

Title: Risk factors for workplace bullying, severe psychological distress, and suicidal ideation during the COVID-19 pandemic: a nationwide internet survey for the general working population in Japan

Authors: Kanami Tsuno¹⁾, Takahiro Tabuchi²⁾

1) School of Health Innovation, Kanagawa University of Human Services, Kanagawa, Japan

2) Cancer Control Center, Osaka International Cancer Institute, Osaka, Japan

Corresponding author: Kanami Tsuno, PhD, MPH.

Current affiliation: School of Health Innovation, Kanagawa University of Human Services, Research Gate Building TONOMACHI 2, 3-25-10 Tonomachi, Kawasaki-ku, Kawasaki-shi, Kanagawa 210-0821, Japan

Tel: +81 044 589 8100

Email: ktsuno-ky@umin.ac.jp

Abstract

Objectives: The pandemic of the new coronavirus disease (COVID-19) has created a challenging environment for workers. This study aimed to investigate the risk factors for workplace bullying and mental health outcomes during the pandemic among workers.

Methods: We conducted a nationwide online cross-sectional survey from August to September 2020 in Japan (N = 16,384). Workplace bullying was measured by one item from the Brief Job Stress Questionnaire; severe psychological distress (SPD) by K6 (≥ 13); and suicidal ideation by one item. Prevalence ratios were calculated by Poisson regression analyses adjusting for potential confounders such as gender, age, occupational characteristics, and a prior history of depression.

Results: Overall, 15% of workers experienced workplace bullying, 9% had SPD, and 12% had suicidal ideation during the second and third wave of the COVID-19 pandemic in Japan. The results of this study showed men, executives, managers, and permanent employees had a higher risk of bullying compared to women or part-time workers. Increased physical and psychological demands were common risk factors for bullying, SPD, and suicidal ideation. Newly starting working from home was a significant

predictor for adverse mental health outcomes, however, it was found to be a preventive factor against workplace bullying.

Conclusions: The results of this study found different high-risk groups for bullying or mental health during the pandemic. When intervening to decrease workplace bullying or mental health problems, we should focus on not only previously reported vulnerable workers but also workers who experienced a change of their working styles or job demands.

Key messages

What is already known about this subject?

- Workplace bullying is one of the severe job stressors in the workplace that cause mental health problems.
- Health care workers, less-educated workers, and non-regular female workers have been reported to have greater psychological distress during the COVID-19 pandemic.

What are the new findings?

- About 15% of workers experienced workplace bullying, 9% had SPD, and 12% had suicidal ideation during the pandemic in Japan.
- Men, executives, managers, and permanent workers had a higher risk of bullying compared to women or part-time workers.
- Increased physical or psychological demands were common risk factors for bullying, SPD, and suicidal ideation.
- While newly starting working from home was a preventive factor against workplace bullying, it was found to be a significant risk factor for adverse mental health outcomes.

How might this impact on policy or clinical practice in the foreseeable future?

- The results of this study indicate a different pattern of high-risk groups for bullying or mental health during the pandemic.
- When intervening to decrease workplace bullying or mental health problems, we should focus on not only previously reported vulnerable workers but also workers who experienced a change of their working styles or job demands.

INTRODUCTION

Workplace bullying is a form of repeated negative acts and one of the severe job stressors in the workplace. Although the prevalence of workplace bullying during the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic is unknown, a global prevalence before the pandemic was reported as 14.6% in the meta-analysis.¹

Previous studies clearly show workplace bullying has a severe adverse effect on workers' mental health. For example, longitudinal associations between workplace bullying and depression,² post-traumatic stress disorder,³ and suicidal ideation⁴ have been reported in the systematic review or meta-analysis. Moreover, mental health problems are not only “outcomes” of workplace bullying, but also “antecedents” of workplace bullying. The meta-analysis studies on the association between workplace bullying and mental health have consistently reported that baseline mental health problems were associated with an increased risk of exposing workplace bullying.^{2 5} Thus, when investigating the association between bullying and mental health, a reversed effect should be taken into consideration.

Women and younger workers were more likely to experience bullying,^{6 7} although the results on the association between age and bullying were found to be inconsistent in the recent systematic review.⁶ Low socioeconomic status (SES),

measured by education, income, and occupation, was also reported as a risk factor for workplace bullying.⁸ This is probably because lower SES workers tend to be in a lower position in the organization than higher SES workers, as shown by the report that workers with a higher position such as managers were less likely but unskilled workers were more likely to expose to bullying.⁹ Nevertheless, only one previous study for workplace bullying has focused on income,⁸ a few studies on education,^{8,10,11} and most other studies only investigated occupation as risk factors of workplace bullying.⁶ In addition to that low SES workers tend to have unstable working conditions, an economical shrinking during the COVID-19 pandemic may worsen their surroundings and increase their vulnerability.¹² More research on workplace bullying needs to focus on the most disadvantaged workers in societies.

Although high job demands are associated with exposure to workplace bullying,^{6,13-15} no study investigated an association between increased job demands or new working style—working from home—and exposure to workplace bullying. Under the COVID-19 pandemic, especially essential workers, including health care workers, have experienced excessive overload physically and psychologically and have developed psychological distress or burnout.^{16,17} In contrast, non-essential workers such as white-collar workers started to work from home and the number of people working

from home increased during the pandemic.¹⁸ These changes in working styles or the workplaces also cause workplace bullying because any kind of change makes workers feel stressful and stressful working environments increase bullying behaviors.^{7 19 20}

An association between working from home and adverse mental health is not fully investigated. During the pandemic, suicide rates increased from 2019 to 2020 in Japan, which was the first time in the decade.²¹ Determinants of the increase in suicide rates have not been fully investigated yet but a recent study reported an increase in social isolation was associated with suicidal ideation in the general population during the pandemic.²² In general, workers are less likely to be isolated compared to unemployed people because they tend to have daily opportunities to meet and talk with supervisors or co-workers in the workplace. However, workers who work from home may be in a different situation; they have less co-worker support than workers who work at the office, while working from home itself has a positive impact on workers' work-life balance.²³ A recent large-scale study in an information company with over 60,000 employees during the pandemic showed that working from home has negative effects such as decreasing synchronous communication between workers and decreasing bridges between disparate departments in the company.²⁴

Various risk factors of mental health problems among workers have been

reported during the COVID-19 pandemic. For example, health care workers,^{17 25} less-educated workers,²⁶ and non-regular female workers²⁷ were more likely to have greater psychological distress. However, studies focusing on the general working population from various industries are scarce, since a majority of studies have focused on only health care workers.²⁵

The aim of this study was therefore to identify the potential risk factors of workplace bullying, severe psychological distress (SPD), and suicidal ideation during the pandemic, such as gender, age, SES, job demands, and working from home, by a nationwide internet survey for the general working population in Japan.

METHODS

Data

We used the baseline cross-sectional data of an ongoing web-based national-representative longitudinal study, the Japan “COVID-19 and Society” Internet Survey (JACSIS) study. The baseline survey was conducted in August and September 2020. The survey requests were sent by the research agency (Rakuten Insight, Inc., Tokyo, Japan) to the 224,389 panelists who were selected by each gender, age, and prefecture category using simple random sampling. Once the target number of

participants (N = 28,000) answered the questionnaire, the recruitment process stopped, resulting in the participation rate for the survey being 12.5% (28,000 of 224,389). The details of the study protocol are described elsewhere.²⁸

To validate data quality, we excluded respondents showing discrepancies and/or artificial/unnatural responses.²⁹ Three question items of “Please choose the second from the bottom”, “choosing positive in all of a set of questions for using drugs” and “choosing positive in all of a set of questions for having chronic diseases” were used to detect any discrepancies. We excluded these respondents with discrepancies or artificial/unnatural responses (n=2518, remaining n=25,482).

Measurements

Risk factors

Our exposures variables of interest were respondents’ demographics variables including gender,⁶ age,⁷ living areas, and marital status (having a partner/spouse), SES,⁸ occupational characteristics, and current working situation. The SES variables included education (high school or below, junior college/vocational school, and university of above)⁸, annual household income during the previous year (JPY1.99 million, JPY2.00-3.99 million, JPY4.00-5.99 million, JPY6.00-7.99 million, JPY8.00-9.99

million, JPY10 million, and unknown), and occupation/employment status (executive, self-employee/individual business owner, family business assistance, manager, permanent worker, dispatched worker, contract worker, and part-time worker).

Occupational characteristics included industry, office size, and job type (desk work, jobs that work with people [sales staff, in-store salesperson, etc.], and jobs that require physical strength [delivery staff, care staff, etc.]). To assess their current working situations, we asked whether the respondents experienced working from home or experienced increased physical or psychological demands during the COVID-19 pandemic. Weekly working hours during the previous month were also assessed as categorical variables.

Finally, a prior history of depression and other mental illnesses were assessed since baseline mental health problems were associated with an increased risk of exposure to workplace bullying.^{2,5}

Workplace bullying

Workplace bullying was assessed by a self-labeling method, using a sub-scale of the New Brief Job Stress Questionnaire.⁸ First, respondents were asked whether they experienced bullying during the six months, using a single-item “Have you been bullied

in your workplace during the six months (since April 2020)?” The respondents who chose “yes” were defined as “victims”. In the survey, we did not present a definition of bullying to respondents due to limitations of space. In addition to the abovementioned question, respondents were also asked whether they had witnessed bullying in their workplace during the six months.

