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ABSTRACT

Purpose: There has been a recent uptick in reports of workplace bullying, which has the potential to have an impact on productivity in manufacturing firms. Employee performance (EmPer) indicators such as psychological resilience (Psyche) and emotional intelligence (EmoI) have been found over the years, but their interplay with other factors has been poorly studied. Studying the mediating and moderating functions of Psyche and EmoI in the context of workplace bullying and employee performance was the primary goal of this research.

Design/methodology/data analysis: employees of manufacturing SMEs in southwestern Nigeria completed 512 online surveys, with each construct measured using an adopted and modified scale from existing studies. Additional analyses were performed on the collected data using partial least squares structural equation modelling (PLS-SEM) software. These analyses included regression, factor analysis, structural equation modelling with the bootstrapping technique, reliability, validity, moderation, and model fit indices.

Findings: According to the study's findings, workplace bullying is positively associated with employee performance, emotional intelligence, and psychological resilience. It was also found that psychological resilience moderates the relationships between bully-EmPer and EmoI-EmPer, and that the bullying-EmPer relationship is partially mediated by mental health factors.

Originality/value: the current study makes a valuable empirical contribution by analyzing how workplace bullying affects performance in a manufacturing setting using a unique heuristic model. This study is the first to examine the mediating and moderating effect of psychological resilience on the link between bullying, Emol, and EmPer among Nigerian manufacturing firms.

Practical implications: Even the most modest SMEs are subject to the well-established interaction between society and enterprise. As a result, managers of employees have an obligation to build bullying-free workplaces that promote safety, safeguard employees' basic rights, and, ultimately, increase their efficiency on the job.
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INTELIGÊNCIA EMOCIONAL E RESILIÊNCIA PSICOLÓGICA NO LOCAL DE TRABALHO BULLYING E DESEMPENHO DOS FUNCIONÁRIOS: UMA PERSPECTIVA DE MEDIAÇÃO MODERADA

RESUMO

Objetivo: Houve um aumento recente nos relatórios sobre o assédio moral no local de trabalho, que tem potencial para ter um impacto na produtividade das empresas industriais. Indicadores de desempenho do empregado (EmPer), como resiliência psicológica (Psyche) e inteligência emocional (Emol) foram encontrados ao longo dos anos, mas sua interação com outros fatores tem sido pouco estudada. Estudar as funções mediadoras e moderadoras do Psyche e do Emol no contexto do bullying no local de trabalho e do desempenho dos funcionários foi o objetivo principal desta pesquisa.

Design/metodologia/análise de dados: os funcionários de PME do setor industrial no sudoeste da Nigéria completaram 512 pesquisas on-line, com cada construção medida usando uma escala adotada e modificada a partir de estudos existentes. Foram realizadas análises adicionais sobre os dados coletados usando o software de modelagem de equações estruturais parciais de mínimos quadrados (PLS-SEM). Estas análises incluíram regressão, análise fatorial, modelagem de equações estruturais com a técnica de bootstrapping, confiabilidade, validade, moderação e índices de ajuste de modelo.

Conclusões: De acordo com as conclusões do estudo, a intimidação no local de trabalho está positivamente associada ao desempenho dos funcionários, inteligência emocional e resiliência psicológica. Também foi constatado que a resiliência psicológica modera as relações entre bully-EmPer e Emol-EmPer, e que a relação bullying-EmPer é parcialmente mediada por fatores de saúde mental.

Originalidade/valor: o estudo atual faz uma contribuição empírica valiosa ao analisar como o bullying no local de trabalho afeta o desempenho em um ambiente de fabricação usando um modelo heurístico exclusivo. Este estudo é o primeiro a examinar o efeito mediador e moderador da resiliência psicológica sobre a ligação entre o bullying, Emol e EmPer entre as empresas de fabricação nigerianas.

Implicações práticas: Mesmo as PME mais modestas estão sujeitas à interação bem estabelecida entre a sociedade e as empresas. Como resultado, os gerentes de empregados têm a obrigação de construir locais de trabalho livres de bullying que promovam a segurança, protejam os direitos básicos dos empregados e, em última instância, aumentem sua eficiência no trabalho.

Palavras-chave: inteligência emocional, desempenho do empregado, resiliência psicológica, modelagem de equações estruturais, bullying no local de trabalho.

1 INTRODUCTION

In today's complex business world, it's hard to say enough about how important employee performance is, since most job outcomes are based on how well employees do their jobs. Generally, different organizations have different characteristics, different role assignments, and different internal structures. The manufacturing company is specifically different from other organizations in terms of its monotonous nature and job routine,
which frequently facilitate burnout, stress, job dissatisfaction, and interpersonal disharmony among co-workers.

