**Abstract**

Drawing on conservation of resources theory this study assesses the relationship

between horizontal solidarity and incivility on work attitudes, namely job insecurity and intentions to leave the organization and the boundary conditions of these interrelations. More specifically it is hypothesized that while incivility enhances job insecurity and intentions to leave the organization, these reactions are reduced in the presence of social resources (i.e. horizontal solidarity). Additionally it is argued that these contradictory forces interact, revealing the boundary conditions of these relations.

Data was collected from 210 preschool teachers and was analyzed using smart PLS3. Findings supported most of the predictions and allowed for a better understanding of both the underlying mechanisms triggering job insecurity and intentions to leave the organization in a reasonably stable work environment of preschool teachers. Findings also supported core principles of COR (Conservation of Resources theory), some of which had been overlooked thus far.

**Introduction**

In the last few decades, market dynamics, driven by technological developments and economic challenges, have triggered a continuous search within organizations for flexibility (Itzkovich et al.,2021). The newly emerging fast-phase rhythm has structured the new working world. Traditional, stable employment configurations have been replaced by precarious work arrangements (Itzkovich and Heilbrunn, 2016; Kim et al., 2012; Lord, 2020; Vives et al., 2010) and increased interdependencies between employees, who trade stability and job security for short-term autonomy, and move between organizations that brand autonomy as a valuable substitute for stability (Itzkovich and Heilbrunn, 2016; Ley et al., 2012). These interdependencies, embedded in the new structure of work, on the one hand increase employees' responsibilities as they enable organizations to cope with the constant change. Yet at the same time, the dynamic nature of the working world and the forced rapid changes, trigger embedded stress in the delicate fabric of work relations ([Contreras](https://www.emerald.com/insight/search?q=Salvador%20Contreras) and [Gonzalez,](https://www.emerald.com/insight/search?q=Jorge%20A.%20Gonzalez) 2021).

Together with the emerging stressful work environment, there is an apparent absence of clear moral standards (Pearson et al., 2000), which fosters inner-organizational conflicts. These are demostrated in uncivil behaviour (Richardson, 2010), usually trickling down the organizational hierarchy (Liu et al., 2020) and representing adverse interrelations between employees who experience these mistreatments and managers who perpetrate them (Itzkovich et al. 2020).

Incivility, defined as low-intensity deviant behaviour (Andersson and Pearson, 1999), manifests these inner conflicts. In part, these conflicts arouse negative emotions and perceptions (Dolev et al. 2021), such as, but not limited to, job insecurity (Shin and Hur, 2020; Itzkovich, 2016) and increased employees’ intentions to leave the organization (Arslan and Kocaman, 2019). Indeed these notions are supported empirically. Pearson and Porath (2005) showed that half of the incivility victims waste time worrying about what will happen, while others consider leaving the organization to avoid future unpleasant incidents. Still, the underlying assumption of this line of research was that these relations are dyadic.

Although it typically has a dyadic nature, the spillover effect of incivility has shaped some of the more recent research (Itzkovich and Heilbrunn, 2016; Ferguson, 2012; Zhou et al.,2019). Accounting for the spiral process of incivility initially suggested by Anderson and Pearson (1999), scholars have investigated the impact of third parties, namely bystanders (Itzkovich et al., 2021), on incivility and outcomes (Holm et al., 2019; Jensen, J. M., and Raver, 2020).

These bystanders can potentially support their co-workers (i.e. express solidarity) in the presence or absence of incivility. Some researchers accounted for such organizational solidarity, yet it was scantly addressed (Itzkovich and Heilbrunn, 2016). When placing solidarity at one pole of a continuum representing the positivity of interrelations between employees and organizations, with incivility as the negative representation of these interpersonal relations at the other pole, it is expected that while solidarity reduces job insecurity and withdrawal intentions, incivility will enhance them. An appreciation of these multi-sourced dynamics is essential for understanding incivility beyond the classical interplay between targets and perpetrators (Anderson and Pearson,1999). Indeed, these forces of light and darkness did recently receive some attention (Itzkovich and Heilbrunn, 2016). Still, the mutual impact of solidarity and incivility on job insecurity and intentions to leave the organization, which can reveal the boundary conditions of these interrelations, were overlooked. This is particularly problematic given the importance of accounting for the interaction between constructs - as suggested by the Conservation of Resources (COR) principles (Hobfoll. et al., 2018) - for a profound understanding of the impact of adverse and supportive behaviors that co-exist in the organizational reality.

