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ABSTRACT

The purpose of the present study was to explore the effects inclusion-exclusion on the job-related attitudes of the organizational workforce. These attitudes included job satisfaction, organizational commitment, burnout, and turnover intention. A quantitative survey was conducted using a sample of employees of a social service organization in San Bernardino County. Participants include employees from all levels and program areas of the social service organization. Study data was collected through the use of a self-report questionnaire. Measures were used to explore commitment to the organization, diversity perception, job satisfaction, turnover intention and burnout, the dependent variables. Using SPSS software to analyze data, descriptive statistics, correlation, and Mann-Whitney U analysis were conducted. More than half of the survey participants, as presented in Table 1 (see Appendix D), identified as women (n=35, 85.4%) and five (12.2%) accounted for the participants that identified as men. Results showed that Inclusion was significantly related to all job related attitudes except burnout, gender and race. Results were consistent with the literature in that inclusion is related to positive work-related attitudes, but inconsistent in regards to its relation with gender and race.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION OF INCLUSION-EXCLUSION

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to introduce the concept of inclusion-exclusion in social service organizations and to provide an overview of diversity management within organizations. Inclusion-exclusion is defined as an employee’s perception of their ability to impact decision-making, their access to information and resources, and their level of involvement in work group processes (Mor Barak, 1998). The perceived level of inclusion in each of the criteria have been shown to affect job-related attitudes such as commitment to the organization and job satisfaction (Ensher, Grant-Vallone, & Donaldson, 2001; Foley, Hany-Yue, & Wong, 2005; Friendman & Holtom, 2002; Mor Barak, 2000b). This chapter will include the problem statement, purpose of the study, and significance of the project for social work practice.

Problem Statement

Traditionally, social service organizations have served diverse populations. The National Association of Social Workers (NASW) puts forward key social work ethical principles that include service, social justice, dignity and worth of the person, importance of human relationships, integrity, and competence. These ethical principles serve as a frame of reference for ethical practice but what they fail to address is the importance of human relationships
between colleagues and coworkers. It is important to understand that human relationships are critical in every context of a person’s life. Inclusion in the workplace is critical for employees to develop relationships with colleagues because it creates social support networks, and it also improves work-related attitudes that may otherwise be negative. Organizational leaders have the power and authority to foster and develop an inclusive workplace beyond merely providing a training on diversity. It is in the organization’s favor that employees are treated equally despite their differences to the mainstream group. It is equally critical that organizational leaders recognize the importance of diverse viewpoints within the workplace.

Organizational leaders should be expected to be able to manage diversity in a manner that is inclusionary of all individuals (Mor Barak, 2000). Administrative leaders are increasingly challenged by diversity within the workplace because they are not prepared for it. As ethnic minority populations increase in the United States, organizational demographics should reflect these changes. Thus, it is the responsibility of leaders in social service organizations to not only strive for a diverse workplace, but also create an environment that is inclusive. Diversity as defined by Grant & Kleiner (1997) includes age, sexual preferences, and disabilities but it may also include differences such as job function and management or non-management. On the other hand, Cox (2001) defines diversity as the “variation of social and cultural identities among people existing together in a defined employment or market setting” (p. 489). Social and
cultural identities may be anything a person identifies with that has had an impact on their lives as stated by Cox (2001). This study will use Cox’s (2001) definition of diversity as a basis for meaning. Diversity in the workplace has increased due in part to Affirmative Action Programs, Civil rights legislation from the 1960’s, Pregnancy Discrimination, Age Discrimination, and the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (Findler, Wind, & Mor Barak, 2007; Mor Barak & Cherin, 1998; Mor Barak, 2000). Policies such as the ones mentioned above have required organizations to hire minority groups but they have not addressed the informal obstacles for these groups (Vallas, 2003). However, exclusion of these individuals has been one of the most recognized problems they face as stated by Mor Barak (2000).

Mor Barak & Cherin (1998) report that, “the heterogeneous workforce is a reality that is here to stay” (p.48). In fact, the U.S. Census Bureau (2014) projects that by 2060 non-Hispanic Whites will comprise 69% of the population, people of Latino descent of all races will comprise 29% of the population (12% increase from 2015), African-Americans will account for 13% and Asians will account for 7% of the U.S. population. The changes in population demographics will likely be reflected in the changes in workforce demographics and according to Mor Barak (2000a), there is an urgency for social work to develop practice paradigms for more inclusive work environments.

To address perceptions of exclusion, organizations have used diversity training in the past, but according to Redia and Anderson (2010), it does not work
even though post-training evaluations prove that it was successful. The time it takes for an employee to revert back to previous attitudes and behaviors is about a week (Redia & Anderson, 2010). The impact of these trainings would have a greater influence if the leaders of the organization reinforced the training concepts, resources, and accountability (Redia & Anderson, 2010). This lack of reinforcement is an issue across organizations. In fact, many organizations that do offer diversity training may do it to check it off a list or only teach how to be politically correct and when budget cuts are needed many times, diversity trainings are the first to go (Redia & Anderson, 2010). It is safe to say that diversity training is progress but it simply is not enough.

Public and private sector organizations face the challenge of creating a work environment that is inclusive of all differences. As mentioned before, the issue of managing diversity by fostering inclusivity is congruent with social work principles. This is one of the reasons which makes this line of research important to the field. It is also critical to understand because perceptions of inclusion have been shown to affect job satisfaction, commitment to the organization, loyalty to the organization, and the worker’s mental health. All of these factors have an effect on effectiveness of services. It stands to reason that social work practice will benefit from a greater understanding of inclusion-exclusion and diversity management on a macro and micro level. It is of the researchers hope that this project will elucidate the meaning of diversity management for administrative
leaders and explore the effects of inclusion-exclusion on the organizational workforce outcomes (i.e., job related attitudes).