Bullying at work is one of the most often reported bad things about people at work. It always has a number of bad effects that not only bother the employees but also hurt the productivity of the organization as a whole. Previous studies had found direct links between workplace bullying and many organizational outcomes, such as low job satisfaction, the intention to leave, job burnout, absenteeism, and employee performance. Bullying brings both psychological injury and emotional distress to the bullied employees and can lead to lower employee performance in the workplace.

Emotional intelligence and psychological resilience are two key psychological concepts that, according to the research that has been done so far, can directly and indirectly help reduce the negative effects of workplace bullying on employee performance. Zaman, Nawaz, Shafique, and Rafique said in 2021 that emotional intelligence can act as a buffer to reduce the negative effects of different social supports for counterproductive work behaviors (like workplace bullying) among employees. Further, Sarrionandia, Ramos-Díaz, and Fernández-Lasarte (2018) reported that emotional intelligence (EmoI) is related to many important behavioral outcomes.

The intersection of bullying and employee performance is the subject of multiple ongoing studies, most especially within the domain of industries such as banking, hospitality, education, health, textiles, and manufacturing, but their interaction through the exploration of intervening individuals’ psychological factors in this association is greatly lacking. On this note, the current research aims to shed new light on the empirical data supporting emotional intelligence and psychological resilience as critical mediators that can considerably lessen the detrimental effects of bullying on employee performance across industries. To the best of the researchers’ knowledge, little is known about the interplay between workplace bullying, employee performance, and organizational outcomes, particularly within the context of manufacturing sectors in Nigeria. Thus, this present study intends to investigate the direct influence of workplace bullying on employee performance and also examine the indirect mechanisms of behavioral constructs like emotional intelligence and psychological resilience, through which the undesirable impact of workplace bullying can be mitigated on employee performance and organizational productivity in the manufacturing industry.
2 CONCEPTUAL REVIEW AND HYPOTHESES DEVELOPMENT

2.1 EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE

Emotional intelligence (EmoI) is the ability to be self-aware and socially attuned, to choose between one's own feelings and those of others, and to use knowledge of both to keep one's own privacy. Andrew (2008) said that emotional intelligence is a person's ability to control, regulate, or change how they feel in order to deal with situational or environmental demands in a way that leads to productive performance. Studies have shown that employees with high emotional intelligence are less disturbed by the negative impact of workplace bullying compared to those with low emotional intelligence.

2.2 PSYCHOLOGICAL RESILIENCE (PSYCRE)

Resilience means "the ability to bounce back from bad things" and is thought to be able to protect a person's positive psychological functioning from stressors. This concept has been defined as the interaction between a worker and the environment around him or her. According to Paul, Bamel, and Garg (2016), resilience is a "positive resource capacity" that helps people find meaning in their lives and take charge of their actions. The ability to deal with stress and problems at work better can be attributed to building resilience. Research has shown that resilience plays a crucial role in both employee productivity and the success of a business as a whole. High levels of resilience encourage employees to become more perseverant, which further empowers them to confront difficult situations at work without apprehension.

2.3 WORKPLACE BULLYING

Bullying in the workplace is defined as "the repeated, intentional, or wanton impairment of a weaker personality, typically manifesting in physical, psychological, social, or emotional outbursts" (Choudhary et al., 2022). Bullying can be either direct or indirect, depending on the type of unproductive behaviours used to maltreat weaker or foremost entities, according to research.

Recently, Rodríguez-Cifuentes, Fernández-Salinero, Moriano, & Topa (2020) pointed out that workplace bullying is violence created in a subtle way, using gossip or jokes to create a conflicting or unconducive working condition that may hurt employees’ affective mood and effectiveness at the workplace. Hayat and Afshari (2021) suggested
that the adverse effects of workplace bullying do not only affect employee performance but also have severe impacts on organizational outcomes.

2.4 EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE

Employee performance (EmPer) is the result of a person's skills, training, and resources, as well as what inspires them to do their best. A worker's performance is defined more precisely as the quantity and quality of their work that they contribute to the overall output (Bahadır, Yeşiltaş, Sesen & Olaleye, 2022). It also incorporates the amount of time and energy that an employee dedicates to their profession. When workers perceive their workplace as pleasant and devoid of emotional or physical stress, they tend to perform better.

2.5 WORKPLACE BULLYING AND EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE

Bullying is a serious problem that can have a negative impact on productivity (Pradhan & Joshi, 2019). When employees have to deal with a scary or hostile work environment, it hurts their productivity and the productivity of everyone else. Employees who are bullied at work are less likely to stick with a company, have lower job satisfaction, lower morale, lower productivity, make more mistakes, have trouble focusing, and miss more work (Pradhan & Joshi, 2019). Fernández-Berrocal and Extremera (2006) revealed that workplace bullying hurts the people who are bullied and hurts the performance of both the individual and the organization. Hence, a bullied worker performs poorly at work. Some scholars have suggested that bullying reduces workplace productivity. Based on historical research, workplace bullying is likely to affect job performance.

