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Abstract

Academics are not immune to workplace bullying. Several studies show that academic institutions have a higher rate of bullying than other organizations the overall nature of bullying's effects show that the victim, the people surrounding him or her, and the organization all suffer or are unable to function as effectively as previously. (Keashly and Jagatic 2011). The study investigated the impact of workplace bullying (WPB) on the university environment (UE) and the mediating function of the UE with the relationship between WPB and teacher self-efficacy (TSE). Survey data were obtained from 665 University faculty members from Pakistan. The proposed relationships were evaluated using SMART-PLS structural equation modeling. Significant impact of WPB on UE and TSE was found in this study. In addition, the study found that UE has a considerable impact on TSE, while WPB has an indirect impact on TSE through UE. The study is significant since there is a dearth of workplace bullying research in Pakistani universities. A very little research has been done on the effect of workplace bullying as a key indicator of university environment and research on the effect of university environment on self-efficacy of the teachers. This study is one of the first attempts to evaluate the relationship between WPB, UE, and TSE. This study has essential practical consequences for practitioners in higher education since it contains important information about the relationship between the university environment, teacher self-efficacy, and workplace bullying incidents.
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Introduction

Academics play a critical part in a country's higher education system. Universities are in responsibility of not simply educating and training the next workforce, but also of contributing to society's advancement through research. Bullying at work in academic settings can interrupt learning of students and reduce the efficiency of intellectual in higher education (McKay et al 2008). Workplace bullying (WPB) is a widespread problem that is identified in many
Workplace bullying, according to Leymann (1990), is caused by a bad climate and a lack of coping skills among innocent victims. A widespread belief is that an unhealthy work atmosphere fosters bullying. Vartia (2011) discovered that bullying is facilitated by characteristics link with organization dysfunctions, including unproductive information flow, authoritarian style for resolving disagreements, a lack of mutual discussions about the work unit's tasks and goals, and insufficient opportunities to influence personal matters. Bullying is highly common among a sample of Pakistani employees. According to the findings, 78 percent of employees from four different firms, including universities, have experienced workplace bullying. (Anjum, 2013). According to Bandura (1992) self-efficacy is a critical component of human conduct. Teachers' self-efficacy indicates their confidence in their students' accomplishments and their ability to organiz their knowledge and abilities in order to attain teaching goals. (Moran, 2003) Hsieh and Wang's (2019) study revealed self-efficacy and mental health was found to have a negative correlation with bullying, while leaving was found to have a positive correlation. Self-efficacy was adversely associated with mental health and favorably associated with intention to leave. They have also found that self-efficacy served as a partial mediator between bullying and mental health, as well as an intention to quit. In his study, Maran 2020 discovered that 58 percent of university professors who had been victims of workplace violence had a high rate of exhaustion in regards of tension and disengagement. Teachers who have never experienced workplace bullying show lower levels of workplace satisfaction and regulatory emotional self-efficacy, especially for negative emotions, when compared to teachers who have never experienced workplace bullying.

