



Manual Living Group Working Climate Inventory (LGWCI)

Questionnaire: version October 2014

Manual: Dutch version October 2015

Translation in English: November 2015

A.L. (Anna) Dekker MSc & V.S.L. (Veronique) van Miert MSc

dr. G.H.P (Peer) van der Helm

prof. dr. G.J.J.M. (Geert-Jan)Stams

Contact University of applied sciences Leiden:

Anna Dekker, dekker.a@hsleiden.nl

Veronique van Miert, miert.van.v@hsleiden.nl

For more information see:

Youth Expert Center: <https://www.hsleiden.nl/residentiele-jeugdzorg-english>

The Living Group Work Climate Inventory (LGWCI) is a composite questionnaire consisting of different validated questionnaires. The questionnaire can be used to provide information about the work climate experiences by staff. It can also be used for research on correlations between the work climate and the living group climate or prison climate. The work climate focuses on the vision of staff at their own work and factors that can influence this. The outcomes can be used in the institutions to improve goals. The living group and work climate research can also be used with multiple measures monitoring progress.

The questionnaire is developed for staff in (forensic) (secure) (youth) care- and treatment facilities who have professional contact with adolescents, clients and patients in their daily job. The staff works in teams on the living group and are responsible for creating and maintain a positive and open living group climate.

Introduction

To create and maintain an open living group climate it is essential that staff finds a balance between flexibility and control (Clark Craig, 2004; Van der Helm et al., 2011a). For flexibility staff has to be responsive and create possibilities for growth for clients (Van der Helm, Klapwijk, Stams & Van der Laan, 2009). Flexibility is necessary for clients to learn new social competences and to break true the negative loop of social fear, depression and aggression (Miers, 2010; White, Shi, Hirschfield, Mun, Loeber, & 2009). Control means safety, a predictable day structure and effective use of rules and is necessary to avoid chaos and violence at the living group (Sato, Uono, Matsuura, & Toichi, 2009). If there is too much focus on control it can evolve in repressive behaviour, resulting in more fear, depression and distrust, which can negatively affect the therapeutic alliance between staff and clients (De Dreu, Giebels, & Van der Vliert, 1998; Wortly, 2002). A repressive and dominant attitude from staff mostly comes from fear to lose control over the clients at the living group (Fast & Chen, 2010; Bugental, 2009). Also fear of aggression is determining for work attitudes of staff (Van der Helm, Boekee, Stams, & Van der Laan, 2011a). To maintain a balance between flexibility and control it is important that the organizational culture fits the institutional goals so that the professional standard can be preserved and staff can be supported in professional behaviour and clients have enough possibilities to learn (Van der Helm et al., 2011a).

Psychological contract

The psychological contract between an employer and an employee consist of the balance between the fulfilment of employers' and employees obligations. Employers' obligations can be divided in social-emotional-, developmental and economic obligations (Bal, Jansen, Van der Velde, Lange, & Rousseau, 2010). The economic obligations are about the degree in which staff thinks that their employer provide them with enough money and goods. Satisfaction about salary is also designated to this factor. The social-emotional contract fulfillment concentrates on the degree in which staff experiences the feeling of support by the organization. Developmental contract fulfillment focuses on the possibilities that the organization supply to staff for development in their work (Bal et al., 2010). Bal et al. (2010) divides employees' obligations into three factors, in particular role-obligations (performing standardized tasks) extra role-obligations (performing tasks that are not standard, like working overtime) and proactive

behavior and obligations (means to improve the organization and set goals) (Bal et al., 2010). The way in which staff and employers experience the psychological contract is related to the experience of organizational culture, but also with the staffs future time perspective (Bal et al., 2010). Future time perspective is about the amount of goals, options and possibilities people think to have about the future (Zacher, Heusner, Schmitz, Zwierzanska, & Frese, 2010).