Mental health outcomes

Severe psychological distress was measured by the K6.³⁰ The K6 consists of six items and assesses how frequently respondents have experienced symptoms of psychological distress during the past 30 days (“0 = never”, “1 = rarely”, “2 = sometimes”, “3 = often” or “4 = always”). In this study, a cut-off score of 13 was used for defining severe psychological distress (SPD).³¹

Suicidal ideation was assessed by one question “Have you ever wished you were dead, since April 2020?” The response options were “1 = yes, for the first time”, “2 = yes, but I had it since before April 2020” or “3 = never experienced it.” Answering “yes” was defined as having suicidal ideation.

Statistical analyses

We used a Poisson regression analysis to examine the relationship between risk factors and workplace bullying. Prevalence ratios (PRs) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) were calculated adjusting for individual characteristics (gender, age, having a partner, and living area) and SES (education, household income, and employment status) (Model 1), occupational characteristics (industry, office size, and job type) (Model 2), and all variables including current working situation (started to work from home after the pandemic, increased physical demands, increased psychological demands, and weekly working hours during the previous month), and a prior history of depression (Model 3). To examine the relationship between workplace bullying and mental health outcomes, we also conducted another Poisson regression analysis. In these analyses, PRs and 95% CIs were calculated adjusting for individual characteristics, SES, occupational characteristics (Model 1), and a prior history of depression (Model 2). Finally, we conducted a Poisson regression analysis stratified by gender. In this analysis, the prevalence ratios of two mental health outcomes were calculated by adjusting individual characteristics, SES, occupational characteristics, workplace bullying, and a prior history of depression. The 2-tailed p-value for statistical significance to see the differences among each social indicator was set at 0.05. All analyses were conducted using SPSS 27.0 for Windows. No missing values exist in this data because all

questions were required to answer.

RESULTS

Characteristics of participants

Table 1 shows the characteristics of the participants. Among 25,482 respondents, we analyzed for 16,384 workers in this study after excluding students, retired persons, full-time housewives/househusbands, and those who did not work at the survey. The average age of the participants was 45.7 (standard deviation: 13.8) years old. The majority of the participants were men, were 45-54 years old, had a partner/spouse, and lived in prefectures under special precautions during the first COVID-19 state of emergency in Japan (April-May 2020). Regarding SES variables, the majority of the participants have graduated university or graduate school, earned 4.00-5.99 million Japanese yen during the previous year as a household income, and worked as permanent workers. In terms of occupational characteristics, the majority of the participants were working in the manufacturing industry, working at a small office with 5-29 employees or a large office with more than 1,000 employees. Their job type was mainly desk work. In terms of current working situations, only 8% of the participants started to work from home after the pandemic but approximately 20% were working from home since before

the pandemic, which means in total about 30% of participants experienced working from home during the COVID-19 pandemic. Although most of the participants worked 40-44 hours/week during the past month, 6% worked over 60 hours/week. Overall, 21% experienced increased physical demands and 33% experienced increased psychological demands during the pandemic. About 4% of the participants had depression or other mental illness at the time of the survey and 6% or 4% had a prior history of depression or other mental illness, respectively.

Overall, 15% of the participants experienced workplace bullying during the past 6 months and 18% witnessed bullying at their workplaces during the past 6 months. About 9% had SPD during the past 30 days and 12% had suicidal ideation during the past 6 months.

Table 1. Characteristics of the participants (N=16,384)

Individual characteristics	n	%
Gender		
Men	9595	58.6
Women	6789	41.4
Age		
Under 24	1024	6.3
25-34	2964	18.1
35-44	3673	22.4
45-54	4146	25.3
55-64	2914	17.8
Over 65	1663	10.2
Having a partner/spouse		
Yes	9633	58.8
No	6751	41.2
Living area		
Prefectures under special precautions	10246	62.5
Others	6138	37.5
Socioeconomic status (SES)		
Education		
High school or below	4167	25.4
Junior college/vocational school	3658	22.3
University or above	8559	52.2
Annual household income during the previous year (million JPY)		
1.99 or less	987	6.0
2.00-3.99	3053	18.6
4.00-5.99	3469	21.2
6.00-7.99	2481	15.1
8.00-9.99	1744	10.6
10.00 or more	1998	12.2
Unknown	2652	16.2
Occupation/employment status		
Executive	927	5.7
Self-employee/individual business owner	1548	9.4
Family business assistance	210	1.3
Manager	2014	12.3
Permanent worker (non-manager)	7201	44.0
Dispatched worker	366	2.2
Contract worker	1062	6.5
Part-time worker	3056	18.7
Occupational characteristics		
Industry		
Public administration	1065	6.5
Agriculture, forestry, and fishing	181	1.1
Construction	908	5.5
Manufacturing	2748	16.8
Electricity, gas, and water supply	235	1.4
Telecommunication	844	5.2
Transport	684	4.2
Wholesale	571	3.5
Retail trade	1269	7.7
Finance	423	2.6
Insurance	288	1.8
Real estate	396	2.4
Restaurants	508	3.1
Hotels	151	0.9
Healthcare	1201	7.3
Welfare	704	4.3
Education and learning assistance	853	5.2
Others	3355	20.5
Office size		
1-4	2379	14.5
5-29	3241	19.8
30-49	1161	7.1
50-99	1625	9.9
100-299	2145	13.1
300-499	999	6.1
500-999	1065	6.5
Over 1,000	3158	19.3
Civil service	611	3.7
Job types		
Desk work	7944	48.5
Jobs that work with people	4024	24.6
Jobs that require physical strength	4416	27.0

Table 1 (cont.). Characteristics of the participants (N=16,384)

	n	%
Current working situation		
Started to work from home after the pandemic		
Yes	1382	8.4
No	15002	91.6
Working from home since before the pandemic		
Yes	2964	18.1
No	13420	81.9
Increase in physical demands		
Yes	3389	20.7
No	12995	79.3
Increase in psychological demands		
Yes	5421	33.1
No	10963	66.9
Weekly working hours during the previous month		
Less than 20 hours/week	2688	16.4
20-29 hours/week	1821	11.1
30-39 hours/week	3103	18.9
40-44 hours/week	4676	28.5
45-49 hours/week	1900	11.6
50-59 hours/week	1265	7.7
Over 60 hours/week	931	5.7
History of psychiatric disorders		
Having mental illness		
Depression		
Never	14782	90.2
Past	989	6.0
Current	613	3.7
Other mental illness		
Never	15203	92.8
Past	611	3.7
Current	570	3.5
Exposure to workplace bullying		
Yes	2441	14.9
No	13943	85.1
Witnessed workplace bullying		
Yes	2940	17.9
No	13444	82.1
SPD (K6 ≥ 13)		
Yes	1442	8.8
No	14942	91.2
Having suicidal ideation		
Yes	1890	11.5
No	14494	88.5

SPD: severe psychological distress.

Risk factors for exposure to workplace bullying

Table 2 shows the results of the Poisson regression analysis, which calculated the PRs for workplace bullying. The significant risk factors of workplace bullying were gender (men), younger age, lower household income (1.99-3.99 million Japanese yen), occupation (executive, manager, permanent employee, and contract employee), larger office size, increased physical or psychological demands, and current or a prior history of depression or other mental illness. On the other hand, those who started to work from home after the pandemic or worked 30-49 hours/week had a lower risk of exposure to workplace bullying.

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

Table 2. Prevalence ratios of workplace bullying: Poisson regression analysis (N=16,384)

