Evaluating Workplace Toxicity and Employee Performance Among Academic Staff of Faculty of Management Sciences, Federal University, Wukari, Taraba State, Nigeria

Dr. Igomu Mathias Drisu[1]; Dr. Isaac Irene Oka[2]; Dr. Baritore Gbiodum Aakoo[3]

[1]Department of Business Administration Faculty of Management Sciences Federal University, Wukari Taraba State, Nigeria
[2]Department of Management Studies,
Faculty of Management Sciences Nigerian Defence Academy Kaduna, Nigeria
[3]Federal Road Safety Corps, FCT Sector Command, Abuja, Nigeria

Abstract:

➢ *Purpose:*
This is a study that aimed to determine the effect of workplace toxicity on employee performance amongst academic employees of the Faculty of Management Sciences, Federal University Wukari, Nigeria. Particularly, it discussed the effects of narcissism, ostracism, and harassment on the performance of staff in a scholarly setting.

➢ *Design/Methodology/Approach:*
The study based its research design on the descriptive type of research where the researcher investigates naturally occurring behaviours without controlling the environment. The sample used was an enumeration method, since the size of the population is quite low (92 academic staff). A questionnaire was used to collect the data in the form of a structured closed-ended questionnaire with a 5-point Likert scale and was distributed through the WhatsApp platform of the faculty. Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) was used to analyse 84 valid responses (91%), using SmartPLS 4.0. The measurement model also fulfilled the requirements of reliability and validity and path coefficients and p-values were used to test the hypotheses.

➢ *Findings:*
The findings found out that harassment and narcissism statistically significantly impact employee performance, whereas ostracism did not exhibit a significant relationship. The most negative impact was created by harassment, with narcissism coming next. The values of R2 and Q2 predict in the model were 0.711 and 0.676 respectively, which pointed at a high level of explanatory and predictive power.

➢ *Implications of the Findings:*
The results demonstrate why institutions should mitigate the impact of toxic behaviours caused by personality, particularly, harassment and narcissism by performing screening on leaders, implementing anti-harassment policies, and accepting diversity.

➢ *Originality/Value:*
The paper brings fresh knowledge on the Nigerian academic setting where the Trait Theory is incorporated to explain how personal personality traits translate to toxic behaviours that largely influence the performance of academic staff in higher education.

How to Cite: Dr. Igomu Mathias Drisu; Dr. Isaac Irene Oka; Dr. Baritore Gbiodum Aakoo (2025) Evaluating Workplace Toxicity and Employee Performance Among Academic Staff of Faculty of Management Sciences, Federal University, Wukari, Taraba State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*, 10(10), 2806-2814. https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/25oct1407

I. INTRODUCTION

The success of any organization mainly depends on the efficiency and effectiveness with which the employees have performed the assigned duties. The efficiency of the academic staff members influences the quality of teaching, research, reputation of the institution and grant and fund accessibility in institutions, particularly in the competitive academic landscape of Nigeria.

Some of the factors that determine the performance of academic personnel include motivation, leadership, resources, policies and above all, the workplace environment. A supportive environment that is defined by psychological safety, fairness and respect enhances job happiness and productivity. Conversely, morale and performance are compromised in unhealthy environments characterized by conflict, exclusion, and harassment (Rohayat, 2022).

Workplace toxicity refers to the occurrence of toxic behaviours and processes that create an unfavourable, emotionally upsetting workplace. It is often manifested as narcissism, exclusion, and harassment, which are interconnected issues that failed to foster team cohesion and lowered the productivity of workers (Arubayi, 2023). Ostracism is intentional exclusion, verbal abuse and intimidation in harassment and manipulation and self-aggrandization in narcissistic behaviours. Such behaviors decrease the productivity, reduce the level of motivation, as well as endangering the health of the employees.

As is widely known, there is a connection between toxicity and underperformance. According to Anjum et al. (2018), Wang et al. (2020), and Haeruddin et al. (2022), toxic workplaces have been associated with burnout, absenteeism, and reduced output, especially among academics at the beginning of their careers. The time and place contextual differences and methodology variation, however, require further studies.

This work has expressed fears over the declining morale and performance of academic staffs in Federal University Wukari, thus, the aim of this paper is to research how workplace toxicity, such as narcissism, ostracism and harassment, affects the performance of employees in the Faculty of Management Sciences.

