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ABSTRACT

WORKPLACE VIOLENCE: A STUDY OF DALLAS-AREA BUSINESS' AWARENESS AND PREPAREDNESS

NITA V. STARNES

DECEMBER 1998

This study examines Dallas-area employers' level of awareness and preparedness for an incident of workplace violence.

Information was obtained from a review of literature and survey results from a sample of employers extracted from a cross section of Dallas-area industries and firms.

Chapters I, II, and III contain general and statistical information introducing the subject of workplace violence, a review of the literature, and the methodology used in the study. Chapter IV presents the results of the research. Chapter V provides further discussion regarding the major findings of the study and recommends that employers establish sound prevention and management policies to help offset the potential danger and expense of violent workplace incidents.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

"... and it came to pass, when they were in the field, that Cain rose up against Abel, his brother, and slew him." Gen. 4:8 KJV

Beginning with this first recorded incident until the present time, work-related violence has continued to escalate. The age of rage has dawned in America as disgruntled employees and customers turn to violence to solve real -- or imagined -- grievances. A 1996 survey on workplace violence ("WPV") conducted by the Society for Human Resource Management indicated that 48 percent of the respondents reported an incident had occurred in their workplace between January 1994 and February 1996. The survey results revealed a significant increase from a similar 1993 survey in which 33 percent of the respondents reported incidents between 1989 and 1993 (Thornburg 1993).

Employers can minimize the risk of violence in the workplace and its impact on employees and others by developing definitive prevention plans. A well prepared plan can mean the difference between acting decisively and effectively or reacting haphazardly when faced with the reality of a violent incident.
STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

Although WPV is rising, there have been few studies to determine the level of companies' awareness and preparedness for a violent episode. In particular, no information exists that explicitly illustrates companies' awareness of and preparedness for an incident of WPV in the Dallas area.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The principal objectives of this study are to determine Dallas area employers' level of awareness and preparedness for a violent incident.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The literature for this study is organized into the following major categories:

I. Managing Workplace Violence
   
   A) Prediction and Prevention - Who is likely to commit violent acts? What can be done to prevent WPV?
   
   B) Incident Management - What are the best methods for managing WPV incidents?
   
   C) Post-Incident Management - How can post-incident planning produce optimal employee and business recovery results?
II. Employers' Awareness and Preparedness

Are employers aware of the threat of WPV to their companies? How prepared are employers for a violent incident?

There is significant overlap in the literature among the categories. However, for organizational purposes, the above key issues have been extracted to become the focus of this study. This literature review is intended to pull together expert opinions on a practical level and to address employers' immediate need for information to assist in preventing and managing WPV.

Managing Violence in the Workplace

The first subsection to Managing Violence in the Workplace, Prediction and Prevention, discusses obvious warning signs and cues for detecting possible occurrences of violent incidents. The section discusses important warning signs pertaining to employees' past and present behavior, as well as clinical symptoms relevant to predicting violence. Also included in the first section is a comprehensive discussion of recommended preventative measures employers can use to avoid WPV incidents.

The next section, Incident Management, is devoted to suggestions for managing an actual crisis. This section addresses the "during" phase of crisis management.
The final subsection, Post-Incident Management, under Managing Violence in the Workplace, discusses the importance of properly responding to a violent incident in order to preserve employees' psychological well-being and companies' financial well-being.

The next section, Employers' Awareness and Preparedness, discusses employers' level of awareness and preparedness regarding the WPV dilemma. The literature cites reasons for employers' lack of action and planning. This section leads into the final section of the chapter which contains the research model and proposed hypotheses for this study.

HYPOTHESES

Based on a review of the available literature and the results of studies and surveys, most employers possess a basic level of awareness and concern regarding the WPV issue. Although literature regarding the level of employers' awareness and preparedness is limited, a survey was conducted in 1996 by the Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM 1996) which touches on the awareness and preparedness issues. The majority of respondents (57 percent) were companies from the Middle and South Atlantic and East North Central regions of the United States. The largest representation of industries responding to the survey was the manufacturing sector (32 percent).
While WPV occurs in the Dallas area, there have been few highly publicized incidents. The Dallas area consists primarily of service industry organizations which tend to be less aware of the risk for violent incidents than the manufacturing firms, where there is greater exposure to and experience with violent workplace incidents (Escalating 1995). Therefore, one might expect manufacturing companies in the Dallas area to be more aware of the WPV issue than the Dallas area service industry companies. This assumption provides the basis for Hypothesis 1.

**Hypothesis 1:** Dallas area service industry organizations are less aware of their risk of violence in the workplace than are the Dallas area manufacturing companies.

The literature clearly indicates that companies have been slow to respond to the growing number of WPV incidents in terms of implementing prevention policies, incident management, and post-incident management plans (McShulskis 1996). Managers continue to erroneously believe that WPV is a security issue rather than a management issue or an organizational culture problem in their companies (Filipczak, et al 1996). One would then expect that a lack of prevention and management policies and plans would be especially prevalent in the Dallas area which is dominated by service industries and where few highly publicized episodes of WPV have occurred.
Hypothesis 2: Dallas area organizations are less prepared to deal with violent incidents in the workplace than the average U.S. company.

PROCEDURES

1. Surveys will be sent to 350 employers in the Dallas, Texas area to determine their level of awareness of the risk of WPV and their preparedness for a violent incident. The sample of employers will be extracted from a cross section of industries and firms listed in the Dallas Society of Human Resource Management membership directory.

2. Survey data generated by this study will be analyzed to determine whether there is a statistically significant difference in the awareness level of Dallas area service organizations versus Dallas area manufacturing organizations, using the two sample T-test.

3. The frequency distribution of responses will be compared to published responses of the 1996 Workplace Violence Survey conducted by the Society for Human Resource Management. This comparative data will be used to measure whether Dallas area organizations are, in fact, less prepared for WPV than are the respondent firms from across the U.S. which participated in the 1996 Workplace Violence Survey conducted by SHRM.
LIMITATIONS

External factors which may restrict the scope of the research or diminish the generalizations and/or conclusions drawn from the results of the study are:

1. Reluctance - Employers' reluctance to discuss WPV experiences due to company liability concerns may limit the richness of data collected.

2. Sensitive subject matter - Injuries and deaths resulting from WPV incidents obviously are traumatic events. Employers and others who have experienced such outcomes may be uncomfortable or unwilling to discuss these sensitive matters. Therefore, it will be impossible to know if respondents have submitted completely honest answers.

3. Sampling frame error - Survey participants will be selected from a narrow range of firms (i.e., SHRM members), resulting in a certain amount of sampling error. The degree to which the sample represents the entire population of Dallas area employers will be limited and thus broad generalizations of results will be restricted.

4. Personal bias - A certain amount of personal bias may unintentionally and unknowingly have been interjected into the questionnaire design.
DEFINITION OF TERMS

Negligent hiring - An employer has a duty to exercise reasonable care in view of all the circumstances in hiring individuals who, because of employment, may pose a threat of injury to members of the public (Johnson, Lewis, and Gardner 1996).

Negligent retention - An employer knew or should have known of an employee's violent propensities and, nonetheless, retained the employee (Johnson, Lewis, and Gardner 1996).

ORGANIZATION OF PAPER

The paper will be structured in five chapters. Chapter I contains general and statistical information introducing the subject of WPV. Included in the chapter are the introduction, statement of problem, the purpose of the study, review of literature, hypotheses, procedures, limitations, definition of terms, and the organization of the paper. Chapter II examines and presents the relevant literature on WPV. Chapter III contains the methodology used in the study, including sample description, procedures for data collection, and data analysis techniques. Chapter IV presents the results of the research. Chapter V provides further discussion regarding the major findings of the study and makes recommendations for employers based on the results of this study.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter is a review of the literature on workplace violence. Accordingly, the information is organized into the following major categories: Managing Violence in the Workplace and Employers' Awareness and Preparedness.

The section regarding managing violence in the workplace focuses on how organizations can predict and prevent violent incidents, as well as how they can manage an incident after it occurs. The section on employers' awareness and preparedness explores the level of employers' awareness regarding a threat workplace violence to their companies and discusses their level of preparedness for an incident.

MANAGING VIOLENCE IN THE WORKPLACE
Prediction and Prevention

Prediction

It is difficult to predict or control events which precipitate workplace violence. However, investigations following violent events often reveal that there were obvious signs which, if detected, could have served as warnings to the occurrence of the incidents. Based on workplace violence case histories, researchers have
developed a profile which covers a significant portion of violent offenders. Most offenders are white males, between the ages of thirty-five to forty. They are often loners with poor interpersonal skills, poor self-esteem, and a migratory job history. They frequently blame others for their problems (their spouse, employer, the government), and see themselves as victims. Many times they own guns or have a preoccupation with the military. They have been employed with the same company for a long time and they often see their job as their sole sense of identity. Also, the offenders often abuse alcohol or drugs (Dykeman 1995) (Stuart 1992) (Heskett 1996).

Thomas D. Harpley, psychologist and clinical director for San Diego-based National Trauma Services, takes profiling a step further by distinguishing between people prone to lethal vs. nonlethal threats or physical assault (not intended to kill). The nonlethally violent employee is under thirty years of age, has a history of violence, and may abuse drugs or alcohol. The lethally violent employee is usually older, has no history of violence, and often has no substance-abuse problems (Filipczak 1993).

