PERSPECTIVES OF TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP BY CHILD WELFARE WORKERS: IMPACTS ON TURNOVER INTENTION

Taekyung Park

Submitted to the faculty of the University Graduate School in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Doctor of Philosophy in the School of Social Work, Indiana University

August 2018
Accepted by the Graduate Faculty of Indiana University, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Doctoral Committee

____________________________________
Robert Vernon, PhD, Chair

____________________________________
Barbara Pierce, PhD

April 23, 2018

____________________________________
Michin Hong, PhD

____________________________________
Marlene Walk, PhD
DEDICATION

I dedicate this work to my sister, Sukhee Park.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to express my gratitude to the distinguished committee members: Dr. Robert Vernon (Chair), Dr. Barbara Pierce, Dr. Michin Hong, and Dr. Marlene Walk. I can definitely say I owed each of them big time during this process. I could not make it this far without their support both academically and psychologically. I was so lucky that all the members of my committee were more than willing to help me complete my work by never saying “NO”. It meant a lot to me. They always believed in me and were patient with my slow work by waiting for me to move one-step at a time. Their mentorship and wisdom are exactly what I want to use for my future students. I could not give up when I thought of my committee members who put a lot of energy in helping me get through this long journey. I cannot thank all of them enough.

As a chair, Dr. Vernon helped me build my committee from the start with his great leadership. The way in which he managed my committee and advised my work during the dissertation process is exactly what I want to apply in my future career as a teacher and researcher. Dr. Pierce was and is like a mother, social worker, and research mentor to me. She helped me not only survive this program but also complete dissertation in every aspect. I specially thank her for making the data collection as part of her research project. Dr. Hong always opened her door to me whenever I needed her for advice of anything. She shared her experience with me to cheer me up. Dr. Walk challenged me to make my research more rigorous, which enhance the quality of my dissertation paper. Frankly speaking, every member of my committee worked very hard for my dissertation paper by providing insightful feedback.
I would like to thank my former external minor advisor, Dr. Julia Carboni. She helped me develop knowledge of leadership theories in the independent study that she did pro bono for my dissertation.

I feel very lucky and blessed to be a student in IUSSW. Every faculty member that I met here in IUSSW was more than just a professor. They are not only social work professors, but also real social workers who cared about the students. Thank you, Dr. Michael Patchner (Dean), Dr. Margaret Adamek (PhD Director), Dr. Hea-won Kim, Dr. David Kondrat, Dr. James Hall, Dr. Carmen Sugawara, and Dr. Jessica Lee for the great support, mentorship, and sharing your wisdom and knowledge with me!

IUSSW IS THE BEST SCHOOL EVER!
Taekyung Park

PERSPECTIVES OF TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP BY CHILD WELFARE WORKERS: IMPACTS ON TURNOVER INTENTION

It is not a new phenomenon that there is a high turnover rate among social workers. In particular, child welfare has shown the highest rates of staff turnover. To address the issue, turnover and retention of child welfare workers have been studied for decades. The history of research produced a long list of determinants for child welfare worker turnover, more than 20 factors, and showed conflicting findings with the same variables. Moreover, the long list of factors for workers’ decisions to leave has poorly contributed to organizational practices for retaining child welfare workers. Therefore, this study aims to examine organizational factors, particularly leadership, for child welfare worker turnover intention, in order to help child welfare agencies to invent a practice model to prevent qualified worker’s turnover. To do so, it is important to examine the effect of organizational commitment on employees’ turnover intention. Therefore, following is the primary research question: Does the use of transformational leadership style in social work organizations explain child welfare worker turnover intention?

A cross-sectional survey research was employed among workers in public child welfare agencies in a Midwest state, United States (N=214). Five models were examined in terms of the direct and indirect effects of transformational leadership on turnover intention of child welfare workers using STATA ver. 15. The study finding showed that transformational leadership styles of local office directors had a direct and negative effect on child welfare workers’ turnover intention. As a result, this study recommends that child welfare provide local office directors with leadership training to reduce preventable
turnover of child welfare workers. However, the findings should be cautiously interpreted due to the sampling strategy used in this study.

Robert Vernon, PhD, Chair
# Table of Contents

List of Tables ..................................................................................................................... xi
List of Figures .................................................................................................................. xii
Chapter One Introduction ................................................................................................. 1
Chapter Two Definitions and Significance of Child Welfare Worker Turnover ............ 5
  Definitions ....................................................................................................................... 5
  Turnover ......................................................................................................................... 5
  Turnover Intention ......................................................................................................... 6
Significance of Child Welfare Worker Turnover ............................................................ 7
  Internal Aspects ............................................................................................................ 8
  External Aspects .......................................................................................................... 11
Chapter Three Empirical Literature Review and Theory Review of Child Welfare Worker Turnover ................................................................. 16
  Literature Review of Social Worker Turnover ........................................................... 16
  Economic Variables ..................................................................................................... 18
  Demographic Variables ............................................................................................... 21
  Psychological Factors ................................................................................................... 22
    Job Satisfaction .......................................................................................................... 23
    Job Stress .................................................................................................................... 23
    Dangerousness ........................................................................................................... 27
    Burnout ..................................................................................................................... 28
    Job Autonomy ............................................................................................................ 29
  Supervision ................................................................................................................... 30
  Organizational Commitment ....................................................................................... 32
  Job Embeddedness ....................................................................................................... 33
Organizational Condition ............................................................................................... 35
  Pay ................................................................................................................................. 35
  Organizational Climate and Culture ........................................................................... 36
Leadership ....................................................................................................................... 38
Summary of Literature Review ....................................................................................... 39
Chapter Four Critical Theory Review Relative to Child Welfare Worker Turnover ...... 42
  Organizational Theory: Complex Adaptive Systems Theory ....................................... 42
  Leadership Theory ....................................................................................................... 46
    Transformational Leadership ...................................................................................... 47
Chapter Five Knowledge Foundation of Child Welfare Worker Turnover Research .... 51
  Summary of Knowledge Gaps in Child Welfare Worker Turnover ......................... 51
  Research Questions and Hypotheses .......................................................................... 52
Chapter Six Methods ......................................................................................................... 56
  Research Design .......................................................................................................... 56
  Sampling and Data Collection ..................................................................................... 56
  Human Subject Reviews .............................................................................................. 57
  Measures ....................................................................................................................... 57
    Turnover Intention ....................................................................................................... 58
    Transformational Leadership ...................................................................................... 59
    Organizational Culture ............................................................................................... 61
LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Categories and Definitions of Variables..................................................58
Table 2: Cutoff Criteria of Fit Indices for Model Evaluation..............................64
Table 3: Descriptive Statistics for Study Participants...........................................65
Table 4: Descriptive Analysis for Continuous Variables .....................................67
Table 5: Correlations among Measurement and Control Variables.....................69
Table 6: Tolerance and VIF Values .......................................................................72
Table 7: Direct, Indirect, and Total Effects among Variables in Models ..............80
LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Conceptual Model of Child Welfare Worker Turnover Intention..........55
Figure 2: Standardized Path Coefficients for Model 1 .....................................73
Figure 3: Standardized Path Coefficients for Model 2 .....................................74
Figure 4: Standardized Path Coefficients for Model 3 .....................................76
Figure 5: Standardized Path Coefficients for Model 4 .....................................77
Figure 6: Standardized Path Coefficients for Model 5 .....................................79
Chapter One: Introduction

The effectiveness of organizational performances within social work organizations or social/human service organizations where child welfare workers practice can be accomplished by integrating a variety of resources, such as financial resources, human resources, and their networks with other agencies. In particular, human resources are very important for effective and efficient performances in child welfare organizations because services cannot be properly delivered to clients without qualified child welfare workers in the era of cost effective management and care management (Vinokur-Kaplan & Bogin, 2000; Ginsberg & Keys, 1995). As Pynes (2009) described, regardless of agency resources, high quality of human services cannot be achieved without highly qualified and skilled workers or practitioners. Thus, recruiting and preserving qualified and experienced practitioners are key factors in child welfare organizations’ overall successful performances, including providing the most effective services to their clients (Daly, Dudley, Finnegam, Jones & Christiansen, 2001).

Despite the significant roles of human resources in human service organizations, unfortunately, high turnover rates of the workers is a serious concern in child welfare. The American Public Human Services Association (Cyphers et al., 2005) conducted a study to compare the turnover rates of social workers to those of other professionals, and reported that the rate is 2.4 times that of other government employees. Moreover, child welfare agencies experience a higher staff turnover rate when compared to other fields (Daly et al., 2001). However, there is no one congruent report of statistical data presenting the staff turnover rate in child welfare organizations. Depending on the literature, the average rates of worker turnover in child welfare organizations varied from
20% up to 57% annually (Alliance for Children and Families, American Public Human Services Association, & Child Welfare League of America 2001; Burstain, 2009; Child Welfare League of America, 2008; Healy & Ol tedal, 2010; Legislative Audit Council, 2014; Mack, 2001; Mor Barak, Nissly, & Levin, 2001; National Child Welfare Workforce Institute, 2011). There was one report that claimed 100% of worker turnover per year (University of Georgia, 2003).

Child welfare field suffered staff turnover rates higher than other human services did, for example average turnover rate in health care was 12.5% in 2003 (Ann Bares, 2014, February 5). Thus, turnover and retention of child welfare workers in every level have been studied in a wide range for decades (Ellett, 2009; Ellett, Ellis, Westbrook, & Dews, 2007; General Accounting Office; 2006, Hwang & Hopkins, 2012; Mor Barak, Levin, Nissly, & Lane, 2006; Mor Barak, et al., 2001). Research on the turnover or retention discovered that more than 80 factors influenced the child welfare workers’ decision to leave or remain in their organizations, such as compensation, organizational culture, organizational climate, organizational commitment, leadership, job satisfaction, job stress, burnout, workloads, job safety etc. (Ellett, 2009; Kim & Kao, 2014; Hwang & Hopkins, 2012; Kim & Barak, 2015; Mor Barak, et al., 2001). Despite the long history of research on child welfare worker turnover and retention, no agreement was reached on models or conceptual frameworks to address the issue (Ellett, 2009; Mor Barak, et al., 2001). Rather than identifying a comprehensive model to address the issue, the long history of research produces a long list of determinants for child welfare worker turnover and results in conflicting findings with the same variables. Indeed, most of the research on social worker turnover examines more than 10 factors each in a linear model. It has
not been long that researchers paid attention to the interrelationships, interactions and inter-influences among the multiple factors (Freund, 2005; Hwang & Hopkins, 2012; Kim & Barak, 2015; Kim & Stoner, 2008; Maertz, Griffeth, Campbell, & Allen, 2007; Mor Barak, et al., 2006) that have been discovered so far. A long list of factors influencing workers’ decisions to leave have poorly contributed to identifying organizational programs that could help retain human resources. It is time to develop a practice model based on a theoretical framework that organizations can adopt rather than to add new factors. Theoretical models should be developed through looking into the dynamics of internal as well as external elements of child welfare organizations and should integrate the factors discovered so far.

The purpose of this study was to create a theoretical framework to explain the extricating relationships of multiple factors of staff turnover in order to help child welfare organizations improve their effectiveness. Most of all, this study weighted the roles of the organizations in preventing avoidable staff turnover. In what follows, the significance of worker turnover in child welfare was first discussed taking into consideration the impacts on clients, organizations, the social work profession, and child welfare worker’s well-being. To select the theories and models pertinent to staff turnover for this study, a vast body of research literature was reviewed. This study extended the literature review to include research on social worker/human service provider’s turnover because child welfare workers share common characteristics with those of social workers or human service providers. This extended literature review helped explain the unique characteristics of child welfare workers who provide services mostly under public administration. The thorough empirical literature review led to select and review the
relevant theories to child welfare worker turnover: organizational theories and leadership theory. Next, based on the theory and literature review, a conceptual model to address high turnover rates of child welfare workers was proposed. Path analysis was employed to examine the model suggested, and the results of analyses were presented with discussion of implication, limitations, and suggestions for future research.
Chapter Two: Definitions and Significance of Child Welfare Worker Turnover

Definitions

Several terminologies are involved in the studies of reducing employee turnover and increasing retention rates in child welfare organizations, such as turnover, voluntary turnover, involuntary turnover, turnover intent, and retention. Each term is defined differently and has its own meaning. However, most of the studies did not clarify the definitions of those terms, especially the difference between voluntary and involuntary turnover, and often interchangeably used intention to leave with voluntary turnover. However, intention to leave is not the same as the voluntary turnover because voluntary turnover means actual leaving. Ben-Dror (1994), Lambert, Cluse-Tolar, Pasupuleti, Prior, and Allen (2012), and Wermeling (2009) were concerned that very few studies clearly defined each term. Therefore, the following describes a definition of each terminology in order to help clarify what aspect of staff turnover this study is focusing on.

Turnover. First, turnover is defined as the degree of individual movement in the membership status, in general (Bluedorn, 1978). In the workforce, employee turnover refers to “the actual movement of workers from one firm to another” (Parnes, 1954, p.20). This movement occurs within the profession and between different professions because some employees leaving an agency will move either to another agency within the same profession or to a completely different profession (field in social work profession) from the previous one. Quitting the current job with no reemployment is also counted as turnover (Ben-Dror, 1994). According to Bluedorn (1978), moving into a different agency is one type of turnover. However, the purpose of this study is to keep quality child
welfare workers as valuable resources in child welfare organizations. Thus, people moving out an agency are the subjects of this paper.

Voluntary vs. Involuntary Turnover. Second, traditionally, there are two major types of turnover: voluntary and involuntary turnover (Lambert et al., 2012, p. 68). Voluntary turnover is the movement initiated by employees while the movement initiated by any forces of others than the decision of an employee refers to involuntary turnover (Bluedorn, 1978). In other words, if staff quits their job and leaves an agency by his or her will, it is voluntary turnover. When employees cannot control their turnover, such as retirement, dismissal, layoffs, and death, those types of turnover are considered as involuntary turnover (Bluedorn, 1978). Price (1977) indicated that voluntary turnover was most common and most harmful to both an agency and its clients as well as the most preventable type of turnover. This paper focuses on voluntary turnover that can be avoidable with a reasonable level of interventions at the organizational level.

Turnover Intention. Third, turnover intent is both a cognitive process that employees consider leaving their current job (Lamber et al., 2012, Mobley et al., 1979, Mor Barak et al., 2001) and activities seeking an alternative job (Aarons, Sommerfeld, Silovsky, & Chaffin, 2009). The research of workforce turnover in social/human services organizations has been conducted in two ways. One method is to measure the actual turnover rate, and the other is to use turnover intent as an independent variable in predicting actual turnover. The best predictor of actual turnover is intention to quit (Mobley, Griffeth, Hand, & Meglino, 1979) along with job satisfaction, burnout, and job stress.
Because longitudinal research on workers’ turnover is hardly feasible, many studies have used the workers’ stated intention to leave the job and/or their organizations as the outcome variable rather than have waited for some period to see who actually leave (Nissly, Barak, & Levin, 2005; Weaver, Chang, & Gil de Gibaja, 2006). Few studies of employee turnover and retention tend to use both actual turnover rates and turnover intent (Mor Barak, et al., 2001; Hatton & Emerson, 1998). Besides, turnover intent as an outcome variable was considered the indicator of job satisfaction, burnout, and stress and thus to help organizations prevent avoidable staff turnover (McGowan, Auerbach, & Strolin-Goltzman, 2009; Mor Barak et al., 2006; Tham, 2007). Thus, turnover intent as a predictor of job satisfaction or burnout should be regarded as an implication of employee well-being that is critical to providing quality services as well as the social work workforce.

Significance of Child Welfare Worker Turnover

Various factors will determine the effectiveness of organizational performance within human service organizations, such as financial resources, human resources, and management styles. Among those factors, the quality of child welfare services provided to clients highly relies on the person who delivers the services and the workforce stability (Schweitzer, Chianello, & Kothari, 2013). While most of the research on child welfare worker turnover stressed the critical roles of workers or human resources of agencies, only a handful of empirical research in business and little in social work including child welfare field focused on investigating the actual costs or the consequences of staff turnover (Dorch, McCarthy & Denofrio, 2008; Strolin, McCarthy, & Caringi, 2007; Seavey, 2004). Despite the lack of empirical evidence of the consequences and the actual
costs of employee turnover in social work, a high turnover rate is recognized as a serious problem not only for the profession but also for organizations (Cyphers, et al., 2005; Schweitzer, et al., 2013). The literature of social worker turnover and retention often discussed the importance of retaining educated, skilled workers, borrowing the evidence found in other disciplines such as psychology, sociology, and economics (Mor Barak, et al., 2001; Strolin, et al., 2007; Yoo, 2002). Iglehart (1990) suggested that social worker turnover, including child welfare workers, had negative effects on co-workers and organizations as well as reducing benefits for organizations.