	Workplace bullying Case (%)	PRs (95% CI) Model 1	PRs (95% CI) Model 2	PRs (95% CI) Model 3
Gender				
Men	1588 (16.6)	1.30 (1.19 to 1.43)	1.32 (1.20 to 1.46)	1.33 (1.20 to 1.46)
Women	853 (12.6)	1.00 (reference)	1.00 (reference)	1.00 (reference)
Age				
Under 24	227 (22.2)	2.98 (2.33 to 3.81)	2.73 (2.13 to 3.51)	2.45 (1.91 to 3.15)
25-34	570 (19.2)	2.74 (2.20 to 3.42)	2.58 (2.06 to 3.22)	2.38 (1.90 to 2.98)
35-44	599 (16.3)	2.41 (1.94 to 2.99)	2.33 (1.88 to 2.90)	2.13 (1.71 to 2.65)
45-54	610 (14.7)	2.18 (1.76 to 2.70)	2.14 (1.72 to 2.66)	2.00 (1.61 to 2.49)
55-64	331 (11.4)	1.69 (1.36 to 2.12)	1.66 (1.33 to 2.08)	1.64 (1.31 to 2.05)
Over 65	104 (6.3)	1.00 (reference)	1.00 (reference)	1.00 (reference)
Having a partner/spouse				
Yes	1318 (13.7)	1.00 (reference)	1.00 (reference)	1.00 (reference)
No	1123 (16.6)	1.01 (0.92 to 1.10)	0.99 (0.91 to 1.09)	1.00 (0.91 to 1.09)
Living area				
Prefectures under special precautions	1534 (15.0)	1.00 (0.92 to 1.09)	1.00 (0.92 to 1.09)	1.01 (0.93 to 1.10)
Others	907 (14.8)	1.00 (reference)	1.00 (reference)	1.00 (reference)
Education				
High school or below	617 (14.8)	1.06 (0.96 to 1.17)	1.08 (0.97 to 1.20)	1.07 (0.96 to 1.19)
Junior college/vocational school	501 (13.7)	1.00 (0.89 to 1.11)	0.99 (0.88 to 1.11)	0.98 (0.88 to 1.10)
University or above	1323 (15.5)	1.00 (reference)	1.00 (reference)	1.00 (reference)
Annual household income during the previous year (million JPN)				
Unknown	194 (19.7)	1.17 (0.99 to 1.38)	1.22 (1.03 to 1.44)	1.21 (1.02 to 1.43)
1.99 or less	503 (16.5)	1.74 (1.43 to 2.13)	1.84 (1.50 to 2.25)	1.58 (1.29 to 1.93)
2.00-3.99	527 (15.2)	1.34 (1.14 to 1.57)	1.39 (1.18 to 1.63)	1.32 (1.12 to 1.55)
4.00-5.99	346 (13.9)	1.13 (0.97 to 1.32)	1.17 (1.00 to 1.36)	1.14 (0.98 to 1.33)
6.00-7.99	234 (13.4)	1.01 (0.86 to 1.19)	1.03 (0.88 to 1.21)	1.03 (0.87 to 1.21)
8.00-9.99	275 (13.8)	0.97 (0.81 to 1.15)	0.98 (0.82 to 1.16)	0.96 (0.81 to 1.15)
10.00 or more	362 (13.7)	1.00 (reference)	1.00 (reference)	1.00 (reference)
Occupation/employment status				
Executive	178 (19.2)	1.51 (1.25 to 1.83)	1.77 (1.45 to 2.16)	1.94 (1.58 to 2.38)
Self-employee/ individual business owner	129 (8.3)	0.74 (0.60 to 0.92)	1.05 (0.82 to 1.36)	1.14 (0.88 to 1.48)
Family business assistance	21 (10.0)	0.90 (0.58 to 1.40)	1.18 (0.74 to 1.87)	1.19 (0.75 to 1.90)
Manager	341 (16.9)	1.27 (1.08 to 1.50)	1.39 (1.17 to 1.66)	1.66 (1.38 to 2.00)
Permanent employee (non-manager)	1250 (17.4)	1.20 (1.05 to 1.36)	1.27 (1.10 to 1.47)	1.56 (1.33 to 1.82)
Dispatched worker	44 (12.0)	0.92 (0.67 to 1.26)	0.88 (0.64 to 1.22)	0.99 (0.72 to 1.37)
Contract worker	142 (13.4)	1.16 (0.95 to 1.42)	1.14 (0.93 to 1.39)	1.31 (1.06 to 1.61)
Part-time worker	336 (11.0)	1.00 (reference)	1.00 (reference)	1.00 (reference)
Industry				
Public administration	170 (16.0)	1.00 (reference)	1.00 (reference)	1.00 (reference)
Agriculture, forestry, and fishing	31 (17.1)	1.34 (0.91 to 1.98)	1.31 (0.87 to 1.96)	1.30 (0.87 to 1.95)
Construction	133 (14.6)	0.99 (0.79 to 1.25)	0.97 (0.75 to 1.24)	1.03 (0.80 to 1.32)
Manufacturing	456 (16.6)	1.04 (0.87 to 1.24)	0.92 (0.75 to 1.14)	1.01 (0.82 to 1.24)
Electricity, gas, and water supply	44 (18.7)	1.18 (0.84 to 1.64)	1.08 (0.76 to 1.53)	1.14 (0.80 to 1.62)
Telecommunication	126 (14.9)	0.92 (0.73 to 1.16)	0.83 (0.64 to 1.08)	0.95 (0.73 to 1.23)
Transport	107 (15.6)	0.98 (0.77 to 1.25)	0.87 (0.66 to 1.14)	0.91 (0.69 to 1.19)
Wholesale	93 (16.3)	1.08 (0.84 to 1.39)	1.00 (0.76 to 1.33)	1.09 (0.82 to 1.44)
Retail trade	158 (12.5)	0.97 (0.78 to 1.22)	0.87 (0.68 to 1.13)	0.90 (0.70 to 1.15)
Finance	67 (15.8)	1.06 (0.80 to 1.41)	0.93 (0.68 to 1.26)	1.00 (0.74 to 1.37)
Insurance	37 (12.8)	0.96 (0.67 to 1.37)	0.86 (0.59 to 1.26)	0.93 (0.64 to 1.36)
Real estate	56 (14.1)	1.15 (0.85 to 1.57)	1.13 (0.82 to 1.56)	1.19 (0.86 to 1.65)
Restaurants	81 (15.9)	1.21 (0.91 to 1.59)	1.12 (0.83 to 1.52)	1.16 (0.86 to 1.57)
Hotels	24 (15.9)	1.09 (0.71 to 1.68)	0.97 (0.62 to 1.52)	0.97 (0.62 to 1.52)
Healthcare	205 (17.1)	1.23 (0.99 to 1.51)	1.10 (0.87 to 1.39)	1.12 (0.88 to 1.41)
Welfare	119 (16.9)	1.22 (0.96 to 1.55)	1.13 (0.87 to 1.47)	1.13 (0.87 to 1.47)
Education and learning assistance	104 (12.2)	0.98 (0.77 to 1.26)	0.91 (0.70 to 1.19)	0.92 (0.70 to 1.20)
Others	430 (12.8)	0.98 (0.81 to 1.18)	0.92 (0.74 to 1.14)	0.97 (0.79 to 1.20)

PRs: prevalence ratios; CI: confidence interval.

Model 1: Individual characteristics (gender, age, living area, and having a partner) and SES (education, household income, and employment status) adjusted in the model.

Model 2: In addition to Model 1, occupational characteristics (industry, office size, and job type) were adjusted in the model.

Model 3: All variables including a prior history of depression were simultaneously entered in the model.

Table 2 (cont.). Prevalence ratios of workplace bullying: Poisson regression analysis (N=16,384)

	Workplace bullying Case (%)	PRs (95% CI) Model 1	PRs (95% CI) Model 2	PRs (95% CI) Model 3
Office size				
1-4	208 (8.7)	1.00 (reference)	1.00 (reference)	1.00 (reference)
5-29	427 (13.2)	1.32 (1.08 to 1.62)	1.32 (1.07 to 1.62)	1.33 (1.08 to 1.64)
30-49	165 (14.2)	1.39 (1.09 to 1.77)	1.39 (1.09 to 1.77)	1.39 (1.09 to 1.77)
50-99	252 (15.5)	1.51 (1.21 to 1.89)	1.52 (1.21 to 1.91)	1.48 (1.17 to 1.85)
100-299	398 (18.6)	1.76 (1.42 to 2.18)	1.78 (1.43 to 2.21)	1.76 (1.42 to 2.19)
300-499	171 (17.1)	1.61 (1.26 to 2.05)	1.63 (1.28 to 2.08)	1.60 (1.25 to 2.05)
500-999	197 (18.5)	1.79 (1.41 to 2.27)	1.82 (1.43 to 2.32)	1.78 (1.40 to 2.27)
Over 1,000	541 (17.1)	1.62 (1.31 to 2.00)	1.68 (1.35 to 2.08)	1.68 (1.35 to 2.08)
Government office	82 (13.4)	1.30 (0.97 to 1.74)	1.28 (0.92 to 1.77)	1.31 (0.94 to 1.82)
Job type				
Deskwork	1161 (14.6)	1.00 (reference)	1.00 (reference)	1.00 (reference)
Jobs that work with people	619 (15.4)	1.09 (0.99 to 1.20)	1.09 (0.98 to 1.22)	1.05 (0.95 to 1.17)
Jobs that require physical strength	661 (15.0)	1.04 (0.94 to 1.15)	1.00 (0.89 to 1.11)	0.96 (0.86 to 1.07)
Started to work from home after the pandemic				
Yes	406 (13.7)	0.82 (0.74 to 0.92)	0.82 (0.73 to 0.92)	0.80 (0.71 to 0.90)
No	2035 (15.2)	1.00 (reference)	1.00 (reference)	1.00 (reference)
Working from home since before the pandemic				
Yes	188 (13.6)	1.06 (0.91 to 1.24)	1.10 (0.94 to 1.29)	0.99 (0.85 to 1.16)
No	2253 (15.0)	1.00 (reference)	1.00 (reference)	1.00 (reference)
Increase in physical demands				
Yes	696 (20.5)	1.45 (1.32 to 1.58)	1.42 (1.30 to 1.55)	1.32 (1.18 to 1.47)
No	1745 (13.4)	1.00 (reference)	1.00 (reference)	1.00 (reference)
Increase in psychological demands				
Yes	953 (17.6)	1.25 (1.15 to 1.36)	1.23 (1.13 to 1.34)	1.04 (0.94 to 1.15)
No	1488 (13.6)	1.00 (reference)	1.00 (reference)	1.00 (reference)
Weekly working hours during the previous month				
Less than 20 hours/week	355 (13.2)	1.00 (reference)	1.00 (reference)	1.00 (reference)
20-29 hours/week	279 (15.3)	1.08 (0.92 to 1.26)	1.05 (0.90 to 1.23)	1.01 (0.86 to 1.18)
30-39 hours/week	441 (14.2)	0.83 (0.72 to 0.96)	0.82 (0.70 to 0.95)	0.84 (0.72 to 0.97)
40-44 hours/week	679 (14.5)	0.73 (0.63 to 0.84)	0.71 (0.62 to 0.83)	0.73 (0.63 to 0.85)
45-49 hours/week	285 (15.0)	0.74 (0.62 to 0.88)	0.73 (0.61 to 0.86)	0.73 (0.61 to 0.87)
50-59 hours/week	222 (17.5)	0.86 (0.72 to 1.04)	0.85 (0.71 to 1.02)	0.85 (0.71 to 1.02)
Over 60 hours/week	180 (19.3)	0.98 (0.81 to 1.19)	0.99 (0.82 to 1.20)	0.93 (0.77 to 1.13)
Having mental illness				
Depression				
Never	2032 (13.7)	1.00 (reference)	1.00 (reference)	1.00 (reference)
Past	223 (22.5)	1.58 (1.38 to 1.82)	1.58 (1.37 to 1.82)	1.33 (1.14 to 1.54)
Current	186 (30.3)	2.00 (1.72 to 2.32)	1.98 (1.70 to 2.31)	1.48 (1.23 to 1.79)
Other mental illness				
Never	2102 (13.8)	1.00 (reference)	1.00 (reference)	1.00 (reference)
Past	158 (25.9)	1.75 (1.49 to 2.06)	1.74 (1.47 to 2.04)	1.44 (1.21 to 1.71)
Current	181 (31.8)	2.09 (1.79 to 2.44)	2.08 (1.78 to 2.43)	1.52 (1.25 to 1.83)

