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Abstract: Workers’ Role disengagement is a concern to private Universities in Nigeria occasioned by workplace incivility, workplace bullying, workplace mobbing, and workplace toxicity. The paper examined the effect of workplace-terrorism and workers’ role disengagement in the selected Private Universities in South-West, Nigeria. Survey research design method was adopted. The target population comprised 1,751 lower and middle level non-academic staff. Multistage sampling technique was utilized. The sample size of 418 respondents was obtained through Krejcie and Morgan formula. A structured questionnaire was adapted, validated and used for data collection. The Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficients for the constructs ranged from 0.704 to 0.891. The response rate was 87.5%. Data were analysed using descriptive and inferential statistics. Findings revealed that workplace-terrorism had positive and significant effect on workers’ role disengagement (Adj. R² = 0.749; F(4, 361) = 272.614, p<0.05). The study concluded that it is vital for organization to safeguard its workforce from being dispirited if it must sustain their full engagement at work.
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1. INTRODUCTION:

Organisations are aware of the benefits amassed to securing inspired and engaged employees, but often fail to prepare themselves for the challenges involved (European Commission, 2015; Sia & Appu, 2015). These challenges are costly and disturbing to institutions as dispirited workers leave organisation at the slightest opportunity (Bradberry, 2016). Corporate Leadership Council (CLC) reports that fifty thousand (50,000) workers in California are psychologically disengaged due to workplace incivility with thirty-seven per cent shortage in productivity, and eighty-seven per cent tendencies to leave the organisation (Waldron Leadership Study, 2017). This report is congruent to Eurofound (2018) which estimates the cost of employees’ turnover to around 93-200 per cent of its monthly income. The cost of employees’ turnover has made it imperative for organisations to safeguard its workforce from the influence of workplace-terrorism if it must breakeven and sustain its relevance among other organisations in the competitive market (Chaudhry, 2017).

The difference between developed and underdeveloped nations/institutions, however, rests on how workplace-terrorism is being managed within the confines of the available organisational rules and regulations. Specifically, Nigerian highest educational institutions are plagued with prevailing challenge of psychological workers’ role disengagement scored by workplace-terrorism factors. The prevalence among its working population has grown since the year 2000 to 2015 from four to fifty-three per cent in the year under review (Omede & Omede, 2015). Nwobia and Aljohani (2017) attribute the problem to anti-intellectual attitudes to ineffective teaching, learning, publication, community service and general productivity among Nigerian Universities. The World Economic Forum (WEF) (2017) shows seventy per cent (70%) workers’ role disengagement, while maintaining that employees do not constantly leave their jobs,
but they leave their managers (management) as less attention is being given to practice of teasing, malicious gossip, incivility, mobbing, bullying, work sabotage, hostility, discrimination, climate, personal integrity among employees in various organisations (Oladapo & Banks, 2013). Further study on the effect of workplace-terrorism has shown that exposure to negative behaviours have devastating consequences on the targets’ health and well-being, such as depression, anxiety, sleep problems and altered physiological response (Hogh, Mikkelsen & Hansen 2011; Nielsen & Knardahi, 2015), and post-traumatic stress symptoms (PTSD) (Nielsen & Knardahi, 2015) which reduce employees productivity, accelerate psychological role disengagement, and employees’ intention to leave.

Authors like Caldwell and Canuto-Carranco (2010), Coanda and Stefanik (2014), Malik (2015), and Robert and Ursano (2014) have focused on organisational terrorism, terrorism and job attitude, workplace preparedness and psychological terror. Not any of these authors has particularly investigated the effect of workplace-terrorism (incivility, mobbing, bullying and toxicity) as a component to measure the dependent variable of workers’ role disengagement in private universities in south-west Nigeria. While Chaudhry (2016) argues that workplace incivility is negatively related to organisational support, vocalization and task re-delegation, Howie (2014) finds linear significant relationship, just as Mankins and Perry (2014) and Smidt, Beer, Brink and Leiter (2016) have identified the need to fill the gap. It is based on this limitation in scope and inconsistency in findings that the researchers hypothesised that workplace-terrorism have no significant effect on workers’ role disengagement in selected private universities in South-West, Nigeria.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW:

