The Effect of Authentic Leadership on Counterproductive Work Behaviors in Egyptian and Turkish Travel Agents: Workplace Incivility as a Mediator

Bassam Samir Al-Romeedy*

Tourism Studies Department, Faculty of Tourism and Hotels, University of Sadat City, Egypt Email, Bassam.samir@fth.usc.edu.eg, ORCID, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7900-5052

Ozlem Ozbek

Tourism and Hotel Management Department, Gonen Vocational School, Bandirma Onyedi Eylul University, Turkey, Email, ozlemtekin10@gmail.com ORCID ID, http://orcid.org/0000-0001-6999-9324

*Corresponding Author

Abstract

The importance of authentic leadership has increased in various organizations as one of the positive leadership styles that affect the survival and continuity of organizations in a dynamic work environment. This is due to the influence of authentic leadership on many organizational outcomes such as performance, satisfaction, productivity, incivility, and counterproductive work behaviors. The objectives of this study are to assess the impact of authentic leadership on workplace incivility and counterproductive work behaviors, identify the impact of workplace incivility on counterproductive work behaviors, and explore the mediating role of workplace incivility in the relationship between authentic leadership and counterproductive work behaviors in Egyptian and Turkish travel agents. Data were obtained from 647 employees working in Egyptian and Turkish travel agents. Results indicated that authentic leadership is negatively affected both workplace incivility and counterproductive work behaviors, while workplace incivility is positively affected counterproductive work behaviors. The results also highlighted that workplace incivility plays a partial mediating role in the link between authentic leadership and counterproductive work behaviors in Egyptian and Turkish travel agents.

Keywords: authentic leadership; incivility; counterproductive work behavior; travel agents; Egypt; Turkey

Introduction

The interest of researchers and practitioners in workplace incivility has increased over the past few years, as some studies have been conducted on the causes and consequences of workplace incivility (Tricahyadinata et al., 2020). Workplace incivility is verbal or non-verbal deviant behavior, such as a condescending look, harsh words, impatience, disrespect for others, which results in a decrease in employees' commitment, and thus increases in counterproductive work behaviors (Murtaza et al., 2020). Workplace incivility is also linked to the violation of work rules and standards of mutual respect (Namin et al., 2022). As a consequence, employees engage in counterproductive work behaviors, which include those voluntary actions and behaviors that cause harm to organizations and employees (Liu et al., 2020).

Salman Chughtai and Ali Shah (2020) noted that there are many researchers who have addressed the social, psychological, economic, and financial effects of workplace incivility on the organization and its employees. The impact of workplace incivility on some organizational outcomes has been studied such as job withdrawal, anger, job anxiety, and absence (Pearson & Porath, 2005), as well as maltreatment, counterproductive work behavior (Bibi et al., 2013),

increased turnover (Lim et al., 2008), and the absence of creativity and innovation at work (Porath & Erez, 2009).

Alola et al. (2021) stressed the need to increase efforts to address workplace incivility due to its negative effects in various fields, including the tourism and hospitality industry. Wang and Chen (2020) also emphasized the increased likelihood of employees in the tourism and hospitality industry experiencing workplace incivility. Alkaabi and Wong (2019) argued that authentic leadership is inversely related to negative workplace behaviors such as workplace incivility. Authentic leadership also motivates employees not to engage in counterproductive work behavior (George et al., 2007). Positive leadership is one of the most important pillars of the success of organizations by motivating employees (Chiwawa & Wissink, 2020; Mukwevho et al., 2020), pushing them to develop their performance, improving organizational performance, and increasing the organization's ability to face various challenges (Koech & Namusonge, 2012; Oluwole, 2020; Salama, 2020). Positive leadership also plays an effective role in enhancing the organization's culture (Tichaawa & Kimbu, 2019), supporting and maintaining positive values, behaviors, and attitudes, and improving employees' productivity and performance (Nasab & Afshari, 2019; Tefera & Dlamini, 2020).

According to Irshad et al. (2019) and Arici (2018), authentic leadership is a positive leadership style, which focuses on enhancing organizational trust and a positive work environment. Authentic leadership, unlike other leadership styles, is based on more positive values, self-awareness, and trust with subordinates (Naiboğlu & Bilgivar, 2021). The importance of authentic leadership emerged as a result of the organization's need for authentic leaders to help and support employees to work in the rapidly changing and volatile work environment (Mubarak & Noor, 2018). There are some studies that have examined the impact of authentic leadership on workplace incivility (e.g. Arasli & Arici, 2020; Alilyyani et al., 2018), and counterproductive work behaviors (e.g. Rukh et al., 2018, Zhang et al., 2021), but there is a scarcity of studies that address authentic leadership, workplace incivility, and counterproductive work behaviors in the tourism industry (Nasab & Afshari, 2019; Tichaawa, 2017).

Consequently; This study attempts to bridge the gap by exploring the impact of authentic leadership on workplace incivility and counterproductive work behaviors, as well as the impact of workplace incivility on counterproductive work behaviors in the tourism industry, specifically in travel agents in the context of Egypt and Turkey. In contrast to studies that have examined the direct impact of authentic leadership on counterproductive work behaviors, this study explores whether workplace incivility mediates the relationship between authentic leadership and counterproductive work behaviors in Egyptian and Turkish travel agents. In light of this; The study aims to: 1) assess the impact of authentic leadership on workplace incivility and counterproductive work behaviors, 2) identify the impact of workplace incivility on counterproductive work behaviors, and 3) explore the mediating role of workplace incivility in the relationship between authentic leadership and counterproductive work behaviors in Egyptian and Turkish travel agencies.

Conceptual framework and hypothesis development
Authentic leadership
Authentic leadership is defined according to Walumbwa, Avolio, Gardner, Wernsing, and Peterson (2008: 94) as "a pattern of leader behavior that draws upon and promotes both positive psychological capacities and a positive ethical climate to foster greater self-awareness, an internalized moral perspective, balanced processing of information, and relational transparency on the part of leaders working with followers, fostering positive self-development".

There are four dimensions of authentic leadership as suggested by Walumbwa et al. (2008). Self-awareness: It refers to the leader's awareness of his strengths and weaknesses, as well as his values, feelings, and goals, and the extent of their impact on subordinates (Mubarak & Noor, 2018). Internalized moral perspectives: It refers to the internal moral values and principles that the authentic leader believes in and adopts in his actions and words (Nasab & Afshari, 2019). Balanced processing of information: It refers to the reliance on gathering and analyzing correct data and information before making decisions to ensure its validity and accuracy (Arici, 2018). Rational transparency: It refers to the degree to which the leader shares information and knowledge with subordinates, and encourages them to do so (Naiboğlu & Bilgivar, 2021).

