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Abstract

Applying conservation of resource theory and self-efficacy theory, the study investigates the relationship between supervisors’ incivility, self-efficacy, cynicism, and job embeddedness of employees in the hotel industry. The role of self-efficacy as an important variable that mediates the relationship between the predictor and the criterion variable is significantly evaluated.

A non-probability sampling technique was used to collect 245 questionnaires from frontline employees of five star and four star hotels in Nigeria. The finding reveals that supervisor incivility has a negative effect on self-efficacy and a positive effect on cynicism and that self-efficacy negatively affects cynicism.

There was no significant relationship with job embeddedness in the study. Importantly, the investigation establishes that self-efficacy is a mediating variable between supervisor incivility and cynicism.

The study noted the importance of adopting a policy that introduces periodical seminars and professional training for both employees and supervisors, as a measure of curbing incivility and cynicism.

The study concludes with theoretical and practical implications, leaving room for further investigation.
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1. Introduction
Workplace incivility is a challenging issue for both employee and management in every phase in the organization. The quest to mitigate uncivil behavior and the effects it has on employees is on the increase according to company managements, practitioners, and researchers. There is no doubt that incivility is a global issue that encompasses all fields of endeavor and apparent in many countries, inter alia, in: Philippines (Scott et al., 2013), Australia (Kirk et al., 2011), Singapore (Lim and Lee, 2011), India (Yeung and Griffin, 2008), New Zealand (Griffin, 2010), Nigeria (Alola et al., 2018; Alola and Alola, 2018; Alola et al., 2019) and China (Chen et al., 2013). Tourism sector as well as the hotel industry contributes significantly to the growth and development of economy (for instance, see Alola and Alola, 2018; Akadiri et al., 2017). Incivility is, therefore, a practical/policy syndrome that demands urgent attention from management. Researchers (Porath and Peason, 1999) have noted that the increasing work demand, quest to out beat others, need to improve efficiency and constraint in meeting targets gives rise to uncivil behavior. According to Anderson and Pearson (1999), incivility is a rude, insensitive deviant behavior, with a low intent targeted toward another person in order to deliberately cause harm. According to the study of Reio and Ghosh (2009), they pointed out that incivility negatively affects organizational performance. As such, job dissatisfaction has been proven to negatively affect employees' physical health (Lim et al., 2008) and organizational commitment (Porath and Pearson, 2010). As evident in the study of Abubakar and Arasli (2016), an employee’s longevity in an organization is contingent at the mercy of his/her supervisor and the absence of a mutual relationship leaves room for cynic behavior (Erdogan, 2002). Deducing from the arguments of Fox and Spector (1999), employees may exhibit counterproductive behavioral responses when going through stressful event (e.g., failing to achieve personal and organizational goals). Supervisor’s incivility is very sensitive issue in an organization because of the supposed employee-supervisor relationship. When employee-supervisor relationship is not moving smoothly, employee tends to cynic behaviour. Also, Riasat and Nisar (2016), in their study on workplace incivility and job stress, and the work of Mahfooz et al (2017) unanimously agreed that workplace incivility has a negative effect on employee. As opined by Anderson (1996), cynicism is characterized by distrust, frustration, and bridge of employee organizational commitment towards the working environment. When an employee loses hope and trust in the organization, the employee becomes less committed, therefore, the tendency to display several deviant behaviors.
becomes evident. This is worrisome for the organization because of the adverse effect on organizational productivity and organizational sustainability (Aslan and Eren, 2014; Alola et al. 2018; Alola et al., 2018). Most often, employees tend to use cynical behavior as a defensive weapon to supervisors’ uncivil behavior. Although employee self-efficacy could be a core self-evaluation of one’s self-worth, the positive influence of personal attributes contradicts the assessment of employee negative behavior. Self-efficacy also helps employees to reduce deviant organizational behavior that violates the organization’s norms and mission (Robinson and Bennett, 1995). It is relevant to note that individuals with high efficacy might be less active in responding to negative organizational stressor (supervisor incivility). Self-efficacy enables employees to handle situations, control environmental factors and complete their given tasks amidst diverse organizational stressors (Abubakar, Namin, Harazneh, Arasli and Tunç, 2017). Some recent scholars have examined the relationship between incivility and other variables, for instance; Kim and Beehr (2017) examined self-efficacy and psychological ownership on both good and bad employee behavior; Fallatah et al. (2017) on authentic leadership, self-efficacy, and turnover intention on new graduate nurses in Canada and Lie et al. (2016) on self-efficacy and follower’s creativity. Additionally, most efficacious employees are always committed in their organization. Nevertheless, organizations try to keep employees in the organization (Yirik and Ekic, 2014; Karatepe and Nkendong, 2014; Alola and Atsa'am, 2019) as they are skillful because retraining an employee is costly than recruiting a new one, also employee training.

