Does Self-Efficacy Moderate the Effect of Customer Incivility on Work Engagement?

I Made Siddhi Wisesa & Agoes Ganesha Rahyuda

Faculty of Economics and Business, Udayana University,
Jl. Raya Kampus Unud, No. 2013, Jimbaran, Kec. Kuta Selatan, Kabupaten Badung, Bali 80361, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT

This research aims to determine how customer incivility can impact frontlines' work engagement and how self-efficacy moderates the relationship between customer incivility and frontlines' work engagement. This research uses a saturated or census sampling technique, which is included in non-probability sampling with a sample of 70 participants. The data for this research is obtained through questionnaires and interviews. This research uses Moderated Regression Analysis (MRA) using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). Research analysis shows that customer incivility can reduce the level of work engagement of frontline employees. A high level of self-efficacy can maintain or increase the level of work engagement of frontline employees even though these employees experience customer incivility.

Corresponding author:
I Made Siddhi Wisesa
siddhi.wisesa@student.unud.ac.id

SARI PATI

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui bagaimana ketidaksopanan pelanggan dapat memengaruhi keterlibatan kerja karyawan garis depan serta bagaimana efikasi diri memoderasi hubungan antara ketidaksopanan pelanggan dan keterlibatan kerja karyawan garis depan. Penelitian ini menggunakan teknik pengambilan sampel jenuh atau sensus, yang termasuk dalam kategori non-probability sampling, dengan sampel sebanyak 70 partisipan. Data untuk penelitian ini diperoleh melalui kuesioner dan wawancara. Analisis data menggunakan Moderated Regression Analysis (MRA) dengan bantuan perangkat lunak Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). Hasil analisis menunjukkan bahwa ketidaksopanan pelanggan dapat menurunkan tingkat keterlibatan kerja karyawan garis depan. Namun, tingkat efikasi diri yang tinggi dapat mempertahankan atau meningkatkan tingkat keterlibatan kerja karyawan garis depan meskipun mereka mengalami ketidaksopanan pelanggan

INTRODUCTION

The quality of service provided by employees to customers can affect not only customer satisfaction but also customer loyalty (Prentice et al., 2020). To maintain the quality of their employees' work, companies must also maintain the quality of employees who work in their business; this includes the emotional condition of their employees. This is important because employees' emotions can affect their attitudes, intentions, and behaviors, both in and out of the work environment (Hwang et al., 2021). One element that can affect the emotional state of employees is customer behavior; for example, customer incivility or customer unfriendliness (Boukis et al., 2020).

Customer incivility, as an aspect of workplace incivility (Anderson & Pearson, 1999), is seen by employees as deviant behavior among customers (Sliter et al., 2010). Customer incivility, when compared to more overt forms of customer misbehavior such as overt physical aggression, is more dangerous and more intense (Schilpzand et al., 2016), tends to be milder but more frequent, and is understood by employees as customer misbehavior. Misbehavior is characterized by rudeness, such as speaking loudly, and disrespect, such as addressing employees inappropriately (Zhu et al., 2019). Anderson and Pearson (1999) show that incivility can occur when a person receives unfriendly treatment from others. A person who is the object of such behavior may vent the negative influence experienced by behaving unfriendly towards others as well (Anderson & Pearson, 1999) unconsciously as a result of the negative emotions triggered by the unfriendly behavior received (Blau & Anderson, 2005). Customer incivility must be considered by companies because it can reduce service performance among employees (Hur et al., 2022). Customer incivility can also negatively affect work engagement (Wang & Chen, 2020) and employees' desire to perform extra-role services, which are important to ensure customer satisfaction (Zhu et al., 2019).

Frontline employees have more interactions with customers than back-office employees and are more likely to encounter unfriendly customers compared to others (Zhu et al., 2019); this is the case in the hospitality industry (Ugwu et al., 2021). Frontline employees at the two properties managed by PT Graha Operational Properti, namely The Seminyak Suite Private Villa and The Bene Hotel, experience this phenomenon as part of their daily routine and challenges when interacting with guests at work. The first respondent for the interview in this study is in a management position and mentioned that customer incivility is commonly experienced by frontline employees at both properties. This claim is supported by a statement from the second respondent, who holds a position as head of a frontline department, that customer incivility is part of the job of a frontline employee, and the longer someone works in a frontline position, the more experience the employee will have in dealing with unfriendly guests.

According to the first and second respondents, customer incivility can be caused by guests who have bad traits such as arrogance and obnoxiousness and do not understand the culture of courtesy. In these cases, the emotional condition of the guest when present at the hotel and the service received is not in accordance with what is expected. Reports about customer incivility occur when customers complain to frontline employees and get angry, raise their voices when talking, and ask to be served by other employees or the employee's boss. The second respondent mentioned that several times he has seen customer incivility in guests who demanded services above the ability that the hotel could provide.