Organizations that adopt authentic leadership have psychological capabilities, a positive and motivating work climate, and strong relationships between leaders and subordinates (Hinojosa et al., 2014). The authentic leader also has the ability to motivate employees to achieve goals, develop performance, and strive for success. The authentic leader is also willing to enhance organizational confidence and positive feelings and attitudes among employees, which is reflected in achieving positive outcomes at work (Azanza et al., 2018). Wang and Xie (2020) and Wei et al. (2018) that the authentic leader contributes to enhancing psychological capital, hope, and positive emotions among employees, which makes them make more efforts to accomplish their job tasks.

Authentic leadership influences many organizational outcomes. For example, Alkaabi and Wong (2019) highlighted that there is a negative correlation between authentic leadership and manager incivility, which reflects negatively on trust in the manager. While Nasab and Afshari (2019) stated that authentic leadership has a positive impact on enhancing employee performance and organizational commitment. Ciftci and Erkanli (2020) also revealed that authentic leadership positively affects both job engagement and psychological capital. Furthermore, Naiboğlu and Bilgivar (2021) showed that authentic leadership significantly enhances organizational communication and employees' psychological well-being. Irshad et al. (2019) reported that authentic leadership positively affects job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behaviors. Finally, authentic leadership enhances organizational voice behavior, confidence in leadership, and employees' sense of integrity and justice (Wei et al., 2018).

The relationship between authentic leadership and workplace incivility

Andersson and Pearson (1999) were the first to define workplace incivility, and distinguish it from other negative behaviors in the workplace, such as antisocial behavior, aggression, and deviant behavior. Andersson and Pearson (1999: 457) defined workplace incivility as "low-intensity behavior with ambiguous intent to harm the target, which violates workplace norms for mutual respect, rude, showing a lack of respect towards others". Workplace incivility includes many unethical behaviors such as not saying thanks, disrespecting the suggestions and ideas of co-workers, sending a personal messages or emails during work or meetings, degrading comments, hostility, snooping, gossiping, ignoring, and insulting (Tricahyadinata et al., 2020).

Incivility does not arise in the workplace alone, but there are some factors that lead to the emergence of such behaviors in the workplace. The lack of organizational justice is one of the factors causing workplace incivility, as employees who feel unfair tend to show incivility (Raza et al., 2020). Salman Chughtai and Ali Shah (2020) also mentioned that the work environment and climate drive employees to show incivility, lack of respect for work rules, and lack of mutual respect. When workplace incivility increases, it has many negative effects on the organization and employees. Hur et al. (2015) depicted that workplace incivility leads to psychological stress at work and emotional exhaustion. As highlighted by Tricahyadinata et al. (2020), workplace incivility has a negative impact on job engagement. Incivility also leads

to job burnout (Nitzsche et al., 2018), and negatively affects the organization's productivity (Abubakar, 2018).

Additionally, workplace incivility may threaten the survival of the organization due to its negative impact on employee motivation (Reio & Sanders-Reio, 2011), work effectiveness (Pearson et al., 2000), job satisfaction (Han et al., 2016), organizational commitment. (Lim et al., 2008), well-being (Leiter et al., 2015; Lewis & Malecha, 2011), performance (Porath & Erez, 2007), and financial performance (Porath & Pearson, 2014). Wang and Chen (2020) stated that coworkers' incivility leads to poor job engagement. Workplace incivility also leads to an increase in turnover as a result of the spread of degrading behavior at work (Sharma & Singh, 2016; Rahim & Cosby, 2016; Namin et al., 2022; Chen & Wang, 2019). Arasli et al. (2018) concluded that workplace incivility leads to weak organizational commitment and employee performance. In this vein; workplace incivility increases job stress, workplace bullying, decreases service quality (Megeirhi et al., 2020), organizational citizenship behaviors (Karatepe et al., 2019), job happiness, and team spirit (Salman Chughtai & Ali Shah, 2020).

Regarding the relationship between authentic leadership and workplace incivility; Alkaabi and Wong (2019) and Megeirhi et al. (2018) found that there is a negative correlation between authentic leadership and managers' incivility. Similarly, Arasli and Arici (2020) and Alilyyani et al. (2018) proved that authentic leadership negatively affects workplace incivility. So; We propose the following hypothesis:

H1: Authentic leadership affects negatively workplace incivility.

The relationship between authentic leadership and counterproductive work behaviors
Researchers have suggested that counterproductive work behaviors are an emotion-based response to stressful organizational conditions (Fida et al., 2015) and a perception-based response to unfairness (Wu et al., 2016). Ma and Li (2019) added that these negative behaviors are carried out by employees in the workplace, and cause harm to the organization and its employees. Robinson and Bennett (1995, p. 556) define anti-productive behaviors as "voluntary behavior that violates significant organizational norms and in so doing threatens the well-being of an organization, its members, or both". Krischer et al. (2010) and Gürlek (2021) mentioned that there are five forms of counterproductive work behaviors, are Sabotage, theft, withdrawal, production deviance, and interpersonal abuse. Khattak and Rizvi (2021) added that these behaviors may take the form of evil, perversion, revenge, and loitering online. These behaviors also include disruption, victimization, waste of time and resources, drinking alcohol or drugs at work, and any other negative behaviors (Kulualp & Koçoğlu, 2019).

Organizational pressures (Ma & Li, 2019), lack of organizational justice (Al-A'wasa, 2018; Liu et al., 2020), weak organizational support (Guo et al., 2015), poor leadership (Bouzari et al., 2020), organizational conflicts (Kundi & Badar, 2021) and low job satisfaction (Nemteanu & Dabija, 2021; Lan et al., 2021) lead to counterproductive work behaviors. Job dissatisfaction resulting from unfairness also leads to counterproductive work behaviors (Mahadiputa & Piartrini, 2021). The lack of employees' participation in setting work goals and decision-making leads to their feeling of job alienation, which is one of the factors that increase counterproductive work behaviors (Kulualp & Koçoğlu, 2019).

