



Workplace Bullying among Offshore Workers of an Oil and Gas Company

Kamto¹, Sjahrul Meizar Nasri¹, Dadan Erwandi¹✉, Fatma Lestari¹, Abdul Kadir¹

¹Occupational Health and Safety Department, Public Health Faculty, Universitas Indonesia, Indonesia

Article Info

Article History

Submitted April 2021

Accepted July 2021

Published January 2022

Keywords:

Workplace Bullying;

Psychological Distress;

Satisfaction with Life

DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.15294/ujph.v11i1.46426>

Abstract

Workplace bullying is now a psychosocial hazard that has led to deterioration in the productivity of workers, which ultimately leads to the decline in the performance of organizations. This study aimed at examining the correlation between bullying, psychological distress, and satisfaction in life. Respondents involved are offshore workers of an oil and gas company ($N = 206$) from various entities. Additionally, the respondents were divided into permanent and contract workers, as well as staff and non-staff members recruited using the snowball sampling method. Statistical analysis was performed using the Spearman correlation test with the SPSS software. The results showed a significant association between bullying and psychological distress ($r_{\text{permanent}}=0.705$, $r_{\text{contract}}=0.548$, $r_{\text{staff}}=0.656$, and $r_{\text{non-staff}}=0.513$, $p=0.01$) and satisfaction with life ($r_{\text{permanent}}=-0.213$, $r_{\text{contract}}=-0.151$, $r_{\text{staff}}=-0.330$, and $r_{\text{non-staff}}=-0.149$, $p=0.05$). This indicated that permanent workers and staff positions have a higher level of psychological distress than contract workers and non-staff members. However, they also have a higher level of life satisfaction. Therefore, although the stress levels are higher among permanent and staff workers, a mediating factor makes their satisfaction remain higher.

INTRODUCTION

Bullying is certainly very old phenomenon, and well known in every culture. It has been introduced by Heinz Leymann in the 1980s who used the term 'mobbing', "ganging up on someone", "bullying", or "psychological terror" to describe this phenomenon. In this conflict, the victim is subjected to a systematic, stigmatizing process and encroachment of his or her civil rights. This scientific report published in early 1984 by the National Board of Occupational Safety and Health in Stockholm, Sweden (Erwandi et al., 2021). Now, its recent development, bullying has become one of the concerns in the Occupational Health and Safety

(OHS) field. Bullying can happen to anyone in any workplace, regardless of rank or income-level, but it is more prevalent in particular professions, such as education and healthcare (Erwandi et al., 2021). In the last decade, bullying was a psychosocial hazard, has been recognized as a significant workplace hazard. Several definitions of bullying have been proposed by researcher. Bullying is a form of aggressive behavior in which a person intentionally and repeatedly causes others to be injured or feel uncomfortable. Bullying can take the form of physical contact, verbal actions, or other more subtle actions (APA, 2020; Ballard & Easteal, 2018). Similar definition of bullying is a

✉ Correspondence Address:

St. Margonda Raya, Pondok Cina, Kecamatan Beji,

Kota Depok, Jawa Barat 16424

E-mail: dadan@ui.ac.id



repetition of negative actions (physical, verbal, or psychological) specifically directed at a target individual over time, in the presence of a power differential between the parties involved (Menesini & Salmivalli, 2017).

Furthermore, various definition of workplace bullying or bullying at work has been suggested. Einarsen et al., (2020) stated that the term “workplace bullying” has been described as a global concept that incorporates harassment, intimidation, and aggressive or sometimes violent behaviors. Workplace Bullying Institute (WBI) proposed workplace bullying is a repeated and health harming, mistreatments or undermining behaviors towards a worker by one or more employees of an employer (Namie, 2021) where the worker considers these behaviors as continuous or permanent during a certain time period and that negative treatments from others in the workplace are something that he/she continuously receives without the ability to ‘fight back’. Bullying is usually done by someone with a higher position or at the same level (D’cruz, 2015). Three models of workplace bullying have been clearly described. The first is work-related bullying, where a person withholds information that can affect performance. The second is person-related bullying, for instance actions related to persistent criticism of errors or mistakes and sarcasm. The third is bullying through physical intimidation, such as intimidating behaviors (finger-pointing, shoving, or blocking victim’s way) (Einarsen et al., 2009; Erwandi et al., 2021). The causes of workplace bullying may link to the organization or individual (Samsudin et al., 2019). Workers with positive organization work climate and culture will experience less bullying than those who work in a negative work climate and culture. In terms of the individual aspect, individuals who are emotionally stable and receive good influence will have less exposure to bullying.

Workplace bullying prevalence in the United States is done by men (67%) while most victims are women (49%) (Namie, 2021). The same survey also stated that the perpetrators of bullying are mostly people of a higher position (65%) and 21% are peers. The reactions of

employer/company are usually mixed (*negative response*, 63%), with ignoring and denying as the most frequent reactions. In Indonesia, unfortunately has not yet had a statistical data and studies regarding workplace bullying. Nevertheless, the International Centre for Research on Woman (ICRW) has reported 84% of children in Indonesia have experienced violence, including bullying. Another type of bullying that was discovered in Indonesia is the one associated to public health issues such as Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV), sexually transmitted infections, and unwanted pregnancies (Erwandi et al., 2021).

