

10-2022

Exploring the Relationship Between Domestic Violence and Workplace Violence

Jared W. Snow
jsnow15@georgefox.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/dbadmin>

Recommended Citation

Snow, Jared W., "Exploring the Relationship Between Domestic Violence and Workplace Violence" (2022).
Doctor of Business Administration (DBA). 56.
<https://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/dbadmin/56>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Digital Commons @ George Fox University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Doctor of Business Administration (DBA) by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ George Fox University. For more information, please contact arolfe@georgefox.edu.

Exploring the Relationship Between
Domestic Violence and Workplace Violence

Jared W. Snow

George Fox University



GEORGE FOX
UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF BUSINESS

**Dissertation Completion Approval
Doctor of Business Administration**

Student Name: Jared Snow Student ID#: 1850912

Cohort #: 11

Concentration: MGMT

Project Title:

Exploring the Relationship Between Domestic Violence and Workplace Violence

has been approved for the Doctor of Business Administration Program
at George Fox University as a dissertation for the DBA degree.

Approval Signatures:

[Signature] Date 10/11/2022
Chair

Dr. Paul Shelton, PhD.

Chair (print)

[Signature] Date 10-17-2022
Member

Dr. Dirk Barram, PhD.

Member (print)

[Signature] Date 10/13/2022
Member

Dr. Brad Jensen, PhD.

Member (print)

[Signature] Date 10-10-22
Dr. Debby Thomas, PhD, Director, DBA Program

Dedication

This dissertation is dedicated to the victims of domestic and workplace violence. This topic should not need the attention it requires. One's home should be a safe place to enjoy time with loved ones, rest, and relax. One's workplace should provide the greatest chance to achieve their professional dreams without doubt, concern, or fear. My hope is that the information provided here will be used to help stop the violence.

Acknowledgments

First, I want to thank my family, Karen, Zach, Gavin, and Kaia for your support while I focused so much time and energy working through my educational journey, in addition to learning more about who I am, who I can be, and how to be a better friend and father in the process. I know this has taken its toll on you, through all our trials and tribulations, and our ups and downs. To my parents, Dr. William Snow and Debi Snow, thank you for your never-ending love and support. With your example, support, and guidance, I found my way, and I cannot thank you enough. I love you all.

Frank Sindelar, you simply answered my email which set us on a path of new learning, friendship, mentorship, and more. I learned so much about interpersonal communication, listening, disclosing... the list goes on. I will forever be grateful for our friendship and the community VIP-ManAlive offered me. Janet McClard, your perspective, wisdom, and positive approach to life is admirable. I appreciate the countless hours of training, education, and friendship that you provided me along the way.

Tiffany Gilmartin, Your Honor, thank you for being present, listening, and understanding as I shared my struggles with you. I appreciate your encouragement and support, and the many lunches we share together. Heather Vaccaro, I appreciate your sense of humor, candor, and the connection we made in class. Thank you for encouraging me to get out of my room to go on adventures and for sharing your life with me. I consider you a forever friend, and I appreciate your accountability and encouragement.

To all of my military leadership, friends, and team. Thank you for being supportive and understanding of me as we endured long weekends and late nights together. You inspired me to do and be more. Thank you.

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to explore whether or not a relationship exists between domestic violence (DV) and workplace violence (WPV). The results may be used to help further develop and refine DV and WPV prevention and intervention programs and policies for use by organizations, batterer treatment programs, and the judicial system to better meet the needs of the community. A survey was developed for this study, consisting of 81 questions thematically derived from literature and existing domestic and workplace related standardized questionnaires. Six scales were developed using the questions posed which further contribute to the DV and WPV body of knowledge. Data suggests a relationship exists between those who initiate DV and those who initiate WPV. Age, gender, and employment status were not statistically significant, while education level, employment type, and role in industry were statistically significant. With limited existing research on the relationship between DV and WPV, this study helps bridge the knowledge gap that other researchers identified as essential.

Keywords: Violence, workplace, domestic, aggression, perpetrator, victim, bullying

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| DEDICATION..... | 3 |
| ACKNOWLEDGMENTS..... | 4 |
| ABSTRACT..... | 5 |
| CHAPTER 1 – INTRODUCTION..... | 8 |
| STATEMENT OF THE RESEARCH PROBLEM | 8 |
| PURPOSE OF THE STUDY | 14 |
| RESEARCH QUESTIONS | 14 |
| DEFINITION OF TERMS | 15 |
| DELIMITATIONS | 17 |
| ASSUMPTIONS AND LIMITATIONS | 18 |
| RESEARCHER’S PERSPECTIVE | 20 |
| CHAPTER 2 – LITERATURE REVIEW..... | 22 |
| VIOLENCE | 22 |
| DOMESTIC VIOLENCE | 24 |
| WORKPLACE VIOLENCE AND AGGRESSION..... | 27 |
| WORKPLACE BULLYING | 30 |
| DOMESTIC VIOLENCE PROGRAMS..... | 32 |
| WORKPLACE VIOLENCE PROGRAMS | 34 |
| STANDARDIZED SURVEYS AND QUESTIONNAIRES..... | 36 |
| CONCLUSION | 38 |
| CHAPTER 3 – METHOD..... | 39 |
| SURVEY DESIGN | 39 |

| | |
|---|------------|
| SURVEY QUESTIONS | 41 |
| PARTICIPANT PROTECTIONS..... | 44 |
| PILOT SURVEY | 45 |
| PROCEDURE | 47 |
| DATA ANALYSIS | 47 |
| CHAPTER 4 – RESULTS..... | 50 |
| DATA COLLECTION | 53 |
| DEMOGRAPHIC DATA | 53 |
| RELIABILITY | 56 |
| RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND HYPOTHESES | 59 |
| ADDITIONAL OBSERVATIONS..... | 66 |
| CONCLUSION | 71 |
| CHAPTER 5 – DISCUSSION..... | 74 |
| DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS | 74 |
| AREAS FOR FUTURE STUDY | 79 |
| CONTRIBUTIONS TO ACADEMIA | 80 |
| CONTRIBUTIONS TO PROFESSION | 81 |
| LIMITATIONS..... | 84 |
| CONCLUSION | 85 |
| REFERENCES..... | 86 |
| APPENDICES..... | 106 |

CHAPTER 1 – INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Research Problem

It is estimated that organizations will spend approximately \$4.2 billion annually addressing the consequences and results of workplace violence (WPV) and workplace aggression (WPA) (Speroni, Fitch, Dawson, Dugan, & Atherton, 2014) and \$6 billion annually on workplace bullying (WPB) (Malik, Sattar, & Yaqub, 2018), collectively termed WPV. Medical care alone is estimated to be up to \$109,000 per WPV occurrence or more with the COVID-19 pandemic (Arnetz, 2022). More current data is limited. For example, the U.S. Bureau of Labor and Statistics published the 2020 census of fatal injuries in December 2021, with data collected in 2019.

The Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) offers various resources for workplace safety and health; however, OSHA enforcement is limited and openly states that, “There are currently no specific OSHA standards for workplace violence” (www.osha.gov/workplace-violence/enforcement). OSHA further states that in accordance with section 5(a)(1) of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970, “employers are required to provide their employees with a place of employment that is “free from recognized hazards that are causing or are likely to cause death or serious physical harm.””. It is the responsibility of the organization to combat WPV.

WPV definitions vary (Caprara et al., 2014; Lanctôt & Guay, 2014) but may be defined as “a distinct form of workplace aggression that comprises behaviors that are intended to cause physical harm” (Barling et al., 2009, p. 673), “behavior by an individual or individuals within or outside an organization that is intended to physically or psychologically harm a worker or workers and occurs in a work-related context”

(Frone et al., 2005, p. 191), or a long-term aggression carried out over time against someone who cannot defend themselves (Cooper, Walker, Askew, Robinson, & McNair, 2011). With these definitions in mind, violence in the workplace may come from within or outside of the organization. The organization and organizational leadership must be prepared to handle such situations, freeing the workplace of violence.

WPV is often treated as an axiom versus an issue to be addressed (Bentley, Catley, Forsyth, & Tappin, 2014; Lanctôt & Guay, 2014), which may result in short and long-term physical and psychological consequences. As with any adverse experience, consequences emerge. Individuals and organizations suffer from WPV in many ways. These include “personal safety concerns, job insecurity, fear, lowered job performance, job satisfaction, affective commitment, intent to turnover, psychological distress, emotional exhaustion, depression, physical well-being, interpersonal deviance, and organizational deviance” (Piquero et al., 2013, p. 390). Lanctôt and Guay (2014) identify additional consequences of WPV, which include physical, psychological, emotional, work functioning, relationship with others, quality of care, social/general, and financial, as well as PTSD, which may reappear at any time in the future, depending on the individual.

WPV became a topic of discussion since the U.S. Post Office violence related cases in the 1980s (Piquero, Piquero, Craig, & Clipper, 2013) and is increasing at a rate of one to three percent annually (Bentley et al., 2014; Estrada, Nilsson, Jerre, & Wikman, 2010; Namie & Namie, 2017), and in some cases, seen as “part of the job” (Lanctôt & Guay, 2014; Natalier, Cortis, Seymour, Wendt, & King, 2021). Nearly 61% of U.S. citizens are aware that WPV occurs, with over 61 million Americans affected by WPV (Namie & Namie, 2017). Organizations with the most significant risk of WPV are the

health, public administration, education, transportation, and hospitality industries (Bentley et al., 2014; Natalier et al., 2021); however, the issue of violence is not restricted to these industries.

Similar violence-focused research exists in the domain of domestic violence (DV), which is a global and highly pervasive epidemic that affects women (Beiras, Nascimento, & Incrocci, 2019; Cardia, 2002; Golu, 2014; WHO, 1996, 2014, 2019) and men in a multitude of ways (Caldwell, Swan, Allen, Sullivan, & Snow, 2009; Houry et al., 2008; Langhinrichsen-Rohling, McCullars, & Misra, 2012; Langhinrichsen-Rohling, Misra, Selwyn, & Rohling, 2012; Lipsky, Caetano, Field, & Bazargan, 2004). Further, same-sex couples are a topic of more recent research as DV extends beyond that of opposite gender relationships (Johnson & Ferraro, 2000; Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 2010; Razera, Gaspodini, & Falcke, 2017; Scarduzio, Carlyle, Harris, & Savage, 2017; West, 2012). DV in the United States has been estimated to cost \$8 billion per year in lost productivity and healthcare costs (Jonge, 2018), in addition to other indirect costs such as hiring and training new employees in the event of employee turn-over (Guthrie & Babic, 2021).

DV is a violent act or abuse by a family member over another (Golu, 2014), which may originate outside of the familial context (Febres et al., 2014), is a severe and complex social and public health issue (Costa et al., 2015; Dixon & Graham-Kevan, 2011) that often goes unseen, and is a widespread form of violence (Awang & Hariharan, 2011). A close correlation is found between “psychological and emotional abuse and suicide attempts” (Golu, 2014, p. 612) and other physical and mental health issues (Coker, McKeown, & King, 2000; Phillips & Vandenbroek, 2018; Thompson et al.,

2006). DV towards women has been researched heavily, with little research on male DV victims (Choi & Hyun, 2016; Dixon & Graham-Kevan, 2011), and even less on the relationship, if any, between DV and WPV (Piquero et al., 2013; Raftery, 2015).

A study in 2020 assessed the impact of workplace harassment (a form of WPV) and DV on employees' productivity in developing countries (Węziak-Białowolska, Białowolski, & McNeely, 2020). This study focused on the experiences of the victims of WPV and DV as it relates to their workplace productivity and desire to leave the organization. While the results varied between countries studied, the general theme indicated that unaddressed WPV and DV led to diminished employee productivity and/or the decision to leave the organization. For its own sake, the organization would benefit by addressing DV, regardless of where this specific violence occurs, as it directly impacts productivity. Intervening in various ways on behalf of, and supporting DV victims, is considered a corporate social responsibility (Giesbrecht, 2022; Guthrie & Babic, 2021).

DV extends its reach into the workplace in several ways, including the loss of productivity (Giesbrecht, 2022; Jonge, 2018; Węziak-Białowolska et al., 2020). Victims of DV are more likely to call in sick, have trouble focusing on their work, or quit their job altogether (Swanberg & Logan, 2005). Victims may be further victimized if the perpetrator brings violent interactions to the victim's workplace (Giesbrecht, 2022; Lee, 2005; Mollica & Danehower, 2014). This places the organization in a supportive role of the DV victim (Mollica & Danehower, 2014). DV research indicates violent behavior extends to non-domestic relationships, i.e., work, acquaintances, etc. (Appel & Holden, 1998; Hamberger, Lohr, Bonge, & Tolin, 1996; Holtzworth-Munroe, Meehan, Herron, Rehman, & Stuart, 2000; Price & Rosenbaum, 2009), and is seldom a standalone event or

set of events (Adams, 2012). The challenge, then, is how do organizations respond to various acts of violence in the workplace?

In the United States, most states, counties, and cities have enacted legislation resulting in more rigorous prosecution and convictions of DV (Price & Rosenbaum, 2009). This includes a requirement for DV perpetrators to attend batterer treatment programs (BTPs), also called batterer intervention programs (BIPs). BTPs are regulated and serve to help the community through violence education and reformation for perpetrators of DV. However, organizational level WPV programs are often limited to policies indicating an intolerance to violence (OSHA, 2022) and victim support with little emphasis on education, intervention, or perpetrator reformation, with many individuals feeling powerless, unable to resolve WPV disputes (Sims, 2019).

Organizations must be attentive to indicators of potential violence and intervene quickly. Unaddressed violence may result in increased turnover, continuing violence within the organization, and placing others, including the organization, at further risk (Mayer, 2021; Sims, 2019; Węziak-Białowolska et al., 2020; Zabrodska, Linnell, Laws, & Davies, 2011). The organizational culture and climate either enhance or detract from WPV (Adewumi & Danesi, 2017; Lewis, Deakin, & McGregor, 2018; Lewis & Sheehan, 2003), yet organizations are failing to accept responsibility for the prevention, intervention, and correction of WPV (Namie & Namie, 2017).

Employees may voice their concerns to the organization or leave (Mayer, 2021). Employers who become aware of DV incidents directed to their employees can offer victims formal support, such as a workplace assistance program, and informal support, such as empathy, screening phone calls, and walking victims to their cars after work

(Guthrie & Babic, 2021; Jonge, 2018; Swanberg & Logan, 2005). Organizational leadership must understand their roles and responsibilities to all parties involved.

Research suggests that organizations may be able to develop additional WPV prevention strategies based on identified risk factors and implement risk mitigation strategies based on job characteristics (Leblanc & Kelloway, 2002; Ward & Fortune, 2016), such as the type and location of work performed. The National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) developed a framework to address worker well-being that looks holistically at worker well-being. This framework includes 1) workplace physical environment and safety climate, 2) workplace policies and culture, 3) health status, 4) work evaluation and experience, and 5) home, community, and society (Chari et al., 2018). This includes developing and implementing education, intervention, and reformation programs. These programs should consider differentiating techniques based on the degree, severity, frequency, and target (coworker or domestic relationship) of the violence (Carbajosa, Catalá-Miñana, Lila, & Gracia, 2017; Holtzworth-Munroe & Meehan, 2004). This includes addressing potential violence at home (DV) (Kolk, 2016; Locke, Amengual, & Mangla, 2009; Lund-Thomsen & Lindgreen, 2014; Węziak-Białowolska et al., 2020). Victims of WPV need to learn how to defend themselves, which includes knowing the reporting methods available to them. Perpetrators of WPV need to understand why they are being violent, changing and overturning the social norms to prevent, reduce, and eliminate their violence altogether (Dixon & Graham-Kevan, 2011; Dutton, 2006; Sinclair & Bruenn, 2002).

Limited research exists on the relationship between DV and WPV. Research on the intervention, prevention, and consequences of WPV, while growing (Natalier et al.,

2021), is limited and needs additional attention (Adewumi & Danesi, 2017; Lanctôt & Guay, 2014). Barling, Dupré, and Kelloway (2009) suggest that further research on violence “across contexts and/or relationships while taking into account dispositional factors” are required (p. 682). Some researchers note that the development of theories concerning interpersonal violent crimes should consider the perspectives of the victims and perpetrators, as well as the context, events, and motivators occurring during or around the incident (Bell & Naugle, 2008; Natalier et al., 2021; West, 2012). If left unaddressed, WPV may become more rampant.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to explore whether or not a relationship exists between domestic violence and workplace violence. The findings from this study will contribute to DV and WPV research and body of knowledge. Further, this study may be used to help further develop and refine effective DV and WPV prevention and intervention programs and policies for use by organizations, BTPs, and the judicial system to better meet the needs of the community.

Research Questions

The objective of this study was to explore whether or not a relationship exists between domestic violence and workplace violence. The following research questions aimed to address this objective.

RQ 1: Are individuals who commit acts of DV more likely to commit acts of WPV?

H1: Individuals who commit acts of DV are more likely to commit acts of WPV.

RQ 2: Are individuals who commit acts of WPV more likely to commit acts of DV?

H2: Individuals who commit acts of WPV are more likely to commit acts of DV.

RQ 3: *Are individuals who commit acts of WPV more likely to be recipients of DV?*

H3: *Individuals who commit acts of WPV are more likely to have been recipients of DV.*

RQ 4: *Are individuals who commit acts of DV more likely to be recipients of WPV?*

H4: *Individuals who commit acts of DV are more likely to have been recipients of WPV.*

Definition of Terms

Violence. Violence is used to gain control over someone through the use of emotional, verbal, physical, and sexual means; to stop someone from doing something they want to do or force someone to do something they do not want to do (Awang & Hariharan, 2011; Sinclair & Bruenn, 2002).

Physical violence. Examples include pushing, shoving, grabbing, hitting, breaking, or taking objects away from others, throwing objects, posturing oneself, and blocking passage to others (Awang & Hariharan, 2011; Golu, 2014; Sinclair & Bruenn, 2002; Speroni et al., 2014).

Verbal violence. The use of the volume of one's voice (volume/loudness as perceived by others), tone, or language (i.e., cursing, patronizing, belittling, etc.) to trivialize, diminish, or objectify others (Awang & Hariharan, 2011; Golu, 2014; Sinclair & Bruenn, 2002; Speroni et al., 2014).

Emotional violence. This type of violence is subtler but nonetheless damaging and is often passive. Examples include withholding information or money, "managing" someone's time (i.e., being late or early), invading another's space, stalking, or trying

another's patience (Awang & Hariharan, 2011; Golu, 2014; Sinclair & Bruenn, 2002; Speroni et al., 2014).

Sexual violence. This includes commonly known sexual violence such as sexual harassment, assault, and rape (Awang & Hariharan, 2011; Caldwell et al., 2009; Golu, 2014). Additionally, the use of gender specific terms, including various crass and vulgar terms (*actual offensive terms intentionally left out*) and subtler specific phrases that denote gender (Sinclair and Bruenn, 2002).

Domestic violence. Also known as intimate partner violence, is a type of violence that "takes place when one partner is dominated and controlled through physical or psychological means" (Awang & Hariharan, 2011, p. 461). This includes physical, verbal, emotional, and sexual violence or control.

Workplace violence. "A distinct form of workplace aggression that comprises behaviors that are intended to cause physical harm" (Barling et al., 2009, p. 673).

Workplace aggression. The "behavior by an individual or individuals within or outside an organization that is intended to physically or psychologically harm a worker or workers and occurs in a work-related context" (Frone et al., 2005, p. 191).

Workplace bullying. "Long-term aggressive or negative acts or behaviors, carried out repeatedly over time, and directed at someone who finds it difficult to defend him/herself because of a relationship with the bully that is characterized by an imbalance of power" (Cooper et al., 2011, p. 2).

Domestic Initiator. Committing a behavior that constitutes a form of domestic violence.

Domestic Receiver. Being a recipient of an act that constitutes a form of domestic violence.

Domestic Observer. Observing an act that constitutes a form of domestic violence.

Workplace Initiator. Committing a behavior that constitutes a form of workplace violence.

Workplace Receiver. Being a recipient of an act that constitutes a form of workplace violence.

Workplace Observer. Observing an act that constitutes a form of workplace violence.

Delimitations

Actions. Before completion of the survey, participants were encouraged to provide honest responses to the questions posed. Participants were instructed to limit their responses to their perpetration/victimization within their domestic relationships and experiences in the workplace.

Literature. The literature reviewed for this study included the keywords and phrases of violence, domestic violence, workplace aggression, workplace violence, definitions of the types of violence, workplace bullying, perpetrator, effects of DV, effects of WPV/WPA, and DV/WPV/WPA recidivism.

Population. The sample population consisted of general population adults from the United States (over the age of 18 years to mitigate risk to minors), identifying as having “any exposure or experience with negative workplace or domestic encounters.” Participants were recruited using the research platform Prolific (prolific.co), enabling a

greater depth of participants and increased response rate. Participants completed the survey using Qualtrics (qualtrics.com) to enable a broader range of participants and to improve the potential response rate.

Methodology. Questions containing personally identifiable information, such as names and addresses, were not collected to protect the participant from intentional or accidental identification. This enabled anonymity for the participant and increased honest responses from the participant.

Assumptions and Limitations

Assumptions. The primary assumption is that participants honestly responded to both sets of questions.

Limitations.

Analysis. Analysis of the responses provided by the participants assumed they were honest regarding their experiences domestically and in their workplace. Data collection was conducted using electronic surveys, limiting responses from participants with or access to a computer with internet service, smartphone, tablet, or other similar devices.

Financial incentive. Participants were identified and financially incentivized (paid through Prolific) to complete this research survey, at a rate of \$12 per hour, an amount determined as “good” by Prolific. Participants completed the survey through Qualtrics, which estimated the time to complete the survey at 15 minutes. As a result, participants received \$3.00 to complete the survey.

Self-reporting. Participants were allowed to complete the survey conducted for this study using their personal computer, tablet, or smartphone.

Sample. The sample population consisted of general population adults, identifying as having “any exposure or experience with negative workplace or domestic encounters.” This allowed for randomization of the work performed, allowing for a potential greater breadth of the types of work, providing diverse experiences and context for this research. Respondents were limited to those willing to participate in the study and share their experiences.

Time constraints. The study results are limited (generalizable) to the limited response rate. The limited research window may have contributed to the total number of respondents, resulting in a limited response rate. Conducting this research over a more extended period could improve the response rate.

Significance of the Study

Various types of WPV are researched using different study designs (Costa et al., 2015), with 57% using quantitative designs, 34% using a literature review method, and 4% using qualitative or mixed methods (Razera et al., 2017). Attempts have been made to identify personality and pathological characteristics that may increase an individual’s likelihood of perpetrating violence. Two approaches often cited include Dutton's Borderline Personality Organization (BPO) and Assaultiveness theory and Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart's Developmental Model of Batterer Subtypes (Dutton, 1995a; Steinberg, Holtzworth-Munroe, & Stuart, 1994). Various theories have been developed; however, little or mixed empirical evidence supports these theories due to the sheer number of theories available and the divisiveness between the researchers (Bell & Naugle, 2008).