The broad theoretical framing of this paper is the Conservation of Resources (COR) theory (Goldner et al., 2019; Hobfoll et al. 2018; Holmgreen et al. 2017). Applying this theory enables us to better understand the interrelations between resource-depleting incivility, horizontal solidarity as a social resource (Hobfoll et al. 1990), and the complex ways they interact as part of a multi-layered process aimed at restoring, maintaining, and increasing resources. In this respect, it has been noted that diversity in resources, such as the availability of horizontal solidarity as a social resource, leads to the adoption of different coping strategies and other emotional and regulatory resources in the face of difficult situations (Itzkovich et al., 2021); yet the interrelation between social resources and the resource-depleting context have been largely overlooked.

Based on these observations and the third principle of COR (Hobfoll et al.,1990), which argues that resource gain is more prominent in the context of resource loss, the overarching aim of the current study is to examine the impact of incivility on job insecurity and intentions to leave, while accounting for the moderating effect of horizontal solidarity on these interrelations. This should, for the first time, enable a better understanding of incivility in a wider social contex.

Additionally, the current research was conducted among preschool teachers whose work is considered secure compared to other work environments (Itzkovich and Dolev, 2021), showing that interrerlations co-exist in a more protected work environment. Taken together, the current study accounts for the mutual impact of darker and brighter facets of work on employees and can shed light on the boundary conditions of these interrelations in the reasonably stable envirounment of preschool teachers .

**II. Literature Review and Hypotheses Development**

**Incivility**

Incivility was first defined by Andersson and Pearson (1999) as "low-intensity deviant behaviour with ambiguous intent to harm the target, in violation of workplace norms for mutual respect" (p. 457).

Civility and incivility represent two opposing poles of interpersonal relations. While civility is represented by satisfactory interactions, incivility is demonstrated through inappropriate social interactions (Itzkovich and Heilbrunn, 2016, Dolev et al., 2021).

To distinguish it from other interpersonal mistreatments, incivility is a milder form (Paulin and Griffin, 2016; Schilpzand, De Pater and Erez, 2016; Schilpzand, P., Leavitt, K. and Lim, S.,2016), characterized by the ambiguous intent of the perpetrator to harm its targets (Jawahar and Schreurs, 2018). In this respect, while most researchers attribute ambiguous intent to the perpetuation of the uncivil act ( Schilpzand et al., 2016), others suggest that as incivility trickles down the organizational hierarchy, it might become purposeful after all (Itzkovich, 2021).

As an adverse interpersonal interaction, incivility inflicts harm on both individuals and organizations. Research findings indicate a negative relationship between incivility and well-being (Baker and Kim 2020). Findings also show that it damages employees both physically and emotionally (Chen et al. 2019) with a spillover impact beyond the individual and working hours (Zhou et al. 2019).

From the organizational perspective, such depletion of individual resources decreases individuals satisfaction from their work (Koon and Pun 2018), in turn leading to increased absenteeism (Zia-ud-Din et al. 2017), withdrawal intentions, and actual withdrawal from work (Ju and Pak, 2021). Through the lens of COR, it was recently noted that mistreatment, such as incivility, is a source of consumption of individual resources (Dolev et al., 2021;Itzkovich and Dolev, 2021). As individuals are motivated to restore lost resources and are willing to invest resources in the proccess (Hobfoll, 1990), they may decide to leave and invest some of their remaining resources in the proccess, in order to restore the lost ones in a new avenue of work. Taken together,it is safe to assume that incivility triggers targets to either consider pursuing or actually search for a new job, to restore their lost resources.

(*H1*) Incivility will be positively correlated with intentions to leave the organization.

In a parallel analysis, the consumption of resources by uncivil behaviour also promotes perceptions of job insecurity.

**Job insecurity**

Job insecurity is defined by Greenhalgh and Rosenblatt (1984, p. 438) as “powerlessness to maintain desired continuity in a threatened job situation”. It is an interpretation of objective reality, which arises in the gap between the individual’s desired confidence level concerning his ability to maintain his job and his perceived level of confidence (Etehadi and Karatepe, 2019).

