From this we suggest that:

Hypothesis 2: Work engagement is negatively related to turnover intention (2a) and career regret (2b).

When explaining Hypothesis 1, our discussions have highlighted that, for hospitality

1
2
3
4 employees, the difficulty in practicing social distancing at work represents a job demand that
5
6 consumes effort and energy and hinders work goal achievement (Crawford *et al.*, 2010). To
7
8 protect themselves from further energy depletion and future frustrations of not realizing work
9
10 goals, employees are inclined to withdraw from the current situation (Crawford *et al.*, 2010).
11
12 Such withdrawal behaviors subsequently result in disengagement from work (Demerouti et al,
13
14 2001). As per our conceptualization of Hypothesis 2, work engagement enables employees to
15
16 experience high levels of fun (Shimazu *et al.*, 2015) and identify with their work (Leiter and
17
18 Bakker, 2010), thereby reducing their turnover intention and career regret. As such, the social
19
20 distancing difficulty, which results in work disengagement, would increase the possibility that
21
22 employees feel regret about their career choice and consider leaving their jobs. Integrating
23
24 these perspectives which indicate linked relationships between difficulty in social distancing,
25
26 work engagement, turnover intent and career regret, we propose that:
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34
35 *Hypothesis 3: Work engagement mediates the effects of difficulty in social distancing*
36
37 *on turnover intention (3a) and career regret (3b).*
38
39
40

41 *2.2. The moderating influence of perceived external employability*

42
43
44

45 The current COVID-19 health crisis has negatively affected employment throughout
46
47 the hospitality industry, leading to limited career opportunities (Huang *et al.*, 2020). Given this,
48
49 employees might consider finding jobs in other industries although noting that many other
50
51 industries have also been affected by the crisis (Filimonau *et al.*, 2020). This makes reflection
52
53 on one's own external employability highly relevant for hospitality workers. It should be noted
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 that the perception of high external employability does not necessarily mean the inclination to
5
6 leave the current organization or occupation. Rather, perceived external employability is more
7
8 of a reflection on career mobility (Berntson and Marklund, 2007), which, in the context of
9
10 COVID-19, indicates a psychological sense of safety or security about one's future
11
12 employment. Specifically, when hospitality workers think that they are employable in other
13
14 industries, they might feel more secure about their employment status than those who perceive
15
16 themselves as less employable externally, partly because of a reduced concern about losing
17
18 livelihoods (De Cuyper *et al.*, 2012). Also important, perceived external employability denotes
19
20 the individual's confidence in their capabilities in difficult job situations (Berntson *et al.*, 2010).
21
22
23
24
25

26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Researchers (e.g., De Cuyper *et al.*, 2012) have recognized perceived external employability as a personal resource that contributes to employees' positive aspects of the self, resiliency, and capability to navigate through challenging employment environments (Hobfoll *et al.*, 2003). According to the JD-R model, personal resources are moderators that buffer the negative effects of job demands on work engagement (Xanthopolou *et al.*, 2013). These resources shape the way employees perceive and react to their work environment (Schaufeli and Taris, 2014) and promote the individual's positive self-regard and sense of ability to control demanding situations (Bakker and Demerouti, 2014). Thus, employees with personal resources have more energy to deal with job demands and are more effective in doing so (Xanthopoulou *et al.*, 2013). As a result, job demands are perceived as less confronting and their effects on work engagement are alleviated.

As highlighted earlier, difficulty in social distancing may constrain employees' ability

1
2
3
4 to be engaged at work. We argue that perceived external employability as a personal resource
5
6 could make them more psychologically capable of alleviating these constraints. This is because
7
8
9 it represents a positive self-evaluation which enables employees to create more job resources
10
11 and perceive less job demands in stressful situations. Specifically, perceived external
12
13 employability induces feelings of control and mastery at work (Presti *et al.*, 2020). Job control
14
15 has long been recognized in the JD-R literature as an important job resource that buffers the
16
17 negative effects of job demands on work engagement (Cheng *et al.*, 2014). Moreover,
18
19 employees with high perceptions of external employability are well prepared beforehand for
20
21 the likely demands or threats at work and take a proactive approach to adapting to job demands
22
23 (Fugate and Kinicki, 2008). This proactive orientation to adaptability facilitates personal
24
25 learning, and the identification and realization of opportunities needed to cope with the job
26
27 demands (Fugate and Kinicki, 2008). Consequently, employees are likely to develop a stronger
28
29 sense of their ability to successfully impact their work environment (Bakker and Demerouti,
30
31 2014). Under such circumstances, they tend to perceive job demands as surmountable and less
32
33 threatening and are willing to invest more into coping efforts. This may alleviate the adverse
34
35 impact of difficulty in social distancing (i.e., the job demand) on work engagement.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45
46 Despite the lack of direct empirical support, the literature has documented indirect
47
48 evidence regarding the moderating effect of perceived external employability. A survey of
49
50 Pakistan public sector managers found that perceived employability weakens the negative
51
52 effects of job demands on affective commitment (Kalyal *et al.*, 2010), a key indicator of work
53
54 engagement (Yalabik *et al.*, 2013). These theoretical arguments and empirical evidence lead to
55
56
57
58
59
60

the hypothesis that:

Hypothesis 4: Perceived external employability moderates the negative relationship between difficulty in social distancing and work engagement such that this relationship is weakened when employees perceive higher levels of external employability.

2.3 Moderated mediation

Hypothesis 3 proposes the mediating role of work engagement in the relationships among difficulty in social distancing on the one hand, and turnover intention and career regret on the other. Hypothesis 4 indicates the moderating role of perceived external employability in the relationship between difficulty in social distancing and work engagement. The two conditions together suggest a moderated mediation effect (Hayes, 2013). Due to its moderating effect on the relationship between difficulty in social distancing and work engagement, we expect perceived external employability to weaken the indirect effects of difficulty in social distancing on turnover intention and career regret. Specifically, we propose:

Hypothesis 5a: The indirect relationship between the difficulty in social distancing and turnover intention via work engagement is moderated by perceived external employability such that this positive indirect effect is weakened when employees perceive higher levels of external employability.

Hypothesis 5b: The indirect relationship between the difficulty in social distancing and career regret via work engagement is moderated by perceived external employability such that this positive indirect effect is weakened when employees perceive higher levels of external

1
2
3
4 employability.
5
6

7 **3. Research design and methods** 8 9

10 *3.1. Data collection* 11 12

13
14 This study is part of a larger research project on the impact of the COVID-19 crisis
15 on employees' career attitudes. All non-managerial personnel working in a large restaurant
16 company in China were invited to participate in this survey. This ensured our sample
17 represented a homogeneous population working in the same organizational context, which
18 reduces the risk of results being impacted by factors such as organizational culture and
19 hierarchies (e.g., Hu *et al.*, 2021; Zhao and Zhou, 2020). Targeting all non-managerial staff
20 also helped minimize the selection bias in the sampling process (Bethlehem, 2010). The
21 company under investigation provided a suitable research context for our study because it had
22 fully experienced the influence of COVID-19 and managed to survive without layoffs and
23 employee pay cuts. The majority of our participants were employed as cashier, host/hostess,
24 bus person and server. All participants' major job responsibilities required them to perform
25 tasks in close physical proximity to others, serving patrons face-to-face, and providing in-
26 person assistance to coworkers or clients. As a result, they consistently reported that they
27 were unable to work remotely or avoid close contact and interaction with coworkers and
28 customers. As noted by the participants, the contact intensive nature of their jobs made it
29 difficult for them to avoid physical presence and face-to-face interaction with others in the
30 workplace. Given that such difficulties in practicing social distance was a common job
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

hindrance widely experienced by the front-line employees in this restaurant company, we believe that they are appropriate informants for the current research.