The costs to recruit, train, and retain new employees may exceed the cost to train or retrain existing employees on the identification, prevention, and reformation of WPV, including DV brought into the workplace (Jonge, 2018; Kolk, 2016; Locke et al., 2009; Lund-Thomsen & Lindgreen, 2014; Węziak-Białowolska et al., 2020). Given the growing research and advocacy regarding the organization's responsibility to support victims of DV, as well as the prevalence of WPV within organizations, further research is necessary to support organizations as they address the issue of violence in the workplace. This places the burden of identification, prevention, and reformation (if possible) of WPV on the organization.

The organization, and its leadership, are responsible for the safe employment of its personnel which extends beyond the direct work environment (Chari et al., 2018). This may be challenging for many organizations looking to serve a customer or client, meet board objectives, satisfy various stakeholders, and comply with local laws and regulations. Absent improved research, developed tools and resources, or governing laws, organizations are left to fend for themselves, which may lead to a simple policy denoting their intolerance for violence in accordance with published standards on corporate social responsibility (ISO, 2010; Lund-Thomsen & Lindgreen, 2014; OSHA, 2022), which may inadvertently perpetuate violence and contribute to the problem versus helping solve it.

Researcher's Perspective

In 2016, this author began working with, and facilitating classes for, VIP-ManAlive, a Placer County, California certified batterer's intervention and prevention, and anger management program. Utilizing a peer re-education format, the program focuses on the core concept of '100% of my behaviors, 100% of the time, are my choice'

(Sinclair & Bruenn, 2002), teaching practical coping skills, improving interpersonal communication, and helping participants change their beliefs of what violence is and why they are violent. Over the course of program facilitation, this author noticed a trend in behaviors that, according to the program participants, extended from their domestic relationships to their work relationships, but were situationally dependent. Based on these observations, this author developed an interest in whether or not a relationship exists between individuals that initiate acts of DV and WPV.

CHAPTER 2 – LITERATURE REVIEW

Organizations are comprised of individuals from diverse backgrounds and experiences, which brings opportunities and challenges to all involved. Organizations and individuals evolve, grow together, and experience the turbulence that occurs as a result. Individual personalities and tendencies appear in many ways, and during stressful situations, present as some would describe as assertive, aggressive, bullying, or even violent. How individuals and organizations respond could mean the difference between success and failure or even limited or long-term impacts on self (or the organization). While significant research exists on the impacts of DV on the individual and society's responsibility to address DV, and with a growing body of knowledge on the impacts of WPV on the individual and organization, little research exists regarding the relationship between WPV and DV, and how organizations may proactively address these issues. This literature review explored the topics of violence, WPV, DV, programs that seek to identify and eliminate WPV and DV, and how WPV and DV were previously studied.

Violence

Violence is generally intended as a (learned) last resort to gain control over someone or something (Sinclair & Bruenn, 2002), often called bullying (Cooper et al., 2011). The intent is not necessarily to cause harm, but to gain control or (perceived) power, and may be performed by male and female perpetrators against female and/or male victims (Awang & Hariharan, 2011; Choi & Hyun, 2016; Golu, 2014; Phillips & Vandenbroek, 2018; M. A. Straus, 2011). Irritability may lead to impulsivity and/or irrational reactions, contributing to aggression, anger, and ultimately violence; however, this area is lacking and requires further research (Caprara et al., 2014). With the general

working definition of WPV as the intent to cause physical or physiological harm at work (Barling, Dupré, & Kelloway, 2009; Frone, Kelloway, & Barling, 2005), the more specific types of violence and their descriptions should bring clarity to the definitions moving forward.

Physical. Physical violence is the use of physical means to gain control over someone or something (Caldwell et al., 2009). This includes pushing, shoving, grabbing at, hitting, breaking, or taking objects away from others, as well as posturing one's self or blocking passage to others (Awang & Hariharan, 2011; Choi & Hyun, 2016; Golu, 2014; Sinclair & Bruenn, 2002; Speroni et al., 2014) to name a few. Physical violence may result in injuries, chronic pain, substance abuse disorders, depression, post-traumatic stress disorder, and suicide (Kraanen, Vedel, Scholing, & Emmelkamp, 2013; Kraanen, Vedel, Scholing, & Emmelkamp, 2014; Phillips & Vandenbroek, 2018). The intent behind physical violence is to use any physical means necessary to gain control over someone or a situation.

Verbal. Verbal violence is anything that comes out of one's mouth. This can include tone, volume, or language (such as profanity). While this may appear to be a bit bland – or obvious – trivializing others, calling people inappropriate names, objectifying others, cursing, and even patronizing is a form of verbal violence (Awang & Hariharan, 2011; Choi & Hyun, 2016; Golu, 2014; Sinclair & Bruenn, 2002; Speroni et al., 2014). The intent here is that the perpetrator uses vocalization to intimidate others into giving in to their desires.

Emotional. Emotional violence is the most common form of violence, mainly because it can be done easily, unintentionally, or as a byproduct of another form of

violence (Sinclair & Bruenn, 2002). Emotional violence includes withholding information, being late to appointments, invading another's space, listening to loud music (in an attempt to "drown out" others), stalking, or even trying another's patience (Awang & Hariharan, 2011; Choi & Hyun, 2016; Golu, 2014; Sinclair & Bruenn, 2002; Speroni et al., 2014). Emotional violence occurs when someone does something that has a negative emotional effect on another individual with the intent to control the impacted individual.

Sexual. Sexual violence is often associated with sexual harassment or assault (Awang & Hariharan, 2011; Choi & Hyun, 2016; Golu, 2014), or the withholding of sexual encounters from a partner in the context of an intimate relationship (West, 2012). Sinclair and Bruenn (2002) add that using gender (male or female) in any violent situation makes it a form of sexual violence, as this implies that gender makes one more (or less) powerful or in control based on their gender.

Domestic Violence

Domestic violence (DV) is a violent act or abuse by a family member over another (Golu, 2014) and is a serious and complex social and public health issue (Beiras et al., 2019; Costa et al., 2015; Dixon & Graham-Kevan, 2011; Low et al., 2019) that often goes unseen, with 80% of women experiencing DV having never reported the incident(s) (Phillips & Vandenbroek, 2018), and is a widespread form of violence (Awang & Hariharan, 2011; Caman, Kristiansson, Granath, & Sturup, 2017). DV is often perpetrated by someone in a position of trust, power, and intimacy over the victim (Awang & Hariharan, 2011; Kraanen et al., 2013), which leaves the victim unable to make their own decisions, express their views, and protect themselves or their children out of fear of repercussions (Golu, 2014). Violent incidents are more often seen as

‘crimes’ compared to similar incidents perpetrated by domestic relationships (Phillips & Vandenbroek, 2018), more often perceived as ‘partner issues.’ Once a single instance of DV occurs, follow-on incidents are more likely to occur and spill over into other relationships within the family (Low et al., 2019).

DV victims are at increased risk of major mental disorders, substance abuse, PTSD, and self-harm due to DV incidents (Caman et al., 2017; Phillips & Vandenbroek, 2018). A study in 2020 assessed the impact of workplace harassment (a form of WPV) and DV on employees' productivity in developing countries (Węziak-Białowolska et al., 2020). This study focused on the experiences of the victims of WPV and DV as it relates to their workplace productivity and desire to leave the organization. DV victims often quit their jobs due to excessive stress or are terminated for missing too many work days (i.e., calling in sick) due to being ashamed of their abuse, emotionally ill, or physically incapable of going to work (Swanberg & Logan, 2005). A significant number of victims struggle with determining if and when they will leave their violent situations, often unsuccessfully leaving on multiple occasions (Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 2010; Phillips & Vandenbroek, 2018; Yamawaki, Ochoa-Shipp, Pulsipher, Harlos, & Swindler, 2012), with some success as a result of homicide perpetrated by the DV victim as a means to escape (Caman et al., 2017).

Existing research identifies that DV is predominately perpetrated by young men with a lower socioeconomic status (Phillips & Vandenbroek, 2018) against women (Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 2010; Langhinrichsen-Rohling & Capaldi, 2012), with up to 55% of women becoming victims in their lifetime (Coker et al., 2000; Thompson et al., 2006; Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000), although men and women alike may perpetrate DV

(Julia C. Babcock, Green, & Robie, 2004; Caldwell et al., 2009; Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 2010; Price & Rosenbaum, 2009; M. Straus, 2008; M. A. Straus, 2011), with growing research on male victims of DV. Since the 1970s, practitioners and researchers from a broad spectrum of disciplines have documented the problems that violence against women and family cause for the victims and society as a whole (Crowell & Burgess, 1996; Razera et al., 2017; M. Straus, 2008). As a result of Crowell and Burgess' (1996) efforts, Congress passed the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (Title IV of Public Law 103–322, the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994), and the Violence Against Women Office (now named the Office on Violence Against Women (OVW)), was established in the U.S. Department of Justice. These acts resulted in identifying violence against women and families as a national problem.

In the United States, approximately two million women are assaulted by their intimate partner each year (Bell & Naugle, 2008), even though approximately 80% of DV incidents are unreported (Phillips & Vandenbroek, 2018), with a close correlation found between “psychological and emotional abuse and suicide attempts” (Golu, 2014, p. 612). Early exposure to violence, low-quality peers (i.e., “bad friends”), and low socioeconomic status as an adolescent increase the likelihood of one becoming a perpetrator of (domestic) violence in adulthood for both males and females (Costa et al., 2015; Phillips & Vandenbroek, 2018). Some of the stressors believed to increase the risk of engaging in domestic violence situations include economic hardships (Bell & Naugle, 2008), employment and socioeconomic status (Awang & Hariharan, 2011; Phillips & Vandenbroek, 2018), and communication skills (Choi & Hyun, 2016).

DV continues to be a global and highly pervasive epidemic with greater recognition of the range of behaviors that constitute DV (Phillips & Vandenbroek, 2018). Attempts have been made to identify personality and pathological characteristics that may increase an individual's likelihood of perpetrating DV. Two approaches often cited include Dutton's Borderline Personality Organization (BPO) and Assaultiveness theory and Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart's Developmental Model of Batterer Subtypes (Dutton, 1995a; Steinberg et al., 1994). Various types of violence are likely to be researched in different types of study designs (Costa et al., 2015). While theories have been developed, little or mixed empirical evidence exists supporting these theories, in addition to the sheer number of theories available and the divisiveness between the researchers as a result (Bell & Naugle, 2008).

Bell and Naugle (2008) note that, when developing theories regarding interpersonal violent crimes, the perspectives of the victims and perpetrators should be addressed and considered, as well as the context and events occurring during or around the incident. Violent individuals need to learn why they are being violent, changing and overturning the social norms to prevent, reduce, and eliminate violence altogether (Dixon & Graham-Kevan, 2011; Dutton, 2006; Sinclair & Bruenn, 2002). If/when they become aware of DV incidents, employers can offer victims formal support, such as a workplace policy or assistance program, and informal support, such as empathy, screening phone calls, and walking victims to their cars after work (Swanberg & Logan, 2005).

Workplace Violence and Aggression

WPV has significant adverse impacts on organizations and individuals (Center for Disease Control, 2019), with research beginning in the 1990's (Einarsen, Raknes, &

Matthiesen, 1994), and is receiving greater attention across the globe (Adewumi & Danesi, 2017; Leblanc & Kelloway, 2002; Mulder, Bos, Pouwelse, & Van Dam, 2017). With varying definitions (Adewumi & Danesi, 2017; Caprara et al., 2014; Golu, 2014; Lanctôt & Guay, 2014), the general working definition of WPV is the intent to cause physical or physiological harm at work (Barling et al., 2009; Frone et al., 2005), which needs to be researched, addressed, and mitigated if not eliminated. Organizational costs of WPV reach an estimated \$10 billion annually (Malik et al., 2018; Speroni et al., 2014). Nearly 61% of U.S. citizens are aware of WPV. At the same time, 61 million Americans are affected by WPV (Namie & Namie, 2017), resulting in various short and long-term physical and psychological conditions for individuals, including PTSD (Hollis, 2019b).

On August 20, 1986, after a troubled work history and facing termination, Patrick H. Sherrill, a part-time postal worker, killed 14 people before taking his own life. Four other postal workers were killed by then-current or former coworkers within the prior three years. WPV had been an issue that was ultimately ignored; however, the severity and the sheer number of lives taken by Sherrill brought the issue of WPV to the public's attention (Rugala & Isaacs, N.D.).

Barling et al. (2009) and Caprara et al. (2014) identify varying terminology and levels of violence used across existing research when describing WPV in general, which adds to the challenges of discussing and addressing workplace violence. The definitions provided in this paper identify the concepts of violent behavior and compartmentalize them into clear and concise definitions. While the term violence may seem a bit strong for the use of profanity, to some, profanity is quite intolerable and may be more closely associated with a violent act.

According to Lanctôt and Guay (2014), there are four types of workplace violence:

“(1) violent acts by criminals who have no other connection with the workplace; (2) violence directed at employees by customers, clients, patients, students, or any others for whom an organization provides services; (3) violence against coworkers, supervisors, or managers by a present or former employee; (4) violence committed in the workplace by someone who does not work there but has a personal relationship with an employee” (p. 493).

NIOSH and OSHA summarized these into four common types of violence, 1) criminal intent, 2) customer/client/patient, 3) coworker, and 4) personal relationship (NIOSH, 2021; OSHA, 2017). This brings to question whether DV is a workplace issue, a domestic issue, or both. WPV, and violence in general, is situational, occupational, and environmentally dependent (Piquero et al., 2013). Violence may occur at any moment, often due to issues regarding “interpersonal communication, time pressure, and workloads... and environmental factors” (Bentley et al., 2014, p. 839). Typically, violence occurs when one does not get their way, so violence of some form is used as a means to gain control – or get one’s way (Caldwell et al., 2009), often described as harassment, nonsexual harassment, emotional abuse, and workplace inactivity (Adewumi & Danesi, 2017). From an organizational perspective, violence may be directed towards the organization itself through physical (vandalism) and virtual/verbal (derogatory social media) forms (Piquero et al., 2013), with most violence occurring from external perpetrators (Bentley et al., 2014).

Research on WPV and WPA often focuses on the individual's coping skills, emotional intelligence, and ability to manage experiences (Giorgi et al., 2016; Van Den Brande, Baillien, De Witte, Vander Elst, & Godderis, 2016), with women experiencing WPV more frequently than men, and in some cases equal to men (Adewumi & Danesi, 2017). Some studies report that 50%-58% of respondents reported violence in their organizations (but did not clearly state if this was to individuals or the organization itself), with an even distribution of perpetrators from within the organization (employees) and external to the organization (family of employees, patients, customers, clients, etc.) (Bentley et al., 2014; Hollis, 2019b). The challenge becomes an issue for the organization and its leadership to address (Adewumi & Danesi, 2017).

Workplace Bullying

Workplace bullying (WPB), also known as mobbing (Einarsen, Hoel, Zapf, & Cooper, 2011; Leymann, 1990; Malik et al., 2018), has been studied since the 1990s (Einarsen, 1999) and considered "long-term aggressive or negative acts or behaviors, carried out repeatedly over time, and directed at someone who finds it difficult to defend him/herself because of a relationship with the bully that is characterized by an imbalance of power" (Cooper et al., 2011, p. 2). Exposure to long-term WPB in the workplace may cause a myriad of adverse health effects, including increased job insecurity, sleep difficulties, anxiety, fatigue, and PTSD (Einarsen et al., 1994; Glambek, Matthiesen, Hetland, & Einarsen, 2014; Hansen, Garde, Nabe-Nielsen, Grynderup, & Høgh, 2018; Matthiesen & Einarsen, 2004). WPB has received attention across the globe and has emerged from a social structure that fosters aggressive behavior, damaging to the victim

and organization (Carol, 2021; Hollis, 2019a; Keuskamp, Ziersch, Baum, & Lamontagne, 2012; Leblanc & Kelloway, 2002; Mulder et al., 2017; Pallavi, 2018).

WPB is an organizational issue, often beginning with a narcissistic and/or toxic leader (Malik et al., 2018; Pallavi, 2018). WPB occurs within organizations and by individuals who desire to gain and maintain control over others in an unethical and opportunistic manner (Namie & Lutgen-Sandvik, 2010; Pelletier, Kottke, & Sirotnik, 2019). Workplace bullies often inspire others to act as accomplices to extend their sphere of influence and further their agenda (Hollis, 2017; Namie & Lutgen-Sandvik, 2010). Inactive participants, those who witness and choose to ignore the bullying behavior, are effectively supporting the bullying behavior, and colluding with the perpetrator, often gaining favor from the bully, and are part of the problem (Jenkins & Nickerson, 2017; Mulder et al., 2017; Quirk & Campbell, 2015).

WPB occurrences vary across industries (Carol, 2021; Leblanc & Kelloway, 2002; Mayhew & Quinlan, 2002; Notelaers, Vermunt, Baillien, Einarsen, & De Witte, 2011; Ortega, Høgh, Pejtersen, & Olsen, 2009) and may start with teasing that progresses to perceived excessive teasing, playing practical jokes, incessant criticism, excessive comments and remarks, neglecting, disturbing others, and forms of intimidation (Hogh et al., 2019; Malik et al., 2018; Pallavi, 2018). Approximately 37% of U.S. citizens experience WPB (Namie & Lutgen-Sandvik, 2010), with 50%-70% involving supervisors (Pallavi, 2018). In a study of 143 participants, results indicated that 75% reported witnessing WPB and 49% reported being the target of WPB (Fisher-Blando, 2008), while another study reported that 16.4% of the respondents experienced at least one act of WPB per work day and 23.8% experienced at least one WPB act per week. The risk of WPB is

more significant in a professional setting, having a college education, or being separated, divorced, or widowed (Keuskamp et al., 2012).

Legislation focused on workplace protection revolves around the 1964 Civil Rights Act, prohibiting harassment based on protected classes such as gender, race, religion, national origin, color, disability, pregnancy, and genetic information (Hollis, 2019a). WPB is seen as human resources challenge to address as it does not directly violate defined laws, other than creating a toxic organization (Malik et al., 2018; Namie & Lutgen-Sandvik, 2010). However, as of 2018, California, Maryland, Minnesota, Tennessee, and Utah have developed legislation addressing WPB (Hollis, 2019a).

Domestic Violence Programs

DV intervention research is in its infancy (Adams, 2012; Julia C. Babcock et al., 2004) and suggests that DV intervention programs are integral to long-term success when employed at an early age at which DV is observed, experienced, or perpetrated (Low et al., 2019; O'Leary & Williams, 2006). Until the 1990s, efforts to address DV were limited to encouraging victims to file complaints, providing support services, and fostering prevention (Beiras et al., 2019). The intent of DV programs is intervention, implement protective measures, and prevention of future violence (Bowen, 2011; Ferrer-Perez, Ferreiro-Basurto, Navarro-Guzmán, & Bosch-Fiol, 2016; Gondolf, 2004). Some researchers question the success of these programs, designed to prevent recidivism (Arias, Arce, & Vilariñoa, 2013; Julia C. Babcock et al., 2004; Eckhardt et al., 2013; Feder & Wilson, 2005), noting that DV is associated with various antisocial and aggressive factors which may originate outside of the familial context (Febres et al., 2014).

A study in 2005 was conducted with 101 inmates enrolled in the Resolve to Stop the Violence Project (RSVP) program in a San Francisco County jail, convicted of DV, averaging 18-25 years old with a fifth-grade education. Those who participated in RSVP experienced a reduced re-arrest rate for violent crimes by 46.3% after spending eight weeks in RSVP, a 53.1% reduction for those spending 12 weeks, and a reduction of 82.6% for those spending 16 weeks or more (Schwartz, 2005). Research suggests that specialized, single-gender groups, are the most appropriate and successful (Adams, 2012; Aldorondo & Mederos, 2002; Sinclair & Bruenn, 2002).

Most states, counties, and cities have created and passed legislature to more rigorously and vigorously prosecute and convict perpetrators of DV. As a result, additional certification requirements must also be met to facilitate batterer treatment programs (BTP) or batterer intervention programs (BIP) (Beiras et al., 2019; Price & Rosenbaum, 2009). For example, California follows California Penal Code 1203.097, which defines the requirements of those convicted of DV, and California Penal Code 1203.098 for service providers treating – re-educating – perpetrators.

BTP facilitators must be cognizant of their intervention/re-education methods (Adams, 2012; Sinclair, 2012; Sinclair & Bruenn, 2002). Adopting a “softer” approach early in the program may be misinterpreted as collusion versus engagement. Being more assertive with the perpetrator may put them aloof, and they may disengage (Adams, 2012). Emphasizing the perpetrator's understanding and use of empathy may increase the program and the individual's success (Romero-Martínez, Lila, Gracia, & Moya-Albiol, 2019). A study in Australia found four essential elements to BTP success: increased public awareness of DV, improved legal recognition for DV, increased police

responsibility to press charges, and greater clarity regarding police procedures (Phillips & Vandenbroek, 2018). BTP programs aim to reduce DV recidivism (Bowen, 2011; Carbajosa et al., 2017). The challenge is that most who attend BTP programs are court-ordered, resulting in low engagement and limited results (Eckhardt, Holtzworth-Munroe, Norlander, Sibley, & Cahill, 2008; Kistenmacher & Weiss, 2008). Programs emphasizing the use of an individual motivation plan appeared to increase the overall success of the participant (i.e., reduced recidivism), based on the type of violence conducted (Carbajosa et al., 2017; Romero-Martínez et al., 2019).

Workplace Violence Programs

Significant research exists on the impacts of WPV and programs to address WPV in the medical fields, while little development outside the medical community exists (Arnetz, 2022; Griffin, Nowacki, & Woodroof, 2021; Lanctôt & Guay, 2014). OSHA offers various resources for workplace safety and health; however, OSHA enforcement is limited and openly states, “There are currently no specific OSHA standards for workplace violence” (www.osha.gov/workplace-violence/enforcement). OSHA further states that in accordance with section 5(a)(1) of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970, “employers are required to provide their employees with a place of employment that is “free from recognized hazards that are causing or are likely to cause death or serious physical harm.””. OSHA published procedures for addressing workplace instruction in 2017, emphasizing efforts to address high-risk industries, including correctional facilities, healthcare, late-night retail, and taxi driving. OSHA generally limits inspections to Type I and Type II WPV (criminal intent and customer/client/patient) and does not inspect cases related to Type III and Type IV WPV

(coworker and personal relationship) (OSHA, 2017). It is the responsibility of the organization to address Type III and Type IV WPV.

