



**EFFECT OF GASLIGHTING ON WORK RELATED BURNOUT
AND TEACHING SELF-EFFICACY OF UNIVERSITY FACULTY**

A Research Project

Presented to

Department of Professional Psychology

Bahria University Lahore Campus

**In Partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the Degree
of Bachelors of Science
BS Psychology**

**By
Rabbia Iftikhar
Sheraz Latif**

**&
Zainab Asif**

JUNE, 2023

APPROVAL SHEET
SUBMISSION OF RESEARCH DEGREE THESES

Name: Rabbia Iftikhar

Sheraz Latif

Zainab Asif

Discipline: BS Psychology

Department: Department of Professional Psychology

I hereby certify that the above candidate's work including the thesis has been completed to my satisfaction. The thesis is in a format of an editorial standard recognized by the faculty/ department as appropriate for examination.

Signature:

Principal Supervisor: Ms. Nayab
Ashraf

Date: _____

These undersigned signify that:

1. The candidate presented at a pre-completion seminar, an overview and synthesis of major findings in the thesis and that the research is of a standard and extent appropriate for submission as a research project.
2. I have checked the candidates' research project and its scope and format. Editorial standards are recognized by the faculty/department as appropriate.

Signature:

Head of Department: Dr. Khawer
Bilal Baig
Date:

DECLARATION OF AUTHENTICATION

We certify that the research work presented in this research project, to the best of my knowledge, is our own. All the sources used, and any help received in the preparation of this thesis have been acknowledged.

We hereby declare that we have not submitted this material, either in whole or in part, for any other degree at this or any institution.

Signatures:

Rabia Iftikhar _____

Sheraz Latif _____

Zainab Asif _____

DEDICATION

This study is dedicated to our supervisor who was very much supportive and helpful through our research. Her guidance and advice carried us through all the stages of writing our thesis. Finally, we would like to express our thank to our patient and supportive supervisor.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First of all, I'm extremely thankful to Allah Almighty, the strongest support throughout the course of our academic career, who provide me with the strength to complete our project.

I owe special gratitude to our supervisor Ms. Nayab Ashraf for providing me with her careful guidance and working patiently with me. Without her confidence, I wouldn't be able to find the motivation to complete this project.

I would like to present my sincerity to my parents, siblings and friends for supporting me throughout the course of our educational career.

I express my gratitude to my group members Sheraz and Zainab for their incredible work and dedication. I would like to acknowledge the excellent teamwork and collaboration that has been evident throughout the project.

I am also very thankful to all the participants for their participation.

Finally, my sincere gratitude to the staff of our department and respective authorities for providing us with a platform and guidance to word on this project.

Rabbia Iftikhar

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First of all, I'm extremely thankful to Allah Almighty, the strongest support throughout the course of our academic career, who provide me with the strength to complete our project.

I owe special gratitude to our supervisor Ms. Nayab Ashraf for providing me with her careful guidance and working patiently with me. Without her confidence, I wouldn't be able to find the motivation to complete this project.

I would like to present my sincerity to my parents, family and friends for supporting me throughout the course of our educational career.

I express my gratitude to my group members Rabbia and Zainab for their incredible work and dedication. I am truly grateful to them for their support and encouragement they have provided me personally, their willingness to go above and beyond to assist and guide me whenever needed has been truly invaluable.

I am also very thankful to all the participants for their participation.

Sheraz Latif

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First of all, I'm extremely thankful to Allah Almighty, the strongest support throughout the course of our academic career, who provide me with the strength to complete our project.

I would like to express my gratitude to my family for their unwavering support and encouragement throughout this thesis. Their love and belief in me have kept me motivated during the challenging moments of this journey.

I owe special gratitude to our supervisor Ms. Nayab Ashraf for providing me with her careful guidance and working patiently with me

I would also like to thank my research mate for their invaluable contributions and insights. This thesis is a testament to our collaboration and hard work. Thank you all for your contributions and support.

I am also very thankful to all the participants for their participation

Zainab Asif

Table of Contents

APPROVAL SHEET	ii
DECLARATION OF AUTHENTICATION	iii
DEDICATION	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	v
ABSTRACT.....	1
INTRODUCTION	2
METHOD	17
Participants.....	17
Study Measures	17
Procedure	19
RESULTS.....	21
DISCUSSION	35
REFERNCES.....	43
APPENDICES	48

ABSTRACT

Gaslighting is social tactic used generally to manipulate perception, reality, and abilities of a person and as a strategy to abuse someone. Facing gaslighting on a regular basis can be quite distressing. When gaslighting is experienced by nation builders; the teachers, they may feel stressed and worried that can eventually cause burnout, therefore, hampering their teaching capacities and competencies. Thus, this quantitative study aimed to investigate the effects of gaslighting on burnout and teaching self-efficacy of university faculty based on non-probability convenient sampling technique. For this purpose, 200 university faculty members were recruited from government and private institutions. The data was collected using self-designed demographic sheet, victim gaslighting questionnaire, burnout assessment tool and teaching self-efficacy scale. The collected data was analyzed using SPSS version 22. After the analysis, it was found out that gaslighting has a strong positive relationship with burnout ($r_s = .66, p \leq 0.01$) which means higher gaslighting might lead to high levels of burnout. Gaslighting ($r_s = -.14, p \leq .001$) and burnout ($r_s = .15, p \leq .05$) were found to have a weak negative correlation with teaching self-efficacy. When analysis was run to find out the gender differences on these experiences, it was found out that males experience higher level of gaslighting (Mean Rank = 109.54) and Burnout (Mean Rank = 103.20) in comparison to females (Gaslighting Mean Rank = 91.28; Burnout Mean Rank = 97.75) respectively. Conversely, females have higher Teaching Self-Efficacy (Mean Rank = 108.87) in comparison to males (Mean Rank = 92.30). Lastly, the results of Mann-Whitney U Test depicted that there are significant differences in experience of Gaslighting ($p \leq .01$) and Teaching Self-Efficacy ($p \leq .05$) based on the education. It was found out that participants with an education of MS/MPhil experience higher Gaslighting (Mean Rank = 105.29) and have low Teaching Self-Efficacy (Mean Rank = 96.39) in comparison to PhD participants (Gaslighting Mean Rank = 80.08; Self-Efficacy Mean Rank = 118.03). The faculty members who experience gaslighting find it difficult to keep their focus and enthusiasm for teaching. This may lead to fewer involvement with students, less creativity in designing lessons and more ineffective instructional and pedagogy methods at all levels. It is therefore likely that learning experiences will be reduced for students.

Keywords: Gaslighting, Burnout, Teaching self-efficacy, University faculty

INTRODUCTION

Humans are social beings. They have intrinsic desire for closeness in order to form stable and healthy relationships with other peoples. Researches have shown that relationships can help people live longer. The reasons behind it might be the trust, honesty, communication, affection and respect in relationship. But not all relationships are healthy, sometimes relations become toxic due to unhealthy behaviors of other people. Unhealthy relationships are characterized by lack of trust, misunderstandings, physical abuse and emotional abuse etc. (Touroni, 2022).

Maintaining healthy and supportive environment for other persons is key element of healthy relation. However, there are some relationships that become destructive and unhealthy characterizing to gaslighting and undermining other's emotions. Generally, people use tactics like criticizing and blaming others, denying responsibilities and dissatisfaction within a relationship (Touroni, 2022).

This concept has been identified firstly in the last decades within psychoanalytic, philosophy and sociology theory with name of "Gaslighting". In the book *"The Gaslight Effect; How to spot and survive the hidden manipulation others use to control your life"* by Robin Sterns, the term gaslighting has become popular in the field of psychology. Since then, gaslighting has been used, written and discussed more widely. In his film he portrays the characters of newly married couple named Gregory and Paula (Muller, J. 2022). Gregory isolated his wife and sets about a task to prove his wife insane. He aimed to undermine her wife and confuse her sense of self and reality every day. Gregory nominative tactic is to question the perception of Paula by dimming and brightening the gaslighting and denying the reality of her experience and then convincing her that she is imaging it and going crazy (Sweet, P. L. 2019).

People confuses gaslighting with disagreement. They think that it is the type of gaslighting but they are different terms. Disagreement is opposition of two different ideas or interests between two persons. But Gaslighting occurs when one person; the gaslighter manipulates the thought pattern and judgements of other (target/victim). Gaslighter suppress the judgements, facts and events of the target making him/her unsure of his own judgements and decisions and questioning his/her credibility. The victim believes that his/her judgements are unjustified and without merit (Stark, 2019).

Gaslighting is defined as a form of emotional abuse where the gaslighter intentionally manipulates the physical environment or mental state of the abusee and then reflect that the abusee have weekend perception of reality (Robert et al., 2013).

Organizations invest their energies on overall culture of company keeping in view that individual's relationship within the company is also important. The most distressing subject globally is violence, and that has been concerning for many decades. It is affecting home and work environment even this has been invaded health care sector worldwide. It ranges from threats and verbal abuse to sexual abuse and even to homicide. Workplace violence is a major concern for employers and employees because it may harm others emotionally or physically leading in reduction of productivity of employers and employees (Javed, 2023).

It may happen during off-site business gatherings (such conferences or trade exhibits), or in other places when the link between the offender and victim is based on their shared profession. It causes disruptive behavior and can affect employees, clients, customers and visitors. Most importantly it effects the victim physical and psychologically (Vasudevan et al., 2020). Gaslighting a serious matter, has negative consequences on the victim. There is need to talk on this topic so the victim would be able to avoid and escape from these situations.

People are reporting the phenomenon of verbal abuse, nonverbal abuse, sexual harassment, assault, environmental disasters, intimate partner's violence, domestic violence, and other traumatizing events they experienced. People don't think about wide range deceptive and offensive actions in the workplace. But no one is reporting the phenomenon which undermines the reality of a person, lower the confidence which question's one's own perception and create cognitive dissonance. When an individual is using these strategies, it is called "gaslighting". And when the same strategy is applied in an institution then it is known as institutional betrayed. This causes negative impact on an institution (Ahern, 2018). In modern causal usage, the term gaslighting is described as the effort of one person to undermine another person's confidence and stability by causing the victim to doubt their own sense and beliefs (Ruíz 2020).

In recent times, gaslighting has been used globally as a social tactic to manipulate perception, reality, and abilities of a person as a strategy to abuse victim (Sweet, 2019). Gaslighting can't be only committed by someone who will be in position of power, but also by peer group, relative, partner and colleagues (Simon, 2011). This social and psychological scheme is not in interpersonal relationships and dominance

but also in the workplace, institutions, politics, structural, cultural and transgender diverse community, even in every aspect of everyday life (Muller, 2022). Everyone can relate with this term sadly, as more or less everyone has experienced it. Gaslighting is done purposely and without any reason to suspect or true conviction that the target's cognitive capacities are indeed failing (Sodoma, 2022).

According to various studies conducted in Pakistan, among the male dominant countries, men dominate the women in every aspect leading to emotional, physical and psychological abuse (Bhatti, 2023). Women become the victim, due to unequal distribution of rights within the society. They reported that men, use perpetrator tactics like “flipping the script”, “twisting reality”, “changing the facts”, to make the women feel that they are insane and the one on fault (Sweet, 2019).