PRs: prevalence ratios; CI: confidence interval.

Model 1: Individual characteristics (gender, age, living area, and having a partner) and SES (education, household income, and employment status) adjusted in the model.

Model 2: In addition to Model 1, occupational characteristics (industry, office size, and job type) were adjusted in the model.

Model 3: All variables including a prior history of depression were simultaneously entered in the model.

Association between workplace bullying and mental health outcomes

Exposure to workplace bullying was significantly associated with SPD and suicidal ideation (PR for SPD: 2.28 [95%CI: 2.53-3.18]; PR for suicidal ideation: 1.92 [1.73-2.13]), after adjusting for individual characteristics, SES, occupational characteristics, and a prior history of depression (Model 2 in Table 3). Although larger PRs were observed for exposure to workplace bullying, witness to bullying was also significantly associated with SPD and suicidal ideation in Model 2 (PR for SPD: 1.90 [95%CI: 1.58-2.28]; PR for suicidal ideation: 1.39 [1.17-1.65]). When stratified by gender, men who experienced workplace bullying had higher PRs for both SPD and suicidal ideation than women (PR for SPD in men: 3.20 [95%CI: 2.74-3.73] vs in women 2.39 [2.00-2.86]; PR for suicidal ideation in men: 1.95 [1.70-2.25] vs in women 1.87 [1.59-2.19]).

Table 3. Workplace bullying and mental health outcomes: Poisson regression analysis

	SPD			Suicidal ideation		
	Case/ All (%)	PRs (95% CI) Model 1	PRs (95% CI) Model 2	Case/ All (%)	PRs (95% CI) Model 1	PRs (95% CI) Model 2
All (N = 16,384)						
Not exposed nor witnessed	761/ 12,869 (5.9)	1.00 (reference)	1.00 (reference)	1,182/ 12,869 (9.2)	1.00 (reference)	1.00 (reference)
Not exposed but witnessed	135/ 1,074 (12.6)	2.01 (1.67 to 2.41)	1.90 (1.58 to 2.28)	150/ 1,074 (14.0)	1.48 (1.24 to 1.75)	1.39 (1.17 to 1.65)
Exposed	546/ 2,441 (22.4)	3.30 (2.95 to 3.69)	2.28 (2.53 to 3.18)	558/ 2,441 (22.9)	2.24 (2.02 to 2.48)	1.92 (1.73 to 2.13)
Men (N = 9,565)						
Not exposed nor witnessed	365/ 7,361 (5.0)	1.00 (reference)	1.00 (reference)	593/ 7,361 (8.1)	1.00 (reference)	1.00 (reference)
Not exposed but witnessed	81/ 646 (12.5)	2.30 (1.80 to 2.94)	2.16 (1.69 to 2.76)	92/ 646 (14.2)	1.67 (1.34 to 2.09)	1.55 (1.24 to 1.93)
Exposed	357/ 1,588 (22.5)	3.69 (3.18 to 4.30)	3.20 (2.74 to 3.73)	340/ 1,588 (21.4)	2.27 (1.98 to 2.61)	1.95 (1.70 to 2.25)
Women (N = 6,789)						
Not exposed nor witnessed	396/ 5,508 (7.2)	1.00 (reference)	1.00 (reference)	589/ 5,508 (10.7)	1.00 (reference)	1.00 (reference)
Not exposed but witnessed	54/ 428 (12.6)	1.72 (1.29 to 2.29)	1.66 (1.24 to 2.21)	58/ 428 (13.6)	1.26 (0.96 to 1.65)	1.21 (0.92 to 1.59)
Exposed	189/ 853 (22.2)	2.81 (2.36 to 3.36)	2.39 (2.00 to 2.86)	218/ 6,789 (12.7)	2.19 (1.87 to 2.57)	1.87 (1.59 to 2.19)

SPD: severe psychological distress; PRs: prevalence ratios; CI: confidence interval.

Model 1: Adjusted for individual characteristics (gender, age, living area, and having a partner), SES (education, household income, and employment status), and occupational characteristics (industry, office size, and job type).

Model 2: In addition to Model 1, a prior history of depression was adjusted.

Other risk factors for mental health outcomes

In men, younger age, not having a partner, low household income (1.99 million Japanese yen), working from home since before the pandemic, increase in physical or psychological demands during the pandemic, and current or a prior history of depression were significantly and independently associated with both SPD and suicidal ideation in the workplace bullying adjusted model (Table 4). In women, similar trends were observed but two different results were found: manufacturing industry was significantly and negatively associated with SPD; permanent employment was also significantly and negatively associated with suicidal ideation, after adjusting for workplace bullying (Table 5).

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

Table 4. Risk factors for mental health outcomes among men (N = 9,565): Poisson regression analysis