➢ *Objectives of the Study*
The main objective of this study was to investigate the effect of workplace toxicity on employee performance in the Faculty of Management Science, Federal University, Wukari, Taraba State, however, the study was guided by the following specific objectives;

- To evaluate the effect of narcissism on employee performance in the Faculty of Management Science, Federal University, Wukari, Taraba State.
- To examine the effect of ostracism on employee performance in the Faculty of Management Science, Federal University, Wukari, Taraba State.
- To assess the effect of harassment on employee performance in the Faculty of Management Science, Federal University, Wukari, Taraba State.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

➢ *Employee Performance*
Employee performance is one of the most significant indicators of the overall welfare, organizational productivity and sustainability. It captures the effectiveness with which individuals perform their tasks and aid in the goals of the business. The factors influencing the performance of employees are very numerous and include not only the individual aspects but also the organization-level factors. Some of the main variables are workplace relationships, leadership, motivation, and reward system.

The authors Haeruddin et al. (2022) and Rohayati (2022) highlight the effect of the institutional culture and leadership on the performance of workers. In their study, it is clear that the effective leadership philosophy such as transformational leadership and participatory leadership can enhance employee performance due to their contribution to job satisfaction. Conversely, toxic leadership behaviours affect low morale, burnout and disengagement among the employees.

Atmadja (2019) also agrees with this perspective and argues that the performance outcomes, as well as the dynamics of the workplace, are directly influenced by the behavior of the leaders. Responsible, caring, and understanding leaders create work environments where employees are made to feel valued, and this enhances productivity. Conversely, micromanagers or those who fail to support employees erect barriers to production.

Availability of resources is another factor to be considered. Wang et al. (2020) note that the necessity of institutional support of the negative effects of toxic workplaces on employee performance can be underlined. With such support systems as training, counseling, just performance evaluations, and recognition, the employees have higher prospects of success even in the stressful conditions.

Employees will do certain activities and conduct themselves in a manner that augers well with the goals of the organization. This means that firms cannot be in existence without adding value to the performance of their employees (Alvaradro, 2016). This could be the value of the investors, clients and the society or the value of coworkers at the company. Each employee has individual commitments towards the performance of some of the operation units and in turn the overall performance of an organisation. The current business climate has been eager to improve the performance of employees to maximize profitability, market share, and brand value because of the rising competition (Arubayi, 2023).

> *Workplace Toxicity*

Workplace toxicity refers to existence of negative interpersonal behaviours, dysfunctional leadership, and detrimental organisational cultures which translate into hostile and psychologically unsafe work environment. The lack of rest, fatigue, exhaustion, and worsening mental and physical conditions in employees is a typical feature of such conditions (Pickering et al., 2017; Herr et al., 2017). Besides slowing down the employee morale and productivity, toxic work environments can also put at risk the safety and overall organizational effectiveness. In a bid to demonstrate how psychological toxicity causes emotional strain, Grijalva and Harms (2013) found out that burnout and secondary traumatic stress were prevalent with nurses in a toxic hospital setting. Toxicity is often caused by systemic factors, including abusive supervision (Chuan, 2014), lack of communication, being rude in the workplace (Smith et al., 2015), and constant stress with no help.

The workplace environment refers to the relationships between coworkers at a workplace (Azuma et al., 2015). The two types of working environments proposed by previous studies are a collaborative work environment (CWE) and a toxic workplace environment (TWE). Pickering et al. (2017) and Wolf et al. (2017) discussed the definition of a CWE, saying that it is marked by amiability, enjoyment in the workplace, and a feeling of involvement. It also incorporates feelings of empathy and organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB) which is common amongst the employees. A TWE is a narcissistic behavior that is associated with disrespectful and abusive leadership, threats, harassment, embarrassment, mobbing, exclusion, rudeness, and bullying among employees. A TWE may cause mental and physical imbalances that adversely affect the psychological performance of the employees and cause high rates of stress and burnout. Work pressure is created in large amounts, resulting into counterproductive work behaviour (CWB) in the work place. CWB does not favour an organization since it influences its reputation and efficiency (Anjum & Ming 2018).