**Purpose of the Study**

In a qualitative study about inclusion-exclusion, Mor Barak (2015) found that the most common word used by the interviewees was *exclusion*. One particularly notable finding of this study was that the interviewees repeating this word were women and individuals of different ethnic backgrounds and what they felt was exclusion from the mainstream culture within their organization.

The “inclusive workplace” is a concept developed by Mor Barak (2000a). Mor Barak & Cherin (1998) conceptualize inclusion-exclusion as: “The worker’s perception of their ability to influence decision making, their level of access to information and resources, and their level of involvement in work group processes” (p. 53). The factors affecting inclusion that are noted by Mor Barak & Cherin (1998) are critical and beneficial for an organization’s workforce to succeed in the agency’s goals. Previous research findings validate inclusion-exclusion as predictors of work-related attitudes such as organizational commitment and job satisfaction (Ensher, Grant-Vallone, & Donaldson, 2001; Foley, Hany-Yue, & Wong, 2005; Friendman & Holtom, 2002; Mor Barak, 2000b). Although more research is needed to truly understand inclusion, what we do know is that it is a factor that must be considered by leaders within an organization because exclusion from circles of influence creates a problem for the excluded and on a larger scale, the organization itself. Exclusion keeps
employees from reaching their potential of contributing and benefiting from being involved in the workplace (Mor Barak, 2015). This claim is supported in Vallas’ (2003) study which found that minority groups had a much harder time developing skill and expertise when they were not part of the dominant group because they did not have social support or informal allies. In turn, exclusion from the dominant group became an obstacle for developing skills needed to meet organizational demands.

Shore, et al. (2011) conceptualize inclusion by including belongingness and uniqueness. According to Optimal Distinctiveness Theory, employee’s needs of belongingness and uniqueness have to be met in order to feel included. To feel included the unique characteristic of an employee must be valued within a group, more importantly though this uniqueness the person brings to the group must be allowed and encouraged to remain (Shore, et al., 2011). On the other hand, without both of these (belongingness and uniqueness) the employee is not a part of the work group therefore are not treated as an insider.

This research study aimed to measure how inclusion-exclusion affects job satisfaction, commitment to the organization, and burnout. The operationalization of Inclusion-exclusion is based on three components: worker’s perception to influence decision-making, level of access to information and resources, and their level of involvement in work group processes. The participants of the study completed a quantitative measure in order to assess their perception of inclusion-exclusion. The measure was used to identify correlations between inclusion-
exclusion and the job-related attitudes mentioned previously. Participants were social service organization employees.

**Significance of the Project for Social Work Practice**

There is limited research on the topic of diversity management in the workplace, particularly in social service organizations (Berka, 2014). Organizational leaders benefit from understanding inclusion-exclusion by becoming more aware of the value of diversity in the workplace, how to manage it, the effects inclusion-exclusion has on the attitudes of the employee and how these attitudes influence the effectiveness of services. It is human nature to seek acceptance, therefore it is important to understand the perceptions of inclusion in the workplace in order to encourage administrators to create better policies for diversity management instead of using the “one-size-fits-all” approach (Mor Barak & Cherin, 1998). Effective diversity management attracts highly qualified personnel, strengthens problem-solving (Cox, 2001), and reduces turnover rates as well as absenteeism (Cox & Blake, 1991). Less than half of human service non-profit organizations have a formal strategy for workforce diversity, yet 70% of employees surveyed believe their employer does not do enough to create an inclusive workplace (HR solutions, 2013). It stands to reason, that many social service organization administrators may not see the significance in a workforce diversity strategy. It may be they do not see the value in having a diversity strategy or they find that a training on diversity is sufficient but if they fail to see it, their employees will continue to feel excluded.
This study aims to expand our understanding of inclusion-exclusion in social service organizations. Specifically, this study explores how the concept of inclusion-exclusion affects an employee’s job satisfaction, commitment to the organization, and burnout.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

This literature review is an overview of the concept of inclusion-exclusion in social service organizations. Specifically, this chapter defines diversity training, explores the research on such trainings, effects of inclusion-exclusion on employees, and theories guiding conceptualization.

Diversity Training

Diversity trainings such as sexual harassment, valuing differences and diversity management (offering mentoring, coaching, family/employee friendly policies, alternative work arrangements) are provided by organizations (Sabharwal, 2014). These efforts have not helped employees reach their full potential (Mor Barak, 2000b). In order for employees to contribute to the organization and reach their full potential, Sabharwal (2014) suggests that strategies must be developed by the leader of the organization. One of the ways to allow employees to contribute to the organization is by eliminating systemic barriers and creating avenues for employees to make a contribution (Sabharwal, 2014). The challenge for organizations in the U.S. is to “assimilate a more diverse labor force into high-status, high-skilled management roles” (Morrison & Glinow, 1990, p. 200). By eliminating these barriers and creating avenues, employees that do not identify with the dominant culture, have the opportunity to
break through the “glass ceiling,” a term that describes the effect of solely providing diversity trainings and accounts for the discrepancy between dominant culture employees and non-dominant culture employees in management positions (Christo-Baker, et al., 2012). Sabharwal’s (2014) stipulates that two things need to accompany diversity management in order to create an inclusive workplace. The first is investment in and value of diversity and secondly, the empowerment of employees to make decisions. In valuing diversity, the organizational leader considers several perspectives in the decision-making process which, in turn, can be empowering to an employee who, otherwise, might not be included in the process.