Some researchers (Di Stefano et al., 2019; Liu et al., 2020, Odunjo-Saka et al., 2023) mentioned that “bully” is another type of behavior that hurts employee performance and organization efficiency. Because it is difficult to recognize and detect, subtle bullying behavior may result in targets considering the behaviors as work-driven. Even though we've talked about situations in which bullying could help performance, we can't ignore the fact that it could also hurt performance. Since, this is the case, we believe it is important to stress the difficulty of identifying bullying in the workplace. Regarding the small-scale manufacturing industry in Nigeria, there is a lack of empirical research on how bullying affects employee performance. Based on the existing literature that
established the relationship between workplace bullying and employee performance, the researchers thus proposed that:

H1: Workplace bullying significantly predicts employee performance.

2.6 WORKPLACE BULLYING AND EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE

According to Ashraf and Khan (2014), one justification for bullying in the workplace is that the bullied individuals lack the emotional intelligence (EmoI) to deal with the situation. Since emotions have a great effect on performance, it makes sense that people with high EmoI will be able to keep their emotions in check in the face of a bully. This will keep the bully's actions from affecting their productivity at work right away. Furthermore, this result demonstrated that a person’s sense of self-efficacy fully moderated the connection between workplace bullying and performance.

Prior studies revealed that workplace bullying and emotional intelligence are related in terms of how people act. Zaman et al. (2021) said that emotional intelligence can act as a buffer to protect employees from the bad effects of any kind of counterproductive work behavior. Meanwhile, Cui and Li (2021) said that people with higher EmoI can recognize, understand, and control their emotional reactions in a positive way. Thus, emotionally intelligent employees are certainly better at mood management and are capable of coping with undesirable emotional states that may arise from workplace bullying experiences. Further, earlier research has shown that employees with high EmoI are better at regulating their moods, which makes EmoI serve as a buffer against the negative impacts of organizational stress and workplace bullying (Fu et al., 2020; Uchejeso & Adebisi, 2021).

Some people have said that the lack of EmoI is the main cause of bullying at work. People with high EmoI are less likely to feel stressed or threatened when around a perpetrator, which is good because emotions have a big effect on performance. Instead, they will be able to keep their feelings in check and avoid letting bullying behavior impact their performance at work. Therefore, those with high EI are protected from the harmful effects of workplace bullying to a greater extent than those with low EmoI.

Even though many studies have looked at the larger effects of bullying at work, we still need to recognize the important role that emotional intelligence plays in the way bullying affects performance. Thus, we hypothesize that:
H2: Workplace bullying has a positive and significant effect on emotional intelligence.

2.7 WORKPLACE BULLYING AND PSYCHOLOGICAL RESILIENCE

Several studies investigated how bullying at work might affect workers. Studies have shown that bullies in the workplace are more likely to target employees who are resilient (Maidaniuc-Chirila, 2015). In a similar vein, resilience was discovered to play a critical role in reducing the negative impacts of bullying in the workplace by Mendiratta and Srivastava (2021). According to the findings, the effect of bullying at work decreases with the subject's level of resilience. In the meantime, Mendiratta and Srivastava (2021) found that bullying in the workplace is inversely related to good corporate citizenship. This result highlighted the significance of job happiness and resilience as parallel mediators in dealing with the worryingly detrimental effect of workplace bullying on employee performance. The study's authors reasoned, then:

H3: Workplace bullying positively influences psychological resilience.

2.8 EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE AND PSYCHOLOGICAL RESILIENCE

There is a lot of evidence in the literature that positive emotions and positive outcomes are linked to behavior at work. Schneider et al. (2013) noted that EmoI encourages the development of psychological resilience and further suggested that employees with high emotional intelligence have a greater level of resilience. These scholars argue that a high EmoI is advantageous in trying times. Further, Cheng et al. (2022) stated that highly resilient individuals are more likely to experience positive emotions even when facing challenging situations. It is expected that being resilient in the workplace may motivate employee performance on the job. Thus, it is proposed that:

H4: Emotional intelligence is positively related to psychological resilience.