Workplace bullying may bring impacts by affecting the mental and physical health of the person exposed to bullying. It is reported that more than 90% of people exposed to workplace bullying experience symptoms of energy loss, sleep disturbances, decreased self-esteem, and increased anxiety (O’Moore & Crowley, 2011; Trépanier et al., 2013). It was reported by Xu et al., 2019 that workers exposed to bullying have a 1.46 times risk of developing type 2 diabetes and mental health disorders (Verkuil et al., 2015). In another study, workplace bullying was reported to be increased absenteeism (Grynderup et al., 2017) although the mechanism is unclear. Another effect of bullying is reduced satisfaction with life through an indirect effect with anxiety and insomnia (Nauman et al., 2019) as well as burnout and work-family conflicts (Raja et al., 2018) as the mediating factors.

Oil and gas industry has a diverse employee composition, consisting of permanent and contract employees, as well as outsourced employees from goods and service companies who interact with each other. With this diverse background, there are social interactions that may potentially lead to workplace bullying that would eventually affect workers' psychological factors, such as anxiety (Nauman et al., 2019) and burnout, which then trigger work-family conflicts (Raja et al., 2018) distress, and lowered satisfaction with life (Nielsen et al., 2012; Verkuil et al., 2015). This will create a poor workplace psychosocial safety climate, and vice

versa (Law et al., 2011) and will ultimately affect the work safety and health performance.

Negative Acts and Bullying

Negative acts are defined as acts that are unwanted by the target that may be carried out deliberately or unconsciously, but clearly cause humiliation, offence and distress. Such acts include common sense categories of social behaviour such as being laughed at, screamed at, ignored, threatened with sacking, maliciously teased, repeatedly criticized for one's work, subjected to excessive surveillance, etc (Bloch, 2010; Einarsen et al., 2011). The concept of workplace bullying relates to exposure to these persistent 'negative acts' against one or more worker. Individual negative acts as such do not necessarily constitute bullying but when occurring in isolation, may be seen as signs of uncivil behaviour or "incivility" at work (Einarsen et al., 2009). Further, workplace bullying emphasis on two main features, 'frequency' and 'duration' (Einarsen et al., 2011). NAQ-R is an instrument designed to measure exposure to bullying in the workplace by estimate of exposure to bullying behaviours. Although based on self-report, such an approach is considered to provide a more objective measure of exposure to bullying (Einarsen et al., 2009).

Psychological Distress

Psychological distress is common mental health problem in both the community and workplace, that is state of emotional suffering typically characterised by symptoms of depression and anxiety (Arvidsdotter et al., 2016; Marchand et al., 2012). Risk factor of distress include personal stress-related (depression, anxiety and burnout) and external work related factor such as high demands, poor support, workplace bullying (Arvidsdotter et al., 2016; Tsuno et al., 2018; Jaradat et al., 2016). Psychological distress is assessed using the Kessler Psychological Distress Scale, to measure of non-specific psychological distress based on a framework that includes behavioural, emotional, cognitive, and psycho-physiological manifestations and their frequency of the symptoms including nervousness, hopelessness, sadness, worthlessness, and fatigue (Slade et al.,

2011; Kessler et al., 2003; Kessler et al., 2002; Drapeau et al., 2011).

Satisfaction with Life

Life satisfaction refers to subjective judgemental process. According to literature, definition of life satisfaction is a global assessment of a person's quality of life according to his chosen criteria or what is thought to be an appropriate standard (Diener et al., 2013; Ackerman, 2020). Another researcher defines that life satisfaction is a person's evaluation of the extent to which they are satisfied with their life overall (Emerson et al., 2017). Life satisfaction is different with happiness. Happiness is an immediate, in-the-moment experience. Although enjoyable, it is ultimately fleeting, and happiness alone usually does not make for a fulfilling and satisfying the life. Life satisfaction is not only more stable and long-lived than happiness, it is also broader in scope (Ackerman, 2020).

Due to such reasons, this research aimed to examine the relationship between workplace bullying, psychological condition, and satisfaction with life among workers in oil and gas industry which is potentially workplace bullying occurred.

METHOD

Participants

This is a cross sectional quantitative survey conducted on employees from an offshore field X of a national oil and gas company at Kutai Kartanegara, East Kalimantan. The total population of this field were 382 workers, consist of staff level (97 persons) and non-staff level (287 persons). Mostly the worker's employment status was contracted employees (277 workers), remaining were permanent employees (105 workers). Definition of staff and non-staff level refer to company policy. Staff are employees who have rank level 10 and above (foreman, supervisor, superintendent or manager level), whereas non-staff are employees who have rank level below 10 (operator, administration or technician position). The inclusion criteria were more than 18 years old up to 60 years old and working duration more than 6 months at this company. Due to pandemic covid19 situation,

survey has been distributed online questionnaires through monkeysurvey.com. Even though online survey, author ask to all respondent to follow health protocol during completing the questionnaire, such as hand washing and physical distancing. The questionnaires were distributed with an explanation of research objectives and informed consent information to ensure that the respondents understood their right to refuse to participate in the study and that their personal data will be kept confidential.

Questionnaire were distributed to all worker (382 worker) by email or WhatsApp and total of 236 were completed in online system, the response rate was 62%. After reviewing, there were 32 questionnaires excluded due to uncomplete and missing data, so 206 (83%) respondents were participated on this study.