Kessler et al. (2013) demonstrated that leadership style and interpersonal conflict affect the negative feelings of employees, which increase counterproductive work behaviors. Further, Akinsola and Alarape (2019) stressed that organizational justice, leadership, and organizational policies influence counterproductive work behaviors. As indicated by Khattak and Rizvi (2021), bad supervision contributes to the emergence of counterproductive work behaviors clearly. Whereas Ahmed et al. (2021) illustrated that employee rumination leads to

counterproductive work behavior. As well, González-Navarro et al. (2018) indicated that there is a positive correlation between envy and counterproductive work behaviors. Counterproductive work behaviors affect organizational performance (Kundi & Badar, 2021; Akinsola & Alarape, 2019; Abdullah et al., 2021), as they negatively affect employee performance and effectiveness (Mahadiputra & Piartrini, 2021), turnover (Ma & Li, 2019), job withdrawal (Makhdoom et al., 2019), reduced productivity, commitment, loyalty, and employee absence (Ramshida & Manikandan, 2013).

To deal with this issue; Megeirhi et al. (2018) and George et al. (2007) indicate that authentic leadership is the most effective leadership style to enhance the organization's culture, which is reflected in the employees' lack of engaging in counterproductive work behaviors. Ciftci and Erkanli (2020) also commented that authentic leadership is based on leading and directing employees without coercion towards achieving the goals of the organization depending on positive leadership, which is reflected in the absence of counterproductive work behaviors. Snygans (2019), Zhang et al. (2021), and Rukh et al. (2018) clarified that authentic leadership affects negatively counterproductive work behaviors. Accordingly, We propose the following hypothesis:

H2: Authentic leadership affects negatively counterproductive work behaviors.

The relationship between workplace incivility and counterproductive work behaviors

Workplace incivility as one of the deviant behaviors in organizations leads to employees engaging in anti-production behaviors, impeding achieving goals, as well as a negative impact on employee satisfaction and motivation (Liu et al., 2020). Moon and Hur (2018), Ferguson (2012), and Bouzari et al. (2020) stated that co-workers' incivility is one of the counterproductive work behaviors' antecedents. Murtaza et al. (2020), Butt and Yazdani (2021), Daniels and Jordan (2019), Scisco et al. (2019), and Jafri and Hafeez (2020) argued that there is a positive relationship between workplace incivility and counterproductive work behaviors. In addition, Hashemi et al. (2018) and Irum et al. (2020) indicated that incivility in organizations increases counterproductive work behaviors. As mentioned by Zahoor et al. (2019), workplace incivility impedes achieving goals and leads to engaging in deviant behaviors, and behaviors that impede production. Tamunomiebi and Ukwuije (2021) also showed that workplace incivility affects counterproductive work behaviors. Too, Schilpzand et al. (2016) and Vahle-Hinz et al. (2019) noted that workplace incivility is associated with a number of anti-productive behaviors such as revenge, deviant behaviors, reciprocity, and job withdrawal behaviors. Accordingly; We propose the following hypotheses:

H3: workplace incivility affects positively counterproductive work behaviors
H4: workplace incivility mediates the relationship between authentic leadership and counterproductive work behaviors.

Methodology
Data was obtained from travel agents in Egypt and Turkey to test the study hypotheses. These travel agents are authorized to offer a wide range of tourist services, including inbound and outbound tour packages (Gaafar et al., 2021; Al-Romeedy, 2019). During the period of October 2021 to December 2021, a total of 886 questionnaires (Egypt= 591, Turkey= 295) were delivered to a random sample of employees. A total of 722 questionnaires were returned from the 886 sent questionnaires. Only 75 questionnaires were discarded because of missing information and replies in the shape of a Z-shape (Al-Romeedy et al., 2020). Finally, 647 questionnaires with a response rate of 73.03 percent were valid for statistical analysis. The

researchers distributed the questionnaire in two ways: online (via social media platforms, LinkedIn, or e-mails) or in-person (by contacting the travel agent's manager and explaining the objectives and content of the questionnaire), and all researchers assured the confidentiality of the provided data and information. All respondents were volunteers and were not compensated in any way.

Authentic leadership (AL): Walumbwa et al. (2008) proposed an eight-item scale to measure AL. The Cronbach alpha (=.889) was confirmed. Workplace incivility (WI): Items for measuring workplace incivility were adapted from a seven-item scale created by Cortina et al. (2001) to assess the extent to which employees encountered workplace incivility. This scale's Cronbach alpha is .834. This score demonstrates the scales' reliability. Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB): We used Bennett and Robinson's (2000) 12-item scale to assess CWB, which encompasses sabotage, withdrawal, production deviance, theft, and abusive behavior. The items were found to be reliable, having a Cronbach alpha score of .798.

Table 1 shows the respondents' characteristics.

Table 1. Respondents characteristics

Characteristics		Frequencies	%
Gender	Male	353	54.6%
	Female	294	45.4%
Age	Less than 25 years	39	6%
	From 25 to 34 years	161	24.9%
	From 35 to 44 years	223	34.5%
	From 45 to 54 years	183	28.3%
	55 years and above	41	6.3%
Education level	Medium level	207	32%
	Bachelor	379	58.6%
	Master	27	4.2%
	PhD	4	0.6%
	Diploma	30	4.6%
Work experience	Less than 3 years	71	11%
	From 3 to 5 years	183	28.3%
	From 6 to 8 years	175	27%
	From 9 to 11 years	128	19.8%
	12 years and above	90	13.9%

As shown in Table 1, samples consisted of 353 male (54.6%) and 294 female participants (45.4%). In terms of age, 34.5% were between 35 and 44 years), 28.3% were between 45 and 54 years old, 24.9% were between 25 and 34 years old, 6.3% were 55 years old and above and 6% were less than 25 years old. In terms of education level, 58.6% possessed a Bachelor's degree, 32% had received medium education level, 4.6% possessed a diploma degree, 4.2% possessed a Master's degree and 0.6% possessed PhD degree. In terms of work experience, 28.3% had worked between 3 and 5 years, 27% had worked between 6 and 8 years, 19.8% had worked between 9 and 11 years, 13.9% had worked 12 years and above, and 11% had worked for less than 3 years.

The common method variance (CMV) was assessed before proceeding with additional statistical analysis. CMV detects false correlations, which are common when cross-sectional data collecting methods (for example, surveys done at the same time) are employed to measure constructs (Tehseen et al., 2017). CMV was examined in this study utilizing the Harman single factor test and the principal component analysis (PCA) approach (Podsakoff et al., 2003). According to the CMV test results, there is no one dominating factor in the three constructs that explains more than 50% of the total variance. As a result, CMV is not a serious problem in this study.

The confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was used to examine the convergent, discriminant validity, and composite reliability (CR) (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988). In addition, the SEM was used to examine the correlation. The indirect consequence was tested using a bootstrapping method with a sample size of 5,000 produced at a 95% confidence interval (Arbuckle, 2011). CMIN/DF, GFI, AGFI, IFI, NFI, CFI, TLI, RMSEA, and SRMR were measured to check the model fit (Hair et al., 2010).

Measures of psychometric properties
As presented in Table 2, CMIN/DF = 2.137, GFI = .937, AGFI = .918, IFI = .941, NFI= .955, CFI = .929, TLI = .960, RMSEA = .044 and SRMR = .040. All these values fell within the recommended ranges (Hair et al., 2010).

Table 2. Model fit indices

Indices	CMIN/DF	GFI	AGFI	IFI	NFI	CFI	TLI	RMSEA	SRMR
Value	2.137	.937	.918	.941	.955	.929	.960	.044	.040

The factor loading looked very good in their respective columns. The CFA was greater than 0.50. (Alola et al., 2018; Fornell & Larcker, 1981). The average variance extracted was also used to prove discriminatory validity (AVE). The outcome demonstrated that the AVE value for each construct is bigger than the squared validity of the other construct. This indicated that discriminate validity is supported (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). Furthermore, the CR test revealed that each value was higher than the 0.50 criterion (Hair et al., 2010).

Table 3. Factor loading, Cronbach Alpha, AVE and CR

Constructs	Factor loading	α	AVE	CR
Authentic leadership		.889	.691	.788
AL1	.766			
AL2	.809			
AL3	.814			
AL4	.799			
AL5	.752			
AL6	.769			
AL7	.882			
AL8	.907			
Workplace incivility		.834	.599	.687
WI1	.911			
WI2	.837			
WI3	.888			
WI4	.802			
WI5	.799			
WI6	.831			
WI7	.847			
Counterproductive Work Behavior		.798	.684	.804
CWB1	.793			
CWB2	.825			
CWB3	.873			
CWB4	.803			
CWB5	.922			
CWB6	.773			
CWB7	.791			
CWB8	.864			
CWB9	.880			
CWB10	.761			
CWB11	.887			
CWB12	.770			

Table 4 highlighted the high level of adoption of authentic leadership style in travel agents in Egypt and Turkey, where the mean was 3.88 and the standard deviation was 0.661. The table also illustrated the low level of workplace incivility (mean= 1.71, SD= .743), as well as the

low level of counterproductive work behaviors (mean= 1.64, SD= .697). Table 4 also depicted that AL significantly and negatively correlated with WI (r = -.701, p < .01) and CWB (r = .657, p < .01). WI was significantly and positively related to CWB (r = .697, p < .01).

Table 4. Mean, standard deviation, and correlations of the constructs

Constructs	Mean	SD	AL	WI	CWB
AL	3.88	.661	1		
WI	1.71	.743	-.701**	1	
CWB	1.64	.697	-.657**	.697**	1

Tests for hypothesis

The hypothesis result indicated in Table 5 that the path coefficient from AL to WI is significantly and negative (β = -.655, p < .01). Hence, H1 that stated that *Authentic leadership affects negatively workplace incivility* is supported. As well, the results support H2; as AL is significantly and negatively linked to CWB (β = -.451, p < .01). Finally, the proposed hypothesis that workplace incivility affects positively counterproductive work behaviors (H3) is supported (β = .477, p < .01). Table 6 revealed that workplace incivility mediates the relationship between authentic leadership and counterproductive work behaviors. The current study used PROCESS Model 4 with a bootstrapped confidence of 5,000 sample size, bias-corrected percentile, and accelerated confidence intervals to further examine the indirect effect of workplace incivility. Workplace incivility, as shown in Table 6, partially mediates the impact of authentic leadership on counterproductive work behaviors, where indirect effect= -.312, LLCI= .028, and ULCI= .034. So, the proposed relationship that workplace incivility mediates between authentic leadership and counterproductive work behaviors is supported (H4).

Table 5. SEM test results

Hypothesis testing	Standard estimation	Standard error	Critical Ratio	p value	Result
H1: AL – WI	-.655	.118	-.5.551	.000	Supported
H2: AL – CWB	-.451	.149	-.3027	.000	Supported
H3: WI – CWB	.477	.177	2.695	.000	Supported

Table 6. Bias-Corrected Bootstrapped result

Hypothesized relationships	Indirect effect	Standard error	LLCI*	ULCI**
H4: AL – WI - CWB	-.312	.173	.028	.034

* Lower Level Confidence Interval   ** Upper Level Confidence Interval

Discussion

The aim of this study is to explore the effect of authentic leadership on counterproductive work behavior in the Egyptian and Turkish travel agents, through the mediating role of workplace incivility. To achieve this aim, an integrative model indicating the effect of authentic leadership on workplace incivility and counterproductive work behavior was developed and tested based on employees of travel agents in Egypt and Turkey. The results support the proposed model and prove that the significant and positive effect of authentic leadership on counterproductive work behavior takes place through workplace incivility. The results indicated that authentic leadership affects significantly and negatively workplace incivility in the Egyptian and Turkish travel agents. This result is in line with Megeirhi et al. (2018) and Alkaabi and Wong (2019) who pointed out that authentic leadership correlates negatively with manager incivility. Also, Arasli and Arici (2020) and Alilyyani et al. (2018) concluded that there is a negative effect of authentic leadership on workplace incivility. Moreover, the results highlighted that authentic leadership has a significant and negative impact on counterproductive work behavior in the Egyptian and Turkish travel agents. This result is consistent with George et al. (2007) who mentioned that authentic leadership influences employees' disengagement in

counterproductive work behaviors. As well, Snygans (2019), Zhang et al. (2021), and Rukh et al. (2018) clarified that authentic leadership affects significantly and negatively counterproductive work behavior. Additionally, the results illustrated that workplace incivility has a significant and positive effect on counterproductive work behavior in the Egyptian and Turkish travel agents. This result is in line with Murtaza et al. (2020), Butt and Yazdani (2021), Daniels and Jordan (2019), Jafri and Hafeez (2020), and Scisco et al. (2019) who concluded that there is a positive link between workplace incivility and counterproductive work behavior. Tamunomiebi and Ukwuije (2021) demonstrated that workplace incivility affects positively counterproductive work behavior. Besides, Hashemi et al. (2018) revealed that workplace incivility in the organization leads to counterproductive work behavior. Finally, the results concluded that workplace incivility plays a partial mediating role in the link between authentic leadership and counterproductive work behavior in the Egyptian and Turkish travel agents.