Researchers who studied child welfare worker turnover added the negative effect on children and families causing poor child welfare outcomes (Healy, Meagher, & Cullin, 2007; Schweitzer, et al., 2013; Strolin, et al., 2007). In addition, Healy, et al. (2007) took one-step further to identify the negative effect on the social work profession. Because the employee turnover rate is higher in social work than in other industries (Tham, 2007; The British Association of Social Workers, 2012), what consequences of child welfare worker turnover will have on the social work profession should be taken into consideration as well. In this study, the impacts on clients and child welfare workers are categorized as internal features of negative effects; the impacts on organizations and the profession are classified as external features. This will meet a consistency with the classification of worker turnover factors and relevant theories to be reviewed in chapter 4.

**Internal Aspects. Impacts on Children and Families.** Child welfare worker turnover can have devastating influences on the clients of an agency where the productive capacity depends on the human capital. Direct care service providers play key roles in determining the quality of services provided by the agency (Mor Barak et al., 2001). Glisson et al.
(2008) highlighted the critical relationships of therapist turnover to program sustainability in mental health clinics. They documented that the service providers determined the sustainability of programs, particularly when the agency introduced and practiced a new program. When program operators are changed, and thus their clients are shuffled and reshuffled, not only will the quality of services decline but also the clients will lose trust in the agency, even in the government. Loss of clients’ trust in the agency can destroy the concrete rapport established with their service providers causing the clients’ feeling discarded by their workers (Labmert et al., 2012; Mor Barak et al., 2001).

In New Zealand, the Ministry of Social Department reported disadvantages of low retention rates on clients by referring to the document generated by the Department of Child, Youth and Family Services (Child, Youth and Family, 2003). Children lost the continuity of personal relationships with their caseworkers within the organizations and experienced the delays of referring to other types of service organizations by prohibiting the communication and co-ordination among agencies (Albizu-Garcia & Juarbe, 2004; Child, Youth and Family, 2003; Wagner, Johnson, & Healy, 2009). Switching caseworkers is instrumental not only in the loss of relationship continuity but also in delaying of service plan activities and important decisions for the children and their families (Aguiniga, Madden, Faulkner, & Salehin, 2013; Auerbach, McGowan, Ausberger, Strolin-Goltzman, & Schudrich, 2010; Strolin-Goltzman, Kollar, & Trinkle, 2010). Flower, McDonald, and Sumski (2005) found that the possibility of permanency outcomes for children (74.5%) was a lot higher when the caseworker did not change than when the caseworker changed (ranged from 17.5% to 0.1%). There were a few studies to examine that child welfare worker turnover had serious impacts on child welfare
outcomes: permanency, safety, and well-being (Children’s Defense Fund & Children’s Rights, Inc., 2007; Flower et al., 2005; Strolin-Goltzman et al., 2010; Texas Department of Family and Protective Services, 2015; Wagner et al., 2009)

Even though the adverse consequences of staff turnover on clients are deemed as indirect costs, Webb and Carpenter (2012) stated that understaffed services had direct impacts on the most vulnerable groups of a society and the community (p. 2). This might cause indirectly but substantially damaging consequences such as increasing economic and social expenses in the society when the needs of service users cannot be met.

**Impacts on Colleagues.** Another internal feature of the negative effects of worker turnover is child welfare workers themselves being influenced. The impacts are both physical and emotional, and perceived as indirect costs (Bliss, Gillespie, & Gongaware, 2009; Flower, et al., 2005; Healy, et al., 2007; Seavey, 2004; Yankeelov, Barbee, Sullivan, & Antle, 2009). Physically, because the coworkers may be required to replace the former workers’ tasks, workloads will increase more than ever (Dorch, et al., 2008; Webb & Carpenter, 2012; Yankeelov et al., 2009), and as a result, their performance levels will diminish as well (Iglehart, 1990). Emotionally, coworkers’ leaving can lower the morale of the colleagues left behind and lead them to feel stressed and to experience burnout and even trauma (Flower et al., 2005; Iglehart, 1990; Strolin-Goltzman et al., 2010; Wagner et al., 2009). Physical and emotional turmoil brought by coworkers’ vacancies can lower the job satisfaction and even require unnecessary health care costs (Murphy, 1996), and will incur leaving the agencies (Healy, et al., 2007; Nissly, et al., 2005; Wilner & Wyatt, 1999).
The relationships and networks firmly established among workers within organizations over time also can be disrupted. Among the relationships are the professional supervisions and ongoing learning processes and development (Child, Youth and Family, 2003). Mentoring programs and providing supervisions have positive effects to prevent or alleviate employee stress and burnout and are recommended for managing human resources in nonprofit organizations (Schwartz & Austin, 2008). Colleagues’ turnover ruins the relationships among colleagues which can function as a social support that helps reduce the occupational stress and job-related strain (LaRocco, House, & French Jr, 1980) and the relationships between supervisors and supervisees which will lead to deteriorating job satisfaction and work morale (Himle, Jayaratne, & Thyness, 1989; Rauktis & Koeske, 1994).

**External Aspects. Impacts on Organizations.** Government reports and research on the impacts of staff turnover on the social/human service organizations have been primarily conducted in the light of costs that agencies have to pay as the result (Chisholm, Russell, & Humphreys, 2011; Dorch et al., 2008; Hollenbeck, Erickcek, & Timmeney, 2011; Institute of Child Protection Studies, 2005; Seavey, 2004). Because social/human service organizations are entirely dependent upon their employees who directly serve the clients, workforce is a key element for completing their missions and commitments (Lambert et al., 2001; Lewis, Packard, & Lewis, 2012; Schmid, 2004). Howard and Gould (2000) stated that the workers’ leaving the agencies, especially through excessive turnover, could be seriously harmful in human/social service organizations. Employees who bridge between an agency and its clients, and between community leaders and various public members can and do influence the quality of services, the effectiveness and efficiency of
performance, the whole image of the organization, and the agency’s successes and failures (Bliss et al., 2009; Dorch et al., 2008; Lambert et al., 2012). The network disruption occurring at the agency level is more serious when the collaboration among agencies was arranged by the worker (Albizu-García & Juarbe, 2004; Vandervort, Gonzalez, & Faller, 2008) who left without appropriately transferring the information to their successor (Levitt & March, 1988). Bliss, et al. (2009) also pointed out the organizations’ loss of know-how and skills developed by the employees.

Many authors have presented negative impacts of child welfare worker turnover on agencies (Dorch et al., 2008; Iglehart, 1990; Lambert et al., 2012; Mor Barak, et al., 2001; Smith, 2005). At the agency level, employees’ leaving is, in general, considered having both direct and indirect costs (Glisson et al., 2008; Iglehart, 1990; Lambert et al., 2012; Mor Barak et al., 2001). Mor Barak et al. (2001) grouped the direct costs of employee turnover into three categories: “separation costs (exit interviews, administration, functions related to terminations, separation pay, and unemployment tax); replacement costs (communicating job vacancies, pre-employment administrative functions, interviews, and exams); and training costs (formal classroom training and on-the-job instruction)” (p.627). Seavey (2004) added two more categories: “vacancy costs (additional overtime, use of temporary hires); increased worker injuries (lost days, experience-rate increases in Workers’ Compensation)” (p. 13).

As a conservative rule-of-thumb for estimating costs of staff turnover in general industries of the U.S., the costs to replace one employee accounts for 25% of the employees’ annual compensation (Seavey, 2004). By applying this 25% of rule-of-thumb to an average compensation of typical full time employees estimated by U.S Bureau of
Labor Statistics, the total direct costs of turnover per employee ranges from $4,200 to $5,200 (Employment Policy Foundation, 2002). Seavey (2004) reviewed nine studies on direct costs of care providers’ turnover and found that the total costs per a provider ranged from $951 to $6,368. In measuring workforce turnover and retention in rural allied health, Chisholm et al. (2011) investigated the costs of vacancy, recruitment and orientation training resulting from staff turnover. The median of the total direct costs appeared to be $18,882 per professional (Chisholm et al., 2011). More government reports from countries other than the U.S. also showed that the turnover costs were at least $1,000 per employee (Institute of Child Protection Studies, 2005; Hollenbeck et al., 2011).

As opposed to direct costs, the indirect costs resulting from employee turnover have ambiguous appraisal and are associated with productivity of co-workers and agencies (Mor Barak et al., 2001). Before actually leaving an agency, the worker’s performance level is anticipated to dramatically decline (Iglehart, 1990), and the agency will lose the efficiency of the employees who make a decision to leave (Mor Barak et al., 2001). The loss of productivity will continue until the new employees master their new jobs (Dorch, et al., 2008; Hollenbeck et al., 2011).

In the age of devolution of social welfare systems (Dolgoff & Feldstein, 2006), it is critical for social/human service organizations to improve their effectiveness of performance by implementing appropriate policies for human resources. The failure to meet the needs of service users can often bring about a loss of funding from the government (Ben-Dror, 1994) as well as foundations. As a long-term effect considered as an indirect cost, a loss of funding appears to become more harmful than ever to agencies
in the current trends of care management, new public management (NPM), and cost-effective management (Farrell & Morris, 2003; Ginsberg, 1995; Schmid, 2004; Slavin, 1980). Therefore, social/human service organizations that seek to provide quality services and to solicit enough funding for appropriately accomplishing their missions should make efforts to keep their valuable human resources.

**Impacts on Social Work Profession.** Negative effects of child welfare worker turnover have been primarily discussed in terms of the three elements mentioned above but not much of the social work profession. Considering the growing demand for social workers which is estimated by the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) from 650,500 in 2010 to 811,700 by 2020 (National Association of Social Work, 2012), the social work profession should, to some extent, pay attention to the issue of the high worker turnover rates (Wermeling, 2009). The existing studies on social worker turnover have not examined whether the professionals left the profession or merely switch organizations (Wermeling, 2009). If the turnover means leaving the profession and/or specific fields of social work, high turnover rates can be a contributing factor for the shortage of social workers. Then, workforce strategies can address the issue.

Another aspect of the negative impacts on the social work profession needs to be concerned with the public perceptions, status, and values of the profession. The Institute of Child Protection Studies (2005) recognized the possibilities of supplying the vacancy with unqualified and/or inexperienced workers. In addition, the report referred not only to the roles of media but also to the clients’ experiences of poor practice. Child welfare worker turnover always incurs low quality service as discussed in the previous section. What is more critical is that the profession does not know what are the long-term
consequences resulting from the accumulation of negative public perceptions brought about by high turnover rates in the profession. Particularly, the research result that employees who have a social work education background do not perform better than those who do not have social work background (Perry, 2006) challenges the profession and discourages child welfare agencies to hire staff with social work degrees (Healy et al., 2007). The current care management seeks to replace the professional social workers with laypersons (Jones, 2001).
Chapter Three: Empirical Literature Review and Theory Review of Child Welfare Worker Turnover

Literature Review of Child Welfare Worker Turnover

With the reasons mentioned in the previous section, it is required from administrators to effectively deal with and prevent the problem of employee turnover through developing retention interventions (Lambert et al., 2012; Weaver, Chang, Clark, & Rhee, 2007). There have been numerous research efforts to address high turnover rates of child welfare workers as well as employees in social/human service organizations over decades: for example, theories of employee turnover; factors to prevent and/or to predict employee turnover; interventions to retain quality and experienced social workers. In this section, the previous research findings were systemically reviewed based on the causes of employee turnover from both generic industries and child welfare. In doing so, the factors identified as the causes of employee turnover will be categorized into three dimensions based on the three theoretical frameworks borrowed from three distinct disciplines: economics, psychology, and sociology.

Most research on workforce turnover within child welfare is relatively atheoretical and focuses on predictors rather than develops theoretical frameworks (Weaver, et al. 2006). First, economic theory consists of job opportunities, job availability of acceptable alternatives, labor market and ease of movement (Steel, 1996). Second, psychological theory focuses on job satisfaction, organizational commitment, effect of stress, burnout and job embeddedness. Third, sociological theory focuses on the specifics of workplace situations and the job, affect theory of social exchange, organizational support and so on (Weaver, et al., 2006). Along with the three
frameworks, innumerable studies on child welfare worker turnover have tested the factors derived from the theories in order to successfully predict staff turnover. Among the factors are demographic variables of “gender, age, tenure, race, marital status, education, and supervisory status”; the personal variables of “job autonomy, job variety, supervision, dangerousness, role ambiguity, role conflict, and role overload”; administrative and organizational variables of “instrumental communication, promotional opportunity, organizational fairness, and input into decision making” (Lambert, et al., 2012, p.69).

Because the focus of this study is on child welfare worker turnover, the major four categories were employed by combining the conceptual frameworks aforementioned and empirical studies of employee turnover in social/human service organizations: economic variables; demographic variables, both personal and profession-related; psychological variables which are related to perceptions of their job; and organizational conditions. The latter three categories are borrowed from Mor Barak, et al.’s (2001) classification which reviewed the literature on human service employee turnover, except for economic variables. It is noteworthy that no agreement on the classification in child welfare exists, and there is no research using all of the variables in one study. Different authors have tested different variables. It is not overemphasis that there are as many factors of social worker turnover as the number of studies on the topic (Mor Barak, 2001). A comprehensive review of research findings based on the factors identified thus far is expected to give the insight into the functions of each factor and the dynamics of various factors, which will lead to choose theories relevant to develop a conceptual model.
Economic Variables

Economic variables focus on the relationships between supply and demand in a labor market. Its basic concept is that the more open job market is the greater employee turnover rates (Price, 1977). In addition, employees consider as a determinant of their leaving the opportunities from which they can benefit (Hulin, Rozon, & Hachiya, 1985). Economists and researchers who have studied employee turnover continued to expect significant relationships between measures of job availability and turnover (Mobley, 1982). In this view, turnover occurs as the result of the arrival of information about the recent job alternatives which employees are seeking in the labor market. Labor market data proved that the availability and attractiveness of alternative positions played an important role in determining to continue or quit membership in an organization (Hulin, et al., 1985).

Most of the major voluntary turnover models spring from the March and Simon’s (1958) model (Anderson & Milovinich, 2012). Their model added to a traditional model the employees’ desirability to leave when they conceive that their contributions exceed the inducements provided by their organizations. Although the model referred to the satisfaction with the current job as one factor for decision to move, the focus of the March and Simon’s (1958) model was on the perceived desirability to leave organizations as well as job availability in the labor market (Anderson & Milovinich, 2012, p. 208). Before the model was developed, economic theorists had studied the influence of prevailing business and industrial conditions on voluntary turnover (Reynolds, 1951; Woytinsky, 1942). Hulin et al. (1985) referred to Eagly’s (1965) research as the best summary of relationships between employee turnover and the labor market. Eagly (1965)
found that labor market conditions that seemingly echo job opportunities accounted for over 70% of the annual variance in the rate of voluntary turnover from 1931 to 1962. In a longitudinal study of voluntary job termination, many researchers (Brissender & Frankel, 1922, Reynolds, 1951, Woytinsky, 1942) found high turnover rates when the economy was active and low turnover rates in the period of depression and high unemployment rates from 1910 to 1950 (Hulin et al., 1985).

With the March and Simon (1958) model, researchers studying employee turnover started focusing not only on the job availability in the market but also on the perceived possibility and desirability of movement. The perceived desirability of movement refers to decisions to forgo the benefits from the current jobs over benefits from job alternatives. The perceived ease of movement implies available opportunities and the number of organizational alternatives. March and Simon (1958) stated that “(u)nder nearly all conditions the most accurate single predictor of labor turnover is the state of economy” (p.100).

There is plenty of evidence to support the relationship between labor market levels and employee turnover rates using the March and Simon’s model and a variety of modified versions of their model, such as Mobley’s model (1977), Price’s model (1977) and Steers and Mowday’s model (1981) (Anderson & Milovich, 2012; Steel, 1996). Michaels and Specter (1982) suggested that job availability and opportunities were the direct variable to predict turnover behavior. The presence and absence of alternative jobs directly affect the decision to leave or remain. Hulin et al. (1985) noted that aggregate labor-market statistics proved concrete relations with voluntary turnover rates regardless of regions, time or fields. Therefore, this model has been used as the direct predictor for
employee turnover and became the cornerstone in developing more complicated models in this area. It is an unarguable fact that their model is the most elementary in employee turnover models.

However, the relationship of economic theory to employee turnover and retention remains uncertain through research replication over decades (Griffeth & Hom, 1988; Michaels & Spector, 1982; Weaver et al., 2006). The perceived alternative employment has more often than not failed to make significant contributions to predicting employee retention (Griffeth & Hom, 1988). Particularly, social work studies rarely used economic variables as the causes of employee turnover. In addition, Borsch-Supan (1990) theorized that the competition for jobs is higher in professions requiring higher education than in areas with less educated people. Social work is one of the professions with a greater percentage of highly educated people. However, the turnover rate is severely high.