Bullied employees are more prone to have troubled connections with their coworkers and even family members. They have low job satisfaction and are more likely to leave the institution, hence such powerful human effects have substantial institutional costs. Furthermore, if an organization has a reputation for being a hostile workplace, recruiting new employees may be challenging, resulting in talent shortages. (Hoel, 2001) Bullying in the workplace has two aspects in terms of employee relations. People who don't get along with each other at work may be the first thing that leads to bullying. This is because of the way the workplace is organized and social (Glomb, 2002). Second, bullying has consequences for employee relations, performance, career development, job security, organizational elements such as organizational structure and office politics as well as other workplace events (Hauge et al., 2007). There is a clear connection between workplace bullying and power misuse. (Salin and Hoel, 2011). Academics may have used workplace bullying to harm the reputations of their competitors in order to advance up the academic ladder. This could lead to hostile academic cultures and a decline in the quality of academic work environments. (Gumbus and Meglich, 2012) This was also found out by Giorgi (2012), who surveyed academics at big Italian universities. The author discovered in her research that workplace bullying is a type of virus that can make a workplace miserable. Her research reveals that workplace bullying can have a negative impact on academic work environments and academic wellness.
Bullying is a crucial work-environmental component that can have a substantial impact on an individual's health as well as their ability to perform successfully at work. (Einarsen et al. 2011) A Swedish study discovered a high correlation between academic productivity loss and work-environment difficulties due to workplace bullying. (Lohela-Karlsson et al. 2018). Both the European Union (2001) and the International Labour Organization (1998) have identified workplace bullying as a severe problem in European workplaces and have indicated a strong desire to study more about the phenomenon's effects on employee psychological well-being and health in general. Workplace bullying is referred to by a variety of terms, including abusive behaviour, incivility, workplace harassment, mobbing, mistreatment, demonization, petty tyranny, and so on. Bullying is defined as repeated negative acts, direct or indirect, that occur over time and are not accepted by the target. It can be perpetrated by one or more people, and the victim is generally powerless to protect themselves (Bartlett and Bartlett, 2011). Academics' mental health and participation in higher education might be damaged by workplace bullying. It has the ability to separate academics from their employment, reduce their intellectual contribution, obstruct their students' guiding abilities, and influence the entire quality of their learning experiences (Bjorkqvist et al., 1994). A study by Ahmad et al., 2017 indicates that workplace bullying is widespread among academics in Pakistan, with up to half subjected to tactics such as excessive work monitoring and professional competence degradation, failure to recognize work contributions, and obstruction to crucial job-related concerns. In normal life, it can be quite difficult to spot bullying. In comparable situations, one individual may experience bullying while another does not. Additionally, due to cultural differences, opinions of bullying vary among work environments and occupations, as well as across nations. Regardless, workplace bullying occurs at all levels in higher education, among academics, non-academic employees, students, administrators and across all disciplines. (Sinkkonen et al., 2014). Furthermore, academic bullying is difficult to characterize because universities are a classic example of an organization that emphasizes task-oriented competence, autonomy, and individuality, which is why. (Agervold, 2007). There are many types of bullying that can happen in many educational institutions. Some of them are very sophisticated and hard to classify as bullying. There are some things about bullying that make it hard to talk about specific types. This makes it more difficult to find out how bullying affects a person's schoolwork. (Merilainen et al, 2019). In 2005, Boynton conducted a survey of academics in the United Kingdom and Northern Ireland. According to the survey, between 25% and 25% of university employees had been bullied, 66 percent of those bullied were thinking or trying to leave their jobs. The study found that low-level bullying included minor insults, spreading rumors and verbal abuse. Study also indicated that universities have organized bullying. Bullying has gotten a lot of attention in recent years, especially in schools and workplaces. There is an increasing quantity of research on the subject in numerous countries (Simpson and Cohen, 2004;
Kunttu and Huttunen, 2009; Coleyshaw, 2010; Keashly and Neuman, 2013). On the other hand, there appears to be a lack of research on bullying in universities. Bullying has been documented in colleges, educational institutions, and workplaces, it is logical to conclude that universities are not immune. (Mostafizur, 2020). Universities have always been reluctant to conduct studies in this sector (Coleyshaw, 2010). Existing literature has identified several gaps about the role of WPB, UE, and TSE that shall be addressed.

First, individuals are most affected by bullying or inappropriate behavior in the form of emotional illnesses and a reduction in professional self-confidence and performance. The consequences are too long-term and collectively linked to a deteriorating work environment, consequently, it decline faculty profitability. (Einersen et al., 2016). Hence the current study took into the effect of workplace bullying on university teachers’ self-efficacy. Second, even though Leymann (1990) defined bullying as an inseparable result of a negative work climate that depletes the resources of a work team as a whole, there are still insufficient research studies that address the University environment, which promotes bullying by challenging employees’ resources. Only a little amount of research has been done on the impact of climate on workplace bullying by Hague & Einarsen, 2007; Agervold, 2009; Skogstad, 2011; Einarsen et al., 2016. So the workplace bullying’s impact on the university environment has been investigated in this study. Third, workplace bullying has been a significant subject of research internationally for a long period, and it continues to be a topic of global interest, with different ideas appearing regularly (Einarsen and Nielsen, 2018). However, there is a scarcity of research on the effects of workplace bullying in the university environment and the university teacher self-efficacy. Forth, multiple mediating variables are used to evaluate the relationship between workplace bullying and well-being. (Burns et al., 2020; Deacon, 2014; Vos, 2013). The direct correlation between workplace bullying and teacher self-efficacy is questionable. Existing research has emphasized the need of examining the university environment as a mediating element in the influence of workplace bullying on different dimensions of university teachers' self-efficacy.

