SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIAL

1) Experiences with Bullying Questions
2) Data Handling and Missing Data
3) Study Effect Sizes and Magnitude
4) Participant Responses Regarding Perceptions of Coercive Bullying Between Patients
5) Mean Self-Reported Mental Illness Symptom Scores (BSI) Across the Total Sample and Three Coercive Bullying Groups
6) Multivariate Models – Perpetration and Individual-Level Factors (Models 1-3)
7) Multivariate Models – Perpetration and Environmental-Level Factors (Models 1-3)
8) Multivariate Models – Victimization and Individual-Level Factors (Models 1-3)
9) Multivariate Models – Victimization and Environmental-Level Factors (Models 1-3)

Supplemental Material 1 – Experiences with Bullying Questions
(Designed as self-report but was administered in structured interview**)**

The following questions are related to the Common Behaviour Checklist you just completed. Whether you identified being engaged in this behaviour or not, please answer the questions with the unit in mind.

1. How often do you think the common (coercive) behaviour you just read about occurs on the forensic unit between clients (whether you are involved or not?)

Never	1-2 times month	Every week	Multiple times a week	Every day

2. How often do you think staff are aware of the behaviour occurring between clients (either during the event or afterwards)?

0-20% of the time	21-40% of the time	41-60% of the time	61-80% of the time	81-100% of the time

3. Circle the areas where you think coercive behaviour occurs among clients? Circle all that apply.

a) In bedrooms
b) In the TV room
c) In the dining room during meal times
d) In another common area on the unit
e) In the hospital but not on the unit
f) During organized hospital activities (e.g., groups)
g) Outside on the hospital grounds
h) In the community (but still by a peer from the unit)
i) Other: _____
j) Other: _____

4. Go back to question 3 and put a star beside the area where you think this coercive behaviour happens the most. Please only choose one.

5. When clients engage in this behaviour against a peer on the unit, how often do they do it alone versus with other co-clients?

Always alone	Mostly alone	Half alone, half with co-clients	Mostly with co-clients	Always with co-clients

6. Why do you think coercive behaviour occurs among clients on the unit? You can list multiple reasons.

- _____
- _____

7. **The following questions are for those who have been a target of any of these coercive behaviours at any time (not just in the last 3 months) <u>while living on an inpatient forensic unit by another client living on that unit</u>. If you have <u>never</u> been a target of any of these behaviours, skip to question 8.**

7a. After being targeted in the past, have you ever reported it to staff?			YES NO	
7b. **If yes,** did that same individual ever target you again afterwards?			YES NO N/A	
7c. How often would you say you report to staff after you have been targeted with coercive behaviour? Circle the best answer.				
Never	Some of the time	Half of the time	Most of the time	All of the time
7d. Have there been times that you did not tell staff and the <u>same person</u> targeted you again afterwards?			YES NO	

7e. If you were ever targeted and then did not tell staff (even if it was once), what were some of the reasons you did not report? List below:

- _____
- _____

7e. Have you ever received consequences from staff (e.g., privileges revoked) for being the <u>target</u> of a coercive behaviour? For example, getting caught smuggling in contraband for someone else, getting caught not taking your medication because someone pressured you to give it to them.

<u>YES</u> <u>NO</u>

If yes, what are some examples of consequences that happened to you?

- _____
- _____

8. In the last month, on <u>average</u> how many <u>hours a day</u> do you spend on the <u>unit</u> between 7am-11pm? _____

9. How many different structured activities are you involved in currently at or outside the hospital? This can include therapies, recreation, vocation, clubs, volunteering, groups, etc.

   _____

10. How much money do you spend on an <u>average week</u> (e.g., cigarettes, clothes, take-out food, etc.)? $_____

11. Did you ever get bullied as a youth? <u>YES</u> <u>NO</u>
12. Did you ever bully others as a youth? <u>YES</u> <u>NO</u>

Supplemental Material 2 – Data Handling and Missing Data

Data Handling Processes

**The following details were originally described in Healey (2023)*

Study Dependent Variables – Perpetration and Victimization:

Prorating: The frequency of self-reported bullying incidents in each category were summed to generate two respective variables. Six participants had not been an inpatient for at least three months (unknown to the researcher at the time of data collection). Their frequency counts were prorated using the following formula: frequency of perpetration (or victimization)/months as inpatient x 3 months. For instance: 3 perpetration incidents/2.32 months as inpatient x 3 months = 3.88 incidents. Each prorated value was rounded to the nearest integer.