In research to examine the relationship of unemployment rates with worker turnover rates in child welfare, Fulcher and Smith (2010) found that increases in child maltreatment, which is used as a proxy of job availability, could encourage workers to leave their jobs. More accurately, research found that perceived few job alternatives was strongly correlated with the intention to stay (Burstain, 2009; Smith, 2005; Texas Department of Family and Protective Services, 2012). Manlove and Guzell, (1997) studied the causes of actual turnover within 12 months among child welfare staff and found a low correlation with choice of other jobs. However, they are among the few researchers that included economic variables in the causes of social worker turnover. Though this will be discussed in the next section, most of the literature on employee turnover in child welfare applies more complicated models with incorporating various factors, such as burnout, stress,
organizational commitment, organizational climate and culture and organizational support other than economic variables (Lambert et al., 2012; Hwang & Hopkins, 2012). The most important concern with using solely economic variables is that interventions employing economic variables cannot be implemented at the agency level. The labor market is operated in more of a macro level than an organizational level. What is more significant is that the social work profession is the fastest growing area and will demand more employees as discussed in Part I (National Child Welfare Workforce Institute, 2011). Weaver and Chang (2005) and Burstain (2009) and the Texas Department of Family and Protective Services (2012) suggested that child welfare workers were less likely committed to and more likely to leave their job when they were aware that it was easy to find a better job. Therefore, economic variables, especially job availability, should not be undervalued as influencing factors of social workers’ decisions to leave agencies.

**Demographic Variables**

Demographic factors are the most common predictors examined in turnover literature: age, gender, level of education, marital status, parental status, tenure, ethnicity, and professionalism (Blankertz & Robinson, 1996; DePanfilis & Zlotnik, 2008; Mor Barak et al., 2001). The following are the most common findings of impacts of demographic variables on turnover or retention. A number of studies found the negative relationships of age and tenure with organizations with turnover. The level of education appears negatively correlated with retention, that is better educated workers are more likely to leave their jobs. Marital status and gender do not show significant influences on turnover while parental status is a strong correlate of turnover because most of the social
workers are women (Ben-Dror, 1994; Vinokur-Kaplan, Jayaratne, & Chess, 1994). In addition, ethnic minorities are less likely to leave their jobs. However, the findings summarized are not consistent among the literature (DePanfilis & Zlotnik, 2008). Conflicting findings of the same variables have been found because each study chose different sets of independent variables.

Even though most of the research on worker turnover in child welfare embraces demographic variables, the researchers have paid less attention to those variables other than the variables of organizational conditions and psychological perceptions of work. Recently, a few researchers are trying to develop more comprehensive models to predict child welfare worker turnover and thus to include age, gender, social work degrees and tenure in the current agencies or positions (Kim & Stoner, 2008; Maertz, et al., 2007). However, the research trends started controlling the demographic variables in the complicating models (Crossley, Bennett, Jex, & Burnfield, 2007; Landsman, 2001; Maertz, et al., 2007; Nissly et al., 2005).

**Psychological Factors**

As aforementioned, it is important to remember that there is no agreement on categorizing the factors for employee turnover because psychological factors discussed in this section can be perceived as organizational conditions by other authors (Muchinsky & Morrow, 1980). It is not an easy task to draw a line among the factors. The task can help develop theories of employee turnover by thoroughly reviewing the literature. Among psychological factors in this study are job satisfaction, job stress, burnout, organizational commitment, workload, job embeddedness, job autonomy, supervision, role ambiguity, dangerousness, and role conflict. These factors are associated with personal perceptions
and individual issues of their job (Burstain, 2009; Fernandes, 2016; Kim & Kao, 2014). It should also be cautioned that those factors are not the complete list, and different researchers disparately measure the same variables. For example, Aaron, et al. (2009) measured job satisfaction and organizational commitment together into one variable, work attitude. However, the listed factors are most frequently used as independent variables in the literature or are currently discovered as significant.

**Job Satisfaction.** As the results of individual issues, job satisfaction has been used as a primary predictor of workers’ job performances and turnover. Particularly, job satisfaction has been tested solely as the direct factor of worker turnover or retention and has been most frequently used to examine its mediating roles between other factors and worker turnover (intent) (Bednar, 2003; Tett & Meyer, 1993). In addition, research has shown consistent results of job satisfaction as a predictor of child welfare worker turnover (DePanfilis & Zlotnik, 2008; Faller, Grabarek, & Ortega, 2010; Mor Barak, et al., 2001). However, there are inconsistent results of job satisfaction as a mediator of turnover process with other factors that are supervision, support from organizations, organizational commitment, organizational culture and climate (Dougherty, Bluedorn, & Keon, 1985; Farkas & Tetrick, 1989; Schudrich, et al., 2012; Williams & Hazer, 1986). Nevertheless, numberless studies discovered that job satisfaction was not only a strong negative correlate of staff turnover but also a mediator of turnover process (Kim & Kao, 2014).

**Job Stress.** Job stress is another primary factor to predict child welfare worker turnover along with job satisfaction. Moreover, job stress has been identified as a dependent variable that addresses the issues concerning workforce, workplaces, work performance,
and workers’ well-being in the child welfare profession for decades, along with job satisfaction and burnout (Baginsky, et al., 2010; Evans, et al., 2006; Kim & Kao, 2014; Mor Barak, et al., 2006; Vmokur-Kaplan, 1996; Vogus, Cull, Hengelbrok, Modell, & Epstein, 2016). Most of the factors discovered by those studies, such as organizational structure, organizational support, organizational commitment, supervision, work autonomy, workload, were also referred to as the influencing factors in turnover or retention research. In addition, the implication of those studies is that reducing job stress contributes to decreasing workers’ turnover or absenteeism.

Research findings of the impacts of job stress on worker turnover can be divided into three groups. First, job stress has been used as a direct factor of worker turnover or retention (McKee, Markham, & Scott, 1992). The study findings have shown the positive correlation between job stress and turnover (McKee, et al., 1992; Mor Barak, et al., 2001; Todd & Deery-Schmitt, 1996). Second, the studies have tried to examine the mediator role of other factors, which are supervisor support, job autonomy, etc., when job stress had negative impacts on worker turnover (Nissly et al., 2005). Third, job stress has been proved to negatively influence job satisfaction and positively affect burnout, which are two crucial factors of worker turnover (Lizano & Barak, 2015; Mor Barak, et al., 2006). Recent trends of the research on child welfare worker turnover was designed to examine the relationship of job stress as an indirect factor with job satisfaction and burnout (Kim & Kao, 2014; Kim & Stoner, 2008; Travis, Lizano & Mor Barak, 2015).

**Workload.** Workload, role ambiguity, and role conflict have been identified as job stressors (Jayaratne & Chess 1984; Coyle, Edwards, Hannigan, Fothergill, & Burnard, 2005; Kim & Kao, 2014) or predictors of job satisfaction (Lambert, et al., 2012) in
research on child welfare workforce. The British Association of Social Workers (The British Association of Social Workers, 2012) undertook “The State of Social Work” survey in 2012 with regard to job attitudes of social workers and reported that 77% of respondents were concerned about unmanageable caseloads. Besides, studies to investigate the predictors of worker turnover have found that child welfare workers dealt with a significantly high amount of workloads (Duraisingam, Pidd, & Roche, 2009; Kim, 2011).

There are three types of research using workload as a predictor variable. First, workload is used as an independent variable with other predictor variables for social worker turnover or retention (Duraisingam, et al., 2009; Ellett, et al., 2007; Smith, 2005; Ulrich, et al., 2007). As an independent variable, studies found a positive correlation between workload and turnover intention but not a significant predictor in multivariate regression analyses (Duraisingam, et al., 2009). In addition, Ulrich et al. (2007) demonstrated that workload is not a correlate of turnover intention and plays no role in predicting turnover. Conflictingly, a study found that workload predicts turnover intention among child welfare staff (Smith, 2005). Second, workload has been the index of job stress along with role ambiguity and role conflict (Kim & Lee, 2007). As an index of job stress, role overload has been no direct relationship with turnover intention but role stress has an indirect predictor through burnout (Kim and Lee, 2007). Third, workload is associated with job satisfaction and burnout to predict worker turnover (Siefert, Jayaratne, & Chess, 1991). A heavy workload impacts job dissatisfaction which in turn causes the turnover intention among social work staff (Fernandes, 2016; Lambert, et al., 2012). Although there are somewhat conflicting research findings of the workload factor.
to predict turnover retention, its impacts on job stress and job satisfaction were found to be consistent.

**Role Ambiguity.** Role ambiguity is the lack of well-defined work objectives or job clarity which is interchangeably used in research (Poulin & Walter, 1992; Siefert et al., 1991). According to role theory, high role ambiguity increases the degrees of workers’ job dissatisfaction, job stress, and anxiety (Rizzo, House, & Lirtzman, 1970). Accordingly, role ambiguity is one of the predictors of job stress along with role conflict in examining the relationships between job stress and worker turnover (Kim & Lee, 2007). As a subscale of job stressor, role ambiguity does not have a direct relationship with turnover intention but influences job stress that is an indirect predictor of turnover intention through burnout (Kim & Lee, 2007). A study investigating the reasons that social workers stay in gerontology revealed high job satisfaction that was predicted by job clarity with nine other factors (Poulin & Walter, 1992). Munn, Berber, and Fritz, (1996) also tested the role ambiguity variable as a predictor of job satisfaction, emotional exhaustion, and turnover intention. The study results revealed a moderate positive correlation between role ambiguity and turnover intention and a significant predictor of burnout and job satisfaction but no significant direct predictor of turnover intention. However, there is research that found no significance in the associations of role ambiguity with job dissatisfaction and burnout (Um & Harrison, 1998).

**Role Conflict.** As a subscale of job stress, role conflict is mostly paired with role ambiguity (Lee & Ashforth, 1993; Munn et al., 1996; Um & Harrison, 1998) more than with workload. Role conflict occurs when individuals experience incompatible or incongruent job expectations due to the gaps between their internal values and role
behaviors defined and the disparate orders from various supervisors (Biddle, 1986; Rizzo, et al., 1970; Tham, 2007). According to organizational role theory, role conflict is the cause of strain, tension and anxiety in workplaces (Biddle, 1986; Rizzo, et al., 1970). A meta-analysis of correlation between role ambiguity and role conflict discovered that role conflict positively impacted propensity to leave, particularly higher in professionals than in lower level jobs, and tension/anxiety, and negatively correlated with overall job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Fisher & Gitelson, 1983). Acker (2004) and Acker (2012) demonstrated that social workers are at great risk because of their low job satisfaction caused by role ambiguity and role conflict.

Like role ambiguity, role conflict is primarily used as a subscale to measure job stress in social work research on worker turnover or retention (Kim & Lee, 2007; Lee & Ashforth, 1993; Travis et al., 2015). As a predictor of job stressor, role conflict has no direct correlation with turnover intention but stress is an indirect predictor through burnout (Kim & Lee, 2007; Lee & Ashforth, 1993). A study that used role conflict to measure work environment found no significant correlation with job satisfaction, which is the predictor of turnover intention (Lambert, et al., 2012). Like role ambiguity, a study result found a moderate positive correlation between role conflict and turnover intention but not a significant predictor of turnover intention, burnout, and job satisfaction among child welfare professionals (Munn et al., 1996). There exist a lot of confusing, contradictory research results of role conflict as an independent variable in worker turnover studies.

**Dangerousness.** Dangerousness (or safety) does not often appear in the research of social worker turnover, retention and well-being other than in the child welfare setting (Strand,
Spath, & Bosco-Ruggiero, 2010). Plenty of studies documented the dangerous work conditions for child welfare professionals (Ellett et al., 2007; Newhill, 1996). Other social work professions also conducted research on high risk and dangerousness of work conditions and concluded that dangerous work conditions are a significantly negative correlate of job satisfaction and a predictor of job stress (Newhill, 1995; Spencer & Munch, 2003). However, a few studies concerned the relationships of dangerousness or safety with worker turnover (Barbee & Antle, 2011; Lambert, et al., 2012; Strand, et al., 2010). Findings of those studies appear inconsistent. Public child welfare workers in the Neighborhood Place model identified the dangerous neighborhood as a barrier to be familiar with clients families but not as a stressor (Barbee & Antle, 2011). Consistently, a study that employed dangerousness as a subscale of job characteristics presented that the variable was not a significant factor of turnover intention (Lambert, et al., 2012). In contrast, significant associations of dangerousness as a subscale of work conditions with turnover intention were found in other research (Ellett et al., 2007; Hopkins, Cohen-Callow, Kim, & Hwang, 2010; Strand et al., 2010).

**Burnout.** Along with social worker turnover, burnout per se has been identified as a serious issue needing to be addressed in the child welfare profession (Kim, 2011; Lloyd, et al., 2002; McFadden, Mallett, & Leiter, 2017). It is not overemphasis that burnout is one representative characteristic of the child welfare profession, considering the high burnout level among the workers (Ben-Zur & Michael, 2007; Kim, 2011). The literature on burnout defines and measures it in many different ways. But, recent research has seemed to reach an agreement on using one conceptual definition and measurement developed by Maslach and Jackson (1981), which is *Maslach Burnout Inventory* (MBI)
According to empirical research, burnout is related to physical and emotional exhaustions involved in development of negative perceptions of work and can be measured in three components of the burnout syndrome: emotional exhaustion; depersonalization; and a lack of professional accomplishment (Kim, 2011; Kim & Lee, 2009; Martin & Schinke, 1998; McFadden, et al., 2017; Söderfeldt, Söderfeldt, & Warg, 1995).

Research on burnout as a predictor of worker turnover or retention has been conducted in several fashions. Many studies on social worker burnout concluded that burnout could influence workers’ stress and job satisfaction and finally cause worker’s absenteeism and turnover (Jayaratne & Chess, 1984). Other research developed models that burnout was a direct predictor of turnover while other factors affected burnout (Abu-Bader, 2000; Kim & Lee, 2009; Kim & Stoner, 2008; Travis et al., 2015). Like other factors, most empirical studies presented the positive correlations between burnout and worker turnover, altogether with other variables (Kim & Lee, 2009; Mor Barak, et al., 2001; Healy et al., 2009).

**Job Autonomy.** Job autonomy is individual discretion in the job and the perceived control of works that employees have over their tasks, making decisions and managing their schedules (Martin & Schinke, 1998; Morgeson, Delaney-Klinger, & Hemingway, 2005). Lack of job autonomy creates critical psychological symptoms (Martin & Schinke, 1998). According to role theory, the degree of discretion that an individual has impacts job satisfaction, stress, burnout, one’s performances, and eventually turnover (Barrick & Mount, 1993; Gleasonwynn & Mindel, 1999; Judge, Thoresen, Bono, & Patton, 2001; Kahill, 1988; Sullivan & Bhagat, 1992). The child welfare profession is known for low
Job autonomy (Lizano, Hsiao, Mor Barak, & Casper, 2014; Schelbe, Radey, & Panisch, 2017).

Research findings of relationships between job autonomy and worker turnover or retention documented their significant direct and indirect (mostly through job satisfaction) associations (Lambert, Lynne Hogan, & Barton, 2001; Simons & Jankowski, 2007). As an indirect predictor of social worker turnover, the research literature demonstrated that job autonomy directly affected job satisfaction or organizational commitment which in turn predicts turnover (intention) or retention (intention) (Galletta, Portoghese, & Battistelli, 2011; Knudsen, Johnson, & Roman, 2003; Schelbe, et al., 2017; Simons & Jankowski, 2007). Few studies presented the results of no significant relationships between job autonomy and turnover or retention intention (Duraisingam, et al., 2009).

**Supervision.** Supervision accounts for a great portion in social work workforce along with burnout. Supervision is an ongoing learning process and provides social supports at the work site (Bogo & McKnight, 2006; Brashears, 1995). Appropriate support from supervisors influences worker outcomes as well as workers’ job satisfaction and stress-level in social/human service organizations (Mor Barak, Travis, Pyun, & Xie, 2009). Effective supervision buffers stressful work conditions and provides supervisees with knowledge and skills demanded and social supports which in turn facilitate the development of competences in their work and increase the effectiveness (Collins-Camargo & Royse, 2010; Egan, 2012; Landsman, 2007). Particularly, Landsman (2007) demonstrated that competency-based supervisor training programs increased the knowledge of supervisors as well as supervisees, and effective supervision contributed to
job satisfaction, commitment, and worker retention. Moreover, a study to test the relationships among effective supervision and organizational culture in promoting evidence-based practice discovered that effective supervision helped enhance workers’ self-efficacy, and concluded that study participants tended to remain in child welfare (Collins-Camargo & Royse, 2010).