The National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) was founded in 1970 under the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970. In 2012, NIOSH began research on the concept of worker well-being, and published an article in 2018 defining worker well-being as an

“...integrative concept that characterizes quality of life with respect to an individual’s health and work-related environmental, organizational, and psychosocial factors. Well-being is the experience of positive perceptions and the presence of constructive conditions at work and beyond that enables workers to thrive and achieve their full potential.” (Chari et al., 2018, p. 590).

WPV is a significant problem that impacts the victim, secondary victims (i.e., observers of the abuse), and the organization. The impacts on the organization include increased personnel turnover, increased training costs, decline in employee cooperation, increased use of sick leave (resulting in less productivity), possible legal fees, and a negative reputation (Glambek et al., 2014; Karabulut, 2016; Park & Ono, 2017; Sims, 2019). Employees who experience WPV are more likely to experience depression, anxiety, and stress-related complaints (Qureshi, Rasli, & Zaman, 2014; Verkuil, Atasayi, & Molendijk, 2015), more so when the violence originates from a supervisor (Török et al., 2016). The most extreme consequences of WPV result in increased suicidal ideations, suicide attempts, or successful death by suicide (Einarsen, Skogstad, Rørvik, Lande, & Nielsen, 2018).

Organizational WPV programs are often limited to policies indicating an intolerance to violence (OSHA, 2022) and victim support with little emphasis on education, intervention, or perpetrator reformation, with many individuals feeling powerless and unable to resolve WPV disputes (Sims, 2019). Unaddressed WPV may result in increased turnover, continuing the violence within the organization, and placing others, including the organization, at further risk (Sims, 2019; Zabrodska et al., 2011). Organizations face challenges because some policies and procedures designed to protect the personnel and organization from WPV result in enabling effects due to a perversion of the policies and procedures (Lipton, 2015; Riemer, 2016). The organizational culture and climate either enhance or detract from WPV (Adewumi & Danesi, 2017; Lewis et al., 2018; Lewis & Sheehan, 2003). Organizations fail to accept responsibility for the prevention and correction of WPV (Namie & Namie, 2017). Organizations should develop a clear policy identifying which behaviors will not be tolerated and specified disciplinary actions (Cooper et al., 2011). Additionally, develop methodologies to support the identification, prevention, and reformation of WPV, to include DV brought into the workplace (Jonge, 2018; Kolk, 2016; Locke et al., 2009; Lund-Thomsen & Lindgreen, 2014; Węziak-Białowolska et al., 2020).

Standardized Surveys and Questionnaires

Several established surveys and questionnaires have been developed to measure various forms of DV and WPV. The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) (Weiss, Dawis, England, & Lofquist, 1967) is a 20 five-item Likert scale questionnaire that measures employee job satisfaction and includes questions regarding authority,

creativity, independence, security, and working conditions. The MSQ focuses on overall employee satisfaction and less on interpersonal conflict.

The Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS) (M. Straus, 1979) and Revised Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS2) (M. Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy, & Sugarman, 1996) are established questionnaires used to measure intrafamily (domestic) violence of various degrees. The CTS consists of an 80-item questionnaire with 20 directed to the perpetrator and their relationship with their child, 20 towards the perpetrator's partner (if applicable), and 40 questions to the perpetrator's partner, mirroring the first set of 40 questions. The CTS2 is a revised version of the initial 80 questions, resulting in a total of 78 questions, 39 to the perpetrator and 39 to their partner. The CTS2 is also available in a 20-item short form. The authors limit the use of these tools to individuals with a minimum of a master's degree in psychology or a related field of study such as occupational therapy or certification and experience with assessing respondents.

The Propensity for Abusiveness Scale (PAS) is a 29-item Likert-type self-report that assesses the propensity for male abuse of a female intimate partner (Dutton, 1995b). The Negative Acts Questionnaire (NAQ) is a 23-item questionnaire to measure the perceived exposure to and victimization of workplace bullying (Einarsen & Raknes, 1997). The Interpersonal Conflicts at Work Scale (ICAWS) is a four-item measure that assesses how well respondents get along with others in the workplace (Spector & Jex, 1998).

The Proximal Antecedents to Violent Episodes Scale (PAVE), a 30-item Likert-type measure, is used to assess the specific contexts in which a male is likely to react to intimate partner violence (J. C. Babcock, Costa, Green, & Eckhardt, 2004). The Intimate

Partner Violence Responsibility Attribution Scale (IPVRAS) is a 12-item scale to assess where intimate partner violence offenders place responsibility for their behavior (Lila, Oliver, Catalá-Miñana, Galiana, & Gracia, 2014). In 2021, NIOSH published the Worker Well-Being Questionnaire (WellBQ) to expand its research on worker well-being based on research conducted in support of its 2018 article by Chari et al. (2018). This research is designed to help organizations improve worker well-being. Yet, some scrutinize the WellBQ for the number of questions posed to respondents, with 68 total questions that take approximately 15 minutes to complete (Peters, Sorensen, Katz, Gundersen, & Wagner, 2021). Regardless, NIOSH is taking steps to research and improve worker well-being, which includes addressing various aspects of WPV.

Conclusion

While research exists and the body of knowledge is growing across the domains of DV and WPV, researchers must continue to study the contributing factors and impacts violence has on individuals and organizations. DV and WPV cost the economy significantly and contribute negatively to the long-term impacts on an individual's (and organization's) well-being. Research has shown that DV is a workplace problem that compounds the challenges organizations face while addressing organization-derived WPV. DV and WPV are no longer separate issues to address by different governing bodies, but have evolved into a singular multi-faceted challenge for organizations to address and support the affected individuals.

CHAPTER 3 – METHOD

Currently, little research exists on the relationship between DV and WPV. This quantitative research study will explore the possibility of a relationship between DV and WPV. Data collection will be conducted through surveys of randomly selected respondents to explore if 1) individuals that commit acts of DV are more likely to commit acts of WPV, 2) individuals that commit acts of WPV are more likely to commit acts of DV, 3) individuals that commit acts of WPV have previously been recipients of DV, and 4) individuals that commit acts of DV have previously been recipients of WPV. This survey will also explore whether relationships exist between WPV, age, gender, education level, employment status, employment type, and role in industry.

Survey Design

Sample Size. The survey used a sample of 300 respondents located in the United States, recruited from a pool of participants, under the assumption that this research will receive sufficient participants with experiences that can be drawn upon to inform this study.

A representative sample of 150 participants with DV or WPV experiences was sought to achieve sufficient statistical power to effectively analyze the results. To achieve the representative target of 150 participants, an oversampling of 300 respondents was elected. Research indicates that 50%-58% of respondents experience WPV (Coker, McKeown, & King, 2000; Thompson et al., 2006; Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000), and 55% of individuals have experienced DV (Coker et al., 2000; Thompson et al., 2006; Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000). Fisher-Blando's (2008) study of 143 participants indicated that 75% of respondents reported witnessing WPB, and 49% reported being the target of WPB.

Keuskamp et al. (2012) reported that 16.4% of respondents experienced at least one act of WPB per workday, and 23.8% experienced at least one WPB act per week. Based on this data, a conservative estimation of the number of ideal participants was 150. The target subgroups are:

Workplace Violence Orientation

1. History of initiating negative workplace encounters
2. History of receiving negative workplace encounters
3. Observer only of negative workplace encounters
4. No experience or observation of negative workplace encounters

Domestic Violence Orientation

1. History of initiating negative domestic encounters
2. History of receiving negative domestic encounters
3. Observer only of negative domestic encounters
4. No experience or observation of domestic encounters

Sampling Methodology. The sample population consisted of general population United States based adults, identifying as having “any exposure or experience with negative workplace or domestic encounters.” Participants were recruited using the research platform Prolific (prolific.co), with 130,000 potential participants, enabling a greater depth of participants and increased response rate. Prolific participants voluntarily establish a Prolific account to participate in research studies, with Prolific protecting user anonymity. Prolific participants were identified based on demographic data collected upon their account creation. A convenience sample set of potential participants received an email notification from Prolific, identifying them as eligible to participate in this

research. Participants may also utilize the Prolific dashboard to search for studies of interest and elect to participate if eligible. Participants chose to participate, or not, without repercussion. Prolific users are financially incentivized (paid through Prolific) to complete research surveys, at a rate of not less than \$8 per hour. To increase the response rate for this study, participants were offered \$12 per hour to complete this survey, an amount identified as “good” by Prolific. The survey platform Qualtrics estimated the time to complete the survey at 15 minutes. As a result, participants received \$3.00 to complete the survey. The survey and instructions were provided in English, limiting participants fluent in English.

Survey Questions

Limited existing and commonly used standardized questionnaires, surveys, or scales are available to research the relationship between DV and WPV (Table 1). The existing questionnaires were not found to sufficiently answer the questions posed in this study. The MSQ (Weiss et al., 1967) includes a total of 100 questions, but only four questions seemed to be thematically relevant. Similarly, the WellBQ (Peters et al., 2021) provides a broad assessment of worker well-being with only six relevant questions. The CTS and CTS2 (M. Straus, 1979; M. Straus et al., 1996) seemed to be the most relevant regarding DV; however, the clinical mental health specialty requirement to access these tools precluded the use of these scales. In the case of the NAQ (Einarsen & Raknes, 1997) and the ICAWS (Spector & Jex, 1998), both sets of questions were promising but lacked the depth needed for this study. The PAVE scale (J. C. Babcock et al., 2004) focuses on the likeliness to become violent in specific situations, and the IPVRAS (Lila

et al., 2014) focuses on where the violent offender places responsibility for their behavior; neither of which are relevant to this study.

There were few authors with questions and approaches that seemed promising. The themes identified in existing research were used to develop the questions posed in this study. Content validity was conducted to assess for representation across the construct based on existing research. The questions (Appendix A) focused on the experiences and perceptions of DV and WPV. These questions will enable a more detailed analysis which may be used in future research and help fill a void in DV and WPV research (Adewumi & Danesi, 2017; Lanctôt & Guay, 2014; Piquero et al., 2013; Raftery, 2015).

Table 1

Screening and Evaluation Criteria

| Name | Purpose | Limitation | Year of Origin |
|--|--|--|----------------|
| Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire ¹ | Employee job satisfaction | Limited to general workplace satisfaction | 1967 |
| Conflicts Tactics Scales ² Revised Conflicts Tactics Scales ³ | Measure intimate partner violence | Requires license in a clinical mental health specialty | 1979 1996 |
| Negative Acts Questionnaire ⁴ | Measures the perceived exposure to workplace bullying and victimization | 11 questions overly focused on WPB | 1994 |
| Propensity for Abusiveness Scale ⁵ | Self-report that assesses propensity for male abuse of a female intimate partner | Focused on potential for abusiveness towards women | 1995 |
| Interpersonal Conflicts at Work Scale ⁶ | Measures how well respondents get along with others in the workplace | 4 questions limited on workplace interactions | 1998 |
| Proximal Antecedents to Violent Episodes Scale ⁷ | To assess the specific contexts in which a man is likely to react with intimate partner violence | Male focused, specific to potential for DV | 2004 |
| Intimate Partner Violence Responsibility Attribution Scale ⁸ | Assess intimate partner violence offenders' responsibility attributions | Centered on placing responsibility for DV behavior | 2014 |
| Worker Well-Being Questionnaire ⁹ | Holistic assessment of worker wellbeing | Limited to general workplace wellbeing | 2021 |

¹Weiss et al. 1967, ²M. Straus, 1979, ³M. Straus et. al., 1996, ⁴Einarsen & Raknes, 1997,

⁵Dutton, 1998b, ⁶Spector & Jex, 1998, ⁷Babcock et. al., 2004, ⁸Lila et. al. 2014, ⁹NIOSH, 2021

Demographics. Demographic data was collected to provide a more detailed analysis for this study. The following nominal and dichotomous demographic questions were posed:

1. What is your age?
2. What is your marital status?
3. Have you been employed in the last 12 months?
4. Are you living with a married or domestic partner?
5. What gender do you identify as?
6. What is your race?
7. What is your highest level of education?
8. What is your employment status?
9. How would you categorize your most current employment?
10. Which best describes your role in industry?

Questions. All questions presented to the participants may be found in Appendix

B. The questions were asked, “in the last 12 months” using a 5-point Likert scale of:

1. Never
2. Once per month or less
3. About once a week
4. About once a day
5. Multiple times per day

Sample questions used in this study include the following:

1. How often do you roll your eyes, scowl, or have an angry look on your face at a family member?
2. How often do you raise your voice or yell at or around a family member?

3. How often do you posture yourself in front of a family member (such as stiffening your body, puffing up your chest, and standing “tall”)?
4. How often do you ignore a coworker or employee’s request or task that you are supposed to complete for them as part of your duties?
5. How often do you call a coworker or employee demeaning names (such as jerk, loser, or lazy)?
6. How often do you throw something at or around a coworker or employee?

Participant Protections

Prolific prevents researchers from screening participants once the participant chooses to complete the survey. To reduce fraudulent responses (i.e., bots), potential participants were presented with two questions, 1) "Please demonstrate that you have read this question by selecting 'somewhat agree'", and 2) a CAPTCHA. Participants were directed to Qualtrics (qualtrics.com) to complete the survey. A brief description of the purpose of the study and inclusion criteria was provided before beginning the survey. Completion of the entire survey was encouraged, with an early opt-out option provided without penalty. Participants were presented with the Survey Invitation (Appendix B) and the informed consent form (Appendix C), including prompts to select "I have reviewed the information provided, asked any questions that I have at this time, and have decided to voluntarily participate in this study" or "I do not wish to participate in this study at this time." Participants who elected to opt out were thanked for their interest and redirected to their Prolific dashboard. Participants that voluntarily agreed to participate were allowed to continue.

Risks. This research presented a minimal risk to the participants. The Code of Federal Regulations ("45 CFR 46.102," 2022) defines minimal risk as the “means that the probability and magnitude of harm or discomfort anticipated in the research are not greater in and of themselves than those ordinarily encountered in daily life or during the performance of routine physical or psychological examinations or tests.” Participants may have become uncomfortable with some of the questions posed. Participants were afforded periodic opportunities to discontinue participating in the survey. Prolific offers an anonymous internal messaging service, allowing participants to message the researcher anonymously, and vice-versa, should any concerns arise. Participants were also encouraged to contact the Domestic Violence Hotline, their workplace supervisor, and the National Suicide Prevention Lifeline should any question concern their well-being.

Additional risk resides in the survey length, where participants may have become bored or distracted. Last, participant confidentiality is maintained using Prolific’s secure cloud environment, with access to the data limited to the researcher. Access to the data is protected by a 14-character, complex password consisting of a minimum of two upper- and lower-case letters, two numbers, and two special characters.

Pilot Survey

A pilot study of 15 participants was conducted to test for reliability, readability, and time to complete. Research varies regarding the recommended sample size for pilot studies. Connelly (2008) suggests that a 10% sample size compared to the final study is recommended, while Julious (2005) suggests a total of 12 participants, and Hill (1998) suggests 10-30 participants. With the representative sample of 150 participants for the

parent study, 15 participants for the pilot study were ideal. Participants that elected to complete the survey provided their consent to participate in the pilot study. The survey included 81 5-point Likert scale questions assessing for orientation with DV and WPV, and ten nominal and dichotomous questions collecting demographic data. The following six pilot study questions (Appendix D) were posed to solicit feedback regarding the survey questions and process.

1. Were the questions asked in this survey relevant based on the invitation?
2. On a scale of 1-5, how well did the survey keep your attention, with 1 being “not well at all”, and 5 being “extremely well”?
3. How would you rate the wording of the questions?
4. What feedback or comments do you have regarding the questions asked?
5. What would you change in the survey?
6. Please describe your overall experience with the survey.

The sample population consisted of non-repetitive respondents from the United States, identified anonymously through Prolific, and completing the survey through Qualtrics. Data collected remained anonymous throughout the collection and research process. Personally identifiable information was not requested of the participant, nor captured by any means from Prolific. Upon completion of the survey, participants were thanked for their support and contribution to the research. Responses to the pilot study specific questions (Appendix D) were reviewed and thematically evaluated. Areas that unanimously presented participant concern or recommendations were evaluated and modified based on participant feedback to improve the final survey. A Cronbach's Alpha was conducted to assess for internal consistency within the questions.

Procedure

Participants that elected to complete the survey provided their consent to participate in the study. The survey included 81 5-point Likert scale questions assessing for orientation with DV and WPV, and ten nominal and dichotomous questions collecting demographic data. The sample population consisted of non-repetitive respondents from the United States, identified anonymously through Prolific, and completing the survey through Qualtrics. Data collected remained anonymous throughout the collection and research process. Personally identifiable information was not requested of the participant, nor captured by any means from Prolific. Upon completion of the survey, participants were thanked for their support and contribution to the research. Once the final survey was complete, the data was collected and analyzed.

Data Analysis

The primary purpose of this study was to explore whether or not a relationship exists between DV and WPV. Additional research questions were analyzed throughout this study. With little existing research on the relationship between DV and WPV, the primary purpose of this study was to explore this relationship. In this survey, participants were characterized and placed into four categories across the two orientations: workplace orientation and domestic orientation. Within each orientation, participants met the criteria for one or more of the categories of 1) history of initiating, 2) history of receiving, 3) observer only, and 4) no experience.

RQ 1: *Are individuals who commit acts of DV more likely to commit acts of WPV?*

H1: *Individuals who commit acts of DV are more likely to commit acts of WPV.*

To explore the first research question, a Pearson correlation was conducted to examine the relationship between participants with a history of initiating negative domestic encounters and their workplace orientation. The purpose of this question was to explore whether or not individuals who commit acts of DV are more likely to commit acts of WPV compared to individuals with a history of receiving or observing DV.

RQ 2: Are individuals who commit acts of WPV more likely to commit acts of DV?

H2: Individuals who commit acts of WPV are more likely to commit acts of DV.

To explore the second research question, a Pearson correlation was conducted to examine the relationship between participants with a history of initiating negative workplace encounters and their domestic orientation. The purpose of this question was to explore whether or not individuals who commit acts of WPV are more likely to commit acts of DV compared to individuals with a history of receiving or observing WPV.

RQ 3: Are individuals who commit acts of WPV more likely to be recipients of DV?

H3: Individuals who commit acts of WPV are more likely to have been recipients of DV.

To explore the third research question, a Pearson correlation was conducted to examine the relationship between participants with a history of initiating negative workplace encounters and their domestic orientation. The purpose of this question was to explore whether or not individuals who commit acts of WPV are recipients of DV compared to individuals with a history of observing DV.

RQ 4: Are individuals who commit acts of DV more likely to be recipients of WPV?

H4: Individuals who commit acts of DV are more likely to have been recipients of WPV.

To explore the third research question, a Pearson correlation was conducted to examine the relationship between participants with a history of initiating negative domestic encounters and their workplace orientation. The purpose of this question was to explore whether or not individuals who commit acts of DV are recipients of WPV compared to individuals with a history of observing WPV.

CHAPTER 4 – RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to explore the possibility of a relationship between DV and WPV. A survey was developed for this study based on themes identified in existing research. The survey method was used as existing standardized questionnaires, surveys, or scales were unavailable to research the relationship between DV and WPV. A pilot study of 15 participants was conducted to test for reliability, readability, and time to complete. It was hypothesized that 1) individuals that commit acts of DV are more likely to commit acts of WPV, 2) individuals that commit acts of WPV are more likely to commit acts of DV, 3) individuals that commit acts of WPV have previously been recipients of DV, and 4) individuals that commit acts of DV have previously been recipients of WPV. This survey also explored if relationships exist between Workplace Initiator and age, gender, education level, employment status, employment type, and role in industry.

Pilot Study

A pilot study of 15 participants was conducted to test for reliability, readability, and time to complete. While research varies regarding the recommended sample size for pilot studies, 15 participants were ideal based on the main study size (Connelly, 2008; Hill, 1998; Julious, 2005).

A Cronbach's Alpha coefficient was calculated for the pilot survey. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient was evaluated based on the principles suggested by George and Mallery (2018) where $> .9$ excellent, $> .8$ good, $> .7$ acceptable, $> .6$ questionable, $> .5$ poor, and $\leq .5$ unacceptable. The items for the pilot survey produced a Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of .96, indicating excellent reliability. Variables DVI1 and WAI2 were

negatively correlated with the overall composite score. These variables were automatically reverse coded to improve reliability. Variables DEI1, DPI1, DPI2, DPI3, WAI5, and WVI1 were removed from the Cronbach's Alpha analysis as these variables contained only one unique value. Table 2 presents the results of the reliability analysis. The full reliability analysis may be found in Appendix E.

Table 2

Pilot Study Reliability

| Scale | No. of Items | α | Lower Bound | Upper Bound |
|-------------------|--------------|----------|-------------|-------------|
| DV and WPV Survey | 75 | .96 | .95 | .98 |

Note. The lower and upper bounds of Cronbach's α were calculated using a 95.00% confidence interval.

The following six pilot study questions (Appendix D) were posed to solicit feedback regarding the survey questions and process.

1. Were the questions asked in this survey relevant based on the invitation?

Participants indicated the questions were relevant, with 14 responses indicating "yes" and one indicating "no".

Table 3

Pilot Question One

| Option | Count |
|--------------|-----------|
| Yes | 14 |
| No | 1 |
| <i>Total</i> | <i>15</i> |

2. On a scale of 1-5, how well did the survey keep your attention, with 1 being "not well at all" and 5 being "extremely well"?

Participants indicated the survey maintained their attention with two (2) at "moderately well", nine (9) at "very well", and four (4) at "extremely well".

Table 4

Pilot Question Two

| Option | Count |
|-----------------|-----------|
| Not well at all | 0 |
| Slightly well | 0 |
| Moderately well | 2 |
| Very well | 9 |
| Extremely well | 4 |
| <i>Total</i> | <i>15</i> |

3. How would you rate the wording of the questions?

Participants indicated the survey was easily readable with 10 at “Easy to read” and five (5) at “About right”.

Table 5

Pilot Question Three

| Option | Count |
|--------------|-----------|
| Easy to read | 10 |
| About right | 5 |
| Too complex | 0 |
| <i>Total</i> | <i>15</i> |

4. What feedback or comments do you have regarding the questions asked?

Responses indicated that the survey was simple, thought provoking, and understandable.

The questions were redundant (noted by one participant) and questioned why the timeframe was limited to the most recent 12 months (indicated by one participant).

5. What would you change in the survey?

Question five produced responses of “nothing” and “none”, as well as a recommendation to increase question grouping to limit the number of survey pages (noted by one participant) as well as increase the studied timeframe from 12 to 24 months (indicated by one participant).

6. Please describe your overall experience with the survey.

Responses indicated the survey was a great experience, pleasant, positive, relatively engaging, improved their awareness (of the topic), and caused some to consider their family and work life.