Job embeddedness is collection of several forces that keeps employees in the organization (Mitchell, Holtom, Lee, Sablynski, and Erez, 2001). According to Lee et al. (2016), employees that are embedded in the organization have less intention to quit. Organizations look out for employees who are embedded in the organization because they stay longer in an organization and of high benefit to the organization. Employee retention is beneficial to organization because of the high cost associated with turnover. Also, it is linked with several variables in the organization, job embeddedness with the organizational outcome (Hussain and Deery, 2018), nevertheless, there is little or no evidence linking job embeddedness with self-efficacy and cynicism.

The study makes three specific contributions to existing literature. Firstly, the study presents empirical and theoretical account of supervisors’ incivility on employees'
health, work outcome and performance. The study is novel because no existing literature relates supervisor’s incivility with job embeddedness (for instance, see Abubakar et al 2016; Riasat. and Nisar, 2016; Kim and Beehr, 2017). Connecting the structure between supervisor incivility, job embeddedness and cynicism is essential for both theory development and building/establishing other necessary interventions for the study. Secondly, the study will depart from the existing strand of literature by testing the direct effect of supervisor incivility on cynicism and job embeddedness. This improves the scholarly understanding of the relationships between the variables without the mediating variable. Thirdly, whereas the extant literature has focused on the nexus between incivility and organizational outcomes (Hur et al., 2015), this study steers clear of the extant literature by articulating the mediating effect of self-efficacy on supervisor’s incivility, job embeddedness, and cynicism. Notable studies extend the strand of literature by focusing on, inter alia: emotional exhaustion (Hur et al., 2016), job performance (Nelson et al., 2017; Sharma and Singh, 2016), job satisfaction and turnover intention (Haider et al. 2018; Lim et al., 2016; Alola et al., 2018). Employee positive self-efficacy is widely acknowledged; the study tested the mediating effect of employee self-efficacy that might have an effect employee. If this happens to be the case, developing employee positive self-efficacy is compelling and timely in the hotel industry.

The rest of the study is structured as follows. Section 2 discusses the theoretical framework and testable hypotheses in the light of extant literature. The research methodology is covered in Section 3 while Section 4 discusses the empirical results and corresponding implications. We conclude in Section 5 with future research directions.

2. The Theoretical Framework, Literature, and Testable Hypotheses

2.1 Theoretical Framework

The Conservation of Resources (COR) theory (Hobfoll, 1989) provides the foundation for the present study. At the heart of the COR theory is the notion that employees accumulate, protect, and allocate valued resources in response to environmental changes (Hobfoll and Freedy, 1993). Importantly, as resources are depleted, adverse outcomes ensue. Conversely, as resources are accumulated and protected, positive outcomes are more feasibly realized. Although COR theory is conceived as a general motivation theory (Hobfoll, 1989), where
accumulation, protection and allocation of resources act to energize, direct, and sustain employee behavior. This theory has often been applied to stress (Halbesleben, 2006; Harvey et al., 2007; Halbesleben et al., 2014), also been applied together exchange-based relationships found in the organizational context (e.g., Perrwe et al., 2004; Treadway et al., 2005; Wright and Cropanzano, 1998). In the view of Pizam (2008), in hospitality industry, employees are usually stressed during service delivery. Emotional support resources and cognitive resources is noted to be of high value to an employee; (Trougakos et al., 2014). Furthermore, the study of Shao and Skarlicki (2014) investigated the effect of stress on employees. The findings are broadly consistent with studies in the extant literature, notably, employee stress originates from diverse sources, inter alia: long working hours (Kensbock et al., 2015), contact with other employees (Ineson et al., 2013), which drains employee psychological strength and triggers organizational negative outcomes such as emotional exhaustion and turnover intention (Lee and Ok, 2014). Moreover, the theory prostitutes’ that employees are able to withstand both negative and positive adverse working conditions at the same time protect their resources. Transforming disappointing and unfavorable situations into conditions that are favorable and positive to job satisfaction and organizational objectives is of benefit to the organization. It is in the light of this ability to transform uncomfortable situations into promising avenues that employees with high level efficacy absorbs emotional energy and remain immune to supervisor’s uncivil behaviour. This builds on the fact that the theory is based on resources depletion (Hoges and Park, 2013). Adding to the COR theory, self-efficacy theory (Bandura, 1977) is defined as “people’s judgments of capacity to organize and execute courses of action required to attain designated type of performances” (Bandura, 1986, P. 391). Bandura suggests that the cause of people’s action is per-determined by an initial decision to behave in a certain way. Self-efficacy is an important accepts of human behavior. Several researchers have conducted studies linking self-efficacy to human behavior (Taylor et al., 1984; Stumpf et al., 1987, Alola et al., 2018). In this respect, a study by Burger (1989) suggested that events can go beyond individual control leading to the negative outcome. He went further to add that when this is within the individual control, positive outcome emerges. According to Litt, (1988), the positive aspect of self-efficacy is evident under high level of self-efficacy while the negative aspect of self-efficacy is more evident under low levels of self-efficacy. Therefore, we propose that when an individual with low self-efficacy is faced with an unfavorable situation, a negative outcome is possible to emerge and vice
versa. The study tries to determine the effect of self-efficacy under conditions of work stress as a mediator which received minimal attention (Schaubroeck and Merritt, 1997). In addition to the purpose of the study, the study tries to check the validity of self-efficacy as a mediating factor in relation to the role of supervisor incivility on cynicism and job embeddedness.