> *Narcissism*

Narcissism is an essential part of the workplace toxicity, particularly when it is adopted by the leaders or co-workers domineering, persisting, seeking compliments, and exploiting others at their cost. Narcissists often use exploitative behaviours, ignore constructive criticism and destroy team cohesion. Housman and Minor (2015) discovered that narcissistic traits were among the predictors of toxic profiles of workers and further added that they tend to violate corporate policies and negatively influence the performance of their peers. Instead of a culture of cooperation and creativity, narcissistic leadership promotes the culture of fear and obedience. These environments often lead to the self-enhancement of the employees instead of self-verification, which leads to defensive behaviour, inauthenticity, and low job satisfaction as Ferris et al. (2015) notes. The spread of narcissism in the workplace may impede team building, block employee voice and raise turnover rates and all these hurt organisational performances in the long run.

> *Ostracism*

Ostracism in the workplace refers to the voluntary deprivation of individuals of social and professional interactions. It can lead to low self-esteem, psychological distress, and revenge by workers. Yang and Treadway (2018) reported that ostracism is a partial and negative form of social rejection that causes unconstructive work behaviours. In their study, workers who feel ostracized have a higher likelihood of engaging in negative behaviors on the company as a way of coping particularly when they need belonging, and they lack much political savvy. Likewise, Ferris et al. (2015) purported that workplace ostracism debilitates work motivation and self-concept that subsequently debilitate job performance. There is both physical and psychological consequences of ostracism that may result in absenteeism and health issues including stress (Azuma et al.,)

> *Harassment*

Arguably the most evident and the most legally notable part of workplace toxicity is harassment, be it verbal, emotional, sexual, or violent. Psychological safety is undermined by the presence of aggressive behaviour and abusive supervision, which leads to long-term issues such as burnout, depression, and anxiety. Chuan (2014) states that harsh supervision encourages the development of toxic emotions that discourages the employees and raises their turnover intentions. Similarly, Cheung and Yip (2015) noted that those employees, who worked in abusive and stressful conditions, were much more susceptible to stress, anxiety, and depression. According to Wolf et al. (2015), workplace hostility makes professionals less able to perform their jobs efficiently and contributes to weariness, particularly in high-stakes situations like emergency healthcare. According to Pickering et al. (2017), harassment also compromises patient or client safety in facilities that provide care, demonstrating how toxicity not only hurts employees but undermines the organisation's external outputs.

III. EMPIRICAL REVIEW

> *Narcissism and Employee Performance*

The study conducted by Arubayi (2023) focused on the impact of toxicity at the workplace on the productivity of workers, focusing on manufacturing companies in the Niger Delta in Nigeria. The primary aim of the research was to determine the impacts of toxicity, namely, narcissism, ostracism, and harassment on employee productivity and the effectiveness of a specific organization. Information about the perception of the toxic behaviours and the impact on their job performance was obtained by means of structured questionnaires which included 132 respondents. The variables in this quantitative survey study were investigated using regression analysis to investigate the associations between the variables. The findings indicated that there is a strong negative correlation between the performance of employees and work-related toxicity. The research particularly revealed that deliberate exclusion (ostracism), narcissistic leadership style, and ongoing harassment would cause psychological distress, reduction in engagement levels and demotivated workforce which in turn caused decline in productivity.

To understand how leadership habits, especially the narcissistic qualities cause the workplace to become toxic and how they affect the productivity and welfare of the staff, Atmadj (2019) conducted qualitative narrative research. The paper has employed a semi-structured interview as the primary method of collecting data where data was collected on ten participants, who are in leadership positions, within government and non-government organizations in the state of New Hampshire. Thematic analysis was applied on recurring themes, and assisted by NVivo software. The findings indicated that the increased toxicity in their organizations was mainly instigated by narcissist leaders who often wanted to seek approval and praise to their voices and disregard the views of other persons. The executives of these organizations were micromanagers of work who ignored the opinions of their employees and maintained strict systems of power that inhibited creativity and psychological safety. The researcher discovered that discontent and disengagement of employees is largely correlated with narcissistic behaviors. A major weakness of the study however is the small geographic and contextual scope as it focused on organizations in one state in the U.S and it could not be generalized to other regions such as Nigeria.

➤ Employee Performance and Ostracism

Yang and Treadway (2018) explored the impact of the ostracism in the workplace on the employee behaviour with a particular focus on the reactions of the excluded workers to the ostracist behaviour by adopting non-productive work behaviour. According to the social information processing theory, the social network analysis was used in the study. The sample included employees of diverse organizations in the US. The data were collected with the help of surveys on perceived ostracism, political acumen, and counterproductive behaviors and analyzed with the help of the techniques of mediated mediation. The findings indicated that employees who are highly motivated to fit-in and also lack political acumen were particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of being ostracized, often responding by sabotage or withdrawal, but it is limited by its self-reported data, which may bias or overstate the results.