We adopted a three-wave time-lagged design to measure the predictor, the mediator, and the outcome at different occasions. This design helps reduce common method variance (Podsakof *et al.*, 2012). The survey was translated from English into Chinese using back translation techniques (Brislin, 1980). We gathered the data at three time points, with a two-week interval in between. The three waves of data were matched via numeric codes uniquely assigned to each participant. The Time 1 survey measured difficulty in social distancing, perceived external employability, and demographic variables. With informed consent, restaurant employees voluntarily filled out the survey during working hours and returned it directly to the research assistants. A total of 242 employees completed the survey at Time 1. Two weeks later (Time 2), a second survey was distributed to these participants to collect the measure of work engagement. All the respondents at Time 1 completed the questionnaire at Time 2. In the third round of data collection (Time 3), our survey measured the two outcome variables (i.e., turnover intention and career regret). Of those participants at Time 2, 223 (response rate = 92%) returned the questionnaire at Time 3. Results¹ based on *t*-test and chi-square test indicated no statistically significant differences in any of our focal variables

¹There were no significant group differences in age: $t = -0.68, p > .05$; in tenure: $t = -0.95, p > .05$; in gender: $\chi^2(1) = 0.96, p > .05$; in difficulty in social distancing: $t = 0.95, p > .05$; in external employability: $t = 1.27, p > .05$; and in engagement: $t = 0.61, p > .05$.

1
2
3
4 between employees who dropped out during data collection and those who completed all
5
6 surveys.

7
8
9 In our final sample, 53.81% of the participants were male. Our respondents had a mean
10
11 age of 29.89 years (SD = 13.01), and an average organizational tenure of 1.21 years (SD =
12
13 1.46).
14

15 16 17 18 3.2. Measures 19

20
21 Unless noted otherwise, the survey response was made on a 7-point Likert scale ranging
22
23 from “1 = strongly disagree” to “7 = strongly agree”.
24

25 26 27 3.2.1. Difficulty in social distancing (Time 1) 28

29
30 Difficulty in social distancing was measured with a 6-item scale developed by Quinn
31
32 *et al.* (2011). In the general introduction of this measure, participants were asked to reflect on
33
34 their current situation at work when responding to the items. For example, referring to their
35
36 current situation, participants responded to statements such as: “My job can only be done at
37
38 workplace”. While this measure is well-established in the context of pandemics (e.g., the H1N1
39
40 influenza pandemic) and has proved to be valid in previous studies, COVID-19 is a new
41
42 pandemic which has a much wider and severe impact. Thus, being cautious, we employed a
43
44 rigorous approach to evaluate the content validity of Quinn *et al.*'s (2011) measure and ensure
45
46 it would appropriately capture the meaning or definition of difficulty in social distancing in our
47
48 study.
49
50
51
52
53

54
55
56 Following the judge panel review approach (Jiang, 2017; Jiang *et al.*, 2019; MacKenzie
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 *et al.*, 1991), we used two panels (an expert-judge panel and a layperson-judge panel) to assess
5
6 whether the measurement items reflected the concept of difficulty in social distancing in a
7
8 Chinese context. The expert panel consisted of 7 bilingual researchers who either held PhDs (n
9
10 = 4) or were final-stage PhD students ($n = 3$), while the layperson panel included 11 front-line
11
12 employees working in other nearby restaurants who were in the same situation as our
13
14 participants throughout the pandemic. As with Jiang *et al.* (2019), we provided each judge with
15
16 a definition of difficulty in social distancing at the top of a one-page document and asked the
17
18 judge to assess all measurement items against the criterion: whether the item is conceptually
19
20 consistent with the definition shown at the top of the page. The judges evaluated the items on
21
22 a 3-point scale (1 = inconsistent, 2 = marginally consistent, and 3 = consistent). As per Lawshe
23
24 (1975), the content validity of an item on a scale requires more than 50% of the panel members
25
26 to agree that the item is at least to some extent consistent with the definition. In both panel
27
28 reviews, all items exceeded Lawshe's (1975) threshold of 50% and achieved broad consistency
29
30 (including marginal consistency) with the definition of difficulty in social distancing.
31
32 Specifically, in the expert panel review, the items achieved broad consistency ranging from 71%
33
34 to 100%, exceeding the threshold of 50%. In the layperson panel review, all items achieved
35
36 broad consistency of 100%. These results suggested that Quinn *et al.*'s (2011) measure was
37
38 content valid to be used in our study. The reliability coefficient (Cronbach's alpha) for the scale
39
40 was .76.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 53 54 3.2.2. *Perceived external employability (Time 1)*

55
56 We measured perceived external employability outside of the hospitality industry using
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 an adapted version of Nelissen *et al.*'s (2017) 4-item scale. A sample item is: "I am optimistic
5
6 that I would find another job outside of the hospitality industry, if I looked for one". The
7
8 reliability coefficient was .89.
9

10 11 12 3.2.3. *Work engagement (Time 2)* 13

14 We employed 6 items used by Schmitt *et al.* (2016) to measure work engagement.
15
16 These items were originally from the shortened Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (Schaufeli *et*
17
18 *al.*, 2006), and reflect employees' vigor and dedication at work. Sample items are: "At my work,
19
20 I feel bursting with energy" and "I am enthusiastic about my job". The response format was a
21
22 7-point Likert scale ranging from "1 = never" to "7 = always". The reliability coefficient
23
24 was .94.
25
26
27
28
29

30 31 3.2.4. *Turnover intention (Time 3)* 32

33 A 2-item scale developed by Boroff and Lewin (1997) was used to measure turnover
34
35 intention. An example item is: "I am seriously considering quitting this company for an
36
37 alternative employer". The reliability coefficient was .95.
38
39

40 41 3.2.5. *Career regret (Time 3)* 42

43 Brehaut *et al.*'s (2003) 5-item scale for decision regret was adapted to measure
44
45 participants' regret about choosing a hospitality career. Referring to their hospitality
46
47 occupation, participants were directed to respond to items such as: "It was not the right career
48
49 decision". The reliability coefficient was .96.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

3.2.6. Control variables

Prior research shows that organizational tenure, gender, and age are predictive of work engagement and career outcomes (e.g., Chung, 2002; Dyrbye *et al.*, 2020; Huo and Boxall, 2017). Therefore, we include these demographics as control variables.

