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Abstract

This paper presents two studies investigating student violence against teachers in Slovakian secondary schools. The studies aimed at gauging the prevalence of student violence (Study 1) and at testing the hypothesis that teacher well-being can be explained by student violence and by teachers’ belief in a just world (Study 2). Study 1 examined a representative sample of 364 teachers in one of the eight Slovakian provinces, and found that 177 (49%) of them reported at least one experience of violence in the last 30 days. Reports of violence were particularly widespread in vocational schools in the provincial capital. Study 2 investigated a sample of 108 teachers at Slovakian vocational schools, and found that 60 (55%) of them reported at least one experience of violence in the last 15 days. The more violence the teachers reported, the more often they experienced negative affect, the less often they experienced positive affect, and the less satisfied they were with life. Finally, the belief in a just world was adaptively associated with teacher well-being in terms of life satisfaction and positive affect. For victims of violence, belief in a just world was further associated with negative affect: the more they believed in a just world, the less frequently they experienced negative affect.

Consequences for research on teacher health and organizational justice research are discussed.
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Although bullying in schools has attracted a great deal of research attention, little is yet known about teachers as victims of violence. As far as we know, only two previous studies have investigated student violence towards teachers. Terry (1998) examined 101 teachers in seven urban high schools in Great Britain, and found evidence for student violence against teachers in both teacher self-reports and peer reports. Elliott, Hamburg, and Williams (1998) found that 56% of teachers do not feel safe in U.S. schools. Furthermore, one-third of teachers reported that both teachers and students in their schools were less eager to go to school because of the threat of violence.

Because these data derive from Great Britain and the United States, a first aim of our research program was to investigate student violence towards teachers in another European country, namely Slovakia. Second, we sought to investigate the consequences of such experiences for teachers’ well-being.

Violence Against Teachers

Olweus (1978) examined violence among students, and defined bullying as a subtype of aggressive behavior in which an aggressor intentionally and repeatedly harms a weaker victim physically and/or psychologically. Einarsen (2000) further specified the relationship between victim and perpetrator to be characterized by a power imbalance, with the victim having difficulties defending him-/herself. In the case of violence toward teachers, however, it is uncertain that such a power imbalance exists. We therefore define violence against teachers as aggressive behavior intended to harm the teacher that students perpetrate repeatedly and intentionally over a certain amount of time.

Which aggressive behaviors does this type of violence involve? In bullying research, verbal acts such as name calling, physical actions such as pushing, social coercion such as forcing people to follow the group, and damage to personal property are defined as bullying
behavior (Karatzias, Power, & Swanson, 2002; Mynard & Joseph, 2000). In the same vein, we define the following behaviors as violence against teachers: (1) harmful verbal behavior (e.g., insults, mockery), (2) harmful physical behavior (e.g., pushing), (3) damage to personal property (e.g., stealing money, damaging clothes), (4) social coercion (e.g., pressuring the teacher to award better grades), and (5) manipulative behavior aimed at socially isolating the victim.

**Well-Being of the Victims of Violence**

Bullying is known to be an important determinant of adolescents’ subjective well-being (Wilkins-Shurmer et al., 2003), and to increase the likelihood of depression and suicidal ideation (van der Wal, de Wit, & Hirasing, 2003). The meta-analysis by Hawker and Boulton (2000) corroborates these findings. The authors conclude that the victims of bullying “suffer a variety of feelings of psychosocial distress. They feel more anxious, socially anxious, depressed, lonely, and worse about themselves than nonvictims. The evidence suggests that these feelings occur among victims of both sexes, of all age groups, and of all subtypes of aggression” (p. 453). To the best of our knowledge, the impact of student violence on teacher well-being has not been investigated in previous research. We expected to find effects similar to those observed for students, with a notable deterioration in teachers’ well-being.