Work engagement or employee attachment to their work is a motivational factor that employees face at work (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017). Work engagement is generally defined as a positive state of mind, satisfying, and related to the work they have (Schaufeli et al., 2002). Customer incivility, as a form of bad behavior by customers experienced

by frontline employees, is predicted to reduce work engagement among frontline employees. Work engagement, which is understood as a positive state of mind owned by employees about their work, is predicted to be increasingly difficult to maintain by employees when they receive customer incivility, which the employees view as negative and an additional burden in their work (Anderson & Pearson, 1999; Schaufeli et al., 2002).

Several studies have shown the relationship between customer incivility and work engagement. Research by Wang and Chen (2020) on 500 frontline employees who work in tourist hotels in the Taiwan area shows that customer incivility has a direct negative effect on work engagement. Employees consider customer incivility to be a burden during work, and if employees do not have sufficient resources to accept this burden, their work engagement and possibly their work performance decrease (Wang & Chen, 2020). Jang et al. (2020) also examine the effect of customer incivility on work engagement among 400 employees with positions as dealers at Kangwon Land Casino in South Korea. They show similar results, finding that customer incivility has a direct negative effect on work engagement. Employees who often experience customer incivility may be in a state of stress because they are more sensitive to losing the resources they have, which causes employees to hesitate to use additional resources to overcome the customer incivility they face (Jang et al., 2020). High stress causes burnout, which can cause a decrease in employee work engagement (Jang et al., 2020).

Self-efficacy is also predicted to reduce the negative impact of customer incivility on employee work engagement. Customer incivility, which is considered by employees as deviant behavior by customers, is predicted to have a negative impact on employees' state of mind and emotions, but this negative impact is predicted to be less on employees who have high self-efficacy, because employees who have high self-efficacy believe that they can do their jobs under any conditions

(Anderson & Pearson, 1999; Bandura, 1977; Schaufeli et al., 2002).

Some research results have shown the ability of self-efficacy to reduce the negative impact on employee emotional conditions caused by various factors. Rhee et al. (2017) examined 450 frontline employees of 5-star hotels in South Korea and showed that self-efficacy reduces the negative impact of coworker incivility on emotional exhaustion. The positive relationship between coworker incivility and emotional exhaustion becomes weaker in employees who have high self-efficacy compared to employees with low self-efficacy (Rhee et al., 2017). Employees with high self-efficacy may be less affected by unfriendly coworker behavior because they are equipped with a sense of trust in their work competencies (Rhee et al., 2017). Naeem et al. (2019) observe 388 full-time employees in China and show that self-efficacy with emotional regulation or emotion control can influence the direct effect of familial incivility on negative emotions or negative emotions and the indirect effects on behavioral workplace incivility or unfriendly behavior at work. The direct positive relationship between family incivility and negative emotions is weaker for employees who have high self-efficacy for emotional regulations (Naeem et al., 2019). Self-efficacy for emotional regulations also affects the indirect relationship between familial incivility and behavioral workplace incivility, in which the relationship will be weaker for employees who have high self-efficacy for emotional regulations (Naeem et al., 2019).

The relationship between customer incivility, work engagement, and self-efficacy can be explained using Job Demand-Resource (JD-R) theory. JD-R theory is popularly used in research to explain how job characteristics can affect employee strain or well-being in an organization (Demerouti et al., 2001). Job demands refer to the various demands of the job that require employee effort, while job resources refer to the various aspects of the job that can serve to help employees meet their job

demands (Demerouti et al., 2001). This study considers customer incivility to be a job demand faced by frontline employees during work, while self-efficacy is considered a job resource among frontline employees.

Job demands and job resources owned by employees based on JD-R theory can affect employees' work performance (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017). Job resources received by employees during work will increase their motivation, which leads to an increase in employee work performance (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017). Job demands that employees have during work will increase their work tension, which leads to a decrease in employee work performance (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017). The influence of job resources on employee motivation can be weakened due to the presence of job demands that employees have during work. Job demands also influence job strain, but this effect can be weakened when employees have job resources (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017). Customer incivility, which is considered a job demand in this study, is predicted to reduce work engagement as a motivational factor owned by employees, and self-efficacy, which is considered a job resource in this study, is predicted to reduce the negative influence that customer incivility has on work engagement.

Literature Review and Hypothesis Development

Work engagement is a positive, satisfying, work-related state of mind characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption and reflects an employee's mastery of the skills required by the job (Schaufeli et al., 2002; Wang & Chen, 2020). Individuals with high work engagement connect their personal values with their work to fulfill themselves physiologically, cognitively, and emotionally, thus allowing them to take initiative and be dedicated to their work (Kahn, 1990). Employees who have energy, mental resilience, high enthusiasm, and full concentration on their work demonstrate a high sense of attachment to their work (Schaufeli et al., 2002; Bakker & Demerouti, 2017).