2.1 Workplace-terrorism

Workplace-terrorism can be defined as actions that threaten and exploit the rights of others (Dubaz, 2016). Malik (2014) expands the concept as inducement of fear and anxiety into the minds of employees which invariably influence the psychological state of mind. Sinclair and LoCicero (2010) share the same view as they define workplace-terrorism as social interaction that involves attempt to create fear in the minds of employees. Bader and Berg (2013) view workplace-terrorism as any negative experience encountered by an employee in the workplace. Furthermore, Reich and Herschoris (2015) expand the earlier definitions by describing workplace-terrorism as a method that superiors use in accomplishing desired objectives. Correspondingly, Caldwell and Canuto-Carranco (2010) have earlier defined the phenomenon as intimidation of employee(s) to achieve a desired goal. In view of this fact, Van, Ang and Botero (2008) note certain advantages in organisational awareness of workplace-terrorism since it promotes employees’ behavioural modification, lifestyle choice, employees’ education, promotion and motivation.

In addition, Van, Ang and Botero (2008) note that workplace-terrorism helps in developing ideal workplace culture. This culture allows management to initiate policies and procedures, communication, training and learning opportunities, and work-life balance that can subdue the negative effects of workplace-terrorism. However, Nyangahu and Bula (2015) state three outcomes of workplace-terrorism. They (Nyangahu & Bula, 2015) affirm that workplace-terrorism induces stress which is being characterized as physical, psychological and behavioural outcomes. Physical outcome resorts to constant headache, grinding of teeth, clenched jaws, chest pain, shortness of breath, pounding heart, high blood pressure, muscle aches, indigestion, constipation or diarrhoea, increased perspiration, fatigue, insomnia and frequent illness. Psychological outcomes generates anxiety, irritability, sadness, defensiveness, anger, mood swings, hypersensitivity, apathy, depression, slow thinking, or racing thoughts, feelings of helplessness, hopelessness, or of being trapped. Behavioural outcome leads to impatience with co-employees, quickness to argue, work procrastination,
withdrawal or isolation from co-employees, neglect of responsibility and poor job performance.

Workplace incivility has been defined as a deliberate withdrawal of fact or sabotage of effort in the workplace (Clark, 2013). This definition according to Clark (2013) explains what Hershcoris (2011) called a behaviour of low intensity that makes employees’ intention difficult to understand. However, in defining the concept of civility to clarify the perspectives of incivility, Clark and Springer (2010) view incivility in the workplace as disrespect, rudeness, avoidance, exclusion, dismissing, ignoring and unfairness among employees. Similarly, Read and Laschinger (2013) define workplace incivility as rude and discourteous behaviors by employees such as gossiping, rumors spreading, name-calling, using a condescending tone, expressing public criticism and refusal to assist a coworker. This is regarded as insults to the dignity of labor and contravention of professional standards of human relational respect (Read et al., 2013).

Leymann (2012) conceptualises workplace mobbing as ganging up of colleagues and/or superiors against an employee. Similar to Leymann (2012) definitions is Harper (2013) who defines workplace mobbing as group mistreatment with significant effects on employees psychological well-being and career prospect. According to Gresham (2018), mobbing can be described as emotional abuse by a group. The term is used when a group of employees engage in a hostile behaviour with concerted fashion against a single employee. The Actors can be colleagues, superiors or subordinates. According to World Health Organisation (WHO) (2015), the methods a group of employees used to mob a co-employee range from direct to indirect methods. These include covert actions such as isolation, avoidance, sometimes confrontational behaviours, such as belittling, bullying and humiliating. The common thread is the maliciousness of the acts and the sense of harassment it brings on the targets, of which according to Malik (2015) generates emotional and psychological terrorism.

Workplace bullying is identified with the concept of mobbing considering the similarities in some of the characteristics. However, the basic difference is the environment within which the terminology operates. Olweus (2010) maintains that these two terminologies though share resemblance cannot be combined because of outward and aggressive characteristics that bullying possess that mobbing does not. This is consistent with Killoren (2014) and Kauppi and Porhola (2012) who describe the character of a bully as obvious, loud, highly aggressive and blatant in achieving his goals. The opinion of Smidt, Beer, Brink & Leiter (2016) is consistent with that of Killoren (2014), and Kauppi and Porhola (2012) in the sense that, they similarly describe workplace bullying as a simple concept of blatant and habitual behavior. According to Oladapo (2013), the fundamental functioning definition of workplace bullying contains recurrent harmful acts, and a condition of dissimilarity in power between the perpetrator and target which usually and popularly happened through the practice of fault-finding, groundless blames or biased behaviours associated with other employees.