**The Belief in a Just World**

A third aim of our research program was to explore factors that may serve to protect mental health and well-being in the context of student violence against teachers. We draw on justice motive theory, which is based on Lerner’s (1980) just world hypothesis. According to this hypothesis, people are motivated to believe that the world is basically a just place where individuals get what they deserve. Although a substantial amount of BJW research has been experimental (for a review, see Hafer & Bègue, 2005), an additional line of research initiated in the 1970s (Rubin & Peplau, 1973) has examined individual differences in BJW (for
reviews, see Furnham, 2003; Furnham & Procter, 1989). Traditional just world research investigates the maladaptive social consequences of the BJW, which include disdain for innocent victims. However, another strand of research has found that BJW also serves important adaptive functions. People high in BJW try to protect their BJW by assimilating unjust experiences to their BJW, especially if it seems that justice cannot be restored in reality. Hence, BJW provides a framework helping individuals to interpret the events of their personal life in a meaningful way by justifying experienced injustices as being at least partly self-inflicted (e.g., Bulman & Wortman, 1977; Lupfer, Doan, & Houston, 1998), by playing down perpetrators’ actions as being unintentional (e.g., Dalbert, 1999), or by minimizing the injustice itself (e.g., Lipkus & Siegler, 1993). In sum, the stronger people’s belief in a just world, the more likely they are to evaluate events in their lives as just (Dalbert & Stoeber, 2006) and, as a result, the less anger they experience (Dalbert, 2002). It is thanks to these assimilation processes that BJW serves to maintain subjective mental health. Individuals with a strong BJW have been shown to be more satisfied with their lives (e.g., Lipkus, Dalbert, & Siegler, 1996), to report more positive mood (e.g., Bulman & Wortman, 1977), to be less likely to be anxious (e.g., Otto, Boos, Dalbert, Schöps, & Hoyer, 2006) or depressive (e.g., Ritter, Benson, & Snyder, 1990), and to show higher levels of self-esteem (e.g., Feather, 1991).

While most research to date has focused on the meaning of general BJW, we chose personal BJW as an indicator of the justice motive in the present studies. Previous research has highlighted the need to differentiate between a general and a more personal BJW (Dalbert, 1999; Lipkus et al., 1996). The personal BJW reflects the belief that events in one’s own life are just; the general BJW reflects the belief that, basically, the world is a just place. It has been shown that individuals tend to endorse the personal BJW more strongly than the general BJW and that the personal BJW is more important in predicting mental health (Dalbert, 1999;
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Dzuka & Dalbert, 2002a; Otto et al., 2006; Sutton & Douglas, 2005). We interpret this pattern of results as a consequence of the personal BJW’s assimilation function, and expect the BJW’s functions of assimilating injustice and buffering mental health to be relevant in the context of teachers exposed to student violence as well.

To summarize, the aim of our research program was threefold. First, we sought to investigate the prevalence of student violence toward teachers in Slovakia (Study 1). Second, we aimed to examine the association between the experience of this kind violence and teacher well-being. Third, we explored the association between personal BJW and teacher well-being (Study 2).

STUDY 1

In the 2004/2005 school year, we conducted a representative study to explore the prevalence of student violence against teachers in one of the eight Slovakian provinces. To control for differences between urban and rural areas, we recruited half of the schools from rural areas and the other half from the provincial capital.

Method

Sample and procedure

There are three types of secondary schools in Slovakia, all of which students attend after the 9th grade: “gymnasium” (4 years, general education), professional school (4 years, specialized education; e.g., nursing), and vocational school (3 years, training for manual occupations). A representative sample of teachers from each of the three school types was drawn from a total population of 111 schools with a total of 3,347 teachers. To this end, four schools of each type located in (a) rural areas and (b) the provincial capital were drawn from the official register at random. We aimed at recruiting about 50 teachers for each of the six subgroups. Two to four schools of each type were therefore contacted at random and invited to participate; most subgroups were represented by teachers from two schools (exceptions:
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three rural professional schools, four rural vocational schools). Because teachers from at least
two schools were recruited for each of the subgroups, experiences of violence, region (capital,
rural), and school type were not confounded. Questionnaires were distributed by the school
psychologist and returned in sealed envelopes. Anonymity was further ensured by not
assessing the teachers’ age or sex.

