ABSTRACT. This cross-sectional study tests a theory-driven, conceptual model examining factors supporting or hindering child welfare workers’ \( n = 359 \) efforts to speak up (voice) or disengage psychologically (neglect) or physically (exit) from their jobs. Based on path analysis results, key findings indicate that workers who feel included in decision-making are more likely to exercise voice and less likely to engage in neglect. In contrast, workers who experienced supervisory and organizational support are less inclined to exit. The findings should be instructive to scholars and practitioners interested in capturing how employees’ responses to stressful and complex work environments are expressed.
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What may spark an individual’s decision to provide critical yet important feedback to a supervisor despite the potential risk? What influences one’s decision to refrain from putting full effort in their work or take steps toward quitting? These types of day-to-day situations underscore the importance of how one’s inability to speak up or decision to not participate in work activities may impede organizational success. In child welfare organizations, these questions are particularly germane as workers often confront a host of work-related challenges resulting in compassion fatigue, work overload, and role stress resulting in burnout—all known predictors of turnover (Bride, Jones, & MacMaster, 2007; Mor Barak, Nissly, & Levin, 2001). Previous research has made significant contributions in understanding the role of organizational and individual factors in contributing to child welfare workers’ job satisfaction, stress, and burnout, as well as intention to leave and turnover (e.g., Mor Barak, Levin, Nissly, & Lane, 2006; Zlotnik, DePanfilis, Daining, & Lane, 2005). Specific strategies have been employed to help alleviate...
these concerns, including: supervision, training, and mentoring (Gomez, Travis, Ayers-Lopez, & Schwab, in press; Mor Barak, Travis, Pyun, & Xie, 2009; Strand & Bosco-Ruggiero, 2010). While this research has helped shed light on child welfare turnover and retention, little is known about the cadre of worker responses.

In this study, we seek to advance child welfare research by uniquely addressing these central questions: How do workers—who may not necessarily be considering quitting—negotiate the challenges of their jobs? Why do some employees “fight” by speaking up for positive change? And why do others engage in “flight” as a process of disengagement by not putting forth full effort in their work, or quitting? Accordingly, we examine factors that support or hinder workers’ efforts to seek change (voice) or disengage (neglect and exit) at work. These efforts can be characterized as fight or flight responses based on how one deals with day-to-day job stress (Eisler & Levine, 2002). As such, employees may engage in one, a combination, or all of the following fight or flight responses.

Employees may fight constructively by engaging in voice. Voice involves employee efforts to repair unsatisfying work conditions or promote improvement or change (Dundon, Wilkinson, Martin, Marchington, & Ackers, 2004). Two examples include: talking to a supervisor or suggesting ways to improve work processes. For conceptual clarification, when voice is discussed, we are referring to constructive forms of speaking up as opposed to complaining or aggressive expressions of dissatisfaction. Complaining is the expression of subjective dissatisfaction or feelings of discontent (Kowalski, 2002). Aggressive responses involve attempts at change for the purpose of winning without concern for the organization or others (Hagedoorn, Van Yperen, Van de Vliert, & Buunk, 1999).

As flight responses, both neglect and exit create psychological or physical distance between employees and their work organization (Carmeli, 2005). Neglect involves one’s psychological withdrawal from work-related tasks and organizational activities (Kidwell & Robie, 2003). The type of neglect examined in this study does not directly relate to an employee’s ineptitude in meeting clients’ needs but rather involves any element of not working such as making errors, missing meetings, or working slower than usual. Exit involves efforts toward quitting one’s job in which employees may contemplate, intend, or take steps toward leaving their job (Hagedoorn et al., 1999).

The voice, neglect, and exit concepts are rooted in Hirschman’s (1970) and Farrell’s (1983) seminal work and have been extensively studied in management, organizational psychology, and consumer sciences. Related to exit, intention to leave and actual turnover have been examined extensively in the field of child welfare (for examples, see Mor Barak et al., 2001, for a meta-analysis). For the first time, this study intersects knowledge born from Hirschman and Farrell’s landmark studies on voice, neglect, and exit with the child welfare turnover literature to offer a value-added approach. By identifying factors that support or hinder employee voice as well as neglect and exit, the results of this study may provide additional information on how to create the best possible worker outcomes—increased worker-initiated voice or constructive feedback, reduced job neglect, and decreased turnover of talented workers.

**COSTS AND BENEFITS OF FIGHT OR FLIGHT RESPONSES**

Employee efforts to constructively fight work challenges by seeking positive change (voice) or flight by psychologically or physically disengaging (respectively, neglect or exit) are critical to gauge due to the potential benefits and costs to social service organizations (see Table 1).

Voice responses have potential to foster favorable, win-win outcomes through the promotion of organizational growth, development, and change (Morrison & Milliken, 2003). As employees use their voice constructively, they may also have a greater opportunity to contribute to the organizations’ functioning (Detert & Burriss, 2007). Thus, constructive voice may also help organizations develop innovations to address workplace challenges. Despite the prospective benefits of voice, voice is not always a welcomed response or without risks and real or perceived consequences (e.g., loss
of promotional opportunity or damaged relationships with coworkers or supervisors; Bowen & Blackmon, 2003). Employees may also feel that their ideas will be overlooked or dismissed (Milliken & Morrison, 2003), especially if they hold minority views (Noelle-Neumann, 1991) or if their ideas are mistaken for complaining (Kowalski, 2002). Finally, costs associated with voice may occur as employees feel that they are not heard. Individuals who may attempt to enact change or express themselves but do not feel heard or validated may become discontent and critical of the organization. This, in turn, may negatively impact the functioning of the organization, such as, increased employee turnover (Batt, Colvin, & Keefe, 2002). Despite the assumption that flight responses (neglect and exit) are detrimental to organizational functioning, in some instances, these responses may have beneficial outcomes. In our review of the peer-reviewed literature, no direct benefits to the employee or organization for workers’ counterproductive behaviors such as neglect were found. As such, employee flight responses are most known for their costs. For example, the economic and service-related costs associated with the turnover can be high and detrimental. Replacing and training new workers is often considered economically costly (United States General Accounting Office [USGAO], 2003). Gaps in services may be felt at the client level as continuity of care may be comprised when direct service workers quit. New employees often have a learning curve to overcome in filling vacant spots (American Public Human Services Association, 2005; USGAO, 2003).