Outlier Adjustment: After prorating, the perpetration frequency ranged from 0-275 (M = 9.15, SD = 34.28) and victimization ranged from 0-949 (M = 27.96, SD = 107.57). Though the planned analyses accounted for zero-inflated and skewed data, a decision was made to adjust these values for outliers. These variables were converted to *z*-scores, where any value +/- 3.29 is considered an outlier (Field, 2009). Two values on each of the dependent variables were identified as outliers, and were transformed to three standard deviations above their respective mean.

The prorated and outlier-adjusted dependent variables was used in all analyses outside of descriptive results.

Missing Data Handling:

Little's MCAR test was used to assess the pattern of missing data among the study data (i.e., all self-report measures, hospital chart review) being used in inferential analyses or thought to be possibly associated with the dependent variables (e.g., social desirability). Results indicated that the data was missing completely at random, χ^2= 696.72, df = 1383, p = 1.00. Overall, there were low amounts of missing data; the variables with the largest proportion of missingness were a history of incarceration (n = 4, 4.3% missing) and ethnicity (n = 4, 4.3%). The small amount of missing data on the SRP-SF and BSI was prorated using the mean of the remaining subscale scores. Prorating was not possible for the BIDR-SF due to the nature of the scoring, so missing data was left as is, resulting in four participants not having any scores on this measure. Given the imputation of missing data on the remainder of the items (e.g., ethnicity, marital status) was inappropriate, and because missing data was very low, analyses proceeded with mildly fluctuating sample sizes.

Supplemental Material 3 – Study Effect Sizes and Magnitude

Effect Size	Associated Analyses	Magnitude of Effect		
		Small	Medium	Large
Epsilon-squared (ε^2)	one-way ANOVA, Welch's *F*	0.02-0.13	0.13-0.26	>0.26
Cramer's *V*	Pearson chi-square, Fisher's Exact Test	0.06	0.17	0.29
Cohen's *d*	independent samples *t*-test	0.20	0.50	0.70
Pearson's *r*	Pearson's *r*	0.10	0.30	0.50
Odds ratio (OR)	Pearson chi-square[a], negative binomial hurdle model (logit half)	1.68 (0.60)	3.47 (0.29)	6.71 (0.15)
Incidence-rate ratio (IRR)	negative binomial hurdle model (negative binomial half)	-	-	-

Notes. Effect size magnitude recommendations by Cohen (1988) and Chen et al. (2010). Universal cut offs for IRR magnitude are not available, but they can be interpreted similarly to ORs.
Cramer's *V* was used for tests with categorial variables where the contingency tables were larger than 2x2 (Kim, 2017).
[a]Odds ratios were only possible in 2x2 tables (i.e., post-hoc pairwise comparisons between two groups on a single variable) where the variables only have 2 levels. Cells with zero counts were assigned a value of 0.5 to calculate the OR, as recommended by Fleiss (1994).

Supplemental Material 4 – Participant Responses Regarding Perceptions of Coercive Bullying Between Patients (*N* = 94)

SM Table A.
Participant Perceptions of Coercive Bullying

	Predefined response options	Endorsement % (*n*)
How often coercive bullying occurs on the forensic inpatient units.	Every day	48.9% (46)
	Multiple times a week	16.0% (15)
	Every week	10.6% (10)
	1-2 times/month	14.9% (14)
	Never	4.3% (4)
How often are staff aware of coercive bullying behavior among inpatients (either during the event or afterwards).	0-20% of the time	27.7% (26)
	21-40% of the time	14.9% (14)
	41-60% of the time	16.0% (15)
	61-80% of the time	13.8% (13)
	81-100% of the time	18.1% (17)
Where coercive bullying occurs (select all that apply; from most endorsed to least).	Common area of unit (e.g., dining room, hallway)	70.2% (66)
	Hospital grounds	67.0% (63)
	TV room	62.8% (59)
	Bedrooms	39.4% (37)
	In hospital, off unit	31.9% (30)
	In community (but still by co-inpatient)	16.0% (15)
How often patients perpetrate coercive bullying alone versus with others.	Always alone	25.5% (24)
	Mostly alone	37.2% (35)
	Half alone, half with co-patients	8.5% (8)
	Mostly with co-patients	10.6% (10)
	Always with co-patients	1.1% (1)

Notes. Derived from structured interview with participants (Healey, 2023).
Four participants did not complete any questions following the first one listed as they felt coercive bullying never occurred. Otherwise, there is some additional missingness across some questions where participants were “unsure”.