2.9 EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE MEDIATES THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN WORKPLACE BULLYING AND EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE

Rodríguez-Cifuentes, Fernández-Salinero, Moriano, and Topa (2020) found that emotional intelligence (EmoI) moderated the relationship between customer incivility and exhaustion through surface acting among 292 customer service representatives in northern Poland. The study found that emotionally intelligent personnel who encountered
rude customers used less surface acting and had fewer tiredness symptoms than their less intelligent peers. Emotional intelligence significantly moderated the connection between work ostracism and work deviance. Thus, emotional intelligence is regarded as a significant personal resource that moderates the adverse effects of workplace bullying on service employees’ performance. In a similar way, employees with high emotional intelligence are thought to have a better handle on their emotional reactions. This gives them the ability to deal with difficult situations, like workplace bullying, in a positive way. It can also help them avoid the negative effects of workplace bullying on things like employee performance. Hence, we suggested that:

H5: Emotional intelligence mediates the relationship between workplace bullying and employee performance.

2.10 PSYCHOLOGICAL RESILIENCE MEDIATES THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN WORKPLACE BULLYING AND EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE

Cheng et al. (2022) viewed time-lagged data from 243 Chinese employees to study bullying at work and how well people felt about themselves. Psychological distress linked the two notions. Workplace bullying also negatively impacts employee self-esteem. Recent studies (Maidaniuc-Chirilă, 2015; Samnani et al., 2013) have looked at what causes bullying and how it affects businesses and workers. Workplace bullying lowers productivity, mental toughness, emotional intelligence, stress, and life happiness. Maidaniuc-Chirilă (2015) examined how resilience affects workplace bullying and employee strain in a cross-sectional survey of 88 Romanian workers. Researchers discovered a link between resilience and workplace bullying. Resilience weakens the bond. These findings suggest that resilient workers may experience less physical stress from workplace bullying. Cheng, Peng, Zhou, Shaalan, Tourky, and Dong (2022) examined how workplace bullying affects subjective well-being using time-lagged data from 243 Chinese employees. Psychological anguish mediated the two constructs. Workplace bullying also negatively impacts employee self-esteem.

So, this means that resilience lessens the indirect negative effects of bullying on the morale and productivity of workers. From what we can tell, resilience is a buffer that helps you weather storms of hardship and stress. Resilience is the ability to bounce back from bad things, which is also seen as a form of psychological capital. In a nutshell, Anasori et al. (2023) said that a person's ability to deal with bullying at work determines
how much it will affect them. Even though there have been a lot of empirical studies on how psychological resilience affects workplace bullying, not enough research has been done on how it affects the link between bullying and employee performance. Psychological resilience is seen as a positive personal trait that gives employees the strength, they need to deal with something bad like bullying at work. Thus, we suggested that:

H6: Psychological resilience mediates the relationship between workplace bullying and employee performance.

2.11 MODERATING ROLE OF PSYCHOLOGICAL RESILIENCE

Studies have shown that different psychological factors play a role in the link between bullying at work and different employee outcomes. Turnipseed and Vandewaa (2012) found a link between emotional intelligence, being kind to others, and how well an employee does their job. The results of this study supported the idea that emotional intelligence is linked to employees sharing information at work. Geofroy and Max Evans (2017) and Zaman et al. (2021) said that emotionally intelligent employees always trust others and have a good understanding of how others feel. It means that people with higher emotional intelligence are less likely to do things at work that aren't helpful.

Zaman et al. (2021) confirmed that emotional intelligence has a significant moderating effect on the relationship between being left out at work and sharing knowledge. The results showed that university professors who are more emotionally intelligent are more likely to share their knowledge.

According to research (Djurkovic et al., 2008; Naseer et al., 2018), a number of psychological characteristics, such as emotional intelligence, psychological resilience, and perceived organizational support, significantly mitigate the detrimental consequences of workplace bullying on employee outcomes. That is why we proposed these theories:

H7: The relationship between workplace bullying and employee performance is moderated by psychological resilience

H8: Psychological resilience moderates the relationship between emotional intelligence and employee performance.

Figure 1 shows the relationship between the study variables based on the ideas we've already talked about and thought about.
3 METHODOLOGY

3.1 RESEARCH DESIGN, POPULATION, AND PARTICIPANTS

This study focuses on manufacturing companies that are listed in the Directory of Small and Medium-Sized Businesses (SMEDAN). A quantitative cross-sectional survey was done using a modified, easy-to-administer survey to get information from the people who were supposed to answer it. The results were then made public. Out of 41.5 million registered businesses, 385 small and medium-sized manufacturing firms were conveniently sampled using the appropriate minimum required sample size using the sampling calculator software. After that, the size of the sample was doubled so that each organization could have two participants. This solved the problem of people not responding and cut down on sampling error (Niyi, Gbasemi, & Olaleye, 2022). Hence, a total sample size of seven hundred and seventy (770) was proposed for this study.