### CONCEPTUAL MODEL AND RESEARCH HYPOTHESES

Based on a multidisciplinary, theoretical framework, the hypothesized conceptual model (Figure 1) posits that as employees perceive their work climate as inclusive and supportive, levels of job stress may be reduced, and personal well-being may increase which in turn can boost constructive voice responses and ease neglect and exit responses.

#### The Role of Diversity Characteristics

This study examines diversity characteristics through the lens of one’s dominant and non-dominant group status according to societal norms (Latting & Ramsey, 2009). Understanding the influence of employees’ diversity characteristics is essential because “there is a fundamental difference between attributes that make a person a unique human being and those that—based on group membership rather than individual characteristics—yield negative or positive consequences” (Mor Barak, 2005, p. 122). Thus, one’s social group membership offers advantages over other social groups based on the dominant status of that group (Latting & Ramsey).

Noelle-Neumann’s (1991) Spiral of Silence theory offers an innovative perspective on the role of diversity characteristics in affecting employee voice. Accordingly, the more that individuals view their opinions as similar to prevailing public opinions, the more they may express those views. If public opinion shifts and

---

**TABLE 1. Categorization of Fight or Flight Responses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Response</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Level of Engagement</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fight</td>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>Engaged</td>
<td>Efforts to improve dissatisfying work conditions or promote organizational change</td>
<td>Talking to a supervisor; taking initiative to implement a new idea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flight</td>
<td>Neglect</td>
<td>Disengaged</td>
<td>Efforts that reflect one’s disengagement from work-related tasks and organizational activities</td>
<td>Avoiding a supervisor; taking extended breaks; working slower than usual on job tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exit</td>
<td>Disengaged</td>
<td>Efforts toward quitting one’s job</td>
<td>Thinking about quitting; searching for a new job</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
individuals note that their views are dissimilar, they will be less inclined to share them. This reluctance may then spark a “spiral of silence” in which employees refrain from exercising voice and expressing dissatisfaction (Bowen & Blackmon, 2003). For example, a relatively new employee may be more reluctant to talk to a supervisor about their improvement-oriented ideas. Thus, depending on power differentials and feeling of dissimilarity (e.g., cultural background and forms of expression, non-dominant group status, experience of exclusion), an individual may limit their propensity to speak up or challenge authority in the workplace.

Empirical studies specifically examining the relationship between job neglect and individual’s diversity characteristics are limited. Rather, researchers have been critical of examinations into demographic characteristics as determinants of counterproductive workplace behaviors. They declared that significant relationships might, in part, be a result of the job environment and related to social and interpersonal factors (Robinson & O’Leary-Kelly, 1998). Hence, the literature reveals scarce and conflicting information for drawing conclusions about child welfare workers as a study population.

The relationship among diversity characteristics and intention to leave or turnover has been well documented but with variable results across disciplines. Indirectly, a review of literature suggests that those who hold an outsider (non-dominant) as compared to an insider (dominant) status within a particular organization may feel marginalized and therefore may lack a sense of belonging or inclusion within their work organization (Stamper & Masterson, 2002), which can in turn affect one’s stress, well-being, and inclination to leave their job (Stone-Romero, Stone, & Salas, 2003). Thus, these dynamics are detailed in hypothesis 1 (H1).
The Role of Work Climate Variables

Work climate variables may influence voice/neglect/exit responses through employees’ perceptions of job stress and psychological well-being (see hypothesis 2 [H2]). Inclusion in decision-making reflects one’s perception of their ability to participate and influence decision-making within their work group or organization (Mor Barak & Cherin, 1998). This type of inclusion is demonstrated at five system levels—work group, organization, supervisor, upper management, and informal networks (Mor Barak, 2005). Perceived supervisor and organizational support involves employees’ views about the extent to which the supervisor or the organization values their contributions and is concerned about their well-being (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Social exchange theory (Blau, 1964) lends support to the hypothesized relationships among perceptions of work climate and voice/neglect/exit responses.

According to social exchange theory, how an individual feels about a relationship is based on the balance between their efforts in the relationship and the anticipated or actual rewards (Blau, 1964). Based on this perspective and supportive empirical research, as employees perceive that they have opportunities to be involved in critical organizational processes, such as decision-making, they will feel empowered and supported, which will positively affect their stress, mental health, and psychological well-being (see for example, Michie & Williams, 2003) and can in turn affect work behaviors (Nissly, Mor Barak, & Levin, 2005). Thus, as stated in the H2, employees may reciprocate a felt sense of inclusion by intending to stay in the job or by being fully engaged in their work.