Like the variable of dangerousness, the effects of supervision on social worker turnover and retention has been most dynamically studied in child welfare (University of Georgia, 2003; Ellett, et al., 2007; Mor Barak, et al., 2001). In worker turnover studies, supervision is found significantly associated with turnover and retention (intention) often through job satisfaction, stress, organizational commitment or burnout (Kim & Lee, 2009; Landsman, 2007; Smith, 2005). There are studies that discovered multiple mediators between supervision and turnover intention (Kim & Lee, 2009; Lambert, et al., 2012; Landsman, 2007). Another type of research on predicting turnover intention by supervision is to investigate the influencing factors on worker turnover as an indirect predictor through job commitment or job satisfaction (Collins-Camargo & Royse, 2010; Smith, 2005). Positive organizational culture and climate mediated the negatively perceived supervision and increased organizational commitment, which in turn lead to increase retention (intention) (Eisenberger, Stinglhamber, Vandenberghe, Sucharski, & Rhoades, 2002; Lee, Forster, & Rehner, 2011). Consistently, as a direct (or an indirect) predictor, supervision is found associated negatively with turnover (intention) and positively with retention (intention) (Children’s Defense Fund & Children’s Rights, Inc., 2007; Claiborne, et al., 2014; Lee, 2011; Fernandes, 2016; Yankeelov, et al., 2009).
**Organizational Commitment.** Organizational commitment in employee turnover studies is a psychological state that characterizes the relationships between individuals and organizations that translate into behavior (Meyer & Allen, 1991). Organizational commitment is mostly measured with workers’ contribution to, attachment to, loyalty to, identification with, and involvement in the organization (Kim & Stoner, 2008; Lambert et al., 2012; Mor Barak et al., 2006; O'Reilly & Chatman, 1986). The more attached to the organization workers are, the lower intention to leave they have (Lambert et al., 2012). In a test of turnover that placed the organizational commitment as a direct factor influenced by job satisfaction, organizational structure, and personal characteristics, the study found that the three factors affected workers’ commitment to the organization and thus, whether social workers tend to seriously consider leaving the organization or not (Lambert et al., 2012).

Numerous studies indicated that organizational commitment is a direct factor (Aarons & Sawitzky, 2006; Carmeli & Freund, 2009; Hwang & Hopkins, 2012; Hwang & Hopkins, 2015; Kim & Kao, 2014; Williams & Hazer, 1986) or an indirect factor of turnover (Boyas, Wind, & Kang, 2012; Freund, 2005; Lee, Mitchell, Sablynski, Burton, & Holtom, 2004). A study to examine organizational commitment and job satisfaction as a factor of social worker turnover intention designed a model that job satisfaction was a direct predictor and commitment was an indirect factor that influenced workers’ satisfaction with the job (Freund, 2005). The study results supported their conceptual model for turnover intention among welfare workers. In addition, Mor Barak et al. (2006) examined the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment among child welfare workers, and found that the two factors influenced each other, and
each factor had direct impact on worker turnover. Furthermore, research has focused on the causes of organizational commitment, which in turn results in worker turnover (Aarons & Sawitzky, 2006). Those factors to affect organizational commitment are mostly linked to organizational structure, culture and climate (Moon, 2000). Overall, high scores in organizational commitment correlate with low turnover intention of social workers.

**Job Embeddedness.** Job embeddedness is a new concept in research on child welfare worker turnover. No study employed job embeddedness as an independent variable of worker turnover in child welfare. As in a helping profession, studies on nurse retention recently focus on the effects of job embeddedness (Reitz, Anderson, & Hill, 2010; Stroth, 2010). However, job embeddedness has been discovered as a significant factor in employee turnover and retention study over a decade (Mitchell, Holtom, Lee, Sablynski, & Erez, 2001).

Psychologically, turnover theorists assumed that people who remain with an organization might simply want to maintain their status quo (Lee & Mitchell, 1994). Yao, Lee, Mitchell, Burton, and Sablynski (2004) defined ‘job embeddedness’ as “the combined forces that keep a person from leaving his or her job” (p.159). Examination on job embeddedness can provide meaningful insight. Two major distinctions are captured using the job embeddedness factor. First, job embeddedness takes into account a more comprehensive relationship of the employee, such as organization-related issues, community-related issues, and job-related issues (Crossley et al., 2007). In this sense, the employee-employer relationship is considered important. Second, the central focus of the job embeddedness variable is on why people do not leave and how to keep people in an
organization (Holtom & O’Neill, 2004). The critical aspects of job embeddedness are “links”, “fit”, and “sacrifice” (Crossley et al., 2007; Holtom & O’Neill, 2004; Mitchell, et al., 2001). Fit is defined as an employee’s perceived compatibility or comfort with an organization and with his or her environment (Holtom & O’Neill, 2004; Mitchell, et al., 2001). The higher the number of links, the more an employee will be tied to the job and the organization (Holtom, Mitchell, & Lee, 2006). Sacrifice is the concept regarding material and psychological costs perceived by employees when they left an organization (Holtom & Inderrieden, 2006). The higher the costs an employee forgoes, the less likely he/she will leave the organization (Shaw, Delery, Jenkins, & Gupta, 1998).

The researchers (Crossley, et al., 2007; Holtom & Inderrieden, 2006; Lee et al., 2004; Reitz, et. al., 2010), driven by the factor of job embeddedness, found that job embeddedness had an unique influence on the intention to quit the current job and search for a new one and on voluntary turnover among employees who provided services for older adults and youths. It is also discovered the significant interaction of job embeddedness with job satisfaction (Crossley, et al., 2007). Because job embeddedness weights job satisfaction, a highly embedded person becomes more satisfied with their job and presents lower turnover intention (Crossley, et al., 2007; Swider, Boswell, & Zimmerman, 2011). As the profession conceives building the relationships with clients as instrumental performances, overall embeddedness founded by clients as well as co-workers can influence social workers, who are well embedded in the work environment which includes the community, to intend to stay in the current organizations. Also, to the extent that the community that social workers belong to is their clients, job embeddedness cannot be ignored as a factor to retain them. In research on child welfare worker turnover,
however, only one study paid attention to job embeddedness which was measured with peer support and found that peer support is scored high in respondents who stayed (Weaver & Chang, 2005).

**Organizational Conditions**

The psychological factors discussed in the previous section can be influenced or even controlled by the organizational environment (Lambert et al., 2012; Lee et al., 2011; Glisson & Durick, 1988). Further, organizational structure has been discovered as the factor to predict the work attitudes (e.g. organizational commitment, job satisfaction, burnout, etc.) (Glisson, Williams, Green, Hemmelgarn, & Hoagwood, 2014; Williams & Glisson, 2014). Factors relative to organizational conditions focus on the details of workplace situations and their influences on the satisfaction with and commitments to organizations of workers (Glisson et al., 2014; Weaver et al., 2006). That is, employees weigh the rationale of regulations and actions by their superiors and then decide whether to be obligated or not. Employees, of course, expect the more legitimate regulations and actions from organizations and their superiors (Halaby, 1996). Organization characteristics consist of the factors controlled at the agency level to influence both directly and indirectly worker turnover: pay (compensation), organizational culture and climate, and leadership style.

**Pay.** In a generic sense, pay is a demographic characteristic of a research subject in most social science and has been dominantly analyzed as a control variable. To the extent that pay is the variable that social workers cannot control, and is dependent on the human resource policy of organizations or social policies, one study included pay into organizational conditions. As described, most of the studies on child welfare worker
turnover using pay as an independent variable categorized it into demographic characteristics and often controlled for it in multivariable analyses (Hwang & Hopkins, 2012; Lee et al., 2011; Vinokur-Kaplan, et al., 1994; Yoon & Kelly, 2008). Consistent findings of research employing the pay variable are the positive correlation with turnover/retention (intention) (DePanfilis & Zlotnik, 2008; Evans & Huxley, 2009; Kim & Kao, 2014; Mor Barak, et al., 2001; Simons & Jankowski, 2007). However, a few studies interpret the important effects of pay on child welfare worker turnover/retention (intention) (Kim & Kao, 2014; Lambert, et al., 2012; Texas Department of Family and Protective Services, 2012). Few studies exclusively focused on the effect of wages on retention intention (Wermeling & Smith, 2009). A possible explanation is that the policy of child welfare worker compensation is beyond the capacity of organizations. If there are constant research results that dissatisfaction with pay is a significant cause of child welfare worker turnover, the pay variable should be taken into consideration in terms of the social values of the profession. Further, research should be able to try to help organizations find alternatives to mitigate social workers’ dissatisfaction with pay.

**Organizational Climate and Culture.** A recent trend is to take organizational climate and culture into consideration as factors to influence social worker turnover although they have a long history in management and human resource studies (Bednar, 2003; Mobley, 1982). According to organizational theory, organizational climate was the older term and has a long history of research in organizational behavior and effectiveness (Glisson et al., 2008; Schein, 1990). Organizational climate is of employees’ psychological perceptions of the work environments which have impacts on their well-being (Hemmelgarn, Glisson, & James, 2006). On the contrary, organizational culture was a somewhat newer term than
climate and referred to norms, values, expectations, and perceptions (Glisson et al., 2008; Hemmelgarn, et al., 2006; Schein, 1990; Hasenfeld, 2000). While climate is considered a surface observation of the workplace culture, organizational culture is defined as the patterns of norms and attitudes shared and established by the members and given groups (Schein, 1990; Tham, 2007).

Most of the studies on organizational culture and climate have been related with job satisfaction, stress, and commitment (Glisson & James, 2002; Lloyd, et al., 2002; Tham, 2007). Recently, organizational culture and climate were used as indirect predictors of or a mediating factor of worker turnover through job satisfaction in many studies (Aarons & Sawitzky, 2006; Bednar, 2003; Hwang & Hopkins, 2012; Mor Barak, et al., 2006). As indirect factors, organizational culture and climate influenced work attitudes and then the attitudes influenced the decision to leave or remain in the organization. Although most studies have agreement on the indirect roles of the relationships between the two factors, Glisson and James (2002) discovered an interesting result that organizational climate was a mediator in the relationship between organizational culture and work attitudes. Later, Aaron and Sawitzky (2006) supported the previous research findings by examining the simultaneous impact of organizational culture and climate on work attitude and their subsequent impact on turnover. In their study, the researchers found that organizational culture directly influenced the work attitudes as well as indirectly affected through organizational climate. The study also showed that a constructive culture had a positive relationship with positive work attitudes, and a defensive culture has negative relationship with positive work attitudes (Aarons & Sawitzky, 2006).
While there are studies examining the mediating effects of organizational culture and climate, Glisson et al. (2008) studied therapist turnover in mental health clinics by examining a function of organizational culture and climate as direct factors. In the study, the researchers found that only organizational climate was significantly correlated with therapist turnover (Glisson et al., 2008). However, Tham (2007) stressed that organizational culture is the most important factor for the social worker turnover intention in the study on the organizational factors for turnover intention among social workers in child welfare.

**Leadership.** Research on leadership style in social work or human service organizations mostly focused on its relationship with job satisfaction, organizational culture and climate, organizational performance, and organizational effectiveness (Elpers & Westhuis, 2008; Medley & Larochelle, 1995; Gellis, 2001, Packard, 2009; Jaskyte, 2004). Packard’s (2009) study on how leadership affects the organizational culture and climate found that a leader played an important role to establish the organizational culture and climate and was an intermediate factor of job satisfaction. In a study on the impact of leadership on organizational culture, Schein (1990) stated that leadership primarily impacted shaping the organizational culture as well as climate (Grojean, Resick, Dickson, & Smith, 2004; Parry & Bryman, 2006; Schmid, 2007).

Regarding the worker turnover and retention study, according to Watson and Abzug (2010), the quality of the relationships between staff members and leaders is a key factor of employees’ intention to remain in the organization. Also, Smith (2010) discussed the importance of effective executive leadership in nonprofit organizations in terms of staff turnover, morale, and client dissatisfaction. Research on social worker
turnover found that leadership or a leader in the organization had a relationship with worker turnover (Evans & Huxley, 2009). The study showed that staff who were dissatisfied with their employers were more likely to leave the organization (Evans & Huxley, 2009). In contrast, Tham (2007) tested the relationship of fair leadership with turnover intention and found that there was no significant relationship when controlling other variables: personal characteristics, work tasks, and organizational elements. However, there was one study on the effect of transformational leadership on employee turnover among mental health service providers. Green, Miller, & Aarons (2011) revealed that transformational leadership buffered the impact of emotional burnout on turnover intention (Leadership theories, including transformational theory, will be more closely reviewed in next section). That study is the only one that leadership, specifically transformational leadership, tested as a major factor of worker turnover. Critically, a study to examine the roles of an intra-organizational network to staff turnover across for-profit, non-profit and public sectors suggested that leaders shape the organizational environment to support the employees through communicating to them the organizations’ values (Moynihan & Pandey, 2008). As a result, it is implicit the significant roles of leadership to social worker turnover/retention (intention). However, research on social worker turnover/retention (intention) has paid little attention to the leadership factor and has shown somewhat inconsistent results.

**Summary of Literature Review**

Innumerable studies in child welfare have tested the factors based on the four categories in order to successfully predict worker turnover. One critical finding of this literature review is that a number of authors inaccurately referred to the results of
research. Different variables were treated as the same ones. For example, organizational commitment is different from professional (occupational) commitment but one of the authors referred to a study which examined correlation between organizational commitment and turnover in order to show the strong correlation of professional commitment. Another critical finding of the current literature review is that the same variables have different effects on turnover/retention (intention) depending on the model that the researcher(s) chose and the types of analyses employed. For example, satisfaction with salary significantly encouraged workers to stay in their organization than those who reported low salary (Lee et al., 2011; Wermeling & Smith, 2009) but salary is not a predictor of worker turnover in multiple regression (Claiborne et al., 2014; Vinokur-Kaplan, et al., 1994).

While researchers have tried to find the most influential factors or to develop a model to predict employee turnover, it has been obvious that there is no one factor to primarily predict worker turnover. Recent research on this topic has suggested that turnover is a result of complicating interactions among all of those aforementioned variables and has focused on developing a model consisting of and showing complicating relationships between those variables (Boyas et al., 2012; DePanfilis & Zlotnik, 2008; Kim & Lee, 2009; Kim & Stoner, 2008; Hwang & Hopkins, 2012; Travis et al., 2015). Especially, though research interests in this topic dramatically decreased, more recent studies have evolved to test an integrated model of multiple factors of employee turnover (Mueller & Price, 1990; Kim & Lee, 2009; Kim & Stoner, 2008; Lambert et al., 2012). To simplify the integration model of complicating relationships of all the variables driven from the four categories, the psychological factors are directly impacted by the factors of
organizational conditions (particularly, organizational culture and climate), which in turn indirectly cause worker turnover/retention (intention).
Chapter Four: Critical Theory Review Relative to Child Welfare Worker Turnover

Based on the empirical literature review, child welfare worker turnover is the result of the intertwined relationships among multiple factors stemming from both the individual and organizational levels. Particularly, factors in the psychological dimension are not independent of organizational factors. Therefore, understanding organizational factors will lead to identify the relationship between organizational conditions and individual perceptions of work/organization, which in turn helps address the issue of worker turnover. Moreover, the ultimate goal of this study is to find the factors associated with child welfare workers’ turnover that could be addressed at an organizational level. Particularly, this study intends to offer specific interventions for child welfare agencies. In what follows, organizational theory will be reviewed to understand the functions and the dynamics of organizations as a function of underlying structures and contexts of organizational life (Gummer, 1980). Organizational theories in this study focus on understanding the structure of organizations. In organizational structure, leadership is the center of the dynamics of organizational activities and the atmosphere of organizations. Therefore, leadership theory will also be reviewed.

Organizational Theory: Complex Adaptive Systems Theory

There is no one theory that can completely explain or cover the features of organizations as Morgan (1980) stated: every theory is a metaphor to describe features of organizations (p. 613). A metaphor is not an identical image of the object to be described but a representative image. As Morgan (1980) described theories of organizations, organizational theories have evolved as the studies of organizations progress from
rational theories to open systems theories (Davis & Scott, 2007) and to complex system
approach (Pondy & Mitroff, 1979).