3.2 MEASURES

Based on prior research, workplace bullying is measured using a scale consisting of 12 items, having four dimensions and three statements each (Escartín et al., 2017; Nam et al., 2010). Chin-Shan and Szu-Yu's (2016) research on emotional intelligence is used. Psychological resilience is measured using six items from the "State-Trait Assessment of Resilience Scale" (STARS), as evidenced by the study of Lock, Rees, and Heritage (2020). A seven-item measure of "in role or task-related behaviors (IRB) created by
Williams and Anderson (1991)” and adopted by Devonish (2013) to measure employees’ performance is employed. All items for this study were adapted and modified with ratings on a "5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree)”.

3.3 ANALYTICAL TECHNIQUE

The study employed descriptive statistics to provide a percentage and frequency breakdown of the sample population and Pearson's correlations to determine the nature of the relationships between the variables. The proposed structural model was validated using "Partial Least Square Structural Equation Modelling" (PLS-SEM) after being examined for multi-collinearity and psychometric validity by correlation analysis, which revealed interactions across variables.

4 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 FINDINGS

Seven hundred and seventy questionnaires were surveyed within seven months (February 2023 to September 2023); only 512 could be used because the other copies were missing information. This gives a response rate of 66.5%. The evaluated descriptive data establishes the respondents' suitability. Five hundred and twelve (512) employees from manufacturing SMEs in southwestern Nigeria make up the group. There were more men (57.2%) than women (42.8%). About 36 percent of respondents were middle-aged or older; the bulk were from 40 to 49 years old, and the youngest were 50 and up. About half of the respondents (57.3%) have a bachelor's degree; another 27.5% have a diploma from high school; and only 17.8% have completed graduate school. This profile is given in Table 1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Freq (n=512)</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>57.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>42.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Below 30 years</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30-39 years</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40-49 years</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>40.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50 years &amp; above</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Secondary School Degree</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: demographic profile of respondents
4.2 DESCRIPTIVE AND CORRELATIONAL ANALYSIS

The statistical significance of the intercorrelations among workplace bullying is shown in Table 2. Employee performance ($r = .77$, $p < .01$), emotional intelligence ($r = .72$, $p < .01$), and overall workplace bullying were all positively correlated, and psychological resilience ($r = .79$, $p < .01$), with strong effect sizes, as well as between emotional intelligence and psychological resilience, with a positive and moderate association ($r = .63$, $p < .01$).

Table 2: observed and latent variables: descriptive and correlations statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Employee Performance (EmPer)</td>
<td>3.603</td>
<td>0.703</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Emotional intelligence (EmoI)</td>
<td>3.414</td>
<td>0.741</td>
<td>.73**</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Psychological Resilience (PsycRe)</td>
<td>3.501</td>
<td>0.721</td>
<td>.77**</td>
<td>.72**</td>
<td>.79**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Workplace Bullying (Bully)</td>
<td>3.692</td>
<td>0.803</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author’s survey and computation, 2023

Notes: $N = 512$; $M =$ means; $SD =$ standard deviation; $** p < 0.01$.

4.3 TEST OF HYPOTHESES

Table 3 summarizes the results about the model's measurement. Emotional intelligence, psychological resilience, workplace bullying, and employee performance are some of the variables that will be evaluated using "Partial Least Square Structural Equation Modelling (PLS-SEM)" in this context. The measurement of the model is evaluated by psychometric testing of all latent constructs. The test comprises "the outer loadings, average variance extracted (AVE), composite reliability (CR), Cronbach's alpha (CA), rho A values, and the convergent validity of items related to their constructs".

