Summary

Agression and violence between employees and employees and supervisors

This partial report looks into mutual aggression and violence (OAG) among colleagues and supervisors in Penitentiary Institutions in 49 locations throughout the Netherlands and forms part of a broader study that focuses on aggression and violence exhibited by detainees toward employees, aggression and violence between employees and supervisors, and illness-related absenteeism. It is difficult to conceptualise aggression and violence. Griffin and Lopez (2005) determined that various concepts and structures are used to describe OAG. OAG includes both verbal and physical manifestations (hands-off versus hands-on), may be sexual or non-sexual in nature and may differ in frequency and seriousness. Furthermore, an individual may become a victim of different forms of OAG.

In studies, subjective experiences and interpretations of victims are rarely used as a starting point to determine OAG. In this report, personal experiences employees had with unwanted sexual attention, intimidation or physical violence in the past 12 months are the focal point. This study module does not evaluate the external validity of the self-reported results; this will be done in a subsequent study that will pose/conduct additional questions and/or interviews and will be performed on the basis of objective reporting data from physicians and/or confidential counsellors.

By means of cluster analysis we found that in the past 12 months 455 men and 186 women had been the victim of OAG (mutual aggression and violence: this concept was devised by combining unwanted sexual attention and/or intimidation and/or physical violence).

Mutual aggression and violence in penitentiary institutions are not exceptions: approximately six percent of staff members have suffered unwanted sexual attention from a colleague, fewer than five percent have suffered physical violence at the hands of a colleague or supervisor and approximately 15% were intimidated at some point in the past 12 months. There are differences between men and women. Men are most frequently faced with intimidation by a colleague or supervisor (over 30%) and become victims of physical violence more frequently than women (approximately 8%), while women have to deal with unwanted sexual attention from a colleague more frequently (approximately 15%). These findings correspond with the study conducted by Rutter and Hine (2005), which also finds that men deal with intimidation and physical violence by colleagues more frequently and that women become a victim of sexual intimidation by colleagues and supervisors more frequently.

Does the well-being of staff members who have and have not been a victim of OAG differ?
This question can be answered affirmatively. The 455 male and 186 female respondents who were victims of OAG in the past 12 months reported clear differences in most of the variables of the BASAM, variables specific to the judicial authorities and the variables in the aggression and violence monitor. They experience less autonomy at work, feel less responsible for their work, feel that their supervisors and colleagues do not appreciate them very much, feel they receive less socio-emotional support from their supervisors, feel that it is harder for them to find somewhere to take their problems and feel that they are given less information. They are also less satisfied with the remuneration, employment conditions and atmosphere in the department (they experience more conflicts). Victims of OAG have also been shown to be absent from work more frequently and for longer periods of time, and function less satisfactorily at work. They also report more psychological problems. It appears they suffer more from flashbacks and recollections of the physical violence. They avoid certain places, tasks or persons that remind them of the incident more frequently and exhibit a greater shock reaction in incidents that resemble the violent incident they experienced. Victims also report a higher level of depression when they think about the incident than persons in the group that did not report victimisation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What factors increase the chances of employees experiencing OAG at the hands of colleagues and/or supervisors, and are there differences between men and women?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

In the first instance, multivariation analyses were performed among the female population. We found that the factors in the model explained 41 percent of the variance in the dependent variables (victim or non-victim of OAG). There were 10 factors that contributed to potential OAG by colleagues and/or supervisors. These factors can be classified into two categories: (1) factors relating to the actual work and (2) factors relating to the person or personality of the employee. With regard to the work the chances of OAG are significantly greater when employees are dissatisfied with their roster and weekend hours, when employees are not sufficiently able to determine from their work whether they function properly, when employees do not receive sufficient information about their performance, when employees do not receive sufficient information in general and when employees feel that they are not providing detainees with help and support. With regard to the factors that relate to the person or personality, the chances of OAG at the hands of colleagues and supervisors are greater when employees feel unsafe, when they feel there is little room for personal development, when there are psychological problems such as avoidance of certain places and persons, when employees experience shock reactions and depression and suffer from unpleasant flashbacks and recollections.