Workplace Bullying Measurement

The questionnaire used for workplace bullying assessment was Negative Act Questionnaire-Revised (NAQ-R), a later tools version that was designed as an improvement of previous instrument well known as NAQ proposed by same researcher, Einarsen. The NAQ-R was therefore created with the aim of establishing a reliable, valid, comprehensive, for use in a variety of occupational aspect. Three main aspects can be construed from this revised version, i.e., work-related bullying, person-related bullying, and physical intimidation (Notelaers & Einarsen, 2012; Erwandi et al., 2021).

The *Negative Acts Questionnaire-Revised* (NAQ-R) Indonesian version questionnaire used for measuring workplace bullying consists of 22 questions regarding exposures to workplace bullying in the last 6 months (Erwandi et al., 2021). A five-points Likert scale was used for these questions, ranging from *1=never*, *2=occasionally*, *3=monthly*, *4=weekly* and *5=every day*. A high score indicated that the respondent was exposed to bullying every day. According to Notelaers & Einarsen (2012), a score of <33 reflects the absence of bullying, while the score of <33 to ≤ 45 is considered to show occasional bullying. A total score of ≤ 45 represents a victim of bullying. The total scores gained in this study

were used in the statistical analysis. The validity and reliability scores for the Indonesian version of this questionnaire are 0.43 - 0.60 and 0.897, respectively (Erwandi et al., 2021).

Psychological Distress Measurement

The psychological distress was measured using the Kessler Psychological Distress Scale (K10) which contains 10 question items that focus on anxiety and depression in the past 30 days. The K10 is also used for screening tools for mental health or psychosocial disorder. Indonesian version questionnaire refer to Erwandi et al. (2021), response category are based on 5-point Likert scale from 1=never to 5=all of the time. Total score is gained by adding up 10 questions response. A total score under 20 is categorized as "well" and a total score of 22–24 is categorized as "likely to have a mild mental disorder." Moreover, total scores of 25 to 29 and 30 or above are interpreted as "likely to have moderate mental disorder" and "likely to have a severe mental disorder," respectively (Anderson et al., 2013; Erwandi et al., 2021). The higher the score is (maximum 50), the higher the stress level. The validity and reliability scores for the Indonesian version of this questionnaire are 0.46 - 0.73 and 0.881, respectively (Erwandi et al., 2021).

Satisfaction with Life Scale Measurement

The *Satisfaction with Life Scale* (SWLS) questionnaire used to measure the satisfaction with life in this study consists of 7-point Likert scale questions with responses ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). The SWLS score can be interpreted to identify whether the respondent is satisfied or dissatisfied with their life. For instance, a score of 5–9 represents extreme dissatisfaction with life, while a score of 10–14 represent dissatisfaction with life. A score of 15–19 represents slight dissatisfaction; a score of 20 means neutral; a score of 21–24 represents slight satisfaction; and a score of 26–30 and 31–35 are indicative of being satisfied and extremely satisfied, respectively (Erwandi et al., 2021; Maroufizadeh et al., 2016). The maximum total score is 35 that represents the feeling of extremely satisfied with life. The validity and reliability scores for the Indonesian

version of this questionnaire are 0.34 - 0.76 and 0.841, respectively (Erwandi et al., 2021).

Statistical Analysis

A bivariate analysis was performed to examine the correlation between negative actions experienced (NAQ-R questionnaire) by workers, psychological stress levels, and satisfaction with life based on job characteristics (staff and non-staff) and employment status (permanent workers and contract workers) use Spearman correlation method.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Demographic Characteristic Participants

Total of 206 respondents participated in this study. Most of the workers were contract workers (76.2%) and permanent workers (23.8%). All of respondents, consist of non-staff workers (74.8%) with a small percentage of staff workers (25.2 %). Complete demographic characteristic of participants is illustrated in the Table 1.

NAQ-R Participants Response (Workplace Bullying)

The recapitulation of the NAQ-R questionnaire responses is illustrated in the Table 2. Permanent employees are experienced bullying higher than contracted. On the other hand, the staff level also has higher score of bullying than non-staff. There is no "victim of bullying" category of both employment status and level.

Psychological Distress

Table 3 shows the psychological distress levels in both employment status and level categories. Permanent and staff category have higher score of psychological distress than contract employees and non-staff level.

Satisfaction with Life

Workers' satisfaction with life, for both permanent and contract workers as well as staff and non-staff positions are illustrated in Table 4. The obtained scores were further divided into "Satisfied", which was the sum of the number of workers whose score ranged from neutral to extremely satisfied, and "Dissatisfied", which was the sum of the number of workers whose score ranged from slightly dissatisfied

Table 1. Demographic Characteristic (N=206)

Demographic characteristics	Fre q	%
Gender		
Male	195	94.7
Female	11	5.3
Age		
<25 Years	22	10.7
25-29 Years	27	13.1
30-34 Years	39	18.9
35-40 Years	48	23.3
>40 Years	70	34.0
Position		
Staff	52	25.2
Non-Staff	154	74.8
Employment Status		
Permanent	49	23.8
Contract	157	76.2
Education		
Senior high school or below	145	70.4
D3/D4/S1 (undergraduate)	60	29.1
S2/S3 (post-graduate)	1	0.5
Length of Service		
<3 Years	53	25.7
4-6 Years	24	11.7
7-10 Years	55	26.7
>10 Years	74	35.9

to extremely dissatisfied. Permanent employees and staff level are more satisfied with their life than contracted employees and non-staff level.