Supplemental Material 5 - Mean Self-Reported Mental Illness Symptom Scores (BSI) Across the Total Sample and Three Coercive Bullying Groups

SM Table B.
Mean Scores on the BSI

BSI Subscale	Total Sample (N = 94)	Bullying/ Victimized (n = 34)	Victimized-Only (n = 35)	Not-Involved (n = 24)	F-test/Welch's F
Higher Order Scales - Mean (*SD*)					
Global Severity Index	0.82 (0.56)	0.90 (0.61)	0.92 (0.54)	0.55 (0.45)	$F(2, 90) = 3.96$, $p = .023$, $\varepsilon^2 = .06$, 95% CI [-.02, .17]
Positive Symptom Total	21.3 (12.1)	24.1 (12.6)	23.0 (11.4)	14.8 (10.8)	$F(2, 90) = 5.02$, $p = .009$, $\varepsilon^2 = .08$, 95% CI [-.02, .20]
Positive Symptom Distress	1.9 (0.80)	1.8 (0.88)	2.1 (0.59)	1.8 (0.93)	$F(2, 90) = 1.70$, $p = .188$, $\varepsilon^2 = .02$, 95% CI [-.02, .10]
Subscales					
Somatization	0.57 (0.61)	0.60 (0.70)	0.65 (0.62)	0.38 (0.44)	$F(2, 90) = 1.48$, $p = .232$, $\varepsilon^2 = .01$, 95% CI [-.02, .10]
Obsessive Compulsive	1.2 (0.93)	1.3 (0.96)	1.3 (1.0)	0.72 (0.52)	$F(2, 59.6) = 6.80^a$, $p = .002$, $\varepsilon^2 = .06$, 95% CI [-.02, .17]
Interpersonal Sensitivity	0.86 (0.95)	1.0 (1.0)	1.0 (0.96)	0.43 (0.71)	$F(2, 59.4) = 4.73^a$, $p = .012$, $\varepsilon^2 = .05$, 95% CI [-.02, .16]
Depression	0.86 (0.73)	0.83 (0.59)	1.1 (0.84)	0.53 (0.61)	$F(2, 90) = 4.86$, $p = .010$, $\varepsilon^2 = .08$, 95% CI [-.02, .19]
Anxiety	0.82 (0.78)	0.79 (0.74)	1.0 (0.79)	0.53 (0.77)	$F(2, 90) = 3.05$, $p = .053$, $\varepsilon^2 = .04$, 95% CI [-.02, .15]
Hostility	0.56 (0.58)	0.65 (0.58)	0.55 (0.53)	0.41 (0.64)	$F(2, 90) = 1.25$, $p = .290$, $\varepsilon^2 = .01$, 95% CI [-.02, .09]
Phobic Anxiety	0.50 (0.62)	0.52 (0.71)	0.61 (0.64)	0.35 (0.43)	$F(2, 90) = 1.21$, $p = .303$, $\varepsilon^2 = .01$, 95% CI [-.02, .09]
Paranoid	1.2 (0.92)	1.37 (0.93)	1.23 (0.85)	1.0 (1.0)	$F(2, 90) = 1.13$, $p = .327$, $\varepsilon^2 = .003$, 95% CI [-.02, .08]
Psychoticism	0.89 (0.85)	1.1 (0.92)	0.90 (0.88)	0.60 (0.64)	$F(2, 90) = 2.17$, $p = .121$, $\varepsilon^2 = .03$, 95% CI [-.02, .12]

Notes. Table was originally presented in Healey (2023).
BSI = Brief Symptom Inventory.
95% CI is for the effect size (ε^2), not the main test statistic.
Total sample includes one 'bullying-only participant' who is not reflected elsewhere.
There were no significant overall effects (using the 95% CI of the effect size), so no column for post-hoc pairwise comparisons is included in the table.
[a]Welch's F test was used as Levene's test of homogeneity of variances was significant.

