CENTRE FOR CRIMINOLOGY
FACULTY OF LAW

St Cross Building, St Cross Road, Oxford OX1 3UI
Tel: +44(0)1865 274444
[redacted]

Staff Culture in IRC Brook House: A briefing paper

[redacted]
University of Oxford

Overview

Over a six-week period in May and June 2019, as part of a larger project on staff culture, I shadowed and spoke informally to over 35 officers at IRC Brook House of whom I formally interviewed 12. This qualitative data fed into the design of a new measure of staff quality of life in detention (SQLD) (see Appendix). In this briefing paper I will report on the main findings from the qualitative research period in Brook House. I hope to administer the survey to staff in Brook House shortly and will produce another report based on those findings.

Key issues

Over the six-week period in Brook House I shadowed staff across a number of different parts of the Centre, including: all but one of the housing units (which was closed for refurbishment), paid and unpaid activities, security and welfare. Over a relatively short period, I spoke formally and informally to over 35 officers. An additional day of research was completed by my research assistant, Mr Dominic Aitken, who had previously spent a month conducting research in Brook House into issues of safer custody.

The research identified a number of key issues:

- The enduring impact of the BBC Panorama programme on staff morale
- A changing (young, and relatively inexperienced) work force
- Broad satisfaction about changes to shift-work patterns, staffing numbers and management, albeit with some exceptions
- Enduring concerns about managing vulnerable detainees
- Some dissatisfaction with career development and processes of staff recognition, including a lack of mentorship and clear promotion opportunities
- Individual, highly motivated staff but also significant evidence of staff vulnerability and burn out
- The impact of gender, particularly masculinity, on staff culture and cohesion

Nearly all staff mentioned the BBC Panorama programme in their formal and informal conversations with me. While some claimed that the footage was exaggerated or even doctored, many expressed shame and regret about working in an institution in which this footage had been recorded. For some officers the television programme clearly galvanised them. These officers sought to maintain a clean, safe, and orderly environment. They perceived the SMT to be more engaged and supported their attempt to change work culture and practices. Others, however, were disheartened or cynical. These staff members tended to be more critical of the SMT and alleged that management favoured certain staff over others. Still others were simply rather disengaged. They tended not to accord much significance either to Panorama or to the investigations, but were more concerned with finding nitty gritty personal matters about their job.

Conclusion

Although as will be reported in more detail below, data from conversations, interviews and observations suggest that officers in IRC Brook House in May and June 2019 were still working in the shadow of the Panorama expose, many of the issues raised were familiar ones in common with other staff at other IRC. As such, solutions to problems identified are also familiar and range from greater support for staff in managing the emotional strain of their work to more transparency and better communication of decision-making by management. Perhaps reflecting the relative youth of staff, officers were concerned about career progression and training. There seems like there could be an opportunity, with the right investment, to develop staff in Brook House and thereby consolidate the shifts in staff culture that have begun.

Discussion

The research I conducted in Brook House was part of a longer and ongoing project on staff culture. The findings I report here resonate with work I have conducted with staff elsewhere and contribute to a growing body of evidence about the importance of staff culture in understanding the nature and purpose of immigration removal centres. This material will be further explored via a survey on 'staff quality of life', a draft of which (not for circulation or citing) appears in the Appendix to this briefing paper.

Morale

Staff morale was, overall, quite positive and contrasted to earlier periods of research I have conducted in Brook House. On the days I was present, staff seemed to be largely motivated by and energetic about their role. They were quick to contrast it with previous periods of work at Brook House, and were particularly pleased with the recent changes to shift patterns. At the same time, however, it was evident that trust levels remained low both in terms of immediate peers and, particularly in regards to those in positions of seniority.

As is often the case in IRCs, staff felt scrutinised from above. Perhaps rather less common, they also expressed concern about trust among their peer group, and below. Much of this was explained in terms of Panorama; with officers newly sensitive to the potential for reporting inappropriate actions and speech. Unfortunately, it suggests that the reasons for whistleblowing and the circumstances in which it would be necessary may be poorly understood.