Correlation Statistical Analysis

Table 5 listed the results of Spearman correlation test to examine the correlation between total negative actions (workplace bullying) received by workers, psychological

Table 2. Respondents' response (N=206)

	Permanent (n=49)		Contract (n=157)		Staff (n=52)		Non staff (n=154)	
	Fre		Freq		Freq		Freq	
	q	%	q	%	q	%	q	%
Total score:								
Not bullied, score <33	45	91.8	151	96.2	48	92.3	148	96.1
Occasionally bullied, 33<score<45	4	8.2	6	3.8	4	7.7	6	3.9
Victim of bullying, score≥45	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
Feeling bullied								
No	44	89.8	150	95.5	48	92.3	146	94.8
Yes	5	9.2	7	4.5	4	7.7	8	5.2

Table 3. Psychological distress level

	Permanent (n=49)		Contract (n=157)		Staff (n=52)		Non staff (n=154)	
	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
Likely to be well (score>20)	40	81.6	145	92.4	42	80.8	143	92.9
Likely to have mild mental disorder (score 20-24)	6	12.3	10	6.4	6	11.6	10	6.5
Likely to have moderate mental disorder (score 25-29)	1	2.0	1	0.6	2	3.8	-	-
Likely to have a severe mental disorder (score >30)	2	4.1	1	0.6	2	3.8	1	0.6

distress score, and satisfaction with life (sig <0.05, 95%). In the group of permanent and temporary workers, the results of the correlation test between bullying and psychological distress showed a positive relationship ($r=0.658$ and $r=0.460$) while the correlation between bullying and satisfaction with life was negative ($r=-0.2$ and $r=-0.232$). This means bullying decreased satisfaction with life among workers in this study. The same tendency was also seen between staff and non-staff positions, where bullying was shown to have a positive correlation with psychological distress and a negative correlation

with satisfaction with life.

Discussion

This study aimed to examine the relationship between workplace bullying, psychological condition, and satisfaction with life among workers in oil and gas industry. Bullying was measured by the NAQ-R questionnaire which consisted of 22 questions about negative actions (Notelaers & Einarsen, 2012; Erwandi et al., 2021). These negative actions represent a general category of social behaviours such as being laughed at, yelled at, ignored, threatened or dismissal, repeatedly

Table 4. Satisfaction with Life Scale

	Permanent (n=49)		Contract (n=157)		Staff (n=52)		Non-staff (n=154)	
	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
Extremely Satisfied	9	18.4	17	10.8	9	17.3	17	11.0
Satisfied	24	49.0	59	37.6	19	36.5	64	41.6
Slightly Satisfied	9	18.4	34	21.7	14	26.9	29	18.8
Neutral	3	6.1	18	11.5	5	9.6	16	10.4
Slightly Dissatisfied	3	6.1	21	13.4	4	7.7	20	13.0
Dissatisfied	1	2.0	7	4.5	1	1.9	7	4.5
Extremely Dissatisfied	-	-	1	0.6	-	-	1	0.6
Category:								
Satisfied	45	91.8	128	81.5	47	90.4	126	81.8
Dissatisfied	4	8.2	29	18.5	5	9.6	28	18.2

Table 5. Correlation result between negatives action (NAQ-R) and other variables*

	Permanent (N=49)	Contract (N=157)	Staff (N=52)	Non staff (154)
	r	r	r	R
Feeling of being bullied	0.429	0.320	0.260	0.381
Psychological distress	0.705	0.548	0.656	0.513
SWL (Satisfaction with Life)	-0.213	-0.151	-0.330	-0.149

*Spearman correlation test (sig <0.05), SPSS 26 software

criticized for the work, supervised excessively, excluded, and so on, which will ultimately place individuals in an inferior position and make them targets for systematic negative actions (D'cruz, 2015). For some people, these actions are not a big problem but when it happens frequently and persistently to the same person in a long duration, it will become a source of serious stress (Einarsen et al., 2020; Tsuno et al., 2018).

To recognize whether an individual experienced bullying, the score of negative actions received by the individual as presented in the results of the NAQ-R questionnaire was used. Workers who obtain a score of less than 33 in this questionnaire can be interpreted as working in a green zone where workers are not bullied at work, but that does not mean there is no room for primary preventive action (Notelaers & Einarsen, 2012). Workers with a score of between 33 and 44 are in the yellow zone where workers have been exposed to a low level of bullying which may get worse if the situation changes. When workers present a

score ≥ 45 , they are already in the red zone and they have become a victim of bullying and require psychological therapy (Notelaers & Einarsen, 2012).

Bullying is a process that develops gradually, starting from a series of indirect negative actions that are pinned to the individual to direct aggressive actions where the individual is ridiculed or laughed at and feels isolated (Notelaers & Einarsen, 2012). Thus, workers with a negative action score of >32 will feel that they are being bullied. This is seen in this study as demonstrated in Table 2 and Table 3 where the percentage of workers who experience negative actions is almost similar or the same as the percentage of feeling bullied. This percentage difference may be caused by individual characteristics, and it is necessary to do more in-depth observations in this regard. The Spearman correlation test results (table 6) also show a positive relationship between negative actions received (bullied) by workers and the perception of being a victim of

workplace bullying in each group of workers which is in line with a previous study by Einarsen et al. (2009) that shows a strong relationship ($r=0.54$, $p<0.001$) between negative actions and feeling of being a victim of bullying.

