

HIGHER EDUCATION ADMINISTRATORS' PERCEPTIONS
OF WORKPLACE VIOLENCE PREVENTION AND TRAINING

By

EDWARD DANIEL RICE

B.S., University of Nebraska at Omaha, 1972
M.S., Kansas State University, 1996

A DISSERTATION

submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Foundations and Adult Education
College of Education

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

2001

Approved by:

Major Professor
Dr. W. F. Spikes

HIGHER EDUCATION ADMINISTRATORS' PERCEPTIONS
OF WORKPLACE VIOLENCE PREVENTION AND TRAINING

By

EDWARD DANIEL RICE

B.S., University of Nebraska at Omaha, 1972
M.S., Kansas State University, 1996

© Edward Daniel Rice

Reprinted with permission

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this quantitative study was to determine if there is a difference between college and university chief business officers, facilities directors, and personnel directors regarding their views of workplace violence issues. The target population was the 1,200 United States higher education member institutions of the Association of Higher Education Facilities Officers (APPA). From the 1,200 APPA member institutions 400 were randomly selected. The three administrators at the selected institutions were sent a letter inviting participation in an electronic mail (e-mail) survey.

The e-mail survey process is discussed and pros and cons from the researcher's experience are included. Using an e-mail survey definitely has more advantages than using a conventional mailing.

The data from the responses indicates there is a difference between the three administrators regarding; 1) their understanding of workplace violence, 2) their organizational need for prevention and training, and 3) there are differences based on demographic characteristics. The comments from 50 respondents provided additional insight into the three administrators' understanding of workplace violence and added support to the findings.

CHAPTER I

Introduction

The recent phenomenon of workplace violence is for several reasons not well understood (Bulatao & VandenBos, 1995; Labig, 1995; White, 1996; Wolf, 1998). First, relatively few incidents of workplace violence have been documented in the literature, with the data that does exist about this phenomenon being considered by many as insufficient in scope and completeness (Labig, 1995; White, 1996; Wolf, 1998). White (1996) has suggested, "Finding reliable data about workplace violence of any type can be difficult. With only a few exceptions, data about workplace violence must be gleaned from statistics gathered on the broader topic of occupational health and safety" (p. 88). Secondly, many organizations that have experienced workplace violence are involved in long-term related litigation. This results in an unwillingness to share information about episodes of workplace violence (Labig, 1995). Third, and finally, there is no agreement as to how to define workplace violence (Bulatao & VandenBos, 1995; Wolf, 1998).

Background

Workplace violence is a social issue that needs to be better understood by all administrators, managers, supervisors, and workers. The literature strongly indicates that many employees and employers do not understand it and tend to ignore the possibility that it could happen to them.

Flannery (1995) writes, "Employees continue incorrectly to consider themselves safe at work. Many continue to think of violence as something that happens in the streets among drug dealers in urban

poverty" (p. 28). Unfortunately, and in direct contrast to this view, about 20 American workers are murdered at work each week (Jenkins, 1998).

Clearly, this is a small number compared to the nonfatal workplace violence that takes place in the U.S. According to Jenkins (1998), data concerning instances of nonfatal workplace violence that were reported in the 1987-92 National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) indicated that approximately one million workers were annually assaulted at work. According to Kaufer and Mattman (1998), a 1995 study by the Workplace Violence Research Institute reported that an estimated 16,400 American workers are threatened, 723 American workers are attacked, and 43,800 workers in the United States are harassed on the job each workday. Bulatao and VandenBos (1995) indicate that data on nonfatal workplace violence has only accumulated gradually. While the majority of workplace violence incidents are nonfatal, they can be just as damaging to the workplace environment as workplace murder (Bulatao & VandenBos, 1995). The cost of one act of violence could include a lawsuit, medical care, lost productivity, additional security measures, and the damaged lives of good people (Davis, 1997; Minor, 1995).

Most people have strong emotional reactions to the subjects of violence and work, and how to deal with these reactions is an essential element in prevention (Labig, 1995). Labig (1995) suggests that the natural response to a phenomenon that seems beyond one's ability to understand or control is to use the psychological defense of denial, "it can't happen here" (p. 15). According to Labig (1995) many managers and administrators do not take the issue of workplace violence seriously. Only when an episode of workplace violence occurs do

administrators realize the vulnerability of their organization and take action (Labig, 1995).

Tom Erickson, Vice President of Human Resources at Elgar Corporation wrote of his workplace violence experience in the forward to Violence in the Workplace (Baron, 1993):

If you had asked me about violence in the workplace two years ago, I wouldn't have understood what you were talking about. In my 20 plus years of human resources experience I can't think of one physical fight I had to break up. I have worked with individuals who were pretty hot under the collar, but things were resolvable without further incidents. Oh! A car was reported as having a scratch put on it by suspected fellow employee. June 4, 1991, I learned that I could be stalked, hunted, and killed in my office. By pure fate, luck, or whatever you call it, I was spared...but two of my friends and colleagues were murdered in cold blood in front of fellow employees. I will never be the same after that, and I believe that's true for many of my fellow employees (p. 1).

Stark and sobering it is a typical response of an employee who has experienced workplace murder (Baron, 1993).

According to Kelleher (1996) "Workers and management generally remain unprepared because of lack of understanding of workplace violence, and an absence of a prevention program" (p. 30). It is also extremely important that employees be trained to recognize threats or warning signs, take threats seriously, and more importantly report the threat. Wilkinson (1998) sums up the need for both prevention and training by stating, "Without training one does not have a full workplace violence prevention program" (p. xxvii). Colleges and

universities are not immune to workplace violence. Hoffman, Summers, & Schoenwald (1998) suggest that college and university campuses need to have prevention strategies in place.

College and University Campuses

A college or university campus is a community where students live and the faculty and staff work. Ikenberry, (1998) writes, "Campuses are alive 24 hours a day, seven days a week, 365 days a year, more or less" (p. xv). Fossey and Smith (1996) believe that the difficulty in picturing violence on campus "lies in our traditional image of campuses as bucolic, tranquil places set aside for our intellectual pursuits" (p. 2). People tend think of a college or university as only education and ignore that there is a business element to operating the campus. It takes a lot of employees to operate a campus, and "As organizations with large numbers of employees, colleges also are vulnerable to increasing workplace violence" (Schuh, 1998, p. 17).

Many colleges and universities invite the public to visit their campus to see and use the facilities. Any visitor desiring to come on a campus can do so by walking or driving. Most buildings are easily accessed. Public colleges and universities want citizens to visit and use their facilities, in contrast with business and industry who use fences and security guards to keep people out (Schuh, 1998). However, private colleges and universities generally are not as accessible to the public because they are private.

Once built the college or university campus stays in place. Campuses located in or near neighborhoods where safety is a concern include the University of Chicago, Marquette University, and the University of Southern California (Schuh, 1998). In 1995 a student jogging along the boundary of the sprawling California State Polytechnic University at Pomona discovered a woman's body. The woman

had no ties to the campus other than she had been murdered on college property. At a Fourth of July celebration in 1993 two people were killed on the campus of Wichita State University when a shoot-out erupted between gang members (Schuh, 1998). In 1995, there were 15 murders reported by 12 colleges. Seven involved students or employees and eight happened to occur on college property (Lily, 1997).

Modern campuses like all other organizations will occasionally experience violence (Baldrige & Julius, 1998). Baldrige and Julius (1998) believe that "Because of the ever-increasing complexity of life on campus, deterioration of surrounding neighborhoods, pressure to succeed, availability of guns and other weapons, more violence is inevitable" (p. 229). These authors paint a very bleak picture of the potential for workplace violence on campuses that clearly are warnings that should not be ignored.

There is a concern in government and on college and university campuses about violence. The U.S. Department of Education reports that violence on campus is rising (Nicklin, 2001). Data on campus violence is collected by two sources. The first source is the Clery Act and the second source is the U.S. Department of Education's Web site that publishes data collected from colleges and universities.

In 1990 a federal statute, the Student Right-to-Know and Campus Security Act, was enacted. The law was named for Jeanne Ann Clery, a Lehigh University student murdered on campus in 1986. The law was designed to provide information about violence on campus (Hartle, 2001). However, the law has grown so complex and incomprehensible it doesn't meet the purpose it was designed for (Hartle, 2001). Hartle (2001) writes, "complying with it has become akin to filling out an income-tax return when the definitions are ambiguous, the forms change every year, and everybody in the neighborhood is responsible for

providing some of the information" (p.1). Hartle (2001) continues, "one thing is clear: No one can accurately judge the relative safety of a campus based solely on the Clery statistics" (p.2).

In September of 2000 the U.S. Department of Education introduced a campus-security Web site to help students to evaluate the safety of a college or university (Nicklin, 2000). Like the Clery act it is a good idea that has not lived up to expectations. Nicklin (2000) writes, "Be warned: Anyone attempting to use the site to evaluate colleges might be hard-pressed to find accurate data for some colleges or to make any meaningful comparisons" (p.1). The Clery Act and the Department Education's Web site are designed to help students check on the safety of a campus. The data generated is a result of all incidents of violence on campus. Nicklin (2001) maintains that experts question the accuracy of the data. But it is a genuine attempt to provide data on the phenomena and hopefully the accuracy will improve.

College and University Administrators

An administrator of a campus must be capable of managing all his/her employees, including high-risk employees. "Managing high-risk employees requires skills most managers probably cannot do, have little or no training in, and until recently, did not even think they would need" (McClure, 1996, p. 111). According to Burns (1995) "workplace violence has been caused by the contributing and conflicting actions of ignorant management" (p. 61). Administrators are responsible for providing managers, supervisors, and employees the correct tools for managing workplace violence. Braverman, Castrey, Denenberg, and Denenberg, (1998) write, "What's happening in our workplaces does not have to do with the fact that guns are available. It has to do with people behaving in a certain way and our inability to intervene before it happens" (p. 5). Braverman et al. (1998) is recommending a

workplace violence prevention program where a threat of violence is first recognized, secondly reported, and lastly defused before violence erupts. To be prepared for workplace violence an administrator must understand workplace violence and have prevention and training programs in place.

College and University Facilities

College and university facilities are the maintenance and service providers to the campus. In Facilities Management, a manual for plant administration, Ernest Boyer, President of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, wrote (Boyer, 1989):

No matter what presidents and administrators say on campus, when they want to present their image to the public and say something about quality, they turn to facilities. They want it understood that excellence has to touch every aspect of the institution (p. xvi).

I do believe that facilities are a part of the affirming community on the campus. They give dignity and status to the institution and allow it to function (p. xvii).

College and university facilities employees interact with faculty, staff, students, and visitors to the campus. Facilities is generally responsible for maintenance, utilities (gas, electricity, steam, water, sewer), mail, motor pool, custodial, grounds and other sundry services and support activities in the operation of college and university campuses. On many campuses the construction of buildings and the architectural planning services are also under the administration of facilities. College and university facilities are responsible for providing a safe and comfortable work environment for faculty, staff,

and students (Mergner, 1989). Because a campus rarely closes and emergencies can occur at anytime, facilities employees are always available for emergencies and can be found working on campus at all hours seven days a week.

College and university facilities employ a variety of people from unskilled workers such as laborers to professional positions such as administrators and architects. The education level of the facilities employees ranges from those with no high school diploma to those with post-secondary degrees.

Because of the many support services provided by college and university facilities, their employees have constant contact with students, faculty, staff, and visitors. The consequences of actions, both positive and negative, by facilities employees have a substantial impact on the college and university campuses' mission. Two episodes this researcher is aware of involve a negative example and a positive example of interaction between facilities and academic departments. The first involved a research department that lost irreplaceable research and the use of an expensive piece of water-cooled research equipment when a facilities employee accidentally shut off the water supply to the building the department occupied. This incident resulted in a very bitter, almost physical confrontation between the department's researchers and the facilities people. To this day there is still an edgy bitterness between the parties involved. In the second example a department held a special recognition reception for the facilities employees who successfully renovated the department's attic space into offices and laboratories with minimal disruption to the occupants and on schedule. The department not only provided a reception with coffee, punch and cookies, they recognized the facilities employees by giving them an engraved plaque in appreciation.

These two incidents are at opposite ends of the spectrum but they indicate the extent of involvement and interaction that the campus facilities employees have within a university.

These three campus administrators the chief business officer, facilities director, and personnel director are responsible for the management of a large number of campus employees. Their understanding of workplace violence, their position regarding the need for workplace violence prevention and training will affect the management of workplace violence on their campus. The facilities director most often reports to the chief business officer. At most college and university campuses the personnel director is either under or reports directly to the chief business officer. The personnel director is the administrator on campus who is responsible for the interpretation and application of policies and procedures, and the training of employees. The personnel director of a campus is deeply involved in workplace violence policies. She/he generally is the representative from personnel on the Incident Management Team (IMT). The IMT, as described by Wolf (1998), is responsible for receiving, investigating, and assessing threats to employees. The chief business officer reports directly to the president of the college or university and is responsible for administrating the business affairs of the campus. Ability to manage workplace violence. The difference between a public and a private college or university may also affect the administrators' management of workplace violence. Most private campuses are affiliated with a specific church and the students, faculty, and staff will most often have an intellectual background and affiliation with that church. A public campus on the other hand is open to a variety of students meeting its admission criteria. The faculty and staff at a public campus generally come from a variety of cultural backgrounds.

The differences between public and private campuses can be summed up by a discussion this researcher observed between two facilities administrators, one at a public and the other at a private campus. Both campuses are also located within the same metropolitan area. Each had participated in an APPA cost comparison study of labor and maintenance costs. The public administrator was lamenting that when the cost comparison study came out she/he had to defend his/her cost for custodial maintenance. The public campus's custodial costs were substantially higher than the private campus's custodial cost. The public campus is located in a large city and is open to all citizens. People are streaming through the public buildings day and night, seven days a week, causing a continual need for custodial maintenance. The private campus is located in a secluded area with access limited to those attending, working, or doing business at the campus. The buildings on the private campus do not require continual custodial maintenance and therefore this cost is less than the public campus's. This is a very simple and logical explanation, but the answer was not obvious until the public and private administrators met and compared their custodial maintenance requirements.

Problem Statement

There is a lack of data regarding workplace violence on college and university campuses. Hoffman et al. (1998) state, "Serious concern has been expressed in a variety of quarters about violence on college and university campuses" (p. 87). How the administrators of a campus choose to manage the phenomena will affect the lives of not only their employees but also the entire campus community. The focus of this study was to examine the views these administrators have concerning their understanding of workplace violence on campus.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this study was to determine if any differences exist between views of college and university chief business officers, facilities directors, and personnel directors regarding their understanding of workplace violence; and how they view their organizational need for workplace violence prevention and training.

Research Questions

The following research questions guided this study:

Research Question One

Do college and university chief business officers, facilities directors, and personnel directors understand the concept of workplace violence in the same or different ways? If different, how and to what extent do they differ?

Research Question Two

Do college and university chief business officers, facilities directors, and personnel directors see their organizational need for workplace violence prevention and training in the same or different ways? If different, how and to what extent do they differ?

Research Question Three

Do gender, age, student enrollment, and public versus private significantly affect how college and university chief business officers, facilities directors, and personnel directors understand the concepts of workplace violence? If different, how and to what extent do they differ?

Research Hypotheses

Research Hypothesis One

Ho: There is a significant difference between the chief business officers, the facilities directors, and the personnel directors regarding their understanding of workplace violence.

Research Hypothesis Two

Ho: There is a significant difference between the chief business officers, the facilities directors, and the personnel directors regarding how they view their organizational need for workplace violence prevention and training.

Research Hypothesis Three

Ho: There is a significant difference in their understanding of workplace violence, how they view their organizational need for workplace violence prevention and training and selected demographic characteristics of gender, age, student enrollment (indicates campus size), and public or private college or university.

Significance of the Study

This study was significant for several reasons. First, there is a lack of workplace violence data concerning colleges and universities. For example, a January, 2000 HR Executive Editorial survey, Violence in the Workplace provides an indication of the lack of data regarding college and university campuses. The study was conducted by invitation through e-mail, an announcement in the Human Resource Executive Magazine, and through a link from Web sites. There were 286 respondents. Education in general was one of 4 organizations lumped together in one category totaling 51 organizations. Of the respondent job titles 3 percent were Chief Financial Officer; 3 percent were Physical Plant Manager, and 57 percent were Personnel Manager. Combined the chief business officers and facilities directors totaled only 17 respondents and the personnel directors totaled 163. The researcher's study will help to fill this void and provide valuable data concerning workplace violence on college and university campuses.