2.2 Literature review and hypothesis development

2.2.1 Supervisor Incivility and Employee Self-Efficacy

Adopting from the conservation of resource theory, employee tend to conserve resources, and in a situation where the resources deposited is not regained, stress is inevitable (Hobfoll, 1989). According to Schreurs et al., (2010), employees that distance themselves from supervisor’s rude behavior conserve the acquired resources; this drains emotion and transforms job stressor to strength (Schreurs et al., 2010). It is interesting to note that one of the causes of supervisor incivility is the high level of power associated with the supervisor’s job description (Cortina et al., 2001). Following the trend of research, scholars have established that incivility causes more harm than good (Schilpzand et al., 2016; Itzkovich and Heilbrum, 2016). Self-efficacy is related to employee motivation which aids employees in accomplishing a given task. According to the work of recent scholars (Alola, Avci and Ozturen, 2018; Taylor and Kluemper, 2012; Sakurai and Jex, 2012), the mechanisms that alleviate negative effect of supervisor’s incivility in the workplace is on the increase, and one of such measure is to increase employee self-efficacy. Therefore, we proposed that since employee self-efficacy is a positive psychological capital it will possibly reduce the effect of supervisor incivility on employees, the following hypothesis was formulated.

H1: Supervisor Incivility Negatively Influences Self-Efficacy.

2.2.2 Supervisor Incivility and Job Embeddedness and Cynicism

In recent decades, renewed scholars (Sliter et al., 2012; Sakurai and Jex, 2012) are interested in finding ways to curtail the effect of supervisor incivility and the effect on employees. Supervisor’s incivility is characterized by uncivil behavior of supervisor to an employee; this harmful act includes avoiding the employee, gossiping, and uttering negative comments (Reio and Sanders, 2011), this is detrimental to employees and organization. Supervisor’s incivility is more harmful than other forms of incivility (customer incivility and co-worker incivility) because of the organizational authority vested on the supervisor to manage several
concerns including behavioral issues. Most often, when low-intensity deviant intent of incivility is not controlled, it affects organizational outcome (Holm et al., 2015). Furthermore, incivility is linked with decreased work behavior. For example, workplace incivility causes decline in job performance and an increase in employee turnover intention (Porath and Pearson, 2012; Wilson and Holmvall, 2013; Haider et al. 2018), decreased work engagement (Chen et al., 2013) and increased levels of absenteeism (Sliter et al., 2012). In the extant literature of Bunk and Magley (2013), pointed out that incivility leads the target to reciprocate in an uncivil way. The study of Haider et al. (2018), on the effect of bad leadership on turnover intention in pharmaceutical companies and found out that destructive leadership has a positively related to the deviant behaviour and turnover intention. Also, Sliter et al. (2012) and Taylor et al. (2012) noted that incivility makes employees less creative and eventually decreases citizenship behavior that triggers anger and distrust in the organization (Bunk and Magley, 2013). Job embeddedness is negatively related to turnover and influence’s employee behavior and working attitude (Crossley et al., 2007). Although, job embeddedness is positively correlated with job satisfaction (Lee et al., 2014), also, Crossley et al., (2007), added that employees anchor to their job as a result of positive experience they had with the organization, community, and supervisor. Therefore, we argue that linking job embeddedness and supervisor incivility will have negative associated since there is strong underpinning point that job embeddedness is the ties that unites employee with the organization. On the other hand, cynicism is a defensive attitude of an employee towards an unhealthy behavior either by the top management or by the organization (Abraham, 2000). It is a feeling that the organization cannot be trusted and lacks integrity (Bernerth et al., 2007). COR theory suggests that employee uses defensive mechanism in response to supervisor uncivil behavior. In addition, cynic employee badmouths the organization (Wilkerson, Evans, and Davis, 2008), reduces organizational commitment and organizational performance (Bernerth et al., 2007).