For the victims, gaslighter's approval become important. They think that they have importance in the life of gaslighter so they don't want to disappoint them even though they feel helpless or worthless. Victims become dependent on the gaslighters' for their emotional support and validation. They find it difficult to maintain the confidence of gaslighters which lead them to mental distress like anxiety or depression causing them to question their own mental state. As a result, gaslighters make the victim to feel insane, crazy and irrational, having distorted perception and thought patterns with self-doubt (Aisha, 2022).

The gaslighters create cognitive dissonance in the victim. The theory of cognitive dissonance was developed by Leon Festinger (1957). According to the theory, a psychological tension is created when there is an inconsistency between an individual's thoughts, beliefs and his/her behaviors. Thus, according to this, the employee feels uncomfortable when their believes are in conflict with one another or contradictory to others. The gaslighter use cognitive dissonance by making the victim to question their own ideas and views which can lead to internal conflict in victim (Ahern, 2018). The victims could experience uncertainty, self-doubt and inner conflict as they try to navigate the gap between their perceptions of reality and the manipulated narrative of the gaslighter. In order to reduce their inner conflict, employees use cognitive strategies such as they may question their own perception, doubt their believes and memory. This leads victim to the state of inner conflict and confusion affecting their psychological well-being. Despite the discrepancies with their original perceptions, victims associate their thoughts with gaslighters' assertions in order to lighten the discomfort of cognitive dissonance.

Gaslighters use tactics like denial, countering or withholding, for example; they pretend that the event has not happened proving that victim is lying, shifting blame to the victim, minimizing and depreciating victim's behavior or feelings, diverting or discrediting victim to prove them crazy and intentionally using negative stereotypes related to gender, personality, age or job to make them believe that they have imagined or exaggerated concerns (Evans, 2023).

In the workplace, gaslighting can occur between coworkers, between employees and management, or between management and subordinates. This can lead to a toxic work environment where gaslighting is used as a tool to exert power and control over others. In the today's business world, gaslighting has become an essential component as it manipulates the labor behavior which is based on psychological violence. This phenomenon causes significant difficulties for the labors and the company itself (Sukhova, 2021). About 18-54% workers gaslighting. Different employees, doctors, nurses, labors under management, even people with same post having same designation experiences gaslighting leading the victim to question their own memory, perception and sanity.

Emotional gaslighting; a type of gaslighting, targets the victim confidence to make accurate assessments based on their emotional responses. A gaslighter makes the victim to believe that the perceptions and judgements he/ she is making is not only wrong but are without any ground. And in the final stage the victim loses complete believe on his perceptions and memory and lowers in their emotional reaction and judgements (Abramson, 2014).

Social media which is one of the expositions to gaslighting, as the social media apps like Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, YouTube and other online apps has become casual in online gaslighting. Perception is shaped by one's desires and motivations, with an aim to delegate another's experiences in order to preserve the power, position and reputation. This ensures the presence of gaslighting, as it manipulates the perception and reality in order to achieve such goals for satisfaction. In an effort to construct a distorted sense of their own reality, people attempt to gaslight others considerably more on social media (Stern, 2007). These are publicly gaslighting tactics which causes doubt about one's own moral judgements.

According to Researchers, the gaslighters are the people who can't tolerate the disagreement or criticism of their point of view at least from friends, partners, colleagues etc. Their purpose is to neutralize the possibility of criticism which will be

done by undermining the conception of the victim of himself/herself as an autonomy. This entails is to impair the victim's ability to criticize or respond to the gaslighter independently (Spear, 2023).

One of the motivations of gaslighter is to take complete or near control of the victim. He makes the victim to believe that he shouldn't trust himself, and he is moving through so many things that he is now starting to forget the things. Gaslighter motivates his victim that he is going crazy and shouldn't trust his own perceptions and experiences which gives insecurities and diffident (Spear, 2023).

Gaslighters preserve their self-image by showing that they are interested in the well-being of the victim and give support or encouragement to them which is a subtle technique of them to control victims. Whereas in reality, they are just satisfying their inner narcissistic demands and exhibit their hostility in a more overt manner by harshly criticizing or disapproving them frequently which could make the victim feel hopeless and helpless (Miano, 2021).

If the attention is given to the personality of the person who becomes the victim to gaslighting, Simon (2010) noted the personality traits of neuroticism, over-intellectualization, emotional dependency, low confidence and over-intellectualization. These traits make a person vulnerable to being the victim of emotional abuse. Victims may also struggle to trust their own thoughts, and emotions and may begin to rely on the gaslighter to define reality. This can make it difficult for the victim to leave the abusive relationship, as they may feel that they cannot survive without the gaslighter's validation and support (Stern, 2007). The victim of gaslighting with vulnerable traits need approval from the gaslighter due to extreme self-doubt (Stout 2005; Stern 2007).

The victims continuously send inferior messages to their mind in certain aspects. The victim himself inferior in both judgements and ability even they make their moral judgements objectively. According to Sandra Bartky, "to be psychologically oppressed is to be weighed down in your mind". This experience of gaslighting and feeling inferior is due to psychological oppression (Stark, 2019).

This creates hostile environment that adds negativity to the environment and eroding the trust and control. Long time exposure to such environment causes physical and psychological distortions which affects the abilities of an individual leading towards reduced coping strategies and causing emotional exhaustion (Johnston et al., 2019).

The university Faculty is the concerned population in the current study. The faculty faces gaslighting by colleagues. The Gap found out in literature is that teachers are not studied who build the nation and are responsible for the upbringing of the next generation. Teachers have great contributions in a society or nation. They shape minds and contribute in developing generations. Their job is sensitive and demands special abilities and positive energy to perform the task well. But when their mental health is compromised and are unable to stay healthy, they would not be able to positively contribute to the expectations everyone has of them and what their job demands. Despite the growing recognition of these variables, there is still much to be learned about their impact on university teachers and the ways in which they interact with one another. This research aims to contribute to this growing body of knowledge by examining the relationships between gaslighting, burnout, and self-efficacy among university faculties, and identifying potential strategies for addressing these issues and improving the experiences of educators in higher education (Bhattacharya, 2014).

When gaslighting is experienced by the faculty of universities it eventually leads to burnout which will affect their teaching quality. Burnout is a state of psychological and physical exhaustion resulting from stress which is predictors of physical fatigue and cognitive dissonance. Burnout is more than exhaustion, it also includes depersonalization and lack of personal accomplishment (Maslach & Jackson, 1981). It has negative relation with job satisfaction.

According to conservation of resources theory by Leiter (1993), burnout occurs when the available resources a person has are less than demands of the environment or the situation. For example, social support is a resource in this regard. Burnout will occur when there is loss or the threat of loss in the resources is present. Resources are related to emotional exhaustion but the demands are related to one's sense of lack accomplishments. An employee experiencing gaslighting will likely have difficulty understanding what is happening at first.

One potential factor contributing to gaslighting among university teachers is the hierarchical practices at academia. As scholars climb the ranks from being a lecturer to assistant, associate and to full professor, they often gain more power and influence over their colleagues and students. This power dynamic can create an environment where gaslighting may be more likely to occur, as those in positions of authority may feel entitled to dismiss the opinions or experiences of others who are not in a same position. Another potential factor is the culture of competition that pervades many academic

disciplines. With limited resources, such as funding, tenure-track positions, and prestigious awards, faculty member may feel pressure to prioritize their own interests over those of their faculty or students. This pressure can lead to a sense of mistrust and suspicion, which may fuel gaslighting behaviors (Johnson, 2019).

Despite the potential negative consequences of gaslighting in academic settings, it remains a relatively understudied phenomenon. More research is needed to better understand the prevalence, causes, and impacts of gaslighting among university teachers. Gaslighting can result in burnout, exhaustion, mental distancing, cognitive impairment, psychological distress and psychosomatic complains. Burnout at the end has effect on teaching self-efficacy like job accomplishment, skill development on the job, social interaction with student, parents and colleagues, and coping with job stress. Burnout has a variety of interconnected factors, such as excessive workload, inadequate support, a lack of resources, repetitive tasks, and protracted exposure to upsetting situations.

Burnout is a psychological syndrome that develops as a long-term reaction to repeated distress and interpersonal pressures (Maslach & Leiter, 2008). It has three important dimensions: overwhelming tiredness, emotions of cynicism and detachment, and a sense if ineffectiveness and lack of accomplishment. This three – dimensional model is significant because it clearly sets the individual’s stress experience within a social context and involves the person’s conception of both self and others (Borgogni et al., 2012).

Maslach (1993) & Maslach and Jackson (1981 & 191986) multidimensional theory explains that burnout has three main components: emotional exhaustion (emotionally drained), depersonalization (giving negative response to others) and reduced personal accomplishment (decrease one’s ability of competition).

According to Harrison (1983), perceived effectiveness and rivalry are the key causes of the burnout syndrome. Although it includes the notion that only subjects who attempt to give an existential purpose to work would ultimately wind up being burned. Thus, when subjects who are highly motivated by their work and intensely identified with it fail to meet their goals, their expectations are unmet, and they believe it is impossible to make a substantial contribution to life, burnout will result.

There are several reasons that cause burnout. Firstly, workload and stress, it contributes to burnout by reducing people’s ability to meet job obligations. When this type of overload becomes a chronic job condition, there is little time to rest, recoup and

rebalance. A manageable and suitable workload, on the other hand, allows opportunity to develop and refine existing talents while also becoming effective in new areas of activity (Maslach & Jackson, 1981).

Burnout, according to the Maslach and Jackson (1981, 1993), model, relates to a feeling of weariness, disinterest and reduced performance. It is a gradual process whereby the stresses of working closely with individuals requiring support or guidance result in various symptoms detrimental to both professional and personal functioning. It is characterized within three domains: the depletion of emotional reserves (emotional exhaustion), an increasingly cynical and negative approach towards others (depersonalization) and a growing feeling of work-related dissatisfaction (diminished personal accomplishment)

Another reason that can lead to burnout is perceived lack of control, there is a definite relationship between a lack of control and burnout. It is present in every aspect of faculty teaching in the universities. They experience a variety of psychological challenges as a result of exposure to stressful settings; like, academic adjustment, high workload, and student's behavior.

Burnout is connected with a large number of stresses such as long working hours, concerns about students and uncertainty about their future, all of which contributes to a low degree of satisfaction between personal and professional lives and all this leading to burnout. Anxiety, despair, stress, vulnerability, anger, mood and mental disease were found to be the indicators of negative adaption in university's environment (Clinciu, 2013).

Workplace with negative environment such as uncertainty and invalidation, is unsafe for the faculties to work. Job stress causing different psychological stress, also leads to the physical problems, like headache, insomnia, muscular problems, chest pain or other infections. These physiological problems are also responsible for the behavioral issues at workplace(universities) as well as in negative consequences at home like problems in family relationships or self-damaging behavior. High job workout leads to low retention. All these things relate with one other and impair teaching performance and functioning by reducing the cognitive, psychological and physical capacities of the victim putting them a t greater risk for any kind of accident (Leiter, 2019).

Negativity at workplace (like gaslighting) leads to negative outcomes within an institution. The supervisors, subordinates and employees result in frequent negative

outcomes like lower well-being, stress, anxiety, lack of creativity and increased absentees with lower production (Parray et al.,2023). Long term exposure these factors causes psychological distress leading to emotional exhaustion and lower job satisfaction.

Burnout, which is followed by physical, emotional and mental tiredness caused by continuous job stress, is widespread problem among university faculties. Persistent invalidation and manipulation brought by gaslighters can lead to educator burnout (Maslach et al., 2001). Gaslighting can sap the motivation of a teacher, also causing emotional disturbances, make it difficult for faculty to hold their responsibilities of teaching which in turn reduces overall productivity of faculty (Johnston, 2019).