A second study by Hua et al. (2023) examined the resources of self-control and negative emotion in mediating the association between interpersonal misbehavior and work ostracism. This research was conducted with the sample of 233 employees in China through the three-wave survey design and the structured questionnaires were used to collect data and structural equation modeling to test it. Ostracism was observed to positively predict interpersonal deviance especially among employees who have low self control and high negative affect. The paper contains comprehensive information on the interaction between the personal factors and the toxic events leading to adverse work behaviors. Its strongest point is the longitudinal design that is more useful in causal interpretation. Nevertheless, attitudes towards deviance and ostracism can be culturally affected, so it is necessary to be careful with generalization to the academic institutions in Nigeria.

➤ Employee Performance and Harassment

Cheung and Yip (2015) conducted a cross-sectional study on the impact of the workplace environment stressor on nurses, including harassment, on nurses in Hong Kong, and its impact on mental health. The study was aimed at assessing prevalence of stress, anxiety and depression symptoms concerning workplace dynamics. The total sample size of 850 nurses was surveyed using standardized instruments, including the Depression Anxiety Stress Scale (DASS-21). The statistical analysis was conducted using the regression models, to evaluate the predictors of psychological discomfort. The study also noted that the anxiety and sadness levels of the respondents were significantly high when they had been subjected to verbal abuse, intimidation and harassment. These findings underscore the psychological negative impact of persistent harassment at work. Despite the fact that the research demonstrates close association between harassment and mental health outcomes, it involves healthcare workers exclusively, which prevents its direct applicability in the context of academic employees in Nigerian universities.

Chuan (2014) conducted qualitative research to explore the role of abusive supervision as the cause of toxic emotional climates in nursing environments a form of occupational harassment. The study involved twenty nurses in in-depth interviews, which were carried out in one of the hospitals in Malaysia and analyzed through thematic content analysis. The findings revealed that abusive supervisors extensively employed emotional manipulation, micromanagement and open humiliation as tools to control, but this led to discouragement, pressure and inability of the subordinates to perform their work. It was concluded in the research that harassment is a serious threat to the institutional coherence and well-being of employees, particularly when initiated by persons in authoritative roles. Though it could provide in-depth information as it is qualitatively rich, the research mainly concentrates on the hierarchical abuse in the healthcare environment, and it might not be structurally the same in the world of academia.

IV. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

➤ The Trait Theory

The Trait Theory was created in 1937 by Gordon Allport, and followed by Raymond Cattell and Hans Eysenck, which states that personal behaviours are controlled by stable personality traits that remain relatively consistent across time and context. Such traits as narcissism, agreeableness, and neuroticism are believed as being important to comprehending the manner in which individuals think, feel, and act under different situations, including in the workplace. This theory explains that workplace toxicity behaviours of a harassing, exclusionary and manipulative nature are interpreted as manifestations of these ingrained personality characteristics. The said view can be empirically confirmed by other researchers like Housman and Minor (2015), who discover that toxic traits, narcissism included, are significant signs of dysfunctional work practices that de-motivate team morale and performance. The trait theory has been criticized because of its strict presentation of personality as one that

cannot be changed and its poor consideration of other situational factors yet has the ability to explain. Mischel (1968) argued that behaviour is very much context dependent and attributes alone are not sufficient and that one should consider how organizations operate, their culture and environment.

The trait Theory offers a foundation through which toxic behaviour can be predicted, identified, and managed in the academic departments by defining these behaviours as a trait behaviour as opposed to situational behaviour. This becomes particularly applicable to the university environment where competition, the influence of power, and lack of accountability may increase the effects of negative personalities. As an example, Arubayi (2023) wrote that narcissistic disposition among employees in the Nigerian manufacturing companies also developed into a factor that led to poor performance of the employees and a toxic workplace environment. It also aids in understanding why there are always people that involve themselves in bad activities despite the policies and organizational culture set by the institutions.

In as far as it has strengths, there are its weaknesses. Critics such as Mischel (1968) argue that personality attributes alone cannot be used to adequately account complex social interactions and that behavior is more contextually affected than is appreciated by the theory. Nevertheless, in a study such as this one, where the issues of harassment, ostracism, and narcissism among academic personnel are studied, the Trait Theory gives a good foundation to understand the personal factors behind the toxicity and their influence on the performance of workers. It highlights the usefulness of screening personality characteristics in the recruitment and leadership process and in particular in academic institutions such as the Federal University Wukari where these features can have significant

effects in the organisational atmosphere, as well as the productivity of staff.