William F. Booth of Risk Management Associates, however, warns against relying too heavily on characteristic
profiling. He argues that this type of profiling can become simplistic stereotyping, unlikely to lead to prevention, and recommends paying attention to warning signs as more valuable keys in predicting workplace violence. "Behavior is a far better barometer than so-called profiling (Johnson, Kiehlbauch, and Kinney 1994)." Instead, Booth suggests that companies construct behavioral profiles to identify potentially violent employees. For example, poor attendance may be connected to drug or alcohol abuse. Likewise, an employee's angry outburst can serve as a warning sign. Other danger signs include bizarre behavior, abrupt departures from work, erratic work patterns, progressive disciplinary problems, dramatic changes in personal appearance, unwarranted or unreasonable anger, difficulty accepting criticism, and verbal threats (Johnson, Kiehlbauch, and Kinney 1994). An employee calling the human resources department to inquire about life insurance death benefits can also be a warning sign. There is no single, all-inclusive list of predictable behaviors a violent person will exhibit and caution should be exercised in interpreting the indicators. Generally, no one sign alone indicates anything more than a minor disciplinary problem. However, multiple signs, or one major warning sign, may be very significant and may be all that is needed to determine that additional evaluation is required (Gombar 1994). Management
should be alert to six specific warning signs which include threats, history of violence, domestic violence, changes in productivity, concentration problems, and stress.

All threats, as well as any references to violence, should be taken seriously. Threats can be veiled, such as, "What happened there could happen here," or direct, such as, "If that supervisor doesn't change, I'm going to change him with my shotgun." It is important to have a written company policy prohibiting violence, harassment, and threats. The policy should outline the steps employees should take to report threats, as well as the steps management should take in evaluating and investigating threats. All threats should be investigated immediately and thoroughly to determine what, if any, disciplinary steps should be taken (Cawood 1991).

Individuals who have committed acts of violence against family members, fellow employees, acquaintances or animals in the past have already shown a lack of respect for others and should be considered high risks for violent behavior. Likewise, individuals who have a history of violence in the past may have a tendency for future violence. (Heskett 1996).

Studies have shown that domestic violence spilling over into the workplace is a major contributor to workplace violence. According to the U.S. Justice Department, current
and former boyfriends and spouses commit more than 13,000 acts of violence against women in the workplace every year (Anfuso 1994). Often an employee has moved from a residence to avoid an estranged spouse or boyfriend. However, offenders know where and when to locate the employee at the workplace and may seek out victims while they are at work. Employers are often inclined to avoid asking personal questions out of respect for employees' privacy. However, when the workplace is placed at risk, personal problems become company business. Management should maintain open communications with employees so that employees will make them aware of potentially violent issues in their personal lives. When management has advance notice of these issues, certain preventive measures can be implemented in an effort to avoid violence. For example, an employee's work station can be temporarily moved out of a public area, calls can be screened if telephone harassment is involved, and security increased if deemed necessary (Friedman 1995).

Productivity may decrease over time or may be normal one week and drastically lower the next. The potentially violent worker tends to show vast inconsistencies which will extend past normal variances (Sollars 1996).

Forgotten job instructions, missed deadlines, coming to work without necessities (i.e., equipment or ID cards) are warning signs that an employee is having concentration
problems. Concentration problems can jeopardize the safety of the employee and/or his or her co-workers (Gombar 1994).

Finally, there is cause for concern when an employee shows signs of serious stress. The signs can include crying, excessive personal calls (including calls to and from bill collectors), and diminished planning and organizational skills. Also, stress can cause nervousness, insomnia, headaches, and tension. Stress tends to magnify an individual's personality; shy individuals may withdraw and loud and boisterous individuals may become even louder (Sollars 1996; Kuzmits 1992).

In addition to the six warning signs, managers should have a general understanding of the types of disorders that can result in aggressive behavior in order to effectively respond to and prevent violence. They should be prepared to recognize symptoms of the most common disorders. These disorders include substance abuse, paranoia, obsessive disorder, neurological disorders, intermittent explosive disorder, depression and manic depression.

Alcohol and drugs have a disinhibiting effect on the employee and often are contributing factors to violent crimes. Substance abuse may magnify an existing aggressive mood, causing the employee to show poor judgment or act in ways that he or she would normally suppress. Indicators that a person is on drugs include nervousness, agitation,
hyperactivity, talkativeness, and a tendency toward violence. Other indicators are increased respiration and blood pressure, and dilated pupils (Graham 1992; Stuart 1992).

Employees suffering from paranoia believe that someone in the company is out to get them. They may discuss these fantasies with co-workers. In the most extreme form, the employee may hear "command" hallucinations—voices instructing him to perform a violent act. Although rare in other situations, command hallucinations are often present in the cases that result in shooting sprees (Graham 1992).

Employees may become obsessed with other workers. The employee's thoughts can become extremely irrational with bizarre and inappropriate behavior. The employee may send love notes or strange e-mails and may even stalk a co-worker (Graham 1992).

Impaired neurological functioning reduces the capacity for impulse control. The employee may have rage reactions, accompanied by blackouts, headaches or seizures (Graham 1992; National Institute of Mental Health 1980).

An employee with Intermittent Explosive Disorder is unable to contain anger. The anger results in violent behavior, including destruction of property. The degree of rage is out of proportion to the precipitating event and the outburst occurs without warning (Waxman 1995).
Depressed employees may show irritability, decreased impulse control, and explosiveness (Graham 1992). Symptoms of depression include exaggerated feelings of sadness, feelings of worthlessness, hopelessness or helplessness, feeling out of control, an increase or decrease in sleep, an increase or decrease in appetite, loss of energy, fatigue, loss of interest, diminished ability to enjoy oneself, difficulty concentrating, indecisiveness, slow or fuzzy thinking, and recurring thoughts about death or suicide (National Institute of Mental Health 1980).

Manic depression causes mood swings, creating periods of high energy level, decreased need for sleep, unwarranted or exaggerated belief in one's own ability, extreme irritability, rapid, unpredictable emotional changes, impulsive, thoughtless activity with a high risk of damaging consequences (Thornburg 1992). Suicidal employees should be evaluated for potential violence to others as they may consider killing others before killing themselves (Graham 1992).

In summary, model employees have been known to commit violent acts. However, victims of a co-worker's violent act usually agree that the perpetrator exhibited one or more warning signs before a violent event. Employers and co-workers should take the warning signs seriously. Ignoring threats or intimidations opens the door to violence in the
workplace. Garry Mathiason, an employment attorney with the San Francisco based law firm Littler, Mendelson, Fastiff, Tichy & Mathiason said,

"The violence cycle is not spontaneous. This behavior starts with small events and builds up to harassment, threats or a series of threats, then to a minor assault, and finally a major one. If a manager can see the cycle building and has policies for handling conflict in place, the cycle can be broken in the early stages, because all employees know that definite limitations are in place. But it requires looking backward and not just at the most recent incident (Dykeman 1995, p. 44)."

**Prevention**

Volumes have been written regarding workplace violence prevention. In fact, most literature regarding the subject focuses on prevention. Former Director of Security for IBM, Patrick King said, "There is no price you will pay to prevent an incident of violence that will exceed what you will pay if you do nothing and one happens. Companies can take very reasonable and cost effective measures that will not only reduce the risk of an incident but will also pay dividends with improved employee morale and a clear understanding by managers and employees of companies' commitment to their safety" (Morrissey 1996).

"Studies have shown that up to 42 percent of job applicants are untruthful on their applications," according to crisis management consultant Norman Shockley (McCune
Many individuals who commit workplace violence have employment gaps and short job tenure. Candidates frequently omit an employment period because of an unfavorable termination or may conceal a gap in employment because of an incarceration. A company can reduce its potential for violent incidents by carefully following preemployment screening procedures, including tests, employment verification, background investigations, drug testing, reviewing driving records, and checking for a criminal history. Legal counsel should be consulted to ensure compliance with laws pertaining to each of these areas. Psychologists have prepared tests which help employers identify individuals who are high risks for acting on violent impulse. Conversely, the more positives a person displays, (e.g., self-control, enjoyment of interaction with others and high frustration tolerance) the lower the chance of harm (McCune 1994). The Reid Integrity Attitude Scale is a multi-dimensional pre-employment test designed to uncover significant details about previous criminal behavior and relevant job experiences, as well as to assess attitudes and experiences relating to integrity, social behavior, substance abuse, and personal achievement (Ross 1995). Another test, the Inwald Survey 2 (IS2), measures applicants on ten different scales. High scores indicate probable precursors to trouble. The scales cover denial of
shortcomings, restless behavior, lack of temper control, reckless driving, firearms interest, work difficulties, lack of social sensitivity, lack of leadership interest, attitudes about antisocial behaviors, and degree of regard for social norms (Ross 1995). It is important to consult with legal counsel prior to adopting and implementing testing procedures to avoid violating invasion of privacy laws and provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act. Tests should be carefully constructed and include only job-related, non-invasive inquiries in order to decrease the likelihood of rejecting qualified applicants (Heskett 1996).