The average time to complete the pilot study was 14.97 minutes, including the six pilot-specific questions, indicating the time to complete was accurate, with an estimated 15 minutes to complete the main study. Participant feedback regarding the time to complete the survey, question design, and overall readability, in addition to the reliability coefficient at .96, the pilot study indicated that the survey may be used as designed for the main study, minus the pilot-specific questions.

Data Collection

The main survey used a sample of 301 respondents located in the United States, recruited from a pool of participants. All respondents completed the survey in its entirety. The sample population consisted of general population United States based adults, identifying as having “any exposure or experience with negative workplace or domestic encounters.” Participants were recruited using the research platform Prolific (prolific.co), with 130,000 potential participants, enabling a greater depth of participants and increased response rate. A convenience sample set of potential participants received an email notification from Prolific, identifying them as eligible to participate in this research.

Demographic Data

Respondents included 191 males, 101 females, one transgender, and eight non-binary respondents (Table 6). The three most common age groups are 28-34 years old, with 78 respondents; 23-27 years old, with 58 respondents; and 35-40 years old, with 46

respondents (Table 7). Marital status indicated that 180 respondents were single (never married), 71 were married, 35 were in a domestic relationship, 12 were divorced, and three were widowed (Table 8), with 200 respondents living with a domestic partner and 101 not living with a domestic partner (Table 9). Respondent's highest level of education predominantly consisted of High School graduates with 113, followed by a Bachelor's degree at 94, and an Associate's degree at 46 (Table 10). Respondent role in industry reported closely between trained professionals (46), middle management (40), support staff (38), and self-employed (37). Junior management and other undefined roles both reported at 27, followed by administrative staff (24), skilled laborers (23), student (18), upper management (13), and temporary employee (8) (Table 11).

Table 6

Gender

| Gender | <i>n</i> | % |
|-------------------|----------|-------|
| Male | 191 | 63.46 |
| Female | 101 | 33.55 |
| Non-Binary | 8 | 2.66 |
| Transgender | 1 | 0.33 |
| Prefer not to say | 0 | 0 |

Table 7

Age

| Age | <i>n</i> | % |
|-------|----------|-------|
| 18-22 | 34 | 11.30 |
| 23-27 | 58 | 19.27 |
| 28-34 | 78 | 25.91 |
| 35-40 | 46 | 15.28 |
| 41-45 | 25 | 8.31 |
| 46-50 | 12 | 3.99 |
| 51-55 | 23 | 7.64 |
| 56-60 | 10 | 3.32 |
| 61-65 | 9 | 2.99 |

| | | |
|-----|---|------|
| 65+ | 6 | 1.99 |
|-----|---|------|

Table 8

Marital Status

| Marital Status | <i>n</i> | % |
|----------------------------|----------|-------|
| Single (never married) | 180 | 59.80 |
| Married | 71 | 23.59 |
| In a domestic relationship | 35 | 11.63 |
| Divorced | 12 | 3.99 |
| Widowed | 3 | 1.00 |

Table 9

Living Arrangement

| Living Arrangement | <i>n</i> | % |
|--------------------|----------|-------|
| Yes | 200 | 66.45 |
| No | 101 | 33.55 |

Table 10

Highest Level of Education

| Education Level | <i>n</i> | % |
|-------------------|----------|-------|
| High School | 113 | 37.54 |
| Bachelor's Degree | 94 | 31.23 |
| Associates Degree | 46 | 15.28 |
| Master's Degree | 25 | 8.31 |
| Trade School | 13 | 4.32 |
| Some High School | 5 | 1.66 |
| Doctorate | 5 | 1.66 |

Table 11

Role in Industry

| Role | <i>n</i> | % |
|----------------------|----------|-------|
| Trained Professional | 46 | 15.28 |
| Middle Management | 40 | 13.29 |
| Support Staff | 38 | 12.62 |
| Self-employed | 37 | 12.29 |
| Junior Management | 27 | 8.97 |
| Other | 27 | 8.97 |
| Administrative Staff | 24 | 7.97 |

| | | |
|--------------------|----|------|
| Skilled Laborer | 23 | 7.64 |
| Student | 18 | 5.98 |
| Upper Management | 13 | 4.32 |
| Temporary Employee | 8 | 2.66 |

Reliability

A Cronbach's Alpha coefficient was calculated for the main survey. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient was evaluated based on the principles suggested by George and Mallery (2018) where $> .9$ excellent, $> .8$ good, $> .7$ acceptable, $> .6$ questionable, $> .5$ poor, and $\leq .5$ unacceptable. The items for the main survey produced a Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of .96, indicating excellent reliability. Table 12 presents the results of the reliability analysis. The full reliability analysis may be found in Appendix F.

Table 12

DV and WPV Survey Reliability

| Scale | No. of Items | α | Lower Bound | Upper Bound |
|-------------------|--------------|----------|-------------|-------------|
| DV and WPV Survey | 81 | .96 | .96 | .97 |

Note. The lower and upper bounds of Cronbach's α were calculated using a 95.00% confidence interval.

The survey questions were categorized and grouped based on DV and WPV orientation. The combined related questions produced a scale for each subgroup of history of initiating (initiator), history or receiving (receiver), and observer only (observer) for both DV and WPV orientations. This produced six scales comprising the entire survey: Domestic Initiator, Domestic Receiver, Domestic Observer, Workplace Initiator, Workplace Receiver, and Workplace Observer.

Each DV scale (Domestic Initiator, Domestic Receiver, and Domestic Observer) consists of four questions related to emotional violence, four related to verbal violence, and four related to physical violence, resulting in a total of 12 questions per scale. Scores

of one through five are attributed to each question based on the respondent's history regarding each question. The range is one point for "Never" through five points for "Multiple times per day" using the following using a 5-point Likert scale:

1. Never
2. Once per month or less
3. About once a week
4. About once a day
5. Multiple times per day

For each DV scale (Domestic Initiator, Domestic Receiver, and Domestic Observer), the minimum number of points a respondent may receive is 12, indicating "no experience" with the respective scale. The maximum number of points a respondent may receive is 60, indicating significant experience within the respective scale.

Each WPV scale (Workplace Initiator, Workplace Receiver, and Workplace Observer) consists of five questions related to workplace bullying, five questions related to workplace aggression, and five questions related to workplace violence, resulting in a total of 15 questions per scale. Scores of one through five are attributed to each question based on the respondent's history regarding each question. The range is one point for "Never" through five points for "Multiple times per day" using the following using a 5-point Likert scale:

1. Never
2. Once per month or less
3. About once a week
4. About once a day
5. Multiple times per day

For each WPV scale (Workplace Initiator, Workplace Receiver, and Workplace Observer), the minimum number of points a respondent may receive is 15, indicating "no

experience” with the respective scale. The maximum number of points a respondent may receive is 75, indicating significant experience within the respective scale.

A Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient was calculated for each DV and WPV scale. The Cronbach’s alpha coefficient was evaluated based on the principles suggested by George and Mallery (2018) where $> .9$ excellent, $> .8$ good, $> .7$ acceptable, $> .6$ questionable, $> .5$ poor, and $\leq .5$ unacceptable.

The Domestic Initiator scale consists of DEI1, DEI2, DEI3, DEI4, DVI1, DVI2, DVI3, DVI4, DPI1, DPI2, DPI3, and DPI4. The items for the Domestic Initiator scale had a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of .85, indicating good reliability. The Domestic Receiver scale consists of DER1, DER2, DER3, DER4, DVR1, DVR2, DVR3, DVR4, DPR1, DPR2, DPR3, and DPR4. The items for the Domestic Receiver scale had a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of .88, indicating good reliability. The Domestic Observer scale consists of DEO1, DEO2, DEO3, DEO4, DVO1, DVO2, DVO3, DVO4, DPO1, DPO2, DPO3, and DPO4. The items for the Domestic Observer scale had a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of .90, indicating good reliability. Table 13 presents the results of the reliability analysis.

The Workplace Initiator scale consists of WBI1, WBI2, WBI3, WBI4, WBI5, WAI1, WAI2, WAI3, WAI4, WAI5, WVI1, WVI2, WVI3, WVI4, and WVI5. The items for the Workplace Initiator scale had a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of .84, indicating good reliability. The Workplace Receiver scale consists of WBR1, WBR2, WBR3, WBR4, WBR5, WAR1, WAR2, WAR3, WAR4, WAR5, WVR1, WVR2, WVR3, WVR4, and WVR5. The items for the Workplace Receiver scale had a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of .88, indicating good reliability. The Workplace Observer scale consists of

WBO1, WBO2, WBO3, WBO4, WBO5, WAO1, WAO2, WAO3, WAO4, WAO5, WVO1, WVO2, WVO3, WVO4, and WVO5. The items for the Workplace Observer scale had a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of .91, indicating excellent reliability. Table 13 presents the results of the reliability analysis.

Table 13

Reliability Table for DV and WPV scales

| Scale | No. of Items | α | Lower Bound | Upper Bound |
|---------------------|--------------|----------|-------------|-------------|
| Domestic Initiator | 12 | 0.85 | 0.84 | 0.87 |
| Domestic Receiver | 12 | 0.88 | 0.87 | 0.90 |
| Domestic Observer | 12 | 0.90 | 0.88 | 0.91 |
| Workplace Initiator | 15 | 0.84 | 0.82 | 0.86 |
| Workplace Receiver | 15 | 0.88 | 0.87 | 0.90 |
| Workplace Observer | 15 | 0.91 | 0.90 | 0.92 |

Note. The lower and upper bounds of Cronbach's α were calculated using a 95.00% confidence interval.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

The primary purpose of this study was to explore whether or not a relationship exists between DV and WPV. In this survey, participants were characterized and placed into four categories across the two orientations: workplace orientation and domestic orientation. Within each orientation, participants met the criteria for one or more of the categories of 1) history of initiating, 2) history of receiving, 3) observer only, and 4) no experience. The DV and WPV survey was further refined into six scales: Domestic Initiator, Domestic Receiver, Domestic Observer, Workplace Initiator, Workplace Receiver, and Workplace Observer. A Pearson Correlation was conducted using the DV and WPV scales to explore the relationship between DV and WPV. Cohen's standard was used to evaluate the strength of the relationships. Coefficients between .10 and .29 indicate a small effect size, coefficients between .30 and .49 indicate a moderate effect

size, and coefficients above .50 indicate a large effect size (Cohen, 1988). Linear regressions were used to determine whether or not one orientation (or scale) predicts another.

RQ 1: *Are individuals who commit acts of DV more likely to commit acts of WPV?*

H1: *Individuals who commit acts of DV are more likely to commit acts of WPV.*

A Pearson correlation analysis was conducted among Domestic Initiator, Domestic Receiver, Domestic Observer, and Workplace Initiator to explore the first research question. The purpose of this question was to explore whether or not individuals who commit acts of DV are more likely to commit acts of WPV compared to individuals with a history of receiving or observing DV.

The result of the correlations was examined based on an alpha value of .05 (Table 14). A significant positive correlation was observed between Domestic Initiator and Workplace Initiator, $r(299) = .51, p < .001$, with r^2 of .26 indicating a small effect size (Cohen, 1988). This suggests that as Domestic Initiator increases, Workplace Initiator tends to increase. A significant positive correlation was observed between Domestic Receiver and Workplace Initiator, $r(299) = .36, p < .001$, with r^2 of .13 indicating a small effect size (Cohen, 1988). This suggests that as Domestic Receiver increases, Workplace Initiator tends to increase. A significant positive correlation was observed between Domestic Observer and Workplace Initiator, $r(299) = .36, p < .001$, with r^2 of .13 indicating a small effect size (Cohen, 1988). This suggests that as Domestic Observer increases, Workplace Initiator tends to increase.

Table 14

Pearson Correlation Results Among Domestic Initiator, Domestic Receiver, Domestic Observer, and Workplace Initiator

| Combination | r | 95.00% CI | n | p |
|-------------|-----|-----------|-----|-----|
|-------------|-----|-----------|-----|-----|

| | | | | |
|--|-----|------------|-----|--------|
| Domestic Initiator – Workplace Initiator | .51 | [.42, .59] | 301 | < .001 |
| Domestic Receiver – Workplace Initiator | .36 | [.26, .46] | 301 | < .001 |
| Domestic Observer – Workplace Initiator | .36 | [.26, .45] | 301 | < .001 |

A linear regression analysis was conducted to assess whether Domestic Initiator significantly predicted Workplace Initiator (Table 15). The results of the linear regression model were significant, with $R^2 = .26$, $p < .001$, indicating that approximately 25.91% of the variance in Workplace Initiator is explainable by Domestic Initiator. Domestic Initiator significantly predicted Workplace Initiator, with $B = 0.45$, $p < .001$. This indicates that on average, a one-unit increase of Domestic Initiator will increase the value of Workplace Initiator by 0.45 units.

Table 15

Results for Linear Regression with Domestic Initiator predicting Workplace Initiator

| Variable | <i>B</i> | <i>SE</i> | 95.00% CI | β | <i>t</i> | <i>p</i> |
|--------------------|----------|-----------|---------------|---------|----------|----------|
| (Intercept) | 11.13 | 0.86 | [9.43, 12.83] | 0.00 | 12.92 | < .001 |
| Domestic Initiator | 0.45 | 0.04 | [0.37, 0.54] | 0.51 | 10.23 | < .001 |

Note. Unstandardized Regression Equation: Workplace Initiator = 11.13 + 0.45*Domestic Initiator

RQ 2: *Are individuals who commit acts of WPV more likely to commit acts of DV?*

H2: *Individuals who commit acts of WPV are more likely to commit acts of DV.*

A Pearson correlation analysis was conducted among Workplace Initiator, Workplace Receiver, Workplace Observer, and Domestic Initiator to explore the second research question. The purpose of this question was to explore whether or not individuals who commit acts of WPV are more likely to commit acts of DV compared to individuals with a history of receiving or observing WPV.

The result of the correlations was examined based on an alpha value of .05 (Table 16). A significant positive correlation was observed between Workplace Initiator and

Domestic Initiator, $r(299) = .51, p < .001$, with r^2 of .26 indicating a small effect size (Cohen, 1988). This suggests that as Workplace Initiator increases, Domestic Initiator tends to increase. A significant positive correlation was observed between Workplace Receiver and Domestic Initiator, $r(299) = .40, p < .001$, with r^2 of .16 indicating a small effect size (Cohen, 1988). This suggests that as Workplace Receiver increases, Domestic Initiator tends to increase. A significant positive correlation was observed between Workplace Observer and Domestic Initiator, $r(299) = .34, p < .001$, with r^2 of .12 indicating a small effect size (Cohen, 1988). This suggests that as Workplace Observer increases, Domestic Initiator tends to increase.

Table 16

Pearson Correlation Results Among Workplace Initiator, Workplace Receiver, Workplace Observer, and Domestic Initiator

| Combination | r | 95.00% CI | n | p |
|--|-----|------------|-----|--------|
| Workplace Initiator – Domestic Initiator | .51 | [.42, .59] | 301 | < .001 |
| Workplace Receiver – Domestic Initiator | .40 | [.30, .49] | 301 | < .001 |
| Workplace Observer – Domestic Initiator | .34 | [.24, .44] | 301 | < .001 |

A linear regression analysis was conducted to assess whether Workplace Initiator significantly predicted Domestic Initiator (Table 17). The results of the linear regression model were significant, with $R^2 = .26, p < .001$, indicating that approximately 25.91% of the variance in Domestic Initiator is explainable by Workplace Initiator. Workplace Initiator significantly predicted Domestic Initiator, $B = 0.57, p < .001$. This indicates that on average, a one-unit increase of Workplace Initiator will increase the value of Domestic Initiator by 0.57 units.

Table 17

Results for Linear Regression with Workplace Initiator predicting Domestic Initiator

| Variable | B | SE | 95.00% CI | β | t | p |
|---------------------|------|------|--------------|---------|-------|--------|
| (Intercept) | 7.36 | 1.13 | [5.14, 9.58] | 0.00 | 6.52 | < .001 |
| Workplace Initiator | 0.57 | 0.06 | [0.46, 0.68] | 0.51 | 10.23 | < .001 |

Note. Unstandardized Regression Equation: Domestic Initiator = 7.36 + 0.57*Workplace Initiator

RQ 3: *Are individuals who commit acts of WPV more likely to be recipients of DV?*

H3: *Individuals who commit acts of WPV are more likely to have been recipients of DV.*

To explore the third research question, a Pearson correlation analysis was conducted among Workplace Initiator, Domestic Receiver, and Domestic Observer. The purpose of this question was to explore whether or not individuals who commit acts of WPV are more likely to have been recipients of DV compared to individuals with a history of observing DV.

The result of the correlations was examined based on an alpha value of .05 (Table 18). A significant positive correlation was observed between Workplace Initiator and Domestic Receiver, $r(299) = .36, p < .001$, with r^2 of .13 indicating a small effect size (Cohen, 1988). This suggests that as Workplace Initiator increases, Domestic Receiver tends to increase. A significant positive correlation was observed between Workplace Initiator and Domestic Observer, $r(299) = .36, p < .001$, with r^2 of .13 indicating a small effect size (Cohen, 1988). This suggests that as Workplace Initiator increases, Domestic Observer tends to increase.

Table 18

Pearson Correlation Results Among Workplace Initiator, Domestic Receiver, and Domestic Observer

| Combination | r | 95.00% CI | n | p |
|---|-----|------------|-----|--------|
| Workplace Initiator – Domestic Receiver | .36 | [.26, .46] | 301 | < .001 |
| Workplace Initiator – Domestic Observer | .36 | [.26, .45] | 301 | < .001 |

A linear regression analysis was conducted to assess whether Workplace Initiator significantly predicted Domestic Receiver (Table 19). The results of the linear regression

model were significant, with $R^2 = .13$, $p < .001$, indicating that approximately 13.17% of the variance in Domestic Receiver is explainable by Workplace Initiator. Workplace Initiator significantly predicted Domestic Receiver, $B = 0.49$, $p < .001$. This indicates that on average, a one-unit increase of Workplace Initiator will increase the value of Domestic Receiver by 0.49 units.

Table 19

Results for Linear Regression with Workplace Initiator predicting Domestic Receiver

| Variable | <i>B</i> | <i>SE</i> | 95.00% CI | β | <i>t</i> | <i>p</i> |
|---------------------|----------|-----------|---------------|---------|----------|----------|
| (Intercept) | 10.15 | 1.46 | [7.28, 13.03] | 0.00 | 6.94 | < .001 |
| Workplace Initiator | 0.49 | 0.07 | [0.34, 0.63] | 0.36 | 6.73 | < .001 |

Note. Unstandardized Regression Equation: Domestic Receiver = 10.15 + 0.49*Workplace Initiator

A linear regression analysis was conducted to assess whether Workplace Initiator significantly predicted Domestic Observer (Table 20). The results of the linear regression model were significant, with $R^2 = .13$, $p < .001$, indicating that approximately 12.84% of the variance in Domestic Observer is explainable by Workplace Initiator. Workplace Initiator significantly predicted Domestic Observer, $B = 0.51$, $p < .001$. This indicates that on average, a one-unit increase of Workplace Initiator will increase the value of Domestic Observer by 0.51 units.

Table 20

Results for Linear Regression with Workplace Initiator predicting Domestic Observer

| Variable | <i>B</i> | <i>SE</i> | 95.00% CI | β | <i>t</i> | <i>p</i> |
|---------------------|----------|-----------|---------------|---------|----------|----------|
| (Intercept) | 9.86 | 1.54 | [6.83, 12.89] | 0.00 | 6.41 | < .001 |
| Workplace Initiator | 0.51 | 0.08 | [0.36, 0.65] | 0.36 | 6.64 | < .001 |

Note. Unstandardized Regression Equation: Domestic Observer = 9.86 + 0.51*Workplace Initiator

RQ 4: *Are individuals who commit acts of DV more likely to be recipients of WPV?*

H4: *Individuals who commit acts of DV are more likely to have been recipients of WPV.*

To explore the third research question, a Pearson correlation analysis was conducted among Domestic Initiator, Workplace Receiver, and Workplace Observer. The purpose of this question was to explore whether or not individuals who commit acts of DV are more likely to have been recipients of WPV compared to individuals with a history of observing WPV.

The result of the correlations was examined based on an alpha value of .05 (Table 21). A significant positive correlation was observed between Domestic Initiator and Workplace Receiver, $r(299) = .40, p < .001$, with r^2 of .16 indicating a small effect size (Cohen, 1988). This suggests that as Domestic Initiator increases, Workplace Receiver tends to increase. A significant positive correlation was observed between Domestic Initiator and Workplace Observer, $r(299) = .34, p < .001$, with r^2 of .12 indicating a small effect size (Cohen, 1988). This suggests that as Domestic Initiator increases, Workplace Observer tends to increase.

Table 21

Pearson Correlation Results Among Domestic Initiator, Workplace Receiver, and Workplace Observer

| Combination | r | 95.00% CI | n | p |
|---|-----|------------|-----|--------|
| Domestic Initiator – Workplace Receiver | .40 | [.30, .49] | 301 | < .001 |
| Domestic Initiator – Workplace Observer | .34 | [.24, .44] | 301 | < .001 |

A linear regression analysis was conducted to assess whether Domestic Initiator significantly predicted Workplace Receiver (Table 22). The results of the linear regression model were significant, with $R^2 = .16, p < .001$, indicating that approximately

15.88% of the variance in Workplace Receiver is explainable by Domestic Initiator.

Domestic Initiator significantly predicted Workplace Receiver, $B = 0.50$, $p < .001$. This indicates that on average, a one-unit increase of Domestic Initiator will increase the value of Workplace Receiver by 0.50 units.

Table 22

Results for Linear Regression with Domestic Initiator predicting Workplace Receiver

| Variable | <i>B</i> | <i>SE</i> | 95.00% CI | β | <i>t</i> | <i>p</i> |
|--------------------|----------|-----------|----------------|---------|----------|----------|
| (Intercept) | 14.00 | 1.28 | [11.47, 16.52] | 0.00 | 10.92 | < .001 |
| Domestic Initiator | 0.50 | 0.07 | [0.37, 0.63] | 0.40 | 7.51 | < .001 |

Note. Unstandardized Regression Equation: Workplace Receiver = 14.00 + 0.50*Domestic Initiator

A linear regression analysis was conducted to assess whether Domestic Initiator significantly predicted Workplace Observer (Table 23). The results of the linear regression model were significant, with $R^2 = .12$, $p < .001$, indicating that approximately 11.65% of the variance in Workplace Observer is explainable by Domestic Initiator. Domestic Initiator significantly predicted Workplace Observer, $B = 0.52$, $p < .001$. This indicates that on average, a one-unit increase of Domestic Initiator will increase the value of Workplace Observer by 0.52 units.