The finding of this study also shows that the permanent workers experience relatively higher bullying actions (8.2%) when compared to the contract workers (3.8%). According to Notelaers et al., 2011 this finding is important because even though it is not supported by empirical evidence, contract workers are usually more vulnerable to workplace bullying for fear of being dismissed or having their contract terminated and unable to defend themselves in interpersonal conflicts. However, the findings from a study by De Cuyper et al., (2009) showed that contract workers are not associated with unpleasant outcomes and low organizational commitment. Perhaps, this is because the contract workers see this contract arrangement as a "choice" and a stepping stone before landing a better job that they already change jobs before they become the victims or targets of bullying (Notelaers et al., 2011). Meanwhile in the permanent worker group, the workers have more established positions and title that they will be more sensitive to negative actions, which make them more vulnerable to become the target of bullying. This indeed needs further observations.

Staff workers have a higher exposure to negative actions (7.7%) than the non-staff group (3.9%). This is similar with permanent workers, although not supported by empirical evidence, field observations implied that this might be caused by the perception of non-staff workers that the negative actions they receive are not bullying. They may perceive the actions as part of a superior's work to give work orders to subordinates.

This study found that the non-staff workers received lower negative actions (3.9%) when compared to the staff workers (7.7%) although none of the workers become the victim of bullying. This finding is in contrast to the findings of Notelaers et al., (2011) that the non-staff workers (blue collar worker) receive more

negative actions than the staff. In their study, they found that the OR = 2.1 for this phenomenon, meaning that the non-staff workers receive 2.1 times higher negative actions, and more often become a bullying victim than the staff workers.

The relationship between bullying and the psychological distress level was discussed in many previous studies. It was reported Verkuil et al., (2015) that people who are bullied have a higher rate of depression, anxiety, somatic symptoms, and changes in their mental health. This is supported in our study through the result of the correlation test that showed a significant relationship in all employment status and occupation of workers, especially among permanent workers ($r=0.705$, $p<0.01$) and staff workers ($r=0.656$, $p<0.01$).

Another study showed that bullying is a potential stressor in workplace (Hauge et al., 2010) that has a significant impact and strong correlation with job stress (Oh et al., 2016; Tsuno et al., 2018). It has been demonstrated that people who experience bullying will have an increase in the psychological distress risk with an OR=1.68 (Nielsen et al., 2012). The distress level in contract workers (score>20) (7.6%) and non-staff workers (7.1%) is lower than in the permanent (18.4%) and staff (19%) workers. This lower level of distress among contract workers and non-staff might link to the cognitive realization that the ability, salary, and position these workers have (salary or position) commensurate their level of education and also because they are not very much involved in the decision-making process. Further studies are needed to get evidence for this.

Individuals who receive bullying actions in their workplace will have more depression and anxiety symptoms which will eventually affect their mental health (Verkuil et al., 2015) due to the relationship between the two variables (Nielsen et al., 2012). Although in this study none of the workers become the 'victim' of bullying (score $\geq$ 45), three workers experienced severe mental disorders. Organization may need to do more in-depth observations and reviews

regarding the psychological distress among workers and prevent workplace bullying.

Bullying also increases the tendency for workers to not come to work due to illness. This study demonstrated that the permanent workers and staff with higher levels of exposure to negative actions also miss more workdays (10.2% and 5.8% among permanent workers and staff, respectively) when compared to contract workers and non-staff (5.7% and 1.9%) (data not shown in the table).

In terms of the ratio of absenteeism to exposure to bullying, the odds ratio for absenteeism was 58% higher (OR 1.58) in those experiencing bullying (Nielsen et al., 2016). A significant reciprocal association is also seen between absenteeism and bullying (Grynderup et al., 2017).

Bullying also affects a person's satisfaction with life. The satisfaction with life is a result of a comparison of the living conditions a person feels to a standard or a series of standards that the person has (Ackerman, 2020). In this study, a negative correlation was seen between bullying and satisfaction with life ($r=-0.213$, $p<0.05$), meaning that the higher the bullying experience is, the lower the satisfaction with life.

The findings in this study indicate that the bullying experienced by permanent workers (9.2%) and staff (7.7%) is higher than that of contract workers (4.5%) and non-staff (5.2%), albeit the level of satisfaction with life in these groups is higher (92% for permanent workers and 90.4% for staff). This might be explained by the assumption that although permanent workers and staff experience more bullying, they have more job security, clearer career path, and higher self-esteem that contribute to their high satisfaction with life. This is different with contract workers and non-staff that, although the level of bullying is lower, they have lower individual resources that may be eroded by bullying. These workers are also more prone to losing job and have lower self-esteem with the lack or limited career path and lower job security, which may become the mediating factors that will directly or indirectly reduce the level of satisfaction with life (Nauman et al.,

2019; Magee et al., 2015; Kakarika et al., 2017; Trépanier et al., 2016; and Arnarsson et al., 2020).