The Impact of Job Stress and Psychological Well-Being

From a broad-based perspective, job stress is a function of conditions in which the job requirements are incongruent with employees’ skills and expectations (National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, n.d.). Role stress, a form of job stress, reflects the extent to which one’s expectations of their role mirror the actual reality of that role (role conflict) and the extent to which an employee is unclear about their expectations (role ambiguity; Acker, 2004). Based on role theory (Biddle, 1986), when a person experiences competing demands, a form of role conflict, he or she will experience stress and diminished work efforts, more so than if they did not have the expectations imposed (Rizzo, House, & Lirtzman, 1970). Rizzo et al. also purported that as employees experience ambiguity in their jobs, they will cope by taking steps to solve the problem or they will avoid the sources of stress. Thus, the experience of ambiguity increases the likelihood of felt anxiety and results in decreased performance.

The current study focuses the effects of role conflict and role ambiguity in relation to psychological well-being on voice, neglect, and exit responses. Researchers have shown that job stress in general may affect human service workers’ psychological well-being (Dobreva-Martinova, 2002; Michie & Williams, 2003). Specifically related to voice, LePine and Van Dyne (1998, 2001) found that self-esteem and the absence of neuroticism (indicators of well-being) were positively related to voice responses. With exit considered a flight response, it is not surprising that researchers have consistently found that stress is one of the strongest predictors of intention to leave and turnover (Mor Barak et al., 2001) and has been linked to counterproductive work behaviors, such as neglect (Kidwell & Robie, 2003; Spector & Fox, 2005). Similarly, psychological well-being has been found to be related to the retention of social workers (Koeske & Kirk, 1995). The third hypothesis (H3) details the relationships among job stress, psychological well-being and voice, neglect, and exit responses.

Relationships Among Voice, Neglect, and Exit

This study sought to consider the effects of voice and neglect on exit, because exit involves an individual’s efforts toward quitting their job (see hypothesis 4 [H4]). While limited empirical research was found to support these relationships, the hypothesis is supported based on social exchange theory (Coyle-Shapiro, 2002). Based on this notion, employees who have unfilled
expectations of their job may then consider quitting. Paré and Tremblay (2004) found that organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB) were negative correlates of intention to withdraw from one’s job. None of the existent literature on voice or neglect examined the relationship among the two constructs. However, in a meta-analysis of the relationship between OCB and counterproductive workplace behaviors, in studies of more than 16,000 respondents, Dalal (2005) found a modest but negative relationship between OCB and counterproductive work behaviors.

**Indirect Effects**

Figure 1 illustrates the extensive combinations of hypothesized indirect effects that are represented in the conceptual model. As discussed previously, employees’ diversity characteristics, perceptions of work climate, job stress, and psychological well-being, and voice, neglect, and exit responses all may influence one another. Accordingly, each of the variables may have both direct and indirect relationships among each other, as stated in the final study hypothesis (H5).

**Research Hypotheses**

H1: As compared with their dominant group counterparts, those in non-dominant groups will engage in less voice, will not differ in neglect responses, and have greater propensity to exit.

H2: The more employees experience inclusion and support, the more they will be inclined to exercise voice as well as limit their neglect and exit responses.

H3: The more employees experience increased role stress and decreased psychological well-being, the less likely they are to exercise voice and the more likely they are to demonstrate neglect and exit.

H4: a) The more employees use voice, the less likely they will demonstrate neglect and exit responses. b) As employees engage in neglect, the more likely they will demonstrate exit.

H5: a) Work climate variables will mediate the relationships among work climate characteristics and voice, neglect, and exit responses. b) Job stress and psychological well-being will mediate the relationships among work climate variables and voice, neglect, and exit responses.

**METHODOLOGY**

This study employed a cross-sectional panel design to investigate the factors contributing to child welfare workers’ fight or flight responses. In total, 364 individuals agreed to participate in the study, and 359 completed all requirements for inclusion in the study. Five participants were not included in the study either because the informed consent was not signed or because they did not submit a questionnaire after signing the informed consent. This study built upon previous research that investigated employee intention to leave and actual turnover and was drawn on a large, longitudinal study focused on supervision and worker retention in child welfare.

**Procedures**

A large child welfare agency in the Western region of the United States served as the study site for the current study. An availability sample of child welfare workers was recruited to participate in the study based on their attendance in required or voluntary trainings offered at a university-based training center. Thirty training sessions were targeted for recruitment of participants from 2004 to 2005. At these sessions, potential study participants were provided general study information during the morning of their required or voluntary training session. At that time, research team members presented general and sufficient information to enable participants to make informed decisions about the potential of enrolling in the study. During the lunch break, participants voluntarily enrolled in the study after researchers provided further detail regarding the purpose of the study. All participants were reassured that their participation would be voluntary and their responses would be kept confidential. Study participants’ enrollment comprised the completion of the questionnaire and the signed informed consent. A university institutional review board’s human subjects application was submitted and approved prior to the start of the study and was renewed accordingly.
TABLE 2. Personal Diversity Characteristics of Study Participants (N = 359)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency (n)</th>
<th>Valid (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>83.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;30</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30–39</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40–49</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50–59</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/a</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American/Black</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Frequencies represent the valid (not total) number of cases within that grouping due to missing cases.

Description of the Study Sample

Descriptions of employee diversity characteristics help provide an understanding of the characteristics of the study sample. For this study, employees were surveyed on their personal (gender, ethnicity, and age) and professional (educational level, job position, and job tenure) characteristics (see Tables 2 and 3).

