*Figure 1: An Illustration of Hobfoll et al. (1990). P. 469*

*High stress conditions representing a situation in which individual and social resources are consumed by the context*

*Low stress conditions representing a situation in which individual resources suffice to deal with the context*
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*Figure 2.* The theoretical structure of the proposed framework.
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*\*Interaction effects (H7-H10)*

*Table 1. Result summary for measurement models*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reflective Variables | Convergent Validity | Internal Constituency Reliability | Discriminant Validity |
|  | AVE | Cronbach's Alpha |  |
|  | > 0.50 | > 0.70 | HTMTConfidence Interval Does Not Contain 1 |
| Irritation | 0.575 | 0.893 | Yes |
| Vertical Solidarity | 0.498 | 0.771 | Yes |
| ROE | 0.808 | 0.921 | Yes |
| SEA | 0.834 | 0.806 | Yes |
| Revenge | 0.738 | 0.911 | Yes |

*\*AVE >0.49 is close enough to be accepted (Hair et al., 2016, p. 113)*

*Table 2*. Significance analysis of the direct effects

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Direct Effect | *t* Value | *p* Value |
| Incivility->Irritation | 0.428 | 6.455 | 0.000 |
| Incivility- > Revenge | 0.233 | 2.797 | 0.005 |
| Irritation->Revenge | 0.187 | 2.314 | 0.021 |
| Moderating effect 1 | -0.148 | 2.336 | 0.020 |
| Moderating effect 2 | 0.226 | 3.543 | 0.000 |
| Moderating effect 3 | -0.154 | 2.593 | 0.010 |
| ROE-> Irritation | -0.231 | 2.992 | 0.003 |
| Solidarity-> Revenge | -0.120 | 1.978 | 0.048 |

Figure 3. simple slop analysis of the interaction effect



Figure 4. simple slop analysis of the interaction effect



Figure 5. simple slop analysis of the interaction effect