An employer should always determine employees' predispositions to violent behavior prior to making a job offer. If an employee commits a violent act after employment, it will likely become necessary for the employer to defend itself against claims of negligent hiring. At least thirty states recognize the tort of negligent hiring. A Kansas court defined negligent hiring as follows:

An employer has a duty to use reasonable care in the selection . . . of employees. This duty requires that an employer hire . . . only safe and competent employees. An employer breaches this duty when it hires employees that it knows or should know are incompetent (Johnson, Lewis, and Gardner 1995, 32).

The Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), a division of the U.S. Department of Labor, issued
an extensive voluntary Workplace Violence "WPV" Prevention Program model. Elements of the WPV Prevention Program include a clearly written policy addressing workplace violence, procedures for establishing a Threat Assessment Team, guidelines for assessing, controlling, and preventing hazards, as well as training and education, and procedures for reporting, investigating, following-up, keeping records, and evaluating all incidents.

Workplace violence prevention efforts must have the visible commitment of top management and must involve supervisors, employees, and employee representatives in order to be successful (OSHA 1996). Management involvement includes providing the organizational resources and motivation necessary to deal with workplace violence issues. Employee involvement includes participating in worksite assessment, helping develop procedures, and identifying existing and potential hazards. Employee input should be solicited and incorporated into written plans.

Employers should establish a written WPV Prevention Policy for all employees, including managers and supervisors. Employees should receive instruction regarding how to report safety concerns and respond to threats and harassment, based on the written WPV guidelines (OSHA 1996). Since most violators have been described by co-workers and supervisors as intimidators, the WPV Prevention Policy
should incorporate a "zero tolerance'' policy. "Zero
tolerance'' may or may not include termination. The policy
should set out ranges of punishment for violations.
Discipline for violating the policy should conform to the
ranges set out in the policy, as well as the individual
situation. James Janik of the Isaac Ray Center suggests
that the policy address infractions including threatening
mail, fax messages, and telephone calls. The policy should
also address intimidating, threatening or coercive behavior,
stalking, vandalism, weapon or ammunition possession,
fighting, and horseplay. Of course, zero tolerance policies
probably will not stop an attack by an irrational, out-of-
control person. However, if a potential perpetrator is
aware that policies are in place and are being enforced, the
policy may serve as a deterrent. This is particularly true
when employees know their responsibility for reporting
threats and violent episodes to management (Ross 1995).
Workplace Violence Prevention policies should be applied
consistently and fairly to all employees, including
supervisors and managers. The policies should never
discriminate against victims of workplace violence. The
policies should be made available to all employees and
copies should be provided to employees upon request (OSHA
1996).
The major objectives of a Threat Assessment Team ("TAM") are early identification of, and intervention in, potentially violent situations to prevent violence in the workplace (Cawood 1991). Key components involved in implementing an effective TAM include a response team that rapidly brings together expertise from a variety of areas, education and training of team members in risk assessment and management strategies, written tools to assist in risk containment activities to maximize positive outcome and minimize liability, and management training to develop skills in early identification and intervention. Threat Assessment Team membership should include representatives of senior management, operations, employees or their representatives, security director, chief financial officer, general counsel, human resources director, head of communications or media relations (OSHA 1996). Sean McWeeney, President of Corporate Risk International in Fairfax, Virginia suggests that the team be chaired by an executive vice president or other "high-ranking officer who has the respect and ear of top management; someone who should not be easily second-guessed on what they do, because this should be a policy-making and operations committee" (Friedman 1994).

Abbott Laboratories, a health care company located in Abbott Park, Illinois, achieved excellent results through
the TAM it established in 1993 (Dainas, Beien, and Powell 1994). The team is activated when employees or management bring a potentially violent situation to the attention of human resources, the employee health provider or the employee assistance provider. Any member of the team can initiate a meeting and the team is capable of convening within one hour. Specific initial screening criteria is used to determine whether the team should be deployed. The team assesses only legitimate risks of violent situations, not workplace issues that can be handled with routine procedures. The team's role is to gather information, evaluate the circumstances, and determine whether a risk actually exists. If a risk does exist, the team develops and implements an action plan to address and defuse the situation.

A case manager is assigned to each high-risk situation to keep critical information communicated between team members. Abbott's team follows a three-part document to assist them in assessing and managing employees with potential to harm themselves or others. The document is used as a tool to thoroughly assess and manage potentially violent situations.

The first section of the document provides a checklist of characteristics and situations associated with violent individuals; the more criteria met, the higher the probable
risk. The checklist serves as a screening instrument to determine whether the team should be deployed.

The second section of the document serves as a risk-assessment tool. Each team member uses this section to gather information regarding the employee's current plan to harm, any history of psychiatric/substance abuse treatment and violent behavior, and the current propensity to violence. The information regarding the employed gained from this section helps the team estimate potential risk.

The third section of the document is a risk-management tool for the team's action plan. It covers notification of potential harm to relevant parties, evaluations and consultations with mental health professionals regarding the employee, and the outcome of the situation.

Abbott's management has been pleased with the positive results experienced from the team's efforts. The team has proven to be part of an effective strategy in providing quick, coordinated responses to real-life, potentially violent situations (Dainas, Beien, and Powell 1994).

Hazard Assessment involves the Threat Assessment Team ("TAM") in reviewing records, analyzing workplace security, and surveying the workplace. A review of existing workplace violence incident records reveals patterns which helps determine the cause and severity of assault incidents. The
records review reveals needed changes and assists in the development of a remedial plan to correct problems.

The TAM should prepare a workplace security analysis by physically inspecting the workplace and evaluating employees' work tasks to determine if conditions exist which might place employees at risk for violent incidents. In addition, an employee questionnaire or survey should be sent to employees at least once within a twenty-four month period to identify the potential for violent incidents and to identify, or confirm, the need for improved security measures (OSHA 1996).

The Threat Assessment Team is responsible for performing reviews to identify and implement control methods which eliminate or minimize violent incidents. The TAM should review the general building, workstation, and area designs to ensure safe and secure conditions for employees and work areas which prevent entrapment. Adequate security systems should be installed and work practice controls and procedures developed to provide a safe working environment. Physical-security measures include enhanced lighting, secured parking areas, coded access cards, intercom systems, closed-circuit television monitoring, emergency alarm buttons, security guards, enclosed reception areas, and restricted access of employees to particular areas. Special consideration should be given to situations involving after-
hours access to the facility and employees who leave the building alone at night (OSHA 1996; Hequet and Picard 1994).

Companies need managers, supervisors, and employees who will be proactive in recognizing and reporting potential violence. Most people want to help maintain a safe workplace. However, employees can be deterred from reporting relevant information due to intimidation from the aggressor, misplaced loyalty, or a belief that management will ignore their report. Companies should offer comprehensive training programs directed at training employees to report threats. Supervisors and employees should be trained to recognize warning signs and how to properly use security hardware. The training should include methods for appropriately responding to violent incidents (including emergency and hostage situations), obtaining medical assistance, reporting violent incidents, and procedures for handling cash. The education process should also teach employees about responding to aggressive behavior from co-workers, customers, or others in the workplace (Heskett 1996).

Managers and supervisors carry an additional responsibility for preventing violence by virtue of their positions. In addition to training that enables them to recognize a potentially violent employee or situation and to take necessary steps to prevent violence, training should
also include methods to ensure employee safety is not compromised and that employees follow safe work practices.

Workplace violence is often attributed to an authoritarian form of management, resulting in employees feeling a sense of powerlessness (Danger 1994; Nigro and Waugh 1996). Therefore, managers and supervisors should receive sensitivity training to avoid provoking employees to violence. The training should prepare managers to make fair decisions and to communicate fairness. Procedures should be implemented to identify abusive managers and to provide them with a chance to change their behavior. Managers' superiors should watch for signs of abusive managerial behavior which can include sudden decreases in employee productivity, changes in a managers' performance ratings of employees from good to inadequate, dissension among employees, rumors, turnover, grievances, and complaints brought to governmental agencies such as the EEOC, and civil suits (Johnson, Lewis, and Gardner 1995). Managers and supervisors who are trained in people skills can anticipate employee-conflict situations and take preventive measures prior to situations escalating to crisis proportions. Managers and supervisors should also be trained regarding the importance of reacting compassionately toward workers if an incident does occur (Barrier 1995).
One of management's most effective tools for avoiding a violent crisis is an Employment Assistance Program (EAP). Usually the Employment Assistance Program provider is an outside source of counselors who can help with a myriad of employee personal problems (i.e., drug abuse, personal finances, marital difficulties, etc.). Employees may feel more comfortable talking to a counselor from an outside firm because of the assurance of confidentiality. When a manager or supervisor encounters a situation that has the potential for violence, the employee involved can be referred to the EAP (many times as a condition of continued employment). Counseling often helps diffuse the situation or the EAP can recommend alternative approaches to the employer. Many times it is a matter of rehabilitation. Behavior which stems from alcoholism or drug abuse can often be addressed by the EAP counselor suggesting a treatment program that can assist the employee with resolving the problem (Filipczak 1993). Employees are often concerned that their identity will be exposed and that the aggressor will seek revenge if incidents are reported. Companies can overcome this concern by offering employees a "hot line" or an 800 number which they can utilize for anonymous reports. Employees are more likely to cooperate if they have a risk-free method of communication (Brandman 1994; Anfuso 1994).
The single most important factor for preventing workplace violence when a company is faced with downsizing is open, honest communication from management (Jesseph 1989). In the wake of what is now known about shootings and violence after terminations, it is wise to have a plan when a company downsizes through lay-offs. Terminations should be handled in a way that protects company files, business secrets, and computer needs. However, the company should not lose sight of the humanistic element during downsizing. Termination procedures should never demean employees and should always attempt to avoid creating a hostile reaction. When terminating employees, management should be prepared to outline specific details about severance packages, unemployment benefits, and outplacement services. Employees will probably be frightened and unable to think clearly during the termination meeting. Therefore, managers should clearly offer to review the information or answer any questions employees might have at a later time. Managers can attempt to focus employees on solutions for the future by talking about outsourcing opportunities. Employees should be referred to the EAP provider if a manager suspects that he is likely to become depressed or suicidal as a result of the layoff. Security should be notified in advance if there is concern that an employee may become violent (Johnson, Kurutz, and Kiehlbauch 1995; Waxman 1995).
Guidelines for reporting, investigating, following-up, and evaluating threats and violent incidents established in the company's Workplace Violence Prevention Policy should be followed carefully. Employees should never fear reprisal for bringing concerns to management's attention. The Threat Assessment Team is responsible for investigating and evaluating each incident. Information obtained from reports of violent incidents provides valuable data necessary to counter workplace violence and provides a basis for program improvements (OSHA 1996).