Table 23

Results for Linear Regression with Domestic Initiator predicting Workplace Observer

| Variable | <i>B</i> | <i>SE</i> | 95.00% CI | β | <i>t</i> | <i>p</i> |
|--------------------|----------|-----------|----------------|---------|----------|----------|
| (Intercept) | 15.85 | 1.60 | [12.72, 18.99] | 0.00 | 9.94 | < .001 |
| Domestic Initiator | 0.52 | 0.08 | [0.35, 0.68] | 0.34 | 6.28 | < .001 |

Note. Unstandardized Regression Equation: Workplace Observer = 15.85 + 0.52*Domestic Initiator

Additional Observations

Additional observations were explored. An analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to determine whether there were significant differences in Workplace Initiator by age, gender, education level, employment status, employment type, and role in

industry. Cohen (1988) identified eta squared of .01 indicates a small effect size, .06 indicates a medium effect size, and .14 indicates a large effect size.

Age. The ANOVA was examined based on an alpha value of .05. The results of the ANOVA were not significant, $F(9, 291) = 0.52, p = .863$, indicating the differences in Workplace Initiator among Age groups were all similar (Table 24). The main effect, Age was not significant, $F(9, 291) = 0.52, p = .863$, indicating there were no significant differences of Workplace Initiator by Age levels. As a result, post-hoc comparisons were not conducted.

Table 24

Analysis of Variance Table for Workplace Initiator by Age

| Term | <i>SS</i> | <i>df</i> | <i>F</i> | <i>p</i> | η_p^2 |
|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|------------|
| Age | 129.13 | 9 | 0.52 | .863 | 0.02 |
| Residuals | 8,095.88 | 291 | | | |

Gender. The ANOVA was examined based on an alpha value of .05. The results of the ANOVA were not significant, $F(3, 297) = 1.71, p = .165$, indicating the differences in Workplace Initiator among Gender were all similar (Table 25). The main effect, Gender was not significant, $F(3, 297) = 1.71, p = .165$, indicating there were no significant differences of Workplace Initiator by Gender. As a result, post-hoc comparisons were not conducted.

Table 25

Analysis of Variance Table for Workplace Initiator by Gender

| Term | <i>SS</i> | <i>df</i> | <i>F</i> | <i>p</i> | η_p^2 |
|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|------------|
| Gender | 139.76 | 3 | 1.71 | .165 | 0.02 |
| Residuals | 8,085.25 | 297 | | | |

Education Level. The ANOVA was examined based on an alpha value of .05. The results of the ANOVA were significant, $F(6, 294) = 3.67, p = .002$, indicating there

were significant differences in Workplace Initiator among the levels of Education (Table 26). The eta squared was 0.07 indicating a medium effect size (Cohen, 1988), and that Education explains approximately 7% of the variance in Workplace Initiator. The means and standard deviations are presented in Table 27.

Table 26

Analysis of Variance Table for Workplace Initiator by Education

| Term | <i>SS</i> | <i>df</i> | <i>F</i> | <i>p</i> | η_p^2 |
|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|------------|
| Education | 573.11 | 6 | 3.67 | .002 | 0.07 |
| Residuals | 7,651.90 | 294 | | | |

Table 27

Mean, Standard Deviation, and Sample Size for Workplace Initiator by Education Level

| Education Level | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>n</i> |
|-------------------|----------|-----------|----------|
| Some High School | 21.00 | 5.34 | 5 |
| High School | 18.41 | 4.90 | 113 |
| Associates Degree | 19.61 | 4.58 | 46 |
| Bachelor's Degree | 20.27 | 5.28 | 94 |
| Master's Degree | 22.72 | 6.13 | 25 |
| Doctorate | 20.40 | 9.53 | 5 |
| Trade School | 16.62 | 1.94 | 13 |

Post-hoc. Paired t-tests were calculated between each pair of measurements to further examine the differences among the variables based on an alpha of .05. For the main effect of Education Level, the mean of Workplace Initiator for High School Diploma ($M = 18.41$, $SD = 4.90$) was significantly smaller than for Master's degree ($M = 22.72$, $SD = 6.13$), $p = .003$. For the main effect of Education Level, the mean of Workplace Initiator for Master's degree ($M = 22.72$, $SD = 6.13$) was significantly larger than for Trade School ($M = 16.62$, $SD = 1.94$), $p = .010$. No other significant effects were found.

Employment Status. The ANOVA was examined based on an alpha value of .05. The results of the ANOVA were not significant, $F(3, 297) = 0.99, p = .396$, indicating the differences in Workplace Initiator among Employment Status were all similar (Table 28). The main effect, Employment Status was not significant, $F(3, 297) = 0.99, p = .396$, indicating there were no significant differences of Workplace Initiator by Employment Status. As a result, post-hoc comparisons were not conducted.

Table 28

Analysis of Variance Table for Workplace Initiator by Employment Status

| Term | <i>SS</i> | <i>df</i> | <i>F</i> | <i>p</i> | η_p^2 |
|-------------------|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|------------|
| Employment Status | 81.68 | 3 | 0.99 | .396 | 0.01 |
| Residuals | 8,143.33 | 297 | | | |

Employment Type. The ANOVA was examined based on an alpha value of .05. The results of the ANOVA were significant, $F(27, 273) = 1.76, p = .013$, indicating there were significant differences in Workplace Initiator among Employment Type (Table 29). The eta squared was 0.15 indicating a large effect size (Cohen, 1988), and that Employment Type explains approximately 15% of the variance in Workplace Initiator. The means and standard deviations are presented in Table 30.

Table 29

Analysis of Variance Table for Workplace Initiator by Employment Type

| Term | <i>SS</i> | <i>df</i> | <i>F</i> | <i>p</i> | η_p^2 |
|-----------------|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|------------|
| Employment Type | 1,219.91 | 27 | 1.76 | .013 | 0.15 |
| Residuals | 7,005.10 | 273 | | | |

Table 30

Mean, Standard Deviation, and Sample Size for Workplace Initiator by Employment Type

| Combination | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>n</i> |
|--|----------|-----------|----------|
| Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting | 21.00 | 8.49 | 2 |
| Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation | 17.80 | 3.59 | 25 |
| Broadcasting | 19.92 | 5.90 | 12 |

| | | | |
|--|-------|------|----|
| College, University, and Adult Education | 22.00 | 7.27 | 6 |
| Computer and Electronics Manufacturing | 21.78 | 9.65 | 9 |
| Construction | 21.08 | 5.58 | 12 |
| Finance and Insurance | 17.20 | 2.28 | 5 |
| Government and Public Administration | 19.96 | 6.32 | 27 |
| Health Care and Social Assistance | 18.80 | 4.44 | 5 |
| Homemaker | 18.94 | 4.41 | 17 |
| Hotel and Food Services | 17.14 | 2.41 | 7 |
| Information Services and Data Processing | 22.11 | 6.25 | 27 |
| Information Technology | 20.50 | 2.89 | 4 |
| Legal Services | 33.00 | - | 1 |
| Military | 20.00 | 4.47 | 6 |
| Mining | 17.00 | 2.21 | 28 |
| Other Education Industry | 18.67 | 6.35 | 3 |
| Other Industry | 20.86 | 6.92 | 14 |
| Other Information Industry | 18.00 | 2.53 | 6 |
| Other Manufacturing | 23.50 | 9.19 | 2 |
| Primary/Secondary (K-12) Education | 16.00 | - | 1 |
| Publishing | 19.43 | 4.10 | 46 |
| Real Estate, Rental and Leasing | 17.50 | 3.66 | 12 |
| Religious | 18.12 | 1.96 | 8 |
| Retail | 16.00 | 1.41 | 2 |
| Scientific or Technical Services | 19.88 | 4.91 | 8 |
| Software | 30.00 | 9.90 | 2 |
| Telecommunications | 20.75 | 6.13 | 4 |

Note. A '-' indicates the sample size was too small for the statistic to be calculated.

Post-hoc. Paired t-tests were calculated between each pair of measurements to further examine the differences among the variables based on an alpha of .05. No significant effects were found.

Role in Industry. The ANOVA was examined based on an alpha value of .05. The results of the ANOVA were significant, $F(10, 290) = 2.35, p = .011$, indicating there were significant differences in Workplace Initiator by Role in Industry (Table 31). The eta squared was 0.07 indicating a medium effect size (Cohen, 1988), and that Role in

Industry explains approximately 7% of the variance in Workplace Initiator. The means and standard deviations are presented in Table 32.

Table 31

Analysis of Variance Table for Workplace Initiator by Role in Industry

| Term | <i>SS</i> | <i>df</i> | <i>F</i> | <i>p</i> | η_p^2 |
|------------------|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|------------|
| Role in Industry | 615.63 | 10 | 2.35 | .011 | 0.07 |
| Residuals | 7,609.38 | 290 | | | |

Table 32

Mean, Standard Deviation, and Sample Size for Workplace Initiator by Role in Industry

| Role in Industry | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>n</i> |
|----------------------|----------|-----------|----------|
| Upper Management | 22.46 | 5.21 | 13 |
| Middle Management | 21.35 | 5.24 | 40 |
| Junior Management | 21.44 | 5.94 | 27 |
| Administrative Staff | 19.46 | 5.66 | 24 |
| Self-employed | 19.16 | 7.34 | 37 |
| Support Staff | 19.24 | 3.23 | 38 |
| Student | 20.17 | 6.38 | 18 |
| Trained Professional | 18.63 | 3.99 | 46 |
| Temporary Employee | 17.88 | 4.55 | 8 |
| Skilled Laborer | 18.39 | 4.46 | 23 |
| Other | 17.04 | 3.04 | 27 |

Post-hoc. Paired t-tests were calculated between each pair of measurements to further examine the differences among the variables based on an alpha of .05. For the main effect of Role in Industry, the mean of Workplace Initiator for Middle Management ($M = 21.35$, $SD = 5.24$) was significantly larger than for Other ($M = 17.04$, $SD = 3.04$), $p = .033$. No other significant effects were found.

Conclusion

The survey method used indicated excellent reliability with a Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of .96. This led to the development of six scales to further explore the

relationship between DV and WPV. The scales are Domestic Initiator, Domestic Receiver, Domestic Observer, Workplace Initiator, Workplace Receiver, and Workplace Observer. Each scale produced a Cronbach's alpha coefficient between .84 and .91, indicating good to excellent reliability within the scales.

Data suggests that as Domestic Initiator increases, Workplace Initiator tends to increase greater than compared to Domestic Receiver and Domestic Observer. Domestic Initiator indicates a small effect on Workplace Receiver and Workplace Observer, resulting in the tendency for an increase in both as Domestic Initiator increases, but to a lesser degree than Workplace Initiator. Domestic Receiver and Domestic Observer produced the same effect size of small, with a correlation of .36 for each. Analysis indicates that on average, a one-unit increase of Domestic Initiator will increase the value of Workplace Initiator by 0.45. Further analysis indicated that Domestic Initiator significantly predicted Workplace Receiver (15.88%), greater than Workplace Observer (11.65%).

Similarly, data suggests that as Workplace Initiator increases, Domestic Initiator tends to increase at a rate greater than compared to Workplace Receiver and Workplace Observer. Analysis indicates that on average, a one-unit increase of Workplace Initiator will increase the value of Domestic Initiator by 0.57. Further analysis indicated that Workplace Initiator significantly predicted Domestic Receiver (13.71%), slightly greater than Domestic Observer (12.84%).

Additional observations explored whether there were significant differences in Workplace Initiator by age, gender, education level, employment status, employment type, and role in industry. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) indicated that age, gender, and

employment status had little effect on Workplace Initiator. In contrast, education level, employment type, and role in industry had a significant effect on Workplace Initiator.

CHAPTER 5 – DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to explore whether or not a relationship exists between domestic violence and workplace violence. This study aimed to help determine if there is a relationship between DV and WPV, and to bring to light an improved understanding of the relationship and potential indicators, if any. Key to understanding this relationship is an awareness of the experiences of others, and how these experiences are indicators themselves. The findings from this study will contribute to DV and WPV research and body of knowledge. Further, this study may be used to help develop and refine effective DV and WPV prevention and intervention programs and policies for use by organizations, batterer treatment programs, and the judicial system to better meet the needs of the community. This chapter discusses the findings from the study, areas for further research, and contributions to academia and the profession (organizations broadly), while reflecting on the literature presented.

Discussion of Findings

Research question one hypothesized that individuals who commit acts of DV are more likely to commit acts of WPV. A correlation was examined between individuals who initiate, receive, and observe acts of DV and those that initiate WPV. A significant positive correlation exists between those that initiate DV and those that initiate WPV. A Pearson correlation indicates that Workplace Initiator has a positive correlation of .51, with a small effect size ($r^2 = .26$), suggesting that as Domestic Initiator increases, Workplace Initiator tends to increase. Domestic Receiver and Domestic Observer each produced a significant positive correlation (.36 each) with a small effect size ($r^2 = .13$). This suggests that as Domestic Receiver and Domestic Observer increase, Workplace

Initiator tends to increase. A linear regression analysis was conducted to assess whether Domestic Initiator significantly predicted Workplace Initiator. The results indicate that 25.91% of the variance in Workplace Initiator is explainable by Domestic Initiator, and that on average, a one-unit increase of Domestic Initiator will increase the value of Workplace Initiator by 0.45 units. The hypothesis is therefore accepted, as individuals who initiate acts of DV are more likely to initiate acts of WPV than compared to those who receive or observe DV.

Research question two hypothesized that individuals who commit acts of WPV are more likely to commit acts of DV. A correlation was examined between individuals who initiate, receive, and observe acts of WPV and those that initiate DV. A significant positive correlation exists between those that initiate WPV and those that initiate DV. A Pearson correlation indicates that Domestic Initiator has a positive correlation of .51, with a small effect size ($r^2 = .26$), suggesting that as Workplace Initiator increases, Domestic Initiator tends to increase. Workplace Receiver and Workplace Observer each produced a significant positive correlation with a moderate effect size, with Workplace Receiver at .40 ($r^2 = .16$), and Workplace Observer at .34 ($r^2 = .12$). This suggests that as Workplace Receiver and Workplace Observer increase, Domestic Initiator tends to increase. A linear regression analysis was conducted to assess whether Workplace Initiator significantly predicted Domestic Initiator. The results indicate that 25.91% of the variance in Domestic Initiator is explainable by Workplace Initiator, and that on average, a one-unit increase of Workplace Initiator will increase the value of Domestic Initiator by 0.57 units. The hypothesis is therefore accepted, as individuals who initiate acts of WPV are more likely to initiate acts of DV than compared to those who receive or observe WPV.

Research question three hypothesized that individuals who commit acts of WPV are more likely to be recipients of DV. A correlation was examined between individuals that initiate WPV and those that receive and observe acts of DV. A significant positive correlation exists between those that initiate WPV and those that receive and observe acts of DV. A Pearson correlation indicates that Workplace Initiator has a positive correlation with Domestic Receiver of .36, with a small effect size ($r^2 = .13$), suggesting that as Workplace Initiator increases, Domestic Receiver tends to increase. A Pearson correlation indicates that Workplace Initiator has a positive correlation with Domestic Observer of .36, with a small effect size ($r^2 = .13$), suggesting that as Workplace Initiator increases, Domestic Observer tends to increase. A linear regression analysis was conducted to assess whether Workplace Initiator significantly predicted Domestic Receiver. The results indicate that 13.17% of the variance in Domestic Receiver is explainable by Workplace Initiator, and that on average, a one-unit increase of Workplace Initiator will increase the value of Domestic Receiver by 0.49 units. A linear regression analysis was conducted to assess whether Workplace Initiator significantly predicted Domestic Observer. The results indicate that 12.84% of the variance in Domestic Observer is explainable by Workplace Initiator, and that on average, a one-unit increase of Workplace Initiator will increase the value of Domestic Observer by 0.51 units. The hypothesis is therefore rejected, as individuals who initiate acts of WPV are less likely, however minimal, to receive acts of DV than compared to those who observe DV.

Research question four hypothesized that individuals who commit acts of DV are more likely to be recipients of WPV. A correlation was examined between individuals

that initiate DV and those that receive and observe acts of WPV. A significant positive correlation exists between those that initiate DV and those that receive and observe acts of WPV. A Pearson correlation indicates that Domestic Initiator has a positive correlation with Workplace Receiver of .40, with a small effect size ($r^2 = .16$), suggesting that as Domestic Initiator increases, Workplace Receiver tends to increase. A Pearson correlation indicates that Domestic Initiator has a positive correlation with Workplace Observer of .34, with a small effect size ($r^2 = .12$), suggesting that as Domestic Initiator increases, Workplace Observer tends to increase. A linear regression analysis was conducted to assess whether Domestic Initiator significantly predicted Workplace Receiver. The results indicate that 15.88% of the variance in Workplace Receiver is explainable by Domestic Initiator, and that on average, a one-unit increase of Domestic Initiator will increase the value of Workplace Initiator by 0.50 units. A linear regression analysis was conducted to assess whether Domestic Initiator significantly predicted Workplace Observer. The results indicate that 11.65% of the variance in Workplace Observer is explainable by Domestic Initiator, and that on average, a one-unit increase of Domestic Initiator will increase the value of Workplace Observer by 0.52 units. The hypothesis is therefore accepted, as individuals who initiate acts of DV are more likely to receive acts of WPV than compared to those who observe WPV.

Additional Observations. Additional observations were explored to determine whether there were significant differences in Workplace Initiator by age, gender, education level, type of employment, and role in industry. Age was not significant, with $p = .863$ based on an alpha value of .05, indicating there were no significant differences of Workplace Initiator by age levels. This suggests that age alone is not a contributing factor

to an individual initiating WPV. Dispositional factors such as work and life experience (Barling et al., 2009) may be present that are more common within an age group; however, these factors were not researched as part of this study. Gender was not significant, with $p = .165$ based on an alpha value of .05, indicating there were no significant differences of Workplace Initiator by gender. Other contributing factors such as gender role or gender within different cultures may be present that are more common to the gender that participants identify with; however, these factors were not researched as part of this study. Last, employment status was not significant, with $p = .396$ based on an alpha value of .05, indicating there were no significant differences of Workplace Initiator by employment status. Similar to age and gender, other contributing factors such as the length of a particular employment status or reason for choosing to become or remain in a certain employment status may be present that are more common to one's employment status; however, these factors were not researched as part of this study. Therefore, age, gender, and employment status alone do not indicate an increased likelihood of initiating WPV.

Education level was significant, with $p = .002$ based on an alpha value of .05, indicating there were significant differences of Workplace Initiator by education level. Data analysis indicates that the level of education explains approximately 7% of the variance in Workplace Initiator. Employment type was significant, with $p = .013$ based on an alpha value of .05, indicating there were significant differences in Workplace Initiator by employment type. Data analysis indicates that employment type explains approximately 15% of the variance in Workplace Initiator. Role in industry was significant, with $p = .011$ based on an alpha value of .05, indicating there were significant

differences of Workplace Initiator by role in industry. Data analysis indicates that the role in industry explains approximately 7% of the variance in Workplace Initiator.

Areas for Future Study

The first suggestion for future research is to reproduce this study using a larger population pool. This will draw upon a larger sample to garner an improved representation from that of the United States population. Similarly, as DV and WPV are worldwide issues (Beiras et al., 2019; Cardia, 2002; Golu, 2014; WHO, 1996, 2014, 2019), this research should be conducted using samples from across the globe to assess the relationship between cultural norms, identified demographics, and DV and WPV. Additionally, conducting this study with participants with a documented history of generally experiencing DV and WPV may provide improved data to draw from.

A second recommendation would be to use this research to develop qualitative studies to explore the relationship between DV and WPV further. Barling, Dupré, and Kelloway (2009) suggest that further research on violence “across contexts and/or relationships while taking into account dispositional factors” are required (p. 682). Researchers suggest that the development of theories concerning interpersonal violent crimes should consider the perspectives of the victims and perpetrators, as well as the context, events, and motivators occurring during or around the incident (Bell & Naugle, 2008; Natalier et al., 2021; West, 2012). Qualitative studies may provide greater insight into the variables contributing to an individual’s experience of initiating, receiving, and observing DV and WPV.

A third recommendation would be to conduct this study using two separate sample populations, 1) individuals with documented experiences of initiating DV and, 2)

individuals with documented experiences of initiating WPV. Conducting more in-depth research on these two populations may refine the data associated with Domestic Initiator and Workplace Initiator. Including additional variables identified within qualitative studies may further refine the data and expand upon the little-known relationship between DV and WPV.

The last suggestion would be to research the consequences and repercussions of DV and WPV from that of the initiator's perspective. Significant research exists on DV and WPV's effects on recipients and observers (Beiras et al., 2019; Cardia, 2002; Golu, 2014; WHO, 1996, 2014, 2019). Research on the initiator's perspective may help provide greater insight into the variables that contribute to an individual's experience of initiating, as well as help researchers identify intervention methods to stop the initiator before the violence occurs.

Contributions to Academia

Research on the relationship between DV and WPV is limited (Natalier et al., 2021) and needs greater attention (Adewumi & Danesi, 2017; Lanctôt & Guay, 2014). This research was based on a new survey developed to explore the relationship between DV and WPV. The survey contributes to the DV and WPV body of knowledge by adding a reliable tool that may be used to research DV and WPV further. Further, this research explored an area with little existing research, the relationship between DV and WPV. With little or mixed empirical evidence that supports existing theories (Bell & Naugle, 2008), this research asserts that further exploration into the relationship between DV and WPV is warranted.

The survey developed for this research produced the six scales of Domestic Initiator, Domestic Receiver, Domestic Observer, Workplace Initiator, Workplace Receiver, and Workplace Observer. These scales may be used in various combinations or as standalone scales to conduct various research specific to DV, WPV, or both. Further, the definitions of the multiple forms of DV and WPV discussed within this research simplify terminology and provide clarity for researchers and the general population. Additionally, the definitions for Domestic Initiator, Domestic Receiver, Domestic Observer, Workplace Initiator, Workplace Receiver, and Workplace Observer simplify terminology that may improve DV and WPV research. This will improve the understanding of what violence is and enable researchers to conduct improved research on the topic of violence, without the need to overly explain or defend their definitions amongst the litany and mixed definitions available in the literature.

Contributions to Profession

The purpose of this study was to explore whether or not a relationship exists between domestic violence and workplace violence. Research on the intervention, prevention, and consequences of WPV, while growing (Natalier et al., 2021), is limited and needs additional attention (Adewumi & Danesi, 2017; Lanctôt & Guay, 2014). This research expands upon the needed research to help organizations understand the breadth of DV and WPV. The literature review provides a succinct yet detailed review of the related literature, enabling the organization and its leadership to make more informed decisions based on recommendations from other researchers and authors.