3.3. Analysis

Following previous researchers (Greenbaum *et al.*, 2018), we used a two-step approach in the data analysis process. First, confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was performed in AMOS to examine the discriminant validity of the measurement model. We chose three most widely adopted goodness-of-fit indices to assess model fit: the standardized root mean residual (SRMR), the root-mean-square error of approximation (RMSEA) and the comparative fit index (CFI). We then tested the hypotheses using regression analyses. Multiple regression was utilized to examine Hypotheses 1 and 2. We adopted bootstrap-based PROCESS analysis based on 5,000 bootstrap samples (Hayes, 2013) for Hypothesis 3 (mediating effects) and Hypothesis 5 (moderated mediation effects). Hierarchical regression analysis was applied to test Hypothesis 4, which involves the interaction effect of difficulty in social distancing and perceived external employability on work engagement.

4. Results

4.1. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA)

We conducted a CFA with five latent variables including difficulty in social distancing,

perceived external employability, work engagement, turnover intention, and career regret. The model fit indices are adequate: $\chi^2(220) = 450.742$, RMSEA = .07, SRMR = .06, and CFI = .95. When compared to alternative models, such as a model with difficulty in social distancing and perceived external employability combined into one factor, the original 5-factor measurement model had the best fit, as shown in Table I. Convergent validity of our measures was supported by the adequate fit of the full measurement model and standardized factor loadings larger than 0.40 (Kline, 2011). Evidence of discriminant validity of the measures is shown by the fact that the correlations among all variables are significantly smaller than unity (Hewagama *et al.*, 2019). Descriptive statistics of study variables are reported in Table II.

INSERT TABLE I ABOUT HERE

INSERT TABLE II ABOUT HERE

4.2. Hypothesis testing

As shown in Table III, difficulty in social distancing negatively predicted work engagement ($b = -0.14$, $se = .06$, $p < .05$). Thus, Hypothesis 1 was supported. Supporting Hypothesis 2a and 2b, work engagement was negatively and significantly related to turnover intention ($b = -0.35$, $se = .09$; $p < .001$) and career regret ($b = -0.23$, $se = .08$, $p < .01$).

INSERT TABLE III ABOUT HERE

To test Hypotheses 3a and 3b, the bias-corrected confidence interval (CI) for the indirect effect were estimated via PROCESS analysis (Hayes, 2013). The indirect effect of

1
2
3
4 difficulty in social distancing on turnover intention via work engagement was significant, given
5
6 that the confidence interval for this indirect effect ($b = 0.05$, boot $se = .02$, 95% CI [0.01, 0.10])
7
8 did not cross zero. Therefore, Hypothesis 3a was confirmed. In addition, difficulty in social
9
10 distancing had a positive indirect effect on career regret ($b = 0.03$, boot $se = .02$, 95% CI [0.002,
11
12 0.071]) through work engagement.
13
14
15

16
17 Table IV displays results for Hypothesis 4 (the moderator role of perceived external
18
19 employability). In Step 1, age, gender, and organizational tenure were entered into the equation
20
21 as control variables. Difficulty in social distancing and perceived external employability were
22
23 entered in Step 2. The interaction term between difficulty in social distancing and perceived
24
25 external employability was entered in Step 3. The variables (i.e., difficulty in social distancing
26
27 and perceived external employability) involved in the interaction were centered before analysis.
28
29 The interaction term was statistically significant ($b = 0.10$, $se = .04$, $p < .05$) in predicting and
30
31 explaining additional variance of ($\Delta R^2 = .03$, $p < .05$) work engagement. Figure 2 is a graphical
32
33 presentation of this interaction effect. We plotted the relationship between difficulty in social
34
35 distancing and work engagement at one standard deviation above and below the mean of
36
37 perceived external employability. It was found that the negative effect of difficulty in social
38
39 distancing on work engagement was higher when perceived external employability was low
40
41 (slope = -0.28, $t = -3.10$, $p < .01$) rather than high (slope = -0.01, $t = -0.13$, $p > .05$).
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50
51 -----
52 INSERT TABLE IV ABOUT HERE
53 -----

54
55 -----
56 INSERT FIGURE 2 ABOUT HERE
57 -----
58
59
60

Supporting Hypothesis 5a, the PROCESS results showed that the indirect effect of difficulty in social distancing on turnover intention via work engagement was stronger for those employees who perceived low ($b = 0.10$, boot $se = .04$, 95% CI [0.03, 0.18]) rather than high ($b = 0.00$, boot $se = .03$, 95% CI [-0.05, 0.06]) levels of external employability. The index of moderated mediation (Hayes, 2015) was significant ($b = -0.03$, boot $se = .02$, 95% CI [-0.07, -0.01]), further confirming Hypothesis 5a.

A similar analytic procedure was used to validate Hypothesis 5b. The indirect effect of difficulty in social distancing on career regret through work engagement was larger when perceived external employability was low ($b = 0.06$, boot $se = .03$, 95% CI [0.01, 0.13]) rather than high ($b = 0.00$, boot $se = .02$, 95% CI [-0.03, 0.04]). Moreover, the index of moderated mediation was significant ($b = -0.02$, boot $se = .01$, 95% CI [-0.049, -0.003]), supporting Hypothesis 5b.

5. Discussion

5.1 Theoretical implications

Underpinned by the JD-R model (Demerouti *et al.*, 2001), we proposed work engagement as the mechanism through which difficulty in social distancing in the hospitality setting would affect employees' turnover intention and career regret. Furthermore, we posited that this mediated relationship would be moderated by an important personal resource—perceived external employability. Our three-wave survey supported all the hypotheses. The theoretical implications of our study are manifold.