**Review of related literature**

**Workplace bullying (WPB)**

The workplace bullying study began in Germany in 1992, when Leymann first time conducted interviews with victims of the issue and began developing the first questionnaire to assess it. Throughout history, workplace bullying or mobbing has been explained in a different ways, but the most thorough is provided by Einarsen, Zapf, Hoel, and Cooper (2003). They defined bullying as the act of harassment, social isolation, and acts to interfere with someone's capability to perform their work duties. These behaviors have a detrimental effect on the individual as well as the company as a whole (Chirilă & Constantin, 2013). A person is considered bullied if he or she is subjected to unpleasant behavior at work regularly (Einarsen & Skogstad, 1996). According to Moreno (2017), bullying is the most detrimental expression that can occur at work because of the constant unfavorable contact with other people, the numerous psychological dangers, and the
bad health outcomes. Researchers frequently distinguish two types of workplace bullying: (1) work related bullying, which includes illogical deadlines, workloads, excessive monitoring and information is being withheld and (2) personal bullying, which includes teasing, and criticism, gossip, insulting comments, ((Matthiesen and Einarsen, 2010; Nielsen et al. 2021). According to a survey done by the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions (2010) 48.7 percent of teachers from Turkey, Norway, Macedonia, Albania, Kosovo, Spain, United Kingdom, and Norway had encountered workplace bullying. (Ariza et al., 2016). Keashly and Neuman (2010) say that In higher education bullying behavior by academics is indirect and covert, but it is done in a systematic way to hurt the reputation and competence of the person being bullied. Bullying in the workplace is a major, frequently unnoticed problem that has significant, social, psychological and organizational costs for both employers and organization. It is not only a legal concern, but it also has an impact on workers' health and welfare. Bullying in the workplace hurts both individuals and organizations. Workplace hostility is a severe and increasing problem that affects a large number of teachers. The victim of workplace bullying may experience despair, depression, fear and even panic when going to work and in severe cases, suicidal thoughts or actions. (Einarsen, 2006). Bullying victims suffer from physical illness such as heart disease, sleep disorders, headaches. Psychological problems like sadness and anxiety and behavioral strain such as aggressive behavior, unexpected sobbing. (Fox, 2010). Bullying or inappropriate behavior has the greatest impact on individuals as emotional disturbance and a decline in self-confidence and performance. These factors are also related to the deteriorating work environment and consequently to the decline in faculty profitability. (Einersan et al. 2016).

Bullying at work is occurs when workers faced negative actions and practices over and over again. The target doesn't like the behavior and it's done in a way that makes it hard for the target to defend him or her. The actions could be done on purpose or not at all. These actions make the person they target feel humiliated, offended, and stressed. The bullying behavior results have been shown to cause a lot of stress and problems in social, occupational, and other areas of life. (Einarsen et al., 2003). After evaluating academic bullying research, Keashly et al. (2013) found that bullying harms not only the targeted and bystanders but also the institution. In the studies of Nelson and Lambert (2001) it has been discovered negative behaviors prevalent in the academic environment which typically involve threats of professional standing, isolating and obstructive behavior which interferes with the target capacity to achieve crucial objectives. The findings of the Mostafizur and others (2020) research show that being bullied has an impact on the safety of individual and increases likelihood to the psychological and social difficulties.