At the same time, the results showed that the measurement model was valid because all three measures (rho A, composite reliability, and Cronbach's alpha) were higher than the 0.7 required. This is because, with the exception of workplace bullying, all AVEs are higher than the threshold (0.5). However, the sister indicator, composite reliability (CR), is higher than 0.6 (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). The fact that updated scales have a low AVE value supports "convergent validity" (Mustpaha et al., 2023; Olaleye et al., 2021a; 2021b). Accordingly, the total assessment shows a good match and good predictive ability.
Table 3: Results summary of the measurement model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latent Variables</th>
<th>Convergent Validity</th>
<th>Internal Consistency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loadings (λ)</td>
<td>AVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Intelligence</td>
<td>&gt; .70</td>
<td>&gt; .50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI1</td>
<td>0.820***</td>
<td>0.718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI2</td>
<td>0.889***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI3</td>
<td>0.877***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI4</td>
<td>0.806***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI5</td>
<td>0.842***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace Bullying</td>
<td>0.469</td>
<td>0.896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control &amp; Manipulation of the Work Context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM1</td>
<td>0.855***</td>
<td>0.712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM2</td>
<td>0.872***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM3</td>
<td>0.804***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional abuse</td>
<td>0.695</td>
<td>0.781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EaB1</td>
<td>0.832***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EaB2</td>
<td>0.864***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EaB3</td>
<td>0.804***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional discredit</td>
<td>0.713</td>
<td>0.799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDs1</td>
<td>0.832***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDs2</td>
<td>0.865***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDs3</td>
<td>0.837***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional devaluation</td>
<td>0.746</td>
<td>0.829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDv1</td>
<td>0.890***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDv2</td>
<td>0.889***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDv3</td>
<td>0.809***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological resilience</td>
<td>0.606</td>
<td>0.870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsycRe1</td>
<td>0.769***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsycRe2</td>
<td>0.761***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsycRe3</td>
<td>0.779***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsycRe4</td>
<td>0.823***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsycRe5</td>
<td>0.764***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsycRe6</td>
<td>0.771***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Performance</td>
<td>0.620</td>
<td>0.896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EmPer1</td>
<td>0.775***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EmPer2</td>
<td>0.755***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EmPer3</td>
<td>0.829***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EmPer4</td>
<td>0.834***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EmPer5</td>
<td>0.809***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EmPer6</td>
<td>0.827***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EmPer7</td>
<td>0.668***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author’s survey and computation, 2023

4.4 DISCRIMINANT VALIDITY

For all constructs except psychological resilience, where the square root of AVE is less than the correlation value, the Fornell-Larcker (1981) criterion states that "the square root of AVE for each latent variable is greater than the inter-construct correlation for every other construct" (see table 4). Table 5 provides evidence of discriminant validity using the HTMT ratio instead of Fornell-Larcker's criterion; all of the values are less than 0.9.
Table 4. Discriminant validity (Fornell-Larcker Criterion)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Employee Performance (EmPer)</td>
<td>0.787</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Emotional intelligence (EmoI)</td>
<td>0.654</td>
<td>0.847</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Psychological Resilience (PsycRe)</td>
<td>0.730</td>
<td>0.627</td>
<td>0.778</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Workplace Bullying (Bully)</td>
<td>0.774</td>
<td>0.715</td>
<td>0.788</td>
<td>0.685</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author’s survey and computation, 2023

Table 5. Discriminant validity (HTMT criterion)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Employee Performance (EmPer)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Emotional intelligence (EmoI)</td>
<td>0.728</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Psychological Resilience (PsycRe)</td>
<td>0.827</td>
<td>0.705</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Workplace Bullying (Bully)</td>
<td>0.864</td>
<td>0.794</td>
<td>0.891</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author’s survey and computation, 2023

4.5 STRUCTURAL MODEL

Both the measuring model and the structural model were evaluated. It is common practice to put the instrument's causality constructions to the test using the structural model. It uses bootstrapping with a sample size of 5000 to estimate the path coefficient, R-squared, and other statistics (t-statistics, P-values, and f-statistics).

4.6 TEST OF MEDIATION

In order to determine whether bullying at work had an impact on how well employees performed their jobs, Baron and Kenney (1986) created four scenarios that tested emotional intelligence and psychological resilience. The mediator factors must first directly affect EmoI and PsycRe. If the mediator significantly affects the result variable, the second condition (EmPer) is met. Table 6 demonstrates these two needs. These three study hypotheses—that bullying at work is linked to emotional intelligence (H2: β = 0.715**, t = 25.124, p = 0.000) and psychological resilience (H3: β = 0.696**, t = 16.801, p = 0.000) and that bullying at work is linked to employee performance (β = 0.774**, t = 4.102, p = 0.000)—meet the third meditation condition that the predictor variable (workplace bullying) should have a big effect on employee performance. Table 6 showed that emotional intelligence partially mediated the association between workplace bullying and the outcome variable, satisfying the fourth mediation condition. Table 6 shows that estimates of bullying at work through EmoI to EmPer (β = 0.097, p 0.05) and PsycRe (β = 0.195, p 0.05) support and build on the findings of Baron and Kenney (1986).
4.7 INTERACTION EFFECT (TEST OF MODERATE-MEDIATION)