Mor Barak (2000a) reports the difference between an exclusive and inclusive workplace using a value-based model. In brief, an inclusive workplace is characterized by an organizational culture that is constantly adapting, and embraces pluralism and factors that are associated with the community (Mor Barak, 2000a). In exclusive workplaces, paradigm shifts within the organization are rare and may be focused on nationalistic values and norms (Mor Barak, 2000a). Consequently, a nationalistic focus excludes groups and individuals who do not identify with the mainstream culture because it does not foster understanding and a value of differences. On the other hand, and inclusive workplace uses two-way communication methods. For example, instead of making the employee aware of expectations during orientation, organizational leaders are open to employee expectations and concerns (Mor Barak, 2000a).
Therefore, in order for an organization to be inclusive, organizational leaders must do more than introduce organizational values, they must also adapt and assimilate to the values of their employees (Mor Barak, 2000a).

**Effects of Inclusion-Exclusion**

Many studies have gone in detail describing the issues organizations face and describe what inclusive organizations are characterized by, however, there has not been much research on how all of these factors affect employees, particularly in the public sector. Sabharwal (2014) identifies this gap in the literature by stating that “the lack of consensus on the impact of diversity and diversity management on performance is one of the reasons why inclusion has promise as an area of study…” (p. 202). This statement justifies the reason for conducting the current study. It has been validated by findings in previous research studies that inclusion is important, the impact of it are explored in this study amongst employees of a non-profit social service organization.

Sommer, Bae, & Luthans (1996) reported that those who had greater support felt more committed and DeCotiis and Summers (1987) indicated that level of commitment was positively related to participative decision making and access to communication and feedback. Similarly, Lawler's (1994, 1995) study indicated that the higher the employee’s perception is of being accepted by the organization, the greater the degree of satisfaction and higher level of commitment to the organization. Therefore, it can be theorized that employees that feel included are more likely to have higher level of commitment to the
organization and it increases productivity. Therefore, based on this research, it can be theorized that a higher perception of inclusion is related to more positive job-related attitudes and an increase in productivity as well as effectiveness.

In order to develop a cultural and conceptual understanding of diversity in the workplace, Cho & Mor Barak (2008) suggest studying it in countries other than the United States. In fact, Cho & Mor Barak (2008) studied diversity within the Korean cultural context which is perceived by outsiders as a homogeneous culture. The study focused on Korean culture and the perceptions of women in the workplace because they are accustomed to working shorter hours in order to be full-time caregivers (Cho & Mor Barak, 2008). The same study reported that prejudices in Korea’s politics as well as educational favoritisms is reflected in the corporate setting. Korean employees are favored within an organization based on the school the employee went to. The study further indicated that although diversity is different from one culture to another, the perception of inclusion-exclusion is affected by being part of the majority or minority in organizations.

Theories Guiding Conceptualization

Festinger’s (1957) social comparison theory indicates that individuals need to “evaluate themselves and to assess their standing within groups” (as cited by Mor Barak, 2000b, p. 52). As reference, individuals use their own group. Social comparison theory is about individuals self-assessing. Mor Barak (2000b) reports that behavior and situational analysis are driven by individual interpretation and the combination between symbols and objects in their environments according to
symbolic interaction theory. According to Collins (1988), this is important for individuals because evaluating how people see them, allows them to determine where they stand in the world (as cited by Mor Barak, 2000b). Based on these two theories we can assume that group inclusion is important within the workplace because of our “personal evaluations” (Mor Barak, 2000b, p. 53).

Socio-meter model on the other hand deals with self-esteem (Mor Barak, 2000b). According to Leary and Downs (1995), physical and psychological well-being depends on the need to be accepted and included by others (as cited by Mor Barak, 2000b). According to Baumeister & Leary (1995), we are interdependent by nature, dependence on others is a basic need and this is what motivates individuals to” maintain connections with significant people and social systems in their lives” (as cited by Mor Barak, 2000b, p. 53). The “socio-meter” as it is called, serves as an indicator that allows people to monitor inclusion or exclusion (Leary, Schreindorfer, & Haupt, 1995), therefore when an environment is exclusionary the individual’s self-esteem is lowered and this affects behavior (Mor Barak, 2000b). Behaviors that result from a lowered self-esteem may include efforts to assimilate or by disengaging from the exclusionary system (Mor Barak, 2000b). Reasons for exclusion of diverse groups include overt or covert racism, sexism, and ageism are reasons for the exclusion of diverse groups (Larkey, 1996, as cited by Mor Barak, 2000b). Financial self-interest may be another reason to exclude individuals from access to power and economic resources (Lakey, 1996, as cited by Mor Barak, 2000b). All three theories have
shaped past research. The current study makes use of Social Comparison Theory as the guiding practice.

Summary

This chapter focused on reviewing the literature on diversity trainings, effects of inclusion-exclusion and theories guiding the conceptualization of this research study. Previous research findings validate the direct effect of exclusion on job-related attitudes such as job satisfaction and intention to stay. Social Comparison Theory stipulates that individuals self-assess according to where they stand within a group. Lastly, the current study added to the diversity management knowledge base in that it focused on the perceptions of inclusion-exclusion in social services; it also measured how these perceptions affect job satisfaction, intention to stay and burnout. To the knowledge of the author, the impact of inclusion-exclusion on job burnout has not be previously examined in any published research study.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODS

Introduction

This chapter covers an overview of the research methods applied in the present study. It covers the study design, sampling, data collection and instruments, procedures, protection of human subjects and data analysis.

Study Design

The purpose of this study was to explore how the perception of inclusion/exclusion affects social workers and human service provider’s job satisfaction, commitment to the organization, turnover intention, diversity perceptions and burnout. A quantitative survey was conducted using a sample of employees of a social service organization in San Bernardino County. Participants include employees from all levels and program areas of the social service organization. The Perceptions of Inclusion Scale (Mor Barak & Cherin, 1998) and Diversity Perceptions Scale (Mor Barak, Cherin, & Berkman, 1998) were utilized in this study. The quantitative research method was chosen in order to describe and explore the perceptions of employees in social service organizations relationship between perceptions of inclusion and work-related attitudes.
Sampling

The approach used for recruitment of participants was a non-probability availability sampling method. Several non-profit social service organizations were contacted in order request approval to conduct data collection and to recruit participants. One organization approved the researcher to collect data. The participants include employees from every program area within the human service organization. This sample was chosen because of the gap in the research of inclusion-exclusion within social service organizations. A mass email was sent to every employee by the chief executive of operations of the organization. The email introduced the researcher as a student conducting a research project. The researcher’s email was below the executive director’s introduction. The researcher’s message included an invitation for employees in the organization to participate in the study. It was clear in the email that participation in the study was voluntary. As a token of appreciation, the participants who wished to be entered in a raffle for a $25 gift card were encouraged to email the researcher. In order to maintain anonymity, submission of one’s name was optional.