Kussy and Holloway (2009) define workplace toxicity as any appearance of pollutants or contaminants that can cause counterproductive activities in the workplace. Similarly, Lipmon-Blumen (2016) expressions reflect an exposition of organisation and its employees to pervasive and oppressive workplace environment. Gilbert, Car-Ruffini, Ivancevich and Konopaske (2012) in their own view describe workplace toxicity as a circumstance where middling performance is compensated above merit-based output, a situation where employees avoid differences with superior for fear of punishment, a circumstance where individual schedules take superiority over the lasting welfare of the organisation. Lee, Wang and Piccolo (2018) highlight two categories of toxic employees as follows: a toxic employee has the ability to easily discover individual or group of employees that can be subjected to servitude; while Gino and Ariely (2012) and Frank
and Obloj (2014) note the potential advantages in the employment or appointment of a toxic personality. Gino et al. (2012) and Frank et al. (2014) affirm that even though a toxic person is difficult, he thrives in work performance, and for that reason enjoys a long stay in wherever organisation he works. This is corroborated by Housman and Minor (2015) who define toxic employees as antisocial personality who has outstanding performance, and that explains why organisation retains them for a long time.

2.2 Workers’ Role Disengagement

Cook (2012) defines workers’ role engagement as the way employee ponders positively about business: his feelings and pro-activeness about organisation in relation to the achievement of organisational goals for clients, employees and management. Mani (2011) conceptualises four drivers of workers ‘role engagement in the workplace namely: employees’ welfare, empowerment, employees’ growth and interpersonal relationships. The view is supported by Hume and Leonard (2013) who explain how favourable social work exchange relationship is important in achieving organisational and individual group targets. Karanges, Beatson, Johnston and Lings (2014) reaffirm that when workers are moved from a state of moderacy to high role engagement, it makes such workers almost twice as likely to want to stay with the organisation and invest discretionary efforts. Therefore, workers’ role engagement is the emotional commitment and involvement that employee adds to the organisation’s vision, mission and objectives. This emotional commitment means that employees care about their works and their organisation, and do not work just for a reward but work to project the image of the organisation.

Conversely, workers’ role disengagement explains employees’ cognitive, physical and psychological departure from responsibilities (Alzayed & Murshid, 2017). Disengaged employees develop negative impressions towards organisation in terms of measures, and are likely to have less contribution in terms of performance ratings (Kruse, 2012). Allam (2017) describes this low performance rating or less contribution as lack of commitment, lack of interest and enthusiasm to work. Perrin (2008) further expands the concept of workers’ role disengagement as a condition that exposes organisation to turnover risk, such as losing key employees who are active. According to Iyer and Israel (2012), it results to sabotage of skills and active performance when workers experience psychological disengagement on duty.

Allam (2017) identifies various causes of works’ role disengagement in the workplace as follows: negative job attitude, absence of teamwork, lack of trust, low morale, no learning, higher rate of turnover, workplace violence and bullying, health problems, higher conflict, higher absenteeism, low level of productivity, higher rate of accident and safety problems, more deviant workplace behaviour, lateness, loss of cultural value, postponement/withholding of works. These categories of workers are not able to generate energy or enthusiasm to do the task and showing negative attitudes at work. Saks (2006) observes that disengaged workers show no commitment, no satisfaction, and intent to leave the organisation. Disengaged workers do not show courage to listen to the truth about their performance, and do not accept their criticism given by others. Allam (2017) maintains that the disengaged workers hide all information and do not share ideas, opinions or views due to lack of trust. As suggested by Branham (2005), disengaged employees often produce a negative impact on income and morale of the employees.