Instruments

Self-reported instruments were used to capture workers’ perceptions and felt experiences of their work environment, job stress, psychological well-being, and voice, neglect, and exit responses. The instruments used adopted preexisting scales to measure the constructs in the conceptual model. Respondents were asked to provide information on their personal (gender, ethnicity, and age) and professional (educational level, job position, and job tenure) characteristics.

Inclusion in decision-making was measured using the five-item subscale from Mor Barak and Cherin’s (1998) Perception of Inclusion scale. The subscale captured employees’ perceptions of their contribution to their job and organizational functioning. Responses were rated on a 6-point scale, and higher scores indicated greater perceived inclusion. The Perception of Inclusion scale and the subscales indicate strong internal consistency and convergent validity in their original application and in a series of cross-national studies (Mor Barak & Cherin, 1998; Mor Barak, Findler, & Wind, 2003; Mor Barak et al., 2006). For the current study, the alpha coefficient was .71.

TABLE 3. Professional Diversity Characteristics of Study Participants (n = 359)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Degree Obtained</th>
<th>Frequency (n)</th>
<th>Valid Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSW</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA/MS/MFT</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSW</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>43.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD or Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct service worker</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>81.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor or manager</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job tenure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 3 months</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 months to 1yr</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1+ to 5 yrs</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5+ to 10</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10+ to 15</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+ yrs</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| mean = 6.9; median = 3.7; SD = 6.7 |

TABLE 4. Descriptive Statistics of Model Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perception of inclusion in decision-making</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived supervisory support</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived organizational support</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role conflict</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role ambiguity</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological well-being</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neglect</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. All scales had minimum and maximum values of 1 to 6 with the exception of psychological well-being, scaled from 1 to 4. Higher scores represent stronger perceptions of inclusion in decision-making, supervisory support, or organizational support; greater stress associated with role conflict or role ambiguity; a heightened sense of psychological well-being; greater voice efforts; and greater neglect and exit.
Perceived supervisory support (PSS) and perceived organizational support (POS) involve employees’ global views about the extent to which supervisors or the work organization, respectively, value their contributions and care about their well-being. Both eight-item scales were originally developed by Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa (1986), and items for both scales are the same except the word “supervisor” replaced “organization” (Eisenberger, Stinglhamber, Vandenberghe, Sucharski, & Rhoades, 2002). Responses were rated on a 7-point scale. Four items in each scale were reverse-scored so that higher scores indicated greater support. Both scales have been used extensively in a variety of settings and have demonstrated strong validity and reliability (e.g., Eisenberger et al., 1986; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). For the current study, the alpha coefficients were acceptable for both measures: PSS = .88; POS = .83.

For the current study, job stress was conceptualized based on role conflict and role ambiguity. Originally developed by Rizzo et al. (1970), the widely used eight-item role conflict and six-item role ambiguity scales measure stress related to the expectations and clarity of employees’ work. Responses were rated on a six-point scale with higher scores indicating greater stress. All of the items on the role ambiguity scale were reverse-scored for consistency with the direction of the role conflict scale. These scales are widely used and have well-established psychometric properties (e.g., Acker, 2004; Netemeyer, Johnston, & Burton, 1990). For the current study sample, the Cronbach’s alpha coefficients were as follows: role conflict = .77; role ambiguity = .83.

Psychological Well-Being

Goldberg, McDowell, & Newell’s (1996) General Health Questionnaire (GHQ), a well-validated (e.g., Coffey, Dugdill, & Tattersall, 2004; Daradkeh, Ghubash, & El-Rufaie, 2001) global measure of current mental health status, was used to assess psychological well-being. For this study the widely used GHQ-12 was used. Items were rated on a 4-point scale with lower scores indicative of psychological distress. The Cronbach’s alpha for this study was at .89.

Voice, Neglect, and Exit

The voice, neglect, and exit scales were adopted from Rusbult, Farrell, Rogers, & Mainous (1988) and measured generalized tendencies toward each response on a 6-point scale. Higher scores indicate greater voice efforts and greater propensity to engage neglect or exit. The voice and exit scales were four items each. In its original formation, the neglect scale was six items; however, one item was removed after reliability analysis was conducted, revealing the item’s low contribution to the Cronbach’s alpha. For the current study, the Cronbach’s alpha for the exit scale (.87) and the neglect scale (.70) were acceptable. The alpha coefficient for the voice scale (.69) was lower but also acceptable, considering the complexity of the construct (Withey & Cooper, 1989).

Data Screening

All interval/ratio level variables were analyzed for normality. PSS and psychological well-being were negatively skewed, whereas role ambiguity, voice, neglect, and exit were positively skewed. To alleviate skewness of the distribution, square root transformations were conducted as recommended by Tabachnick and Fidell (2001) and adjusted accordingly. The calculated bivariate correlations (see Table 5) were assessed to determine whether collinearity-related problems existed among all permutations of the study variables. Based on the criterion of a correlation that is greater than .85 (Kline, 1998), there was no threat of multicollinearity to testing the model. Yet, as a caution, we decided to include job tenure and exclude the age variable from the path analysis because of their high correlation ($r = .71, p < .05$).