Workplace bullying will affect the physical and psychological conditions of the targeted individuals, leading to lowered health degree and psychological distress (Verkuil et al., 2015; Nielsen et al., 2012) which, in turns, will reduce satisfaction with life (Nauman et al., 2019; Miranda et al., 2019). It has also been shown in previous studies that workplace bullying will increase absenteeism (Nielsen et al., 2016), cardiovascular diseases (Xu et al., 2019), and mental health (Verkuil et al., 2015).

Another finding is both psychological distress and life satisfaction of permanent employees are higher than contract workers. This is not consistent with other research findings that psychological distress is negatively correlated with satisfaction with life (Beutel et al., 2016; Tsuno et al., 2018; Nauman et al., 2019). Contributing factors to life satisfaction are not clearly understood yet, but financial security (Ruberton et al., 2016; Cheung & Lucas, 2015), culture, political freedom, respect, work life balance, self-esteem are also associated with greater life satisfaction (Ackerman, 2020; Gagnano et al., 2020). Permanent employees have mostly such resources as contributing factor to achieve higher satisfaction with life than contract employees.

CONCLUSION

Workplace bullying is an important problem that will affect the psychological condition of the target or victim. In addition to its effects on physical health, workplace bullying also results in psychological effects including stress and decreased satisfaction with life. It is concluded that in this study that among workers who work in the offshore fields of the oil and gas company under study, permanent workers and workers in staff position experience a higher bullying actions and psychological distress than those who were contract workers and workers in non-staff position. However, the satisfaction with life is higher in permanent workers and workers with staff position which might be due to the absence of anxiety as the mediating factor for

decreasing satisfaction with life and they have many things to achieve their satisfaction with life. Yet, more in-depth studies on the possible mediating factors in this phenomenon is required. Programs to improve workplace condition to prevent workplace bullying are still needed despite the small number of bullying in these oil fields to prevent the occasional bullying to escalate into a more severe bullying.

REFERENCES

- Ackerman, C.E. 2020. *Life Satisfaction Theory and 4 Contributing Factors*.
<https://positivepsychology.com/life-satisfaction/>
- American Psychological Association. 2020. *Bullying*.
<https://www.apa.org/topics/bullying>
- Anderson, T.M., Sunderland, M., Andrews, G., Titov, N., Dear, B.F. & Sachdev, P.S. 2013. The 10-Item Kessler Psychological Distress Scale (K10) as a Screening Instrument in Older Individuals. *American Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry*, 21 (7): 596–606.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jagp.2013.01.009>
- Arnarsson, A., Nygren, J., Nyholm, M., Torsheim, T., Augustine, L., Bjereld, Y., Markkanen, I., Schnohr, C.w., Rasmussen, M., Nielsen, L. & Bendtsen, P. 2020. Cyberbullying and Traditional Bullying among Nordic Adolescents and Their Impact on Life Satisfaction. *Scandinavian Journal of Public Health*, 48 (5): 502–510.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1403494818817411>
- Arvidsdotter, T., Marklund, B., Kylén, S., Taft, C. & Ekman, I. 2016. Understanding Persons with Psychological Distress in Primary Health Care. *Scandinavian Journal of Caring Sciences*, 30 (4): 687–694. <https://doi.org/10.1111/scs.12289>
- Ballard, A. & Easteal, P. 2018. What's in a Name? The Language of Workplace Bullying. *Alternative Law Journal*, 43 (1): 17–23.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1037969X17748177>
- Beutel, M.E., Klein, E.M., Aufenanger, S., Brahler, E., Dreier, M., Muller, K.W., Quiring, O., Reinecke, R., Schmutzer, G., Stark, B. & Wolfling, K. 2016. Procrastination, Distress, and Life Satisfaction Across the Age Range - A German Representative Community Study. *PLoS One*, 11 (2): 1–12.
<https://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0148054>
- Bloch, C. 2010. *Negative Acts and Bullying: Face-threatening Acts, Social Bonds and Social Place (in Emotionalizing Organizations and Organizing Emotions)* (pp. 126–146). Palgrave Macmillan: Macmillan Publishers Limited.
<https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230289895>
- Cheung, F. & Lucas, R.E. 2015. When does Money Matter Most? Examining the Association between Income and Life Satisfaction over the Life Course. *Psychology and Aging*, 30 (1): 120–135. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0038682>
- D'cruz, P. 2015. *Depersonalized Bullying at Work From Evidence to Conceptualization*. Springer.
<http://www.springer.com/series/10143>
- De Cuyper, N., Notelaers, G. & De Witte, H. 2009. Transitioning between Temporary and Permanent Employment: A Two-wave Study on the Entrapment, the Stepping Stone and the Selection Hypothesis. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 82 (1): 67–88.
<https://doi.org/10.1348/096317908X299755>
- Diener, E., Inglehart, R. & Tay, L. 2013. Theory and Validity of Life Satisfaction Scales. *Social Indicators Research*, 112 (3): 497–527.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-012-0076-y>
- Drapeau, A., Marchand, A. & Beaulieu-Prévost, D. 2011. *Epidemiology of Psychological Distress (in L. L'Abate (Ed.), Mental Illness - Understanding, Prediction and Control (pp. 105–130)*. InTech.
- Einarsen, S., Hoel, H. & Notelaers, G. 2009. Measuring Exposure to Bullying and Harassment at Work: Validity, Factor Structure and Psychometric Properties of the Negative Acts Questionnaire-revised. *Work and Stress*, 23 (1): 24–44.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02678370902815673>
- Einarsen, S., Hoel, H., Zapf, D. & Cooper, C.L. 2020. *Bullying and Harrassment in the Workplace* (Stale Einarsen & H. Doel (Eds.); Third edit, pp. 3–53). CRC Press - Taylor & Francis Group.
- Einarsen, Stale, Hoel, H., Zapf, D., & Cooper, C.L. 2011. *The Concept of Bullying and Harassment at Work: The European Tradition*. In *Bullying and Harassment at Workplace (Second Edi)*. CRC Press - Taylor & Francis Group.
- Emerson, S.D., Guhn, M. & Gadermann, A.M. 2017. Measurement Invariance of the Satisfaction with Life Scale: Reviewing Three Decades of Research. *Quality of Life Research*, 26 (9): 2251–2264. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11136-017-1552-2>
- Erwandi, D., Kadir, A. & Lestari, F. 2021. Identification of Workplace Bullying: Reliability and Validity of Indonesian Version