A cross-sectional study of Finnish primary school teachers, in whom burnout was measured with the Maslach Burnout Inventory-General Survey and work stress was conceptualized using the effort–reward imbalance (ERI) model. Recovery was measured with the Recovery Experience Questionnaire and the Jenkins Sleep Problems Scale. These measurements are used to study work stress and poor recovery that how will they contribute to the development of burnout and to examine recovery as a mediator in the relationship between work stress and burnout among teachers (Gluschkoff et al., 2016). The results showed supporting a balance between effort and reward at work may enhance leisure time recovery and improve sleep quality, as well as help to reduce burnout rates.

Workplace negativity (like gaslighting) leads to negative outcomes within an institution. The supervisors, subordinates and employees result in frequent negative outcomes like lower well-being, stress, anxiety, lack of creativity and increased absentees with lower production (Parray et al.,2023). Long term exposure these factors causes psychological distress leading to emotional exhaustion and lower job satisfaction.

Researchers have proposed a number of theoretical models that attempts to explain the burnout syndrome in response to the need to comprehend the condition. The majority of them are predicated in the notion that the disease is sequential and regards burnout as a reaction to ongoing work stress. Such models primarily draw their underlying assumptions from social psychology and organizational psychology. Chronic workplace stress that continued over time led to unfavorable outcomes. Finally, it was stated that while each of the ideas covered, draws attention on various sources,

they all aim to explain how and why the subject comes to this severe state of "feeling burnt out."

With regard to the professional burnout, the majority of the university teachers are experiencing moderate and high levels of burnout. Gaslighting is a factor that contribute to burnout among university faculty by causing emotional distress and undermining a sense of personal accomplishment. In addition to contributing in burnout, gaslighting can lead to anxiety, depression, and other mental health problems. Gaslighting can also erodes a faculty member's confidence and self-esteem, which can may get difficult to perform job duties and meet expectations. At the end which has effects on the teaching self- efficacy of a faculty (Maslach et al. 2001).

Faculty members enters in the profession of teaching with desire to assist the students. They have strong ideals and high energy levels with high hopes to do something good for their students. But when the level of burnout increases with low level of enthusiasm due to negative work environment, faculty used to detach with work environment. This results in lack of motivation, low feelings and low level of morale and detachment from work due to which the efficacy of faculty members decreases and their desire to help students also disappear (Shukla & Trivedi, 2008). A faculty member who is low at motivation, high at feeling of frustration, low at feeling of enthusiasm and detached from his students, how can be such faculty be effective in classroom.

This form of psychological abuse can have severe consequences on individuals, particularly in professional context leading to the symptoms like exhaustion, cognitive dissonance, emotional impairment, physiological symptoms and psychological distress (Parray et al.,2023). These feelings are characterized by fatigue, sleep disturbance, lack of attention and reduced professional efficacy. Gaslighting can contribute to burnout among university faculty. The constant invalidation, emotional exhaustion, manipulation, sense of lack of confidence and autonomy which in returns reduce teacher's motivation of being a good teacher with good coping abilities and managing problems, leading to decreased job satisfaction, increased absentees and then overall affecting the students, class environment and developing negative attitudes in them. This will impact their academic performance and limit the future opportunities for them reducing their self-efficacy, making them ineffective for the students.

People with high self-efficacy perceive troubles as challenges, are highly committed to the activities they carry out, invest a lot of time and effort in their activities, think strategically to solve difficulties, recover easily from failure or

difficulty, feel they are in control of a majority of stressors and, furthermore, feel they are less vulnerable to stress and depression (Bandura, 1997).

Low self-efficacy also has negative outcomes such as anxiety, depression, impair academic as well as job performance. Self-efficacy primarily decides the way an individual feels, thinks, act and is proved to be an optimistic feeling providing the ability to cope with a variety of stressors. Coping in the other hand defines the way people manage life conditions that are stressful and refers to various cognitive or behavioral efforts used to manage, reduce, or control stress (Kumar, 2021).

Albert Bandura (1997) introduced the concept of self-efficacy over a quarter of a century ago. According to him, Self-efficacy is believing in one's ability to organize and execute the courses of action which are necessary for attaining those objectives. Since that time, there have been scientific studies demonstrating a powerful impact of perception of efficacy on learning, performance and motivation in many areas. The first step we want to take is to believe in efficacy. The choice to take, the persistence which we show in that decision and our decisions about giving up or continuing are dependent on a great degree upon beliefs within one's own capacity of organizing and executing actions required for some results (Bandura,1997).

Four sources of efficacy expectations, as defined by Bandura (1997), were considered: active mastery, vicarious experiences, verbal persuasion and physiological and emotional states. Therefore, the fundamental construct for understanding how people feel and function at work is self-efficacy. According to Bandura (1997), self-efficacy is a good indicator of the actions we're going to take that will be carried out, persistence in performance, motivation and so on. For example, Prieto (2002) considered self-efficacy as being a critical factor in the study of university faculty when it came to teaching. However, the teaching of self-efficacy has been ignored in higher education up until now (Burton et al., 2005).

Bandura's findings reveal four sources of information that humans rely upon to assess their own capabilities. The most powerful influence among the four sources of information on self-efficacy can be referred to as "enactive experience" in which self-efficacy for a behavior is increased by successfully performing the behavior, consistent with mastery experience in Bandura's framework. The second major influence is vicarious experience," in which other people with similar interests are seen to do the right thing. A third source of influence is verbal persuasion, which, if realistic, can

encourage efforts that are more likely to increase efficacy through success. In addition, physiological and emotional states such as stress can affect self-efficacy beliefs.

People who have a strong sense of their own competence are able to face tough tasks as challenges, mastered, rather than as threats to avoid, fostering internal interest and deepness, engrossment in activities (Bandura, 1994, p. 1).” The objective threshold for learning, which indicates that the self-efficacy is present, has not been established; Bandura, 2011.

If a person feels that it is possible to achieve his or her tasks, he or she will have attained self-efficacy. According to Bandura (2002), a person's perceptions of his or her ability influence whether he or she thinks rationally and strategically; whether they carry out an optimistic or pessimistic attitude. Bandura (2006) describes how this belief works in the following passage:

Self-efficacy also influences the courses of action people choose to pursue, the challenges and goals they set for themselves and their commitment to them, how much effort they put forth in given endeavors, the outcomes they expect their efforts to produce, how long they persevere in the face of obstacles, their resilience to adversity, the quality of their emotional life and how much stress and depression they experience in coping with taxing environmental demands and what they choose to do in life, and the accomplishments they have achieved.

So, motivation and persistence are directly affected by self-efficacy because of its direct influence on the perceived obstacles. Also, as stated previously, the option of abandoning or continuing a course of action, or affecting one's environment is, by definition, under the control of the self-efficacious person—without the ability to choose, self-efficacy does not exist (Bandura, 2011).

The fact that teachers believe they can have an impact on the learning of their pupils, even those who are hard or unenlightened, has been defined as teacher self-efficacy," according to (Gusky & Passaro, 1994) To this end, it appears that teachers' belief in self-efficacy has an effect on the level of planning, organization and enthusiasm of teachers with a strong sense of effectiveness is higher than that of teachers without a strong sense of effectiveness (Allinder, 1994). Teachers who have greater efficacy ratings are more open to new ideas and willing to experiment with new methods in order to better meet the needs of their students (Cousins & Walker, 2000) amount of effort they put into teaching, their attainment level and objectives set for themselves.

Efficacy beliefs are affecting teachers' commitment when things don't go according to plan and their resilience against setbacks (Gibson & Dembo, 1984). A greater sense of efficacy enables teachers to be less critical of students who make errors (Ashton & Webb, 1986), to work longer with a student who is struggling (Gibson & Dembo, 1984), and makes the teachers more likely to stay in teaching (Glickman & Tamashiro, 1982).

The characteristics of an efficient teacher, for instance efficiency, creativity and determination, are shaped by teachers' own capacity to do this (Klassen & Chiu 2010). In addition, it has been shown that highly experienced teachers are good at planning and organizing the work of their students, be more determined, ambitious, adaptable and ready to embrace new ideas than ever before in history according to (Prothro, 2008).

The apparent lack of occupational competence was also found to be a major cause for burnouts by (Chwalisz, Altmaier and Russell, 1992). When faced with academic stress, teachers who doubt their effectiveness turn their efforts inward in order to relieve their emotional distress, while teachers with high perceived effectiveness direct their efforts to solving problems. Therefore, a crisis in professional efficacy can be an essential contributing factor in burnout, and thus, burnout may be considered a breakdown in the occupational domain of a person's sense of his or her own efficacy (Leiter, 1992). In addition, it has been demonstrated that teachers who feel ineffective have a higher tendency to resign from the teaching field (Glickman & Tamashiro, 1982), and results reveal that teachers with high levels of self-efficacy and more resources experience less stress and burnout than teachers with low levels of self-efficacy and fewer resources, and vice versa (Chan, 2002; Betoret, 2006), suggesting that teacher burnout is reduced when teachers have a positive perception of their own self-efficacy and when resources are available.

Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2001) divided the three aspects of self-efficacy into categories of teachers, rated on the scale of teacher self-efficacy in terms of teaching strategies, student engagement and classroom management. Learning strategies are methods that support the autonomy of learners, which increase learning through motivation, deep concentration, observations and evaluation of knowledge (Learning 2002). Teachers are considered as the hardest working professionals across a number of countries, including Pakistan. The profession is very stressful, due to a variety of factors such as teachers' salary structure, societal status, working time, heavy workload

and job circumstance (Naheed, Rehman, & Shah, 2000). The profession of Teaching is not very impressive in terms of their economic status.

As Bandura stated in his self-efficacy theory and it is also visible based on the results of the study that there is a reciprocal relationship between self-efficacy and burnout, it seems more realistic to think that self-efficacy beliefs can influence the state of burnout than vice versa (Celikkalelili, 2011). One of its most important proofs is the model of burnout based on Bandura's self-efficacy theory and developed by Meier. According to Meier, burnout is a state in which individuals expect little reward and considerable punishment from work because of a lack of valued reinforcement, controllable outcomes, or personal competence (Şanlı, 2006).

In a series of studies, it is shown that doubts about your own self-efficacy can lead to burnout. Chwalise et.al., (1992) reported that teachers who scored less self-efficacy had a higher degree of burnout compared to those with the highest scores in self-efficacy.

So, the current study is of importance because generally, it is considered that when a teacher is unable to behave in a certain manner which is against the classroom environment and is displacing emotions, demotivating students, showing aggression etc. it is usually because of the domestic concerns. Whereas, this might also be due to work related concerns or variables. The work-related psychological variables can be the reason of reflected aggression or frustration.

The environment of the workplace can be a source of potential stress for an individual. If the workplace is stress free, people love engaging in work and even do an extra mile just because they are happy and are peacefully enjoying their work. But the opposite can affect the working capacity and can lead to exhaustion and mental stress which eventually is visible in the behaviors of the individuals.

Particularly, when the matter is about the teachers, it is of concern because they have a very important role to play in the society and for the society. They are the nation builders. Their one comment or behavior can make or break the life of a student. They have the power to influence the minds of numerous students they teach on a daily basis. If they, are not satisfied from their working environment and are not unable to reflect their fullest potential, they will be unable to play their part in building a true nation that is required for growth and progress of the country.