Analytic Procedures

Path analysis with Amos version 6.0 (Arbuckle, 2005) using the maximum likelihood estimation method was used to test the theory-driven hypothesized model. To achieve optimal model parsimony, the hypothesized model was tested in three phases using a stepwise approach (based on a method employed by Mor Barak et al., 2006). Phase I modeled the
relationship among diversity characteristics and work climate variables. Phase II tested the refined Phase I model (diversity characteristics → work climate) with the addition of job stress and psychological well-being as outcome variables. Phase III built on the earlier step and incorporated exit, neglect, and voice as outcome variables. In each phase, the paths were evaluated for model fit, and non-significant paths were removed; then the refined model was assessed again for fit in the next phase. The final results from Phase III created the refined, most parsimonious model. Several goodness-of-fit indexes were used to determine the consistency of the conceptual model’s fit with the data as recommended by Byrne (2001). Assessment of supported hypotheses was based on the level of significance of each pathway (p values less than .05 were considered significant; Diamantopoulos & Siguaw, 2000). Indirect effects were tested using a causal steps technique (Baron & Kenny, 1986). Sobel’s test of indirect effects was used to test for significant mediation effects (Preacher & Hayes, 2004).

**FINDINGS**

This study examined the antecedents of employee fight (voice) or flight (neglect and exit) responses. Results revealed that the hypothesized model fit the data well, explaining 27.6%, 18.8%, and 29.7% of the variance of exit, neglect, and voice, respectively (see Figure 2). Due to the complexity of the model, results focused on the antecedents to these responses and not necessarily the relationship among all the plausible paths.

H1 posits that as compared with their dominant group counterparts, those in non-dominant groups will engage in less voice response, will not differ in neglect responses, and have greater propensity to exit. This hypothesis was partially supported. First, two of the five non-dominant group categories held statistically significant pathways to voice as predicted: ethnicity (African American: $\beta = -0.098, p = 0.043$; Latinos: $\beta = -0.124, p = 0.011$) and job tenure ($\beta = 0.299, p = 0.066$). Next, as hypothesized, most of the non-dominant group members (women, bachelor’s degree holders, direct service workers, inexperienced employees) did not differ from their dominant group counterparts in their neglect responses. However, the finding of Latino respondents reporting higher scores on the neglect scale than other ethnic groups was not as anticipated ($\beta = 0.146, p = 0.003$).

Finally, employees with longer job tenure (i.e., seasoned employees) had fewer exit responses than those with a shorter job tenure ($\beta = -0.145, p = 0.006$).

H2 purported that the more employees experience inclusion and support, the more they will be inclined to exercise voice and limit their neglect and exit responses. This hypothesis was partially supported based on the statistically significant direct paths from a) perception of inclusion in decision-making to voice ($\beta = 0.172, p < 0.001$)

---

### TABLE 5. Bivariate Correlations of Scale Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Perception of inclusion in decision-making</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Perceived supervisory support</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Perceived organizational support</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Role conflict</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td>-.39**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Role ambiguity</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>-.14**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Psychological well-being</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>-.22*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Exit</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>-.35**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>-.34**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Neglect</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Voice</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>14**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. 1 = Pairwise deletion. Actual number of cases not reflected.
*p < .05. **p < .01.
FIGURE 2. Final Phase III Path Model

Phase III model fit statistics:

\[ \chi^2 = 58.402, \text{df} = 61, p = .571; \text{NFI} = .934; \text{CFI} = 1.00; \text{RMSEA} = .000; \text{CN} = 255; \text{ECVI} = 1.916 \]

- R\(^2\) Inclusion = .179
- R\(^2\) Role conflict = .229
- R\(^2\) Exit = .276
- R\(^2\) Superv. support = .179
- R\(^2\) Role ambiguity = .155
- R\(^2\) Neglect = .188
- R\(^2\) Org. Support = .333
- R\(^2\) Psychological well-being = .115
- R\(^2\) Voice = .297

Notes:
- Only significant paths (p < .05) are shown.
- The following significant paths were suppressed for clarity of presentation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job tenure</td>
<td>Supervisory support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job tenure</td>
<td>Role ambiguity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job tenure</td>
<td>Voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>neglect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Role conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td>Role conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td>Psychological well-being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td>Voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td>Neglect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory support</td>
<td>Exit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role conflict</td>
<td>Well-being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role conflict</td>
<td>Exit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and neglect ($\beta = -0.183, p = .006$); b) POS and exit ($\beta = -0.191, p < .001$); and c) supervisory support and exit ($\beta = -0.110, p = .026$).

H3 captured the impact of job stress and psychological well-being on employee voice, neglect, and exit responses. It was hypothesized that the more employees experience increased role stress and decreased psychological well-being, the less they may be willing to seek change (voice) and the more likely they will be to disengage (neglect and exit). Role conflict was positively related to voice ($\beta = .273, p < .007$); yet this was not as hypothesized. On the other hand, psychological well-being had no direct effects on voice. Role conflict ($\beta = .157, p = .004$) and role ambiguity ($\beta = .104, p = .037$) had direct effects on neglect. Psychological well-being was a statistically significant predictor of neglect ($\beta = -.172, p < .001$). Statistically significant pathways were found from role conflict ($\beta = .159, p = .002$) and role ambiguity ($\beta = .104, p = .037$) to exit. Also, the statistically significant direct effect of psychological well-being to exit ($\beta = -0.180, p < .001$) offered partial support for this hypothesis.

H4 suggests that the more employees’ use voice, the less likely they will be to disengage, using neglect and exit responses. Conversely, the more employees use neglect, the more likely they will be to use exit. This hypothesis was partially supported. First, the statistically significant pathway from voice to neglect ($\beta = .152, p = .005$) does not support the hypothesized relationship due to directionality of the relationship. Finally, as predicted, there was a statistically significant direct effect from neglect to exit ($\beta = .138, p = .005$).