Theoretically and practical implications

The study's results hold important implications for both theory and practice. Theoretically, authentic leadership was found to be relevant in the Egyptian and Turkish travel agents. While the authors argue that such results are due to the efforts of the Egyptian and Turkish travel agents to face workplace incivility and counterproductive work behavior. Along with the direction of these agents to provide an ethical workplace and develop the quality of work life. The authors indicated that workplace incivility mediates the relationship between authentic leadership and counterproductive work behavior in Egyptian and Turkish travel agents. Practically, the results hold important implications for the Egyptian and Turkish travel agents' managers and MENA countries. Authentic leadership was found to be an effective tool to reduce workplace incivility which would, in turn, decrease the level of counterproductive work behavior. Hence, travel agents' managers should continue to adopt the authentic leadership style, adopt other positive leadership styles such as inspirational, reciprocal, and transformational leadership, and avoid negative leadership styles that would increase workplace incivility, and push workers to engage in counterproductive work behaviors.

The managers of these agents should also pay attention to building human relations between employees and enhancing organizational trust because of their impact on employees' satisfaction, developing their performance, and their quest to achieve the required goals. Also, building human relations limits the appearance of workplace incivility, and reduces negative behaviors that hinder the work of these agents. There is also a need to develop more effective incentive policies for workers to prevent their withdrawal from work. Furthermore, managers and supervisors should also follow the open door policy to get to know the opinions and suggestions of employees to develop work, in addition to identifying their problems, discussing them, and working to solve them. Too, employees should be involved in setting work goals, and making decisions so that they are more committed to implementing them. Moreover, there is great importance for developing a policy and procedures that guarantee the protection of human resources in travel agents, and achieve more job security for them, especially in light of the turbulent work environment, which in turn helps raise their morale, develop their organizational citizenship behaviors, and curb anti-productive behaviors.

Given that the absence of organizational justice leads to workplace incivility and counterproductive work behavior; Managers should apply organizational justice within agents among all employees, without discrimination or bias, which is reflected in reducing workplace incivility and anti-production behaviors. These agents should also pay attention to creating a positive work climate, and creating ideal conditions within the agent, which is reflected in increasing employees' effectiveness and then achieving goals efficiently. Additionally, managers are keen to avoid conflicts and problems at work that would increase withdrawal

behaviors and pay attention to solving all problems at work or among employees quickly and preventing their recurrence in the future to ensure the provision of a supportive work environment for employees and achieving goals. Similarly, there is a need to adopt an organizational culture that supports positive values and behaviors, and to avoid negative behaviors such as bullying, lying, and weak organizational commitment, which would push employees to engage in anti-production behaviors. Finally, the study recommends the necessity of preparing a guide for ethical practices within travel agents to promote mutual ethical behavior between management and employees on the one hand, and between the agent and its customers on the other hand. Travel agents should consider the application of such ethical behaviors as part of their organizational culture, which everyone should emphasize.

While this study offers policymakers valuable information, there are a number of limitations to this study. First, The study sample was drawn from employees of travel agents in Egypt and Turkey. As a result, it is recommended that future research expand the area of research and the study population by engaging top management. Second, this research explored the effect of authentic leadership on both workplace incivility and counterproductive work behavior. Future research is suggested to investigate the effect of authentic leadership on other organizational outcomes such as strategic flexibility, organizational reputation, sustainable performance, and other outcomes that may affect the agents' continuity. Third, this research explored the mediating role of workplace incivility in the link between authentic leadership and counterproductive work behavior. Future research could explore other mediating variables other than incivility, for example, perceived organizational support, organizational health, quality of work-life, bullying. Fourth, we applied this study to the Egyptian and Turkish travel agents without comparing the results of the impact of authentic leadership on both the incivility and counterproductive work behavior between Egypt and Turkey. The future research could be comparative studies between Egypt and Turkey in relation to these effects, and explain the reasons for the difference in the results, if any. It is also possible to include some other countries in the comparison, such as the UAE and Tunisia.

References

Abdullah, M. I., Huang, D., Sarfraz, M., Naseer, J. & Sadiq, M. W. (2021). Signifying the Relationship Between Counterproductive Work Behavior and Firm's Performance: The Mediating Role of Organizational Culture. *Business Process Management Journal*, 27(6), 1892-1911.

Abubakar, A. M. (2018). Linking Work-Family Interference, Workplace Incivility, Gender and Psychological Distress. *Journal of Management Development*, 37(3), 226-242.

Ahmed, I., Islam, T., Ahmad, S. & Kaleem, A. (2021). A COVID-19 Contextual Study of Customers' Mistreatment and Counterproductive Work Behavior at Coffee Cafés. *British Food Journal*, 123(11), 3404-3420.

Akinsola, O. S. & Alarape, A. I. (2019). Determinants of Counterproductive Work Behaviour among Local Government Workers in Ibadan. In *9 th International Conference on Humanities, Psychology and Social Sciences, Athens-Greece*.

Al-A'wasa, S. I. S. (2018). The Impact Of Organizational Justice On The Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB): A Field Study Conducted in the Jordan Customs Department (JCD). *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 9(1), 27-38.

Alilyyani, B., Wong, C. A. & Cummings, G. (2018). Antecedents, Mediators, And Outcomes Of Authentic Leadership In Healthcare: A Systematic Review. *International Journal Of Nursing Studies*, 83, 34-64.

Alkaabi, O. & Wong, C. (2019). Relationships Among Authentic Leadership, Manager Incivility and Trust in the Manager. *Leadership in Health Services*, 33(1), 27-42.

Alola, U. V., Avci, T. & Ozturen, A. (2018). Organization sustainability Through Human Resource Capital: The Impacts of Supervisor Incivility and Self-Efficacy. *Sustainability*, 10(8), 2610.

Alola, U. V., Avcı, T. & Öztüren, A. (2021). The Nexus of Workplace Incivility and Emotional Exhaustion in Hotel Industry. *Journal of Public Affairs*, 21(3), 1-16.

Al-Romeedy, B. (2019). The Role of Job Rotation in Enhancing Employee Performance in the Egyptian Travel Agents: The Mediating Role of Organizational Behavior. *Tourism Review,* 74(4), 1003-1020.

Al-Romeedy, B., Moosa, S. & Elbaz, A. (2020). Does the Curricula of Tourism Studies in Higher Education Meet the Educational and Occupational Needs of the Tourism Labour Market?. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure,* 9(5), 1131-1143.