1
2
3
4 First, when restaurant employees find it difficult to practice social distancing rules, they
5
6 tend to disengage from work. This is consistent with the JD-R framework, which proposes a
7
8 negative association between job demands and work engagement (Demerouti *et al.*, 2001). A
9
10 likely explanation is that difficulty in social distancing, as a job demand, consumes energy and
11
12 heightens the health risks, fear and anxiety of restaurant workers (Gursoy *et al.*, 2021; Khoa *et*
13
14 *al.*, 2021). As a self-protection strategy, they are less likely to be enthusiastic about their work
15
16 (Crawford *et al.*, 2010). This finding responds to Donthu *et al.*'s (2021) call for future research
17
18 that examines the impact of social distancing in service sectors. To our knowledge, this is the
19
20 first piece of empirical evidence that supports Tuzovic and Kabadayi's (2021) conceptual
21
22 model regarding the adverse effects of social distancing on service employees' wellbeing and
23
24 career outcomes. This empirical result also confirmed Kotera *et al.*'s (2021) findings that
25
26 hospitality work involves both physical and emotional demands, which can be detrimental to
27
28 employee wellbeing.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37
38 In addition, our results endorsed prior research on the nexus between engagement and
39
40 turnover intention (e.g., Bhatnagar, 2012; Memon *et al.*, 2021; Schaufeli and Bakker, 2004) by
41
42 showing that highly engaged employees have less intent to leave the current job. Also
43
44 importantly, our study enriched this nexus by illustrating that engaged workers are less likely
45
46 to experience career choice regret, which may signal the potential of turnover. These findings
47
48 extend prior research, which has exclusively focused on the association of work engagement
49
50 with only organizationally important career attitudes, including career commitment (Barnes
51
52 and Collier, 2013) and career satisfaction (Laschinger, 2012), by incorporating a career
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 outcome from the employee's perspective (i.e., career regret). The relationship between work
5
6 engagement and turnover intention can be explained by high levels of job resources and
7
8 dedication at work experienced by engaged employees. Under such circumstances, employees
9
10 are reluctant to leave their current jobs (Halbesleben and Wheeler, 2008) because they have a
11
12 tendency to protect their existing job resources (Hobfoll, 2001). Similarly, because engaged
13
14 employees are characterized by high levels of intrinsic work motivation (Shimazu *et al.*, 2015),
15
16 they are likely to have developed positive attitudes toward their occupation. This in turn
17
18 prompts them to perceive less career regret. Our findings emphasize that these perspectives on
19
20 how work engagement can drive employees' career reflections still hold, even under extreme
21
22 conditions (e.g., COVID-19).
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 The negative effect of difficulty in social distancing on work engagement, which exerts
31
32 an influence on employees' career attitudes, indicates a possible process chain that represents
33
34 workplace demands' impact on hospitality employees' vocational outcomes. Confirming this
35
36 process, our study verifies that work engagement as a mediator transmits the effects of
37
38 difficulty in social distancing on career regret and turnover intention. This adds to the extant
39
40 research on the consequences of social distancing on service employees, which consistently
41
42 argues that social distancing hinders service workers and their wellbeing (e.g., Mongey *et al.*,
43
44 2020; Tuzovic and Kabadayi, 2021) but which has not until now tested the underlying
45
46 explanatory process.
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 Furthermore, our study found that perceived external employability is a personal
54
55 resource that alleviates the negative relationship between difficulty in social distancing and
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 work engagement and, as a consequence, weakens the indirect effects of difficulty in social
5
6 distancing on turnover intention and career regret through work engagement. An explanation
7
8 is that highly employable individuals have strong perceptions of employment security (Silla
9
10 *et al.*, 2009) and self-efficacy beliefs in dealing with unfavorable job situations (Berntson *et*
11
12 *al.*, 2010). They might view difficulty in social distancing as more manageable and, therefore,
13
14 such difficulties deplete less of the energy required to be engaged at work. Our identification
15
16 of the moderating role of the perceived external employability contributes to the literature in
17
18 three ways. First, this helps address the void of studies on the coping mechanisms that
19
20 alleviate the adverse effects of social distancing on employee wellbeing and work
21
22 experiences. Second, this finding adds to the limited evidence in the literature of the
23
24 interaction between personal resources and job demands as outlined in JD-R theory. Third,
25
26 extant studies on external employability have uniformly centred on its positive main effect on
27
28 work engagement (e.g., De Cuyper *et al.*, 2008; Ngo *et al.*, 2017), while its moderating effect
29
30 remains under studied. This research gap is filled by our current finding that external
31
32 employability as a buffer can reduce the negative impact of job demands on work
33
34 engagement. It implies that high levels of perceived employability could help employees
35
36 manage the negative influence of job demands, and thus shaping their positive attitudes
37
38 towards their current organizations. This result suggests that, in the context of COVID-19,
39
40 employees' perceived external employability does not necessarily lead to outcomes that hurt
41
42 the organization, despite its turnover-stimulating potential as reported in previous research
43
44 (e.g., Nelissen *et al.*, 2017).
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

5.2 Practical implications

Our study offers several practical implications for the broader service sector (e.g., personal care, tourism, and hotel industries) that depend on face-to-face and close physical interactions in service delivery. Our results show that the high physical-proximity nature of jobs within these service industries makes it difficult to practice social distancing at work. This subsequently jeopardizes employees' work engagement and career-related attitudes. Based on this finding, in order to maintain service employees' engagement and their positive career attitudes, managers may endeavor to reduce work demands incurred by social distancing difficulties when employees need to be present in the workplace during public health crises like COVID-19. Example strategies may include limiting the number of patrons in the workplace and implementing contactless payment and delivery systems.

Furthermore, it is helpful to encourage customers' co-production behaviors in service delivery so that they can facilitate restaurant workers to practice social distancing during service interactions (Altınay and Arıcı, 2021). In addition, employers should provide service employees with personal protective equipment (e.g., masks and gloves) to protect their health and safety. The use of facemasks has been shown in prior research as conducive to successful service interactions during the COVID-19 crisis (e.g., Hofmann *et al.*, 2021). Also, it would be worthwhile for contact-intensive service organizations to send strong signals (e.g., by modifying their logos) to front-line workers that emphasize the necessity and benefits of social distancing rules (Ali *et al.*, 2021). Doing so helps enhance employees' acceptance of social distancing regulations, thereby reducing their perceived threat of social distancing difficulty.

Moreover, our findings indicate that perceived external employability should be a directly targeted personal resource that alleviates the negative effects of the job demand linked with social distancing. One key practical implication of this finding is that, under the current economic downturn and health crisis, the service organizations that require high contact intensity for service delivery may consider assisting employees with skill enhancement, career development, and upward and lateral job transitions. Such practices can enhance their perceptions of employability (Nelissen *et al.*, 2017), which subsequently helps offset the negative effects of social distancing rules on service workers.

5.3 Limitations and directions for future research

This study has some limitations that future studies should heed. While we ensured that our independent, mediating, and dependent variables were measured at three separate time points to reduce common method variance, we did not implement a repeated measure design. This prevents us from making a rigorous causal explanation of the relationship between difficulty in social distancing, work engagement, and career attitudes. It would be useful for future research to collect repeated measures to examine how changes in employees' perception of difficulty in social distancing affect changes in work engagement and career outcomes. Second, since our study was conducted in a single firm, it remains unclear whether the findings are generalizable to other service industries. For instance, for hotel companies who have hibernated or shut down their operations during the pandemic, their employees may have different experiences with social distancing rules, which leads to their differing affective

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

responses to their work and career. Therefore, future research could cross-validate our results by collecting data from other organizational settings.



References

- Ali, F., Dogan, S., Amin, M., Hussain, K. and Ryu, K. (2021), "Brand anthropomorphism, love and defense: does attitude towards social distancing matter?", *The Service Industries Journal*, Vol. 41 No. 1-2, pp. 58-83.
- Altinay, L. and Arici, H. E. (2021), "Transformation of the hospitality services marketing structure: a chaos theory perspective", *Journal of Services Marketing*, ahead-of-print.
- Avdiu, B., and Nayyar, G. (2020), "When face-to-face interactions become an occupational hazard: Jobs in the time of COVID-19", *Economics Letters*, Vol. 197, Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econlet.2020.109648>
- Bakker, A. B., and Demerouti, E. (2014), "Job demands-resources theory", Chen, P. and Cooper, C. (Eds.), *Work and Wellbeing: A Complete Reference Guide* (vol. 3), John Wiley and Sons, pp. 1-28.
- Barnes, D., and Collier, J. (2013), "Investigating work engagement in the service environment", *Journal of Services Marketing*, Vol. 27 No. 6, pp. 485-499. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JSM-01-2012-0021>
- Bartsch, S., Weber, E., Büttgen, M., and Huber, A. (2021), "Leadership matters in crisis-induced digital transformation: how to lead service employees effectively during the COVID-19 pandemic", *Journal of Service Management*, Vol. 32 No. 1, pp. 71-85.
- Bellemare, J. A. (2015), "Communication frames of hotel managers and their effects on job satisfaction, intent to leave, and job regret", unpublished PhD thesis, University of Missouri-Columbia.