Data Collection and Instruments

Study data was collected through the use of a self-report questionnaire. Burnout out scores were collected using the Maslach Burnout inventory (Maslach & Jackson, 1981). Overall job satisfaction was measured using Cammann, Fichman, Jenkins, and Klesh (1983) as part of the Michigan Organizational
Assessment Questionnaire (OAQ). To capture turnover intention Cammann, Fichman, Jenkins, and Klesh (1979) and Seashore, Lawler, Mirvis, Cammann (1982; See Appendix C) were used. Modified versions of the following scales were also used: Mor Barak, Cherin, and Berkman (1998) was used to gather scores on perceptions of diversity. Mor Barak and Cherin (1998) was utilized in order to collect perceptions of inclusion scores. Organizational commitment scores were collected using McKay, Avery, Tonidandel, Morris, and Hernandez (2007; See Appendix C) adapted from Mowday, Steers, and Porter’s (1979) Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ). The level of measurement was ordinal for each question of the survey (e.g., Strongly Disagree, Moderately Disagree, Disagree, Agree, Moderately Agree, Strongly Agree).

Data collection limitations include anonymity and response bias. Both were addressed by directing the participants to SurveyMonkey®. A concern was that participants would not be honest if they were given a paper survey. Another concern was anonymity. This concern was addressed by conducting the survey online as opposed to having the participants physically submit their survey to a specific place within the office. The validity and reliability of the study was ensured because it builds on instruments that are standardized.

Procedures

The data was gathered at a non-profit social service organization in San Bernardino County. The executive director forwarded the email from the
researcher inviting individuals to participate. A link for online survey was provided in the email. The employees were given a week to complete the survey. The deadline was extended after the initial date for three more days and it was emphasized that participation in the study was voluntary; this was done in order to address concerns from employees. Rightly so, some employees were hesitant to participate and expressed this to the executive director.

Those who decided to participate were required to agree to the terms stated in the informed consent before they were able to begin the survey. At the end of the survey the respondents were thanked and directed to the debriefing statement page.

**Protection of Human Subjects**

The confidentiality of the participants was protected by asking the participants to take the measure online. Although confidentiality cannot be guaranteed online, measures were taken as far as technology allows. Participation in the study was voluntary. Before beginning the survey, the participants were to read and agree to the informed consent. The informed consent included information about the study, the risks and benefits of the study, and duration of the survey. The research study was approved by the California State University, San Bernardino Institutional Review Board School of Social Work subcommittee prior to launching the study.
Data Analysis

Using SPSS to analyze data, descriptive statistics, Pearson $r$ (correlations), and Mann-Whitney $U$ analysis were conducted. The perceptions of inclusion-exclusion were measured as well as job satisfaction, commitment to the organization, diversity perception, turnover intention and burnout. The participant’s perception of inclusion-exclusion and job-related attitudes within the social service organization were measured using established scales. Frequency distribution and percentage distribution analysis were conducted in order to analyze the frequency distribution of responses in regards to inclusion-exclusion. Specifically, the cumulative frequency distribution of each variable was examined for the purpose of observing trends in responses. Pearson $r$ test was conducted to examine if there was an association between the independent variable (inclusion-exclusion) and job satisfaction, turnover intention, diversity perception, commitment to the organization, and burnout (dependent variables).

Mann-Whitney $U$ test was used to examine group differences in workplace attitude scale means. Mean group differences based on several demographic characteristics and the workplace attitude scales were tested using the Mann-Whitney $U$ test. Group differences in workplace attitude scales were tested based on gender, race, what program area they work in and if they are part of the leadership team at their organization. Examining group differences based on demographic characteristics was deemed important to consider in the data analysis because research shows that minority groups, more often than not, do
not feel included in their place of work. These variables were analyzed in order to explore the possibility of a relationship existing between perception of inclusion-exclusion and demographic characteristics.

Summary

This chapter described the study’s research design, sampling, data collection and instruments, procedures, and data analysis. Participants responses were collected online using SurveyMonkey®. The online method of collecting data addressed limitations of anonymity. Participants included employees from one social service organization.
CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to outline the results of the statistical analyses conducted. The chapter will include a detailed report of the sample, descriptive statistics, as well as the results of inferential statistics analysis conducted. The first section will summarize the results for the descriptive statistics which include gender, tenure, leadership team participation, race, and program area in which they work in. The section will also report the mean, standard deviation, range of scores and the number of respondents for the inclusion, diversity perception, burnout, organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover scales.