Leadership

The way in which their managers are guiding staff is influential on the interdependent cooperation and reconciliation (Bass & Bass, 2009). There are different styles of leadership. First inspirational leadership. In this style of leadership the manager leads his team in an inspirational manner and the organizational culture takes on an innovative form (Van der Helm et al., 2011a). It's also of importance that the managers actively include staff in (future) change and decision-making. In this way the staff will expect changes and view this as positive increases (Lenselink, 2009). This style of leadership correlates to an open living climate (Van der Helm et al., 2011a). In this style of leadership there's a parallel process:: an inspirational style of leadership by the manager and an innovative organizational culture create the possibility that staff can lead clients in an inspirational manner (Boekee, 2010).

The second style of leadership is passive leadership. This style of leadership consists of a manager who composes his self in a passive manner and who gives little support to his staff. This can lead to disappointment about a lack of support and an organizational retraction from the staff. Clients on their turn can also adopt this negative attitude. Besides a passive leadership style can lead to more repressive control in the living group (Perelman & Clements, 2009) and a closed living environment (van der Helm et al., 2011a).

The last style of leadership is controlling leadership. This style of leadership is based on control and is characterized on the fact that the achievement of goals gets rewarded, whilst deviating from the normal work pattern gets corrected (Bass, 1985). This style of leadership isn't sufficient to perform the difficult task where flexibility and control must be combined to achieve a healthy living climate. To achieve this a controlling leadership style must be combined with an inspirational leadership style (Bass & Bass, 2009; Fiedler, 1964; Van der Helm et al., 2011a).

Team functioning

Interpersonal team communication is an essential factor for the functioning of staff who work in the residential care sector (Van Miert, e.a., 2015, Boekee, 2010; Van der Helm & Hanrath, 2011). A feeling of unity provides an unambiguous approach of the clients, behavior reconciliation and open communication. Through communication errors within a team non-desirable situations can arise, where safety for clients as well as staff can be threatened (Boekee, 2010). Another threat for teamfunctioning is when staff does not adjust their activities to one another or when there are differences in the ways the clients are treated. Then the team will split and both groups of workers will see each other as 'bad' or 'good' workers, resulting in reduced intercommunication (Van der Helm & Stams, 2013).

Work motivation

A high work motivation is needed to coach the clients who reside in the residential care. Besides, motivation is important to remain sensitive towards the clients despite incidents and disappointment. Work characteristics that contribute to intrinsic work motivation are feedback, autonomy, skill variety, task identity and task significance (Hackman & Oldham, 1980). Task-significance has to do with the extent to which an employee thinks his or her work matters and thus has to do with the meaning given by the employee to the work.

The idea that treatment is 'meaningful', is an important basis for the success of a treatment (Haslam, 2004; Van der Helm et al., 2011a). The 'nothing works'-paradigm (Cullen & Gendreau, 2001) and the absence of a shared social identity at work can be destructive for the work motivation and may provide a reduction of positive perceptions of task significance, autonomy and task identity (Haslam, 2004; Van der Helm et al., 2011a). When staff believes their efforts will have little or no positive effect on the development of the clients, this may influence the work staff in a negative matter. In this way, the low expectations from staff with respect to the progress of the clients may indeed come true as a result of the less well functioning of staff. A factor related to task-significance is job-satisfaction (Hackman & Oldham, 1980; Haslam, 2004). Also, job satisfaction is related to staff' intention to leave to organization and look for another job (Steenhuisen et al., 2011).

Workload and work stress

Working in (forensic) residential (youth) care facilities is difficult due to the complex and pervasive behavioral problems and psychiatric background of many clients (Buljac & Wijngaarden, 2009; Van der Helm, 2011). In (secure) residential care, clients often react aggressive to enforce their own self-respect and confidence and simultaneously earn respect from the others on the living group (Ostrowsky, 2010; Thomaes, Bushman, Stegge, & Olthof, 2008). For staff, it can be quite hard to adequately deal with this and sometimes they experience fear as a result from the unpredictable and aggressive behaviour (Van der Helm, 2011a). Consequently this may lead to a coercive cycle because staff tends to act dominantly and maintain structure by reinforcing the rules (repression). Besides, research had shown that more repressive (coercive) work experience cause more stress at work (Lambert, Altheimer, Hogan, & Barton-Belessa, 2011), which is likely to reinforce the negative behavioral cycle: the experienced stress caused by an increased level of work stress may hamper the staff being responsive for the needs of the clients. Therefore, a high level of experienced work stress forms a treat for an open living group climate (Van der Helm et al., 2011a). Another (more temporarily) cause of both work stress and stress for the clients when there are constant changes in the team composition. In (secure) residential care, there is a high level of staff leaving their job (Steenhuisen, De Zwart, & Visser, 2011). There is a relation between intention to leave, work motivation and work stress.