By highlighting that job insecurity is not limited to the unidimensional perceived ability to maintain one's current job or lose it, scholars introduced a comprehensive approach that considers job insecurity as a potential outcome of any percived loss of a variety of desired job features (Greenhalgh and Rosenblatt, 1984; O'Neill and Sevastos, 2013), including but not limited to the social elements of work. Understanding job insecurity as a multi-dimensional construct explains how the loss of civility, a desired social element of work, can act as a trigger for perceived job insecurity. In this respect, once incivility is experienced, the social environment at work is damaged. As the social facet is one of many aspects that make up the job and its level of satisfaction or security, job insecurity is expected to increase when this work element is damaged. The analytical prism of COR supports another interpretation. It argues that incivility depletes personal resources (Itzkovich and Dolev, 2021), as well as social resources (i.e reduced helping behaviour of co-workers), which are further reduced if bystanders to the uncivil act ignore the target or join the perpetrator. By doing so, they have the potential to inflict additional demage on the target (Itzkovich et al. 2021), thereby consuming more of his social resources in addition to his personal resources, which should enable individuals to cope with the uncertainty embedded in job insecurity.

Taken together, it is safe to assume that incivility will increase perceptions of job insecurity.

(*H2*) Incivility will be positively correlated with job insecurity.

Assuming that the individaul has enough resources needed for a job search (Hulshof et al., 2020), in line with the first and second principles of COR, people are motivated by resource loss and are therefore likely to invest some of their remaining resources to protect against future resource loss (Hobfoll et al., 2018). Specifically, COR holds that an outcome of job insecurity is the intent to leave the organization in order to restore the loss of security. Thus, it is argued that:

(*H3*) Job insecurity will be positively correlated with intentions to leave the organization.

While incivility represents one possible pole of interdependencies between employees and organizations, solidarity tends to the other but now positive pole.

**Solidarity**

Based on a sense of responsibility to others and mutual interdependence, solidarity refers to a situation in which the well-being of one person or group is positively correlated with that of others (De Beer & Koster, 2009: 12).

In the organizational context, solidarity is positioned within pro-social types of behaviours (Koster and Sanders 2007), such as organizational citizenship behaviour (Kelly et al., 2018). Unlike OCB type I (i.e. OCB directed toward individuals), in which behaviours are indifferent to the identity of their beneficiaries, solidarity accounts for the direction and hierarchical level of the participants in the act of support (Psychogios et al.,2020). In this sense, while vertical solidarity can be directed towards supervisors, horizontal solidarity can be directed towards or sourced by peers of the same hierarchical level. The latter is called horizontal solidarity from coworkers, and this accounts for the cooperative behaviours of coworkers toward their peers in this study (Sanders & Schyns, 2006).

Furthermore, in this study help gained from others is considered a social resource in the framework of the extension of COR accounting for the conservation of social resources theory (Hobfoll et al.,1990). Hobfoll et al. (1990), in his conservation of social resources theory (COSR), considered support from others (i.e. horizontal solidarity) both as an instrument to enhance resources and also (together with other resources that are contained within the individual), as an end state defining the self. Recently this groundbreaking theory was supported by finding horizontal solidarity as an antecedent of cooperation, positive attitudes and behaviours (Psychogios et al.,2020) and an outcome of high-quality organizational communication patterns (Bolino & Turnley, 2003; Psychogios et al., 2020).

In contrast, incivility, which represents low-quality communication patterns that are observed and experienced even beyond the target and perpetrator ( Itzkovich et al. 2021), reduces employee satisfaction due to the poor moral quality of organizational communication (Miner et al., 2018).

This research argues that such dissatisfaction with the quality of communication will reduce individuals’ helping behaviours and inclination to support others. While high quality internal communications were found to be drivers of organizational community atmosphere and organizational citizenship behaviours (Psychogios et al. 2020), in their absence, helping behaviours are expected to decrease.

COR can also account for the underlying mechanism of these notions. Like any other form of mistreatment, incivility consumes targets and observers' emotional and social resources (Itzkovich et al. 2021; Porath and Pearson, 2012), which were noted as drivers of helping behaviours (Porath and Pearson, 2012; Psychogios et al.2020). In line with the fourth principle of COR, it is argued that individuals enter a defensive mode to preserve the self when their resources are exhausted, as might be the case in the presence of incivility. Thus, once their resources are consumed by incivility, bystanders, similarly to targets of incivility, will not jeopardize their remaining resources through engagement in helping the target. This is further exacerbated by the concern that identifying with the target could excrease their risk exposure or mark them as a future targets (Itzkovich et al., 2021).

Based on these notions, it is postulated that:

*H4*) Incivility will be negatively correlated with horizontal solidarity.