JD-R theory explains that job demands placed on frontline employees are predicted to reduce their motivation (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017). This study assumes that customer incivility, seen as a job demand for frontline employees, is predicted to reduce the level of work engagement, a motivation factor for frontline employees. The addition of job demands from customer incivility increases the strain on employees, which leads to a reduction in motivation, specifically work engagement. This assumption is supported by Wang and Chen (2020), who consider customer incivility as a burden employees receive during work, and if employees do not have sufficient resources to accept this burden, their work engagement decreases, and their work performance is potentially reduced.

Several studies have examined the relationship that customer incivility has on work engagement. Zhu et al. (2019) show that employees who receive unfriendly treatment from customers (customer incivility) are predicted to experience a reduced sense of attachment to their work (work engagement). This makes employees reluctant to provide extra-role services to unfriendly guests. Another study by Jang et al. (2020) shows that employees who often receive customer incivility can be in a state of stress because they are more sensitive to losing the resources they have. Furthermore, high stress causes burnout, which leads to a reduction in work engagement among employees. Mostafa (2022) shows that employees who serve guests expect to have good and friendly social interactions, but when serving guests who are not friendly, these expectations are not met, and the unmet expectations can reduce employees' work engagement.

H1: Customer incivility negatively affects work engagement.

Self-efficacy is defined as a person's belief or confidence about his or her ability to mobilize the motivation, cognitive resources, and actions needed to successfully carry out a task in a particular

context (Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998). Self-efficacy is a major driving factor for someone to do something (Bandura, 2012). Frontline employees can assess the ability they have to do a job well based on information they get from previous performance achievements, experiences, professional feedback from others, verbal persuasion within the work environment, and physiological and emotional conditions among frontline employees (Bandura, 1977; Van der Bijl & Shortridge-Baggett, 2001).

According to JD-R theory, job resources owned by frontline employees are predicted to reduce the negative influence that job demands have on employee motivation factors (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017). JD-R theory also explains that personal resources, such as self-efficacy, can play the same role as job resources (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017). This study assumes that self-efficacy as a personal resource among frontline employees is predicted to reduce the negative influence that customer incivility has on work engagement. Self-efficacy is an additional resource to fulfill job demands that frontline employees have during work. The existence of additional resources that can be applied by frontline employees to deal with customer incivility will reduce the depletion of job resources owned by frontline employees in their efforts to meet additional job demands, namely customer incivility. This assumption is supported by Rhee et al. (2017), who examine the role of self-efficacy in moderating the relationship between coworker incivility and emotional exhaustion. They find that employees with high self-efficacy are likely to be less affected by the behavior of unfriendly coworkers because they have confidence in their work competence or self-efficacy.

Several studies have examined the role of self-efficacy in moderating the relationship between several variables. Research by Naeem et al. (2019) shows that self-efficacy for emotional regulation or emotion control can change the direct effect of family incivility or family members' unfriendliness on negative emotions and the

indirect effects on behavioral workplace incivility or unfriendly behavior in the workplace. The direct positive relationship between family incivility and negative emotions is weaker for employees who have high self-efficacy for emotional regulations (Naeem et al., 2019). Self-efficacy for emotional regulations also affects the indirect relationship between family incivility and behavioral workplace incivility, for which the relationship will be weaker for employees who have high self-efficacy for emotional regulations (Naeem et al., 2019). Another study by Makara-Studzinska et al. (2019) shows that self-efficacy can moderate the relationship between stress and professional burnout. Self-efficacy is predicted to generate greater work engagement and enthusiasm, which can play a moderating role between stressful situations and feelings of disappointment with work (Makara-Studzinska et al., 2019). Self-efficacy can influence greater confidence in one's coping strategies in both demanding and undemanding situations at work (Makara-Studzinska et al., 2019). Another study by Adil et al. (2020) shows the ability of self-efficacy to moderate the relationship between work engagement and creative work involvement, and employees who have high creative self-efficacy are more likely to engage in work that requires creative behavior.

H2: The negative effect of customer incivility on work engagement owned by frontline employees becomes smaller for frontline employees who have high self-efficacy.

METHODS
This research uses a quantitative approach because the data used is in the form of numbers. This research is causality associative research, which is research used to determine the causal relationship between one variable and another. The variables in this study are work engagement (Y) as the dependent variable, customer incivility (X) as the independent variable, and self-efficacy (M) as the moderator variable.

This research was conducted in two locations, namely The Bene Hotel and The Seminyak Suites Private Villa, managed by PT Graha Operational Properti. This location was chosen because its frontline employees demonstrated a phenomenon regarding customer incivility or customer unfriendliness, which can affect work engagement or work attachment. There are differences in the level of work engagement owned by employees who work at PT Graha Operational Properti. The selection of The Bene Hotel and The Seminyak Suites Private Villa as research locations is also based on the absence of previous research that discusses customer incivility, work engagement, and self-efficacy.

The population in this study comprises employees of The Bene Hotel and The Seminyak Suites Private Villa, all of whom are in the front office department, housekeeping department, food and beverages department, and security department. These two properties are managed by PT Graha Operational Properti, with 70 workers. This study uses saturated or census sampling techniques, which are included in the non-probability sampling category. The number of participants in this study is 70 people.