Construction of the Living Group Work Climate Inventory (LGWCI)

The complete Living Group Work Climate Inventory (LGWCI) exists of 186 items, from which 130 fit in one of the scales. The items are ranged on a five point Likert-scale (1 = 'I totally disagree' and 5 = 'I totally agree').

This measurement provides insight in the perceived work climate of staff. The frequent use for practical and empirical research makes it possible to continuously evaluate the measurement resulting in suggestions for further development of the LGWCI.

Employers' obligation fulfillment

The items of the scales about work obligations are derived from questionnaire validated by Bal et al. (2010, originally based on Coyle-Shapiro & Conway, 2005). The scale *Social-emotional developmental obligation* (6 items) is about the social-emotional commitment with the organization and how staff globally experiences support from the organization. An example of an item is: 'I have a good work-private balance'. The scale *Developmental obligations* (2 items) provide insight in the way staff experiences possibilities for growth and opportunities for the future in this organization. An example of an item is: 'My future here is filled with opportunities'. De scale *Economic obligations* (4 items) is about the contentment about the salary. The item 'I have a good salary' is an example.

Employees' obligation fulfillment

The items of the scales which belong to the employee's obligation fulfillment are also derived from the validated questionnaire of Bal et al. (2010, originally based on De Vos, Buyens, & Schalk, 2003; Robinson, Kraatz, & Rousseau, 1994). The scale *Inrole obligations fulfillment* (6 items) is about the contentment of staff's own dedication for standard tasks. An example of an item is: 'I can handle my job well'. The scale *Extra role obligations fulfillment* (8 items) provides insight in the way employees see themselves do other activities, beneficial for the purpose of the organization, besides the standard tasks. An item is: 'I work extra hours if necessary'. The scale *Proactive behavior obligations fulfillment* (4 items) is about initiating activities for organizational improvement or improvement for the clients. As an example, one of the items is: 'I look for better ways to do my job'.

The staffs future perspective for themselves in this organization is measured by the scale *Future perspective* (3 items). This scale is also derived from the questionnaire of Bal et al. (2010, based on Lang & Carstensen, 2002). An example of the items is: 'There are many opportunities await me in the future'.

Leadership

The LGWCI recognizes three types of leadership, namely inspiring, passive and controlling leadership. The scales and the belonging items are derived from the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) (Bass, 1990; Bass, 1995). The scale *Inspiring leadership* (9 items) measures the way staff feels supported, leaded and stimulated by their team manager practicing their job. Also, it is about experiencing commitment to and appreciation from the team manager. An example of an item is: 'He/she introduces new projects and new challenges'. The scale *Controlling leadership* (3 items) provides insight

in the way staff feels they are being seen and monitored by their team manager. An example of an item is: 'He/she is alert for failure to meet standards'. The third scale, *Passive leadership* (5 items) is about the lack of support from the manager and organizational withdrawal of the team manager. The item: 'he/she avoids making decisions' is an example.

All items can also be formulated for the person who is in charge of the treatment of the clients, because they and staff need to communicate about the development of the clients. Besides these information sharing, these persons (i.e. treatment coordinators) should support staff when they experience complications in the interactions with clients at the living group.

Team functioning

The questionnaire for measuring team functioning of the staff is the PANTRIX (18 items) (Van Miert, Van der Helm, Van Tol, Dekker, & Stams, in press) and recognizes positive and negative elements in team functioning. An example of an item of the scale *Positive team functioning* is 'Team members can handle unexpected situations at the living group' and an item of the scale *Negative team functioning* is: 'The team is disintegrating, roles and positions are unclear'.