A total of 472 teachers were contacted and 364 returned our questionnaire (return rate
= 77%). The return rate differed across school types, ranging from 66% (rural professional
schools) to 92% (rural vocational schools). Each of the six groups comprised between 50
(urban gymnasium schools, see Table 1) and 73 teachers (rural vocational schools).

Measures

Teachers were asked to report on their experiences of five harmful student behaviors
in the last 30 days by stating whether their students had, without provocation, (1) used
abusive language (e.g., insults, taunts, profanities); (2) physically threatened or assaulted
them; (3) taken or destroyed their personal property; (4) forced them to do something against
their will; (5) intentionally socially isolated them (e.g., by spreading rumours); and any (6)
other negative experiences. Responses were given on a four-point rating scale with the
alternatives “never,” “once or twice,” “several times,” and “countless times.”

Results and Discussion

Because the response category “countless times” was endorsed only rarely, we
dichotomized the answers to reflect whether or not the behavior in question had been
experienced. The results are summarized in Table 1. Harmful verbal behaviors were reported
most often (35.4%) and harmful physical behaviors least often (4.9%). Only 18 teachers
(4.9%) reported additional experiences of student violence in response to the open question,
and these were mostly specifications of the five harmful behaviors already mentioned.

Overall, \( n = 177 \) (49%) teachers had experienced at least one of the harmful behaviors
assessed in the last 30 days. We conducted a configuration analysis to compare the observed frequencies with the expected frequencies by region (capital, rural) and school type. $\chi^2$-statistics revealed some significant deviations from the expected frequencies, as documented in Table 1. Harmful verbal behaviors, harmful physical behaviors, and taking or destroying personal property were reported significantly more often by teachers at urban vocational schools than by teachers in the other five groups. Harmful verbal behaviors and manipulative behaviors were reported significantly less frequently by teachers at gymnasium schools in the provincial capital.

Study 1 thus revealed that about half of the Slovakian teachers assessed reported having experienced at least one violent student act in the last 30 days. Harmful verbal behaviors were most frequently reported, and teachers at vocational schools in the provincial capital reported most acts of violence. Study 2 aimed at exploring how these experiences of student violence impact teacher well-being.

Only very few teachers reported having experienced violent behaviors other than those assessed by our five questions. These questions thus seem to provide comprehensive coverage of a broad range of possible violent student behaviors toward teachers. Nevertheless, a number of revisions to the questionnaire were made in Study 2. In Question 1, we clarified that the teacher should have experienced the harmful verbal behavior directly. We added a new question assessing whether teachers had heard colleagues’ reports of student abusive language toward them or seen graffiti insulting them. Because Questions 2 and 3 both assessed two different behaviors at once, we specified that only one had to have been experienced for the statement to be endorsed. Furthermore, interviews revealed that teachers did not consider social coercion and social isolation to be a significant element of student violence against teachers. We therefore deleted Questions 4 and 5 from our questionnaire in Study 2. The response category “countless times” was also deleted. Finally, because we
sought to investigate how student violence impacts teacher well-being, we reduced the time period covered from 30 days in Study 1 to 15 days in Study 2.

STUDY 2

Our second study examined the association between the experience of violence and well-being, and possible moderating effects of the personal BJW. Because teachers in vocational schools in the provincial capital were most likely to report experiences of violence, we focused on this type of urban school. We expected to find that (a) the more violence teachers experienced, the lower their well-being, and (b) the more strongly teachers endorsed the belief in a personal just world, the better their well-being. (c) Finally, we expected to find a buffering effect of BJW: the higher teachers’ belief in a personal just world, the less strongly experiences of violence against them were expected to be associated with well-being.

Method

Sample and procedure

A total of 210 teachers in five vocational schools were contacted; 108 returned our questionnaire (response rate 51%). As in Study 1, questionnaires were distributed by the school psychologist and returned in sealed envelopes, and anonymity was ensured by not assessing demographic data.