It is reasonable to state that supervisor’s incivility has an effect on employee attitude. And the negative attitude towards the organization warrants the employee to exhibit unruly behavior. Hence, we propose the following underpinning hypotheses.

*H2: Supervisors’ incivility negatively influences job embeddedness*

*H3: Supervisor’s incivility positively influence cynicism*
Instructively, Bandura (2012) and Ho and Gupta (2014) posited that self-efficacy is the capacity to carry out a given task effectively and ensures successful outcome despite challenges. It is a motivational construct that influences employee behavior, attitude, and choice of activity in a range of contexts. Regulation of efforts constitutes one of the core characteristics of self-efficacy. Several studies have linked self-efficacy with a multitude of outcomes, *inter alia* positive organizational outcomes (Van et al., 2011), work engagement and intrinsic motivation (Brown et al., 2014), self-identity and training performance (Fan and Lai, 2014) and effective work outcome (Judge and Bono, 2001). Additionally, self-efficacy is associated with persistent and positive organizational outcomes (Salanova et al., 2011). On the other hand, previous literature has positively linked job embeddedness with positive organizational outcomes, like satisfaction (Ferreira et al., 2017), innovative work behavior (Haider and Akbar, 2017), creative performance (Karatepe, 2016) and work engagement (Arasli et al., 2017). Job embeddedness is on-the-job and off-the-job factors associated with individual links, fit, and sacrifice (Mitchel et al., 2001). Suffice to say that efficacious employees are “goal-getters” (Bandura, 2012), finding a positive alternative to every situation (Hannah et al., 2007). Conversely, cynicism negatively affects organizational outcomes by lowing organizational citizenship behavior (Jung and Kim, 2012) and employee performance (Bommer et al., 2005). A negative ripple effect is believed to ensue from a cynic employee to other employees and the organization at large. Therefore, since self-efficacy influences behavior, the study proposed that self-efficacy will have an effect on both job embeddedness and cynicism. The study proposed that self-efficacy have a link with job embeddedness and cynicism.

**H4:** Self-efficacy positively influences job embeddedness.

**H5:** Self-efficacy negatively influences cynicism.

### 2.2.4 Employee Self-Efficacy as a Mediator

Specifically, self-efficacy is associated with job satisfaction (McNatt and Judge, 2008), turnover intentions (Avey, Luthans, and Jensen, 2009), task performance (Avey, Reichard, Luthans, and Mhatre, 2011) and OCBs (Walumbwa, Hartnell, and Oke, 2010). We drew from the conservation of resources theory (COR) and self-efficacy theory to explain our hypothetical relationship. The regulation of one’s behavior requires extra deposition (e.g., self-efficacy) to withstand emotional
absorption as a result of a negative organizational outcome (such as supervisor incivility). Employees in the hospitality industry are at the center of the depression in service delivery (Pizam, 2008). Shao and Skarlicki (2014) carried out research on the application and effect of stress on frontline employees and established a negative correlation. Employee stress emanates from diverse sources, *inter alia*: long working hours (Kensbock et al., 2015), contact with other employees which drains employee psychological strength (Ineson et al., 2013) and triggers negative outcomes (Lee and Ok, 2014). This theory proposed that employee self-efficacy protects individual resources since the theory is based on resources depletion (Hoges and Park, 2013). Applying self-efficacy theory, Bandura (1977) maintained that action is predetermined taught, stressing that the theory stipulates that since self-efficacy is important accepts of human behavior, control of reaction to organization stressor is easily obtainable. Researchers linked self-efficacy to other variables (Taylor et al., 1984; Stumpf et al., 1987, Alola et al., 2018) and found a positive relationship. In this respect, a study by Burger (1989) reviewed that events can go beyond individual control leading to the negative outcome. On the other hand, Jex et al., (2001) opined that self-efficacy influences employee’s behaviors through ways employee react to events (coping). Stating that employees with low self-efficacy use more emotional focused coping than an employee with high self-efficacy. Researchers have reported that employee with high self-efficacy report less stress and less mental distortion whereas employee with low self-efficacy often display job dissatisfaction, turnover intention, and emotional depression (Judge and Bono, 2001; Semmer, 2003; Siu et al., 2007). Therefore, applying COR theory and self-efficacy theory to our model, we propose the following hypotheses:

**H6**: Self-efficacy mediates the relationship between supervisor incivility and job embeddedness.

**H7**: Self-efficacy mediates the relationship between supervisor incivility and cynicism.

![Figure 1: Research model.](image)
3. Research Methodology

3.1 Measurement

The study adopts a quantitative approach to analyze the data. Questionnaires were designed and separated into five parts, namely, demographic variable, supervisor incivility, employee self-efficacy, job embeddedness, and cynicism. Data were collected from four and five-star hotels in the two major Nigerian cities: Lagos and Abuja. In a non-probability sampling technique, sample for the study is selected from a given population that represents the whole population. Investigation of the subset of the population was the most appropriate approach for data collection (Wang and Wang 2017; Bornstein et al., 2013). The sample size was determined according to the researcher’s judgment since no data was available to determine the survey population (Darvishmotevali et al., 2017). In addition, the researchers used only hotel employees that have direct contact with customers.