1
2
3
4 Berntson, E. and Marklund, S. (2007), "The relationship between perceived employability
5 and subsequent health", *Work and Stress*, Vol. 21 No. 3, pp. 279-292.

6
7
8
9 <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678370701659215>

10
11 Berntson, E., Näswall, K., and Sverke, M. (2010), "The moderating role of employability in
12 the association between job insecurity and exit, voice, loyalty and neglect", *Economic
13 and Industrial Democracy*, Vol. 31 No. 2, pp. 215-230.

14
15
16
17
18
19 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0143831X09358374>

20
21 Bethlehem, J. (2010). "Selection bias in web surveys", *International Statistical Review*, Vol.
22
23
24
25 78 No. 2, pp. 161-188.

26
27 Bhatnagar, J. (2012), "Management of innovation: role of psychological empowerment, work
28 engagement and turnover intention in the Indian context", *The International Journal of
29 Human Resource Management*, Vol. 23 No. 5, pp. 928-951.

30
31 Birtch, T., Chiang, F., Cai, Z., and Wang, J. (2021), "Am I choosing the right career? The
32 implications of COVID-19 on the occupational attitudes of hospitality management
33 students", *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, Vol. 95, Advance online
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
publication.

Boroff, K., and Lewin, D. (1997), "Loyalty, voice, and intent to exit a union firm: A
conceptual and empirical analysis", *ILR Review*, Vol. 51 No. 1, pp. 50-63.

Brehaut, J. C., O'Connor, A. M., Wood, T. J., Hack, T. F., Siminoff, L., Gordon, E., and
Feldman-Stewart, D. (2003), "Validation of a decision regret scale", *Medical Decision*

- 1
2
3
4 *Making*, Vol. 23 No. 4, 281-292. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0272989X03256005>
- 5
6
7 Brislin, R. W. (1980), "Translation and content analysis of oral and written materials",
8
9 Triandis, H. and Berry, J. (Eds.), *Handbook of Cross-cultural Psychology*, Allyn &
10
11 Bacon, pp. 389-444.
- 12
13
14 Budjanovcanin, A., Rodrigues, R., and Guest, D. (2019), "A career with a heart: exploring
15
16 occupational regret", *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, Vol. 34 No. 3, pp. 156-169.
- 17
18
19
20 Bufquin, D., Park, J., Back, R., de Souza Meira, J., and Hight, S. (2021), "Employee work
21
22 status, mental health, substance use, and career turnover intentions: An examination of
23
24 restaurant employees during COVID-19", *International Journal of Hospitality*
25
26 *Management*, Vol. 93, Advance online publication.
- 27
28
29
30
31 Cajner, T., Crane, L., Decker, R., Grigsby, J., Hamins-Puertolas, A., Hurst, E., Kurz, C., and
32
33 Yildirmaz, A. (2020), "The U.S. labor market during the beginning of the pandemic
34
35 recession", BFI Working Paper.
- 36
37
38
39 Chen, C. and Chen, M. (2021), "Well-being and career change intention: COVID-19's impact
40
41 on unemployed and furloughed hospitality workers", *International Journal of*
42
43 *Contemporary Hospitality Management*, Advance online publication.
- 44
45
46
47 Cheng, T., Mauno, S., and Lee, C. (2014), "Do job control, support, and optimism help job
48
49 insecure employees? A three-wave study of buffering effects on job satisfaction, vigor
50
51 and work-family enrichment", *Social Indicators Research*, Vol. 118 No. 3, pp. 1269-
52
53 1291. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-013-0467-8>
- 54
55
56
57
58
59
60 Chung, Y. (2002), "Career decision-making self-efficacy and career commitment: Gender

- 1
2
3
4 and ethnic differences among college students”, *Journal of Career Development*, Vol. 28
5
6 No. 4, pp. 277-284. <https://doi.org/0894-8453/02/0600-0277/0>
7
8
9 Crawford, E., LePine, J., and Rich, B. (2010), “Linking job demands and resources to
10
11 employee engagement and burnout: a theoretical extension and meta-analytic
12
13 test”, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 95 No. 5, pp. 834-848.
14
15
16 <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0019364>
17
18
19 Cuyper, N. D., Bernhard-Oettel, C., Berntson, E., Witte, H. D., and Alarco, B. (2008),
20
21 “Employability and employees’ well-being: Mediation by job insecurity”, *Applied*
22
23 *Psychology*, Vol. 57 No. 3, pp. 488-509.
24
25
26
27
28 De Cuyper, N., Mäkikangas, A., Kinnunen, U., Mauno, S., and Witte, H. (2012), “Cross-
29
30 lagged associations between perceived external employability, job insecurity, and
31
32 exhaustion: testing gain and loss spirals according to the conservation of resources
33
34 theory”, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 33 No. 6, pp. 770-788.
35
36
37 <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1800>
38
39
40
41 Demerouti, E., Bakker, A., Nachreiner, F., and Schaufeli, W. (2001), “The job demands-
42
43 resources model of burnout”, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 86 No. 3, pp. 499-512.
44
45
46 <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.499>
47
48
49 Donthu, N., Kumar, S., Ranaweera, C., Sigala, M., and Sureka, R. (2021), “Journal of Service
50
51 Theory and Practice at age 30: past, present and future contributions to service
52
53 research”, *Journal of Service Theory and Practice*, Vol. 31 No. 3, pp. 265-295.
54
55
56
57 Dyrbye, L., West, C., Johnson, P., Cipriano, P., Peterson, C., Beatty, D., ... and Shanafelt, T.
58
59
60

(2020), "An investigation of career choice regret among American nurses", *AJN The American Journal of Nursing*, Vol. 120 No. 4, pp. 24-33.

Filimonau, V., Derqui, B., and Matute, J. (2020), "The COVID-19 pandemic and organizational commitment of senior hotel managers", *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, Advance online publication.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2020.102659>

Finsterwalder, J. (2020), "Social distancing and wellbeing: conceptualizing actor distance and actor safe zone for pandemics", *The Service Industries Journal*, pp. 1-23.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/02642069.2020.1841753>

Finsterwalder, J., and Kuppelwieser, V. (2020), "Equilibrating resources and challenges during crises: a framework for service ecosystem well-being", *Journal of Service Management*, Vol. 31 No. 6, pp. 1107-1129. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JOSM-06-2020-0201>

Fugate, M., and Kinicki, A. (2008), "A dispositional approach to employability: Development of a measure and test of implications for employee reactions to organizational change", *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 81 No. 3, pp. 503-527. <https://doi.org/10.1348/096317907X241579>

Greenbaum, R., Mawritz, M., Bonner, J., Webster, B., and Kim, J. (2018), "Supervisor expediency to employee expediency: The moderating role of leader-member exchange and the mediating role of employee unethical tolerance", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 39 No. 4, pp. 525-541. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2258>

1
2
3
4 Gupta, S., Montenovolo, L., Nguyen, T., Lozano-Rojas, F., Schmutte, I., Simon, K., ... and

5
6 Wing, C. (2020), "Effects of social distancing policy on labor market outcomes", *NBER*
7
8
9 *Working Paper* (w27280).

