*Figure 1.* The theoretical structure of the proposed framework.
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*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 |
| Job Insecurity | 0.619 | 0.774 | Yes |
| Intentions to Leave the Organization | 0.708 | 0.885 | Yes |
| Horizontal Solidarity | 0.697 | 0.892 | Yes |

Table 2. Significance analysis of the direct effects

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Direct Effect | *t* Value | *p* Value |
| Incivility- Job Insecurity | 0.398 | 6.321 | .000 |
| Incivility – Intentions to Leave the Organization | 0.320 | 3.371 | .001 |
| Incivility- Solidarity | -0.288 | 3.178 | .001 |
| Job Insecurity- Intentions to Leave the Organization | 0.278 | 3.286 | .001 |
| Moderating Effect of Horizontal Solidarity on Incivility-> Job Insecurity  | -0119 | 2.281 | 0.023 |
| Moderating Effect of Horizontal Solidarity on Incivility-> Intentions to Leave the Organization | 0.140 | 2.361 | 0.018 |
| Horizontal Solidarity – Job Insecurity | -0.139 | 2.326 | 0.020 |

Figure 2. simple slop analysis of the interaction effect.



Figure 3. simple slop analysis of the interaction effect.