Just as incident evaluation and analysis provide valuable information to preventing workplace violence, recordkeeping also helps select the appropriate level of controls to prevent a recurrence of violence. Further, valuable information regarding a company's training needs can be obtained through post-incident analysis (OSHA 1996).

Incident Management

Most cases of aggressive or intimidating behavior do not result in violence (Heskett 1996). However, it is important for a manager or supervisor to know how to handle these incidents and minimize the chance that they will escalate to violence. Preplanning and following recommended procedures are imperative prior to scheduling meetings to counsel or discipline employees. Several specific steps should be taken prior to meeting with a difficult employee.
The steps are as follows: Reserve a conference or other private room to guarantee privacy. The selected room should have as many exits as possible. Have a box of facial tissue, in the event the employee starts to cry, and a pitcher or glass of water available, thereby eliminating the need for the employee to leave the room. Remove objects that could be used as weapons prior to the meeting. If it is suspected that the employee may become angry or hostile, he should not be given advance notice of the meeting. Do not allow the employee to bring personal belongings to the meeting. Women should not be allowed the opportunity to get their purses. A third person should be present if the person conducting the meeting feels intimidated by the employee. Notify building security if there is concern that the employee will become violent. Security can provide uniformed or plain clothes officers, depending on the circumstances. Post the security officer within hearing distance of the room. A signal can be arranged in advance to alert the security officer to enter. Enter the room before the employee and place an object in the chair closest to the door, forcing the employee to occupy another chair. This provides an easy exit from the room or easy access if security needs to enter in a hurry. Maintain a distance of four to six feet from the employee. Be sure body language reflects calm and control. Maintain direct eye contact with
the employee. Refrain from waving hands or arms to make a point so as to avoid making the employee feel threatened or challenged. If the employee becomes irate, attempt to calm him or her before continuing the conversation. It may be appropriate to continue the conversation at a later time. (Heskett 1996)

Being aware of warning signs of violent behavior allows a manager to take preventive measures before violence erupts. One warning sign is resistive tension. Resistive tension is a physical response that prepares a person for a fight (Heskett 1996). Indications of resistive tension include clenching of fists and a general tightening of muscles and exaggerated body movements may be displayed. Key indicators are yelling, screaming, and possibly swearing. Voices will become increasingly louder and the individual may begin to wave his or her arms around, pound fists on furniture, make rude gestures, or kick and stomp feet (Heskett 1996).

The individual may then go from the described activities to suddenly ceasing all movement. He or she may become very quiet, almost calm, while planning the next move. The next move may be a renewed attempt to talk rationally and to calm himself. However, extreme caution should be maintained during the sudden quiet period. If the
person has a history of violence, consider summoning security.

Immediately before a person becomes violent, one or more actions may be displayed. The person may take on what is referred to as a "boxer stance." The legs will be shoulder-width apart, and one leg will be slightly in front of the other, in a balanced position. The hands may be raised to shoulder or chest height. The person may start clenching the hands or position them offensively. The shoulders may shift or move back and forth as if the person were trying to stretch them. The person may quickly search the area behind the interviewer, looking for others who might come to the interviewer's defense. Notify security immediately and exit the room as quickly as possible upon appearance of any of the described warning signs (Heskett 1996).

In her book, Workplace Violence, Before, During and After, Sandra Heskett warns that a violent incident is not the time to play hero. Thinking clearly and rationally is critical to surviving the incident and will also help save the lives of others (Heskett 1996).

When a violent incident occurs, chaos results and seconds count. Regardless of the cause of the incident, management will be expected to take immediate action, making advance planning imperative. Randy McPheeters of the
General Dynamics Convair Division said, "It's your problem until the authorities arrive. Things happen so fast" (LaBar 1994). In the midst of the chaos, many important and practical decisions will need to be made. Aside from emergency medical actions and dealing with the police, innumerable problems must be addressed. Calming hysterical witnesses, notifying the victims' families, dealing with restricted access to the building by police (making employees' personal belongings irretrievable), and finding phones to be inoperable are just a few of the problems which can be encountered after a violent incident (Johnson, Lewis, and Gardner 1995).

Prior to the crisis, the Threat Assessment Team will have established a chain of command for handling an actual crisis. During a crisis, the most important issue is the emergency notification of security and law enforcement personnel, managers, employees, hospitals, and fire departments. Because telephone lines can be damaged during a violent episode, a duress alarm which notifies police or security personnel should be available. The Threat Assessment Team and all other employees will have been instructed regarding the exact location of the alarm and the importance of exercising caution to activate the alarm without attracting a perpetrator's attention. McPheeters stressed the value of maintaining routine contact with
outside emergency responders prior to the actual crisis so they are familiar with the layout of the workplace and with whom to deal in emergencies (Overman 1991).

**Post-Incident Management**

Despite all reasonable precautions, if there is a violent workplace incident, management has a duty to respond immediately to preserve employees' psychological well-being and the company's financial well-being. Managers and supervisors should have been trained earlier regarding the importance of reacting compassionately toward employees after an incident. Post-incident recovery plans should already be in place which contain detailed instructions, allowing for quick actions and decisions. Proper development and implementation of post-incident recovery plans save the company money and time. (Overman 1991)

First and foremost in importance is dealing with the trauma experienced by victims, victims' families, and employees who witnessed the violence. Tremendous confusion and even hysteria are natural responses. Counselors, trained in dealing with this type of trauma who have been identified ahead of time, should be on site and immediately available to employees and their families. The counselors will be responsible for developing a response to prevent post-traumatic stress syndrome. Consequences suffered by workplace violence victims (in addition to physical
injuries) include short and long-term psychological trauma, fear of returning to work, changes in relationships with co-workers and family, feelings of incompetency, guilt, powerlessness, and fear of criticism by supervisors and managers. Strong follow-up programs will help employees deal with these problems. Additional sources for help include employee assistance programs, peer counseling, and support groups (Kuzmits 1992; Overman 1991). Appropriate and promptly rendered assistance reduces the psychological trauma and general stress levels among victims and witnesses. Further, immediate and effective treatment also reduces the company's health insurance premiums and worker's compensation costs and minimizes the liability exposure (Heskett 1996; Johnson, Lewis, and Gardner 1995).

Certain other steps will need to be taken after a violent incident. Notification of victims' families regarding employees' injuries or death must begin immediately. Employees must be evacuated from the building and sent home. Arrangements for alternative forms of transportation often must be made when the employees are unable to drive their cars. Insurance carriers must be notified in order to assess the extent of damage to the physical structure. Clean-up and repair of the premises should begin as soon as allowed by law enforcement and other investigators. Notify legal counsel so that any limits
concerning actions the company can take or information that can be released to employees or the press are identified. Begin collecting information to identify what occurred during the crisis as soon as possible and determine whether there were eye witnesses or photographic records of the event. Problems encountered after a violent incident can include finding payroll and personnel information inaccessible or destroyed, determining return to work and company reopening issues, and dealing with the press who will be on the scene (Heskett 1996).

Copies of current important and irreplaceable records should be kept at a vault or other nearby off-site location for easy access in case the originals are destroyed or inaccessible because of a violent incident. Magnetic reproduction is an efficient method for record duplication. Further, if the company outsources its payroll function, payroll record replacement will be simplified.

Management should be sensitive to the employees' feelings and perceptions when reentering the building where a violent incident occurred. Literature cites instances in which workers were called back to work before the clean-up had been completed, causing employees to experience further trauma when they saw walls in which bullet holes were still clearly visible. Vendor clean-up contracts and agreements should be included in the recovery plan. Vendors' names and
telephone numbers, as well as home telephone numbers, should be readily accessible in order to expedite the clean-up process. Better rates can be negotiated before an incident rather than immediately thereafter, when the company is desperate for assistance (Heckett 1996).