Workplace bullying in academia

Westhues (2004) also explains that academia is a great environment for bullying because of the subjective nature of performance measures and the contradictory agendas that exist. He also identified three of the most common risk factors associated with bullying: competition for
position or responsibilities, jealousy, and the perpetrator's insecurity about himself or herself. According to Simpson and Cohen's (2004) study twenty five percent (25%) of university employees in the United Kingdom had encountered workplace bullying. Additionally, they say university administrators and heads of departments of faculties were hesitant to admit any type of bullying occurring at university for fear of being blamed for their own bad management or leadership. According to Mckay et al., 2008, academia is a particularly vulnerable environment for harassment. According to the study, 32% of employees (faculty, staff, and administrators) said they had been bullied for more than three years. They further said that when they focused on teaching staff, this percentage rose to 49%. Another study conducted in 2013 by De and Jacobs discovered that 90.8 percent of South African teachers were victims of workplace bullying during the previous 12 months. The attackers made a concerted effort to destroy and isolate the victims' professional status. Malik et al.(2017) found from their comparison study that the teachers of Finland reported superior working conditions, increased social support and increased prospects of promotion and development at work compared to Pakistani counterparts. Additionally the findings indicated bullying in the workplace substantially less prevalent in Finland. According to Anjum and Muazzam's (2018) findings, 42% of university teachers in Lahore, Pakistan have reported workplace bullying in their respective institutions.

University environment (UE)

Giorgi (2012) conducted study about the links between the work environment, workplace bullying and health among Italian academics. His findings indicated bullying has direct and indirect effect on health via the partial mediation of organizational climate. Bullying in particular might be considered a cause rather than a result of the organizational atmosphere. Previous research reveals the type of teacher work environment influences their overall likelihood of being bullied. (e.g. Escartin, 2019; Giorgi, 2010; Vartia, 2011; Vickers, 2014). According to Escartin (2019), the main reasons for bullying are not personality traits but rather work environment factors. Qualities of a certain work environment such as affiliation with one's work unit and collective beliefs of fairness and psychosocial safety suggest a teacher's overall risk of bullying. Coleyshaw (2010) explains that bullying at work can include professional understating; unreasonable work-related demands or work-related malpractice. These types of bullying can make the workplace less pleasant. Appreciation, vertical trust, predictability and quality of leadership are factors in the workplace that make bullying more likely to happen. People who have had professional understanding experiences seem to have less positive feelings about all aspects of a good working environment. Bullying in the workplace may be caused by a lack of "appreciation" in the workplace. The person's negative impact on the work environment may make people more likely to be aggressive which in turn makes them more likely to bully other people. Environmental factors, on the other hand, may lead to inter group issues and negative social climate which may lead to bullying at work (Einarsen, 2011). A bad organizational climate can lead to bullying at work, according to the Iftikhar 2015 study's overall findings. This could
be because of things like unclear job descriptions, a lot of time pressures, and poor working conditions.

Teacher self-efficacy (TSE)

Workplace stress and physical health can be affected by workers' self-perceptions of their abilities, says Bandura (2000). Those with low self-efficacy due to excessive work demands exceed their capacity for cope may suffer from physically and mentally stress in the workplace (Friedman, 2003). Teacher self-efficacy is a key aspect in ensuring that families are involved in educational process. Teachers those are confident in their abilities are less concerned with the parent-teacher connection (Fives and other, 2004)

Workplace bullying and teacher self-efficacy

Teacher self-efficacy relates to how confident teachers are that their efforts will have a beneficial impact on their students' abilities, behavior, and overall achievement. In other words, teacher self-efficacy refers to a person perception that he or she possesses the required skills to assist pupils in learning pushed for the concept of self-efficacy as a useful tool for explaining the teacher behavior. Teacher with low self-efficacy avoid things that may be beyond their ability, whereas a teacher with strong self-efficacy may develop more challenging activities (Schunk, 1989). According to studies by Voeten (2009) and Salmivalli (2010), the relationship between self-efficacy and mobbing is as self-efficacy increases, mobbing decreases. Association between mobbing and self-efficacy which is regarded to be one of the consequences of these acts was investigated in these studies. DiGiulio, (2004) defines this relationship as follows: "Self- competent teachers make an effort to develop positive relationships with the school principal and administration." They are well prepared and make effective use of their strengths. On the other hand, teachers who lack self-efficacy do not consider their chances of success, and hence do not prepare well or at all, affecting their performance in other areas of life as well. As a result, in light of the preceding context the following hypothesis is advanced:

H1. There is significant impact of Workplace bullying on Teacher self-efficacy

Workplace bullying and university environment

Jenkins (2012) has identified several factors that have been identified as contributing factors to workplace bullying. According to him organizational environment is one of the major factors that contribute to the existence and maintenance of workplace bullying specifically leadership style, role ambiguity and conflict, poor job design, no supportive environment, stressful working environment and job insecurity. Qureshi (2013) express further bullying in the workplace is negatively linked with the organizational atmosphere. According to his study, widespread bullying as a result of the workplace climate might harm employees' physical and mental health. If workplace bullying is not managed effectively, it can have a major detrimental impact on
employees and the organization's overall performance, making a healthy, happy, and engaged workforce unattainable. Organizations must develop methods to address workplace bullying, but managers must first understand the reasons and causes of bullying. Iftikhar (2015), Leymann (1996) described several cases in which bullying was caused by inadequate or ineffective working conditions and issues with leadership. Other researchers findings like Einarsen et al. (1994), Vartia (1996), and Osterwalder (1998) support this point of view as well. These all researchers discovered a substantial association between the frequency of bullying occurrences and an organization's working circumstances. It is possible to conclude a poor working environment can lead to the prevalence of bullying.

Einarsen (1994) found people who watch bullying have the worse work environment than people who aren't bullied. Further, it adds leadership styles and the general cohesion of the workplace to the list of work environment variables that are linked to bullying. Observing negative behavior toward one's coworkers is linked to a bad work environment. It could also be that bullying makes the work environment worse or bullying is easier to do in chaotic workplaces (Cooper-Thomas et al., 2013). Based on the review of the literature it is proposed that

H2. There is significant impact of workplace bullying on the university environment.

University environment and teacher self-efficacy

Negative social atmospheres facilitate bullying in the workplace. (Einarsen, 2000) Furthermore the study discovered bullying and organizational climate damage employee health resulting in altered sleeping habits. Brotheridge et al. (2012) found workplace bullying had negative effects on one's personal health and behavior and self-efficacy.

Self-efficacy is based on the theory of social cognitive theory which emphasizes the development and use of human agency. This means people can have some control over what they do. Bandura (2006) says that in this view people are self-organizing, proactive, self-regulating, self-reflecting and they do these things on their own. From this point of view self-efficacy affects one's goals and behavior and it is also affected by one's actions and the environment in which one lives (Schunk and Meece, 2006). Thus in light of the preceding context the following hypothesis is proposed:

H3. There is significant impact of the university environment on teacher self-efficacy.

The mediating role of the University environment

Self-efficacy beliefs influence how people see environmental possibilities and obstructions as well as the activities they choose the amount of effort they put into them and how long they will
persevere when faced with challenges. (Bandura, 2006). According to social cognition theory, teacher self-efficacy can be defined as an individual teacher belief in their own abilities to plan, organize, and carry out educational activities. Workplace bullying does not predict work engagement according to Adil et al. (2020) study on work environment and self-efficacy. Participants who reported a higher level of creative self-efficacy showed a larger positive link between job engagement and creative work involvement. In essence, people with high self-efficacy regard creative work as a hard activity to master rather than a threat to be avoided. According to the literature, workplace bullying has a connection to the university environment, which affects teacher self-efficacy (see Figure 1). So the study asserts that the university environment mediates the association between workplace bullying and teacher self-efficacy. Taking into consideration the information provided above the following hypothesis is proposed:

H4. The university environment mediates the relationship between workplace bullying and teacher self-efficacy

![Figure 1. Research model](image)

**Research Methodology**

The study's population was composed of Pakistani university faculty/teachers. 665 faculty members were chosen from prominent public and private sector universities in the Southern Punjab province of Pakistan. Convenience sampling was used to pick the sample because workplace bullying is a highly sensitive subject so random sampling would have been challenging. To disseminate the questionnaire faculty members were contacted directly and by email. A total of 394 female and 271 male responders made up 59 and 41%. Respondents under 30 (116), 31–45 (446), 46–55 (84), and above 55 (19) years old represented for 17, 67, 13, and 3%, respectively. Most of the respondents were married (73%). Similarly, 118 respondents had M.A./M.Sc/BS degrees, 297 had M.Phil/MS degrees, 219 had Ph.D. degrees, and 31 had done Post Doc, representing 18, 45, 32, and 05 %, respectively. Most of the participants were on the post of Lecturer. 149 respondents had less than 1 year of work experience, 202 respondents had
1 to 5 years, 168 respondents had 6 to 10 years, 82 respondents had 11 to 15 years, and 64 respondents had more than 16 years of work experience, accounting for 22, 30, 25, 12 and 11% of the total respondents, respectively (Table 1).