Supplemental Material 6 - Multivariate Models – Perpetration and Individual-Level Factors (Models 1-3)

The following notes apply to the tables in Supplemental Material 6-9:

- All of the following tables were originally presented in Healey (2023)
- OR = odds ratio, IRR = incidence rate ratio
- Hospital was dummy-coded and used as a covariate in all models; the OR/IRR are not interpreted
- Bolded value indicates the OR/IRR 95% CI does not include the null value (1.00)

SM Table C.
Perpetration - Individual Model 1: Negative Binomial Hurdle Model

	Logit Model: Perpetrated Coercive Bullying or Not				Negative Binomial Model: Rate of Coercive Bullying Perpetration			
Variable	*b (SE)*	*p*	OR	OR 95% CI	*b (SE)*	*p*	IRR	IRR 95% CI
Intercept	-0.82 (0.70)	.241			0.37 (0.86)	.665		
Hospital (2)	0.17 (0.84)	.844	1.18	[0.23, 6.14]	1.47 (0.98)	.134	4.35	[0.64, 29.76]
Hospital (3)	0.21 (0.79)	.791	1.23	[0.26, 5.86]	2.77 (0.92)	.003	15.92	[2.60, 97.46]
Hospital (4)	0.16 (0.81)	.846	1.17	[0.24, 5.78]	2.33 (0.92)	.011	10.26	[1.70, 61.91]
Age	-0.04 (0.02)	.062	0.96	[0.92, 1.00]	-0.07 (0.04)	.076	0.93	[0.85, 1.01]
Gender (woman)	0.86 (0.68)	.200	2.37	[0.63, 8.92]	**-1.79 (0.69)**	**.010**	**0.17**	**[0.04, 0.65]**

Note: Tables were originally presented in Healey (2023).

SM Table D.
Perpetration – Individual Model 2: Negative Binomial Hurdle Model

	Logit Model: Perpetrated Coercive Bullying or Not				Negative Binomial Model: Rate of Coercive Bullying Perpetration			
Variable	*b* (*SE*)	*p*	OR	OR 95% CI	*b* (*SE*)	*p*	IRR	IRR 95% CI
Intercept	-0.69 (0.94)	.464			0.74 (1.63)	.658		
Hospital (2)	-0.60 (0.97)	.541	0.55	[0.08, 3.72]	0.82 (1.11)	.458	2.27	[0.26, 19.89]
Hospital (3)	-0.52 (0.92)	.570	0.59	[0.10, 3.58]	2.31 (1.17)	.047	10.12	[1.03, 99.75]
Hospital (4)	-0.34 (0.93)	.712	0.71	[0.11, 4.40]	2.09 (1.30)	.108	8.07	[0.63, 103.16]
Personality traits/disorder	0.32 (0.57)	.574	1.38	[0.45, 4.17]	-0.31 (0.86)	.714	0.73	[0.14, 3.90]
Substance use disorder	0.40 (0.69)	.556	1.50	[0.39, 5.75]	-0.02 (1.00)	.984	0.98	[0.14, 6.96]
SRP-SF Total	**0.08 (0.02)**	**< .001**	**1.09**	**[1.04, 1.13]**	0.01 (0.02)	.664	1.01	[0.97, 1.05]

Note. SRP-SF = Self-Report Psychopathy Scale – Short Form (Paulhus et al., 2016)

SM Table E.
Perpetration – Individual Model 3: Negative Binomial Hurdle Model

	Logit Model: Perpetrated Coercive Bullying or Not				Negative Binomial Model: Rate of Coercive Bullying Perpetration			
Variable	*b* (*SE*)	*p*	OR	OR 95% CI	*b* (*SE*)	*p*	IRR	IRR 95% CI
Intercept	-0.87 (0.73)	.229			0.99 (1.17)	.397		
Hospital (2)	0.33 (0.82)	.688	1.39	[0.28, 6.99]	1.03 (1.03)	.320	2.79	[0.37, 21.00]
Hospital (3)	0.11 (0.83)	.893	1.12	[0.22, 5.63]	2.51 (1.01)	.012	12.35	[1.72, 88.57]
Hospital (4)	0..40 (0.80)	.616	1.50	[0.31, 7.20]	2.08 (1.20)	.084	7.99	[0.76, 84.29]
Incarceration history	0.16 (0.50)	.755	1.17	[0.44, 3.11]	-0.55 (0.76)	.468	0.58	[0.13, 2.55]
Months as inpatient	0.002 (0.003)	.655	1.00	[0.99, 1.01]	-0.002 (0.004)	.587	1.00	[0.99, 1.01]

Note: Tables were originally presented in Healey (2023).