One method for analyzing the moderating variables is moderating regression analysis. Moderation regression analysis is a regression analysis that involves moderating variables in building its relationship model (Solimun et al., 2017). The relationship model formed in a study if it does not have a moderating variable is referred to as regression analysis only. Without the moderating variable, the analysis of the relationship between the independent variable and the dependent variable can still be carried out. All assumptions of regression analysis apply in moderation regression analysis, meaning that the assumptions in moderation regression analysis are the same as those in the regression analysis (Solimun et al., 2017).

RESULT AND DISCUSSION
Moderated Regression Analysis
This study examines the effect of customer incivility on work engagement. This study also examines the role of self-efficacy in moderating the effect of customer incivility on work engagement. This research uses the SPSS 25.0 program to analyze the results of the answers of frontline employee respondents who work at PT Graha Operational Properti.

Based on the results of the Moderated Regression Analysis in Table 1, the structural equation formed can be formulated as follows.

$$Y = 4.109 - 0.864X - 0.021M + 0.219 X*M$$

Customer Incivility on Work Engagement
The results of hypothesis testing on the effect of customer incivility on work engagement in Table 1 show that the customer incivility variable has a regression coefficient value of -0.864 and a Sig. value of 0.000. Thus, it can be concluded that

Table 1. Moderated Regression Analysis

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error			
(Constant)	4.109	0.871		4.717	0.000
Customer Incivility	-0.864	0.235	-0.774	-3.683	0.000
Self-Efficacy	-0.021	0.243	-0.021	-0.088	0.930
*Customer Incivility*Self-Efficacy*	0.219	0.070	0.779	3.148	0.002
Dependent variable: *Work engagement*					

Primary Data, 2023

H0 is rejected and Ha is accepted, because the Sig value is 0,000 < 0,05. This result shows that customer incivility has a significant negative effect on work engagement. These results also show that the increasing customer incivility felt by frontline employees reduces the level of work engagement possessed by frontline employees of PT Graha Operational Properti. The first hypothesis in this study is accepted.

Self-Efficacy Moderate the Effect of Customer Incivility and Work Engagement

The results of testing the hypothesis of the role of self-efficacy in moderating the relationship between customer incivility and work engagement in Table 5.8 show that the interaction of customer incivility and self-efficacy has a regression coefficient value of 0.219 and a Sig. value of 0.002. Thus, it can be concluded that H0 is rejected and Ha is accepted, because the Sig value is 0,002 < 0,05. This shows that self-efficacy can moderate the effect of customer incivility on work engagement at PT Graha Operational Properti. The resulting moderating effect is to weaken the relationship, which means that if frontline employees have a high level of self-efficacy, they can maintain or increase their level of work engagement even though these employees experience customer incivility behavior. The self-efficacy variable in this study can be said to be pure moderation, and this is evidenced by the effect of self-efficacy on work engagement, which has a sig value of 0.930> 0.05. The value obtained in this study suggests that the interaction between self-efficacy and work engagement is insignificant. Another interaction relationship between self-efficacy and customer incivility has a sig value of 0.002 <0.05, which can be said to have a significant effect. The existence of moderating variables is purely only as a moderating variable and does not act as an independent variable, so the second

hypothesis in this study is accepted.

Coefficient of Determination

A determination analysis in this study was conducted to determine the extent to which the variation of independent variables, namely X (customer incivility), M (self-efficacy), and XM (interaction of customer incivility and self-efficacy) between the variable Y (work engagement). A small R^2 value means that the ability of the independent variable to explain the dependent variable is very limited, while a value close to one means that the independent variable provides almost all the information needed to predict variations in the dependent variable (Ghozali, 2018).

Table 2 shows that the r square value r^2x) = 0.647. The analysis uses the following formula:

$$D = r^2 x 100\%$$
$$D = 0,647 x 100\%$$
$$D = 64,7\%$$

The R2 value = 64.7% shows that there is 64.7 percent work engagement among PT frontline employees. Graha Operational Properti is influenced by the variables customer incivility, self-efficacy and the interaction of customer incivility and self-efficacy, while the remaining 35.3 percent is influenced by other variables not examined in this research.

Model Feasibility Test (F test)

Ghozali (2018) explains that the F test basically shows whether the independent or independent variables included in the model influence the dependent or dependent variable. The F test in this study aims to determine whether the moderation regression model in this study is suitable for use. The F-test was carried out by looking at the significance values in the ANOVA table with the help of the SPSS

Table 2. Coefficient of Determination

R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
0.805[a]	0.647	0.631	0.65263

Primary Data, 2023

Table 3. Model Feasibility Test (F Test)

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	51.577	3	17.192	40.364	0.000
Residual	28.111	66	0.426		
Total	79.688	69			

program. If the ANOVA significance value < α, then the model in this research is said to be suitable for use (Ghozali, 2018). The error margin in this study is 5% with a confidence level of 95%. The results of the model feasibility test in this research can be seen in Table 3.