Work motivation: job-satisfaction and task-significance

Fourteen items fit in the scales *Job-satisfaction* (7 items) and *Task-significance* (7 items). The items of these two scales are derived from the Dutch TABOK (Jansen & Zaal, 1984) and VBBA (Van Veldhoven & Meijman, 1994). Some items are formulated by the consultation of several professionals and experts who work in Dutch forensic (youth) secure care facilities.

The scale *Job-satisfaction* is also about the satisfaction staff experiences by doing their job, but also about contentment about the job itself. It is possible that an employee is content with his job-choice but experiences unsatisfying factors in the work climate which negatively affect the pleasure one enjoys from practicing the job (This will follow from the results of other scales in the LGWCI). An example of *Job-satisfaction* is: 'I am satisfied with my job'. An example of *Task-significance* is 'I enjoy making contact with the clients.' It is expected that a higher scale score points out a sympathy with the wellbeing of clients and a strong belief in the benefits of the treatment in the particular institution.

Perceived workload

The items about the perceived workload are also derived from the VBBA (Van Veldhoven & Meijman, 1994) and are about pressure, work related stress and perception of the workload (8 items). An example of the perceived workload is: 'At my unit there has been a shortage of staff'. The scale *Resistance to change* (5 items) is about negative feelings and thoughts about possible organizational or procedural changes concerning the staff's job. A high scale score points out the high rate of resistance (negative). An example of an item is: 'I hate changes at work'.

Shared vision and Commitment

As well as the previous scales, the TABOK (Jansen & Zaal, 1974) and the VBBA (Van Veldhoven & Meijman, 1994) are consulted for the construction of the scales *Shared vision* (5 items) and *Commitment* (8 items). *Shared vision* provides insight in the way staff experiences agreement in one's own vision and both the vision of colleagues and the organizational mission and vision. An example of an item is: 'My team members and I share our vision of the clients and organization'. *Commitment* is about the affective commitment of staff. An example of an item is: 'I feel emotionally attached to this organization'.

Work-environment

The scale Work-environment is constructed in cooperation with several experts who were consulted after suggestions from professionals. An example of an item of this scale is: The scale work environment is made from practical implications. An example of an item is: 'There is enough fresh air and natural light at the unit' .

Quality, reliability and validity of the LGWCI

Quality

The LGWCI is not being reviewed by any (inter)national board (i.e. COTAN for the Netherlands) and almost all items are derived from validated questionnaires.

Reliability and validity

In the tables below, the items per scale are shown. Considering all Cronbach's *alpha coefficients*, all scales are found out to be satisfactory internal consistent ($\alpha > .60$). In some cases, items need to be recoded (1=5; 2=4; 3=3; 4=2; 5=1) so they properly fit in the scale. These items have the addition 'om' after their item number.

Tabel 1.

Construction of the Scale of the LGWCI (October 2014) – and the reliability of the scales in Cronbach's Alpha (n = 779)

Scale	Items	Reliability (Cronbach's Alpha α)
Employers' and employees' obligation fulfilment		
Social-emotional obligations	v1v1, v1v2, v1v3, v1v4, v1v6, v1v7	.688
Developmental obligations	v1v24, v1v27	.784
Economic obligations	v1v18, v1v19, v1v10, v1v11	.678
In role obligations	v1v28, v1v29, v1v30, v1v31, v1v32, v1v33	.827
Extra role obligations	v1v12, v1v13, v1v14, v1v15, v1v16, v1v17, v1v18, v1v19	.719
Proactive behaviour obligations	v1v20, v1v21, v1v22, v1v23	.824
Future perspective	v1v24, v1v25, v1v26	.867
Leadership: team manager		
Passive leadership	v21v2, v21v7, v21v9, v21v10, v21v16om	.692
Controlling leadership	v21v3, v21v6	.674
Inspiring leadership	v21v1, v21v4, v21v5, v21v8, v21v11om, v21v14, v21v15, v21v16, v21v17	.860
Leadership: treatment coordinator		
Passive leadership	v22v2, v22v7, v22v9, v22v10, v22v16om,	.687
Controlling leadership	v22v3, v22v6	.639
Inspiring leadership	v22v1, v22v4, v22v5, v22v8, v22v11om, v22v14, v22v15, v22v16, v22v17	.842
Team functioning		
Positive team functioning	v3v4, v3v6, v3v9, v3v10, v3v11, v3v12, v3v13, v3v17	.883
Negative team functioning	v3v1, v3v2, v3v3, v3v5, v3v7, v3v8, v3v14, v3v15, v3v16, v3v18	.813
Job-satisfaction	v4v1, v4v2, v4v3, v4v5, v4v6, v4v14, v4v15om	.772
Task-significance	v4v7, v4v8, v4v9, v4v10, v4v12, v4v13, v4v16	.781
Perceived workload	v5v1, v5v2om, v5v3, v5v4, v5v5, v5v6, v5v7, v5v8	.710
Resistance to change	v5v9, v5v10, v5v11, v5v12om, v5v13	.643
Shared vision	v6v1 v6v2 v6v3 v6v5 v6v13om	.749
Commitment	v6v4 v6v6 v6v8 v6v9 v6v10 v6v11 v6v14 v6v15	.742
Work environment	v7v1 v7v2 v7v3om v7v4 v7v5 v7v6 v7v7	.598