Additionally, horizontal solidarity reflects a situation in which individuals are supported by others who perceive their wellbeing as connected to the wellbeing of those they support (De Beer and Koster 2009). Although the traditional definition of job insecurity was unidimensional, scholars agreed that fear of loss could also be grounded on fear of losing various work features, such as the social environment of work (Itzkovich 2015; 2016), thereby supporting a multidimensional perception of the construct of job insecurity.From the positiveperspective, seeing solidarity as an expression of a positive social facet of work expresses how it contributes to a feeling of security. Thus it can have the overall effect of reducing job insecurity.

In the framework of COR, job insecurity is an interpretation of objective reality which arises in the disparity between the individual's desires and his actual confidence level concerning his ability to maintain his job (Etehadi and Karatepe, 2019) or facets of it ( Itzkovich 2016). This gap depends on an individuals' available resources to reduce the gap or deal with its implications (Patnaik et al., 2021). It is argued that support from others is a resource that can reduce the uncertainty concerning the ability to maintain the social resources of work (Hobfoll et al., 1990). Thus it can be postulated that:

*H5*) Horizontal solidarity will be negatively correlated with job insecurity.

In the same vein, pertaining to COR, it is argued that intentions to leave the organization reflect the target’s desire to restore the lost resources (Kiazad et al., 2014), including the social ones consumed by incivility. As a social resource, horizontal solidarity is a desired resource in and of itself, but is also required to protect other resources and is an integral component of an individuals’ identity (Hobfoll et al. 1990). When it is present, the desire to look for alternative resources in a new work environment is reduced. Thus it can be argued that:

*H6*) Horizontal solidarity will be negatively correlated with intentions to leave the organization.

The third principle of COR suggests that resource gain is more prominent in the context of resource loss. This principle highlights the interaction between resource gain and loss, implying that the potential interaction between these interrelations' brighter (i.e. horizontal solidarity) and darker sides (i.e. incivility) can better explain the comprehensive meaning of potential impacts of incivility and their boundary conditions. This line of research answers the call from Miner et al. (2018), to measure context in order to identify boundary conditions reflected through different appraisals of similar behaviours triggered by context diversity. In this respect, it is assumed that job insecurity and intentions to leave the organizations are context-dependent. Incivility is expected to increase perceptions of job insecurity more for those who experience low solidarity from their co-workers. This approach relies on research conducted on bystanders. Bystanders enhance the negative impact on targets of mistreatment when they do not support the target ( Itzkovich 2021). Co-workers that do not express solidarity (i.e. pertain to the low solidarity pole) in the presence of incivility, are expected to be perceived as unsupportive compared to those who express high solidarity. In this case, theperceived damage inflicted by the incivility is likely to be more prominent. In line with these notions, it is argued that:

*H7*) Incivility will be be more positively correlated with job insecurity for those experiencing low horizontal solidarity.

In line with COR fourth principle and the added damage of unsupportive bystanders, the additional negative impact of low social support on the adverse effects of incivility will exhaust incivility targets’ resources, triggering a defensive mode (Hobfoll et al., 2018). Under these conditions, it is expected that targets will not have enough resources needed for a job search (Hulshof et al., 2020), and thus, they are less inclined to search for an alternate job or even consider the option. An additional hypthesis is therefore:

*H8*) Incivility will be more negatively correlated with intentions to leave the organization for those experiencing low horizontal solidarity.

**Method**

The study used a quantitative method. Results were analyzed through SmartPLS3 based on the PLS-SEM methodology, which differs from the CB-SEM methodology. The assessment of PLS-SEM models is based on Bootstrapping, a nonparametric procedure that tests the statistical significance of various PLS-SEM results such as path coefficients, Cronbach’s alpha, HTMT, and R² values. It differs from the CB-SEM model assessment that is based on model fit. (Hair et al. 2016). The authors decided that PLS-SEM is superior compared to CB-SEM based models.

**Participants**

Participants included 210 female preschool teachers between the ages of 24 and 64, with an average age of 39.4. This gender bias was unavoidable as the vast majority of preschool teachers in Israel are females. All teachers were employed in early education centres located in the centre of Israel, the most populated area in the country. 87% of all participants held full-time positions, and 81.3% held permanent positions. The Israeli Ministry of Education employed 97.4% of the participants, and the rest were contract workers. The average tenure for all participants was 14.45 years.