V. METHODOLOGY

A descriptive research design was used in the study because this design is suitable in describing the nature, behaviours, and relationships among variables in a given group in a structured manner without interfering with the natural environment. As Creswell (2014) points out, this method is especially useful when exploring the real-life phenomenon, i.e., the problem of workplace toxicity and the performance of employees, since these phenomena exist in organisations in their natural forms.

The whole population of all 92 academic members of the Faculty of Management Sciences of Federal University Wukari was the sample population of the study. The enumeration technique was utilized because of such a small population since every member of the population was involved. By using this method, the researchers will cover all the demographic aspects of interest and make the results of the study more representative and reliable (Etikan et al., 2016).

The data is collected through the distribution of a closed-ended questionnaire on the basis of 5-point Likert scale, where the respondents can state the degree of their agreement or disagreement with each of the statements. The survey was sent on the WhatsApp group of the faculty, and the respondents could fill out the survey in their own time. Eighty four valid responses were obtained, which gave a high response rate of 91%. In the analysis of data, the research adopted Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) through SmartPLS software. PLS-SEM, as suggested by Hair et al. (2022), is especially applied when the sample size of a study is small and it is resistant to traditional normality conditions.

Table 1 Constructs Loadings, CR, AVE, and VIF for Multicollinearity

Variables	Indicators	Loading	CR	AVE	VIF
Narcissism	Narc1	0.764	**0.880**	**0.595**	1.694
	Narc2	0.821			2.022
	Narc3	0.815			1.865
	Narc4	0.754			1.706
	Narc6	0.695			1.488
Ostracism	Ostr 1	0.802	**0.931**	**0.694**	2.513
	Ostr 2	0.817			2.135
	Ostr 3	0.783			2.341
	Ostr 4	0.869			2.859
	Ostr 5	0.880			3.074
	Ostr 6	0.842			2.420
Harassment	Hara 1	0.753	**0.867**	**0.567**	1.995
	Hara 2	0.650			1.754
	Hara 4	0.813			2.050
	Hara 5	0.811			2.457
	Hara 6	0.724			1.770
Employee Performance	Empe3	0.824	**0.919**	**0.741**	2.181
	Empe4	0.894			3.035
	Empe5	0.811			2.225
	Empe6	0.909			3.332

Researcher's Computation, 2025

The results of the measurement model including the indicator loadings, Composite Reliability (CR), Average Variance Extracted (AVE), and Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) were provided in Table 1 to evaluate the multicollinearity of the constructs (Narcissism, Ostracism, Harassment, and Employee Performance). The loading of all the retained items is between 0.650 and 0.909, which is well below the recommended minimum of 0.60 by Hair et al. (2022) guaranteeing that the indicators are reflective enough of what they represent. The Composite Reliability (CR) values of the four constructs of between 0.867 and 0.931 are far beyond the 0.70 standard suggested by Nunnally and Bernstein (1994) and this means that there is a high level of internal consistency. Equally, the AVEs of all constructs lie above the 0.50 mark (Hair et al., 2022), which proves

satisfactory convergent validity. All these findings support the reliability of the measurement model and its validity. It is, however, worth mentioning that three indicators, Narc5, Hara 3, and Empe 1 and 2, were left out of the analysis as the loading of these indicators was lower than the recommended 0.60 value by Hair et al. (2022), which means the indicators do not make any meaningful contribution to their corresponding latent variables. This was done by removing these low-loading items to enhance the overall model fit and further analysis of the structural model would be made on strong and reliable indicators. In the case of multicollinearity, all VIFs were less than the critical cut-off value of 5.0 (according to Hair et al., 2022), which indicates that the issue of multicollinearity was not an issue in this study.

Table 2 Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio (HTMT)

Variables	Employee Performance	Harassment	Narcissism	Ostracism
Employee Performance				
Harassment	0.759			
Narcissism	0.819	0.840		
Ostracism	0.788	0.822	0.737	

The values of heterotrait-monotrait Ratio (HTMT) to determine discriminant validity of the constructs in the study are shown in Table 2. Henseler, et al (2015) recommend values of HTMT to be less than 0.90 to ensure that constructs are empirically different. The values of HTMT in this study are within the acceptable limits with the maximum at 0.840 between Harassment and Narcissism, 0.822 (Harassment and Ostracism) and 0.788 (Employee Performance and

Ostracism) are also below the recommended range. These findings confirm the sufficient discriminant validity, which suggests that the constructs are connected, but are conceptually and statistically different. This justifies the integrity of the measurement model and complies with the suggestions of Hair et al. (2022), who state that the constructs are correctly designed to be analyzed further with Structural Equation Modelling.