- of the Negative Acts. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18 (8): 3985.
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18083985>
- Gragnano, A., Simbula, S. & Miglioretti, M. 2020. Work-Life Balance: Weighing the Importance of Work-Family and Work-Health Balance. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17 (907): 1-20.
<https://www.mdpi.com/1660-4601/17/3/907/pdf>
- Grynderup, M.B., Nabe-Nielsen, K., Lange, T., Conway, P.M., Bonde, J.P., Garde, A.H., Gullander, M., Kaerlev, L., Persson, R., Rugulies, R., Vammen, M.A., Høgh, A. & Hansen, Å.M. 2017. The Associations between Workplace Bullying, Salivary Cortisol, and Long-term Sickness Absence: A Longitudinal Study. *BMC Public Health*, 17 (1): 1-12.
<https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-017-4716-7>
- Hauge, L.J., Skogstad, A. & Einarsen, S. 2010. *Personality and Social Sciences the Relative Impact of Workplace Bullying as a Social Stressor at Work. Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 51: 426-433.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9450.2010.00813.x>
- Jaradat, Y., Nielsen, M.B., Kristensen, P., Nijem, K., Bjertness, E., Stigum, H. & Bast-Pettersen, R. 2016. Workplace Aggression, Psychological Distress, and Job Satisfaction among Palestinian Nurses: A Cross-sectional study. *Applied Nursing Research*, 32: 190-198.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apnr.2016.07.014>
- Kakarika, M., González-Gómez, H.V. & Dimitriadis, Z. 2017. That wasn't Our Deal: A Psychological Contract Perspective on Employee Responses to Bullying. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 100: 43-55.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2017.02.005>
- Kessler, R.C., Barker, P.R., Colpe, L.J., Epstein, J.F., Gfroerer, J.C., Hiripi, E., Howes, M.J., Normand, S.L.T., Manderscheid, R.W., Walters, E.E. & Zaslavsky, A.M. 2003. Screening for Serious Mental Illness in the General Population. *JAMA Psychiatry*, 60 (2): 184-189.
<https://doi.org/10.1001/archpsyc.60.2.184>
- Law, R., Dollard, M.F., Tuckey, M.R. & Dormann, C. 2011. Psychosocial Safety Climate as a Lead Indicator of Workplace Bullying and Harassment, Job Resources, Psychological Health and Employee Engagement. *Accident Analysis and Prevention*, 43 (5): 1782-1793.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aap.2011.04.010>
- Magee, C., Gordon, R., Robinson, L., Reis, S., Caputi, P. & Oades, L. 2015. Distinct Workplace Bullying Experiences and Sleep Quality: A Person-centred Approach. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 87: 200-205.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2015.08.004>
- Marchand, A., Drapeau, A. & Beaulieu-Prévost, D. 2012. Psychological Distress in Canada: The Role of Employment and Reasons of Non-employment. *International Journal of Social Psychiatry*, 58 (6): 596-604.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0020764011418404>
- Maroufizadeh, S., Ghaheri, A., Samani, R.O. & Ezabadi, Z. 2016. Psychometric Properties of the Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS) in Iranian Infertile Women. *International Journal of Reproductive Biomedicine*, 14 (1): 57-62.
<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27141550/>
- Menesini, E. & Salmivalli, C. 2017. Bullying in School: the State of Knowledge and Effective Intervention. *Psychology, Health & Medicine*, 22 (1): 240-253.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13548506.2017.1279740>
- Miranda, R., Oriol, X., Amutio, A. & Ortúzar, H. 2019. Adolescent Bullying Victimization and Life Satisfaction: Can Family and School Adult Support Figures Mitigate this Effect? *Revista de Psicodidáctica (English Ed.)*, 24 (1): 39-45.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psicoe.2018.07.001>
- Namie, G. 2021. *2021 WBI Workplace Bullying Survey*.
<https://workplacebullying.org/2021-wbi-survey>
- Nauman, S., Malik, S.Z. & Jalil, F. 2019. How Workplace Bullying Jeopardizes Employees' Life Satisfaction: The Roles of Job Anxiety and Insomnia. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10 (2292): 1-13.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02292>
- Nielsen, M.B., Indregard, A.M.R. & Overland, S. 2016. Workplace Bullying and Sickness Absence: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis of the Research Literature. *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment and Health*, 42 (5): 359-370.
<https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.5271/sjweh.3579>
- Nielsen, M.B., Hetland, J., Matthiesen, S.B. & Einarsen, S. 2012. Longitudinal Relationships between Workplace Bullying and