Presentation of Findings

Descriptive Statistics

More than half of the survey participants, as presented in Table 1 (see Appendix D), identified as women (n=35, 85.4%) and 5 (12.2%) accounted for the participants that identified as men. In order to be inclusive of all gender identities, the survey participants had the option of selecting “other,” none of the participants identified with this option. The modal tenure range was the 0-5 years and it consisted of 31 participants (75.6%). The 6-11 and 12-17 year ranges consisted of 4 each (9.8%) and the 18-23 year range consisted of 1 participant
(2.4%). Twelve (29.3%) of the participants identified as non-Hispanic White and those who did not accounted for 68.3% (n=28) of the survey participants. The organization has a leadership team. Usually the individuals that are a part of the leadership team meeting are directors, program managers, and senior caseworkers. Seventeen (41.5%) participants responded that they are a part of the leadership team and 23 (56.1%) responded “no.” Front line workers included employees from the following service areas (also called program areas): family and community services (n=9, 22%), counseling (n=16, 39%), refugee and immigration services (n=2, 4.9%). Thirteen (31.7%) survey participants worked in administration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Demographics of Study Sample</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5 (12.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>(85.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic White</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(29.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>(68.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tenure</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-5 years</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(75.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-11 years</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(9.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-17 years</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(9.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-23 years</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Leadership Team

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(41.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(56.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 (see Appendix D) presents the results for the descriptive statistics for the central study variables. Inclusion (n=31) scores ranged between 38 and 79 with a mean of 57.6 (SD=8.19). Diversity (n=29) scores ranged between 26 and 48 with a mean of 38.10 (SD=5.74). The burnout (n=29) standard deviation was 7.18 with a mean of 19.38 and the scores for this variable ranged from 7 and 32. Organizational commitment (n=29) scores ranged from 16 and 30 with a mean of 22.28 (SD=4.22). Job satisfaction (n=32) scores ranged from 6 and 18 with a mean of 14.91 (SD=2.99). The lowest mean was for turnover (5.17) with a standard deviation of 2.70, scores ranged between 2 and 12 and 29 respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion Scale</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>57.55</td>
<td>8.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity Perception Scale</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>38.10</td>
<td>5.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnout Scale</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19.38</td>
<td>7.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment scale</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22.28</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction Scale</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14.91</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intention Scale</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Inferential Analysis

Analysis was conducted utilizing SPSS software version 23. Pearson correlation analysis was used to examine the association between the following scales: inclusion, diversity perception, organizational commitment, burnout, job satisfaction, and turnover intention. This correlation analysis was conducted given that the Pearson’s correlation test describes the strength and direction of the linear relationship between two variables (Pallant, 2013, p. 133). Table 3 (see correlation matrix in Appendix D) presents the results of the correlation analysis. It was found that inclusion was statistically significantly related to all of the other study variables except burnout, gender and race. Inclusion was statistically and significantly related to diversity perception, and the correlation was positive ($r = .41$, $p \leq .05$). Organizational commitment was positively correlated to inclusion ($r = .59$, $p \leq .01$). Higher rates of inclusion were related to higher rates of organizational commitment. Job satisfaction was positively related to inclusion ($r = .49$, $p \leq .05$). Lastly, turnover intention was negatively associated to inclusion ($r = -.42$, $p \leq .05$).

Diversity climate was significantly correlated to organizational commitment, burnout, job satisfaction, and turnover. There was no statistically significant correlation found between gender, race, and diversity climate. Organizational commitment was significantly associated to diversity climate ($r = .62$, $p \leq .01$). Burnout was negatively associated to diversity climate at a
statistically significant level \((r = -0.44, p \leq 0.05)\) as well as turnover \((r = -0.45, p \leq 0.05)\). Job satisfaction was positively related to diversity climate \((r = 0.47, p \leq 0.05)\).

Organizational commitment was significantly correlated to burnout \((r = -0.51, p \leq 0.05)\), job satisfaction \((r = 0.51, p \leq 0.05)\) and turnover \((r = -0.47, p \leq 0.05)\). Burnout was also correlated to job satisfaction and turnover but it had the opposite association in comparison to organizational commitment. Job satisfaction was negatively related to burnout at a \(p = 0.01\) level \((r = -0.55)\) and turnover was positively correlated to burnout at a \(p = 0.05\) level \((r = 0.73)\). Job satisfaction and turnover was the last association that was significant \((r = -0.68, p \leq 0.01)\). Lastly, gender and race were not significantly correlated to any of the scales.

Table 3. Correlation Matrix of Study Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Inclusion scale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Diversity climate scale</td>
<td>0.41*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Organizational commitment scale</td>
<td>0.59*</td>
<td>0.62**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Burnout scale</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>-0.44*</td>
<td>-0.51*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Job satisfaction scale</td>
<td>0.49*</td>
<td>0.47*</td>
<td>0.51*</td>
<td>-0.55**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Turnover intention scale</td>
<td>-0.42*</td>
<td>-0.45*</td>
<td>-0.47*</td>
<td>0.73**</td>
<td>-0.68**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Gender</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Non-Hispanic White</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Gender and Non-Hispanic White were coded as follows (1 = Female, 2 = Male); Non-Hispanic White (1 = Non-Hispanic White; All others = 2).
A series of Mann-Whitney $U$ tests were conducted to test for differences between two independent groups on a continuous measure, this was conducted as the non-parametric alternative to the $t$-test for independent samples (Pallant, 2013, p. 235). The survey question was “are you a part of the leadership team?” therefore, the two independent groups were the “yes” group and the “no” group. Table 4 (see Appendix D) presents these results. For the “yes” group (e.g. members of the leadership team) the mean score on burnout was 22.00 ($n=13$) and a standard deviation of 5.35 and for those that were not a part of the leadership team the mean was 17.25 ($n=16$) with a standard deviation of 7.90. The mean difference for this test was statistically significant at a $p \leq .05$ level ($U=0.56$). The following scales were also tested for group difference but were not statistically significant: inclusion ($U=.07, p \geq .05$), diversity perception ($U=.42, p \geq .05$), organizational commitment ($U=.85, p \geq .05$), job satisfaction ($U=.82, p \geq .05$), and turnover intention ($U=.48, p \geq .05$).