Second, workplace violence prevention is not taken seriously due to the premise that workplace violence is random, not preventable, and

not likely to occur (Davis, 1997; Labig, 1995). "In 1994 it was estimated that 80 percent of American businesses, had not taken any steps toward dealing with the prospect of aggression and violence in the workplace" (Davis, 1997, p. 7). "It took John Costalupes a little more than three minutes to shatter some illusions, specifically the "can't happen here" attitude that university employees, like most Americans, have about violence in the workplace" (Broderick, 2000, p. 1). One day after gunning down his former supervisor, Costalupes walked into the dean's office at the University of Minnesota medical school. Jo Anne Benson, a plainclothes university police officer had been posted at the dean's office because of the fear Costalupes would show up. Confronted by Officer Benson, Costalupes fled the office; but Benson and other officers pursued and caught him. Officer Benson, at a little over five feet in height and about 130 pounds, was unable to stop the 260-pound Costalupes from putting a gun to his head and killing himself (Broderick, 2000). Costalupes had lost his job 8 years previously and continued to blame his former supervisor for not being able to find a job (Broderick, 2000). This study provides researchers valuable data on the need for workplace violence prevention on college or university campuses.

Third, a workplace violence prevention program requires the training of all employees. Bush & O'Shea, (1996) report that in a survey, "Respondents reported little training designed to prepare employees for the recognition of potentially violent individuals" (p. 292). Training employees to recognize and respond properly to threats can often defuse the problem before it gets out of control (Broderick, 2000). During the years after his dismissal, Costalupes had written threatening letters to university officials. But after he committed his act of violence no threats could be found in university files.

Skills indirectly applicable to workplace violence prevention, such as communications and stress management are common but those more directly applicable are not (Bush & O'Shea, 1996). This study provides researchers valuable data of the need for workplace violence training on college and university campuses.

Assumptions

For the purpose of this study the following assumptions were made:

- 1). There is a concern about workplace violence among college and university administrators.
- 2). College and university administrators are willing to answer questions truthfully concerning workplace violence.
- 3). College and university administrators will be allowed to answer questions concerning workplace violence.

Limitations of the Study

The following limitations applied to this research:

- 1). The respondent's understanding and knowledge of workplace violence.
- 2). The types of institutions chosen, i.e. colleges or universities requiring four years of academic credit for graduation.
- 3). The nature of the roles and responsibilities held by the respondents.

Definitions of Terms

For the purposes of this study the following definitions were used:

Administrators. The chief business officers, facilities directors, and personnel directors of college and university campuses.

Campus. The buildings and grounds of a college or university.

Chief business officer. An individual, often with the title of vice president or vice chancellor, responsible for administration and finance of a college or university.

Crisis. "A crisis is a point in time when we face danger" (Ellerbrock & Stevens, 1995, p. 34).

Crisis management. A plan that deals with the direct aftermath of a violent incident (Carll, 1999).

External workplace violence. Violence or threats of violence generated by individuals not working for the college or university.

Facilities director. An individual, most often with the title of director, assistant or associate vice president/vice chancellor, assistant or associate vice president/vice chancellor, responsible for the physical plant or facilities of a college or university.

Higher education. A college or university which requires at least four years of academic credit for graduation.

Internal workplace violence. Violence or threats of violence generated by individuals working for the college or university.

Personnel director. An individual, most often with the title of director, responsible for personnel or human resources of a college or university.

Incident Management Team (IMT). The IMT is responsible for implementing and operating the violence prevention program (Wolf, 1998).

Post-incident response. Developing a crisis management plan and identifying resources needed after an act of violence occurs (Wolf, 1998).

Predicting violence. Recognizing warning signs that people almost always exhibit before becoming violent (Labig, 1995).

Pre-incident planning. "Preparation for recognizing and taking action to prevent violence" (Wolf, 1998, p. 60).

Violence prevention. A program "focusing on pre-incident planning, threat management and post-incident response" (Wolf, 1998, p. 60).

Threat management. "Activities to define the risks an organization faces from employees and outsiders" (Wolf, 1998, p. 64).

Workplace violence. "Workplace violence consists of violent acts, including physical assaults and threats of assault, directed toward persons at work or on duty" (Wolf, 1998, p. 2).

Workplace violence prevention. "There are a variety of essential tasks that are core components of a comprehensive workplace violence prevention system. A well-designed system should address the policies, training activities, systems, structures and procedures" (Wilkinson, p. 59, 1998).

Workplace violence training. "Training is the linchpin to all violence prevention strategies" (Wilkinson, 1998, p. 72).

Methodology

This study used a descriptive design. The targeted population was the college and university members of APPA. Four hundred colleges and universities were randomly selected from the 1200 APPA institutional members.

The chief business officer, facilities director, and personnel director at the 400 randomly selected campuses were sent letters inviting them to participate in this electronic survey. The survey was accessed by respondents at a Web site, answered and returned via e-mail to the researcher. Letters were sent by e-mail addresses allowing the respondent to have automatic access to the survey simply by double clicking the survey e-mail address with his/her mouse.

The questionnaire was divided into 4 parts. Part I, II, and III contained statements relating to workplace violence, workplace violence prevention, and workplace violence training. A Likert-like scale was used for each response. Part IV contained five demographic questions and a space for comments. The responses were analyzed by using the following statistical procedures: 1) frequency distributions, 2) measures of central tendency, 3) percentages, 4) multivariate analysis of variance, 5) analysis of variance, and 6) post-hoc tests.

Summary

We know that it is difficult to find reliable data about workplace violence, that litigation makes it difficult to get information from organizations including colleges and universities that have experienced violence, and there is some disagreement how to define workplace violence. Davis (1997) estimates that 80% of U.S. organizations including colleges and universities do not have a workplace violence prevention program. College and university campuses are as vulnerable to workplace violence as any other organization.

What we do not know is the degree of understanding of workplace violence by college and university chief business officers, facilities directors, and personnel directors. How well these college and university administrators understand workplace violence will be critical in determining their organizations' needs for workplace violence prevention and workplace violence training.

Chapter II

Literature Review

This chapter is an overview of the issues that are germane to workplace violence on campus. The chapter specifically looks at the research and literature of workplace violence as well as workplace violence prevention and training.

Understanding Workplace Violence

There is a perception, which is fueled by the news media, that workplace violence consists primarily of murder. Workplace violence is more complex than an employee suddenly appearing at her/his workplace heavily armed with the intention of killing supervisors or other employees. Carll's (1999) list of workplace violence includes: "threats (letters, faxes, verbal, e-mail, voice mail), vandalism, equipment sabotage, personal conflict (fighting co-workers, punching supervisors, assaults, shootings, stabbings, romantic obsessions with co-workers), family conflict (husband arrives at workplace and attacks his wife and possibly co-workers), hostage taking, suicide, and homicide" (pp. 7, 8). To address the need for workplace violence

prevention and training campus administrators must have an understanding of the breadth of workplace violence.

Defining

A major reason that workplace violence is misunderstood is there are no standard definitions for workplace violence (Wilkinson, 1998; Wolf, 1998). The following definition is direct and easy to understand, "workplace violence consists of violent acts, including physical assaults and threats of assault, directed toward persons at work or on duty" (Jenkins, 1998, p. 2). Bulatao and VandenBos (1996) indicate that this definition is the most suitable way to identify workplace violence because it refers to violence that occurs in the workplace or while the victim is at work or on duty.

Becoming Violent

What many people do not understand is that workplace violence is never a sudden event and anyone can become violent. Workplace violence starts with an individual becoming stressed due to events happening in their work or at home or a combination of work and home events. This stress can escalate through a series of events that take place in the individual's life (Labig, 1995). Events in the workplace such as "grievance, termination, poor work environment, and downsizing are always stressful for the employees involved and are therefore capable of provoking violence" (Labig, 1995 p. 111).

According to Hymowitz and Silverman (2001), today's stress is about too much information coming from too many sources, coupled with the feeling of loss of control. An example occurred when an aerospace engineer watched, horrified, as two co-workers had to be physically separated during a disagreement over the proper procedure for filing paperwork (Costello, 2001).

Cycle of Violence

Through 15 years of clinical research a psychologist, John Monahan, developed a cycle of violence model that explains how an individual can become violent (Labig, 1995). Monahan's cycle of violence has four stages:

- 1) The potential for violence can begin when an individual encounters an event that he/she experiences as stressful.
- 2) The individual involved reacts to this event with certain kinds of thoughts to which she/he is inclined because of his/her personality.
- 3) The thoughts caused by the reaction to the event lead to emotional responses by the individual.
- 4) The emotional responses in turn determine the behavior that the individual will use to respond to the situation (Labig, 1995).

The cycle continues as other people in the individual's environment respond to the individual's behavior. The way people respond can either increase or decrease the individual's experience of. If the individual's environment increases stress, her/his reactive thoughts and emotions are likely to be intensified and lead to escalating behaviors. The individual can reach a point where he/she comes to believe that violence is the only viable solution (Labig, 1995).

According to Labig (1995) this model fits the available data about individuals who have committed workplace violence. An individual in the cycle of violence is reacting and responding in certain ways. These reactions and responses by the individual are the threats, behaviors, or warning signs that employees can be trained to recognize and report. Once recognized, reported, and investigated a determination can be made to get the individual help. A workplace violence prevention program that is effective will help the individual and prevent the act of violence. This must happen before the

individual reaches the point where she/he believes violence is the only solution. Understanding the cycle of violence model can aid college or university administrators in managing the threat of workplace violence before it becomes an act of violence.

The Workplace

Our workplace is a very important part of our lives. Many people spend from 35 to 65% of their waking hours at work (Capozzoli and McVey, 1996, pp. ix, x). People dedicate a great amount of time and energy to their work. Much of the frustration and anger exhibited by potentially violent employees may be attributed to work environment factors. According to Kelleher (1997), "The quality of the work environment is a factor that is generally considered after an incident of violence" (p. 120). College and university administrators must understand that a poor work environment can contribute to violence. Work environment factors to take into consideration include safety and general working conditions, inept or uncaring management, inadequate rewards for work, ineffective training and education programs, and inadequate communication (Kelleher, 1997). Administrators of organizations that are good at preventing workplace violence tend to understand the need for a supportive work environment, open communications, and effective training (Labig, 1995).

Workplace Violence Prevention

An effective workplace violence prevention program must have financial support, employees trained to recognize and report threats or warning signs of potential violence, a staff trained for quick intervention, and open communications across all lines (Kelleher 1997). Braverman et al. (1998) explains, "You need to create systems that can detect people who are breaking down under stress and that can deal with them in a way that is fair, legal and compassionate" (p. 4).

Many campuses already have existing policies and procedures that can be used with a workplace violence prevention program. Examples of these policies and procedures are: the hiring process, counseling for employees, the termination process, safety and security, training, communications, crisis management, and a healthy work environment can be an integral part of a prevention program. Wolf (1998) developed a model for a workplace violence prevention program that focuses on three activities: pre-incident planning, threat management and post-incident response. Because each campus is unique, "One size does not fit all" (Kinney, 1995, p. 51), a prevention program such as Wolf's (1998) can be modified to fit each campus' needs. The model is a guide that can be adopted or tailored to fit the needs of a campus.

Pre-incident Planning

Wolf (1998) emphasizes the development of three elements for a prevention program. First is the written prevention policy that is used to explain to employees in writing what actions will not be tolerated, the disciplinary action that will take place, what to report, and whom to report it to. The second element is a communication structure. The communication structure informs employees of the policy and how to use it. The third element is training. Training prepares employees to recognize threats and how to take action to prevent an incident.

According to Wolf (1998), the most important element of the pre-incident planning is to establish in the policy statement an Incident Management Team (IMT). The IMT is the thread that ties all three elements together; in other words it takes ownership of the violence prevention program.

Incident Management Team.

The IMT is responsible for receiving reports of threats from employees and then investigating the threats. Generally the IMT is made up of representatives from personnel, security, legal, health and safety, facilities, and the labor union. At smaller campuses the IMT could be made up of representatives from personnel, or from other campus areas that can provide beneficial input. In their responsibilities the IMT members are required to implement and operate the prevention program. These responsibilities make the IMT a key to workplace violence prevention on campus. If the written policy is the foundation of the prevention program, the IMT is the engine that makes it happen. The IMT is also responsible for developing lines of communication to explain the violence prevention policy to employees and establish the training needs for campus employees (Wolf, 1998). This is very important because if no one understands the workplace prevention program and how to use it, it will not be used. Training is so vital to all elements of workplace violence prevention that it is discussed on its own merits after this section.

Threat Management

Threat management focuses on the process of workplace violence prevention. In threat management the IMT receives, investigates, and assesses threats reported by employees. The researcher is aware of a campus that has established the personnel director as the point of contact for reporting threats. The personnel director then makes a decision to bring in the IMT to investigate or investigates it himself/herself, or may even allow the department involved to resolve the incident. This points out the uniqueness of each campus and how each campus can adapt a prevention program around its resources.

Assessment.

The assessment is very critical because the IMT must attempt to determine the risk potential of a threat by an employee. It is the IMT's responsibility to also attempt to discover what stresses are affecting the individual. In assessing threats a crucial aspect is in developing lines of communication with all affected employees. During this period the IMT will be identifying and establishing contacts with outside resources, i.e. law enforcement, threat assessment professionals, and mental health resources to assist in threat management, assessment, treatment, and developing protective strategies for credible threats (Wolf, 1998). For the workplace violence prevention program to function properly, IMT members must be trained, dedicated and empowered to do their task.

Post-incident Response

The post-incident response is the crisis management after a violent event has occurred, which many campuses already have in place. If campuses do not have a post-incident response they need to develop a written crisis management plan. The plan should identify resources that will be needed should a violent event occur. The post-incident response includes helping employees understand the psychological impact of a violent event, conducting critical-incident debriefing sessions to facilitate recovery, identifying and referring distressed employees to counseling resources, and helping to re-stabilize the organization (Wolf, 1998).

Training Needs

Wilkinson (1998) states the case succinctly, "Without training one does not have a full workplace violence prevention program" (p. xxvii). If the policy and procedures are the foundation, the IMT the engine, then training is the energy that runs the engine. "The ability to identify those individuals and circumstances that have a high

correlation to violence comes only through training" (Davis, 1997, p. 92). The tragedy of workplace violence occurs when those warning signs go unrecognized. Managers, supervisors, and employees can be trained to identify and report the warning signs that indicate a potential for violence. Many campuses will already have training programs for communication and stress management in place. Although important, these programs do not relate directly to workplace violence prevention needs of identifying and reporting threats or warning signs of potential violence. Training can also be used to communicate to employees the consequences of making threats or acting violently. Just by informing employees that this type of behavior is not tolerated will have a positive effect on preventing workplace violence.

Warning Signs

Individuals who act violently often exhibit progressively serious threatening behavior or warning signs before actually becoming violent (Labig, 1995; Minor, 1995). The warning signs are an alarm signal to the campus administration of the need for an assessment (Baron, 1993; Carll, 1999; Labig, 1995; Minor, 1995). Table 1 contains behavior profiles or warning signs of the potential for violence developed by Davis (1997), Baron (1993), and Carll (1999). The behavior profiles are categorized by three stages of potential violence, which Davis (1997) identifies as early potential, escalating potential, and realized potential. Davis (1997) writes, "The warning signs are not exclusive to these three stages of behavior but can be observed in any of the stages of behavior and occur in conjunction with other warning signs and/or the stages" (p. 22). In other words, one should be on the alert for any signs of threatening behavior.

Training Needs

Training requires a significant commitment of campus resources and expertise to manage workplace violence and assure a safe work environment (Wolf, 1998). Workplace violence training requires more than just training managers, supervisors, and employees to identify and report the warning signs. In Table 2 are Wolf's (1998) suggestions of the training needs and to whom to provide the training.

Table 1

Behavior Profile developed by Davis (1997), Baron (1993), and Carll (1999).

Potential of Violence	Davis (1997) violent behavior profile	Baron (1993) violent behavior profile	Carll (1999) violent behavior profile
Early Potential	Objectifying and dehumanizing others. Challenging authority. Regularly becoming argumentative. Alienating customers. Originating and spreading lies about others. Swearing excessively. Using explicit sexual language. Abusing others verbally. Sexually harassing others	Spreads rumors and gossip to harm others. Refuses to cooperate with immediate supervisor. Consistently argues with co-workers and customers. Belligerent to customers. Constantly swears at others. Makes unwanted sexual comments.	Intimidation of others with harassing phone calls, stalking behavior, or romantic obsessions with co-worker who doesn't return the interest.
Escalating Potential	Arguing frequently and intensely. Blatant disregard of organizational policies and procedures. Setting traps for others. Stealing from organization and other employees. Making verbal threats. Conveying sexual attention or violent intentions by letter, fax, voice mail, or e-mail.	Argues increasingly with everyone. Refuses to obey company policies and procedures. Sabotages equipment and steals property. Sends sexual or violent notes to co-workers. Sees self as victimized by management.	Aggressive behavior. Social isolation. Overly suspicious, paranoid behavior. Chronic work related conflicts. Perceived injustices. Unwilling to take responsibility for one's own action. Threats toward company or another employee.
Realized potential	Physical confrontations and altercations. Displaying weapons. Committing or attempting to commit assault, sexual assault, arson, or suicide	Recurrent physical fights. Frequent displays of intense anger. Recurrent suicide threats. Destruction of property. Utilization of	Conflicts. Frequent anger or hostility. Flare-ups and aggressive behavior toward co-workers. Physical contact such as pushing or punching.

		weapons to harm others. Commission of murder, rape, and/or arson.	Possession of or the access to weapons.
--	--	--	---

The experts generally agree on the overall training needs, but each emphasizes his/her own particular area of interest. Davis (1997) believes that, "More than mid-level and upper-level managers, first-level supervisors and managers are the ones interacting with employees, customers, and clients on a regular basis" (p. 91). The

Table 2

Organizational Training Needs, Wolf (1998)

<u>Who Needs the Training</u>	<u>Organizational Training Needs</u>
Administrators	The phenomena Definitions and data on workplace violence Litigation exposures The response requirements to implement a violence prevention program The need for endorsing and allocating resources to the IMT and empowering it to develop and operate the program
Incident Management Team	Recognizing early warning signs of potential violence Investigating and verifying reported threats Assessing the context in which the threat occurred Communicating strategies with persons threatened, the subject making the threat, and other key campus personnel i.e. security, legal, health Developing appropriate response options for the level of risk Documenting IMT activities to demonstrate IMT acted reasonably given the level of risk Interviewing techniques Conflict resolution Awareness of own safety during process
Managers, supervisors, union representatives	Understanding the policy IMT's responsibility Threat reporting Recognizing warning signs of potential violence Conflict resolution Understanding general responsibilities in supervising employees Understanding accountability for behavior and conduct Understanding accountability for general health and safety of work environment

	Understanding accountability for reporting any behaviors that violate policy
Employees	Awareness of workplace violence Understanding the policy Responsibility of reporting policy violations Reporting threats

rationale being the first level supervisors are the ones more likely to notice potential threats of violence before the behavior escalates to dangerous levels.