- Psychological Distress. *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment and Health*, 38 (1): 38–46. <https://doi.org/10.5271/sjweh.3178>
- Notelaers, G. & Einarsen, S. 2012. The World Turns at 33 and 45: Defining Simple Cutoff Scores for the Negative Acts Questionnaire-Revised in a Representative Sample. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 22 (6): 670–682. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2012.690558>
- Notelaers, G., Vermunt, J.K., Baillien, E., Einarsen, S. & Witte, H.De. 2011. Exploring Risk Groups Workplace Bullying with Categorical Data. *Industrial Health*, 49 (1): 73–88. <https://doi.org/10.2486/indhealth.ms1155>
- Oh, H., Uhm, D. & Yoon, Y. 2016. Workplace Bullying, Job Stress, Intent to Leave and Nurses' Perceptions of Patient Safety in South Korean Hospital. *Nursing Research*, 65 (5): 380–388. https://scholar.google.co.id/scholar_url?url=https://readersinsight.net/jmi/article/download/123/163&hl=id&sa=X&ei=UChfYYzJY2oywTy66jAAQ&scisig=AAGBfm2Ivgv4fbJzUHXFFEYssG_Eq8HMRQ&oi=scholar
- O'Moore, M. & Crowley, N. 2011. The Clinical Effects of Workplace Bullying: A Critical Look at Personality Using SEM. *International Journal of Workplace Health Management*, 4 (1): 67–83. <https://doi.org/10.1108/1753835111118608>
- Pavot, W., & Diener, E. (1993). Review of the satisfaction with life scale psychological assessment. *Psychological Assessment*, 5(2), 164–172. <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-90-481-2354-4>
- R. Kessler, G. Andrew, L. Colpe, E. Hiripi, D. Mroczek, S. Normand, E. Walters, & A. Zaslavsky. (2002). Short screening scales to monitor population prevalences and trends in non-specific psychological distress. *Psychological Medicine*, 32, 959–976. <http://journals2.scholarsportal.info.myaccess.library.utoronto.ca/tmp/1625187752428454629.pdf>
- Raja, U., Javed, Y. & Abbas, M. 2018. A Time Lagged Study of Burnout as A Mediator in the Relationship between Workplace Bullying and Work-family Conflict. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 25 (4): 377–390. <https://doi.org/10.1037/str0000080>
- Ruberton, P.M., Lyubomirsky, S. & Gladstone, J. 2016. How your Bank Balance Buys Happiness: The Importance of “Cash on Hand” to Life Satisfaction. *Emotion*, 16 (5): 575–580. <https://doi.org/10.1037/emo0000184>
- Samsudin, E.Z., Isahak, M., Rampal, S., Rosnah, I. & Zakaria, M.I. 2019. Organisational Antecedents of Workplace Victimization: The Role of Organisational Climate, Culture, Leadership, Support, and Justice in Predicting Junior Doctors' Exposure to Bullying at Work. *International Journal of Health Planning and Management*, 35 (1): 346–367. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hpm.2926>
- Slade, T., Grove, R. & Burgess, P. 2011. Kessler Psychological Distress Scale: Normative Data from the 2007 Australian National Survey of Mental Health and Wellbeing. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry*, 45 (4): 308–316. <https://doi.org/10.3109/00048674.2010.543653>
- Trépanier, S.G., Fernet, C. & Austin, S. 2013. Workplace Bullying and Psychological Health at Work: The Mediating Role of Satisfaction of Needs for Autonomy, Competence and Relatedness. *Work and Stress*, 27 (2): 123–140. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2013.782158>
- Trépanier, S.G., Fernet, C. & Austin, S. 2016. Longitudinal Relationships between Workplace Bullying, Basic Psychological Needs, and Employee Functioning: A Simultaneous Investigation of Psychological Need Satisfaction and Frustration. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 25 (5): 690–706. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2015.1132200>
- Tsuno, K., Kawachi, I., Kawakami, N., Miyashita & Kazuhisa, A. 2018. Workplace Bullying and Psychological Distress. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 60 (12): 1067–1072. <https://doi.org/10.1097/JOM.0000000000001433>
- Verkuil, B., Atasayi, S. & Molendijk, M.L. 2015. Workplace Bullying and Mental Health: A Meta-Analysis on Cross-sectional and Longitudinal Data. *PLoS ONE*, 10 (8): 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0135225>
- Xu, T., Hanson, L.L.M., Lange, T., Starkopf, L., Westerlund, H., Madsen, I.E.H., Rugulies, R., Pentti, J., Stenholm, S., Vahtera, J., Hansen, Å.M., Virtanen, M., Kivimäki, M. & Rod, N.H. 2019. Workplace Bullying and

Workplace Violence as Risk Factors for
Cardiovascular Disease: A Multi-cohort Study.

European Heart Journal, 40 (14): 1124–1134.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/eurheartj/ehy683>