In the social sciences, knowledge has been founded upon research. Research
depends upon particular methods to examine questions of social phenomena. A particular
research method should be determined according to researchers’ perceptions of the
outside world. Perceptions of the world lead to two research paradigms: quantitative
research (modernism, positivist, post-positivist) and qualitative research (constructivist,
post-modernism) (Guba, 1990). Quantitative research has been dominantly adopted based
on the belief that there is an objective reality which people can observe with excluding
people’s values and biases (Sohng, 1994). Therefore, researchers can objectively know or
explore the law of the world with objective methods by humans’ capabilities of rational
observation (Cooper & Burrell, 1988). The positivist social scientists believe the human
beings can explain complex human behaviors and human relationships with the value-
free observations and developed standard research methods that they believe can be
employed to all the phenomena studied (Guba & Lincoln, 1989). This trend is not
unexceptional in studies of organizational behaviors, and in the line are the rational
system theories. Traditional theories of organizational behavior are conducive to analyze
the existing organizations, whatever types of organizations, but fail to provide functional
and desirable management and administrative guidelines or principles, especially for the
social service organizations as complex organizations (Dent, 1999; Garrow & Hasenfeld,
2010). They ignored the interactions of organizations with the external environments in
which they are situated. The Simon’s (1955) model of organizational influence to support
the rationality of individual decisions and activities is consistent with Habermas’ (2006)
argument about the importance of providing enough information for reaching the rational and right decisions. Enough information provided by the organization will lead the participants to rational decisions of collective works among members (Barnard, 1968; Simon, 1955). According to rational theory, organizations attempt to expand control over organizational elements when they face uncertain and unpredictable environments (Gummer, 1980). However, enough information by the rational system theory, which can only be driven from simple and isolated organizations, fails to embrace complex interactions among individuals and the dynamics within organizations (Dougherty, 2006; Marion & Uhl-Bien, 2002) as well as the dynamics between an agency and its external environment.

Therefore, there has been strong criticism of traditional organizational theories built upon the rationality of human beings. For example, Chia (1995), Cooper (1989), Cooper and Burrell (1988), and Kilduff and Mehra (1997) in an organizational study, Guba (1990) and Guba and Lincoln (1994) in education, and Padgett (2008) in social work have pointed out that knowledge is constructed by “subjective and inter-subjective experience by individuals” (Morgan, 1980, p. 608). They recognize the “differences” (Cooper & Burrell, 1988, p. 98) of individual experiences, actions, relationships, “becoming or processes (Chia, 1995, p. 581)” of social behaviors, particularly organizational behaviors. To grasp organizational behaviors and social systems, post-modernism organization theorists perceive organizations/social systems as social actions and processes, particularly language games (Chia, 1995; Cooper & Burrell, 1988). Further, leadership theorists, Marion & Uhl-Bien (2002), discussed that social phenomena are not in linear causal relationships which classic science believes, and
organizations and leadership in organizations are viewed as complex, dynamic and unpredictable. Modernism organization analysts failed to capture these attributes of organizations (Kilduff & Mehra, 1997).

Complexity science has been influencing social science and organizational scholars started being interested in dynamical aspects of systems/organizations (Marion & Uhl-Bien, 2002; Regine & Lewin, 2000). Complexity theories characterize organizational behaviors as dynamic, chaotic, uncertain, unpredictable, multidimensional, nonlinear etc. (Dooley & Van de Ven, 1999; Marion & Bacon, 1999; Morel & Ramanujam, 1999; Thompson, 1967). Like natural systems theory, complex systems theory recognizes the influences of external environments and the complexity of organizations are results of interactive adaptive behaviors (Morel & Ramanujam, 1999). While organizations adapt to their environment, their actors perceive and interpret the external forces and proactively modify and in turn adapt to it (Boisot & Child, 1999). Unlike natural systems theory, well-adaptive organizations do not mean that they stay in equilibrium which is a main characteristic of natural systems theories (Boisot & Child, 1999; Morel & Ramanujam, 1999). An important aspect of complexity theories is that certain patterns within an organization emerge from collective behaviors among the elements of systems (Frank & Fahrbach, 1999; Maguire & McKelvey, 1999; Morel & Ramanujam, 1999). These patterns are observable, identifiable, and measurable. Among these patterns are communication and decision making processes that define the organizational culture (Frank & Fahrbach, 1999; Styhre, 2002). If organizations are highly structured and stable, nothing new can/will emerge, which in turn means no study on social systems is needed (Maguire & McKelvey, 1999). Therefore, the complex
systems approach focuses on the dynamic relationships and interactions among the components of systems (Frank & Fahrbach, 1999).

Complex systems involve a large number of interacting components which are both internal and external (Boisot & Child, 1999; Morel & Ramanujam, 1999). The interactions among multiple, independent components engage complex nonlinear causality (Marion & Uhl-Bien, 2002; McKelvey, 2004; Regine & Lewin, 2000). In complex systems, a variable can be a cause of an effect and also an effect of other causes. Patterns that emerge are the results of complex (sometimes, mutual) causal relationships among the components of the system. To understand complex systems, therefore, holistic observation of whole components is necessary (Dent, 1999; Marion & Uhl-Bien, 2002). In postmodern organizations which are made up of diverse individuals, groups and types of constituents, holistic nonlinear causality is required to address issues. Particularly, human service organizations are characterized as unpredictable, indeterminate, highly dependent on their institutional environment etc. (Hasenfeld, 2010). Therefore, issues facing human service organizations needs to be addressed through understanding the nonlinear causal relationships among variables.

Leadership Theory

Leadership practice in social work is a relatively fledgling area (Lawler, 2007). Social work leadership is “the communication of vision, guided by the NASW Code of Ethics, to create proactive processes that empower individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities” (Rank & Hutchison, 2000, p.499). According to leadership theory, leadership plays conducive roles in determining organizations’ structures, cultures and climate (Alvesson, 2011; Barnard, 1968; Hall, 1977; Packard,
Organizational culture is perceived as a tool to help employees share personal values (Martin, Frost, & O’Neill, 2006). Organizational culture and climate have been proven major, indirect factors to predict employee turnover (Glisson, Dukes, & Green, 2006; Mobley, 1982). Those studies on employee turnover using organizational culture and climate, organizational commitment and job satisfaction both directly and indirectly employed leadership as a predictor variable and as an intervention program (Aarons et al., 2009; Evans & Huxley, 2009; Glisson, et al., 2006; Strand et al., 2010; Renner, Porter, & Preister, 2009; Strolin-Goltzman, et al., 2009; Yoon & Kelly, 2008). Therefore, the leadership theory will be reviewed, particularly transformational leadership effective for employees’ job satisfaction and for worker performance in human/social service organizations (Bargal & Schmid, 1993; Brimhall et al., 2016; Epers & Westhuis, 2008; Gellis, 2001; Gill, Flaschner & Shachar; 2006; Green, Albanese, Cafri, & Aarons, 2014; Green et al., 2011; Mary, 2005; Medley & Larochelle, 1995; Rank & Hutchison, 2000).

Transformational Leadership. Leadership theory has evolved from the trait approach - charismatic leadership- to dimensions of leadership - contingency, transactional, transformational leadership, and distributed leadership (Grint, 2011; Yukl & Heaton, 2002). Downton first coined the term, transformational leadership in 1973 (Northouse, 2001, p.131). However, Burns (1978) initiated the term as an important approach to leadership theory by proposing two kinds of leaders, transactional leadership and transformational leadership. Transactional leadership is associated with exchange because followers of a leader have expectations to some extent, and the leader will meet the followers’ needs. However, transformational leadership is concerned with motivation and morality of the followers. Bass (1985) developed a questionnaire discerning the two
types of leadership based on Burn’s work and conceptualized three components of transformational leadership: “intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration, and charisma” (Bargal & Schmid, 1993, p. 44).

Later, Bass & Avolio (1997) generated four factors of transformational leadership: idealized influence (charisma), inspirational motivation (inspiration), intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration. Leaders who have the features of idealized influences present a vision and act as a powerful role model for followers. Followers want to emulate the leaders (Gellis, 2001). Inspirational motivation describes leaders who communicate and share a vision in the organization and who motivate followers to build confidence and commit to the vision (Gellis, 2001, Northouse, 2001). Intellectual stimulation refers to functions that facilitate followers to be creative and innovative and challenges them to break from their past beliefs and values (Northouse, 2001). Individual consideration is related to the supportive environment of the organization. Leaders who have this feature will treat followers with care and concern. As a result, transformational leadership expects successful performance of followers as a consequence of the functions of the four factors (Gellis, 2001). Den Hartog, House, Hanges, Ruiz-Quintanilla, and Dorfman, (1999) stated that plenty of evidence that transformational leadership is more effective than other leadership models has been discovered through empirical research.

Bargal and Schmid (1993) stated that although the four factors are developed in the business field, it still has significant implication for human service organization management in the age of confronting economic cutbacks and care management. Because human resources are the main asset in human service agencies, it is important to motivate
and inspires workers professionally and interpersonally through transformational leadership (Lawler, 2007). Transformational leadership also stresses the importance of participation of the employees in decision-making. By actively participating in decision-making and developing the organizational vision, employees’ commitment to the organization will be enhanced (Gill et al., 2006). In complex organizations which are the characteristics of social/human service organizations (Hasenfeld, 2010), a facilitating leadership style - transformational leadership - catalyzes the organizations’ environments which empowers followers and promotes social networking among members of agencies (Marion & Uhl-Bien, 2002).

Transformational leadership is positively correlated with the organizational culture that leaders and followers share goals, visions and values (Jaskyte, 2004; Schein, 1990). The transformational leadership model is relatively new and little discussed in social work but a few empirical studies have demonstrated the effectiveness of the leadership in social work and human service organizations (Gellis, 2001; Mary, 2005; Medley & Larochelle, 1995). Kays (1993) examined the relationship of the transformational leadership model to employee’s job satisfaction in child welfare and mental health centers. The study found that the two variables are significantly and positively correlated. Mary (2005) also found that transformational leadership is related to positive leadership outcomes in human service organizations.

Even though empirical studies have shown the effectiveness of transformational leadership in social work and the positive relationships to job satisfaction, role clarity, commitment and co-worker support in human service organizations (Gellis, 2001; Tafvelin, Hyvönen, & Westerberg, 2012), little research which examines it as a predictor
or an intervention for employee turnover has been discovered. However, studies have examined the influences of leadership in social work organizations on employee turnover as being discussed in Part III. Those studies did not pay much attention to a specific leadership type. Therefore, now it is time to take into account the specific leadership types effective in social work settings to the extent that leadership is correlated with the organizations’ cultural consensus in nonprofit human service organizations (Jaskyte, 2004), in order to use it as an intervention for employee turnover at the agency level.
Chapter Five: Knowledge Foundation of Child Welfare Worker Turnover Research

Summary of Knowledge Gaps in Social Worker Turnover

An empirical literature review discovered conflicting and inconsistent research findings of child welfare worker turnover. High turnover rates among the child welfare work practitioners have not decreased despite the long history of research and interventions on the issue. It also seems that numerous variables need to be employed in more complicated and yet a well-organized model. While relevant theories were reviewed, it was captured that the previous empirical research overlooked the dynamics between organizational environments and leadership styles in child welfare worker turnover. Most of the studies examining the relationship between leadership and turnover intention in child welfare, if there were, paid attention to immediate leaders and little to distance leaders. However, studies on organizational leadership in both public and private sectors demonstrated that transformational leadership had a positive influence on building supportive organizational culture and climate, and those relationships affect organizational commitment. Even though some studies have shown the effectiveness of transformational leadership in social work organizations, in terms of worker performance and service outcomes, worker turnover studies in social work have not linked leadership style with organizational culture and climate.

In addition, it is suggested that organizational culture and climate are shaped by the leader’s help and vice versa (Avolio, 2007; Bass & Avolio, 1993; Bass & Riggio, 2006; Chemers, 2016; Schein, 2010; Zaccaro & Klimoski, 2002). Other research on turnover intention in child welfare suggested that organizational commitment was associated with organizational environments (Landsman, 2008). Bass and Avolio (1993)
recommended that transformational leaders develop and change to positive organizational culture. However, organizational researchers have not designed or examined the combining effects of the three main domains of organizations (leadership, organizational environment, and organizational commitment) with turnover intention. Therefore, this study proposes an integrative model of child welfare turnover intention influenced by transformational leadership through organizational culture and climate and organizational commitment. This model will lead child welfare agencies to invent and adopt a workforce management strategy, particularly leadership practice that previous research has failed to capture.

**Research Questions and Hypotheses**

The primary research questions addressed in this study are exhibited in the conceptual model developed based on the review of child welfare worker turnover literature, diagramed in Figure 1. Particularly, this study investigated the roles of transformational leadership style in constructing work conditions in child welfare organizations and its impacts on child welfare worker turnover intention. Therefore, the following are the research questions and the hypotheses corresponding to each research question:

1. Does transformational leadership affect turnover intention directly or indirectly?
   a. Hypothesis 1-1. Transformational leadership has a direct negative relationship with child welfare worker turnover intention.
b. Hypothesis 1-2. Transformational leadership has an indirect relationship with child welfare worker turnover through organizational culture and organizational climate.

c. Hypothesis 1-3. Transformational leadership has an indirect relationship with child welfare worker turnover through organizational commitment.

d. Hypothesis 1-4. Organizational culture, climate, and commitment mediates the relationship between transformational leadership and turnover intent.

2. Does transformational leadership affect working conditions (organizational culture, climate, and commitment)?

   a. Hypothesis 2-1. Transformational leadership has a direct, positive relationship with organizational culture and climate.

   b. Hypothesis 2-2. Transformational leadership has an indirect relationship with organizational commitment through organizational culture and organizational climate.

   c. Hypothesis 2-3. Transformational leadership has a direct, positive relationship with organizational commitment.

   d. Hypothesis 2-4. Organizational culture and climate have direct, positive relationships with organizational commitment.

3. Does working conditions affect child welfare workers’ turnover intention?

   a. Hypothesis 3-1. Organizational culture and climate have a direct negative relationship with turnover intention.
b. Hypothesis 3-2. Organizational commitment has a direct, negative relationship with turnover intention.

c. Hypothesis 3-3. Organizational climate has an indirect negative relationship with child welfare workers’ turnover intention through organizational commitment.

d. Hypothesis 3-4. Organizational culture has an indirect negative relationship with child welfare workers’ turnover intention through organizational commitment.

Based on the review of the empirical literature and relevant theories, a conceptual model of the turnover intention study is proposed in Figure 1, which is a full model. The purpose of this research is to examine the relationships of transformational leadership style with organizational commitment and employee turnover intention. Particularly, it is assumed, according to the review of comprehensive review of the literature and critical theories, that transformational leadership creates a positive and supportive culture and climate of organization for employees. Furthermore, the organizational culture and climate constructed by transformational leadership contribute to employees’ positive organizational commitment. Finally, the positive organizational commitment is expected to reduce employees’ turnover intention. Economic and demographic variables were not included in this study because the purpose of this study is to find organizational roles in preventing staff from leaving. Since this study focuses on the variables that can be translated into interventions implemented at organizational level, economic and demographic variables were excluded. The functions of the labor market was beyond the control of child welfare agencies, so do demographic variables. Examination of the
The proposed conceptual model is expected to help develop policies and practices for human resource management of child welfare organizations. Eventually, the stable child welfare workforce contributes to providing stable quality social services to vulnerable populations.

Figure 1: Conceptual Model of Child Welfare Worker Turnover Intention
Chapter Six: Methods

Research Design

A cross-sectional survey research design was employed to investigate the research questions and the hypotheses drawn from the conceptual model that concerns the relationship between transformational leadership style in child welfare organizations and worker turnover intention.

Sampling and Data Collection. This study tests a series of paths with multiple variables. For model estimation and hypotheses testing concerning model parameters and specification, sample size should be large enough: no less than 200 as a general rule of thumb (Kline, 2005). Therefore, this study targeted to collect at least 200 cases. The sample for this study was drawn from a population of public child welfare social workers in Indiana in 2017. Family case managers were recruited as a part of Workforce Excellence Project funded by National Child Welfare Workforce Institute (NCWWI). The project provided local office managers with leadership training. The project surveyed family case managers under those who took the leadership training as well as under those who did not take the training in the agencies sharing similar characteristics in terms of the number of case managers and geographic for the sake of comparison. Thirty-two local offices were identified for the survey, 16 offices for each group, with the help of Deputy Director of Indiana Department of Child Services (DCS). Total of 32 local offices in each county are under state administrated child welfare system in Indiana.

Family case managers received an email message with an online survey link from their local office director informing them of the survey and asking them to participate voluntarily. Before they received the email note from the researcher, the local office
directors were requested to send their family case managers the email note by the Deputy Director’s Office. The survey links were created in Qualtrics, a web-based survey tool that allowed creating multiple links. Thirty-two different links were created, and each link was sent out to different agencies. This strategy made the researcher keep track of response rates and identify agencies for reminder emails. The survey links were distributed three times in total including two reminder emails from April 26 to May 10 in 2017. The survey links were closed on May 17, 2017. The number of target population participation estimated was at approximately 1,048 according to Deputy Director’s office. Overall response rate was around 25% (n = 264). There were six local offices where no family case managers took the survey. Without data transformation, missing cases were simply removed. After removal of missing cases, 214 cases were identified as usable for this study.

Human Subject Reviews

The Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Indiana University approved this study (IRB STUDY #18520871). There was no incentive to complete the survey. Study participants had to read study information sheet (See Appendix A) provided in the online survey link before they took the survey.