Table 3 R. Square

Variable	R Square
Employee Performance	0.711

PLS-SEM 2025

Table 3 shows the value of the coefficient of determination (R^2) of the dependent variable, Employee Performance, as 0.711. This means that the joint effect of the independent variables of narcissism, ostracism and harassment can account to about 71.1 percent of the variance in employee performance. Hair et al. (2022) state that a substantial R2 is one that is greater than 0.70 and indicates that the model is very predictive. This implies that the

structural model adopted in this research provides a significant extent of explanatory relevance, justifying the fact that workplace toxicity is an important predictor of the performance of academic staff. Thus, the model does not only fit the data properly, but it also gives a strong background of what the toxic behaviours cause in the academic setups like Federal University Wukari.

Table 4 PLS Predict

Variable	Q²_predict
Employee Performance	0.676

PLS-SEM 2025

Table 4 indicates the value of the Q2predict in the dependent variable, that is, Employee Performance, at 0.676. This is an actual value obtained as a result of the PLS Predict process and measures the predictive relevance of the model. A value of Q2predict above zero shows that the model is predictively relevant, whereas values near and beyond 0.50 point to strong (Hair et al., 2022). The Q2 predict value, 0.676 in this study is an indication that the model has high out of sample predictive power, i.e., the extent to which narcissism,

ostracism, and harassment can explain a significant percentage of employee performance in its sample (as indicated in R2) and can also be used to predict employee performance in a similar academic environment outside of the current data. This also enhances the suitability and usefulness of the model in informing interventions and policy decisions to enhance the performance of staff through alleviating workplace toxicity.

Table 5 Path Coefficients

Variables	Beta	T Statistics	P Values	Decision
Narcissism -> Employee Performance	0.287	2.440	**0.015**	Rejected
Ostracism -> Employee Performance	-0.019	0.150	**0.881**	Accepted
Harassment -> Employee Performance	0.635	6.283	**0.000**	Rejected

PLS-SEM, 2025

The path coefficient analysis in the table 5 provides the test of the structural relationship that exists between the independent variables, (Narcissism, Ostracism, and Harassment) and the dependent variable, (Employee Performance). The form of the hypotheses in this study was in the null form which implies that the default position is that there would be no significant correlation between each of the predictors and employee performance. Acceptation or rejection of each null hypothesis is made on the basis of the p-values with a common level of significance of 0.05.

According to the results, the beta coefficient of Narcissism is 0.287, t-statistic of 2.440 and p-value of 0.015. The p-value of less than 0.05 rejects the null hypothesis of this path, which shows the statistically significant relationship between narcissism and employee performance. This indicates that narcissist behaviours, e.g. dominance, entitlement or lack of concern towards others, play an important role in defining the performance of academic staff, which may in an irritative or discouraging way.

In the case of Ostracism, the beta coefficient is -0.019, the t-statistic is 0.150 and the p-value is 0.881, which falls way above the 0.05 mark. Consequently, the null hypothesis is accepted and this means that there is no statistically significant direct influence of ostracism on employee performance in this respect. This result suggests that exclusionary behaviours, though they might be detrimental in the long-term, may not affect the performance outcomes of academic employees directly or immediately in Federal University Wukari.

The relationship of harassment with the employee performance is the strongest, as it has a beta of 0.635, a t-statistic of 6.283, and a p-value of 0.000. This very low p-value shows a very significant relationship, and this results in the rejection of the null hypothesis. The outcome affirms the fact that harassment in terms of verbal abuse, intimidation, or unfair treatment significantly influences employee performance in a profound and statistically significant manner. This highlights the pressing importance of the institutional policies to combat and thwart harassment to protect the productivity and the well-being of staff.