In order to test the validity of the questionnaire, a pilot study was conducted with 30 respondents to establish face validity. A total of 450 questionnaires were distributed to customer contact employees. Prior to the distribution of the questionnaires, a letter was sent to the management of these hotels to ask for permission and assured them of the confidentiality of their identities. The questionnaires were sealed after collection to make the responses anonymous and to decrease the potential threat of common method bias (Podsakoff et al., 2003). Out of the 450 questionnaires that were distributed, only 245 questionnaires were filled and returned, excluding the ones that were half-filled or not properly filled, yielding a response rate of 54.4% (Locke, et al., 2013; Karatepe, Ozturk, and Kim, 2019).

3.2 Measures

Measures were adopted from previous studies; employees were asked to state their encounter with the supervisors and how this encounter affects their personality and their relationship with the organization.

3.2.1 Supervisor incivility: adopted from the work of Hur et al. (2016) with 5 items (for examples: (i) Supervisor action was condescending to me, (ii) Supervisor showed little interest in my opinions, (iii) Supervisor made demeaning remarks about me).
3.2.2 Employee self-efficacy: adopted from the work of Peak et al. (2015) with 5 items (for examples (i) I feel confident analyzing a long-term problem to find a solution, (ii) I feel confident in presenting my work area at meetings with management, (iii) I feel confident contributing to discussions about my hotel’s strategy).

3.2.3 Cynicism (Depersonalization): Cynicism was adopted from the study of Maslach et al. (1996) with 5 items (for examples (i) I feel I treat some recipients as if they were inhuman, (ii) I have become more callous towards people since I took this job, (iii) I worry that this job is hardening me emotionally).

3.2.4 Job embeddedness: Job embeddedness was adopted from the study of Karatepe (2013) with 7 items (for examples (i) I feel attached to this hotel, it would be difficult for me to leave this hotel, (ii) I am too caught up in this hotel to leave, (iii) I feel tied to this hotel).

All four measures rated on a five-point Likert scale ranging from (strongly disagree 1 to strongly agree 5).

4. Data analysis
4.1 Descriptive Statistics of the Respondents
Out of the 245 questionnaires that were used for the study, 165 were male and 80 were female. Almost all the respondents were less than 42 years and the remaining 18 were 42 years and above. More than half of the respondents were single, accounting for 51.8%, while the rest were married, divorced, or widowed. Nearly two-thirds (or 59.6%) of the respondents have a master’s degree, 2 have primary school certificate and the rest have either secondary school or an undergraduate certificate. Of the total respondents, 97 have worked for between 4-6 years, and 63 have worked for 7 and above, while the rest have worked for less than 4 years.
### Table 1: Descriptive Statistics of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>67.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-33</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>39.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34-41</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42-49</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>51.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow/widower</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>59.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational tenure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than a year</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 years</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>39.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 and above</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Model Fit Indexes

To further test the model fit, we employed Analysis of Moment Structures (IBM AMOS 20 Statistics). The results indicated a good fit for the four-factor model to the data on the basis of a number of fit statistics, $\text{CMIN}/\text{DF} = 2.218$; GFI (goodness of fit index) = .871; AGFI (adjusted goodness of fit index) = .832; IFI (incremental fit
index) = .920; CFI (comparative fit index) = .920; RMSEA (root mean square error of approximation) = .071; RMR (root mean square residual) = .062 (Byrne, 2001).

In addition, the Cronbach alpha was tested to determine the internal consistency of the variables. Specifically, the Cronbach alpha score ranges from 0.877 to 0.798, respectively. The results indicated that all coefficient alpha scores were greater than .70. The measures are considered reliable (Nunnally, 1978).