2.3 Workplace-terrorism variables and worker’s role disengagement

The work of Coanda and Stefanik (2014) on psychological terrorism in the workplace revealed that psychological terrorism impact negatively on the well-being of the victim through loss of self-esteem, feelings of victimisation, depression, psychosomatic disorders, insomnia, self-destructive behavior (alcoholism), acute stress and post-traumatic stress, drop in work efficiency and turnover intention. Alison
and Alison (2017) however fault this finding by addressing workplace-terrorism from the angle of workplace relation in the study about Revenge Versus Rapport through interrogation terrorism and torture. Alison and Alison (2017) found alliance building positively related to psychological terror and role disengagement. Conversely, Trepanier, Fernet and Austin (2012) used a different terminology such as workplace psychological harassments to describe workplace-terrorism dimensions. The terminology inform the pre-determined motive of employees that rapport based method cannot escape. Trepanier et al., (2012) and Coanda and Stefanik (2014) therefore argued that perceived victimisations are positively related to workers’ psychological disengagement and turnover intention.

In a psychological and sociological context, Ozer and Gunluk (2010) linked the concept of workplace-terrorism with a destructive treatment on employees. The authors found that destructive treatments such as bullying and mobbing have positive significant effect on job satisfaction and increase in turnover intention. Clark and Springer (2010) found significant relationship between incivility and avoidance, exclusion, dismissing and ignoring of co-employees which are constructs of role disengagement. Chaudhry (2016) found workplace-terrorism as negatively related to ignoring and avoidance of instigator, and positively related to organisational support, vocalisation and task re-delegation. Meanwhile, Nazir et al. (2016) affirmed this assertion while examining the interrelationship of incivility, cynicism and turnover intention. Nazir et al. (2016) found that workplace incivility is related to cynicism and turnover intention at respective variance.

Bedarkar and Pandita (2014) found workers’ role disengagement as negatively significant to business performance. Bedarkar and Pandita (2014)’s assertion is confirmed by Mxenge, Dywili and Bazana (2014) who found workers’ role disengagement as being related to employees’ intention to quit. Robyn and Du Preez (2013) earlier established that engaged workers are likely to have a closer connection with their organisation and have no intention to quit. Meanwhile, Coetzee and De-Villiers (2010) found correlation between physical exhaustion and workers’ role disengagement. Govindarajo, Kumar and Ramuly (2014) found workers’ role disengagement as an antecedent of psychological safety, organisation identity, trust, sense of being undervalued, perceived inequalities in job engagement and benefit, unrealized ambitions, stress and anxiety and disinterest, unethical behaviours such as harassment, bullying, discrimination and unfair enforcement of authority, overgrown bureaucracy and work complexity, poor interpersonal relationships, all sharing the characteristic of workplace-terrorism.

The above findings are also similar to Bakker and Demerouti (2008) who established that disengaged workers encounter bad feelings and fall ill frequently than engaged workers. Bakker and Demerouti (2008)’s findings tallied with Robinson (2010) who found that underutilisation of workers has significant relationship with mobbing and emotional exhaustion, while Xu and Cooper (2011) maintain the opposite direction that confidence, support and a blame-free environment are positively related to psychological safety. Further to this, Papalexandris and Galanki (2009) identified organisation management and mentoring behaviour as solution to workplace-terrorism and workers’ role disengagement. The factor has been found necessary for impacting confidence to subordinates rather than fear, power sharing rather than bullying, and communication rather than silence. Similarly, Xu et al. (2011) found that role engagement is related to relationship behaviours among superiors and subordinates. Theoretically, reciprocity theory asserted that workers feel distressed when perceived mistreatment in the workplace. The theory posited that when workers fail to achieve equity, they are hostile towards the organisation producing this negative behaviour in an attempt to restore justice. The theory opined that the
tendency that workers reciprocate to negative behaviour increase if response from the organisation produces negative results or below expectation. Workers as well reciprocate towards kind and unkind behaviour, and regard organisation that is providing and fulfilling psychological contract as possessing kind behaviour that contribute to the growth of the employees. Theoretical and empirical findings support that workplace-terrorism has effect on workers’ role disengagement.

The study adopted the theoretical model of Smith (1970), Marx, (1976) and Braverman (1974) in considering the importance of reciprocity, expectancy and perception of justice to workplace-terrorism and workers’ role disengagement. The models suggested that the independent construct i.e. workplace-terrorism dimensions affect the variable of the dependent construct (workers’ role disengagement). Showing that workplace incivility, bullying, mobbing and toxicity determine workers’ role disengagement.

3. METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH:

The study focused on the effect of workplace-terrorism: incivility, bullying, mobbing, toxicity on workers’ role disengagement in South-West, Nigeria. South-West Nigeria hosted twenty-nine out of the seventy-four private universities in Nigeria. The study was carried out on five (5) selected private universities who have approved authorisation of National Universities Commission (NUC) to run Postgraduate Programmes up to doctoral level. Further, the private universities constituted those with a minimum population of 400 non-academics staff and six successive convocations (graduations). The study adopted survey research design and the target population is one-thousand seven-hundred and fifty one (1751) lower and middle level non-academic staff of Afe Babalola University (334), Babcock University (415), Bowen University (320), Covenant University (360), and Joseph Ayo Babalola University (322) representing eighty per cent of the total population distribution of the universities non-academic staff. Krejcie and Morgan (1970) formula was adopted in calculating the sample size of the respondents with sample size estimated at 0.5 margin error of 95% confidence level. The total number (1751) of respondents from the selected universities fell within the range of 1500-2000, determining the sample size of 322 respondents. The researchers adopted primary method of data collection for the adapted questionnaire as earlier used by Frank and Obloj (2014) and Faheem and Mahmud (2015). Factor analysis test was conducted by the use of Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin & Bartlett tests of sphericity (Hadi, Abadullah & Ijham, 2016). Also used was Average Variance Extract and composite reliability as recommended and utilized by Yusoff (2011) to ensure a completion of the construct validation. The KMO test is greater than 5% and Bartlett test of Sphericity result is less than 5% showing that item statements that comprised in the research instruments of each variable actually measured what were intended. The result of the KMO and Bartlett test of Sphericity obtained for the constructs of workplace- terrorism and workers’ role disengagement is represented in Table 1.

Table 1: The result of the KMO and Bartlett test of Sphericity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>KMO Test</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>Bartlett’s Test</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Workplace Incivility</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.786</td>
<td>0.799</td>
<td>407.978.00</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Workplace Mobbing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.595</td>
<td>0.782</td>
<td>247.896.00</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Workplace Bullying</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.613</td>
<td>0.869</td>
<td>389.326.00</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Workplace Toxicity</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.555</td>
<td>0.775</td>
<td>407.044.00</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Role Disengagement</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.590</td>
<td>0.891</td>
<td>370.448.00</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Pilot Study, SPSS Output 2018
The establishment of validity and reliability of the questionnaire informed the need to administer copies of the research instrument. Four hundred and eighteen copies of the questionnaire were distributed but three hundred and sixty-six were retrieved and judged usable after data filtration. The diagnostic test was conducted to establish the normality of the data to permit predictive and generalization validity. From the tests conducted, it was observed that correlation existed and the normality of the data was linear and perfectly fit.

3.1 The econometric Model Specification:

The equation emerged from the conventional quadratic formula that \( Y \) is a function of \( X \) \( Y = f(X)^n \) with \( n \) indicating the power of infinity. From a function perspective, workers’ role disengagement (WRD) is a function of \( WI, WM, WB, WT \). Hence, \( Y \) is the dependent Variable (WRD) and \( X \) the independent Variables \((x_1 ... x_4)\) as workplace-terrorism. Thus, the model states that \( Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 WI + \beta_2 WM + \beta_3 WB + \beta_4 WT + \mu_1 \)

Where:

\( \beta_0 = \) Constant term i.e. the level of workers’ role disengagement when workplace-terrorism is not available or at zero.

\((B_1 ... B_2)\) are the parameters to be estimate which are the components of workplace-terrorism

\( WI = \) Workplace Incivility (WI)
\( WM = \) Workplace Mobbing (WM)
\( WB = \) Workplace Bullying (WB)
\( WT = \) Workplace Toxicity (WT)

\( \mu_1 = \) Error Term (Stochastic Variable)

3.2 Researchers a priori Expectation

In this study, it was assumed that independent variables would have statistically significant effect on the dependent variable. The researchers anticipated a positive significant effect of workplace-terrorism on workers’ role disengagement.