	SPD				Suicidal ideation		
	All	Case	%	PRs (95% CI)†	Case	%	PRs (95% CI)†
Age							
Under 24	512	94	18.4	1.78 (1.03 to 3.08)	119	23.2	3.73 (2.48 to 5.59)
25-34	1659	221	13.3	3.39 (2.02 to 5.68)	240	14.5	3.12 (2.13 to 4.56)
35-44	2112	212	10.0	4.12 (2.46 to 6.90)	269	12.7	2.97 (2.05 to 4.29)
45-54	2431	196	8.1	4.83 (2.87 to 8.14)	258	10.6	2.48 (1.72 to 3.59)
55-64	1816	63	3.5	4.76 (2.75 to 8.25)	103	5.7	1.54 (1.05 to 2.28)
Over 65	1065	17	1.6	1.00 (reference)	36	3.4	1.00 (reference)
Having a partner/spouse							
Yes	6093	369	6.1	1.00 (reference)	464	7.6	1.00 (reference)
No	3502	434	12.4	1.31 (1.12 to 1.54)	561	16.0	1.34 (1.16 to 1.54)
Living area							
Prefectures under special precautions	6008	526	8.8	1.05 (0.90 to 1.22)	662	11.0	1.03 (0.90 to 1.17)
Others	3587	277	7.7	1.00 (reference)	363	10.1	1.00 (reference)
Education							
High school or below	2246	179	8.0	0.94 (0.78 to 1.13)	249	11.1	0.97 (0.83 to 1.14)
Junior college/vocational school	1360	112	8.2	0.92 (0.74 to 1.14)	158	11.6	1.02 (0.85 to 1.22)
University or above	5989	512	8.5	1.00 (reference)	618	10.3	1.00 (reference)
Annual household income during the previous year (million yen)							
Unknown	1241	66	5.3	0.76 (0.54 to 1.05)	100	8.1	1.04 (0.77 to 1.40)
1.99 or less	450	86	19.1	1.57 (1.13 to 2.17)	117	26.0	2.08 (1.54 to 2.82)
2.00-3.99	1592	185	11.6	1.30 (0.99 to 1.72)	234	14.7	1.57 (1.21 to 2.04)
4.00-5.99	2177	175	8.0	1.01 (0.77 to 1.32)	241	11.1	1.38 (1.07 to 1.78)
6.00-7.99	1602	120	7.5	1.08 (0.81 to 1.42)	140	8.7	1.23 (0.94 to 1.61)
8.00-9.99	1164	80	6.9	0.98 (0.72 to 1.33)	102	8.8	1.25 (0.94 to 1.66)
10.00 or more	1369	91	6.6	1.00 (reference)	91	6.6	1.00 (reference)
Occupation/Employment status							
Executive	733	68	9.3	1.06 (0.73 to 1.55)	77	10.5	0.92 (0.66 to 1.28)
Self-employee/individual business owner	1144	79	6.9	1.37 (0.90 to 2.08)	120	10.5	1.04 (0.73 to 1.47)
Family business assistance	69	15	21.7	2.57 (1.40 to 4.74)	12	17.4	1.10 (0.58 to 2.08)
Manager	1699	111	6.5	0.84 (0.59 to 1.20)	133	7.8	0.80 (0.59 to 1.09)
Permanent worker (non-manager)	4568	423	9.3	0.90 (0.66 to 1.22)	516	11.3	0.84 (0.65 to 1.09)
Dispatched worker	142	17	12.0	1.07 (0.61 to 1.88)	27	19.0	1.19 (0.76 to 1.86)
Contract worker	598	31	5.2	0.76 (0.48 to 1.19)	51	8.5	0.81 (0.57 to 1.16)
Part-time worker	642	59	9.2	1.00 (reference)	89	13.9	1.00 (reference)
Industry							
Public administration	771	73	9.5	1.00 (reference)	69	8.9	1.00 (reference)
Agriculture, forestry, and fishing	134	19	14.2	1.32 (0.76 to 2.28)	19	14.2	1.24 (0.72 to 2.14)
Construction	623	37	5.9	0.75 (0.49 to 1.16)	55	8.8	1.00 (0.68 to 1.48)
Manufacturing	2069	182	8.8	1.03 (0.74 to 1.42)	206	10.0	1.03 (0.75 to 1.41)
Electricity, gas, and water supply	173	16	9.2	0.93 (0.53 to 1.65)	24	13.9	1.31 (0.80 to 2.15)
Telecommunication	649	50	7.7	0.88 (0.59 to 1.32)	78	12.0	1.22 (0.85 to 1.76)
Transport	523	38	7.3	0.81 (0.52 to 1.26)	66	12.6	1.22 (0.83 to 1.79)
Wholesale	376	33	8.8	1.09 (0.70 to 1.71)	43	11.4	1.30 (0.86 to 1.96)
Retail trade	538	39	7.2	0.93 (0.60 to 1.44)	60	11.2	1.21 (0.82 to 1.80)
Finance	239	12	5.0	0.66 (0.35 to 1.25)	16	6.7	0.83 (0.47 to 1.47)
Insurance	139	11	7.9	1.09 (0.56 to 2.11)	10	7.2	0.96 (0.48 to 1.90)
Real estate	261	16	6.1	0.97 (0.54 to 1.72)	24	9.2	1.30 (0.79 to 2.13)
Restaurants	170	23	13.5	1.29 (0.76 to 2.16)	26	15.3	1.25 (0.76 to 2.05)
Hotels	68	7	10.3	0.95 (0.42 to 2.13)	9	13.2	1.07 (0.52 to 2.21)
Healthcare	414	39	9.4	1.08 (0.70 to 1.65)	43	10.4	1.10 (0.72 to 1.66)
Welfare	270	24	8.9	0.97 (0.59 to 1.60)	32	11.9	1.09 (0.69 to 1.71)
Education and learning assistance	402	35	8.7	0.97 (0.63 to 1.48)	44	10.9	1.19 (0.80 to 1.78)
Others	1776	149	8.4	1.02 (0.73 to 1.42)	201	11.3	1.15 (0.83 to 1.58)
Office size							
1-4	1462	94	6.4	1.00 (reference)	154	10.5	1.00 (reference)
5-29	1569	121	7.7	1.26 (0.89 to 1.80)	170	10.8	0.99 (0.74 to 1.33)
30-49	615	46	7.5	1.22 (0.79 to 1.88)	55	8.9	0.82 (0.57 to 1.20)
50-99	892	89	10.0	1.31 (0.89 to 1.93)	104	11.7	0.94 (0.68 to 1.31)
100-299	1280	122	9.5	1.28 (0.88 to 1.86)	151	11.8	0.96 (0.70 to 1.32)
300-499	602	60	10.0	1.31 (0.86 to 2.00)	74	12.3	1.01 (0.71 to 1.44)
500-999	640	62	9.7	1.38 (0.91 to 2.11)	73	11.4	1.04 (0.73 to 1.49)
Over 1,000	2094	169	8.1	1.23 (0.85 to 1.78)	210	10.0	0.95 (0.70 to 1.30)
Government office	441	40	9.1	1.41 (0.86 to 2.29)	34	7.7	0.81 (0.51 to 1.31)

SPD: severe psychological distress; PRs: prevalence ratios; CI: confidence interval.

† Individual characteristics (gender, age, living area, and having a partner), SES (education, household income, and employment status), occupational characteristics (industry, office size, and job type), workplace bullying, and a prior history of depression adjusted.

Table 4 (cont.). Risk factors for mental health outcomes among men (N = 9,565): Poisson regression analysis

	SPD				Suicidal ideation		
--	-----	--	--	--	-------------------	--	--

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/) .

	All	Case	%	PRs (95% CI)†	Case	%	PRs (95% CI)†
Job type							
Deskwork	4795	395	8.2	1.00 (reference)	492	10.3	1.00 (reference)
Jobs that work with people	2145	200	9.3	1.02 (0.85 to 1.22)	233	10.9	0.94 (0.79 to 1.11)
Jobs that require physical strength	2655	208	7.8	0.91 (0.75 to 1.10)	300	11.3	1.00 (0.85 to 1.18)
Started to work from home after the pandemic							
Yes	1973	178	9.0	1.15 (0.96 to 1.38)	223	11.3	1.19 (1.01 to 1.40)
No	7622	625	8.2	1.00 (reference)	802	10.5	1.00 (reference)
Working from home since before the pandemic							
Yes	888	112	12.6	1.49 (1.20 to 1.85)	140	15.8	1.45 (1.20 to 1.76)
No	8707	691	7.9	1.00 (reference)	885	10.2	1.00 (reference)
Increase in physical demands							
Yes	1813	339	18.7	2.17 (1.87 to 2.51)	378	20.8	1.87 (1.64 to 2.14)
No	7782	464	6.0	1.00 (reference)	647	8.3	1.00 (reference)
Increase in psychological demands							
Yes	2930	429	14.6	2.07 (1.80 to 2.39)	549	18.7	2.24 (1.97 to 2.54)
No	6665	374	5.6	1.00 (reference)	476	7.1	1.00 (reference)
Weekly working hours during the previous month							
Less than 20 hours/week	943	90	9.5	1.00 (reference)	120	12.7	1.00 (reference)
20-29 hours/week	747	101	13.5	1.14 (0.85 to 1.53)	134	17.9	1.25 (0.97 to 1.60)
30-39 hours/week	1686	124	7.4	0.89 (0.67 to 1.18)	175	10.4	0.94 (0.74 to 1.21)
40-44 hours/week	3040	216	7.1	0.87 (0.66 to 1.14)	283	9.3	0.84 (0.66 to 1.06)
45-49 hours/week	1416	82	5.8	0.71 (0.51 to 0.97)	117	8.3	0.76 (0.58 to 1.01)
50-59 hours/week	1009	97	9.6	1.09 (0.80 to 1.49)	103	10.2	0.92 (0.69 to 1.21)
Over 60 hours/week	754	93	12.3	1.24 (0.91 to 1.68)	93	12.3	0.99 (0.74 to 1.31)
History of depression							
Never	8644	544	6.3	1.00 (reference)	706	8.2	1.00 (reference)
Past	559	100	17.9	2.14 (1.72 to 2.65)	148	26.5	2.70 (2.26 to 3.24)
Current	392	159	40.6	4.00 (3.32 to 4.83)	171	43.6	3.69 (3.10 to 4.41)

SPD: severe psychological distress; PRs: prevalence ratios; CI: confidence interval.

† Individual characteristics (gender, age, living area, and having a partner), SES (education, household income, and employment status), occupational characteristics (industry, office size, and job type), workplace bullying, and a prior history of depression adjusted.