Table 4. Results for Mean Group Difference in Burnout By Leadership Team Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are you a part of the leadership team?</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>17.25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.904</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Based on a Mann-Whitney $U$ test, the mean difference is statistically significant at a $p \leq .05$ level.
CHAPTER FIVE
DISCUSSION

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to discuss the implications of the results of the present study. Limitations of the study will be presented in this chapter and recommendations for social work practice, policy, and future research are also presented. Lastly, the chapter will conclude with final thoughts about diversity management, inclusion-exclusion, and the benefits of both to social service workers and social service organizations.

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to explore perceptions of inclusion-exclusion within a social service organization and how those perceptions affect job satisfaction, commitment to the organization, turnover intention, diversity perception, and burnout. The results indicate that higher perceptions of inclusion are associated with higher levels of organizational commitment, diversity climate perceptions and job satisfaction. It is worthy to note that inclusion and organizational commitment had the strongest relationship. The findings also showed that higher perceptions of inclusion was negatively associated with lower turnover intention as well as lower burnout. These results are consistent with research findings on the positive effects of inclusion on workforce outcomes (Sommer, et al., 1996; Decottiis & Summers, 1987; Lawler, 1994, Ensher, Grant-
Vallone, & Donaldson, 2001; Foley, Hany-Yue, & Wong, 2005; Friendman & Holtom, 2002; Mor Barak, 2000b; Mor Barak, Lizano, Kim, Duan, Rhee, Hsiao & Brimhall, 2016).

Another noteworthy result is that inclusion was not significantly associated to burnout. To the researcher’s knowledge, this is the first time burnout was measured in correlation to inclusion. Burnout was, however, negatively associated with diversity climate perception which alludes to the notion that employees who perceive a more diverse work climate are less likely to be burned out. Based on the relatively high scores on the diversity climate perception scale, it can be inferred that employees perceive the organization to have a strong diversity climate. Strong diversity climate is a positive quality of any organization because it shows that diversity is important to the organizational leader.

Another positive relationship that was found between diversity climate perceptions and the outcomes of interest included organizational commitment which was the strongest correlation between the two. The study results also suggest a significant association between job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Organizational commitment was negatively related to burnout and turnover intentions which means that the more committed a worker is to the organization the less burned out they are and less likely to leave the organization. Results for participants who were part of the leadership team indicated that they are more burned out than those who were not a part of it (e.g. line workers).
Giffords’ (2009) study stipulates that women, who are the majority in the social services field, are more likely to score higher in organizational commitment. In regards to the present study, most of the participants identified as women which may be the reason for high scores but gender was not significantly correlated to any of the scales, including organizational commitment. Unlike gender, race has been shown to have negative effects on job-related attitudes (Hopkins, Cohen-Callow, Kim, & Hwang, 2010) but this was also not significantly correlated to the scales in the current study.

**Limitations**

Research on diversity management defines diversity as basically anything different from the mainstream culture. Besides, race that makes one different from the dominant culture, diversity can also include sexual orientation, age, and disabilities. The scores from the scales showed that there is a correlation between, for example, inclusion and diversity climate perception but this does not mean causation; this is a limitation of the current study. Another limitation of this study is the sample size, because the sample size was small it is limited in its generalizability to other social service organizations. Also, not using sampling technique also limits the generalizability of study findings.

To protect the identity of the employees, the researcher was forced to ask whether they identified or not as non-Hispanic White. The sample size was small, therefore, asking specific questions regarding socio-race and ethnicity might have exposed the identity of the respondents. A larger sample size also would
have addressed this limitation. The purpose of asking specific questions pertaining to socio-race is that correlations with inclusion and other scales might have been significant.

Another limitation of the present study is that as a quantitative study, the researcher was unable to explore what inclusion means to the employees. A mixed methods approach would have allowed for the exploration of the definition of inclusion as it pertains to diversity in social service organizations.

**Recommendations for Social Work Practice, Policy and Research**

It was the researcher’s hope that this study would elucidate the meaning of diversity management for administrative leaders and explore the effects (i.e., job related attitudes) of inclusion-exclusion on workforce outcomes. The results indicate that there is a significant relationship between inclusion and diversity climate perception and this tells us that when it comes to inclusion-exclusion, diversity climate perception is a factor to consider. Diversity management is important in social service organizations not only because it is important to the clients that are served but also because leaders who manage diversity create a place that is inclusive of all; and inclusive workplaces that encourage differences allows for more effective problem-solving (Cox, 2001). Effective diversity management has other positive effects as well. It stands to reason that diversity management is critical to the success social service organizations.

The present study can help guide organizational leaders in social service organizations who want to improve diversity management given that the results
of this study indicate that perceptions of inclusion were significantly associated with several positive work related effects such as lower turnover intention, commitment to the organization, and job satisfaction. Executive directors want the best for their organizations and as a result, the best means creating an inclusive workplace by emphasizing the importance of managing diversity for the benefit of reaching organizational goals. Mor Barak (2015) stressed the need for more work to be done in order to better understand inclusion and Giffords (2009) claimed that the link of attitudes and behaviors that affect how social service providers work to accomplish their organization’s mission and goals is critical. The present study is a step towards making the link between attitudes and behaviors and also in understanding how they are correlated to inclusion-exclusion. As mentioned before, the issue of managing diversity by fostering inclusivity is congruent with social work principles and should be continued to be studied.

In the future, longitudinal studies should be conducted in order to test if inclusion-exclusion actually leads to the job satisfaction, diversity perceptions, commitment to the organization, burnout, and turnover studied in the current research (i.e. does inclusion cause positive workforce outcomes). A longitudinal study would follow participants for a longer time frame as opposed to a single moment in time. Now that associations between these inclusion and diversity climate and several workplace attitudes are validated by this research study, the next step would be to seek to test a causal relationship between the variables.
It would be equally important would be to recruit more mainstream groups within social service organizations in order for study results to be more representative. In the present study, although the survey asked the respondent’s perception of inclusion, it is not clear what the mainstream group is within the organization. Hence, the scores do not give us insight on the dominant culture within the organization. Studies would benefit from inquiring about the culture within an organization because doing so would facilitate interpretation of inclusion scores regarding the dominant group and tests would indicate whether or not inclusion is associated to work related attitudes such as job satisfaction.