Practical use and scoring

The LGWCI is convenient for periodical use, for example twice of three times per year. It provides insight in the perception of the staff work climate, which is useful for both organizational management, the team managers and all team members. Filling in the total form (online or on paper)

takes approximately 25 minutes. If wanted by the management of the organization, a selection of the scales can be made.

In principle, the results will not be calculated at the individual level but only at organizational or team level. However participating in work climate research is an opportunity for staff to share their opinions, it is not the purpose to use the LGWCI for measuring one's individual work climate or condemn staff. Insight in the work climate of a team in total is input for a group discussion and feedback cycles concerning all team members.

The scale scores can be compared to a suitable reference group and, when available, previous results. There are two reference groups; 'Dutch (Secure) Residential Youth Care Facilities' (in short: Youth) (Table 2a) and 'Dutch (Secure) (Residential) Facilities for Adults' (in short Adults) (Table 2b). The reference group 'Youth' exists of data conducted in four Dutch forensic correctional youth facilities for delinquent juveniles and four Dutch secure correctional facilities for juveniles who suffer from severe behavioral and/ or psychiatric problems ($n = 373$). The reference group 'Adults' exists of data conducted in several residential and non-residential (forensic) facilities for treatment of both adults with and without an delinquent background but all suffering from severe behavioral and/ or psychiatric problems ($n = 406$). All data of both reference groups is collected in the period between October 2014 and October 2015.

Using a reference group makes it possible to compare the perceived work climate of all staff of an organization with a big group of colleagues. It is recommended to use Cohen's d to calculate the differences because, in most cases, the conditions are not satisfied for an t-test. The Cohen's d coefficient is usually used to calculate an effect size (Cohen, 1992). See also: <http://www.polyu.edu.hk/mm/effectsizefaq/calculator/calculator.html>. The outcome is the difference (expressed as effect size) between two means, taking the standard deviation into account. Cohen's d can both have a positive or negative value .

Cohen's d	Effect
< -1.30 of > 1.30	Great or very strong effect
(-).80 tot (-)1.29	Strong effect
(-).50 tot (-).79	Average effect
(-).20 tot (-).49	Small to average effect
-.19 tot .19	No or negligible effect

Research of 'lectoraat Residential Youth Care' of Hogeschool Leiden can provide (for free) to other researchers who are interested with:

- Reference groups
- Several SPSS-files (formats); .sav, syntax
- .xls file to easily calculate Cohen's d coefficients
- Formats of leaflets which can be used for presenting the results with team members and clients

Table 2a.