Measures

According to the research questions and hypotheses listed in the previous chapter, the variable categories and definitions of each concept are specified below in Table 1. Study participants provided basic demographic information such as age, gender, degrees, tenure in the current position, tenure in DCS, and experience in leadership training provided by DCS. Study variables were measured using existing scales without
modifications that have been previously validated in other studies (See Appendix A for the Survey Questionnaire). Following describes measurement of each variable.

Table 1: Categories and Definitions of Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Concepts (Constructs)</th>
<th>Operationalization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variable</td>
<td>Turnover Intention</td>
<td>A cognitive process that employees consider leaving their current job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Variable</td>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>Idealized influence (Charisma) Intellectual stimulation Inspirational motivation Individualized consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td>Shared norms, Values, Expectations, and Perceptions by members of an organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Climate</td>
<td></td>
<td>Psychological perceptions of an organization and the work environments that impact workers’ behaviors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Employees’ attachment to their current organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Variables</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Years of age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Female, Male, or Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Work Degrees</td>
<td>Bachelor/ Master in Social Work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Turnover Intention.** Turnover intention was the endogenous variable in the current study. Intentions to quit were used to measure turnover intention. The six-item scale was developed to assess employees’ intentions to quit their current organizations by Potter, Leak, Longworth-Reed, Altschul, and Rienks (2016). This scale focused on measuring individual intention to leave an organization and was used to examine organizational health in child welfare in Indiana. Each item was responded on a seven-point scale (1= strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree). Following are the six items: “I would have a hard time finding another child welfare job at a different agency,” “I plan to
leave this agency as soon as possible,” “I have too much time invested at this agency to leave,” “I expect to still be working at this agency in 5 years,” “I am committed to staying at this agency,” and “I would gain little from switching to another child welfare agency” (Potter et al., 2016).” The study showed that this scale had a Cronbach’s alpha of .88 which is considered strong internal reliability consistency (Potter et al., 2016). Cronbach's alphas were computed and confirmed that the scale showed good internal consistency reliability with the scores (Alpha = 0.84) above 0.80 considered highly reliable (Abu-Bader, 2010).

**Transformational Leadership.** Transformational leadership is leader behavior that influence followers to transcendent individual self-interest for the collective good of their organizations and “help followers reach their fullest potential” (Northouse, 2001, p.131) through the attention to the individual needs. Transformational leadership is theorized in four dimensions: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individual consideration. Idealized influence is the degree of charismatic behaviors and attitudes that followers identify with leaders. Inspirational motivation is the degree to which leaders articulate a vision that is inspiring followers. Intellectual stimulation is the degree of leaders’ actions that challenge followers to think creatively and to take risks. Individualized consideration is the degree to which leaders attend to individual follower’s needs and concerns and then help them develop themselves.

The four dimensions of transformational leadership listed above were measured with 20 items from the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ Form 5X; Avolio, Bass & Jung, 1999). The MLQ Form 5X was revised version of MLQ to measure full range of leadership factors. Avolio et al. (1999) developed a six-factor leadership model
to find best fit for the MLQ survey. They started with 80 items for six leadership factors and could determine a final set of leadership factors with 36 items through confirmatory factor analyses (Avolio et al., 1999). Of the 36 items of MLQ Form 5X, 20 items (four items for intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation and individualized consideration respectively, and eight items for idealized influence) exactly measure transformational leadership comprising the four dimensions. In their original development of MLQ Form 5X, the transformational leadership factor showed discriminant validity. This finding was supported by the study to evaluate structural validity of MLQ Form 5X through confirmatory factor analyses, and found the instruments was able to capture the full range leadership factors (Muenjohn & Armstrong, 2008). The Cronbach alphas produced from the study were .86 for English version. Most studies using transformational leadership from MLQ Form 5X showed strong internal reliability which is more than .80 of Cronbach alpha (Alsayed, Motaghi, & Osman, 2012; Avolio, Zhu, Koh, & Bhatla, 2004; Piccolo & Colquitt, 2006).

This study measured transformational leadership with 20 items from MLQ Form 5X. Case workers evaluated the local office directors to measure transformational leadership because this study aims to capture individual perceptions of organizational leadership. Each item was scored using the five points scale. The example items for each dimension are: “seeks different views” for intellectual stimulation, “articulates a compelling vision of the future” for inspirational motivation, “individualized attentions” for individualized consideration respectively, and “goes beyond self-interests” for idealized influence. Cronbach's alphas were computed and confirmed that the scale
showed good internal consistency reliability with the scores (Alpha = 0.98) above 0.80 considered highly reliable (Abu-Bader, 2010)

**Organizational Culture.** Organizational culture refers to shared norms, values, expectations, and perceptions by members of an organization (Glisson et al., 2008; Hemmelgarn, et al., 2006; Schein, 1990; Hasenfeld, 2000). This present study measures organizational culture by employing existing scales used to examine its effect on child welfare worker turnover intention (Shim, 2010). The study found that the organizational culture was a predictor of worker turnover in child welfare agencies with supporting test results of validity and reliability of the measurement model. The scale consists of 32 items rated by five Likert-type scales. Following are the example items: There are clear measures of success and progress indicators for work with clients; My work uses client focused interventions. Cronbach’s alphas were computed and confirmed that the scale showed good internal consistency reliability with the scores (Alpha = 0.92) above 0.80 considered highly reliable (Abu-Bader, 2010).

**Organizational Climate.** Organizational climate is of the employees’ psychological perceptions of an organization and the work environments that impact workers’ behaviors (Aarons & Sawitzky, 2006; James & Jones; 1974; James & Sells, 1981). This present study measures organizational climate by employing existing scales used to examine its effect on child welfare worker turnover intention (Shim, 2010). The study found that the organizational climate was a predictor of worker turnover in child welfare agencies with supporting test results of validity and reliability of the measurement model. However, a few items were reworded to avoid confusing the participants after being consulted by the DCS employees. The scale consists of 26 items rated by five Likert-type scales.
Following are the example items: There are clear measures of success and progress indicators for work with clients; My work uses client focused interventions. Cronbach's alphas were computed and confirmed that the scale showed good internal consistency reliability with the scores (Alpha = 0.92) above 0.80 considered highly reliable (Abu-Bader, 2010).

**Organizational Commitment.** In this study, organizational commitment is referred to as employees’ attachment to their current organizations (Landsman, 2001; Mowday, et al., 1979). Various instruments for organizational commitment exist (Landsman, 2001; Mowday, et al., 1979). This study used organizational commitment scale developed by Mowday, et al. (1979) consisting of 15 items. This scale is the first and most frequently used instrument to measure organizational commitment. An example item is: “I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this organization be successful”. Cronbach's alphas were computed and confirmed that the scale showed good internal consistency reliability with the scores (Alpha = 0.86) above 0.80 considered highly reliable (Abu-Bader, 2010).

**Control Variables.** Based on the findings of the previous studies, gender, age, and educational background (social work degrees) were selected as control variables (Crossley, Bennett, Jex, & Burnfield, 2007; Landsman, 2001; Maertz, et al., 2007; Nissly et al., 2005). Family case managers’ gender was coded as a binary variable (1 = female; 0 = male) and, their age was measured by a self-report of the years of age. The workers’ educational background was measured by a binary variable (1 = social work degrees in master and/or bachelor; 0 = master and/or bachelor degrees in other disciplines).

**Analyses**
Statistical analyses in this study involved following steps, using STATA ver. 15. First, data were screened for missing values. Second, descriptive statistics for the sample were computed: summary statistics of frequency distribution, means, and others; and bivariate correlations among the study variables. Third, reliability was tested for the five measurements: turnover intention, organizational commitment, transformational leadership, organizational culture, and organizational climate. Fourth, path analysis based on maximum likelihood estimation was used to estimate a series of mediated models of the relationships among the observed variables. The overall model fit was evaluated by multiple statistical indexes of model fit because the chi-square test contradicts large sample size which is requisite for structural equation modeling (SEM; Lei & Wu, 2007). This study used a minimal set of fit indices recommended by Kline (2005): “model chi-square, Steiger-Lind root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA), the Bentler comparative fit index (CFI), Non-normed fit index (NNFI), and the standardized root mean square residual (SRMR) (Kline, 2005. p.134)”. Researchers have recommended to report not only chi-square but also SRMR along with one of other fit indices (Albright & Park, 2009; Hooper, Coughlan, & Mullen, 2008; Lei & Wu, 2007). The Table 2 shows the fit indices that were used in this study and the cut-off values of each index for model evaluation (Albright & Park, 2009; Hooper, et al., 2008; Kline, 2005; Schreiber, Nora, Stage, Barlow, & King, 2006).
Table 2: Cutoff Criteria of Fit Indices for Model Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi-square ($\chi^2$)</td>
<td>$\chi^2 = 0$ means perfect fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As value of $\chi^2$ increases, the model fit becomes worse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Mean Square Error of</td>
<td>RMSEA $\leq .05$: close approximate fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximation (RMSEA)</td>
<td>$.05 &lt;$ RMSEA $&lt; .08$: reasonable error of approximation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RMSEA $\geq .10$: poor fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative fit index (CFI)</td>
<td>CFI ranges from 0 for poor fit to 1 for good fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CFI $\geq .90$ is recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized root mean square residual (SRMR)</td>
<td>SRMR $= 0$: perfect fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SRMR $&lt; .05$: well fitting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SRMR $&lt; .08$: acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Normed Fit Index (NNFI)</td>
<td>$0 &gt;$ NNFI $&gt; 1$ Can be acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NNFI $&gt; 0.095$: Good fit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter Seven: Results

Descriptive Statistics

The majority of the respondents were female (83.6%), and case workers (81%), and aged between 20 and 39 (69.2%). About 78% of the sample had bachelors or masters’ degrees in other disciplines than social work and 28% indicated that they had received a social work degree. Most of workers worked less than 5 years in their current positions (87.4%) and in DCS (80.8%). Approximately 5% of participants received leadership training for supervisors. The participants of this study shared very similar characteristic with the state child welfare workforce with reference to state report on comprehensive organizational health assessment (National Child Welfare Workforce Institute, 2015). The survey targeted entire employees in DCS and obtained 72% of responses that consisted of 84% of female and about 20% workers with social work degrees. High rates of employees with short term work experience was also similar characteristics of the state report. Table 3 presents demographic characteristics of the study participants.

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics for Study Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender (N = 212)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>83.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (N = 200)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Degrees</strong> (N for Undergraduate = 194 &amp; N for graduate = 34)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSW</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>67.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSW</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Master's Degree</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work Degree in either BSW or MSW</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership Training for Supervisor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Title</strong> (N = 185)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caseworker</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years in Current Position</strong> (N = 181)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years of Working in DCS</strong> (N = 198)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>59.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 presents descriptive statistics for independent and dependent variables. Overall, the mean scores of all the study variables are higher than the middle points of individual instruments. Child welfare workers in this sample reported moderate turnover intent (M = 17.3, SD = 4.8, Range = 7-30). Following are the mean scores for independent and mediating variables: 75.4 out of 100 for transformational leadership (SD = 18.2, Range = 20-100), 73.5 out of 105 for organizational commitment (SD = 18.2, Range = 35-105), 110.1 out of 160 for organizational culture (SD = 16.8, Range = 56-160), and 89 out of 130 for organizational climate (SD = 14.9, Range = 29-130).

Table 4: Descriptive Analysis for Continuous Variables (N = 214)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intent</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>7-30</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>20-100</td>
<td>-0.74</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>35-105</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Culture</td>
<td>110.1</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>56-160</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Climate</td>
<td>89.0</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>29-130</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
<td>4.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bivariate Analysis Results**

Bivariate analysis among measurement variables showed that turnover intention was negatively correlated with transformational leadership (r = -0.36, p < 0.001), organizational commitment (r = -0.51, p < 0.001), organizational culture (r = -0.37, p < 0.001), and organizational climate (r = -0.37, p < 0.001). Transformational leadership was significantly associated with organizational commitment (r = 0.41, p < 0.001), organizational culture (r = 0.49, p < 0.001), and organizational climate (r = 0.43, p <
0.001). Significant correlation of organizational commitment was found with organizational culture ($r = 0.64, p < 0.001$) and organizational climate ($r = 0.63, p < 0.001$). In addition, correlation between organizational culture and climate was very strong ($r = 0.87, p < 0.001$). However, all three-control variables (age, gender, and degrees) were not significantly correlated to turnover intention, transformational leadership, organizational commitment, organizational culture, and organizational climate. Table 5 displays the correlation coefficients matrix for the study variables. Pearson product-moment correlation was run between continuous variables that are turnover intent, transformational leadership, organizational commitment, organizational culture, organizational climate, and age. Between categorical variables (degrees and gender) and continuous variables, Spearmon’s rank-order correlation was used for bivariate correlation analysis.
Table 5: Correlations among Measurement and Control Variables (N = 214)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TI</th>
<th>TL</th>
<th>OCM</th>
<th>OCU</th>
<th>OCL</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>SW.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intention (TI)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership (TL)</td>
<td>-0.36***</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment (OCM)</td>
<td>-0.51***</td>
<td>0.41***</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Culture (OCU)</td>
<td>-0.37***</td>
<td>0.49***</td>
<td>0.64***</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Climate (OCL)</td>
<td>-0.37***</td>
<td>0.43***</td>
<td>0.63***</td>
<td>0.87***</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work Degrees (SW.D)</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: *** P ≤ 0.001.
Path Analyses

This study tested a series of path models of the relationships linking worker's perceptions of leadership, organizational culture, organizational climate, organizational commitment, and turnover intention in public child welfare organizations, while controlling for the effects of gender, age, and social work degrees on turnover intention. In order to test the full model built upon the five research hypotheses, five sequential models were developed as well as examined in order to identify a path model best fit to the data based on the literature review of factors for child welfare workers’ turnover intention. This study designed the initial model in which the transformational leadership and organizational commitment were included as independent variables. Given that this study focuses on the role of transformational leadership on child welfare workers’ turnover intention, the first model involved transformational leadership as an independent variable and organizational commitment as a mediator. In addition, previous studies on the child welfare workforce suggested that organizational commitment was the direct factor for turnover intention (Aarons & Sawitzky, 2006; Carmeli & Freund, 2009; Hwang & Hopkins, 2012; Hwang & Hopkins, 2015; Kim & Kao, 2014;).

For the second model, demographic variables of age, gender, and social work degrees were added to the first model as control variables because the three variables were most often identified as control variables in the child welfare workforce field (Crossley, Bennett, Jex, & Burnfield, 2007; Hopkins, et al., 2010; Landsman, 2001; Maertz, et al., 2007; Nissly et al., 2005). This helps better understand the impacts of transformational leadership in child welfare agencies on turnover intention by exploring the roles of workers’ demographic characteristics. In the third, fourth, and fifth models,
this study added organizational condition variables, organizational culture and organizational climate, based on the previous research in which they were the direct and/or indirect predictors of turnover intention (Shim, 2010). Shim (2010) found that both organizational culture and climate separately and directly predicted turnover intention of child welfare workers. However, organizational conditions were found to be predictors for workers’ work attitudes such as organizational commitment (Glisson et al., 2002; Lambert et al., 2012; Landsman, 2008; Rai, 2012). Moreover, there are research findings that transformational leaders built positive organizational cultures and organizational climates (Jaskyte, 2004; Sarros, Cooper, & Santora, 2008). Therefore, the third and fourth models were developed by adding the two mediators and on the relationship between transformational leadership and organizational commitment respectively. Then, the fifth model added both organizational culture and organizational climate to the second model as mediators between transformational leadership and organizational commitment. The last three models will help identify the best models for turnover intention of child welfare workers using transformational leadership.

This study used two major methods to determine the multicollinearity among the independent variables. Cutoff values for both methods were VIF > 10 and Tolerance < 0.1 that proposed by Abu-Bader (2010) and Cohen, Cohen, West, and Aiken, (2003) who employed them for research on workforce issues and human behaviors. Tolerance and the variance inflator factor (VIF) values of all independent variables were within the acceptable ranges. Table 6 presents the values of Tolerance and VIF of independent variables in this study.
Table 6. Tolerance and VIF Values (N = 214)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tolerance</th>
<th>VIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>0.745</td>
<td>1.342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>0.554</td>
<td>1.805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Culture</td>
<td>0.216</td>
<td>4.638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Climate</td>
<td>0.232</td>
<td>4.317</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Dependent variable is Turnover Intention.