A myriad of statistically significant indirect relationship were found (see H5). Yet two statistically significant relationships among the model variables in which full mediation occurred are discussed as key findings. As hypothesized, role conflict mediated the relationship between perceived supervisory support and neglect ($p = .003$). In the same manner, role conflict mediated the relationship between organizational support and voice responses organizational support and voice responses ($p < .001$) but not in the expected manner. As employees experienced support from the organization, their role conflict lowered, yet the more role conflict was experienced, the greater the voice response became.

### DISCUSSION

#### The Role of Diversity Characteristics

Study findings revealed that employees differed in their voice, neglect, and exit responses by gender, ethnicity, job level, and job tenure. No significant differences were present on the outcomes variables based on educational level. As predicted, some non-dominant group members were less likely to engage in voice than their dominant group counterparts, including shorter-tenured employees, Latinos, and African-Americans. This finding is consistent with those who posited that those in historical or hierarchal power positions have greater access to information, latitude in decision-making, and links in interpersonal processes that make certain voice responses more acceptable (Islam & Zyphur, 2005; Van Dyne & LePine, 1998). Despite this finding, other non-dominant groups (women, those with bachelor’s degrees, and direct service workers) did not differ from their dominant group counterparts in voice responses when this was considered among other predictors.

Mostly as hypothesized, group membership was not associated with neglect responses. However, Latinos reported having more efforts that reflect disengagement from work-related tasks or organizational activities in comparison to Caucasians, African Americans, and Asians. This finding is challenging to interpret due to the limits in the literature on the relationship between non-dominant group status and neglect in human service organizations. However, as a point of context, neglect as a construct reflects workers’ efforts on tasks or organizational activities (e.g., missing meetings, working slowly), not how they are interacting with or treating the clients. Therefore, other factors such as cultural background or challenges with work/family balance may exacerbate neglect responses. For example, Stone-Romero et al. (2003) stated that in some cases the act of being late may have differing meanings depending on the cultural context.
In the United States, lateness is considered disruptive to organizational effectiveness, whereas some Latin American countries do not have such negative connotations. Consequently, the measure of neglect used in this study may not account for this cultural difference.

Seasoned employees were less likely to engage in efforts toward quitting their jobs as compared with shorter-tenured employees. This finding was not surprising considering that employees with longer tenure may be more invested in their work organization and, therefore, less likely to leave (Mor Barak et al., 2001). The lack of statistically significant relationships among other diversity characteristics and exit is aligned with mixed findings in the reviewed literature (Griffeth, Hom, & Gaertner, 2000; Mor Barak et al., 2001).

The Influence of Work Climate Variables

Results demonstrated that work climate variables affected voice/neglect/exit responses in differing ways: a) Voice was positively associated with inclusion in decision-making and was not affected by supervisory or organizational support; b) neglect was inversely associated with inclusion in decision-making and was not affected by supervisory or organizational support; c) exit was not influenced by inclusion in decision-making and was inversely related to supervisory and organizational support. Social exchange theory (Blau, 1964; Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005) helps explain these differing effects of inclusion versus support on voice, neglect, and exit. For starters, voice and neglect may directly contribute to employees’ on-the-job functioning. Specifically, these reflect the extent to which employees are engaged (voice) or not engaged (neglect) in work tasks or organizational activities (Dundon et al., 2004; Kidwell & Robie, 2003). As a result, perceived involvement in vital organizational processes may result in positive worker outcomes (Spreitzer et al., 1999). This may be particularity relevant for voice-related behaviors because researchers have argued that participation in decision-making processes is an element of voice (Dundon et al.). Exit involves employee intentions and behaviors toward quitting that may not directly affect daily activities. Therefore, support may cultivate an exchange-based relationship between the employee and their supervisor or organization. In this relationship, employees experience support, they will reciprocate by remaining employed with their current organization. However, the experience of support does not necessarily keep employees; rather, those outcomes are a product of being included in decision-making.

The Role of Job Stress & Psychological Well-Being

Study findings revealed that, contrary to our hypothesis, voice was positively related to role conflict and not related to role ambiguity or psychological well-being. The positive relationship between role conflict and voice suggests that this form of stress appeared to stimulate the fight response. As such, based on role theory (Biddle, 1986), employees may have engaged in change-oriented efforts to reduce sources of their role stress. Despite this relationship, neither role ambiguity nor psychological well-being was related to employee voice. Because role ambiguity reflects uncertainty about one’s roles, the Spiral of Silence theory (Bowen & Blackmon, 2003) offers perspective on this relationship. Plausibly, uncertainty about one’s role may breed fear or insecurity which may be accompanied by a lack of willingness to speak up. Under conditions of uncertainty, the flight response—a propensity to withdraw from duties or the job itself—may be actualized rather than a fight response or willingness to voice. Psychological well-being had no statistically significant relationship with voice, which is contrary to researchers’ studies of individuals’ state of being, such as self-esteem in relation to voice (LePine & Van Dyne, 1998).

As hypothesized, neglect and exit were positively related to role stress (role conflict and role ambiguity) and inversely related to psychological well-being. Using role stress theory (Biddle, 1986) as a guiding framework, job stress may adversely affect worker outcomes, such as job productivity and counterproductive work behaviors. Finally, employees who had a heightened sense of psychological well-being were less likely to report exit- and neglect-related efforts. This
finding was in contrast to Mor Barak et al.’s (2001) findings in a meta-analysis of human service workers’ turnover that psychological well-being was not related to intention to leave or actual turnover. On the other hand, not surprisingly, in relation to neglect, the inverse relationship between psychological well-being and counterproductive work behaviors was supported by others’ research (Spector & Fox, 2005).