Anderson, J. C. & Gerbing, D. W. (1988). Structural Equation Modeling in Practice: A Review and Recommended Two-Step Approach. *Psychological Bulletin*, 103(3), 411-423.

Andersson, 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.

Arasli, H. & Arici, N. C. (2020). The Effect of Nepotism on Tolerance to Workplace Incivility: Mediating Role of Psychological Contract Violation and Moderating Role of Authentic Leadership. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 41(4), 597-613.

Arasli, H., Namin, B. H. & Abubakar, A. M. (2018). Workplace Incivility as a Moderator of the Relationships Between Polychronicity and Job Outcomes. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 30(3), 1245-1272.

Arbuckle, J. L. (2011). IBM SPSS Amos 20 user's guide. *Amos Development Corporation, SPSS Inc*.

Arici, H. E. (2018). Perceived Supervisor Support and Turnover Intention: Moderating Effect of Authentic Leadership. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 39(7), 899-913.

Azanza, G., Gorgievski, M. J., Moriano, J. A. & Molero, F. (2018). Influencing Salespeople's Work Outcomes Through Authentic Leadership. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 39(7), 926-944.

Bennett, R. J. & Robinson, S. L. (2000). Development of a Measure of Workplace Deviance. *Journal of applied psychology*, 85(3), 349-360.

Bibi, Z., Karim, J. & Din, S. (2013). Workplace Incivility and Counterproductive Work Behavior: Moderating Role of Emotional Intelligence. *Pakistan Journal of Psychological Research*, 28(2), 317-334.

Bouzari, M., Safavi, H. & Vatankhah, S. (2020). The Impact of Ethical Leadership on Counterproductivity among Cabin Crews. *European Journal of Tourism Research*, 25, 2507-2507.

Butt, S. & Yazdani, N. (2021). Influence of Workplace Incivility on Counterproductive Work Behavior: Mediating Role of Emotional Exhaustion, Organizational Cynicism and the Moderating Role of Psychological Capital. *Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences (PJCSS)*, 15(2), 378-404.

Chen, H. T. & Wang, C. H. (2019). Incivility, Satisfaction and Turnover Intention of Tourist Hotel Chefs: Moderating Effects of Emotional Intelligence. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 31(5), 2034-2053.

Chiwawa, N. & Wissink, H. (2020). Determinants of Employee Engagement in the South African Hospitality Industry During COVID-19 Lockdown Epoch: Employee Perception. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure,* 10(2), 487-499.

Ciftci, D. O. & Erkanli, H. (2020). Mediating Role of the Positive Psychological Capital on the Relation between the Authentic Leadership Style and Employees' Work Engagement: An Applied Study on Hospitality Industry 1. *Business and Economics Research Journal*, 11(2), 461-478.

Cortina, L. M., Magley, V. J., Williams, J. H. & Langhout, R. D. (2001). Incivility in the Workplace: Incidence and Impact. *Journal of occupational health psychology*, 6(1), 64-80.

Daniels, S. R., & Jordan, S. L. (2019). The Effect of Paternalism on Incivility: Exploring Incivility Climate as an Important Boundary Condition. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, *26*(2), 190-203.

Ferguson, M. (2012). You Cannot Leave it at the Office: Spillover and Crossover of Coworker incivility. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 33(4), 571-588.

Fida, R., Paciello, M., Tramontano, C., Fontaine, R. G., Barbaranelli, C. & Farnese, M. L. (2015). An Integrative Approach to Understanding Counterproductive Work Behavior: The Roles of Stressors, Negative Emotions, and Moral Disengagement. *Journal of business ethics*, 130(1), 131-144.

Fornell, C. & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating Structural Equation Models with Unobservable Variables and Measurement Error. *Journal of marketing research*, 18(1), 39-50.

Gaafar, H., Elzek, Y. & Al-Romeedy, B. (2021). The Effect of Green Human Resource Management on Green Organizational Behaviors: Evidence from Egyptian Travel Agencies. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure,* 10(4), 1339-1356.

George, B., Sims, P., McLean, A. N. & Mayer, D. (2007). Discovering your authentic leadership. *Harvard business review*, 85(2), 129-138.

González-Navarro, P., Zurriaga-Llorens, R., Tosin Olateju, A. & Llinares-Insa, L. I. (2018). Envy and Counterproductive Work Behavior: The Moderation Role of Leadership in Public and Private Organizations. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 15(7), 1455.

Guo, W. C., Yang, J. & Fu, J. (2015). The Influences of Perceived Organizational Support and Organizational Justice on Counterproductive Work Behavior: The Mediating Effect of Organizational Cynicism. *Chinese Journal of Management*, 12(4), 530-537.

Gürlek, M. (2021). Workplace Ostracism, Syrian Migrant Workers' Counterproductive Work Behaviors, and Acculturation: Evidence from Turkey. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 46, 336-346.

Hair, J. F., Anderson, R. E., Babin, B. J. & Black, W. C. (2010). *Multivariate Data Analysis: A Global Perspective*. Pearson Upper Saddle River.

Han, S. J., Bonn, M. A. & Cho, M. (2016). The Relationship Between Customer Incivility, Restaurant Frontline Service Employee Burnout and Turnover Intention. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 52, 97-106.

Hashemi, S. E., Savadkouhi, S., Naami, A. & Beshlideh, K. (2018). Relationship Between Job Stress and Workplace Incivility Regarding to the Moderating Role of Psychological Capital. *Journal of Fundamentals of Mental Health*, 20(2), 103-112.

Hinojosa, A. S., McCauley, K. D., Randolph-Seng, B. & Gardner, W. L. (2014). Leader and Follower Attachment Styles: Implications for Authentic Leader–Follower Relationships. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 25(3), 595-610.

Hur, W. M., Moon, T. W. & Han, S. J. (2015). The Effect of Customer Incivility on Service Employees' Customer Orientation Through Double-Mediation of Surface Acting and Emotional Exhaustion. *Journal of Service Theory and Practice*, 25(4), 394-413.

Irshad, P., Ahmad, W. & Rashid, M. U. (2019). The Effect of Authentic Leadership on Employee Work Outcome in Public Hospitals of Peshawar: Mediating Role of Employee Empowerment. *City University Research Journal*, 9(2), 306-317.

Irum, A., Ghosh, K. & Pandey, A. (2020). Workplace Incivility and Knowledge Hiding: A Research Agenda. *Benchmarking: An International Journal*, 27(3), 958-980.

Jafri, M. A. & Hafeez, M. (2020). Impact of Workplace Incivility and Organizational Injustice on Counterproductive Work Behavior. *International Journal of Disaster Recovery and Business Continuity*, 11(1), 2716-2727.