Model

\[ y_1 = \beta_0 + \beta_1 WI + \beta_2 WM + \beta_3 WB + \beta_4 WT + \mu \]

\( A \) priori Expectation

Reject if \( \beta_i \neq 0 \), where and \( \beta_i = \beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_4 \)

\( p \leq 0.05 \); otherwise accept

4. RESULTS AND FINDINGS:

Descriptive Analysis of Demographic Information of the Respondents

The study sought to establish the demographic data of the respondents. The researcher began by the general analysis on the demographic data got from the respondents which include: gender, language, respondent’s age, institutional status, staffing, highest educational qualification, marital status, and length of service. The demographic characteristics of the respondents by gender indicated that 210 respondents representing 57.4% were male while 156 respondents representing 42.6% were females, indicating that most of the respondents were male. Profile of language revealed that 20 respondents representing 5.5% were Hausas, 85 respondents representing 23.2% were Igbo, and 259 respondents representing 70.8% were Yoruba while 2 respondents representing 0.5% indicated other languages. As regards age, 13 respondents representing 3.6% were between ages 25-30 years, 54 respondents representing 14.8% were between 31-35 years, 189 respondents
representing 51.6% were between 36-40 years, 90 respondents representing 24.6% were between 41-45 years, 10 respondents representing 2.7% were between 46-50, 2 respondents representing 0.5% were between 51-55 years while 8 respondents representing 2.2% were between 56-60 years, indicating that there were more respondents within the age 36-40 years. The table also revealed that 89 respondents representing 24.3% were low level managers while 277 respondents representing 75.7% were middle level managers.

Furthermore, 28 respondents representing 7.7% indicated that they have OND/NCE, 201 respondents representing 54.9% had HND/B.Sc., 113 respondents representing 30.9% had MA/MSC/MBA, 3 respondents representing 0.8% had M.Phil, while 21 respondents representing 5.7% had Ph.D., indicating that there were more respondents with HND/B.Sc. With respect to marital status, 313 respondents representing 85.5% were married, 43 respondents representing 11.7% are single while 10 respondent representing 2.7% are widows. As regards length of service, 61 respondents representing 16.7% were between 1-5 years, 206 respondents representing 56.3% were between 6-10 years, 87 respondents representing 23.8% were between 11-15 years while 12 respondents representing 3.3% were between 16-20 years.

To test the hypothesis a multiple regression analysis was conducted to determine how workers’ role disengagement is affected by the four workplace-terrorism dimensions. In the analysis, the values of workers’ role disengagement were regressed on the values of each of the four workplace-terrorism dimensions. The results were presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Regression Results for Effect of Workplace-terrorism Dimensions on Workers’ Role Disengagement

a) Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.867a</td>
<td>0.751</td>
<td>0.749</td>
<td>2.90337</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Workplace Toxicity, Workplace Incivility, Workplace Bullying, Workplace Mobbing

b) ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>9192.044</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2298.011</td>
<td>272.614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>3043.063</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>8.430</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12235.107</td>
<td>365</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Workers’ Role Disengagement
b. Predictors: (Constant), Workplace Toxicity, Workplace Incivility, Workplace Bullying, Workplace Mobbing

c) Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>1.870</td>
<td>0.913</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.049</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 presents the summary results of multiple regression analysis of the effect of workplace-terrorism dimensions on workers’ role disengagement in selected private universities in South-West, Nigeria. Results in Table 2 showed that workplace-terrorism have significant effect on worker’s role disengagement in selected private universities in South-West, Nigeria (Adj. $R^2 = 0.749$; $F(4, 361) = 272.614$, $p<0.05$). The Adjusted $R^2$ value was 0.749 and it is significant at $p$ value 0.000. This implied that workplace-terrorism dimensions: workplace incivility, workplace mobbing, workplace bullying and workplace toxicity explained 74.9% of the variations in workers’ role disengagement in selected private universities in South-West, Nigeria. The other variables in the universities explained the remaining 25.1%. Therefore, further studies should be done to establish the other factors (25.1%) that affect role disengagement in selected private universities in South-West, Nigeria.