Supplemental Material 7 - Multivariate Models – Perpetration and Environmental-Level Factors (Models 1-3)

SM Table F.

Perpetration – Environmental Model 1: Negative Binomial Hurdle Model

	Logit Model: Perpetrated Coercive Bullying or Not				Negative Binomial Model: Rate of Coercive Bullying Perpetration			
Variable	*b* (*SE*)	*p*	OR	OR 95% CI	*b* (*SE*)	*p*	IRR	IRR 95% CI
Intercept	-0.86 (0.74)	.243			-0.18 (1.31)	.888		
Hospital (2)	0.41 (0.81)	.615	1.51	[0.31, 7.42]	1.11 (1.08)	.303	3.04	[0.37, 25.19]
Hospital (3)	0.29 (0.78)	.709	1.34	[0.29, 6.23]	2.96 (1.10)	.007	19.23	[2.22, 166.60]
Hospital (4)	0.42 (0.80)	.600	1.52	[0.32, 7.25]	2.73 (1.05)	.009	15.35	[1.95, 120.63]
Money spent weekly	0.0001 (0.003)	.952	1.00	[0.99, 1.01]	0.01 (0.01)	.490	1.01	[0.99, 1.02]

SM Table G.

Perpetration – Environmental Model 2: Negative Binomial Hurdle Model

	Logit Model: Perpetrated Coercive Bullying or Not				Negative Binomial Model: Rate of Coercive Bullying Perpetration			
Variable	*b* (*SE*)	*p*	OR	OR 95% CI	*b* (*SE*)	*p*	IRR	IRR 95% CI
Intercept	-1.63 (0.91)	.073			0.65 (1.27)	.610		
Hospital (2)	0.47 (0.82)	.567	1.60	[0.32, 7.94]	0.89 (1.03)	.385	2.44	[0.33, 18.17]
Hospital (3)	0.58 (0.81)	.476	1.78	[0.36, 8.77]	2.56 (1.05)	.015	13.00	[1.66, 101.51]
Hospital (4)	0.34 (0.80)	.668	1.41	[0.30, 6.68]	2.53 (1.01)	.012	12.57	[1.74, 91.09]
Unescorted hospital/grounds passes	0.85 (0.63)	.176	2.35	[0.68, 8.11]	-0.24 (0.84)	.779	0.79	[0.15, 4.09]

Note. Original model in Healey (2023) also included unescorted community passes, but given the conceptual overlap with hospital/grounds passes and to preserve length in the manuscript, it was left out of the current study.

Note. Tables were originally presented in MASKED FOR REVIEW (2023).

SM Table H.
Perpetration – Environmental Model 3: Negative Binomial Hurdle Model

	Logit Model: Perpetrated Coercive Bullying or Not				Negative Binomial Model: Rate of Coercive Bullying Perpetration			
Variable	*b* (*SE*)	*p*	OR	OR 95% CI	*b* (*SE*)	*p*	IRR	IRR 95% CI
Intercept	-0.60 (0.75)	.420			0.79 (0.96)	.410		
Hospital (2)	0.43 (0.81)	.599	1.53	[0.31, 7.56]	1.01 (1.01)	.319	2.75	[0.38, 19.97]
Hospital (3)	0.35 (0.79)	.658	1.42	[0.30, 6.63]	2.98 (1.04)	.004	19.63	[2.56, 150.25]
Hospital (4)	0.45 (0.80)	.569	1.57	[0.33, 7.49]	2.75 (1.01)	.007	15.66	[2.14, 114.43]
Number of visits	-0.02 (0.07)	.784	0.98	[0.86, 1.12]	-0.11 (0.11)	.291	0.89	[0.72, 1.10]
Number of structured activities	-0.07 (0.08)	.412	0.93	[0.79, 1.10]	-0.11 (0.11)	.312	0.90	[0.72, 1.11]

Note. Tables were originally presented in Healey (2023).