**Research Tools**

*The Perceived Incivility Scale*

Workplace incivility was measured utilizing a dedicated 12-item 5-point Likert scale (Cortina, Kabat-Farr, Leskinen, Huerta and Magley 2013). Participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they experienced uncivil behaviours during the previous year, such as: being interrupted, being targeted by angry outbursts, or being subjected to hostile stares from coworkers and supervisors or the parents of students. A sample item was: ‘*During the past year, were you ever in a situation where any of your supervisors or coworkers yelled, shouted, or swore at you*?'. Answers ranged from 1 - *never* to 5 - *many times*. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient for the scale was .92.

*The Job Insecurity Scale*

Job insecurity was measured utilizing the De Witte (2000) 4-item, 5-point Likert scale, with answers ranging from 1 - *strongly disagree* to 5 - *strongly agree*. Sample items include, '*The chances are that I will soon lose my job*', and '*I am sure that I can keep my job*'. The Cronbach’s alpha was calculated to be .77.

*The Intentions to Leave Scale*

A four-item scale, developed by Hunt and & Osborn (1981). was used to measure participants’ intentions to leave their organization. Items such as “Which of the following statements most clearly reflects your feelings about your future with this organization in the next year? (1 = I definitely will not leave, 2 = I probably will not leave, 3 = I am uncertain, 4 = I probably will leave, and 5 = I definitely will leave)” is a sample item representing the scale. The complete list of items can be retrieved from Shore and Martin (1989).

Cronbach’s alpha for the present study was .86.

*The Horizontal Solidarity Scale*

The items measuring horizontal solidarity (towards coworkers) are based on Lindenberg (1998), and the measurement refers to consistent cooperative behaviour across the following five social dilemma situations (Koster and Sanders 2004; Sanders, Schyns, and Koster 2003): common good, sharing, need, breach temptation, and mishap (Lindenberg 1998). Based on Koster (2005), we used the following five items to measure solidarity from coworkers: 1)"My coworkers help me to finish tasks" 2)"My coworkers are willing to help me when things go wrong unexpectedly" 3)"My coworkers apologize to me when they have made a mistake" 4) "My coworkers divide the pleasant and unpleasant tasks equally between them and me" 5)"My coworkers fulfil agreements made with me" (Koster 2005:127). The Cronbach’s alpha of the constructed solidarity from coworkers index was .890.

**Procedure**

A web-link to an online questionnaire was provided to all preschool teachers on the list of the Association of Preschool Teachers in the summer of 2016. Anonymity was assured and informed concent was obtained from participants. Two hundred and thirty questionnaires were filled out and submitted, 210 of which contained usable data. A ten per cent response rate was calculated. 44.7% of the above-noted 210 participating teachers reported experiences of incivility.

As informed by the PLS-SEM methodology, prior to the assessment of the inner model (also called the structural model, accounting for the relationships among the latent variables that make up the research model), the assessment of the outer model - also called the measurement model - aimed to account for the quality of the relationships among the latent variables and their indicators, to ensure the reliability and validity of the latent variables (Hair, Hult, Ringle & Sarstedt, 2016).

Table one includes the calculated convergent validity, internal consistency and discriminant validity for the outer model for each of the above scales. The data indicates that convergent validity, internal consistency and discriminant validity have all been achieved. The third question of the intention to leave scale was removed due to low reliability. The final estimates are presented in table one.

**INSERT TABLE 1 HERE**

Hair et al. (2016) noted that while reflective measurement scale indicators represent the effects of an underlying construct, the formative measurement scale indicators form the construct. The distinction between formative and reflective is based on a set of guidelines proposed by the authors (Hair *et al.,* 2016 p.45-55). Their decision was also supported by an empirical statistical test, namely confirmatory tetrad analysis (Hair *et al.,* 2016 p.285-290). According to these guidelines and the CTA results, the incivility scale was evaluated as a formative measurement scale.

Following the assessment of the outer model's reflective measures, the outer model's formative construct (i.e incivility) was assessed according to the protocol for the assesment of formative measures. Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) values were calculated in order to test for collinearity between the incivility indicators. VIF values were all below five, the threshhold recommended by Hair et al. (2016) for collinearity. Additionally all item loadings were significant and could therefore be kept as part of the measurement model.