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

Table 5. Risk factors for mental health outcomes among women (N = 6,789): Poisson regression analysis

	SPD				Suicidal ideation		
	All	Case	%	PRs (95% CI)†	Case	%	PRs (95% CI)†
Age							
Under 24	512	88	17.2	3.91 (2.37 to 6.44)	111	21.7	2.87 (1.95 to 4.21)
25-34	1305	163	12.5	3.08 (1.92 to 4.95)	198	15.2	2.26 (1.58 to 3.24)
35-44	1561	175	11.2	2.83 (1.78 to 4.51)	233	14.9	2.18 (1.53 to 3.09)
45-54	1715	135	7.9	2.17 (1.36 to 3.48)	201	11.7	1.79 (1.26 to 2.55)
55-64	1098	57	5.2	1.54 (0.93 to 2.55)	83	7.6	1.22 (0.83 to 1.79)
Over 65	598	21	3.5	1.00 (reference)	39	6.5	1.001.00 (reference)
Having a partner/spouse							
Yes	3540	258	7.3	1.00 (reference)	338	9.5	1.00 (reference)
No	3249	381	11.7	1.12 (0.93 to 1.34)	527	16.2	1.24 (1.06 to 1.46)
Living area							
Prefectures under special precautions	4238	402	9.5	1.01 (0.85 to 1.19)	517	12.2	0.91 (0.79 to 1.05)
Others	2551	237	9.3	1.00 (reference)	348	13.6	1.00 (reference)
Education							
High school or below	1921	184	9.6	1.02 (0.83 to 1.25)	257	13.4	0.98 (0.82 to 1.17)
Junior college/vocational school	2298	184	8.0	0.88 (0.72 to 1.08)	278	12.1	1.00 (0.85 to 1.19)
University or above	2570	271	10.5	1.00 (reference)	330	12.8	1.00 (reference)
Annual household income during the previous year (million yen)							
Unknown	1411	128	9.1	1.33 (0.93 to 1.91)	176	12.5	1.27 (0.93 to 1.74)
1.99 or less	537	73	13.6	1.53 (1.02 to 2.29)	107	19.9	1.49 (1.05 to 2.12)
2.00-3.99	1461	161	11.0	1.46 (1.03 to 2.08)	241	16.5	1.58 (1.16 to 2.14)
4.00-5.99	1292	120	9.3	1.37 (0.96 to 1.95)	151	11.7	1.25 (0.91 to 1.72)
6.00-7.99	879	76	8.6	1.30 (0.89 to 1.90)	90	10.2	1.15 (0.82 to 1.62)
8.00-9.99	580	38	6.6	1.05 (0.68 to 1.63)	46	7.9	0.93 (0.62 to 1.38)
10.00 or more	629	43	6.8	1.00 (reference)	54	8.6	1.00 (reference)
Occupation/Employment status							
Executive	194	27	13.9	1.19 (0.78 to 1.81)	31	16.0	0.91 (0.62 to 1.34)
Self-employee/individual business owner	404	29	7.2	0.98 (0.62 to 1.53)	45	11.1	0.94 (0.65 to 1.36)
Family business assistance	141	19	13.5	1.75 (1.03 to 2.97)	15	10.6	0.79 (0.45 to 1.38)
Manager	315	30	9.5	0.89 (0.60 to 1.34)	37	11.7	0.75 (0.52 to 1.07)
Permanent worker (non-manager)	2633	256	9.7	0.93 (0.75 to 1.16)	311	11.8	0.72 (0.60 to 0.87)
Dispatched worker	224	30	13.4	1.34 (0.89 to 2.01)	37	16.5	0.98 (0.68 to 1.41)
Contract worker	464	44	9.5	0.96 (0.68 to 1.35)	65	14.0	0.89 (0.68 to 1.18)
Part-time worker	2414	204	8.5	1.00 (reference)	324	13.4	1.00 (reference)
Industry							
Public administration	294	32	10.9	1.00 (reference)	34	11.6	1.00 (reference)
Agriculture, forestry, and fishing	47	7	14.9	1.09 (0.45 to 2.63)	10	21.3	1.96 (0.92 to 4.20)
Construction	285	25	8.8	0.72 (0.41 to 1.26)	41	14.4	1.30 (0.78 to 2.15)
Manufacturing	679	49	7.2	0.56 (0.34 to 0.91)	78	11.5	1.00 (0.63 to 1.58)
Electricity, gas, and water supply	62	5	8.1	0.55 (0.21 to 1.45)	13	21.0	1.68 (0.85 to 3.32)
Telecommunication	195	20	10.3	0.75 (0.41 to 1.36)	22	11.3	0.98 (0.55 to 1.76)
Transport	161	19	11.8	0.91 (0.50 to 1.67)	31	19.3	1.57 (0.92 to 2.67)
Wholesale	195	20	10.3	0.70 (0.39 to 1.27)	21	10.8	0.86 (0.48 to 1.55)
Retail trade	731	71	9.7	0.80 (0.50 to 1.28)	100	13.7	1.05 (0.67 to 1.65)
Finance	184	18	9.8	0.72 (0.39 to 1.34)	23	12.5	1.09 (0.61 to 1.95)
Insurance	149	10	6.7	0.58 (0.28 to 1.22)	16	10.7	1.05 (0.55 to 1.98)
Real estate	135	12	8.9	0.77 (0.38 to 1.55)	16	11.9	1.12 (0.59 to 2.12)
Restaurants	338	49	14.5	1.04 (0.63 to 1.74)	62	18.3	1.22 (0.75 to 1.98)
Hotels	83	8	9.6	0.65 (0.29 to 1.45)	11	13.3	0.97 (0.47 to 1.99)
Healthcare	787	71	9.0	0.78 (0.49 to 1.25)	83	10.5	0.97 (0.62 to 1.54)
Welfare	434	33	7.6	0.72 (0.42 to 1.22)	71	16.4	1.52 (0.96 to 2.43)
Education and learning assistance	451	38	8.4	0.84 (0.50 to 1.39)	36	8.0	0.77 (0.46 to 1.28)
Others	1579	152	9.6	0.78 (0.51 to 1.20)	197	12.5	1.01 (0.66 to 1.54)
Office size							
1-4	917	94	6.4	1.00 (reference)	154	10.5	1.00 (reference)
5-29	1672	121	7.7	1.26 (0.89 to 1.80)	170	10.8	0.99 (0.74 to 1.33)
30-49	546	46	7.5	1.22 (0.79 to 1.88)	55	8.9	0.82 (0.57 to 1.20)
50-99	733	89	10.0	1.31 (0.89 to 1.93)	104	11.7	0.94 (0.68 to 1.31)
100-299	865	122	9.5	1.28 (0.88 to 1.86)	151	11.8	0.96 (0.70 to 1.32)
300-499	397	60	10.0	1.31 (0.86 to 2.00)	74	12.3	1.01 (0.71 to 1.44)
500-999	425	62	9.7	1.38 (0.91 to 2.11)	73	11.4	1.04 (0.73 to 1.49)
Over 1,000	1064	169	8.1	1.23 (0.85 to 1.78)	210	10.0	0.95 (0.70 to 1.30)
Government office	170	40	9.1	1.41 (0.86 to 2.29)	34	7.7	0.81 (0.51 to 1.31)

SPD: severe psychological distress; PRs: prevalence ratios; CI: confidence interval.

† Individual characteristics (gender, age, living area, and having a partner), SES (education, household income, and employment status), occupational characteristics (industry, office size, and job type), workplace bullying, and a prior history of depression adjusted.

Table 5 (cont.). Risk factors for mental health outcomes among women (N = 6,789): Poisson regression analysis

	SPD				Suicidal ideation		
--	-----	--	--	--	-------------------	--	--

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/) .

	All	Case	%	PRs (95% CI)†	Case	%	PRs (95% CI)†
Job type							
Deskwork	3149	395	8.2	1.00 (reference)	492	10.3	1.00 (reference)
Jobs that work with people	1879	200	9.3	1.02 (0.85 to 1.22)	233	10.9	0.94 (0.79 to 1.11)
Jobs that require physical strength	1761	208	7.8	0.91 (0.75 to 1.10)	300	11.3	1.00 (0.85 to 1.18)
Started to work from home after the pandemic							
Yes	991	178	9.0	1.15 (0.96 to 1.38)	223	11.3	1.19 (1.01 to 1.40)
No	5798	625	8.2	1.00 (reference)	802	10.5	1.00 (reference)
Working from home since before the pandemic							
Yes	494	112	12.6	1.49 (1.20 to 1.85)	140	15.8	1.45 (1.20 to 1.76)
No	6295	691	7.9	1.00 (reference)	885	10.2	1.00 (reference)
Increase in physical demands							
Yes	1576	265	16.8	2.01 (1.70 to 2.37)	338	21.4	1.84 (1.59 to 2.12)
No	5213	374	7.2	1.00 (reference)	527	10.1	1.00 (reference)
Increase in psychological demands							
Yes	2491	411	16.5	2.72 (2.30 to 3.22)	510	20.5	2.18 (1.89 to 2.51)
No	4298	228	5.3	1.00 (reference)	355	8.3	1.00 (reference)
Weekly working hours during the previous month							
Less than 20 hours/week	1745	168	9.6	1.00 (reference)	222	12.7	1.00 (reference)
20-29 hours/week	1074	94	8.8	0.85 (0.66 to 1.10)	151	14.1	1.03 (0.83 to 1.26)
30-39 hours/week	1417	124	8.8	0.85 (0.66 to 1.09)	165	11.6	0.92 (0.74 to 1.14)
40-44 hours/week	1636	145	8.9	0.78 (0.60 to 1.01)	201	12.3	0.90 (0.72 to 1.13)
45-49 hours/week	484	59	12.2	0.73 (0.42 to 1.26)	72	14.9	1.07 (0.80 to 1.44)
50-59 hours/week	256	34	13.3	1.19 (0.80 to 1.77)	32	12.5	0.99 (0.67 to 1.46)
Over 60 hours/week	177	15	8.5	0.73 (0.42 to 1.26)	22	12.4	0.91 (0.58 to 1.43)
History of depression							
Never	6138	449	7.3	1.00 (reference)	609	9.9	1.00 (reference)
Past	430	99	23.0	2.58 (2.07 to 3.22)	136	31.6	2.72 (2.25 to 3.28)
Current	221	91	41.2	4.06 (3.20 to 5.14)	120	54.3	4.06 (3.31 to 4.98)

SPD: severe psychological distress; PRs: prevalence ratios; CI: confidence interval.