VI. DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The initial significant conclusion is that narcissism is considerably positively related to the performance of the employees, and the null hypothesis is rejected. This observation is consistent with the empirical research carried out by Atmadja (2019) that found out that narcissistic leadership qualities, such as entitlement, the absence of empathy, and manipulative behaviours, resulted in poor environments that caused employees to have low morale and low productivity. In the same manner, Housman and Minor (2015) also observed a situation in which narcissistic workers reduced the performance of their teams and took away the organisational cohesion. Off the current study, these conclusions are supported indicating that power and competition can indeed enhance the effects of personality traits in academic institutions leading to the present research finding that narcissistic behaviours are worth it. In terms of theory, this result is a vast argument in favour of Trait Theory that holds that stable personality characteristics like narcissism are likely to lead individuals to specific behavioural patterns.

Conversely, the research established that ostracism does not have statistically significant relationship with employee performance thus null hypothesis was accepted. This observation goes against a number of empirical research studies that have been examined. As an example, Yang and Treadway (2018) have revealed that work place ostracism resulted in counterproductive work behaviours, particularly among those who had a strong need to belong. On the same note, Hua et al. (2023) established that ostracised employees tended to commit interpersonal deviance especially when negative affect and low self-control were the criterion. The difference in the results can be explained by the difference in context. In the academic environment of the present day research in Nigeria, workers may have devised countermeasures, which cancel the direct impact of ostracism, or the behaviours may be more subtle and, therefore, it is regarded as less significant in the actual performance in the workplace. Concerning the Trait Theory, the observation can imply that although trait-based behaviours (e.g. exclusionary tendencies) may be the underlying causes of ostracism, the effects of the latter on performance may be conditioned by situational or cultural factors, which is not thoroughly covered by the theory. This weakness helps to substantiate some of the criticisms of Trait Theory especially those put forward by Mischel (1968) who stated that behaviour is usually more affected by situation than solely by the personality traits.

The researchers have discovered that the effect of harassment on employee performance is strong and statistically significant resulting in the null hypothesis being rejected. This finding is highly consistent with the empirical evidence by Cheung and Yip (2015), who stated that harassment resulted in high levels of stress, anxiety, and depressive symptoms among Hong Kong nurses, which eventually had an impact on their performance. On the same note, Chuan (2014) emphasized the role of abusive supervision (a type of harassment) in leading to the development of emotional exhaustion and low productivity. The current academic environment seems to directly decrease the level of job satisfaction and work performance since

academic employees who experience unfair treatment, intimidation, or verbal abuse are not bound to be engaged or productive. This observation fits very well with the Trait Theory, in the sense that aggressive or domineering character can be used to involve harassment types of behaviours that destabilize the working environment, lowering performance output.

VII. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

According to the results of this research, it is be concluded that the relationship between narcissism and harassment has a strong effect on the performance of the employees within the academic staff, whereas ostracism did not exhibit a direct statistical significance in this case.

- As a way of curbing the adverse effects of narcissism on employee performance, the university ought to engage personality assessment mechanisms in recruitment, promotion and selection of leaders. This may be done through incorporation of confirmed psychological instruments in the administrative assessment.
- Even though ostracism was not statistically significant in this research, inclusivity is still critical in the long-term engagement and cohesion of the staff. The university ought to embrace inclusion and equal participation culture through the encouragement of open communication channels, fair allocation of academic duties, and joint decision-making. This may be done through rotation of committee roles, periodic team-building workshops and the introduction of anonymous feedback systems where the staff can speak about exclusion or marginalisation without any fear of reprisals.
- Harassment demonstrated the most negative impact on the performance of the employees; hence, the institution needs to take immediate measures to adopt and enforce a strong anti-harassment policy. It is possible to do so by introducing a separate ethics and compliance committee, offering confidential reporting mechanisms (physical and virtual) and running frequent sensitisation programs on employee rights and the respect of conduct. Penalties on verified cases of harassment must be explicit and administered uniformly to discourage the occurrence of repeat offence and develop confidence in the system.

REFERENCES

[1]. Allport, G. W. (1937). Personality: A psychological interpretation. New York: Holt.

[2]. Alvarado, C. (2016). Environmental ingredients for disaster: Developing and validating the Alvarado work environment scale of toxicity (Doctoral thesis, California State University).

[3]. Cheung, T., & Yip, P. (2015). Depression, anxiety and symptoms of stress among Hong Kong nurses: A cross-sectional study. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 12(9), 11072–11100.

[4]. Anjum A & Ming X. (2018) Combating toxic workplace environment: an empirical study in the context of Pakistan. J Model Manag. 2018;13(3):675–697.