Karatepe, O. M., Kim, T. T. & Lee, G. (2019). Is Political Skill Really an Antidote in the Workplace Incivility-Emotional Exhaustion and Outcome Relationship in the Hotel Industry? *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 40, 40-49.

Kessler, S. R., Bruursema, K., Rodopman, B. & Spector, P. E. (2013). Leadership, Interpersonal Conflict, and Counterproductive Work Behavior: An Examination of the Stressor–Strain Process. *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research*, 6(3), 180-190.

Khattak, P. & Rizvi, S. T. H. (2021). The Effect of Abusive Supervision and Psychopathy on Counter Productive Work Behavior: The Role of Psychological Capital. *NICE Research Journal*, 14(1), 1-26.

Koech, P. M. & Namusonge, G. S. (2012). The Effect Of Leadership Styles on Organizational Performance at State Corporations in Kenya. *International journal of business and commerce*, 2(1), 1-12.

Krischer, M. M., Penney, L. M. & Hunter, E. M. (2010). Can Counterproductive Work Behaviors be Productive? CWB as Emotion-Focused Coping. *Journal of occupational health psychology*, 15(2), 154-166.

Kulualp, H. G. & Koçoğlu, C. M. (2019). The Open Door to Prevent Counterproductive Work Behavior: ethical leadership. *Anais Brasileiros de Estudos Turísticos-ABET*, 9, 1-13.

Kundi, Y. M. & Badar, K. (2021). Interpersonal Conflict and Counterproductive Work Behavior: The Moderating Roles of Emotional Intelligence and Gender. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 32(3), 514-534.

Lan, J., Mao, Y., Peng, K. Z. & Wang, Y. (2021). The Combined Effects of Positive and Negative Affect on Job Satisfaction and Counterproductive Work Behavior. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 1-19.

Leiter, M. P., Peck, E. & Gumuchian, S. (2015). Workplace Incivility and its Implications for Well-Being. In *Mistreatment in organizations*. Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Lewis, P. S. & Malecha, A. (2011). The Impact Of Workplace Incivility On The Work Environment, Manager Skill, and Productivity. *JONA: The Journal of Nursing Administration*, 41(1), 41-47.

Lim, S., Cortina, L. M. & Magley, V. J. (2008). Personal and Workgroup Incivility: Impact on Work and Health Outcomes. *Journal of applied psychology*, 93(1), 95-107.

Liu, C. E., Yuan, X., Hu, C., Liu, T., Chen, Y. & He, W. (2020). Work-Related Identity Discrepancy and Counterproductive Work Behavior: The Role of Emotional Exhaustion and Supervisor Incivility. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(16), 1-13.

Liu, S., Qin, C., Liu, X. & Lu, W. (2020). Employment Status and Counterproductive Work Behaviour: A Chain Mediating Effect in the Chinese Context. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 59, 460-481.

Ma, L. & Li, W. (2019). The Relationship Between Stress and Counterproductive Work Behavior: Attachment Orientation as a Moderate. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, 7(4), 413-423.

Mahadiputra, I. G. E. S. & Piartrini, P. S. (2021). The Moderating Role of Emotional Intelligent On the Relationship among Job Stress, Organizational Justice and Counterproductive Behavior, 5(1), 672-683.

Makhdoom, I. F., Atta, M. & Malik, N. I. (2019). Counterproductive Work Behaviors as an Outcome of Job Burnout among High School Teachers. *Bulletin of Education and Research*, 41(2), 79-92.

Megeirhi, H. A., Ribeiro, M. A. & Woosnam, K. M. (2020). Job Search Behavior Explained Through Perceived Tolerance for Workplace Incivility, Cynicism and Income Level: A moderated Mediation Model. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 44, 88-97.

Megeirhi, H., Kilic, H., Avci, T., Afsar, B. & Abubakar, A. M. (2018). Does Team Psychological Capital Moderate the Relationship Between Authentic Leadership and Negative Outcomes: An Investigation in the Hospitality Industry. *Economic Research-Ekonomska Istraživanja*, 31(1), 927-945.

Moon, T. W. & Hur, W. M. (2018). Go Home and Kick the Dog: Spillover Effects of Experienced Coworker Incivility on Customer-Directed Counterproductive Work Behavior. *Journal of Service Theory and Practice,* 28(5), 554-575.

Mubarak, F. & Noor, A. (2018). Effect of Authentic Leadership on Employee Creativity in Project-Based Organizations with the Mediating Roles of Work Engagement and Psychological Empowerment. *Cogent Business & Management*, 5(1), 1-14.

Mukwevho, H., Nesamvuni, A. E. & Roberson, J. R. (2020). Factors Impacting Employee Absenteeism and the Managers' Perception of its Causes in the Hotel Industry. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure,* 9(5), 1161-1177.

Murtaza, G., Roques, O. & Khan, R. (2020). Religious Beliefs as a Moderator of the Relationships Between Workplace Incivility and Counterproductive Work Behaviours. *Human Systems Management*, (Preprint), 1-11.

Naiboğlu, G. & Bilgivar, O. O. (2021). The Effect of Authentic Leadership on Organizational Communication: The Mediating Role of Psychological Well-Being. *International Journal of Educational Research Review*, 7(2), 99-113.

Namin, B. H., Øgaard, T. & Røislien, J. (2022). Workplace Incivility and Turnover Intention in Organizations: A Meta-Analytic Review. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(1), 1-19.

Nasab, A. H. & Afshari, L. (2019). Authentic leadership and employee performance: mediating role of organizational commitment. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 40(5), 548-560.

Nemteanu, M. S. & Dabija, D. C. (2021). The Influence of Internal Marketing and Job Satisfaction on Task Performance and Counterproductive Work Behavior in an Emerging Marketing during the COVID-19 Pandemic. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(7), 1-16.

Nitzsche, M., Ribeiro, L. & Laneiro, T. (2018). Workplace incivility among Portuguese hotel employees: Is lack of respect burning them out?. *Journal of Spatial and Organizational Dynamics*, 6(1), 52-71.

Oluwole, A. (2020). The Impact of Job Satisfaction on Employees' Turnover Intention within the Hotel Industry in Lagos State, Nigeria. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure,* 10(4), 1110-1130.

Pearson, C. M. & Porath, C. L. (2005). On the Nature, Consequences and Remedies of Workplace Incivility: No time for "nice"? Think again. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 19(1), 7-18.