10
11
12 Gursoy, D., and Chi, C. (2020), "Effects of COVID-19 pandemic on hospitality industry:

13
14 Review of the current situations and a research agenda", *Journal of Hospitality*

15
16
17 *Marketing & Management*, Vol. 29 No. 5, pp. 527-529.

18
19
20 Gursoy, D. Can, A., Williams, N. and Ekinci, Y. (2021). "Evolving impacts of COVID-19

21
22 vaccination intentions on travel intentions", *The Service Industries Journal*, Vol. 41 No.

23
24
25 11-12, pp. 719-733.

26
27
28 Halbesleben, J. and Wheeler, A. (2008), "The relative roles of engagement and

29
30 embeddedness in predicting job performance and intention to leave", *Work & Stress*,

31
32
33 Vol. 22 No. 3, pp. 242-256.

34
35
36 Hao, F., Xiao, Q., and Chon, K. (2020), "COVID-19 and China's Hotel Industry: Impacts, a

37
38 disaster management framework, and post-pandemic agenda", *International Journal of*

39
40
41 *Hospitality Management*, Advance online publication.

42
43
44 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2020.102636>

45
46
47 Hayes, A. (2013), *Introduction to Mediation, Moderation, and Conditional Process Analysis*,

48
49 Guilford Press, New York, NY.

50
51
52 Hayes, A. (2015), "An index and test of linear moderated mediation", *Multivariate*

53
54
55 *Behavioral Research*, Vol. 50 No. 1, pp. 1-22.

Hewagama, G., Boxall, P., Cheung, G., and Hutchison, A. (2019), "Service recovery through empowerment? HRM, employee performance and job satisfaction in hotels", *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, Vol. 81, pp. 73-82.

Hobfoll, S. (2001), "The influence of culture, community, and the nested-self in the stress process: Advancing conservation of resources theory", *Applied Psychology*, Vol. 50 No. 3, pp. 337-421.

Hobfoll, S., Johnson, R., Ennis, N., and Jackson, A. (2003), "Resource loss, resource gain, and emotional outcomes among inner city women", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 84 No. 3, pp. 632-643. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.84.3.632>

Hoffman, G., Walton, G., Narelda, P., Qiu, M., and Alajami, A. (2020), "COVID-19 Social distancing measures altered the epidemiology of facial injury-A UK-Australia comparative study", *British Journal of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery*, Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bjoms.2020.09.006>

Hofmann, V., Stokburger-Sauer, N., Wanisch, A. and Hebborn, H. (2021), "Masked smiles matter – employee verbal expertise and emotion display during COVID-19", *The Service Industries Journal*, Vol. 41 No. 1-2, pp. 107-137.

Hu, X., Yan, H., Casey, T., and Wu, C. H. (2021), "Creating a safe haven during the crisis: How organizations can achieve deep compliance with COVID-19 safety measures in the hospitality industry", *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, Vol. 92, advanced online publication.

1
2
3
4 Huang, A., Makridis, C., Baker, M., Medeiros, M., and Guo, Z. (2020), “Understanding the
5
6 impact of COVID-19 intervention policies on the hospitality labor market”, *International*
7
8 *Journal of Hospitality Management*, Advance online publication.

9
10
11 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2020.102660>

12
13
14 Huo, M.-L., and Boxall, P. (2017), “Lean production and the well-being of the frontline
15
16 manager: The job demands–resources model as a diagnostic tool in Chinese
17
18 manufacturing”, *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, Vol. 55 No. 3, pp. 280-297.

19
20
21 <https://doi.org/10.1111/1744-7941.12152>

22
23
24 Japutra, A. and Situmorang, R. (2021), “The repercussions and challenges of COVID-19 in
25
26 the hotel industry: Potential strategies from a case study of Indonesia”, *International*
27
28 *Journal of Hospitality Management*, Vol. 95, advanced online publication.

29
30
31
32
33 Jiang, Y., Wang, Q., and Weng, Q. (2020), “Job characteristics as drivers of occupational
34
35 commitment: The mediating mechanisms”, *Current Psychology*, pp. 1-11.

36
37
38 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-020-00755-8>

39
40
41 Jiang, Z. (2017), “Proactive personality and career adaptability: The role of thriving at
42
43 work”, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 98, pp. 85-97.

44
45
46 Jiang, Z., Jiang, Y. and Nielsen, I. (2019), “Workplace thriving in China”, *International*
47
48 *Journal of Manpower*, Vol. 40 No. 5, pp. 979-993.

49
50
51 Kalyal, H., Berntson, E., Baraldi, S., Näswall, K., and Sverke, M. (2010), “The moderating
52
53 role of employability on the relationship between job insecurity and commitment to
54
55 change”, *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, Vol. 31 No. 3, pp. 327-344.

1
2
3
4 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0143831X09351214>
5

6 Kang, S. E., Park, C., Lee, C. K., and Lee, S. (2021), "The stress-induced impact of COVID-
7 19 on tourism and hospitality workers", *Sustainability*, Vol. 13 No. 3, pp. 1-17.
8

9
10
11
12 Karatepe, O. M., Saydam, M. B., and Okumus, F. (2021), "COVID-19, mental health
13 problems, and their detrimental effects on hotel employees' propensity to be late for
14 work, absenteeism, and life satisfaction", *Current Issues in Tourism*, Vol. 24 No. 7, pp.
15 934-951.
16
17
18
19
20
21

22
23 Kline, R. (2011). *Principles and Practice of Structural Equation Modelling*. Guilford
24 Publications, New York, NY.
25
26
27

28
29 Khoa, D., Wang, C. and Guchait, P. (2021), "Using regulatory focus to encourage physical
30 distancing in services: when fear helps to deal with Mr. Deadly COVID-19", *The Service
31 Industries Journal*, Vol. 41 No. 1-2, pp. 32-57.
32
33
34
35
36

37 Kotera, Y., Adhikari, P., and Sheffield, D. (2021), "Mental health of UK hospitality workers:
38 shame, self-criticism and self-reassurance", *The Service Industries Journal*, Vol. 41 No.
39 15-16, pp. 1076-1096.
40
41
42
43
44

45 Laschinger, H. (2012), "Job and career satisfaction and turnover intentions of newly
46 graduated nurses", *Journal of Nursing Management*, Vol. 20 No. 4, pp. 472-484.
47
48
49

50 Lawshe, C. H. (1975), "A quantitative approach to content validity", *Personnel
51 Psychology*, Vol. 28, No. 4, pp. 563-575.
52
53
54