Additionally Common Method Bias (CMB) was considered in a cross-sectional measurement method utilized in the current study. To verify that the data collected is free of common method bias, in the context of PLS-SEM, VIF values of the inner model were measured. It was noted that VIF values greater than 3.3 imply collinearity between the constructs, which is an indication of CMB, while VIF values lower than the threshold of 3.3 indicate that the data can be considered free of CMB. Our results showed VIF values lower than 3.3; thus, it is safe to assume that our data is not affected by CMB(Kock, 2015)**.**

**Results**

To assess the research hypotheses, the research model was constructed in SmartPLS3 as follows.

As shown in Figure 1, based on the theoretical model, connections were specified between incivility, job insecurity, horizontal solidarity and intentions to leave the organization. Additionally, the moderating effect of horizontal solidarity on the relationship between incivility and both job insecurity and intentions to leave the organization were tested.

**INSERT FIGURE 1 HERE**

Results showed that the R2 results for job insecurity and intentions to leave the organizations were moderate, (0.24) and (0.25) respectivly, whereas the R2 value of horizontal solidarity was rather weak (0.08). In addition to measuring the R2 values, the change in the R2 value when a specified exogenous construct was omitted from the model, was tested to evaluate its impact on the endogenous constructs. This measure is referred to as the f2 effect size, where values of 0.02, 0.15, and 0.35, respectively, represent small, medium, and large effects (Hair et al. 2016).

Results indicated a weak effect size both of incivility on job insecurity (0.189) and of on intentions to leave the organization(0.104). / although the effect size of solidarity on . In turn, the effect size of job insecurity on intentions to leave the organization was 0.078. Additional small effect sizes were noted: Solidarity and the moderation of solidarity on the relationship between incivility and job insecurity both had an effect size of 0.023 on job insecurity. Lastly the moderation of solidarity on the relationship between incivility and intentions to leave the organization had an effect size of 0.032.

The blindfolding procedure was also used to assess the predictive relevance (Q2) of the path model. Values larger than 0 suggest that the model has predictive relevance for a specific endogenous construct. The Q2 values show predictive relevance of all endogenous constructs as follows: Job Insecurity (0.131); Intentions to Leave the Organization (0.179); Horizontal Solidarity (0.048)

Significance analyses of the direct effects are specified in Table 2

**INSERT TABLE 2 HERE**

As can be seen in Table 2, solidarity moderated the relationship between incivility and both job insecurity and intentions to leave the organization. In order to understand the meaning of the relationship, a simple slope analysis, as presented in figures two and three, reveals that when incivility is high - as can be seen in figure two - those pertaining to the low solidarity pole are prone to report job insecurity more than those who experience high solidarity. In the absence of incivility, the difference is smaller but still in favour of those who experience horizontal solidarity

**INSERT FIGURE 2 HERE**

**INSERT FIGURE 3 HERE**

Figure three indicates an even more complicated reality. While experiencing incivility , those who also experience horizontal solidarity are more prone to express their willingness to leave the organization compared to those who do not have support from others; while in the absence of incivility those lower in solidarity are more prone to express their willingness to leave the organization.

**Discussion**

The current study accounted for the interrelations between depleting resource context (experienced incivility), social resources (i.e. horizontal solidarity), their specific impact on job insecurity and intentions to leave the organization and more importantly, their interactive effect in the framework of COR and its extension COSR. Hobfoll et al. (1990) identified the need to account for social attributes when measuring the conservation of resources. In their illuminating extended model, Hobfoll et al. (1990) discussed the interrelations between social and personal resources in confronting stressful situations, yet, although solidarity as a social resource was measured in the context of incivility ( Itzkovich and Heilbrunn, 2016), thus far no research accounted for the interactive impact of social support named by Hobfoll et al. (1990) as a social resource, and individual resource depleting context, namely incivility.

The first four hypotheses focused on the implications of incivility, suggesting that it increases job insecurity and intentions to leave the organization. In addition, job insecurity itself increases intentions to leave the organization. Additionally it was predicted that incivility reduces solidarity from co-workers. All four hypotheses were confirmed. Indeed former studies found such links between incivility and job insecurity and intentions to leave (Arslan et al. 2019; Oyeleye et al., 2013; Shin and Hur,2020) and similarly between job insecurity and intentions to leave the organization (Jung et al. 2021; Shoss,2017). Still, this is the first use of the COR framework to account for these connections. Utilizing COR as a framework allows a deeper understanding of the underlying mechanisms that trigger these interrelations.