Pearson, C. M., Andersson, L. M. & Porath, C. L. (2000). Assessing and Attacking Workplace Incivility. *Organizational dynamics*, 29(2), 123-137.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y. & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common Method Biases in Behavioral Research: A Critical Review of the Literature and Recommended Remedies. *Journal of applied psychology*, 88(5), 879-903.

Porath, C. L. & Erez, A. (2007). Does Rudeness Really Matter? The Effects of Rudeness on Task Performance and Helpfulness. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(5), 1181-1197.

Porath, C. L. & Erez, A. (2009). Overlooked but not Untouched: How Rudeness Reduces Onlookers' Performance on Routine and Creative Tasks. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 109(1), 29-44.

Porath, C. L. & Pearson, C. M. (2014). The Price of Incivility: Lack of Respect Hurts Morale—and the Bottom line. *Harvard Business Review*, 91(12), 114-121.

Rahim, A. & Cosby, D. M. (2016). A Model of Workplace Incivility, Job Burnout, Turnover Intentions, and Job Performance. *Journal of Management Development*, 35(10), 1255-1265.

Ramshida, A. P. & Manikandan, K. (2013). Organizational Commitment as a Mediator of Counterproductive Work Behavior and Organizational Culture. *International Journal of Social Science & Interdisciplinary Research*, 2(2), 59-69.

Raza, M. A., Ul-Hadi, N., Khan, M. & Mujtaba, B. G. (2020). Empirical Evidence of Organizational Justice and Incivility in the Tourism Industry: Assessing the Moderating Role of Islamic Work Ethics and Trust in Leader. *Journal of Transnational Management*, 25(4), 274-299.

Reio Jr, T. G. & Sanders-Reio, J. (2011). Thinking About Workplace Engagement: Does Supervisor and Coworker Incivility Really Matter?. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 13(4), 462-478.

Robinson, S. L. & Bennett, R. J. (1995). A Typology of Deviant Workplace Behaviors: A Multidimensional Scaling Study. *Academy of management journal*, 38(2), 555-572.

Rukh, L., Shahrukh, H. M. & Iqbal, K. Z. (2018). Effect of Authentic Leadership on Organization Commitment: Mediating Role of Job Satisfaction. *Journal of Entrepreneurship & Organization Management*, 7(3), 247-248.

Salama, W. M. (2020). Impact of Management by Objectives in Enhancing Sustainable Organisational Performance in Hotels. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure,* 10(3), 805-820.

Salman Chughtai, M. & Ali Shah, S. Z. (2020). A Moderated Mediation Model: Mediating Mechanism of Workplace Incivility and Moderating Role of Islamic Work Ethics between Dark Triad and Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Management Issues in Healthcare System*, 6(1), 1-17.

Schilpzand, P., De Pater, I. E. & Erez, A. (2016). Workplace Incivility: A Review of the Literature and Agenda for Future Research. *Journal of Organizational behavior*, 37, S57-S88.

Scisco, J. L., Giumetti, G. W., Bodinger, J. F., Randall, K. J. & Shemanskis, R. N. (2019). The Impacts of Face-to-Face and Cyber Incivility on Performance, Helping Behavior,

Counterproductive Behaviors, and Physiological Activity. *Occupational health science*, 3(4), 409-420.

Sharma, N. & Singh, V. K. (2016). Effect of Workplace Incivility on Job Satisfaction and Turnover Intentions in India. *South Asian Journal of Global Business Research*, 5(2), 234-249.

Snygans, C. (2019). *Authentic Leadership, Fun at Work, Work Engagement and Perceived Work Performance in a Chemical Organisation* (Doctoral dissertation, North-West Universit , South Africa)..

Tamunomiebi, M. & Ukwuije, O. (2021). Workplace Incivility and Counterproductive Work Behaviour: A Review of Literature. *European Journal of Human Resource*, 5(1), 20-31.

Tefera, O. & Dlamini, W. (2020). Effect of Innovation, Knowledge Sharing and Trust Culture on Hotels' SMEs Growth in Eswatini. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure,* 10(3), 881-894.

Tehseen, S., Ramayah, T. & Sajilan, S. (2017). Testing and Controlling for Common Method Variance: A Review of Available Methods. *Journal of Management Sciences*, 4(2), 142-168.

Tichaawa, T. M. (2017). Business Tourism in Africa: The Case of Cameroon. *Tourism Review International*, 21(2), 181-192.

Tichaawa, T. M. & Kimbu, A. N. (2019). Unlocking Policy Impediments for Service Delivery in Tourism Firms: Evidence from Small and Medium Sized Hotels in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Tourism Planning & Development*, 16(2), 179-196.

Tricahyadinata, I., Hendryadi, Suryani, Zainurossalamia ZA, S. & Riadi, S. S. (2020). Workplace Incivility, Work Engagement, and Turnover Intentions: Multi-group Analysis. *Cogent Psychology*, 7(1), 1-16.

Vahle-Hinz, T., Baethge, A. & Van Dick, R. (2019). Beyond One Work Day? A Daily Diary Study on Causal and Reverse Effects Between Experienced Workplace Incivility and Behaving Rude Towards Others. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 28(2), 272-285.

Walumbwa, F. O., Avolio, B. J., Gardner, W. L., Wernsing, T. S. & Peterson, S. J. (2008). Authentic Leadership: Development and Validation of a Theory-based Measure. *Journal of Management*, 34(1), 89-126.

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.

Wang, Z. & Xie, Y. (2020). Authentic Leadership and Employees' Emotional Labour in the Hospitality Industry. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 32(2), 797-814.

Wei, F., Li, Y., Zhang, Y. & Liu, S. (2018). The Interactive Effect of Authentic Leadership and Leader Competency on Followers' Job Performance: The Mediating Role of Work Engagement. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 153(3), 763-773.

Wu, M., Sun, X., Zhang, D. & Wang, C. (2016). Moderated Mediation Model of Relationship Between Perceived Organizational Justice and Counterproductive Work Behavior. *Journal of Chinese Human Resource Management*, 7(2), 64-81.

Zahoor, I., Malik, N. I. & Atta, M. (2019). Relationship between Job Insecurity, Workplace Incivility and Counterproductive Work Behaviors Among Employees: Role of Work Family Conflict. *Foundation University Journal of Psychology*, 3(2), 133-162.

Zhang, Y., Guo, Y., Zhang, M., Xu, S., Liu, X. & Newman, A. (2021). Antecedents and Outcomes of Authentic Leadership Across Culture: A Meta-analytic Review. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 1-37.