**The Relationship Among Exit, Neglect, & Voice**

Based on study findings, voice and neglect were significantly and positively related. That is, as employees made efforts to improve dissatisfying conditions or promote change, they were also more likely to disengage from work-related tasks and organizational activities. Upon reexamination of the literature, the nature of this relationship may be, in part, due to employees reacting to undesirable experiences at work, as originally conceptualized in the landmark studies of exit/neglect/voice (Farrell, 1983; Hirschman, 1970; Rusbult et al., 1988). Within the same time frame, employees may engage in a variety of options to cope with the presenting circumstances at work, including both voice and neglect. Dalal’s (2005) hedonism assumption supports this idea. Dalal posited that individuals engage in specific behaviors to achieve a higher level of satisfaction or good mood. Neglect has been certainly framed as “a set of behaviors that dissatisfied individuals enact to avoid the work situation” (Hanisch & Hulin, 1990, p. 63). Voice as conceptualized and operationalized in this study shares a similar sentiment in which the construct is partially defined as efforts to improve dissatisfying conditions (Dundon et al., 2004). Intention to leave and turnover have been extensively examined as worker outcome variables in social service research (Mor Barak et al., 2001). Findings revealed that employee exit (related to intention to leave) responses are determined by neglect but not voice responses. Not unexpectedly, a significant and positive relationship between neglect and exit was found. Researchers generally agree that employees’ intention to leave and turnover may be precipitated by one’s limited engagement in work-related tasks and organizational activities (Griffeth et al., 2000). Therefore, as employees become psychologically disengaged, they may be more inclined to quit their jobs.

**Indirect Effects**

This study aimed to explore both the direct and indirect relationships within the theory-driven conceptual model. The results revealed an array of significant indirect relationships that contributed to perceived support, job stress, psychological well-being, and choice of response. However, two statistically significant relationships among the model variables in which full mediation occurred are discussed as key findings. Role conflict mediated the relationship between PSS and neglect. The nature of this relationship was as hypothesized. Employees who experienced supervisory support had lower levels of role conflict, and lower levels of role conflict were associated with lower levels of neglect. In the same manner, role conflict mediated the relationship between organizational support and voice responses in that, as employees experienced support from the organization, their role conflict lowered. However, the more role conflict was experienced, the greater the voice response. Therefore, the existence of role conflict buffered the relationship between organizational support and voice but not in an expected manner.

**Strengths and Limitations**

First, this study is a premier study of the combination voice/neglect/exit responses within a child welfare setting. Accordingly, the study’s conceptual model draws from social work, organizational behavior, and psychology theories to offer a comprehensive multidisciplinary perspective. Second, unique combinations of organizational variables were examined for their effects on the voice/neglect/exit responses. Accordingly, this study was able to gain insight into the work climate, job stress, and psychological well-being factors in combination with diversity characteristics that enhanced the likelihood of child welfare workers engaging in behaviors that benefit the organization (voice) rather than possibly being a detriment (exit or neglect).
This study does have limitations that warrant consideration for interpreting the findings. First, the data were collected using self-reported measures at one point in time. To determine whether common method variance is a validity threat, Harman’s one factor test was conducted to assess whether one underlying factor accounted for the majority of the covariance in the data (Podsakoff & Organ, 1986). Thus, all of the items in the key study variables were entered into an un-rotated principal components factor analysis. Principal components analysis yielded 16 factors with eigenvalues greater than 1.0 with no single factor accounting for a majority of the covariance. Consequently, common method variance did not emerge as a significant problem. Second, a limitation of the study relates to external validity due to the availability or convenience sampling of 359 child welfare workers. The study sample was overrepresented or underrepresented in certain categories as compared with the study population from which the data were drawn. The sample was significantly younger and had significantly more women, fewer African Americans, and more Asian/Pacific Islanders than the study population. The sample was also more educated, included a higher proportion of line workers, and had significantly shorter agency tenure than the population.

Additionally, the hypothesized model captured only five diversity characteristics (gender, ethnicity, educational level, job position, and job tenure). Therefore, other personal or individual characteristics such as personality, personal skills, and life experience, as well as other non-dominant or dominant group characteristics (e.g., parental status) or professional (roles, responsibilities, type of program), were not assessed. Researchers have cautioned against not considering these types of characteristics in modeling individual attitudes and behaviors (Jackson & Joshi, 2004). However, the current study did capture one measure of the participants’ personal characteristics (psychological well-being) that was not work related.

Next, although cross-cutting workplace issues exist among social service workers (Annie E. Casey Foundation, 2003), an expanded study that captures the perspectives of differing work settings would be advantageous. Hence, to increase the external validity of the current study, a more representative sample is desirable for future studies. Finally, reliance on cross-sectional data limits opportunities to infer statistical causality among antecedent and outcome variables (Rubin & Babbie, 2001). A supplemental longitudinal study incorporating different time points is useful to test for causality in the hypothesized model.

CONCLUSIONS/IMPLICATIONS

Child welfare organizations are charged in cultivating the well-being of the individuals, families, and communities that they serve. At the heart of these organizations are direct service workers, supervisors, and managers/administrators who conduct the day-to-day operations that enable organizations to fulfill their missions. The narrative of the child welfare organization is similar to other social service organizations in a shared focus on enhancing the well-being of others (Annie E. Casey Foundation, 2003). Accordingly, reports have discussed that these types of organizations also share similar challenges in retention and recruitment of talented workers. Hence, this study has research and practice implications for child welfare and potentially provides additional insight to social service organizations.