However, Heskett (1996) makes an excellent point by emphasizing more training for employees. Heskett (1996) believes that employees are the eyes and ears of an organization and know what is going on before management. Employee training should include security and safety-related topics, and recognizing and reporting threats or warning signs of potentially violent behavior. Most employees want to do the right thing and are willing to do what is needed. The participation in a workplace violence prevention program by all employees is vital for a safe workplace environment.

Existing Research

Bulatao and VandenBos (1996) identify the Northwestern National Life Insurance (NWNL) survey in 1993 as the first comprehensive assessment of workplace violence. The survey consisted of 600 sampled U.S. workers (excluding business owners and sole proprietors) who were interviewed for 15 minutes by telephone. Two key findings are important to the workplace violence on campus study. First, statistics provided by the sample lead to estimates that more than 2 million U.S. workers were physically attacked at work, 6 million U.S. workers were threatened and 16 million U.S. workers were harassed during that year. According to Bulatao and VandenBos (1996) the majority of harassment victims (58%), a large share of attack victims (43%), and threat victims (24%) did not report the offense. This is supported by the

National Crime Victimization Survey data for 1987-1992 indicating that over half of all the violent incidents sustained at work are not reported to police (Bachman, 1994). Assault, a major category of nonfatal workplace violence, is recalled less accurately by survey respondents than any other crime measured by the National Crime Victimization Survey (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1994). Nonfatal workplace violence is less dramatic, receives much less attention, and may even be substantially underestimated in existing statistics (Toscano & Weber, 1995).

Based on their day-to-day work, interests, and training, the personnel directors of a campus will have a better understanding of workplace violence than facilities directors and chief business officers. Based on their daily contact with employees the facilities directors will have a better understanding of what workplace violence, both reported and unreported, are occurring in facilities than chief business officers and personnel directors of a campus. Based on their busy schedule and lack of first hand contact, the business officers may not get information on the unreported incidents and will have the lowest level of understanding of the frequency and intensity of workplace violence.

In 1995 Bush and O'Shea (1996) surveyed organizations (they did not indicate how many surveys were sent out) in southeastern Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware to determine the frequency with which organizations used various approaches to prevent acts of violence in the workplace. Their questionnaire was mailed to senior human resources managers who were members of the Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM). They received responses from 59 organizations. Of these, 10 responses belonged to the category of other organizations that included education. The questionnaire items dealt with practices

and policies that focused on minimizing internal threats. Targeted items to reduce internal violence included communication training, violence prevention plans, crisis management, and training to recognize threats of violence in the workplace. Over half of the organizations indicated that they provide their employees with training in effective communication and negotiation skills. They found that only 24% of the responding organizations had a violence prevention plan in place. However, 36% of the organizations had formed a detailed crisis management plan in preparation for an incident of violence in the workplace. Only 10% reported any training "designed to prepare employees for the recognition of potentially violent individuals" (Bush & O'Shea, 1996, p. 292). Interestingly, Bush and O'Shea (1996) indicated that the data are consistent with other recent surveys by the SHRM and the American Management Association, which revealed that even after episodes of workplace violence, organizations remained unlikely to offer such training.

In the fall of 1998 the Risk and Insurance Management Society (RIMS) and the Risk Management/Insurance Division of the American Society of Safety Engineers (RM/I ASSE) surveyed members on their current programs and policies of workplace violence prevention (Sullivan, 1999). They randomly selected 1,000 RIMS members and 500 RM/I ASSE members. Of the 299 responses received, 40% offer training to managers to recognize warning signs of violent behavior and 35% provide employee training on conflict resolution. But only 24% offer training to employees to recognize warning signs of violent behavior. Also, 58% indicated that employees have expressed fear that violence may occur at work. There was not a specific question about the organization having a workplace violence prevention program. The survey did ask if the organization had a written policy addressing

violent acts in the workplace, 62% answered yes. The survey recommended that administrators produce a formal written workplace violence prevention policy that is distributed and discussed with all employees. The survey also recommended that personnel directors encourage employees to report threats or violent behavior.

The HR Executive Magazine survey of January 2000 was conducted through e-mail invitation, an announcement in Human Resources Executive Magazine, and a link from Web sites. There were responses from 286 organizations. This form of respondent recruiting did not allow for data indicating how many surveys were sent out. In the categories of respondent organizations, education was included with service businesses, healthcare, and nonprofit. This category made up 18% of the organizations responding. Three percent of the respondent of this category had job titles equivalent to Chief Financial Officer or Vice President; three percent had equivalent job titles of Physical Plant Manager, and 57 percent had equivalent job titles of Human Resource or Personnel Manager. Combined, the chief business officers and facilities directors totaled only 17 respondents but the personnel directors totaled 163.

Of all the respondents 75 percent indicated that management was concerned about workplace violence. Only 25% of the organizations have a committee or incident management team that is charged with the prevention of workplace violence. Sixty one percent (61%) have taken proactive steps to prepare for violence. The proactive steps consisted of: 75% communicate their policies; 70% use pre-employment screening; 46% train management and staff; and 22% train only management. Only 26% indicated their employees know the profile behavior of a potentially violent person. So there is some question as to the type

of training the organizations are providing. It evidently is not in recognizing warning signs of violent behavior.

Organizations responding to research questionnaires include categories containing education organizations. Although a very broad category, it most likely contains some college and university campuses. A majority of the respondents have neither a formal written workplace violence prevention policy nor a training program to recognize warning signs of violent behavior.

Based on their day-to-day work, interests, and training, the personnel directors of a campus may view their organizational needs differently for both workplace violence prevention and workplace violence training than chief business officers and facilities directors. Based on their daily contact with employees the facilities directors may view their organizational needs different for both workplace violence prevention and workplace violence training in facilities than chief business officers and personnel directors. Based on their busy schedule and lack of first hand contact with employees the business officers may view their organizational needs for workplace violence prevention and workplace violence training differently than the facilities directors and personnel directors.

Incidents of Campus Workplace Violence

In August of 1992, on the campus of Concordia University in Montreal, Canada, four employees were killed and one was injured when another employee, Valery Fabrikant, entered their workplace and shot them. Three of the victims killed were intended targets and the fourth happened to be in the wrong place at the wrong time. Fabrikant was carrying three handguns and a briefcase full of ammunition when he was caught. The board of governors of Concordia ordered an independent review of the incident (Kelleher, 1997). According to Kelleher (1997)

the review indicated Fabrikant "exhibited repeated nonconformance to regulations and social norms, impulsive and erratic behavior, irritability and aggressiveness, and a lack of remorse for the implications of his actions" (pp. 72, 73). Ratelle (1994) reported that the university never verified Fabrikant's resume and there were university documents describing how he had harassed and terrorized administrators and co-workers for years. In addition to this evidence, Ratelle (1994) states, "that Concordia had known since 1982 of a rape allegation made against Mr. Fabrikant by a student" (p. 1). "Instead, from 1980 to 1992 Mr. Fabrikant was given raises and promotions" (Ratelle, 1994, p. 1). The university administrators did not understand workplace violence and the price paid for this was too high.

In February 1993 a patient at the University of Southern California Hospital critically wounded three doctors. The perpetrator had two handguns, a sawed off rifle and a ten-inch knife. Afterwards, doctors working in this environment commented they were not surprised that violence had occurred. "No one was prepared for the event and there were apparently very few, if any, security measures in effect at the time" (Kelleher, 1996, p. 51). It seems a contradiction that no one was surprised the violence took place and yet there was nothing in place to prevent it.

On March 9, 1995, in a parking lot at Northwestern University, John Costalupes ambushed his former supervisor, shooting him four times. According to witnesses Costalupes tried to drive over the victim as he left the parking lot. One day after the shooting Costalupes appeared at the dean's office of the University of Minnesota medical school. Confronted by a security guard who had been stationed there because of a fear of such an appearance, Costalupes fled and when caught killed himself with his own gun. Costalupes had been fired 8

years before by his former supervisor when both were at the University of Minnesota medical school. In 1989, when Costalupes was fired, the current dean of the medical school was working at another university. Sources at the Minnesota campus indicated that Costalupes was a loner and had been fired because he failed to follow instructions (Shah & Callahan, 1995). After being fired, Costalupes claimed he was a victim and wrote threatening letters to university officials (Slaney, 1995). No record of any threat could be found in the university police files (Broderick, 2000).

On June 28, 2000, Jian Chen entered the office of his supervisor, Rodger Haggitt, at the University of Washington and closed the door. Witnesses later said they heard loud angry voices and then two popping sounds (Jamieson & Schubert, 2000). Chen had killed Haggitt and then committed suicide. Brown (2000) related that investigators were looking into reports that prior to the shooting there had been concern by university officials that Chen had purchased a gun. According to Jamieson and Schubert (2000), in the last 28 years the university has had eight homicides including this one.

Analysis

In understanding workplace violence, administrators must be aware that violence can strike a college or university campus at any time. Administrators must also understand that the only effective defense against workplace violence is their campus employees. For the employees to be effective requires that the campus have a workplace violence prevention program and workplace violence training to support the program.

There is enough information about the Costalupes case to know he was fired, he believed he was a victim, he was very angry, and he wrote threatening letters. In addition, we know he failed to follow

instructions, and was a loner. The written threats alone should have been a clear warning sign of the potential for violence. In Table 1 the second row, escalating potential, and the first column of violent behavior profile is the warning sign "conveying violent intentions by letter." Although he had written threatening letters, there were no records of any such letters. One of the basic rules of workplace violence prevention is to take all threats seriously. Other indicators from Table 1 that apply to this case are, "refuses to cooperate with immediate supervisor," "sees self as victimized by management," and "social isolation."

It appears that there were ample warning signs of potential violence. Could this tragedy have been averted if the administrators involved had understood workplace violence, and had workplace violence prevention and training? Russell and Pater (1998) indicate there are always opportunities for intervention before violence is committed. The key is to recognize the opportunities and intervene quickly and effectively before the violence takes place. The success or failure of violence prevention hinges on suitable actions taken by people in the organization.

The individuals who killed other employees in the incidents of campus workplace violence had two things in common. One, they each had reached a point where murder was the only answer to their particular problem. Secondly, in reaching that point of murder, each of these individuals had performed numerous acts of non-fatal violence. The non-fatal acts of violence took place over periods of one to ten years. There definitely were lost opportunities to stop these individuals long before they reached the point where killing was the only solution. The tragedy is when nothing is done.

Chapter III

Methodology

The purpose of this study was to determine if any differences exist among college and university chief business officers, facilities directors, and personnel directors regarding how they view workplace

violence. Specifically this study examined how they understand workplace violence; how they view their organizational need for workplace violence prevention; and how they view their organizational need for workplace violence training. This study used a descriptive design, which according to Isaac and Michaels (1981, p. 166), "is to describe systematically the facts and characteristics of a given population or area of interest, factually or accurately."

Population

The target population was the 1,200 higher education institutional members of the Association of Higher Education Facilities Officers (APPA) in the United States. Founded in 1914, the association changed the old name of Association of Physical Plant Administrators (APPA) to the more modern sounding name of the Association of Higher Education Facilities Officers in 1988. The association decided to keep the acronym of APPA because of its recognition value. Each institutional member has one APPA authorized institutional representative. The institution representative is most often the facilities administrator, generally with a title of director, assistant vice president or associate vice president of facilities.

Sampling Method

In determining appropriate sample size, four factors must be considered: 1) the level of significance, 2) the power of the test, 3) the population variance, and 4) the effect size. The most important factor to consider is the effect size, or the degree to which the phenomenon exists. The sample size question is simply not how large should the sample be but rather how large should the sample be in order to detect a specific effect size (Hinkle, Wiersma, and Jurs, 1994). Initially, a sample size of 155 was determined by using the standard formula for determining sample size for specific levels of significant

effect size and power. The following standard parameters was used a .75 standard deviation, a level of significance of .05, an effect size of .20, a power of .80 and the table of sample sizes for interval data using two-tailed tests. Due to the unknown response rate for an electronic survey instrument, the sample size was increased to 400. Each of the 400 campuses was randomly selected by assigning generated random numbers to the U.S. APPA higher education institutional membership directory. For example random numbers such as 99, 32, and 36 were assigned to institutional member number 99, 32, and 36. A computer program at Research Randomizer, a Web site, generated the random numbers.

Rights of Human Subjects

Prior to beginning the study, proper documentation was submitted to the Kansas State University Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects for review and approval. All subjects were informed that their participation is voluntary and confidential (see Appendix A). The survey instrument was coded to keep an accounting of who had responded in order that follow up letters could be sent to those who had not responded.

Data Collection

The format for the research questionnaire was a modified version of a questionnaire originally developed by Railsback (1997). The only similarity is the use of the Likert-type scale. The Railsback (1997) instrument was used to measure the differences among guidance counselors, principals and the local Board of Education presidents regarding how they perceive business education courses in high schools. The Railsback (1997) study did not test the instrument for reliability and validity.

The instrument for the study of workplace violence on campus was designed to measure the differences among the chief business officers, facilities directors, and personnel directors regarding their understanding of workplace violence; and their views on organizational need for workplace violence prevention and training at their campus. The instrument is displayed in Appendix B. The questions for the survey were developed from the literature review in Chapter II; see Table 3 for the survey items and the reference.

Table 3

Survey Items and Literature Reference

Survey Items	Reference
1. Workplace violence (WV) includes	Carll, 1999
2. Workplace violence defined	Jenkins, 1998
4. Environmental factors	Kelleher, 1997
6. No effective program	Kelleher, 1997
7. WV does not happen	Labig, 1995
9. Customer can cause WV	Jenkins, 1998
10. Workplace is where an employee is working	Bulatao & VandenBos, 1996
11. Employee prepared for WV	Labig, 1995
14. Frustration and anger	Kelleher, 1997
18. Assailants do not give clear warning	Labig, 1995; Minor, 1995
20. Employee's behavior can be a warning	Labig, 1995; Minor, 1995
21. Work environment can cause violence	Kelleher, 1997
22-28. Cycle of violence	Labig, 1995
29. Employees cannot be trained to identify	Davis, 1997; Wilkinson, 1998
30-40. Need for WV prevention	Wolf, 1998
41-60. Need for WV training	Wolf, 1998

In August 2000, a pilot questionnaire consisting of 99 statements in four parts was mailed to the Kansas Board of Regents institutions and Washburn University chief business officers, facilities directors, and personnel directors. Respondents were asked to comment on the questions and make suggestions. A major criticism was the length of the questionnaire and the complexity of questions. Fourteen questions were eliminated and 20 were simplified. To test for reliability, the revised questionnaire was sent in October 2000. Thirty college and university campuses were randomly selected from the APPA institutional member list by using random numbers generated by the Research

Randomizer Web site. The result of Cronbach's reliability test was an Alpha of .958. "The reliability of a test is expressed as a positive decimal number ranging from 0.0 to 1.0 with 1.0 indicating perfect reliability and 0 the absence of reliability" (Aiken, 1991, p. 101). Comments from respondents again indicated that the test was too long. The questions were again reviewed and 20 redundant questions were eliminated.

Electronic Mail (e-mail) Survey

Letters (Appendix A) were sent by United States mail (snail mail) or by electronic mail (e-mail) to each of the facilities directors, the chief business officers and the personnel directors at the 400 randomly selected campuses. The letter described the purpose of the study and how to access the Web site in order to answer the questions. Individuals who received snail mail had to manually enter the Web site electronic address on their computer. Individuals who received e-mail had only to double click the survey Web site address with their mouse, allowing automatic access to the Web site. Once at the Web site, access to the questionnaire required the respondent to enter a specific password. Each letter mailed contained a password and a verification number. The verification number was a unique number assigned to each of the 400 campuses. One of the demographic questions was for the respondent to indicate their administrative position, i.e. business, facilities, or personnel. The verification number and administrative position provided a means to keep track of the campuses and the administrators who had responded. Follow up letters requesting participation in the survey were sent by snail mail or e-mail after the first, the second, and the third week to the individuals in the administrative positions that had not responded.