Table 1.
Respondents profile N=665

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency (f)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>below 30</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31-45</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>above 55</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Un married</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualification</td>
<td>M.A / M.Sc./BS</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M.Phil./MS</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post Doc</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designation</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate lecturer</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visiting lecturer</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research Assistant</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Experience</td>
<td>less than 1 year</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-10 Years</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>above 16 years</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Instruments**

The widely used revised version of the well-known workplace bullying questionnaire (Negative Acts Questionnaire Revised, NAQ-R, Einarsen, Hoel, & Notelaers, 2009) was used to assess workplace bullying actions using 18 items. The response scale consisted of five points, with 1 representing never and 5 representing daily. One of the items used is, someone is spreading rumors about your personal life. Each of these items has an Alpha Cronbach coefficient of 0.922.

Vartia’s (1996) OSQ scale was utilized to assess the University environment as a source of bullying. The university climate was assessed using nine items with a three-point answer scale, where 1 indicated disagreement and 3 indicated agreement. Each of these nine items has an Alpha Cronbach’s coefficient of 0.81. As an illustration of the item, “the differences of opinion are freely listened to and discussed with all teachers.” statement was used. The TSE
Questionnaire, developed by Celep and Eminoglu in 2012, was used to assess teacher self-efficacy. In five points Likert response scale 1 representing total disagreement and 5 representing total agreement. An example of the used item is, "I will be able to fulfill most of the objective I have set for myself." For these items, the Alpha Cronbach's coefficient is 0.90.

Results and Analyses

Measurement Model

With the help of the measurement model reliability and validity of the constructs were checked. All of the model's factor loadings are greater than 0.50, which is the minimum acceptable number (Hair, Black, Babin, & Anderson, 2010). The items can be removed if the composite reliability (CR) or average variance extracted (AVE) increases more than the amount that is suggested (Hair et al., 2016). In this study, removing the item (UE23, loading = 0.478) did not affect the composite reliability or AVE because the construct values were already over the acceptable standard. For this reason, no items were removed out of the study for further analysis.

The construct reliability was determined using Cronbach's alpha. To get a reasonable level of model reliability, Cronbach's alpha must be higher than 0.7 (Bagozzi, 1988). All of the constructs in this study had Cronbach's alpha values greater than 0.7, indicating good reliability. The composite reliability (CR) and average variance extract (AVE) were used to determine the model's convergent validity. In this study composite reliability is 0.940 for TSE, 0.867 for UE, and 0.931 for WPB, and average variance extract is 0.571 for TSE, 0.423 for UE, and 0.432 for WPB. Convergent Validity is established when CR > 0.70. and AVE > 0.40 (Hair et al. 2016).

As a result, constructs in this study possess convergent validity. (Table 2)

Table 2. Factor loadings, Reliability, and validity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>loadings</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
<th>Rho_A</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>AVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workplace bullying (WPB)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.521</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.534</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.634</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.565</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.661</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.620</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.680</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.637</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.688</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.590</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.795</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.707</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.791</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.683</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.628</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.667</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.733</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.618</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discriminant Validity

The discriminant validity of the constructs is determined using the Heterotrait-Monotrait (HTMT) ratio technique. The most conservative threshold value for the HTMT ratio, according to Henseler et al. (2015), is less than or equal to 0.90. In this study all HTMT readings are below the 0.90 cutoffs. As a result, discriminant validity is achieved (see Table 3).

Table 3. Discriminant Validity using HTMT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TSE</th>
<th>UE</th>
<th>WPB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TSE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UE</td>
<td>0.161</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPB</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0.279</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Structural Equation Modeling

The structural model reflects the research framework's hypothesized pathways. This study used the PLS-SEM method to evaluate this framework. H1 examines the relationship between WPB and TSE. The findings indicate that WPB possesses a statistically significant effect on TSE (β = -0.300, t = 5.961, p < 0.001) H1 was therefore supported. WPB has a significant effect on the
University environment was assessed by H2. The findings indicate that WPB possess a statistically significant effect on UE ($\beta = 0.233, t = 5.245, p < 0.001$). H2 was therefore supported. Whether UE is related to TSE was examined by H3. Findings of the study indicate UE possess also a statistically significant effect on TSE ($\beta = 0.177, t = 3.737, p < 0.001$). H3 was therefore supported.