Table 3: Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composite</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Loadings</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
<th>AVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supervisor Incivility</strong></td>
<td>The supervisor action was condescending to me.</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>0.501</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor showed little interest in my opinion.</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The supervisor made demeaning remarks about me.</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor addressed me in unprofessional terms, either publicly or privately.</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor ignored or excluded me from professional discussions.</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-Efficacy</strong></td>
<td>I feel confident analyzing a long-term problem to find a solution.</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>0.575</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I feel confident in presenting my work area in meetings with management.</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I feel confident contributing to discussions about my hotel’s strategy.</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I feel confident helping to set targets/goals in my work area.</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I feel confident contacting people outside my hotel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(e.g., customers) to discuss problems.

Job embeddedness

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel attached to this hotel</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It would be difficult for me to leave this hotel</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am too caught up in this hotel to leave</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel tied to this hotel</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I simply could not leave the hotel that I work for</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am tightly connected to this organization</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cynicism

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have become more callous toward people since I took this job</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I worry that this job is hardening me emotionally</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not really care what happens to some recipients</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel recipients blame me for some of their problems</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Model fit statistics, $\text{CMIN/DF} = 2.218$; GFI (goodness of fit index) = .871; AGFI (adjusted goodness of fit index) = .832; IFI (incremental fit index) = .920; CFI (comparative fit index) = .920; RMSEA (root mean square error of approximation) = .071; RMR (root mean square residual) = .062.

Table 4. Means, Standard Deviation and Correlations of the Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Supervisor incivility</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>-.293**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cynicism</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.322**</td>
<td>-.334**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Job Embeddedness</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>-.235**</td>
<td>.365**</td>
<td>-.331**</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note: Composite scores for each variable were computed by averaging respective item score. * denotes the correlation is significant p<0.01 and ** (t=1.67) correlation is significant at p<0.05(t=1.96). M=Mean, SD=Standard

The result of the CFA as shown in Table 3, the average variance extracted (AVE), value for the entire construct were higher than the cutoff point of .50 (Fornell and Larcker, 1981; Cavana et al., 2001). The result established the evidence of convergent validity. For the composite reliabilities, the score ranges from 0.799 to 0.881, exceeding the cutoff point of 0.70 (Fornell and Larcker, 1981) indicating adequate internal consistency. The average variance extracted (AVE) is higher than the square correction ($R^2$) between the pair of constructs, establishing discriminate validity. In Table 4, the means, standard deviation, and correlations of the variables were presented. The result shows that supervisor incivility is negatively correlated to self-efficacy, ($r = -.293**, p < 0.01$) and job embeddedness ($r = -.235**, p < 0.01$) but positively correlated to cynicism ($r = .322*, p < 0.01$). On the other hand, self-efficacy is negatively correlated to cynicism ($r = -.334**, p < 0.01$), but positively correlated to job embeddedness ($r = .365**, p < 0.01$), whereas cynicism is negatively correlated to job embeddedness ($r = -.331**, p < 0.01$). The results above show that the first three conditions of Baron and Kenny’s (1986) were established.

Table 5: Result of Path Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Standardized Estimates</th>
<th>$t$-values</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct effect</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP $\rightarrow$ EFF</td>
<td>-.289</td>
<td>-4.665**</td>
<td>.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP $\rightarrow$ JOB</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>1.228</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP $\rightarrow$ CYN</td>
<td>.322</td>
<td>5.150 **</td>
<td>.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFF $\rightarrow$ JOB</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.691</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFF $\rightarrow$ CYN</td>
<td>-.342</td>
<td>-5.523**</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUP= supervisor incivility; EFF=self-efficacy; JOB= job embeddedness; CYN = cynicism
In Table 5, the hypotheses (that supervisor incivility will have a negative effect on employee self-efficacy and Job embeddedness but positive effect on cynicism) results were presented. The study found out that supervisor incivility has a negative effect on self-efficacy ($\beta = -.289^{**}$, $p<0.01$) and positive effect on cynicism ($\beta = .322^{**}$, $p<0.01$). Our study failed to establish a negative relationship between supervisor incivility and job embeddedness ($\beta = .080$). Therefore, both Hypothesis 1: (i.e, supervisor incivility negatively influences self-efficacy) and Hypothesis 3: (i.e, supervisors' incivility is positively related to cynicism) were accepted while Hypothesis 2: (i.e, supervisors incivility is negatively related to job embeddedness) was rejected. From the proposition that self-efficacy will have a positive effect on job embeddedness and a negative effect on cynicism, our result shows that self-efficacy has no effect on job embeddedness ($\beta = .045$) but negatively related to cynicism ($\beta = -.342^{**}$, $p<0.01$). Therefore, Hypothesis 4 (i.e., that self-efficacy is positively related to job embeddedness) was rejected and Hypothesis 5 (i.e, that employee self-efficacy is negatively related to cynicism) was accepted.