Identifying Names and Addresses

The APPA membership directory provided the position titles, names, snail mail addresses, and about 90% of the e-mail addresses of facilities directors. Three campuses identified the chief business officer as the APPA representative. These were small schools, in the range of less than 4,999 students enrolled. College and university directories were also accessed at Web sites to find names and addresses.

Two sources were used to find the position titles, names, e-mail addresses, and snail mail addresses of the chief business officers and personnel directors. The sources were the membership directory of the College and University Personnel Association (CUPA) and the Web sites of the colleges and universities. The campus Web sites provided e-mail addresses for about 60% of the chief business officers and about 85% of the personnel directors. Six campuses of the 400 randomly selected did not have Web sites or their Web sites could not be accessed. About 10 college and university campuses, both private and public, primarily in the eastern portion of the United States, did not allow any access to their Web site directory without a password.

With the name and address search completed there were 151 administrative positions that were not identified by name. These included 100 chief business officers, 42 personnel directors and nine facilities directors.

There are Web sites that list the Web sites of college and university campuses. These Web sites were very helpful in finding specific campus sites. Once a campus Web site is accessed it is best to go directly to the site map. The site map is generally located on the main page and is like a table of contents for the site. By using the site map one can find what directories are available and access

them. The user friendly Web sites will have a directory that allows searches by department, by name, and by title. This is very helpful when the name is unknown. The best learning experience is go to a campus Web site and thoroughly go through all the information provided to gain a feel or experience of what is available at that site. Searching Web sites takes time and is a lot of work, but it is worth the effort to get a good list of names and addresses.

Master File

At the heart of accounting for the 1,200 administrative positions was a master file listing each of the 400 campuses. The file manually compiled on the researcher's computer had at the very least the administrative position title, i.e. chief business officer, facilities director, personnel director and the campus snail mail address. Where the information was available the file included a name, and e-mail address. The e-mail address specifies the destination of an electronic mail message. The Free On-Line Dictionary of Computing (FOLDOC) describes an electronic mail address (e-mail) as being made up of the name of the mailbox followed by "@" and then the host part or the name of the destination computer. In the example below Barbara Whatsherz's e-mail address is comprised of the mailbox "bwhatsherz" and the destination computer "xyz.edu." The master file numerically listed the 400 randomly selected campuses and their three administrative positions by their assigned verification number. For example:

Verification number 2001

Barbara Whatsherz **bwhatsherz@xyz.edu**
Chief Business Officer
University of XYZ
Somewhere, USA

Facilities Director
University of XYZ
Somewhere, USA

Amy Howzit ahowzit@xyz.edu

Personnel Director
University XYZ
Somewhere, USA

In this example chief business officer and the personnel director have e-mail addresses and the facilities director has no name, just the position title. The chief business officer and the personnel director received their letters by e-mail. The facilities director would receive his/her letter by snail mail.

Mailing

In the first mailing, 941 were sent by e-mail on November 5th and 259 were sent by snail mail on November 7, 2000. There was a delay in sending snail mail letters due to the late delivery of address labels. To prepare 259 printed letters with individual addresses, verification numbers, sign, fold, stuff the envelope, seal the envelope, put the address label on the envelope and take the letters to the post office took over 24 hours of work. To prepare 941 e-mail letters with individual addresses, verification numbers and send took about 18 hours. Of the 941 e-mailed, 141 were returned to the sender as having a bad address. The 141 letters with a bad e-mail address were then sent out within a few days by snail mail. This brought the total of snail mail letters up to 400 and decreased the e-mailed letters to 800.

Only two of the letters sent by snail mail were returned in contrast to the 141 e-mail letters returned with bad addresses. The U.S. Post Office marked the two snail mail letters as "receiver not known." This points out a disadvantage of using the high tech e-mail. The e-mail user name and address must be perfectly spelled and punctuated with no errors.

At the end of the first week 72 questionnaires had been returned. At this time a follow up letter was prepared and mailed to those who had not responded from the initial mailing. A week after the second

mailing over 200 questionnaires had been returned. At this time a third mailing was sent and by the 30th of November 374 questionnaires had been returned. Over the next few weeks 5 more questionnaires trickled in. This brought the total of questionnaires returned to 379.

Unsolicited e-mail Comments

The use of e-mail allowed the receiver of the letter to instantly return comments directly to the researcher's e-mail address. These unsolicited comments seemed to fall into four categories: 1) unable to participate, 2) too busy or too important to participate, 3) will get back, and 4) have problems. The most interesting are the "unable to participate" comments because they do not indicate why. The remaining comments can be viewed in Appendix C.

Unable to Participate.

Personnel Director: I am sorry that (name of college) will not be able to participate in your survey. Best of luck in your project.

The researcher sent back a note thanking them and asking if they could indicate why they were unable to participate. There was no reply.

Personnel Director: I'm sorry but I will not be able to participate in this study. I hope everything goes well.

Personnel Director: I apologize. I am unable to participate.

None of these personnel directors explained why they could not respond.

Personnel Director: Closed permanently on June 30, 2000. We will not be participating in your survey.

This is a response that was not expected and it left a very sad feeling.

Chief Business Officer: You may send your request to the president.

A request was sent to the president but there was no reply.

One personnel director and one chief business officer who had received their letters by snail mail called and stated they did not want to participate. The snail mail letter contained the researcher's telephone number but did not contain his e-mail address.

Response Data

Of the 379 who responded, 15 (4%) did not enter their verification number making it impossible to determine which campus had responded and what method of sending the letter had been i.e. snail mail or e-mail for these 15 respondents. Deducting the 15 respondents who did not include their verification number from 379 respondents leaves 364 respondents that were tracked.

Of the 400-snail mail letters sent there were 95 (23.75%) respondents. Of the 800 e-mail letters sent there were 269 (33.6%) respondents. It is easier for an individual to point her/his mouse and double click than to manually enter a Web site address. Out of the 400 campuses 242 (60.5%) had at least one respondent. Twelve of the campuses had 100 percent participation by their three administrators.

e-mail Overview

There are problems with using an electronic survey but the problems are minor in comparison to mailing a survey. It took less time to send 941 e-mail letters than to send 259 snail mail letters. The response rate on the e-mail letters was (33.6% compared to 23.75%) about 40 percent higher than that of the snail mail letter responses. Snail mail letters required the respondents to manually enter the Web

site address. But with e-mail letters the respondents merely had to double click the questionnaire e-mail address allowing automatic access. The comment of one respondent puts this in perspective, "What a great way to do a survey." This is a great endorsement for the electronic survey, its "user friendly."

Instrument

The research instrument contained 65 questions about workplace violence (see in Appendix B). The survey used a Likert type scale format for all the questions except for the five demographic questions. The advantages of a Likert type scale include: ease of preparation; it is based entirely on empirical data regarding the subjects' responses rather than the subjective opinions of judges; it produces more reliable and highly intercorrelated items; and the scales provide more information about the subject's attitudes, since an intensity reaction is given to each of many items (Adams, 1964). The disadvantages of a Likert type scale include: a concern with the verbal statements that are used as a basis for inferences about real attitudes, attitude scales are easily faked, and anonymity makes correlation of the findings with related data about the individual difficult (Adams, 1964).

Part I of the survey instrument contained 29 statements dealing with workplace violence, workplace violence prevention, workplace violence training, and definitions of workplace violence. Respondents were asked to choose a response that best described their understanding of the statements. The following scale was used by the respondents in selecting their responses to the statements: SA = Strongly Agree (5); A = Agree (4); D = Disagree (3); SD = Strongly Disagree (2); and DK = Don't Know (1).

Part II of the survey instrument contains a list of 11 statements about workplace violence prevention. Respondents were asked to choose a response that best described the view they have of their organizational need regarding workplace violence prevention. The following scale was used by the respondents in selecting their responses: E = Essential (5); VI = Very Important (4); I = Important (3); SI = Somewhat Important (2); NI = Not Important (1).

Part III of the survey instrument contains a list of 20 statements about training for workplace violence. Respondents were asked to choose a response that best described the view they have of their organizational need regarding workplace violence training. The following scale was used by the participants in selecting their responses: E = Essential (5); VI = Very Important (4); I = Important (3); SI = Somewhat Important (2); NI = Not Important (1).

Part IV of the survey instrument contained five demographic questions, a question asking for comments, and a question asking if the respondent would like a summary of the findings of the completed report.

Research Hypotheses

Research Hypothesis One

Ho: There is a significant difference among the chief business officers, the facilities directors, and the personnel directors regarding their understanding of workplace violence.

Research Hypothesis Two

Ho: There is a significant difference among the chief business officers, the facilities directors, and the personnel directors

regarding their organizational need for violence prevention programs and training.

Research Hypothesis Three

Ho: There is a significant difference regarding their understanding of workplace violence, their organizational need, workplace violence prevention and training, and selected demographic characteristics of gender, age, student enrollment (indicates institution size), and public or private campus.

Data Analysis

The survey instrument was analyzed by using the following statistical procedures: (1) frequency distributions; (2) measures of central tendency; (3) percentages; (4) multivariate analysis of variance; (5) analysis of variance; and (6) post-hoc tests. The organization of data was done using a principal components analysis of identity scales and a summation over the items for each of the scales. This reduced the number of variables from 60 items to three scales representing common themes between and among items.

A series of multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVAs) was used to test significance over several dependent variables simultaneously. The MANOVA both acts as a control for inflated p-levels associated with multiple univariate tests and provides insight into univariate findings. When the MANOVA was significant, associated univariate tests were examined. A non-significant MANOVA suggests that any significant associated analysis of variance (ANOVAs) were due to chance.

The ANOVAs were used to determine if there were significant differences among the demographic groups for each of the three dependent variables. Post-hoc tests were used to examine group

differences when the ANOVA was significant. This was only required when there were three or more groups (e.g., school size). A standard confidence interval of 95 percent ($p < .05$) was used for all of the analysis.

Chapter IV

Results

Three hundred and seventy-nine surveys were returned for a response rate of 31.58%. The demographic information from the survey is summarized in Table 4. The size of the campus was identified by student enrollment, those with less than 4,999 made up 49.4% (178) of the campuses, next were the 5,000 to 11,999 (85, 23.6%), then the 12,000 to 19,999 (54, 15%) and lastly the >20,000 (43, 12%). There were 137 facilities directors, 131 personnel directors, and 92 chief business officers. The majority of respondents were male (260), with 97 female. Three respondents did not indicate their gender. There were more public institutions than private, with one respondent not indicating. In the age groups the largest number were in the 50 to 59 group, the next were the 40 to 49, then the over 60, and last the under 39. The typical respondent was a male between the ages of 50 and 59, either a personnel director or facilities director, and at a public campus with less than 4,999 students enrolled.

Prior to conducting the analyses, all data were examined for missing data and outliers. Nineteen of the surveys were not used because they were over 90% incomplete, leaving 360 surveys for data analysis. Based on the observations of frequencies and histograms there appeared to be no outliers for each of the individual variables.

Violations of the general linear model including normality, linearity and homoscedasticity were tested. Based on the observation of normal probability plots, tests of skewness, and tests of kurtosis, all of the scales appeared to be normally distributed. Due to the normality of the hypothesized scales, the assumption of linearity and homoscedasticity were inferred to be satisfied.

To analyze the data collected, it was necessary to perform three basic recodes. First, questions 1-30 originally contained five response options, "Disagree strongly", "Disagree", "Agree", "Agree strongly", and "Don't know". The final response option, "Don't know" was not considered to be an end (or mid) point. It was decided that this option would be treated as a missing response. This was decided because the questions asked the respondent to identify how he/she viewed certain workplace violence related issue. A respondent, who did not know how he/she viewed the issue, is no different from a respondent who omitted a response, thus indicating either lack of agreement with any of the listed responses or an inability to answer the question (i.e., he/she did not know the answer). This recode resulted in a four point Likert scale that ranged from "Disagree strongly" to "Agree strongly".

Second, there were six questions (#6, #7, #8, #17, #18, and #29) that were worded in a negative manner. The response options for these six questions were therefore in reverse order when compared to the other 54 questions. To facilitate comparison, the four response

options for these questions were reversed: a response of "1" was recoded to a "4"; "2" became "3"; "3" became "2" and "4" became "1". For all the major analyses, these questions were treated as though they were asked in an affirmative (as opposed to a negative) manner.

Finally, demographic question #64 asked the respondents' age, and there were five options, "Under 30", "30-39", "40-49", "50-59", and "Over 60". Due to the low number of respondents (six) who fit in the "Under 30" category, the bottom two groups were combined to form an "Under 39" category.

Table 4

Frequencies and Percentages for Demographic Information (N=360)

Position Title	1=facilities directors (137)-38% 2=chief business officers (92)-25.6% 3=personnel directors (131)-36.4%
Students Enrolled (Size)	1=<4,999 (178)-49.4% 2=5,000-11,999 (85)-23.6% 3=12,000-19,999 (54)-15% 4=>20,000 (43)-12%
Gender	1=male (260)-72.2% 2=female (97)-27% 0=unknown (3)-0.8%
Institution	1=public (213)-59.2% 2=private (146)-40.5% 0=unknown (1)-0.3%
Age	1=<39 (35)-9.8% 2=40-49 (120)-33% 3=50-59 (164)-45.6% 4=>60 (38)-10.6%

An examination of the intercorrelation matrix between and among the items within each of the three hypothesized scales suggested a lack

of convergence for the hypothesized items. Based on observations, an exploratory principle component analysis was undertaken.

Principal Components Analysis for Workplace Violence Scale

A principal components factor analysis (PCA) on the 60 items associated with workplace violence scale was performed with an orthogonal rotation. The PCA was conducted as a means of reducing the 60 items into more manageable subsets of related items for ease of interpretation and understanding. First, eight factors with eigenvalues greater than 1.00 were extracted. The original PCA solution was reviewed and based on the scree plot, the number of items in a factor, and the interpretability of factors, a three-factor solution emerged as the most interpretable one (see Table 4).

Scale 1 contained 33 items and accounted for 26.0% of the variance, scale 2 contained 14 items and accounted for 7.2% of the variance, and scale 3 contained five items and accounted for 6.0% of the variance. Items were retained if they: 1) loaded .40 or greater; 2) did not cross-load on any other factor at the .40 level; and 3) did not reduce the reliability of the factor. Based on the item loadings the three scales were as follows: 1) Organizational need for prevention and training, 2) Understanding causes, and 3) Features of institution programs. Scale #1, prevention and training, provides the data for hypothesis two, the Organizational Need for Prevention and Training; scale #2, causes/cycle, provide the data for hypothesis one, Understanding Workplace Violence and scale #3, provides additional descriptive information; and all three scales, provide the data for hypotheses three the demographics.

The reliability for the 33 items in Scale #1 was a coefficient Alpha of .96. The reliability for the 14 items in Scale #2 was a coefficient Alpha of .74. And the reliability for the five items in

Scale #3 was a coefficient Alpha of .78. All three reliabilities met or exceeded the generally accepted minimum value of .70 (Aiken, 1991).

Originally the research instruments 60 questions were organized into three parts. In part one the first five questions were definitions and questions five through 29 were about understanding workplace violence issues. In part two questions 30 through 40 were about need for prevention. In part three questions 41 through 60 were about need for training. These were reorganized into the three scales (Table 5). In scale #1 are questions 1, 5, and 30 through 60. In

Table 5

Factor Loading for Workplace Violence Items (N=360)

QUESTIONS	SCALE 1 (33)	SCALE 2 (14)	SCALE 3 (5)
1 Workplace violence (WV) includes	0.37		
2 WV defined			
3 Sexual Harassment			
4 Environment factors		0.31	
5 WV is a serious concern	0.43*		
6 No effective program		0.48*	
7 WV does not happen		-0.35**	
8 Employees not capable of dealing w/WV			-0.45**
9 Customer can cause WV		0.36	
10 Workplace is where an employee is working			
11 Employee prepared for WV			0.58
12 WV prevention program			0.79
13 Crisis Management program			0.49
14 Frustration and anger		0.49	
15 No employees carry weapons			
16 Age, gender, race			
17 WV prevention is not important		-0.38***	
18 Assailants do not give clear warning		-0.39***	
19 Employees don't take threats seriously			
20 Employee's behavior can be warning sign		0.47	
21 Work environment can cause violence		0.49	
22 Mental and behavioral cycle		0.47	
23 Reaction to stressful events			
24 Emotional reactions to stressful events		0.36	
25 Violence is the only answer		0.43	
26 De-escalate the chance of violence			
27 Training to prevent WV			0.72
28 The cycle of violence		0.54	
29 Employees can't be trained to identify		-0.51***	
30 Violence prevention program	0.60*		
31 Consequences of violating policy	0.56		
32 Defining unacceptable workplace behavior	0.57		
33 Procedures to report threats	0.67		
34 Procedures to describe threats	0.67		
35 Strategies to protect threatened employees	0.67		
36 Team responsibilities for WV prevention	0.66		
37 Post-incident activities	0.66		
38 WV prevention training for all employees	0.66*		
39 Defining training audience	0.59		
40 Identifying internal & external resources	0.63*		
41 Recognition of early warning signs	0.67		
42 Emergency response procedures	0.70		

43 Reporting and documenting violence	0.69
44 Negotiating skills	0.62
45 Understanding V	0.77
46 Allocating resources for WV programs	0.76
47 Litigation	0.71
48 How to reopen post WV	0.72
49 Top administration endorsement of WV	0.74
50 Team responsible for WV program	0.71
51 Investigate and verify threats	0.78
52 Assess the context of threat	0.70
53 Develop appropriate campus responses	0.77
54 Document campus responses	0.74
55 Interviewing techniques	0.74
56 Awareness of safety during investigation	0.74
57 WV program information	0.75
58 Responsibilities of supervisors	0.64
59 Supervisor accountability	0.62
60 Employee responsibility	0.73

* Cross loaded -- Only highest value used to identify the scale

** Recoded from negative values to positive values

In scale #2 are questions 4, 6, 7, 9, 14, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 28, and 29. In scale #3 are questions 8, 11, 12, 13, and 27.