† Individual characteristics (gender, age, living area, and having a partner), SES (education, household income, and employment status), occupational characteristics (industry, office size, and job type), workplace bullying, and a prior history of depression adjusted.

DISCUSSION

In this nationwide internet survey for the general working population, 15% of workers experienced workplace bullying, 9% had SPD, and 12% had suicidal ideation during the second and third wave of the COVID-19 pandemic in Japan (April-September 2020).

The results of this study showed younger age, low household income, increase in physical demands, increase in psychological demands, and a prior history of depression were common significant risk factors for workplace bullying, SPD, and suicidal ideation.

Although this pattern is similar to the trend before the pandemic,^{6,8} a different pattern was also observed in this study: men and workers with higher occupational positions such as executives, managers, or permanent workers had a higher risk of bullying compared to women or part-time workers. As job workload was reported as antecedents of bullying,^{6,13-15} the COVID-19-related working environment changes, such as an increase in physical or psychological demands, may affect the findings. A new working style—working from home—was also associated with adverse mental health, however, starting working from home was found to be a preventive factor against workplace bullying. This indicates that working from home has both advantages and drawbacks; although starting working from home contributes to decreasing aggressive and negative acts from supervisors or co-workers, it makes workers being isolated due to lack of

mutual communication between work members.²⁴ This may contribute to having psychological distress because the amount of worksite social support decreased at the same time.²³ Overall, the results of this study implicate that when intervening to prevent workplace bullying or mental health problems among workers, we should focus on not only previously reported vulnerable workers but also workers who experienced a change of their working styles or their job demands.

The prevalence of workplace bullying in this study was similar to the global prevalence before the pandemic.¹ Although it was higher than previously reported in the representative working sample in Japan (6.1%),⁸ this does not immediately mean that more workers experience bullying at work during the pandemic because the measurement durations are different; the previous study measured experiencing workplace bullying during the month but this study measured during the previous six months. As previously reported, measurement methods greatly contributed to the prevalence rates of workplace bullying.¹ As a recent national survey of workplace bullying and harassment in Japan showed a non-different prevalence of workplace bullying in 2020 (31.4%) and in 2016 (32.5%), the prevalence itself may not be changed before and during the pandemic in Japan.

In this study, men, younger workers, workers with lower household income,

executives, managers, permanent workers, contract workers, workers working in larger office size, workers experienced an increase in physical or psychological demands, and workers with current or a prior history of depression or other mental illnesses were more likely to expose to workplace bullying. Although most of the results are consistent with previous studies,^{2 5 6 8 13 14} inconsistent results were observed in terms of gender and occupational positions in this study;⁹ men, executives, and managers had a higher risk of experiencing workplace bullying compared to women and part-time workers. This trend may be caused by the pandemic since an increase in physical or psychological demands was also associated with exposure to bullying in this study. During the pandemic, managers had to determine what countermeasures should be implemented to protect employees against COVID-19. At the same time, managers had to follow the government statements or guidelines against COVID-19, which may decrease their job autonomy or control.¹⁴ Moreover, during the pandemic, executives and managers had to adapt new technologies such as online meetings or new working styles including working from home.¹⁸ Taking into account that most of the executives and managers probably did not have expertise in infection control or new technologies, this may boost subordinates' frustration, which may cause aggressive behaviors toward managers.³² A study for managers has reported the risk for a manager to being bullied

was higher in those who suffer from work stress, those less satisfied with their payment, and those who do not see opportunities for promoting within their organizations.¹⁰ Managers in Japan have been reported as highly stressful workers since most of them are middle managers with heavy workloads and limited autonomy, who are often described as "player managers" (managers who have double burdens: players and managers).³³ This also may contribute to a high prevalence of workplace bullying among managers in this study.

Exposure to workplace bullying was significantly associated with SPD and suicidal ideation both in men and women, even after adjusting for individual characteristics, SES, occupational characteristics, and a prior history of depression. This indicates a strong relationship between bullying and mental health problems, as previously shown.^{2-4 34} Moreover, not exposed but witnessed bullying was also associated with both SPD and suicidal ideation in this study. This is in line with the longitudinal study which showed a spillover effect of workplace bullying on psychological distress.³⁴ Our findings indicate that this effect could be applied to workers' suicidal ideation.

Men were more likely to have SPD or suicidal ideation than women when being bullied. Although gender differences have not been investigated in the

meta-analyses on the association between bullying and mental health,²⁻⁴ the results of this study are consistent with the study of the association between work-related physical violence and depression in Japan.³⁵ Two possible explanations are considered: first, men were more likely to be in managerial positions than women. Since a high prevalence of workplace bullying was observed in executives and managers in this study, this may affect the high prevalence of SPD or suicidal ideation in men. The second possible explanation is low psychological preparedness, which refers to a sense of control over the trauma.³⁶ Since men had a lower risk of workplace bullying before the pandemic, men who experienced bullying may tend to feel shocked and have more severe mental health problems than women who have a higher risk for bullying in general.^{6,7}

Newly starting working from home was a preventive factor against workplace bullying, while it was a predictor for adverse mental health outcomes in this study. This indicates that working from home has both advantages and drawbacks; although newly introduced working from home decreases communication among workers including aggressive and negative acts from supervisors or co-workers, it makes workers being isolated from co-workers. Thus, this may contribute to workers' deterioration of mental health because the amount of worksite social support was decreased at the same time.²³ In this study, although working from home since before the pandemic was associated

with both SPD and suicidal ideation, starting to work from home during the pandemic was associated with only suicidal ideation. This is consistent with the study reported long-term working from home hindered workers' mutual communication or supports from co-workers.^{23 24} Thus, the results of this study implicate that working from home contributes to protecting workers from negative acts, but the amount of worksite social support should not be decreased and workers' mental health status should be monitored regularly for remote workers.

We found younger age, lowest household income, increase in physical demands, increase in psychological demands, and a history of depression were risk factors of SPD and suicidal ideation both in men and women, in addition to workplace bullying and working from home. Although existing literature already showed the significant association between job demands and mental health,³⁷ this study added to it that changes in job demands may also affect SPD or suicidal ideation during the pandemic. In contrast, the absence of a partner/spouse was associated with SPD and suicidal ideation in men but only associated with suicidal ideation in women. This is probably because the benefit of having a partner/husband was greater in men than women on mental health and having a partner/husband does not mean she can gain enough amount of support from him.³⁸

Several limitations should be noted. First, this study was cross-sectional so that causality cannot be determined. Although we adjusted for a prior history of depression to omit reverse causality, a longitudinal study is needed to clarify the association between risk factors and workplace bullying, SPD, and suicidal ideation in the COVID-19 pandemic. Second, workplace bullying was measured by a self-labeling method, which may cause underestimation compared to the behavioral experience method that asks respondents how often they experienced the various negative acts without using the term “harassment” or “bullying.”¹ Third, there might be a sampling bias due to the nature of an online survey. This may limit generalizability of our study results.

Despite these limitations, this study was the first to identify important risk factors of workplace bullying, SPD, and suicidal ideation in the nationwide large-scale study for the general working population in Japan. The strengths of this study were investigating various risk factors including working styles and a change in job demands and revealed new risk factors: working from home for SPD or suicidal ideation and managers for workplace bullying. Further research is needed to examine other possible risk factors of workplace bullying, SPD, and suicidal ideation.

CONCLUSIONS

Overall, 15% of workers experienced workplace bullying, 9% had SPD, and 12% had suicidal ideation during the second and third wave of the COVID-19 pandemic in Japan.

The results of this study showed men, executives, managers, and permanent workers had a higher risk of bullying compared to women or part-time workers. Workers who experienced increase in physical or psychological demands were at risk for bullying, SPD, and suicidal ideation. Newly starting working from home was a significant predictor for adverse mental health outcomes, however, it was found to be a preventive factor against workplace bullying. The results of this study show a different pattern of high-risk groups during the pandemic. When intervening to decrease workplace bullying or mental health problems, we should focus on not only previously reported vulnerable workers but also new high-risk groups or workers who experienced a change of their working styles or job demands.

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to other research members of JACSIS for their tremendous efforts to conduct this survey.

Contributors

KT conceived the research idea. KT and TT conducted a survey and gathered the data.

KT carried out the statistical work and wrote the first draft. KT and TT revised it and wrote the final version of the paper.

Funding

This study was funded by the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS) KAKENHI Grants [grant number 17H03589; 18H03062; 18H03107; 19K10446; 19K10671], the JSPS Grant-in-Aid for Young Scientists [grant number 19K19439], Health Labour Sciences Research Grant [grant number 19FA1005; 19FG2001], and Research Support Program to Apply the Wisdom of the University to tackle COVID-19 Related Emergency Problems, University of Tsukuba. The findings and conclusions of this article are the sole responsibility of the authors and do not represent the official views of the research funders.