Measures

Violence against teachers. Teachers were asked to report on their experiences of four harmful student behaviors in the last 15 days by stating whether they had (1) directly experienced students’ abusive language (e.g., insults, taunts, profanities); (2) been physically threatened or assaulted by students (one experience sufficed to endorse the statement); (3) had their property taken or destroyed by students (one experience sufficed); (4) heard colleagues’ reports of harmful verbal behaviors towards them or seen graffiti insulting them (one experience sufficed). Responses were given on a three-point rating scale ranging from 0 to 2
Violence against teachers

with the alternatives “never,” “once or twice,” and “several times” (α = .63; r_{\text{est}} = .30; Cronbach, 1951). Scale scores were computed by summing the responses to the 4 items to give scores ranging from 0 to 8, with higher scores indicating more violence.

**Personal belief in a just world** was measured using the Personal Belief in a Just World Scale (Dalbert, 1999). The scale comprises 7 items designed to capture the belief that, overall, events in one’s life are just (α = .85; sample items: “I am usually treated fairly”) with a 6-point answer scale ranging from 1 (“totally disagree”) to 6 (“totally agree”). Scale scores for BJW and the three well-being variables (see below) were computed by averaging across items, with higher scores indicating greater endorsement of the construct.

**Subjective well-being.** The cognitive component of subjective well-being was measured by the 7-item General Life Satisfaction Scale (Dalbert, Montada, Schmitt, & Schneider, 1984). The scale describes satisfaction with one’s present and past life and future perspectives (α = .90; sample item: “I am satisfied with my life”); we used a 6-point answer scale ranging from 1 (“totally disagree”) to 6 (“totally agree”). The items of this life satisfaction scale are comparable with those of the life satisfaction scale developed in parallel by Diener, Emmons, Larsen, and Griffin (1985). The emotional component of subjective well-being was assessed by the Positive Affect Scale (Dzuka & Dalbert, 2002b; α = .83) consisting of four descriptors (pleasure, happiness, joy, physical freshness) and the Negative Affect Scale (Dzuka & Dalbert, 2002b; α = .71) comprising six descriptors (anger, guilt feelings, shame, anxiety, pain, sorrow). Teachers were asked to state how often they experience each of these affect states. Answers were given on a 6-point answer scale ranging from 1 (“almost never”) to 6 (“almost always”).

**Results and Discussion**

Results for experiences of violence are presented in Table 2. Sixty teachers (55%) had experienced at least one harmful student act within the last 15 days; harmful verbal behaviors
were again the most frequent (44%). The violence variable showed a negatively skewed distribution (skew = 2.55; Ferguson & Cox, 1993). To improve the normality of the violence distribution, we transformed the variable by adding 1.0 and then log-transforming it (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996). Correlations between the variables are documented in Table 3. The more experiences of violence the teachers reported, the less satisfied they were with life, the less often they experienced positive affect, the more often they experienced negative affect, and the less strongly they endorsed the personal BJW. In addition, the more strongly teachers endorsed the personal BJW, the more satisfied they were with life and the more often they experienced positive affect. Negative affect and personal BJW were independent, however.

To further clarify the relationship between well-being, BJW, and experiences of student violence, we performed hierarchical multiple regression analyses for life satisfaction, positive affect, and negative affect, respectively. Following Aiken and West (1991), we centered personal BJW and experiences of student violence before analyzing the data. Violence (centered) was entered in the first block, personal BJW (centered) in the second block, and the product term representing the interaction of personal BJW (centered) with violence (centered) stepwise in the final block. Results are presented in Table 4. Violence explained between 6% and 9% of the variance in well-being; personal BJW between 4% and 16%. The more violence the teachers experienced and the less they endorsed the belief in a personally just world, the less satisfied they were with life and the less frequently they experienced positive affect. Finally, we observed a buffering effect of BJW on negative affect. The more violence the teachers experienced, the more often they experienced negative affect; however, this relationship applied only to those with a weak personal BJW ($M - SD = -0.86; B = 0.77$) and not to those with a strong personal BJW ($M + SD = 0.86; B = -0.05$). This interaction is illustrated in Figure 1.
GENERAL DISCUSSION

In line with Terry (1998) and Elliot et al. (1998), we found clear evidence for student violence against teachers. In fact, both of our studies revealed an unexpectedly high level of student violence against teachers, with almost every second teacher in our Slovakian sample having experienced at least one violent student act in the recent past. Note, however, that most violent behaviors had been experienced only once or twice in last 30 or 15 days, and involved abusive language. Experiences of violence were most often reported by teachers at vocational schools in the provincial capital.