Descriptive Measures

Means, standard deviations, F value, and degrees of freedom among the three scales are located in Table 6, Table 7, Table 8, Table 9, and Table 10.

In Table 6 the multivariate F test [F(6,704) = 3.27, p<.01] was significant. This clearly indicates that the response of the three types of administrators varies.

The univariate F test [F(2,354) = 5.15, p<.01] for the factor of organizational need for prevention and training was significant. This indicates that hypotheses two a significant difference between the chief business officers, the facilities directors, and the personnel directors regarding their organizational need for violence prevention and training is accepted. Personnel directors (M = 4.13) view the need for prevention and training as more important than do chief business officers (M = 3.96) and facilities directors (M = 3.91).

Research Hypothesis Two

Ho: There is a significant difference between the chief business officers, the facilities directors, and the personnel directors

regarding their organizational need for violence prevention programs and training.

The univariate F test [$F(2,354) = 4.46, p < .05$] for the factor of understanding the causes of workplace violence also was significant. This indicates that there is a significant difference between the chief business officers, the facilities directors, and the personnel directors regarding their understanding of workplace violence is accepted. Personnel directors ($M = 3.10$) report understanding the causes of workplace violence better than do chief business officers ($M = 3.04$) and facilities directors ($M = 3.00$). However, the univariate F [$F(2,354) = 2.77, p > .05$] for the factor of features of local institution was not significant. This indicates that the three types of administrators describe their local programs in largely similar ways.

Research Hypothesis One

Ho: There is a significant difference between the chief business officers, the facilities directors, and the personnel directors regarding their understanding of workplace violence.

Table 6

Multiple Analysis of Variance and Analysis of Variance for the Three

Administrative Positions

	<u>Facilities Dir.</u>		<u>Chief Bus. Off.</u>		<u>Personnel Dir.</u>		<u>F</u>
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	
Scale #1	3.91	0.64	3.96	0.57	4.13	0.56	5.15**
Scale #2	3.00	0.23	3.04	0.31	3.10	0.24	4.46*
Scale #3	2.29	0.47	2.63	0.47	2.49	0.48	2.77
Multivariate							3.27**

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$

Note: DF for Multivariate = 6 and 704, for Univariate = 2 and 354

In Table 7 the multivariate F test [$F(9,854.39) = 5.15, p < .01$] was significant. Clearly indicating that responses vary based on the size or enrollment of the institution.

The univariate F test for the factor of organizational need for prevention and training was significant [$F(3,353) = 3.26, p < .05$]. Administrators at campuses with over 20,000 student enrollment ($M = 4.24$) view the need for prevention and training as more important than administrators at 12,000 to 19,999 student enrollment ($M = 4.06$), than at campuses with 5,000 to 11,999 student enrollment ($M = 4.01$), and at campuses under 4,999 student enrollment ($M = 3.93$).

Table 7

Multiple Analysis of Variance and Analysis of Variance for Student

Enrollment (size) in 1,000s

	<u>0-4.999</u>		<u>5-11.999</u>		<u>12-19.999</u>		<u>>20.0</u>		<u>F</u>
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	
Scale #1	3.93	0.64	4.01	0.53	4.06	0.54	4.24	0.55	3.26*
Scale #2	3.01	0.27	3.04	0.25	3.13	0.25	3.11	0.23	4.35**
Scale #3	2.40	0.45	2.57	0.46	2.70	0.41	2.75	0.54	10.32**
Multivariate									5.15**

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$

Note: DF for Multivariate = 9 and 854, for Univariate = 3 and 353

The univariate F test for the factor of understanding the causes of workplace violence was significant [$F(3,353) = 4.35, p < .01$]. Administrators at campuses of 12,000 to 19,999 student enrollment ($M = 3.13$) report having a better understanding of the causes/cycle of workplace violence than at campuses greater than 20,000 student enrollment ($M = 3.11$), than at campuses with 5,000 to 11,999 student

enrollment ($\underline{M} = 3.04$), and finally at campuses with less than 4,999 student enrollment ($\underline{M} = 3.01$) had the least understanding.

The univariate \underline{F} test for the factor of local program questions of workplace violence was significant [$\underline{F}(3,353) = 10.32, \underline{p} < .01$].

Administrators at campuses with more than 20,000 student enrollment ($\underline{M} = 2.75$) report having a greater understanding of prevention questions, next were administrators at campuses with 12,000 to 19,999 student enrollment ($\underline{M} = 2.70$), then administrators at campuses with 5,000 to 11,999 student enrollment ($\underline{M} = 2.57$), and lastly the administrators at campuses with less than 4,999 student enrollment ($\underline{M} = 2.40$).

Research Hypothesis Three

Ho: There is a significant difference regarding their understanding of workplace violence, their organizational need, workplace violence prevention and training, and selected demographic characteristics of gender, age, student enrollment (indicates institution size), and public or private campus.

In Table 8 the multivariate \underline{F} test [$\underline{F}(3,350) = 1.98, \underline{p} > .05$] was not significant. Gender as a variable does not lead to significant differences in response.

Table 8

Multiple Analysis of Variance and Analysis of Variance for Gender

	<u>Male</u>		<u>Female</u>		<u>F</u>
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	
Scale #1	3.97	0.60	4.11	0.58	4.23*
Scale #2	3.04	0.26	3.08	0.22	2.13
Scale #3	2.53	0.44	2.48	0.52	0.92
Multivariate					1.98

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$

Note: DF for Multivariate = 3 and 350, for Univariate = 1 and 352

In Table 9 the multivariate F test [F(9,847) = 2.23, p<.01) was significant. Based on the demographic of age there is a significant difference in the response.

The univariate F test [F(3,350) = 1.44, p>.05] for need of prevention and training was not significant and the univariate F test [F(3,350) = 1.70, p>.05] for understanding causes/cycle of workplace violence was not significant.

Table 9

Multiple Analysis of Variance and Analysis of Variance for Age

	<u>Under 39</u>		<u>40 - 49</u>		<u>50 - 59</u>		<u>Over 60</u>		<u>F</u>
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	
Scale #1	4.13	0.45	4.06	0.61	3.94	0.58	3.96	0.70	1.44
Scale #2	3.09	0.20	3.07	0.26	3.02	0.24	3.06	0.29	1.70
Scale #3	2.36	0.49	2.63	0.44	2.49	0.47	2.41	0.41	4.49**
Multivariate									2.23

*p<.05 **p<.01

Note: Df for Multivariate = 9 and 847, for Univariate = 3 and 350

The univariate F test [F(3,350) = 4.49, p<.01] for the features of local program was significant. The 40 to 49 age group (M = 2.63) views the features of their local programs better than the other groups. Next are the 50 to 59 age group (M = 2.49), followed by the over 60 age group (M = 2.41, and lastly the under 39 age group (M = 2.36).

In Table 10 the multivariate F test [F(3,352) = 8.22, p<.01] was significant. Responses vary based on the demographic of institution (public or private).

Table 10

Multiple Analysis of Variance and Analysis of Variance for Institution

	<u>Public</u>		<u>Private</u>		F
	M	SD	M	SD	
Scale #1	4.07	0.56	3.92	0.63	5.99**
Scale #2	3.07	0.26	3.01	0.25	3.18
Scale #3	2.62	0.50	2.39	0.43	20.18**
Multivariate					8.22**

*p<.05 **p<.01

Note: DF for Multivariate = 3 and 352, for Univariate = 1 and 354

The univariate F test [F(1,354) = 5.99, p<.01] for the organizational need for prevention and training is significant. Administrators at public (M = 4.07) campuses view the need for prevention and training as more important than private (M = 3.92) campuses. The univariate F test [F(1,354) = 3.18, p>.05] for the causes/cycle of workplace violence is not significant.

The univariate F test [F(1,354) = 20.18, p<.01] for features of local program is significant. Administrators at public campuses (M = 2.62) view the features of their local programs better than private campuses (M 2.39).

Survey Comments

There were 52 survey comments that were sorted into four categories. The categories of 1) Prevention and Training, 2) Small and/or Private Campuses, 3) Sexual Harassment, and 4) Miscellaneous were determined by reading the comments and identifying key phrases and words. In the first category prevention and training the following words kept coming up in the comments: policy, training, importance, discipline, resources. These words relate to prevention and training programs. The second category identified themselves as small and/or private campuses by making specific comments relating to their size and/or private campus, i.e., "have a different attitude," "don't have

sufficient resources." Those in the third category commented specifically about sexual harassment, i.e. "Sexual harassment covers many different activities," "It is misleading and counter productive to include something like sexual harassment in the definition of workplace violence." The fourth category became a catch-all that contains miscellaneous comments, i.e. "great way to do a survey," "Good luck." The list of the comments can be seen in Appendix D.

Chapter V

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to determine the differences that exist between college and university chief business officers, facilities directors and personnel directors in understanding workplace violence, how they see the need for prevention and training, and characterization of their local program. This chapter presents a summary of the study, discussion of the findings, and recommendations for future research.

Summary

The study determined that differences exist between college and university chief business officers, facilities directors, and personnel directors regarding their views of understanding workplace violence, and their organizational need for workplace violence prevention and training programs.

Three hundred and sixty responses to a questionnaire on campus workplace violence were analyzed. The questionnaire was based on three research questions:

- 1). Do college and university chief business officers, facilities directors, and personnel directors understand the concept of workplace violence in the same or different ways? If different, how and to what extent do they differ?

2). Do college and university chief business officers, facilities directors, and personnel directors see their organizational need for workplace violence prevention and training in the same or different ways? If different, how and to what extent do they differ?

3). Do gender, age, student enrollment, and public versus private significantly affect how college and university chief business officers, facilities directors, and personnel directors understand the concepts of workplace violence? If different, how and to what extent do they differ?

Conclusion

The crux of the differences among the respondents in the three administrative positions is in their view of the organizational need for prevention and training. This difference is supported by the three administrators' views of understanding workplace violence, specifically their understanding of causes/cycle. In addition the comments of respondents provided a rich source of data indicating insight into the differences among personnel directors, facilities directors and chief business officers and the campus demographics of student enrollment and public or private campus.

Importance of Prevention and Training

Personnel directors view the organizational need for workplace violence prevention and training as more important than do chief business and facilities directors. This is logical when one realizes that personnel directors are more involved with workplace violence as part of their daily duties than the other two administrators. A strong majority of the respondents (94.1%) indicated that workplace violence is a serious concern. Not as many but still a majority (80%) indicated that workplace violence happens in their organization. The respondents (97.4%) also indicated they have a very good understanding of what

workplace violence includes. These three pieces of data are very encouraging.

Prevention

Only 39.9% of all respondents indicated they have a workplace violence prevention program at their campus and 88% indicated that most organizations in the U.S. do not have an effective workplace violence prevention program. This does not give a favorable endorsement to the organizational prevention programs. Whereas, 70.1% indicate they have a crisis management program. This is consistent with the Bush and O'Shea (1996) survey of human resource managers that found 24% of organizations surveyed had a violence prevention program and 36% of organizations surveyed had a crisis management program. Bush and O'Shea (1996) indicated that their data was consistent with surveys by SHRM and the American Management Society. Colleges and universities have a small increase in campus prevention programs and a significant increase in crisis management programs over the respondents of the Bush and O'Shea (1996) study. Crisis management programs also include other disasters, i.e. tornadoes, earthquakes, etc. However, the more rapid increase of crisis management programs indicates either that colleges and universities understand the need for the management of crisis issues that have happened but do not view violence prevention as important or as practical or they plan to implement a prevention program later.

Training Data

Interestingly, only 33.1% of all respondents indicated their employees are prepared for workplace violence, yet 72.8% indicated that their employees are capable of dealing with workplace violence. This seems to imply that workplace violence training is not necessary because employees can deal with the violence. This lack of training is

supported by the data. Only 39.4% of all respondents indicate they provide training that deals with preventing workplace violence. This also is consistent with the Risk and Insurance Management Society (RIMS) and the Risk Management/Insurance Division of the American Society of Safety Engineers (RM/I ASSE) survey of 1998 that found only 40% of respondents offered workplace violence training (Sullivan, 1999). Russell and Pater (1998) believe that training is the cornerstone of an effective prevention program and it requires a total commitment by the organization. Workplace violence training could save lives but less than 40% of the campuses have invested in this cornerstone. It may mean that administrators believe violence cannot happen at their campuses. This is reminiscent of Labig (1995) describing the natural response to a phenomenon that seems beyond one's ability to understand or control, the "it can't happen here" (p. 15) philosophy.

Comments by facilities directors provide insight into the differences: "While handling workplace violence is important, I would not think a campus wide committee is the answer." "I do not believe a distinct program is important because I believe all the essential elements of such a program should be inherent as a part of normal standards of conduct and personnel policies and procedures." "I feel there are already too many programs/policies dictated by liability lawyers, state and federal governments, and special interest groups. We do not need another one." These three facilities directors clearly do not believe a structured violence prevention and training program is needed. All three may be looking at existing programs to fulfill their needs. The first facilities director is referring to the Incident Management Team but may not understand its function, which is to review threats of violence and make recommendations, communicate the violence

prevention policy and procedure to employees, and establish the training. This individual is also at a small campus where a more informal program would be more appropriate. The second and third facilities directors do not want another program. They are more concerned with having another program, presumably because of the institutional cost.

There was an interesting response when respondents were asked about their employees carrying a weapon in the workplace. Over 52% of all the respondents indicated that it happens. But remember less than 40% have a workplace violence prevention program and less than 40% provide workplace violence training. Something is not right here. One facilities director wrote, "are trade tools considered weapons?" It is reasonable to assume that anything can be used as a weapon. The question should have been worded more specifically. It is possible that other administrators thought of tools as weapons. The researcher hopes that those responding were logical about what a weapon is. The same facilities director continued with, "When you think in terms of how many employers there are in the U.S. the amount of workplace violence is really insignificant in terms of production hours." A common misconception of workplace violence is that it only entails homicide, which is a small number in comparison to non-fatal incidents. Non-fatal workplace violence can be damaging over time with lawsuits, medical care, lost productivity, and the damaged lives of employees. The same facilities director also wrote, "Is an angry glance violent behavior? I judge it is not." Judging what constitutes an angry glance is difficult at best and most often it is not an act of violence. But such an event could be the start of cycle of violence. And this is what makes violence prevention and training programs

important in that employees learn to recognize what is and is not violence.

Personnel directors are in support of prevention and training. One wrote, "Although my institution does not have a formal policy in place we are currently working on that and it is a priority for us. Additionally, even in the absence of a policy we are training employees in this area." Another personnel director wrote:

We are in the process of submitting a draft of violence in the workplace policy and guidelines, also a domestic violence policy and procedures. This has taken a great deal of work with a focus committee of 31 representatives from throughout our 18 campuses. This evidently is a large campus that is just getting their workplace violence policy written and it is still in draft form. Another personnel director wrote, "This is an area where supervisory training is important. Supervisors should be trained on how to identify potential risk and how to respond." Clearly this supports the data that personnel directors view the need for prevention and training as more important than do facilities directors and chief business officers. A comment from a personnel director indicates her/his view; "We understand the need to try to prevent workplace violence and to respond appropriately when it happens."

Personnel directors do understand the importance of prevention and training but are they assuming the other administrators understand the importance as well? The following comment by a personnel director alludes to this: "I would anticipate that most of the answers to the questions are obvious in that they are extremely important. I will be curious to discover is that is not the case." Personnel directors need to educate the other administrators of the importance of prevention and

training. The issue for personnel directors is to get the other administrators to understand workplace violence and the need for prevention and training.

Demographics

The campus demographics of student enrollment and public or private campus and the personal demographic of age do have an impact on the differences. However, the personal demographic of gender was not significant and was not used.

There are differences between the larger and smaller campuses with regards to the need for prevention and training. The smaller campuses do not view prevention and training as important as the next larger campus and the importance increases at each succeeding larger campus size.

