

A person wearing a high-visibility orange vest and dark pants stands with their back to the camera in a grassy field. To the left is a wire fence, and in the background, there is a blue metal structure, possibly a gate or part of a farm. The scene is dimly lit, suggesting dusk or dawn.

# The effect of Influence at Work on workers: COPSOQ findings from a large-scale study in New Zealand

Akib Mohammad (WorkSafe NZ)  
Fatima Junaid (Massey University)  
Trang Khieu (WorkSafe NZ)

**WORKSAFE**  
Mahi Haumarū Aotearoa

# Disclaimer

“The opinions, findings, recommendations, and conclusions expressed in this study are those of the author(s), not WorkSafe New Zealand or any agencies. Anonymous data was only accessed by the two WorkSafe co-authors. All study results were analysed and reported at aggregated level.”

# Background of the WorkSafe Survey

# Theoretical Background

- **Hobfoll's Conservation of Resources theory (Hobfoll, 1989; Hobfoll et al., 1990)**
- **Managing and conserving one's limited physical, emotional, and psychological resources to maintain overall well-being.**
- **The relationship between quantitative demands, influence at work, and bullying can have a significant impact on an individual's resources.**
- **Sample of 3,612 workers from all industries across New Zealand.**

	<b>NZPS 2021</b>
<b>Sample size</b>	3,612 workers
<b>Methods</b>	<p>Online survey</p> <p>Additional respondents were sourced from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• street-intercept interviews in high deprivation areas</li> <li>• the New Zealand Electoral Roll (certain occupations were targeted)</li> <li>• a Facebook community for recent migrants,</li> <li>• a Maritime New Zealand database of fishing and shipping operators</li> </ul>
<b>Fieldwork period</b>	3 March and 30 May 2021.
<b>Response rate</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Online panel interviews: 28%</li> <li>• Face-to-face intercept interviews in high deprivation areas (online self completion survey using tablet): 41%</li> <li>• Electoral roll for forestry and fishing workers (mail out to complete online survey): 11%</li> <li>• Open link to online survey for recent migrants and MNZ database: Unknown, but we achieved 26 people for the sample from the MNZ database</li> </ul>
<b>Weighting</b>	The data have been weighted so the overall sample is representative of the population of interest by gender within industry, ethnicity, and age, according to Stats NZ population counts
<b>Aims</b>	The survey uses the Copenhagen Psychosocial Questionnaire (COPSOQ) developed by the Danish National Research Center to measure a range of elements of the psychosocial work environment, including experiences of hostile acts like bullying, harassment, and violence.

# Hypotheses



Those who have high influence at work will experience less bullying

Those who will experience bullying will have low job satisfaction

Those who have high influence at work will have high job satisfaction

Those who have high quantitative demands they will have low job satisfaction



Influence at work will moderate the effects of quantitative demands on job satisfaction

Influence at work will moderate the negative effects of bullying on job satisfaction



We argue that influence at work can reduce the detrimental effects of quantitative demands on job satisfaction, and that those who have higher influence at work are likely to experience less bullying. Thus, influence at work moderates the relationship of bullying and quantitative with job satisfaction.

# Descriptive statistics

Scale	Cronbach's Alpha	Weighted mean/ proportion*	Std. error
Quantitative demands	0.72	47.80	22.14
Influence at work	0.77	55.31	21.51
Job satisfaction	0.77	66.05	20.37
Exposure to bullying	-	22.5	-

*\*\*Cronbach's alpha is used for measuring the scales' reliability. Cronbach's alpha over 0.7 means that the scale is highly reliable in relation to measuring its dimension.*

*\* Proportion is calculated for exposure to bullying.*

# Model

Parameter estimates of selected covariates from the multiple regression model for job satisfaction

	Model 1		Model 2	
	coefficient	std. Error	coefficient	std. Error
Intercept	58.37**	1.04	67.95**	0.35
Quantitative demands (QD)	-0.16**	0.01	-3.45**	0.32
Influence at work (IN)	0.31**	0.01	6.59**	0.36
Bullying (BU)	-8.62**	0.76	-8.63**	0.75
IN*QD			0.63*	0.29
IN*BU			0.72	0.76

\*p-value < 0.05; \*\*p-value < 0.01

# Analysis

1. Those who have high influence at work will experience less bullying

	Bullying		t-test
	No	Yes	P-value
Influence at work score	55.9	53.3	<0.05

2. Those who will experience bullying will have low job satisfaction

	Bullying		t-test
	No	Yes	p-value
Job satisfaction score	68.5	57.6	<0.05

3. Those who have high influence at work will have high job satisfaction  
(correlation= 0.32; p-value< 0.01)

4. Those who have high quantitative demands they will have low job satisfaction  
(correlation= -0.17; p-value< 0.01)

# Key findings

Those who have high influence at work will experience slightly less bullying

Those who will experience bullying will have low job satisfaction

Those who have high influence at work will have high job satisfaction

# Key Findings

Those who have high quantitative demands they will have low job satisfaction

Influence at work will moderate the effects of quantitative demands on job satisfaction

Influence at work doesn't moderate the relationship of bullying and job satisfaction

# Conclusion

Our study highlights that the role of influence at work on job satisfaction. Job influence also moderates the relationship between influence at work job satisfaction.

# Thank you for your listening!

## Questions?

For the full NZPS 2021 report, please check this link

<https://www.worksafe.govt.nz/research/new-zealand-psychosocial-survey/>

Getting you home healthy and safe.  
That's what we're working for.

**WORKSAFE**

Mahi Haumarū Aotearoa