Opinions varied about strategic planning by the SMT, although there was some support for the changes that were underway. Similarly, morale varied based on the personal experience of officers in terms of their career progression. I spoke to quite a few staff who had been promoted quickly; they tended to be more positive than their colleagues who had worked in the centre for longer and who remained in the DCO role.

Everyone was very keen to distance themselves from the findings of the various recent investigations into Brook House. Staff were particularly keenly aware of the Panorama expose. Many felt personally impugned by the representation of staffing practices evident in that program, and felt that, along with other examples, unfairly shaped views of Brook House staff.

Some, simply noted that it was difficult to work with this reputation.

"*It's horrible only hearing bad things about what we do. It really affects how you feel about yourself*," one manager reported.

Others, however, blamed the company's response to the programme.

"If we look at us as an organisation, we always focus on the negative. We never focus on the positive. We never focus on the really good pieces of work we do. And that filters out."

A changing work-force

Staff mentioned the changing work-force many times. There was fairly widespread concern about the numbers and inexperience of new recruits and the difficulties the company was facing retaining new staff. Those in the job, wondered why the company was finding it so difficult to identify who was suited to it. Some suggested that new recruits should be invited into the IRC before they took up the place on the ITC in order to check whether they could imagine working in that environment. While many people believed that officers need some 'life experience' in order to cope with the demands of their job, not everyone agreed. Some pointed out either that they themselves had begun work at Brook House when they were young, or that other qualities were more important than age, above all, an open mind and an ability to talk to anyone.

It became clear that a number of officers were not just concerned about the lack of experience of new recruits, but were frustrated with what they perceived as too much institutional effort that was being expended on hiring, rather than on working with those who had been in post for some time. This concern arose in discussions about pay: when officers pointed out that new recruits earned the same as those who had been in post for many years. It was also evident in discussions about morale.

"It's very easy to get someone new, isn't it?", one manager observed. *"It's very easy to do a recruitment day and get someone new. But actually, my argument is, don't focus on the new; focus on the staff you've got…. focus on them, as opposed to getting just new people in."*

Recruitment strategies exacerbated feelings among some officers that their work was unrecognised. A number of staff claimed that they were just "*numbers*". Not only did officers of all grades claim that their particular strengths and contributions were of no concern to the company, but also that they would be easily replaceable. This view, unsurprisingly, adversely affected their morale.

"*My personal opinion would be, if I left tomorrow, it would make no odds to them. It would just be inconvenient for a few months while they, while they got someone else on board. We are just numbers at the end of the day*."

Staffing, shift patterns and senior management

Everyone, other than ACOs, was extremely positive about the new shift pattern. They all said it had made a huge difference not only to their working life, but also to their personal life. ACOs, whom I did not have time to formally interview but who I spoke to informally on many occasions, resented their exclusion from the new contract and did not understand the reasoning behind it.

There was less uniformity in views about staffing levels or about the nature and engagement of senior management. Whereas some officers believed that current levels of staff were much higher than they had been previously, others alleged that the staffing levels were partly an artefact of paperwork; claiming that in practice people were commonly

redeployed to other areas in the centres as needed. Strains were still felt when there were large numbers of detainees on constant watch, but also during particular times of the day, eg over lunch on the housing units.

Similarly, staff had competing views about senior management, both in terms of their vision for the centre and in terms of their visibility around the centre. While most agreed that they saw a member of the SMT in the morning, when they did their rounds, few had much interaction with them otherwise. As in all IRCs, in other words, there was quite a considerable gap between the SMT and uniformed staff.