This view fits with comments by two facilities directors. One wrote, "Small, private institutions don't have sufficient time and resources to always do what could/should be done to address such issues as workplace violence." The other facilities director wrote, "In rural, northern state, while possibility of violence exists, the probability is very low; therefore, with extremely limited resources available, cost/benefit points us in other directions." The administrators of smaller and/or private campuses have identified four issues. First, these campuses do not have the time; second, they do not have the resources; third, they are not as likely to experience workplace violence; and fourth, campuses in rural areas do not experience workplace violence. It is evident from the comments that the size, type of campus (public/private), and location of a campus impacts the administrators' view of the importance of the need for prevention and training. The smaller campuses could be compensating in some other fashion for the lack of resources.

The age group for administrators at small campuses provides an indication of their view of the features of their institutional programs. Those in the age group 40 to 49 and 50 to 59 age group have a better view of the features of institutional programs than the over 60 and the under 39 age groups. And, the 40 to 49 and the 50 to 59 groups together make up the majority (91%) of all respondents at the two smallest campus-sized groups (under 11,999). However, the administrators at the smaller campus sized groups do not see the need for prevention and training as important as all the campuses with over 12,000 students. But this may help in understanding the alternative or non-formal prevention and training programs that the smaller schools are using.

These administrators in many cases wear more than one hat. The chief business officer at a smaller campus can be the finance, budget, and payroll manager and still have facilities, personnel, and other areas reporting to her/him. In this role the chief business officer is directly supervising more people and has more interactions with employees. This is also true of the roles of the facilities directors and personnel directors at smaller campuses. A fundamental of violence prevention is to create a work environment that encourages respect and deep interest in the wellness of all employees (Kelleher, 1996). This is very important for all campuses but even more important for campuses without the resources to establish a formal violence prevention and training program. According to Labig, (1995) a recommendation of the NWNL study is to foster a harmonious work environment. The attitude and demeanor of the chief business officer and the other two administrators can increase or decrease stress in the work environment. Administrators who understand workplace violence will work to provide a healthier work environment.

With the demographic of public or private campuses the public campuses see this as a greater need than do the private campuses. Again, this seems to follow the comments of the smaller campuses. APPA does not define a small campus, but those with less than 4,999 students enrolled are APPA's smallest category of campus size. Of the campuses responding, 178 (49.4%) had less than 4,999 students enrolled. Of these 81.9% are private.

A facilities director wrote, "As a small school we depend upon outside resources for such things as follow-up (i.e. EAP program, local police, etc.)." The small and/or private campuses indicate they do not have workplace violence experiences and they lack the resources for prevention and training programs. The small and/or private campuses put their resources into areas that they believe are more needy. The differences between public and private are more than likely an extension of the differences with size.

The attitude at private campuses is also very different. Many private campuses are also affiliated with a church. A chief business officer of a private campus wrote:

We are a (name of church) institution, which certainly does not mean we are not susceptible to violence, but does mean we have a somewhat different attitude on campus among employees, a civility, if you will, that many institutions enjoy to a lesser degree. Which means that we may be the headline tomorrow for a case of workplace violence!

The different attitude or civility would have an impact on the private campuses' needs for violence prevention and training. It is also a refreshing and a very realistic approach by a private campus to acknowledge their strength and their vulnerability.

Recommendations

Over 94.1% of respondents agreed that workplace violence is a serious concern and 80% indicate that workplace violence happens at their campus. But, only 39.9% indicated that their organization had a workplace violence prevention program and only 39.4% indicated they had training specifically for violence prevention. However, 88% of the respondents indicated that violence prevention programs are not effective. The colleges and universities strongly indicate four important factors: first, workplace violence is a serious concern; second, it happens on their campuses; third, less than 40% have workplace violence prevention and training programs; and four, most organizational prevention programs are not effective. There needs to be further study of this contradiction of concern and violence happening versus a lack of prevention and training programs and a belief that most organizational programs are not effective.

It is interesting that 33.1% indicated their employees are prepared for workplace violence and 72.8% indicated their employees are capable of dealing with workplace violence. The contradiction of not being prepared, yet being capable of dealing with workplace violence needs further study.

Small campus and private campus responses indicate that workplace violence is not as important when compared to larger campuses and public campuses. Generally, a private campus is a small campus. The implication hits the target when the comments of a small or private campus are examined, i.e. "Small private institutions don't have sufficient time and resources." Further study of what small and private campuses do to respond to workplace violence issues would be beneficial to all.

Finally, the researcher recently ran into an administrator from a private campus at a conference. This administrator had been sent a letter requesting participation in the survey but did not participate. No one from that particular campus participated. When the researcher mentioned this to the individual, the answer was an immediate, "of course not." The individual made it clear that his/her campus would not participate because of the potential of litigation regarding an incident of violence on campus. This issue of litigation and sharing of workplace violence information needs to be studied. There, potentially, is valuable information that could be of help to other campuses but is unavailable because of perceived threat of litigation.

Practical Recommendations

It is highly recommended that all campuses establish a violence prevention policy. It does not have to be a complex plan but it does need four ingredients. The policy should describe in simple terms what actions will not be tolerated, the disciplinary action that will be taken, what to report, and to whom to report it.

One can have a policy but not have a program because without training there is no program. It is recommended that campuses establish training for all employees. Again, this does not have to be extensive. Employees need to receive training that includes recognizing the signs of potentially aggressive behavior or violent behavior, what to report and to whom to report it. Management and supervisors need also to receive training to identify and intervene in potentially violent situations. Campuses that do not have the fiscal resources for training will need to use internal resources or what is available for training. The important issue here is to communicate information to employees. Employees want to do the right thing.

It is vital to a violence prevention program to have an Incident Management Team (IMT) or an entity that is trained to review alleged threats. In this process the IMT gathers the information, documents and analyzes it, and then makes a recommendation. The IMT is the one link between employees and the process. Whatever element is used, be it a team or a single entity, each campus can adapt and mold the violence prevention program around their particular situation, especially using their resources.

Lastly, strive to provide a supportive and harmonious work environment. Administrators, managers, and supervisors must communicate with all employees and encourage employees to communicate back. And remember that individuals under continued stress could over time evolve into performing increasingly violent acts. Keep in mind that violence prevention is simply a process of recognizing potentially violent situations and then intervening humanely before the situation erupts into violence. An effort by the personnel directors could help to increase the awareness of the other administrators about workplace violence and the need for prevention and training.

Current Status

Tragically, workplace homicide continues to happen. On December 26th 2000, Michael McDermott walked into the company headquarters of Edgewater Technology in Wakefield, Massachusetts. Heavily armed, his first victim was a vice president of human resources. When his spree was over he had killed seven co-workers (Colton & Schabner, 2000). On February 5th 2001, William Baker walked into the International Truck and Engine Corporation in Meltrose Park, Illinois. Baker had been fired from his job at this factory in 1994 for stealing. Heavily armed, Baker shot eight workers, killing four before killing himself (Carrera, 2001).

According to researchers at Texas A&M University, Corpus Christi, over 110,000 incidents of workplace violence were reported in the U.S. in 1998, 750 led to death and cost employers \$4.2 billion (Bourg, 2000). Dr. Theodore Feldmann of the University of Louisville School of Medicine indicates that warning signs are apparent in two-thirds of workplace violence incidents (Bourg, 2000). The brother of a man killed by William Baker said, "You never think it will happen to you" (Carrera, 2001, p. 1). Workplace violence is still not understood.

The object of a prevention and training program is to make employees aware of the warning signs and to report threats or potential incidents of violence. Employees need to be aware that the objective is to get troubled employees help either from internal sources or external mental health professionals. Hopefully, this help will save lives and get a troubled employee through the stress she/he is going through. The goal of all employers and employees is to create and maintain a harmonious and civil working environment.

Bibliography

Adams, G. (1964). Measurement and evaluation in education psychology and guidance. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Aiken, L. (1991). Psychological testing and assessment (7th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Bachman, R. (1994). Violence and theft in the workplace. In: U.S. department of justice crime data brief. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, NCJ-148199.

Baldrige, J., & Julius, D. (1998). Crisis management resulting from violence on campus: Will the same common mistakes be made? In A. M. Hoffman, J. H. Schuh, & R. H. Fenske, (Eds.). Violence on campus, (p. 229). Gaithersburg, MD: Aspen.

Barling, J. (1996). The prediction, experience, and consequences of workplace violence. In E. Bulato & G. VandenBos, (Eds.). Violence on the job: Identifying risks and developing solutions. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Baron, S. (1993). Violence in the workplace: A prevention and management guide for business, (p. 1). Ventura, CA: Pathfinder.

Bourg, J. Watching for warning signs. ABCNEWS.com. [on-line]. Available:
<http://abcnews.go.com/sections/us/DailyNews/shooting010206.html> (Dec. 2000).

Boyer, E. (1989). Facilities and the academic mission. Facilities management: A manual for plant administration, (pp. xvi, xvii). Alexandria, VA: APPA

Braverman, M., Castrey, B. P., Denenberg, R. V., & Denenberg, T. S. (1998). Preventing violence in the workplace, (pp. 4, 5). Paper presented at the National Labor-Management Conference, Chicago, IL.

Broderick, R. Breaking Point: Violence in the Workplace, [On-line] (p. 1). Available: <http://www.minicava.umn.edu/wvart.htm> (Feb. 2000).

Brown, C. (2000). Two uw doctors killed in shooting. Seattle Times, [On-line], Available:

http://seattletimes.nwsourc.com/news/local/html98/shot29m_20000629.htm

1

Bulatao, E., & VandenBos, G. (1995). Workplace violence: It's scope and the issues. In G. VandenBos, & E.

Bulato, (Eds.). Violence on the job: Identifying risks and developing solutions. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Bureau of Justice Statistics, U.S. Department of Justice. (1994). Criminal victimization in the United States, 1992. In: National crime victimization survey report. Washington, DC: Author, NCJ-145125.

Burns, P. (1995). Multiple victims multiple causes, (p. 61). Tulsa, OK: SyTech Research.

Bush, D. & O'Shea, P. (1996). Workplace violence: Comparative use of prevention practices and policies. In E. Bulatao & G. Vandenbos, (Eds.) Violence on the job: Identifying and developing solutions, (p. 292). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Capozzoli, T. & McVey, R. (1996). Managing violence in the Workplace, (pp. ix, x). Delray Beach, FL: St. Lucie.

Carll, E. (1999). Violence in our lives, (pp. 7, 8). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Carrera, S. We just ran. ABCNEWS.com, p. 1 [on-line]. Available: http://abcnews.go.com/sectio...News/sorkplaceviolence_experts001227.html (Feb. 2001).

Castrey, B. P., Denenberg, T. S., Greenbaum, M. L., & Lenssen, J. (1998). Preventing workplace violence in public schools, a collaborative approach. Paper presented at the meeting of the Society of Professionals in Dispute Resolution, Portland, OR.

Colton, A. & Schabner, D. ABCNEWS.com. [on-line]. Available: <http://abcnews.go.com/sections/us/DailyNews/shootin001227.html> (Dec. 2000).

Costello, D. (2001). Incidents of desk rage disrupt America's offices. The Wall Street Journal, B1.

Davis, D. (1997). Threats pending fuses burning, (pp. 7, 22, 91, 92). Palo Alto, CA: Davis-Black.

Ellerbrock, S., & Stevens, B. (1995). Crisis intervention: An opportunity to change, (p. 34). Greensboro, NC: Clearinghouse on Counseling and Student Services. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 405 535).

Flannery, R. (1995). Violence in the workplace, (p. 28). New York, NY: Crossroads.

Free On-Line Dictionary Of Computing (2000). Computing Dictionary. [On-line] Available:
<http://foldoc.doc.ic.ac.uk/foldoc/index.html>

Fossey, R. & Smith, M. (1996). Editors' notes. In R. Fossey & M. Smith, (Eds). An administrator's guide for responding to campus crime: From prevention to liability, (p. 2). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Greenbaum, M. L., Castrey, B. P., Denenberg, T. S., & Lenssen, J. Preventing workplace violence in the public schools. Paper presented at the Society of Professionals in Dispute Resolution Conference, 1998, Portland Oregon.

Hartle, T. (2001). Toward a better law on campus crime. Chronicle of Higher Education. [On-line], (pp. 1, 2). Available:
<http://chronicle.com/weekly/v47/i18/18601001.htm>

Herzberger, S. (1993). The cyclical pattern of child abuse. In R. M. Lee & C. M. Renzetti (Eds.), Researching sensitive topics (p. 34). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Heskett, S. (1996). Workplace violence: Before, during, and after. Boston, MA: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Hinkle, D., Wiersma, W., & Jurs, S. (1994). Applied statistics for behavioral sciences. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Hoffman, A., Summers, R., & Schoenwald, I., (1998). Violent crime in the college and university workplace. In A. M. Hoffman, J. H. Schuh, & R. H. Fenske, (Eds.). Violence on campus, (p. 87). Gaithersburg, MD: Aspen.

HR Executive Editorial Survey. (2000). Violence in the workplace [On-line]. Available:
<http://ercdataplus.com/hrexecutive/results/jan2000/page3.htm>

Hymowitz, C., & Silverman, R. (2001). Can workplace stress get worse? The Wall Street Journal, p. B1.

Ikenberry, S. (1998). Foreword. In A. M. Hoffman, J. H. Schuh, & R. H. Fenske (Eds.). Violence on campus, (p. xv). Gaithersburg, MD: Aspen.

Isaac, S. & Michaels, W. (1981). Handbook in research and evaluation, (p. 166). San Diego, CA: Edits

Jamieson, R. & Schubert, R. (2000). 2 die in uw school shooting. Seattle Post [On-line]. Available: <http://seattle-i.swsourc.com/local/pathweb.shtml>

Jenkins, E. (1998). Violence in the workplace: Scope of the problem and risk factors. In C. Wilkinson (Ed.). Violence in the workplace, (p. 2). Rockville, MD: Government Institutes.

Kansas State University Policies and Procedures (2000). Workplace violence policy chapter 4060, [On-line]. Available:
<http://www.ksu.edu/policies/ppm/4060.html>

Kaufer, S., & Mattman, J. (1998). Workplace violence: An employer's guide, [On-line]. Available:
http://noworkviolence.com/articles/employers_guide.htm

- Kelleher, M. (1996). New arenas for violence: Homicide in the American workplace, (pp. 30, 51). Westport, CN: Praeger.
- Kelleher, M. (1997). Profiling the lethal employee: Case studies of violence in the workplace, (pp. 72, 73, 120). Westport, CN: Praeger.
- Kinney, J. (1995). Violence at work, (p. 51). Englewood, CA: Prentice Hall.
- Labig, C. (1995). Preventing violence in the workplace, (pp. 15, 111). New York, NY: AMACOM.
- Lee, R. & Renzetti, C. (1993). The problems of researching sensitive topics. In R. M. Lee & C. M. Renzetti (Eds.), Researching sensitive topics (pp. 3-5). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Lily, K. (1997) Many campus murders involve neither students nor professors, [On-line]. Available: <http://chronicle.com/data/articles.dir/art-43.dir/issue-28.dir/28a04601.htm>
- McClure, L. (1996). Risky business: Managing employee violence in the workplace. (pp. 111, 112, 184). Binghamton, NY: Haworth Press.
- Mergner, J. (1989). Overview of plant operations. Facilities management: A manual for plant administration. Alexandria, VA: Association of Physical Plant Administrators of University and Colleges.
- Minor, M. (1995). Preventing workplace violence: Positive management strategies. Menlo Park, CA: Crisp.
- Monaohan, J. (1981). Predicting violent behavior: An Assessment of clinical techniques, (p. 19). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Nicklin, J. (2001). U.S. report shows rise in campus crime; Experts question data. The Chronicle of Higher Education, [On-line]. Available: <http://chronicle.com/daily/2001/01/2001012202n.htm>

Nicklin, J. (2000). Inconsistencies mar web site on campus crime. The Chronicle of Higher Education, (p.1) [On-line] Available:

<http://chronicle.com/weekly/v47/i14/14a04501.htm>

Nicoletti, J., & Spooner, K. (1996). Violence in the workplace: Response and intervention strategies. In E. Bulatao, & G. VandenBos (Eds.). Violence on the job, (pp. 267-282). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Railsback, B. L. (1997). Perceptions held by Kansas high school guidance counselors and principals and local board of education presidents regarding the value of business education courses in the high school curriculum. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Kansas State University, Manhattan.

Ratelle, L. (1994). Shapeup at Canadian university. The Chronicle of Higher Education, (p. 1), [On-line]. Available

<http://chronicle.com/search97cgi/s97-cgi?...esc&ViewTemplate=ArchiveView%Fnew%2Ehts&>

Russell, R., and Pater, R. (1998). Training employees and managers in violence prevention. In C. Wilkinson (Ed). Violence in the workplace, (pp. 71-94). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Schuh, J. (1998). Campus vulnerability. In A. M. Hoffman, J. H. Schuh, & R. H. Fenske (Eds.). Violence on campus, (pp. 17, 19, 22). Gaithersburg, MD: Aspen.