Competing interests

None declared.

Patient consent for publication

Not required.

Ethical approval

The study protocol was reviewed and approved by the Research Ethics Committee of the Osaka International Cancer Institute (approved on June 19, 2020; approval number 20084). The internet survey agency respected the Act on the Protection of Personal Information in Japan. All participants provided web-based informed consent before responding to the online questionnaire. A credit point known as “Epoints”, which could be used for internet shopping and cash conversion, was provided to the participants as an incentive.

Provenance and peer review

Not commissioned; externally peer reviewed.

Data availability statement

The data used in this study are not available in a public repository because they contain personally identifiable or potentially sensitive patient information. Based on the

regulations for ethical guidelines in Japan, the Research Ethics Committee of the Osaka International Cancer Institute has imposed restrictions on the dissemination of the data collected in this study. All data inquiries should be addressed to the person responsible for data management, Dr. Takahiro Tabuchi at the following e-mail address: tabuchitak@gmail.com.

ORCID IDs

Kanami Tsuno: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9399-6596>

Takahiro Tabuchi: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1050-3125>

References

- 1 Nielsen MB, Matthiesen SB, Einarsen S. The impact of methodological moderators on prevalence rates of workplace bullying. A meta-analysis. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology* 2010;83:955-979.
- 2 Verkuil B, Atasayi S, Molendijk ML. Workplace Bullying and Mental Health: A Meta-Analysis on Cross-Sectional and Longitudinal Data. *PLoS One* 2015;10:e0135225.
- 3 Nielsen MB, Tangen T, Idsoe T, Matthiesen SB, Magerøy N. Post-traumatic stress

- disorder as a consequence of bullying at work and at school. A literature review and meta-analysis. *Aggression and Violent Behavior* 2015;21:17-24.
- 4 Leach LS, Poyser C, Butterworth P. Workplace bullying and the association with suicidal ideation/thoughts and behaviour: a systematic review. *Occup Environ Med* 2017;74:72-79.
- 5 Nielsen MB, Einarsen S. Outcomes of exposure to workplace bullying: A meta-analytic review. *Work & Stress* 2012;26:309-332.
- 6 Feijo FR, Graf DD, Pearce N, Fassa AG. Risk Factors for Workplace Bullying: A Systematic Review. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2019;16.
- 7 Salin D. Risk factors of workplace bullying for men and women: the role of the psychosocial and physical work environment. *Scand J Psychol* 2015;56:69-77.
- 8 Tsuno K, Kawakami N, Tsutsumi A et al. Socioeconomic determinants of bullying in the workplace: a national representative sample in Japan. *PLoS One* 2015;10:e0119435.
- 9 Ortega A, Høgh A, Pejtersen JH, Feveile H, Olsen O. Prevalence of workplace bullying and risk groups: a representative population study. *Int Arch Occup Environ Health* 2009;82:417-26.
- 10 Ariza-Montes JA, Muniz RN, Leal-Rodriguez AL, Leal-Millan AG. Workplace bullying

- among managers: a multifactorial perspective and understanding. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2014;11:2657–82.
- 11 Iida M, Sasaki N, Kuroda R, Tsuno K, Kawakami N. Increased COVID-19-related workplace bullying during its outbreak: a 2-month prospective cohort study of full-time employees in Japan. *Environmental and Occupational Health Practice* 2021;3.
- 12 Patel JA, Nielsen FBH, Badiani AA et al. Poverty, inequality and COVID-19: the forgotten vulnerable. *Public Health* 2020;183:110–111.
- 13 Notelaers G, Baillien E, De Witte H, Einarsen S, Vermunt JK. Testing the strain hypothesis of the Demand Control Model to explain severe bullying at work. *Economic and Industrial Democracy* 2012;34:69–87.
- 14 Baillien E, De Cuyper N, De Witte H. Job autonomy and workload as antecedents of workplace bullying: A two-wave test of Karasek's Job Demand Control Model for targets and perpetrators. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology* 2011;84:191–208.
- 15 Van den Broeck A, Baillien E, De Witte H. Workplace bullying: A perspective from the Job Demands-Resources model. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology* 2011;37.
- 16 Barello S, Caruso R, Palamenghi L et al. Factors associated with emotional

- exhaustion in healthcare professionals involved in the COVID-19 pandemic: an application of the job demands-resources model. *Int Arch Occup Environ Health* 2021;94:1751-1761.
- 17 Sasaki N, Asaoka H, Kuroda R, Tsuno K, Imamura K, Kawakami N. Sustained poor mental health among healthcare workers in COVID-19 pandemic: A longitudinal analysis of the four-wave panel survey over 8 months in Japan. *J Occup Health* 2021;63:e12227.
- 18 Bick A, Blandin A, Mertens K. Work from Home After the COVID-19 Outbreak *Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas, Working Papers* 2020;1-19.
- 19 Holten A-L, Hancock GR, Mikkelsen EG, Persson R, Hansen ÅM, Høgh A. The longitudinal effects of organizational change on experienced and enacted bullying behaviour. *Journal of Change Management* 2017;17:67-89.
- 20 Holmes TH, Rahe RH. The Social Readjustment Rating Scale. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research* 1967;11:213-218.
- 21 Sakamoto H, Ishikane M, Ghaznavi C, Ueda P. Assessment of Suicide in Japan During the COVID-19 Pandemic vs Previous Years. *JAMA Netw Open* 2021;4:e2037378.
- 22 Murayama H, Okubo R, Tabuchi T. Increase in Social Isolation during the COVID-19 Pandemic and Its Association with Mental Health: Findings from the JACSIS 2020 Study. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 2021;18.

- 23 Vander Elst T, Verhoogen R, Sercu M, Van den Broeck A, Baillien E, Godderis L. Not Extent of Telecommuting, But Job Characteristics as Proximal Predictors of Work-Related Well-Being. *J Occup Environ Med* 2017;59:e180-e186.
- 24 Yang L, Holtz D, Jaffe S et al. The effects of remote work on collaboration among information workers. *Nat Hum Behav* 2021.
- 25 Wu T, Jia X, Shi H et al. Prevalence of mental health problems during the COVID-19 pandemic: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Affect Disord* 2021;281:91-98.
- 26 Sasaki N, Kuroda R, Tsuno K, Imamura K, Kawakami N. Deterioration in Mental Health Under Repeated COVID-19 Outbreaks Greatest in the Less Educated: A Cohort Study of Japanese Employees. *J Epidemiol* 2021;31:93-96.
- 27 Nagasu M, Muto K, Yamamoto I. Impacts of anxiety and socioeconomic factors on mental health in the early phases of the COVID-19 pandemic in the general population in Japan: A web-based survey. *PLoS One* 2021;16:e0247705.
- 28 Okubo R, Yoshioka T, Nakaya T et al. Urbanization level and neighborhood deprivation, not COVID-19 case numbers by residence area, are associated with severe psychological distress and new-onset suicidal ideation during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of Affective Disorders* 2021;287:89-95.
- 29 Tabuchi T, Shinozaki T, Kunugita N, Nakamura M, Tsuji I. Study Profile: The Japan

- "Society and New Tobacco" Internet Survey (JASTIS): A Longitudinal Internet Cohort Study of Heat-Not-Burn Tobacco Products, Electronic Cigarettes, and Conventional Tobacco Products in Japan. *J Epidemiol* 2019;29:444-450.
- 30 Furukawa TA, Kawakami N, Saitoh M et al. The performance of the Japanese version of the K6 and K10 in the World Mental Health Survey Japan. *Int J Methods Psychiatr Res* 2008;17:152-8.
- 31 Kessler RC, Barker PR, Colpe LJ et al. Screening for serious mental illness in the general population. *Arch Gen Psychiatry* 2003;60:184-9.
- 32 Berkowitz L. Frustration-aggression hypothesis: examination and reformulation. *Psychol Bull* 1989;106:59-73.
- 33 McCann L, Hassard J, Morris J. Middle Managers, the New Organizational Ideology and Corporate Restructuring: Comparing Japanese and Anglo-American Management Systems. *Competition & Change* 2016;8:27-44.
- 34 Tsuno K, Kawachi I, Kawakami N, Miyashita K. Workplace Bullying and Psychological Distress: A Longitudinal Multilevel Analysis Among Japanese Employees. *J Occup Environ Med* 2018;60:1067-1072.
- 35 Tsuno K, Kawakami N. The impact of work-related physical assaults on mental health among Japanese employees with different socioeconomic status: The Japan Work

- Stress and Health Cohort Study (JSTRESS). *SSM Popul Health* 2016;2:572–579.
- 36 Hoge EA, Austin ED, Pollack MH. Resilience: research evidence and conceptual considerations for posttraumatic stress disorder. *Depression and Anxiety* 2007;24:139–152.
- 37 Madsen IEH, Nyberg ST, Magnusson Hanson LL et al. Job strain as a risk factor for clinical depression: systematic review and meta-analysis with additional individual participant data. *Psychol Med* 2017;47:1342–1356.
- 38 Kposowa AJ. Marital status and suicide in the National Longitudinal Mortality Study. *Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health* 2000;54:254–261.