Table 6. Mediating effect of self-efficacy on job embeddedness and cynicism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Job embeddedness</th>
<th>Cynicism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.127</td>
<td>-.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Qualification</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Tenure</td>
<td>-.096**</td>
<td>-.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor incivility</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mediator</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$ at each step</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta R^2$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$</td>
<td>2.59**</td>
<td>2.35**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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We tested for the mediating effect of self-efficacy on the study model. There was a reduction in the size of the model when self-efficacy was added and the result was not significant ($\beta = .081$), but there was significant evidence of increment in $R^2$ (.004, versus .006). This initial result was later confirmed using the Sobel test calculation ($z = 0.9409$). The finding failed to support the argument that self-efficacy mediates the relationship between supervisor incivility and job embeddedness, and as such Hypothesis 5 was rejected. On the other hand, there was mediation for Hypotheses 6 as shown in Table 6 above. When the mediating variable (self-efficacy) was inputted in the model, the size of the model significantly reduced ($\beta = .225 \ p<0.05$) and there was a significant reduction in $R^2$ (.083, versus .057). Then Sobel test ($z =3.174 \ p<0.01$) confirm and support our initial assumption that self-efficacy mediates the relationship between supervisor incivility and cynicism, hence, Hypothesis 6 was accepted. For the demographic variables, age, educational qualification, and organizational tenure have significant negative relationships with supervisor incivility. Educational qualification has a negative significant relationship with self-efficacy. This further explains that frontline employees that are older and have good quality of education with longer tenure in organization exhibits stronger self-efficacy and withstands supervisor incivility. Also, employees that are highly educated are likely to be less self-efficacious.

4.3 Discussion

With the increasing complexity of the organizational structure and the negative externalities associated with the underlying complexity, support from both supervisors and organizations is crucial for employees, especially customer-contact employees. According to Hom et al. (2009), employees who feel fairly treated have strong tier with the organization. Since supervisors embody the organization and give directives (Eisenberger et al., 2010), fostering good relationships with employees is crucial in establishing and promoting good behavior (Collins, 2017; Collins et al., 2014). As evident in the present study,
supervisor incivility negatively affects employee self-efficacy as affirmed in previous studies on self-efficacy and bullying (Mikkelsen and Einarsen, 2002; Roberts et al., 2011). According to Taylor and Kluemper (2012) and Sakurai and Jex (2012), self-efficacy is one major mechanism that mitigates supervisor incivility. This suggests that self-efficacious employee copying capability increases with the perception of supervisor incivility. Therefore, human resource managers should develop mechanisms for the enhancement of self-efficacy.

![Figure 2: Result of the research model.](image)

Nevertheless, while supervisor incivility was significantly correlated with job embeddedness, but no significant relationship was found on the two self-efficacy and job embeddedness, therefore the predicted hypotheses did not support the assumption. The notion that employees detach themselves from the organization limits the potency of job embeddedness and increases cynic behavior. Our study could not find any study linking supervisor incivility with job embeddedness. It is worthwhile to note that individuals that experience supervisor incivility is not embedded in an organization. Rather, according to Smidt et al. (2016) when organizational commitment decreases as a result of incivility in the workplace, employees may engage in deviant behavior; “cynicism”. Also, our findings are consistent with the work of Laschinger et al. (2008) which established that employees who experience supervisor uncivil act are most likely to be cynic. This study is also in line with the works of Erdogan (2002) and Colquitt et al. (2001) which have established that job demands result in negative job outcome. Less embedded employees are not likely to feel the influence of unfair treatment by supervisor incivility. This reduces the ability of frontline employee to identify with the organization and tend towards cynic behavior (Elsbach and Bhattacharya, 2001). Organizations do not tolerate cynic behavior because of the harmful effect on both the organization and employees. Also, Chiaburn et al. (2013) pointed out that employees that do not display cynic behavior have higher job satisfaction and work performance. Therefore, incivility should neither be tolerated nor
accepted in the organization. It is interesting to note that the study could not establish a direct relationship between self-efficacy and job embeddedness. Unfortunately, employees who are self-efficacious are not likely to be embedded and there is no significant relationship between supervisor incivility and job embeddedness. Less embedded employees are not likely to feel the influence of unfair treatment by supervisors. This makes the frontline employees that are affected to be less interested in the organization and tend towards cynicism (Elsbach and Bhattacharya, 2001).