Workplace interventions development that promote inclusion and diversity management are important for social service administrators (Mor Barak, et al., 2016). It can be assumed based on findings from this study and previous research, that developing inclusion and diversity management interventions would have positive outcomes for human service organizations. These interventions are important, but more critical is that leaders believe that diversity is vital to the success of the organization. Studies show that diversity training is not enough. Diversity must be valued because it benefits everyone when it is managed effectively. The policies developed must create an organizational culture of inclusion and understanding. Legislation like affirmative action made it possible for people of color to enter corporate America and it is of the researcher’s hope that the present study will increase the attention and necessity for diversity management and inclusion.
Conclusion

In conclusion, organizational leaders have a big undertaking as they learn about diversity management. Findings from this research study validate that inclusion has positive outcomes for organizations, now it is time to develop and implement strategies and/or programs that will facilitate inclusion in order to create an environment that satisfies the needs of, includes, and cares for the employees.
APPENDIX A

INFORMED CONSENT
College of Social and Behavioral Sciences
School of Social Work
Informed Consent

The study in which you are being asked to participate is designed to understand inclusion-exclusion in social service organizations. This is a graduate research project conducted by Eva Rizzo, under supervision of Dr. Erica Lizano, Assistant Professor at California State University, San Bernardino (CSUSB). This study has been approved by the School of Social Work's Sub-Committee of CSUSB's Institutional Review Board.

PURPOSE: This study aims to understand inclusion-exclusion within social service organizations.

DESCRIPTION: If you agree to participate in this study, you will be asked to participate in the survey online via Survey Monkey. You will be asked basic demographic questions and you will be asked to rate your attitudes about statements related to inclusion-exclusion in the workplace.

PARTICIPATION: This survey is completely voluntary. You can choose to skip questions you do not wish to answer or withdraw from the survey at any time, with no consequences.

CONFIDENTIALITY: Surveys are submitted anonymously through an internet survey provider (Survey Monkey) and IP addresses will not be collected during the survey. Confidentiality will be maintained to the extent permitted by technology. No guarantee can be made regarding the tracking or interception of responses by any third party. Your employer will not have access to your responses. By completing this survey, you are agreeing to the provided informed consent. All survey responses will be kept on an encrypted flash drive in a locked file for three years. After the third year, the researcher will destroy them.

DURATION: If you decide to participate in this study, you will be given 39 questions over 1 survey. The survey should take no more than 20 minutes to complete.

909.537.5501 · 909.537.7029

5500 UNIVERSITY PARKWAY, SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92407-2393
College of Social and Behavioral Sciences
School of Social Work

RISKS: There are minimal risks to participation in this study; however, there may be a potential risk for a breach of confidentiality on behalf of the survey engine. If you feel that any particular question is too personal, or if you are distressed when considering any question, you are free to refrain from answering or you can stop at any time.

BENEFITS: There are no direct benefits to you for participating in the research. Cumulative results and analysis of the survey will be made available to management for their review. On a larger scale, information you provide will add to the knowledge base of professional social work.

PAYMENT FOR PARTICIPATION: You will not receive payment for your participation. As an incentive for completing the questionnaire, you may choose to be entered into a raffle for a $25 Starbucks gift card. Only one drawing will occur and only one participant will win.

CONTACT: Should you have any questions about this survey, you may contact Dr. Erica Lizano at (909)537-5584 or elizano@csusb.edu.

RESULTS: Results of the study can be obtained from the CSUSB Scholar Works database at the end of Spring Quarter of 2016.

CONFIRMATION STATEMENT: This is to certify that I read and understand the information above, and decided to participate in this study.

ONLINE AGREEMENT: SELECTING THE ‘I AGREE’ OPTION ON THE WEBPAGE INDICATES CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN THE STUDY.

909.537.5501 • 909.537.7029

5500 UNIVERSITY PARKWAY, SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92407-2393
APPENDIX B

DEBRIEFING STATEMENT
Debriefing Statement

The study you just participated in aimed to understand the concept of inclusion-exclusion within social service organizations. Many times social service providers and social service organization employees are held up to high standards of inclusion of their clients but may fall short in realizing the importance of inclusion also amongst themselves and colleagues. I hope to find out if higher rates of inclusion are related to more positive job-related attitudes.

If you have any questions about this study, please feel free to contact Eva Rizzo or Dr. Erica Lizano at (909)537-5584. If you would like to obtain a copy of the results of this study, please contact Dr. Erica Lizano at the above-mentioned phone number. Results will be made available at the end of Spring Quarter of 2016.

Thank-you for your time and participation in this study
APPENDIX C

DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS
DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENT

1. What is your gender?
   Female
   Male
   Other (please specify)

2. Do you identify as non-Hispanic White?
   Yes
   No

3. Are you a part of the leadership team?
   Yes
   No
   Other (please specify)

4. How long have you been at this organization?
   0-5 years
   6-11 years
   12-17 years
   18-23 years
   24-29 years
   30-35 years
   Other (please specify)

5. What program area do you work in?
   Family and Community Services
   Counseling Services
   Refugee and Immigration Services
   Administration
   Other

Data collection instrument is a modified version of the following sources:


Items number 8 and 24 were created by the author.