Table 4 summarizes the findings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relations</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>$t$- Statistics</th>
<th>$p$-values</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1: WPB -&gt; TSE</td>
<td>-0.300</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>5.961</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>H1.supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2: WPB -&gt; UE</td>
<td>0.233</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>5.245</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>H2.supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3: UE -&gt; TSE</td>
<td>0.177</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>3.737</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>H3.supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mediation Analysis

Finally, H4 examines whether UE acts as a mediator between WPB and TSE. The results ($\beta = -0.300, t = 5.961, p < 0.001$) indicates the direct effect (H1) found to be statistically significant. The effect was decreased ($\beta = -0.259, t = 4.561, p < 0.001$) when the mediator variable UE included in the model, and the direct association was shown to be significant. The indirect effect, however, was proven to be significant in the presence of mediator ($\beta = 0.041, t = 2.923, p < 0.004$) The results show that there was a complete mediation. It demonstrates that the effect of WPB on TSE is entirely dependent on UE. As a result, H4 is acceptable (see Table 5)

Table 5. Mediation analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total effect (WPB -&gt; TSE)</th>
<th>Direct effect (WPB -&gt; TSE)</th>
<th>Indirect effect (WPB on TSE) with the inclusion of mediator (UE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td>$P$-values</td>
<td>Coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.259</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

The aim of the study is to determine the link between WPB, UE, and TSE with the PLS-SEM model. In this section, we discuss findings related to the research model. First of all, the study showed a significant impact of WPB on TSE. The study's hypothesis was confirmed by the results. Lev and Rich (2004) suggested that teachers' self-efficacy displays their belief in their students' accomplishments as well as their capacity to organize information and skills and fulfill
instructional objectives. In the educational setting, the term might refer to instructors' perceived competence to organize educational activities and manage classrooms. It may also affect their ability to control their emotions (Eisenberg, 2004). Low teacher self-efficacy, on the other hand, can lead to poor classroom management, which can lead to increased violence, bullying, stress, and burnout (Allen, 2010). Studies examining the association between self-efficacy and mobbing discover that as self-efficacy grows, mobbing behavior decreases (Salin, 2003; Saunders, 2007).

Second, the study found a significant impact of WPB on UE. This impact consists of the previous research of Cortina et al. (2001). The study's findings suggest that negative acts have an impact on all workers, not only victims and observers. Consequently, bullying is contagious, which might have negative implications. Negative experiences may lead some people to break workplace rules and execute their jobs with low performance. Distressed individuals, norms of politeness in particular may be broken by this, causing other people in the workplace to act aggressively and making the workplace less pleasant. The findings of Bjorklund et al. (2021) show that people who work in a bad (low value) social climate are more than three times as likely as the general population to be bullied than people who work in a positive, supportive, and pleasant environment. Furthermore, those who worked in an unfriendly environment for innovation were more likely to be bullied. The study of Iftikhar (2015) said that if organizations pay more attention to negative behavior, especially in terms of reducing negative acts in work environments, it will be a good way to improve employees' health, and performance or at least lessen their problems. The outcomes affirm this recommendation that instead of dealing with bullying situations on an individual basis, organizations should strive to make their workplaces more organized through initiatives and regulations in order to decrease the risk of bullying occurring.