As employees return to work, they need to feel confident about the level of security provided. They might also want some major changes in the office decor, including open offices (rather than cubicles) so that in the future they can see if problems are developing, rather than being taken by surprise. It is also common for returning workers to demand extra security measures, including security personnel, before returning to work. Even then, some people will not want to come back to work because of the memories associated with the violent experience. Companies must consider how to handle the disruption to their normal business activities. During the first 24 hours following the violent incident, members of the Threat Assessment Team need to determine the extent to which the normal operations of the company have been disrupted. For example, customer orders may be delayed and someone needs to be in charge of notifying customers regarding changes in the schedule (Johnson, Lewis, and Gardner 1995). Companies can expect reduced productivity immediately following a violent incident. McPheeters commented, "You have to allow time for
people to recover. Management cannot immediately have the attitude of 'life goes on; pull yourself up by your boot straps and get back to work.' It takes awhile for productivity to recover" (LaBar 1994).

However, to avoid losing customer confidence, companies should not stay closed too long. If a company does not reopen within a reasonable period of time, it risks customers' assumption that the company is permanently closed due to the episode. Companies should maintain the goal of regaining customer confidence for the benefit of its employees, customers, community, and stockholders. Tom Harpley of National Trauma Services in San Diego said, "Violence in the workplace can have wide-ranging ramifications. It can impact productivity and leave the company vulnerable to potential liability. Companies should take steps to limit the personal and financial impact. The company will never get back to business as usual. Everyone has been changed forever. You have to find a new normal" (Stuart 1992).

Unfortunately, many companies experience severe economic set-backs, including bankruptcy, following a violent incident. A trauma plan should be in place to help a company survive a violent crisis. Management should keep a copy of the plan in more than one place and several managers should be familiar with the plan and know where it
is kept. Many companies have disaster plans to cover natural disasters such as earthquakes and fires, and should be able to modify the disaster plan to cover violence in the workplace (Hillenbert and Wolf 1998).

The best approach to dealing with the press is open honesty. If information is not readily available, say so. Do not say "no comment" or remain silent. Both approaches indicate automatic guilt in the public's mind. Designate a spokesperson (not a CEO) and also name a back-up substitute. The company's CEO will lose credibility if he or she does not know the answer to a question (Thornburg 1992). Stick to the facts, keep it short, and avoid jargon. The assigned spokesperson should be knowledgeable regarding the law and careful not to communicate in libelous or slanderous terms when talking to the press. This individual should provide accurate information within the guidelines established by legal counsel. Monitor the accuracy of press coverage, provide updates, and advise immediately if they are in error. Know the media and understand its deadlines. Make sure the media knows the company and its guiding principles in order to ensure balanced and fair reporting. All these steps protect the company's reputation. If the media has a story to file, they will file it whether they are able to obtain the facts from the company or not. It is in the company's best interest to cooperate and communicate with
the media. The company's goal should be to defuse the situation, remain on friendly terms with the press, and avoid sensationalism (Johnson, Lewis, and Gardner 1995).

EMPLOYERS' AWARENESS AND PREPAREDNESS

Although there is undeniable evidence that workplace violence occurs regularly all over the country and, in fact, incidents are rapidly increasing, companies have done little to combat the problem. A review of the literature reveals there is not a complete lack of awareness or concern for the workplace violence dilemma on the part of most companies and managers (Pease 1995; SHRM 1996; McShulskis 1996). Unfortunately, mere awareness and concern does nothing to decrease the frequency of violent incidents or protect employees from the harshness of its reality. Why then, when concern is high, are action and planning low? According to a survey conducted by management professors, Ricky Griffin of Texas A&M University and Anne O'Leary Kelly of the University of Dayton in Ohio, respondents believe that workplace violence is a security issue rather than a management issue or an organizational culture problem in their companies (Filipczak, et al 1996). Other reasons cited by the literature include: (1) lack of knowledge of what to do, (2) the cost, and, (3) the belief that violence "won't happen here" (Fain 1996).
A 1996 Workplace Violence Survey conducted by the Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM) reveals that nearly half (48 percent) of the respondents experienced a violent incident since January 1, 1994. However, statistics from the survey indicate that while the majority of the companies acknowledge workplace violence is a growing concern, few are prepared to predict, prevent, and manage the violent incidents. For example, only about 29% of the responding companies offer violence prevention/management training to human resource managers and 28 percent offer training to other managers and supervisors. Slightly more than one out of ten (11 percent) offer training to employees to identify the warning signs of violent behavior; and one out of four (25 percent) train employees in conflict resolution. Four out of ten (39 percent) of the companies do not have written policies in place to address workplace violence issues. Approximately 37 percent of the companies have no set procedures for responding to threats. One third of the companies do not investigate the background of potential employees. Nearly nine out of ten (87 percent) of the companies have not undergone a formal risk assessment since January 1, 1994. According to one author, "The risks of injury and consequently, liability, are greatest when employers bury their heads in the sand" (DiLorenzo and Carroll 1995). The 1996 SHRM Workplace Violence Survey
results clearly indicate a lack of sufficient awareness of and preparedness for a possible incident of workplace violence. Therefore, it can be concluded from the review of the literature that companies have been slow to respond to the growing number of violent workplace incidents and managers continue to believe that workplace violence is a security issue rather than a management or an organizational culture problem in their companies.
CHAPTER III

METHOD

This chapter discusses the research procedure and methodology used in the current study. First, a discussion of the sample is presented, including a description of the respondents and a summary of descriptive variables that were examined. Comparisons of sample populations from the current survey and the Society of Human Resource Management's (SHRM) 1996 Workplace Violence Survey are included. Next, the method used for collecting data is explained, followed by a description of the specific instrument used to measure the variables. Finally, the data analysis techniques used to analyze the hypotheses are described.

Sample

The sample frame for this study consisted of 350 employers in the Dallas, Texas area from which 81 responses to the survey were returned. Four responses were discarded due to incomplete or missing data, resulting in a final usable sample of 77 responses. The overall current survey response rate was 22 percent. Seventy-one percent of the survey respondents were from the service sector and 29 percent were from the manufacturing sector. The SHRM survey was sent to 5,000 SHRM members nationwide, of which 1,016 (20 percent)
responded. Survey responses from both the SHRM and the current surveys represented a wide range of organization sizes as illustrated in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES</th>
<th>SHRM SURVEY (PERCENTAGE)</th>
<th>CURRENT SURVEY (PERCENTAGE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 100 employees</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 to 250 employees</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251 to 500 employees</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501 to 1,000 employees</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,001 to 2,500 employees</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,501 to 5,000 employees</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 5,000 employees</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Forty-two of the 77 respondents to the current survey reported that they had experienced incidents of workplace violence and 35 of these 42 respondents indicated that violent incidents have occurred at their Dallas area sites. The violent incidents reported covered a variety of categories as indicated in Table 2:
TABLE 2
VIOLENT INCIDENTS IN THE WORKPLACE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incident</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homicide</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shooting</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stabbing</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal threat</td>
<td>50.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fistfight</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Assault</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pushing/Shoving</td>
<td>40.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Collection

The employer sample was extracted from a cross-section of industries and firms listed in the Dallas Society of Human Resources Management membership directory. Each employer listed in the membership directory was assigned a number. The numbers were then placed in a container, thoroughly mixed, and 350 numbers were randomly drawn. Survey forms were mailed to the 350 companies selected. Recipients were asked to return their completed survey by mail or fax within fourteen days of receipt of the survey form. Seven days after mailing the survey forms, follow-up cards were mailed to recipients who had not responded.
Measures

The survey instrument was composed of original questions, as well as questions adapted from the 1996 Workplace Violence Survey prepared by the Society of Human Resource Management (SHRM). A copy of the survey instrument is provided in Appendix A and a copy of the SHRM survey is provided in Appendix B at the end of Chapter 5.

In order to assess participants’ level of awareness of workplace violence (WPV) and preparedness for a violent incident, the responses to particular questions were summed to create two new variables for analysis. The awareness score of the WPV survey was calculated by summing the scores on question numbers 1-6 and 8-10, and the preparedness score was created by summing the scores on questions 11-24. The maximum and minimum possible score on awareness was 23 to 4, with the maximum and minimum possible score on preparedness being 46 to 0.
Analysis

Results of the survey responses were analyzed to determine, Hypothesis 1: whether Dallas area manufacturing companies were more aware of workplace violence issues than their service industry counterparts and, Hypothesis 2: whether Dallas area organizations were less prepared to deal with violent workplace incidents than the average U.S. company. Hypothesis 1 was analyzed using a Two-Sample T test and Hypothesis 2 was tested by comparing frequency distributions on relevant questions from the Dallas-based sample in the current study to the corresponding responses on the SHRM national survey.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS

This chapter summarizes statistical comparisons. An analysis was performed using statistical software and the results of that data analysis were used to test the hypothesized issues in this study.

Hypothesis 1:

A Two sample T-test comparing the service and manufacturing sub-samples indicated no significant difference in the awareness score (P = .2835) of service firms vs. manufacturing firms. The average awareness scores for each sector were:

Service = 15.382
Manufacturing = 15.318

Hypothesis 2:

Tables 3-8 compare responses to specific questions from the current study's frequency distribution results and published responses to similar questions contained in the 1996 SHRM Workplace Violence Survey. The specific questions were selected due to the relationship to organizations' preparedness for violent incidents. For example, Table 3 indicates that 87 percent of the respondents in the current study have a non-violence policy in their company while only
63 percent of respondents on the SHRM survey reported having this type policy.