Sieber, J. (1993). Ethics and politics. In R. M. Lee & C. M. Renzetti (Eds.), Researching sensitive topics (pp. 27-28). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Shah, A., & Callahan, P. (1995). Suspect in NU professor's shooting kills himself, [On-line]. Available:

<http://sound.media.mit.edu/dpwe-bin/mhmessage.cgi/AUDITORY/postings/1995/17>

Slaney, M. (1995). Mario Ruggero. Auditory, [On-line] Available:
[http://sound.media.mit.edu/dpwe-
bin/mhmessage.cgi/AUDITORY/postings/1995/17](http://sound.media.mit.edu/dpwe-bin/mhmessage.cgi/AUDITORY/postings/1995/17)

Soukhanov, A. (Ed.) (1984). Webster's II new riverside university dictionary. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Sullivan, Joann. Workplace Violence Survey and White Paper, [On-line]. Available: <http://www.rims.org/govt/work.shtml> (Dec. 1999).

Tardiff, K., (1998). The potential for violence among employees with psychic disorders. In Wilkinson, C. (ed.). Violence in the workplace. Rockville, MD: Government Institutes.

Toscano, G., & Weber, W. (1995). Violence in the workplace. Compensation and working conditions. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

White, T. (1996) Research, practice, and legal issues. In E. Bulato & G. Vandebos (Eds.). Violence on the job, (p. 88). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Wilkinson, C. (Ed). (1998). Violence in the workplace, (pp. xxvii, 59, 72). Rockville, MD: Government Institutes.

Wolf, K. (1998). Implementing a workplace violence prevention and threat management system. In C. Wilkinson, (Ed.). Violence in the workplace, (pp. 2, 64). Rockville, MD: Government Institute.

Appendix A

Letter

Address

Date

I am a doctoral student at Kansas State University. Your school is one of 400 randomly selected for my survey project "Workplace Violence on Campus." This letter is intended for each of the three individuals directly responsible for: Administration & Finance/Business Affairs, Physical Plant/Facilities Management, and Personnel/Human Resources at your school. Workplace violence is a hot topic and this survey's data could help better understand it.

There will be strict confidentiality and anonymity. Data will be presented in an aggregate manner and there will be no reference to personal identities in any written reports. Participation is voluntary and you can withdraw from this study at any time. It takes about 15 minutes to complete.

The e-mail survey is accessed at <http://www.ksu.edu/facilities> the password is _____ and your verification number is _____. When you have completed the survey simply hit the submit button.

Please complete and submit by _____, 2000. If you would like a summary of the completed project findings just indicate yes in the appropriate response box.

Thank you for your help.

Edward Rice
Associate Vice President
Division of Facilities
Kansas State University

Questions about the study or the manner in which it is conducted should

be directed to:

Dr. W. Franklin Spikes, Professor (785) 532-5873
Department of Foundations and Adult Education
351 Bluemont Hall
1100 Mid-Campus Drive
Manhattan, KS 66506-5305

Questions regarding the rights of human subjects should be directed to:
Clive Fullagar, Chair (785) 532-3224
Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects
1 Fairchild Hall, Manhattan, KS 66506

Appendix B

Survey Instrument

Workplace Violence on Campus e-mail Survey

Verification Number

Choose a response that best describes your understanding of the following statements.

Part I: Workplace Violence Issues

A. Definitions

- 1) Workplace violence includes: threats (letters, faxes, verbal), vandalism, personal conflict (fighting co-workers, punching supervisors, assaults, shootings, stabbings, romantic obsessions with co-workers), family conflict (husband arrives at work and attacks his wife and possibly co-workers), hostage taking, suicide, and homicide.
 Agree Strongly
 Agree
 Disagree
 Disagree Strongly
 Don't Know
- 2) Workplace violence can be defined as acts ranging from the use of offensive language to homicide.
 Agree Strongly
 Agree
 Disagree
 Disagree Strongly
 Don't Know
- 3) Sexual harassment is a part of workplace violence.
 Agree Strongly
 Agree
 Disagree
 Disagree Strongly
 Don't Know
- 4) Work environment factors to take into consideration after workplace

violence occurs include: general working conditions, uncaring management, ineffective training, and inadequate communications.

- Agree Strongly
- Agree
- Disagree
- Disagree Strongly
- Don't Know

B. Choose a response that best describes your understanding of the following statements.

- 5) Workplace violence is a serious concern.
 - Agree Strongly
 - Agree
 - Disagree
 - Disagree Strongly
 - Don't Know
- 6) Most organizations in the U.S. today do not have an effective workplace violence program.
 - Agree Strongly
 - Agree
 - Disagree
 - Disagree Strongly
 - Don't Know
- 7) Workplace violence does not happen in our organization.
 - Agree Strongly
 - Agree
 - Disagree
 - Disagree Strongly
 - Don't Know
- 8) Our employees incapable of dealing with workplace violence incidents.
 - Agree Strongly
 - Agree
 - Disagree
 - Disagree Strongly
 - Don't Know
- 9) A customer can be the cause of workplace violence.
 - Agree Strongly
 - Agree
 - Disagree
 - Disagree Strongly
 - Don't Know
- 10) The workplace is anywhere an employee is working or on duty.
 - Agree Strongly
 - Agree
 - Disagree
 - Disagree Strongly
 - Don't Know
- 11) Employees of our organization are prepared for workplace violence.
 - Agree Strongly
 - Agree
 - Disagree
 - Disagree Strongly
 - Don't Know
- 12) Our organization has a workplace violence prevention program.
 - Agree Strongly

- Agree
 - Disagree
 - Disagree Strongly
 - Don't Know
- 13) Our organization has a crisis management program in place.
- Agree Strongly
 - Agree
 - Disagree
 - Disagree Strongly
 - Don't Know
- 14) Much of the frustration and anger exhibited by potentially violent employees may be attributed to work environment factors.
- Agree Strongly
 - Agree
 - Disagree
 - Disagree Strongly
 - Don't Know
- 15) An employee carrying weapons in the workplace does not happen in our organization.
- Agree Strongly
 - Agree
 - Disagree
 - Disagree Strongly
 - Don't Know
- 16) Profiles of age, gender, and race can be used to identify violent individuals.
- Agree Strongly
 - Agree
 - Disagree
 - Disagree Strongly
 - Don't Know
- 17) A workplace violence prevention program is not important.
- Agree Strongly
 - Agree
 - Disagree
 - Disagree Strongly
 - Don't Know
- 18) Assailants never give clear warning signals before violence erupts.
- Agree Strongly
 - Agree
 - Disagree
 - Disagree Strongly
 - Don't Know
- 19) Our employees do not take threats seriously.
- Agree Strongly
 - Agree
 - Disagree
 - Disagree Strongly
 - Don't Know
- 20) An employee's behavior can be a warning sign that there is a potential for violence.
- Agree Strongly
 - Agree
 - Disagree
 - Disagree Strongly
 - Don't Know

- 21) Over time a person can become violent due the environment they work in.
- Agree Strongly
 - Agree
 - Disagree
 - Disagree Strongly
 - Don't Know
- 22) A mental and behavioral cycle of violence begins when an individual encounters an event that he/she experiences as stressful.
- Agree Strongly
 - Agree
 - Disagree
 - Disagree Strongly
 - Don't Know
- 23) An individual's reaction to a stressful event is determined by his/her thoughts at that moment.
- Agree Strongly
 - Agree
 - Disagree
 - Disagree Strongly
 - Don't Know
- 24) In reference to the previous question, these thoughts lead to emotional responses, which in turn determine the behavior that the individual will use to respond to the situation.
- Agree Strongly
 - Agree
 - Disagree
 - Disagree Strongly
 - Don't Know
- 25) A person can become stressed by what they experience and reach a point where they believe that violence is the only answer.
- Agree Strongly
 - Agree
 - Disagree
 - Disagree Strongly
 - Don't Know
- 26) The responses of those around a person in the cycle of violence cannot de-escalate the chance of violence.
- Agree Strongly
 - Agree
 - Disagree
 - Disagree Strongly
 - Don't Know
- 27) Our organization provides training that deals with preventing workplace violence.
- Agree Strongly
 - Agree
 - Disagree
 - Disagree Strongly
 - Don't Know
- 28) By understanding the cycle of violence it is possible to identify characteristics, emotional responses, and ways of thinking that make a person more likely to use violence when under severe stress.
- Agree Strongly
 - Agree
 - Disagree

- Disagree Strongly
 - Don't Know
- 29) Employees cannot be trained to identify warning signs that indicate a potential for violence.
- Agree Strongly
 - Agree
 - Disagree
 - Disagree Strongly
 - Don't Know

Part II: The Need For Workplace Violence Prevention

Choose a response that best describes your organizational needs.

- 30) A Violence Prevention Policy.
- Extremely Important
 - Very Important
 - Important
 - Somewhat Important
 - Not Important
- 31) The consequences of violating the Violence Prevention Policy.
- Extremely Important
 - Very Important
 - Important
 - Somewhat Important
 - Not Important
- 32) Defining unacceptable workplace behaviors.
- Extremely Important
 - Very Important
 - Important
 - Somewhat Important
 - Not Important
- 33) Procedures describing how, and by whom, employees and supervisors can report threats, intimidating and violent incidents.
- Extremely Important
 - Very Important
 - Important
 - Somewhat Important
 - Not Important
- 34) Procedures describing how, and by whom, threats and violent acts will be investigated.
- Extremely Important
 - Very Important
 - Important
 - Somewhat Important
 - Not Important
- 35) Implementing strategies to protect threatened employees and assets.
- Extremely Important
 - Very Important
 - Important
 - Somewhat Important
 - Not Important
- 36) Establishing a team responsible for managing the Workplace Violence Prevention Program.
- Extremely Important
 - Very Important
 - Important

- Somewhat Important
- Not Important
- 37) Post-incident activities to reduce the impact of trauma in employees and the organization after a violent act has occurred.
 - Extremely Important
 - Very Important
 - Important
 - Somewhat Important
 - Not Important
- 38) Workplace violence prevention training for all employees.
 - Extremely Important
 - Very Important
 - Important
 - Somewhat Important
 - Not Important
- 39) Defining audiences for violence prevention awareness training.
 - Extremely Important
 - Very Important
 - Important
 - Somewhat Important
 - Not Important
- 40) Identifying internal and external resources to assist in management of threatening situations.
 - Extremely Important
 - Very Important
 - Important
 - Somewhat Important
 - Not Important

Part III: The Need for Workplace Violence Training

Choose a response that best describes your organizational needs.

- 41) Recognition of early warning signs.
 - Essential
 - Very Important
 - Important
 - Somewhat Important
 - Not Important
- 42) Emergency response procedures.
 - Essential
 - Very Important
 - Important
 - Somewhat Important
 - Not Important
- 43) Reporting and documenting violent incidents.
 - Essential
 - Very Important
 - Important
 - Somewhat Important
 - Not Important
- 44) Negotiation skills.
 - Essential
 - Very Important
 - Important
 - Somewhat Important
 - Not Important
- 45) Understanding of what workplace violence consists.

- Essential
 - Very Important
 - Important
 - Somewhat Important
 - Not Important
- 46) Understanding the need for allocating resources to support a workplace violence program.
- Essential
 - Very Important
 - Important
 - Somewhat Important
 - Not Important
- 47) Understanding what litigation the organization can be exposed to when there is workplace violence.
- Essential
 - Very Important
 - Important
 - Somewhat Important
 - Not Important
- 48) Employees understanding how to reopen when workplace violence occurs.
- Essential
 - Very Important
 - Important
 - Somewhat Important
 - Not Important
- 49) The need for top administration to endorse the workplace violence program.
- Essential
 - Very Important
 - Important
 - Somewhat Important
 - Not Important
- 50) Empowering a team to be responsible for managing the workplace violence prevention program.
- Essential
 - Very Important
 - Important
 - Somewhat Important
 - Not Important
- 51) How to investigate and verify the reported threats.
- Essential
 - Very Important
 - Important
 - Somewhat Important
 - Not Important
- 52) How to assess the context in which the threat occurred.
- Essential
 - Very Important
 - Important
 - Somewhat Important
 - Not Important
- 53) How to develop appropriate organizational response options given the level of risk.
- Essential
 - Very Important
 - Important

- Somewhat Important
Not Important
- 54) How to document organizational activities to demonstrate that reasonable actions were taken given the level of risk.
- Essential
Very Important
Important
Somewhat Important
Not Important
- 55) Interviewing techniques for investigation of threats.
- Essential
Very Important
Important
Somewhat Important
Not Important
- 56) Awareness of one's safety during the investigation process.
- Essential
Very Important
Important
Somewhat Important
Not Important
- 57) Workplace violence prevention policy information.
- Essential
Very Important
Important
Somewhat Important
Not Important
- 58) General responsibilities of supervising employees.
- Essential
Very Important
Important
Somewhat Important
Not Important
- 59) Supervisor accountability for behavior and conduct.
- Essential
Very Important
Important
Somewhat Important
Not Important
- 60) What responsibility employees have to ensure safe work practices by reporting any violations of the organization's policies.
- Essential
Very Important
Important
Somewhat Important
Not Important

Demographic Questions: Please select the best choice.

- 61) What is your position title?
- Facilities Director
Chief Business Officer
Personnel Director
- 62) How many students are enrolled in your school?
- less than 4,999
5000-11,999
12,000-19,999

- 20,000 and over
- 63) Gender:
 - Male
 - Female
- 64) Age:
 - Under 29
 - 30-39
 - 40-49
 - 50-59
 - Over 60
- 65) Is the institution you work for public or private?
 - Public
 - Private
- 66) Any comments?

- 67) Would you like a summary of the findings of the completed project?
 - Yes
 - No

Appendix C

Unsolicited Comments

Unsolicited Comments

Too Busy

Chief Business Officer: Sorry, I don't have time to answer 65 questions.

Chief Business Officer: As it happens, I am no longer in one of the positions you are studying.

Chief Business Officer: The task has been assigned to _____.

Chief Business Officer: I'll forward this request to the two of you for a possible response to this student, since the two of you deal with public relations and statistics on campus crime.

Chief Business Officer: I have forwarded your request to our Director of Public Safety who is in better position to respond to your request.

Chief Business Officer: I have forwarded this to our safety director.

Chief Business Officer: I forwarded this to our VP for HR and our Chief of Campus Police. I do not

have access to this information.

Facilities Director: I will ask one of my associates to help. I simply cannot possibly work this into my schedule until the first week in December if then. It is a busy time.

Facilities Director: We got it under control.

Personnel Director: I am sorry but I do not have the time to assist you.

Personnel Director: The Human Resources Services Office at (name of university) is in receipt of a letter you sent in regard to a survey. The survey instrument itself is not available. I have just started employment as the HR director and do not have the background nor unfortunately the time to assist your institution in this survey at the current time.

It seems evident that these comments are excuses. Some of these individuals did not bother to read the letter or examine the questionnaire. What is interesting is that even they responded with comments. If they had received a snail mail letter it is doubtful they would have telephoned or written a letter. For some reason they could not resist double clicking the researcher's e-mail address and typing a few words.

Will Get Back

Chief Business Officer: Just to let you know we plan to complete your survey.

This individual did complete and submit the questionnaire.

Facilities Director: I am trying to get to this as soon as I can.

This individual did complete and submit the questionnaire.

Personnel Director: I had understood from your original message that the information did not need to be submitted until November 30, and I plan to respond by that date. If your deadline has changed, please let me know. Otherwise, it's not necessary to spend your time sending me follow-up.

This individual did not submit a questionnaire.

Chief Business Officer: We will be coordinating with those directly responsible for HR, Finance, Facilities Management and University Police and completing the on-line survey by the Nov 30th deadline.

This individual did not submit the questionnaire.

Problems

Facilities Director: I am presently unable to check my e-mail with customary frequency due to computer problems. I will be checking messages several times a week from alternate locations until my computer can be repaired or replaced.

This individual did complete and submit the questionnaire.

Personnel Director: When I attempt to open the page, I receive error message and a "do you want to de-bug This page" message. I am afraid to open it, since it looks like it contains a virus.

Chief Business Officer: I have tried to respond to your website: too slow; locked up; finally did get into the survey, and complete down to number 8 but screen wouldn't scroll down any further.

Chief Business Officer: The Java Script asked for a

password. I had none.

Facilities Director: the system does not accept the password.

Personnel Director: Sorry I can not open the document.

Facilities Director: I tried to access the survey last week and was not able. Would you fax it or e-mail it.

Chief Business Officer: Won't work, response invalid Password.

Facilities Director: Unfortunately I do not have a Password.

Chief Business Officer: Sorry, but the password doesn't seem to work...

Chief Business Officer: I have tried twice but the password won't work.

Personnel Director: When I accessed your web site, I was asked for a JAVA script password. I don't have one, so I received an error message. Please advise.

Personnel Director: My password will not work. I have tried it several times.

Personnel Director: We have made several attempts to access the web site. Our browser says the site does not exist.

Chief Business Officer: I am happy to complete your survey, but the password won't let me on to do it.