The F test provided an overall test of significance of the fitted regression model. The analysis from the model had the F value of 272.614 with $p$-value of 0.000, which is less than 0.05. The findings, thus, were sufficient to support the idea that workplace-terrorism dimensions had statistically significant effects on role disengagement. A further test on the Beta coefficients of the resulting model showed that workplace mobbing, workplace bullying, and workplace toxicity had a significant positive effect on workers’ role disengagement in selected private universities in South-West, Nigeria with gradients (coefficients) of 0.322, 0.183, and 0.374 respectively. The variables had a $p$-value of 0.000. However, workplace incivility had an insignificant effect on workers’ role disengagement with $p$-value of 0.484 which is greater than 0.05 as shown in Table 2, thus prompting its exclusion from the model.

As regards to the relative effect of each variable, workplace toxicity, workplace mobbing and workplace bullying have a significant positive effect on role disengagement in selected private universities with gradients (coefficients) 0.380, 0.336 and 0.186 respectively as shown in Table 3.2. The proposed model showed that after removing workplace incivility one of the independent variables, further test on the Beta coefficients of the resulting model showed that workplace toxicity (Beta = 0.392) is the most important in influencing role disengagement in selected private universities in South-West, Nigeria. This is followed by workplace mobbing (Beta = 0.339), while workplace bullying (Beta=0.194) was found to have the weakest influence on workers’ role disengagement (Beta= 0.119).

The new results are presented in Table 3. According to Table 3, $R^2$ remained the same at 0.867 and 0.751 respectively.
Table 3: Model Summary on Workplace Mobbing, Workplace Bullying, Workplace Toxicity and Workers’ Role Disengagement to determine the relative effect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.867&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.751</td>
<td>0.749</td>
<td>2.90133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Workplace Toxicity, Workplace Mobbing, Workplace Bullying

F-test for Multiple Regression Model

ANOVA<sup>a</sup>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3062.632</td>
<td>363.832</td>
<td>0.000&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>8.418</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12235.107</td>
<td>365</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Workers’ Role Disengagement

b. Predictors: (Constant), Workplace Toxicity, Workplace Mobbing, Workplace Bullying

Coefficients after Dropping Workplace Incivility Variable Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.192</td>
<td>0.789</td>
<td>2.777</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace Mobbing</td>
<td>0.336</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.339</td>
<td>6.648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace Bullying</td>
<td>0.186</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.194</td>
<td>3.632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace Toxicity</td>
<td>0.380</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.392</td>
<td>8.035</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Workers’ Role Disengagement

Source: Researcher’s Field Survey, 2019

The ANOVA test in Table 3, Model 1, showed that the significance of the F-statistic 0.000 is less than 0.05 which means that the null hypothesis is rejected and concluded that there is a relationship between all the three independent variables (excluding workplace incivility) jointly and workers’ role disengagement. Based on the regression coefficients results in Model 2, the optimal model was found to be as follows:

\[
\text{WRD} = 2.192 + 0.336\text{WM} + 0.186\text{WB} + 0.380\text{WT} \]

\[
\text{Where:}
\]

WRD = Workers’ Role disengagement

WM = Workplace Mobbing

WB = Workplace Bullying

WT = Workplace Toxicity
According to the regression equation established, taking all factors (workplace mobbing, workplace bullying, and workplace toxicity) constant at zero, worker’s role disengagement as a result of these independent factors become 2.192. The results of the individual variable effects of workplace-terrorism dimensions’ manifestation showed that a unit increase in workplace mobbing results in 0.336 units increase in workers’ role disengagement while holding workplace bullying, and workplace toxicity constant. A unit increase in workplace bullying results in 0.186 units increase in workers’ role disengagement while holding workplace mobbing and workplace toxicity constant. Similarly, a unit increase in workplace toxicity results in 0.380 units increase in workers’ role disengagement while holding workplace mobbing and workplace bullying constant. Based on p-values of individual predictors, the null hypothesis which states that workplace-terrorism dimensions have no significant effect on workers’ role disengagement in selected private universities in South-West, Nigeria is hereby rejected.