The results of the model feasibility test analysis in Table 3 show that the FSig. amounts to 0.000 < 0.05. It can be concluded that customer incivility, self-efficacy, and the interaction of customer incivility and self-efficacy simultaneously have a significant effect on the work engagement of PT frontline employees. Graha Operational Properti, or the moderation regression model in this research, is suitable to be used to analyze the influence of customer incivility on work engagement and the role of self-efficacy in moderating the relationship between customer incivility and work engagement.

MANAGERIAL IMPLICATION

Frontline employees at PT. Graha Operational Properti on average feel that the company quite often accepts customers' incivility. This can lead to a decrease in the quality of service for guests who behave unfriendly, which can cause guests to complain because they feel that the service is not in accordance with what they should receive. Customers' incivility that is most often received by frontline employees in carrying out their work comes in the form of guests calling to frontline employees rudely, such as "woy mas" or "you there", as an attempt by guests to get the attention of frontline employees. This can lead to frontline employees not having the desire and enthusiasm to serve these guests because their behavior is not in accordance with the norms of politeness trusted by frontline employees. Graha Operational Properti on average has strong work engagement.

This can increase employee morale while working, which leads to increased employee performance. Frontline employees feel they only have enough energy while working. This can lead to frontline employees being moderate in serving guests and making no effort to provide more service to guests to ensure guests feel happy during their stay. Graha Operational Properti on average has sufficient self-efficacy. This can lead to frontline employees feeling confident when serving guests and feeling more capable of fulfilling guests' wishes. Frontline employees feel capable of adapting to meet the demands of their work. This can lead to employees feeling more capable of handling guest wishes or dealing with unfriendly guest behavior.

CONCLUSION

This research supports the theory used, or JD-R theory, which explains not only the relationship between job demands and job resources owned by frontline employees but also how job demands influence the relationship between job resources and employees as well as job resources. Such resources can influence the relationship between job demands and employees, which indicates the ability to moderate job resources or job demands. The results of this research show that customer incivility behavior witnessed by frontline employees can influence the level of work engagement that these employees have. The self-efficacy of frontline employees can influence the impact of customer incivility on the employee's work engagement level. The research results show that the effect of customer incivility on work engagement is significantly negative and that self-efficacy can weaken the negative impact of customer incivility on work engagement. The results of the data analysis from frontline employee respondents at Graha Operational Properti are in accordance with

the initial hypothesis, namely that customer incivility, which is seen as an additional job demand for frontline employees, can reduce the level of work engagement which is included in the motivation factor of frontline employees. The addition of job demands from customer incivility will increase the tension experienced by frontline employees, which leads to a reduction in the motivation factor, namely work engagement. Self-efficacy as a personal resource possessed by frontline employees can reduce the negative influence caused by customer incivility on the level of work engagement. Self-efficacy becomes an additional resource to meet the additional job demands on frontline employees while working. The existence of additional resources owned by frontline employees will reduce the depletion of job resources owned by frontline employees in their efforts to meet additional job demands, namely customer incivility. ■

REFERENCES

Abbas, R. Z., Murad, H. S., Yazdani, N., & Asghar, A. (2014). Extending "Kahn's Model of Personal Engagement and Disengagement at Work" with Reference to Existential Attributes. *International Journal of Social Economics, 41*(1), 2-31. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSE-10-2012-0143

Abuelhassan, A. E., & AlGassim, A. (2022). How organizational justice in the hospitality industryinfluences proactive customer service performance through general self-efficacy. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 34*(7), 2579-2596. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-10-2021-1238

Adil, M. S., Hamid, K. B., & Waqas, M. (2020). Impact of perceived organizational support and workplace incivility on work engagement and creative work involvement: a moderating role of creative self-efficacy. *Int. J. Management Practice, 13*(2), 117-150. https://dx.doi.org/10.1504/IJMP.2020.105671

Albrecht, S., Bakker, A., Gruman, J., Macey, W., & Saks, A. (2015). Employee Engagement, Human Resource Management Practices and Competitive Advantage: An Integrated Approach. *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance, 2*(1), 7-35.https://doi.org/10.1108/JOEPP-08-2014-0042

Ali, B. J., Gardi, B., Othman, B. J., Ahmed, S. A., Ismael, N. B., Hamza, P. A., . . . Anwar, G. (2021). Hotel service quality: The impact of service quality on customer satisfaction in hospitality. *International Journal of Engineering, Business and Management, 5*(3), 14-28.http://dx.doi.org/10.22161/ijebm.5.3.2

Anderson, L. M., & Pearson, C. M. (1999). Tit for tat? The spiraling effect of incivility in the workplace. *Academy of Management Review, 24*(3), 452-471. https://doi.org/10.2307/259136

Bakker, A. B., & Costa, P. L. (2014). Chronic Job Burnout and Daily Functioning: A TheoreticalAnalysis. *Burnout Research, 1*(3), 112-119. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.burn.2014.04.003

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). Job Demands–Resources Theory: Taking Stock and Looking Forward. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 22*(3), 273–285. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/ocp0000056