"*It kinda just feels like the only time [management] ever speak to us is when they're gonna scrutinise. They're unaware about how busy we actually are. So then whenever they do walk through it'll be the five minutes we've got to sit and have a cup of tea and that's it, all hell breaks loose. It's all our fault, we've not done anything, look busy, do this, do that and the rest of it, which is massively frustrating..."* (DCO)

Finally, I asked staff about whether they socialised outside of work with people from Brook House. Answers varied, with some claiming never to do so, and others referring to shared holidays. Everyone was very positive about the decision to restart football matches with Tinsley House, as they saw that event as a good morale boost. Managers were anxious about socialising with DCOs, worried about hearing inappropriate comments or behaviour.

Managing vulnerable detainees

As ever, staff raised concerns about suicide and self-harm among the detained population. They often referred to the negative personal impact of witnessing such behaviour. While everyone agreed that incidents were down at Brook House, they were quick to point out that the low numbers of detainees made matters easier to manage. "*What will happen when we go back up?"* they wondered.

Most agreed that "*it's very draining*". Yet some found that working with vulnerable people had had some unintended benefits. "*It's definitely changed me*", one DCO said. "*It's helped me to understand X better, outside, who has mental health problems*."

Those who had personally had to manage incidents expressed concerns about the lack of support mechanisms in place. While they said that senior colleagues checked on them in the immediate aftermath, they pointed out that often they had struggled some time later.

Only a few more senior staff mentioned the 'adults at risk' policy. It was unclear whether or how this policy and its requirements were affecting people's daily work.

Career development and processes of staff recognition

I asked officers about their plans for the future at Brook House and with the company. Very few people were aware of other jobs within G4S. Fewer still were in a position to apply to work elsewhere in the company due to family obligations nearby.

While some DCOs hoped to become managers eventually, some expressed reservations about the additional responsibilities that would come with that new role. Few of those whom I spoke to who were already in a manager role believed they would rise to the senior management level. The gap between DCM and SMT was considered significant; this left staff unsure how to plan their career.

Some of the officers I spoke to were actively looking for other jobs, whereas others were more passively hoping eventually for a career in the police or some other enforcement sector. Most lived locally and so were not wanting to go far.

A number of staff raised concerns about processes of recognition. Generally, they felt quite demoralised, and believed that they were expendable for the company. This view was evidence across all the levels of seniority.

I asked everyone if they had a mentor or a particular member of staff who assisted them and on whom they could rely. This question surprised most people and, although some staff believed they acted as sounding boards for others, nobody reported having a mentor. This would be something that would be relatively easy to implement.

Staff motivation and vulnerabilities

Many of the officers I interviewed were highly motivated by their work. Common themes in our discussions concerned their enjoyment of problem-solving and team-work. Overall, I think I spoke to a disproportionate number of custody managers, many of whom had been promoted rapidly. These individuals were proud of their work and often saw themselves as vanguards of the new, post-Panorama staff culture and practice.

Others, particularly those who had not benefited from rapid promotion, or who had not put themselves forward for this, were likely to be more critical of these kinds of colleagues. It was not possible to gauge the impact of this kind of attitude on the ability of the managers to work effectively. Still others appeared to be disengaged altogether. '*I think it could be different but I can't make any changes. I just work here*,' one officer from a management grade told me.

All of the detention custody managers complained about their heavy workload. Some were unsure whether it was sufficiently balanced out (or justified) by their additional salary. It was common to hear them complain about rules governing overtime, which, they told me, meant they might be paid less than someone entirely new in post.

In my observations, it seemed that the paperwork responsibilities of the managers kept them in their offices, away from the landings and the detainees. Managers also told me that they rarely socialised with DCOs, due to fears about witnessing inappropriate behaviour outside work.

Irrespective of their grade, officers disclosed to me a number of quite worrying personal problems, most of which were either directly caused by working in Brook House or had been exacerbated by it. When I inquired about whether they had sought out or been

offered some kind of counselling or support at work, they all mentioned a service available over the phone. Nobody, however, had taken up this offer.