Mean Scale Scores, Standard Deviations, and Percentile Scores of the Reference Group 'Dutch (Secure) Residential Youth Care' (n = 373)

Scale	M	SD	Percentile						
			5	10	25	50	75	90	95
Employers' and employees' obligation fulfilment									
Social-emotional obligations	4.00	.53	3.25	3.67	4.00	4.33	4.67	4.71	3.25
Developmental obligations	3.25	1.06	2.00	2.50	3.00	4.00	4.50	5.00	2.00
Economic obligations	3.22	.84	2.00	2.75	3.25	3.75	4.25	4.50	2.00
In role obligations	4.41	.49	3.83	4.00	4.50	4.83	5.00	5.00	3.83
Extra role obligations	4.09	.56	3.38	3.75	4.13	4.50	4.75	5.00	3.38
Proactive behaviour obligations	4.44	.53	3.75	4.00	4.50	5.00	5.00	5.00	3.75
Future perspective	3.19	1.03	1.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Leadership: team manager									
Passive leadership	2.40	.73	1.40	1.80	2.40	2.80	3.40	3.45	1.40
Controlling leadership	3.71	.87	2.50	3.00	4.00	4.13	5.00	5.00	2.50
Inspiring leadership	3.68	.72	2.56	3.11	3.72	4.22	4.56	4.78	2.56
Leadership: treatment coordinator									
Passive leadership	2.36	.79	1.30	1.80	2.40	2.80	3.40	3.80	1.30
Controlling leadership	3.50	.95	2.50	3.00	3.50	4.00	4.50	5.00	2.50
Inspiring leadership	3.66	.71	2.67	3.22	3.67	4.22	4.56	4.78	2.67
Team functioning									
Positive team functioning	3.87	.66	2.88	3.50	3.88	4.38	4.75	4.88	2.88
Negative team functioning	2.79	.71	1.90	2.20	2.70	3.30	3.75	4.03	1.90
Job-satisfaction	4.13	.55	3.29	3.82	4.14	4.57	4.79	4.86	3.29
Task-significance	4.36	.49	3.71	4.00	4.43	4.71	4.86	5.00	3.71
Perceived workload	3.27	.66	2.50	2.88	3.25	3.75	4.25	4.38	2.50
Resistance to change	2.56	.63	1.80	2.00	2.60	3.00	3.50	3.65	1.80
Shared vision	3.89	.69	3.00	3.40	4.00	4.40	4.70	4.80	3.00
Commitment	3.31	.63	2.50	2.88	3.38	3.75	4.13	4.38	2.50
Work environment	3.83	.55	3.14	3.43	3.86	4.14	4.43	4.71	3.14

Table 2b.

Mean Scale Scores, Standard Deviations, and Percentile Scores of the Reference Group 'Dutch (Secure) Residential Care for Adults' (n = 407)

Scale	M	SD	Percentile						
			5	10	25	50	75	90	95
Employers' and employees' obligation fulfilment									
Social-emotional obligations	3.81	.57	2.89	3.28	3.67	4.08	4.50	4.83	5.00
Developmental obligations	2.80	.99	1.00	1.00	2.00	2.75	3.63	4.50	4.83
Economic obligations	2.97	.78	1.50	1.68	2.44	3.25	3.75	4.33	4.91
In role obligations	4.36	.46	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.67	4.83	5.00	5.00
Extra role obligations	3.88	.52	3.04	3.13	3.47	3.94	4.41	4.88	4.96
Proactive behaviour obligations	4.22	.52	3.59	3.75	4.00	4.50	5.00	5.00	5.00
Future perspective	2.84	.96	1.00	1.00	2.00	2.83	3.67	4.33	4.77
Leadership: team manager									
Passive leadership	2.51	.85	1.00	1.14	1.35	2.00	3.05	4.00	4.20
Controlling leadership	3.31	.88	1.50	2.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.50	4.50
Inspiring leadership	3.41	.80	2.08	2.41	3.06	4.00	4.33	4.81	4.89
Leadership: treatment coordinator									
Passive leadership	2.45	.72	1.14	1.40	1.95	2.40	2.85	3.06	3.40
Controlling leadership	3.16	.89	1.00	1.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.50
Inspiring leadership	3.37	.70	1.56	2.19	2.75	3.33	3.89	4.03	4.18
Team functioning									
Positive team functioning	3.84	.67	2.63	2.75	3.38	3.88	4.41	4.63	4.75
Negative team functioning	2.60	.74	1.37	1.67	1.90	2.50	3.43	4.03	4.30
Job-satisfaction	4.05	.53	3.43	3.53	3.96	4.43	4.71	4.86	4.86
Task-significance	4.07	.47	3.19	3.53	3.86	4.21	4.57	4.86	5.00
Perceived workload	3.32	.60	1.93	2.34	2.63	3.13	3.50	3.75	4.04
Resistance to change	2.53	.53	1.60	1.60	1.80	2.40	2.65	3.20	3.66
Shared vision	3.48	.68	2.40	2.60	3.20	3.80	4.40	4.46	4.86
Commitment	3.15	.57	2.25	2.34	2.63	3.00	3.38	3.66	3.88
Work environment	3.54	.59	2.43	2.63	3.11	3.57	4.00	4.29	4.71