[5]. Arubayi, D. O. (2023). Workplace toxicity and employee performance of manufacturing firms: Evidence from Nigeria. International Journal of Management & Entrepreneurship Research, 5(2), 143–157

[6]. Arubayi, D. O. (2023). Workplace toxicity and employee performance of manufacturing firms: Evidence from Nigeria. International Journal of Management & Entrepreneurship Research, 5(2), 143–157.

[7]. Atmadja, T. S. (2019). Workplace toxicity, leadership behaviors, and leadership strategies (Doctoral dissertation, Walden University). Retrieved from https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations/6516

[8]. Azuma K, Ikeda K, Kagi N, Yanagi U, Osawa H. (2015). Prevalence and risk factors associated with nonspecific building-related symptoms in office employees in Japan: relationships between work environment, Indoor Air Quality, and occupational stress. Indoor Air. 25(5):499–511.

[9]. Cattell, R. B. (1946). Description and measurement of personality. World Book Company.

[10]. Cheung, T., & Yip, P. (2015). Depression, anxiety and symptoms of stress among Hong Kong nurses: A cross-sectional study. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 12(9), 11072–11100.

[11]. Chuan, C. L. (2014). Mediating toxic emotions in the workplace: The impact of abusive supervision. Journal of Nursing Management, 22(8), 953–963. https://doi.org/10.1111/jonm.12089

[12]. Chuan, C. L. (2014). Mediating toxic emotions in the workplace—the impact of abusive supervision. Journal of Nursing Management, 22(8), 953–963.

[13]. Creswell, J. W. (2014). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (4th ed.). Sage Publications.

[14]. Etikan, I., Musa, S. A., & Alkassim, R. S. (2016). Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics, 5(1), 1–4.

[15]. Eysenck, H. J. (1952). The scientific study of personality. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

[16]. Ferris, D. L., Lian, H., Brown, D. J., & Morrison, R. (2015). Ostracism, self-esteem, and job performance: When do we self-verify and when do we self-enhance? Academy of Management Journal, 58(1), 279–297.

[17]. Grijalva, E., & Harms, P. D. (2013). Narcissism: An integrative synthesis and dominance complementarity model. Perspectives, 28(2), 108-127.

[18]. Günüsen, N. P., Wilson, M., & Aksoy, B. (2018). Secondary traumatic stress and burnout among Muslim nurses caring for chronically ill children in a Turkish hospital. Journal of Transcultural Nursing, 29(2), 146–154.

[19]. Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2022). A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM) (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.

[20]. Henseler, J., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2015). A new criterion for assessing discriminant validity in variance-based structural equation modeling. Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 43(1), 115–135.

[21]. Herr, R. M., Barrech, A., Riedel, N., Gundel, H., Angerer, P., & Li, J. (2017). Long-term effectiveness of stress management at work: Effects of changes in perceived stress reactivity on mental health and sleep problems seven years later. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 15(2), 255

[22]. Housman, M., & Minor, D. (2015). Toxic workers (Harvard Business School Strategy Unit Working Paper No. 16-057). Harvard Business School.

[23]. Hua, C., Zhao, L., He, Q., & Chen, Z. (2023). When and how workplace ostracism leads to interpersonal deviance: The moderating effects of self-control and negative affect. Journal of Business Research, 156, 113554.

[24]. Jay, K., & Andersen, L. L. (2018). Can high social capital at the workplace buffer against stress and musculoskeletal pain? A cross-sectional study. Medicine, 97(3)

[25]. Mischel, W. (1968). Personality and assessment. New York: Wiley.

[26]. Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). Psychometric theory (3rd ed.). McGraw-Hill.

[27]. Pickering CE, Nurenberg K, Schiamberg L. Recognizing and responding to the "toxic" work environment: worker safety, patient safety, and abuse/neglect in nursing homes. Qual Health Res.2017;27(12):1870–1881.

[28]. Rohayati, T. (2022). Workplace toxicity and leadership strategies. Manajemen dan Bisnis Indonesia, 17(3), 761–763.

[29]. Smith, J. G., Morin, K. H., & Lake, E. T. (2015). Association of the nurse work environment with nurse incivility in hospitals. Journal of Nursing Management, 26(2), 219–226.

[30]. Wolf L.A, Perhats C, Delao A.M & Clark P.R. (2017). Workplace aggression as cause and effect: emergency nurses' experiences of working fatigued. Int Emerg Nurs.33:48–52.

[31]. Yang, J., & Treadway, D. C. (2018). A social influence interpretation of workplace ostracism and counterproductive work behavior. Journal of Business Ethics, 148(4), 879–891.