Third, the study showed a significant impact of UE on TSE. Results confirmed this hypothesis and are in line with the results of earlier studies of Flores and Clark, (2004). The results demonstrate that depression, anxiety of performance, and the failure fear are all symptoms of low efficacy. Teachers who hold negative ideas about their qualifications they have doubts of their own abilities. As a result, people avoid work that they think they can't do, and when they face problems, they limit or give up their efforts according to DiGiulio (2004). Self-efficacious teachers are well-prepared and make excellent use of their abilities. Teachers with poor self-efficacy, on the other hand, do not consider their chances of success and hence do not prepare well this also has an effect on their performance in other aspects of life. (Cimen, 2007). Adil's (2020) findings show that the respondents indicated high levels of self-efficacy had a stronger positive association between work involvement job commitments. The results of the Tobin et al, 2014 study, which included 679 teachers, showed that both organizational climate and organizational learning were significantly associated with teacher self-efficacy.
Finally, the research findings provide significant empirical light on the indirect effect of WPB on TSE through the use of UE mediation. The findings indicate that UE acts as a mediating factor in the link between WPB and TSE. The outcomes are line with the findings of the earlier studies which have identified the important mediating influence of organizations environment. The study of Qabool et al.;(2021) shows that self-efficacy and the job environment has been important predictors towards the job performance. Compliance with safety regulations is facilitated by a positive work environment. Self-efficacy and work atmosphere both play a role in mediating job performance. Bullying at work has a direct and indirect effect on health via the partial mediation of organizational climate, (Giorgi, 2012). Additionally, Reaves’s (2018) study discovered that teachers who experienced comfortable and protected environment had much higher level self-efficacy than those who did not feel secure or protected in their workplace.

**Conclusion**

Workplace bullying is a difficult issue that can damage the victim's entire personality. Bullying is based on humiliation and personal degradation. Bullying can also alter the victim's environment, leaving them alone. The educational system can be cruel at times, making it difficult for instructors to escape or defend themselves. As a result of workplace bullying, teachers' personalities, professional performance, and personal lives are negatively impacted.

So the following research established that frequently neglected, yet critical, components and ideas, WPB and UE, create the problems and issues of TSE. This paper mentions one of the earliest attempts at developing and testing an integrated model that connects WPB and TSE via the mediating role of UE. This article adds to the body of knowledge on workplace bullying and university environments by demonstrating that WPB can substantially decrease the healthy environment of the university (UE) that plays a key role in boosting the likelihood of a successful TSE. Findings of the article, WPB is affecting the functioning of the UE and TSE. Policymakers and administrators should devise a strategy to control WPB to promote a healthy working environment for their university teachers. To ensure the long-term development of the TSE, higher education or senior management must take action against WPB and promote their perspective for UE processes with other members. Furthermore, it is recommended that at the university level the teachers should provide awareness of the phenomena, as well as defense mechanisms and understanding of legal rules, be increased for the goals of prevention. As a result, this research believes it is critical to investigate this phenomenon, disseminate the findings, and incorporate them into undergraduate teacher education courses. At the same time, each university department should establish an ethical code for faculty and recognize mobbing as an inappropriate kind of behavior in the university.

**Study Implications**
A key relationship between the university environment, teacher self-efficacy, and workplace bullying is revealed by this study's results. It’s a good idea, from a practical standpoint, to explicitly address and discuss workplace bullying perceptions when HR managers receive training on how to handle suspected incidences of bullying. Individuals who work in academic environments can use the findings of this study to assist in preventing bullying at an early stage.

Limitations and future directions

There are certain limitations and future directions to the research study that must be recognized. Data were obtained from university faculty members in southern Punjab, Pakistan; thus, the methodology should be repeated in various contexts. Second, while the current study examined the effect of WPB on the TSE, future research should examine other dimensions such as well-being and teacher performance. Third future studies should examine the role of victim personality as a mediator between WPB and TSE. And finally, data were acquired by self-report, which may have resulted in underreporting of workplace bullying due to its socially taboo nature. Thus, it is advised that in the future study, additional methodologies such as interviewing and focus groups should be used in combination with a self-report questionnaire to acquire comprehensive data on the incidence and intensity of bullying. The current research was carried out in Pakistan. Across countries, cultural inequalities in bullying determinants and consequences must exist (Glas et al., 2011). In this field of study, cross-cultural research is required. As a result, existing bullying models must be tested cross-culturally and adjusted as needed. It is advised that instructors' awareness of the phenomena, as well as defense mechanisms and understanding of legal rules, be increased for the goals of prevention. As a result, the authors of this research believe it is critical to investigate this phenomenon, disseminate the findings, and incorporate them into undergraduate teacher education courses. At the same time, each university department should establish an ethical code for faculty and recognize mobbing as an inappropriate kind of behavior in the university.
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