A number of officers spoke about the impact of their job on their family life. Some of those who were separated from their partners believed that the long shifts and demanding nature of their work had negatively affected their outside relationships. People commonly believed they were not meant to discuss work matters outside, even with their family members.

Trauma informed research suggests that staff well-being is crucial to a safe and decent establishment. The survey will try to gauge in more detail the issues officers face.

Gender and staff culture

Staff spoke formally and informally about gender in a variety of ways, paying particular attention to matters of masculinity. While there was a sense that earlier views and practices were being challenged post-Panorama -- "*Before it used to be a very much that boys' club and, you know, young guys who they were very pumped up on steroids*" one officer told remarked -- they had not all disappeared. "*I think sometimes there's a bit of a bravado goes on, a bit of false bravado. Some of the younger guys over the years, not so much now, maybe a little bit*."

While most of the officers insisted that gender made little difference to their work practice, some believed that women staff were better placed at calming down some of the detainees; i.e. that men responded differently to a woman. Male staff suggested that women could not be used for C&R to the same extent as men, while female officers sometimes expressed frustration that they had been sidelined from that kind of work.

When speaking about male officers some staff (women and men) suggested that male 'bravado' placed men at a disadvantage in managing incidents, as they were less likely to be able to 'talk through' their feelings. One officer referred rather bitterly to the previous emphasis on 'macho' culture, and claimed those who had rejected it, had been vilified. Such observations suggest that to minimise the dangers posed by aggressive masculinity in an institution like Brook House would be to try to encourage more open discussion among staff about their experiences and emotions. This view would be in line with 'trauma informed' practice, currently in use across the female and high security prison estate.

Conclusions

Staff are crucial to the good order and operating of any custodial institution. Yet, officers often feel overlooked and under-appreciated. In my observations, I saw officers following procedures, but not necessarily engaging with detainees otherwise. Staff still seemed, to me, to spend quite a lot of time in their offices.

Partly their ability to engage meaningfully with detainees is circumscribed by the pressures on their time. Notwithstanding changes in staffing rates, there are few officers on housing units per detainees. Officers are frequently called away for other duties, particularly related to ACDTs, but also for other issues.

It is also difficult to interact with people who are highly distressed and with whom there are language barriers etc. However, those centres where staff engagement is higher, tend to have less distressed detainee populations, and so a balance needs to be struck.

Finally, evidence from elsewhere suggests that workers who feel valued in any organisation will be more committed to it. To that end, the kinds of issues raised by staff about career progression, more individualised support (ie mentoring), and better communication across the staff complement and recognition are all significant. Until such matters can be address, it seems likely that this career path will remain one of convenience or happenstance, rather than one of aspiration. As one officer put it to me, when I asked if he would be happy for his children to work in Brook House: *"I hope my kids do better than I done. I wish better for them, as such. You see I want them going to college to get degrees and… to do better than myself".* What would it take to change that view?

APPENDIX

CENTRE FOR
CRIMINOLOGY
FACULTY OF LAW

St Cross Building, St Cross Road, Oxford
OX1 3UL Tel: +44(0)1865 274444/8 Fax:
+44(0)1865 281924 ccr@crim.ox.ac.uk
[redacted]



Measure of the Staff Quality of Life in Detention (SQLD) [Draft survey, not for citing or circulation, comments welcome, please email: [redacted]

Staff Survey questionnaire

About the survey:

This survey is being carried out to better understand what it is like to work in this Immigration Removal Centre.

Responses will be kept in strict confidence. There is no need to write your name on this survey, although if you are happy to be contacted for future research you will have an opportunity to include an email for contact.

PART 1 asks for some background information.

PART 2 asks about the quality of your working life in this removal centre.

PART 3 asks you about how you are coping with you work and to list the most satisfying and most stressful things about working in this removal centre. It provides room for you to write some general comments.

Part 1

These first set of questions help us understand who is filling out the survey.
The researchers will not identify you in any reports, and the survey data will never be shared with anyone outside the research team and transcriber in raw format where an individual could be identified.