In Table 4, 73 percent of the SHRM survey respondent companies reported having a policy which prohibits carrying weapons on the workplace premises, compared to 96 percent of the Dallas-area companies responding to the current survey.
Table 5 reveals that 66 percent of SHRM respondents perform pre-employment background investigations while 81 percent of the Dallas-area respondents to the current survey perform those investigations.

As illustrated in Table 6, 81 percent of the Dallas-area companies represented in the current survey have implemented security measures to control access to the building and employees, as opposed to 67 percent of the SHRM respondents who indicated that they have implemented similar security measures. Respondents in the current study were questioned regarding whether an internal assessment had been made in the past 12 months to determine the potential for violence occurring in the organizations.
Table 7 indicates that 87 percent of the SHRM survey respondents stated their organizations have not performed the assessment vs. 83 percent of Dallas-area companies which have not performed an internal assessment.
Table 8 demonstrates that 22 percent of the Dallas-area survey respondents have written policies for post-incident management vs. 63 percent of the SHRM survey respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
<th>SHRM 63%</th>
<th>CURRENT 22%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the response frequencies indicated in Tables 3 through 8, it appears that Dallas firms are actually more prepared to deal with violent incidents in the workplace than the average U.S. company represented in the SHRM survey. Therefore, the results do not support Hypothesis 2.
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

This chapter presents an in-depth discussion of the study results. The findings for Hypothesis 1 and Hypothesis 2 are reviewed and possible reasons are explored regarding why the anticipated relationships were not found. Also, post hoc analyses is presented as further examination of the data. Finally, conclusions and recommendations are offered.

Hypothesized Relationships

**Hypothesis 1**

Based on the first hypothesized relationship in the study, Dallas-area service industry organizations were expected to be less aware of their risk for workplace violence than Dallas area manufacturing companies. Hypothesis 1 was based on assumptions drawn from the limited available literature regarding employers' level of awareness to the workplace violence (WPV) issue. The hypothesis proposed that manufacturing companies would be more aware of the risk of violence since the highest evidence of workplace violence occurs in manufacturing organizations (Escalating 1995). The underlying assumption for Hypothesis 1 was that, because their exposure is greater, manufacturing
organizations' level of awareness regarding the issue would be higher than service organizations' awareness.

The results of the current study, however, indicated no significant difference in the awareness level of Dallas-area service firms and Dallas-area manufacturing firms. Given that the results did not reach a level of the conventional statistical significance (P was .2835, rather than P < .05), consideration should be given to possible reasons for the failure to support Hypothesis 1.

The U.S. has experienced a dramatic expansion of the service sector in recent years (McKenzie 1997). As the U.S. economy continues to shift toward the service sector, workplace violence will be an increasingly important occupational safety and health issue. Workers involved in retail trade, services, and finance/insurance/real estate service sectors, for example, are exposed to different kinds of hazards than workers in the heavy industry areas such as manufacturing, construction, agriculture, forestry, fishing, mining, or transportation/communication/public utilities. These factors are extremely important to the future direction of occupational safety and health as employment patterns shift from traditional heavy industry to retail trade and the service sectors (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services 1996). It is important to consider the changes to the service/retail sector's hazard exposures
brought about by the economic shift and the sector's reaction to those changes in analyzing future trends.

Although different from the traditional hazards common to heavy industry, the service sector's WPV risks are nevertheless very real. The service sector's exposure to risk primarily involves specific factors such as dealing with the public, the exchange of money, and the delivery of services or goods (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services 1996). It is logical to assume that as the service sector grows, incidents of workplace violence can be expected to increase, forcing the service sector to address WPV issues. These are the same challenging issues which have historically confronted the manufacturing industry. Consequently, the knowledge gained from increased exposure to WPV incidents will advance the service sector's awareness of the WPV issue, thereby moving its level of awareness closer to the manufacturing sector's level of awareness.

Dallas-area service sector responses to the current survey reveal an interesting correlation between the dominance of the local service sector over the local manufacturing sector, and the service sector's awareness of its risk for workplace violence. The service sector responses actually reflect the anticipated futuristic trends heretofore described for the service sectors outside the Dallas area which are expected to grow and dominate their
markets. Dallas-area service/retail organizations constitute 54.7 percent of area businesses, compared to manufacturing organizations' 14.2 percent. The balance of Dallas-area business is made of "other" organizations (31.1 percent). Service/retail organizations have historically comprised the majority of the Dallas-area business base (Dallas 1997). Therefore, it is reasonable that the Dallas-area service organizations' present level of WPV awareness is consistent with the awareness level predicted for future service/retail organizations throughout the U.S. as those organizations gain larger shares of their markets. The exposure to WPV violence afforded by the Dallas-area service sector's vast size has provided experience with WPV issues beyond the average U.S. companies', resulting in increased service sector awareness.

Hypothesis 2

Hypothesis 2 proposed that Dallas area organizations are less prepared to deal with violent incidents in the workplace than the average U.S. company represented in the SHRM survey. Literature indicates companies have generally been slow to increase preparedness in response to WPV incidents (Filipczak, et al 1996). Therefore, Hypothesis 2 was based on the assumption that a lack of prevention and management policies and plans would be especially prevalent
in the service industry-dominated Dallas area. However, the results of the current study failed to support Hypothesis 2.

It is plausible that Dallas area organizations' level of preparedness to deal with WPV increased during the two year period from the 1996 SHRM survey to the current 1998 survey due to education and general exposure to the issue. The passage of time brings continuing changes to the business environment. For example, a comparison of responses to the 1993 SHRM Workplace Violence survey and the 1996 SHRM Workplace Violence survey reveals significant changes in WPV statistics and attitudes toward WPV for the two time periods (e.g., 72 percent of companies responding to the 1993 SHRM survey conducted reference checks, whereas 97 percent of companies responding to the 1996 SHRM survey conducted reference checks). Similarly, it is probable that Dallas area organizations' preparedness improved between the two year period from the 1996 SHRM survey (upon which the hypothesized expectations were based) and the current (1998) survey. Literature discusses evolution of the WPV concept:

"In 1996, few employers are prepared to deal with violence. Most know it is a problem, but like harassment ten years ago, they are not prepared to deal with the enormity of the issue. In the year 2006 virtually every responsible employer will have violence prevention programs in place (Segal 1996, 37)."

Results of the current study suggest Dallas area organizations are considerably ahead of schedule.
Eighty-seven percent of the responses to the current survey, versus 61 percent of the 1996 SHRM survey responses, indicated that Dallas-area organizations have a written policy designed to address threatening or violent behavior. The current study revealed 96% of the respondents' organizations have written policies prohibiting carrying weapons on the workplace premises, compared to 73 percent of the 1996 SHRM survey respondents. Effective September 1, 1995, Texas enacted the concealed handgun statute (Texas 1995). The high rate of violence and weapons policies evidenced by the current study probably resulted from organizations' reaction to the Texas concealed weapons legislation.

Although the current study shows a favorable comparison between Dallas-area firms' preparedness to deal with violent incidents and average U.S. companies' preparedness, weaknesses with Dallas-area firms' post-incident management plans are evident. Seventy-eight percent of the current respondents did not have written policies for post-incident management (steps to take after a violent incident), and 58 percent had no procedures to assist employees after a violent incident.

The following responses presented in Table 9 include reasons given by fifteen organizations in the current study
as to why they have not implemented violence prevention policies:

**TABLE 9**
REASONS FOR NOT HAVING VIOLENCE PREVENTION POLICY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No need</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little potential for violence</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increases Liability</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough incidents experienced to warrant a prevention policy</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Other" reasons for not having violence prevention policies ranged from "Preparation of the policy is in progress", to "Had not really thought about it." The second most frequent reason given (27 percent) indicated that not enough incidents have been experienced to warrant a prevention policy. One might wonder how many incidents of workplace violence are "enough" to justify implementing a prevention policy.

Post Hoc Analysis

Subsequent to analyzing the data as it pertained to the hypotheses, a significant correlation between organization size and organizational awareness and preparedness was detected. Generally, organizations' level of awareness and
preparedness regarding the workplace violence issue increased with organizational size, i.e., larger organizations tended to be more aware and prepared for workplace violence than smaller organizations. Using the organizational size categories in Table 1, an Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was run to evaluate whether the scores on the awareness and preparedness measures differed significantly among firms in different size categories. The ANOVA test results revealed that the level of awareness does indeed differ significantly at $P = .0323$, according to organizational size. The same test produced an even stronger significance level regarding the statistically significant differences across organizational size with regard to preparedness for a violent incident ($P = .0013$). Responses to the 1996 SHRM survey corroborate these findings. In that survey, 70 percent of respondents from large organizations reported having set procedures for dealing with threats of violence, compared to 55 percent of the respondents from small organizations.

The ANOVA also indicated a significant difference ($P = .0029$) in the preparedness level for those firms having a visible commitment and support from the top management versus those firms that do not have this commitment and support. Top management commitment is essential to the effectiveness of a WPV program (OSHA 1996).
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The results of the current survey confirm that violence in the workplace is a very real problem in the Dallas-area. Fifty-five percent of the companies responding to the survey have experienced at least one workplace violence incident. While many respondents acknowledge workplace violence as a concern and are taking the necessary steps to help ensure it does not happen in their organizations, much is left to be done to avert and deal with the crisis.