6. My co-workers openly share information with me
   Strongly Disagree, Moderately Disagree, Disagree, Agree, Moderately Agree, Strongly Agree
7. I feel that I have the cooperation of the people in my work group  
  Strongly Disagree, Moderately Disagree, Disagree, Agree, Moderately Agree,  
  Strongly Agree

8. I am able to influence decisions that affect my program area  
  Strongly Disagree, Moderately Disagree, Disagree, Agree, Moderately Agree,  
  Strongly Agree

10. I am often invited to voice my opinion in meetings with management higher  
     than my immediate  
     Supervisor  
     Strongly Disagree, Moderately Disagree, Disagree, Agree, Moderately Agree,  
     Strongly Agree

11. I am usually among the last to know about important changes in the  
    organization  
    Strongly Disagree, Moderately Disagree, Disagree, Agree, Moderately Agree,  
    Strongly Agree

12. I frequently receive communication from management higher than my  
    immediate supervisor (i.e.  
    memos, e-mails)  
    Strongly Disagree, Moderately Disagree, Disagree, Agree, Moderately Agree,  
    Strongly Agree

14. I am usually invited to important meetings in my organization  
    Strongly Disagree, Moderately Disagree, Disagree, Agree, Moderately Agree,  
    Strongly Agree

15. My supervisor often asks for my opinion before making important decisions  
    Strongly Disagree, Moderately Disagree, Disagree, Agree, Moderately Agree,  
    Strongly Agree

17. I feel valued in my relationship with my supervisor  
    Strongly Disagree, Moderately Disagree, Disagree, Agree, Moderately Agree,  
    Strongly Agree

18. I am able to influence decisions that affect the organization  
    Strongly Disagree, Moderately Disagree, Disagree, Agree, Moderately Agree,  
    Strongly Agree

20. I am often asked to participate in activities not directly related to my job  
    function
Strongly Disagree, Moderately Disagree, Disagree, Agree, Moderately Agree, Strongly Agree

23. I am rarely invited to join my co-workers when they go out for lunch or drinks after work
Strongly Disagree, Moderately Disagree, Disagree, Agree, Moderately Agree, Strongly Agree

24. I am usually among the last to know about important changes in my program area
Strongly Disagree, Moderately Disagree, Disagree, Agree, Moderately Agree, Strongly Agree


Item number 26 was created by the author.

26. I feel I am treated differently because of my gender
Strongly Disagree, Moderately Disagree, Disagree, Agree, Moderately Agree, Strongly Agree

27. Managers here keep track record of hiring employees objectively, regardless of their race, sex, sexual orientation, nationality, religion or age
Strongly Disagree, Moderately Disagree, Disagree, Agree, Moderately Agree, Strongly Agree

29. Managers here give feedback and evaluate employees fairly, regardless of an employee's race, sex, sexual orientation, religion, nationality, or age
Strongly Disagree, Moderately Disagree, Disagree, Agree, Moderately Agree, Strongly Agree

30. I think that diverse viewpoints add value
Strongly Disagree, Moderately Disagree, Disagree, Agree, Moderately Agree, Strongly Agree

34. Managers interpret human resource policies (such as sick leave) fairly for all employees
Strongly Disagree, Moderately Disagree, Disagree, Agree, Moderately Agree, Strongly Agree

35. The organization spends enough money and time on diversity awareness and related training
Strongly Disagree, Moderately Disagree, Disagree, Agree, Moderately Agree, Strongly Agree

36. Managers here give assignments based on skills and abilities of employees
Strongly Disagree, Moderately Disagree, Disagree, Agree, Moderately Agree, Strongly Agree


21. Working with people directly puts too much stress on me
Strongly Disagree, Moderately Disagree, Disagree, Agree, Moderately Agree, Strongly Agree

28. I feel emotionally drained from my work
Strongly Disagree, Moderately Disagree, Disagree, Agree, Moderately Agree, Strongly Agree

31. I feel I'm working too hard on my job
Strongly Disagree, Moderately Disagree, Disagree, Agree, Moderately Agree, Strongly Agree

33. I feel used up at the end of the workday
Strongly Disagree, Moderately Disagree, Disagree, Agree, Moderately Agree, Strongly Agree

39. I feel fatigued when I get up and have to face another day on the job
Strongly Disagree, Moderately Disagree, Disagree, Agree, Moderately Agree, Strongly Agree

42. I feel frustrated by my job
Strongly Disagree, Moderately Disagree, Disagree, Agree, Moderately Agree, Strongly Agree

44. I feel burned out from my work
Strongly Disagree, Moderately Disagree, Disagree, Agree, Moderately Agree, Strongly Agree
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Items number 40, 41, and 43 were created by the author.

37. The organization inspires me to do my best work everyday
   Strongly Disagree, Moderately Disagree, Disagree, Agree, Moderately Agree, Strongly Agree

38. I would recommend this organization as a place of work everyday
   Strongly Disagree, Moderately Disagree, Disagree, Agree, Moderately Agree, Strongly Agree

40. The organization motivates me to contribute more than is normally required to complete my work
   Strongly Disagree, Moderately Disagree, Disagree, Agree, Moderately Agree, Strongly Agree

41. My program area motivates me to contribute more than is normally required to complete my work
   Strongly Disagree, Moderately Disagree, Disagree, Agree, Moderately Agree, Strongly Agree

43. My program area inspires me to do my best work everyday
   Strongly Disagree, Moderately Disagree, Disagree, Agree, Moderately Agree, Strongly Agree


9. All in all, I am satisfied with my job
   Strongly Disagree, Moderately Disagree, Disagree, Agree, Moderately Agree, Strongly Agree

13. In general, I don't like my job
   Strongly Disagree, Moderately Disagree, Disagree, Agree, Moderately Agree, Strongly Agree

16. In general, I like working here
   Strongly Disagree, Moderately Disagree, Disagree, Agree, Moderately Agree, Strongly Agree


19. I sometimes feel compelled to quit my job in my current workplace
   Strongly Disagree, Moderately Disagree, Disagree, Agree, Moderately Agree, Strongly Agree

22. I will probably look for a new job in the next year
   Strongly Disagree, Moderately Disagree, Disagree, Agree, Moderately Agree, Strongly Agree
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