Supplemental Material 8 - Multivariate Models – Victimization and Individual-Level Factors (Models 1-3)

SM Table I.
Victimization - Individual Model 1: Negative Binomial Hurdle Model

	Logit Model: Victimized by Coercive Bullying or Not				Negative Binomial Model: Rate of Coercive Bullying Victimization			
Variable	*b* (*SE*)	*p*	OR	OR 95% CI	*b* (*SE*)	*p*	IRR	IRR 95% CI
Intercept	0.83 (0.69)	.229			2.11 (0.64)	< .001		
Hospital (2)	0.68 (0.90)	.447	1.98	[0.34, 11.43]	0.74 (0.75)	.326	2.10	[0.48, 9.19]
Hospital (3)	-0.69 (0.78)	.372	0.50	[0.11, 2.30]	1.05 (0.73)	.149	2.86	[0.69, 11.93]
Hospital (4)	1.28 (0.93)	.172	3.58	[0.57, 22.33]	1.05 (0.69)	.129	2.86	[0.74, 11.15]
Age	0.01 (0.03)	.628	1.01	[0.96, 1.06]	-0.04 (0.02)	.060	0.96	[0.92, 1.00]
Gender (woman)	0.34 (0.87)	.699	1.40	[0.25, 7.79]	-0.28 (0.60)	.640	0.76	[0.24, 2.44]

SM Table J.
Victimization - Individual Model 2: Negative Binomial Hurdle Model

	Logit Model: Victimized by Coercive Bullying or Not				Negative Binomial Model: Rate of Coercive Bullying Victimization			
Variable	*b* (*SE*)	*p*	OR	OR 95% CI	*b* (*SE*)	*p*	IRR	IRR 95% CI
Intercept	0.30 (0.89)	.735			2.86 (0.79)	< .001		
Hospital (2)	0.36 (0.96)	.706	1.43	[0.22, 9.33]	0.17 (0.78)	.830	1.18	[0.26, 5.40]
Hospital (3)	-1.28 (0.88)	.146	0.28	[0.05, 1.56]	0.47 (0.81)	.560	1.61	[0.33, 7.92]
Hospital (4)	0.94 (1.00)	.348	2.56	[0.36, 18.27]	0.58 (0.77)	.453	1.78	[0.40, 7.99]
Neurocog/develop diagnosis	-0.94 (0.72)	.190	0.39	[0.10, 1.59]	-0.30 (0.63)	.633	0.74	[0.21, 2.55]
Medical diagnosis	-0.32 (0.56)	.567	0.73	[0.24, 2.17]	0.42 (0.44)	.349	1.52	[0.63, 3.62]
Positive Symptom Total (BSI)	**0.07 (0.03)**	**< .01**	**1.07**	**[1.02, 1.13]**	-0.02 (0.02)	.234	0.98	[0.95, 1.01]

Notes. Neurocog/develop = neurocognitive/developmental disorder.
BSI = Brief Symptom Inventory (Derogatis, 1993).

Note. Tables were originally presented in Healey (2023).

SM Table K.
Victimization - Individual Model 3: Negative Binomial Hurdle Model

	Logit Model: Victimized by Coercive Bullying or Not				Negative Binomial Model: Rate of Coercive Bullying Victimization			
Variable	*b* (*SE*)	*p*	OR	OR 95% CI	*b* (*SE*)	*p*	IRR	IRR 95% CI
Intercept	0.77 (0.70)	.265			1.97 (0.68)	< .01		
Hospital (2)	0.81 (0.89)	.363	2.26	[0.39, 13.02]	0.76 (0.78)	.328	2.15	[0.46, 9.91]
Hospital (3)	-0.52 (0.79)	.509	0.59	[0.13, 2.79]	1.12 (0.76)	.138	3.07	[0.70, 13.48]
Hospital (4)	1.29 (0.92)	.163	3.63	[0.59, 22.15]	1.13 (0.71)	.110	3.11	[0.77, 12.49]
Months as inpatient	-0.003 (0.004)	.370	1.00	[0.99, 1.00]	-0.01 (0.005)	.136	0.99	[0.98, 1.00]

Note. Tables were originally presented in Healey (2023).