55 Lee, K., Carswell, J., and Allen, N. (2000), "A meta-analytic review of occupational
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 commitment: relations with person-and work-related variables”, *Journal of Applied*
5
6
7 *Psychology*, Vol. 85 No. 5, pp. 799-811. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.85.5.799>
8
9 Leiter, M. and Bakker, A. (2010), “Work engagement: Introduction”, Bakker, A. and Leiter,
10
11 M. (Eds.), *Work Engagement: A Handbook of Essential Theory and Research*,
12
13 Psychology Press, pp. 1-9.
14
15
16 MacKenzie, S.B., Podsakoff, P.M. and Fetter, R. (1991), “Organizational citizenship
17
18 behavior and objective productivity as determinants of managerial evaluations of
19
20 salespersons’ performance”, *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision*
21
22 *Processes*, Vol. 50 No. 1, pp. 123-150.
23
24
25
26
27 Mele, C., Russo-Spena, T., and Kaartemo, V. (2020), “The impact of coronavirus on
28
29 business: developing service research agenda for a post-coronavirus world”, *Journal of*
30
31 *Service Theory and Practice*, Vol. 31 No. 2, pp. 184-202.
32
33
34
35 Memon, M. A., Salleh, R., Mirza, M. Z., Cheah, J. H., Ting, H., Ahmad, M. S., and Tariq, A.
36
37 (2020), “Satisfaction matters: the relationships between HRM practices, work
38
39 engagement and turnover intention”, *International Journal of Manpower*, Vol. 42 No. 1,
40
41 pp. 21-50.
42
43
44
45
46 Mongey, S., Pilossoph, L., and Weinberg, A. (2020), “Which workers bear the burden of
47
48 social distancing policies? (No. w27085)”, National Bureau of Economic Research,
49
50 NBER Working Paper No. 27085.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Nelissen, J., Forrier, A., and Verbruggen, M. (2017), "Employee development and voluntary
5 turnover: Testing the employability paradox", *Human Resource Management Journal*,
6
7 Vol. 27 No. 1, pp. 152-168.
8
9

10
11
12 Ngo, H. Y., Liu, H., and Cheung, F. (2017), "Perceived employability of Hong Kong
13 employees: Its antecedents, moderator and outcomes", *Personnel Review*, Vol. 46 No. 1,
14
15 pp. 17-35.
16
17
18

19
20
21 Nicola, M., Alsafi, Z., Sohrabi, C., Kerwan, A., Al-Jabir, A., Iosifidis, C., ... and Agha, R.
22
23 (2020), "The socio-economic implications of the coronavirus and COVID-19 pandemic:
24 A review", *International Journal of Surgery*, Vol. 78, pp. 185-193.
25
26
27
28
29 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijssu.2020.04.018>

30
31 Podsakoff, P., MacKenzie, S., and Podsakoff, N. (2012), "Sources of method bias in social
32 science research and recommendations on how to control it", *Annual Review of*
33
34 *Psychology*, Vol. 63, pp. 539-569. [https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-120710-](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-120710-100452)
35
36
37
38
39
40
41 100452

42 Poulidakas, K., and Branka, J. (2020), "EU jobs at highest risk of COVID-19 social distancing:
43
44 Will the pandemic exacerbate labour market divide", IZA Discussion Papers, No. 13281,
45
46
47
48
49 Institute of Labor Economics (IZA), Bonn.

50
51 Presti, A., Törnroos, K., and Pluviano, S. (2020), "Because I am worth it and employable: A
52 cross-cultural study on self-esteem and employability orientation as personal resources
53
54 for psychological well-being at work", *Current Psychology*, Vol. 39, pp. 1785-1797.
55
56
57
58
59
60 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-018-9883-x>

- 1
2
3
4 Quinn, S., Kumar, S., Freimuth, V., Musa, D., Casteneda-Angarita, N., and Kidwell, K.
5
6 (2011), "Racial disparities in exposure, susceptibility, and access to health care in the US
7
8 H1N1 influenza pandemic", *American Journal of Public Health*, Vol. 101 No. 2, pp.
9
10 285-293. <https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2009.188029>
11
12
13
14 Sajtos, L., Bove, L., Bridges, E., and Holmqvist, J. (2021), "Learning from pandemics past
15
16 and present for service theory and practice", *Journal of Service Theory and Practice*,
17
18 pp. 181-183.
19
20
21
22 Schaufeli, W. and Salanova, M. (2008), "Enhancing work engagement through the
23
24 management of human resources", Naswall, K., Hellgren, J. and Sverke, M. (Eds), *The*
25
26 *Individual in the Changing Working Life*, Cambridge University Press, pp. 380-402.
27
28
29
30 Schaufeli, W., and Bakker, A. (2004), "Job demands, job resources, and their relationship
31
32 with burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study", *Journal of Organizational*
33
34 *Behavior*, Vol. 25 No. 3, pp. 293-315. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.248>
35
36
37
38 Schaufeli, W., and Taris, T. (2014), "A critical review of the job demands-resources model:
39
40 Implications for improving work and health", Bauer, G. & Hammig, O. (Eds.), *Bridging*
41
42 *Occupational, Organizational and Public Health*, Springer, pp. 43-68.
43
44
45
46 Schaufeli, W., Bakker, A., and Salanova, M. (2006), "The measurement of work engagement
47
48 with a short questionnaire", *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, Vol. 66, pp.
49
50 701-716. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164405282471>
51
52
53
54 Schmitt, A., Den Hartog, D., and Belschak, F. (2016), "Transformational leadership and
55
56 proactive work behaviour: A moderated mediation model including work engagement
57
58
59
60

- and job strain”, *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 89 No. 3, pp. 588-610. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12143>
- Shamir, B. (1991), “Meaning, self and motivation in organizations”, *Organization Studies*, Vol. 12 No. 3, pp. 405-424.
- Shimazu, A., Schaufeli, W., Kamiyama, K., and Kawakami, N. (2015), “Workaholism vs. work engagement: The two different predictors of future well-being and performance”, *International Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, Vol. 22 No. 1, pp. 18-23. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12529-014-9410-x>
- Silla, I., De Cuyper, N., Gracia, F., Peiro, J., and De Witte, H. (2009), “Job insecurity and well-being: Moderation by employability”, *Journal of Happiness Studies*, Vol. 10 No. 6, pp. 739-751. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-008-9119-0>
- Tett, R., and Meyer, J. (1993), “Job satisfaction, organizational commitment, turnover intention, and turnover: Path analyses based on meta-analytic findings”, *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 46 No. 2, pp. 259-293.
- Tortorella, G., Narayanamurthy, G., Godinho Filho, M., Staudacher, A. P., and Mac Cawley, A. F. (2020), “Pandemic's effect on the relationship between lean implementation and service performance”, *Journal of Service Theory and Practice*, Vol 31 No. 2, pp. 203-224.
- Tremblay, M., and Messervey, D. (2011), “The job demands-resources model: Further evidence for the buffering effect of personal resources”, *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, Vol. 37 No. 2, pp. 10-19. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajip.v37i2.876>

1
2
3
4 Tuzovic, S., and Kabadayi, S. (2021), "The influence of social distancing on employee well-
5 being: A conceptual framework and research agenda", *Journal of Service Management*,
6
7 Vol. 32 No. 2, pp. 145-160 <https://doi.org/10.1108/JOSM-05-2020-0140>
8
9

10
11 Wilson, J., Lee, J., Fitzgerald, H., Oosterhoff, B., Sevi, B., and Shook, N. (2020), "Job
12 insecurity and financial concern during the COVID-19 pandemic are associated with
13 worse mental health", *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, Vol. 62
14
15 No. 9, pp. 686-691. <https://doi.org/10.1097/JOM.0000000000001962>
16
17
18
19