Implications for Further Research

The study’s focus on inclusion draws implications for one’s dominant and non-dominant group membership. In formative studies of diversity and inclusion, Mor Barak and colleagues (Mor Barak, Findler, & Wind, 2003; Mor Barak & Cherin, 1998) have investigated the relationships among demographic characteristics and perceptions of inclusion. Specifically, the researchers found that women and members of racial/ethnic minorities were more likely to feel excluded from important organizational processes (Mor Barak & Cherin, 1998). In accordance with these findings, further study is needed to illuminate the complexities and nuances of individuals’ dominant and non-dominant group characteristics, cultural diversity, and inclusion in child welfare, social services, and related fields.
As distinct forms of job stress, role conflict and role ambiguity had differing effects on exit, neglect, and voice as well as dissimilar antecedents. Both role conflict and role ambiguity contributed to the likelihood that employees will engage in neglect or exit. However, only role conflict inspired employees to engage in voice. Additionally, the antecedents to role conflict and role ambiguity differed. These findings suggest that researchers keep these conceptually distinguished and not combine them to create a general role stress construct, as also suggested by McGee, Ferguson and Seers (1989).

Researchers might do well to examine the multidimensionality of voice as a construct—specifically singling out change-related behaviors (Islam & Zyphur, 2005). This is due to the comprehensiveness of voice constructs that can represent a host of responses, including speaking up to overcome undesirable work conditions or promoting organizational change—for example, talking to a supervisor or making an effort to implement change in the absence of a particular dissatisfaction. Thus, this research would benefit from further development specifically geared toward child welfare as well as social services.

In many disciplines, scholars generally agreed that voice needs conceptual clarification (Kowtha, Landau, & Beng, n.d.). Similarly, the measure of job neglect as used in this study reflects a single form of counterproductive work behaviors reflective of organizational concerns in a corporate setting (Hagedoorn et al., 1999; Kidwell & Robie, 2003). However, job neglect might imply two different sets of activities in child welfare. On the one hand, neglect may impact organizational processes by employees who are not putting forth full work effort. On the other hand and more seriously, neglect may also reflect failing to attend to client needs. The latter was not measured in this study, and future researchers should consider distinguishing or identifying measures focusing on employee neglect and client need as distinct from organizational processes. Considering the demands and challenges of working in child welfare (e.g., high caseloads, reporting responsibilities, one-on-one client interactions, accountability to governing bodies), conceptually teasing out how both voice and neglect responses work within the specific realm of child welfare provides opportunities for researchers to probe deeper into how employers might keep employees engaged in constructive work behaviors.

**Implications for Organizational Effectiveness**

Organizations should consider using a range of measures to understand how workers are negotiating the challenges of their jobs. Based on the present study’s findings, exit, neglect, and voice have differing antecedents and effects. From one perspective, assessments of employees’ exit responses may help organizations prevent turnover and retain competent, well-trained employees as desired. An assessment of neglect may provide work organizations with opportunities to learn about the determinants of employee participation and effort in their particular settings. The study of voice, in particular, provides opportunities for work organizations to understand employee mechanisms to express concerns as well as processes geared toward workplace innovation (Kowtha et al., n.d.). This may provide opportunities for organizations to develop innovative policies and practices to retain employees and keep them fully involved in work and organizational activities.

At the practice level, employee engagement in voice primarily can serve two functions. Voice can ease dissatisfaction in the workplace and also enhance organizational effectiveness through worker innovation and feedback (Detert & Burris, 2007). In the child welfare environment, voice as a tool for increased organizational effectiveness is particularly relevant. Hopkins (2002) stated that human and social service systems now rely on employees engaging in extra role activities. As a part of that process, Chia, Landau, and Ong (2000) suggested that organizational leaders consider training supervisors on soliciting input from and providing validation to employees, even if not all ideas are incorporated. The goal would be to let employees know that their ideas were considered and to prevent them from withdrawing participation in the future. Organizational leaders should also consider training employees on offering constructive voice or speaking up for positive change, which differs...
from complaining (Kowalski, 2002) or speaking up with the goal of winning (Hagedoorn et al., 1999). Many employees may feel that if they speak up, they are engaging in a change-related behavior. However, organizational leaders may not experience it that way and may associate the employee efforts as the irritability and accusations associated with complaining. Ultimately, these types of interventions would cultivate an organizational climate that encourages employee innovation and feedback, meaningful dialogue, and participation in decision-making (Berry, 2004).

**Conclusion**

Work organizations are reliant on employees—at all levels—to be proactive, constructive, and engaged in their jobs. At the same time, organizational leaders’ emphasis on change, innovation, and quality improvement further contributes to the ever-increasing focus on worker feedback and positive change efforts. While organizations want employees who constructively contribute to their jobs, recruiting, training, and developing these workers is replete with challenges. This study’s central research question focuses on the dynamics of child welfare workers’ efforts to seek positive change (fight) or disengage by limiting their work effort or quitting (flight) to workplace challenges. Through better understanding of these types of factors affecting workers’ response to challenges, child welfare and social service organizations may be better equipped to reap the benefits of having engaged employees who contribute to the effectiveness of their work organizations.

**NOTE**

1. The full mediation models were significant at level .025 with Bonferroni’s correction. All other indirect effects, which are not discussed here, represent partial mediation.
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