**Direct, Indirect, and Total Effects of Structural Paths.** In the first model, the relationship among transformational leadership, organizational commitment, and turnover intention was defined. Figure 2 displays the diagram of standardized path coefficients for the Model 1. Transformational leadership was positively associated with organizational commitment ($\beta = 0.408, p \leq 0.001$) and negatively with turnover intention ($\beta = -0.183, p \leq 0.00$). Organizational commitment was negatively related to workers’ turnover intention ($\beta = -0.437, p \leq 0.001$). In addition, transformational leadership was related to workers’ turnover intention indirectly via the mediating variable of organizational commitment ($\beta = -0.178, p \leq 0.001$). The total effect of transformational leadership on turnover intention via organizational commitment was significant ($\beta = -0.361, p \leq 0.001$). Therefore, organizational commitment partially mediated transformational leadership to workers’ turnover intention. The chi-square statistics and degrees of freedom indicate that the Model 1 is just-identified with $R^2$ of 0.1981 ($x^2 (3) = 112.134$, RMSEA (95% CI) = 0.000 (0.000-0.000), CFI = 1.000, NNFI = 1.000, and SRMR = 0.000). Regarding RMSEA of zero and CFI of one can be caused when chi-square statistic is equal to or less than degrees of freedom, which is the case here (Gu,
Thomas, & Chen, 2017; Hu & Bentler, 1999; Kline, 2005). The values do not mean that the model is perfect fit.

Figure 2. Standardized Path Coefficients for Model 1

Note: Solid Line = Statistically Significant, *** = P ≤ 0.001

In the second model, control variables (gender, age, and social work degrees) were added to the Model 1. Figure 3 displays the diagram of standardized path coefficients for the Model 2. Overall, none of the control variables had significant relationships to workers’ turnover intention. However, the direct, indirect, and total effects of transformational leadership and organizational commitment on workers’ turnover intention have increased. Transformational leadership was positively associated with organizational commitment (β = 0.406, p ≤ 0.001) and negatively with turnover intention (β = -0.210, p ≤ 0.001). Organizational commitment was negatively related to workers’ turnover intention (β = -0.444, p ≤ 0.001). In addition, transformational leadership was related to workers’ turnover intention indirectly via the mediating variable of organizational commitment (β = -0.180, p ≤ 0.001). The total effect of transformational leadership on turnover via organizational commitment was significant (β
The Model 2 seemed to fit the data well with $R^2$ of 0.2185 ($\chi^2 (9) = 1119.535$, RMSEA (95% CI) = 0.000 (0.000-0.071), CFI = 1.000, NNFI = 1.056, and SRMR = 0.015). RMSEA of zero and CFI of one can be caused when chi-square statistic is equal to or less than degrees of freedom, which is the case here (Gu, et al., 2017; Hu & Bentler, 1999; Kline, 2005). The values do not mean that the model is perfect fit (Kline, 2005, p. 139).

Figure 3. Standardized Path Coefficients for Model 2

In the third model, organizational climate was added to the path between transformational leadership and organizational commitment in the Model 2. Figure 4 displays the diagram of standardized path coefficients for the Model 3. Overall, the total effect of transformational leadership on turnover intention through organizational climate and organizational commitment was significant ($\beta = -0.391, p \leq 0.001$). However, the coefficient value did not changed at all from the Model 2. The total effect of
transformational leadership on organizational commitment through organizational climate was significant ($\beta = 0.406, p \leq 0.001$). The total effects of organizational climate on turnover intention via organizational commitment was significant ($\beta = -0.263, p \leq 0.001$). In direct effects, organizational commitment and organizational climate were positively associated ($\beta = 0.550, p \leq 0.001$). Transformational leadership and organizational climate had a positive relationship ($\beta = 0.422, p \leq 0.01$). Turnover intention was negatively associated with organizational commitment ($\beta = 0.430, p \leq 0.001$) and transformational leadership ($\beta = 0.205, p \leq 0.01$). However, organizational climate had no direct effect on turnover intention ($\beta = -0.026, p \geq 0.05$). No significant relationship between control variables and turnover intention was found. The Model 3 fits the data well with $R^2$ of 0.2612 ($\chi^2 (15) = 239.756$, RMSEA (95% CI) = 0.000 (0.000-0.064), CFI = 1.000, NNFI = 1.019, and SRMR = 0.023). RMSEA of zero and CFI of one can be caused when chi-square statistic is equal to or less than degrees of freedom, which is the case here (Gu, et al., 2017; Hu & Bentler, 1999; Kline, 2005). The values do not mean that the model is perfect fit (Kline, 2005, p. 139).
In the fourth model, a new variable of organizational culture was added to the Model 2. Figure 5 displays the diagram of standardized path coefficients for the Model 4. Overall, the total effects of transformational leadership on turnover intention through organizational culture and organizational commitment was -0.391 (p ≤ 0.001). However, the coefficient value for the relationship between transformational leadership and turnover intention was the same as that from the Model 2 (β = -210, p ≤ 0.01). The total effect of transformational leadership on organizational commitment through organizational culture was 0.406 (p ≤ 0.001). The total effects of organizational culture on turnover intention via organizational commitment was -0.257 (p ≤ 0.001). In direct effects, organizational commitment and organizational culture were positively associated (β = 0.574, p ≤ 0.001). Transformational leadership and organizational culture had positive relationship (β = 0.481, p ≤ 0.01). Turnover intention was negatively associated
to organizational commitment (β = 0.442, p ≤ 0.001) and transformational leadership (β = 0.210, p ≤ 0.001). However, organizational culture has no significant direct effect on turnover intention (β = -0.003, p ≥ 0.05). No significant relationship between control variables and turnover intention was found. The Model 4 fits the data with R² of 0.3026 (χ² (15) = 260.200, RMSEA (95% CI) = 0.000 (0.000-0.087), CFI = 1.000, NNFI = 1.017, and SRMR = 0.022). RMSEA of zero and CFI of one can be caused when chi-square statistic is equal to or less than degrees of freedom, which is the case here (Gu, et al., 2017; Hu & Bentler, 1999; Kline, 2005). The values do not mean that the model is perfect fit (Kline, 2005, p. 139).

Figure 5. Standardized Path Coefficients for Model 4

Note: Solid Line = Statistically Significant, Dashed line = Statistically Insignificant
*** = P ≤ 0.001, ** = P ≤ 0.01, * = P ≤ 0.05

Finally, in the fifth model, both organizational culture and organizational climate were added to the Model 2. Figure 6 displays the diagram of standardized path
coefficients for the Model 5. Overall, the total effect of transformational leadership on turnover intention through organizational culture, organizational climate, and organizational commitment were -0.391 (p ≤ 0.001). The coefficient value for the relationship between transformational leadership and turnover intention was not changed, compared with all the four models previously tested. In addition, the total effect of transformational leadership on organizational commitment through organizational culture and organizational climate was not changed either (β = 0.406, p ≤ 0.001). However, the total effects of organizational culture (β = -0.100, p ≥ 0.05) and organizational climate (β = -0.182, p ≥ 0.05) on turnover intention through organizational commitment were not significant. In direct effects, organizational commitment was positively associated with transformational leadership (β = 0.128, p ≤ 0.05), organizational culture (β = 0.326, p ≤ 0.01), and organizational climate (β = 0.287, p ≤ 0.01). Transformational leadership has direct relationships with organizational culture (β = 0.481, p ≤ 0.001) and organizational climate (β = 0.422, p ≤ 0.001) as well. Turnover intention was also directly predicted by organizational commitment (β = -0.435, p ≤ 0.001) and transformational leadership (β = -0.210, p ≤ 0.01). In contrast, turnover intention was not directly predicted by organizational culture (β = -0.042, p ≥ 0.05) and organizational climate (β = -0.057, p ≥ 0.05). Finally, the Model 5 seemed to fit the data well R² of 0.3030 (χ² (22) = 557.057, RMSEA(95% CI) = 0.000 (0.000-0.056), CFI = 1.000, NNFI = 1.017, and SRMR = 0.026). Overall, the five models seemed to fit the data well based on the cutoff criteria proposed in Table 2. The values of R² and Model Fit Indices for the five models were presented in Table 7 and Table 8 respectively. Table 7 shows the coefficients of structural paths for the five models defined. RMSEA of zero and CFI of one can be caused when
chi-square statistic is equal to or less than degrees of freedom, which is the case here (Gu, et al., 2017; Hu & Bentler, 1999; Kline, 2005). The values do not mean that the model is perfect fit (Kline, 2005, p. 139).

Figure 6. Standardized Path Coefficients for Model 5

Note: Solid Line = Statistically Significant, Dashed line = Statistically Insignificant
*** = \( P \leq 0.001 \), ** = \( P \leq 0.01 \), * = \( P \leq 0.05 \)
Table 7: Direct, Indirect, and Total Effects among Variables in Models (N = 214)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Direct Effects</th>
<th>Indirect Effects</th>
<th>Total Effects</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DN</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC</td>
<td>TL</td>
<td>0.306***</td>
<td>0.408</td>
<td>0.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI</td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>-0.155***</td>
<td>-0.437</td>
<td>0.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL</td>
<td>-0.049**</td>
<td>-0.183</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>-0.047***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Fit</th>
<th>x²</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>RMSEA (95% CI)</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>NNFI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>0.000 (0.000 - 0.000)</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Direct Effects</th>
<th>Indirect Effects</th>
<th>Total Effects</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DN</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC</td>
<td>TL</td>
<td>0.302***</td>
<td>0.406</td>
<td>0.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI</td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>-0.159***</td>
<td>-0.444</td>
<td>0.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL</td>
<td>-0.056***</td>
<td>-0.210</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>-0.048***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.089</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>-0.078</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Model Fit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Fit</th>
<th>$x^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>RMSEA (95% CI)</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>NNFI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.949</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.814</td>
<td>0.000 (0.000 - 0.071)</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.056</td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>SW. D</th>
<th>Direct Effects</th>
<th>Indirect Effects</th>
<th>Total Effects</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$b$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
<td>$b$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DN</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC</td>
<td>OCL</td>
<td>0.507***</td>
<td>0.550</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.129**</td>
<td>0.174</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.173***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCL</td>
<td>TL</td>
<td>0.340***</td>
<td>0.422</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI</td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>-0.153***</td>
<td>-0.430</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCL</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.009</td>
<td>-0.026</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>-0.078***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.054**</td>
<td>-0.205</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>-0.049***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.087</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>-0.078</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW. D</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.383</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.609</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Fit</th>
<th>$x^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>RMSEA (95% CI)</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>NNFI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.2185</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variables</td>
<td>Direct Effects</td>
<td>Indirect Effects</td>
<td>Total Effects</td>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DN</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>$b$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC</td>
<td>OCU</td>
<td>0.467***</td>
<td>0.574</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL</td>
<td>0.097*</td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCU</td>
<td>TL</td>
<td>0.438***</td>
<td>0.481</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI</td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>-0.158***</td>
<td>-0.442</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCU</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL</td>
<td>-0.056**</td>
<td>-0.210</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.090</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>-0.078</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW. D</td>
<td>0.378</td>
<td>0.356</td>
<td>0.609</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Fit</th>
<th>$x^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>RMSEA (95% CI)</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>NNFI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.294</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.637</td>
<td>0.000 (0.000 - 0.087)</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.004</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>OCL</td>
<td>OCU</td>
<td>TL</td>
<td>OCL TL</td>
<td>OCU TL</td>
<td>TI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.264**</td>
<td>0.287</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC</td>
<td>0.266**</td>
<td>0.326</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCU</td>
<td>0.095*</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.206***</td>
<td>0.278</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.302***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL</td>
<td>0.341***</td>
<td>0.422</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCL</td>
<td>0.438***</td>
<td>0.481</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCU</td>
<td>-0.155***</td>
<td>0.365</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>-0.041*</td>
<td>-0.125</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>-0.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.089</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>-0.078</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW. D</td>
<td>0.389</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.610</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>x^2</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>RMSEA (95% CI)</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>NNFI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.328</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.805</td>
<td>0.000 (0.000 - 0.056)</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.014</td>
<td>0.027</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: DN = Dependent Variable, IN = Independent Variable, TI = Turnover Intention, TL = Transformational Leadership, OCM = Organizational Commitment, OCU = Organizational Culture, OCL = Organizational Climate. SW.D: Social Work Degree

*** P ≤ 0.001, ** P ≤ 0.01, * p ≤ 0.05.
Chapter Eight: Discussion

Summary of Key Findings

The objective of the study was to develop a theoretical framework to address child welfare worker turnover by examining both direct and indirect effects of transformational leadership on their turnover intention, perceived by family case managers working in public child welfare agencies. To investigate both the direct and indirect effects of transformational leadership, this study tested five path models that hypothesized relationship between transformational leadership, organizational commitment, organizational culture, and organizational climate, and turnover intention.

One of the key findings in this study was that the transformational leadership style of local office directors had a direct negative impact on turnover intention of child welfare workers, supporting research hypothesis 1-1: Transformational leadership has a negative relationship with social worker turnover intention. In addition, organizational commitment partially mediated the effects of transformational leadership on turnover intention, supporting research hypothesis 1-3: Organizational commitment mediates the relationship between transformational leadership and turnover intention. Control variables (i.e., age, gender, and social work degrees) were not significantly related to turnover intention of child welfare workers. However, the total effect of transformational leadership on turnover intention slightly increased after including control variables. This result is consistent with previous research and the proposed theory of the relationship between transformational leadership and work attitudes, including turnover intention and organizational commitment in human service organizations (Mary, 2005; Rittschof & Fortunato, 2016). It indicates that child welfare workers under leaders with greater levels
of transformational leadership characteristics are more likely to show positive perceptions of organizational commitment and less likely or willing to quit their job than those working under directors with lower scores. Very little research exists to discover the effect of transformational leadership on workers’ turnover intention in child welfare settings. This finding contributes to transformational leadership style in child welfare by suggesting its positive effects on workers’ turnover intention.

The second key finding was that transformational leadership had positive and direct effects on building positive work conditions such as, organizational culture, and organizational climate. In addition, organizational conditions directly predicted organizational commitment of child welfare workers. The results support the research hypotheses 2-1 (Transformational leadership has a positive relationship with organizational culture and climate.) and hypothesis 2-4 (Organizational culture and climate have a positive relationship with organizational commitment.). They are also consistent with the previous research on the roles of transformational leadership in building positive organizational culture and organizational climate in private sectors and nonprofit organizations (Jaskyte, 2004; Sarros, et al., 2008). The direct positive relationships of organizational conditions to organizational commitment was widely studied in the private sector as well (Joo & Park, 2010; O'Reilly, Chatman, & Caldwell, 1991). However, the total effects of transformational leadership on turnover intention after adding organizational culture or organizational climate were not changed from the initial model with control variables (Model 2). This may more strongly support the effect of transformational leadership on turnover intention through organizational commitment than those models with organizational conditions. Another possible explanation would be
the measurement of organizational culture and climate. Even if the multicollinearity test of independent variables falls into acceptable ranges, it is still possible that organizational culture and climate used in this study measured the similar aspects of work environment.

The third key finding of the study was no direct relationships of organizational culture and climate with turnover intention. This finding refutes hypothesis 3-1 (Organizational culture and climate have a relationship with turnover intention) and hypothesis 1-2 (Organizational culture and organizational climate mediate the relationship between transformational leadership and turnover intention.). My finding of no direct relationship between organizational conditions and turnover intention found in this study is inconsistent with previous research results that found mediating effects of organizational culture and climate on turnover intention (Aarons & Sawitzky, 2006; Bednar, 2003; Hwang & Hopkins, 2012; Mor Barak, et al., 2006). Nevertheless, organizational conditions partially mediated the relationship between transformational leadership and organizational commitment within the Models 3, 4, and 5. This supports research hypothesis 2-2: Organizational culture and organizational climate mediate the relationship between transformational leadership and organizational commitment. No research known to the author examined the mediating roles of organizational conditions in the relationship between transformational leadership and organizational commitment. However, as aforementioned, there are research findings supporting the positive relationships between organizational culture and climate to organizational commitment (Joo & Park, 2010; O'Reilly, Chatman, & Caldwell, 1991).

It is interesting that the explained variance of Model 3 was higher than that of the Model 4. There seemed to be different degrees of effects on turnover intention between
organizational culture and organizational climate. However, the total effects of transformational leadership through organizational culture and/or organizational climate on turnover intention should be carefully interpreted. The coefficient values of the total effects were not changed after adding either or both organizational culture and climate. Again, this could be due to the measurement issue that organizational culture and climate used in this study are not different. However, the explained variance ($R^2$) has increased from the base model to the models with organizational culture and organizational climate. It is common that adding more independent variables raises the variances accounted for (Abu-Bader, 2000).