Analyses were then performed among the male population. Based on eight factors in the regression model it was possible to explain 36 percent of the variance in the dependent variable (victim or non-victim of OAG). These factors can be classified into work-related factors and person-related factors. Male employees are at a higher risk of OAG if they feel they are not able to work sufficiently independently and when supervisors make contradictory demands. With regard to person-related factors the chances of OAG are greater when there are disputes
in the department, when there are psychological problems related to earlier incidences of OAG and when employees are intimidated by detainees. It is extremely remarkable that satisfaction with regard to remuneration and increased integrity can increase the chances of OAG.

**Leadership styles and the link to mutual aggression and violence**

Women experience less corrective leadership and men and younger employees experience more corrective leadership than older employees. Employees who have been employed for less than 10 years experience more socio-emotional leadership than employees who have been employed between 10 and 20 years and employees who have been employed for 21 years or more. Is there a link between leadership styles and mutual aggression and violence? Men run a higher risk of experiencing unwanted sexual attention from a number of colleagues if there is a lack of socio-emotional leadership. Men have a higher chance of intimidation by a supervisor if there is a lack of social-emotional leadership and if there is too much corrective leadership. Women have a higher risk of intimidation by a supervisor if there is no lack of stimulating leadership.

**What factors make a predictive contribution to illness-related absenteeism (short period and longer than four weeks)?**

The study into illness-related absenteeism distinguishes between occasional absenteeism and serious absenteeism. For the female population four factors (declared variance is 22%) increase the chances of occasional absenteeism and three factors (declared variance is 30%) increase the chances of serious absenteeism. The chances of an employee occasionally failing to report for work increase strongly if the person has been the victim of physical violence at the hands of a colleague, and to a lesser extent as a result of physical violence at the hands of a supervisor, or after suffering physical injury. The variable ‘no longer enjoying the work’ makes a limited contribution. The chances of a woman being absent from work for longer than four weeks increase if the employee suffered serious physical injury and, to a lesser extent, if the employee suffered minor physical injury. If a woman underperforms at work for more than six weeks and experiences little or no stimulating leadership the chances of serious absenteeism increase.

For men, what are the factors that increase the chances of occasional and serious absenteeism? Ten factors (a declared variance of 22%), such as minor or serious physical injury, increase the chances of occasional illness-related absenteeism to a greater or lesser extent, but to a far lesser extent than for women. The following factors also play a role: not enjoying the work, underperforming at work for more than six weeks, having concrete plans to change jobs, suffering from psychological problems, such as unpleasant flashbacks, depression etc. Insufficient socio-emotional leadership, little support from colleagues, unfavourable working conditions and conflicts in the workplace increase the chances of occasional absenteeism in a small but significant way. Serious absenteeism is explained by seven factors in the model; the declared variance is 38%. For men, suffering serious physical injury is the major risk factor for serio-
ous absenteeism, followed by underperforming at work for a period of more than six weeks. Unwanted sexual attention from a supervisor, intimidation by a number of colleagues, little support from a number of colleagues and conflicts in the department also play a role.

**Differences between Remand Centres and Prisons in relation to mutual aggression and violence?**

Mutual aggression and violence do not differentiate between respondents employed in Penitentiary Institutions, non-executives, other executives and executive unknown. However, there are differences between regimes. In this partial report we look only at differences between Remand Centres and Prisons. Respondents employed in Prisons are on average eight years younger than the respondents employed in Remand Centres, and approximately seven years younger than the total population in the study. Prison staff also have a shorter service and function duration (service duration= five years; function duration= four years) than respondents employed in Remand Centres (service duration=12 years, function duration= nine years). The chances of becoming a victim of OAG are different in Remand Centres and Prisons. Factors that increase the chances of victimisation in Remand Centres are: intimidation by detainees, contradictory demands imposed on the employee and the employee being unable to work sufficiently independently; psychological problems as a result of an earlier incident also play a role. These four factors explain 39% of the total variance. The chances of becoming a victim of OAG in Prisons increase if the employee is intimidated by detainees, is faced with psychological problems as a result of an earlier incident, when there is a lack of information, when there are conflicts in the workplace, when there is a lack of integrity and when the employee feels he/she is unable to provide detainees with sufficient structure. The six factors together explain 35% of the variance.