20
21 Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A., and Fischbach, A. (2013), "Work engagement among
22 employees facing emotional demands", *Journal of Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 12 No. 2,
23
24 pp. 74-84. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1866-5888/A000085>
25
26
27
28

29
30 Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A., Demerouti, E., and Schaufeli, W. (2007), "The role of
31 personal resources in the job demands-resources model", *International Journal of Stress*
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

61
62 Yalabik, Z., Popaitoon, P., Chowne, J., and Rayton, B. (2013), "Work engagement as a
63 mediator between employee attitudes and outcomes", *The International Journal of*
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

99
100 Yu, H., Lee, L., Popa, I., and Madera, J. (2021), "Should I leave this industry? The role of
101 stress and negative emotions in response to an industry negative work
102 event", *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, Vol. 94, Advance online
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

1
2
3
4 Yu, J., Park, J. and Hyun, S. (2021), "Impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on employees'
5
6 work stress, well-being, mental health, organizational citizenship behavior, and
7
8 employee-customer identification", *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*,
9
10 *Vol. 30* No. 5, pp. 529-548. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19368623.2021.1867283>
11
12

13
14 Zhang, J., Litvinova, M., Liang, Y., Wang, Y., Wang, W., Zhao, S., Wu, Q., Merler, S.,
15
16 Viboud, C., Vespignani, A., Ajelli, M., and Yu, H. (2020), "Age profile of susceptibility,
17
18 mixing, and social distancing shape the dynamics of the novel coronavirus disease 2019
19
20 outbreak in China", *Preprint at medRxiv*. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.19.20039107>
21
22
23

24
25 Zhao, H. and Zhou, Q. (2020), "Socially responsible human resource management and hotel
26
27 employee organizational citizenship behavior for the environment: A social cognitive
28
29 perspective", *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, advanced online
30
31 publication.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table I. CFA results for nested model comparisons

Model	χ^2	<i>df</i>	$\Delta\chi^2$	Δdf	CFI	SRMR	RMSEA
Model 1	450.742***	220	-	-	.945	.060	.069
Model 2	698.263***	224	247.521*** ^a	4	.886	.100	.098
Model 3	721.470***	224	270.728*** ^a	4	.881	.067	.100
Model 4	2736.064***	230	2285.322*** ^a	10	.399	.219	.222

Note:
 Model 1: the baseline model, i.e., the full five-factor measurement model.
 Model 2: As with model 1, but with difficulty in social distancing and external employability items loading onto one factor.
 Model 3: As with model 1, but with turnover intention and career regret items loading onto one factor.
 Model 4: All items loading onto one factor.
 *** $p < .001$.
^a relative to Model 1.

Table II. Means, standard deviations and correlations among variables

Variables	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Age (years)	29.89	13.01							
2. Gender	.46	.50	.16*						
3. Tenure (years)	1.21	1.46	.25***	-.11					
4. Difficulty in social distancing	4.32	1.19	.16*	-.04	.10				
5. Perceived external employability	4.04	1.41	.12	.05	.01	.23***			
6. Work engagement	5.17	1.04	-.04	.03	-.07	-.16*	-.10		
7. Turnover intention	2.52	1.38	-.06	-.05	.09	.01	0.00	-.26***	
8. Career regret	2.52	1.28	-.02	-.08	.15*	.10	0.00	-.20**	.66***

Notes. Gender: Male = 0 and female = 1; Off-diagonal elements are correlations.

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$.

Table III. Results of multiple regression analyses

Variables	Work engagement	Turnover intention	Career regret
(Constant)	5.79 (.30)***	4.63 (.64)***	3.53 (.60)***
<i>Control variables</i>			
Age	0.00 (.01)	-0.01 (.01)	-0.01 (.01)
Gender	0.03 (.15)	-0.05 (.19)	-0.08 (.17)
Tenure	-0.03 (.05)	0.09 (.07)	0.13 (.06)*
<i>Independent variable</i>			
Difficulty in social distancing	-0.14 (.06)*	-0.03 (.08)	0.05 (.08)
<i>Mediator</i>			
Work engagement		-0.35 (.09)***	-0.23 (.08)**
R ²	.03	.08**	.07*

Note. Unstandardized coefficients are reported. Numbers in parentheses are standard errors.

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

Table IV Results of hierarchical moderated regression analyses

Criterion variable: Work engagement	Step 1 <i>b</i> (<i>se</i>)	Step 2 <i>b</i> (<i>se</i>)	Step 3 <i>b</i> (<i>se</i>)
(Constant)	5.27 (.19)**	5.19 (.19)**	5.17 (.19)**
<i>Control variables</i>			
Age	0.00 (.01)	0.00 (.01)	0.00 (.01)
Gender	0.05 (.15)	0.04 (.15)	0.01 (.14)
Tenure	-0.04 (.05)	-0.04 (.05)	-0.04 (.05)
<i>Main effects</i>			
Difficulty in social distancing		-0.12 (.06)	-0.15 (.06)*
Perceived external employability		-0.05 (.05)	-0.04 (.05)
<i>Interaction effect</i>			
Difficulty in social distancing × Perceived external employability			0.10 (.04)*
<i>R</i> ²	.01	.03	.06*
<i>R</i> ² change		.03	.03*

Note. *b* indicated unstandardized coefficients. Numbers in parentheses are standard errors.

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .001$.




Figure 1. Proposed conceptual framework: Impact of difficulty in social distancing on hospitality employee outcomes during COVID-19




Figure 2. The graphic presentation of the interaction effect of social distancing difficulty and perceived external employability on work engagement.

Appendix. Standardized factor loadings of measurement items on their respective latent factors

Variables	Items	Standardized factor loading
Difficulty in social distancing	1. If public health officials declared that it was necessary for people to stay home from work, it would be difficult for me to stay home from work for 7 to 10 days.	.529
	2. I am not able to work at home.	.752
	3. I will not get paid if stays home from work.	.688
	4. I do not have sick leave at job.	.462
	5. I could lose my job if not able to go to work.	.535
	6. Job can only be done at workplace.	.594
Perceived external employability	1. I am optimistic that I would find another job outside of hospitality, if I looked for one.	.706
	2. I will easily find another job outside of hospitality instead of my present job.	.778
	3. I could easily switch to another job in other industries, if I wanted to.	.915
	4. I am confident that I could quickly get a job with a non-hospitality employer.	.863
Work engagement	1. When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work.	.649
	2. At my work, I feel bursting with energy.	.815
	3. At my job I feel strong and vigorous.	.897
	4. My job inspires me.	.942
	5. I am enthusiastic about my job.	.927
	6. I am proud of the work that I do.	.886
Turnover intention	1. I am seriously considering quitting this company for an alternate employer.	.948
	2. During the next year, I will probably look for a new job outside this firm.	.961
Career regret	1. It was not the right career decision.	.749
	2. I regret the career choice that was made.	.943
	3. I would not go for the same career choice if I had to do it over again.	.930
	4. The career choice did me a lot of harm.	.937

5. The career decision was not a wise one.

.955

Journal of Service Theory and Practice

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60