Referenties

- Bal, M., Jansen, P., Van der Velde, M., De Lange, A., & Rousseau, D. (2010). De rol van toekomstperspectief in het psychologisch contract van oudere werknemers. *Organisatie en Management*, 84, 381-394.
- Bass, B. M. & Bass, R. (2009). *The Bass Handbook of Leadership: Theory, Research, and Managerial Applications*. The Free Press, New York, NY.
- Boekee, I. (2010). Angst de Baas, invloed van het therapeutisch leefmilieu op pedagogisch medewerkers binnen justitiële jeugdinrichting. (masterscriptie) Leiden: Hogeschool Leiden.
- Buljac, M. (2012). Healthy teams: analyzing and improving team performance in long-term care. (proefschrift) Rotterdam: Erasmus Universiteit Rotterdam.
- Buljac, M. & Van Wijngaarden, J. (2009). De weg naar een effectiever werkerns team. *Jeugd en Co Kennis*, 3, 23-26.
- Bugental, D. (2009). Predicting and preventing Child Maltreatment, a biocognitive transactional approach. In: Sameroff, A.J. (ed.). *Transactional Models of Development*. Washington: APA.
- Clark Craig, S. (2004). Rehabilitation versus control: an organizational theory of prison management. *The Prison Journal*, 84, 928-1148.
- Cullen, F. & Gendreau, P. (2001). From nothing works to What Works: Changing professional ideology in the 21st century. *The Prison Journal*, 81, 313-338.
- De Dreu, C. K. W., Evers, A., Beersma, B., Kluwer, E. S., & Nauta, A. (2001). A theory-based of conflict management strategies in the workplace. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 22, 645-668.
- De Dreu, C. K. W., Giebels, E., & Van de Vliert, E. (1998). Social motives and trust in integrative negotiation: The disruptive effects of punitive capability. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83, 408-422.
- Fast, N. J. & Chen, S. (2009). When the boss feels inadequate: Power, incompetence and aggression. *Psychological Science*, 20, 1406-1413.
- Fiedler, F. E. (1964). A contingency model of leadership effectiveness. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 1, 149-190.
- Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1980). *Work redesign*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Den Hartog, D. N., Van Muijen, J. J., & Koopman, P. L. (1997). Transactioneel versus transformationeel leiderschap: een analyse van de MLQ in de Nederlandse situatie. *Gedrag en Organisatie*, 7, 155-166.
- Haslam, S. A., (2004). *Psychology in organizations. The social identity approach*. London: Sage.
- Helm, G. H. P., van der (2011). *First do no harm*. (proefschrift). Amsterdam: Vrije Universiteit.
- Helm, G. H. P., van der, Boekee, I., Stams, G. J. J. M. & Laan, P. H., van der (2011a). Fear is the key. Keeping the balance between flexibility and control in Dutch youth prison. *Journal of Children's Service*, 4, 248-263.
- Helm, G. H. P., van der & Hanrath, J. (2011). *Wat werkt binnen de gesloten jeugdzorg*. Amsterdam: SWP.
- Helm, G. H. P., van der, Klapwijk, M., Stams, G. J. J. M., & Laan, P. H., van der (2009). 'What works' for Juvenile prisoners: the role of group climate in a youth prison. *Journal of Children services*, 4, 36-48.
- Helm, G. H. P. van der, Stams, G. J. J. M., Laan, P. H., van der (2011b). Measuring group climate in prison. *The prison journal*, 91 (2), p. 158-176.
- Helm, G. H. P., van der, & Stams, G.J.J. M. (2012). Conflict and Coping by Clients and Group Workers in Secure Residential Facilities. In: Oei, K & Groenhuizen, M. *Progression in Forensic Psychiatry: about Boundaries*. Amsterdam: Kluwer.
- Helm, G. H. P., van der, Tol, N., van, Scheppingen, L., van, Miert, V. S. L., van, Dekker, A. L., & Stams, G. J. J. M. (in press). Measuring team functioning in secure residential care: a validation Study of the Pantrix.
- Jansen, P. G. W., & Zaal, J. N. (1984). *Handleiding TABOK. Uitsprakenlijst taakbeleving en organisatieklimaat*. Den Haag: Rijks Psychologische Dienst.
- Lambert, E. G., Altheimer, I., Hogan, N. L. & Barton-Bellessa, S. M. (2011). Correlates of Correctional