This study provides an analysis of the findings central to the purpose of the research related to the relationship between DV and WPV, which is that individuals that

initiate acts of DV are more likely to initiate acts of WPV. Additionally, individuals that initiate acts of WPV are more likely to initiate acts of DV. Organizations may leverage this knowledge in a meaningful way to the organization itself, the affected employees, their coworkers, and their families. Individuals that initiate acts of WPV may receive support such as counseling and education that helps them understand how their behaviors impact others (directly and indirectly), and that their violent behaviors at work may continue at home, adversely affecting their family life. Similarly, individuals that identify as initiating acts of DV may seek support through employee assistance programs (EAP), counseling, and other educational venues. Addressing how their acts of DV may impact their workplace, and that acts of DV indicate an increased chance of initiating WPV may help individuals gain a better understanding of how their behaviors impact more than a single aspect of their life. Organizations may leverage this knowledge, develop improved EAP programs designed to help those with DV and WPV experiences, and further develop programs based on variables that increase the likelihood of a DV or WPV act occurring.

A study by Węziak-Białowolska, Białowolski, & McNeely (2020) assessed the impact of DV and WPV on employees' productivity. While the results varied between countries studied, the general theme indicated that unaddressed DV and WPV lead to diminished employee productivity and/or the decision to leave the organization. The organization would benefit by addressing DV and WPV, regardless of where the violence occurs, as it directly impacts productivity. Intervening in various ways on behalf of DV victims is considered a corporate social responsibility (Giesbrecht, 2022; Guthrie &

Babic, 2021). Acts of WPV are inherently the responsibility of the organization since the violent act occurred within the workspace.

Absent improved research, organizations are left to fend for themselves, which may lead to a simple policy of intolerance for violence in accordance with published standards on corporate social responsibility (ISO, 2010; Lund-Thomsen & Lindgreen, 2014; OSHA, 2022), which may inadvertently perpetuate violence and contribute to the problem versus helping solve it. The National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) framework to address worker well-being looks holistically at worker well-being. Batterer treatment programs and organizations should consider differentiating techniques based on the degree, severity, frequency, and target (coworker or domestic relationship) of the violence (Carbajosa et al., 2017; Holtzworth-Munroe & Meehan, 2004). This study may help further develop and refine effective DV and WPV prevention and intervention programs and policies for use by organizations.

Research from this study suggests that organizations may be able to develop WPV prevention strategies based on identified risk factors and implement risk mitigation strategies based on characteristics (Leblanc & Kelloway, 2002; Ward & Fortune, 2016) such as the type of work performed, role in industry, and education level. This includes addressing DV (Kolk, 2016; Locke et al., 2009; Lund-Thomsen & Lindgreen, 2014; Węziak-Białowolska et al., 2020). Industries that are more inclined to experience acts of WPV may leverage this research to better understand the implications of an increased likelihood of WPV and implement policies and actionable plans to address WPV.

Organizations worldwide employ individuals with various education levels and roles within their organizations. Understanding how education and roles in industry

enable the organization to take more proactive approaches to decrease acts of WPV within the organization. While the type of work performed, role in industry, and education level account for statistically significant variance in those initiating WPV (type of work performed (15%), role in industry (7%), and education level (7%)), organizations must consider other factors that contribute to an individual initiating acts of WPV (Barling et al., 2009).

Limitations

The primary limitation is the assumption that participants were honest regarding their experiences with DV and WPV. The sample population consisted of general population adults, identifying as having “any exposure or experience with negative workplace or domestic encounters.” When faced with questions about their own experiences (common with initiating DV or receiving and observing DV from a loved one), there is a tendency for individuals to minimize their experience based on fear of retaliation, or the story they tell themselves morphs over time. Second, this research focused on a one-way experience – the perspective of one individual recollecting on experiences within the past 12 months. Developing a two-way survey method may provide greater depth into the experiences of the initiator and the observer or receiver. Additionally, the 12-month research period may limit the respondent’s ability to recall their experiences or restrict their experiences to an overly brief period of time.

Participants were financially incentivized (\$3.00 each) to complete this research survey. Participants may have chosen to complete the survey for the financial incentive and provided quicker responses to complete the survey quickly. Participants that voluntarily respond without compensation may be more inclined to provide greater

consideration and thought when responding. Last, the limited research window and a limited number of respondents may be improved by extending the research for a greater period of time and to a larger population.

Conclusion

DV and WPV are global issues in need of greater attention and research to help identify and develop intervention and prevention solutions to reduce the instances of DV and WPV. This study aimed to explore the relationship between DV and WPV, to expand upon the existing literature and research, contributing to the DV and WPV body of knowledge. Through this research, organizations are able to better understand the impacts and reach DV and WPV have on the organization itself, the individuals, and their coworkers and family members. Further, individuals, as well as the organization, may better understand that DV and WPV are not simply stand-alone events; rather, they are related in various degrees. Learning that there is a statistically significant chance that an initiator of WPV may initiate DV, and vice versa, enables the organization to develop more effective policies, processes, and procedures to address DV and WPV. While it is somewhat less likely that an observer or receiver of WPV may initiate DV, and vice versa, there is still a statistical significance within this relationship that must be addressed. Additional observations indicate that age, gender, and employment status were not statistically significant, while education level, employment type, and role in industry were statistically significant. These insights introduced additional variables that may be further researched to contribute to DV and WPV research, continuing the pursuit of a greater understanding of DV and WPV.

REFERENCES

45 CFR 46.102, (2022).

Adams, P. (2012). Interventions with men who are violent to their partners: Strategies for early engagement. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 38(3), 458-470.
doi:10.1111/j.1752-0606.2012.00320.x

Adewumi, O., & Danesi, R. (2017). Gender: A vulnerability factor or not? Exploring and investigating workplace bullying in Nigeria. *Journal of Economics, Business and Management*, 5(10), 324-330. doi:10.18178/joebm.2017.5.10.533

Aldorondo, E. A., & Mederos, E. (2002). Common practitioners' concerns about abusive men. In E. Aldarondo & F. Mederos (Eds.), *Programs for men who batter: Intervention and prevention strategies in a diverse society*. In *Programs for men who batter: Intervention and prevention strategies in a diverse society*. Kingston, NJ: Civic Research Institute.

Appel, A. E., & Holden, G. W. (1998). The co-occurrence of spouse and physical child abuse: A review and appraisal. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 12(4), 578-599.
doi:10.1037/0893-3200.12.4.578

Arias, E., Arce, R., & Vilariño, M. (2013). Batterer intervention programmes: A meta-analytic review of effectiveness. *Psychosocial Intervention*, 22(2), 153-160.
doi:10.5093/in2013a18

Arnetz, J. E. (2022). The Joint Commission's new and revised workplace violence prevention standards for hospitals: A major step forward toward improved quality and safety: Workplace violence prevention standards. *Joint Commission journal on quality and patient safety*, 48(4), 241-245. doi:10.1016/j.jcjq.2022.02.001

- Awang, H., & Hariharan, S. (2011). Determinants of domestic violence: Evidence from Malaysia. *Journal of Family Violence*, 26(6), 459-464. doi:10.1007/s10896-011-9380-6
- Babcock, J. C., Costa, D. M., Green, C. E., & Eckhardt, C. I. (2004). What situations induce intimate partner violence? A reliability and validity study of the Proximal Antecedents to Violent Episodes (PAVE) scale. *J Fam Psychol*, 18(3), 433-442. doi:10.1037/0893-3200.18.3.433
- Babcock, J. C., Green, C. E., & Robie, C. (2004). Does batterers' treatment work? A meta-analytic review of domestic violence treatment. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 23(8), 1023-1053. doi:10.1016/j.cpr.2002.07.001
- Barling, J., Dupré, K. E., & Kelloway, E. K. (2009). Predicting workplace aggression and violence. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 60(1), 671-692. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.60.110707.163629
- Beiras, A., Nascimento, M., & Incrocci, C. (2019). Programs for men who have used violence against women: An overview of interventions in Brazil. *Saúde e Sociedade*, 28(1), 262-274. doi:10.1590/s0104-12902019170995
- Bell, K. M., & Naugle, A. E. (2008). Intimate partner violence theoretical considerations: Moving towards a contextual framework. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 28(7), 1096-1107. doi:doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2008.03.003
- Bentley, T. A., Catley, B., Forsyth, D., & Tappin, D. (2014). Understanding workplace violence: The value of a systems perspective. *Applied Ergonomics*, 45(4), 839-848. doi:doi.org/10.1016/j.apergo.2013.10.016

- Bowen, E. (2011). *The rehabilitation of partner-violent men*. Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley Blackwell
- Caldwell, J. E., Swan, S. C., Allen, C. T., Sullivan, T. P., & Snow, D. L. (2009). Why I hit him: Women's reasons for intimate partner violence. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma, 18*(7), 672-697. doi:10.1080/10926770903231783
- Caman, S., Kristiansson, M., Granath, S., & Sturup, J. (2017). Trends in rates and characteristics of intimate partner homicides between 1990 and 2013. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 49*, 14-21. doi:10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2017.01.002
- Caprara, G. V., Tisak, M. S., Alessandri, G., Fontaine, R. G., Fida, R., & Paciello, M. (2014). The contribution of moral disengagement in mediating individual tendencies toward aggression and violence. *Developmental Psychology, 50*(1), 71-85. doi:10.1037/a0034488
- Carbajosa, P., Catalá-Miñana, A., Lila, M., & Gracia, E. (2017). Differences in treatment adherence, program completion, and recidivism among batterer subtypes. *The European Journal of Psychology Applied to Legal Context, 9*(2), 93-101. doi:10.1016/j.ejpal.2017.04.001
- Cardia, N. (2002). World report on violence and health. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization, 80*(11), 915-915. Retrieved from apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/268669
- Carol, O. (2021). Workplace bullying: Nature, consequences, and recommended policies. *Journal of organizational psychology, 21*(2), 70-95. doi:10.33423/jop.v21i2.4196
- Chari, R., Chang, C.-C., Sauter, S. L., Petrun Sayers, E. L., Cerully, J. L., Schulte, P., . . . Uscher-Pines, L. (2018). Expanding the paradigm of occupational safety and

- health: A new framework for worker well-being. *Journal of occupational and environmental medicine*, 60(7), 589-593. doi:10.1097/JOM.0000000000001330
- Choi, E. Y., & Hyun, H. J. (2016). A predictive model of domestic violence in multicultural families focusing on perpetrator. *Asian Nursing Research*, 10(3), 213-220. doi:doi.org/10.1016/j.anr.2016.04.004
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.): Routledge.
- Coker, A., McKeown, R., & King, M. (2000). Frequency and correlates of intimate partner violence by type: Physical, sexual, and psychological battering. *American Journal of Public Health*, 90(4), 553-559. doi:10.2105/AJPH.90.4.553
- Connelly, L. M. (2008). Pilot studies. *Medsurg nursing*, 17(6), 411-412.
- Center for Disease Control. (2019, 2019-06-13). Preventing intimate partner violence. Retrieved from [cdc.gov/violenceprevention/intimatepartnerviolence/fastfact.html](https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/intimatepartnerviolence/fastfact.html)
- Cooper, J. R., Walker, J., Askew, R., Robinson, J. C., & McNair, M. (2011). Students' perceptions of bullying behaviours by nursing faculty. *Issues in Educational Research*, 21(1), 1-21.
- Costa, B. M., Kaestle, C. E., Walker, A., Curtis, A., Day, A., Toumbourou, J. W., & Miller, P. (2015). Longitudinal predictors of domestic violence perpetration and victimization: A systematic review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 24(Supplement C), 261-272. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2015.06.001
- Crowell, N. A., & Burgess, A. W. (1996). *Understanding violence against women*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.

- Dixon, L., & Graham-Kevan, N. (2011). Understanding the nature and etiology of intimate partner violence and implications for practice and policy. *Clinical Psychology Review, 31*(7), 1145-1155. doi:doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2011.07.001
- Dutton, D. G. (1995a). Male abusiveness in intimate relationships. *Clinical Psychology Review, 15*(6), 567-581. doi:10.1016/0272-7358(95)00028-N
- Dutton, D. G. (1995b). A scale for measuring propensity for abusiveness. *Journal of Family Violence, 10*(2), 203-221. doi:10.1007/BF02110600
- Dutton, D. G. (2006). *Rethinking domestic violence*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Eckhardt, C., Holtzworth-Munroe, A., Norlander, B., Sibley, A., & Cahill, M. (2008). Readiness to change, partner violence subtypes, and treatment outcomes among men in treatment for partner assault. *Violence and Victims, 23*(4), 446. doi:10.1891/0886-6708.23.4.446
- Eckhardt, C., Murphy, C., Whitaker, D., Sprunger, J., Dykstra, R., & Woodard, K. (2013). The effectiveness of intervention programs for perpetrators and victims of intimate partner violence. *Partner Abuse, 4*(2), 196-231. doi:10.1891/1946-6560.4.2.196
- Einarsen, S. (1999). The nature and causes of bullying at work. *International Journal of Manpower, 20*(1/2), 16. doi:10.1108/01437729910268588
- Einarsen, S., Hoel, H., Zapf, D., & Cooper, C. (2011). The concept of bullying and harassment at work: The European tradition. *Bullying and harassment in the workplace. Developments in theory, research, and practice, 3-39*.
- Einarsen, S., Raknes, B., & Matthiesen, S. B. (1994). Bullying and harassment at work and their relationships to work environment quality: An exploratory study.

European Work & Organizational Psychologist, 4(4), 381.

doi:10.1080/13594329408410497

Einarsen, S., & Raknes, B. I. (1997). Harassment in the workplace and the victimization of men. *Violence and Victims*, 12(3), 247-263. doi:10.1891/0886-6708.12.3.247

Einarsen, S., Skogstad, A., Rørvik, E., Lande, Å. B., & Nielsen, M. B. (2018). Climate for conflict management, exposure to workplace bullying and work engagement: A moderated mediation analysis. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 29(3), 549-570. doi:10.1080/09585192.2016.1164216

Estrada, F., Nilsson, A., Jerre, K., & Wikman, S. (2010). Violence at work - The emergence of a social problem. *Journal of Scandinavian studies in criminology and crime prevention*, 11(1), 46-65. doi:10.1080/14043851003703846

Febres, J., Brasfield, H., Shorey, R. C., Elmquist, J., Ninnemann, A., Schonbrun, Y. C., . . . Stuart, G. L. (2014). Adulthood animal abuse among men arrested for domestic violence. *Violence Against Women*, 20(9), 1059-1077. doi:10.1177/1077801214549641

Feder, L., & Wilson, D. (2005). A meta-analytic review of court-mandated batterer intervention programs: Can courts affect abusers' behavior? *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 1(2), 239-262. doi:10.1007/s11292-005-1179-0

Ferrer-Perez, V., A., Ferreiro-Basurto, V., Navarro-Guzmán, C., & Bosch-Fiol, E. (2016). Batterer intervention programs in Spain: The professionals perspective. *Psychosocial Intervention*, 25(3), 159-168. doi:10.1016/j.psi.2016.06.001

Fisher-Blando, J. L. (2008). *Workplace bullying: Aggressive behavior and its effect on job satisfaction and production (Unpublished doctoral dissertation)*.

- Frone, M. R., Kelloway, E. K., & Barling, J. (2005). *Handbook of work stress*. Thousand Oaks, Calif: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- George, D., & Mallery, P. (2018). *IBM SPSS statistics: A simple guide and reference*(15th ed.). doi:doi.org/10.4324/9781351033909
- Giesbrecht, C. J. (2022). Toward an effective workplace response to intimate partner violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 37(3-4), 1158-1178.
doi:10.1177/0886260520921865
- Giorgi, G., Perminiene, M., Montani, F., Fiz-Perez, J., Mucci, N., & Arcangeli, G. (2016). Detrimental effects of workplace bullying: Impediment of self-management competence via psychological distress. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7(60), 1664-1078. doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00060
- Glabek, M., Matthiesen, S. B., Hetland, J., & Einarsen, S. (2014). Workplace bullying as an antecedent to job insecurity and intention to leave: a 6-month prospective study. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 24(3), 255-268. doi:10.1111/1748-8583.12035
- Golu, F. (2014). Predictors of domestic violence – comparative analysis. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 127(Supplement C), 611-615.
doi:doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.321
- Gondolf, E. W. (2004). Evaluating batterer counseling programs: A difficult task showing some effects and implications. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 9(6), 605-631. doi:10.1016/j.avb.2003.06.001
- Griffin, C., Nowacki, K., & Woodroof, A. (2021). Creating safe and healing environments: Innovative curriculum to support team members during patient and

- family escalations in a quaternary care pediatric hospital. *Archives of psychiatric nursing*, 35(2), 200-205. doi:10.1016/j.apnu.2020.09.006
- Guthrie, R., & Babic, A. (2021). Employers' potential liability for family and domestic violence: An Australian overview. *The Economic and Labour Relations Review*, 32(4), 513-533. doi:10.1177/10353046211024332
- Hamberger, L., Lohr, J., Bonge, D., & Tolin, D. (1996). A large sample empirical typology of male spouse abusers and its relationship to dimensions of abuse. *Violence and Victims*, 11(4), 277-292. doi:10.1891/0886-6708.11.4.277
- Hansen, Å. M., Garde, A. H., Nabe-Nielsen, K., Grynderup, M. B., & Høgh, A. (2018). Health consequences of workplace bullying: Physiological responses and sleep as pathways to disease. In *Pathways of Job-related Negative Behaviour* (pp. 1-25).
- Hill, R. (1998). What sample size is "enough" in internet survey research? *Interpersonal Computing and Technology*, 6(3-4), 1-10.
- Hogh, A., Clausen, T., Bickmann, L., Hansen, Å. M., Conway, P. M., & Baernholdt, M. (2019). Consequences of workplace bullying for individuals, organizations and society. In *Pathways of Job-related Negative Behaviour* (pp. 1-24).
- Hollis, L. P. (2017). Higher education henchmen: Vicarious bullying and underrepresented populations. *Advances in Social Sciences Research Journal*, 4(12), 64-73.
- Hollis, L. P. (2019a). The abetting bully: Vicarious bullying and unethical leadership in higher education. *Journal for the Study of Postsecondary and Tertiary Education*, 4, 1-18. doi:10.28945/4255

- Hollis, L. P. (2019b). Something to lose sleep over: Predictive analysis of black men's and white men's insomnia issues due to workplace bullying in higher education. *Journal of Black Sexuality and Relationships*, 5(4), 1-19.
- Holtzworth-Munroe, A., & Meehan, J. C. (2004). Typologies of men who are maritally violent: Scientific and clinical implications. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 19(12), 1369-1389. doi:10.1177/0886260504269693
- Holtzworth-Munroe, A., Meehan, J. C., Herron, K., Rehman, U., & Stuart, G. L. (2000). Testing the Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart (1994) batterer typology. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 68(6), 1000-1019. doi:10.1037/0022-006X.68.6.1000
- Houry, D., Rhodes, K. V., Kemball, R. S., Click, L., Cerulli, C., McNutt, L. A., & Kaslow, N. J. (2008). Differences in female and male victims and perpetrators of partner violence with respect to WEB scores. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 23(8), 1041-1055. doi:10.1177/0886260507313969
- ISO (2010). ISO 26000 guidance on social responsibility. Retrieved from <http://iisd.org/standards/csr.asp>.
- Jenkins, L. N., & Nickerson, A. B. (2017). Bullying participant roles and gender as predictors of bystander intervention. *Aggressive Behavior*, 43(3), 281-290. doi:10.1002/ab.21688
- Johnson, M. P., & Ferraro, K. J. (2000). Research on domestic violence in the 1990s: Making distinctions. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 62(4), 948-963. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2000.00948.x

- Jonge, A. (2018). Corporate social responsibility through a feminist lens: Domestic violence and the workplace in the 21st century. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 148(3), 471-487. doi:10.1007/s10551-015-3010-9
- Julious, S. A. (2005). Sample size of 12 per group rule of thumb for a pilot study. *Pharmaceutical statistics : the journal of the pharmaceutical industry*, 4(4), 287-291. doi:10.1002/pst.185
- Karabulut, A. T. (2016). Bullying: Harmful and hidden behavior in organizations. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 229, 4-11. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.07.108
- Keuskamp, D., Ziersch, A. M., Baum, F. E., & Lamontagne, A. D. (2012). Workplace bullying a risk for permanent employees. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health*, 36(2), 116-119. doi:10.1111/j.1753-6405.2011.00780.x
- Kistenmacher, B. R., & Weiss, R. L. (2008). Motivational interviewing as a mechanism for change in men who batter: A randomized controlled trial. *Violence and Victims*, 23(5), 558. doi:10.1891/0886-6708.23.5.558
- Kolk, A. (2016). The social responsibility of international business: From ethics and the environment to CSR and sustainable development. *Journal of World Business*, 51(1), 23-34. doi:10.1016/j.jwb.2015.08.010
- Kraanen, F. L., Vedel, E., Scholing, A., & Emmelkamp, P. M. G. (2013). Screening on perpetration and victimization of intimate partner violence (IPV): Two studies on the validity of an IPV screening instrument in patients in substance abuse treatment. *PLoS One*, 8(5), 1-10. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0063681

- Kraanen, F. L., Vedel, E., Scholing, A., & Emmelkamp, P. M. G. (2014). Prediction of intimate partner violence by type of substance use disorder. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment, 46*(4), 532-539. doi:10.1016/j.jsat.2013.10.010
- Lanctôt, N., & Guay, S. (2014). The aftermath of workplace violence among healthcare workers: A systematic literature review of the consequences. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 19*(5), 492-501. doi:doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2014.07.010
- Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J. (2010). Controversies involving gender and intimate partner violence: Response to commentators. *Sex Roles, 62*(3-4), 221-225. doi:10.1007/s11199-010-9743-0
- Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J., & Capaldi, D. M. (2012). Clearly we've only just begun: Developing effective prevention programs for intimate partner violence. *Society for Prevention Research, 13*(4), 410-415. doi:10.1007/s11121-012-0310-5
- Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J., McCullars, A., & Misra, T. A. (2012). Motivations for men and women's intimate partner violence perpetration: A comprehensive review. *Partner Abuse, 3*(4), 429-468. doi:10.1891/1946-6560.3.4.429
- Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J., Misra, T. A., Selwyn, C., & Rohling, M. L. (2012). Rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional intimate partner violence across samples, sexual orientations, and race/ethnicities: A comprehensive review. *Partner Abuse, 3*(2), 199-230. doi:10.1891/1946-6560.3.2.199
- Leblanc, M. M., & Kelloway, E. K. (2002). Predictors and outcomes of workplace violence and aggression. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(3), 444-453. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.87.3.444

- Lee, J. (2005). *Addressing domestic violence in the workplace*. Amherst, Mass.: HRD Press.
- Lewis, D., Deakin, R., & McGregor, F.-L. (2018). Workplace bullying, disability and chronic ill health. In *Metrology* (pp. 1-29).
- Lewis, D., & Sheehan, M. (2003). Introduction: Workplace bullying: Theoretical and practical approaches to a management challenge. *International Journal of Management and Decision Making*, 4. doi:10.1081/DMR-120018245
- Leymann, H. (1990). Mobbing and psychological terror at workplaces. *Violence and Victims*, 5(2), 119-126. doi:10.1891/0886-6708.5.2.119
- Lila, M., Oliver, A., Catalá-Miñana, A., Galiana, L., & Gracia, E. (2014). The intimate partner violence responsibility attribution scale (IPVRAS). *The European Journal of Psychology Applied to Legal Context*, 6, 29-36. doi:10.5093/ejpalc2014a4
- Lipsky, S., Caetano, R., Field, C., & Bazargan, S. (2004). Violence-related injury and intimate partner violence in an urban emergency department. *Journal Of Trauma-Injury Infection And Critical Care*, 57(2), 352-359. doi:10.1097/01.TA.0000142628.66045.E2
- Lipton, B. (2015). A new 'ERA' of women and leadership: the gendered impact of quality assurance in Australian Higher Education. *Australian Universities' Review*, 57(2), 60.
- Locke, R., Amengual, M., & Mangla, A. (2009). Virtue out of necessity? Compliance, commitment, and the improvement of labor conditions in global supply chains. *Politics and Society*, 37(3), 319-351. doi:10.1177/0032329209338922

- Low, S., Tiberio, S. S., Shortt, J. W., Mulford, C., Eddy, J. M., & Capaldi, D. M. (2019). Intergenerational transmission of violence: The mediating role of adolescent psychopathology symptoms. *Development and Psychopathology*, 31(1), 233-245. doi:10.1017/S0954579417001833
- Lund-Thomsen, P., & Lindgreen, A. (2014). Corporate social responsibility in global value chains: Where are we now and where are we going? *Journal of Business Ethics*, 123(1), 11-22. doi:10.1007/s10551-013-1796-x
- Malik, M. S., Sattar, S., & Yaqub, R. M. S. (2018). Mediating role of psychological contract breach between workplace bullying, organizational commitment and employee turnover intentions. *Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences*, 12(3).
- Matthiesen, S. B., & Einarsen, S. (2004). Psychiatric distress and symptoms of PTSD among victims of bullying at work. *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling*, 32(3), 335-356. doi:10.1080/03069880410001723558
- Mayer, J. F. (2021). Resistance to chronic violence in informal workplaces: The strategies of domestic workers in Brazil (2003–2018). *Bulletin of Latin American research*, 40(3), 385-400. doi:10.1111/blar.13232
- Mayhew, C., & Quinlan, M. (2002). The relationship between precarious employment and patterns of occupational violence. In K. Isaksson, C. Hogstedt, C. Eriksson, & T. Theorell (Eds.), *Health Effects of the New Labour Market* (pp. 183-205). Boston, MA: Springer US.