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84, 191-215. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0033-295X.84.2.191

Bandura, A. (2012). On the Functional Properties of Perceived Self-Efficacy Revisited. *Journal of management*, 38(1), 9-44. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206311410606

Binyamin, G., & Carmeli, A. (2010). Does structuring of human resource management processesenhance employee creativity? The mediating role of psychological availability. *Human Resource Management, 49*, 999-1024. https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.20397

Blau, G., & Anderson, L. (2005). Testing a measure of instigated workplace incivility. *Journal ofOccupational and Organizational Psychology, 78*(4), 595-614. http://dx.doi.org/10.1348/096317905X26822

Bon, A. T., & Shire, A. M. (2022). Review of Conservation of Resources Theory in Job Demands and Resources Model. *International Journal of Global Optimization and Its Application, 1*(4), 236-248. https://doi.org/10.56225/ijgoia.v1i4.102

Boukis, A., Chistos, K., Daunt, K. L., & Papastathopoulos, A. (2020). Effects of customer incivility on frontline employees and the moderating role of supervisor leadership style. *Tourism Management, 77*, 16-20. https://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4256998

Buchwald, P., & Schwarzer, C. (2010). Impact of Assessment on Students' Test Anxiety. *International Encyclopedia of Education, 3*(1), 498 - 505. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08 044894-7.00304-3

Caesans, G., & Stinglhamber, F. (2014). The relationship between perceived organizational support and work engagement: The role of self-efficacy and its outcomes. *European Review of Applied Psychology, 64*(5), 259-267. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erap.2014.08.002

Chan, E. S., Ho, S. K., Ip, F. F., & Wong, M. W. (2020). Self-efficacy, work engagement, and job satisfaction among teaching assistants in Hong Kong's inclusive education. *Sage Open, 10*(3), 1-11. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/2158244020941008

Chen, G., Gully, S. M., & Eden, D. (2001). Validation of a New General Self-Efficacy Scale. *Organizational Research Method, 4*(1), 62-83. https://doi.org/10.1177/109442810141004

Chen, Y.-S., & Huang, S. Y. (2016). A conservation of resources views of personal engagement in the development of innovative behavior and work-family conflict. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 29*(6), 1030-1040. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/JOCM-11-2015-0213

Cheng, B., Dong, Y., Xing, Z., Guo, G., & Peng, Y. (2020). Does customer incivility undermine employees' service performance? *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 89*, 102544-102554. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2020.102544

Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The job demands- resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(3), 499–512. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.499

Edmondson, A. (1999). Psychological Safety and Learning Behavior in Work Teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 44*, 350-383. https://doi.org/10.2307/2666999

Ghozali, I. (2018). *Aplikasi Analisis Multivariate dengan Program IBM SPSS 25.* Semarang: Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro.

Habibi, E., Poorabdian, S., & Shakerian, M. (2015). Job strain (demands and control model) as a predictor of cardiovascular risk factors among petrochemical personnel. *Journal of education and health promotion, 4*(16), 1-7. https://doi.org/10.4103%2F2277- 9531.154034

Hendricks, K. S. (2016). The Sources of Self-Efficacy. *Update: Applications of Research in Music Education, 35*(1), 32-38. https://doi.org/10.1177/8755123315576535

Hobfol, S. E., & Ford, J. S. (2007). Conservation of Resources Theory. *Encylopedia of Stress, 1*(1), 562 - 267. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-012373947-6.00093-3

Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist, 44*(3), 513-524. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0003- 066X.44.3.513

Hur, W.-M., Shin, Y., & Shin, G. (2022). Daily relationships between customer incivility, organizational control, self-efficacy, and service performance. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services, 69*, 55-66. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2022.103092

Hwang, Y., Shi, X., & Wang, X. (2021). Hospitality employees' emotions in the workplace: a systematic review of recent literature. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 33*(10), 3752-3796. 3752-3796. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-12-2020-1426

Jalagat Jr., R. (2016). Job Performance, Job Satisfaction, and Motivation: A Critical Review of their Relationship. *International Journal of Advances in Management and Economics, 5*(6), 36-42. https://www.managementjournal.info/index.php/IJAME/article/view/64

Jang, J., Jo, W., & Kim, J. S. (2020). Can employee workplace counteract the indirect effect of customer incivility on proactive service performance through work engagement? A moderated mediation model. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management, 29*(4), 1- 18. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/19368623.2020.1725954

Kabir, S. M. (2016). Methods of Data Collection. In S. M. Kabir (Ed.), *Basic Guidelines for Research: An Introductory Approach for All Disciplines* (pp. 201-275). Bangladesh: BookZone Publication.

Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological Conditions of Personal Engagement and Disengagement at Work. *Academy of Management Journal, 33*(4), 692-724. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.2307/256287

Karatepe, O. M., Ozturk, A., & Kim, T. T. (2019). The effects of nonwork and personal resources on frontline bank employees' work engagement and critical job outcomes. *International Journal of Bank Marketing, 37*(3), 858-879. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/IJBM-05-2018-0133

Kristiana, I. F., Fajrianthi, & Purwono, U. (2019). Analisis Rasch Dalam Utrecht Work Engagement Scale-9 (UWES 9) Versi Bahasa Indonesia. *Jurnal Psikologi Universitas Diponegoro, 17*(2), 204-217. *Diponegoro, 1 7 (2)*, 204-217. https://doi.org/10.14710/jp.17.2.204-217

Latham, G. P. (2012). *Work Motivation: History, Theory, Research, and Practice.* Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications Inc.

Lee, W. S., & Moon, J. (2018). Attributes of the coffee shop business related to customer satisfaction. *Journal of Foodservice Business Research, 21*(6), 628-641.http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15378020.2018.1524227

Leiter, M. P., Maslach, C., & Frame, K. (2014). Burnout. *The Encyclopedia of Clinical Psychology*, 1-7. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118625392.wbecp142

Mache, S., Vitzthum, K., Wanke, E., Groneberg, D. A., Klapp, B. F., & Danzer, G. (2014). Exploring the impact of resilience, self-efficacy, optimism and organizational resources on work engagement. *Work*, 47(4), 491-500. https://doi.org/10.3233/wor-131617

Makara-Studzinska, M., Golonka, K., & Izydorczyk, B. (2019). Self-Efficacy as a Moderator between Stress and Professional Burnout in Firefighters. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 16*(2), 183-199. https://doi.org/10.3390%2Fijerph1602018

Memon, M. A., Salleh, R., Mirza, M. Z., Cheah, J.-H., Ting, H., Ahmad, M. S., & Tariq, A. (2021).Satisfaction matters: the relationships between HRM practices, work engagement and turnover intention. *International Journal of Manpower, 42*(1), 21-50. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/IJM-04-2018-0127

Meyer, K. E., & Peng, M. W. (2005). Probing Theoretically into Central and Eastern Europe: Transactions, Resources, and Institutions. *Journal of International Business Studies, 36*(6),600-621. http://dx.doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.jibs.8400167

Morrow, P. C., McElroy, J. C., & Scheibe, K. P. (2011). Work unit incivility, job satisfaction, andtotal quality management among transportation employees. *Transportation Research PartE, 47*, 1210-1220. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tre.2011.03.004

Mostafa, A. M. (2022). Customer Incivility, Work Engagement and Service-Oriented Citizenship Behaviors: Does Servant Leadership Make a Difference? *Human Performance, 35*(1), 31-47. https://doi.org/10.1080/08959285.2021.1998061

Naeem, M., Weng, Q., Ali, A., & Hameed, Z. (2020). Linking family incivility to workplace incivility: Mediating role of negative emotions and moderating role of self-efficacy for emotional regulation. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology, 23*(1), 69-81. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1111/ajsp.12391

Na-Nan, K., & Sanamthong, E. (2020). Self-efficacy and employee job performance: Mediating effects of perceived workplace support, motivation to transfer and transfer of training. *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management, 37*(1), 1-17. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/IJQRM-01-2019-0013

Newman, A., Donohue, R., & Eva, N. (2017). Psychological safety: A systematic review of the literature. *Human Resource Management Review, 27*(3), 521-535. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1016/j.hrmr.2017.01.001

Nunkoo, R., Teeroovengadum, V., Ringlee, C. M., & Sunnassee, V. (2020). Service quality and customer satisfaction: The moderating effects of hotel star rating. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 91*, 76-101. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2019.102414

Orlowski, M., Bufquin, D., & Nalley, M. E. (2021). The influence of social perceptions on restaurant employee work engagement and extra-role customer service behavior: A moderated mediation model. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly, 67*(2), 261-275. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1938965520910119

Pearsall, M. J., & Ellis, A. P. (2011). Thick as thieves: The effects of ethical orientation and psychological safety on unethical team behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 96*(2), 401-411. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0021503

Pfitzner-Eden, F. (2016). Why Do I Feel More Confident? Bandura's Sources Predict Preservice Teachers' Latent Changes in Teacher Self-Efficacy. *Frontiers In Psychology, 7*, 1-16. https://doi.org/10.3389%2Ffpsyg.2016.01486

Prentice, C., Lopes, S. D., & Wang, X. W. (2020). The impact of artificial intelligence and employee service quality on customer satisfaction and loyalty. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management, 29*(7), 739-756. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/19368623.2020.1722304

Rai, A., & Maheshwari, S. (2021). Exploring the mediating role of work engagement between thelinkages of job characteristics with organizational engagement and job satisfaction. *Management Research Review, 44*(1), 133-157. https://doi.org/10.1108/MRR-10-2019-0442

Rhee, S.-Y., Hur, W.-M., & Kim, M. (2017). The Relationship of Coworker Incivility to Job Performance and the Moderating Role of Self-Efficacy and Compassion at Work: The JobDemands-Resources (JD-R) Approach. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 32*(6), 711- 726. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1007/s10869-016-9469-2

Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2004). Job demands, job resources, and their relationship withburnout and engagement: A multi□sample study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 25*(3), 295-315. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/job.248

Schaufeli, W. B., & Taris, T. W. (2014). A Critical Review of the Job Demands-Resources Model:Implications for Improving Work and Health. In *Bridging Occupational, Organizational and Public Health* (pp. 43-68). Springer: Dordrecht.

Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., Gonzalez-roma, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). The Measurement of Engagement and Burnout: A Two Sample Confirmatory Factor Analytic Approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 3*(1), 71-92. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1023/A:1015630930326

Schilpzand, P., De Pater, I. E., & Erez, A. (2016). Workplace incivility: A review of the literatureand agenda for future research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 37*, S57–S88. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1002/job.1976

Schunk, D. H., & DiBenedetto, M. K. (2019). Motivation and social cognitive theory. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 60*, 121131. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2019.101832

Sliter, M., & Jones, M. (2016). A qualitative and quantitative examination of the antecedents of customer incivility. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 21*(2), 208-219. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/a0039897

Sliter, M., Jex, S., Wolford, K., & McInnerney, J. (2010). How rude! Emotional labor as a mediator between customer incivility and employee outcomes. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 15*(4), 468–481. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/a0020723

Sliter, M., Sliter, K., & Jex, S. (2012). The employee as a punching bag: The effect of multiple sources of incivility on employee withdrawal behavior and sales performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 33*(1), 121-139. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1002/job.767

Solimun, Rinaldo, A. A., & Nurjannah. (2017). *Metode Statistika Multivariat Pemodelan Persamaan Struktural (SEM) Pendekatan WarpPLS.* Malang: Universitas Brawijaya Press.

Stajkovic, A. D., & Luthans, F. (1998). Self-efficacy and work-related performance: A meta- analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 124*(2), 240-261. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0033-2909.124.2.240

Sugiyono. (2019). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif R&D.* Bandung: Alfabeta.

Tahmassian, K., & Moghadam, N. J. (2011). Relationship Between Self-Efficacy and Symptoms of Anxiety, Depression, Worry and Social Avoidance in a Normal Sample of Students. *Iranian journal of psychiatry and behavioral sciences, 5*(2), 91-98. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/pmc3939966/

Tian, G., Wang, J., Zhang, Z., & Weng, Y. (2019). Self-efficacy and work performance: The role of work engagement. *Social Behavior and Personality An International Journal, 47*(12), 1-7. https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.8528

Tims, M., Bakker, A. B., & Derks, D. (2012). Development and validation of the job crafting scale. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 80*(1), 173-186.https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1016/j.jvb.2011.05.009

Ugwu, F. O., Onyishi, E. I., Anozie, O. O., & Ugwu, L. E. (2021). Customer incivility and employee work engagement in the hospitality industry: roles of supervisor positive gossip and workplace friendship prevalence. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Insights, 5*(3), 515-534. 515-534. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/JHTI-06-2020-0113

Van der Bijl, J., & Shortridge-Baggett, L. M. (2001). The theory and measurement of the self- efficacy construct. *Scholarly Inquiry for Nursing Practice, 15*(13), 189-207. https://doi.org/10.1891/0889-7182.15.3.189

Wang, C.-H., & Chen, H.-T. (2020). Relationships among workplace incivility, work engagement and job performance. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Insights, 3*(4), 415-429. https://doi.org/10.1108/JHTI-09-2019-0105

Wang, M., Liao, H., Zhan, Y., & Shi, J. (2011). Daily Customer Mistreatment and Employee Sabotage Against Customers: Examining Emotion and Resource Perspectives. *Academy of Management Journal, 54*(2), 312-334. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2011.60263093

Wang, X., Guchait, P., Khoa, D. T., Paşamehmetoğlu, A., & Wen, X. (2022). Hospitality employees' affective experience of shame, self-efficacy beliefs and job behaviors: The alleviating role of error tolerance. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 102*,145-156. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2022.103162

Wilson, N. L., & Holmvall, C. M. (2013). The development and validation of the Incivility from Customers Scale. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 18*(3), 310-326. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/a0032753

Wrzesniewski, A., & Dutton, J. E. (2001). Crafting a Job: Revisioning Employees as Active Crafters of Their Work. *Academy of Management Review, 26*(2), 179-201. https://doi.org/10.2307/259118

Yu, J., Ariza-Montes, A., Giorgi, G., Lee, A., & Han, H. (2020). Sustainable Relationship Development between Hotel Company and Its Employees: Linking Job Embeddedness, Job Satisfaction, Self-Efficacy, Job Performance, Work Engagement, and Turnover. *Sustainability, 12*(17), 7168-7183. https://doi.org/10.3390/su12177168

Zhu, J. N., Lam, L. W., & Lai, J. Y. (2019). Returning good for evil: A study of customer incivility and extra-role customer service. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 81*, 65-72. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2019.03.004