Psychological resilience variation lessens the effect that bullying has on employee performance through emotional intelligence. Guarana and Hernandez (2016) provided three conditions to evaluate moderation’s second stage. If the independent variable has a conditional indirect effect on the criterion variable through the mediator that changes at high and low moderator levels, then the mediator and moderator must interact a lot to predict it. Table 6 confirms moderated mediation’s initial condition. Aiken and West (1991) say that PLS-SEM was used to test the second stage of the moderation-mediation relationship between emotional intelligence and bullying at work and EmPer. Table 6 demonstrates that EmoI and PsycRe strongly predict EmPer. This shows that bullying and EmPer are more positively correlated in those with high EmoI. Psychologically resilient people would benefit more from EmoI and EmPer’s outstanding qualities. The study’s hypotheses 7 and 8 demand a moderate moderator. (See Figure 2). Emotional intelligence (EmoI) indirectly moderates the direct effect of workplace bullying on employee performance significantly and positively (β = 0.149, t = 2.171, p 0.05). Psychological resilience positively moderates the relationship between EmoI and employee performance (β = 0.191, t = 2.775, p 0.05). Figure 3 shows how EmoI and PsycRe moderate. High emotional intelligence and psychological resilience boost the positive effects of bullying on employee performance. This study supports all direct and indirect theoretical pathways.

Sullivan and Feinn (2012) say that you should report the statistical significance (p-value), the beta coefficient, and the variance explained (R2). They used Cohen’s (1988) levels of 0.02, 0.15, and 0.35 to decide whether an effect was small, moderate, or large. Three paths had small effects, one had moderate effects, and the rest had large effects over 0.35. PLS-SEM does not require model fit evaluation, but it was done here because the NFI (0.907) was close to 1 and the SRMR (0.046) was below the 0.08 criterion for model fit (Hair Jr. et al., 2017; Olaleye, Abdurrashid & Mustapha, 2023). Consequently, we can be confident that the model used to explore the fundamental concept is appropriate.

Table 6: Test of moderated mediation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Model Fit Indices: SRMR= 0.046; NFI = 0.907; Chi-square =1825.784</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>Std. Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 1 (Direct)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bully $\rightarrow$ EmPer</td>
<td>0.774**&lt;br&gt;*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Model 2 (Mediational)

**H1:** Bully $\rightarrow$ EmPer  
$0.435^{**} *$  
$6.022$  
$0.000$  
$0.153$  
$0.656$  
*Supported*

**H2:** Bully $\rightarrow$ EmoI 
$0.715^{**} *$  
$25.124$  
$0.000$  
$1.044$  
$0.511$  
*Supported*

**H3:** Bully $\rightarrow$ PsycRe  
$0.696^{**} *$  
$16.801$  
$0.000$  
$0.640$  
$0.630$  
*Supported*

**H4:** EmoI $\rightarrow$ PsycRe  
$0.129^{**} *$  
$2.796$  
$0.005$  
$0.022$  
$0.630$  
*Supported*

Indirect effect (Mediation)

**H5:** Bully $\rightarrow$ EmoI $\rightarrow$ EmPer  
$0.097^{**} *$  
$2.124$  
$0.034$  
*Partial mediation*  
*Supported*

**H6:** Bully $\rightarrow$ PsycRe $\rightarrow$ EmPer  
$0.195^{**} *$  
$4.540$  
$0.000$  
*Partial mediation*  
*Supported*

Indirect effect (Moderation)

**H7:** PsycRe $*$ Bully $\rightarrow$ EmPer  
$0.149^{**} *$  
$2.171$  
$0.002$  
$0.124$  
*Supported*

**H8:** PsycRe $*$ EmoI $\rightarrow$ EmPer  
$0.191^{**} *$  
$2.775$  
$0.007$  
$0.103$  
*Supported*

Source: Author’s survey and computation, 2023

Figure 2. Path Analysis
5 DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The current study is relevant since it examines workplace bullying and employee performance. It also examines how emotional intelligence and psychological resilience prevent bullying-related reductions in efficiency and how resilience moderates the link. Research has linked workplace bullying to employee performance.
According to Pradhan and Joshi (2019), workplace bullying increases performance. Hypothesis one contradicts past studies that found a link between bullying and worker output, as it is well known that bullying lowers performance (Ashraf & Khan, 2014; Devonish, 2013; Odunjo-Saka et al., 2023; Olaleye et al., 2021). Bullying for the superior's benefit is likely to be positive. A manager may threaten an employee with termination or other forms of bullying, such as harassment or advancement, to increase performance. Thus, the recipient regards the conduct as good, inspirational, or fruitful.

Bullying positively affects feelings, proving the second hypothesis. Higher EmoI reduces workplace bullying. The bullied worker's stress level depends on how they view the bully's activities. Studies have shown that workplace bullying, if managed effectively, can boost an employee's emotional intelligence to the point where they outperform expectations. These data confirm that workplace bullying often improves job satisfaction (Ismail et al., 2018).