Supplemental Material 9 - Multivariate Models – Victimization and Environmental-Level Factors (Models 1-3)

SM Table L.
Victimization - Environmental Model 1: Negative Binomial Hurdle Model

	Logit Model: Victimized by Coercive Bullying or Not				Negative Binomial Model: Rate of Coercive Bullying Victimization			
Variable	*b* (*SE*)	*p*	OR	OR 95% CI	*b* (*SE*)	*p*	IRR	IRR 95% CI
Intercept	0.89 (0.75)	.235			2.26 (0.71)	< .01		
Hospital (2)	0.70 (0.89)	.429	2.01	[0.36, 11.42]	0.39 (0.75)	.608	1.47	[0.34, 6.45]
Hospital (3)	-0.68 (0.78)	.383	0.51	[0.11, 2.34]	0.86 (0.75)	.251	2.36	[0.54, 10.25]
Hospital (4)	1.26 (0.93)	.176	3.51	[0. 57, 21.67]	1.00 (0.72)	.166	2.71	[0.66, 11.12]
Money spent weekly	-0.0004 (0.003)	.874	1.00	[0.99, 1.01]	-0.0002 (0.004)	.966	1.00	[0.99, 1.01]

SM Table M.
Victimization – Environmental Model 2: Negative Binomial Hurdle Model

	Logit Model: Victimized by Coercive Bullying or Not				Negative Binomial Model: Rate of Coercive Bullying Victimization			
Variable	*b* (*SE*)	*p*	OR	OR 95% CI	*b* (*SE*)	*p*	IRR	IRR 95% CI
Intercept	1.13 (0.89)	.207			0.87 (0.81)	.281		
Hospital (2)	0.69 (0.88)	.435	2.00	[0.35, 11.28]	0.64 (0.71)	.366	1.89	[0.47, 7.56]
Hospital (3)	-0.77 (0.81)	.336	0.46	[0.09, 2.24]	1.18 (0.72)	.103	3.24	[0.79, 13.32]
Hospital (4)	1.30 (0.92)	.159	3.68	[0.60, 22.48]	0.95 (0.67)	.155	2.59	[0.70, 9.63]
Unescorted hospital/grounds passes	-0.31 (0.62)	.620	0.74	[0.22, 2.48]	**1.51 (0.54)**	**< .01**	**4.53**	**[1.58, 12.95]**

Note. Original model in Healey (2023) also included unescorted community passes, but given the conceptual overlap with hospital/grounds passes and to preserve length in the manuscript, it was left out of the current study.

Note. Tables were originally presented in Healey (2023).

SM Table N.
Victimization – Environmental Model 3: Negative Binomial Hurdle Model

	Logit Model: Victimized by Coercive Bullying or Not				Negative Binomial Model: Rate of Coercive Bullying Victimization			
Variable	*b* (*SE*)	*p*	OR	OR 95% CI	*b* (*SE*)	*p*	IRR	IRR 95% CI
Intercept	0.51 (0.78)	.509			2.50 (0.72)	< .001		
Hospital (2)	0.69 (0.89)	.434	2.00	[0.35, 11.34]	0.50 (0.75)	.503	1.65	[0.38, 7.19]
Hospital (3)	-0.78 (0.79)	.322	0.46	[0.10, 2.14]	0.84 (0.77)	.281	2.31	[0.51, 10.51]
Hospital (4)	1.23 (0.93)	.185	3.42	[0.56, 20.97]	1.04 (0.72)	.152	2.82	[0.68, 11.64]
Number of visits	0.05 (0.08)	.509	1.05	[0.90, 1.22]	0.01 (0.09)	.915	1.01	[0.85, 1.20]
Number of structured activities	0.08 (0.10)	.416	1.09	[0.89, 1.33]	-0.08 (0.09)	.378	0.92	[0.77, 1.11]

Note. Tables were originally presented in Healey (2023).

References

Chen, H., Cohen, P., & Chen, S. (2010). How big is a big odds ratio? Interpreting the magnitudes of odds ratios in epidemiological studies. *Communications in Statistics - Simulation and Computation, 39(*4), 860–864. https://doi.org/10.1080/03610911003650383

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Field, A. (2009). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics* (3th ed.). Sage Publications Ltd.

Fleiss, J. L. (1994). Measures of effect size for categorical data. In H. Cooper & L. V. Hedges (Eds.), *The handbook of research synthesis* (pp. 245–260). Russell Sage Foundation.

Kim, H-Y. (2017). Statistical notes for clinical researchers: Chi-squared test and Fisher's exact test. *Restorative Dentistry & Endodontics, 42*(2), 152-155. https://doi.org/10.5395/rde.2017.42.2.152