1. Where do you work in this Centre? ……

2. What is your current job/grade?

☐ DCO ☐ ACO

☐ SMT ☐ Manager

☐ Education ☐ Chaplaincy

☐ Administration ☐ Health Care

☐ Other (write in) ……..

3. What is your gender?

☐ Male ☐ Female ☐ Transgender

☐ Other ☐ Prefer not to say

4. What is your religion?

☐ No religion ☐ Jewish

☐ Christian ☐ Muslim

☐ Buddhist ☐ Sikh

☐ Hindu ☐ Other (write in) ……..

5. What is your ethnic group?

White

☐ English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish/British

☐ Irish

☐ Gypsy or Irish Traveller

☐ Any other white background ……

Mixed/Multiple ethnic groups

☐ White and Black Caribbean

☐ White and Black African

☐ White and Asian

☐ Any other Mixed/Multiple Ethnic background ……..

Asian/Asian British

☐ Indian

☐ Pakistani

☐ Bangladeshi

☐ Any other Asian background

……..

Black/African/Caribbean/Black British

☐ African

☐ Caribbean

☐ Any other Black/African/Caribbean/Black British Background ……..

Other Ethnic group

☐ Arab

☐ Any other ethnic group

……..

6. How old are you? ……

7. What is your marital status?

☐ Single ☐ Married/Civil partnership

☐ In relationship (but not married/civil partnership)

☐ Divorced/ Separated ☐ Widowed

8. To what extent does your job involve contact with detainees?

☐ Most of the time ☐ Some of the time

☐ Very little of the time ☐ None of the time

9. What is the highest level of education you have completed?

☐ Did not complete high school

☐ Completed high school (GCSE, O Level or equivalent)

☐ Completed Sixth Form (A Level or equivalent)

☐ Completed University (undergraduate degree eg BA, BSc)

☐ Completed Further Education (beyond undergraduate level)

……...

10. What languages do you speak other than English (please list all)

.....
.....

PART 2

Now we would like to know about the quality of your working life in THIS detention centre.

Please read each statement carefully and tick the option that best describes how you feel. Only tick ONE (1) answer for each statement.

These questions are about staff relationships in this removal centre:

	Always	**Most of the time**	**Sometimes**	**Never**	**Don't know/not applicable**
1. I get along well with my colleagues in this removal centre	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. I am supported in my job by my line manager	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. Staff socialise outside work	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. Senior Managers are approachable when I need to discuss an issue with them	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. I often see Senior Managers around this removal centre	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. I get along well with the immigration staff at this removal centre	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7. Staff from different ethnic backgrounds get along well in this centre	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
8. The Centre Manager supports staff in dealing with detainees	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
9. I trust the Senior Management Team in this removal centre	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
10. I trust my line manager in this removal centre	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

These questions are about your career:

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know/not applicable
11. I feel as though I have had the right training to do my job well in this removal centre	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
12. I am given opportunities to use my initiative in this removal centre	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
13. Anyone could do my job	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
14. I would like to be more involved in helping detainees prepare for release	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
15. I have confidence in the system of performance measurement used in this removal centre	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
16. I would recommend working in this removal centre to friends and family members	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
17. I know what I need to do to get promoted in this removal centre	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
18. I feel dissatisfied with the opportunities I have for learning and development in this removal centre	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
19. I have the right amount of responsibility in my job at this removal centre	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

20. I am actively looking for another job, outside this removal centre	Yes ☐	No ☐

These questions are about communication in this removal centre:

	Always	Most of the time	Sometimes	Never	Don't know/not applicable
21. Communication between staff and management is good in this removal centre	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
22. I am kept well informed of what is going on around the removal centre	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
23. I feel involved in the decision-making processes in this removal centre	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
24. I understand the purpose of my job	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
25. I am asked for my opinion on how to best do my job	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know/ Not applicable
26. I know who to contact if there is a detainee I am concerned about	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
27. I have someone at work I can talk to if I am struggling with an aspect of my job	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
28. My opinions matter to senior management	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
29. I know what to do if I witness a colleague acting inappropriately	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
30. I would be comfortable reporting a colleague acting inappropriately to senior management	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