Because our studies were among the first on this phenomenon, we did not examine teachers’ subjective evaluations of the harmful student behaviors covered. As such, there is no way of knowing how serious, how intentional, how harmful, and how threatening the teachers would gauge these behaviors to be. Future studies can provide more detailed insights into this type of student violence by assessing teachers’ subjective evaluations.

Nevertheless, the validity of our assessment was supported by the findings on the well-being of violence victims and nonvictims, which were in line with our theoretical expectations. The more violence the teachers had experienced in the last 15 days, the less satisfied they were with life, the less often they experienced positive affect, and the more often they experienced negative affect. Note that we assessed well-being on a trait level. Although teachers did not generally report frequent experiences of student violence, we nevertheless observed associated differences in their trait well-being. There may be different reasons for this finding. Either the experiences of violence were infrequent, but regular, or even a single experience of student violence can suffice to impair trait well-being. Overall, the questions administered seem to provide a comprehensive assessment of student violence against teachers and to identify teachers who are unable to successfully regulate their well-being (Cummins & Nistico, 2002).
This pattern of results raises the question of why student violence against teachers occurs. Is it typical of a specific teacher/student relationship or of specific students? Is it associated with other types of violence, such as bullying, or is it a reflection of violence in a broader social context, such as the neighborhood or society in general (Laub & Lauritsen, 1998)? And what do the students themselves think about their violent behavior toward teachers? Is it an intentional response to unjust teacher behavior, for example, or a widespread, but less strategically considered element of school culture? Future studies on student violence against teachers should embed the phenomenon within a broader context and contrast the teachers’ view with the students’ perspective.

While earlier research indicated that BJW is a stable construct that does not vary over time or between contexts (for a review, see Dalbert, 2001), more recent research has shown that BJW can be shaped by experiences (Dalbert & Stoeber, 2006) and may decline after serious and enduring life events such as long-term unemployment or imprisonment (Cubela-Adoric, 2004; Otto & Dalbert, 2005). In line with the latter observations, our data showed more frequent experiences of violence to be associated with a reduction in personal BJW. At the same time, there was an adaptive association between BJW and negative affect for victims of violence.

Positive relationships have already been found between well-being and BJW in representative samples of adults (e.g., Ritter et al., 1990), and between well-being and personal BJW in, for example, school students (Dalbert & Stoeber, 2006) and unemployed adolescents (Dzuka & Dalbert, 2002a). The present results extend this observation to a teacher sample. In line with our hypothesis, we observed adaptive associations between personal BJW and well-being: the more the teachers believed that events in their life were, overall, just, the more satisfied they were with life and the more often they experienced positive affect. In addition, a buffering effect was revealed: a positive association between
violence and negative affect was observed only for violence victims with a weak personal BJW. This pattern of results is in line with the notion that personal BJW can help to protect subjective well-being in the face of critical life events (Dalbert, 2001). Note, however, that no causal conclusions can be drawn from our cross-sectional data.

Our studies extend just world research to research on teacher health and, at the same time, apply just world reasoning to strain at the workplace. To date, most studies on well-being and BJW have focused on general well-being dimensions, such as depression, life satisfaction, or positive and negative affect. Domain-specific well-being descriptors have rarely been included (cf. distress at school, Correia & Dalbert, in press). Our studies investigate the impact of a specific work stressor, namely student violence. Future research should examine whether the BJW’s buffering effect can also be observed for more work-specific well-being dimensions, such as job satisfaction, commitment, and burn-out. Research on organizational justice has repeatedly shown that justice at the workplace is associated with higher job satisfaction and more organizational commitment (for a review, see Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng, 2001), but has not addressed the question of why justice matters. The results of Study 2 can be interpreted as first evidence that justice at the workplace is important because it sustains employees’ belief in a personal just world.