In the former studies, the researchers have emphasized on how gaslighting effect the intimate partners, employees and medical staff. There is less exploration on

how gaslighting effect the teachers particularly the university faculty. Furthermore, throughout literature, gaslighting, burnout and teaching self-efficacy measure has been explored separately with other variables. This research would add to the theoretical data on how gaslighting effects the faculty teaching at the universities.

The researchers have following objectives with reference to this research:

- To Explore the extent of gaslighting as experienced by university faculty
- To investigate whether experiences of gaslighting leads to burnout in the faculty members
- To check the effect of gaslighting and burnout on teaching self-efficacy of faculty members
- To investigate whether demographic factors like gender, education, years of experience, job sector leads to any differences in the experiences of these above-mentioned variables.

The following are the hypotheses which were proposed based on the gaps after reviewing the literature:

H₁: There would be a correlation between gaslighting and burnout of university faculty

H₂: There would be a correlation of gaslighting and burnout with overall teaching self-efficacy

H₃: There would be a significant difference in experience of gaslighting, burnout and teaching self-efficacy based on the gender of the faculty members.

H₄: There would be a significant difference in experience of gaslighting, burnout and teaching self-efficacy based on education of the faculty members.

METHOD

Research Design

The study aimed to investigate the effects of gaslighting on burnout and teaching self-efficacy of university faculty. This research was a quantitative research based on non-probability convenient sampling technique.

Participants

For this research, data was gathered from 200 faculty teaching at universities; 100 from government and 100 from private sector universities of Lahore.

The below mentioned points were the inclusion criteria for the study:

- The age range of the participants were from twenty-six to forty years
- Teachers from different faculty and departments were included in the study
- Permanent faculty member working in the capacity of the lecturer and senior lecturer were included in the study only
- Faculty members with minimum one year of work experience were included.
- Faculty members working at both private and government sector universities were recruited in the study
- Both; male and female faculty members were included
- Married and unmarried faculty members were also included

The following are the exclusion criteria for the study:

- Associate lecturers were not included in the study.
- PhD faculty was also excluded from the study.
- Research Associates who were teaching along with conducting research were also excluded
- Faculty teaching at medical institutions and teaching hospitals were also excluded.

Study Measures

Study measures are important in research as they assess constructs in different scopes.

Different measures that were used in this study describe below:

Demographic Sheet

A self-designed demographic sheet was used to obtain demographic data from the participants including information about their gender, age, marital status, education, educational sector, type of faculty and experience of teaching.

Victim Gaslighting Questionnaire (Kanwar et.al., 2021)

Victim Gaslighting Questionnaire (VGQ) was developed by Kanwar Hamza Shuja (2021). This scale is a self-report measure based on 14 items. It obtains information about feelings, beliefs and behaviors of individuals due to gaslighting. The scoring of each item is based on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The completion time for this tool is around 5 minutes.

The score was computed by averaging responses to all the ten items. The total possible scores ranged between 14 and 70, with higher scores suggesting higher levels of victimization of gaslighting in the individual. The present scale had no reverse items. Example of statements from VGT include, “You find yourself questioning your beliefs and opinions because of their opposition”, “You apologize without knowing what you did wrong”. The Cronbach’s alpha reliability of the overall instrument was $\alpha = 0.934$. Additionally, the alpha reliability for the subscale peer disagreement and loss of self-trust was $\alpha = 0.927$ and $\alpha = 0.854$, respectively.

Burnout Assessment Tool (Schaufeli, 2017)

Burnout Assessment Tool (BAT) is a self-report measure that determines the presence of burnout. It was developed by Schaufeli et. Al (2020b). The scale has two forms; general form and work-related burnout form. The work-related burnout form comprised of 22 items along with 10 additional items covering secondary symptoms. The items were set on 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 to 5 (1= never, 2= rarely, 3= sometimes, 4= often, and 5= always). It had five subscales that include exhaustion (8 items) “I feel mentally exhausted”, mental distance (4 items) “I struggle to find any enthusiasm for my work”, cognitive impairment (5 item) “feel unable to control my emotions”. The above mentioned 10 items made fifth subscale of the measure that is secondary symptoms “I suffer from headaches” the completion time for this test was maximum 10 minutes. The reliability scores from $\alpha = 0.90$ to 0.92.

Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale (Ralf Schwarzer et.al., 1999)

This scale measured the teaching self-efficacy in faculty members teaching in universities. It was developed by Ralf Schwarzer et.al. (1999). The purpose of the scale was to measure teacher self-efficacy within the teaching profession. The major areas were job accomplishment, skill development on the job, social interaction with students, parents, and colleagues and coping with job stress. This scale comprised of 10 items set on 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (not at all true) to 4 (exactly true), 4 being the maximum score. Maximum completion time would be 5 minutes. Examples of the items from Teacher Self-Efficacy include, “I know that I can carry out innovative

projects even when I'm opposed by skeptical colleagues", "When I try really hard, I am able to reach even the most difficult students". Cronbach's alpha score range from $\alpha = 0.76$ to 0.82 .

Procedure

First of all, formal permissions were taken from the authors of the scales to use them to collect data from the participants. Afterwards, for collecting research data, formal permissions were taken from different institutions to recruit faculty members working at the respective institutes. After taking permissions, faculty members were approached. Those faculty members who met the inclusion criteria of the study were given introduction of the researchers and were also briefed about the aims and objectives of the study. They were asked that if they agree to participate, they can sign the consent form stating their formal consent for participation in the research. The participants were also informed that the consent form has information about their rights as study participants, limits to their confidentiality, statement about maintaining their anonymity and data sharing policy.

After signing the consent form, participants were given a demographic sheet to specify some information themselves. Afterwards, the participants were asked to fill out three questionnaires including Victim Gaslighting Tool, Burnout Assessment Tool and Teaching Self-efficacy scale to find out the effect of gaslighting on their experience of work-related burnout and their teaching self-efficacy. The administration of the questionnaire took 20 minutes on average. The participants were given no formal breaks while they were filling in the questionnaire.

Ethical Consideration

Different ethical concerns were followed in the research. Formal permissions were taken from the authors of the tool before using them in the study to collect the data for the study. Formal permissions were also taken from different universities before gathering data from their faculty. Formal consent was taken from each participant before they started to fill in the survey that gave them awareness of their conscious and voluntary decision of participation in research. The participants were given the right to withdraw from the study anytime without any penalty. In the case of withdrawing, they were ensured that their data would be destroyed. The concerns about confidentiality were also addressed.

The participants were debriefed about the study and were informed that their provided data would be kept secret, their anonymity would be maintained and the gathered data would be used for academic purpose only.

RESULTS

Table 3.1a

Demographics Characteristics of Faculty

Indicator		n (%)
Gender	Male	101 (50.5)
	Female	99 (49.5)
Age in Years	26-30	95 (47.5)
	31-35	72 (36.0)
	36-40	33 (16.5)
Marital Status	Married	107 (53.5)
	Unmarried	93 (46.5)
Education	MS/MPhil	162 (81.0)
	PhD Scholars	38 (19.0)
Field of Teaching	IT/CS	73(36.5)
	Business/Accounts	36 (18.0)
	Arts/Humanities	57 (28.5)
	Engineering/Technology	6 (3)
	Any Other	28 (14.0)
Education Sector	Private	100 (50.0)
	Government	100 (50.0)
Year of Work Experience	Up to 5 years	113 (56.5)
	6-10 years	68 (34.0)
	11-15 years	13 (6.5)
	More than 15 years	6 (3.0)

Table 3.2*Reliability Analysis for Gaslighting, Burnout and Teaching Self-efficacy*

Scale	<i>M</i> ± <i>SD</i>	Range	Cronbach's α
Gaslighting Scale	38.65 ± 11.63	13 – 65	.92
Peer Disagreement	25.42 ± 7.73	7 – 35	.90
Loss of Self Trust	13.23 ± 4.55	5 – 25	.81
Burnout Assessment Inventory	58.29 ± 14.38	23 – 115	.92
Exhaustion	7.94 ± 2.57	3 – 15	.76
Mental Distance	8.58 ± 2.77	3 – 15	.66
Cognitive Impairment	7.36 ± 2.81	3 – 15	.80
Emotional Impairment	7.14 ± 2.77	3 – 15	.81
Psychological Complaints	14.06 ± 4.03	6 – 30	.78
Psychosomatic Complaints	13.22 ± 3.96	5 – 25	.81
Teaching Self Efficacy Scale	32.71 ± 5.35	10 – 40	.87

Note. $\alpha \geq 0.9$ Excellent Internal Consistency, $\alpha \geq 0.7$ Good Internal Consistency, $\alpha \geq 0.6$ Acceptable Internal Consistency Psychometric properties of Victim Gaslighting Questionnaire, Burnout Assessment Tool and Teaching Self Efficacy Scale.

Table 3.3a
Assessment of Victim Gaslighting Questionnaire

Indicator	Strongly Disagree n (%)	Disagree n (%)	Uncertain n (%)	Agree n (%)	Strongly Agree n (%)
You constantly change your words or thoughts	26 (13.0)	75 (37.5)	30 (15.0)	47 (23.5)	22 (11.0)
Your point of view is dismissed or said to be “wrong” completely	30 (15.0)	81 (40.5)	46 (23.0)	29 (14.5)	14 (7.0)
You get accused for “overreacting” when you try to explain your feelings	38 (19.0)	77 (38.5)	39 (19.5)	28 (14.0)	18 (9.0)
You apologize without knowing what you did wrong	30 (15.0)	70 (35.0)	38 (19.0)	37 (18.5)	25 (12.5)
Most interactions leave you feeling small or ashamed of yourself	50 (25.0)	63 (31.5)	40 (20.0)	34 (17.0)	13 (6.5)
They assign motives to your actions that are opposite to your intentions	30 (15.0)	72 (36.0)	41 (20.5)	45 (22.5)	12 (6.0)
You often feel that you have to defend your reality from them	24 (12.0)	65 (32.5)	44 (22.0)	55 (27.5)	12 (6.0)
They make you believe that nobody can be trusted except them	24 (12.0)	65 (32.5)	53 (26.5)	44 (22.0)	14 (7.0)
You often feel them denying things even when there is proof	21 (10.5)	54 (27.0)	64 (32.0)	49 (24.5)	12 (6.0)
You feel unsure of your decision-making abilities because of their disagreement	26 (13.0)	71(35.5)	45 (22.5)	37 (18.5)	21 (10.5)

n = 200 Faculty member

Table 3.3b*Same as pervious Table*

Indicator	Strongly Disagree n (%)	Disagree n (%)	Uncertain n (%)	Agree n (%)	Strongly Agree n (%)
They accused you of lying and manipulation when in reality they are the ones doing it	39 (19.5)	56 (28.0)	41 (20.5)	48 (24.0)	16 (8.0)
Their positive actions do not complement their degrading words	16 (8.0)	60 (30.0)	58 (29.0)	45 (22.5)	21 (10.5)
You find yourself questioning your beliefs and opinions because of their opposition	31 (15.5)	48 (24.0)	54 (27.0)	50 (25.5)	17 (8.5)
You often find yourself questioning your own sanity because of their words	27 (13.5)	53 (26.5)	59 (29.5)	41 (20.5)	20 (10.0)

n = 200 Faculty members

Table 3.3 a & b (VGQ) indicates that out of 200(100%) participant, 75 (37.5%) participants disagreed on constantly changing their words or thoughts whereas, 22(11.0%) also strongly agreed on the same statement. 14(7.0%) strongly agreed that their point of view was dismissed or said to completely wrong whereas 13(15.0%) strongly disagreed on it. 77(38.5%), 70(35.0%) and 63(31.5%) disagreed on being accused for overacting, on apologizing without any reason and leave with feelings of small or ashamed and 28(14.0%), 37(18.5%) and 34(17.0%) also agreed on this same statement respectively. 53(26.5%) were uncertain where they believe that nobody can be trusted except them, 24(12.0%) also strongly disagreed on it. 50(25.5%) agreed on the statement that they question their beliefs and opinion because of their opposition, 37(18.5%) also agreed on the statement of feeling unsure about their decision-making abilities because of their disagreement