4.4 Implications, Theory and Practice

4.4.1 Theoretical Implications

The conservation of resources theory (COR) (Hobfoll, 1989) and self-efficacy theory (Bandura, 1977) provides an insight into the present study. This theory applies the significance of employee's accumulation, protection, and allocation of valued resources in response to work demand (Hobfoll and Freedy, 1993). The study employs this theoretical finding to contribute significantly in different ways to the current literature of supervisor incivility and self-efficacy. Our study investigates the effects of supervisor incivility on job embeddedness and self-efficacy, and the mediating effect of self-efficacy. Cynicism represents an effective reaction to the gradual depletion of employee psychological power and wellbeing that frontline employees encounter from supervisor’s incivility (Maslach et al., 2001). The tested hypotheses in this study contribute to theory-building since it is vital for established theories to withstand empirical scrutiny across time and scope in order to remain relevant to organizations, corporations, and society.

4.4.2 Practical Implications

The study provides vital information for human resource managers in hotel industry as well as managers in other related sectors. The rapid raise in supervisor’s incivility has constantly led to deviant organizational behavior (cynicism) in recent years and which raised concern for researchers. The quest to control supervisors and employee’s negative behaviour is on the increase. This study contributes to the practical advancement in the hospitality management industry by empirically testing the relationship between supervisor incivility, cynicism, job embeddedness and the mediating role of self-efficacy. In practical terms, human resource managers need to constantly train and educate supervisors on the benefit of
polite interactions with other employees. According to Mackey et al. (2017), employees that are trained, behave better than their untrained counterparts. Supervisors are expected to develop cordial relationship with the subordinates in order to influence employees' constructive and positive behavior. Educating supervisor is done through seminars and workshops. Research have agreed that employee education is very vital to organization (Bowers and Martin, 2007; Eisingerich and Bell, 2008), stating that the benefits out-weigh the costs. Also, supervisor’s behaviour can also be check mate in the following ways: Firstly, supervisors will receive performance appraisal at the end of each month, this is done in accordance with employees’ confidential rating. This monitoring exercise will enhance supervisors’ positive behavior. In turn, supervisors with the least performance score can be called to order while promoting and rewarding the one with the highest score. This mechanism will not only be of benefit to the frontline employees but also to the organization because supervisors’ incivility negatively affects employees’ emotions (Halbesleben and Bowler, 2007). Also, unruly behavior from supervisor is checked, to avoid escalating to cynicism (Abubakar et al., 2017). Secondly, since the hotel industry is constantly in a very stiff competition, front-line employees are of utmost importance to every service organization. Hence, fair policies that will be of benefit to the front-line employees could be enacted to prevent employees frequent turnover intention. Most employees that are involved in cynic behavior might end up quitting the organization and the cost of retaining an employee is lesser than training a new employee. Thirdly, employee embeddedness is important to the organization, the frequent supervisor-employee positive interaction buttresses the fact that an organization has the interest of the employee (Collins, 2017). Therefore, both the supervisors and the managers should give employees sense of belonging, by making employees feel that they are not just working for the organization, but they are part of the organization. Employees can be empowered by making them part of the decision-making processes, especially in vital decisions that affect their roles in the organization. This approach has been established to decrease employee cynic behaviour (Abubakar et al., 2017). Finally, self-efficacy, which is the self-consciousness of one’s ability and belief, is increased through employee education, appraisal, and promotion which build employee emotion to withstand the supervisor’s incivility and increase positive organizational behavior.
5. Conclusion, Limitations and Future Research Recommendations

This study examined the effect of supervisor incivility on job embeddedness and cynicism via the mediating role of self-efficacy. A convenience sampling technique was used to collect data from frontline employees of five star and four star hotels in the cities of Lagos and Abuja in Nigeria. The study used a cross-sectional method in the collection of data and a quantitative approach with SPSS and AMOSS 20 to analyze the data. Assessment of the various underpinning relationships has broadly shown that supervisors’ incivility is detrimental to both employees and organizations. Also, the findings show that supervisors’ incivility leads to employee cynical behaviors. Seven hypotheses have been tested and based on the findings, human resource managers were advised on the benefits of employee self-efficacy and the protective role of self-efficacy against supervisor incivility and cynicism. These results are encouraging because self-efficacy can be supported or promoted by proactive human resource management role. Human resource managers can endeavor to create working conditions that reduce supervisor incivility and subsequently curtail cynicism which is detrimental to both employee and the organization at large.

Although this study contributes to extant literature by linking supervisor incivility, self-efficacy and cynicism in the hotel industry, limitations to this work cannot be ruled out. The present study made use of cross-sectional data; other studies can use longitudinal data. As more data become available, temporal, and geographical scopes of the study can be broadened in the light of longitudinal approaches to data analysis in order to assess if the established findings withstand further empirical scrutiny. The study was conducted in Nigeria hotel industry; further study can be done by conducting it in other industries, inter alia: airline, health, and restaurant industries. Therefore, in interpreting the results, caution should be employed by avoiding generalization because the data was collected only from the Nigerian hotel industry.
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