The most effective way for employers to deter violent behavior in their workplaces is to take prevention measures which include a written workplace violence policy, a threat assessment team, workplace hazard assessment, control and prevention, training and education, incident reporting and investigation procedures, follow-up, evaluation, and recordkeeping. While results from this study indicate the majority of the respondents (87 percent) have implemented violence prevention plans, a significant number still have not. Further, more should be done to improve the hazard assessment and training areas of existing prevention plans. For example, responses to the current study showed that 36 percent of the managers/supervisors have received training to identify warning signs of violent behavior, compared to 22 percent of the employees. Since co-workers typically have close day-to-day contact with potentially violent
offenders, additional emphasis should be placed on training co-workers to recognize and report early warning signs. Increasing employee conflict resolution training from the current rate of 29 percent (as reported by Dallas-area respondents) should reduce the number of workplace conflicts. Additionally, information gathered during a workplace risk assessment can be used by employers to structure prevention programs. Responses to the current survey, however, indicate that 83 percent of the Dallas-area organizations have not undergone an internal assessment in the past twelve months.

As mentioned earlier in this chapter, 78 percent of the current respondents did not have written policies for post-incident management, and 58 percent had no procedures to assist employees after a violent incident. The absence of post-incident management plans seems to indicate a lack of employer belief that workplace violence will actually happen to them.

Dallas-area businesses should experience steady future growth. Based on Dallas-area employers' present high level of workplace violence awareness, it can be assumed that the continued growth will result in even greater employer awareness. However, in order to be entirely prepared to deal with prevention and post-incident management issues, it is critical that Dallas-area businesses improve employee
warning sign recognition and reporting procedures training, as well as recognize that no one is exempt from workplace violence.

Establishing sound prevention and management plans should help offset the potential danger and expense of violent workplace incidents. Hopefully, these plans will help prevent disasters in the workplace and assist with individuals' and organizations' recovery if a tragedy occurs. A well thought-out plan administered by senior management, human resources professionals, the threat assessment team, and others should assist in rebuilding the organization and the lives of the individuals associated with the organization if the unthinkable happens.
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APPENDIX A

WORKPLACE VIOLENCE SURVEY
CURRENT STUDY
WORKPLACE VIOLENCE QUESTIONNAIRE

The following survey was prepared by Nita Starnes, a graduate student at Texas Woman's University, Denton, Texas. Information obtained from survey responses will be incorporated into the preparation of a thesis to satisfy the Master of Business Administration course requirements. The survey has been designed to determine managers' impressions regarding workplace violence and what, if any, steps their organizations are taking to prevent violence from occurring. All responses are voluntary, are entirely confidential, and will be used only for statistical tabulation purposes, in combination with the answers of all other respondents.

Please participate in this confidential survey by faxing the completed questionnaire to:

Attention: Nita Starnes
Fax #214/871-8209

Please respond even if you have not had any incidents of violence. If you have questions, feel free to call Nita Starnes during business hours at 214/871-8229, or during evenings and weekends at 940/566-3681. Your cooperation through sharing your time and experience is helpful and appreciated!

Definitions:

Workplace - any location, permanent or temporary, where an employee performs any work-related duty. This includes, but is not limited to, the buildings and the surrounding perimeters, including the parking lots, field locations, clients' homes, and traveling to and from work assignments. (U.S. Department of Labor)

Workplace Violence - A physical assault, verbal assault, threatening or menacing behavior, verbal abuse or harassment, occurring in the work setting.
DIRECTIONS: CHECK THE MOST APPROPRIATE ANSWER, UNLESS QUESTION REQUESTS MULTIPLE ANSWERS. DISREGARD QUESTIONS WHICH DO NOT APPLY.

VIOLENT INCIDENTS

1. Designate how you perceive the threat of workplace violence to your organization.
   
   _____ Definitely not a threat
   _____ Probably not a threat
   _____ Might or might not be a threat
   _____ A probable threat
   _____ A definite threat

2. Designate your perception of the threat of workplace violence to businesses in general.

   _____ A definite threat
   _____ A probable threat
   _____ Might or might not be a threat
   _____ Definitely not a threat
   _____ Probably not a threat

3. Rank your perception of the following as leading causes of workplace deaths in Texas (rank in order, with #1 being the most probable cause of death).

   _____ Motor vehicle accidents
   _____ Air transportation
   _____ Job related accidents
   _____ Suicide
   _____ Workplace violence
   _____ Other

4. Do you consider workplace violence to be more of a (select one of the following).

   _____ Security issue
   _____ Management issue

5. Do you agree with the statement, "Workplace violence is a relatively new problem for businesses?"

   _____ Strongly disagree
   _____ Disagree
   _____ No opinion
   _____ Agree
   _____ Strongly agree
6. Do you agree that the threat of job loss or actual job termination is the leading cause of workplace violence?

_____ Strongly disagree
_____ Disagree
_____ No opinion
_____ Agree
_____ Strongly agree

7. Do you agree that appropriate applicant screening methods will eliminate the risk of workplace violence?

_____ Strongly disagree
_____ Disagree
_____ No opinion
_____ Agree
_____ Strongly agree

8. An employer can be cited under the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 for incidents involving workplace violence.

_____ Yes  _____ No  _____ Don’t know

9. Has your organization ever experienced a violent incident?

_____ Yes  _____ No  _____ Don’t know

If yes, did the incident occur at a Dallas area facility?

_____ Yes  _____ No  _____ Don’t know

10. If your organization has experienced a violent incident(s), check all categories that apply:

_____ homicide  _____ fistfight
_____ shooting  _____ sexual assault
_____ stabbing  _____ pushing/shoving
_____ verbal threat
_____ Other  __________________________

VIOLENCE PREVENTION

11. Does your organization perform background investigations as a part of the hiring process?

_____ Yes  _____ No  _____ Don’t know
If yes, how? (check all that apply)

____ Previous work history, including reasons for dismissal
____ Reference check
____ Credit check
____ Criminal background check
____ Military discharge information
____ Motor vehicle record
____ Education records (degree verification)
____ Other ____________________

12. Has your organization implemented psychological testing as a part of the hiring process?

____ Yes    ____ No    ____ Don’t know

13. Does your organization have a written policy designed to address threatening or violent behavior?

____ Yes    ____ No    ____ Don’t know

If yes, have your employees been given copies of the policy?

____ Yes    ____ No    ____ Don’t know

If not, do you intend to implement one during the next 12 months?

____ Yes    ____ No    ____ Don’t know

14. If your organization does not have a violence prevention policy, indicate the reason.

____ No need
____ Little potential for violence
____ Increases liability
____ Not enough incidents experienced to warrant a prevention policy
____ Other ____________________

15. Check all the services offered by your organization to help prevent workplace violence.

____ Refer potentially violent employees to an Employee Assistance Plan
____ Offer training to HR managers to identify warning signs of violent behavior
Offer training to all managers/supervisors to identify warning signs of violent behavior
Offer training to employees to identify warning signs of violent behavior
Provide employee training on conflict resolution
Aid employees in obtaining restraining orders against potential aggressors
Other _______________________

16. Has your organization implemented security measures to control access to the building and employees?

Yes No Don’t know

If not, why?

No need
Place of business open to public
Too expensive
Little potential for violence
Other ______________

17. If so, what security measures does your organization enforce to help prevent workplace violence? (Check all that apply)

Check-in or sign-in desk to screen visitors
Access card entry system
Security guards inside building
Security guards patrol grounds and/or parking lot
Provide an escort to/from parking lot for employees after hours
Provide cabs for employees working late
Video surveillance inside the building
Video surveillance outside the building
Increased lighting on the grounds and/or parking lot
Limit public access to all or portions of the building
Issue I.D. cards to employees and visitors

Other

18. Has an internal assessment been made in the past 12 months to determine the potential for violence occurring in your organization’s workplace?

Yes  No  Don’t know

19. Are your organization’s safety and security measures evaluated at least annually?

Yes  No  Don’t know

20. Does your organization have a written policy prohibiting carrying weapons on the workplace premises?

Yes  No  Don’t know

21. Does your organization have an established system for handling grievances?

Yes  No  Don’t know

POST-INCIDENT MANAGEMENT

22. Does your organization have a written policy for post-incident management (steps to take after a violent incident)?

Yes  No  Don’t know

23. Check all steps taken by your organization to assist employees subsequent to a violent workplace incident.

Offer counseling for employees not directly involved in the incident
Offer counseling for victims
Offer counseling to the aggressor/assailant
Offer counseling to the victim’s family
Allow employees to take liberal leave/leave of absence
Aid employees in job relocations within organization
Aid employees in job relocations outside the organization
Other

24. Do the workplace violence prevention/management programs referenced in this questionnaire have the visible commitment and support from the top management of your organization?
   _____ Yes  _____ No  _____ Don’t know

25. Indicate the size of your organization, including all branch offices, according to the total number of employees. Include part-time employees in your total.
   Number of Employees:
   _____ Less than 100  _____ 1001-2500
   _____ 100-250  _____ 2501-5000
   _____ 251-500  _____ Over 5000
   _____ 501-1000

26. Identify your industry sector (please check only one):
   _____ Manufacturing  _____ Services

COMMENTS:

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________

PLEASE FAX YOUR RESPONSES
TO: NITA STARNES
214/871-8209

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION AND ASSISTANCE!!
It is understood that the following responses to Workplace Violence Questionnaire will be used by Nita Starnes in preparation of a thesis. All responses are entirely confidential and will be used for statistical tabulation purposes only, in combination with the answers of all other respondents.
APPENDIX B

1996 WORKPLACE VIOLENCE SURVEY
SOCIETY FOR HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT
What steps are organizations taking to prevent violence from occurring in their workplace? What is being done in the wake of violence? The results of this survey will contain these and other answers that are specific to the issue of workplace violence. All the information you give in response to this survey will provide other human resource professionals with valuable information and insight. Your answers are confidential in nature, and will be used only for statistical tabulation purposes — in combination with the answers of all other respondents.