These questions are about your work with detainees here:

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know/not applicable
31. I want to help detainees resolve their problems	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
32. I do not trust most of the detainees here	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
33. Officers and detainees get along well here	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
34. Most detainees are good people	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
35. My job is to support the Home Office to remove as many detainees as possible	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
36. Detainees are safe in this removal centre	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
37. It is a waste of time trying to help some detainees	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
38. The most satisfying jobs here involve detainee contact	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
39. Illegal drugs cause problems between detainees here	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
40. Detainees have too much power in this centre.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

These questions are about your safety in the centre

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know/not applicable
41. My colleagues here make me feel safe	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
42. I feel safe around detainees	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
43. I feel safe in my office	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
44. I feel safe in residential corridors here	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
45. I feel safe in detainee bedrooms	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
46. I feel safe in the residential dining room(s)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
47. I feel safe in the gym/sports hall	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

48. Are there any other spaces where you do not feel safe? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Where? (please write):
……
……
……
……
……

These questions are about staff morale:	Always	Most of the time	Sometimes	Never	Don't know/not applicable
49. I look forward to coming to work each day	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
50. Some staff get away with 'coasting' in this removal centre	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
51. I am proud of the work I do in this removal centre	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

52. Staff morale is good at this removal centre	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
53. Extra effort goes unrecognised in this removal centre	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
54.The stress levels of my job are reasonable	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
55. My job pressures interfere with my family or personal life	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
56. The amount of work I am expected to do in this job is fair	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
57. I am praised for my work when I do it well	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
58. The benefits of this job outweigh any negatives	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Is there anything about your job that you find especially stressful?

……

……

……

Overall, how would you rate the quality of your working life <u>in this removal centre</u>? (where 1 = lowest and 10 = highest)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Overall, how would you rate your current level of work-related stress? (where 1= lowest and 10 = highest)

[Stress may be defined as feelings of emotional strain, pressure, discomfort, anger, uneasiness and/or tension]

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

What are the 3 <u>most satisfying</u> things for you about working in this removal centre?

1……

2……

3……

What are the 3 <u>least satisfying</u> things for you about working in this removal centre?

1……

2……

3……

Part 3

This final set of questions concern how you are coping with your working life in THIS removal centre:

In the past week, how often have you felt each of the statements below?

		Never	Some of the time	Most of the time	All the time
a.	I feel low in energy, slowed down	☐	☐	☐	☐
b.	I still enjoy the things I used to enjoy	☐	☐	☐	☐
c.	I can laugh and see the funny side of things	☐	☐	☐	☐
d.	I feel restless	☐	☐	☐	☐
e.	I have difficulty falling asleep	☐	☐	☐	☐
f.	I wake up a lot during the night	☐	☐	☐	☐
g.	I have thoughts of ending my life	☐	☐	☐	☐
h.	I am crying easier than I used to	☐	☐	☐	☐
i.	I feel everything is an effort	☐	☐	☐	☐
j.	I get sudden feelings of panic	☐	☐	☐	☐
k.	I have bad dreams	☐	☐	☐	☐
l.	I feel as hungry as I always have	☐	☐	☐	☐
m.	I care about my appearance	☐	☐	☐	☐
n.	I feel happy	☐	☐	☐	☐
o.	I have thoughts of hurting myself	☐	☐	☐	☐
p.	I feel lonely	☐	☐	☐	☐

Finally, if you have any further comments about the quality of your working life in this removal centre, please tell us about them here:

……
……
……
……
……
……
……
……
……
……
……
……
……
……
……
……
……
……

Thank you very much for participating in this survey