The fourth key finding was the direct and negative impact of organizational commitment on turnover intention of child welfare workers. This supports research hypothesis 3-2 (Organizational commitment has a negative relationship with turnover intention.) and is consistent with the previous research on and theories of the relationship between organizational commitment and turnover intention (Boyas et al., 2012; Burstain, 2009; Hopkins, et al., 2010; Hwang & Hopkins, 2015; Mowday, et al., 1979). Organizational commitment showed full mediating effects of both organizational culture and organizational climate on turnover intention. In other words, significant direct relationships of organizational culture and organizational climate to turnover intention disappeared due to the effects of organizational commitment. This finding supports both research hypothesis 3-3 (Organizational commitment mediates the relationship between organizational climate and turnover intention.) and hypothesis 3-4 (Organizational commitment mediates the relationship between organizational culture and turnover intention.). However, organizational culture, climate, and commitment mediates the
relationship between transformational leadership and turnover intention. This finding supports research hypothesis 1-4. These results reflect two distinct types of studies on relationship between organizational conditions (culture and climate) and turnover intention: 1) indirect effects through organizational commitment between organizational conditions and turnover intention (Lambert et al., 2012); 2) the direct positive relationships between organizational conditions and organizational commitment (Glisson & James, 2002). However, any of the research aforementioned did not find the complete mediating effects of organizational commitment on the relationship between organizational conditions and organizational commitment.

Last, the study found positive direct and indirect effects of transformational leadership on organizational commitment in all five models. This finding supports research hypothesis 2-3 (and was consistent with a study that found the direct and positive effect of transformational leadership on organizational commitment in the child welfare workforce field (Rittschof & Fortunato, 2016). To the author’s knowledge, that study was the first study conducted in child welfare using transformational leadership and organizational commitment. However, a body of literature found the direct relationships between leadership behaviors (including transformational leadership behaviors) perceived by workers and organizational commitment in both social work and business sectors (Chen, Chen, & Chen, 2010; Glisson & Durick, 1988; Jaskyte, 2004; Walumbwa, Wang, & Lawler, 2005). Local office directors perceived as transformational leaders by child welfare workers were more likely to commit to their organizations than those who identified their directors with less transformational leadership.
To summarize, the transformational leadership style of local office directors played a key role in child welfare workers’ intent to leave their agencies. In other words, despite the mediating roles of organizational commitment and workplace conditions, leadership styles were the most significant predictor of turnover intention in this data set. Therefore, the findings of this study strongly supported the theoretical framework of the relationship between transformational leadership and turnover intention in the child welfare workforce.

**Implications and Recommendations for the Child Welfare Workforce Field**

The major finding of the current study is the significance of transformational leadership style of local office directors in child welfare agencies. Regardless of the mediating factors of organizational conditions, transformational leadership was related to child welfare workers’ intent to leave their agencies at the same degree of strength. The study implies that workers’ turnover intention can be influenced not only by their immediate leaders/supervisors but also by their distant leaders such as local office directors. Most of the previous studies examined the immediate leaders or supervisors’ leadership styles as a predictor of turnover intention in child welfare agencies (Claiborne et al., 2014; Collins-Camargo & Royse, 2010; Ellett et al., 2003; Lee, et al., 2011; Smith, 2005). However, this study indicated that local office directors could also discourage or promote the workers’ commitment to their agencies and intent to leave the agency. In addition, the findings of this study imply that the leaders can play a key role in building work environments such as organizational cultures and organizational climates. The previous literature tended to pay attention to only the leadership of supervisors and managers in relation between organizational climate and organizational cultures and
workers’ turnover intention or actual turnover (Lee, et al., 2011; Smith, 2005) rather than leadership styles of distant managers and leaders. Leadership studies in child welfare did not seriously take the critical roles of distant leaders into account. Recently the child welfare workforce started paying attention to the development of leadership competencies at all levels of agencies (Bernotavicz, McDaniel, Brittain, & Dickinson, 2013). This study supports these recent trends.

While child welfare agencies cannot intervene in workers’ turnover intention that have personal reasons for leaving, agencies can take actions to improve the issues of leadership styles and workplace conditions to prevent turnover intention. According to the findings in the study, organizational interventions can be undertaken to improve worker’s commitment to the agencies and to prevent worker’s thoughts of leaving the agencies. Transformational leadership theory holds that leader behaviors and skills are not innate characteristics but can be achievable by training (Avolio, et al., 1999; Bass & Riggio, 2006; Caringi et al., 2008). Thus, child welfare agencies can engage two techniques to promote transformational leadership styles. First, child welfare agencies can hire leaders who demonstrate transformational leadership styles. The agencies can establish and apply the standards to reflect the four characteristics of transformational leadership: candidates who place the groups’ (organizations) common goals before their self-interests and inspire, motivate, and care for their follows to achieve the organizational goals. Second, child welfare agencies can provide the current leaders with training on transformational leadership styles. The state in which the current study was conducted has been providing multiple leadership trainings for the different levels of managers and supervisors from child welfare agencies. Thus, the state may be able to
revisit and update the curriculum of its training programs by adding the four dimensions of transformational leadership. In particular, transformational leadership theorists recommend that style for every level of employees (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Thus, it is recommended that the state encourage its child welfare agencies to provide training on transformational leadership at the employee level.

Limitations of the Study and Directions for Future Research

This cross-sectional study has several limitations that require special cautions to interpretation of the findings. First, this study did not randomly select the sample due to the feasibility of the research. The data collection was a part of Workforce Excellence Project in a state that purposely selected their study participants because of previous participation in leadership training. This may cause concerns to make the findings of study generalizable to other states as well as to all public child welfare agencies. Therefore, the findings of this study cannot accurately represent the perceptions of the entire child welfare workers across the country. However, the local offices selected were widely spread out around the state, and child welfare workers from twenty-seven local offices out of 89 (over 30%) responded to the survey. Future research on this subject can design a random sampling strategy to apply the findings to the entire population.

Second, the measurement tools used in this study raise some concerns. Because this study used existing scales for both independent variables and a dependent variable, this study ran only reliability tests but not validity tests. Even though the reliability values were higher than acceptable levels, some of the results caused some concerns of the actual differences between organizational culture and organizational climate. While previous research demonstrated that the two variables were measuring different scopes of
organizational conditions and tested them in child welfare settings, the results in this study seemed to reveal that they shared common aspects (Shim, 2010). However, this issue did not seriously affect the main hypothesis of the current research. Nevertheless, future research should examine whether or not the measurement of organizational culture and climate are different component of work conditions in child welfare agencies.

Third, transformational leadership is a relatively new concept in social work, including child welfare. Social work, let alone child welfare field, has paid little attention to implementing training built upon transformational leadership theory. In addition, leadership training provided to the local office directors by National Child Welfare Workforce Institute was aimed at adaptive leadership theory that incorporates some of the transformational constructs. Moreover, child welfare lacks research on the roles of distant leaders in turnover intention. However, this study chose a specific leadership style, transformational leadership, to test effects of leaders on turnover intention. Thus, rather than using one specific leadership style, a future study could conduct a comparison study among multiple leadership styles, such as adaptive leadership, servant leadership, and distributive leadership, on the turnover intention of child welfare workers. Then, future research can identify a leadership style best fit for child welfare agencies.

Fourth, some of the independent variables such as leadership and organizational conditions are organizational level data for which multilevel analysis is more appropriate. However, this study ran individual-level analyses because the preliminary analysis showed that turnover intent was not different within agencies. The preliminary analysis found that individual perceptions of transformational leadership and organizational culture, climate, and commitment were significantly different between agencies. The
findings might have been due to the small sample size. Therefore, future research should benefit the multilevel analysis for a more complete understanding of the effects of organizational level variables such as leadership styles, organizational culture, organizational climate, and organizational commitment.

Finally, low response rate could have had a serious impact on the results of this research to capture the picture of workers’ turnover intention since only 214 cases were used in data analysis out of 1,048 (25%) caseworkers recruited via their local office directors. Although the demographic information of this study shared very similar characteristics to research report conducted to the entire population in the same state, the caseworkers who did not respond to the survey might be different from those who participated in the study in some of key aspects of this study such as transformational leadership and turnover intention. Thus, future research needs to make an effort for improving the sample size and the response rate.

Despite the several limitations, this study examined effects of transformational leadership style of the local office managers (distance leaders) on child welfare workers’ turnover intention as well as the organizational environments. The findings demonstrated the importance of leaders in child welfare agencies, which in turn drew attention to more research on the effects of transformational leadership in child welfare. Therefore, this study contributes to developing some strategies to prevent turnover intention in child welfare such as providing leaders with training built upon transformational leadership theory and identification tools for recruiting transformational leaders.
Appendix A: Survey Questionnaire

Child Welfare Case Worker Survey

Thank you for your willingness to share some of your thoughts about work in Child Welfare. The following survey asks some questions about what you believe TODAY about work in the Child Welfare area. Please feel free to answer honestly. (Only the research team will have access to your confidential responses.)

First, we would like to ask you about general information regarding yourself and your work.

1. Gender: Female_____ Male_____ Other_____

2. What is your age? _______

3. What degrees have you earned so far: BSW_____ MSW_________ Other bachelor’s (specify major)_________
   master’s (specify major)________

4. How long have you been employed at DCS: __________

5. What is your job position (or job title)?
   ■ Caseworker (Case manager)       ■ Supervisor       ■ Manager       ■ Other___________

   5-1. If you are a supervisor, have you received LAS training?       ■ Yes       ■ No

   5-2. If you are a manager, have you received LAMM or CWMII training?
   ■ Leadership Academy for Middle Managers       ■ Child Welfare Management Innovative Institute
6. How long have you been in your current position? _________________

7. We ask you to rate your Director on the following. Please rate how frequently each statement fits the person you are describing.

Use the following rating scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THE PERSON I AM RATING... (FOR YOUR DIRECTOR)</th>
<th>Not at all 1</th>
<th>Once in a while 2</th>
<th>Sometimes 3</th>
<th>Fairly often 4</th>
<th>Frequently, if not always 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Re-examines critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Talks about their most important values and beliefs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Talks optimistically about the future.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Instills pride in me for being associated with him/her.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Talks enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Specifies the importance of having a strong sense of purpose.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Spends time teaching and coaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Goes beyond self-interest for the good of the group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Treats me as an individual rather than just as a member of a group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Acts in ways that builds my respect.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Considers the moral and ethical consequences of decisions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Displays a sense of power and confidence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Considers me as having different needs, abilities, and aspirations from others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Gets me to look at problems from many different angles.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Helps me to develop my strengths</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Suggests new ways of looking at how to complete assignments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Emphasizes the importance of having a collective sense of mission.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Expresses confidence that goals will be achieved.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**8. Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements about your agency:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree 1</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree 2</th>
<th>Agree 4</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree 3</th>
<th>Strongly agree 5</th>
<th>Somewhat agree 6</th>
<th>Strongly disagree 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this organization be successful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I talk up this organization to my friends as a great organization to work for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I feel very little loyalty to this organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working for this organization.
5. I find that my values and the organization’s values are very similar.
6. I am proud to tell others that I am part of this organization.
7. I could just as well be working for a different organization as long as the type of work were similar.
8. This organization really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance.
9. It would take very little change in my present circumstances to cause me to leave this organization.
10. I am extremely glad that I chose this organization to work for, over others I was considering at the time I joined.
11. There’s not too much to be gained by sticking with this organization indefinitely.
12. Often, I find it difficult to agree with this organization’s policies on important matters relating to its employees.
13. I really care about the fate of this organization.
14. For me this is the best of all possible organizations for which to work.
15. Deciding to work for this organization was a definite mistake on my part.
9. Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements about your agency:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I would have a hard time finding another child welfare job at a different agency.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I plan to leave this agency as soon as possible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I have too much time invested at this agency to leave.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I expect to still be working at this agency in 5 years.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I am committed to staying at this agency.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I would gain little from switching to another child welfare agency.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements about your agency:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. There are clear measures of success and progress indicators for work with client</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. My work uses client focused interventions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. There is a “can do” attitude among co-workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. My work uses helping strategies that work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I have the support to make work-related decision when appropriate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. My professional opinions are respected in my agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. My agency is committed to my personal safety in the office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. My agency is committed to my personal safety in the field</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. The initial orientation to my job was adequate

10. I am prepared for my job because of my prior training and education

11. There is a good fit between training and the demands of my job

12. The work has the right level of challenge

13. We have computer technologies that make the job easier and better

14. I receive support and recognition from supervisor

15. I receive support and recognition from co-workers

16. I have a good relationship with my client

17. Clients regularly succeed in reaching goals

18. I receive support and recognition from clients

19. My work offers opportunities to ensure the safety and well-being of client

20. In my agency, there is more emphasis on the quality of the services than on the number of clients served

21. The support staff in the agency is adequate

22. The agency provides the resources I need to help families and children

23. I have adequate legal support at my disposal.

24. The agency helps me to implement best practice

25. Training provided by the agency is helpful to my work
26. Training provided by the state is helpful to my work

27. There are clear and effective incentives and rewards for a job well done

28. There is a good fit between my personal life and work life

29. There is a good fit between my family life and work life

30. This job fits with my career goals

31. The pay is sufficient

32. The benefits are sufficient

11. Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements about your agency:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. There are clear job expectations and performance standards for my work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Interviews for the agency give prospective workers an accurate picture of the work and the agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I am able to distinguish between local rules and state regulations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Cases are assigned in a fair manner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The agency's purpose is clear to me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The work reflects the agency's purpose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. In my work, I have a feeling of success and accomplishment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. My work offers opportunities to make a difference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>My work offers opportunities for improving knowledge and skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>The agency is respected in my community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>When my co-workers are successful, I feel successful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>When outsiders attack my agency, I feel they are attacking me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>I would recommend my agency to others seeking employment in child welfare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>All in all, I feel good about what my agency does for children and families</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>On the whole, I have sufficient emotional energy for the job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>There is a good fit between my job and my personal health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>On the whole, I am able to do my job and not burnout</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>My work offers schedule flexibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>On-call demands are reasonable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>The amount of paperwork is reasonable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>The computer systems used to track families are user friendly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>The computer systems make my work easier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Uniform Case Records are helpful in day to day casework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Uniform Case Records are helpful in my work with clients</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>The workload is reasonable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>In the agency, work processes are efficient and streamlined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you!
Appendix B: Study Information Sheet

INDIANA UNIVERSITY STUDY INFORMATION SHEET FOR

[Workforce Excellence Evaluation]

You are invited to participate in a research study of workforce excellence evaluation.

You were selected as a possible subject because you are a case manager in one of DCS agencies. We ask that you read this form and ask any questions you may have before agreeing to be in the study.

The study is being conducted by Dr. Vernon, Robert, Dr. Pierce, Barbara and Taekyung Park from Indiana University School of Social Work (IUSSW). It is funded by National Child Welfare Workforce Institute.

STUDY PURPOSE

The purpose of this study is to evaluate the impact of workforce excellence project. DCS has provided diverse trainings for the employees, including supervisors and directors, and implemented evidence-based practice to improve stable workforce in child welfare agency. This study will compare the agencies that received or did not receive the interventions for workforce excellence with regard to work environment, leadership, and employees’ work attitude.

PROCEDURES FOR THE STUDY:

If you agree to be in the study, you will do the following things:

- Complete a questionnaire about your perceptions of work and agency environment.
- No identifying data will be collected in the questionnaire.
- The survey will take no more than 30 minutes.

**RISKS AND BENEFITS**

The risk of participating in this research is being uncomfortable answering the survey questions.

There is also a risk of loss of confidentiality.

You are not expected to benefit from participating in this research.

**CONFIDENTIALITY**

Every effort will be made to keep your personal information confidential. We cannot guarantee absolute confidentiality. Your personal information may be disclosed if required by law. Your identity will be held in confidence in reports in which the study may be published and databases in which results may be stored. Electronic data collected will be stored in password protected computer and be secured by placing in a locked cabinet of Principal Investigator. Hard data collected through paper pencil survey will be stored in a locked cabinet of Principal Investigator which will be accessed by only members of research team.

**Investigator (PI) with no access by unauthorized people**

Organizations that may inspect and/or copy your research records for quality assurance and data analysis include groups such as the study investigator and his/her research associates, the Indiana University Institutional Review Board and (as allowed by law) state or federal agencies, specifically the Office for Human Research Protections (OHRP), the National Cancer Institute (NCI) [for research funded or supported by NCI], the National Institutes of Health (NIH) [for research funded or supported by NIH], etc., who may need to access your medical and/or research records.
PAYMENT

You will not receive payment for taking part in this study. Researchers have no financial interest or gain in this study.

CONTACTS FOR QUESTIONS OR PROBLEMS

For questions about the study, contact the researcher Taekyung Park.

For questions about your rights as a research participant or to discuss problems, complaints or concerns about a research study, or to obtain information, or offer input, contact the IU Human Subjects Office at (317) 278-3458 or [for Indianapolis] or (812) 856-4242 [for Bloomington] or (800) 696-2949.

VOLUNTARY NATURE OF STUDY

Taking part in this study is voluntary. You may choose not to take part or may leave the study at any time. Leaving the study will not result in any penalty or loss of benefits to which you are entitled. Your decision whether or not to participate in this study will not affect your current or future relations with IUSSW.

This research is intended for individual 18 years of age or older. If you are under age 18, do not complete the survey.
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