Table 3.4a.*Assessment of Burnout Assessment Tool*

Indicator	Neutral n (%)	Rarely n (%)	Sometimes n (%)	Often n (%)	Always n (%)
At work, I feel mentally exhausted	41 (20.5)	58 (29.0)	71 (35.5)	25 (12.5)	5 (2.5)
After a day at work, I find it hard to recover my energy	27 (13.5)	57 (28.5)	69 (34.5)	35 (17.5)	12 (6.0)
At work, I feel physically exhausted	23 (11.5)	61 (30.5)	74 (37.0)	33 (16.5)	9 (4.5)
I struggle to find any enthusiasm for my work	31 (15.5)	46 (23.0)	61 (30.5)	43 (21.5)	19 (9.5)
I feel a strong aversion towards my job	34 (17.0)	44 (22.0)	53 (26.5)	46 (23.0)	23 (11.5)
I'm cynical about what my work means to others	25 (12.5)	57 (28.5)	66 (33.0)	34 (17.0)	18 (9.0)
At work, I have trouble staying focused	38 (19.0)	70 (35.0)	57 (28.5)	24 (12.0)	11 (5.5)
When I'm working, I have trouble concentrating	41 (20.5)	72 (36.0)	51 (25.5)	25 (12.5)	11 (5.5)
I make mistakes in my work because I have my mind on other things	49 (24.5)	61 (30.5)	60 (30.0)	23 (11.5)	7 (3.5)
At work, I feel unable to control my emotions	48 (24.0)	67 (33.5)	56 (28.0)	23 (11.5)	6 (3.0)
I do not recognize myself in the way I react emotionally at work	51 (25.5)	51 (25.5)	59 (29.5)	32 (16.0)	7 (3.5)
At work I may overreact unintentionally	54 (27.0)	64 (32.0)	56 (28.0)	18 (9.0)	8 (4.0)

n = 200 Faculty members

Table 3.4b*Assessment of Burnout Assessment Tool*

Indicator	Neutral n (%)	Rarely n (%)	Sometimes n (%)	Often n (%)	Always n (%)
I have trouble falling or staying asleep	34 (17.0)	60 (30.0)	64 (32.0)	27 (13.5)	15 (7.5)
I tend to worry	17 (8.5)	49 (24.5)	88 (44.0)	32 (16.0)	14 (7.0)
I feel tense and stressed	29 (14.5)	35(17.5)	86 (43.0)	40 (20.0)	10 (5.0)
I feel anxious and/or suffer from panic attack	46 (23.0)	52 (26.0)	61 (30.5)	29 (14.5)	12 (6.0)
Noise and crowds disturb me	15 (7.5)	39 (19.5)	76 (38.0)	41 (20.5)	29 (14.5)
I have trouble falling or staying asleep	36 (18.0)	54 (27.0)	70 (35.0)	24 (12.0)	16 (8.0)
I suffer from palpitations or chest pain	59 (29.5)	54 (27.0)	54 (27.0)	22 (11.0)	11 (5.5)
I suffer from stomach and/or intestinal complaints	45 (22.5)	63 (31.5)	58 (29.0)	23 (11.5)	11 (5.5)
I suffer from headaches	16 (8.0)	55 (27.5)	82 (41.0)	37 (18.5)	10 (5.0)
I suffer from muscle pain, for example in the neck, shoulder or back	21 (10.5)	51 (25.5)	76 (38.0)	43 (21.5)	9 (4.5)
I often get sick	18 (9.0)	66 (33.0)	82 (41.0)	24 (12.0)	10 (5.0)

n= 200 Faculty members

The results of the table 3.4 a & b (BAT) displayed that 71(35.5%) faculty members felt mentally exhausted sometimes and 69(34.5%) find it hard sometimes to recover energy. 33(16.5%) often feel physically exhausted whereas 61(30.5%) rarely felt it. 19(9.5%) always struggle to find any enthusiasm for their work. 24(12.0%) and 25(12.5%) often had trouble staying focused and concentrated at work, respectively. 59(29.5%) and 56(28.0%) sometimes didn't recognize the way they react emotionally and overreact unintentionally at work. 14(7.0%), 10(5.0%) and 12(6.0%) always tend to worry, felt tense and anxious respectively. 37(18.5%), 43(21.5%) and 24(12.0%) often suffered from headache muscle pain and got sick.

Table 3.5*Assessment of Teaching Self Efficacy*

Indicator	Not at all True n (%)	Barely True n (%)	Moderately True n (%)	Exactly True n (%)
I am convinced that I am able to successfully teach all relevant subject content to even the most difficult students	12 (6.0)	29 (14.5)	84 (42.0)	75 (37.5)
I know that I can maintain a positive relationship with parents even when tensions arise	4 (2.0)	22 (11.0)	90 (45.0)	84 (42.0)
When I try really hard, I am able to reach even the most difficult students	10 (5.0)	17 (8.5)	85 (42.5)	88 (44.0)
I am convinced that, as time goes by, I will continue to become more and more capable of helping to address my students 'needs	7 (3.5)	17 (8.5)	77 (38.5)	99 (49.5)
Even if I get disrupted while teaching, I am confident that I can maintain my composure and continue to teach well	6 (3.0)	29 (14.5)	72 (36.0)	93 (46.5)
I am confident in my ability to be responsive to my students 'needs even if I am having a bad day	5 (2.5)	27 (13.5)	82 (41.0)	86 (43.0)
If I try hard enough, I know that I can exert a positive influence on both the personal and academic development of my students.	9 (4.5)	19 (9.5)	63 (31.5)	109 (54.5)
I am convinced that I can develop creative ways to cope with system constraints (such as budget cuts and other administrative problems) and continue to teach well	7 (3.5)	22 (11.0)	93 (46.5)	78 (39.0)
I know that I can motivate my students to participate in innovative projects	7 (3.5)	15 (7.5)	76 (38.0)	102 (51.0)
I know that I can carry out innovative projects even when I am opposed by skeptical colleagues	6 (3.0)	23 (11.5)	77(38.5)	94 (47.0)

n = 200 Faculty members

The results of the table 3.5 a & b (TSE) indicated that 84(42.0%) faculty members displayed that the statement “I am convinced that I am able to successfully teach all relevant subject content to even the most difficult students” was moderately true. 17(8.5%) found it barely true that they were able to reach the most difficult students. 82(14.0%) faculty members agreed on the option of moderately true regarding to the statement that they have confident on their ability to be responsive to their students. 19(9.5%) also found it barely true that they know they can exert a positive influence on both the personal and academic development of their students whereas 9(4.5%) found this statement not at all true. 15(7.5%) and 23(11.5%) faculty members barely agreed on the statement that they could motivate their students to participate in innovative projects and carryout it even when they were opposed by skeptical colleagues respectively.

Hypothesis 1

There would be a correlation between gaslighting and burnout of university faculty.

Table 3.6

Spearman's Correlation Table Showing the Relationship between Gaslighting and Burnout

Indicators	M ± SD	1	2	3
1. Gaslighting	38.65 ± 11.633	—	.66***	
2. Burnout	58.29 ± 14.38	.66***	—	

n = 200 Faculty members. * $p \leq .05$. ** $p \leq .01$. *** $p \leq .001$

The results of Spearman's Correlation depicted that gaslighting has strong positive relationship with burnout ($r_s = .66, p \leq .001$). These results depict that higher gaslighting (M = 38.65, SD = 11.633) might lead to more burnout (M = 58.29, SD = 14.38). A detailed description is given (Table 3.6).

Hypothesis 2

There would be a correlation of gaslighting and burnout with overall teaching self-efficacy.

Table 3.7

Spearman's Correlation Table Showing the Relationship between Gaslighting and Burnout

Indicators	M ± SD	1	2	3
1. Gaslighting	38.65 ± 11.633	—	.66***	-.14*
2. Burnout	58.29 ± 14.38	.66***	—	-.15*
3. Teaching Self-Efficacy	32.71 ± 5.35	-.14*	-.15*	—

n = 200 Faculty members. * $p \leq .05$. ** $p \leq .01$. *** $p \leq .001$

Results of Spearman's Correlation indicated that gaslighting ($r_s = -.14, p \leq .001$) and burnout ($r_s = -.15, p \leq .05$) has a weak negative correlation with teaching self-efficacy (M = 32.71, SD = 5.35). A detailed description is given (Table 3.7).

Hypothesis 3

To check whether there are any differences in experience of gaslighting, burnout and teaching self-efficacy based on gender of the participants

Table 3.8

Comparison of Gaslighting, Burnout and Teaching Self – Efficacy in Relation to gender of the participants

Indicator	Composite Score	Gaslighting			Burnout			Teaching Self Efficacy		
		N	Mean Rank	Test Statistics	<i>p</i> Value	Mean Rank	Test Statistics	<i>p</i> Value	Mean Rank	Test Statistics
Gender	Male = 101	109.54	4086.50	.02*	103.20	4727.00	0.05*	92.30	41711.00	.004***
	Female = 99	91.28			97.75			108.87		

Test: Mann-Whitney U Test

n = 200 Faculty members. Mann-Whitney U Test. * $p \leq .05$. ** $p \leq .01$. *** $p \leq .001$

The results of Mann-Whitney U Test depicted that there are significant differences in experience of Gaslighting ($p \leq .05$), Burnout ($p \leq .05$) and Teaching Self – Efficacy. It was found out that males experience higher level of gaslighting (Mean Rank = 109.54) and Burnout (Mean Rank = 103.20) in comparison to females (Gaslighting Mean Rank = 91.28; Burnout Mean Rank = 97.75) respectively. Whereas, females have higher Teaching Self – Efficacy (Mean Rank = 108.87) in comparison to males (Mean Rank = 92.30). A detailed description is given (Table 3.8)

Hypothesis 4

To check whether there are any differences in experience of gaslighting, burnout and teaching self-efficacy based on education of the participants.