At least three limitations of our studies should be mentioned. First, we assessed experiences of violence using an ad hoc constructed self-report measure of sufficient reliability. Observational data are needed to further corroborate the validity of this assessment. Second, we used cross-sectional data only, meaning that no causal conclusions can be drawn. Longitudinal data on the interplay between experiences of violence, BJW, and teacher health are needed to provide more precise information about the assumed causal direction of the associations observed. Third, we did not control for the possible influence of third variables, such as neuroticism. Eysenck (1982) defined neuroticism to be characterized
by unpredictability and over-sensitivity. Several studies to date have evidenced a negative association between BJW and neuroticism (e.g., Dzuka & Dalbert, 2002a). The more neurotic individuals are, the less they believe in a just world. At the same time, neuroticism explains well-being (e.g., Costa & McCrae, 1980). Thus, the association between BJW and well-being may be caused by neuroticism. In a previous study with sample of Slovakian adolescents, however, we found a unique association between BJW and well-being when controlling for neuroticism (e.g., Dzuka & Dalbert, 2002a).

Insights into the coping mechanisms that mediate the buffering effect of the BJW on well-being may help to support teachers in their efforts to preserve well-being in the face of student violence, because different coping mechanisms may, in the long run, have different consequences. Self-blame, minimizing the injustice, and playing down the intentionality of the perpetrator are typical coping mechanisms (for a review, see Dalbert, 2001) that serve to protect the BJW and thus sustain well-being. However, unrealistic self-blame can, in the long run, lead to feelings of helplessness and should therefore be seen as maladaptive. In contrast, realistic self-blame can lead to adaptive modification of teachers’ behavior and can therefore be seen as constructive.

Conclusion

To date, there has been very little research into student violence against teachers. Yet both of our studies indicate that harmful student behavior toward teachers is widespread. About half of the teachers in our studies had experienced at least one violent student act in the recent past, and these experiences -- most of them involving abusive verbal behavior -- were associated with impaired well-being. Future studies on violence at school or in broader society, as well as studies on teacher health and burn-out, should examine student violence against teachers to further clarify the implications of this type of violence for teachers, students, and society in general.
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Table 1

Frequency of Student Violence (Study 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gym Urban</th>
<th>Gym Rural</th>
<th>Prof Urban</th>
<th>Prof Rural</th>
<th>Vocat Urban</th>
<th>Vocat Rural</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmful verbal behaviors</td>
<td>8#</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33*</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>129 (35.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmful physical behaviors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18 (4.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damage to personal property</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13*</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>45 (12.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social coercion</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>61 (16.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manipulative behaviors aimed at socially isolating the victim</td>
<td>2#</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>60 (16.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18 (4.9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Gym = gymnasium schools; Prof = professional schools; Vocat = vocational schools; \( n \) = number of teachers in the subsample.

* significantly more frequent; # significantly less frequent (all \( p < .05 \)).
Table 2

*Frequency, Means, and Standard Deviation of Student Violence (Study 2)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never (= 0)</th>
<th>Once or twice (= 1)</th>
<th>Several times (= 2)</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harmful verbal behaviors</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmful physical behaviors</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damage to personal property</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues’ reports or graffiti</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3

*Correlations Between Variables (Study 2)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>Life satisfaction</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>Positive affect</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>Negative affect</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>Personal BJW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>Violence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01
Table 4

Regression of Well-Being on Experiences of Violence, Personal BJW, and Their Interaction (Study 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Change in $R^2$</th>
<th>$B$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Life satisfaction</strong> ($F_{total}(2,106) = 17.65; p &lt; .001$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences of violence</td>
<td>.09**</td>
<td>-0.75*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal BJW</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>0.47**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positive affect</strong> ($F_{total}(2,106) = 7.17; p &lt; .01$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences of violence</td>
<td>.08**</td>
<td>-0.82*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal BJW</td>
<td>.04*</td>
<td>0.19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative affect</strong> ($F_{total}(3,105) = 4.33; p &lt; .01$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences of violence</td>
<td>.06**</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal BJW</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>.04*</td>
<td>-0.48*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$. 
Figure Caption

Figure 1. Regression graph illustrating the effects of experiences of violence and personal belief in a just world (BJW) on negative affect (Study 2).
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