Please participate in this confidential survey by completing and returning this questionnaire in the enclosed business reply envelope or by fax by April 19, 1996. Even if you haven’t had any incidents of violence, that information is valuable to us and we would still appreciate having the survey returned. If you have any questions, please call Allison Kindelan, SHRM’s Survey/Research Analyst at (703)548-3440 ext. 3607. Thank you for sharing your time and experience.

**INCIDENCE OF VIOLENCE**

1. How many times have the following violent incidents occurred at the facility in which you work since January 1, 1994? (Please indicate the number of each in the space provided)
   - Shooting
   - Rape/sexual assault
   - Stabbing
   - Fistfight
   - Pushing/shoving
   - Verbal threats of violence
   - No incidents have occurred Please skip to #7)
   - Other: ________________

2. In these incidents of violence, how many times has the assailant/aggressor been: (Please indicate a number for each sex)
   - female?
   - male?

3. In these incidents of violence, how many times has the victim been: (Please indicate a number for each sex)
   - female?
   - male?

4. In these incidents of violence, how was the violence directed? (Please indicate the number of each in the space provided)
   - Employee-to-employee
   - Employee-to-supervisor
   - Supervisor-to-employee
   - Relative-to-employee
   - Former employee-to-supervisor
   - Girlfriend/boyfriend-to-employee
   - Other: ________________

5. In your opinion, what has been the primary motivation(s) for the incident(s) of violence that occurred in your workplace? (Please check all that apply)
   - Firing
   - Work-related stress
   - Layoff
   - Financial/legal difficulties
   - Family/marital problems
   - Emotional problems/Mental illness
   - Drug/alcohol abuse
   - Personality conflict
   - Employee strike
   - During the commission of a crime
   - Don’t know/No knowledge of motive
   - Other (please specify): ________________

5. Since January 1, 1994, has the number of violent incidents in your workplace:
   - increased
   - decreased
   - stayed about the same
### BEFORE VIOLENCE OCCURS

7. Since January 1, 1994, have employees at your organization expressed fears that violence may occur at work?
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No
   - [ ] Don’t know

   If yes, has the number of employees’ concerns:
   - [ ] increased
   - [ ] decreased
   - [ ] stayed the same
   - [ ] don’t know

8. As a human resource professional, have you received training to help you identify warning signs leading to potentially violent behavior?
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No
   - [ ] Don’t know

9. Does your organization provide any of the following services for employees to help prevent violence in your workplace?
   (Please check all that apply)
   - [ ] Refer potentially violent employees to an EAP
   - [ ] Offer training to HR managers to identify warning signs of violent behavior
   - [ ] Offer training to all managers/supervisors to identify warning signs of violent behavior
   - [ ] Offer training to employees to identify warning signs of violent behavior
   - [ ] Provide employee training on conflict resolution
   - [ ] Aid employees in obtaining restraining orders against potential aggressors
   - [ ] Other: ____________________________

10. Has your organization undergone a formal risk assessment of the potential for violence in your workplace since January 1, 1994?
    - [ ] Yes
    - [ ] No
    - [ ] Don’t know

11. Does your organization have a written policy in place addressing violent acts in the workplace?
    - [ ] Yes
    - [ ] No
    - [ ] Don’t know

    If not, do you plan to implement one in 1996?
    - [ ] Yes
    - [ ] No
    - [ ] Don’t know

12. Does your organization have a written policy addressing rules and regulations about weapons on the premises?
    - [ ] Yes
    - [ ] No
    - [ ] Don’t know

13. How does your organization respond to threats of violence from an employee? (Please check all that apply)
    - [ ] Referral to EAP
    - [ ] Probation
    - [ ] Suspension
    - [ ] Mandatory counseling
    - [ ] Termination
    - [ ] No set procedure
    - [ ] Other: ____________________________

14. Does your organization thoroughly investigate the background of potential employees?
    - [ ] Yes
    - [ ] No
    - [ ] Don’t know

    If yes, how? (Please check all that apply)
    - [ ] Previous work history including reasons for dismissal
    - [ ] Reference check
    - [ ] Credit check
    - [ ] Criminal background check
    - [ ] Military discharge information
    - [ ] Motor vehicle record
    - [ ] Education records (degree verification)
    - [ ] Other: ____________________________

15. Does your organization require psychological testing as a standard part of the hiring process for all potential employees?
    - [ ] Yes
    - [ ] No
    - [ ] Don’t know
IN THE AFTERMATH OF VIOLENCE

16. In your opinion, how have incidents of violence affected the employees in your organization? (Please check all that apply)
   ___ Decreased morale ___ Increased turnover
   ___ Increased stress levels ___ No effect
   ___ Increased fear ___ Don't know — Have had no incidents of violence
   ___ Decreased productivity ___ Other: ________________________________
   ___ Increased absenteeism ___ ________________________________
   ___ Increased fear ___ ________________________________
   ___ Decreased productivity ___ ________________________________
   ___ Increased absenteeism ___ ________________________________
   ___ Decreased level of co-worker trust ___ ________________________________

17. What steps does your organization take to help employees after a violent incident has occurred in the workplace?
   (Please check all that apply)
   ___ Offer counseling for employees not directly involved in the incident
   ___ Aid employees in job relocations within organization
   ___ Offer counseling for victims
   ___ Aid employees in job relocations outside the organization
   ___ Offer counseling to the aggressor/assailant
   ___ Offer counseling to the victim's family
   ___ Allow employees to take liberal leave/leave of absence
   ___ Other: ________________________________

SECURITY MEASURES

18. Does your organization have a security system designed to control access to your building and your employees?
   ___ Yes ___ No
   ___ Little potential for violence
   ___ Other: ________________________________
   ___ No need
   ___ Place of business open to public
   ___ Too expensive

19. What types of security measures has your organization implemented since January 1, 1994? (Please check all that apply)
   ___ Added a check-in or sign-in desk to screen visitors
   ___ Video surveillance inside the building
   ___ Installation of access card entry systems
   ___ Video surveillance outside the building
   ___ Place security guards inside the building
   ___ Increased lighting on the grounds and/or parking lot
   ___ Security guards patrol grounds and/or parking lot
   ___ Limiting public access to all or portions of the building
   ___ Provide an escort service to/from parking lot for employees after hours
   ___ Issued ID cards to employees and visitors
   ___ Other: ________________________________
   ___ Provide __________ for employees working late

20. Were these security measures implemented:
   ___ as a direct response to an incident(s) of violence in your workplace?
   ___ as a preventative measure?
   ___ Other: ________________________________

DEMOGRAPHICS

21. Number of employees for which you/your department provides services: (Please check only one)
   ___ Less than 100 employees
   ___ 100-250 employees
   ___ 251-500 employees
   ___ 501-1000 employees
   ___ 1001-2500 employees
   ___ 2501-5000 employees
   ___ Over 5000 employees
22. Your industry: (Please check only one)
   ___ Manufacturing  ___ Education
   ___ Telecommunications ___ Health care
   ___ Utilities, transportation, communications ___ Government
   ___ Retail/wholesale ___ Services
   ___ Hospitality ___ Other - please specify:
   ___ Finance, insurance, real estate
   ___ Computer

23. Your region: (Please check only one)
   ___ New England (CT, ME, MA, NH, RI, VT)
   ___ Middle Atlantic (NJ, NY, PA)
   ___ South Atlantic (DE, DC, FL, GA, MD, NC, SC, VA, WV)
   ___ East North Central (IL, IN, MI, OH, WI)
   ___ East South Central (AL, KY, MS, TN)
   ___ West North Central (IA, KS, MN, MO, NE, ND, SD)
   ___ West South Central (AR, LA, OK, TX)
   ___ Mountain (AZ, CO, ID, MT, NV, NM, UT, WY)
   ___ Pacific (AK, CA, HI, OR, WA)

Comments:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

IN ADDITION . . .

1. Is your organization unionized?
   ___ Yes ___ No

   If yes, have you had any violent incidents related to:
   ___ strikes ___ during negotiation periods
   ___ during union organizing periods ___ Other:

   Who was involved
   ___ Employee ___ Other:
   ___ Manager/supervisor ___ Other:
   ___ Union official

IN ADDITION . . .

1. Have there been any incidents at your organization that you would consider to be cases of domestic violence spilling over into the workplace?
   ___ Yes ___ No

Please return this survey by April 19, 1996 to SHRM attention Allison Kindelan by Fax at (703) 836-0367 or mail in the enclosed Business Reply Envelope to:

Survey Research Analyst/Government Affairs Department
Society for Human Resource Management
606 N. Washington Street • Alexandria, VA 22314
1-800-283-7476 • (703) 548-3440 ext. 3607

Thank you for your assistance.