Table 3.9

Comparison of Gaslighting, Burnout and Teaching Self – Efficacy in Relation to Education of the participants

Indicator	Composite Score		Gaslighting			Burnout			Teaching Self Efficacy		
	N	Mean Rank	Mean Rank	Test Statistics	<i>p</i> Value	Mean Rank	Test Statistics	<i>p</i> Value	Mean Rank	Test Statistics	<i>p</i> Value
Education	MS/MPhil = 162	105.29	2302.00	.01**	102.81	2703.00	.24	96.39	2412.00	.04*	
	PhD Scholars = 38	80.08			90.63			118.03			

n = 200 Faculty members. Mann-Whitney U Test. * $p \leq .05$. ** $p \leq .01$. *** $p \leq .001$

The results of the Mann-Whitney U Test depicted that there are significant differences in experience of Gaslighting ($p \leq .01$) and Teaching Self – Efficacy ($p \leq .05$) based on the education. It was found out that participants with education MS/MPhil experiences higher level of Gaslighting (Mean Rank = 105.29) and lower level of Teaching Self – Efficacy (Mean Rank = 96.39) in comparison to the participants with education PhD experiencing low level of Gaslighting (Mean Rank = 80.08) and higher level of Teaching Self-Efficacy (Mean Rank = 118.03). A detailed description is given (Table 3.9)

Additional Analysis

Table 3.10

Comparison of Gaslighting, Burnout and Teaching Self – Efficacy in Relation to different Demographics and Work-Related Burnout

Indicator	Composite Score	Gaslighting			Burnout			Teaching Self Efficacy		
		Mean Rank	Test Statistics	<i>p</i> Value	Mean Rank	Test Statistics	<i>p</i> Value	Mean Rank	Test Statistics	<i>p</i> Value
Age ^b	26-30 = 95	101.05	3.04	.21	100.27	2.421	.30	94.65	5.197	.07
	31-35 = 72	106.65			106.65			98.83		
	36-40 = 33	85.50			87.74			121.00		
Marital Status ^a	Married = 107	102.70	4740.00	.56	104.14	4585.50	.35	106.71	4311.50	.10
	Unmarried = 93	97.97			96.31			93.36		
Years of Work Experience ^b	Up to 5 years =113	101.91	2.29	.53	103.73	3.898	.28	94.28	6.052	.11
	6-10 years = 68	102.96			102.04			103.18		
	11-15 years = 13	89.23			76.85			122.85		
Educational Sector ^a	>15 years = 6	70.58			73.33			138.83		
	Private = 100	100.64	4986.00	.97	98.51	4800.50	.63	102.11	4839.00	.70
	Government = 100	100.36			102.50			98.89		

n = 200 Faculty members. Mann-Whitney Test^a, Kruskal Wallis Test^b

Results of Mann-Whitney U Test and Kruskal Wallis indicated that there no statistically significant difference ($p > 0.05$) was found in gaslighting, burnout and teaching self-efficacy based on age, marital status, Year of work experiences and education sector. A detailed description is given (Table 3.10)

DISCUSSION

In the former studies, the researchers had emphasized on how gaslighting effect the intimate partners, employees and medical staff. But gaslighting is also experienced by the faculty of universities. Exposure to gaslighting causes burnout in victim (Maslach & Jackson, 1981). The consequences of this phenomenon will be faced by the institution, students and parents. So, to explore the effect of gaslighting in above mentioned references, the current study explored the effect of gaslighting on work burnout and its significant impact on teaching self-efficacy of university faculty.

Two hundred faculty members were recruited in this study from different universities 100 from government (50.0%) and 100 from private (50.0%) universities out of which 50.5% were male and 49.5% were female. The majority of the participants belonged to the range of 26-30 (47.5%) and 36% were belonged to the age range of 31-35 years. More than half of the faculty members (53.5%) were married. Around 81% participants had a degree of MS/MPhil (81.0%) and rest of the 19% were PhD Scholars belonging from different departments like IT/CS (36.5%), Business/Accounts (18.0%), Engineering/Technology (3%) and other departments (14.0%). More than half of the participants had a teaching experience of up to 5 years (56.5%). Around 34% stated their teaching experience to be from 6 to 10 years (34.0%).

The results of the participants on the Victim Gaslighting Questionnaire (VGQ) indicated that out of 200 faculty members, 37.5% participants disagreed on constantly changing their words or thoughts whereas, 34% agreed on the same statement. On the question of changing their view-points as it was dismissed or said to completely wrong only 30 (15%) participants disagreed. When the participants were asked about being accused for overacting, on apologizing without any reason and leave with feelings of small or ashamed, only 38.5% participants disagreed on average. Around 50 (25.5%) agreed on the statement that they question their beliefs and opinion because of their opposition. About 30% of the faculty members also agreed that they feel unsure about their decision-making abilities because of the disagreement of the gaslighters present in their environment.

The results of Burnout Assessment Tool displayed (BAT) displayed that 77% faculty members felt mentally exhausted at work. Only 11.5% faculty members gave a

neutral statement to find it hard to recover their energy. 19(9.5%) always struggle to find any enthusiasm for their work. Around 60.5% faculty members stated that they feel a strong aversion towards their job due to Gaslighting and burnout. About 50% of the participants mentioned that they experience trouble in concentrating in their work. Out of 200 participants, only 54 rarely experience the do recognize their emotional reaction. The rest of the 150 participants mentioned that they go through the problem of overreact unintentionally at work. About 51% faculty members mentioned that they do feel anxious or experience panic attack like symptoms at work. Majority of the participants also stated that they have psychosomatic symptoms because of constant stress at work like headache (129 participant; 64.5%) and muscle pain (128 participant; 65%).

The results of Teaching Self-Efficacy Scale (TSE) indicated that 84 (42.0%) faculty members displayed that the statement “I am convinced that I am able to successfully teach all relevant subject content to even the most difficult students” was moderately true for them. Around 49.5% faculty members stated that they will be a better version of themselves as the time goes by. 54.5% faculty stated that on trying hard, they are able to exert a positive influence on their students whereas around 14% faculty found this statement to be not at all or barely true. 11% faculty members were unsure that whether they can motivate their students to participate in innovative projects. Similarly, 14.5% faculty members were even unsure of their own capabilities of carrying out innovative projects when they were opposed by skeptical colleagues.

Inferential statistics were used to test the hypothesis. For first hypothesis, to find out the relationship between gaslighting and burnout, a Spearman’s Correlations was run. After analysis, it was found out that gaslighting has strong relationship with burnout ($r_s = .66, p \leq .001$). The results suggested that experiencing higher gaslighting leads to higher lead to higher burnout.

The significant results reflect that the faculty members do practice gaslighting potentially in order to gain or practice their power. In universities, hierarchical structures are practiced due to which the faculty member at higher position try to exert control over others. They use gaslighting to impose their power and keep control by manipulating the perception, reality, and abilities of a person (Sweet, 2019). Other potential reasons can be to avoid taking responsibilities for their actions and manipulate them. When a faculty

member who disagree with the current procedures or status quo of certain department or university, then administrator or colleagues try to suppress them.

When a faculty member experiences gaslighting consistently, this type of negative environment disturbs the physical and/or mental health of that faculty members. This is because the gaslighting behavior of others will target the confidence and beliefs of the victim. Gaslighters would try to control the victim by making them believe that changing their perceptions and their thoughts is essential. This lowers the individual's confidence level and make him/her doubt their own perceptions and memory. The gaslighter makes the victim to believe that the perceptions and judgements he/ she is making is not only wrong but are without any ground. In the final stage, the victim loses complete believe on his perceptions and memory and lowers in their emotional reaction and judgements (Abramson, 2014). Since his/her colleagues or the ones who are gaslighting them so they cannot share their experience with them. Even they cannot share their experience of gaslighting with their other friends or family members because they fear that they will also doubt their perceptions and judgements. This is why the individual doesn't share their experiences with anyone. When someone keeps all these feelings inside, it will make the individual frustrated and exhausted, leading to burnout and effecting their personal as well as professional life.

Burnout leads to various health problems like sleep problems, and other psychosomatic concerns like feeling tense and stressed, experiencing headaches and muscle pain. Whereas in work life, burnout can affect the motivation level, cognitions; the individual feels difficult to concentrate on work, may overreact unintentionally and feel mentally exhausted. As their motivation goes down, their work life would get effected. If they have to work with the person who gaslights them, they won't feel comfortable working. They would always think multiple times before speaking and consider and re-consider their own opinion thus, leaving a negative impact on the progress of respective individual. They would feel unable to be themselves. Experiencing unhealthy environment on a daily basis led to burnout affecting the individual's mental health.

For the second hypothesis, Spearman Correlation was run to check whether there would be a correlation of gaslighting and burnout with overall teaching self-efficacy. The findings suggested that gaslighting ($r_s = -.14, p \leq .001$) and burnout ($r_s = -.15, p \leq .05$) has

a weak negative correlation with teaching self-efficacy. The findings indicated that high level of gaslighting and burnout leads to low level of teaching self-efficacy. These findings are consistent with the previous researches.

Taking into account the above findings, it is found that high level of gaslighting leads to high level of burnout. Burnout will affect the professional life of the individual, facing gaslighting. When faculty members experience high level of gaslighting their self-efficacy decreases. This means they may not feel confident in their abilities and perceptions, leading to feelings of inadequacy or incompetence. Studies suggest that teachers face different exertions at work like role conflicts, role ambiguity, relationship with co-worker and students, overload and excessive working duration can lead to physical and mental tiredness which provoke frustration, exhaustion, anxiety and physical complaints. When this stress is not relieved effectively and promptly, teachers will lose enthusiasm and motivation for teaching (Yu et.al., 2015).

Facing gaslighting on regular basis can be quite distressing and can leave teachers feeling stressed, worried, and on edge all the time. It has an emotional cost that can increase stress levels and eventually cause burnout. Burnout, state of persistent stress-related emotional, mental, and physical weariness that can negatively affect a teacher's general wellbeing and level of job satisfaction. Self-efficacy can be affected by gaslighting cause teachers to lose confidence in their talents, question their ability to teach, and question their efficacy in the classroom. This decline in self-efficacy may have an adverse effect on their performance, motivation, and general job satisfaction. Emotional burnout has strong correlation with teaching self-efficacy (Smetackova, 2017). Burnout contribute to decrease self-efficacy as it can cause someone to feel exhausted, overwhelmed and emotionally drained. When someone experiencing both gaslighting and burnout, it can be particularly challenging for them to maintain a sense of confidence and efficacy in their teaching role. This can have negative consequences for their job performance, job satisfaction and overall well-being.

For third hypothesis, to find the difference between gaslighting, burnout and teaching self-efficacy in relation to gender of the participants, a Mann-Whitney U Test was conducted. The findings of the tests depicted that there are significant differences in experience of gaslighting ($p \leq .05$), burnout ($p \leq .05$) and teaching self-efficacy ($p \leq .05$)

based on gender of the faculty members. It was found out that males experience higher level of gaslighting (Mean Rank = 109.54) and burnout (Mean Rank = 103.20) in comparison to females (Gaslighting Mean Rank = 91.28; Burnout Mean Rank = 97.75) respectively. Whereas, female faculty members have higher teaching self-efficacy (Mean Rank = 108.87) in comparison to male faculty members (Mean Rank = 92.30).

The potential reasons behind the results might be due to societal expectations and gender norms. Men are often expected to be strong, independent, in control of themselves and emotionally strong which can make them more vulnerable to gaslighting. Additionally, men may be less likely to seek help or talk about their experiences with family, friends or colleagues which can make it difficult for them to recognize and address gaslighting behavior. This makes them more susceptible to facing gaslighting and undermine their perception and capabilities. Due to societal ideals of independence, masculinity, and lack of accessible support system, men may often experience more difficulties in getting support for emotional or psychological problems. This unwillingness of men to ask for help or talk about their experiences may cause more stress, exhaustion, and make it challenging for them to successfully deal with gaslighting situations. These potential reasons can lead men to experience increased burnout and as a result this burnout effects their teaching self-efficacy.