5. DISCUSSION:
The objective of this study determined the effect of workplace-terrorism dimensions on workers’ role disengagement in selected private universities in South-West, Nigeria. The study revealed that Workplace-terrorism dimensions have positive and significant effect on workers’ role disengagement in selected private universities in South-West, Nigeria. Study such as Nazir, Ungwu and Ahmad (2016) established that there is a relationship between incivility, cynicism and turnover intention. They (Nazir, et al.) found that workplace incivility is related to cynicism and turnover intention at respective variance. This is corroborated by Robyn and Du Preez (2013) who earlier established that engaged employees are likely to have a closer connection with their organisation and have no intention to quite. Meanwhile, Coetzee and De-Villiers (2010) found that physical exhaustion leads to workers role disengagement. Simons and Buitendach (2013) found job engagement as employees being happily absorbed to their work, claiming that by the time employees are gladly absorbed, time does not wait, and because of that, it becomes a challenge for such individual to disconnect themselves physically or psychologically from their job.

Govindarafoo, Kumar and Ramuly (2014) and Bakker and Demerouti (2008) established that role-disengaged workers encountered bad feelings and fall ill frequently than engaged workers. Bakker and Demerouti (2008) findings corresponded with Robinson (2010) who found that underutilised employees are more often likely to suffer from mobbing and more likely to be emotionally exhausted, but, Xu and Cooper (2011) discovered opposing view that confidence, support and a blame-free environment are elements of psychological safety. On the other hand, Bedarkar and Pandita (2014) found workers’ role disengagement as impediment to successful business performance. Their assertion was confirmed by Mxenge, Dywili and Bazana (2014) as they (Mxenge, Dywili and Bazana, 2014) found significant relationship between workers role disengagement and employees’ intention to quit.

Howie (2014) found a linear relationship between threats, occupational stress and workers role disengagement. Burum and Goldfied (2007)’s study on workplace-terrorism is similar to Howie (2014) in terms of significant relationship that they shared with organisational growth and employees’ success. The work of Alison and Alison (2017) also found positive relationship between workplace-terrorism and employees’ relation, rapport-based method and alliances building. Further to this, Papalexandris and Galanaki (2009) had earlier found workplace-terrorism positively significant to organisation management, mentoring behaviour, and workers’ role disengagement. Affirming the study of Papalexandris, et al. (2009), Bedarkar and Pandita (2014) found that workers’ role disengagement is significant to successful business performance, the assertion which is being confirmed by Mxenge, Dywili and Bazana (2014) as significant
relationship between workers’ role disengagement and employees’ intention to quit. In the same vein, Robyn and Du Preez (2013) established that employees’ engagement is positively significant to employees’ intention to quit. Meanwhile, Coetzee and De-Villiers (2010) in a similar study established that physical exhaustion is positively significant to role disengagement of employees. To buttress the above findings, Govindarajo, Kumar and Ramuly (2014) found workers’ role disengagement as an antecedent of psychological effects to lack of psychological safety, lack of proper identification with organisation objectives, lack of trust, sense of being undervalued, perceived inequalities in job engagement and benefit, unrealized ambitions, stress and anxiety, disinterest, unethical behaviours, harassment, bullying, discrimination, unfair enforcement of authority, overgrown bureaucracy, work complexity and poor interpersonal relationships.

Based on the majority of findings that workplace-terrorism increases workers’ role disengagement, this study therefore rejects the null hypothesis that says workplace-terrorism dimensions have no positive and significant effect on workers’ role disengagement in selected private universities in South-West, Nigeria.

6. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION:

The study investigated workplace-terrorism dimensions (workplace incivility, workplace mobbing, workplace bullying, workplace toxicity) on workers’ role disengagement in the selected private universities in South-West, Nigeria. The results of the study produced statistical and empirical proofs on the effect of workplace-terrorism on workers’ role disengagement. The study showed that workplace-terrorism dimensions (workplace incivility, workplace mobbing, workplace bullying, workplace toxicity) have positive and significant effects on workers’ role disengagement in selected private universities in South-West, Nigeria. However, further test on the Beta coefficients showed that workplace toxicity (B= 0.392) is the most important in influencing role disengagement in selected private universities in South-West, Nigeria. This is followed by workplace mobbing (B= 0.339), while workplace bullying (B=0.194) was found to have the weakest influence on role disengagement (B= 0.119).

The study recommended that it is vital for organisation to safeguard its workforce from being dispirited if it must sustain their full engagement at work. In the workplace also, there must be a clear definition of job designation and clear terms of reference through which specific channel of responsibility and accountability are established among superiors and subordinates.
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