- Orientation in a Treatment -Oriented Prison: A Partial Test of Person-Environmental Fit Theory. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 38, 453-470.
- Lange, A., Pahlich, A., Sarucco, M., Smits, G. Dehghani, B., & Hanewald, G. (1995). Psychometric characteristics and validity of the Dutch adaptation of the Buss- Durkee Hostility Inventory (the BDHI- D). *Behaviour research and therapy*, 33, 223-227.
- Miers, A. C. (2010). *Bias or Reality? Negative perceptions of ambiguous social cues, social performance and physical arousal in socially anxious youth*. Leiden: Universiteit Leiden.
- Van Miert, V. S. L., Van der Helm, G. H. P., Van Tol, N., Dekker, A. L., & Stams, G. J. J. M. (2015). Team functioning in semi-secure and correctional residential care facilities; a validation study of the Pantrix. Submitted to: *International Journal of Forensic Mental Health*.
- Ostrowsky, M. K. (2010). Are violent people more likely to have low self-esteem or high self-esteem? *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 15, 69-75.
- Perelman, A. M. & Clements, C. B. (2004). Beliefs about what works in juvenile rehabilitation. *The Prison Journal*, 84, 452-71.
- Rousseau, D. M. (1995). *Psychological Contracts in Organizations. Understanding Written and Unwritten Agreements*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Sato, W., Uono, S., Matsuura, N., & Toichi, M. (2009). Misrecognition of facial expressions in delinquents. *Child and Adolescent Psychiatry and Mental Health*, 3, 627-636.
- Schein, E. H. (1996). Culture: the missing concept in organization studies. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41, 229-240.
- Schein, E. H. (1997). *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schubert, C. A., Mulvey, E. P., Loughran, T. A., & Loyosa, S. H. (2012). Perceptions of institutional experience and community outcomes for serious adolescent offenders. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 39, 71-93.
- Steenhuisen, E., Zwart, L., de, & Visser, J. (2011). *Verloop in de jeugdzorg: cijfers en redenen van vertrek*. Amsterdam: TNS Consult.
- Thomaes, S., Bushman, B. J., Stegge, H., & Olthof, T. (2008). Trumping shame by blasts of noise: Narcissism, self-esteem, shame, and aggression in young adolescents. *Child Development*, 79, 1792-1801.
- Veldhoven, M., van & Meijman, T. (1994). *Het meten van psychosociale arbeidsbelasting met een vragenlijst: de vragenlijst beleving en beoordeling van de arbeid (VBBA)*. Amsterdam: Nederlands Instituut voor Arbeidsomstandigheden.
- White, H. R., Shi, J., Hirschfield, P. , Mun, E. I., & Loeber, E. R. (2009). Effects of institutional confinement for delinquency on levels of anxiety and depression among male adolescents. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 8, 295-313.
- Zacher, H., Heusner, S., Schmitz, M., Zwierzanksa, M. M., & Frese, M. (2010). Focus on opportunities as a mediator of the relationships between age, job complexity, and work performance. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 76, 374-386.