A computer expert was consulted about these problems. The diagnosis was that the individuals responding had old software that would not interface with the researchers' software program. All of these individuals were contacted by e-mail asking if they would agree to receive the questionnaire by fax and then fax the answers back. Three

of the individuals agreed to do this but only two completed and submitted the questionnaire.

Appendix D

Survey Comments

Survey Comments

Workplace Violence Prevention and Training

Facilities Director. Most violence/threats/related issues arising with the Facilities crews are brought about by employees bringing personal problems and relationships to work. While handling workplace violence is important, I would not think a campus wide committee is the answer.

Personnel Director. We are in the process of submitting a draft of violence in the workplace policy and guidelines, also a domestic violence policy and procedures. This has taken a great deal of work with a focus committee of 31 representatives from throughout our 18 campuses.

Personnel Director. The governor of the State of _____ has issued an Executive Order for zero tolerance of workplace violence. All human resource professionals have been trained.

Facilities Director. Best of luck in your research. In many cases we provide detailed training at our Hospital operation but not much on the core/Academic campus.

Personnel Director. This is an area where supervisory training is important. Supervisors should be trained

on how to identify potential risk and how to respond. General orientation for all other employees is in helping the organization identify crisis situations and to make them understand that the organization cares about its employees' safety and will respond appropriately if necessary. Usually sufficient.

Facilities Director. I do not believe a distinct program is important because I believe all the essential elements of such a program should be inherent as a part of normal standards of conduct and personnel policies and procedures.

Facilities Director. Your survey did not ask question related to and employees out of work situations that lead to mind sets and stress. This factor I think is very important in assessing the potential volatility of employees responses to work situations.

Personnel Director. I would anticipate that most of the answers to the questions are obvious in that they are extremely important. I will be curious to discover is that is not the case.

Personnel Director. Although my institution does not have a formal policy in place we are currently working on that and it is a priority for us. Additionally, even in the absence of a policy we are training employees in this area.

Facilities Director. The threats of violence that have occurred at this institution have all been job performance related.

Facilities Director. I really dislike multiple choice

surveys that use words like "can, possibly, etc."

Also, are trade tools considered weapons? When you think in terms of how many employers there are in the U.S. the amount of workplace violence is really insignificant in terms of production hours. Of course it depends on how you define violence. Is an angry glance violent behavior? I judge it is not. The whole survey ignores the fact that there are inherent risk in everyday life and an employee has some responsibility for his/her own safety. Once an organization institutes a policy or program they are assuming responsibility for all actions of all employees. I feel there are already too many programs/policies dictated by liability lawyers, state and federal governments, and special interest groups. We do not need another one.

Facilities Director. Some of the questions required black and white responses where as the actual answer is more complicated. There are laws that deal with the conveyance of a threat and these must be factored into any response to aggression or threats.

Facilities Director. The problem with workplace violence is no different than the problem with any issue. That being the willingness of people to come forward and have the courage to share their concerns with others in the workplace who could possibly react to the problem. Unfortunately, workplace problems are not usually addressed until they are at the disaster level.

Facilities Director. Our Police department has a program for violence in the workplace, but we have not taken it deeply enough into our organization yet. Good luck.

Facilities Director. In my opinion we must implement zero tolerance policy and punish those who go against it severely.

Facilities Director. In rural, northern state, while possibility of violence exists, the probability is very low; therefore, with extremely limited resources available, cost/benefit points us in other directions.

Personnel Director. We have policy pending, have a Threat Management Team consisting of HR, EAP, sometimes Forensics rep, and those affected to strategize around the alleged threats. This has been well used and has been in place for 4 years.

Personnel Director. Our policy is a draft that has been submitted to executive management for approval.

Facilities Director. This is an extremely important matter that demands everyone's attention and involvement.

Personnel Director. As an organization we have been very fortunate.

Facilities Director. Not having experienced any incidents of workplace violence at my campus tends to make my response more moderate than that from a person who has gone through such an experience.

Chief Business Officer. In looking at workplace violence, location of work site may be a factor.

Personnel Director. We began the academic year with the murder of a faculty member by a student, who then committed suicide. We understand the need to try to prevent workplace violence and to respond appropriately when it happens.

Facilities Director. My specific situation often did not match choices. We have a program. It is about 30% implemented. Our workplace is generally nonviolent.

Chief Business Officer. In most cases I found that none of the responses provided were in fact representative of my feelings. Use of "could be" "might be" "would never" and phrases that either indicate something could never be the case, or would always be the case, was indeed frustrating to me. I cannot imagine you will be able to get anything useful from this survey (other than perhaps address your preconceived beliefs). This is my opinion, but based on various degrees in Mathematics and Statistics, with a focus on survey research.

Small or Private Campuses (Small and Private = S & P)

Chief Business Officer (S & P). My responses have been made in the context of what else is important at my institution. I believe we have a relatively peaceful workplace.

Facilities Director. Violators need to be held accountable for their actions, not treated as victims of society.

Facilities Director (S & P). Small, private institutions don't have sufficient time and resources to always do what could/should be done to address such issues as workplace violence.

Facilities Director (S & P). Some of this varies in importance if you have good local resources outside of the institution that you can call upon. Therefore my response varied some. As a small school we depend upon outside resources for such things as follow-up (i.e. EAP program, local police, etc.).

Chief Business Officer (S & P). We are a (name of church) institution, which certainly does not mean we are not susceptible to violence, but does mean we have a somewhat different attitude on campus among employees, a civility, if you will, that many institutions enjoy to a lesser degree. Which means that we may be the headline tomorrow for a case of workplace violence!

Chief Business Officer. I think you would better to survey our public safety director and our personnel director and delete the director of the physical plant. Public safety doesn't report to him.

Facilities Director. In addition to directing the physical plant, I am also the director of public safety with 31 years of experience.

Chief Business Officer. Fortunately, we are in an area that does not have a high incident of workplace violence but we do have policies in place if it does occur.

Personnel Director (S & P). I'm not sure all these questions are applicable to us.

Facilities Director (S & P). Your questions seem skewed toward the conclusion that workplace violence is a big problem. This is not my opinion.

Chief Business Officer (S & P). We have not experienced any serious violence, thus I have not first-hand knowledge of issues.

Personnel Director (S & P). Verbal confrontation between employees has a potential to become violent if in the wrong context but is not violence in itself. Supervisor training, not all employees, needs to include managing stress and emotion of a variety of kinds among employees or how to call in help. Threats and violence are on a list of unacceptable employee behaviors that include theft, harassment, etc.

Personnel Director (S & P). Director of Public Safety and Director of Human Resources is actively working on a policy and education training program.

Facilities Director (S & P). Not having experienced any incidents of workplace violence at my campus tends to make my responses more moderate than that from a person who has gone through such experience.

Personnel Director (S & P). It is my understanding That employers have an obligation to publish such a policy and an inherent responsibility to provide an environment free of such problems.

Facilities Director. I would have liked to have a space at the end of each question to put comments.

Sexual Harassment

Chief Business Officer. Question regarding sexual harassment is very confusing. Sexual harassment covers many different activities. Some are violent and some are not.

Personnel Director. It is misleading and counter productive to include something like sexual harassment in the definition of workplace violence as it clouds both problems.

Miscellaneous

Personnel Director (S & P). Wish you the best in your pursuit of your degree.

Personnel Director (S & P). This is a great way to do a survey!

Personnel Director (S & P). Good luck with your data! I hope you get adequate response. I am a doctoral student too, so I feel your "pain."

Facilities Director. Good Luck "Doctor."

Personnel Director. My answers to 23 & 24 reflect my belief the person may not be thinking, only feeling and acting.

Facilities Director. Thanks for allowing me to be a part of this survey.

Facilities Director. I would have liked to have a space at the end of each question to put comments.

Facilities Director. The questions seem to be written by someone who has not worked in a management role

with numerous employees.

Personnel Director (S & P). Hello & thanks for including us in your inquiry. As it happens, I am conducting a similar project for my master's thesis. With your permission, I may wish to contact you later with questions on your conclusions, etc.

Personnel Director (S & P). If I had an option of providing some narrative on some questions, I think the responses would have been more meaningful.

Appendix E

Frequency Distribution

Frequencies Distributions

1. Workplace Violence (WV) Includes

2. WV Defined

Disagree	1.1
----------	-----

Strongly Disagree	19.0
Agree	41.1
Agree Strongly	38.8
N	353

Disagree	2.2
Agree	32.4
Agree Strongly	65.4
N	358

3. Sexual Harassment

Disagree Strongly	3.2
Disagree	30.7
Agree	44.9
Agree Strongly	21.2
N	345

4. Environmental Factors

Disagree Strongly	0.6
Disagree	8.0
Agree	55.6
Agree Strongly	35.8
N	349

5. WV is a serious concern

Disagree	5.9
Agree	40.6
Agree Strongly	53.5
N	357

6. No effective WV program

Disagree Strongly	0.7
Disagree	11.3
Agree	64.2
Agree Strongly	23.8
N	282

7. WV does not happen

Disagree	13.5
Strongly	
Disagree	66.5
Agree	18.1
Agree	2.0
Strongly	
N	349

8. Employees cannot deal with WV

Disagree	7.3
Strongly	
Disagree	65.5
Agree	25.8
Agree	1.5
Strongly	
N	330

9. Customers can cause WV

Disagree	0.3
Strongly	
Disagree	1.7
Agree	64.5
Agree	33.5
Strongly	
N	355

10. Workplace is anywhere an employee is working

Disagree	0.6
Strongly	
Disagree	5.1
Agree	51.4
Agree	42.9
Strongly	
N	354

11. Employees prepared for WV

Disagree	6.8
Strongly	
Disagree	60.1
Agree	32.5
Agree	0.6
Strongly	
N	323

12. WV prevention program

Disagree	7.5
Strongly	
Disagree	52.6
Agree	34.1
Agree	5.8
Strongly	
Total	346

13. Crisis management program

Strongly Disagree	26.1
Disagree	
Agree	55.1
Agree Strongly	15.0
N	341

14. Frustration and anger

Disagree Strongly	7.0
Disagree	46.2
Agree	43.1
Agree Strongly	3.7
N	327

15. No employees carry weapons

Disagree Strongly	2.4
Disagree	50.0
Agree	37.8
Agree Strongly	9.8
N	286

16. Age, gender, and race

Disagree Strongly	34.0
Disagree	56.9
Agree	8.8
Agree Strongly	0.3
N	318

17. WV prevention program is not important

Disagree Strongly	41.0
Disagree	56.9
Agree	1.7
Agree Strongly	0.3
N	346

18. Assailants do not give clear warning

Disagree Strongly	15.0
Disagree	75.1
Agree	9.0
Agree Strongly	0.9
N	334

19. Employees do not take threat Seriously

Disagree Strongly	18.0
Disagree	71.3
Agree	10.7
N	327

20. Employees' behavior can be a warning sign

Disagree	2.5
Agree	68.6
Agree Strongly	28.3
N	357

21. Work environment can cause violence

Disagree Strongly	0.3
Disagree	15.3
Agree	75.9
Agree Strongly	8.4
N	320

22. Mental and behavioral cycle for stressful events

Disagree Strongly	1.1
Disagree	24.4
Agree	72.0
Agree Strongly	2.5
N	279

23. Reaction to stressful events

Disagree Strongly	0.3
Disagree	26.7
Agree	69.2
Agree Strongly	3.8
N	292

24. Emotional reactions to stressful events

Disagree Strongly	1.1
Disagree	16.8
Agree	75.4
Agree Strongly	6.8
N	280

25. Violence is the only answer

Disagree	9.2
Agree	82.0
Agree Strongly	8.9
N	327

26. De-escalate the chance of violence

Disagree Strongly	23.8
Disagree	65.1
Agree	7.9

27. Training to prevent WV

Disagree Strongly	7.0
Disagree	53.6
Agree	35.1
Agree Strongly	4.3
N	341

Disagree Strongly	7.0
Disagree	53.6
Agree	35.1
Agree Strongly	4.3
N	345

28. The cycle of violence

Disagree	3.7
Agree	84.3
Agree Strongly	12.0
N	325

29. Employees cannot be trained to identify warning signs

Disagree Strongly	28.4
Disagree	65.8
Agree	5.5
Agree Strongly	0.3
N	345

30. Violence prevention program

Not Important	1.1
Somewhat Important	12.0
Important	28.3
Very Important	30.0
Extremely Important	28.6
N	357

31. Consequences of violating policy

Not Important	0.3
Somewhat Important	2.2
Important	20.1
Very Important	38.3
Extremely Important	28.6
N	358

32. Defining unacceptable workplace behavior

Somewhat Important	0.6
Important	12.3
Very Important	37.9
Extremely Important	49.3
N	359

33. Procedures to report threats

Somewhat Important	0.6
Important	12.0
Very Important	37.2

34. Procedures to describe threats

Extremely Important	50.3
N	358

Somewhat Important	1.7
Important	16.7
Very Important	43.2
Extremely Important	38.4
N	359

35. Strategies to protect threatened employees

Somewhat Important	1.4
Important	13.1
Very Important	37.5
Extremely Important	48.1
N	360

36. Team responsible for WV prevention

Not Important	3.1
Somewhat Important	11.8
Important	26.7
Very Important	34.0
Extremely Important	24.4
N	356

37. Post-incident activities

Not Important	0.6
Somewhat Important	3.1
Important	21.0
Very Important	37.3
Extremely Important	38.1
N	357

38. WV prevention training for all employees

Not Important	1.4
Somewhat Important	12.1
Important	23.4
Very Important	38.6
Extremely Important	24.5
N	355

39. Defining audience

Not Important	4.2
Somewhat Important	11.5
Important	32.3
Very Important	37.9
Extremely Important	14.0
N	356

40. Identifying external and internal resources

Not Important	0.6
Somewhat	4.2

41. Recognizing early warning signs

Important	24.9
Very Important	43.6
Extremely Important	26.8
N	358

Not Important	0.3
Somewhat Important	4.5
Important	19.7
Very Important	40.3
Essential	35.2
N	355

42. Emergency response procedures

Somewhat Important	2.5
Important	14.0
Very Important	31.8
Essential	51.7
N	356

43. Reporting and documenting violent incidents

Somewhat Important	1.4
Important	15.4
Very Important	32.5
Essential	50.7
N	357

44. Negotiating skills

Important	21.7
Very Important	44.3
Essential	29.8
N	359

46.

45. Understanding WV Allocating resources for WV

Not Important	0.3
Somewhat Important	2.3
Important	21.7
Very Important	38.6
Essential	37.2
N	358

program

Not Important	2.2
Somewhat Important	10.9
Important	25.1
Very Important	36.3
Essential	25.4
N	358

47. Litigation

Not Important	1.1
Somewhat Important	5.9
Important	23.2
Very Important	38.1
Essential	31.7
N	357

48. How to reopen post WV

Not Important	2.0
Somewhat Important	7.1
Important	35.3
Very Important	35.6
Essential	20.1
N	354

49. Top administration endorsement of WV program

Not Important	0.6
Somewhat Important	1.4
Important	11.8
Very Important	21.7
Essential	64.5
N	355

50. Team responsible

Not Important	4.2
Somewhat Important	9.2
Important	23.7
Very Important	34.4
Essential	28.5

51. Investigate and verify threats for WV program

Not Important	1.7
Somewhat Important	17.3
Very Important	40.2
Essential	40.5
N	353

Somewhat Important	2.8
Important	22.7
Very Important	40.5
Essential	34.0
N	353

N	358
---	-----

52. Assess the context of threat

Not Important	0.3
Somewhat Important	2.0
Important	16.9
Very Important	46.6
Essential	34.2
N	354

**53. Develop appropriate
organizational responses**

**54. Document organizational
responses**

Not Important	0.6
Somewhat Important	3.7
Important	23.9
Very Important	40.4
Essential	31.5
N	356

55. Interviewing techniques

Somewhat Important	2.5
Important	20.6
Very Important	43.7
Essential	31.5
N	355

56. Awareness of safety during investigation

Not Important	0.3
Somewhat Important	2.2
Important	19.9
Very Important	42.0
Essential	35.6
N	357

57. WV program information

Not Important	0.8
Somewhat Important	3.6
Important	24.4
Very Important	40.6
Essential	30.5
N	357

58. Responsibilities of supervisor

Not Important	0.6
Somewhat Important	2.5
Important	18.5
Very Important	44.0
Essential	34.5
N	357

59. Supervisor accountability

Not Important	0.3
Somewhat Important	2.8
Important	17.4
Very Important	41.7
Essential	37.8
N	357

60. Employee responsibility

Not Important	0.3
Somewhat Important	3.1
Important	17.6
Very Important	44.3
Essential	34.7
N	352

61. Area of responsibility

Facilities Director	38.1
Chief Business Officer	25.6
Personnel Director	36.4
N	360

62. Number of students enrolled

5000-11,999	23.6
12,000- 19,999	15.0
> 20,000	11.9
N	360

63. Gender

Male	72.8
Female	27.2
N	357

64. Age

< 49	9.8
50-59	33.6
➤ 60	45.9
N	357

65. Institution

Public	59.3
Private	40.7
N	360