Research validated the third hypothesis between workplace bullying and psychological resilience, while hypothesis four predicts resilience with emotional intelligence. In academic studies, Trapp (2001) revealed that secondary school instructors with high emotional intelligence were resilient, while students found that emotional repair and clarity were associated with resilience. Emotionally intelligent people intentionally employ their rational thoughts and actions to shape their feelings. Emotionally intelligent people are more resilient.

EmoI mediates workplace bullying and EmPer in Hypothesis 5. EmoI strongly and positively mediates bullying and employee performance, which supports an earlier empirical investigation (Sheehan & Jordan, 2000). EmoI is a success factor for managers and HR professionals trying to improve job performance. Emotional intelligence may reduce job performance losses from workplace bullying. Research suggests that managers mistreat people because they can't control their emotions. The sixth hypothesis is that psychological resilience is a significant and positive moderator of workplace bullying and employee performance. Workplace bullying directly affects employee performance, even when other considerations are considered. Workplace bullying produces stress, which can affect employee behavior. Bullying at work can impair productivity directly or indirectly, depending on how each person feels.

Psychological resilience reduces the relationship between workplace bullying and employee performance. Emotionally resilient and goal-oriented workers would disprove
the idea that workplace bullying damages people. Bullying at work is a major motivator for productivity and performance. When the influencer thinks the conduct is worth doing (Samnani et al., 2013), there is no evidence that bullied workers with stronger psychological resilience are more productive and efficient. Finally, the moderated mediation model verified H7. Psychological resilience moderates the indirect effect of workplace bullying on employee performance via EMoI. According to the heuristic model, workplace bullying affects workers with lower psyches more negatively and those with higher psyches more positively.

Emotional intelligence and psychological resilience control employee performance. The eighth null hypothesis established this. According to this study, organizational resilience improves workers' emotional intelligence (self-management, relationship management, self-awareness, and social awareness) and performance (Dhoopar et al., 2022). Bullying has an impact on work performance both directly and indirectly, according to the study. Bullying affects workplace performance through emotional intelligence and psychological resilience. This initial study also examines how EMoI and PsycRe affect employee performance.

5.1 IMPLICATIONS FOR THEORY AND PRACTICE

The importance of this study lies in the fact that it has started a new debate about bullying in the workplace, employee performance, psychological resilience, and the relationships between emotional intelligence and behavior. During the hiring and selection process, human resource managers in manufacturing companies should look for people who are highly resilient and emotionally intelligent. This will help improve employee performance, job outcomes, and the overall productivity of the organization.

This report gives advice to companies on how to stop bullying in the manufacturing industry and to organizations on how to stop bullying by putting anti-bullying policies into place. This study will help people in charge of manufacturing businesses understand WB and come up with good solutions. Managers that focus on employee well-being by fostering safe and bullying-free environments not only protect their employees' fundamental rights but also boost their job performance.

Third, workplace abuse highlights EMoI's importance. High EMoI helps people deal with workplace bullying, which boosts productivity. Fourth, resilience improves workers' emotional intelligence and performance. This study bridges the gap between
resilience, emotional intelligence, and success. The current study adds to the organizational resilience and crisis management literature. These qualities are the best indicators of employee success; therefore, the results also show how to boost organizational resilience and staff emotional intelligence during crises. Finally, researchers examined how workers can improve performance despite their employer's hidden objective using the Job Demand-Resources (JD-R) model, conservation of resources theory, and resilience studies. If their targets see the bully's actions as beneficial, they may be manipulating them. HR executives and organizational managers dislike these activities since they may harm the company's culture, even though they may boost target performance. Managers should provide attributional training to help staff and the public spot abuse.

5.2 LIMITATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Even though this study found important things, it only looked at a small number of manufacturing businesses in Nigeria. This is because both the cultural differences and the limited information from the companies can affect the conclusions.

Second, this research is being done in Nigeria, which is a developing country that is widely thought to be one of the richest in Africa. We think that in the future, researchers should pay extra attention to a comparative study between the developed world and the developing world in this domain. Thirdly, the cross-sectional method was used for data collection from participants at a single point in time. For future studies on bullying at work and other employee-related issues, it is suggested that a longitudinal approach be used. Fourth, it isn't enough to just look at two personal factors (psychological resilience and emotional intelligence) when figuring out how bullying at work affects employee performance indirectly. In the future, researchers may look at other personal factors, such as self-efficacy, optimism, psychological distress, and where people feel they have control. Lastly, an experiment could be done in the future to find out how these interesting variables are related and what causes what.

6 CONCLUSION

The current investigation shows how bullying at work can affect how well employees do their jobs. This study makes an interesting discovery by showing that psychological resilience and emotional intelligence have positive effects when they
interact with each other. This gives us a better idea of how important and useful psychological resilience and emotional intelligence are for predicting good outcomes for employees in manufacturing companies.
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