The fourth hypothesis postulated that incivility depletes solidarity. While previous research noted that incivility depletes personal resources (Itzkovich and Dolev 2021), the notion that incivility consumes social resources is overlooked and mainly discussed through bystanders’ theories and not in the framework of COR , COSR or solidarity.

Moreover, in line with Miner et al. (2018), who called for the need to investigate different contexts to learn how similar behavior (i.e. incivility) may be appraised and understood differently depending on the setting in which it occurs, the current study was performed among preschool teachers who are exposed to diverse sources of incivility: from teaching assistants, parents of students and/or supervisors at the Ministry of Education (Itzkovich and Dolev 2021). Moreover, it demonstrated, in line with Rosenblatt & Ruvio's (1996), that job insecurity exists in professions that are considered secure.

The fifth and sixth predictions accounted for the contribution of high social resources (i.e. high solidarity) to the mitigation of damage caused by incivility, and the increased damage the latter causes in their absence. Only hypothesis number 5 was confirmed, supporting the notion that solidarity as a social resource can reduce job insecurity. This means that third parties are also regarded as social resources when they express solidarity, and they can thereby reduce job insecurity as their solidarity is considered one (social) facet of work. This notion is supported by the multidimensional model of job insecurity, which considers job insecurity as a fear of loss of a variety of desired job features (Greenhalgh and Rosenblatt, 1984; O'Neill and Sevastos, 2013), including the social resources of work.

The inability to support the sixth hypothesis can be understood through the last two hypotheses. For the first time, to the best of the author’s knowledge, hypotheses seven and eight accounted for the interaction between incivility as resource depletion and solidarity as a social context concerning both job insecurity and intentions to leave the organization. Accounting for these interactions supports an understanding of the boundary conditions of these relations.

Findings revealed that solidarity moderated the relationship between incivility and both job insecurity and intentions to leave the organization. Specifically, those pertaining to the low solidarity pole are prone to report job insecurity more than those who experience high solidarity. In the absence of incivility, the difference is smaller but still in favour of those who experience horizontal solidarity. This finding supports the third principle of COR, which postulates that resource gain and loss are interactive (Hobfoll et al. 2018). It also shows that horizontal solidarity is a resource that in its absence , exacerbates the damage of incivility, as co-workers become passive bystanders (D'Cruz and Noronha, 2011; Itzkovich et al.,2021) that extend the damage of incivility.

An even more complicated relationship was found concerning the eighth hypothesis. While experiencing incivility, those who also experience horizontal solidarity will be more prone to express their willingness to leave the organization than those who do not have support from others; while in the absence of incivility, those lower in solidarity are more prone to express their willingness to leave the organization. These opposing tendencies balanced each other and thus explain the inability to confirm the sixth hypothesis without accounting for the interaction.

In turn these findings also support the forth principle of COR. When resources are consumed by incivility but mitigated by solidarity, individuals have enough resources to look for an alternative job. This is the case in contexts of low solidarity and also of low incivility. Yet the combination of incivility and lack of support is an exhausting resource scenario, in which individuals, as noted by the fourth principle of COR, will enter a defensive mode unwilling to jeopardize potential additional resources (Itzkovich et al 2021; Patnaik et al., 2021) that they do not currently have, but which are required for a job search (Hulshof et al., 2020).

Together these findings add another theoretical notion extending the third principle of COR, postulating that resource gain such as social support reduces the damage triggered by resource loss (resulting from incivility). Although not noted as a COR principle, this notion corresponds with COSR theory that views social resources, such as supporting others and personal resources, as affecting and affected by the context in an interactive rhythm (Hobfoll et al. 1990).

**Limitations**

While the study makes a broad contribution, a number of limitations can be identified. One limitation of the current study is its cross-sectional design that does not allow us to determine causality. Cross-sectional designs are prone to common method bias, yet these results were measured as reported to ensure that the data is valid.

Additionally, the current study measured all constructs at a single point in time. A longitudinal perspective would help to further validate its results and to account for the dynamicity embedded in COR.

Although some limitations were noted, the current study allows us a deeper understanding of the interrelations between social and individual resources when facing stress triggered by incivility. Overall, notwithstanding its limitations, this study’s findings can add to our understanding of the interactive impact of social resources and resource-depleting context and the underlying mechanism of these impacts. Additionally, it supports the theoretical notions of COR and COSR, in some cases extending the principles structuring the theories that point to the importance of building supportive organizational cultures to mitigate incivility and its implications.
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