- Mollica, K., & Danehower, C. (2014). Domestic violence and the workplace: The employer's legal responsibilities. *Journal of Management and Marketing Research, 17*, 1.
- Mulder, R., Bos, A. E. R., Pouwelse, M., & Van Dam, K. (2017). Workplace mobbing: How the victim's coping behavior influences bystander responses. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 157*(1), 16-29. doi:10.1080/00224545.2016.1152213
- Namie, G., & Lutgen-Sandvik, P. (2010). Active and passive accomplices: The communal character of workplace bullying. *International Journal Of Communication, 4*, 343-373.
- Namie, G., & Namie, R. (2017). Workplace bullying survey. Retrieved from workplacebullying.org/wbiresearch/wbi-2017-survey/
- Natalier, K., Cortis, N., Seymour, K., Wendt, S., & King, D. (2021). Workplace violence against domestic and family violence and sexual assault workers: A gendered, settings-based approach. *The British journal of social work, 51*(7), 2301-2320. doi:10.1093/bjsw/bcaa030
- NIOSH. (2021). NIOSH questionnaire aimed at gauging, enhancing worker well-being. *Safety & Health, 203*(6), 21.
- Notelaers, G., Vermunt, J. K., Baillien, E., Einarsen, S., & De Witte, H. (2011). Exploring risk groups workplace bullying with categorical data. *Industrial health, 49*(1), 73. doi:10.2486/indhealth.MS1155
- O'Leary, K. D., & Williams, M. C. (2006). Agreement about acts of aggression in marriage. *Journal of Family Psychology, 20*(4), 656-662. doi:10.1037/0893-3200.20.4.656

- Ortega, A., Høgh, A., Pejtersen, J., & Olsen, O. (2009). Prevalence of workplace bullying and risk groups: A representative population study. *International Archives of Occupational and Environmental Health*, 82(3), 417-426. doi:10.1007/s00420-008-0339-8
- OSHA (2017). *Enforcement procedures and scheduling for occupational exposure to workplace violence*. Retrieved from www.osha.gov/enforcement/directives/cpl-02-01-058
- OSHA (2022). Workplace violence. Retrieved from osha.gov/workplace-violence
- Pallavi, P. (2018). Bullying pervaded at different organizational cultures. *Journal of Emerging Technologies and Innovative Research*, 5(5), 939-945.
- Park, J. H., & Ono, M. (2017). Effects of workplace bullying on work engagement and health: The mediating role of job insecurity. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 28(22), 3202-3225. doi:10.1080/09585192.2016.1155164
- Pelletier, K. L., Kottke, J. L., & Sirotnik, B. W. (2019). The toxic triangle in academia: A case analysis of the emergence and manifestation of toxicity in a public university. *Leadership*, 15(4), 405-432. doi:10.1177/1742715018773828
- Peters, S. E., Sorensen, G., Katz, J. N., Gundersen, D. A., & Wagner, G. R. (2021). Thriving from work: Conceptualization and measurement. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 18(13), 7196. doi:10.3390/ijerph18137196
- Phillips, J., & Vandenbroek, P. (2018). *Domestic, family and sexual violence in Australia: An overview of the issues – Parliament of Australia*. Retrieved from

aph.gov.au/About_Parliament/Parliamentary_Departments/Parliamentary_Library
/pubs/rp/rp1415/ViolenceAust

- Piquero, N. L., Piquero, A. R., Craig, J. M., & Clipper, S. J. (2013). Assessing research on workplace violence, 2000–2012. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 18*(3), 383-394. doi:doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2013.03.001
- Price, B., & Rosenbaum, A. (2009). Batterer intervention programs: A report from the field. *Violence and Victims, 24*(6), 757-770. doi:10.1891/0886-6708.24.6.757
- Quirk, R., & Campbell, M. (2015). On standby? A comparison of online and offline witnesses to bullying and their bystander behaviour. *Educational Psychology, 35*(4), 430-448. doi:10.1080/01443410.2014.893556
- Qureshi, M. I., Rasli, A. M., & Zaman, K. (2014). A new trilogy to understand the relationship among organizational climate, workplace bullying and employee health. *Arab Economic and Business Journal, 9*(2), 133-146. doi:10.1016/j.aebj.2014.05.009
- Raftery, C. (2015). Workplace violence. *The Journal for Nurse Practitioners, 11*(8), 831. doi:doi.org/10.1016/j.nurpra.2015.07.017
- Razera, J., Gaspodini, I. B., & Falcke, D. (2017). Intimate partner violence and gender a/symmetry: An integrative literature review. *Psico-USF, 22*(3), 401-412. doi:10.1590/1413-82712017220302
- Riemer, N. (2016). Academics, the humanities and the enclosure of knowledge: The worm in the fruit. *Australian Universities' Review, 58*(2), 33-41.
- Romero-Martínez, Á., Lila, M., Gracia, E., & Moya-Albiol, L. (2019). Improving empathy with motivational strategies in batterer intervention programmes: Results

of a randomized controlled trial. *The British journal of clinical psychology*, 58(2), 125. doi:10.1111/bjc.12204

Rugala, E. A., & Isaacs, A. (N.D.). *Workplace violence: Issues in response*. Critical Incident Response Group. Quantico, Virginia.

Scarduzio, J. A., Carlyle, K. E., Harris, K. L., & Savage, M. W. (2017). "Maybe she was provoked": Exploring gender stereotypes about male and female perpetrators of intimate partner violence. *Violence Against Women*, 23(1), 89-113. doi:10.1177/1077801216636240

Schwartz, S. (2005). Life skills project: Sunny Schwartz. *Journal of Correctional Education*, 56(2), 115-123.

Sims, M. (2019). Bullying is not tolerated here: We have policies and procedures which protect staff. An auto-ethnography of frustration. *Sociology Insights*, 3(1), 1-10.

Sinclair, H. (2012). Manhood and violence. 27(1). Retrieved from tikkun.org/nextgen/manhood-and-violence

Sinclair, H., & Bruenn, L. (2002). Manalive: Violence intervention and prevention programs. In: Course Manual.

Spector, P. E., & Jex, S. M. (1998). Development of four self-report measures of job stressors and strain: Interpersonal Conflict at Work Scale, Organizational Constraints Scale, Quantitative Workload Inventory, and Physical Symptoms Inventory. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 3(4), 356-367. doi:10.1037/1076-8998.3.4.356

Speroni, K. G., Fitch, T., Dawson, E., Dugan, L., & Atherton, M. (2014). Incidence and cost of nurse workplace violence perpetrated by hospital patients or patient

visitors. *Journal of Emergency Nursing*, 40(3), 218-228.

doi:doi.org/10.1016/j.jen.2013.05.014

Steinberg, R. J., Holtzworth-Munroe, A., & Stuart, G. L. (1994). Typologies of male batterers: Three subtypes and the differences among them. *Psychological Bulletin*, 116(3), 476-497. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.116.3.476

Straus, M. (1979). Measuring intrafamily conflict and violence: The Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS). *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 41(1), 75-88.
doi:10.2307/351733

Straus, M. (2008). Dominance and symmetry in partner violence by male and female university students in 32 nations. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 30(3), 252-275. doi:10.1016/j.childyouth.2007.10.004

Straus, M., Hamby, S., Boney-McCoy, S., & Sugarman, D. (1996). The revised conflict tactics scales (CTS2): Development and preliminary psychometric data. *Journal of Family Issues*, 17(3), 283-316. doi:10.1177/019251396017003001

Straus, M. A. (2011). Gender symmetry and mutuality in perpetration of clinical-level partner violence: Empirical evidence and implications for prevention and treatment. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 16(4), 279-288.

doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2011.04.010

Swanberg, J. E., & Logan, T. K. (2005). Domestic violence and employment: A qualitative study. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 10(1), 3-17.
doi:10.1037/1076-8998.10.1.3

Thompson, R., Thompson, R., Bonomi, A., Anderson, M., Reid, R., Dimer, J., . . .

Rivara, F. (2006). Intimate partner violence: Prevalence, types, and chronicity in

adult women. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 30(6), 447-457.

Retrieved from [ajpmonline.org/article/S0749-3797\(06\)00098-5/pdf](http://ajpmonline.org/article/S0749-3797(06)00098-5/pdf)

Tjaden, P., & Thoennes, N. (2000). *Extent, nature, and consequences of intimate partner violence: Findings from the National Violence Against Women Survey*.

Washington, DC.

Török, E., Hansen, Å. M., Grynderup, M. B., Garde, A. H., Høgh, A., & Nabe-Nielsen, K. (2016). The association between workplace bullying and depressive symptoms: the role of the perpetrator. *BMC Public Health*, 16(1), 993.

doi:10.1186/s12889-016-3657-x

Van Den Brande, W., Baillien, E., De Witte, H., Vander Elst, T., & Godderis, L. (2016).

The role of work stressors, coping strategies and coping resources in the process of workplace bullying: A systematic review and development of a comprehensive model. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 29, 61-71.

doi:10.1016/j.avb.2016.06.004

Verkuil, B., Atasayi, S., & Molendijk, M. L. (2015). Workplace bullying and mental health: A meta-analysis on cross-sectional and longitudinal data. *PLoS One*, 10(8), e0135225-e0135225. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0135225

Ward, T., & Fortune, C.-A. (2016). The role of dynamic risk factors in the explanation of offending. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 29(Supplement C), 79-88.

doi:doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2016.06.007

Weiss, D. J., Dawis, R. V., England, G. W., & Lofquist, L. H. (1967). *Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire*. Work Adjustment Project. St. Paul, MN.

- West, C. M. (2012). Partner abuse in ethnic minority and gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender populations. *Partner Abuse*, 3(3), 336-357. doi:10.1891/1946-6560.3.3.336
- Węziak-Białowolska, D., Białowolski, P., & McNeely, E. (2020). The impact of workplace harassment and domestic violence on work outcomes in the developing world. *World development*, 126, 104732 - 110742. doi:10.1016/j.worlddev.2019.104732
- WHO. (1996). *Prevention of violence: Public health priority*. Geneva: World Health Organization Retrieved from apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/179463
- WHO. (2014). Violence against women: Intimate partner violence and sexual violence. In: Manila: WHO Regional Office for the Western Pacific.
- WHO. (2019). *Violence against women: Intimate partner and sexual violence against women: Evidence brief*. Retrieved from Geneva: apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/329889
- Yamawaki, N., Ochoa-Shipp, M., Pulsipher, C., Harlos, A., & Swindler, S. (2012). Perceptions of domestic violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 27(16), 3195-3212. doi:10.1177/0886260512441253
- Zabrodska, K., Linnell, S., Laws, C., & Davies, B. (2011). Bullying as intra-active process in neoliberal universities. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 17(8), 709-719. doi:10.1177/1077800411420668

APPENDICES**Appendix A****Domestic Violence and Workplace Violence Survey****Domestic Violence**

The following questions are asked, “in the last 12 months” using a 5-point Likert scale of:

1. Never
2. Once per month or less
3. About once a week
4. About once a day
5. Multiple times per day

Emotional**Initiator – DEI**

1. How often have you taken something away (such as car keys, remote control, video game, credit card) from a family member to get them to do something you wanted or stop them from doing what they wanted?
2. How often have you rolled your eyes, scowled, or had an angry look on your face at a family member?
3. How often have you entered a family member’s personal space (such as their bedroom) without their permission?
4. How often have you persisted with a family member, such as demanding a response to a question or reminding them to do chores?

Receiver – DER

1. How often has a family member taken something away (such as car keys, remote control, video game, credit card) from you to get you to do something they wanted you to do.
2. How often has a family member rolled their eyes, scowled, or had an angry look on their face at you?
3. How often has a family member entered your personal space (such as your bedroom) without permission?
4. How often has a family member persisted with you, such as demanding a response to a question?

Observer – DEO

1. How often have you seen a family member taken something away (such as car keys, remote control, video game, credit card) from a family member to get them to do something they wanted.
2. How often have you seen a family member roll their eyes, scowl, or have an angry look on their face at a family member?
3. How often have you seen a family member enter another family member’s personal space (such as their bedroom) without permission?

4. How often have you seen a family member persist with another family member, such as demanding a response to a question?

Verbal**Initiator – DVI**

1. How often have you raised your voice or yell at or around a family member?
2. How often have you used a *tone* in your voice to persuade a family member to behave in a certain manner?
3. How often have you called family members demeaning names (such as jerk, loser, or lazy)?
4. How often have you used profanity towards or around a family member?

Receiver – DVR

1. How often has a family member raised their voice or yell at or around you?
2. How often has a family member used a *tone* in their voice to persuade you to behave in a certain manner?
3. How often has a family member called you demeaning names (such as jerk, loser, or lazy)?
4. How often has a family member used profanity towards you?

Observer – DVO

1. How often have you heard a family member raise their voice or yell at or around another family member?
2. How often have you heard a family member use a *tone* in their voice to persuade a family member to behave in a certain manner?
3. How often have you heard a family member call another family member demeaning names (such as jerk, loser, or lazy)?
4. How often have you heard a family member use profanity towards another family member?

Physical**Initiator – DPI**

1. How often have you pushed, shoved, hit, or kicked a family member?
2. How often have you hit, kicked, or thrown an object at or around a family member?
3. How often have you postured yourself in front of a family member (such as stiffening your body, puffing up your chest, standing “tall”)?
4. How often have you used your body or objects to intentionally block a family member from passing by?

Receiver – DPR

1. How often has a family member pushed, shoved, hit, or kicked you?
2. How often has a family member hit, kicked, or thrown an object at or around you?
3. How often has a family member postured themselves in front of you (such as stiffening their body, puffing up their chest, standing “tall”)?

4. How often has a family member used their body or objects to intentionally block you from passing by?

Observer – DPO

1. How often have you seen a family member push, shove, hit or kick a family member?
2. How often have you seen a family member hit, kick, or throw an object at or around a family member?
3. How often have you seen a family member posture themselves in front of a family member (such as stiffening their body, puffing up their chest, standing “tall”)?
4. How often have you seen a family member use their body or objects to intentionally block a family member from passing by?

Workplace Violence

The following questions are asked, “in the last 12 months” using a 5-point Likert scale of:

1. Never
2. Once per month or less
3. About once a week
4. About once a day
5. Multiple times per day

Workplace Bullying

Initiator – WBI

1. How often have you talked over or interrupted a coworker or employee?
2. How often have you ignored a coworker or employee’s request or task that you are supposed to complete for them as part of your duties?
3. How often have you played practical jokes or pranks on coworkers or employees, knowing they would not find it funny or amusing?
4. How often have you held information “hostage” or “over the head” of a coworker or employee to get them to do what you want?
5. How often have you convinced a coworker or employee to do your work for you?

Receiver – WBR

1. How often has a coworker or supervisor talked over or interrupted you?
2. How often has a coworker or supervisor ignored your request or task that you need completed as part of your duties?
3. How often has a coworker or supervisor played practical jokes or pranks on you, knowing you would not find it funny or amusing?
4. How often has a coworker or supervisor held information “hostage” or “over your head” to get you to do what they want?
5. How often has a coworker or supervisor convinced, or attempted to convince you to do their work for them?

Observer – WBO

1. How often have you seen a coworker or supervisor talk over or interrupt another coworker or employee?

2. How often have you seen a coworker or supervisor ignore another coworker or employee's request or task that they are supposed to complete for them as part of their duties?
3. How often have you seen a coworker or supervisor play practical jokes or pranks on coworkers or employees, knowing they would not find it funny or amusing?
4. How often have you seen a coworker or supervisor hold information "hostage" or "over the head" of a coworker or employee to get them to do what they wanted?
5. How often have you seen a coworker or supervisor convince, or attempt to convince a coworker or employee to do their work for them?

Workplace Aggression

Initiator – WAI

1. How often have you raised your voice or yell at or around a coworker, employee, or customer?
2. How often have you used a *tone* in your voice to manipulate a coworker, employee, or customer to behave in a certain manner?
3. How often have you called a coworker, employee, or customer demeaning names (such as jerk, loser, or lazy)?
4. How often have you used profanity towards or around a coworker, employee, or customer?
5. How often have you hit, kicked, or punched an object around a coworker, employee, or customer?

Receiver – WAR

1. How often has a coworker, supervisor, or customer raised their voice or yell at or around you?
2. How often has a coworker, supervisor, or customer used a *tone* in their voice to manipulate you to behave in a certain manner?
3. How often has a coworker, supervisor, or customer called you demeaning names (such as jerk, loser, or lazy)?
4. How often has a coworker, supervisor, or customer used profanity towards or around you?
5. How often has a coworker, supervisor, or customer hit, kicked, or punched an object around you?

Observer – WAO

1. How often have you heard a coworker, supervisor, or customer raise their voice or yell at or around another coworker or employee?
2. How often have you heard a coworker, supervisor, or customer use a *tone* in their voice to manipulate another coworker or employee to behave in a certain manner?
3. How often have you heard a coworker, supervisor, or customer called another coworker or employee demeaning names (such as jerk, loser, or lazy)?
4. How often have you heard a coworker, supervisor, or customer use profanity towards or around another coworker or employee?
5. How often have you seen coworker, supervisor, or customer hit, kick, or punch an object around another coworker or employee?

Workplace Violence (physical)**Initiator – WVI**

1. How often have you pushed, shoved, grabbed, hit, or kicked a coworker or employee?
2. How often have you thrown something at or around a coworker or employee?
3. How often have you scowled or had an angry look on your face while around a coworker or employee?
4. How often have you postured yourself in front of a coworker or employee (such as stiffening your body, puffing up your chest, standing or sitting “tall”)?
5. How often have you used your body or objects to intentionally block a coworker or employee from passing by?

Receiver – WVR

1. How often has a supervisor, coworker, employee, or customer pushed, shoved, grabbed, hit, or kicked you?
2. How often has a supervisor, coworker, employee, or customer thrown something at or around you?
3. How often has a supervisor, coworker, employee, or customer scowled or had an angry look on their face towards or around you?
4. How often has a supervisor, coworker, employee, or customer postured themselves in front of you (such as stiffening your body, puffing up your chest, standing or sitting “tall”)?
5. How often has a supervisor, coworker, employee, or customer used their body or objects to intentionally block you from passing by?

Observer – WVO

1. How often have you seen a supervisor, coworker, employee, or customer push, shove, grab, hit, or kick a coworker or employee?
2. How often have you seen a supervisor, coworker, employee, or customer throw something at or around another coworker or employee?
3. How often have you seen a supervisor, coworker, employee, or customer scowl or have an angry look on their face towards or around another coworker or employee?
4. How often have you seen a supervisor, coworker, employee, or customer posture themselves in front of another coworker or employee (such as stiffening your body, puffing up your chest, standing or sitting “tall”)?
5. How often have you seen a supervisor, coworker, employee, or customer use their body or objects to intentionally block another coworker or employee from passing by?