There may be multiple factors why women experience less gaslighting and burnout. The potential reasons could include that women have different role expectations in the society, better social support and greater ability to prioritize self-care. Cultural diversity and organizational cultures can also be the supportive environments for women where gaslighting is likely to occur less. This can contribute to the creation of a supportive environment where attempts at gaslighting might be less frequent. Women, in general can also express their emotions openly and ask for help when they face/have difficulties.

When women, as emotional beings, share their experiences with others, they may receive opinions that they may be experiencing gaslighting or it may be their mere perception. This can help them identify the problematic behaviors early and easily, allowing them to change their company or be more careful about how they deal with gaslighters.

This practice can positively impact women's wellbeing and lessen their vulnerability to burnout. Having effective coping mechanisms, nurturing and emotional behavior of females make them more resilient to gaslighting. As a result, they experience less burnout in comparison to males and have less effect on their teaching self-efficacy and thus their teaching abilities.

For fourth hypothesis, a Mann-Whitney U Test was conducted to find the difference between gaslighting, burnout and teaching self-efficacy in relation to education of the participants. The results of the test depicted that there are significant differences in experience of Gaslighting ($p \leq .01$) and Teaching Self-Efficacy ($p \leq .05$) based on the education. It was found out that participants with education of MS/MPhil experiences higher level of Gaslighting (Mean Rank = 105.29) and lower level of Teaching Self-Efficacy (Mean Rank = 96.39) in comparison to the participants with education of PhD who experiencing low level of Gaslighting (Mean Rank = 80.08) and higher level of Teaching Self-Efficacy (Mean Rank = 118.03).

MS/MPhil faculty members are frequently seen as having less power and influence when compared to PhD scholars or other senior faculty members. This discrepancy in power could make them more susceptible to gaslighting by others in terms of power, including senior faculty to manipulate someone's intelligence, competence, or judgement. MS/MPhil (Post graduate) faculty members are typically in the early stages of their academic careers, whereas PhD scholars are actively engaged in their research projects and working towards completing their doctorate degrees. MS/MPhil faculty members might still be developing their confidence and professional identity, which make them more vulnerable to attempts of gaslighting by others to undermine their self-perception and their class management and teaching skills.

The other potential reason behind the results might be that PhD scholars have more experience and knowledge in the field. This deepens their understanding of the environment in which they are working. This boosts their confident in their ideas and they are less likely to be influenced by someone trying to manipulate or gaslight them. Whereas, post graduates are in more competitive environment where they feel the pressure to prove themselves or their capabilities to strengthen their position thus, they might be more likely to question their own thoughts and beliefs due to gaslighting. This can make them

susceptible to manipulation. Other faculty members take advantage of this and use gaslighting as a way to change the perception and belief of them.

Additional analysis, Mann-Whitney U Test and Kruskal Wallis were run. The results of the test indicated that there no statistically significant difference ($p > 0.05$) was found in gaslighting, burnout and teaching self-efficacy based on age, marital status, Year of work experiences and education sector.

Conclusion

The study was conducted on faculty members to investigate the effect of gaslighting on work burnout and teaching self-efficacy of university teachers. It was found that gaslighting effects burnout and teaching self-efficacy of faculty members teaching at different public and private sector universities. The faculty members who experience gaslighting might find it difficult to keep their focus and enthusiasm for teaching because they feel drained in efforts to maintain their mental health and well-being and avoid work related burnout. This may lead to fewer involvement of faculty with students, less creativity on the part of teachers in designing lessons and more ineffective instruction at all levels. It is therefore likely that learning experiences will be reduced for students. It seems that due to this, the learning of students will be compromised, and teachers will not be able to perform their job of nation building, polishing students' skills, and bringing out the best in them and preparing them for practical life with proper zeal.

Limitations and Recommendation of the Study

- The data collected for this study was from limited geographical location; city of Lahore only. Future researchers can collect data from different cities and make comparison of the practices in different cities.
- The use of self-report measures could have led to some responses bias in the reporting of the phenomenon by the participants, resulting in over or under reporting of the phenomenon.
- The study employed quantitative data collection procedures.
- Future researchers can use in-depth interviews as well to yield important data which can serve the findings of the quantitative research and can provide in-depth insight into the actual phenomenon as being practiced in the field.

Implications

The present study serves many important implications which are listed below:

- The study aimed to contribute to awareness and recognition about gaslighting as a form of psychological manipulation and its effect on faculty members in the context of teaching and education.
- By highlighting the impact of gaslighting on burnout and teaching self-efficacy in faculty members, the policy makers can recognize and address this issue within educational and institutional settings which can lead to ensuring healthier and empowering work environment for faculty.
- Policy makers can implement training programs and workshops to educate faculty about gaslighting behaviors, their consequences and effective coping strategy and awareness can be given faculty members to seek counseling and support for maintenance of good mental health and ways can be figured out to control such practices in the nib.
- Workshops can be conducted at universities to providing support system to the faculty on improving both their mental health and teaching effectiveness and devise useful pedagogical methods despite experiencing tough times in life.
- The future researchers can do a comparative study of teachers experiencing gaslighting and its effects on the experiences of their students in the classroom environment.

REFERNCES

- Abramson, K. 2014. "Turning Up the Lights on Gaslighting." *Philosophical Perspectives* 28, Ethics: 1–30.
- Ahern, K. (2018). Institutional betrayal and gaslighting. *The Journal of perinatal & neonatal nursing*, 32(1), 59-65.
- Aisha, A. D., Darmawan, C. T., Haya, F., Maharani, N. N., & Khalisa, N. R. (2022) Gaslighting in Relationships and Its Damaging Impacts on Victims.
- Anderson, K.L. (2009), "Gendering coercive control", *Violence against Women*, Vol. 15 No. 12, pp. 1444-1457, doi: 10.1177/1077801209346837
- Bhatti, M. M., Shuja, K. H., Aqeel, M., Bokhari, Z., Gulzar, S. N., Fatima, T., & Sama, M. (2023). Psychometric development and validation of victim gaslighting questionnaire (VGQ): across female sample from Pakistan. *International journal of human rights in healthcare*, 16(1), 4-18.
- Christensen, M., & Evans-Murray, A. (2021). Gaslighting in nursing academia: a new or established covert form of bullying. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nuf.12588>
- Eurasian Journal of Educational Research E Ğ İ T İ m a r a ş ... - ejer. (n.d.). https://ejer.com.tr/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/ejer_2010_issue_40.pdf
- Cliniciu, A. I. (2013). Adaptation and stress for the first year university students. *Procedia-social and behavioral sciences*, 78, 718-722.
- Evans, O. G. (2023) What Is Gaslighting? Examples, Types, Causes, & How To Respond.
- Evers, W., & Brouwers, A. (2019, July). *Effects of aggressive behavior and perceived self-efficacy on burnout among staff of homes for the elderly*. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/ref/10.1080/01612840118397?scroll=top&role=tab&aria-labelledby=refs>. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/01612840118397>
- Fouzia Naz, Dr Mohsin Atta, & Dr Najma Iqbal Malik. (2017). Teacher Self-efficacy as Determining Factor of Burnout Among College Teachers . *Journal of Research Science*, 5.
- Gibbs, C. (2003). Explaining effective teaching: self-efficacy and thought control of action. *The Journal of Educational Enquiry*, 4(2).

- Gluschkoff, K., Elovainio, M., Kinnunen, U., Mullola, S., Hintsanen, M., Keltikangas-Järvinen, L., & Hintsanen, T. (2016). Work stress, poor recovery and burnout in teachers. *Occupational medicine*, 66(7), 564-570.
- Gluschkoff, K., Elovainio, M., Kinnunen, U., Mullola, S., Hintsanen, M., Keltikangas-Järvinen, L., & Hintsanen, T. (2016). Work stress, poor recovery and burnout in teachers. *Occupational medicine*, 66(7), 564-570.
- Gomes, G. G. (2014, September). *Northeastern University*.
<https://repository.library.northeastern.edu/files/neu:349625/fulltext.pdf>.
- Harker R, Gibbs CJ, Ryan H, Weir K & Adams D (2000, in press) The impact of change on teacher satisfaction, motivation and health. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*.
- Javed, B. (2023, May 21). *Violence in the workplace: Types, consequences & preventions*. Occupational Health and Safety Blog. <https://www.hseblog.com/violence-in-the-workplace/>
- Johnson, S. L., & Teng, H. J. (2017). Gaslighting in the workplace: A systematic review. *Journal of Business and Ethics*, 148(1), 69-80.
- Johnston, C., Foyne, M. M., & Dixon, K. (2019). Workplace bullying and psychological well-being: The moderating role of personality. *Journal of Employment Counseling*, 56(3), 108-121
- KlassenKlassen, R. M., & Chiu, M. M. (2010). Effects on teachers' self-efficacy and job satisfaction: Teacher gender, years of experience, and job stress. *Journal of educational Psychology*, 102(3), 74
- Kumar Pradhan, R., Prasad Panigrahy, N., & Kesari Jena, L. (2021). Self-efficacy and workplace well-being: understanding the role of resilience in manufacturing organizations. *Business Perspectives and Research*, 9(1), 62-76.
- Leiter, M. P. (1993). Burnout as a developmental process: Consideration of models. In W. B. Schaufeli, C. Maslach, & T. Marek (Eds.), *Professional burnout: Recent developments in theory and research* (pp. 237- 250). Washington, DC: Taylor & Francis.
- Leiter, M. P., & Maslach, C. (2009). Burnout and workplace injuries: A longitudinal analysis. In A. M. Rossi, J. C

- Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1984). Burnout in organizational settings. *Applied Social Psychology Annual*, 5, 133-153
- Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (2008). Early predictors of job burnout and engagement. *Journal of applied psychology*, 93(3), 498.
- Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Leiter, M. P. (2001). Job burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 397-422
- Miano, P., Bellomare, M., & Genova, V. G. (2021). Personality correlates of gaslighting behaviours in young adults. *Journal of Sexual Aggression*, 27(3), 285-298.
- Mistral, W. (2011), "Mental health and substance use", *British Journal of Healthcare Management*, Vol. 17 No. 7, pp. 298-301, doi: 10.12968/bjhc.2011.17.7.298.
- Muller, J. (2022). *Gaslighting: a Weapon of Dominance Against Trans and Gender Diverse People* (Doctoral dissertation, Flinders University, College of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences.)
- Myhill, A. (2015), "Measuring coercive control: what can We learn from national population surveys?", *Violence against Women*, Vol. 21 No. 3, pp. 355-375, doi: 10.1177/1077801214568032
- Parray, Z. A., Islam, S. U., & Shah, T. A. (2023). Exploring the effect of workplace incivility on job outcomes: testing the mediating effect of emotional exhaustion. *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance*, 10(2), 161-179.
- Roberts, T., & Andrews, D. J. C. (2013). A critical race analysis of the gaslighting against African American teachers. *Contesting the myth of a "post racial era": The continued significance of race in US education*, 69, 94.
- Ruíz, E. (2020). Cultural gaslighting. *Hypatia*, 35(4), 687-713.
- Saleh, H. K. (2007, December 19). *Computer self-efficacy of university faculty in Lebanon - educational technology research and development*. SpringerLink. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11423-007-9084-z>
- Self-efficacy in college teaching*. Vanderbilt Center for Teaching: Self-Efficacy in College Teaching. (n.d.). https://cft.vanderbilt.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/59/vol15no7_self_efficacy.htm
- Shukla, A., & Trivedi, T. (2008). Burnout in Indian teachers. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 9, 320-334