Demographic

1. (DEM1) What is your age?
 - a. 18-22
 - b. 23-27

- c. 28-34
 - d. 35-40
 - e. 41-45
 - f. 46-50
 - g. 51-55
 - h. 56-60
 - i. 61-65
 - j. 65+
2. (DEM2) What is your marital status?
- a. Single (never married)
 - b. Married
 - c. In a domestic partnership
 - d. Divorced
 - e. Widowed
3. (DEM3) Have you been employed in the last 12 months?
- a. Yes
 - b. No
4. (DEM4) Are you living with a married or domestic partner?
- a. Yes
 - b. No
5. (DEM5) What gender do you identify as?
- a. Male
 - b. Female
 - c. Transgender
 - d. Non-Binary
 - e. Prefer not to say
6. (DEM6) What is your Race?
- a. Caucasian
 - b. African American
 - c. Latino or Hispanic
 - d. Asian
 - e. Native American
 - f. Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
 - g. Other
7. (DEM7) What is your highest level of education?
- a. Some High School
 - b. High School
 - c. Associates Degree
 - d. Bachelor's Degree
 - e. Master's Degree

- f. Doctorate
 - g. Trade School
8. (DEM8) What is your employment status?
- a. Full-time (36+ hours per week)
 - b. Part-time (less than 36 hours per week)
 - c. Presently unemployed
 - d. Retired
9. (DEM9) How would you categorize your most current employment?
- a. Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting
 - b. Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation
 - c. Broadcasting
 - d. College, University, and Adult Education
 - e. Computer and Electronics Manufacturing
 - f. Construction
 - g. Finance and Insurance
 - h. Government and Public Administration
 - i. Health Care and Social Assistance
 - j. Homemaker
 - k. Hotel and Food Services
 - l. Information Services and Data Processing
 - m. Information Technology
 - n. Legal Services
 - o. Military
 - p. Mining
 - q. Other Education Industry
 - r. Other Industry
 - s. Other Information Industry
 - t. Other Manufacturing
 - u. Primary/Secondary (K-12) Education
 - v. Publishing
 - w. Real Estate, Rental and Leasing
 - x. Religious
 - y. Retail
 - z. Scientific or Technical Services
 - aa. Software
 - bb. Telecommunications
 - cc. Transportation and Warehousing
 - dd. Utilities
 - ee. Wholesale
10. (DEM10) Which best describes your role in industry?
- a. Upper Management
 - b. Middle Management
 - c. Junior Management

- d. Administrative Staff
- e. Self-employed
- f. Support Staff
- g. Student
- h. Trained Professional
- i. Temporary Employee
- j. Skilled Laborer
- k. Other

Appendix B

Survey Invitation

Good afternoon,

I am seeking participation regarding research that I am conducting on interpersonal conflict in the workplace and within domestic relationships. This study is in association with George Fox University.

Purpose of the Study: The purpose of this study is to explore whether or not a relationship exists between those who experience negative workplace encounters and domestic encounters. The information from this study will contribute to workplace and domestic violence research and body of knowledge. This study may be used to help further develop and refine effective workplace and domestic violence prevention and intervention programs and policies for use by individuals, organizations, and treatment programs.

The survey should take less than 15 minutes to complete and will remain open until 5:00 PM PST on Friday, **DATE**.

You can access the survey here: **SURVEY LINK**

Your responses will remain confidential and anonymous.

Should the survey bring to light any concerns that may have gone unaddressed, or should you have any questions regarding these topics based on the questions posed, please contact the below resources.

Domestic Violence:

www.thehotline.org, 1-800-799-SAFE (7233)

Call 911 in the event of an emergency

Workplace Violence:

Your workplace supervisor, manager, Human Resource Office, Equal Employment Office.

National Suicide Prevention Lifeline:

<https://suicidepreventionlifeline.org>, 1-800-273-TALK (8255)

Thank you for your participation, it is greatly appreciated!

Jared Snow

Appendix C

Informed Consent to Participate in Research

Study Title: Exploring the Relationship Between Domestic Violence and Workplace Violence

Principal Researcher: Jared Snow

Study Location: Online

Prospective Research Participant

Read this consent form carefully and ask as many questions as you like before you decide whether you want to participate in this research study. You are free to ask questions at any time before, during, or after your participation in this research.

Introduction

You are invited to participate in this study on interpersonal conflict in the workplace and domestic relationships. This study is in association with George Fox University. You do not have to participate in this study. If you agree to participate, you may leave the study at any time, for any reason, without penalty. You are welcome to talk to anyone regarding your experience with this survey.

Why is this study being done?

This study will explore the relationship between those who experience negative workplace encounters and domestic encounters.

Why am I being asked to participate in this study?

You are being asked to participate in this study because you are over the age of 18 years and self-identify as having any exposure or experience with negative workplace or domestic encounters.

What will be done in the study?

If you agree to participate in this study, you will be asked to complete a survey that consists of multiple-choice questions about your experiences with negative workplace encounters and domestic encounters. Participation in this study will take approximately 15 minutes.

What are the risks to me?

The risks involved in this study are low. You may feel uncomfortable answering some of the survey questions. If you do become uncomfortable, you may take a break from responding or skip the question. You may also stop completing the survey or withdraw from the survey altogether, without penalty or consequence.

Should the survey bring to light any concerns, or should you have any questions regarding these topics based on the questions posed, please contact the below resources.

Domestic Violence:

www.thehotline.org, 1-800-799-SAFE (7233)

Call 911 in the event of an emergency

Workplace Violence:

Your workplace supervisor, manager, Human Resource Office, Equal Employment Office.

National Suicide Prevention Lifeline:

<https://suicidepreventionlifeline.org>, 1-800-273-TALK (8255)

What are the direct benefits for me?

There are no direct benefits offered for participating in this survey. However, you may feel a sense of pride knowing that your contributions helped make this research possible. The results of this study may be used to help improve workplace and domestic violence prevention and intervention programs.

What are my options if I choose not to participate?

There are currently no other known options if you decide not to participate in this study. You are encouraged to participate in other studies.

What kind of information about me will be collected during the study? How will you protect my information?

You will not be asked for any personal information, such as your name or address. The researcher will not be able to determine who provided a response. Any information provided to Prolific when creating your account will not be provided to the researcher. Only the information provided in this survey will be available and used. The George Fox University Institutional Review Board (IRB) that oversees human subject research and/or other governing entities with legal permission may access the anonymous data obtained during this study.

Will I be compensated for my time?

After completing the online survey, you will be paid through the Prolific platform. You will receive \$2.50 for completing this survey.

Who should I contact if I have questions?

If you have any questions, comments, or concerns with the research, please contact the researcher by email below or you may use Prolific's anonymous contact messaging platform:

Jared Snow

jsnow15@georgefox.edu

If you have questions regarding your rights as a research participant or steps to take in the event you experience any harm, please contact the Institutional Review Board. The IRB is a community from George Fox University providing oversight on safety and ethical issues related to research involving people.

George Fox University Institutional Review Board

CONSENT

I have read and understand this consent form, and I volunteer to participate in this research study. I understand that it is my responsibility to print or save this form for my records. I voluntarily choose to participate, but I understand that my consent does not take away any legal rights in the case of negligence or other legal fault of anyone who is involved in this study. I further understand that nothing in this consent form is intended to replace any applicable Federal, state, or local laws.

Please print or save a copy of this form for your records.

_____ I have reviewed this information, asked any questions that I have at this time, and have decided to voluntarily participate in this study.

_____ I do not wish to participate in this study at this time.

Appendix D

Domestic Violence and Workplace Violence Pilot Survey

Survey Experience

1. Were the questions asked in this survey relevant based on the invitation?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
2. On a scale of 1-5, how well did the survey keep your attention, with 1 being “not at all”, and 5 being “very focused”?
3. How would you rate the wording of the questions?
 - a. Easy to read
 - b. About right
 - c. Too complex
4. What feedback or comments do you have regarding the questions asked?
5. What would you change in the survey?
6. Please describe your overall experience with the survey.

Appendix E

Reliability Table, Pilot Study

| Variable | M | SD | r | r _{drop} | α _{drop} |
|----------|--------|-------|---------|-------------------|-------------------|
| DEI2 | 1.933 | 0.594 | 0.287 | 0.169 | 0.965 |
| DEI3 | 1.333 | 1.047 | 0.631 | 0.656 | 0.964 |
| DEI4 | 1.533 | 0.64 | 0.695 | 0.334 | 0.965 |
| DER1 | 1.133 | 0.352 | 0.638 | 0.386 | 0.965 |
| DER2 | 1.6 | 0.507 | 0.318 | 0.14 | 0.965 |
| DER3 | 1.333 | 0.617 | 0.311 | 0.521 | 0.964 |
| DER4 | 1.6 | 0.737 | 0.493 | 0.443 | 0.965 |
| DEO1 | 1.267 | 0.594 | 0.51 | 0.378 | 0.965 |
| DEO2 | 1.867 | 0.915 | 0.117 | 0.562 | 0.964 |
| DEO3 | 1.4 | 0.632 | 0.646 | 0.618 | 0.964 |
| DEO4 | 1.733 | 0.799 | 0.92 | 0.635 | 0.964 |
| DVI1* | -1.333 | 0.488 | -0.19 | -0.0096 | 0.965 |
| DVI2 | 1.533 | 0.516 | 0.279 | 0.258 | 0.965 |
| DVI3 | 1.2 | 0.414 | 0.375 | 0.241 | 0.965 |
| DVI4 | 2.067 | 1.387 | 0.429 | 0.42 | 0.965 |
| DVR1 | 1.533 | 0.64 | 1.256 | 0.587 | 0.964 |
| DVR2 | 1.6 | 0.632 | 0.662 | 0.46 | 0.965 |
| DVR3 | 1.333 | 0.617 | 0.95 | 0.766 | 0.964 |
| DVR4 | 1.467 | 0.743 | 0.937 | 0.585 | 0.964 |
| DVO1 | 1.6 | 0.828 | 0.823 | 0.691 | 0.964 |
| DVO2 | 1.667 | 0.9 | 0.595 | 0.458 | 0.965 |
| DVO3 | 1.533 | 0.834 | 1.327 | 0.737 | 0.964 |
| DVO4 | 1.667 | 1.047 | 0.44 | 0.391 | 0.965 |
| DPI4 | 1.067 | 0.258 | -0.885 | 0.421 | 0.965 |
| DPR1 | 1.2 | 0.414 | -0.992 | 0.813 | 0.964 |
| DPR2 | 1.2 | 0.414 | -0.992 | 0.813 | 0.964 |
| DPR3 | 1.2 | 0.414 | -0.0655 | 0.761 | 0.964 |
| DPR4 | 1.2 | 0.414 | -0.992 | 0.813 | 0.964 |
| DPO1 | 1.267 | 0.458 | -2.051 | 0.839 | 0.964 |
| DPO2 | 1.267 | 0.458 | -2.051 | 0.839 | 0.964 |
| DPO3 | 1.267 | 0.594 | -0.839 | 0.602 | 0.964 |
| DPO4 | 1.133 | 0.352 | 0.974 | 0.762 | 0.964 |
| WBI1 | 1.6 | 0.828 | 0.59 | 0.484 | 0.964 |
| WBI2 | 1.4 | 0.507 | 0.542 | 0.303 | 0.965 |
| WBI3 | 1.4 | 1.056 | 0.279 | 0.237 | 0.965 |

| | | | | | |
|-------|--------|-------|---------|--------|-------|
| WBI4 | 1.2 | 0.561 | -0.302 | 0.0483 | 0.965 |
| WBI5 | 1.2 | 0.414 | 0.2 | 0.15 | 0.965 |
| WBR1 | 2.533 | 1.187 | 1.134 | 0.753 | 0.964 |
| WBR2 | 1.533 | 0.516 | 1.171 | 0.492 | 0.964 |
| WBR3 | 1.533 | 0.64 | 0.816 | 0.412 | 0.965 |
| WBR4 | 1.4 | 0.828 | 0.285 | 0.493 | 0.964 |
| WBR5 | 1.733 | 0.884 | 1.457 | 0.78 | 0.964 |
| WBO1 | 2.667 | 1.047 | 0.128 | 0.273 | 0.965 |
| WBO2 | 2.267 | 1.387 | 0.00784 | 0.763 | 0.964 |
| WBO3 | 1.733 | 0.961 | 0.226 | 0.252 | 0.965 |
| WBO4 | 1.733 | 1.163 | 0.765 | 0.667 | 0.964 |
| WBO5 | 2.133 | 1.302 | 0.809 | 0.883 | 0.963 |
| WAI1 | 1.4 | 0.632 | 1.357 | 0.535 | 0.964 |
| WAI2* | -1.133 | 0.352 | 0.353 | 0.21 | 0.965 |
| WAI3 | 1.333 | 1.047 | -0.189 | 0.551 | 0.964 |
| WAI4 | 2.333 | 1.496 | 0.731 | 0.611 | 0.964 |
| WAR1 | 2 | 1.309 | -1.028 | 0.855 | 0.963 |
| WAR2 | 1.933 | 0.961 | 0.509 | 0.566 | 0.964 |
| WAR3 | 1.467 | 0.743 | 0.894 | 0.803 | 0.964 |
| WAR4 | 2.4 | 1.242 | 0.864 | 0.749 | 0.964 |
| WAR5 | 1.2 | 0.414 | -0.38 | 0.663 | 0.964 |
| WAO1 | 2.133 | 1.06 | 1.806 | 0.809 | 0.963 |
| WAO2 | 1.733 | 0.704 | 0.373 | 0.206 | 0.965 |
| WAO3 | 1.667 | 0.816 | 0.771 | 0.714 | 0.964 |
| WAO4 | 2.4 | 1.352 | 0.757 | 0.734 | 0.964 |
| WAO5 | 1.2 | 0.414 | -0.38 | 0.663 | 0.964 |
| WVI2 | 1.067 | 0.258 | -1.138 | 0.185 | 0.965 |
| WVI3 | 1.467 | 0.64 | 1.225 | 0.717 | 0.964 |
| WVI4 | 1.133 | 0.516 | -1.138 | 0.177 | 0.965 |
| WVI5 | 1.133 | 0.516 | -1.138 | 0.177 | 0.965 |
| WVR1 | 1.133 | 0.352 | -0.501 | 0.5 | 0.965 |
| WVR2 | 1.267 | 0.458 | 1.014 | 0.568 | 0.964 |
| WVR3 | 1.667 | 0.724 | 1.399 | 0.722 | 0.964 |
| WVR4 | 1.267 | 0.458 | -2.051 | 0.839 | 0.964 |
| WVR5 | 1.133 | 0.352 | -0.501 | 0.5 | 0.965 |
| WVO1 | 1.067 | 0.258 | -0.885 | 0.421 | 0.965 |
| WVO2 | 1.333 | 0.617 | 0.267 | 0.494 | 0.964 |
| WVO3 | 1.867 | 0.99 | 0.496 | 0.689 | 0.964 |
| WVO4 | 1.467 | 0.64 | 0.339 | 0.694 | 0.964 |

| | | | | | |
|--|-------|-------|--------|-------|-------|
| WVO5 | 1.133 | 0.352 | -0.851 | 0.326 | 0.965 |
| Note: Missing cases removed using listwise deletion. A '*' indicates the variable was automatically reverse coded. | | | | | |

Appendix F

Reliability Table, Main Study

| Variable | M | SD | r | r _{drop} | α_{drop} |
|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------------------|-----------------|
| DEI1 | 1.292 | 0.638 | 0.485 | 0.436 | 0.961 |
| DEI2 | 2.193 | 0.964 | 0.504 | 0.538 | 0.961 |
| DEI3 | 1.385 | 0.705 | 0.458 | 0.445 | 0.961 |
| DEI4 | 1.831 | 0.935 | 0.451 | 0.475 | 0.961 |
| DER1 | 1.365 | 0.748 | 0.569 | 0.547 | 0.961 |
| DER2 | 2.209 | 1.067 | 0.535 | 0.586 | 0.961 |
| DER3 | 1.751 | 1.093 | 0.54 | 0.551 | 0.961 |
| DER4 | 1.967 | 1.039 | 0.514 | 0.552 | 0.961 |
| DEO1 | 1.442 | 0.779 | 0.623 | 0.604 | 0.961 |
| DEO2 | 2.206 | 1.124 | 0.57 | 0.612 | 0.96 |
| DEO3 | 1.721 | 1.011 | 0.587 | 0.599 | 0.96 |
| DEO4 | 1.947 | 1.047 | 0.566 | 0.591 | 0.96 |
| DVI1 | 1.904 | 0.868 | 0.565 | 0.586 | 0.961 |
| DVI2 | 1.934 | 1.031 | 0.605 | 0.615 | 0.96 |
| DVI3 | 1.468 | 0.798 | 0.535 | 0.526 | 0.961 |
| DVI4 | 2.05 | 1.273 | 0.455 | 0.489 | 0.961 |
| DVR1 | 2.023 | 1.001 | 0.546 | 0.578 | 0.961 |
| DVR2 | 2.003 | 0.985 | 0.62 | 0.663 | 0.96 |
| DVR3 | 1.651 | 0.891 | 0.559 | 0.574 | 0.961 |
| DVR4 | 1.963 | 1.201 | 0.483 | 0.525 | 0.961 |
| DVO1 | 1.99 | 1.008 | 0.557 | 0.583 | 0.961 |
| DVO2 | 1.993 | 1.023 | 0.578 | 0.609 | 0.96 |
| DVO3 | 1.724 | 0.994 | 0.527 | 0.559 | 0.961 |
| DVO4 | 1.977 | 1.237 | 0.479 | 0.531 | 0.961 |
| DPI1 | 1.073 | 0.329 | 0.474 | 0.37 | 0.961 |
| DPI2 | 1.1 | 0.361 | 0.524 | 0.417 | 0.961 |
| DPI3 | 1.133 | 0.435 | 0.421 | 0.342 | 0.961 |
| DPI4 | 1.153 | 0.513 | 0.48 | 0.388 | 0.961 |
| DPR1 | 1.11 | 0.422 | 0.456 | 0.348 | 0.961 |
| DPR2 | 1.163 | 0.451 | 0.468 | 0.388 | 0.961 |
| DPR3 | 1.249 | 0.628 | 0.467 | 0.39 | 0.961 |
| DPR4 | 1.216 | 0.614 | 0.424 | 0.331 | 0.961 |
| DPO1 | 1.113 | 0.417 | 0.492 | 0.404 | 0.961 |
| DPO2 | 1.153 | 0.479 | 0.43 | 0.36 | 0.961 |
| DPO3 | 1.246 | 0.594 | 0.442 | 0.392 | 0.961 |

| | | | | | |
|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| DPO4 | 1.213 | 0.573 | 0.506 | 0.425 | 0.961 |
| WBI1 | 1.764 | 0.857 | 0.475 | 0.449 | 0.961 |
| WBI2 | 1.435 | 0.739 | 0.364 | 0.304 | 0.961 |
| WBI3 | 1.203 | 0.537 | 0.483 | 0.393 | 0.961 |
| WBI4 | 1.113 | 0.417 | 0.321 | 0.243 | 0.961 |
| WBI5 | 1.439 | 0.735 | 0.493 | 0.44 | 0.961 |
| WBR1 | 2.262 | 1 | 0.525 | 0.539 | 0.961 |
| WBR2 | 1.847 | 0.9 | 0.569 | 0.571 | 0.961 |
| WBR3 | 1.266 | 0.624 | 0.438 | 0.39 | 0.961 |
| WBR4 | 1.306 | 0.637 | 0.461 | 0.43 | 0.961 |
| WBR5 | 1.824 | 0.966 | 0.592 | 0.602 | 0.96 |
| WBO1 | 2.492 | 1.174 | 0.566 | 0.598 | 0.96 |
| WBO2 | 2.007 | 1.01 | 0.532 | 0.552 | 0.961 |
| WBO3 | 1.528 | 0.831 | 0.501 | 0.462 | 0.961 |
| WBO4 | 1.535 | 0.846 | 0.496 | 0.481 | 0.961 |
| WBO5 | 2.05 | 1.105 | 0.58 | 0.59 | 0.961 |
| WAI1 | 1.349 | 0.639 | 0.448 | 0.414 | 0.961 |
| WAI2 | 1.435 | 0.775 | 0.526 | 0.495 | 0.961 |
| WAI3 | 1.256 | 0.657 | 0.42 | 0.379 | 0.961 |
| WAI4 | 1.585 | 1.057 | 0.462 | 0.47 | 0.961 |
| WAI5 | 1.037 | 0.221 | 0.332 | 0.252 | 0.961 |
| WAR1 | 1.841 | 0.942 | 0.519 | 0.522 | 0.961 |
| WAR2 | 1.844 | 1.009 | 0.639 | 0.66 | 0.96 |
| WAR3 | 1.429 | 0.73 | 0.556 | 0.543 | 0.961 |
| WAR4 | 1.897 | 1.216 | 0.482 | 0.513 | 0.961 |
| WAR5 | 1.173 | 0.48 | 0.456 | 0.383 | 0.961 |
| WAO1 | 1.983 | 0.991 | 0.528 | 0.551 | 0.961 |
| WAO2 | 1.91 | 1.027 | 0.624 | 0.655 | 0.96 |
| WAO3 | 1.777 | 1 | 0.586 | 0.597 | 0.96 |
| WAO4 | 1.99 | 1.237 | 0.524 | 0.55 | 0.961 |
| WAO5 | 1.189 | 0.484 | 0.47 | 0.408 | 0.961 |
| WVI1 | 1.037 | 0.235 | 0.365 | 0.263 | 0.961 |
| WVI2 | 1.06 | 0.251 | 0.404 | 0.312 | 0.961 |
| WVI3 | 1.561 | 0.783 | 0.542 | 0.548 | 0.961 |
| WVI4 | 1.199 | 0.523 | 0.365 | 0.33 | 0.961 |
| WVI5 | 1.056 | 0.295 | 0.428 | 0.322 | 0.961 |
| WVR1 | 1.07 | 0.268 | 0.443 | 0.363 | 0.961 |
| WVR2 | 1.133 | 0.394 | 0.516 | 0.422 | 0.961 |
| WVR3 | 1.767 | 0.966 | 0.552 | 0.556 | 0.961 |

| | | | | | |
|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| WVR4 | 1.352 | 0.66 | 0.497 | 0.479 | 0.961 |
| WVR5 | 1.173 | 0.487 | 0.454 | 0.398 | 0.961 |
| WVO1 | 1.123 | 0.385 | 0.432 | 0.348 | 0.961 |
| WVO2 | 1.196 | 0.453 | 0.48 | 0.408 | 0.961 |
| WVO3 | 1.97 | 1.059 | 0.517 | 0.531 | 0.961 |
| WVO4 | 1.429 | 0.682 | 0.479 | 0.47 | 0.961 |
| WVO5 | 1.223 | 0.554 | 0.458 | 0.401 | 0.961 |

Appendix G

IRB Approval

2213018

GEORGE FOX UNIVERSITY HSRC INITIAL REVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE

Page 6

Title: Exploring the Relationship Between Domestic Violence nad Workplace Violence


Principal Researcher(s): Jared W. Snow

Date application completed: July 20, 2022

(The researcher needs to complete the above information on this page)**COMMITTEE FINDING:**

For Committee Use Only

☒ (1) The proposed research makes adequate provision for safeguarding the health and dignity of the subjects and is therefore approved.☐ (2) Due to the assessment of risk being questionable or being subject to change, the research must be periodically reviewed by the **HSRC** on a _____ basis throughout the course of the research or until otherwise notified. This requires resubmission of this form, with updated information, for each periodic review.☐ (3) The proposed research evidences some unnecessary risk to participants and therefore must be revised to remedy the following specific area(s) on non-compliance:☐ (4) The proposed research contains serious and potentially damaging risks to subjects and is therefore not approved.

Chair or designated member

Date