- Simon, G. (2011), "Gaslighting as a manipulation tactic: what it is, who does it, and why",
Counselling Resources available at:
<https://counsellingresource.com/features/2011/11/08/gaslighting/>
- Simon, G.K. (2010), *In Sheep's Clothing : understanding and Dealing with Manipulative People*,
Tantor Media, Incorporated
- Skaalvi Skaalvik, E. M. (2018). Mathematics anxiety and coping strategies among middle school students: relations with students' achievement goal orientations and level of performance. *Social Psychology of Education*, 21, 709-723
- Smetackova, I. (2017). Self-efficacy and burnout syndrome among teachers. *The European Journal of Social & Behavioural Sciences*
- Sodoma, K. A. (2022). Emotional Gaslighting and Affective Empathy. *International Journal of Philosophical Studies*, 30(3), 320-338.
- Spear, A. D. (2023). Epistemic dimensions of gaslighting: Peer-disagreement, self-trust, and epistemic injustice. *Inquiry*, 66(1), 68-91.
- Stark, C. A. (2019). Gaslighting, misogyny, and psychological oppression. *The monist*, 102(2), 221-235
- Stern, R. (2007), *The GASLIGHT EFFECT How to Spot and Survive the Hidden Manipulations Other People Use to Control Your Life*, Harmony
- Stern, R. (2007). *The gaslight effect: How to spot and survive the hidden manipulation others use to control your life*. New York, NY: Harmony Books
- Stout, M. (2005), "The sociopath next door : the ruthless versus the rest of us", Harmony, available at: http://translibri.com/pdf/Sociopath_Sample.pdf
- Structural equation modeling (SEM) analyses indicate, W. T., Byrne, B. M., Guskey, T. R., Lee, R. T., Woolfolk, A. E., Ashton, P., Bandura, A., Bentler, P. M., Brissie, J. S., Burke, R. J., Cherniss, C., Chwalisz, K., Coladarci, T., Davies, F. W., Emmer, E. T., Forsyth, A. D., Friedman, I. A., Frayne, C. A., ... Guglielmi, R. S. (2000, February 23). *A longitudinal study of teacher burnout and perceived self-efficacy in classroom management*. Teaching and Teacher Education.
- <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0742051X99000578>
- Sukhova, O. (2021). Gaslighting in employee remuneration as an element of management culture in modern Russia. In *XXIII International Conference" Culture, Personality, Society in the*

Conditions of Digitalization: Methodology and Experience of Empirical Research Conference".—Ekaterinburg, 2020 (pp. 254-260). Knowledge E.

Sweet, P. (2019). The sociology of gaslighting. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122419874843>

Sweet, P. L. (2019). The sociology of gaslighting. *American Sociological Review*, 84(5), 851-875.

These theories include the cognitive-social theory of self by Harrison et al. (1997), the social exchange theory by Van Dierendonck et al. (2001), the conversation theory by Hobfoll (2001), the organizational theory by Winnubst and Diekstra (19998), the structural model by Gil-Monte et al. (1995), and the model of guilty by Gil-Monte (2008)

Touroni, D. E. (2022, November 9). *A healthy vs an unhealthy relationship - how to tell the difference*. The Chelsea Psychology Clinic.

<https://www.thechelseapsychologyclinic.com/sex-relationships/healthy-vs-unhealthy-relationship/>

Vasudevan, H., & Pillai, T. M. R. (2020). Workplace Bullying and Management of Mistreated Behaviour: A Case Study in the Banking Sector. *IIUM Journal of Case Studies in Management*, 11(2), 15-22.

Yu, X., Wang, P., Zhai, X., Dai, H., & Yang, Q. (2015). The effect of work stress on job burnout among teachers: The mediating role of self-efficacy. *Social Indicators Research*, 122, 701-708.

APPENDICES

Appendix A
Consent Form



Bahria University Lahore Campus

Discovering Knowledge

A Project of Pakistan Navy

Consent Form for Participation in Research

We (Rabbia Iftikhar, Sheraz Latif & Zainab Asif), are students of BS (Hons.) Psychology program at Bahria University Lahore Campus. We are conducting a group research project for the purpose of degree completion and you are being asked to take part in the research. The title of our study is: “*Effect of Gaslighting, on work Burnout and Teaching Self-efficacy*”. Please read this form carefully and ask any questions you may have before agreeing to take part in the study. If you agree to participate, firstly, you will be given a demographic sheet to fill in based on questions regarding your gender, age, education, profession, and some questions regarding your experiences of working and studying together at the same time. After this, you will be given a questionnaire which will be based on questions gaslighting, burnout assessment and teaching self-efficacy. This will take almost 15-20 minutes to complete.

Participation in this research is completely voluntary. Taking part in this research has no foreseeable psychological and emotional harms. The identity and the confidentiality of your given responses will be kept secret. Confidentiality will be disclosed only in case of severe legality. So, try to answer all the questions. You can withdraw from the research at any point in time. In such a case, the gathered information will be destroyed and you will not be penalized for withdrawing from the research. If you wish to participate, the collected data will be used for academic and publishing purposes, maintaining your confidentiality. It will only be disclosed to the research supervisor and to the department.

If you need additional information, the researcher can be contacted at:

rabbiamalik34890@gmail.com

Statement of consent: I have read all the above information carefully and have received answers to any questions I asked. I agree to take part in the study.

Signature of Participant: _____

Date: _____

E-mail (optional): _____

Appendix B
Demographic Sheet

Demographic Sheet

1. Gender

- a) Male b) Female

2. Age

- a) 26-30 b) 31-35 c) 36-40

3) Marital Status

- a) Married b) Unmarried

4) Education

- a) MS b) MPhil c) PhD Scholars

5) Field of Teaching

- a) Information Technology/Computer Sciences
b) Business and Economics/Accounting
c) Arts and Humanities
d) Engineering and Technology
e) Any Other: _____

6) Educational Sector

- a) Private Sector b) Government Sector

7) Years of Work Experience:

Appendix C
Study Tools

Victim Gaslighting Scale (VGQ)

Instructions: This instrument is designed to measure your daily experiences in general. Please answer the questions as honestly as possible. Using the scale below, indicate your level of agreement or disagreement in the space which is next to each statement.

Sr. No.	Item statement	1 (Strongly Disagree)	2 (Disagree)	3 (Uncertain)	4 (Agree)	5 (Strongly disagree)
1	You constantly change your words or thoughts before speaking					
2	Your point of view is dismissed or said to be “wrong” completely					
3	You get accused for “overreacting” when you try to explain your feelings					
4	You apologize without knowing what you did wrong					
5	Most interactions leave you feeling small or ashamed of yourself					
6	They assign motives to your actions that are opposite to your intentions					
7	You often feel that you have to defend your reality from them					
8	They make you believe that nobody can be trusted except them					
9	You often find them denying things even when there is proof					
10	You feel unsure of your decision-making abilities because of their disagreement					
11	They accused you of lying and manipulation when in reality they are the ones doing it					
12	Their positive actions do not complement their degrading words					
13	You find yourself questioning your beliefs and opinions because of their opposition					
14	You often find yourself questioning your own sanity because of their words					

Burnout Assessment Tool (BAT)

Instructions: The following statements are related to how you feel. Please state how often each statement applies to you.

Sr No.	Items	1 (Never)	2 (Rarely)	3 (Sometimes)	4 (Often)	5 (Always)
1	At work, I feel mentally exhausted					
2	After a day at work, I find it hard to recover my energy					
3	At work, I feel physically exhausted					
4	I struggle to find any enthusiasm for my work					
5	I feel a strong aversion towards my job					
6	I'm cynical about what my work means to others					
7	At work, I have trouble staying focused					
8	When I'm working, I have trouble concentrating					
9	I make mistakes in my work because I have my mind on other things					
10	At work, I feel unable to control my emotions					
11	I do not recognize myself in the way I react emotionally at work					
12	At work I may overreact unintentionally					
13	I have trouble falling or staying asleep					
14	I tend to worry					
15	I feel tense and stressed					
16	I feel anxious and/or suffer from panic attack					
17	Noise and crowds disturb me					
18	I have trouble falling or staying asleep					
19	I suffer from palpitations or chest pain					
20	I suffer from stomach and/or intestinal complaints					
21	I suffer from headaches					

22	I suffer from muscle pain, for example in the neck, shoulder or back					
23.	I often get sick					

Teaching Self- Efficacy

Instructions: Please indicate how much you agree with the following statement. If a particular situation has not occurred recently, answer according to how you think you would have experienced.

Sr. No.	Item statement	1 (Not at all True)	2 (Barely True)	3 (Moderately True)	4 (Exactly True)
1	I am convinced that I am able to successfully teach all relevant subject content to even the most difficult students				
2	I know that I can maintain a positive relationship with parents even when tensions arise				
3	When I try really hard, I am able to reach even the most difficult students				
4	I am convinced that, as time goes by, I will continue to become more and more capable of helping to address my students 'needs				
5	Even if I get disrupted while teaching, I am confident that I can maintain my composure and continue to teach well				
6	I am confident in my ability to be responsive to my students 'needs even if I am having a bad day				
7	If I try hard enough, I know that I can exert a positive influence on both the personal and academic development of my students.				
8	I am convinced that I can develop creative ways to cope with system constraints (such as budget cuts and other administrative problems) and continue to teach well				
9	I know that I can motivate my students to participate in innovative projects				

10	I know that I can carry out innovative projects even when I am opposed by skeptical colleagues				

Appendix D
Tool Permission

Permission of Victim Gaslighting Questionnaire (VGQ)

Sure you can use the scale for your research purpose. Anyhow the instrument scoring sheet is attached herewith for your reference. The rest of the detail you can find in the article.

Permission of Burnout Assessment Tool (BAT)

Can I use the BAT for free?

Yes, you can download it on this page. Please use the correct citation as mentioned in the manual.

Permission of Teaching Self- Efficacy

Do I need permission to use the general perceived self-efficacy (GSE) scale?

For a permission letter, see page 9. You do not need our explicit permission to utilize the scale in your research studies. We hereby grant you permission to use and reproduce the General Self-Efficacy Scale for your study, given that appropriate recognition of the source of the scale is made in the write-up of your study.

Appendix E
Permission Letters

Appendix F
Palagirism Report

Plagiarism Report

Report

ORIGINALITY REPORT

10 %	9 %	7 %	6 %
SIMILARITY INDEX	INTERNET SOURCES	PUBLICATIONS	STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1	ejer.com.tr Internet Source	2 %
2	citeseerx.ist.psu.edu Internet Source	1 %
3	Mahnoor Mahmood Bhatti, Kanwar Hamza Shuja, Muhammad Aqeel, Zainab Bokhari, Syeda Nasreen Gulzar, Tabassum Fatima, Manahil Sama. "Psychometric development and validation of victim gaslighting questionnaire (VGQ): across female sample from Pakistan", International Journal of Human Rights in Healthcare, 2021 Publication	1 %
4	worldwidescience.org Internet Source	1 %
5	www.tdx.cat Internet Source	1 %
6	www.tandfonline.com Internet Source	1 %
	www.readperiodicals.com	

7	Internet Source	1%
8	link.springer.com Internet Source	1%
9	www.researchgate.net Internet Source	1%
10	Submitted to University of Brighton Student Paper	1%

Exclude quotes On

Exclude matches < 1%

Exclude bibliography On

